gained good fortune by means of Rudrādhya II. 27.274;
being requested to destroy one's sins I. 82.68;
Viṣṇu was seen by II. 6.82;
named of Bilva tree; liṅga made of which was worshipped by Lakṣmi 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 Mahābhadrata, tank I. 49.60.

— w. one of the twenty-four daughters of Praśūtī and Dakśa I. 5.20;
married by Dharma Prajāpati I. 5.23;
Darpa born to I. 70.293.

Lakṣmīdāna
description of mode of making a gift of I. 36.1.

Lakṣmipati
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.

Laghī
d. 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 Gomukhāvyūha II. 27.90.

Lajjā
d. w. one of the twenty-four daughters of Praśūtī and Dakśa 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 Dākṣāvyūha II. 27.136.

—
d. w. one of the sixteen worshipped in the second enclosure of the Paitāmahāvyūha II. 27.223.
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 Stieten-cron which is far from historical reality.

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. I. 77-218.


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 Bhāmati corrected with the help of the Purāṇas.’ A second example is given here.

The Bhāmati commentary of Vācaspati reads: तयाहु रूपमिनि—को हि योगप्रभावाते अस्त्य इव समुद्र विषति स इव वष्कारण्येषु सूजित (on Sūriraka-bhāṣya 4.4.9). 2 It is clear that Vācaspati connects सूजित with Agastya. A similar passage is found in Vācaspati’s Tātparyatikā: तयाहु रूपमिनि को हि योगप्रभावाते अस्त्य इव समुद्र विषति स इव वष्कारण्येषु सूजित (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 Dāndaka4 (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: अस्त्यो हि समुद्र संकल्पायेष पशी। कस्यविद् च यहो: शास्त्रं प्राणिविन्दाः/मेघाण्येषु वष्कारण्येषु व्याधिवरमाणा।
3. Udayana in his Parāāduddhi explains the passage as: विनयितान्य अनेकावलोकोपमयां एकं सुभोक्त मृत्यु समूहस्त्र नमुद-हरमयां। योगिनिवानसंवृद्धि विविधप्रभवाः दर्शन सुभोक्तिस्वितं वष्कारण्यम् (p. 90, Mithila Institute Series).
4. Šaṅkaramiśra in his Upaskāra refers to these two incidents as the results of yogic power: योगवात् एव मयं प्रवासितार्न: अस्त्यो समुद्राय वष्कारण्यविनिमाणं चेति श्रद्धाला। (9.1.14).
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 literature we find no mention of the creation of the Daṇḍaka forest by Agastya in it, though it says many things about this forest. 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 Śūkra (and not of the sage Agastya) to the king Daṇḍa (son of Ikṣvāku), who violated Arajas, daughter of the sage. 5.

5. See Sk. Nāgarakhaṇḍa. 35.30-41 (through viṣṇoṣṭi viḍyā); Nāgarakhaṇḍa 36.36-47 (by uttering the mantra ‘क्रमसः करारी...’); Nāgarakhaṇḍa 60.2-3 (through Śaṇḍi viḍyā with the help of an Ātharvāṇa 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 (श्रीरावरण...रघुप्य ब्रह्मणा: क्रमः), Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.52.16 (अमरवतिरलर्वितः...).

6. As for example, see Śānti-p. 29.137 (यमयानित्विश्रुति संप्रदय भवानि सहस्मक; according to Nīl. mahāraṇya is Daṇḍakāraṇya and ‘yam’ refers to ‘prithum’.

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 Arajas, daughter of Śūkra. Consequently Śūkra 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 (दुष्कतां भवदृढः राज्यं ब्रह्मणं विनाशितम्) and 151.7 (येसं कोपान्तिकायति शिखः नीरवायतं). The significance of ब्रह्मणि (even to-day) remains to be disclosed by competent scholars. See also Arthāśāstra 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 Śūkra, 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 Śūkra is said to be the agent of the act of destroying the forest Daṇḍaka, the printed reading तत्स्व (in both the passages) which connects Agastya with the act of destruction may be corrected to शुद्धि यत. The finite verb सृजिति 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 Śūkra. But since he read the reading as shown above and regarded it as valid he explained सृजिति not by its synonym जनरति or उत्पादिति but by विवाहायाम (in विद्वस्तः) so that the meaning would be in consonance with the nature of a forest. Udayana’s explanation of विवाहायाम (both through yoga) is not at all clear. Is there any similarity between विवाहायाम and विवाहायाम (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 ‘तत्स्व’ रागिनि: and ‘विद्वस्तः’. 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: विवाहायाम शिळस्वरूपिण सिद्धिर्विविधिरियुक्तिः क: शारिरेऽकर्मणा शून्यं कर्मवृद्धिः समुप्रस्तापकथा व निर्यथः.

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. विवाहायाम— from the root विव (विव) ‘to found’, cp. माहिष्यस्तिवर्गीयः निवासायाम् (Viṣṇu-p. 4.11.9).
may be supposed to have some regional basis. Since only Agastya is mentioned in this Bhāṣya-passage, the bhāṣya-pulāḥāna came to be wrongly considered as connected with Agastya.13 Agastya’s connection with the Daṇḍaka (as mentioned in Rāmaṇa 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 Daṇḍaka2 forest also, but that is not through yogic power but through kingly power (Harivaṇa 1.10.24-25). A fruitful discussion on the reason for the corrupt readings seems to depend on the older manuscripts of Bhāmata and Tātparyatikā.

9. Vijñānavibhikṣu seems have written kṣetrapāna inadvertently; he should have written kāmapāna; cp. daññacchāya name ṣekhan: kañaṅga kṣetrapāna-svarṇamoolam: ṣubha-prabhāva bhūvanā (Kāmāsātra 1.2.44).

10. Vācaspattam is found to have quoted from the Viṣṇupuraṇa and Vāyu-puraṇa. He seems to have known some of the other Puraṇas also, for while explaining Nandīśvara’s acquiring of a divine body (as stated in the Viṣṇu-puraṇa 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 Puraṇas (Sk. Kāśikānda 11.106, Śiva-p. 3.6.49-52 and other Puraṇas).