Cleanings from Aśvaghōsa’s Buddhacarita.

by

Andrzej Gawroński

(I. Preliminary remarks. II. The two Indian editions of the Buddhacarita. III. Prof. Formichi’s book on Aśvaghōsa. IV. Critical and exegetical notes on the Buddhacarita).

I. Preliminary remarks.

According to the Hindu standard of taste the Buddhacarita of Aśvaghōsa „cannot but be ranked as a third class poem“¹), according to us Europeans it is a sublime composition occupying one of the very first places in the endless array of the creations of Indian thought and fancy ²). The reason of this different appreciation is obvious to anyone acquainted with poetry and poetics in India and in Europe. Aśvaghōsa as an artificial word-catcher and as a neat-handed carver of quaint ideas cannot be placed on the unattainable level of Kālīdāsa and his successors, yet. if earnest conviction and sincerity of feelings be taken into account, a place high above the average must be assigned to him. Indeed, such power of inculcating one’s own assured belief upon the reader’s mind, such awe and at the same time such love as that which Aśvaghōsa feels towards his divine Master, are rarely if ever met with in Indian litera-

ture. But these qualities of a moral order are not his only title to glory; for despite of the hard judgment pronounced on Aṣvaghoṣa by the distinguished native critic, the Buddhacarīta is undoubtedly possessed of intrinsic poetical merit. The refinement of Kālidāsa’s language was not within its author’s reach — both writers are divided by centuries — yet his style is generally as vivid as it is lucid and at times he reveals himself a true master of word-painting: Nor are the artificialities of the kāvyā style unknown to him and if too rare to win for him the good graces of an Indian pandit they are here and there frequent enough to incur even the blame of an European critic. No wonder then if the appearance of the Buddhacarīta — which in spite of all efforts of Cowell aided by his brilliant editorial qualities was brought to light in a very imperfect shape — has set astir the critical activity of many an eminent Sanskrit scholar. Much has been done and much yet remains to do. The text of the Buddhacarīta such as it is known to us from Cowell’s edition and from the two Indian editions now in course of publication still offers various difficulties to the understanding. And if after the excellent articles of Böhtlingk, Kern, Kielhorn, Leumann, Lüders, Speyer, Windisch and last not least after the work of the first editor himself I venture to present in the following a rather large number of fresh emendations or else to throw out mere suggestions which to me seem plausible, I do so in the hope that some at least of my corrections of the corrupt passages and attempts towards final elucidation of the difficult ones may really advance our understanding of the text and in part help to restore its original wording.

Some time ago — early in the year 1913 — I accomplished a German translation of the Buddhacarīta which I intended to publish along with an improved reprint of the Sanskrit original, representing the text such as I have translated it and moreover reproducing all the numerous corrections and conjectures proposed by the different scholars and scattered in different periodicals. It was also my intention to collate afresh the Paris MS. since the text of Canto I as printed by Prof. Lévi does not always agree with the various readings in Cowell’s edition. But
about the same time new material was discovered in India. Two new editions of the *Buddha-carita* have been begun by two native scholars, both of them accompanied by copious critical apparatus. At first I thought my work rendered superfluous, but on closer examination of the new publications I saw that is was only delayed, for neither of the Indian editions may be called definitive. It also became clear to me that already the common base of all MSS. extant must have contained numerous faults; besides it could not have been identical with the archetype since it differs in several points from that MS. which is known to us through the intermediary of the Tibetan translation. However, before I shall be able to bring my work to a successful end, I thought it proper to publish some gleanings from it in the form of critical and explanatory notes on the poem. This consideration is the ultimate cause of the present article or rather of that part of it which begins on p. 12.

II. The two Indian editions of the *Buddha-carita*.

But first of all I must be allowed to make some remarks on the two Indian editions and on the new manuscript material made known to us through their intermediary as well as on the Italian translation of the *Buddha-carita* by Prof. Formichi. The edition of Mr. Nandargikar 1) is based on a single MS. discovered some time ago in Panjab and now in private possession in Bombay. This MS. is almost identical with that one which may be accepted as the common source of the three Nepal MSS. reproduced in Cowell’s edition 2). In fact it repeats almost all the blunders and monstrosities of the editio princeps. The few evident or only apparent corrections which it shows (mostly confirming Cowell’s conjectures) 3) may or may not be genuine; to me they seem to

---


2) A pandit of Calcutta seems to have come across that MS. and he is »writing a monograph on it«. (Can this mean: preparing an edition of it?) See Mr. Joglekar’s Prefatory Note p. II last but one a linea.

3) E. g.: in IV. 89 and V. 12 Cowell reads in accordance with
look a little suspicious. From the editor's preface we learn nothing as to the age of his MS. and this is indeed a pity 1). Whatever it may be this MS. will prove of little avail for the future critical edition of the work. Not devoid of interest are the numerous marginal notes in Bt (= Mr. Nandargikar's MS.). We can gather from them that some four or five MSS. of the Budhacarita are still extant in North-Western India but also that some at least of the said notes were added after 1892 because they give the readings of Cowell's edition. A startling instance of this is afforded by the note on III. 64 which reproduces not only Cowell's vipūnavat for nipūnaçat of Bt but even the meaningless "dīrghakīm for "dīrghikīm which is a printer's error corrected by the editor himself in the Additional Errata.

Far more important is Mr. Joglekar's edition of the Budhacarita 2). It often considerably differs from the editio princeps and may be said to represent a different group of MSS. from that given by Cowell's edition as well as by Bt and its marginal notes. The group represented by Cowell's MSS. has been less subject to changes. It has perhaps upon the whole more corrupt readings than the other one but its inferiority in that respect is generally of a palaeographical nature whereas Mr. Joglekar's edition often has a more polished character but its apparent correctness seems

his MSS. "dharma" and "dharmah" but in a footnote to the former of the two passages he suggests the correction "dharma. Now this is the reading of Bt in both cases but again Mr. Joglekar's MSS. have both times "dharma ("dhamah) and it may be noted (cp. infra) that Mr. Joglekar's MSS. represent a different group hence where they agree with Cowell's MSS. they in all probability reproduce the reading of their common source. — But there are instances, however most rare, where Bt alone has preserved the original reading. Such is the case in III. 55 where it has the undoubtedly true reading yō bhūśitaś cāpy avaruñyate ca against Cowell and Joglekar (who, by the way, do not agree this time). This correction was made independently by me as early as in 1908.

1) It is written »in semi Śarada characters«.
to be rather secondhand. Cases in which Cowell’s edition is inferior to that of Mr. Joglekar are mostly like the following ones: IV. 54d sismiyē ed. pr., sismiyē Jogl. Bt, IV. 56a kim vinā nāvagacchanti ed. pr., kim vennā Jogl., kim twimā Bt, IV. 65c sa-mupekṣeyānī ed. pr., samupekṣeyā Jogl. Bt. 1) On the other hand whenever the readings of Cowell differ from those of Mr. Joglekar without being evidently corrupt as in the examples quoted above they may be said to be on the whole the true ones. See f. i. II. 1b tasyātmajasyātmajītaḥ sa rājā ed. pr. (“jito narēndraḥ Bt), “vidāh sa rājā Jogl. where the rhyme testifies in favour of Cowell’s MSS.; similarly II. 51b putrasthitaye sthitāṣrīḥ 2) ed. pr., Bt, sthiraṣrīḥ Jogl.; II. 7c vināṣmavarṣaṇāpiutadāsāh ed. pr., Bt, vināṣya varṣaṇāpiutadāsoṇ Jogl. where asmaṇvarṣa is evidently the genuine reading; V. 31b vratakheḍesu ed. pr. Bt, bata khēḍesu Jogl. where bata is clearly secondary and meaningless (one of Mr. Joglekar’s MSS. viz. H has vratacaryayuṣu). But of course instances may be quoted in which the readings preserved by Jogl. are undoubtedly original. E. g. IV. 99d mahābhāye raksāti yō na rōditi ed. pr., mahābhāye hṛṣyati yō na rōditi Jogl. hṛṣyati is as natural as it is excellent 3). Likewise in IV. 97a aho ’tīdhiraṁ ed. pr., Bt is less good than aho sudhīraṁ Jogl. because the final vowel of aho should be properly pragrhyā. To conclude we may state that the two groups of MSS. in many cases supplement one another. Yet they are not sufficient to enable us to bring out a correct critical edition of the work. There remains ample room for emendations and conjectures. Numerous examples may be adduced to show that even the common source of both groups contained evident blunders which must needs be removed. Some instances are: IV. 28 ed

1) I have purposely chosen instances in which Bt differs from Cowell’s MSS. in order to show that after all it is no mere copy of one of them. It is perhaps an independent and more correct copy of the Nepal MS. But cf. the other examples, infra.
2) Cp. kulāsya sthitaye sthitijñāḥ, Kumārasaṁbhava I. 18b.
3) Cp. e. g.: hṛṣyanty ātumukhaṁ drṣṭvā navam navam ivāgatam
   ātum navam parivartena pāṁśināḥ pāṁśasāṁkṣayāh

Rāmāyaṇa II. 105. 25 (ed. Bomb.)
ākrida iva babhrājē vivasvān apsarōtyataḥ, read: vāibhrājē (Kielhorn);
IV. 91 ab māhaṁtyain na ca taunmadhyē yatrasimānyataḥ kṣayah,
read: tan manyē (Kielhorn, Kern) and cp.: tan ēva manyē puru-
sārtham uttamaṁ na vidyate yatramūḍha pumah pumah kriyā XI. 59 cd;
V. 75a koliśatravō, read: kīla śatravō (Kielhorn, Speyer) etc.

These remarks may suffice with regard to the MSS. Little
remains to be said concerning the technical side of the new edi-
tions. In fact, they exhibit in this respect all the good qualities and
some of the drawbacks of Indian publications. From the com-
mentary on the Buddhacarita compiled by a modern pandit and
printed along with the Sanskrit text of the poem in Mr. Joglekar's
edition we may now and then get some assistance as e. g. ad
IV. 51d where pratiśrutyena kūjātī is divided into pratiśrutyā
iva and explained by pratiśravyanīneva. This is certainly right and
Böhtlingk's conjecture viz. pratiśrūtkēva, although excellent in
itself, is thus rendered unnecessary. The notes of Mr. Joglekar
are almost always very acute and bear testimony of that intimate
acquaintance with all things Indian which is but rarely attained by
an European scholar. His translation, finally, is upon the whole
good and independent though its author sometimes makes a point
of squeezing some sense out of corrupt passages where there is none. Yet his edition cannot be safely relied upon. His expla-
nations are sometimes in disagreement with his own text (e. g.
ad IV. 10; 52) and since his quotations from Cowell's edition,
where he can be controlled, are by no means complete or exact we
cannot trust him for completeness or exactness of those variants
which he gives from private MSS. Nearly the same holds good of
Mr. Nandargikar's edition. His translation (for in his Notes he has
given us a nearly complete translation of most of the stanzas) is
often enough wholly dependent on that of Cowell and regarding
the critical accuracy — well, can a writer be said to possess
any who on p. III of his Introduction believes Kanisaka to have
ascended to the throne about 120—125 A. D. and on p. VII of
the self-same Introduction states him to have reigned in the
first century A. D.?
III. Prof. Formichi’s book on Aśvaghoṣa.

The Italian translation of the first thirteen Cantos of the Buddhacarita by Prof. Formichi 1) must be considered a sad failure. It is almost incredible how little the translator is familiar with Sanskrit. He simply has no understanding for it and yet he is never loth to give new explanations of difficult passages, to make numerous conjectures and to charge other scholars with bad mistakes. Prof. Formichi’s method of interpretation is very simple: he tries to apply isolated Sanskrit words to his Italian patterns of thought and he does it with a sovereign disdain of style. of syntax, nay even of elementary grammar. Such a method may prove of some help if applied to the somnambulistic would-be Sanskrit of a Mlle Hélène Smith but in the case of a poem written by a man who did really think in Sanskrit it cannot but fail. Controversy with Prof. Formichi would be impossible. Hence I don’t even attempt it. I will limit myself to quoting some few specimens of his peculiar erudition. May he who doubts the truth of my words have patience enough to read the whole book as attentively as I did.

Whenever Indian ideas, Indian beliefs or Indian legends are alluded to we may take it for granted that Prof. Formichi will miss the hint. — I. 11 dvīsadvipēndrāḥ (samarāŋgasat | udvāntamuktāprakāraṁ śirōbhīḥ), it is a common belief in India that the heads of elephants contain pearls (see Kumārasambhava I. 6 and the verse quoted by Mallinātha in his commentary thereon). Accordingly the correct translation is: “the lordly elephants of his enemies” (Cowell) but Prof. Formichi prefers to

1) Carlo Formichi, Aṅvaghoṣa Poeta del Buddismo, Bari Laterza 1912 (Biblioteca di Cultura Moderna). The translation occupies pp. 123—286. Cp. Prof. Leumann’s review of this book in ZDMG., LXVI (1912) pp. 517—519. The learned critic does not allude, however, to the translation itself and he devotes to the third part of the book (Textual criticism and explanatory notes) only a few words. He probably did not think it necessary to peruse it attentively, little suspecting what it conceals.
say: "i sommi principi nemici" i. e. "the chief hostile princes (sic! dvipendra)" 1).

I. 50 acaryakain yogavidhaun dvijanam apruptam anyair Janakā jagāma | means of course: "Janaka attained a power of instructing the twice-born in the rules of Yoga which none other had ever reached" as correctly rendered by Cowell with express reference to the well-known passage of the Chandogya-Upaniṣad viz. V. 3. 7. But from Prof. Formichi we learn something really new viz. that Janaka was himself a brahman: "tra i brahmani Janaka raggiunse nella dottrina dello Yoga quel grado di maestro non mai prima raggiunto da altri" i. e. "among brahmans Janaka attained in the doctrine of Yoga that degree of master(rye) which was not hitherto attained by any other".

II. 18a vibudharsikalpaṃ has to be translated with Cowell "like some rṣi of the gods" since the series brahmarṣis, rūjarsis, and devarṣis is a thing universally known but Prof. Formichi speaks of the prince's "glory like that of prophets and gods" (pari a quella dei profeti e degli deì) 2).

IV. 79. strīsamsargain vināśantain Pāṇḍur jñātvipī Kāura-vaḥ | Mādrīrīpoganukṣiptāh sieve kāmājam sukham ||

This refers of course to the well-known story of Pāṇḍu who in consequence of a curse was obliged to refrain from intercourse with his two wives Kuntī and Mādrī for he knew that it must end in death. But Prof. Formichi turns this peculiar curse incurred by Pāṇḍu into a general law and translates "pur sapendo che il praticar femmine conduce alla rovina" i. e. "although he knew that intercourse with women (!) leads to ruin". — Etc. etc.

A few instances how Sanskrit grammar is treated by Prof. Formichi may now follow:

I. 87 priyatanayān, Prof. Formichi discards the self-evident correction of Bühler viz. priyatanayās and takes the reading of

---

1) I beg my reader’s pardon for the most clumsy English in these literal translations from the Italian.

2) XIII. 31 a vibudharsaṇayāḥ ≡ the god-sages (Cowell) ≡ i santi dei i. e. the holy gods (Formichi).
the text adverbially (I) "Felice per la nascita del figlio" or "happy at the birth of his son".

II. 10a pratibhyō 1) is said to be a compound (but what kind of compound?) arisen from prati bhīyāḥ 2) and meaning "con timore" i.e. "with fear"! This explanation of mine I may indeed present as sure 3) adds he.

XII. 35c tasmād ēṣa mahābāho. Prof. Formichi's note thereon runs as follows: "Congettura in c con la scorta dei codici tasmād ēṣāmahāmōha ma°. La congettura 3) del Cowell: « mahā-bāho » non può assolutamente stare 4). One must indeed rub one's eyes well before believing that this peculiar sandhi is no mere optical illusion. ēṣāḥ amahāmōha is here taught to develop into ēṣāmahāmōha although every beginner in Sanskrit knows full well that it cannot give but ēṣāḥ 'mahāmōha. And this is not an isolated example of this peculiar sandhi. Another instance is afforded by ēṣo jīvati 4) met with in Prof. Formichi's note on VII. 52. (I don't speak of such cases as no puram instead of nāḥ puram). Well, what shall Prof. Formichi say to this? For in case he should plead inadvertence I must assure him in advance that I don't believe anybody to be capable of writing down such nonsense with deliberation.

Syntax, style and dictionary are treated no better. One or two instances may suffice:

II. 27c Śākyanarēndravādhuḥ means of course "the daughter-in-law of the Śākya king" (Joglekar) but Prof. Formichi translates "principessa degli Ākya" 4) i.e. "a princess (nareṇ-dravadhū) of the Śākyas".

1) Read: prabhubbhō, Jogl.
2) Prof. Formichi deems it necessary to inform his fellow-specialists in a grave tone that pratibhyas became pratibhyō before a voiced consonant. No doubt!
3) This is no conjecture of Cowell's but the reading (however wrong) of two MSS.
4) That the same blunder was committed by Cowell is of course no justification of Prof. Formichi. Mr. Nandargikar who upon the whole follows Cowell closely enough, has the correct translation viz. "daughter-in-law of the lord of the Śākyaś". But if Mr. Nandargikar
II. 40c vṛttaparaśvadēna "con la dignità della condotta" i.e. "by the dignity of his conduct".

III. 28d vikriyā is taken to mean "mostro" i.e. "monster".

III. 45d pravāca kimcīn mādunā svareṇa "in a low voice" (Cowell), "softly" (Joglekar). Prof. Formichi says "in tono quasi amaro" i.e. "in an almost bitter tone".

IV. 52. api nāma vihaṅgānāṁ vasantēnāhitō madāḥ | na tu cintayataś cīttaṁ janasya prājñāmānānah ||

Prof. Formichi supplies iti after cintayataś. His literal translation of the whole stanza runs as follows: "Forse agli ucelli si è dalla primavera infusa (data, regalata, ispirata) l'ebbrezza d'amore, ma non già al pensatore: tal pensiero è proprio dell'uomo presuntuoso" which means (in as clumsy English as his Italian here is): "Perhaps the amorous intoxication was infused (given, granted, inspired) by the spring into birds though not into the thinker: such thought (cittam!) is proper to a presumptuous man". 1) Risum teneatis?

IV. 56a kim vinā nāvagacchanti. "Vinā in a è usato come espletivo e avverbialmente, però non mi sembra necessario corrreggere secondo vuole lo Speyer kim imā nā" "i.e. "in a vinā is used in the sense of an expletive and adverbially, hence it does not seem to me necessary to correct in accordance with Speyer kim imā nā". 2) !vinā has thus come to be an "expletive adverb" (or "an adverbial expletive?"

V. 18c ajanā 'nyajanāir atulyabuddhiḥ. I think we have to read with Böhtlingk ajanē but according to Prof. Formichi we

now and then rectifies his predecessor's mistakes, Signor Formichi differs from him only for the worse.

1) Ed. Joglekar has cittē instead of cittam. This variant is simple and convincing. Mr. Joglekar's rendering of the stanza is virtually correct. The sense of it is: What, shall even thoughtless birds devote themselves to love-making but not you who are possessed of reason and deem yourself wise (hence are able to appreciate love at its just measure)? — Böhtlingk's translation does not satisfy me though his conjecture (citram) is very plausible too.

2) That Prof. Speyer's correction has hit the mark show the new variants viz. kim vēmā ed. Jogl. and kim tvimā ed. Nand.
cannot do so, because (a thing which apparently escaped Böhtlingk's attention) "ajana è un aggettivo e non credo si possa adoperare come sostantivo" i. e. "ajana is an adjective and I don't think one might use it in the sense of a substantive" 1).

V. 30 bahudōṣāṁ hi vadanti dharmacaryāṁ "they say that the practice of religion is full of evil" (Cowell) but Prof. Formichi translates: "il darsi alla vita monastica è, a detta di tutti, un grave errore" i. e. "to embrace monastic life is, as everybody maintains, a serious blunder". — Etc. etc.

How deep Prof. Formichi's knowledge of Sanskrit versification is we may gather from his note on III. 65. It runs thus: "In c Böhtlingk legge: varāpsarvortam, e Leumann: varāpsarobhṛtam. Non so persuadermi della scorrettezza della lezione del testo, è lascio stare "nṛtyam prendendolo per un bahuvrīhi concordante con adhipālayam". The same in English: "In c Böhtlingk reads varāpsarvortam and Leumann varāpsarobhṛtam. I cannot persuade myself of the incorrectness of the reading of the text and leave "nṛtyam untouched taking it for a bahuvrīhi to be construed with adhipālayam". Isn't it exhilarating? As if the difficulty lay in how to explain a compound like varāpsarōnṛtyam! That the fifth syllable in every pāda of a Ru-cīrā stanza must be short and that in consequence thereof the reading of the text violates the metre, all this is a mystery passing Prof. Formichi's comprehension 2).

To this may be added a long series of blunders, omissions etc. due to an almost incredible negligence. Who would think that Prof. Formichi has neglected to consult the double list of Errata prefixed to Cowell's edition? And yet this is perfectly true. He sometimes corrects evident misprints (NB already corrected by the editor) with the pompous words "I conjecture..."; again he tries to defend a printer's error in compliance with

---

1) It is expressly stated to be substantive in Prof. Cappeller's dictionary and very probably in others too.

2) Prof. Formichi's disregard for the caesura is shown by his rendering of tac chaṛīrāṁ VIII. 56 ed. which is no compound (ep. tāu caraṇānu 55) and cannot mean »il suo corpo« (= his body) but »that body« (Cowell).
his guiding principle of respecting the manuscript readings; elsewhere he is quite at a loss what to do, as in XI. 27b where he seems to be a little astonished that both Cowell and Prof. Windisch "evidently correct badhavebhyaḥ to bāndhavebhyaḥ" which latter figures in the first list of Errata... Prof. Formichi himself "cautiously conjectures" (congetturo con riserva) bāndhavebhyaḥ and, of course, misinterprets the whole stanza.

Prof. Formichi's numerous corrections of the text are perfectly in keeping with the rest of his work and if here and there they do even convince, the general impression is left unchanged by these most rare exceptions.

IV. Critical and exegetical notes on the Buddha-carita.

Before passing to my own notes on the text of our poem I beg the reader to pay attention to two points.

Firstly, that my quotations of parallel passages are mostly taken from the epic poems of Kālidāsa. In fact I am sure Kālidāsa must have devoted particular study to the works of his great predecessor. His language is much more akin to that of Aśvaghōṣa than may be gathered from Cowell's or Mr. Nandargikar's remarks.

The second point is with regard to the introductory stanzas of the Buddha-carita (as well as to several others in the first Canto) which are wanting in the Tibetan and the Chinese translations. They may or may not be genuine but at any rate they do not come from the pen of Amṛtananda and seem to be much older. My reasons for this statement are:

1) Amṛtananda himself confesses to have composed Cantos XIV (i.e. XIV. 32 ff) — XVII 5) but he does not maintain the same with respect to the beginning of the poem 4).

1) One of his luckiest corrections is sanābhādhyā for sanābadhyā of the printed text in III. 57c but this and one or two similar ones are more than balanced by other cases. — Cp. also p. 15, note 1).

2) In the respective prefaces to their editions of the Buddha-carita and of the Rāghuvaṃśa.

3) See Cowell’s Preface p. VI.

4) As would appear from Prof. Lenmann’s remarks in his criticism of Prof. Formichi’s book. See p. 7, note 1), supra.
2) With regard to poetical merit the first 24 stanzas in Cowell’s edition are by far superior to anything in the last three and a half Cantos of the printed text. In fact, they are scarcely if at all inferior to the remainder of the poem.

3) They contain a regular introduction viz. a maṅgala (I. 1) and a description of the hero’s birth-place (I. 2 ff) which reminds us vividly of the Kumārasambhava I. 1 ff. The two beginnings closely correspond to each other.

4) They return, each and all, in Mr. Joglekar’s MSS. which belong to a different group as stated above p. 4 f.

5) They are given by Mr. Nandargikar’s MS. which does not go beyond XIV. 14 and was perhaps copied from the Nepal MS. before its completion by Amṛtānanda i. e. before the year 1830. Cp. p. 5, note 1).

6) I. 45 has an exact parallel in Rāghuvaṁśa III. 19. This argument cannot be rejected without further ceremony, since there exists a marked parallelism between the description of Buddha’s birth in our poem and that of Rāghu’s birth in the third canto of the Rāghuvaṁśa. Let the reader consider the following coincidences, some of which were already pointed out by other scholars:

Buddhacarita I.

Māyāpi tam kuṣigataṁ dadhānā
vidyudvijātaṁ jaladāvatva |

Rāghuvaṁśa III.

patisaḥ pratitaṁ prasavōnmukhim
priyāṁ dadarśa kāle divom
abhritom iva ||

22 ab

25

tataḥ prasānnaṁ ca babhūva
Pusyas tasyaś ca dévyā
vratasamśkrtāyāḥ | pārśvāt suśo
lōkahitāya jajñé nirvēda-
am caiva nirāmayai ca ||

dīṣāḥ prasēdur marutō
vavuḥ sukhāḥ pradakṣi-
ṇācir havidagnir adadē|
babhūva sarvāṁ śubhaśāṁśi tat-
kaṇam bhavō hi lōkāhīy-
dayāya tadām || 12 cd

1) But I admit that this stanza, as well as several others written in a different metre, may be spurious.
vātā vavuḥ sparśasukhā
manojñā divyāni vāsamśy
avapātayantarḥ | sūryāḥ sa eva-
bhidyadhikam ca kāśe jajvāla
sāumyārciranāiritō 'gnih

Kumārasambhava I. 23)

bodhāya jatō' smi jagaddhitār-
thaṃ

--- jagatō hitāya ||

sa hi svagātraprabhāyōj
jvalantyā dīpaprabhām
bhāskaravan mūmōsa |

mahāhajāmbūnacārvarvarō
vī
dyōtayāmūsa disāś ca sar-
vāḥ

ariṣṭasayyāṃ paritō visūrīṇā

sujuanmanas tasya nijēna tē-
jasā | niśthadīpāḥ saha-
sū hatatvisō babhūvur ātē-

khyaśamarpitā iva ||

(Compare also:
Raghuvaṁśaprādipēna
tenāpratimatējasā |
rakṣaghagatā dīpāḥ
pratyađīṣtā ivābhavan ||

X. 68).

kvacit kvaṇattūryamṛdaṇ-
gagītāir viṇāmukundāmu-
rajādibhiś ca | striṇāṃ
calat Kurdistanabhūṣitanāṃ virāj-
tam cōbhayaṃrāvatas tat || 1)

sukhasraṇā mangalatūrya-

nisvanāḥ pramōdagtyāḥ sa-
ha vārayōṣitām | na kevalān
sadmani Mahādhipateḥ pathi
vyajrmbhanta dīvānkasāṃ api ||

45

1) This stanza is manifestly corrupt. It is not impossible that the
key to its emendation is to be found in the second half of the
parallel stanza of the Raghuvaṁśa.
supī'pi\textsuperscript{1}) putre 'nimisāikacakṣuḥ ||

nivātapadmastimitēna ca-kṣuṣā nṛpasya kāntam pibatah sutānanam ||

70 d

narapatir api putrajan-matuṣṭo viṣayagatāni\textsuperscript{2}) vimucya bandhanāni | kulasadgśam acīkaraṇa yathāvat priyatanayas\textsuperscript{3}) tanayasya jātakarma ||

17 ab

nasāmyatatasya babhuva rakṣiturb visarjayēd yam sutajanmahṛṣitaḥ |

ṛṇābhidhānāt svayam ēva kevalam tādā pitṛnām mumuce sa bandhanāt ||

87

20

dhātryaṅḳasamviṣṭam avēksya cānām Devyaṅḳasamviṣṭam ivāganisūnum |

Umāvṛṣāṅkāu Śarajanyanāma yathā yathā Jayantēna Śaṭīpurāνdarāu |

tathā nṛpaḥ sā ca suṛena Ma-gadhi nanandatus tatsadṛśēna
tatsamāu ||

66 ab

23

bhavanam atha viqūhya Śaḵyārājō Bhava iva Šaṅmukha janamanā pratiṇāh |

93 ab

Some of these coincidences belong to the common store of images and similes of Sanskrit poets\textsuperscript{4}) but their cumulation cannot but be regarded as striking.

\*\*\*

\textsuperscript{1}) So to be read with Lévi (translation) and Formichi.
\textsuperscript{2}) Kielhorn's correction for "matāni."
\textsuperscript{3}) Bühler's corréction for "tanayam."
Canto I.

2c. udagra dhishyAna gaganã 'vagãdhãm. Both Indian editions seem to corroborate this conjecture of Cowell's but none the less the corrupt readings of his MSS. viz. 'dhishãr gaganã C and 'dhishãr gaganã P (but Prof. Lévi gives udagra dhishyãr as the reading of P and translates „la cité du hardi Kapila“) make necessary another emendation viz. udagra dhishyãr gaganã 'vagãdhãm. We find just the same image in Rãma yãna V. 2. 23 where the city of Laûkã is described as

Kãllasanilayaprakhyam ãlikhontam ivãmbaram |
dhrityamãram ivãkãsãm ucchiritair bhavanãtãtmãñã

2d. purãm maharsãh Kapilasya vastu || The true reading is vastu as suspected by Cowell and proved by (1) the concordant testimony of both Indian editions, (2) the frequent periphrase Kapilahvayãm purãm (e. g. I. 94 b. VIII. 5a; purãm = vastu not vastu), (3) the reading of CP ad VI. 30d viz. sokãm Kapilavãstunãh for 'vastunãh of D and the printed text. M. Müller was certainly right in considering the current form Kapilavastu as a wrong sanskritization of the Pali Kapilavatthu. (See: Six Systems of Indian Philosophy, 2nd ed., p. 238 note).

5c. jagaty adrstvãva samanam anyat. — Bõhtlingk prefers ëva of P and as we can add now of Joglekar's edition to ëva of the editio princeps and that of Nandargikar. Both readings however are equally good and it is very difficult to decide in favour of one of them.

6ab. rãmamukhendin paribhãtapadman yatrãpayatõ 'py avi- 
mãnya bhãnuã | — apayatõ is simply absurd. The sun cannot set — — after sunset and yet this is exactly the meaning of our text as shown by the translations („There the sun, even

The author sometimes confounds actual agreement in similes and images due to congeniality with agreement in universally Indian ideas and, finally, with borrowing of peculiar expressions. Besides, his treatise is rather superficial and anything but exhaustive. Nevertheless it is very interesting.
although he had retired, — hurried towards the western ocean", Cowell, and "where the sun, though he had withdrawn, set out towards the western sea", Nandargikar). We must adopt the reading of C upayâto. When the rays of the rising sun fall (upayâ) on the moon they rob its glance i.e. they dishonour her (vimûnay); now the sun was unable to bereave of their glance the face-moons (i.e. moon-faces) of the fair women in Kapilavâstu and he retired as if vexed by the existence of moons shining even by day. The rûpaka rûmûnukhêndûn is the clue of the whole image; parîbhûtapadûn is a bahuvrihi compound and stands in apposition to it 1).

8a. kṣtvâpi râtrânu kumudaprahûsam. — Böhtlingk is right in his criticism of Cowell’s translation of this pada ("After mocking the water-lilies even at night") but his own suggestion that api should mean here "further" does not hold. It means simply "although". Although the city of K. was a successful rival of night-lotuses (mocked = surpassed) i.e. was more beautiful than they, yet it was more than a match for day-lotuses too, i.e. it surpassed them in splendour. In other words the city of K. possessed two attributes which are elsewhere incompatible, much in the same manner as its ruler (and indeed many an other ruler in Indian literature) of whom it is said in verse 10: although he had the majesty of the sun yet he possessed the mild nature of the moon i.e. he united in himself two qualities generally opposed.

14c. sâsi yatha bhâir akṣtvāyathûbhâhãḥ. — Böhtlingk was of course fully right in defending the reading of the text against Cowell’s suggestion (supported now by both Jogl.’s and Nand.’s editions) of the easier "bhumî since the yamaka must be respected and it is only a pity that he neglected to give an explanation of this knotty passage. The sense of the stanza is: the splendour of the king did not prejudice to that of his brilliant

1) Similar instances abound in Sanskrit literature. Cp. e.g. tasyâḥ — premâkarâ rajanikarâ vijitâravindâm vadanâm (Dāsa-kumâracarita, Pûrvapithikâ, description of Vasumati). The inverse order is also common e.g. tvamatkhapañkajena sâsinañ sôbhâm têraskârinâ (Ratnâvalî v. 25).

Roczniak orientalistyczny.
ministers at whose head he stood, even as the splendour of the moon, lord of the stars, does not eclipse the light of the chief nakṣatras. The ministers of king Sudhodana were like him of noble descent and not much inferior to their lord in majesty 1). Cp. also III. 9.c.d and VIII. 74.b.

15 b. raviṇaḥ prabhāvāḥ vāsatamaḥprabhāvāḥ ।—Prof. Lüders is right in restoring the yamaka 2) but he is wrong in dividing the whole into “prabhā avāsta”. Read: raviṇaḥ vāsatamaḥprabhāvāḥ with va = iva. The queen is compared to the sunshine which is regarded as something distinct from the sun himself i.e. in our case from king Sudhodana. The parallel case where the moon and the moonshine are viewed as two inseparable lovers is very common in Sanskrit literature. See e.g. Kumarasambhava IV. 33, Raghuvamśa VI. 85a; VIII. 37; XVII. 6. 3). From the Pāñcatantra a stanza may be cited in which the sun-rays are differentiated from the sun and compared to the attendants of a king. (I. 80, Kielhorn’s edition in the Bombay Sanskrit Series).

26 a. prātaḥ payodād iva. — I should read prātaḥpayodād because if we take prātaḥ as a separate word then we have nothing corresponding to it in b.

26 c. sphuranmayuṣkhaṁ vihatandhakaraiḥ „bursting forth“ 4) with his rays which dispelled the darkness“ (Cowell) but sphuranmayuṣkhaṁ is a compound word and the whole ought to be translated „with flashing rays that drove darkness before them“

1) In the „critical“ part of Prof. Formichi’s book we meet now and then with flashes of genuine humour. So in this case. Böhltingk has said: „(I) 14 c An akṛtyānathābhāiḥ clari nicht gerüttelt werden wegen des vorangehenden Gleichklanges“ and Prof. Formichi says: „(I) 14. In c leggo col Böhltingk bhair akṛtyānathābhāḥ.

2) According to Prof. Leumann (NKGWG, 1896) this is also the reading of the MSS. — Prof. Jacoby read as early as in 1893 raviṇaḥ prabhāvāḥ vāsatamaḥprabhāvāḥ and akṛtyānathābhāiḥ. (Das Rāmāyana, etc. p. 125/6.).

3) Aja and Īndumati are compared by Kālidāsa to a drop of oil falling down from a lamp and to the fiery streak produced thereby respectively. See Raghuvamśa VIII. 38.

4) i.e. sphurau ma".
(Nandargikar). Cp. sphuratprabāhamandala, Kumārasambhava I. 24b, Raghuvamśa III. 60 d; V. 51 c; XIV. 14 a.

36 c. yadgauravat. — Prof. Lüders’ correction, yam gauravat, is good but unnecessary. The compound stands for yasmin gauravat; in 37 b we have inversely yasya prabhāvat for which yatprabhāvat could be used. Cp. also tadvauravat, Kumārasambhava VII. 31 a (tasu matṣya adarat, Mallinātha).

40 a. With girirūjakīlā—bhūṣ ca cācala we may compare the following passage from a Gupta inscription: bhūr—“vikampitaśūlakīla”, CII III No 17. The Gangdhar stone inscription of Viśvavarman (dated 480 A. D.) p. 75 l. 13.

43 cd. — kāntūhaleṇāvī ca pūdaṇaś ca prapūjayēma sa gandhapuspaṇāh || —The two ca’s (first of them omitted in P) are inelegant if not incorrect. Ed. Nand. has pūdāpiśi tat; this tat must be corrected to taṇī. Ed. Jogl. reads pūdāpiṇāni which is better than pūdāpiśi ca but less good than pūdāpiśi taṇī. In c kāntūhaleṇāvī would be better. — Cp. drumāir abhīṣṭaprasavarcaitātithi | tāpōvanām—, Kumārasambhava V. 17 b d.

55 a. taṁ brahmaṇavidbrahmavidin jvalantam. — The reading of D (which is also that of C secunda manu) viz. brahmaṇavid brahmavid in should have been given preference to. „That knower of brahman— was introduced— by the king’s guru, himself a knower of brahman“. In this kind of padānaprāsa a certain contraposition is generally to be found. Examples abound.

56 c. balasainjñayāvī — could this not mean „at a mere sign of the guard?“.

57 d. The text of Nandargikar contains a metrical error (purā Vasīthaṁ iva Rantisdevah). Another metrical error occurs in Joglekar’s edition in 68 d (taṁ prēkṣya kutas tava dhīra būspaḥ).

61 b. dharmena sukṣmāni dhanaṁ aprīṣya | — dharmena is perhaps an instrumental of comparison, cp. Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax § 107 and Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax § 39. This construction is a peculiarity of the epic dialect but it occurs also, although very rarely, in the classical language. The meaning would be: „riches trivial as compared with dharma“.
Canto II.

5 b. sādhavyo ṛajaskā gatavatpayaskāh (scil. gāvah). — arajaskāh is correct as shown now by the frequent use of the same epithet in Bhāsa’s works; see the bharatavākya in the Pratijñāyaugaṃdharaṇa, Avimāraka, Abhiṣekanāṭaka (bhavantu arajasō gāva ityādi). The correction of Prof. Kern viz. sādhurajaskāh is thus rendered superfluous. If however an emendation of the text were deemed necessary then the only one which offers itself without difficulty is ṛaraskāh; cp. the parallel passage I. 89 c.

6 d. devo asya pakṣāv aparastu nāṣaṃ || — Böhtlingk was right in adopting the reading of C nūsa (cp. also nāsit ed. Jogl); his translation, however, should be slightly modified. Not „er hatte (nur) zwei Parteien, eine andere (dritte) hatte er nicht“ but „er hatte zwei Parteien, aber (eine zweite d. h.) eine Gegenpartei hatte er nicht“; Cp. vipakṣa „foe, enemy“.

7 c. vināśinavāsaṃsānipātadosīḥ. — Perhaps we ought to read „ghoṣāḥ in view of the marked parallelism between ab and c. which requires some counterpart to ṛabdaḥ, as well as of the parallel passage XIII. 45 vārīdharaḥ bhantaḥ sāvidyutah sāsanicandag hōṣāḥ (cp. also III. 34 d).

15. steyādibhiḥ cāpy abbhitās ca nāṣāmin
savaḥāṃ svacakraṃ paracakraṃuktam |
ksēmāṁ subhikṣāṁ ca babhīva tasya
purāṇa aranyāṇī yathāvā rāstrē ||

The MSS. have in d aranyāṣya C and aranyāṇī P. The new Indian editions read purēṣo aranyēṣu ¹), which is clearly a later emendation. Various other corrections have been tried, all of them without success. And yet the variant preserved by C comes very near the truth. Read: purāṇaranyāṣya i. e. purā Anaranyāṣya and cp.:

nānāvṛṣṭir babhīvaṃ su na durdhikṣāḥ satān vārē |
Anaranyē mahārāje taskavā vapi kaścana ||
Rāmāyaṇa II. 110. 10.

(21) 22. (tato mahārāṇi ca candanāni
ratnaivaliś cūșadhibhīḥ sa gaṃbḥīṛḥ |
mygaṃprayuktān rahakāṁś ca hāṁmān
acakrīvē śmai suhṛdālayēbhyaḥ || )
vayo'nuṛūpāṇi ca bhūṣanāṇi
hiraṃmayā hastimṛgaśvakaś ca
rathāś ca gāvī vasanoprayuktā
gantarś ca cūmikarāpūryacitrāḥ ||

This alternation of accusatives and nominatives is of course
wrong. I read therefore hiraṃmayān hastimṛgaśvakaṁś ca 22 b
and rathāṁś ca 22 c. Ed. Nand. has gantryaḥ ca but it leaves
the remaining accusatives unchanged. Ed. Jogl. replaces
the whole set of accusatives in both stanzas by nominatives and has
moreover the singular gantri ca for gantriś ca.

26a. sthirāsilasamnyutāt. — I should like to read "yuktāt
in order to avoid a change of metre. ³ samnyutāt was perhaps or-
originally a gloss. See my note on V. 87.

29c. sarvartusukhārṣayēṣu. — Cp sarvartusukhasēvyāni, Rā-
mayāṇa IV. 43. 46.

31d. bhruvaṇcītār aridhanirvēṣitaś ca. — This could remain
if we were to take bhruvaṇcītār as an adjective qualifying
the following substantive. But against such an interpretation speaks
the parallel passage IV. 25 ¹) where brows and stolen glances are
bhrvowēcītār ²) (i. e. bhruvō 'ncītār) cannot be good because of
the singular bhruvō. I should therefore propose to read bhru-
vaṇcītār i. e. bhruvaṇcītār with the same euphonic license which
occurs in tryambakam for tryambakam in Kumārāsaṁbhava
III. 44d.

42c d. babandha śāntvēṇa phalēna caitäms tyajō 'pi tēśāṁ hy
anapāyadṛṣṭaḥ || The change of subject in d as well as the
wholly unnecessary hi are very hard. I read: tyajō hi tēśāṁ

¹) The parallelism was first pointed out by Prof. Lüders.
²) The short u confirms my correction.
anupayaddhah || One of Mr. Joglekar's MSS. (A) has kha\=lu pa\-pad\ddhah which conveys exactly the same idea viz. he fettered them (= the criminals) with goodness since setting them altogether free was considered a bad advice. Compare the following passage from the Mr\=chak\=atika:  

\begin{quote}
Ca\(\text{r}\)uddat\(\text{a}\)\(\text{a}\)h | satruh k\(\text{\i}\)t\(\text{\i}\)para\(\text{\=d}\)hah \(\text{\i}\)sa\(\text{\=ra}\)\(\text{\=n}\)am \(\text{\=up}\)\(\text{\=e}\)\(\text{\=ya}\)h \(\text{\=p}\)\(\text{\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=}
a water-plant; they are due to palaeographical similitude of this word to śālēya. But the compounds containing śālēya in the first member are no more good since they are properly epithets of rocks and not of groves. They are perhaps due to the copyist's acquaintance with the epic poems of Kālidāsa; see śālēyanaśadheśu śālātālēsu, Kumārasambhava I. 55d and śālēyaganadhīni śālātālāni, Rāghuvamśa VI. 51b. — For my part, I am inclined either to adopt the simple reading of Jogl. śitēna boddhāni, which was also my first correction, or to propose a combination of śitēna (Jogl.) with naddhāni (Nand., marginal note) for which a partial parallel may be found in Rāmayana III. 16. 23: avaśyayatamōnaddhō — vaunrajayoh. To śita the sense of "coolness. frost" should be given; Cowell's translation "cold season" is not good.

16a. śrōtirathāh — "hips" (Cowell). „Was soll aber ratha hier bedeuten? Ist vielleicht śrōtiratāḥ zu lesen?" (Böhtlingk). But śrōtiratāḥ is too pale. I think the author alludes to the hips (or rather buttocks) being sometimes called Kāma's chariot. The buttocks are compared to his triumphal car in the passage of the Daśakumaracarita mentioned above in a foot-note to I. 6, (tasyāḥ) — dūriktyogīmanarathō 'tīghanaiṁ jaganānāṃ, in the description of A v antsundari: jāitrarathaśaturyeṇa ghanam jaganānān (viz. vidhāya), p. 45, 8 and in several other passages.

17. śīghrān samarthaṁ tu gantum anśa
   gatiṁ nijagrāha sayān na tūrnam |
   hriyā praṇalbhanī nigūhamānā
   rahāḥ prajuktāni vibhūṣaṇāni ||

Prof. Kern has restored c in what seems to me a perfectly satisfactory manner. He reads hriyāpraṇalbha („vor Scham schüchtern“) vinigūhamānā. By the obscure rahāḥ prajuktāni vibhūṣaṇāni in d the tinkling girdle and other ornaments are meant as shown by the following stanza which throws a bright light on the situation hinted at by Aśvaghoṣa:

iyam apratitodhasāyaṁivasātvāmvam prathamār rahāḥsakhi |
gatīvibhramasādāniravā sa śucā nānumṛtēva lakṣyate ||
Rāghuvaṁśa VIII. 58.
Finally, the commentary of Mallinātha on this stanza enables us to understand the use of *hriyāpragalbhā*. He says: *iyām prathamūdyā rukhasokhi | suratasamaye ’py anuyānaṭ iti bhāvaḥ |
31b. kāṇa bhūyō parirmśtam ureyām | I should read ba-
lēnav which agrees better with śisutē, yuvā and jārām.
33a. vayaḥprakarṣūt means: since you are to live long, since your life shall be protracted.
41d. param samāṣṭisya is explained by kṛto ’svatantraḥ.
42d which confutes Prof. Speyer’s objection.
47c. śruta ca me rōgabhayaṃ. — The use of ca is hard. I should like to read hi.
48d. puryāgamain bhūmi-patiś caṅkāra || It is simply inconceivable to me how one can take this to mean ”the king himself entered the city“ (Cowell). Besides it is bad Sanskrit. The explanation given by Mr. Joglekar is more correct (pur-
yām agamaṃ puryāgamain returning, coming) but his transla-
tion does not correspond to the situation (”the king himself returned to the city“). Mr. Nandargikar’s translation (”The lord of the earth returned of his capital“) is still less satisfactory, since the king did not leave the royal precinct. Moreover the addition of ”himself“ by Cowell and Mr. Joglekar is entirely arbitrary. In order to avoid all these drawbacks, but without the full conviction to have hit the mark. I venture to correct pur-
yāgamain into pūrṇāgamain ”he convoked an assembly of ci-
tizens“. The following stanza seems to presuppose some such assembly 1).
58c. kīṁ kevalasyāivā janasya dharmah. — Read: kevala-
syāiśa. kevalasya janasya corresponds thus exactly to sarvaprāja-

1) mārgasya śaucudhik-tāya caiva cukrōsa ruṣṭo ’pi ca nōgra-
dandah || which does not mean *and, although unused to severe punishment, even when displeased, he rebuked him whose duty it was to see that the road was clear* (Cowell), for this translation omits ēva which belongs to the preceding word (and not to the following one as rendered by Mr. Nandargikar), but: *he rebuked only him whose duty etc. (and not the others) for even though angry he was averse to severe punishment*. 
nām and eṣa dharmāḥ to agam antah. eva for eṣa (and vice versa) is not uncommon.

62a. tasmād ratham suta nivartayaṁ tuḥ. — Prof. Leumann tries to defend the neuter ratham on account of vyuḥāni X. 27 e and lōkāni X. 31 d but the latter passage has been brilliantly restored by Prof. Windisch (lōkān imāṁs trāṁ api kim puṇar gām) and vyuḥāni (whose correctness is doubted by Böhtlingk) is a Ṛṣi leγ̑ωμένων while ratha is used as a masculine in both the preceding and the following stanzas. The would-be neuter ratham owes its origin to the mechanical influence of some such phrase as nivartayamāsa sa nāva tam ratham | III. 63 b.

Canto IV.

10. sōbhayata guṇāiṛ ebhir api tuṁ Uttarān Kurun | Kūbēraśyāpī cākriḍōṁ 1) pray eṣas vasudhāṁ imāṁ ||
Read sōbhayatha and translate: „You embellish with these graces (of yours) even the Northern Kurus, nay, even the pleasure-grove of Kubēra, not to speak of this country“. In his harangue, Udayin is throughout stating the excellencies of the nautch-girls addressed and therefore the simple indicative mood is used in verses preceding and following our stanza. Ed. Jogl. has sōbhayantyō which is not so good as sōbhayatha though at any rate better than sōbhayata or sōbhayēta (Kern). It is further false to translate vasudhāṁ imāṁ by „this earth“ (as opposed to heaven), neither the Kurukṣetra nor the Kailāśa being celestial regions. It means „this country“ i. e. the territory of the Śākyas as opposed to the more distant land of the Northern Kurus and to the garden of Kubēra situated still farther off in the Northern direction. (I am well aware that the reading sōbhayatha contains a slight metrical irregularity).

24 c.d. saṁāruhuḥr atmanāṁ kumāragrahaṇāṁ prati || — „rose even above themselves for the conquest of the prince“ (Cowell), 2) „strung themselves up for the purpose of seizing the

1) with Bühler and ed. Jogl. for ca krūḍāṁ.
2) Mr. Nandargikar follows Cowell here as elsewhere.
prince” (Mr. Joglekar). Neither the text nor the renderings quoted are satisfactory. For “even” (api) and “above” (ati) no warrant is found in the Sanskrit original. It is also clear that samaruh being a neuter verb, it cannot govern atmānam as its object. Hence I venture to propose a slight correction viz. samāruruhann atmānam “they engaged themselves in captivating the prince”. But prati remains a little hard.

29 d. saṁghaṭṭāīr valgubhiḥ || I read saṁghaṭṭāvalgubhiḥ. saṁghaṭṭāīr is due to other instrumentals in the same line.

32. kacid ājñāpayantīva pravācārdrāmapanā ||
iha bhaktīṁ kuryavetā hastāṁ samīśāya lipsayā ||
The whole stanza must appear meaningless unless we assign to bhakti the double meaning of “decoration” and “love”. Another girl, still wet with unguent, said to the prince: “Set a decorative line (bhakti) here” (this explains the use of ārdrāmapanā) and at the same time she, as it were, commanded love (bhakti) — instead of begging it (this explains the use of ājñāpayantīva).

40. apayantiṁ tathāivāṁyā babandhur māyodāmabhiḥ ||
kacīṁ sakṣepamadhuṁ āṁ jagrhrur vacanāṅkuśaṁ ||
Since jaghrur is evidently opposed to babandhur it must have the meaning of “stung” or something like. But this it cannot mean. It cannot further mean “punished” (Cowell) because the driver does not punish the elephant with his hook. We expect some verb meaning “to goad, to drive, to spur on”. Should we read tūtudur or jaghnus tu (cp. bāspapratidābhīhatāu nṛpṛṇā IX. 1c)? or perhaps cukṣudur? Cp. the following stanza from the Pañcatantra:

\[\text{tavat syāt sarvākṛtya eva puruṣo 'tra svayāṁ praabhūḥ ||}
\text{strīvāyānkuśavikṣaṇo yāvan nō dhriyaṭe balāt ||}
\]

II. v. 143 (ed. Bühler, BSS).

59 d. supēd ought to be corrected with Bühlingk to svapēd\(^1\).

\(^1\) It is true that both Indian editions have svapīyād but I suspect this to be rather a corrected than a correct form since both editions read in the same line tiṣṭhan nīṣidēd vá (tiṣṭheṇ J in Jogl. ed.) which seems to be an ancient blunder.
Kielhorn calls this "eine dem Kunstdichter ebenso unerlaubte Form wie viśvasēl in XI. 16 es ist" but I think we may give Aśvaghoṣa credit for having used both these forms since one of them is found even in Kālidāsa's Meghadūta viz. uśvasantryah from uśvasati in v. 8 b 1).

61a. viṇuṣyamānē 'pi tarāṇ. — Read: hi since this image is illustrative of the foregoing yathācetiṣ tathāiva saḥ. Besides api seems pleonastic on account of puspāir api phalāir api in b.

76b. jalaprabhavasamabhavā | — Cowell's rendering of this compound viz. "daughter of the son of the Water (Agni)" has been rectified by both Indian interpreters whose attention the known legend of the Mahābhārata did not escape. jalaprabha (a word not registered in the Petropolitan dictionary) means here "fish". jalaprabhavasamabhava corresponds closely to matsyayoniṣṭa Mahābhārata I. 64. 110 b 2) and refers to Satyavati, a daughter of the celestial nymph Adrika (cursed with the temporary assumption of the shape of a fish) by king Vasu or Parīcara. She was brought up among fishermen for which reason she got the name dāsārājasuta I. 64. 91 d (or simply dāsasuta in an interpolated śloka of the same chapter, 54a). Hence she is called dāsakanyā in a passage of the Daśakumaracarita which, by the way, very probably proves Daṇḍin's acquaintance with the Buddhacarita. Cp. Daśakumaracarita p. 85 (Nirṇaya Sūgara Press ed. 9) and Buddhacarita IV. 72 ff.

94a. anṛte śraddadhānasya. — Read śraddadhānasya. The whole means: why should one deceive an ingenuous lover.

100 c d. janasya caksurgamaniyamaṇḍalō mahidharain cāstum iyāya bhāskaraḥ ||

That Böhtlingk was perfectly right in taking (against Cowell) the compound adjective in c for "nicht etwa ein Beiwort der


2) I am quoting the Mahābhārata from the new Bombay edition of the Southern recension, the only one available to me.
Sonne überhaupt, sondern der untergehenden“ is proved by an exactly parallel case viz. the epithet of the setting sun in the Kumārasambhava VIII. 29b nītrāgamyaṃ avalokya bhāskara-

ram ¹).

Canto V.

14 c d. balajānvanajīvitapravṛttān
vijagānātmagatō madah kṣanēna ||

If we connect madah with "pravṛttān then ātmagatō becomes meaningless and superfluous. In fact it is omitted by Cowell and wrongly rendered by Mr. Joglekar who does not take account of its reflexive nature. I read "pravṛttō and translate: "The arrogance regarding himself and originating in (or: derived from, caused by) his vigour, his youth and his life, vanished in a moment".

52 d. tōranaśālobhānjaṅjikēva || This emendation of Cowell’s is now rendered doubly sure by the testimony of Mr. Joglekar’s edition. From the whole description (avalambya gavākṣapārśvan--
cāpavibhugangātrayasthīḥ--) as well as from the stanza XVI. 17 of the Rāghuvaṃśa quoted by the Indian scholar it appears clearly that the meaning of tōranaśālobhānjaṅjikē is "a caryatid". The reading "mālabhaṅjikē is necessarily false since it is the name of a play i. e. an action and a girl can be compared only to an object. A play cannot lie leant against a window.

58 (c) d. (aṣayiṣṭa vikirṇakaṇṭhasūtrā)
gajabhagna pratipātāntanaṃva ||

This is the reading of the editio princeps based on P but of course it is unacceptable. C (i. e. C and D) has pratipātānta-

¹) The German translator of the Kumārasambhava, Dr Walter, has not quite understood this passage and indeed many an other too. Nevertheless his translation is careful and good. (See: Der Kumarasambhava oder die Geburt des Kriegsgottes, ein Kunstgedicht des Kālidāsa--- in deutsche Prosa übertragen--- von Dr phil. Otto Walter, München-Leipzig 1913).
néeva which may fairly be corrected to patitā ¹) latāṅganéva. This conjecture of mine made years ago is now confirmed in a very curious manner by the reading of Mr. Joglekar's edition viz. gajabhagnā bhūvi-pātīteva mōcā which conveys exactly the same idea though in different words. Cp. also V. 29b; 51d; VIII. 24cd and other similar passages. Numerous examples of the same simile may be quoted from other poets e. g. Śītā vyathitā cakampī chinnēva yuktā kadalī gajēna, Rāmāyāna III. 53. 61 (ed. Gorresio); anapāyini saṁśrayadrume gajabhagnē patanāya vallārī, Kumārasaṁbhava IV. 31 etc.

61a. vinītyaghaptā vinītydhagātā. — Read: vinītyaghātā which alone agrees with madugāṁviteva in c.

68b. jāvinām Chandakam ittham ity uvāca | — ittham iti is hard. Read: abhyuvāca.

73b. nibhītvāni krasvatanuśapyaṣṭhakarnām | Read: nibhītā-krasvas and cp. e. g. nibhītordhekarṇāh (viz. rathyāh), Śakuntalā v. 8b (ed. Cappeller).

87. Harituragaturningavat tumīnagah
   so tu vicaraṇa manasāvā cūryamānah |
   aṃrṇaparurṣabhabraṃ antarikṣaṃ
   sarusahābhūni ²) jagāna gōjanāti ||

Read in c: aṃrṇatarunābhāsam. The reading paruṣa is either due to palaeographical confusion or else to a gloss aparuṣa, much in the same manner as colasya in X. 18a which was abbreviated from acalasya, a gloss to śālasya ³). aruṇa means here of course the dawn, a moment later the sun will rise (VI. 1a). With regard to the rhyme cp. turunānāragayogat, Rāghuvaṁśa V. 72c. With harituragaturningavat tumīnagah has to be

1) Perhaps we ought to read phalitā on account of ab. Cp. tuto‘bhīṣaṅgāvadācāvpraviddha prabhāṣyaśamanubharaṇaprasūmā | svamūrtilabhapraṇītām dhāritrinī latēva Śītā sahasā jagāma || Rāghuvaṁśa XIV. 54.

2) Sarasā is of course wrong but I am unable to decide between parama (Böhtlingk) and sarala (Prof. Kern).

3) Another very interesting proof that glosses have here and there crept into our text is the variant trātum P ad I. 67d which is a commentary on the misunderstood pūtum.
compared atītya harinā harinā ca var tantē vājīnāḥ. Šakuntalā (ed. Cappeller) p. 3 l. 16.

Canto VI.

1 a b. tatō mūhūrtē 'bhuyudīte jagaccaksuśi bhāskarē | — C has mūhūrtābhyudīte. I think we ought to read tatō mūhūrtad udīte "a moment after, when the sun rose,".

5. imānu Tārksyopamajavanā turaṅgam anugacchatā |
   darśita sāunya madbhaktirvikramaścāyamātmānaḥ ||

Cowell remarks with regard to Tārksya: "an old mythic representation of the sun as a horse"; cp. the following stanza:
   gatiṁ khara ivāśvasya Tārksyasyāva patatrināḥ |
   anugantuṁ na śaktir mē gatiṁ tava mahīpatē ||
   Rāmāyaṇa II. 105. 6.

6 cd. bhartṛsnēha śa ca yasyāyaṁ idṛṣaḥ śakta 1) eva ca ||
Read: idṛṣi śaktir ēva ca. bhartṛsnēha corresponds to madbhakti and śakti to vikrama in the immediately preceding stanza.

8. tat prītō 'smi tavānēna mahābhūjena karmanā |
   dṛṣyate mayi bhāvo 'yam phatebhyo 'pi parāṃmukhe ||

There must be something wrong in the third pāda, dṛṣyate cannot satisfy. Cowell translates according to the true acceptance of the word "is seen" but one feels that something more eloquent is needed. I read: dṛṣyam tē 2).

10d. nāsti nīskāraṇasvataḥ || — I should divide nīskāraṇa svataḥ and explain the latter word by svasyāyam ity abhimānaḥ. svataḥ is here a synonym of mamatva (as used e. g. in the Kumārasambhava I. 12 d) or, to put it otherwise, of snēha. Cp. Mallinātha's commentary on Kumārasambhava III. 35 d; "snēha" is here glossed: istasūddhanānāṃbandhanāḥ prēmāparanāmā mamatābhīmānaḥ.

35 a(b). atha bandhunā ca rājyam ca (tyaktum ēva kṛtya ma-

1) The MSS. have sakta.
2) Cp. the reading of P (sāunya tapōvane) ad VII. 11 a (sāun-nyas tapōvane).
tiḥ ||). — Cowell's suggestion bandhūṁś ca is good but unnecessary. bandhu may be employed for any relative once mentioned or whose degree of relationship is easily gathered from the context and it assumes then the more precise meaning of father, wife 1) etc. as the case may be. Here as in other passages of our poem it means "father". Cp. IX. 28 c (taṁ Rāhulāṁ mokṣaya bandhusokat); 34 c; also IX. 17 c. Cowell's constant rendering of bandhu by "kindred" is not to the point because of the collective sense of the English word.

43. madvīyogam prati cChanda saṁtāpas tyajyatam ayam nīnābhāvō hi niyatam prthagjātīsu dehiṣu ||

The latter half of this slōka has been utterly misunderstood by Cowell who translates "change is inevitable in corporeal beings who are subject to different births". The correct rendering of the whole verse is: "Abandon this distress, Chanda, regarding (thy) parting from me, because separate existence is an inevitable rule with men who are born separately".

47 c.d. saṁyogō viprayogas ca tatha me prāṇināṁ mataḥ || Read: maṭau in accordance with Aśvaghōsa's syntax.

59 c. dhṛtvanśakam kāvanahāṁsacitram. — Cowell has not understood this passage. He was rectified by Böhtlingk who translates: "nachdem er (sein) mit goldenen Gänse verziertes Gewand angesehen hatte". Prof. Leumann prefers the reading of C "cīhuam and translates the compound by "mit goldenen schwan (oder mit goldenen schwänen) gezeichnet". He quotes in support of his opinion a parallel passage from the Jain canon where a piece of cloth is called haṁsalakhana i.e. "mit einem schwan (oder mit schwänen) gezeichnet". Of course he is perfectly right but the same parallel may be found nearer at hand viz. in Kalidāsa's works. See: vadhūdūkulaṁ kalahāṁsalakṣa-

1) E.g. in dūrabandhuḥ, Mēghadūτa v. 6 c, which is glossed as asaṁnāhitodārāḥ by Vallabhadēva and viyuktabhārīyō by Mallinātha (Prof. Hultsch gives the meaning of bandhu as 'kinsman, relative', Glossary s. v.). Cp. the Metropolitan dictionary s. v. bandhu.
Canto VII.

12. tatpurvam adyāramadarśanaṁ mē yasmād īmām dharmavidhiṁ na jānē |
           tasmāt --

I think we have to read yat pūrvam in a because of yasmād in b, but I cannot find fault with tatpurvam in itself as Prof. Speyer seems to do. In III. 25 c it is used adverbially (as in Kumārasambhava V. 10 c), here it is an adjective qualifying āśramadarśanan (cp. Rāghuvaṁśa XIV. 38 c, Kumārasambhava VII. 30 b) 2).

13(c) d. (kramena tasmāi kathuyāṁcaṅkara)
      tapōviśeśāṁ tapasah phalam ca ||

Read: tapōviśeśāṁs and cp. tapōvikāraṁs ca nirūkṣya, supra 11 a and bhūmās tu te te tapasāṁ vikalpāḥ, infra 14 d. — C (i.e. C and D) has tapōviśeśāṁ ta o; with this spelling has to be compared kāmāṁ C for kāmān of P and the printed text in X. 34 c.

23. trāsaś ca nityāṁ maruṇāt prajāmāṁ
           yatnena cecchanti punah prasutim |

1) Dr Walter translates this by »das mit Schwänen gezierte feine Kleid der jungen Frau«; it should be»gezeichnete«. (See p. 27 note 2).

2) Cp. also: tatprathamāvalambanam || Kumārasambhava V. 66 d (tat ēva prathamāṁ tatprathamām | -- tav ca tav ava-
           lambanāṁ grahaṇāṁ ca -- | Mallinātha).
I should read in b punahprasūtim (cp. e.g. svargāya yuṣmākam again tu dharmō mamāhuilāsas tv apunarbhavāya, infra, 48ab) and in d magnā and bhītaḥ because the plural is employed throughout in the preceding and in the following stanzas.

42 b. saṁkīrṇadharmaḥ patītō 'scīr vā | — The reading of P viz. "dharme" should have been preferred as clearly shown by dharme sthītaḥ in the prince’s answer to this question.

44 a (b) ity evaṃ uktē sa tapasvimadhīye
(tapasvimukhyena manuṣimukhyah | )

Read: uktāḥ. It cannot be separated from manuṣimukhyah (ūcacakṣaṃ d).

46 c (ratiṣaṃ mē) dharmamavagrahasya. — "when I first grasped the idea of dharma" (Cowell). I translate: "(of me) who have newly taken to the dharma i.e. who am a neophyte regarding it". Cp. (aham--) dharmam imam prapannah XI. 7 b. As to the use of the root grah in this sense cp. e.g. pravrajyāṁ agraḥśam, Daśakumāra-carita p. 139. 6. Cp. also navagraha as an epithet of elephants.

51 d. kuṁḍódahastō. — The MSS. have kuṁḍēvahastō C and kuṁḍēvahastō P. I should propose to read kuṁḍirahastō.

Canto VIII.

13. idāṁ purāṁ tēṇa vivarjitaṁ vanāṁ
vanāṁ ca tat tēṇa samanvitaṁ purām |
na sōbhatē tēṇa hi nō vinā purāṁ
Marutvatā Vyātravadhē yathā divām ||

The best commentary on this stanza is the following passage from the Hitopadeśa: tēṇa vinā sakalajanapūrṇo 'py ayam grāmō maṁ praty aranyavat pratibhāti 1) (quoted in Speyer's

1) Cp. also: gṛham hi gṛhināhaṃ aranyasadgaṃ mama || Pañcatantra III. 130 cd (ed. Hertel, HOS, Cambridge Mass. 1908; cp. v. 129). Other similar verses might be quoted.

Roeznik orientalistyczny.
Sanskrit Syntax § 179 c) Rem.). Cowell was certainly wrong in his explanation of this verse (Translation, II. 15, foot-note) and so was Böhtlingk (ad II. 15 d), though less. By the way, its immediate source is doubtless the following śloka:

\[
\text{vanam nagaram evāsti yena gacchati Rūghavah} | \\
\text{asmābhīś ca parītyaktam purām saṃpādyatāṁ vanam ||}
\]

Rāmāyaṇa II. 33. 22.


19a janāś ca harṣātiśayena vaṁcitāḥ. — Read: hēśātiśayēnā.  
35(a) b. (varam manuṣyasya vicakṣāṇo ripur
na mitram aprājīnaḥ ayogapēśalām.  

Prof. Formichi tries to thunder down Cowell for his translation of ayogapēśalā but without success. The word must be divided into a-ayogapēśalā 1) and being opposed to vicakṣāṇa it means nearly the same as aprājīna i.e. foolish. The idea is very common all over the world. Cp. e.g. paṇḍito 'pi varam śatrur na mūrkho hitakārakah, Pañcatantra I. v. 417a b. etc.

43c(d). anūgasāu svāḥ samavehi sarvaśā (gataḥ nyādēvaḥ sa hi devi devavat ||)

Read: anūgasāu nāu because samāvehi demands an object and this cannot be the following clause. Cowell’s translation is: “know that we two are entirely guiltless”.

54. abhāginiś nīnām iyaṁ vasundhara
tam āryakarmāṇam anuttamām prati | 
gatas tato 'sau guṇavān hi tādhāro
upōḥ prajābhāgyagyunāḥ prasūyatē || 2)

prati is an unhappy conjecture of Cowell’s. The reading of the MSS. viz. patiṁ (pati P) should be restored. I translate: “Surely this earth does not deserve this noble, incomparable

1) yōga has here the sense of ’manner, expedient, resource, shift, trick etc.‘ rather than of ’emergency‘ as rendered by Cowell. See also XI. 47 b and arthāyōgavicaṇṭāh, Rāghuvamśa IX. 18 d (yōgāyōgāyēṣu, Mallinātha).
2) This stanza is probably interpolated but it no less deserves elucidation.
lord (or husband). Therefore he is gone, for it is the merits and the virtues of the subjects which produces a virtuous king like him<sup>3</sup>.

62 d. tathā sa dharmaṁ mad ṛte cikīrṣati || —Read: tataḥ sa as in the following stanza (— — tato 'syā jātō mayi dharmamatsarāḥ ||).

66 b. na taj (viz. svargasukham) janasyātmavatō 'pi durlabhām | —Read hi (Prof. Kern) and cp. e. g. dvitiyas tu (viz. svargaḥ) sarvasyaśiva sulabhāḥ kuladharmānuṣṭhitām, Daśakumāracharita p. 83 l. 1.

81 a(b). iti tanayaviyōgajātadukkham<br>({kṣitisastryaṁ sahaśajīn vihāya dhāiryam |
Read: *duḥkkhaḥ*. The reading of the text is due to the numerous accusatives in the following line.

Canto IX.

6 (a) b. (--- astī sa dirghabāhuḥ)<br>prāptah kumārō na tu nāvaruddhāḥ |
P has cāva<sup>°</sup>. The end of this line must in my opinion conceal something opposed either to prāptah or to kumāraḥ. Should we read na ca nāvaruddhāḥ? Or perhaps na tu bālabuddhiḥ? Cp. bāto 'py abālapratimō II. 23 c; bālaś ca bālabuddhiś ca, MBh. VII. 55. 5.

14 b. parāmi te 'cyāvinam ētam artham | —The MSS. have the corrupt reading tēvāvinim ētam. The Tibetan translation leaves the choice between bhūvitam (adopted by Kielhorn) and bhāvinam and I cannot doubt that the parallel passages decide in favour of the latter correction. See II. 25 a; 33 b.

21 c. ubhē 'pi is perhaps good. Cp. IV. 97 a (above p. 5). Moreover the hi suggested by Böhtlingk is quite out of place here since tasmāt alone is sufficient.


29 (a) b. (śokāññīna tvadvirahēudhanēna) niḥsvāsadhiśīna tamahśikhēna |
The rūpaka tamahśikha contains a manifest contradiction. I read: tapahśikhēna.
34 c.d. saṁtāpahetur na sutō na bandhur ajñānanāmimittika eṣa tāpaḥ ||

Read: eva. eṣa tāpaḥ is unnecessarily strong. On the other hand stress should be laid on ajñānanāmimittika.

40 d. parāpacāreṇa ca dharmapīḍā. — This is a conjecture of Cowell’s but as Böhtlingk rightly observed the reading of the MSS. viz. parāpacāreṇa should have been preferred. What is meant by parāpacāra we learn e. g. from the story of Śambhuka as told in the Rāmāyaṇa VII. 73—76 and in the Rāghuvaṁśa XV. See especially the following verses:

yō hy adharmam akāryam vā viṣayē pārthivasya tu karōti cāsrīmūlam tatpurē vā durmatir naraḥ |
kṣipram ca narakam yati sa ca rājā na saṁsayaḥ ||

Rāmāyaṇa VII. 74. 29/30.

rājan praṇīsu te kuścid apacāraḥ pravartate |
tam anvisya praśamayēr bhavitūsi totaḥ kṛti ||

Rāghuvaṁśa XV. 47.

Cp. also apunyena praṁām aganyatōmarēṣu, Daśakumāracarita p. 252 l. 6, and other similar sayings.

47 c.d. agneḥ yathā hy uṣṇam apiṁ dravatvāṁ tadvat pravyttāṁ prakṛtyām vadanti ||

I should read: pravyttāṁ prakṛtyār vadanti.

50 d. āikyam ca dattō jagat udvahantī || —Read gatvā and cp. e. g. gatvākāvatvān sa Kṛṣṇena, Mahābhārata II. 25. 69a.

51 c. yad ātmanas tasya ca tēna yūgaḥ. — I should read tatra (i. e. tasmin garbhē) for tasya which cannot be an epithet of ātmanas since ātman is here mentioned for the first time.

60b svapūram praviṣya | — Read: praviṣṭāḥ. This must have been felt by Cowell for he translates „came to his city“.

61a. evamvidhā dharmayaśoḥprayōptaḥ. I read ṛdēpāḥ because a substantive is needed here.

62b. (mantriṇāḥ—-) nrpaṣya cakṣuṣaḥ. — Prof. Leumann’s conjecture nrpaṣya cakhyaṣaḥ is unnecessary. The same metaphor recurs e. g. in the Gangdhar stone inscription of Viśva-varman (CII III. p. 75, l. 23) where a certain Maṇḍūrakṣaka, the minister of king Viśa-varman, is called rājnas tṛtīyam
iva caṇṣuḥ. Another instance is the following śloka (II. 30) from the Kumārasambhava:

(sa dvīnētraṁ Hareś caṇṣuḥ sahasranayanālīhikam |
Vācaspatir uvācēdaṁ praṇjalir Jalajāsamam ||)

Cp. also the numerous passages in Sanskrit literature where the king is spoken of as nayca caṇṣuḥ and the like, e. g. Rāghu-
vamśa I. 55; IV. 13 (caṇṣuṁmatra--- śastreṇa) etc.

64 ab. na me ksamaṁ sanātanaṁ hi darśanaṁ grahitum. —
I should like to read sanātanaṁ.

Canto X.

12 c. vibhīyatāṁ kva pratigacchatītī. — I should propose to read parigacchatī cp. XI. 73 c.

15 a. tasmin vanē lōdhravanōpagūḍhē. — The reading vanē is false and must be corrected to girāu, firstly, because it refers (tasminl) to the mahādhariṁ Pāṇḍavaṁ named in the preceding line, secondly, because the future Buddha standing on the Pāṇ-
ḍava mountain, clad as he is in his red garment, is compared to the rising sun touching the verge of the Eastern mountain, and finally, because it would be pleonastic to speak of a vana as vanōpagūḍha.

33 c. yuvat svavamāsaprāturūrōpam. — We must separate prāturūpa rūpam on analogy with a b and d.

35. dharmasya cārthasya ca jīvalokē
dṛtyarthibhūtāni hi yāuvanāni |
sainrakṣyamāṇē api durgrahāṇī
dūrōtās tēna yathō harantī ||

The text of d is evidently corrupt. Cowell’s rendering of it is plainly impossible but neither the corrections proposed seem to me satisfactory (pathē Prof. Leumann, pathē dṛavanti Bōht-
ingk, svēna pathē Prof. Windisch, best emendation). I read in d kāmē yataḥ tēna pathē hriyantē and translate the whole stanza as follows: „Youth in this world of living beings is an enemy of duty and wealth; hard to master though it be ever so guarded, it is drawn forth on that path where the pleasures (are to be found“).
Canto XI.

6. suhyttyāḥ cāryatayaḥ ca rājan
   vibhāvya mām āva vinīścyayā tē |
   atrāṇunēśyāmi suhyttyāiva
   brūyām ahaṁ nōttaram anyad atra ||

This stanza is indeed a hard nut to crack. The MSS. read in d vihāya prāg which is borrowed from śloka 7 as pointed out by Cowell. The Tibetan translation as communicated by Wenzel says: "whatever a determination of thine imagines of me, to this (answering I would say". It would seem to me that some Sanskrit phrase as saṁhāvayaty ēṣa vinīścyō mām would be more in keeping with this than Cowell's conjecture. Then in c atra is quite out of place; it is apparently borrowed from d: indeed the copyist after having gone aloud through the whole line might have easily put the last word of it in the beginning. Finally, the optative brūyām is wholly incongruous with the future anunēśyāmi. Hence I should read in c atō 'rūnēśyarī ca. The translation will be no more difficult after these changes.

8a. nāśvīśēbhyyō 'pi tathā bhīhēmi. — Read hi instead of 'pi because this stanza contains an argument for the statement made in the foregoing one. Besides in a gradation like this api should be if at all expected after the last substantive.

19d. kaḥ kāmasamjaṁuṁ viṣam āsasūda || — Read perhaps āsvadēta.

27c. hiṁsṛēṣu teṣu āyatanopamēṣu kāmēṣu. — No correction is needed. hiṁsṛēṣu is equivalent to hiṁsṛāṇēṃ madhyē. Translate: "these pleasures which may be compared to dwelling-places among evil-doers (or wild beasts)" and compare with this the following half śloka which for the present I am unable to identify: hiṁsṛāṇēṃ puratō vāsō na sukha-yōpajayate.

28. girāu vane cāpsu ca sāgarē ca
    yadbhraṁśam archanty abhilāṅghamōnāḥ |
    teṣu drumapragraphalopamēṣu
    kāmēṣu kasyātmavatō ratiḥ syat ||
Cowell says in his translation of this verse: "which those who would leap up to reach fall down upon a mountain or into a forest" etc. But this does not render the Sanskrit original. Besides it would be rather difficult to fall down upon a mountain. Böhtlingk's remarks are untenable because it is evident that yad stands in correlation with tēṣu and making part as it does of a whole set of relative pronouns standing for kāmāḥ it cannot be taken in the sense of "da" (= since). yadbhram-śam is a compound and means "the fall (caused) by them" i.e. by the pleasures. abhilāṅgahānāḥ must be taken substantively (=men passing viz. mountains, rivers etc. where they come to fall) and the whole stanza means: "It is for the sake of pleasures that men are fighting their way through mountains and forests, passing rivers and going over oceans whereby they reach a miserable end, because the pleasures are unattainable even as fruits growing on the topmost branches of a tree — what self-controlled man would find joy in them?". Cp. tasyāva (i.e. kāmasya) kṣet viśiṣṭaṁsthānāvaṁtaṁ kaṣṭaṁ tapāṁsi mahātaṁ dānāṁ daruṇāṁ yuddhāṁ bhimāṁ samudrālaṅgahānaṁ īṇa ca narāḥ samācaṁaṁ | Daśakumāra-carita p. 86/87.

29 c. angārakarṣapratinēṣu tēṣu kāmēṣu. — A similar passage from the Pañcatantra viz. svahastenāṅgārāḥ karṣitāḥ (I. p. 27 l. 13) shows that we have here to do with a proverbial locution meant to characterise fruitless exertion. The numerous corrections proposed (karṣū Böhtlingk, varṣa Kielhorn, rāṣṭi Speyer) are thus rendered superfluous.

57 b. sāntam avāptukāmah. — The correction to sāntim is unnecessary. In fact the neuter of the past participle is often used by Āśvaghoṣa in the sense of a(n abstract) substantive. Cp. viṣayāvaṇaptasukhe V. 76 b (it is far less natural to take avāptasukha as a karmādhāraya compound); tād evam āvam na-rādēva dōsato na tattroṣrūtāṁ pratigantum arhasi (read: prati gantum and translate: do not charge the blame of his departure on us two; dōsato gam) VIII. 49 b. An instance of the same employment of the past participle from the Raghuvamśa is: sraṣṭur varātisargat tu mayā tasya durātmahāḥ |
attyārūḍham ripoh sōḍhām candanēva bhoginah ||
(atyārūdhām atyārōhanaṃ | ativiḍḍhīr ity arthaḥ | napumsakē bhāvē ktaḥ | Mallinātha). X. 42.

60a. yad apy avocaḥ paripāyaṭām jarā. — Read: pratipāyaṭām and compare jarā pratikṣya viduṣā śameṣpānā 6d.

60e. capalain hi ḍṛṣyate. — No correction is needed. capalain is used abstractedly cp. (supra ad 57 b and) the following statement of Speyer’s: „Auch kommt es, wenigstens im Sanskrit (nur in aus buddhistischen Quellen geslossten Schriften?) ver-einzelt vor, dass das Neutrum eines Adjectivs als Abstractum verwendet wird, wie śāghyam „Lobenswürdigkeit“ Paṇc. I. 374, śuci „Reinheit“ Jtkm 128, 3, sthiram [= sthāiryam] Śukas. 23. 10a (V. u. S-S. § 2). — Cp. usṣānam as opposed to dravataṃ IX. 47 e.

66 d. viśasya yasmin (i. e. kratāu) param ucyatē phalam ī — Cowell connects param with phalam („highest reward“) but it belongs to viśasya and means „another“. Cp. parahimsayā in the next stanza (67 b) „through the injury of another“ (Cowell).

Canto XII.

1 c d. Arāḍasyāśramaṁ lhejē vapuṣā pūjayann iva || — Read: pūrayann iva and cp. vapuṣābhībhūya tam uṣramam—— propede VII. 1 c d and tvayy āgatē pūrya ivāśranaḥ ’bhūt, VII. 38 a.

8 c. abhuktivēva śriyam prāptaḥ. — abhuktivēva would be better.

13 c. tvuddaḍsanaṇād ahaṁ manye. — P has tvuddaḍsanaḥam, I read tvaddaḍsanaṃ. Kumaṇasambhava VI. 55 has anugraḥat but there the construction is different.

22 b. badhyate. — The root bandh is out of place here. We must read either varđhatē which stands in the parallel passage quoted by Prof. Hopkins 1) from the Mahābhārata or else bādhyaṭe. Prof. Formichi reads vadhyate but this is rather an epic form for the classical hanyate. Besides it would be pleonastic on account of the following mriyate for of course it cannot mean „soffre“ (= suffers).

28 a. ya evaham sa ēvedain. — I read without hesitation tad ēvedain.

1) JAOS, XXII, second half (1901) p. 388.
35 c. d. tasmād eśa mahābhāho mahāmāha iti smṛtaḥ || — P. has mahāmāha instead of mahābhāho. Read of course tasmād eśo 'ma-

hāmāha' in order to keep in agreement with the preceding and

following stanzas.

41 c. ārjavaṁ javatāṁ hitvā. — This cannot be possibly right. Could we read āvaraṁ jagatāṁ hitvā? Cp. punar āvaraṁ jágaṁ, infra 86 b.

68 d. (iti tasya sa tād vyāyām gṛhitvā--) pratyuttaram uvā-

da saḥ || — This second saḥ is certainly false. Read ha and ep.

infra 81 d.

70 a. b. vikāрапракṛtibhyō hi kṣetrajñām muktam apiṣ aham

manyē. — Read vikārapракṛtibhyāṁ hi and cp. supra 17 a pra-

kṛtiś ca vikāraś ca.

81 d. pratijāgāma ha || — "he turned away" (Cowell) but does it not rather mean "he returned"? I should read parājāgāma ha "he went away". Or perhaps parijāgāma? Cp. XI. 73 c.

92 c. d. vārsūṁ sat karmarēpsur akarō kāryam atmanāṁ ||

Read paraṁ prēpsur and ep. above Bōdhisattvāh paraṁ prēpsus
tasmād Udrakam atyajat || 86 c. d.

101 a. b. nirvṛtiḥ prāpyate sanyaksatatendriyatarpanat || — Se-

parate sanyak saṭa".

107 c. saphēnānātānātāmbar. — Read separately saphēn-

ānātā (corresponding to sītāśāṅkhājīvalabhujā, a) nītāmbar (cor-

responding to nilakambalavāsini, b).

Canto XIII.

13 c. priyabhidheyeṣu ratipriyeṣu (--- cakravākeṣu--). —

"the cakravāka birds) tenderly attached as they are and

well deserving the name of lovers". There can be no doubt that the
cakravāka birds fully deserve this name, nevertheless the cor-

correct translation of the Sanskrit original would be simply "bearing

the name of i. e. called the dear or the beloved ones". Now

priya is certainly no such constant epithet of the cakravāka

that it might be insisted upon as one of their chief character-

istics. Further, ratipriya cannot mean "tenderly attached".

I read therefore without the slightest hesitation priyāvidheyeṣu
and translate the whole: "obedient to their sweet-hearts and devoted to pleasure". Cp. the epithet of the voluptuous Aguīvarṇa in the Raghuvarmśa strīvidhē-yanavayāvanaḥ, XIX. 4 d.

16 d. khīn syād acittō na śaraḥ sa ēṣāḥ || — "can he be destitute of all feeling? is not this that very arrow?" (Cowell). "forse che inanimato non abbia ad essere il dardo, ma lui il santo" (Prof. Formichi). Cowell's translation is of course better, since an arrow was not a senseless object with an Indian poet (vāṇī hy ayaṁ tiṣṭhāti lelīhānaḥ, v. 13 b). but we ought to read śaraḥ sa ēva in view of tam ēva bāṇam, c, and ēsa śaraḥ sa ēva yaḥ—, v. 11 c. The reading of the text means: is this no arrow?

26 c. harṣēṇa kaścid uṣāvan nanartha. — Read nanarda. Bulls are no peacocks.

48 c. sō 'prāptakālo vivaśāḥ papāta. — This is good in itself but the context makes necessary the correction sō 'prāptakaṁō.

One final remark: there are numerous points of contact between the Buddhacarīta and the Rāmāyāna (especially Book II), which seem to prove undisputedly that Aśvaghōsa was intimately acquainted with the latter work. To this question, however. I intend to devote a special article which, I trust, will be published erealong.