CHAPTER 4

NEW LIGHT SHED ON SOME READINGS OF THE TEXT OF VADDARÄDHANE

It has been noted, in Part III, Ch. 2, that the quotations in the Vaddaradhane, particularly the Prakrit ones, have come down to us in much corrupt form. And those verses, which cannot be traced to their sources, present a formidable problem of reconstruction. Then the problem of the readings of some words, which have altogether alternate words in the other of the two groups of manuscripts, noted at the foot-notes, has already been discussed by the editor of the Vaddaradhane elsewhere: They appear to have been formerly side notes for difficult or obsolete words, which, some how dropping down the original readings, came down to us as a part of the text later. Such readings and their alternatives are as follows: maraluṃdidadallige (p. 17.23), paṭṭirdallige (fn. 18); lunḍida (p. 19.2), nidegeyva (fn. 1); śīti (p. 69.26), todedu (fn. 13); jānisuttam (p. 138.3), dhyārisuttam (fn. 1). Besides such cases, there are several readings of words in the text of the Vaddaradhane which deserve special notice. They are mostly names of persons, places, works, vows, diseases etc. Some of these being Prakrit forms, some others having partly Prakrit sounds and a few others being

unfamiliar ones, appear to have been mishandled by scribes or copyists. In some cases orthographical similarity appears to have given rise to a new word or name. Under these circumstances a comparative study of some names occurring in the corresponding stories in the available Ārādhanā Kathākasas or some other narrative works, a search for the mention of or references to some others in other works or a consideration of contextual evidences in the text itself in the case of others, would shed a great deal of light on their readings as obtained in the text of the Vaddārādhanē.

Hanita (p. 23.16): It is obviously, as the context suggests, the name of a medical treatise forming a constituent part of the general syllabus covered by Agni-bhūti and Vāyubhūti within seven or eight years under Sūryamitra in St. No. 1 (pp. 3.25 to 4.3). No work of this name is found. It appears to be a corrupt form of Bārīta (or Bārīta Samhitā), a medical supplement to Ātreya Samhitā noted by Aufrecht,2 Dr. R.N. Dandekar, in his paper 'Literature and Sciences in the Age of the Guptas',3 provides much more information on this point: As it is usual with several ancient

Indian works, this work is also named after its author, Hārīta, who is an early medical authority and one of the pupils of Pānarvasu Ātreya. Hārīta, along with Kesārapanī and others, is mentioned by the Nāvanītaka (The Cream of earlier texts on medicine), an important text belonging to the famous 'Bower Manuscripts' of the 4th cent. A.D. discovered in 1890. The copyists' unfamiliarity with the name of this ancient work, together with the orthographical similarity between the Kannada rI and nI, may have given rise to this deformity.

Ashvinīmata (p. 4.1 and p. 23.16): This is also as the context suggests, the name of a medical work, a constituent part of the above noted syllabus. The name of this work is not found. It is not noted by Aufricht. Monier Williams, however, gives Ashvinmat - a mantra containing the word Ashvān.

Bāhala (p. 4.1): This too is the name of a medical treatise forming a constituent part of the same syllabus noted above. Bāhala, in all probability, is the corrupt form of Bāhata or Bāhada, the Prakrit form of the Sanskrit Vagbhata, the name of one of the 'Three Great' of the ancient Indian medicine - the other two being Caraka and Sūrūtā, who too are listed in the same syllabus. The editor rightly conjectures the correct reading to be Bāhata (fn. 2, p. 2). Moreover the text gives the right reading in another place: Bāhata (p. 23.16). Though all other names of the works in the syllabus (p. 3.26 to 4.3) are in their Sanskrit form, Bāhata is in
its Prakrit form and Susruta (p. 4.2) has partly Prakrit sound. Possibly these two may be the relics of the original Prakrit list in the author's source.

Maṭravāda (p. 4.3): Obviously this is the name of a work connected with spells and it too forms a constituent part of the above noted syllabus. The correct reading of this name appears to be Mantrapāda, which is noted by Aufrecht, as being No. 2943 in Oppert: The list of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libraries of Southern India, by Gustov Oppert, Vol. I and II, Madras 1880.

Lōgāṇī (p. 6.7): It is the name of a Jaina cosmographical work. It appears to be a scribal deformity of the Prakrit Logāyaṇī or Logāyinī which seem to be identical with Lokāyaṇī or Lokāyinī referred to by Yativṛsabha in his Tiloyapaṇṇatti vs. 8.530 and 4.2444 respectively (Tiloyapaṇṇatti I, Eds. Dr. A.N. Upadhye and Dr. Hiralal Jain, Sholapur 1943).

Saṅgāṇī (p. 6.8): It is also the name of another a scribal deformity of the Jaina cosmographical work. It too seems to be Prakrit Saṅgaṇī or Saṅgāṇī referred to by Yativṛsabha in the same work and in the same verses noted above. Abhijñāna Rājendra (Vol. VII) notes Saṅgahasutta.

Kaṃbaḷanāga (p. 12.18): This is the name of one of the three Nāgas, the abode of whom is in a park outside the city of Campā (St. No. 1, p. 12). This appears to be a corrupt form of Kaṃbaḷanāga, possibly a popular usage of Padmaṇāga, Padma,
Sāmkha and Pānduka are the three of the nine treasures (navanidhi)\(^5\) in Jaina mythology; and the names of these three Nāgas, in the above noted context, seem to have been given after these three treasures. Harisena too gives (St.No. 126, v. 57) Pađmanāga as the name of one of the three Nāgas in the same context; but the remaining two names do not agree with the other two in the Vaddārādhane. Nemidatta, however, does not mention any of them.

Sāmbaranaṅa (p. 12.18) : This is the name of the second Nāga mentioned in the above noted context. Sāmkhanāga, as per the reading in some other manuscripts, noted by the editor (in fn. 12), appears to be the reasonably acceptable reading in the light of the above discussion under Kambalanāga.

Bhuktapratayākhyānavidhi (p. 24.20) : It, obviously, is not the right reading. It undoubtedly stands for Bhaktapratayākhyānavidhi (the religious rite of submitting oneself to death by abstaining from food), the exposition of which forms the main and bulky part of the Bhagavatī Arādhana (gāhās Nos. 64-2029). Hence the reading of the gāha manuscript, noted by the editor (in fn. 10), is quite acceptable.

Dāmarathi (p. 39.27) : This is the name of a wet-nurse in St. No. 2. Vāmarati is another reading in some other

---
\(^5\) The Cāvuṅdaraya Purāṇa enumerates these nine treasures on p. 71.
manuscripts as noted by the editor (in fn. 6). Harisena gives Vāmavār in the corresponding story and in the same context (St.No. 127, v. 225). Nemidatta’s corresponding story does not contain this reference. Under these circumstances, can Vāmarati or Vāmarathi be the right reading?

Dhāanye (p. 46.21) : This is the name of one of the wives of Sukamśala in St.No. 2; and it sounds like one unheard of. Harisena, however, gives Dhanya in the corresponding story in the same context (St.No. 127, v. 30). Nemidatta’s story contains no reference to this name. Both Dhāanye (Dhānyā) and Dhanya appear to have come from the Prakrit form Dhannā. Whether Dhāanye is the author’s derivation or the later corrupt form of Dhanye as derived by him from the Prakrit form, is difficult to decide. We know that Īnita, as noted above, is not the right reading though all manuscripts agree on it. Under these circumstances, Dhanye appears to be the right reading.

Thēvatsādyāna (p. 51.22) : It is obviously Revatōd- yāna. Harisena gives, Revateskōdyāna in the corresponding story in the same context (St.No. 128, v. 15). Revatōlotsa is partly Prakrit sound, which fact indicates the author’s Prakrit source for the story.

Sōsō (p. 68.28) : This is the name of one of the diseases from which the sage Sanatkumāra suffered in St.No. 4. The whole list of diseases is in Prakrit and some names of
those diseases have come down to us in corrupt form. Sāso-asthama (Skt. svāsa) is the right reading which Devendra gives in the story of Sanatkumāra, in his Commentary on the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra.6

bhātaccchādhi (p. 68.29): This also is the name of a disease enumerated in the same list noted just above. The correct reading is bhātaccchāmḍo—disliking for food, which is given by Devendra in the same list.7

The names of some of the sub-divisions of the Supernatural power of medicine—osahas riddhi acquired by the sage Sanatkumāra in St.No. 4 (p. 69.3-4), appear to be corrupt forms of the Prakrit ones possibly taken over by the author, as he has done in the case of the list of the diseases noted above, from his Prakrit source. Devendra gives this list of the sub-divisions of the Supernatural power of medicine too8 with a little difference in the sequence of enumeration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vadd. (p. 69.3-4)</th>
<th>Devendra (p. 141b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>āmōsadhi</td>
<td>āmosahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khēlōsadhi</td>
<td>khelosahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>javōsadhi</td>
<td>jallosahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vippōsadhi</td>
<td>vipposahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarvōsadhi</td>
<td>sarvposahi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Ibid.
Harisena refers to the same list as follows: əmakhəlausadhih...
viṣṭājallausadhih sarvausadhi (St.No. 129, v. 47); and this clearly indicates the list in the Vaddārādhanā to be the corrupt form of the Prakrit origin.

Viṣāla(-yeṃba toreya) (p. 101.10-11): Regarding the reading of this name or the whole phrase, including the words in the bracket, there is some confusion. The editor notes (fn. 5) Jagneya as another reading in some manuscripts. Harisena gives in the corresponding story in the same context Yamunakhyanaḍitīre (St.No. 132, v. 7) and Nemidatta as viṣṭīrṇa Yamunatate (St.No. 62, v. 10). Hence in the Vaddārādhanā, Jagneya or Jagune (Tadbhava of Yamuna) appears to be the name of the river mentioned by the author and viṣāla(-vēḍa) appears to be the adjective, similar to which Nemidatta also has used, i.e., viṣṭīrṇa. Owing to some queer confusion, the reading under discussion has come down to us.

A part of the list of some of the contents of the science of thievery given in St.No. 13 (p. 122.16-17), has not come down to us with proper punctuation: 'tālōḍghāṭinīvidyāmaṭra cūrṇa yoga ghuṭikāmājana' needs to be read as follows:
tālōḍghāṭinīvidyā (spell for breaking locks), maṭracūrṇa (magic powder for invisibility), yōgaghuṭikā (magic pill for invisibility), aṃjana (magic ointment for invisibility). Bloomfield notes tālōḍghāṭinīvidyā, yōgacūrṇa, ghuṭikā, aṃjana etc., from the various sources.9

Surakha (p. 128.25) : As the author tells, in St. No. 13 (p. 128), it is the name of a treatise on the science of catching thief. It appears to be a corrupt form of the Prakrit Surakkha (Sanskrit Surakea). This work, like many ancient Indian works, appears to have been named after its author. Monier Williams gives Suraksa as the name of a sage.

Karpara (-sūtra) (p. 128.25-26) : This is the name, according to the author himself, of a work on the science of thievery. It, too, appears to be a corrupt or adapted form of Kharapa, a treatise on thievery named after its author and mentioned by Sajjalaka in the Ārīrūḍata of Bhāsa and Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra (IV.8). More details regarding this have been already noted in Part III, Ch. 1.

patrachchāyā (p. 131.6) : patracchēda - an art of leaf-cutting appears to be the right reading.

āmārtagatakevalī (p. 134.26) This word in all probability stands for āmāntakrtakevalī - a kevalin who attains liberation in the same birth. Harisena gives antakrtakevalī in similar context (St. No. 139, v. 170). It may be noted that Āṣṭagaḍadasānō is the name of the 8th Aṅga of the Ardhamagadhi Canon.

Sukla (p. 154.16) : This word should obviously read as Sukra, which is one of the seven dātus enumerated by the

Though all the manuscripts used by the editor agree on the reading under discussion, it could not have come from the author's pen.

**Mahādranaṇa tapasana (p. 166.13-14)**: How this reading came down to us is difficult to explain. On the other hand, the other reading Mahākālànembarasana, noted by the editor (fn. 17), is the right one: In the concerned story, viz. that of Cilātaputra, Mahākāla (p. 162.23), the king of the village of the forest-dwellers, is the grand-father (mother's father) of Cilātaputra. Hariśena tells in the corresponding story that Cilātaputra went to his mother's father: 'mātāmahān-
tikāṃ prāpa' (St.No. 140, v. 17). Both of these evidences clearly corroborate the justifiability of the other reading noted by the editor (fn. 17).

**Avītasena (p. 169.12)**: Instead of this reading, the other one Arītasena, noted by the editor (fn. 5), appears to be right. Orthographical similarity between the Kannada 'ri' and 'vi' may have given rise to the reading under discussion. Hariśena gives Arītasena in the corresponding story in the same context (St.No. 141, v. 11). Nemidatta, however, gives Rītasena (St. No. 71, v. 12).

**Kumbhakāraghata (p. 175.17)**: All the manuscripts used by the editor agree on this reading. It is the name of a town. In the corresponding story Hariśena gives it as Kumbhakāraka (St.No. 142, v. 1), Nemidatta as Kumbhakāraka (St.No. 72, v.2)
and Prabhacandra also as Kumbhakārakāta.\(^1\) Maranasaṃhitī and Saṅthārāga Painna give as Kuṭabhārekaṇḍa.\(^2\) All the readings of the same name in different Ānūdhana Kathākosa, undoubtedly indicate the Prakrit source for the concerned story given by each author. But in the case of the reading in the Vaddārādhane under discussion, 'kāta', somehow, seems to have been replaced by 'ghaṭa', perhaps to suit, logically, Kumbhakāra.

nisrāva (p. 184.22) : At the face it looks like a Sanskrit word. Monier Williams' dictionary does not contain it. It appears to be a scribal deformity or hyper-Sanskritisation of nisrāva — scum of boiled rice, which is included by both Monier Williams and Kittel in their respective lexicons.

Vistamatsya (p. 193.13) : This reading is found throughout in the last story, with a single exception as Vistamatsara in one manuscript noted by the editor (fn. 2, p. 193). In the corresponding story Harisena gives this name as Ristakō mantri (St. No. 144, v. 3 and onwards too), Nemidatta as Ristāmātyo mantri (St. No. 74, v. 3 and onwards too) which is a tautological expression; and the Saṅthārāga Painna too gives it as Rittha.\(^3\) The original gāhā in Bhagavatī Ānūdhana, No. 1557, on which this story is based, gives the name as Ritthāmacco (minister Rittha). But the same gāhā quoted in the Vaddārādhane (p. 193) gives the name in the corrupt form as Vithhāmacco. Orthographical confusion, at an early stage of

\(^1\) According to Dr. Upadhye, Brhat-kathākosa, Notes, p. 392.
\(^2\) Intro. to Brhat-kathākosa, p. 27.
\(^3\) Intro. to Brhat-kathākosa, p. 26.
the manuscript-tradition, between the Kannada 'ri' and 'vi', as also noted under Avistasaena above, may have given rise to vista-; and somehow, in the early stage of manuscript-tradition, Ritthamacca seems to have been transformed as Riṣṭamatsya, for it is preceded by mantri (p. 193.13). This is how the same name in the original Prakrit source has given rise to such interesting readings in different works of different authors.