



d. in. 24587

Gleanings from Aśvaghōṣa's Buddhacarita.

by

Andrzej Gawroński

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

I. Preliminary remarks.

According to the Hindu standard of taste the Buddhacarita of Aśvaghōṣa „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 fancy²⁾. The reason of this different appreciation is obvious to anyone acquainted with poetry and poetics in India and in Europe. Aśvaghōṣa as an artificial word-catcher and as a neat-handed carver of quaint ideas cannot be placed on the unattainable level of Kālidāsa 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 incalculating one's own assured belief upon the reader's mind, such awe and at the same time such love as that which Aśvaghōṣa feels towards his divine Master, are rarely if ever met with in Indian litera-

¹⁾ Aśvaghōṣa's Buddhacarita ed. K. M. Joglekar, Bombay 1912, p. 4.

²⁾ »Heute ist er uns als einer der hervorragendsten Dichter der Sanskritliteratur, als der bedeutendste Vorgänger des Kālidāsa... bekannt«. M. Winternitz, Geschichte der indischen Literatur, II. Band 1. Hälfte p. 292 (Leipzig, Amelang 1913).

ture. But these qualities of a moral order are not his only title to glory; for despite of the hard judgment pronounced on *Aśva-ghōṣa* by the distinguished native critic, the *Buddhacarita* 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 *kāvya* style unknown to him and if too rare to win for him the good graces of an Indian *paṇḍit* they are here and there frequent enough to incur even the blame of an European critic. No wonder then if the appearance of the *Buddhacarita* — 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 *Buddhacarita* 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 Böhrling, 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 *Buddhacarita* 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 *Buddhacarita* 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 it 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 *Buddhacarita*.

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 *Buddhacarita* by Prof. Formichi. The edition of Mr. Nandargikar¹⁾ 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 edition²⁾. 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

¹⁾ The *Buddha-Caritam* of Aśvaghosha (I—V) edited by G. R. Nandargikar, Poona 1911.

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 *Buddha-charita* 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 *nipūnavat* of Bt but even the meaningless °*dīrghakīm* for °*dīrghikām* 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 *Buddha-charita* 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. °*dharmō* and °*dharmāḥ* but in a footnote to the former of the two passages he suggests the correction °*dharmā*. Now this is the reading of Bt in both cases but again Mr. Joglekar's MSS. have both times °*dharmō* (°*dharmāḥ*) 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 bhūṣitāś cāpy avarudyatē 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 Śāradā characters<.

²⁾ Ashvaghosha's *Buddha-charita* (Cantos I—V) with a scholium by Dattatraya Shastri Nigudkar. Principal. Sanskrit Pathashala, Rajapur and Introduction. Notes and Translation by K. M. Joglekar, M. A., Girgaon, Bombay 1912.

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., *siṣimiyē* Jogl. Bt, IV. 56 a *kiṃ vinū nāvagacchanti* ed. pr., *kiṃ vēmā* Jogl., *kiṃ tvimā* Bt, IV. 65c *samupekṣeyam* ed. pr., *samupekṣeya* 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. 1 b *tasyātmaḥjasyātmaḥjitaḥ sa rājū* ed. pr. (*jitō narēndraḥ* Bt), *vidah sa rājū* Jogl. where the rhyme testifies in favour of Cowell's MSS.; similarly II. 51 b *putrasthitayē sthitaśrīḥ* ²⁾ ed. pr., Bt, *sthiraśrīḥ* Jogl.; II. 7c *vināsmavarṣāsanipātadōṣāḥ* ed. pr., Bt, *vināśya varṣāsanipātadōṣam* Jogl. where *āsmavarṣa* is evidently the genuine reading; V. 31 b *vratakḥēḍesu* ed. pr. Bt, *bata khēḍesu* Jogl. where *bata* is clearly secondary and meaningless (one of Mr. Joglekar's MSS. viz. H has *vratacaryūsu*). But of course instances may be quoted in which the readings preserved by Jogl. are undoubtedly original. E. g. IV. 99d *mahābhayē rakṣatī yō na rōḍitī* ed. pr., *mahābhayē hṛṣyati yō na rōḍitī* Jogl., *hṛṣyati* is as natural as it is excellent ³⁾. Likewise in IV. 97 a *ahō 'tidhīram* ed. pr., Bt is less good than *ahō sudhīram* Jogl. because the final vowel of *ahō* should be properly pragr̥hya. 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. *kuḥḥasya sthitayē sthitijñāḥ*, Kumārasambhava I. 18b.

³⁾ Cp. e. g.:

hṛṣyanty ṛtūmukhaṃ dṛṣtvā navam navam ivāgatam |
ṛtūnam parivartena prāṇinām prāṇasamkṣayaḥ ||

Rāmāyaṇa II. 105. 25 (ed. Bomb.)

ākṛīḍa iva babhrājē vivasvān apsarōvṛtaḥ, read: *vāibhrājē* (Kielhorn); IV. 91 ab *māhātmyam na ca tanmadhyē yatra sāmānyataḥ kṣayah*, read: *tan manyē* (Kielhorn, Kern) and ep.: *tam ēva manyē puruṣārtham uttamam na vidyate yatra punaḥ punaḥ kriyā* XI. 59 cd; V. 75 a *kalīśatravō*, read: *kila 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 editions. In fact, they exhibit in this respect all the good qualities and some of the drawbacks of Indian publications. From the commentary on the *Buddhacarita* compiled by a modern paṇḍit 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 *pratiśrutyēva kūjati* is divided into *pratiśrutyā iva* and explained by *pratidhvanīneva*. This is certainly right and Böhtlingk's conjecture viz. *pratiśrutkeva*, 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 explanations 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 Kaṇṣka 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 Aśvaghōṣa.

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 *dviṣaddvipēndrāḥ (samarāṅgaṇeṣu | udvāntamuktāprakurūḥ 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, *Aṣvaghōṣa 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! *dvipēndrāḥ*)“¹⁾.

I. 50 *ācāryakām yōgavidhāu dvijānām aprūptam anyāir Janakō jagāma* | means of course: „Janaka attained a power of instructing the twice-born in the rules of Yōga which none other had ever reached“ as correctly rendered by Cowell with express reference to the well-known passage of the Chāndōgya-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 Yōga that degree of master(ship) which was not hitherto attained by any other“.

II. 18a *vibudharṣikalpam* has to be translated with Cowell „like some ṛṣi of the gods“ since the series *brahmarṣis*, *rūjarṣis*, 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 dèi)²⁾.

IV. 79. *strīsaṃsargaṃ vināśāntāṃ Pāṇḍur jñātavāpi Kāuravaḥ* | *Mādrirūpaganākṣiptaḥ sisēvā kāmajaṃ sukhāṃ* ||

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 *priyatanaṃ*, Prof. Formichi discards the self-evident correction of Bühler viz. *priyutanayas* 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 *vibudharṣayaḥ* »the god-sages« (Cowell) »i santi dèi« i. e. the holy gods (Formichi).

the text adverbially (!) „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 bhīyah*²⁾ and meaning „con timore“ i. e. „with fear“! „This explanation of mine I may indeed present as sure“ adds he.

XII. 35c *tasmād eṣa mahābāhō*. Prof. Formichi's note thereon runs as follows: „Congetturo in e con la scorta dei codici *tasmād eṣamahāmōha ma*°. La congettura³⁾ del Cowell: « *mahābāho* » non può assolutamente stare“. One must indeed rub one's eyes well before believing that this peculiar sandhi is no mere optical illusion. *eṣaḥ amahāmōha* is here taught to develop into *eṣamahāmōha* although every beginner in Sanskrit knows full well that it cannot give but *eṣō 'mahāmōha*. And this is not an isolated example of this peculiar sandhi. Another instance is afforded by „so *jīvati*“ met with in Prof. Formichi's note on VII. 52. (I don't speak of such cases as *no puram* instead of *naḥ 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 *Śākyanarēndravadhūh* means of course „the daughter-in-law of the Śākya king“ (Joglekar) but Prof. Formichi translates „principessa degli Śākya“⁴⁾ i. e. „a princess (*narēndravadhū!*) of the Śākya“.

1) Read: *prabhubhyō*, 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 Śākya«. But if Mr. Nandargikar

II. 40c *vṛttaparaśvadhēna* „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 *prōvāca kimcin mṛdunā svarēṇa* „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 vihaṅgūnām vasantēnāhito madaḥ | na tu cintayataś cittaṁ janasya prāññamāninaḥ ||*

Prof. Formichi supplies *iti* after *cintayataś*. His literal translation of the whole stanza runs as follows: „Forse agli uccelli 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 (*cittaṁ!*) 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 correggere 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 *ajanō '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 *cittaṁ*. 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 (*citraṁ*) 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 Böhlingk'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 *bahudōṣāṃ hi vadanti dharmacaryām* „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 Böhlingk legge: *varāpsarovṛtam*, 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 Böhlingk reads *varāpsarōvṛtam* and Leumann *varāpsarōbhṛtam*. 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 *varāpsarōṅṅtyam*! That the fifth syllable in every pāda of a Rucirā 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 comprehension²⁾.

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 charīram* VIII. 56 ed. which is no compound (cp. *tāu caraṇāu* 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 *bādhavēbhyah* to *bāndhavēbhyah*“ which latter figures in the first list of Errata... Prof. Formichi himself „cautiously conjectures“ (congetturo con riserva) *bādhanēbhyah* 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, ¹⁾ the general impression is left unchanged by these most rare exceptions.

IV. Critical and exegetical notes on the *Buddhacarita*.

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 ²⁾.

The second point is with regard to the introductory stanzas of the *Buddhacarita* (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 *Amṛtānanda* and seem to be much older. My reasons for this statement are:

1) *Amṛtānanda* himself confesses to have composed Cantos XIV (i. e. XIV. 32 ff) — XVII ³⁾ but he does not maintain the same with respect to the beginning of the poem ⁴⁾.

¹⁾ One of his luckiest corrections is *sambādhyā* for *sambadhya* 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 *Buddhacarita* and of the *Raghuvamśa*.

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)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 Raghuvamśa 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 Raghu's birth in the third canto of the Raghuvamśa. Let the reader consider the following coincidences, some of which were already pointed out by other scholars:

Buddhacarita I.

Raghuvamśa III.

*Māyāpi tam kuṣigataṃ dadhānā
vidyulvitasāṃ jaladāvatīva |*

*patiḥ pratītaḥ prasavōnmukhīm
priyām dadarśa katē divam
abhritām iva ||*

22 ab

12 cd

*tataḥ prasannaś ca babhū-
va Puṣyas tasyās ca dēvyā
vratasamśṛtāyāḥ | pārśvāt suto
lōkahitāya jajñē nirvēda-
nām cāiva niramayām ca ||*

*diśaḥ prasēdur marutō
vavulḥ sukhāḥ pradakṣi-
nārcir havir agnir ādadē |
babhūva sarvaṃ subhaśamsi tat-
kṣaṇam bhavō hi lōkūbhya-
dayāya tadṛśām ||*

25

14

¹) But I admit that this stanza, as well as several others written in a different metre, may be spurious.

*vātā vavuh sparśasukhā
manōjñā divyāni vāsāmsy
avapātayantaḥ | sūryaḥ sa evā-
bhyadhikam cakāṣe jajvāla
sāumyārcir anīritō 'gnih'* ||

41

*bōdhūya jātō'smi jagaddhitār-
tham*

34 a

---- *jagatō hitāya* ||

39 d

*sa hi svagātraprabhayōj-
jvalantya dīpaprabhām
bhāskaravan mumōṣa |
mahārhaḥjambūnadacārvarṇō vi-
dyōtaya māsa dīśaś ca sar-
vāḥ* ||

32

(Compare also:
*prasannadik pāmsuvivi-
ktavātām śaṅkhasvanāmanta-
rapuspavyṣṭi | śarīriṇām
sthāvarajaṅgamānām su-
khāya tajjanmadīnam ba-
bhūva* ||

Kumārasambhava I. 23)

*ariṣṭasayyāmparītō visāriṇā
sujanmanas tasya nijēna tē-
jasā | niśīthadīpāḥ saha-
sā hatatviṣō babhūvur alē-
khyasamarpitā iva* ||

15

(Compare also:

*Raghuvamśapradīpēna
tēnāpratimatējasā |
rakṣāgrhagatā dīpāḥ
pratyādiṣṭā ivābhavan* ||

X. 68).

*kvacit kvaṇattūryamḡdañ-
gagītāir viṇāmukundāmu-
rajādibhiś ca | strīṇām
calatkuṇḍalabhūsitānām virāji-
tam cōbhayapārśvatas tat* || ¹⁾

45

*sukhaśravā mangalatūrya-
nisvanāḥ pramōdanṛtyāiḥ sa-
havārayōṣitām | na kēvalam
sadmani Māgadhīpatēḥ pathi
vyajrmbhanta divāukasūm api* ||

19

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 Raghuvamśa.

*suptō 'pi¹⁾ putrē 'nimiṣāika-
cakṣuḥ ||*

70 d

*nivātapadma stimitēna ca-
kṣuṣū nṛpasya kāntam piba-
taḥ sutānanam |*

17 a b

*narapatir api putrajan-
matuṣṭō viṣayagatāni²⁾
vimucya bandhanāni | ku-
lasadṛśam acikarad yathāvat
priyatanayas³⁾ tanayasya jāta-
karma ||*

87

*na samyatastasya babhū-
va rakṣitur visarjayēd
yaṁ sutajanmahṛṣitaḥ |
ṛṇābhidhānāt svayam ēva kē-
valam tadū pītṛṇām mumucē
sa bandhanāt ||*

20

*dhātryanākasamviṣṭam avēkṣya
cāinam Dēvyānākasamviṣṭam
ivāgnisūnum |*

66 a b

*Umāvṛṣāṅkāu Śarajan-
manā yathā yathā Jayan-
tēna ŚacīPuraṁdarāu |
tathā nṛpaḥ sā ca sutēna Mā-
gadhī nanandatus tatsadṛśēna
tatsamāu ||*

23

*bhavanam atha vigāhya Śākya-
rājō Bhava iva Śaṇ-
mukhajanmanā pratītaḥ |*
93 a b

Some of these coincidences belong to the common store of images and similes of Sanskrit poets⁴⁾ but their cumulation cannot but be regarded as striking.

* * *

1) So to be read with Lévi (translation) and Formichi.

2) Kielhorn's correction for °matāni.

3) Böhler's correction for °tanayam.

4) Cp. Indica, herausgegeben von Ernst Leumann, Heft 3, Übereinstimmungen in Gedanken, Vergleichen und Wendungen bei den indischen Kstdichtern von Vālmīki bis auf Māgha von Otto Walter.

Canto I.

2c. *udagradhiṣṇyam gaganē 'vagādham*. Both Indian editions seem to corroborate this conjecture of Cowell's but none the less the corrupt readings of his MSS. viz. °*dhiṣṇōr gaganē* C and °*dhiṣṭōr gaganē* P (but Prof. Lévi gives *udagradhiṣṇōr* as the reading of P and translates „la cité du hardi Kapila“) make necessary another emendation viz. *udagradhiṣṇyair gaganē 'vagādham*. We find just the same image in Rāmāyaṇa V. 2. 23 where the city of Laṅkā is described as

Kāṭusanilayaprakhyam ālikhantam ivāmbaram |
dhriyamānam ivakāsam ucchritair bhavanōttamāih ||

2d. *puram maharṣēh 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 *Kapilāvayam puram* (e. g. I. 94 b, VIII. 5 a; *puram* = *vastu* not *vastu*), (3) the reading of CP ad VI. 30 d viz. *śokam Kapilāvastunaḥ* for °*vastunaḥ* of D and the printed text. M. Müller was certainly right in considering the current form *Kapilavastu* as a wrong sanskritization of the Pāli *Kapilavatthu*. (See: Six Systems of Indian Philosophy, 2nd. ed., p. 238 note).

5c. *jagaty adṣṭvēva samānam anyat*. — Böhtlingk prefers *ēva* of P and as we can add now of Joglekar's edition to *iva* 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.

6 a b. *rāmāmukhēdūn paribhūtapadman yatrāpayātō 'py avi-mānya bhāmuh* | — *āpayātō* 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 *upayātō*. When the rays of the rising sun fall (*upayā*) on the moon they rob its glance i. e. they dishonour her (*vimānay*); now the sun was unable to bereave of their glance the face-moons (i. e. moon-faces) of the fair women in Kapilavāstu and he retired as if vexed by the existence of moons shining even by day. The rūpaka *rāmāmukhēndū* is the clue of the whole image; *paribhūtapadmān* is a bahuvrīhi compound and stands in apposition to it ¹⁾.

8a. *kytvāpi rātrāu kumudaprahūsam*. — Böhlingk is right in his criticism of Cowell's translation of this pāda („After mocking the water-lilies even at night“) but his own suggestion that *api* should mean here „ferner“ 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. *śaśi yathā bhāir akṛtanyathābhāih*. — Böhlingk 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 ° *bham* 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. *tasyāh* --- *premakarō rajanīkarō vijitāravindam vadanam* (Daśakumāracarita, Pūrvapīthikā, description of Vasumatī). The inverse order is also common e. g. *tvannmukhapāṅkajena śaśinaḥ śōbhām tīraskārīṇā* (Ratnāvalī v. 25).

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 Śuddhōdana were like him of noble descent and not much inferior to their lord in majesty ¹⁾. Cp. also III. 9cd and VIII. 74b.

15 b. *raviṣrabhāvāstatamaḥprabhāvā* | — Prof. Lüders is right in restoring the yamaka ²⁾ but he is wrong in dividing the whole into °*prabhā avāsta*°. Read: *raviṣrabhā vāstatamaḥprabhāvā* with *vā* = *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 Śuddhōdana. The parallel case where the moon and the moonshine are viewed as two inseparable lovers is very common in Sanskrit literature. See e. g. Kumārasambhava IV. 33, Raghuvamśa VI. 85a; VIII. 37; XVII. 6. ³⁾ From the Pañcatantra 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. *prataḥ payōdād iva*. — I should read *prataḥpayōdad* because if we take *prataḥ* as a separate word then we have nothing corresponding to it in b.

26 c. *sphuranmayūkhāir vihatāndhakārūḥ* „bursting forth ⁴⁾ with his rays which dispelled the darkness“ (Cowell) but *sphuranmayūkhāir* 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. Böhtlingk has said: „(I) 14 c An *akṛtānyathābhāḥ* darf nicht gerüttelt werden wegen des vorangehenden Gleichklanges“ and Prof. Formichi says: „(I) 14. In c leggo col Böhtlingk *bhāir akṛtānyathābhāḥ*.“

²⁾ According to Prof. Leumann (NKGWG, 1896) this is also the reading of the MSS. — Prof. Jacobi read as early as in 1893 *raviṣrabhāvā 'statamaḥprabhāvā* and *akṛtānyathābhāḥ*. (Das Rāmāyana. etc. p. 125/6.).

³⁾ Aja and Indumatī 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. *sphuran mā*°.

(Nandargikar). Cp. *sphuratprabhāmaṇḍala*, Kumārasambhava I. 24b, Raghuvamśa III. 60d; V. 51c; XIV. 14a.

36c. *yatgāuravāt*. — Prof. Lüders' correction, *yam gāuravāt*, is good but unnecessary. The compound stands for *yasmin gāuravāt*; in 37b we have inversely *yasya prabhāvāt* for which *yatprabhāvāt* could be used. Cp. also *tadgāuravāt*, Kumārasambhava VII. 31a (*tāsu mātṛṣv adarāt*, Mallinātha).

40a. With *gīrirājakūlā* --- *bhūś cacūla* we may compare the following passage from a Gupta inscription: *bhūr* --- °*vikampitasaśūlukūlā*°, CII III No 17. The Gangdhar stone inscription of Viśvavarman (dated 480 A. D.) p. 75 l. 13.

43cd. — *kāutūhalēnāiva ca pādapūis ca prapūjayāmāsa sa-gandhapuspūih* || — The two *ca*'s (first of them omitted in P) are inelegant if not incorrect. Ed. Nand. has *pādapūis tat*; this *tat* must be corrected to *tam*. Ed. Jogl. reads *pādapānūin* which is better than *pādapūis ca* but less good than *pādapūis tam*. In c *kāutūhalēnāiva* would be better. — Cp. *drumāir abhāṣtaprasavarcitatithi* | --- *tapōvanam* ---, Kumārasambhava V. 17bd.

55a. *tam brahmaividbrahmavidam jvalantam*. — The reading of D (which is also that of C secunda manu) viz. *brahmaivid brahmaividam* 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 *padānuprāsa* a certain contraposition is generally to be found. Examples abound.

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

57d. The text of Nandargikar contains a metrical error (*purā Vasīsthān iva Rantidevaḥ*). Another metrical error occurs in Joglekar's edition in 68d (*tam prēkṣya kutas tava dhīra bāṣpaḥ*).

61b. *dharmēṇa sūkṣmāyī dhanany apūsyā* | — *dharmēṇa* 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. *sādhvyō 'rajaskā gūṇavatpayaskāḥ* (scil. *gūṇah*). — *arajaskāḥ* is correct as shown now by the frequent use of the same epithet in Bhāsa's works; see the *bharatavākya* in the *Pratiññāyāugandharāyaṇa*, *Avimāraka*, *Abhiṣēkanātaka* (*bhavantu arajasō gāva ityādi*). The correction of Prof. Kern viz. *sādhūrajaskāḥ* is thus rendered superfluous. If however an emendation of the text were deemed necessary then the only one which offers itself without difficulty is *'jaraskāḥ*; cp. the parallel passage I. 89 c.

6 d. *dvāṁ asya pakṣāv aparas tu nāsam* || — Böhtlingk was right in adopting the reading of C *nāsa* (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. *vinūsmavarṣāsanipūtadoṣāḥ*. — Perhaps we ought to read *ghōṣāḥ* in view of the marked parallelism between ab and c. which requires some counterpart to *'śabdah*, as well as of the parallel passage XIII. 45 *vārīdharā bhṛantah savidyutah sāsānicāṇḍa ghōṣāḥ* (cp. also III. 34 d).

15. *stēyādibhiḥ cūpy abhītaḥ ca naṣtam*
svastham svacakram puracakramuktam |
kṣēmaṁ subhikṣam ca bahūva tasya
purāny aranyūni yathāiva vāṣṭre ||

The MSS. have in d *aranyasya* C and *aranyūni* P. The new Indian editions read *purēṣv 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: *purānaranyasya* i. e. *purā Anaranyasya* and cp.:

nānāvṛṣṭir bahūvāsmīn na durbhikṣah satām varē |
Anaranyē mahāvājē taskarō vāpi kaścana ||

Rāmāyaṇa II. 110. 10.

¹⁾ A marginal note in B1 reads *purāny aranyūni*. Cp. above p. 4.

(21)22. (*tatō mahārāṇi ca candanāni*
ratnāvalis cāuṣadhibhiḥ saagarbhāḥ |
mṛgaprayuktān rathakāmś ca haimān
ācakrīre smāi suhṛdālayebhyaḥ ||)
vayō'nurūpāni ca bhūṣaṇāni
hiraṇmayā hastimṛgāśvakās ca
rathās ca gāvō vasaṇaprayuktā
gantrīs ca cāmīkararūpyacitrāḥ ||

This alternation of accusatives and nominatives is of course wrong. I read therefore *hiraṇmayān hastimṛgāśvakāmś ca* 22 b and *rathāmś ca* 22 c. Ed. Nand. has *gantryās 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 *gantrī ca* for *gantrīs ca*.

26 a. *sthīrasūlasamūtāt*. — I should like to read **yuktāt* in order to avoid a change of metre. **samūtāt* was perhaps originally a gloss. See my note on V. 87.

29 c. *sarvartusukhāśrayeṣu*. — Cp. *sarvartusukhasavyāni*, Rāmāyaṇa IV. 43. 46.

31 d. *bhrūvañcitāir ardhānirūṣitāis ca*. — This could remain if we were to take *bhrūvañcitāir* 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 spoken of separately. The reading of Joglekar's edition viz. *bhrūvōñcitāir* ²⁾ (i. e. *bhrūvō 'ñcitāir*) cannot be good because of the singular *bhrūvō*. I should therefore propose to read *bhrūvañcitāir* i. e. *bhrūvañcitāir* with the same euphonic license which occurs in *triyambakām* for *tryambakām* in Kumārasambhava III. 44 d.

42 c d. *babandha sātāvṇa phalēna caitāms tyāgō 'pi tēṣām hy anapāyadṛṣṭaḥ ||* The change of subject in d as well as the wholly unnecessary *hi* are very hard. I read: *tyāgō hi tēṣām*

¹⁾ The parallelism was first pointed out by Prof. Lüders.

²⁾ The short *u* confirms my correction.

anupāyadr̥ṣṭaḥ || One of Mr. Joglekar's MSS. (A) has *khalu pāpadr̥ṣṭaḥ* 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 *Mrechakāṭika*:

Cārudattaḥ | śatruḥ kṛtāparādhaḥ śaraṇam upetya pūdayōḥ patitaḥ śastrēṇa na hantavyaḥ |

Śarvilakāḥ | evam tarhi śvabhiḥ khādyatam |

Cārudattaḥ | na hi na hi upakārahatas tu kartavyaḥ |

(ed. Stenzler p. 176 ll. 21—24).

Cowell's rendering of this stanza is in my opinion too simple and does no justice to the artificial style of a mahākavi.

43c. *yaśāmsi cāpad guṇagandhavanti*. There is no need to change the reading of the text into *garbhavanti* as Prof. Lüders should like; *gandha* means here „pride“ i. e. king Śuddhōdana was proud of his glory acquired by virtues. *gandha* is used in the same sense by Kālidāsa in *Raghuvamśa* XIII. 7a.

55a. *virakṣiṣantaḥ śriyam ātmasamsthā* (--- *bhūmipālāḥ*). Ed. Nand. has *ātmasamsthām* which was already suggested by Cowell. This is no doubt the better reading. Cp. e. g.:

durārādhyāḥ śriyō vājñām durūpā duṣparigrahāḥ |

tiṣṭhanty āpa ivādhārē cīram ātmani samsthītāḥ ||

Pañcatantra I. 67 (ed. Kielhorn).

Cp. further (*hāmā*) *āsāsyamūnā api mōhayanti cittaṁ nyūnam kim punar ātmasamsthāḥ* || XI. 9cd.

Canto III.

1d. *śīte nibaddhāni ca kānanāni* || — Since *baddha* with Loc. means „bound to“ and not „bound by“ or „bound up in“, as rendered by Cowell, this reading was justly condemned by the majority of the interpreters. Mr. Joglekar's edition has *śītena baddhāni* and a marginal note in Mr. Nandargikar's edition gives the following variants: *śāilēyanaddhāni*, *śāivālagandhīni* and *śāivālanaddhāni* in addition to *śāilēyagandhīni* of the text. The two readings with *śāivāla* are manifest blunders since *śāivāla* is

a water-plant; they are due to palaeographical similitude of this word to *sāileya*. But the compounds containing *sāileya* 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 *sāileyanad-dhēṣu sītātaleṣu*, Kumārasambhava I. 55d and *sāileyagan-dhīni sītātālāni*, Raghuvamśa VI. 51 b. — For my part, I am inclined either to adopt the simple reading of Jogl. *sītēna bad-dhāni*, which was also my first correction, or to propose a combination of *sītēna* (Jogl.) with *naddhāni* (Nand., marginal note) for which a partial parallel may be found in Rāmāyaṇa III. 16. 23: *avaśyāyatamōnaddhā -- vanarājayaḥ*. To *sīta* the sense of „coolness, frost“ should be given; Cowell's translation „cold season“ is not good.

16 a. *śrōṇīrathāḥ* — „hips“ (Cowell). „Was soll aber *ratha* hier bedeuten? Ist vielleicht *śrōṇīrathāḥ* zu lesen?“ (Böhtlingk). But *śrōṇīrathāḥ* 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 Daśakumāracarita mentioned above in a foot-note to I. 6, (*tasyāḥ*) --- *dūrīkṛtayōgimanōrathō 'tighanam jaghanam*, in the description of Avantisundarī: *jāitrarathacāturyeṇa ghanam jaghanam* (viz. *vidhāya*), p. 45, 8 and in several other passages.

17. *śighraṁ samarthāpi tu gantum anyā
gatim nijagrāha yayāu na tūrṇam |
hriyā pragalbhāni nigūhamānā
rahaḥ prayuktāni vibhūṣaṇāni ||*

Prof. Kern has restored c in what seems to me a perfectly satisfactory manner. He reads *hriyāpragalbhā* („vor Scham schüch-tern“) *vinigūhamānā*. By the obscure *rahaḥ prayuktāni vibhūṣa-ṇāni* 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 Aśvaghōṣa:

*iyam apratibōdhasūyitīm raśanā tvām prathamā rahaḥsakhī |
gativibhramasādānīravā na śucā nānumṛtēva laksyatē ||*

Raghuvamśa VIII. 58.

Finally, the commentary of Mallinātha on this stanza enables us to understand the use of *hriyūpragalbhū*. He says: *iyam prathamādya rahaṣakhī | suratasamayē 'py amyaṇād iti bhavaḥ |*

31 b. *kālēna bhūyō parimṛṣtam urvyām |* I should read *bālēna* which agrees better with *śisutvē*, *yuvā* and *jarām*.

33 a. *vyaḥprakarṣāt* means: since you are to live long, since your life shall be protracted.

41 d. *param samāśliṣya* is explained by *kṛtō 'svatantraḥ* 42 d which confutes Prof. Speyer's objection.

47 c. *śrutvā ca mē rōgabhayaṁ*. — The use of *ca* is hard. I should like to read *hi*.

48 d. *puryāgamam bhūmipatiś cakāra* || 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 (*puryām āgamam puryāgamam* returning, coming) but his translation 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 *puryāgamam* into *pāurāgamam* „he convoked an assembly of citizens“. The following stanza seems to presuppose some such assembly ¹⁾.

58 e. *kim kēvalasyāiva janasya dharmah*. — Read: *kēvalasyāiṣa. kēvalasya janasya* corresponds thus exactly to *sarvaprajā-*

¹⁾ *mārgasya śaucādhikṛtāya cūva cakrōśa ruṣṭō 'pi ca nōgradaṇḍah* || 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 *eva* 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 *ēsa dharmah* to *ayam antah*, *ēva* for *ēsa* (and vice versa) is not uncommon.

62 a. *tasmād ratham sūta nivartyatām nah*. — Prof. Leumann tries to defend the neuter *ratham* on account of *vyūhāni* X. 27 c and *lōkāni* X. 31 d but the latter passage has been brilliantly restored by Prof. Windisch (*lōkān imāns trīn api kin punar gām*) and *vyūhāni* (whose correctness is doubted by Böhlingk) is a ἄπαιζ λεγόμενον 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 *nivartayāmāsa sa nāiva tam ratham* | III. 63 b.

Canto IV.

10. *śōbhayata gunāir ebhir api tām Uttarān Kurūn |*
Kubērasyūpi cākṛīdām ¹⁾ *prāg ēva vasudhām imām ||*

Read *śōbhayatha* 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, Udāyin 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 *śōbhayantjō* which is not so good as *śōbhayatha* though at any rate better than *śōbhayata* or *śōbhayēta* (Kern). It is further false to translate *vasudhām imām* by „this earth“ (as opposed to heaven), neither the Kurukṣētra nor the Kāilāsa being celestial regions. It means „this country“ i. e. the territory of the Śākyaas 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 *śōbhayatha* contains a slight metrical irregularity).

24 c d. *saṃārurukhur ātmānam kumāragrahaṇām 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 kṛīdām*.

2) Mr. Nandargikar follows Cowell here as elsewhere.

prince“ (Mr. Joglekar). Neither the text nor the renderings quoted are satisfactory. For „even“ (*apī*) and „above“ (*ati°*) no warrant is found in the Sanskrit original. It is also clear that *samāruh* being a neuter verb, it cannot govern *ātmanam* as its object. Hence I venture to propose a slight correction viz. *sam-āruruhan ātmānam* „they engaged themselves in captivating the prince“. But *prati* remains a little hard.

29 d. *saṅghattāir valgubhiḥ* || I read *saṅghattavalgubhiḥ* .
saṅghattāir is due to other instrumentals in the same line.

32. *kācid ājñāpayantīva prōvācārdrānulepanā* |
iha bhaktim kurusveti hastam saṁślisya 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 *ārdrānulepanā*) and at the same time she, as it were, commanded love (*bhakti*) — instead of begging it (this explains the use of *ājñāpayantīva*).

40. *apayāntam tathāivānyā babandhur mālyadūmahih* |
kāścit sākṣēpamadhurāir jagghur vacanāṅkuśūḥ ||

Since *jagghur* 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 *tutudur* or *jaghuus tu* (cp. *bāspapratōdābhīhatau nṛpēṇa* IX. 1 c)? or perhaps *cukṣudur*? Cp. the following stanza from the Pañcatantra:

tāvat syāt sarvakṛtyeṣu puruṣō 'tra svayam prabhuḥ |
strivākyāṅkuśavīksuṁṇō yāvan nō dhriyatē balāt ||

II. v. 143 (ed. Bühler, BSS).

59 d. *supēd* ought to be corrected with Böhtlingk to *svapēd*¹⁾.

¹⁾ It is true that both Indian editions have *svapyād* but I suspect this to be rather a corrected than a correct form since both editions read in the same line *tiṣṭhan niṣīdēd vā* (*tiṣṭhēn* J in Jogl. ed.) which seems to be an ancient blunder.

Kielhorn calls this „eine dem Kunstdichter ebenso unerlaubte Form wie *viśvasatī* in XI. 16 es ist“ but I think we may give Aśvaghōṣa credit for having used both these forms since one of them is found even in Kālidāsa's Mēghadūta viz. *āśvasatyah* from *āśvasatī* in v. 8 b ¹).

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

76 b. *jalaprabhavasambhavām* | — 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. *jalaprabhava* (a word not registered in the Petropolitan dictionary) means here „fish“. *jalaprabhavasambhavā* corresponds closely to *matsya-yōnījū* Mahābhārata I. 64. 110 b ²) and refers to Satyavati, a daughter of the celestial nymph Adrikā (cursed with the temporary assumption of the shape of a fish) by king Vasu or Paricara. She was brought up among fishermen for which reason she got the name *dāśarājasutā* I. 64. 91 d (or simply *dāśasutā* in an interpolated śloka of the same chapter, 54 a). Hence she is called *dāśakanyā* in a passage of the Daśakumāracarita which, by the way, very probably proves Daṇḍin's acquaintance with the Buddhacarita. Cp. Daśakumāracarita p. 85 (Nirṇaya Sāgara Press ed. ³) and Buddhacarita IV. 72 ff.

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

130 c d. *janasya cakṣurgamanīyamaṇḍatō*
mahādharaṁ cāstam iyāya bhāskarah ||

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

¹) ed. Hultsch, London 1911. Mallinātha and Stenzler read *āśvasatyah* from *āśvasatī*.

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. 29 b *netragamyam avatōkya bhāskarām*¹⁾.

Canto V.

14 c d. *balayāvanajvītapravṛttāu*
 vi jagāmātmagatō madaḥ kṣuṇēna ||

If we connect *madaḥ* with °*pravṛttāu* 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. *tōraṇasālabhañjikēva* || This emendation of Cowell's is now rendered doubly sure by the testimony of Mr. Joglekar's edition. From the whole description (*avalambhya gavākṣapārśvam -- cūpavibhugūnagātrayaṣṭih --*) as well as from the stanza XVI. 17 of the Raghuvamśa quoted by the Indian scholar it appears clearly that the meaning of *tōraṇasālabhañjikā* is „a caryatid“. The reading °*mūlabhañjikā* 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. (*aśayīṣṭa vikīrṇakanṭhasūtrā*)
 gajabhagnā pratipātītāṅganēva ||

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

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).

nēva which may fairly be corrected to *patitā* ¹⁾ *latānganēva*. 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-pātiteva mōcā* which conveys exactly the same idea though in different words. Cp. also V. 29 b; 51 d; VIII. 24 c d and other similar passages. Numerous examples of the same simile may be quoted from other poets e. g. *Sītā vyathitā cakampē chinūēva yuktā kadalī gajēna*, Rāmāyaṇa III. 53. 61 (ed. Gorresio); *anapāyini saṁsrayadrūmē gajabhagnē patanūya vallarī*, Kumārasambhava IV. 31 etc.

61 a. *viṅtāsyaputā viṅddhagātrā*. — Read: *viṅttagātrā* which alone agrees with *madughūrṇiteva* in c.

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

73 b. *nibhṛtam hrasvatanūjapṛsthakarṇam* | Read: *nibhṛta-hrasva*° and cp. e. g. *nibhṛtōrdhvakarṇāḥ* (viz. *rathyāḥ*), Śakuntalā v. 8 b (ed. Cappeller).

87. *Harituragaturāṅgavat turāṅgaḥ*
sa tu vicaran manasīva cōdyamānaḥ |
aruṇaparūṣabhāram antarīkṣamī
sarasabāhūnī ²⁾ *jagāma yōjanānī* ||

Read in c: *aruṇataruṇabhūsam*. The reading *parūṣa* is either due to palaeographical confusion or else to a gloss *aparūṣa*, much in the same manner as *calasya* in X. 18 a which was abbreviated from *acalasya*, a gloss to *sāilasya* ³⁾. *aruṇa* means here of course the dawn, a moment later the sun will rise (VI. 1 a). With regard to the rhyme cp. *taruṇāruṇarāgayōgāt*, Raghuvamśa V. 72 c. With *harituragaturāṅgavat turāṅgaḥ* has to be

¹⁾ Perhaps we ought to read *phalitā* on account of ab. Cp. *tato'bhīṣaṅgavilavipraviddhā prabhṛśyamānābharaṇaprasūnā* | *svamūrtilābhaprakṛtīm dharitrīm lateva Sītā sahasā jagāma* || Raghuvamśa XIV. 54.

²⁾ *Sarasa* 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. 67 d which is a commentary on the misunderstood *pātum*.

compared *atitya hariṇō harimś ca vartante vājinah*. Śakuntalā (ed. Cappeller) p. 3 l. 16.

Canto VI.

1 a b. *tatō muhūrte 'bhyudite jugaccakṣuṣi bhāskarē* | — C has *muhūrtābhyudite*. I think we ought to read *tatō muhūrtad udite* „a moment after, when the sun rose,--“.

5. *imāṁ Tārksyōpamajavāṁ turāṅgam anugacchatā* |
darśitā sāumya madbhaktir vikramas cāyam ātmanah ||

Cowell remarks with regard to Tārksya: „an old mythic representation of the sun as a horse“; cp. the following stanza:

gatim khara ivāśvasya Tārksyasyēva patatrinah |
anugantum na śaktir mē gatim tava mahīpatē ||

Rāmāyaṇa II. 105. 6.

6 c d. *bhartṛsnēhas ca yasyūyam idṛśah śakta* ¹⁾ *ēva ca* ||
Read: *idṛśi śaktir ēva ca*. *bhartṛsnēha* corresponds to *madbhakti* and *śakti* to *vikrama* in the immediately preceding stanza.

8. *tat prītō 'smi tavānēna mahābhūgeṇa karmaṇā* |
drśyatē mayi bhāvō 'yam phalēbhyō 'pi parānmukhē ||

There must be something wrong in the third pāda, *drśyatē* 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: *drśyas te* ²⁾.

10 d. *nāsti niškāraṇāsvatā* || — I should divide *niškāraṇāsvatā* and explain the latter word by *svasyūyam ity abhimānah*. *svatā* 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: *iṣṭasādhananibandhanah prēmāparanāmā mamatābhimānah*.

35 a (b). *atha bandhūm ca rājyam ca (tyaktum ēva kṛtū ma-*

¹⁾ The MSS. have *śakta*.

²⁾ Cp. the reading of P (*sāumya tapōvanē*) ad VII. 11a (*sāumyas tapōvanē*).

tiḥ ||). — Cowell's suggestion *bandhūm's 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 Rāhulam mōkṣayaṁ bandhuśōkāt*); 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. *madvīyōgam prati cChanda santāpas tyajyatām ayam |*
nānūbhāvō hi niyatām pṛthagjātiṣu dēhiṣu ||

The latter half of this śloka 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. *sāmyōgō viprayōgaś ca tathā mē prāṇinām mataḥ ||*
Read: *matāu* in accordance with Aśvaghōṣa's syntax.

59 c. *dr̥ṣṭvāṁśukam kāñcanahaṁsacitram*. — Cowell has not understood this passage. He was rectified by Böhtlingk who translates: „nachdem er (sein) mit goldenen Gänsen verziertes Gewand angesehen hatte“. Prof. Leumann prefers the reading of C °*cihuam* and translates the compound by „mit goldenem 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 *hāmsalakhana* 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 Kālidāsa's works. See: *vadhūdukūtaṁ kalahaṁsalakṣa-*

¹) E. g. in *durabandhuḥ*, Mēghadūta v. 6 c, which is glossed as *asānnihitadārah* by Vallabhadēva and *vīyuktabhāryō* by Mallinātha (Prof. Hultzsch gives the meaning of *bandhu* as „kinsman, relative“, Glossary s. v.). Cp. the Petropolitan dictionary s. v. *bandhu*.

nam¹⁾, Kumārasambhava V. 67 c, *kalahansalakṣaṇam kalahansacihnam*, Mallinātha; (*babhūva --- upāntabhūgeṣu ca rōcanānkō gajājinasyāiva dukūlabhūvaḥ* || Kumārasambhava VII. 32) *gajājinasyāivopāntabhūgeṣv añcalapradēṣeṣu rōcanāivānkō hanisādicihnam yasya sa tathoktō dukūlabhūvaḥ paṭṭāmsukatvam ca babhūva*, Mallinātha. — Painted stuff is still called „indienne“ in French although it is no more imported from India but fabricated at home (Rouen).

Canto VII.

12. *tatpūrvam adyāśramadarśanam mē
yasmād imam dharmavidhīm na jānē |
tasmāt--*

I think we have to read *yat pūrvam* in a because of *yasmād* in b, but I cannot find fault with *tatpūrvam* 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 *āśramadarśanam* (cp. Raghuvamśa XIV. 38 c, Kumārasambhava VII. 30 b)²⁾.

- 13(c)d. (*kramēṇa tasmāi kathayāmcakāra*)
tapōviśeṣam tapasaḥ phalam ca ||

Read: *tapōviśeṣam* and cp. *tapōvikārāmś ca nirīkṣya*, supra 11 a and *bhinnās tu tē tē tapasām vikalpāḥ*, infra 14 d. — C (i. e. C and D) has *tapōviśeṣām ta°*; with this spelling has to be compared *kāmām* C for *kāmām* of P and the printed text in X. 34 c.

23. *trāsas ca nityam maraṇāt prajānām
yatnēna cēchanti punaḥ prasūtim |*

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

²⁾ Cp. also: *tatprathamāvalambanam* || Kumārasambhava V. 66 d (*tad ēva prathamam tatprathamam | --- tac ca tad avalambanam grahaṇam ca--* | Mallinātha).

*satyān pravṛttāu niyataś ca mṛtyus
tatvāiva magnō yata ēva bhūtaḥ ||*

I should read in b *punaḥprasūtīm* (cp. e. g. *svargāya yu-
ṣmākam ayam tu dharmō mamābhīlāśas tv apunarbhavāya*, infra,
48 ab) and in d *magnū* and *bhūtaḥ* because the plural is employed
throughout in the preceding and in the following stanzas.

42 b. *saṃkīrṇadharmā patitō 'sucir vā* | —The reading of P
viz. ° *dharmē* should have been preferred as clearly shown by
dharmē sthitūḥ in the prince's answer to this question.

44 a (b) *ity ēvam uktē sa tapasvimadhye
(tapasvimukhyena manśīmukhyah |)*

Read: *uktah*. It cannot be separated from *manśīmukhyah*
(*ācacaḥṣē* d).

46 c (*ratiśca mē*) *dharmānavagrahasya*. — „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 re-
garding it“. Cp. (*aham--*) *dharmam imam prapannaḥ* XI. 7b.
As to the use of the root *grah* in this sense cp. e. g. *pravrajyām
agrahīṣam*, Daśakumāracarita p. 139. 6. Cp. also *navagraha*
as an epithet of elephants.

51 d. *kuṇḍōdahastō*. — The MSS. have *kuṇḍēvahastō* C and
kuṇḍōvahastō P. I should propose to read *kuṇḍīrahastō*.

Canto VIII.

13. *idaṃ puram tēna vivarjitam vanam
vanam ca tat tēna samanvitam puram |
na śobhatē tēna hi nō vinā puram
Marutvatā Vṛtravadhē yathā divam ||*

The best commentary on this stanza is the following pas-
sage from the *Hitōpadēśa*: *tēna vinā sakalajanapūrṇō 'py
ayam grāmō mīm praty aranyavat pratibhāti* ¹⁾ (quoted in Speyer's

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

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 ślōka:

vanam nagaram ēvāstu yēna gacchati Rāghavaḥ |
asmābhiḥ ca parityaktam puram sampādyatām vanam ||
 R ā m ā y a ṇ a II. 33. 22.

Cp. p. 42, final remark.

19 a *janās ca harṣātisayena vañcitāḥ.* — Read: *hēṣātisayēna.*

35 (a) b. (*varam manuṣyasya vicakṣaṇō ripur |*
na mitram aprājñam ayōgapēśalam.

Prof. Formichi tries to thunder down Cowell for his translation of *ayōgapēśala* but without success. The word must be divided into *a-yōgapēśala* ¹⁾ and being opposed to *vicakṣaṇa* it means nearly the same as *aprājña* i. e. foolish. The idea is very common all over the world. Cp. e. g. *paṇḍitō 'pi varam śatruṇa mūrkhō hitakāraḥ*, Pañcatantra I. v. 417 a b, etc.

43 c (d). *anāgasāu svaḥ samāvēhi sarvaśō*
(gatō nṛdēvaḥ sa hi dēvi dēvat ||)

Read: *anāgasāu nāu* because *samāvēhi* demands an object and this cannot be the following clause. Cowell's translation is: „know that we two are entirely guiltless“.

54. *abhāginī nūnam iyaṁ vasundharā*
tam āryakarmūnam anuttamaṁ prati |
gatas tatō 'sāu guṇavān hi tādrśō
nṛpaḥ prajābhāgyaguṇāḥ prasūyatē || ²⁾

prati is an unhappy conjecture of Cowell's. The reading of the MSS. viz. *patim* (*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 *arihayōgavicakṣaṇaḥ*, Raghuvamśa IX. 18 d (*yōgēśūpāyēṣu*, 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 him⁴.

62 d. *tathā sa dharmam mad ṛtē cikīrṣati* || — Read: *tataḥ sa* as in the following stanza (— — *taṭo 'sya jātō mayi dharmamatsaraḥ* ||).

66 b. *na taj* (viz. *svargasukham*) *janasyūtmatavātō 'pi durlobham* | — Read *hi* (Prof. Kern) and cp. e. g. *dvitīyas tu* (viz. *svargah*) *sarvasyāiva sulabhaḥ kuladharmānuṣṭhāyinaḥ*, Daśakumāracarita p. 83 l. 1.

81 a(b). *iti tanayaviyōgajātaduḥkham*
(*kṣitisadṛśam sahaḥjam vihāya dhāiryam* |

Read: °*duḥkhaḥ*. The reading of the text is due to the numerous accusatives in the following line.

Canto IX.

6 (a) b. (--- *asti sa dīrghabāhuḥ*)
prāptaḥ kumārō na tu nāvabuddhaḥ |

P has *cāva*°. The end of this line must in my opinion conceal something opposed either to *prāptaḥ* or to *kumārah*. Should we read *na ca nāvabuddhaḥ*? Or perhaps *na tu bālabuddhiḥ*? Cp. *bālō 'py abālapratimō* II. 23 c; *bālas' ca bālabuddhiḥ ca*, MBh. VII. 55. 5.

14 b. *parāmi tē 'cyavinam etam artham* | — The MSS. have the corrupt reading *tēvāvinam etam*. The Tibetan translation leaves the choice between *bhāvitam* (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.

26 d. (*dēvim*--) *kalitum ca nārhasi*. — Should we read: *ca mārha*? Cp. my note on II. 26 a.

29 (a) b. (*śōkāgninā tvadvīrahēndhanēna*)
niḥsvāsadhūmēna tamaḥśikhēna |

The rūpaka *tamaḥśikhā* contains a manifest contradiction. I read: *tapahśikhēna*.

34 c d. *saṃtāpahetur na sutō na bandhur
ajñānanāimittika eṣa tāpaḥ ||*

Read: *ēva . eṣa tāpaḥ* is unnecessarily strong. On the other hand stress should be laid on *ajñānanāimittika*.

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

*yō hy adharmam akāryam vā viṣayē parthivasya tu
karōti cāśrīmulam tatpurē vā durmatir naraḥ |
kṣipram ca narakam yāti sa ca rājā na saṃśayaḥ ||*

Rāmāyaṇa VII. 74. 29/30.

*rājan prajāsu tē kaścid apacāraḥ pravartatē |
tam annīṣya praśamayēr bhavitāsi tataḥ kṛtē ||*

Raghuvamśa XV. 47.

Cp. also *apūnyena prajānām aganyatāmarēṣu*, Daśakumāra-carita p. 252 l. 6, and other similar sayings.

47 c d. *agnēr yathā hy uṣṇam apām dravatvam
tadvat pravṛttāu prakṛtīm vadanti ||*

I should read: *pravṛtīm prakṛtē vadanti*.

50 d. *āikyam ca dattvā jagad udvahanti ||* — Read *gatvā* and cp. e. g. *gatvāikatvam sa Kṛṣṇēna*, Mahābhārata II. 25. 69 a.

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

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

61 a. *ēvamvidhā dharmayaśaḥpradīptāḥ*. I read °*pradīpāḥ* because a substantive is needed here.

62 b. (*mantriṇaḥ*---) *nṛpasya cakṣuṣaḥ*. — Prof. Leumann's conjecture *nṛpasya cakhyuṣaḥ* is unnecessary. The same metaphor recurs e. g. in the Gangdhar stone inscription of Viśvavarman (CII III. p. 75, l. 23) where a certain Mayūrākṣaka, the minister of king Viśvavarman, is called *rājnas tṛtīyam*

iva cakṣuḥ. Another instance is the following ślōka (II. 30) from the Kumārasambhava:

sa dvinētram Harēś cakṣuḥ sahasranayanūlhikam |
Vācaspatir uvācedaṁ prāñjalir Jalajāsanam ||

Cp. also the numerous passages in Sanskrit literature where the king is spoken of as *nayacakṣuḥ* and the like, e. g. Raghuvamśa I. 55; IV. 13 (*cakṣuṣmattā---* *sāstrēna*) etc.

64 a b. *na mē kṣamaṁ saṅgaśatam hi darśanam grahītam*. — I should like to read *sāṅgaśatam*.

Canto X.

12 c. *viññāyatām kva pratigacchatīti*. — I should propose to read *parigacchatī* cp. XI. 73 c.

15 a. *tasmin vanē lōdhraṇvānōpagūdhē*. — The reading *vanē* is false and must be corrected to *girāu*, firstly, because it refers (*tasmin!*) to the *mahādharām Pāṇḍavam* named in the preceding line, secondly, because the future Buddha standing on the Pāṇḍava 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 *vanōpagūḥa*.

33 c. *yāvat svavanīśapratirūparūpaṁ*. — We must separate °*pratirūpa rūpaṁ* on analogy with a b and d.

35. *dharmasya cārthasya ca jīvatokē*
pratyarthibhūtāni hi yāuwanāni |
saṁrakṣyamāṇāny api durgrahāṇi
kāmā yatas tēna yathā haranti ||

The text of d is evidently corrupt. Cowell's rendering of it is plainly impossible but neither the corrections proposed seem to me satisfactory (*pathā* Prof. Leumann, *pathā dravanti* Böhtlingk, *svēna pathā* Prof. Windisch, best emendation). I read in d *kāmā yatas tēna pathā 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. *suhṛttayā cāryatayā ca rājan*
vibhāvya mām eva viniścayas tē |
atrānunēṣyāmi suhṛttayāiva
brūyam aham nōttaram anyad atra ||

This stanza is indeed a hard nut to crack. The MSS. read in d *vihāya prāg* which is borrowed from ślōka 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 *saṁbhāvayaty eṣa viniścayō 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 *brūyam* is wholly incongruous with the future *anunēṣyāmi*. Hence I should read in c *atō 'nunēṣyāmi's ca*. The translation will be no more difficult after these changes.

8 a. *nāśviṣēbhyō 'pi tathā bibhēmi*. — 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 reasonably if at all expected after the last substantive.

19 d. *kaḥ kāmasaṁjñān viṣam āsusāda ||* — Read perhaps *āsvadeta*.

27 c. *himsrēṣu tēṣv āyatanōpamēṣu kamēṣu*. — No correction is needed. *himsrēṣu* is equivalent to *himsrāṇām madhyē*. Translate: „these pleasures which may be compared to dwelling-places among evil-doers (or wild beasts)“ and compare with this the following half ślōka which for the present I am unable to identify: *himsrāṇām puratō vāsō na sukhāyōpajāyate*.

28. *gīrāu vanē cāpsu ca sūgarē ca*
yadbhramśam archanty abhīlaṅghamōnāḥ |
tēṣu drumapragraphalōpamēṣu
kāmēṣu kasyātmatvatō ratiḥ syāt ||

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. Böhlingk's remarks are untenable because it is evident that *yad* stands in correlation with *tēsu* 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). *yadbhramśam* is a compound and means „the fall (caused) by them“ i. e. by the pleasures. *abhilaṅghamānāḥ* 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. *tasyāiva* (i. e. *kāmasya*) *kr̥tē viśiṣṭasthūnavartināḥ kaṣṭhāni tapāmsi mahānti dānāni daruṇāni yuddhāni bhīmāni samudralaṅghanādīni ca narāḥ samācāraṅti* | *Daśakumāracarita* p. 86/87.

29c. *āṅgārakarsapratimēsu tēsu kāmēsu*. — A similar passage from the Pañcatantra viz. *svaḥastēnāṅgārāḥ 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* Böhlingk, *varṣa* Kielhorn, *rāṣi* Speyer) are thus rendered superfluous.

57b. *śāntam avāptukāmaḥ*. — The correction to *śāntim* is unnecessary. In fact the neuter of the past participle is often used by Aśvaghoṣa in the sense of a(n abstract) substantive. Cp. *viśayāvāptasukhē* V. 76b (it is far less natural to take *avāptasukha* as a *karṇadhārāya* compound); *tad evam āvāṁ naradevi dōṣatō na tatprayātum pratigantum arhasi* (read: *pratigantum* and translate: do not charge the blame of his departure on us two; *dōṣatō gam*) VIII. 49b. An instance of the same employment of the past participle from the *Raghuvamśa* is:

sraṣṭur varātisargāt tu mayā tasya durātmanāḥ |
atyārūḍham ripōḥ sōḍham candanēnēva bhōgināḥ ||

(*atyarūḍham atyarōhaṇam | ativyddhir ity arthaḥ | napuṃsakē bhāv-
ktaḥ | Mallinātha*). X. 42.

60 a. *yad apy avōcaḥ paripālyatām jarā*. — Read: *prati-
pālyatām* and compare *jarā pratīkṣyā viduṣā śamēpsunā* 6 d.

60 c. *capalam hi drśyatē*. — No correction is needed. *ca-
palam* is used abstractedly ep. (supra ad 57 b and) the following
statement of Speyer's: „Auch kommt es, wenigstens im Sanskrit
(nur in aus buddhistischen Quellen geflossenen Schriften?) ver-
einzelt vor, dass das Neutrum eines Adjectivs als Abstractum
verwendet wird, wie *ślāghyam* „Lobenswürdigkeit“ Pañc. I. 374,
śuci „Reinheit“ Jtkm 128, 3, *sthiram* [= *sthāiryam*] Śukas. 23.
10“ (V. u. S-S. § 2).— Cp. *uṣṇam* as opposed to *dravatvam* IX. 47 c.

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

Canto XII.

1 c d. *Arādasyāśramam bhēje vapuṣā pūjayann iva* || — Read:
pūrayann iva and ep. *vapuṣābhībhūya tam āśramam---* *prapēde* ||
VII. 1 c d and *tvayy āgatē pūrṇa ivāśramō 'bhūt*, VII. 38 a.

8 c. *abhuktvēva śriyam prāptaḥ*. — *abhuktvāiva* would be better.

13 c. *tvaddarśanād aham manyē*. — P has *tvaddarśanāham*,
I read *tvaddarśanam*. Kumārasa in bhava VI. 55 has *anugra-
hāt* but there the construction is different.

22 b. *badhyatē*. — The root *bandh* is out of place here.
We must read either *vardhatē* which stands in the parallel pas-
sage quoted by Prof. Hopkins ¹⁾ from the Mahabharata or
else *bādhyatē*. Prof. Formichi reads *vadhyatē* but this is rather
an epic form for the classical *hanyatē*. Besides it would be
pleonastic on account of the following *mriyatē* for of course it
cannot mean „soffre“ (= suffers).

28 a. *ya evāham sa evēdam*. — I read without hesitation
tad evēdam.

¹⁾ JAOS, XXII, second half (1901) p. 388.

35 c d. *tasmād eṣa mahābāhō mahāmōha iti smṛtaḥ* || — P. has *mahāmōhō* instead of *mahābāhō*. Read of course *tasmād eṣō 'mahāmōha* in order to keep in agreement with the preceding and following stanzas.

41 c. *ārjavam javatam hitvā*. — This cannot be possibly right. Could we read *āvartam jagatām hitvā*? Cp. *punar āvartate jagat*, infra 86 b.

68 d. (*iti tasya sa tad vākyaṁ gṛhītvā*---) *pratyuttaram uvāca saḥ* || — This second *saḥ* is certainly false. Read *ha* and cp. infra 81 d.

70 a b. *vikāraprakṛtibhyō hi kṣētrajñam muktam apy aham manyē*. — Read *vikāraprakṛtibhyām hi* and cp. supra 17 a *prakṛtiś ca vikāraś ca*.

81 d. *prati jagāma ha* || — „he turned away“ (Cowell) but does it not rather mean „he returned“? I should read *parājagāma ha* „he went away“. Or perhaps *parijagāma*? Cp. XI. 73 c.

92 c d. *varsāṇi saḥ karmaprēpsur akarōt kārśyam ātmanaḥ* || Read *param prēpsur* and cp. above *Bōdhisattvaḥ param prēpsus tasmād Udrakam atyajat* || 86 c d.

101 a b. *nirvṛtiḥ prāpyatē samyaksatateन्द्रियatarpaṇāt* | — Separate *samyak sata*°.

107 c. *saphēṇamātanitāmbur*. — Read separately *saphēṇamālā* (corresponding to *sitaśaṅkhōjjvalabhujā*, a) *nītāmbur* (corresponding to *nīlakambalavāsini*, b).

Canto XIII.

13 c. *priyābhidhēyeṣu ratipriyēsu* (--- *cakravākēsu*---). — „(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 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*s that it might be insisted upon as one of their chief characteristics. Further, *ratipriya* cannot mean „tenderly attached“. I read therefore without the slightest hesitation *priyāvidhēyeṣu*

(= *priyādhīnēsu*) and translate the whole: „obedient to their sweet-hearts and devoted to pleasure“. Cp. the epithet of the voluptuous Agni-varṇa in the Raghuvamśa *strīvidhēyanavayāwanah*, XIX. 4d.

16 d. *kiṃ syād acittō na śarah sa ēṣah* || — „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 (*bāṇō hy ayaṃ tiṣṭhati lēlihānah*, v. 13 b), but we ought to read *śarah sa ēva* in view of *tam ēva bāṇam*, c, and *ēṣa śarah sa ēva yaḥ*---, v. 11 c. The reading of the text means: is this no arrow?

26 c. *harṣēna kaścīd vṛṣavan nanarta*. — Read *nanarta*. Bulls are no peacocks.

48 c. *sō 'prāptakāto vivasaḥ papāta*. — This is good in itself but the context makes necessary the correction *sō 'prāptakāmō*.

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