

P
A
N

H

11823

Prof. Dr. K. Twardowski

11823

PRACE KOMISJI ORJENTALISTYCZNEJ POLSKIEJ AKADEMJI
UMIEJĘTNOŚCI NR. 6.

MÉMOIRES DE LA COMMISSION ORIENTALE DE L'ACADÉMIE POLONAISE
DES SCIENCES ET DES LETTRES.

ANDRZEJ GAWROŃSKI

NOTES ON THE SĀUNDARANANDA
CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY

SECOND SERIES

(SĀUNDARANANDA. KRYTYKA TEKSTU I OBJAŚNIENIA).

W KRAKOWIE

NAKŁADEM POLSKIEJ AKADEMJI UMIEJĘTNOŚCI
SKŁAD GŁÓWNY W KSIĘGARNIACH GEBETHNERA I WOLFFA
WARSZAWA - KRAKÓW - LUBLIN - ŁÓDŹ - POZNAŃ

1922

PRACE KOMISJI ORIENTALISTYCZNEJ POLSKIEJ AKADEMJI
UMIEJĘTNOŚCI NR. 6.

MÉMOIRES DE LA COMMISSION ORIENTALE DE L'ACADÉMIE POLONAISE
DES SCIENCES ET DES LETTRES.

ANDRZEJ GAWROŃSKI

NOTES ON THE SĀUNDARANANDA

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY

11823

SECOND SERIES

(SĀUNDARANANDA. KRYTYKA TEKSTU I OBJAŚNIENIA).

H-117520

W KRAKOWIE

NAKŁADEM POLSKIEJ AKADEMJI UMIEJĘTNOŚCI
SKŁAD GŁÓWNY W KSIĘGARNIACH GEBETHNERA I WOLFFA
WARSZAWA - KRAKÓW - LUBLIN - ŁÓDŹ - POZNAŃ

1922

11823



K
18.12.14
A. B.

Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego pod zarządem J. Filipowskiego.

Canto I.

3 bd. *haviṣe yaś ca svātmārtham gām abhukṣad vaśiṣṭhavat |*
tapahśiṣṭeṣu śiṣyēṣu gām adhu(dhō)kṣad Vaśiṣṭhavat ||

Neither *abhukṣat* b nor *adhōkṣat* d are correct grammatical forms. The second of them has been changed by the editor to *adhukṣat*. The same emendation ought to be made in the first line; *adhukṣat* sounds better than either *abhukṣat*, which is faulty, or *abhāukṣit*, as proposed by Prof. Hultzsch, which does not rhyme. The expression 'to enjoy the earth' (*māhīm* or *pṛthivīm bhukṣtē*) is of frequent occurrence; hence the confusion of the roots *bhuj* and *duh*. There is a double pun in the words *gām adhukṣad vaśiṣṭhavat*. Translate: „He milked the < sacrificial > cow (*gām*) for his own sake, with the view of < performing the daily > libations, just as a prince < milks the earth (*gām*) >; he milked the speech (*gām*) in the midst of his disciples < i. e. he let flow upon them all kind of wise words, thus satisfying their desires > just as Vaśiṣṭha < milked his *kāmadhēnu* (*gām*) >“⁴. 'Milking the earth' is a standing phrase for 'levying duties'; it recurs, in much the same simile, II, 19: *gām adharmēṇa nādhukṣat kharatarṣeṇa gām iva*; other instances are Kumāras. I, 2 (quoting the famous case of Pṛthu, MBhār. VII, 69); Ragh. I, 26; Kirātārj. I, 18; with ślēṣa e. g. Śiśupāl. IV, 19 (*gō* = earth and bull). As to the double meaning of *gō* 'cow' and 'speech' cf. XVIII, 11 of our poem; also e. g. Kāvyaḍarśa I, 6; Uttararāmacarita V, 31 (*kāmān dugdha ityādi*).

5 d. *tasya vistṛṇatapasah pārśvė Himavataḥ śubhė |*
kṣētram cāyatanam cāiva tapasām āsrayō 'bhavat ||

I doubt whether *āsrayō* is right. The younger MS has *āsriyō* which is no word at all; in the older one there is a lacuna. The common word, in such cases, is certainly *āśramō*; *y* for *m* is often met with in our MSS. „He, that man of extensive tapas, had on

a beautiful slope of the Himavat a hermitage: a field and a home of ascetical exertions". Cf. infra 18 b: *atha tējasvisadanam tapah-kṣētram tam āśramam*; these words directly point to our stanza.

6. — I am not sure whether the description of the hermitage, which begins with this verse, is correctly given in the printed text. We find the relative *yaḥ* in vv. 6 and 8 but not in vv. 7, 9 and 10. Now, the latter two can be considered as still governed by *yas* 8 c, but in v. 7 the relative is clearly missing; it may be concealed in the compound *sāṅgarāga*, rather strange in this connection and probably corrupt. As to *tatra*, 11 d, it is hardly correct and most probably ought to be changed to *yatra*, which recurs throughout the remaining portion of this long kulaka, viz. in vv. 12—17.

10 c. *nīvāraphalasaṃtuṣṭāiḥ svasthāiḥ śāntāir anutsukāiḥ |*
ākīrṇō 'pi tapōbhṛṅgāiḥ śūnyaśūnya ivābhavat ||

For *tapōbhṛṅgāiḥ* (a nonsensical word, especially in this connection) Prof. Hultsch reads *tapōvṛddhāiḥ*. But the true reading is quite near at hand. In fact, *bhṛṅgāiḥ* (written with anusvāra) is only a disfigured **mṛgāiḥ*. Mention of wild animals, especially of antelopes, grown tame in hermitages, is seldom omitted in a description of an *āśrama*. Cf. e. g. Raghuv. I, 50 (and 52), by the bye, probably a direct echo of our stanza:

ākīrṇam ṛṣipatnīnām utajadvārarōdhībhiḥ |
apatyāir iva nīvārabhāgadhēyōcitāir mṛgāiḥ ||

Mark the words common to the two stanzas!

13 a. *api kṣudramṛgā yatra śāntās cēruḥ samam mṛgāiḥ |*
śaranyēbhyas tapasvibhyō vinayaṃ śikṣitā iva ||

The compound word *kṣudramṛgāḥ* apparently has here the unusual meaning of *krūramṛgāḥ*, unless indeed it has to be changed into some such word. „(The hermitage) in which even wild beasts were moving about in peace together with antelopes, etc.“ As a rule, however, the word *kṣudramṛga* is not used in this figurative sense; in the Mahābhārata the animals thus designed, not further specified, are often opposed to the lion. The friendly cohabitation of wild beasts and domesticated forest animals in hermitages is one of the most common characteristics of such places. Here are some instances from the mahākāvya: Raghuv. XIV, 75 *tapasvisamsargavinītasattvē tapōvanē* (cf. also *ūnam na sattvēṣv adhikō babādhē tasmin*

vanam gōptari gāhamānē, ib. II, 14); Kumār. V; 17 *virōdhisattvōjjhitapūrvamatsaram...* *tapōvanam*; Jānakīhar. V, 22 *vidhūtahimsayā | niṣēvyatē svāpadasaṃpadā padam tapasvinām ṛddham idam sāmāvaham* ||; Kirātārj. VI, 34 *itarētarānabhībhavēna mṛgās tam upāsate gurum ivāntasadaḥ*, said of Arjuna living as a hermit in a forest of the Himālaya. Cf. also e. g. *krīḍanti sarpāir nakulā mṛgāir vyāghrās ca mitravat | prabhāvād dīptatapasūm samnikarṣān mahātmanām* || MBhār. XIII, 45, 45. An instance from a Buddhist work is: *māitrimayēṇa prasāmēna tasya viṣyandinēvānuparītacittāḥ | parasparadrōhanivyttābhāvās tapasivād vyāḍamṛgā vicēruḥ* || Jātakam. I, 8. It would be easy to add other numerous examples to this list. Cf. Garbe, *Indien und das Christentum*, Tübingen 1913, p. 77.

24. *śakavṛkṣapratichannam vāsam yasmāc ca cakrīrē |
tasmād Ikṣvākuvamśyās tē bhūvi Śākyā iti smṛtāḥ* ||

This stanza is found, without indication of its source, in the Notes added by Mr. Nandargīkar to his edition of the first ten Cantos of the Jānakīharaṇa of Kumāradāsa. While commenting upon the word *Śākyāḥ* which occurs in V, 55 of that poem, the editor explains it by: *śakāḥ abhijanāḥ yeṣām tē | yad vā* and here he quotes our stanza with an insignificant difference of reading in the last pāda which, according to his text, runs *Śākyā iva bhūvi smṛtāḥ* (a doubtless inferior reading) and with the remark *ity āgamaḥ | śakē bhavāḥ Śākyāḥ*. Now, Mr. Nandargīkar's edition of the Jānakīharaṇa is dated Bombay 1907. At that time Mr. Haraprasāda Śāstrī's edition of Sāundarananda was not even begun, as can be gathered from his preface to it; in fact, it was not published till 1910, at the other end of India, in Calcutta. Thus it appears, that Aśvaghōṣa's etymology of the family name of the Śākyas was a current tradition (*āgama*) in India, long after its original source had been forgotten.

26 cd. *Vālmīkir iva dhīmāś ca dhīmatōr Māithilēyayōḥ* ||

scil. *cakrē svavamśasadṛśiḥ kriyāḥ*. This presupposes the existence, in some form or other, of the Uttarakāṇḍa of Rāmāyaṇa. Cf. also my article on the Buddhacarita and Rāmāyaṇa II, *Studies*, pp. 27—40.

35 ab. *baddhāṅguṣṭhāṅgulitranā hastādhiṣṭhitakārmukāḥ |*

I am not satisfied with the editor's corrections in this line. The paper MS, in which alone it is preserved, reads: *baddhagōṣṭhādgu-*

livāṇā hastaviṣṭitakārmukā. Now, I am not able to emendate the second pāda in a satisfactory way; the printed text means 'on whose bows hands were standing' (cf. e. g. *siṃhādhiṣṭhitakandaram* scil. *giriśreṣṭham*, Rām. V, 56, 36) which is a very awkward way of saying that the princes hold bows in their hands; perhaps we ought to read (*d*)*hṛtavistrakārmukāḥ* (= *grhītavipulacāpāḥ*), cf. *pragghī-tacāpa* VIII, 58 a; *dhṛtadhanus* VIII, 59 b; *dhṛtakārmuka* XVII, 40 c. The first pāda, on the contrary, is quite clear; the original, in all probability, had *baddhagōdhāṅgulitrāṇā(h)*, cf. e. g. *baddhagōdhāṅgulitrāṇān saśarāsaṇasāyākān*, MBhār. VII, 36, 27; *trāṇāḥ pragghī-taśarāsaṇāḥ*, ib. 127, 26 and other similar lines in MBh. and Rāmāy.

39 b. *atha tē puṇyakarmāṇāḥ pratyupasthitavṛddhayaḥ |*
tatra tajjñāir upākhyātān avāpur mahatō nidhīn ||

This stanza follows after a passage (vv. 34—38) which shows the young Ikṣvāku princes, or Śākyaas as they now came to be named, roaming about in the wilderness, maddened by youth and unrestrained. They are called *sūnyacētasāḥ* 'void of reason' in the immediately preceding stanza. Accordingly, *pratyupasthitavṛddhayaḥ*, being quite out of place, ought to be changed to *buddhayaḥ* 'having recovered their reason'. In all probability we have to do here with a copyist's misreading. Cf. my note to Buddhac. I, 94 (Studies, p. 2).

47. *vyastāis tāis tāir guṇāir yuktān mativāgvikramādibhīḥ |*
karmasu pratirūpēṣu sacivāms tān nyayūyujan ||

This is the fourth stanza of a kulaka consisting of six verses connected throughout by the relative *yatra* or *yat* referring to the city of Kapilavāstu. Such as it runs, however, our stanza breaks the unity of the grammatical construction. Accordingly, the relative has to be restored in it, just as it has been restored by Prof. Hultsch in the immediately preceding line. Now, *vyastāis* being, in my opinion, most probably a gloss on *tāis tāir*, which has much the same meaning, it can very well be removed from the text. The original reading was *yatra tāis tāir* or, less probably, *yasmīms tāis tāir*. In *d*, *sacivāms tān* stands probably for *sacivān svān*, the demonstrative *tān* referring to nobody and thus being out of place.

54 a. *vāsavṛkṣaṃ guṇavatām āśrayaṃ śaraṇāṣiṣṇām |*
ānartaṃ kṛtāsāstrāṇām ālānaṃ bāhusālinām ||

The compound *vāsavṛkṣa* was a favourite word with our poet. It occurs Buddhac. VI, 46 where it has its proper sense:

vāsavykṣē samāgamyā vigacchanti yathāṇḍajāḥ |
nīyatam viprayōgāntas tathā bhūtasamāgamaḥ ||

In the above-quoted stanza of Sāundar. the word *vāsavykṣa* is used in a figurative sense. The city of Kapilavāstu is said to be: „The nestling-tree of the virtuous, the asylum for those who seek a refuge, the play-ground of the learned, the binding-stock of athletic champions“. (The figurative sense of *ālāna* contains an allusion to the elephant-like strength of athletes attracted by the city). Finally, *vāsavykṣa* is found, still in a figurative sense, in one of the fragments of Śāriputraprakaraṇa edited by Prof. Lüders. One of the allegorical figures of this drama, Dhṛti, says to her two companions: *tēna hi sarvā yēva tāvad = ēnam vāsavykṣī-kurmaḥ ēsa hi sa maharṣir = Magadhapurasy = ōpavanē samprati... viharati* „So wollen wir denn alle zusammen leibhaftig ihn zu unserem Nestbaume machen. Denn der grosse Weise hält sich augenblicklich in dem Parke der Hauptstadt von Magadha auf.“ (K. Pr. Turfan-Expeditionen, Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte, I, Lüders, Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen, Berlin 1911, pp. 66, 18). In a footnote, Prof. Lüders asks: „Der Ausdruck *vāsavykṣa* ist auffällig. Dürfen wir daraus schliessen, dass die drei Genien mit Flügeln dargestellt wurden und daher Vögeln glichen?“ Not likely. The figurative sense of this word is rendered evident by Sāundarananda. It is confirmed by the testimony of Mṛcchakaṭika, a work not very much less old than Śāriputraprakaraṇa and sharing with it many an interesting particular, as Prof. Lüders himself has shown (op. cit., p. 26). Vasantasēnā is listening to the story of the ruined shampooer, who formerly served Cārudatta, then still a rich merchant. After the shampooer had concluded, the courtesan drops the following remark: *Madaṇīē vāsapādavavisaṅṭhuladāē pakkhiṇō vi idō tadō āhiṇḍanti* (ed. Stenzler, p. 38, l. 22). Here *vāsapādava* refers to Cārudatta. This transparent allusion is elaborated in a later stanza (pp. 73/74) which reads as follows:

guṇapravālam vinayaprasākaḥ
viśrambhamūlam mahanīyapuṣpam |
taṁ sādhuṣṭam svaguṇāiḥ phalādhyam
suhṛdvihamgāḥ sukham āśrayanti ||

60 c. — For *dīpyamānāiḥ* read *dīpyamānam* in close correspondence with the first pāda of this stanza. The reading of the text is syntactically hard.

Canto II.

16 c. — Read *ajāiṣīt* for *acāiṣīt*?? The numerous Aorist forms of this canto are not always well preserved and often look very suspicious.

18. *sāuhāradadyḍhabhaktivān maitrēṣu viguṇēsv api |*
nādidāsīd aditsīt tu sāmukhyāt sa sva(ttva)m arthavat ||

This stanza conveys no clear impression. The abstract noun *maitrēṣu* is somewhat strange; it is equivalent to *mitrēṣu* which ought perhaps to be put into the text. In the last pāda, I am little satisfied with the editor's reading *sa svam* for the unintelligible *syāmtvam* of the MS, the pronoun *sa* never being employed throughout this long enumeration of the king's virtues. Perhaps *svārtham* would do, cf. for the anuprāsa V, 16 d. „He did not wish to offer gifts to friends, who proved unworthy, <merely> on account of his steady devotion to friendship (i. e. his friendship did not go so far as to offer gifts to unworthy friends, cf. infra, 38 ed); on the other hand, he would give away his riches, out of friendliness, in a proper way“.

20 a. — Read *nāsprkṣat* for *nāsrkṣat*??

28. 29. *rakṣaṇāc cāiva sāuryāc ca nikhilān gām avīvapāt |*
spaṣṭayā daṇḍanīyā cā rātrisattrān avīvapāt ||
kulam vājarṣivṛttēna yaśōgandham avīvapāt |
dīptyā tama ivādītyas tējāsārīn avīvapāt ||

Each line of these two stanzas ends with an Aorist form *avīvapāt* which can be derived either from *vap* ‘to strew’ or from *vap* ‘to shear’. Neither of these two roots can be said here to be really appropriate; the Vedic root *vī* ‘to enjoy’ can scarcely be thought of. In the second stanza Prof. Hultsch proposes to read *avāvīpāt* from *āp* b and *i* d respectively, but he says nothing of *avīvapāt* in v. 28 and yet it can hardly be right in d and is certainly wrong in b. I am not sure whether *abībhavat* would not do in 28 b and 29 b; of course it is a mere guess but at least it gives a very good sense in the latter verse. It seems somewhat strange that the Aorist of such a common verb as *bhāvayati* should be missing in this long muster-roll of Aorist forms. *abībhavat* occurs several times in the Jānakīharaṇa, whose author clearly favours the causal Aorist, perhaps under the influence of Aśvaghōṣa.

30 a. *apaprathat pitṛmś cāiva satputrasadyśair guṇāih |*

The younger MS has *avatapat* which is no preterite at all. Prof. Hultsch avails himself of the latter form and conjectures *atītyapat*, as, in his opinion, the reading of the text is meaningless in this connection. To me, however, it seems quite right. The verse may be rendered: „He made his manes illustrious by virtues natural in a good son“, i. e. he added to their fame by his own glory. The participle *prathita* occurs infra VIII, 27 a with the figurative sense of ‘illustrious’ (*prathitasya dhīmataḥ kulajasya... sadṛṣī na gḥāya cētanā*). It is of frequent occurrence in the epic works of Kālidāsa, e. g. Kumāras. V, 7 c; Raghuv. IX, 76 a (*prathitānvaya*); XI, 38 b (*prathitavomśajanman*), as also in Kirātārj., e. g. V. 3; VI, 39 b; VIII, 53 d etc. The epithet *prathitaguṇa* is found Jānakīhar. IX, 68 b. Cf. also e. g. *ayam naḥ prathayiṣyēta sarvān ity abhavat Pṛthuḥ*, MBhār. VII, 69, 2. — The idea conveyed by the line quoted above is very common all over the world.

37 d. *prajāḥ paramadharmajñāḥ sūkṣmaṁ dharmam avīvapat |*
darśanāc cāiva dharmasya kālē svargam avī(va)pat ||

For the second *avī(va)pat* Prof. Hultsch surmises *avīviśat*. Some such verb seems to be required by the sense. But then *avīvahat* is perhaps a less violent change.

53 b. *sūryaraśmibhir aklīṣṭam puṣpavarṣam papāta khāt |*

Cf. a nearly identical line, Mahābhār. II, 92, 83:

tatō 'ntarikṣāt sumahat puṣpavarṣam avāpatat |

Here too the neuter has been used. Other similar phrases might be quoted, both from MBh. and Rām. Evidently the poet was under the impression of some such line.

Canto III.

22 c. *sa vicakramē divi bhuvīva*
punar upavivēṣa tasthivān |
nīscalamatir aśayiṣṭa (Hultsch) punar
bahudhābhavat punar abhūt tathāikadhā ||

As the whole stanza deals with different positions and gaits as well as shapes assumed by Buddha, the isolated *nīscalamatir*, which refers to his state of mind, ought probably to be corrected to *ḡgatir*, ‘again he lay immovable’.

34 b. *manasā lulōbha na ca jātu
paravasūṣu baddhamānasah |*

I can see no reason for discarding the reading of the older and much better MS, viz. *gr̥ddhamānasah*; the sense remains nearly the same.

39 d. *akathamkathā gr̥hina (Hultsch) ēva
paramapariśuddhadṛṣṭayah |
sr̥ōtasi hi vap̥tirē bahavō
rajasas tanutvam api cak̥rirē parē ||*

On the first sight everything seems quite right in this stanza. Perhaps it is. But perhaps there is something wrong about the fourth pāda. How can there be a difference between a *sr̥ōtāāpanna* and a *tanūkytarajas*? A disciple who „has descended into the stream“ must necessarily have little *rajas* left and vice versā. Moreover, *bhavō* being the common grammatical subject of a b c, it is desirable for the sake of smooth style to make it also the subject of d. The immediately preceding stanza as well as the one next following have each of them only one subject. The original probably had *purē* instead of *parē*. It enhances the idea conveyed by *gr̥hina ēva*; cf. also *puram tat*, infra, 42 b. The stanza may be rendered: „Numerous citizens (*bahavaḥ*), freed from religious doubts, while continuing to lead a family life (*gr̥hina ēva*), with their sight highly purified, attained to the first degree of devotion (*sr̥ōtasiva v̥tirē*) and caused their *rajas* to become tiny, even though < remaining > in the town (*api... purē*)“.

Canto IV.

2 c. — *Vāśramanam*. — The late Prof. Kern was perhaps the first to draw attention to the interchange of *v* and *m* in some Sanskrit words. He says in a note to his edition and translation of the *Yōgayātrā* of Varāhamihira: *Çravaṇa* ist entstanden aus *çramaṇa*, doch nicht gerade ein Fehler, vielmehr eine in's Sanskr̥t aufgenommene dialektische Aussprache, ebenso wie *Draviḍa* aus *Dramiḍa*. Umgekehrt ist *Yamakoti* entstanden aus *Yavakoti*, und *yamanikā* aus *yavanikā*. (Reprinted from Weber's *Indische Studien* in H. Kern, *Verspreide geschriften*, I, 's-Gravenhage 1913, p. 164). The form *Dramiḍa*, mentioned by Kern, is also found

Sāundar. VI, 49a. The change of *v* to *m* is of course of Middle Indian origin; cf. Pischel, Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen § 261, where the form *Vesamaṇa* = *Vāśravaṇa* is quoted from Ardh-Māgadhī and Jāina-Māhārāṣṭrī; both these dialects are, in some way or other, related to Eastern India (Pischel §§ 16—21) where Aśvaghōṣa was born. Cf. also the important paper of Ascoli (prior to Kern?) intitulated *La riduzione praeritica di m in v, ed i suoi effetti* (Studj critici II, pp. 265—305; see pp. 300, 302—4), not mentioned by M. Bloch neither in his valuable *Formation de la langue Marathe* § 152, 3° nor in his recent note on *La nasalité en indo-aryen* (Cinquantenaire de l'École pratique des Hautes Etudes, Sect. hist. et phil., p. 64).

3 bc. *stambhēna garvēṇa ca māninīti |*
 dīptyā ca mānēna ca bhāminīti

I think we ought to read *bhāminī* for *māninī* and vice versā, it being certainly far more natural to explain *māninī* by *mānēna* than by any other word.

4 c. *sā hāsahamsā nayanadvirēphā*
 pīnastanābhayunnatāpadmakōṣa |
 bhūyō babhāsē svakulōditēna
 strīpadminī Nandadivākarēṇa |||

svakulōditēna perhaps alludes to Nanda's descent from the Sun. It means literally 'born in his own family' which, if applied to Nanda, would be nonsense, as no man can be born outside his own family. But the grammatical subject of the sentence is (Nanda)divākara i. e. 'the Sun (in the shape of Nanda)'. Therefore, the poet said *uditēna* which means 'risen' as well as 'born'. It is very clever to compare a radiant youth of the solar dynasty, causing his well-beloved to smile, with the Sun reborn, as it were, in his own dynasty and looking at the lotus-like face of his earthly mistress until it opens to him in a smile. Nanda's father is styled *arkabandhu* 'a cousin to i. e. a descendant of the Sun' Buddhacar. I, 9; Buddha has got the same epithet *Kavīndravacanasamuccaya* N^o. 4, cf. the editor's note thereon (ed. F. W. Thomas, Bibl. Ind. N^o. 1309, Calcutta 1912). *svakulōditēna*, in the above-quoted stanza, is used in much the same way as e. g. (*dhṛtā bhūpatibhiḥ*) *svavamśajāiḥ* (*tvayā... mahī... apavarjitā*) Kirāt. I, 29. *sukulōditēna*, hesitatingly suggested by

Prof. Hultsch, has a hap-hazard look contrasting as it does with the epithets of *strīpadminī* all of them very aptly chosen to qualify a lotus-pond.

- 5 d. *rūpēṇa cātyantamanōharēṇa*
rūpānurūpēṇa ca cēṣṭitēna |
manuṣyalōkē hi tadā babhūva
sā Sundarī strī puruṣēṣu Nandaḥ ||

puruṣēṣu is no doubt very awkward. The poet means: „She was the only woman (worth of that name) in the world of Manu's children, Nanda — the only man“. But the text does not say that. There can be little doubt but that the tautologic *puruṣēṣu* (= *manuṣyalōkē*) must be corrected to *puruṣas tu*. All is clear then. Sundarī was the woman of her age, but who was Nanda? Of course he was the man.

8. — The anaphoric pronoun *tat* is missing in this stanza; cf. 7 c, 9 d, 11 b. Perhaps it is to be sought in *sahārasta*, d, changed to *sahāramsta* by the editor.

12. *vibhūṣayāmāsa tataḥ priyām sa*
siṣēviṣus tām na mṛjāvahārtham |
svēnāiva rūpēṇa vibhūṣitā hi
vibhūṣaṇānām api bhūṣaṇam sā ||

The idea that a beautiful girl „herself embellishes her embellishments“ has taken firm root in later Sanskrit literature. It is particularly often met with in Kālidāsa and Bhāravi. Cf. e. g. Vikramōrvaśī (Bollensen) v. 22:

ābharanasyābharanam prasāadhanavidhēḥ prasāadhanaviṣēṣaḥ |
upamānasyāpi sakhē pratyupamānam vapus tasyāḥ ||

See also: Kumāras. I, 42; VII, 7; 20; Kirātārj. VIII, 40 d (*alam-kr̥tam tadvapuṣāiva maṇḍanam*); IV, 9; X, 1 (cf. also I, 23; VII, 5), and so on. The following instance from the MBhār. is worth being quoted in full (I, 187, 37):

- tvaṁ hi sarvānavadyāṅgī sarvābharanabhūṣitā |*
vibhūṣaṇam ivāiteṣāṁ bhūṣaṇānām abhīkṣitam ||
 14 b. *bhartus tataḥ śmaśru nirūpayantī* (Hultsch)
viṣēṣakam bhāsi cakāra tāḍṛk |

But the *viṣēṣaka* painted by Sundarī, black as it was being made in imitation of Nanda's beard, can hardly be called *bhāsi* 'resplendent';

a beard is not so, as a rule. The word in question is only a conjecture by the editor; the younger MS reads *bhāsāpisi*, which is meaningless; in the older one there is a lacuna. I think, the original had *sāpi*, disfigured in the younger MS by the addition of two syllables. The meaning is obviously „looking at her husband's beard, she too made a similar mark on her own cheek“. Nothing more natural, indeed.

16. *cikṣēpa karnōtpalam asya cāmsē*
karēṇa savyēna madālasēna |
pattrāṅgulim cārthanimilitākṣē
vaktre 'sya tām ēva vinirdudhāva ||

This stanza probably inspired Kālidāsa with the idea of the second half of Kumāras. IV, 8:

smarasi Smara mēkhalāgunāir
uta gōtraskhalitēṣu bandhanam |
cyutakēsaraśūṣitēkṣaṇāny
avataṁsōtpalatādanāni vā ||

17 b. — *nakhaprabhōdbhāsitarāṅgulibhyām* (viz. *padbhyām*). The comparative *udbhāsitarā* looks suspect. *tara* is probably wrong and stands for some adjective qualifying *ānguli*; *vara*?

21. — This stanza was perhaps the model of Kumāras. V, 9. Kālidāsa, however, succeeded in turning the same components (bees, the śāivala plant, and a lotus) into a pretty different image.

- 39 bc. *sā taṁ prayāntaṁ ramaṇaṁ pradadyāu*
pradhyānaśūnyasthitaniścalākṣī |
sthītōccakarnā vyapaviddhaśaṣpā
bhrāntaṁ mṛgaṁ bhrāntamukhī mṛgīva ||

The pale and inexpressive *sthita* is in all probability only a copyist's blunder for *sthira*. Sundarī's eyes, lost in contemplation, are steady and unmoving, hence she is called *pradhyānaśūnyasthiraniścalākṣī* (*sthiraniścalē sthirē ca tē niścalē ca*; *pradhyānāt śūnyē sthiraniścalākṣiṇī yasyāḥ sū tādrṣī*). As to the compound *sthirōccakarnā* (*mṛgī*) it has got an exact parallel in *nibhṛtōrdhvakarnāḥ* (*rathyāḥ*), Śakuntalā, ed. Cappeller, v. 8 b. Steadiness can be indicative of attention as well as of speed.

44. *sa kāmāragēṇa nigrhyamāṇō*
dharmānurāgēṇa ca kṛṣyamāṇaḥ |

*jagāma duḥkhēna vivartyamānaḥ
plavaḥ pratisrōta ivāpagāyāḥ ||*

Not *vivartyamānaḥ* but *nivartyamānaḥ* (in correspondence with *nigryhyamānō*) is probably the true reading. Nanda was not caused to roll or to turn round (*vi-vrt*), but to turn back, to return (*ni-vrt*). This stanza has a very close parallel (probably a direct imitation) in a verse by a late poet, Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa, author of the Pārvaṭipariṇaya, until recently falsely attributed to the writer of the Kādambarī. Here it is:

*avalōkanāya lōlā dṛṣṭir iyaṁ mṛgadṛṣō nivṛttimatī |
gatvā pratipravāham rājati śapharī nivartamānēva ||*
(ed. R. Schmidt, Leipzig 1917, p. 75).

The words *pratipravāham* and *nivartamānā* point directly to our poem. The only difference is *śapharī* for *plavaḥ*; a very slight one, indeed.

The idea of a lover or friend unable to bear the separation from the object of his attachment is a very common one in Sanskrit literature, although, to the best of my recollection, I have not met with it in a poet earlier than Aśvaghōṣa (cf., however, Nala X *gatvā gatvā Nalō rājetyādi*). It appears in two main aspects. (1) One goes away but is ever retained by the view of his friend, as a ship going or a fish swimming up-stream is retained by the current. Cf. Sāundar. IV, 44; Pārvaṭipar. V, 30 (quoted above); also Sāundar. IV, 42 and Kumāras. V, 85, as pointed out by Mr. Haraprasāda Śāstrī. A distant echo of this simile is Vikramōrvaśī v. 24:

*vivikṣōr yad idaṁ nūnam udyānam nādyā śantayē |
srōtasēvōḥyamānasya pratīpagamanam mahat ||*

(2) One goes away, but leaves his heart behind, as Buddhacar. VI, 67 (*yayāu śarīreṇa puram na cetasā*). This idea forms the subject of the elaborate image exhibited by the sixth ucchvāsa of Daṇḍin's Daśakumāracarita, the last portion of which reads as follows: *kuvalayaśaram iva Kusumāśarasya mayy apāṅgam samarpayantī sāpadēsam asakṛdāvartyamānavadanacandramaṇḍalatayā svahṛdayam iva matsamīpē prēritam pratinivṛttam na vēty ālōkayantī saha sakhībhiḥ kumārīpuram agamat* (ed. Goḍābole-Parab⁵ Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, 1906, p. 211). Not less artificial is Śīsupālavadhā XIII, 47.48:

*gatam Acyutēna saha śūnyatām gatāḥ
 pratipālayan mana ivāṅganājanaḥ ||
 alasāir madēna sudṛṣaḥ śarīrakāiḥ
 svagrāhān prati pratiyayuh śanāiḥ śanāiḥ |*

The v. 27 of Śakuntalā (ed. Cappeller, p. 15) is a contamination of Buddhac. VI, 67 and of Sāundar. IV, 44. On the other hand, Buddhacar. VI, 50 has nothing to do with the idea in question in either of its two aspects. Buddha simply means: „Go, my dear Chanda, and break the news of my departure to my father; but if you really love me, as you say, more than your home, then you may return afterwards and lead an ascetic's life in the forest together with me“. Prof. Formichi's rendering of this stanza and his note to it are, I am sorry to declare, quite insipid. His Buddha says with amazing affectedness: „Well, my dear, if you really love me, then I am pleased to offer you a poetical remedy for your heart-trouble: tu, pure, procedendo innanzi col corpo, torna indietro col pensiero! Backwards and forwards. Just as that silly lover Duśyanta did — witness Kālidāsa, Śakuntalā, Act I“. Simply disgusting. But there is no accounting for tastes.

Canto V.

10 d. *tādṛṅnimittam Sugataś cakāra
 nāhārakṛtyam sa yathā vivēda ||*

The readings of the MSS (viz. *kālanmahāra*, Palm-leaf; *kāram vāhāra*, Paper) point rather to *nāhārakālam*, a conjecture the probability of which is enhanced by *bhāikṣakālah* and *kālam pratismārayatīva sūryaḥ* of the preceding stanza. Apparently, a negligent scribe, puzzled by **kāranāhārakālam**, first put *kālam* for **kāra* and then failed to write it out again, thus giving rise to the older reading.

18 d. *yasmād imam tatra cakāra yatnam
 tatsnēhapakṣān munir ujjihīrṣan ||*

Read: *tam snēha*°. There are two reasons for this emendation. Firstly, *ujjihīrṣan* demands an object, which is missing in the text, and, secondly, it is difficult to say to whom or to what *tat* refers? To Sundarī? But she is not spoken of at all. The word *snēhapakṣa* denotes a general idea, just as *saṃklēśapakṣa*, supra, 16a. Buddha wanted to liberate his brother from sensual love, which is the root

of clinging to the world and consequently of all evil. Cf. infra 23 b *lōlam manaḥ kāmasukhān niyaecha*, and specially 34 a *atha pramādā ca tam ujjihṛṣan*, an exactly parallel passage, where *pramāda* = *snēhapakṣa*.

31 a. — Prof. Hultsch is right in preferring *savidyō* to *sa vāidyō*. Cf. e. g. *savidyāḥ sarvajīvajñāḥ sarvā vai vicikitsakāḥ* MBhār. XIII, 211, 51.

47 a. *bālasya dhātrī vinigṛhya lōṣtram*
yathōddharaty āsya puṭapraviṣtam (cf. Studies, ad locum) |
tathōjjihṛṣuḥ khalu rāgaśalyam
tat tvām avōcam parūṣam hitāya ||

I am not sure whether *vinigṛhya* ought not to be corrected to *vinigarhya* on account of *avōcam parūṣam*. A conscientious nurse rarely if ever fails to seize the opportunity of scolding her pupil in a situation like that described by our poet. „You naughty boy, why must you always put such nasty things into your mouth? How often have I told you not to do so? And now, look you here! you were very nearly choked!“ Some such reprimand is hinted at by *vinigarhya*. Well, Buddha did not act differently. He severely rebuked Nanda for indulging in worldly pleasures, but, in so doing, he tried to cure his mind. So far, all is right. But *vinigṛhya* is supported, at least to a certain degree, by *nigṛhya* in the next following verse, 48 b. 'Shall we change that too and read *vigarhya* for it? Not likely.

The opposition *parūṣam hitāya* is a favourite theme with Sanskrit poets. It occurs in similes, proverbial sayings, compliments and the like, told and retold under various disguises and almost without end. Cf. Sāundar. I, 9; III, 33; V, 15; VIII, 22; XI, 15. 16. Some of these passages may or may not have been directly utilised by a later poet, but it is impossible to determine, whether or which. Take e. g. such cases as *hitam vipriyam apy uktō yaḥ śuśrāva na cukṣubhē* said of king Śuddhōdana, Sāundar. I, 9, and *hitān na yaḥ saṁśṛṇutē sa kimprabhukḥ*, Kirātārj. I, 5, or *durlabham hi priyahitam* (viz. *vākyam*), Sāundar. XI, 16, and *hitam manōhāri ca durlabham vacaḥ*, Kirātārj. I, 4.

51 cd. *vyayōjayac cāsrupariplutākṣam kēśasriyam*. — Mark the double Accusat. depending on *vyayōjayat*. Or was *kēśasriyā* the original reading?

Canto VI.

6d. *athātra kācit pramadā sabāṣpā* (Studies, ad loc.)
tām duḥkhitām draṣṭum abhīpsamānā (Hultsch) |
prāsādasōpānatalapraṇādam
cakāra padbhyām sahasā rudantī ||

I don't believe *rudantī* to be the original reading. It comes rather unexpectedly after the words *prāṇādam cakāra padbhyām*. Why did the woman, eager to see her afflicted lady (*tām duḥkhitām draṣṭum abhīpsamānā*) make a noise with her feet while going upstairs? Evidently, because she was running fast. She was in no mood to tarry. Consequently, I should like to read *sahasā vrajantī*. As the editor has pointed out (Preface, p. IV), the compound *prāsādasōpānatalapraṇāda* occurs also Buddhac. III, 15a. There too the women were running fast as appears from the words *anyōnyavēgāc ca samākṣipantyaḥ*. The poet observed quite correctly: only slow steps are silent, persons running in a staircase always make a noise. The words *sahasā vrajantya* recur Kumāras. VII, 57 = Raghuv. VII, 6, in the well-known passage imitated from Buddhac. III, 13 and the following stanzas. In the same passage there is a spurious verse (too tasteless to have been written by Kālidāsa) given in the Nirṇaya Sāgara edition of Kumāras. (ed. Phansikar⁴, 1906), in which the words *tvarayā vrajantī* are found at the end of a pāda; this testimony, insignificant as it is, cannot be rejected a limine, since another such spurious verse, (ed. cit., p. 17, after I, 45) exhibits at the end of a pāda the words *sutarām rarāja* which are found in identical position Buddhacar. I, 14d. In Raghuv. VIII, 7 we read *sahasōdvēgam vrajēd iti*. On the other side, *sahasā rud* does not occur in the works of Kālidāsa; as far as I can see, we have only *babhūva Rāmuḥ sahasā sabāṣpaḥ*. Raghuv. XIV, 84, where *sahasā* of course refers to *babhūva*. Finally, the words *sahasā rudantī*, in the stanza quoted at the head of this note, are clearly tautologic on account of *pramadā sabāṣpā* which I firmly believe to be the original reading. *vrajantī* was probably changed to *rudantī* by a scribe who found in his MS *sabāṣpām* instead of the correct *sabāṣpā*, but felt, quite rightly, that the woman too should cry. To strengthen the verb *rud* our poet employs the adverbs *prasabham* (Sāundar. VI, 35) and *bhṛsam* (Buddhac. VIII, 37).

- 7c. *tasyās ca sōpānatalapraṇādam*
śrutvāiva tūrṇam punar utpapāta |
prītyā prasaktēva ca samjaharṣa
prīyōpayānam pariśankamānā ||

The reading *prasaktēva* 'as if attached' (to whom? can any doubt Sundarī's attachment to her adored Nanda?) testifies to the uncommonly bad taste of a thoughtless scribe. *prasaḥyāiva* is perhaps the true reading. Sundarī was lying on a sofa, in utter depression. All at once, she heard foot-steps on the staircase. Somebody was running upstairs. In an instance she was on her feet again (*pāda b*), and thinking her husband was coming she felt a violent joy (*prasaḥyāiva ca samjaharṣa*) because she loved him (*prītyā*).

12a. *sā strīsvabhāvēna vicintya tat tat* etc. — The same words recur at the commencement of a metrically identical line (Indravajrā) in the well-known stanza *atyucchritē mantriṇītyādi*, *Mudrārākṣasa*, (ed. Hillebrandt), IV, 13 = *Tantrākhyāyika* (ed. Hertel), I, 56 (cf. Speyer, *Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara*, Amsterdam 1908, p. 51). I attribute such cases to subconscious memory, cf. my *Notes sur les sources de quelques drames indiens*, I, Cracow 1921.

- 17d. *bhaktim sa Buddham prati yām avōcat*
tasya prayātum mayi sō 'padēśaḥ |
munāu prasādō yadi tasya hi syān
mṛtyōr ivōgrād anu tad bibhīyāt ||

Not *nanu mad*, as I was formerly inclined to admit, but *anṛtād* is the doubtlessly correct reading for *anu tad*. „Were he really devoted to the holy man, he would shrink back from untruth as from horrible death“. Sundarī is quite right: Nanda did prove untrue to her, as he did not come back at the appointed time. She is amazed at his breach of promise and tries to explain it as best she can. My correction is in perfect agreement with the drift of her thoughts, vv. 13—19.

19a. — The reading of the older MS. viz. *ētam* for *ēvam* is obviously preferable.

26c. *Padmā vipadmā*. — Cf. for the anuprāsa *vipadmām iva padminīm*, *Rāmāy.* V, 15, 21, and for the sense *bhraṣṭapadmām iva Śrīyam*, VI, 34, 16 and *padmahīnām iva Śrīyam*, VI, 36, 8, said of Sītā, while pining in Rāvaṇa's captivity; *sarvē bruvanti tām* (viz.

Śakuntalām) *dṛṣṭvā padmahīnām iva Śriyam* MBhār. I, 97, 5, and other similar lines. But *iva* should not be missing in Sāund.

28. *na bhūṣaṇē[nā]’rthō mama saṁpratīti*
sā dikṣu cikṣēpa vibhūṣaṇāni |
nirbhūṣaṇā sā patitā cakāṣē
viśīrṇapūspastabakā latēva ||

This stanza confirms my former correction to Buddhacar. V, 58 viz.:

tathānyā
jaḥanasrastavibhūṣaṇāmśukāntā |
aśayiṣṭa vikīrṇakaṇṭhasūtrā
gajabhagnā patitā latāṅganēva ||

for *pratipātītāṅganēva*, Cowell, text, and *pratipātāṅganēva*, MS., cf Rocznik orientalistyczny, I, 1, ad locum. Moreover, *vikīrṇakaṇṭhasūtrā* (Buddhac.) perhaps stands for *viśīrṇa*^c, as shown by *viśīrṇapūspastabakā* (Sāundar.). In fact, a participle meaning *torn off* or *torn to pieces* better suits the text than one having the sense of *scattered about*, as the poet does not speak of single pearls (as Sāundar. VI, 5 c) but of the necklace, of the string uniting the pearls (*kaṇṭhasūtra*). The two stanzas quoted above are nearly identical; there can be no doubt about the poet having repeated his idea. Similarly, the next stanza but one of the Sāundar., viz. VI, 30, is a repetition of the idea conveyed by Buddhacar. VIII, 37. In the earlier poem the palaces seem to imitate the lamenting women by the cooing of the doves in the dove-cots erected on the roofs; in the Sāundar. it is Sundarī who imitates, as it were, by her lamentations the cooing doves of the palaces. Thus the correctness of Böhtlingk’s conjecture in Buddhac. VIII, 37, viz. *sahāvarōdhanāih* for *sahāiva rōdhanāih*, is past all doubt. The cooing of the doves is often compared to crying by Indian poets, e. g. Mudrārākṣasa VI, v. 12 and elsewhere.

31 b. *vāidūrya* is a favourite word with Aśvaghōṣa, cf. X, 8 d; 24 a; 29 b; 30 c; XVII, 2 d. It is worth noting that it is not equally favoured by the later mahākavis, who, indeed, scarcely, if ever, make use of it. On the contrary, *vāidūrya* is often met with in popular epics.

32 d. *tamō vivēśābhinanāda cōccāih*
paṅkāvatīrṇēva ca sāmsasādu |

It smells of singularly bad taste to imagine Sundarī herself sinking in mud. The usual comparison, suggested by frequent experience of daily life, is with a cow or an elephant (cf. VIII. 17; XVII. 72). When applied to persons, *pañka* is used only in a figurative sense, as e. g. *kāmapañka*, XVIII; 40. Thus, we ought perhaps to read *pañkāvatīrṇēva ca gauḥ sasāda*.

Canto VII.

6 ad. — *prīyaṅgu* has been happily conjectured by the editor. Cf. *Rtusamhāra* IV, 10 c.

8 c. *latām praphullām atimuktakasya*
cūtasya pārśvė parirabhya jātām |
nīśāmya cintām agamat tadāivam
śliṣṭā bhavēn mām api Sundarīti ||

I surmise *kadāivam*. „Looking at the flowery atimuktaka-creeper which grew holding the cūta-tree embraced on both sides, he was afflicted and thought: when shall Sundarī embrace me in this manner?“

12 b. — *tamaḥśikhēna* is against my conjecture ad Buddhacar. IX, 29 b (*Rocznik Oryentalistyczny* I. 1, Gleanings, ad loc). Still, I find it rather difficult to attribute to *tamas* a figurative sense, necessarily vague and yet strong enough to make us forget the true meaning of this word. As a rule, quite the reverse is the case, witness the-innumerable allusions to ‘darkness’, when the *guṇa tamas* is spoken of (cf. X. 58; XII, 29; Buddhacar. I, 1). We find *tama(h)* falsely for *tapas* III, 2 d (Hultzs) Moreover, the word *tapas* (grief) is peculiarly well adapted to the situation both in this stanza and in that of Buddhacar. On the other side, the compound *tamōviṣāgninā* (viz. *Manmathāhinā*) confirms the reading of the text and enhances the improbability of my conjecture. After all, it seems best to withdraw it.

20 a. *baddhvāsanaṁ pādapanirjharasthaḥ*. — This is rendered by Prof. Hultzs: „unter einem Baum, an einem Wasserfall“, as if the text had *nirjharapādapaḥ*, which it has not. Moreover, I am not aware that these two words are usually compounded in either order; I know only of *vananirjhara*, but that is another thing. There is a very common compound, viz. *gīrinirjhara*, often met with in

Buddhist literature. *giri* being inadmissible here, I surmise *parvatanirjharasthaḥ*. For the compound *parvatanirjhara* cf. Rāmāy. V, 57, 30.

24—45 and Buddhaer. IV, 72 ff. — A really striking European parallel to these two passages is Boccaccio, Fiammetta ed. Bibliotheca Romanica pp. 39—41.

42 d. *sadvṛttavarmā kila Sōmavarmā*
babhrāma Cittōdbhavabhinnadharmā ||

Prof. Hultsch's correction, viz. °*marmā* for °*dharmā* seems rather convincing. Nevertheless, the word °*dharman* is peculiar to our poet. Therefore it is not quite improbable that the meaning of this line is: his *kāma* proved stronger than his *dharma*. There is a verse in the Śiśupālavadhā not dissimilar to ours, viz. *janakō 'si Janādana sphuṭam hatadharmārthatayā Manōbhvaḥ*, XVI, 49. The pun in *Cittōdbhava* is identical with that in *Manōbhū!* Let it be said however, that Māgha is no imitator of Aśvaghōṣa. The palpable influence of our poet on his great successors seems to end with Bhāravi. Later on it becomes accidental.

45 d. — *vimamaṛṣa* is corrected to *vimamaṛṣa* by Prof. Hultsch. Of course the learned Sanskritist is quite right as far as etymology goes; cf. *vimṛśanti* VIII, 37. We all know that there is a great confusion about the orthography of *mṛś* and *mṛṣ* in Sanskrit MSS as well as in many editions, especially when made in India. It is an easy thing to restore the correct form in every case. And yet *vi-mṛṣ* for *vi-mṛś* in an inveterate error, and it would be difficult to decide past all doubt which was the form used by Aśvaghōṣa. What we must call the faulty orthography of this word, is yet secured by anuprāsa in the following line of Bhāravi's (Kirātārj. VI, 44):

avimṛśyam ētaḍ abhilaṣyati sa dviśatām vadhēna viśayābhiratim ||
where, despite Prof. Cappeller's authority (HOS, Vol. XV, Anmerkungen, ad loc.), I should hesitate to read *avimṛśyam*.

Canto VIII.

5 c. *manasō hi rajastamaḥsatām*
bhīṣajō 'dhyātmaidaḥ parikṣakāḥ ||

The paper MS, where alone this line is preserved, reads *rajastamasattva*. The editor, while conjecturing °*satām*, himself observed

that „*sat* as a substitute for *sattva* is unusual⁴. But *sattva* too is quite out of place in this verse. How can a healer of souls be said to heal that which is considered the very best particle of the soul? How can one heal the health? Neither *sattva* nor *sat* will do here. Perhaps the original reading was *rajastamasvatō*: „Healers of the mind oppressed by *rajas* and *tamas* are < to be looked for among > men skilled in psychological research“. Cf. *sarajastamaska* and *vītarajastamaska*, XVI, 18; cp. also XVIII, 52. As the three *guṇas* are frequently, nay usually, named together, a half-learned copyist put *sattva* into the text, most probably reading *rajastamassattvabhīṣajō* as a compound word.

10 a. *sadṛśam yadi dharmacāriṇaḥ*
 satatam prāṇiṣu māitracētasah |
 adhṛtāu yad iyam hitāṣitā
 mayi tē syāt karuṇātmanaḥ sataḥ ||

yadi is void of any sense; probably it is due to the mechanical influence of *yad iyam*, c. I am not able to restore the original reading with sufficient certainty; it may or may not have been *khalu* or *bata*, both of which occur in the same position, infra, 15 a and 16 a. The whole stanza is a complimentary address which has a pretty close parallel in Buddhac. XI, 2.

15. 16. — *mahatō vyādhabhayād viniḥṣṛtaḥ | pravivikṣati vāgūrām*
mṛgaḥ... vihaḡaḥ khalu jālasamvṛtō... mōkṣitaḥ |... pravivikṣuḥ
svayam ēva pañjaram || Cf. *quae bellua ruptis | cum semel effugit*
reddīt se prava catenis?, Horace, Serm. II, 7. — There are other similar lines both in this poem and in Buddhacar.

32 c. *pramadāḥ samadā madapradāḥ*
 pramadā vītamadā bhayapradāḥ |
 itī dōṣabhayāvahās ca tāḥ
 katham arhanti niṣēvaṇam nu tāḥ ||

In my opinion *yāḥ* is preferable to *tāḥ*, c. It is not fair to charge upon Aśvaghōṣa every consequence of his late copyists carelessness.

35. *vacanēna haranti valgunā (Hultzsch)*
 niṣitēna praha[ra]nti cētasaḥ |
 madhu tiṣṭhati vāci yōṣitam
 hṛdaye hālalaḡam mahad viṣam ||

As Prof. Hultsch has pointed out, the latter half of this stanza is found in Bhartṛhari's Śṛṅgāraśataka, only with a practical application at which Āsvaghōṣa would frown in disgust. It recurs also, under a transparent disguise, in Kālidāsa's Śakuntalā. Kālidāsa, however, being no Buddhist and no mysogyne, has turned the accusation against men. It is put into the mouth of Śakuntalā herself, in the scene of her repudiation by Duṣyanta. She says: *suṭṭhu dāva sacchandacāriṇī kidamhi jā ahaṃ imassa Puruvamsassa paccaeṇu muhamahunṇō hīaavisassa hatthabbhāsaṃ uvagadā* (ed. Cappel-ler, p. 63). It is impossible to decide, whether Kālidāsa was indebted for this idea to our poet or to some proverbial saying¹). — In the first pāda, Prof. Hultsch was of course quite right in substituting *valgunā* to the meaningless *varṇanā*. The adjective *valgu* is a not unfrequent epithet of *vacana* and such like words; cf. e. g. *valguvāg api ca vāmalōcanā*, Raghuv. XIX, 13; an instance from Buddhist literature is *svarēṇa valgunā*, Lalitavistara (ed. Lefmann) p. 323, 19.

41 b. *viṣayād viṣayāntaram gatā
pracaraty ēva yathā hatāpi gāuḥ |
anavēkṣitapūrvasāuhydā
ramatē 'nyatra gatā tathāṅganā ||*

I cannot make out the sense of *hatāpi*. Shall we read *vanē hi?* *hi* recurs in the next following verse. As for *vanē*, the Hitōpadēśa has a similar sentence which seems to justify this conjecture, viz.:

*na strīṇām apriyaḥ kaścit priyō vāpi na vidyatē |
gāvas tṛṇam ivāraṇyē prārthayanti navam navam ||*
(ed. Nirṇaya Sāgara Press⁶, 1906, I v. 117).

42 b. *praviśanty api hi striyaś citām
anubadhanty api muktajīvitaḥ |*

The latter half of this line is unintelligible to me. There is a lacuna in the older MS; the younger one reads *avadhanti*, a meaningless word „written in a very bad hand by one who knew no Sanskrit“ (Appendix). But what can the editor have meant by his *anubadhanti*?

¹) Cf. also:

*nāvanītam hṛdayam brāhmaṇasya vāci kṣurō nīśitas tikṣṇadhārah |
tad ubhayaṃ viparītam kṣatriyasya vān nāvanīti hṛdayam tikṣṇadhāram ||*
MBhār. I, 3 (Pāuṣyaparvan) = Böhlingk, Chrestom. ³ 61, 29. 30.
nīśitas is synonymous with *tikṣṇadhārah* and destroys the symmetry between ab and cd. Can it stand for *nīhitas*? Of course, it must not.

What is the object of this verb, since, being transitive, it must have some? The meaning of this pāda seems to be more or less this: women do not leave us alone even in the other world. Shall we read *anubadhnanty* (or *anugacchanty*) *apī muktajīvitān?*

45. *Kuruhāihayavyṣṇivamśajā*
bahumāyākavacō 'tha Śambarah |
munir udbhrāntamanās ca Gāutamah
samavāpur vanitōddhataṁ rajah ||

Of the muni Gāutama, mentioned in this verse, it is said Buddhacar. IV, 18:

Gāutamam Dīrghatapasam maharṣim dīrghajīvinam |
yōṣit samtōṣayāmāsa varṇasthānāvarā satī ||

This has been correctly translated by Prof. Hultsch in his paper „Zu Aśvaghōsha's Saundarananda“: „Den grossen Weisen Gāutama Dīrghatapas, der ein langes Leben besass, erfreute ein an Kaste und Stand unebenbürtiges Weib“ (p. 132). The story of the same muni Gāutama is alluded to in the Sabhāparvan of the Mahābhārata, adh. 21, 5 (ed. Bombay 1906):

'yatra Dīrghatamā nāma ṛṣiḥ paramayantritaḥ' |
śūdrāyam Gāutamō yatra mahātmā saṁśitavrataḥ |
Āuśināryām ajanayat Kākṣivādyaṁ sutān munih ||

The name is given as *Dīrghatamāḥ* also 7, 11. Apparently, the muni of that name was the father of Kākṣivat Gāutama, mentioned Sāundar. I, 1, whose son was Caṇḍakāuśika, according to the Mahābhārata (cf. Hultsch, ad locum). — It is not improbable that the adhyāya in which the above-quoted śloka occurs was known to Aśvaghōṣa much in the same form which it has to-day. It begins with a description of the city of Girivraja or Rājagṛha, extending over the first fifteen ślokas, some of which are marked by the editors as interpolated. There is a similar description of that city in Buddhacar. X, 2, viz

śailāih suguptam ca vibhūṣitam ca
dhr̥tam ca pūtam ca śivāis tapōdāih |
pañcācalāṅkam nagaram prapēdē
śāntaḥ Svayambhūr iva nākapṛstham ||

As the two prominent features of the surroundings of Rājagṛha are named the five mountain-peaks and the tapōdas or 'hot-water

springs' according to Prof. Leumann who compared this word with the *mahātavōvatirappabhavapāsavaṇa* of the Jāinas (Nachrichten, Göttingen, 1896). Now, both the five mountains and the *tapōdas* form the chief subject of Mahābh. II, 21, 1—15, cf.:

Vāihārō vipulaḥ śāilō Varāhō Vṛṣabhas tathā |
tathā R̥ṣigiris tāta śubhās Cāityakapañcamāḥ || 2 ||
ētē pañca mahāśṛṅgāḥ parvatāḥ śitaladrumāḥ |
rakṣantīvābhisamhatya samhatāṅgā Girivrajam || 3 ||
‘ētēṣu parvatēndrēṣu sarvasiddhasamālayāḥ |
yatinām āśramās cāiva munīnām ca mahātmanām || 12 ||
Vṛṣabhasya Tamālasya mahā(or Mahā?)vīryasya vāi tathā |
gandharvarakṣasām cāiva nāgānām ca tathālayāḥ || 13 ||
Kakṣivatas tapōvīryāt tapōdā iti viśrutāḥ |
punyatīrthās ca tē sarvē siddhānām cāiva kīrtitāḥ || 14 ||

It is particularly worth noting, that in both poems the city is said to be protected by the five mountains surrounding it. The last three ślōkas, whether interpolated or not, cannot in any way depend on Buddhacar., as they contain details not found in that poem. As to the story of the muni Dīrghatapas (or °mas) Gāutama and the śūdra girl, it appears to have been a local legend of Rājagṛha, connected with some hermitage in the neighbourhood of that city. Who that śūdra girl was, we know from MBhār. I, 113, 45 ff. The name Dīrghatamas (not °pas) is explained ib. vv. 21. 22.

52a. *sravatīm* is an epical form, warranted by (and due to?) metre.

55c. *capalam bhavatōtsukam manaḥ*. — Read *bhavanōtsukam* = *gṛhayānōtsukam*, supra, 1 b. Cf. also *gṛhōnmukham manaḥ* IX, 27 b.

Canto IX.

6a c. — Mark the neuter *idam dēham*. Elsewhere the masculine is used. Read *imam*?

7a. *yadānnapānāśanayānakarmaṇām*
asēvanād apy atisēvanād api |

The sense of the dvandva in *a* being 'eating and drinking, sitting and walking', 'āśana°' has to be changed to 'āsana°'. The correct orthography is found XVI, 19 b *yānāsana°*; XIV, 35 *āsanagata°* (cf. my note thereon, Studies). Cf. infra, note to IX, 14a.

13 c. — In the first series of these Notes (Studies, ad locum) I suggested *kadū ca* for *kēcic ca*, the latter being contrary to metre. My suggestion was only a slip of the pen (due to *sadū ca*, d) of which I now feel rather ashamed. The correct reading is of course *kadāpi*, Cf. XIII, 32.

14 a. *śayyāśanapānabhōjanāiḥ*. Read *śayyāsana*^o. Cf. supra, ad 7 a, and XIV, 46 b.

20 c. — The tatpuruṣa *samitsamiddha* also Kumāras. I, 57 a.

22 d. *balam mahad vā yadi tē ca* (for *yēna*, cf. Studies, ad [loc.] *manyasē*

kuruṣva yuddham saha tāvad indriyāiḥ |
jayaś ca tē 'trāsti mahac ca tē balam
parājayaś cēd vitatham ca tē balam ||

The first half of this stanza has been rendered in my former paper on this subject as follows: „Or, if you consider yourself very strong, then indeed wage war with your senses“. The second half apparently means: „If victory be yours, well, then your strength is great <indeed>; but if you lose the battle <then at least> your strength has not been employed in vain“. Now, this is precisely the reverse of what is found in the printed text. It is evident that we have to read *na* for *ca*.

23 b. — We have absolutely no right to discard the reading of the older MS viz. *arīn* which is excellent and far better than *narān* conjectured by the editor.

28. — The idea contained in this beautiful stanza is a very common one in India and, indeed, all over the world. One of the closest parallels is Vētalapañcav. (ed. Uhle) XXIII v. 9 (*punaḥ prabhātam punar ēva śarvarītyādi*).

35 d. — *bhayaṃ hy ahaṃ cēti mamēti varcchati*. In prose: „*aham*“ *iti ca* „*mama*“ *iti vā bhayaṃ hy arcchati*. Now, this *ca vā* instead of *ca ca* smells of a solecism of which, insignificant as it is, I suspect far less Aśvaghōṣa than one of his later transcribers. *vā* is perhaps due to *ahaṃ mamēti vā*, 36 c.

37 b. — *'balē |* cannot be possibly good, *abala* being no epithet of houses; I am unable to mend this line.

44 b. *yathā ca kuṣṭhavyāsanēna duḥkhitāḥ*
pratāpayan nāiva śamam nigacchati |
tathēndriyārthēṣv ajitēndriyaś carun
na kāmabhōgair upasāntim rcchati ||

Let us try to translate this stanza such as it stands: „As one who suffers from leprous disease comes not to peace *pratāpayan* (= by warming, by heating — whom or what? Nonsense!) even so one who is devoted to the objects of senses, not having conquered his senses, does not attain peace by indulging in sensual pleasures“. The symmetry between the two half-stanzas being complete, it cannot be doubted that instead of *pratāpayan*, which is quite meaningless, a substantive in the Instrumental case is needed, in correspondence with *kāmabhōgāih*. Now, what is the first impulse of a silly leper who wants to allay his sufferings? Of course he scratches his sore skin. Scratching however is of no avail, it does not bring peace. But sensual love is like leprosy: it causes itches. Such is the drift of the stanza. It requires some such word as *pragharsaṇāir* instead of *pratāpayan*.

49 b. *tad ētaḍ ājñāya vipāpmanātmanā*
 vimōkṣadharmō hy upasāṁhitam hitam |
 juṣasva mē sajjanasammatam matam

The Nominative *vimōkṣadharmō* followed by the unexpected *hi* breaks the syntactical unity. No doubt, we can regard the whole of the second pāda as standing within brackets, but that would be clearly a pis-aller. I am no friend of making shift with any interpretation but to save the reading of a faulty MS. Most probably we have to read: *vimōkṣadharmē 'bhyupasāṁhitam*. The meaning is: „Thus (*tad*) having known, by dint of your sinless self, this good (*ētaḍ hitam*) accumulated in the Doctrine of Salvation, etc.“

51 b. *Nandasya bhāvam avagamyataḥ sa bhikṣuḥ*
 pāriplavam gṛhasukhābhimukham na dharmē |

The compound in b is most probably a misreading for the original *gṛhasukhē 'bhimukham*.

Canto X.

2 c. *sa hrīmatē hrīvitatō jagāda*. — In the first series of my notes on this poem I suggested *hrīvigatō* 'shameless' (*vigatā hrīr yasmāt*) for the reading of the text. I did so because Nanda's conduct is no doubt shameless enough from the standpoint of a pious Buddhist and because the immediately preceding words viz. *papraccha cittaskhalitam sucittaḥ* oppose the two brothers to each other in a similar way. But on second thoughts, I am inclined to with-

draw my first conjecture and to read *hrīvinatō* 'bent down in shame' which is better supported by palaeographical evidence *n* being liable often to interchange with *t*. Anyhow, it would be useless to compare XII, 12 d, the situation there being different.

7 d. *vibhūṣaṇam rakṣaṇam ēva cādrēḥ*, cf. Buddhac. X, 2 *śailāiḥ suguṣṭam ca vibhūṣitam ca*.

11. — As—is well known, the poets represent the yaks as being so fond of their tails that they prefer death to the loss even of a part of them. Instances of this idea in other mahākāvyas are Kumāras. I. 48; Kirātārj. XII, 47; Śiśupālav. IV. 43. The word *prīti* or *priya* is common to Sāundar., Kumāras. and Kirātārj. The adjective *priyavāla* of the last poem means 'whose hair is dear (viz. to their possessors)'. Prof. Cappeller was not right in rendering it by 'schönhaarig' and in comparing Mēghadūta 53, which proves nothing, instead of Sāundar. and especially Kumāras. (*vālapriyatva*). Tails are elsewhere stated to be peculiarly dear also to apes, cf. *kapīnām kila lāṅgūlam idaṁ bhavati bhūṣaṇam*, Rāmāy. V, 53, 3. Consequently, *mahāhariḥ*, MBhār. VII, 171, 25 is perhaps 'an ape' rather than 'a lion'.

14 c. *tēbhyah phalam nāpur atō 'pajagmuḥ*. — For *tēbhyah* we have to read *yēbhyah*. This is another instance of stylistical laxity due to some scribe and not to be attributed to the poet. *ataḥ* frequently corresponds to a relative, cf. XVI, 19 c; XVIII, 14 c. *y* for *t* is no unheard of substitution, especially in a pronoun, cf. my notes on IX, 22 (Studies); VIII, 32 c, supra.

15 c. 16 c. — The order of words in the compound *ekavipannadyṣṭi* has been chosen *vṛttānurōdhat* i. e. metri causā. The correct form is *muṣṭāikadyṣṭi*, 50 a. Cf. infra, note to XVII, 24 a.

21—25. — Mark the rather unusual use, in a mahākāvya, of *phalati* (also *phulla*) and *rōhati* (also *rōhin*) as transitives; *phalati* also Kirāt. I, 15 c; Śiś. II, 89. As the first line of v. 21 may, at first sight, appear puzzling, it is as well to give a translation of it: „Where the trees flowery with red lotuses (*raktāni kamalāni* is Accus.) are lighting like torch-staffs; where other trees, producing (*rōhīṇō*) blue lotuses, look bright as if they had their eyes open“. — The simile contained in the first half of this stanza has been repeated by Kumāradāsa, Jānakīharaṇa III, 3:

vṛkṣā manōjñadyuti campakākhyā
rūpam vitēnur navakuḍmalādhyā |

*nyastā vasantasya vanasthalībhiḥ
sahasradīpā iva dīpavṛkṣāḥ ||*

„The champak-trees, rich in fresh buds, assumed an agreeably resplendent appearance, resembling torch-staffs with thousands of torches arrayed by the Wood-world-folk <the personified attendants> of the Spring“. *vanasthalyaḥ* = e. g. *vanarājīyōṣitaḥ*, Kirātārj. IV, 28 d.

60 a. *imā hi śakyam na balān na sēvayā
na sampradanēna na rūpavattayā |
imā hriyantē khalu dharmacaryayā
sacēt praharṣasā cara dharmam ādṛtaḥ ||*

The older MS has an evidently corrupt reading here, viz. *imā hi śakya ēva gātra sēvayā*, which, however, may easily have arisen from that exhibited by the younger one. Prof. Hultzsch suggests *haritum* instead of *na balāt*, an Infinitive being, in his opinion, the necessary complement of *śakyam*, in agreement with Speijer, Sanskrit Syntax, § 388. If the words *na balāt* be really due to a scribe, then it must be owned that, for once, he had excellent taste. Physical force, indeed, would he sorely missed among the different means of winning the apsarases; cf. e. g. the story of Rāvaṇa and Rambhā, as told in the Uttarakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa or the incident forming the subject of the first act of Vikramōrvaśi. „They cannot be won either by force or by service — says Buddha — either by gifts or by beauty; they are won by righteous life alone. If you please yourself <at the idea of enjoying them>, then try to live in agreement with the Law“. But I don't believe that the words *na balāt* were added by a scribe. And I don't believe that Prof. Hultzsch is right in ousting them from our text. There is a construction of *śakya* which has not been treated by Speijer. It is not with the Infinitive but with the Locative and is characterised by great laxity. As far as I can see, this construction is peculiar to epical Sanskrit. Here are some instances of it from Rāmāyaṇa IV: *na Vāsāvēnāpi sahasracakṣuṣā yudhāsmi śakyō Varuṇēna vā punaḥ | mayā tv iyaṁ bāhubalēna nirjitā purā purī Vaiśravaṇēna pālitaḥ || 13, 21; adhanēnārthakāmēna nārthaḥ śakyam vicinvatā | 83, 38; śakya Sūtāsamā bhāryā martyalōkē vicinvatā | na Lakṣmaṇasamō bhrātā sacivaḥ sāmparāyikaḥ || 49, 6; na cātikramitum śakyam daivam Sugrīva mānuṣāḥ | yat tu śakyam vayasyēna suhṛdā vā param mama || kṛtam Sugrīva tat sarvaṁ bhavatā, 49, 28. 29; niranukrōsatā cēyam yādṛṣi*

tē niśācara | svajanēna tvayā śakyaṃ pāuruṣaṃ Ravaṇāmuja || 87, 17. Aśvaghōṣa was greatly indebted for the technical side of his poetry to the popular epics. I have already drawn attention to this fact, in part at least, in my short article on the Buddhacarita and Rāmāyaṇa II (Studies, N^o 2). But a detailed study of our poet's relation to and dependence on both the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata still remains a desideratum.

Canto XI.

29. *yathā paśyati madhv ēva na prapātam avēkṣatē |
paśyasy apsarāsas tadvad bhraṃśam antē na paśyasi ||*

Cf., in addition to the editor's note to this stanza, the following verse of the Mahābhārata (II, 86, 5):

*madhu vāi mādhvikō labdhvā prapātam nāiva budhyatē |
āruhya tam majjati vā patanam cādhiyacchati ||*

Other similar verses might be quoted, e. g. VII, 51, 15; 133, 10. It is not improbable, however, that our stanza contains an allusion to the famous parable of „the man in the well“ told by Vidura to king Dhṛtarāṣṭra (Mahābh. XI, 5); cf. Kuhn, Festgruss an Böhtlingk, Stuttgart 1898, pp. 68—76 (not accessible to me for the moment and quoted from) Winternitz, Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, I pp. 351—352.

32. *tr̥ptir nāstīndhanūir agnēr nāmbhasā lavaṇāmbhasaḥ |
nāpi kāmēṣu at̥rptasya tasmāt kāmā na tr̥ptayē ||*

In pāda c the symmetry of the construction is broken, an Instrumental being wanted instead of the Locative. Moreover, it is scarcely worth while to assure a refractory novice that „an insatiate man cannot be satiated“; now, that is precisely what the text says: *tr̥ptir nāstī... at̥rptasya*. The original probably had: *kāmāiḥ sat̥ṣṇasya*. „Fire cannot be satiated by fuel, nor the ocean by water, still less an eager man by sensual pleasures; therefore, the pleasures are unable to satiate“. *sat̥ṣṇasya*, recurs infra, 37 c: *kāmēṣu hi sat̥ṣṇasya na śāntir upapadyatē*. Cf. also XIII, 40, a pretty close parallel to our stanza:

*viśayāir indriyagrāmō na tr̥ptim adhigacchati |
ajasraṃ pūryamāṇō 'pi samudraḥ salilāir iva ||*

and IX, 43 where *icchā viśayēṣu* is equivalent to *tr̥ṣṇā*.

38 a. — See—Studies, ad loc. The words *balād balī* are found in MBh., e. g, I, 137, 19; VII, 106, 29.

41 d. *tasya bhuktavataḥ svargē viṣayān uttamān api |*
bhraṣṭasyārtasya duḥkhēna kim āsvadaḥ karōti saḥ ||

I am unable to construe d. Read *kim āsvadam kariṣyati??*

46 b. *Bhūridyumnō Yayātis ca ētē cānyē nṛparṣabhāḥ |*
karmabhir dyām abhikriya tatḥṣayāt punar atyajan ||

The absence of the Sandhi in this position is a solecism of which Aśvaghōṣa was not capable. Moreover, the Plural *ētē* is evidently quite out of place here since it cannot refer to Bhūrid. and Yay. and no other kings are named in this stanza. The sense being „Bh. and Y. and many another noble king“, we ought to read accordingly *tē tē cānyē*. The words *ētē cānyē ca* (*bahavaḥ*) being of frequent use in epical Sanskrit, it is no wonder they should have crept into our text.

47 b. *asurāḥ pūrvadēvās tu surāir apahṛtaśriyaḥ |*
śriyam samanūṣocantaḥ pātālam śaraṇam yayuḥ ||

Prof. Hultsch translates: „Die Asuras aber, die früheren Götter, deren Macht von den Göttern geraubt wurde“, but the compound here is better taken to be equivalent to a temporal or a causal clause, firstly, because it is no standing epithet of the demons and, secondly, because these were obliged to seek refuge in the nether world at a certain moment of their career, viz. when the gods had defeated them.

48. *kim ca rājarṣibhis tāvad asurāir vā surādibhiḥ |*
Mahēndrāḥ śataśaḥ pētur mahātmyam api na sthiram ||

Here too I am sorry to disagree with Prof. Hultsch. He translates: „Ferner sind hunderte von Mahēndras gefallen durch königliche Weise oder Asuras. Götter usw. Selbst Hoheit ist nicht beständig“. The stanza may be rendered: „But what <need is there of quoting examples> of royal sages, demons or <minor> gods and the like! Even Great Indras fell down by hundreds. Greatness itself is not steady“. Cf., for the similar use of the Instrumental, Avimārakā of Bhāsa, II v. 9:

bhagnā mayāikēna parāḥ sasāinyā
adyāpi gandhēna na samśrayantē |

*kiṃ mānuṣāiḥ? sō 'py asurēśvarō mē
hatō bhujābhyām avirūpadhārī ||*

51 b. *tivram hy utpadyatē duḥkham dhīmatāni yan mumūrṣatām |
kiṃ punaḥ patatām svargād dēvatva* (Studies, ac loc.) *sukhasēvinām ||*

Why should the intelligent alone suffer at the moment of death? Stupid men suffer no less. Moreover, the relative *yat* is not sufficiently accounted for. But the whole of the pāda is only a miscarried conjecture of the editor's. The younger MS (in the older one there is a lacuna here) reads *duḥkham himatāvat*. This is very nearly correct. Read *duḥkham iha tāvat* in correspondence with and in opposition to *kiṃ ca... svargāt*. „Even here men going to die suffer horribly. How much more < suffer > those who enjoy the happy condition of gods, when they must fall down from heaven!“

53 cd. *ētāny ādāu nimittāni cyutāu svargād divāukasām |
aniṣṭānīva martyānām ariṣṭāni mumūrṣatām ||*

aniṣṭāni and *ariṣṭāni* ought to change their respective places as it is to the latter but not to the former of the two that *iva* can refer. Translate: „Such and like to these are the omina previous to the celestials' falling down from heaven; they are just as unpleasant as the evil forebodings of mortals going to die.“

56. *aśarīram bhavāgryam hi gatvāpi munir Udrakaḥ |
karmaṇō 'ntē cyutas tasmāt tiryagyōniṃ prapatsyatē ||*

Prof. Hultsch translates: „Denn obwohl der Seher Udraka das körperlose höchste Dasein erreicht hatte, ging er dessen verlustig, als (seine guten) Werke zu Ende waren, und wird in einen Tierleib eingehen“. But Muni Udraka was dead quite recently, no more than a couple of years before that time (Cf. H. Kern, *Geschiedenis van het Buddhisme in Indië*, vol. I, Haarlem 1882, pp. 81, 104). How can we estimate his exceptionally good works at a rate so exceptionally low? And what is he doing meanwhile, between the exhaustion of his good karma and his future rebirth as an animal? There is necessarily something wrong about Prof. Hultsch's rendering of this verse. The participle *cyutaḥ* (which, as we all know, was an adjective at the outset and had no tense-value at all) being dependent on *prapatsyatē* itself points to a remote future. „Muni Udraka, despite the highest uncorporeal existence he has attained, fallen down from it (i. e. after having lost it) at his good works' end, will be born in an animal's womb.“ Plenty of time yet.

Canto XII.

9. — I am still unable to explain this stanza. Anyhow, it cannot be separated from Raghuv. XV, 9. The words *dhātōr adhir iva* are common to both verses and cannot be changed in Sāundar., as Prof. Hultsch would like to do. But my former suggestion now appears to me scarcely more probable than his.

Canto XIII.

41 ab. *avaśyam gōcarāi(h) svāi(h) svāir vartitavyam ihēndriyāiḥ |*
Read *gōcarē svē svē* each sense having only one sphere allotted to it. A trace of the original reading is preserved in the missing of the visarga.

Canto XIV.

22 c. *dhātur ārambhadr̥tyōś ca sthāmavikramayōr api |*
nityam manasi kāryas tē bādhyamānēna nidrayā ||

We have here an interesting case of *tē = tvayā*, exactly like Rāmāy. III, 43, 49 quoted Speijer, Sanskrit Syntax, § 257, footnote (3). For the position of *tē* cf. e. g. MBhār. I, 16, 22 = Böhlingk, Chrest.³ 71, 9. I intend to devote a special article to *mē = mayā* and *tē = tvayā* in the Mahābhārata.

39 d. *anātham tan manō jñēyam yat smṛtir nābhirakṣati |*
nirñētā dṛṣṭirahitō viṣayēsu carann iva ||

Read *viṣamēsu*. „The mind that is not guarded by attentive memory should be known as one having no guardian; it is like to one who having no leader and being bereft of eye-sight walks over uneven ground“. Cf. infra 47 d, *carann ivōroyām bahukaṅṭakāyām*.

48 d. *cittam niṣēddhum na sukhēna śakyam*
kṛṣṭōdakā gāur iva sasyamadhyāt ||

I cannot make out the sense of *kṛṣṭōdakā*; it is apparently out of place. Can the original have been *puṣṭōdarā*?

Canto XV.

8 a. *anityā mōṣadharmāṇō riktā vyāsanahētavaḥ |*
bahusādharāṇāḥ kāmā varjyāhy āśviṣā iva ||

The epithet *mōṣadharmāṇaḥ* looks rather suspect. Perhaps we have to read *mōha*°, cf. infra, 24 c.

21 c. — *°upaghātam* is, to the best of my recollection, the only instance of this Absolutive in the epics of Aśvaghōṣa.

34. *pratiśrayaṃ bahuvīdhaṃ saṃśrayanti yathādhvagāḥ |
pratiyānti punas tyaktvā tadvaj jñāṭisamāgamah ||*

The closest parallel to this is perhaps MBhār. XIII, 36, 60. 61:

*adhvagānām iva pathi cchāyām āsṛitya saṃgamah ||
ēvaṃ karmavaśō (°śē?) lōkō (°kē?) jñāṭinām hitasamāgamah |*

- 39 b. *svayam ēva yathālikhya rakṣēc citrakarāḥ striyam |
tathā kṛtvā svayaṃ snēhaṃ saṅgam ēti janē janaḥ ||*

The word *rakṣēt* is not expressive enough; it does in no way correspond with *saṅgam ēti*, as it ought to. I don't hesitate to read *rajyēt* instead of it. „As an artist, having himself painted a woman, falls in love with her, even so people become mutually attached after having for themselves invented < that idle feeling called > love“. The best commentary on the first half of this stanza is afforded by the well-known story of Pygmalion who

*sculpsit ebur formamque dedit qua femina nasci
nulla potest operisque sui concepit amorem.*

(Ovid, Metamorph. X, 248/9).

Cf. also: As a painter enthrones in his heart the perfect picture, and the poet the perfect poem of his imagination, and then lavishes all his devotion on it, so Ramesh enshrined this slip of a girl in his fancy as his heart's delight and the bringer of joy and prosperity to his home. (Rabindranath Tagore, The Wreck, ch. IV).

- 65 d. *ity anēna prakārēṇa kālē sēvitum arhasi |
pratipakṣaṃ vitarkāṇām gadānām agadān iva ||*

pratipakṣān, corresponding with *agadān*, would be more intelligible. The ending *am* for *ān* is exhibited by a various reading ad XV, 34 a.

Canto XVI.

- 22 a. *dōṣādhikē janmani tivradoṣa
utpadyatē rāgiṇi tivrarōgaḥ |
mōhādhikē mōhabatādhikaś ca
tadalpadōṣē ca tadalpadōṣaḥ ||*

dōśādhikē has been conjectured by the editor. The younger MS, where alone this line is available, reads *rōśādhikē*. This reading ought not to be changed. On the contrary, *tīvrādōśa* has to be corrected to *tīvra-rōśa*, as shown by the preceding stanza, the *krōdhapraharsādibhiḥ* of which is equivalent to and exemplified by *rōśa*, *rāga* and *mōha*. „If one's janman is characterised by prevailing wrath, then he is born into the world as a very wrathful man; if by lust, then as a very lustful one; if by infatuation, then as one on whom infatuation has strong influence; if any of these vices be small in it, then he is born as one in whom they are small“. *dōśa* in pāda a has been repeated from d, by a careless scribe.

23 b. *phalam hi yādṛk samavāiti sākṣāt*
tadāgamō bījam avāity atītam |

Prof. Hultsch suggests *tadāgamē*. For my part, I hold *tadāgamād* to be more natural. We say similarly: ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν (ex fructibus eorum) ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτοῦς, Matth. 7, 16. The usual construction is with the Instrumental which here as often is equivalent to the Ablative, not to the Locative. Cf. e. g. *tasya... pratīyatē dhātūr ivēhitam phalāiḥ*, Kirātārj. I, 20.

27 b. — *vyādhayō* is a confirmation of Prof. Lüders' correction Buddhacar. XI, 59, viz. *bhī rujō* for *bhīrutā*.

35 c. *sthitē samādhāu hi na dharṣayanti*
dōśā bhujāṅgā iva mantrabaddhāḥ ||

The absolute Locative *sthitē samādhāu* is awkward and *dharṣayanti* has no object. Consequently, the correct reading appears to be *sthitām*.

46 a. — I read *yathāsvabhāvēna* as a compound word; cf. *yathā-tmyatō*, supra 39 a.

50 d. *na payō labhēta mōhēna śṛṅgād yadi gā duhīta ||*

This was a sinful act according to Mahābh. XIII. 127, 9:

śṛṅgayōḥ kapilām yas tu vāhayēta duhēta vā |
tiryagyōnīm sa labhatē jāyamānaḥ punaḥ punaḥ ||

54 c. *evam hi cittam praśamaṁ niyacchaty*
udīryamāṇō 'gnir ivōdakēna ||

Read *niyacchaty* in agreement with 53 a (*praśamaṁ na yāti*) and 55 c (*layam ēti*) which are exactly parallel. After *niyacchaty* we should expect *udīryamāṇam agnim*.

73 a. *tavāthavādhyātmanavagrahatvān*
nāvōpaśāmyēd aśubhō vitarkaḥ |

The pronoun *tava* cannot be right, as Buddha does not directly address Nanda throughout the whole of this passage, but gives general rules. Accordingly, we have to read *tathāpy athādhyātma*, the particle *atha* having here, as often elsewhere, the meaning of 'but if'.

77 a. *nirdhūyamāṇās tv atha lōsatō 'pi*
tiṣṭhēyur evākuśalā vitarkāḥ |
kāryāntarāir adhyayanakriyādyāiḥ
sēvyō vidhir vismaraṇāya tēṣāṃ ||

lōsatō 'pi, being no word at all, has of course to be changed. But I don't believe that Prof. Hultsch has hit the mark with his *lēsatō 'pi*. As would appear from the second half of this stanza (as well as from 80 a, infra, where by the bye we have to read *ēvaṃprakārāir* as one word) there is question in it of different means of mastering the *akuśalā vitarkāḥ*. The poet says: but if they are blown away *lōsatō 'pi*, they are still likely to remain, so you must try other means. Now, I am not sure whether *rōsatō 'pi* would not do. From the psychological point of view it is not only unimpeachable but can be said to be due to a very fine observation. In fact, „unholy considerations“ will not cede to wrath, so it is useless to be angry about them. The best means of forgetting them and, consequently, of getting rid of them consists in devoting one's time to study and other occupations. Quite right too. — At the commencement of his struggle with the evil lust, Nanda is styled *krōdha-paritacētūḥ*, XVII, 8 c. The akṣara *ra* is found twice instead of *la* in our poem, viz. XVI, 49 b (*kātō* for *kārō*, Hultsch) and VII 34 a (*kulajā* for *kurājā*, Hultsch).

85 c. *yatrāgataḥ śatruvinigrahārtham rājēva*

Read *yātrāgataḥ* 'as a king engaged in a warlike expedition'. Cf. XVII, 11.

Canto XVII.

19 c. *duḥkhapratīkāravidhāu sukhākhyam*
tatō bhavam duḥkham iti vyapaśyat ||

sukhākhyā looks preferable to *sukhākhyam* as it is only the last pāda, throughout these four verses (18—21), that contains the conclusion

drawn from the other three. Moreover, *sukhākhyam* as referred to *bhavam* is awkward.

24 a. — *bōdhyangasītāttaśastrah* metri causā for *āttabōdhyān-gasītāśastrah*. Cf. supra, note to X, 15 c. 16 c.

37 d. *prāpad dvitīyam phalam āryadharmē* ||

For *prāpad* we have to read *prāpa*, the Perfect being throughout employed in this portion of the present canto. Cf. especially *āpa*, 22 d, and *avāpa*, 43 b. *ddv* for *dv* is only an orthographical peculiarity.

43 a. — The editor's conjecture °*dāhēna* for °*dēhēna* (Appendix) is confirmed by XVIII, 29 and XVII, 66.

45 d. *kṣōbham prakurvanti yathōrmayō hi*
dhīraprasannāmbuwahasya sindhōh |
ēkāgrabhūtasya tathōrmibhūtās
cintāmbhasaḥ kṣōbhakarā vītarkāh ||

The sense of *cintā* (in the compound word *cintāmbhas*) being much too narrow and, moreover, possessed of a special shade viz. that of 'sorrow' not exactly appropriated to our case, I should like to read *cittāmbhasaḥ*. There is throughout question of *cittam* in these Cantos, not of *cintā*. The words *ēkāgrabhāvān manasaḥ* recur in the next stanza but one, 47 b, it being evident thus, that *manas* here refers to the figurative *cittāmbhas* i. e. to *citta*, with which, indeed, it is synonymous. The same *manas* is compared with water (*jala*) supra, v. 7; it is said to be troubled by lust as that is by lightning, the simile being very nearly related to that contained in the stanza quoted at the head of this note.

49 c. *prītēr atah prēkṣya sa tatra dōṣān*

The MS reads *prītvataḥ*. This has to be changed to *prītāv atah*, the Locative here agreeing with *tatra* just as in the immediately preceding verse, viz. *prītāu tu tatrāpi sa dōṣadarśī*. Cf. also infra, 52 a.

51 d. *tasmād babhāṣē śubhakrtsnabhūmim*
parāparaḥṇaḥ paramēti māitryā ||

The words *paramēti māitryā* look suspect. As the feminine *māitrā* is often employed by our poet (cf. Hultsch, ad XI, 57) we can read either *māitrām* or, perhaps, *māitrim* in agreement with the Accusative °*bhūmim*. „He declared love to be the highest of all“.

56 c. *dhyānam sa niṣṛitya tataś caturtham*
arhattvalābhāya matim cakāra |

*sattvāya mitram balavantam āryam
rājēva dēśān ajitān jigīṣuḥ ||*

The words *sattvāya mitram* cannot be possibly right. There are two reasons for declaring them false, (1) *sattvāya* is meaningless in this connection, (2) *mitram* is never used as a masculine by Aśvaghoṣa. *sattvāya m* most probably represents an original *sahāyam*, to which *mitram* was perhaps added as a gloss in an early MS. But I am not able to mend the corrupt *itram*. Perhaps we ought to read *itvā* in correspondence with *niḥśritya* as *sahāyam* is with *dhyānam*? Or else *iṣṭam*? Other guesses, as *icchān* or *icchēd*, are less probable. *atra*?

Canto XVIII.

4 b. *yasyātha kāmāprabhavā hi bhaktiḥ
svatō 'sya sā tiṣṭhati rūḍhamūlā |
dharmānvayō yasya tu bhaktirāgas
tasya prasādō hṛdayāvagāḍhaḥ ||*

The reading of the MS viz. *sutasya* is of course wrong, but the editor's correction is directly impossible, since *svatas tiṣṭhati* coming after *kāmāprabhavā* implies a contradiction in terms. I am unable to offer a satisfactory correction. The sense can be improved by reading either *na tasya*, thus making the first line oppose the second, or else *tasyāpi*, in which case there is a difference of degree between the two lines. For my part, I am inclined to accept the first interpretation. „If one's devotion originates in love, then it has feeble roots, but if devoted affection be based on the dharma, then charity is deeply seated in the heart“.

10 a. — Not *nirastajanma* but *nirastajanman* is the correct form of the Vocative.

14 c. — Read *saktir* for *śaktir*, the latter being only due to bad orthography. Nanda gives up his attachment to all that is constituted of earth and the other elements. *sakti* is equivalent to *saṅga*, infra, v. 16.

43 c. *svam nāśramam samprati cintayāmi*. — This can be rendered: „I think now no more of my condition, i. e. of my being a gṛhastha“, but such an interpretation is rather far-fetched. It is far more natural to read *na śramam*: „I think now no more of the fatigues I endured“. The word *śrama* recurs in exactly the same sense infra, 45 d. *ā* for *a* and vice versā is frequent.

45 d. — My former suggestion viz. *svadhītam* for *svādhīnam* (which is contrary to metre) is scarcely right. Can *svādhīnam* be a gloss on *vidhēyam*??

62 d. *nirmōkṣāya cakāra tatra ca kathām kālē janāyārthinē |*
nāivōnmārgagatān [janān] paribhavan nātmānam utkarṣayan ||

The word *janān* has been added by the editor in order to fill up the gap. In my opinion, *parān* would be preferable, firstly, as it is opposed to *ātmānam*, and, secondly, as it occurs supra, 54 d, in a stanza where Nanda's future conduct is forecast in exactly the same words in which it is now described, viz. *carānukampayā vimōkṣayan kṛcchragatān parān api = nirmōkṣāya cakāra... kathām... nāivōnmārgagatān parān paribhavan.*

Streszczenie.

Rozprawa niniejsza zawiera szereg przyczynków do krytyki tekstu i objaśnień rzeczowych. Niepodobna taką rzecz streścić, podam tylko kilka uwag ogólniejszej natury.

Tekst zachowany w dwóch odpisach, wcześniejszym i późniejszym, ale obu bardzo późnych, przekazany jest nadzwyczaj błędnie, często wcale niezrozumiały. Poprawiali go dotąd, o ile mi wiadomo, pp. Baston, Speijer, Hultsch i Jacobi, a także i ja sam. Poprawki niniejsze opierają się zarówno na danych graficznych, jak na poczuciu języka i stylu; droga śliska, ale niunikniona. Miałem przytem na uwadze zarówno poprzedników poety (Mahābhārata, Rāmāyaṇa), jak jego następców, zwłaszcza z pośród epików artystycznych (Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Kumāradāsa, Māgha i inni)

Wpływ, jaki Aśvaghōṣa wywarł na poetów późniejszych, jest uznany, a nawet, jeżeli idzie o Kālidāśę, potrącono o niego troszkę bliżej. Wpływ, jaki na niego wywarła epeja dawniejsza, jest dotąd wcale nieopracowany, wyjąwszy po części moją własną rozprawkę (Buddhacarita and Rāmāyaṇa II) w drugim zeszycie niniejszego wydawnictwa. Godzi się tedy, jako niesformułowany w tekście angielskim rezultat obecnych i poprzednich moich badań krytycznych nad Sāundaranandą i Buddhacaritą, podkreślić tutaj z naciskiem, że zarówno Mahābh. jak Rāmāy. zaważyły ogromnie na języku

i stylu poetyckim, jaki sobie Aśvaghōṣa urobił. Cała jego technika wysłowienia się wskazuje wyraźnie na obie te epepeje, jako na bezpośrednie swoje źródło. Wpływ ich, pod tym względem, na późniejszych poetów, w przybliżeniu nawet nie był tak silny, jak na Aśvaghōṣę. Przeciwnie, na nich działa już sam Aśvaghōṣa, potem inni.

Stąd wniosek, że przed naszym poetą epepeja artystyczna (*mahā-kāvya*) nie osiągnęła jeszcze swojej formy klasycznej, jednolitej już zasadniczo, mimo wszelkie różnice, od niego aż do końca. Były zapewne przedtem tylko próby o charakterze przejściowym między Rāmāy. a Buddhacar. i Sāundar., a o niezbyt chyba wielkiej doniosłości artystycznej, skoro Aśvaghōṣa jeszcze tak bezpośrednio wzoruje się na języku obu wielkich epepei. Postaram się wrócić do tej sprawy w niedługim czasie. Tutaj dodam tylko, że podobnie oceniono rolę naszego poety w historii dramatu.

Prof. Dr. K. Twardowski



When the second and third series of Prof. Hultsch's contributions to the textual criticism of the Sāundārananda, bringing the corrections proposed by Prof. Jacobi and the late Prof. Speijer, were published in the Journal of the German Oriental Society, the MS of my Notes was already in the printing office. I did not think it necessary to introduce any changes into it and willingly acknowledge the priority of my learned colleagues wherever I agree with them. Such agreement will often be found to enhance the probability of our conjectures.

Perhaps it is well to mention that the Mahābhārata is quoted from the new Bombay edition (1906 ff.), the only one available to me, mainly based on South Indian MSS.

Dotychczas wyszły: — Parus:

- Nr. 1. Tadeusz Kowalski: Zagadki ludowe tureckie. (Énigmes populaires turques. Texte turc avec traduction et résumé français).
- Nr. 2. Andrzej Gawroński: Studies about the Sanskrit Buddhist literature.
- Nr. 3. X. Władysław Szczepański: Mieszkańcy Palestyny pierwotnej do 1400 przed Chr. (Les habitants de la Palestine primitive jusqu'à 1400 avant J. Chr. Avec résumé français).
- Nr. 4. Andrzej Gawroński: Notes sur les sources de quelques drames indiens.
- Nr. 5. Tadeusz Kowalski: Ze studjów nad formą poezji ludów tureckich. (Études sur la forme de la poésie des peuples turcs. Avec résumé français).
- Nr. 6. Andrzej Gawroński: Notes on the Sāundarananda, critical and explanatory.

W druku: — Sous presse:

- Nr. 7. Helena Willman-Grabowska: Les composés nominaux dans le Śatapathabrāhmaṇa.