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A FEW PURĀNIC PASSAGES AND VIEWS WRONGLY UNDERSTOOD BY MODERN SCHOLARS

By
RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

We sometimes come across glaring mistakes in the translations (or explanations) of Purānic passages in the works written by modern scholars. Erroneous views on Purānic matters are also found in these works. In the following pages a few examples of wrong translations and views are given to draw the attention of scholars interested in Purānic studies. These examples would show that a sound knowledge of Sanskrit as well as of Purānic tradition is essential for carrying fruitful research in the Purāṇas (Epics are included in the Purāṇas).

(1) A wrong observation on an expression of the Vāyu-purāṇa

Referring to the names of measures (especially land measures) as given in some of the Purāṇas, Wilson observes: “The Vāyu-purāṇa giving similar measurements upon the authority of Manu (मनोवर्णिनि प्रमाणानि), although such a statement does not occur in the Manusānt-hitā, adds that...” (Viṣṇupurāṇa, p. 40; footnote no. 6 on the verse 1.6.19; pub. Punthi Pustaka, Calcutta).

According to us the aforesaid observation of Wilson is wrong, as it is based on a reading of the Vāyu-purāṇa which is evidently corrupt.

The relevant Vāyu-verses as printed (Anandasrama ed.) are:

चक्रस्वयं यथाप्रच्छ मिल्य सम्बलमोनोत्सुवः।
मनोवर्णिनि प्रमाणानि तदा प्रमूलि च चिक्रं ॥१०११
यथा ज्ञानप्रेध्वमयीनु हस्तक्षिप्तनिनयि च ।

(8.101-102a)

It is a pity that a Purānic scholar like Wilson failed to realize that the printed reading मनोवर्णिनि प्रमाणानि is highly corrupt (as shown below). Since the printed reading bears no sense, it is useless to draw any conclusion from it.

(2) A wrongly conceived name of the descendants of Druhyu, the son of Yayāti

Wilson writes: “The Mahābhārata says that the descendants of Druhyu are the Vaibhojas, a people unacquainted with the use of cars or beasts of burden and who travel on rafts. They have no kings” (Viṣṇupurāṇa, 4. 18, p. 354).

It can be easily understood that in the expression मनोवर्णिनि प्रमाणानि the word मनोवर्णिनि must be taken as an adjective qualifying the noun प्रमाणानि (measures). The word मनोवर्णिनि can be taken as an adjective if it is regarded as an example of Bahuvrihi compound bearing the sense of मन: अर्थ: नेत्र ताति र। Do these words express any sense in connection with measures? What purpose is served by the word manas (mind)? No meaning of the word artha (namely prayojana, vastu, abhidheya, etc.) suits the context.

It is evidently clear that had the aforesaid expression contained the word मनु, it would have assumed the form मनवर्णिनि (in Bahuvrihi compound) meaning ‘those whose artha is Manu’. Does the word मनोवर्णिनि yield any sense? It is absurd to think that the sage Manu is an artha (in any of its senses recorded in the lexicons) of the measures. Even if we take the expression as a non-compound word and read it as मनोवर्णिनि प्रमाणानि we do not get rid of the absurdity, for there is no sense in saying that ‘the measures are the arthas of Manu’.

All these tend to prove that the printed reading is corrupt and it requires to be corrected.

If we compare the aforesaid Vāyu passage with the similar passages in other Purāṇas, it would appear that the printed reading मनोवर्णिनि प्रमाणानि must be corrected to मनोवर्णिनि प्रमाणानि (निक्रे) meaning ‘they conceived (or standardized or fixed) measures for the purpose of measuring things’. It is needless to say that this is the only reading which yields sense and suits the context.

1. मनोवर्णिनि प्रमाणानि (Brahmāṇḍa–p. I. 7.95; Dev.-purāṇa 72.14); मनोवर्णिनि प्रमाणानि तास्तु पूवं निक्रे (Mārkaṇḍeya–p. 49.36; तः refers to प्रमाणि).
The above account is based on Adi-p. 85.34 (दृत्रोऽणु सृवति) and Adi-p. 84.21-22 (सत्ताब्जपमुख्यनांविवेकः वराणोऽणुवति लो निहृत्य प्रास्यति सान्याः).

It is highly lamentable that a scholar like Wilson thought that the word Vaibhoga could be the basis of the passage प्रायः. There is not the slightest doubt that in Adi-p. 85.34 is an indeclinable and that gratifying to note that Bhojas as the descendants of Druhyu have been mentioned in Matsya-p. Viśqpurāṇa (3).

(3) A Wrong rendering of yuga in Viśqpurāṇa 2.3.52
While dealing with the life of Bharata (Jaḍabharata) the Viśqpurāṇa says:

यद्ही जडामति: सोमण युधिताधारलोककोनसः
कुत्रु: मतिमतां श्रेयशत्वन्य त्वक्ति ययाः
(2.3.52).

Wilson translates सुधामतानलपलनसस्ततानुयुक्तम् as ‘fixing his eyes upon the pole’ (p. 200). Here yuga has been taken in the sense of a pole, which in the present context means ‘the long rounded piece of wood attached to the palanquin (fībi̇taka) of the king.’

Though apparently there is no difficulty or impossibility in gazing the pole of the palanquin by Bharata, who was one of those who carried the palanquin, yet this sense does not seem to be appropriate, if we consider the two epithets (viz. मतिमतां श्रेयशत्वन्य and जडामति:) of Bharata given in the aforesaid verse. What is the relevance or coherence in saying that a person, who was the best of intelligent persons and was of stupefied mind, looked to the pole of the palanquin. Bharata was called jaḍamati on account of his being fully absorbed in meditation on the self i.e., he acted as if he were jaḍamati—in reality he was neither lunatic nor idiot. 2

2. Cf. The Śāstric statements on the nature of yogins of higher order: वालोमतिविषपायव्यु (‘काको संचचरते’ (दृत्रोऽणुसर्वुपूर्वपिनिवध् 2); वालोमतिविषपायव्यु 3.89); अनुदत्ता उन्मत्ववृत्तारसति: (भार्गवपक्राश्चकोपिनिवध्).
In the above verse *samsthìna* cannot mean destruction or dissolution, which falls under the characteristic *pratisarga*. Evidently *samsthìna* in the above verse means *sannivela*, the usual meaning of this word (Amarakoṣa 3.3.124) or *viniṣṭa* (arrangement) and it is quite reasonable to hold that *varmaññakocca* points to those chapters in the *Purāṇas* that deal with bhuvanakocca. Though the fifth characteristic of the *Purāṇas* is usually said to be *varhañṇa*-rita, yet the author of the above verse seems to include it in *vama* thinking that *vamañṇa-carita* (deeds of persons mentioned in the genealogical lists) is not quite different from *vama*.

(5) A Wrong View about the Offspring of Kubera

While dealing with the Pulastyas F. E. Pargiter says:

"Viśravas had four wives...... Devavarīṇi,...... Pushpotkāṭa,...... and Vaka and......Kaikasi. Viśravas’s son by Devavarīṇi was Kubera Vaiśravaṇa and Kubera had four sons Nalakūbara, Rāvaṇa Kumbhakarṇa and Vibhiṣaṇa and a daughter Śūrpanakhā" (Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p. 241).

A perusal of the *Purāṇas* reveals that the view of Pargiter is based on a wrong understanding of the relevant *Purāṇic* passages. While it is correct to state that Viśravas had four wives, it is wrong to say that Kubera had four sons, named Rāvaṇa etc. and a daughter named Śūrpanakhā.

Pargiter informs us that the account of the Pulastya dynasty is found in the five *Purāṇas*, namely the Vaiṣṇava-p., Brahmana-p., Liṅga-p., Kūrma-p., Padma-p., and the Bhāgavata-p.

Let us consider the relevant passage of the Vaiṣṇava-p which reads:

अदबलो कुबेरोजजननं विचुल तन्कूवकसं।
रावण कुमारकृष्ठः कन्यां शृणुततः तथा।
विभीषणजयतः कृष्णयजननं सुतुनः।

(70.41)

8. Pargiter spells it with a dental n, which is wrong. There must be a cerebral n in this word according to Pāṇinian sūtra पर्यप्रमः संज्ञायायात् (8.4.3). If the word is taken in its derivative sense (a woman having fingernails like winnowing basket) it must be spelt with a dental n.

(6) A Wrongly Rendered Verse of the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa

Pargiter translated Mārkaṇḍeya-p. 10.31 as follows:

"Hence O father, I will abandon this wellknown series of pains .... and I will depart. Does not the duty enjoined by the three Vedas, which abound in unrighteousness, resemble the result of sin"? (Fn.—Prof. Monier-Williams gives वर्णम as masculine only).

The reading of the verse (in the Jīvanānanda edition of 1879) is as follows:

तस्माद गायायामः तस्माद लक्ष्मिनः हुम्हस्ततिमनः।
वेविधमवत्सराः किम्याप्फलस्ततिमनः।

The above translation and the footnote show that (1) Pargiter took the word किम् as a separate word indicating a question and considered पापफलस्ततिमन as one word and that (2) he considered the second line an independent sentence since he took त्रयी-dharma as a word which should have been used in the masculine gender (dharma being a masculine word).
All of these views of Pargiter are untenable as the following consideration would show:

It is astonishing that though the verse as printed contains no negative particle, yet Pargiter translated it as if it were negative in sense. (Mark the expression ‘does not’).

The genuineness of the reading किंपकाकस्यनिर्मम्य as highly doubtful. As the word पःःःः itself signifies क्षेप (censure) it is useless to make it compounded with किम according to the Pāṇinian sūtra 2.1.64 (किम: क्षेप).

The proper reading of the fourth foot of the verse is किंपकाक-कस्यनिर्मम्य as clearly appears from the following works which quote this verse mentioning the मार्कण्डेय-पुराण as its source:

(i) The bhasya by Vījñānabhinī on Śāmkhya-sūtra 1.6 (with the reading नवृत्तम् नुसरतिनिमित्तम्); (ii) the comm. by Nāgēśa on Śāmkhya-sūtra 1.6 (with the same reading as found in Bhikhu’s bhasya); (iii) the comm. Vidvatāsīṇī by Bālarāma Īḍāna on Śām. Kā 2 (with the reading नवृत्तम् नुसरतिनिमित्तम्); (iv) the comm. Tattvavībhākara on Śām. Kā 2 (with the reading नवृत्तम् नुसरतिनिमित्तम्).

Since किम्पका is a tasteless fruit,9 trayādharma has been rightly compared to it.10 The fruit is said to be poisonous though it is similar to mangoes in colour and smell (vide Jātaka in Bengali, p. 180 ed. by Ṣaṇacandra Ghoṣa). Nāgēśa takes it to be the same as the निम्ब (comm. on Śām. Sū. 1.6), while according to others it is the mahātālaphala.

In the above verse यात्रायम्म्म is the object of लय्यात्रा. We are not going to say here anything about the reading of the words नवृत्तम् नुसरतिनिमित्तम् or नुसरतिनिमित्तम्, or about the process of construing these words with the other words in the verse.

(7) A wrong rendering of the word सागराः in the मार्कण्डेय-पुराण

Mārkāṇḍeya-p. 21.85b-86 read:

(8) A wrong view about the character of the word अग्निः in मार्कण्डेय-प. 84.8

The Mārkāṇḍeya-p. reads:

While rendering the above verse Pargiter translates अग्निः as ‘thou studies’ (according to him अग्निः is the form in active voice) and remarks that the use of the root अग्निः as अत्मानपदिन is rare (‘atmanepada, which seems rare’).

A consideration of the above verse would show that the sentence is in passive voice, the agent being गुरुयोग्यतायत्ववाय (वन्म:), and as such the root अग्निः is required to be used in its अत्मान-
A wrong meaning of अष्टाधिकांश in Kûrma—p. 1.12.196

The Kûrma-purâṇa contains 1008 names of Devî in the 12th chapter of its first part. After enumerating these names the Purâṇa uses the expression नानाम婆र्तकसहस्रादि in 1.12.196.

While dealing with this Purâṇa Dr. Winternitz takes the word अष्टाधिकांश as meaning ‘eight thousand’ (History of Indian Literature, Vol. I, part II, p. 503). Since this chapter of the Purâṇa contains 1008 names, the word अष्टाधिकांश must be taken in the sense of अष्टाधिकांशसहस्रादि (8+1000=1008). Had Winternitz taken the trouble to go through the chapter he would not have committed such a glaring mistake.

A wrong rendering of a Devibhâgavata verse

The Devibhâgavata (2.6.7) reads:

इति श्रवः स्वयम् ये भाये गाज्यानि सेवकि तथा।
हििििा च तथा श्रवः गाज्यानि सेवकि प्रतिििरि॥

Dr. R. C. Hazra thinks that the aforesaid verse speaks of ‘Dhṛtarāṣṭra’s marriage with Gandhāri and Saubali’ (Studies in the Upapuruṣas, vol. II p. 289).

Evidently the view is wrong. The verse simply says that Dhṛtarāṣṭra had two wives: one belonged to the Gandhāra country (or was the offspring of the king of Gandhāra) and was the daughter of Subala and the other was a woman of the Vaiśya caste. That Dhṛtarāṣṭra married the daughter of Subala, king of the Gandhāra country, has been stated in the Mbh. Adi-parvan, ch. 110. The word subalātmajā has been used for this lady in 110.9.

It appears that the words हे श्रवः in the first half of the above verse created the mistaken idea that Gandhāri and Saubali were the names of the two wives of Dhṛtarāṣṭra. The use of the words हिििा and तथा in the second half however clearly shows that the idea is wrong. That the second wife of Dhṛtarāṣṭra belonged to the Vaiśya caste is stated in the Mahâbhârata (Adi-p. 114.42-44).

A wrong translation of a verse of the Bhaviṣya-purâṇa

The Utsargamāyukha (p.16) of N.lakaṇṭha and the Rajadharmakaustubha (p. 183) of Anantadeva quote the following verse from the Bhaviṣya-purâṇa:

7
The aforequoted verse is Bhaviya-p. Uttara 128.11 with the readings विक्रमस्य विज्ञाना श्वरयात्रा या नित्यात्र क्षयात्।

It has been translated by Dr. Kane as: “He who plants either one Asvattha, or one Picumarda, or one Nyagrodha, or ten Tintidlis, (5) one Kapittha, (6) one Bilva and (7) one Amalaka or plants five mango trees would not see hell” (H. Dh. S. II, p. 895).

According to us the above translation is wrong. The verse undoubtedly speaks of a person who is a पार्च्यार (lit. a planter of five mangoes) and says what constitute पार्च्यार (in the first three lines). Thus it is quite logical to think that all the fruits mentioned here are collectively called पार्च्यार.

The fruits are: (1) one Asvattha, (2) one Picumarda, (3) one Nyagrodha, (4) ten Tintidlis, (5) one Kapittha, (6) one Bilva and (7) one Amalaka.

Apparantly it seems to be quite illogical to think that seven kinds of fruits (having a total number of 16) are called by the name पार्च्यार. According to ancient teachers the use of पार्च्यार in this sense is however no fault as the word is a संज्ञा. It is not necessary for a संज्ञा to describe the character of the संज्ञा in a precise way. As for example we may consider the संज्ञा Navaratra (the name of a worship). It literally means ‘having nine nights’. Though this worship sometimes lasts for eight nights (if there is तिथिवस्त्रो) or for ten nights (if there is तिथिवस्त्रो), yet there is no fault in naming the festival ‘Navaratra’ (Puruṣarthacintamāni, p. 61).

16. The verse is also found in Varaha-p. 172.39 (with the readings विक्रमस्य, दश नवयात्रा; हें तथा शाहिसतावलिङ्गे, वष्णवारोपी; cr.ed. 170.36); in Padma-p. 6.243.97 (with the readings दश तित्तिष्ठीम, नर्कम् न पश्चात्); in Padma-p. 5.243.97 (with the readings विक्रमस्य, दश तित्तिष्ठीम, नर्कम् न पश्चात्).

17. नायनकलो वैतानस्तुत्तोक्तायाम् संहितानिलो। वाराहिकरणेषु: कल्पः शान्तिक्लेप: प्रथमः। (Vāyu-p. 61.54; Brahmāṇḍa-p. 1.33. 61b–62a). नायनकलो वैदानां संहितानां तथेव च। वराहिकरणेषु: शान्तिक्लेपः: कल्पः शान्तिक्लेपः प्रथमः। (Viṣṇu-p. 3.6.14b–15a).
Angirasa kalpa is connected with abhicāra; it prescribes mūraṇa, mohana, uccētana, videṣaya, stambhana and valikaraṇa. That part of the Atharva Veda which deals with abhicāra is said to have been seen by the sage Angirasa.

Now we are going to show the invalidity of the explanation of sivasa kalpa as given by Dr. Kane. It is impossible to construe sivasa (a word with the third case-ending) with ctiṣṭa. Even if sivasa is changed into siva no useful purpose is served. Moreover there is no authority for taking sivasa as referring to the Atharvasiras Upaniṣad. Again, if sivasa is taken to be the name of an Upaniṣad, the use of the word kalpa with it becomes highly objectionable. Since the Nakṣatra kalpa and the other three kalpas are not the names of any Upaniṣads, the Angirasa kalpa cannot reasonably be taken as the name of an Upaniṣad unless there are strong grounds to hold so.

(14) A wrong meaning of the word yamalarjunau

The Mañameyodaya of Nārāyaṇa reads:

समाने जापि वुता: कस्य कुमारसिद्धिवित: ||
नलकृप-मणिप्रीवी : असतुर्यलामाजुनी ||

(p. 152)

Mr. S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri and Dr. Kunham Raja translate the second half as: As the yamala and the arjuna trees stood Nalakūpa and Manigrīva.

From the translation it appears that the translators took yamalarjuna as denoting two distinct trees—one called Yamala and the other called Arjuna.

To take yamalarjuna in the aforesaid sense is evidently wrong. The second line of the above verse undoubtedly refers to the Tamalarjuna-bhāgā episode connected with the life of the child śrīdhara. The commentator śrīdhara bhāṣya means अनिभाराबिद्धि, “निभाराबिद्धि वैभवो भूतानाः सत्यव न। चौधुरः श्वारामिन्द्राः श्वारामिन्द्राः पवित्रः। ॥ २। तत्वाविद्यानि कल्य मकरणिमणि सविनिमणि । अभिभाराबिद्धिन्म निभाराबिद्धिन्म सविनिमणि ॥ ६। (Nāraṇāya-p. 1.51 2, 6).

(15) A wrong view about the name of the city Gajasāhvaya

Anugāta 36.51 (=Āsvamedha-p. 51.51) reads:

इत्युत्तकतवर्ज्ञी क्रुद्ध कृतक्रुद्ध धनक्रुद्ध: ||
गच्छो नगर क्रुद्ध गजसाह्वयस्मि वे ||

Shri K. T. Telang has rendered Gajasāhvaya in this verse by ‘the city of Gajasa’ and has stated in the footnote that it is the same as Hastināpura, the capital of the Pāṇḍavas (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. VIII, p. 394).

According to us it is utterly wrong to think that Gajasāhvaya is the city of Gajasa, i.e. the city named Gajasa.

From some of the statements of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas it is fairly clear that the city of Hastināpura was founded by king Hastin, a descendant of king Duṣyanta, and it was also called by the name Gajasāhvaya (gaja being a synonym of hastin) and by the names of similar character, namely Nagasahvaya and Vāraṇāśivaya (nāga and nāraṇa being the synonyms of hastin).

18. The Bṛhadāraṇyāk-p. (10.10.24) reads नत्तूकर्मणिमीत्रावासास्माद हरिऊणामाजुनी। It appears that since the first foot is metrically defective (on account of having nine syllables), the name नत्तूकर्म was changed into नत्तूक। Since कृद्ध and कृद्ध are not synonyms this change in the name is objectionable. Examples of anusṭubh verses with नत्तूकर्मणिः are sometimes found in Purānic verses, especially in those verses that contain proper names.
Commentators have shown grammatical correctness of the words Gajasahvaya and Nagasahvaya. It is an example of Hastinapuram (Mbh. 16) A wrong rendering of the name in the form of Hastinam puram or Hastinapuram (Mbh. Sabha-p. 1.16) in which Hastina is to be taken in the sense of 'founded by king Hastin'.

(16) A wrong rendering of Viṣṇupurāṇa 1.2.25

Viṣṇupurāṇa 1.2.25 reads:

प्रकृति संस्कृतिः व्यक्तित्वलक्षणे तु यदु

तस्मात् प्रकृतसंस्कृतीमुद्ध्ये प्रतिसंवर

It has been translated by Dr. Dasgupta as: "As all manifested things had returned to the parkṛti at the time of the last dissolution, the prakṛtī is called pratiṣāṇcara" (H. I. P. III, p. 497).

The translation is wrong as the following consideration would show. The verse is on dissolution (pratiṣāṇcara). It says that on account of the fact as stated in the first half of this verse (cp the word tasmat) this (ayam) kind of dissolution (pratiṣāṇcara) is called (ucyate) by the name prakṛta (prakṛtasaṃjña). Prakṛtasaṃjña means one whose sādhja (name) is prakṛta (prakṛtajñāna: prakṛta: sādja: nāma: vṛttam).

It is to be noted here clearly that the verse does not say anything about prakṛti (as is thought by the translator) but about pratiṣāṇcara, precisely the prakṛta form of pratiṣāṇcara. It is well-known that the Purāṇas speak of four kinds of pralaṣy or pratiṣāṇcara, namely nitya, naimittika, prakṛta or prakṛti and ātyantika.

19. गजेन सर्वत्राः बालोऽन्मयं नाम वस्य (Śridhara on Bhāgavata 1.4.6);

20. A similar use of स is to be found in the words व्यक्तित्वलक्षण (Mahābhāṣya 8.3.72) and बुद्धीसार (Vyāsabhāṣya 2.5).

21. In the sense of हरिनम: पृ:; the usual form is हरिपुरम.

22. For the Purānic description of pralaya, see Brahma-p. 231-233; Viṣṇu-p. 6. 3-7; Kūrma-p. 2. 45-46; Mārkaṇḍeya-p. 46; Vāyu-p. 100-102; Agni-p. 368-382; Garuḍa-p. 215-217; Bhāgavata-p. 12. 4; Brahmapuṣpa-p. 3. 1-3.

Dr. Dasgupta has failed to notice that in none of the Purāṇas prakṛti is called pratiṣāṇcara. He should know that most of the Purāṇas describe the prakṛta form of pratiṣāṇcara more or less in the same way as is found in the Viṣṇupurāṇa so far as the essential character of pratiṣāṇcara is concerned. The commentator has explained the verse clearly. He takes pratiṣāṇcara not in the sense of the preceding dissolution but all past dissolutions (prātītāphorāṃ)

It is remarkable to note that though Dr. Dasgupta has failed to understand the verse, Wilson has translated it correctly (...,‘that dissolution is termed elemental, prakṛta, p. 11).

(17) A wrong rendering of Viṣṇupurāṇa 1.2.30

यथा सन्निधिमात्रेण गम्भ: कोम्भाय जाः

मनसो निष्कृत्व: वातु तथातो परस्मयः

This has been translated by Dr. S. N. Dasgupta as: "His (Parameśvara's) proximity alone is sufficient to produce the disturbance leading to creation; just as an odorous substance produces sensation of odour by its proximity without actually modifying the mind" (H. I. P. vol. III, p. 498).

This translation shows that (i) Dr. Dasgupta does not construe manas: with kṣobha, i. e., he does not construe the words in the verse to make a sentence like यथा गम्भ: कोम्भाय जाः मनसो निष्कृतवाच तथातो परस्मयः and that (ii) he takes the word उपकृतवाच in the sense of the act of modifying.

Both of the above views are manifestly wrong. The context shows that the verse must be construed as: यथा गम्भ: सन्निधिमात्रेण मनसः कोम्भाय जाः न हु उपकृतवाच तथा अत्यंतिपरस्मयः (सर्वंकिल्ले सन्निधिमात्रेण प्राप्त वृष्ण) च योग्यमात्रः, न हु उपकृतवाच).

Thus the verse means to say that Parameśvara causes kṣobha (agitation, disturbance) in prakṛti and puruṣa not through any kind of agency but through his proximity. The purpose of using this simile is to show that Parameśvara does not exert any effort in the act of disturbing puruṣa and prakṛti.
The commentator Śrīdhara is in favour of the meaning of the verse as shown by us. He explains उपकर्तुः by तद्वर्तकर्तुकारित्व. The Śaṅkara teacher Bhāskara has quoted this verse as from the Viṣṇupurāṇa with the introductory remarks क्रियाविनियमतः कथाविकारायेदुधिक्षारामायण (Bhāṣya on Latitāsahasranāma p. 66, on the name निर्णया).\(^{28}\)

(18) A wrong view about Pāru, son of king Yayāti

Vācaspati says in his Tattvavaiśārādi : तथा चीरोऽवाहिता पूरी योवनसम्पत्ता (on Vyāsabhāṣya 2.42). The sentence has been rendered by Woods as : As was said by Yayāti when he conferred youth upon his (father) Pāru.\(^{24}\)

Woods deliberately used the word 'father' (which does not exist in the comm.) with a view to indicating the relation between Pāru and Yayāti. It is highly unfortunate that Woods erred in indicating such a wellknown relation. That Yayāti was the father of Pāru has been stated in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas; vide Adi-p. 83.10; Matsya-p. 32.9-15; Vāyu-p. 93.16-17; Bhāgavata-p. 9.18.33; Viṣṇu-p. 4.10.6; Liṅga-p. 1.66.66; Brahma-p. 12.6; Brahmapurāṇa-p. 2.68.16.

It is a matter of great regret that in his Hindi annotations on the Vyāsabhāṣya the Indian scholar Suresa Candrā Śrīvāstvavya committed the same mistake as done by Woods.\(^{25}\)

(19) A wrong view about the name of the wife Yati, son of king Nahuṣa

It is stated in the Purāṇa Index by V. R. Ramacandra Diksitar that Yati, the eldest son of Nahuṣa, married Gā, daughter of Kakutstha (s. v. Yati).

The Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa passages referred to in this connection, read काकुष्ठस्य उष्णा नाम लेवे वलितावर (Vāyu. 93.14 Brahmāṇḍa, 3.68.13).\(^{26}\) It appears that Shri Diksitar took Gām as the accusative singular of Gā. Though grammatically the form is correct, yet in fact the name must be taken as Go (the accusative singular form of which is also Gām) and not Gā, which is a meaningless word.

It is to be noted in this connection that while the word Gā as a name is found in none of the Purāṇas, the name Go is often found in these works. As for example (i) one of the Pitrkanyas was called Go (A. I. H. T., p. 69); (ii) Go was the name of the wife of king Brahmadatta (तति मायेमाय भागवती-प. 9.21.25).

(20) A wrong view about Bhārata, the Purāṇic name of India

R. D. Karmarkar in his paper entitled 'The original name of India' writes : "According to Brahmapurāṇa, however, the name Bhārata is after Bharata (son of Duḥṣanta and Śakuntalā) who was a Cakravartin" (A. B. O. R. I. Vol. XXXVI, p. 117). The relevant verse quoted in the footnote is: चक्रवती वदिते जे कुत्षक्षकयो भुवनः। श्रुतलाभो भयो तय नामानु भुवनाः। (Brahma-p. 13.57). A similar view is expressed by other scholars also. J. H. Dave in his 'Immortal India' says: "Mahābhārata says that it (Hastināpura) was the capital of King Duḥṣhyanta and of his illustrious son...

23. The verse is found in the Kālika-p. (25.4) also with the reading मनोस्वरूपकारित्व (in the third foot). The reading लोककर्तुः (in the place of लोककर्तुः) is evidently corrupt.

24. Woods seems to read Pāru in the Tattvavaiśārādi passage quoted above. In fact the name is Pāru and not Pāru as may be proved by the Purāṇic passages mentioning the sons of Śarmiṣṭhā which read द्रुष्यमा नार्यमा च पूर्वमा च श्रीमिष्ठा चालयंस्वर्णी (Brahmā-p. 12.6; Vāyu-p. 93.17; Viṣṇu-p. 4.10.2; Bhāgavata-p.9.9.33; Liṅga-p. 1.66.66; Garuda-p. 139.18; Agni-p. 273.23); द्रुष्यमा नार्यमा च पूर्वमा च श्रीमिष्ठा चालयंस्वर्णी (Kūrma-p. 1.2.27); द्रुष्यमा नार्यमा च पूर्वमा च श्रीमिष्ठा चालयंस्वर्णी (Matsya-p. 32.10). There would arise metrical fault if the name is read as Pāru.
A careful reading of the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata reveals that it was not the son of king Duṣyanta after whose name our country was called Bharata but it was Bharata of the dynasty of Svāyambhuva Manu of the Svāyambhuva manvantara (Bharata, the son of Duṣyanta belonged to the Vaivasvata manvantara).

It should be clearly noted that the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata expressly state that the Bharatas (the people called Bhārata) were named after the son of a Janapada, cannot be interpreted to mean the name of a country, for the word Bharata, being not the name of a dynasty or race (kula), cannot be used in the plural number. The word Bhāratā evidently refers to a people (Bhāratā jana). Sometimes the word Bhāratam (in neuter) is used, which must be taken as the name of a dynasty or race (kula).

(21) A wrong view about a statement of the Mahābhārata

Dr. Radha Kumud Mukherjee writes: "Secondly there is a statement of the Mahābhārata (14.66-70) to the effect that there was a period of 1050 (or 1015) years between Mahāpāda's inauguration and Parīkṣit's birth which took place soon after the Bharata War." (Hindu Civilization, vol. I, p. 150).

27. The Purāṇaṣ works frequently use the form दुधम्न (from the Divādi root duṣ—दुधम्निकी दुधम्न). If the forms दुधम्न and दुधम्न are taken to be correct they may also be derived in the following manner: (i) दुध + वसू + वसत (वसत); and (ii) दुध + सत + वसत with the help of the prāśodārādi sūtra. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa speaks of वसत dūṣiṣh as दुधम्न in 13.5.4.11, which shows that Bharata's father was called दुधम्न. 28. See the initial chapters of the sec. on Bhuvanakośa in most of the Purāṇas.

29. भारताद्  भारती कीविन्दं  भारत  कुम्मु (Adiparvan 74.131); वकुलालयं  भारती  यस्य  नामा  दु  भारतम्  (Vāyu-p. 99.134).

20. There is a passage in the Skanda-purāṇa (Viṣṇukhaṇḍa, Utkalakhaṇḍa 17. 50b-51a) that the passage refers to the author of the Nātya sāstra is beyond doubt.

30. राम का क्रियाकलाप, p. 20 (It is the Hindi translation of the book originally written in Bengali by Dr. Sashi Bhusan Dasgupta.). The relevant sentence in Hindi is: भारतीय साम आदि भाषा सामवेदीक भीतरूप है.
(24) A wrong view about the number of the sub-divisions of the seven dvipas as mentioned in the Purāṇas.

Dr. Manomohan Ghosh writes: "According to the Puranic geography the world was divided into seven continents, such as Jambu, Plakṣa, Śālmali, Kuśa, Krauṭca, Śaka and Puṣkara. Each of these continents was further subdivided into nine regions..." (The Nātyaśāstra, p. 16, footnote 1).

The above view is partly wrong. That the earth was divided into seven dvipas (continents) is correct, but it is wrong to say that each of these seven dvipas was divided into nine regions (varṣas).

A careful perusal of the Purānic chapters on bhuvanakosa would reveal that (i) the Jambudvipa was subdivided into nine varṣas (regions), that (ii) the Puṣkara-dvipa was subdivided into two varṣas and that (iii) the rest of the seven dvipas, namely Plakṣa, Kuśa, Krauṭca, Śaka and Śālmali were subdivided into seven varṣas.

For the first view, see Matsya-p. 112; Vāyu-p. 37; Brahmanda-p. 2.14; Brahma p. 18; Mārkaṇḍeya-p. 53; Liṅga-p. 1.47; Bhāgavata-p. 5.16; Viśū卢-p. 2.1; Kūrma-p. 1.39; 1.44; Agni-p. 107-108; Gṛauḍa-p. 1.55; Varāha-p. 74.

The names of the nine varṣas of the Jambudvipa slightly vary in different Purāṇas. Most probably the correct forms of the names would be: Bhārata, Kimpuruṣa, Harivarṇa, Ilāvṛta, Ramyaka, Hiraṇmayā, Uttarākura, Bhadrāśva and Ketumāla.

For the second view, see Kūrma-p. 149. 1-5; Matsya-p. 123. 13-18; Viśū卢-p. 2.4. 73-78; Vāyu-p. 49. 104-110; Mārkaṇḍeya-p. 53.20-21; Brahma-p. 20 75-79; Bhāgavata-p. 5 20.31; Liṅga-p. 1.53. 25-26; Varāha-p. 88. The names of the two varṣas of the Puṣkara-dvipa are Mahavīra and Dhātaki-khaṇḍa.

(25) A wrong view about the Rāmāyaṇic description of Nandin

While speaking of the gods as described in the Rāmāyaṇa Dr. S. Radhakrishnan says that 'the new divinities of Kāma, Kubera... Nandi the bull, received prominent mention' (Indian Philosophy, I, p. 482).

(26) A wrong view about the Īśvaragītā and the Vīṣagītā

Parameswara Aiyar writes: "The names Īśvaragītā (vide Śarīramābhāṣya 2.1.14 and 2.3.45), Harigītā (Śānti-p. 346.10; 348).

32. Radhakrishnan uses the form Nandi (with a short i), which is wrong. The correct form is Nandī (stem—Nandin).
33. Śīva-p. 3.6-7; Varāha-p. 213.69-71; 144.167; Kāśikādhāra 11.108; Kūrma-p. 241. 17-42; Liṅga-p. 1.42-44; 125.3. In these passages Nandin has never been described as a bull.
34. Nandin's assuming a divine body was so well known that philosophical works refer to it while discussing the results of karman; vide Vyāsabhāṣya 2.12 (नन्दीत्र जन्ममयं भवेत् देवदेवे परिणामात्); see also Vyāsabhāṣys 2.13 and 4.3.
8, 53) and Vyāṣagītā (meaning ‘the songs of Vyāsa’) in all probability refer to the Bhagavādgītā only and no other work” (‘Imitations of the Bhagavādgītā ...’ in Cultural Heritage of India, Vol. III, p. 204-205).

I may inform the learned author that though the Gītā-verses have sometimes been quoted with the remarks ‘iti Vyāṣah’ and the like, indicating that these verses are the compositions of Vyāsa, yet the word Vyāṣagītā does not seem to have been used to refer to the Bhagavādgītā. In fact Vyāṣagītā is the name given to the several chapters in the Uttarārdha (second half) of the Kūrmapurāṇa (chaps. 12-33). No independent treatise bearing the name Vyāṣagītā is known though there is every possibility of such works.

It is true that the word Iśvaragītā often refers to the Bhagavādgītā, but it is also found as the name of the several chapters of the second half of the Kūrmapurāṇa (Chaps. 1-11). This Iśvaragītā was deemed so important that Vijāñabhikṣu, the commentator of the Śāṅkhyaśūtra and the Vyāsabhāṣya, thought it necessary to compose a commentary on it.85

A NOTE ON THE JAVANESE BRAHMĀNDA PURĀNA IN THE LIGHT OF PRASAT KANDOL DOM INSCRIPTION OF INDRAVARMAN.

By

SMT. ANAMIKA RAY

The inscription under review was originally published by G. Coedes in his monumental work Inscriptions du Cambodge. Its importance, however, was realized after it was incorporated in the Corpus of Kambuja inscriptions by R. C. Majumdar along with his learned introduction and a good number of notes and observations so very useful for the reconstruction of history and culture of Indonesia. It was discovered from Prasat Kandol Dom situated very close to Prah Ko in the province of Sutnikom. In all there are 97 verses in the inscription, of which 84 verses are composed in Sanskrit while the rest are in the local Khmer language of Kambuja. In respect of orthography, the special point which calls for notice is the doubling of ya, na and ka with a following ra in the words śṛṇya (v. 29), ṣṛṇava (v. 32) and tarkka (v. 40). Similar orthographical feature is noticeable in the Indian inscriptions of Gupta period (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III, p. 4 etc.), which possibly guided the style of the Indonesian poet.

Apparently the inscription describes the military achievements of Indravarman, who is stated to have conquered Cinadeśa, Campadeśa and Yavadvipa. But the greater part of it is devoted to the intellectual achievements of Śivasoma. The name of Śivasoma

1. This is described in v. 20 of the inscription, which runs as under: Cinacampayavadvipabhaṇḍhritattvagamastake/ Tasyajña mālatimāla nirṛttmala cumbalayate/ The word Cumbala of this verse is noteworthy. It occurs in two more inscriptions of Kambuja, viz. in verse 95 of the Ta Prohm Inscription of Jayavarman VII and in verse 86 of the Phimanaka Inscription of the same ruler. Cordier takes it to mean a kind of sweet-scented plant while Coedes derives it from Pali Cumbat and interprets it in the sense of ‘diden’. According to Majumdar, however, the word seems to be of an uncertain meaning (Inscriptions of Kambuja, p. 471, fn. 1).

35. This commentary has not been published as yet. MSS. of this comm. were seen and used by such scholars as M. M. Gopinath Kaviraj and Dr. S. N. Dasgupta; vide A Hist. of Indian Philosophy (by Dr. Dasgupta) Vol. III, p. 482).