

Orthology Photography Fiction Fishing
Christianity Art Cooking Essays
Buddhism Freemasonry Medicine Biology
Music Ancient Egypt Evolution

Carpentry Physics Dance Geology
Vespaematics Fitness Shakespeare
Economics Yoga Marketing Confidence
Immortality Biographies Poetry

Forgotten Books

— www.forgottenbooks.com —

Chemistry History Law Accounting
Philosophy Anthropology Alchemy Drama
Quantum Mechanics Atheism Sexuality
Personal Health Ancient History Criminal
Entomology Psychiatry Language Sport
Paleontology Neuroscience Literature

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

**PRACE KOMISJI ORIENTALISTYCZNEJ POLSKIEJ AKADEMJI
UMIEJĘTNOŚCI NR. 2.**

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

ANDRZEJ GAWROŃSKI

**STUDIES ABOUT THE SANSKRIT
BUDDHIST LITERATURE**

W KRAKOWIE

NAKŁADEM AKADEMJI UMIEJĘTNOŚCI

**SKŁAD GŁÓWNY W KSIĘGARNI G. GEBETHNERA I SP. W KRAKOWIE
GEBETHNERA I WOLFFA W WARSZAWIE**

1919

**PRACE KOMISJI ORJENTALISTYCZNEJ POLSKIEJ AKADEMJI
UMIEJĘTNOŚCI NR. 2.**

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

ANDRZEJ GAWROŃSKI

**STUDIES ABOUT THE SANSKRIT
BUDDHIST LITERATURE**

W KRAKOWIE

NAKŁADEM AKADEMJI UMIEJĘTNOŚCI

SKŁAD GŁÓWNY W KSIĘGARNI G. GEBETHNERA I SP. W KRAKOWIE

GEBETHNERA I WOLFFA W WARSZAWIE

1919,

PK
2903
G28

WYDZIAŁ
HISTORII
I SPOŁECZNOŚCI

376 96 / B
X
BN

CONTENTS.

	P.
1. Further notes on the Buddhacarita	1
2. Buddhacarita and Rāmāyaṇa II	27
3. Critical notes on the printed text of the Jātakamālā	40
4. The epical poems of Aśvaghōṣa and the Divyāvadāna . . .	49
5. Critical notes on the Sāundarananda	56

Addition to p. 52 ll. 10 foll.

While discussing the possible relation of Divyāv. 352, 2—3 to Sāund. IV, 6 I have overlooked that a similar phrase is found in the Lalitavistara 59, 19 viz. *rājñā cāpi Śuddhōdanēna manuṣyātikrāntaṁ divyāsamprāptam grhātaraṁ* (query °*varaṁ*?) *pratisaṁskāritaṁ abhūt*. But the Divyāvadāna (just as the Sāundarananda) speak of a human being, not of a palace.

I. Further Notes on the Buddhacarita.

The present article forms a sequel to what I published on the same subject in the first volume of the Polish Archives of Oriental Research, three years ago. The notes I venture to present to the reader were mostly taken in the year 1915 when I was busy in bringing about the MS (long since ready for print) for a revised edition of the Buddhacarita. Whoever thinks we had better refrain from such conjectural emendation and critical examination of ancient texts, may condemn my work as superfluous. For my part I subscribe to Böhtlingk's opinion that it is „für die Wissenschaft erspriesslicher, schon gedruckte Werke, die dem Inhalt oder der Sprache nach Beachtung verdienen, zu sichten und zu verbessern, als neuere Erzeugnisse von fraglichem Werte zu veröffentlichen“. Now, the Buddhacarita certainly deserves consideration in the utmost degree.

Canto I.

3d. *saṁbhāvanām vā saphalīcakāra ||*

Cp. *avi nāma amhāṇaṁ saṁbhāvaṇā saphalā havē*, Mālavikāgnimitra ed. Bollensen, p. 44, 1.

31a. *dīptyā ca dhāiryēṇa śriyā rarāja*

śriyā spoils the metre lengthening as it does the last syllable of the preceding word. The true reading viz. *rarāja lakṣmyā* has been preserved in A, one of Mr. Joglekar's MSS. *śriyā* is probably due to a gloss. Is it not somewhat strange that an evident metrical

blunder should have passed unnoticed by so 'many critics, European and Indian alike (my own humble self among others)? I don't stand upon trifles but this is certainly a case that bears no testimony in favour of our real intimacy with Sanskrit poetry.

93. *bhavanam atha vigāhya Śākyarājō*
Bhava iva Ṣaṇmukhajanmanā pratītaḥ |
idam idam iti harṣapūrṇavaktrō
bahuvīdhapustīyaśaskaram vyadhata ||

A commentary on the somewhat obscure words *idam idam iti* is afforded by the following passage of the Kādambarī: „*tatra ca dviguṇitakuthāsanōpaviṣṭaḥ samīpōpaviṣṭēna tadguṇōpavarṇanapārēṇa Vāiśampāyanēna yathārham bhūmibhāgōpavēṣitēna rājaputralōkēna 'idam asmāi dīyatām, idam asmāi dīyatām' iti prasādaviśēṣadarśanasamvardhitasēvārasēna ca sahāhāravidhim akarōt*“ (ed. Bombay, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press⁴ 1912, p. 191).

94. *iti narapatiputrajanmavṛddhyā*
sa janāpadam Kapilāhvayam puram tat |
Dhanadapuram ivāpsarō'vakīrṇam
muditam abhūn Nalakūbaraprasūtāu ||

°*vṛddhyā* in the first pāda must strike one as quite out of place in this connexion. I think it is simply due to a slip of the pen and stands for °*buddhyā* which yields an excellent meaning and is far more natural. Cp. *athō nimittāiś ca tapōbalāc ca taj janma janmāntakarasya buddhvā*, 54 ab. The same mistake in writing — or in spelling if one likes better to put it so — recurs in II 25d where Mr. Nandargikar's text has *buddhi*° for *vṛddhi*° of all other MSS and editions. *u* for *ṛ* and inversely are of no rare occurrence in Sanskrit MSS. See e. g. IV 101c (*viniguhya* Cowell, Nandargikar, *vinigrhya* Joglekar), V 86c (*akuruta* Cowell, Nandargikar, *akṛṣata* Joglekar), VI 67b (*upaguhya* CD, *upagrhya* P). Cp. also my notes on IV 40 and 101, *infra*. — By the bye, this is a clear evidence that already the common source of the existing MSS of our poem contained errors.

Canto II.

7c. *vināśmavarṣāśanipātadōṣāiḥ*

That I was right in proposing to read °*ghōṣāiḥ* for °*dōṣāiḥ* is shown by the various reading of H (one of Mr. Joglekar's MSS) ad V 25a viz. *mahābhradōṣaḥ* for *mahābhraghōṣaḥ* of all other MSS.

10c. *abhyarthitaḥ sūkṣmadhanō 'pi cāyam*

cāitat (standing in correlation to *yat* a) instead of *cāyam* seems to show the best way out of the difficulties of this stanza.

11. *nāśō vadhō bandhuṣu nāpy adātā*
nāivāvratō nānṛtikō na himsraḥ |
āsīt tadā kaścana tasya rājyē
rājñō Yayātēr iva Nāhuṣasya ||

nāśō vadhō a is the reading of P; CD as well as Mr. Nandargi-
kar's MS have *nāsāuvadhō* which has been explained by Prof.
Leumann as a derivative of *svadhā*. Mr. Joglekar's edition reads:
dvēṣyō 'nṛjur bandhuṣu which is manifestly corrupt. Other propos-
ed corrections are: *nāsāuhydō* (Böhtlingk), *nāśēvadhīr* (? Kern),
nāgāuravō (Kielhorn), *nāsāucadhō* (Formichi). Now, the whole pas-
sage to which our stanza belongs has got a close parallel in a si-
milar passage of the Rāmāyaṇa where a picture of Daśaratha's
happy reign is given. The following six ślōkas deserve to be
quoted in full:

kāmī vā na kadaryō vā nṛśaṁsaḥ puruṣaḥ kvacit |
draṣṭum śakyam Ayōdhyāyām nāvidvān na ca nāstikaḥ || 8 ||
nāmṛṣṭabhōjī nādātā nāpy anaṅgadantiṣkadhyk |
nāhastābharanō vāpi dṛśyatē nāpy anātmavān || 11 ||
nānāhitāgnir nāyajvā na kṣudrō vā na taskaraḥ |
kaścid āsīd Ayōdhyāyām na cāvṛttō na saṁkaraḥ || 12 ||
svakarmaniratā nityam brāhmaṇā vijitēndriyāḥ |
dānādhyāyanaśīlāś ca saṁyatāś ca pratigrahē || 13 ||
nāstikō nānṛtī vāpi na kaścid abahuśrutaḥ |
nāsūyakō na cāśaktō nāvidvān vidyatē kvacit. || 14 ||

nāṣaḍaṅgavid atrāsti nāvratō nābahuśrutaḥ |
na dīnaḥ kṣiptacittō vā vyathitō vāpi kaścana || 15 ||

(Rāmāyaṇa I 6, 8. 11—15).

A comparison of the two passages shows that every epithet used by Aśvaghoṣa has got an exact parallel in the Rāmāyaṇa. Cp. *adātṛ* BC and *adātṛ* Rām. 11a, *avrata* BC and *avratin* Rām. 15b, *anṛtika* BC and *anṛtin* Rām. 14a. For *himśra* BC we find its synonyms viz. *nṛśaṁsa* Rām. 8b and *taskara* 12b. The influence of the earlier poet on the later one is beyond doubt, though of course the author of the Rāmāyaṇa being more profuse of words his description is more redundant than that of Aśvaghoṣa. But style does not matter. It is importing to notice that no epithet used by the Buddhist poet is wanting in the older poem. Now, should *nāśō vadhō* alone break the chain of parallels? I should not think. But what ought it to be changed to? Well, we have the choice between correcting it to *nāsūyakō* Rām. 14c or adopting the somewhat disputable *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον nāsāuvadhō* which would perhaps correspond to *nāyajvā* 12a. Personally I am rather inclined to decide in favour of the first form, *nāsūyakō* being better suited to *bandhuṣu* than *nāsāuvadhō*. But the question is still open. It may be added that the influence of Rāmāyaṇa on our passage is rendered doubly sure by the fact that another line of Aśvaghoṣa's, very closely following our stanza (II 11 and II 15), has been elucidated with the help of a parallel ślōka of Vālmīki's. (See my former article on the Buddhacarita, Polish Archives of Oriental Research, Vol. I, ad locum).

21. 22. — We have a set of nominatives here, not of accusatives as I have assumed in my former article. *ācakrīrē* is therefore passive.

42cd. *babandha sāntvēna phalēna cāitāms*
tyāgō hi tēṣām anupāyadr̥ṣṭaḥ ||

My translation of these two pādas (Archives I, ad locum) can be corroborated by a similar line met with in a nearly contemporary poet, viz.

*iyam tu pūjā mama daṇḍadhārīṇaḥ
kṛtāparādhasya hi satkṛtir vadhaḥ ||*

(Bhāsa, Pratijñāyāugandharāyaṇa IV v. 23cd.).

46cd. *Śāuddhōdanē Rāhusapatnavaktrō
jajñē sutō Rāhula ēva nāmnā ||*

„Anscheinend denkt sich der dichter *Rāhula* als compositum mit *-la* „nehmend“ (im sinne von *-hara*) da ohne eine solche voraussetzung die vergleichung *Rāhula*’s mit dem *Rāhu-sapatna* sich wie ableitung von *lucus a non lucendo* ausnehmen würde“. This remark of Prof. Leumann’s is quite right, but he should have said ‘selbstverständlich’ instead of ‘wahrscheinlich’. The popular etymology mentioned by the learned professor has passed current in India and is borne out by several examples. Cp. f. i.:

Sīhabāhu narindo so sīham ādinṇavā iti |

Sīhalo tena sambandhā ete sabbe pi Sīhalā ||

(Mahāvamsa VII 42).

‘That king *Sīhabāhu* has been called *Sīhala* on account of his having torn asunder a lion’.¹⁾ But I must beg the reader’s pardon for a short digression which does not appear misplaced in this connexion. One of the legends of the *Divyāvadāna* explains the proper noun *Simhala*, which is the same as Pāli *Sīhala*, in a different way. The passage in question runs as follows: *ayam dārakaḥ Simhasya sārthavāhasya putrō bhavatu Simhala iti nāma tasya Simhala iti nāmadhēyam vyavasthāpitam*²⁾. It appears from this as well as from one or two similar passages³⁾ that the taddhita suffix *-la*

¹⁾ Even modern writers are not loath to repeat such etymologies. Cp. the following passage from Paṇḍit Jībānanda Vidyāsāgara’s commentary on the *Mudrārākṣasa*: *vṛṣalam | vṛṣam dharmam lāti nāśayatīti vṛṣalaḥ śūdraḥ* (*Mudrārākṣasa* ed. by J. V., 4-th edition by A. B. Vidyābhūṣaṇa & N. B. Vidyārātna, Calcutta 1911 p. 11, 6).

²⁾ *Divyāvadāna* ed. Cowell and Neil, p. 523.

³⁾ *ayam dārakō Bhavasya grhapatēḥ putraḥ tasmād bhavatu Bhavila iti nāmadhēyam vyavasthāpitam*. (ibid. p. 24). Cp. also: *ayam dārakaḥ Priyasēnasya sārthavāhasya putras tad bhavatu dārakasya nāma Supriya iti*. (ib. p. 99). A Buddhist nun surnamed *Ṛddhīlamātā* (cp. *Rāhulamātā*) is mentioned *Divyāv.* p. 160. Other i. e. not patronymic names ending in *-la* are of course likewise possible.

was felt as forming or was even used to form patronymic proper nouns (cp. also *mātula* from *māty*). Now, Śuddhōdana and his progeny looked on Raghu as one of their most prominent ancestors. Is it too bold to assume that *Rāhula* — which appears to be a middle Indian form — corresponds to Sanskrit **Raghula* and means virtually the same as *Raghunandana*, *Rāghava* etc.?

Canto III.

8c. (*tataḥ sa jāmbūnadabhāṇḍabhydbhir*
 yuktam caturbhir nibhṛtāis turaṅgāiḥ |)
 aklībavidyucchuciraśmidhāram
 (*hiraṇmayam syandanam ārurōha ||*)

There is also a variant viz. *aklīvavidhyacchuci*° P. The long compound filling the third pāda of the stanza quoted above has given rise to a difference of opinion as to what should be its correct rendering. No doubt, it is grammatically possible to take *aklība* as referring to *raśmidhāra* and *vidyucchuci* as qualifying *raśmi*. This is the explanation of this word given by Böhtlingk. But it is only fair to acknowledge that it is hurting the stylistical point of view. The compound has a clumsy appearance. No wonder that Cowell preferred to construe *aklība* with *vidyut*. He is followed by the Indian interpreters. But again, lightnings can hardly be called 'manly'. It would be most natural to analyze the compound as an ordinary karmadhāraya-bahuvrīhi, *aklība vidyut*(?) and *śuci* (or *vidyucchuci*?) being epithets of the charioteer. Of course, *vidyut* which looks very suspicious and cannot be explained in a satisfactory manner, must be corrupt. But what shall we have to put in its stead? Well, there is a passage in the Jātakamālā which along with the various reading of the Paris MS enables us to remove all difficulties by restoring the original wording of the text. The general situation is nearly the same. We are told in a legend, intitulated Ayōgrhajātaka, how Bōdhisattva, then a young prince, decided to make a tour through his father's capital. Having got the king's permission he mounted his splendid car with four horses of state put to it and drove out into the richly adorned streets.

But growing disappointed by the wanton display of mirth and splendour he began to ponder over the light-heartedness — not to say light-headedness — of men who shrink not from making merry in the face of imminent death. The influence of the olden legend of prince Siddhārtha on this portion of the story is undeniable. But I think we must go even further and assume a direct influence of the *Buddhacarita* on *Ārya-Śūra*. The whole passage of the *jā-taka* that can interest us being unfortunately too long to be repeated in full, we must content ourselves with quoting the few words that can help us to restore the genuine text of the stanza in question. They are found on p. 226 ll. 12—13 of Kern's edition and read as follows: *hāimabhāṇḍābhyalamkṛtavinītacaturaturāṅgaṁ dakṣadāksīṇyanipunaśuciviniṭadhīrasārathim citrōjjvalavēṣa-praharaṇāvaraṇānuyātraṁ rathavaram adhiruhya*. The first compound corresponds to III 8 ab of our poem. The last *pāda* of our stanza corresponding to *rathavaram adhiruhya* as well as to the preceding epithet of the chariot, there remains the long compound *dakṣa*° — *sārathim* as the equivalent of our third *pāda*. It is worth noticing that the correspondence of the two passages is nearly perfect. Considering the remarkable parallelism of the general situation, the direct influence of *Aśvaghōṣa* on the later poet seems out of question¹). Now the compound *dakṣadāksīṇyanipunaśuciviniṭadhīrasārathim* is a *bahuvrīhi* the first of the two members of which is a long *dvandva* made up of two adjectives. There is every reason to believe that *aklībavidyucchuciraśmidhāram* is every bit a similar compound. In fact, *śuci* is common to both of them, *aklība* has got its exact correlate in *dhīra*, which is synonymous with it. But what of *vidyut*? Of course it can mean nothing. The

¹) In one of the later stanzas of the same *jātaka* (No. XXXII) we find the following assertion:

na manyunā snēhaparikṣayēṇa vā |
prayāmi dharmāya tu niścītō vanāṁ ||
 (v. 41 cd).

This is clearly a reminiscence from *Buddhacarita* XI 15:

jarāmaraṇanāśārthaṁ pravīṣtō 'smi tapōvanam |
na khalu svargatarṣeṇa nāsnēhēna na manyunā ||

true reading has been preserved under a slight disguise in the seemingly meaningless *vidhyat* (no present participle from *vyadh!*) of P which ought to be corrected to *vidvat*, thus being made to agree with *dakṣa* and *dākṣiṇyanipuna*. *vinīta* is either an independent addition of the later poet or else it is due to a slip of the copyist's pen having crept into our compound from the preceding one. For my part, I am rather inclined to cancel it, there being indeed very little probability that Ārya-Śūra, a picked stylist if there ever had been any in India, should have applied the same epithet first to horses and then, in the next following compound, to the charioteer. So then I don't hesitate to read in the Buddhacarita: *aklībavidvacchucīraśmidhāram*. The emendation is pretty sure.

33d. *(ēvaṁ jarāṁ rūpavināśayitrīm)*
jānāti cāivēcchati cāiṣa lōkaḥ ||

jānāti cāivēcchati cāiva is certainly more natural. *lōka* answers here to 'people'. There is no reason to insist upon it. *ēṣa* for *ēva* (and inversely) is pretty often met with. The MSS of our poem are not distinguished for any particular correctness with respect to this point.

Canto IV.

25cd. *cakrur ākṣēpikāś cēṣṭā bhītabhītā ivāṅganāḥ ||*

Prof. Lüders' correction viz. *bhītabhītā* 'furchtsam und doch wieder nicht furchtsam also schüchtern' is superfluous, since *bhītabhīta* alone can be taken to mean 'schüchtern'. Cp. the following stanza:

māninījanavilōcanapātān
uṣṇabāṣpakaluṣān pratigrhṇan |
mandamandamuditaḥ prayayāu khaṁ
bhītabhīta iva śītamayūkhaḥ ||

(Kirātārjunīya, IX 26).

This has been translated by Prof. Cappeller as follows: 'Die durch heisse Tränen getrübbten Blicke der schmollenden Frauen entgegennehmend, stieg der aufgegangene Mond langsam und gleichsam

schüchtern in die Luft empor'. (HOS vol. XV. Cambridge Mass. 1912). Here, the situation admits of no other rendering.

39b. *(pīnavalgustanī kācid) vātāghūrṇitakuṇḍalā |*
(uccāir avajahāsāinaṁ samāpnōtu bhavān iti ||

I greatly doubt whether Cowell's *vātā*^o has really hit on the genuine reading in spite of its being supported by the testimony of Mr. Nandargikar's MS. Other MSS read *vāsā*^o CD and *vāsya*^o P. Mr. Joglekar's edition has what appears to be a gloss on our text viz. *līlācañcalakuṇḍalā*¹). Well, I think we need no further help to restore the original wording of the line. It must have run *lāsā-ghūrṇitakuṇḍalā* or perhaps *lāsyā*^o i. e. 'with her ear-rings whirling about in (or through) sportive dance'. This epithet helps us to understand the whole stanza: 'Catch me if you can! exclaimed mockingly another girl, rotating in merry dance till her ear-rings whirled around'. No object is needed (*mām āpnōtu*, Böhtlingk) it being sufficiently accounted for by the situation.

40d. *(apayāntaṁ tathāivānyā babandhur mālyadāmabhiḥ |*
kāścit sākṣēpamadhurāir) jagrhur vacanāṅkusāiḥ ||

jagrhur cannot be possibly right. But neither can my former suggestions (*jaghnus tu* etc.) claim to be anything more than mere guesses. And yet the true reading was very near at hand. *jagrhur* ought to be changed to *jagarhur*. The correctness of this emendation is proved(1) by the various readings ad IV 101c viz. *vinigarhya* and *vinigrhya* (besides *viniguhya*. see infra, ad locum); (2) by the following ślōka:

grhē grhē rudatyaś ca bhartāraṁ grham āgatam |
vyagarhayanta duḥkhārtā vāgbhis tōtrāir iva dvipān ||
 (Rāmāyaṇa II, 48, 6).

59. *jarāṁ mṛtyuṁ ca vyādhim ca kō hi jānan sacētanah |*
svasthas tiṣṭhēn niṣīdēd vā svapēd vā kim punar hasēt ||

The 3. sing. pot. *svapēt* d which is sneered at by partisans of clas-

¹) Cp. a pretty similar case discussed in my note to V 58d. (Polish Archives I).

sical Sanskrit had stuck to our ślōka in India. The stanza is quoted in a somewhat modified form by Ballāla:

jarām mṛtyum bhayaṁ vyādhim yō jānāti sa paṇḍitaḥ |
svasthas tiṣṭhēn niśīdēd vā svapēd vā kēna cid dhasēt ||
 (Bhōjaprabandha ed. Bombay 1913, v. 36).

The second pāda of this is a standing phrase borrowed from other similar gnomes; of course, it breaks the syntactical unity of the whole. Ballāla seems to know nothing about the origin of the ślōka he incorporated into his collection of stories as he attributes it to an anonymous brother of Vatsarāja, a contemporary of Bhōja's. Herr Oster, too, has failed to discover the source of our stanza¹).

101c. *sva ēva bhāvē viniguhya manmatham*

viniguhya is found in Cowell's (MSS=) edition as well as in that of Mr. Nandargikar. The Tibetan translation as communicated by Wenzel seems to have read *vinigarhya*. This reading — which no doubt is the genuine one — is also noticed in margin of Mr. Nandargikar's MS. Mr. Joglekar reads *vinigrhya*. Indeed, *ar* and *u* are often liable to be substituted for one another. Of course, *mṛta* cannot become *muta*, nor, say, *suta* — *sarta*. But wherever a possibility of substitution is given i. e. wherever the various reading thus arising is an intelligible word, we are bound to examine the case. Thus °*buddhya* I 94a has proved far better than °*vṛddhya* and *jagarhuḥ* IV 40d had to be preferred to *jagrhuḥ* although the evidence of the MSS was in favour of the latter forms.

102a. *tataḥ purōdyānagatām janaśriyam*
(nirīkṣya sāyam pratisamhṛtām punaḥ |
anītyatām sarvagatām vicintayan
vivēśa dhiṣṇyam kṣitipālakātmajāḥ ||)

CDP read *janastriyam*, an impossible word; *janaśriyam* which has been conjectured by Cowell is also the reading of the both Indian

¹) L. Oster, Die Rezensionen des Bhojaprabandha. Diss. Darmstadt 1911, pag. 29.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



HISTORY

Tens of thousands of important historical sources, many previously unobtainable, are now available for the first time with a Forgotten Books Full Membership.

Unlimited Access
\$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

nibbutā bata sā nārī yassāyaṃ īdiso pati.

Cp. also III 23c: *dhanyāsyā bhāryēti śanāir avōcan.*

56c. *savilāsa ratāntatāntam ūrvōr*
(*vivarē kāntam ivābhiniya śīśyē ||*)

The same anuprāsa is met with in a stanza of Amaru: *sura-
tāntatāntanayanam vaktram* (v. 3c ed. Durgāprasāda & Parab²,
Bombay 1900).

62b. (*iti sattvakulānurūparūpaṃ*)
vividham sa pramadājanaḥ śayānaḥ |
(*sarasuḥ sadṛśam babhāra rūpaṃ*
pavanāvarjitarugṇapuṣkarasya ||)

śayānaḥ is certainly wrong. It gives the construction of ab a clumsy turn, the second member of the adverbial compound in a viz. *-rūpaṃ* being difficult to account for and appearing rather superfluous. This must have been felt instinctively by the copyist of the common source of Cowell's MSS, as he omitted the second *rūpa* thus shortening the line of two syllables ([°]*kulānurūpa* P, [°]*kulānurūpaṃ* CD). I think we ought to correct *śayānaḥ* into *da-dhānaḥ* which not only makes appear the use of *-rūpaṃ* very appropriate (the compound being now a substantive), but, moreover, restores the natural parallelism between ab and cd, [°]*rūpaṃ da-dhānaḥ* answering exactly to *babhāra rūpaṃ*. The substitution of *śayānaḥ* for the genuine reading is sufficiently accounted for by its frequent employment throughout the whole description.

69. *hṛdi yā mama tuṣṭir adya jātā*
vyavasāyaś ca yathā dhṛtāu nivīṣṭaḥ |
vijanē 'pi ca nāthavān ivāsmi
dhruvam arthō 'bhimukhaḥ sa mē ya iṣṭaḥ ||

iva c ought to be changed to *yathā* in agreement with *yā* a and *yathā* b. Relative clauses of this type are a favourite construction with the author of the Buddhacarita. Cp. VII 57, XIII 59. Sāund.-N. VI 47c. A look at them will teach us that there is no room for any intermediate remarks between the antecedent and the conclusive sentence. On the contrary the protasis is immediately followed by the apodosis.

This rule is observed by other poets too ¹⁾. Besides, *iva* is out of place in our stanza. Siddhārtha speaks under immediate impression of the assistance lent him by the celestials. He feels really *nātha-vān*, not only 'as it were'. Hence his deep conviction: I'm sure I'll attain the object of my desires.

75cd. *aham apy amṛtaṁ param yathāvat
turagaśrēṣṭha labhēya tat kuruṣva ||*

yathāvat being of course impossible Speyer proposed to read *yathā yat* instead of it. I think *yathā tat* is more natural. Construe: *tat kuruṣva yathāham tat param amṛtaṁ labhēya* (viz. that highest amṛta which I am continually striving at, which is the sole object of my desires, which you cannot fail to appreciate at its full worth etc. etc.).

81a. *kanakavalayabhūṣitaprakōṣṭhāḥ*

Cp. *kanakavalayabhramśarikṭaprakōṣṭhaḥ*, Mēghadūta 2b.

84. *atha sa vikacapaṅkajāyatākṣaḥ
puram avalōkya nanāda simhanādam |
jananamaraṇayōr adṛṣṭapārō
na punar aham Kapilāhvayaṁ pravēṣṭā ||*

Read *punar* for *puram* b and vice versa *puram* for *punar* d. — *Kapilāhvayaṁ* cannot stand alone for *Kapilavāstu*. Cp. *Kapilāhvayaṁ puram* I 94 b and VIII 5 a. See also my note to VIII 33, *infra*.

Canto VII.

19c. *adṛṣṭatattvō 'pi na saṁtutōṣa*

Here too, as elsewhere, 'pi stands falsely for *hi*. Siddhārtha is not

¹⁾ Cp. c. g. Rāmāyaṇa II, 14, 14:

*yas tē mantrakṛtaḥ pāṇir agnāu pāpē mayā dkṛtaḥ |
saṁtyajāmi svajam cāiva tava putram saha tvayā ||*

But the construction is seldom met with in Sanskrit literature.

discomfited although he has caught no glimpse of truth in the hermit's exposition of the tapas doctrine but just because of it.

21cd. *tē viprayuktāḥ khalu gantukāmā
mahattaram bandhanam ēva bhūyaḥ ||*

While restoring in a brilliant manner the second pāda, Kielhorn has failed to notice the slight mistake in writing which disfigures the first one. The verb *viprayuj* is not suited to *bandhana*. Read *vipramuktāḥ* and cp. e. g. *viṣayagatāni vimucya bandhanāni* I 87 b, *andhāya yaś ca sprhayēd anandhō baddhāya muktō* etc. XI 53 ab; *vipramukta* is said elsewhere of arrows discharged from the bow (XIII 15 a, 47 a), *viprayōga* denotes only the idea of separation from one's family and the like (VI 46, 47).

33. *abhyuddhṛtaprajvalitāgnihōtram
kṛtābhiṣēkarṣijanāvakīrṇam |
jāpyasvanākūjitadēvakōṣṭham
dharmasya karmāntam iva pravṛttam ||*

I doubt whether any reader of this can be really satisfied with the literal sense of *karmānta* = *karmanō 'ntaḥ*. On the other hand I have always been struck by the ambiguity of the compounds *abhyuddhṛtaprajvalita*, *kṛtābhiṣēka* and *svanākūjita*. Well, to cut it short, I surmise that *karmānta* has the meaning of 'forge, smithy'. Cp. *karmāra*. At once, new light is shed on the whole stanza, which acquires the character of an artificially elaborated simile. Translation and commentary: 'It (scil. the penance-grove) appeared like a forge of dharma in full activity: glowing agnihōtras were being accumulated in it (as red-hot iron or perhaps incandescent hammers is or are brandished in a forge), it was full of holy ascetics who were performing their ablutions (as a forge is full of red-hot iron which is being sprinkled with water) and its chapels resounded with the murmur of prayers (as a forge resounds with the din of hammering)'. Cp. I 10.

In my explanation of the above, I am confirmed by a line of the *Mṛcchakatika* which runs as follows:

*(kim yāty asya puraḥ śanāiḥ pravahanaṁ tasyāntaram mārगतē)
(bhagnē 'kṣē parivartanam prakurutē chinnō 'thavā pragrahaḥ |)*

karmāntōtthita dāruvāritagatir mārgāntaram yācatē
(svāiram prēritagōyugaḥ kim athavā svacchandam āgacchati ||)
 (ed. Stenzler p. 107 l. 15)

karmāntōjjhita°, *karmāntōjita°*, *vartmāntōjjhita°* and one or two other corrupted readings are found in the MSS. The first of these variants viz. *karmāntōjjhita°* has been followed by Böhtlingk who translated 'Oder hemmt ein bei der Arbeit liegen gebliebener Balken die Fahrt, so dass er einen anderen Weg suchen muss?' Mr. Goḍbole preferred to adopt *vartmāntōjjhita°* which is evidently a spurious reading, rather awkwardly explained by Lalladīkṣita as *vartmanah mārgasya antē madhyē (!) ujhitēna tyaktēna*¹). Now, there can be no doubt that Stenzler's reading is genuine. It is clearly the lectio difficilior and, moreover, occurs in an excellent MS. Other variants quoted above must be recognised as later corruptions or rather palpable attempts at correcting the original wording grown unintelligible to copyists and commentators. All these difficulties are done away with if we assign to *karmānta* the meaning of 'smithy' or perhaps the larger sense of 'workshop' or the like. The whole line should be translated: 'He is perhaps trying to clear his way (*antaram !antaram !*) being checked in his advance by a rafter protruding from a smithy (or: a working-house)'. The technical meaning of *karmānta* having fallen into desuetude was soon forgotten, the few passages where our word occurred being taken to contain a regular tatpuruṣa compound. But a last glimpse of the true acceptation of *karmānta* is found in Prthvīdhara's commentary on it viz.: *karmāntō rājādīnām niyōga-viśēṣaḥ*. This is not much, to be sure, but at any rate it shows that *karmānta*, though banned from the recognised vocabulary was still felt to purport more than 'the end of the work'.

43ab. *imē hi vāñchanti tapaḥsahāyam*
tapōnidhānapratimam bhavantam |

¹) Followed by Regnaud who says: 'ou bien son chemin était obstrué par une pièce de bois qui se trouvait au milieu' (!). I have no other translation at hand save that of Kellner of which, however, we do not need here to take account.

I read *tapōnidhā apratimam* b. *imē* alone, without a substantive, can hardly satisfy as the preceding stanzas do not speak of ascetics to whom the pronoun could refer. Moreover, the prince can scarcely be called *tapōnidhānapratima* as he never yet practised penance. Finally, it is rather better style if the same term (here *tapas*) repeated in what is called the anuprāsa manner is not found in two coordinate words. To quote but one example: *tam arcayitva vidhivad vidhijñam tapōdhanam mānadhanāgrayāyī*, Raghuvamśa V 3 ab. But of course this cannot be a general rule.

57c. *(gambhīratā yā bhavatas tv agādhā
yā dīptatā yāni ca lakṣaṇāni |)
ācāryakam prāpsyati tat pṛthivyām
(yan na rṣibhiḥ pūrvayugē 'py avāptam ||)*

prāpsyati can refer neither to the nominatives in ab (as it is the prince himself who shall become the Teacher) nor to *bhavatas* (as it would make the construction too loose). The genuine reading is most probably *prāpsyasi*. Cp. my note to VI 69, supra.

Canto VIII.

7c. *(tatō bhramadbhir diśi dīnamānasāir
anujjvalāir bāṣpahatēkṣaṇāir janāiḥ |)
nivāryamāṇāv iva tāv ubhāu puram
(śanāi rajaḥsnātam ivābhijagmatuḥ ||)*

Read: *nivāryamāṇāv api*. Of course, Chandaka must have been stopped every now and then by men desirous to learn what misfortune has befallen prince Siddhārtha. The following stanzas show that the inhabitants of Kapilavāstu did no justice to the stoical device: no news is good news. But Chandaka was too much grieved to be communicative. He did not heed the passers-by who troubled him with questions and he would not speak till he saw himself surrounded by the entire town-folk. To be sure *api* is the only particle which answers for the situation; *iva* is sufficiently accounted for by its appearing in the next pāda. It has been written anticipatively, as is often the case, by a careless copyist.

29ab. *karaprahārapracalāiś ca tā babhur*
yathāpi nāryaḥ sahitōnnatāiḥ stanāiḥ |

yathāpi cannot be possibly good. *vrthāpi* (Böhtlingk) and *tathāpi* (Formichi) have been proposed instead of it. I should like to read *babhus tathā hi*.

31d. *(uvāca niḥśvāsacalatpayōdharā)*
vigādhaśōkāśrudharā Yaśōdharā ||

vigādha° (Cowell, foot-note; Böhtlingk) is only a miscarried conjecture. Now, *śōkāśru* is no doubt a very unusual word. One is rather wont to say either *śōkāmbu* or *aśru*. On the other hand, *ambudhara* is a very common compound and the feminine *ambudharā* may very well stand for *ambudhārā jaladhārā* or a similar word meaning 'river'. The whole can be taken to be a bahuvrīhi and to mean: '(having a river i. e.) floating or submerging in a deep river of tears'. As a tatpuruṣa compound it can be analyzed: *vigādham śōkāmbu aśru dhārayatīti vi*°. But the first explanation is preferable because of the epithet *vigādha*. Cp. *śōkāmbhasi tatprabhavē hy agādhe duḥkhārṇavē majjati Śākyarājaḥ*, IX 24ab.

57cd. *pradātum evābhyucitō na yācitum*
katham sa bhikṣām parataś carīṣyati ||

This idea has been imitated by Ārya-Śūra: *atha sa rājā pradāna-samucitatvād anabhyastayācñākārpaṇyamārgō* etc. Jātakamālā, 12, 5/6. The compound *pradānōcita* has taken root in Sanskrit literature. So it is met with in a stanza of Bhāravi's where it has been falsely interpreted by both Mallinātha and his successful rival Prof. Cappeller :

mahattvayōgāya mahāmahimnām
ārāadhanīm tām nṛpa dēvatānām |
dātum pradānōcita bhūridhāmnīm
upāgataḥ siddhim ivāsmi vidyām ||

Kirātārjunīya III 23.

'*hē pradānōcita dānapātrabhūta*' (Mallinātha). 'um diese Wissenschaft... dir o König, der du der Gabe würdig bist, zu verleihen, bin ich gekommen' (Cappeller, HOS vol. XV, Cambridge Mass. 1912). Both interpreters have failed to see the effective antithesis

between *dātum upāgatō 'smi* and *pradānōcita*. 'I come to bestow this science on you who are wont yourself to bestow gifts on others'.

Canto IX.

3d.

chittvā kathām

Prof. Leumann has the following remark: „*chittvā kathām* heisst nicht 'plunging at once into the subject', sondern 'die (bisher von Bhārgava mit seinen schülern geführte) unterhaltung unterbrechend'; vgl. im PW *kathām āchidyā* (Kathās. LXI, 94) und ferner Jāt. 4 Ed. p. 119₂₇ *katham pacchinditvā* 'die unterhaltung unterbrechend', wogegen ibid.₃₂ *katham samutthāpetvā* 'die unterhaltung beginnend'“. Nevertheless Cowell was perfectly right in taking *kathā* to mean 'the usual compliments at meeting a person'. Of course *kathā* can mean 'unterhaltung' just as it can mean 'tale, story, romance' or 'sermon, lecture' etc. according to the context. Here it corresponds to the *saṃmodānīyā kathā sārāṇīyā* of the Pāli texts. The ceremonious compliments delivered at greeting a person were obligatory on every well-bred Hindu. *āgamanaprayōjanam avaśyam praṣṭavyam* says Mallinātha ad Raghuvamśa V 3. Only plain rudeness or great urgency can account for *kathāchēda* i. e. cutting short of such compliments. Thus, king Purūravas is addressing a female cuckoo in a polite manner. But she will not heed him. Whereupon he asks rather astonished: *katham kathāvicchēdakāriṇī svakāryē vyāsaktā?* (Vikramōrvaśī ed. Bollensen 60, 6). Similarly it is said in one of Bhāsa's dramas:

Rāvaṇaḥ: — *Vibhīṣaṇa | ēhy ēhi | upaviśa |*

Vibhīṣaṇaḥ: — *ēṣa ēṣa upaviśāmi | (upaviśati)*

Rāvaṇaḥ: — *Vibhīṣaṇa | nirviṇṇam iva tvām lakṣayē |*

Vibhīṣaṇaḥ: — *nirvēda ēva khalv anuraktagrāhiṇam svāminam
upāśritasya bhṛtyajanasya?*

Rāvaṇaḥ: — *chidyatām ēṣā kathā | tvam api tāvad
vānaram ānaya |*

Abhiṣekanāṭaka p. 32/33.

Here, too, Rāvaṇa 'plunges into the subject' cutting short the complimentary *kathā*. *chidyatām ēṣā kathā* corresponds to *tiṣṭhatu praṇayaḥ* of other texts. Of course, it can have any other meaning; cp. e. g. Bhāsa's Dūtavākya v. 30.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

HOLY BIBLE

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

puram̐darasyāpi puram̐ śrayēta || 45 ||
lōbhād dhi mōhād atha vā bhayēna
yō vāntam annam̐ punar ādadīta |
lōbhāt sa mōhād atha vā bhayēna
saṁtyajya kāmān punar ādadīta || 46 ||
yaś ca pradīptāc charaṇāt katham̐cin
niṣkramya bhūyaḥ praviśēt tad ēva |
gṛhasthyam utsṛjya sa dṛṣṭadōṣō
mōhēna bhūyō 'bhilaṣēd grahītum || 47 ||
yā ca śrutir mōkṣam̐ avāptavantō
nṛpā gṛhasthā iti nāitad asti |
sāmapradhānaḥ kva ca mōkṣadharmā
daṇḍapradhānā kva ca rājanītiḥ || 48 ||
śamē rātiś cēc chithilam̐ ca rājyam̐
rājyē matiś cēc chamaviplavaś ca |
śamam̐ ca tāikṣṇyam̐ ca hi nōpapannam̐
śītōṣṇayōr āikyam̐ ivōdakāgnyōḥ || 49 ||
vahnēś ca tōyasya ca nāsti samdhiḥ
śaṭhasya satyasya ca nāsti mēlaḥ |
āryasya pāpasya ca nāsti prītiḥ
śamasya daṇḍasya ca nāsti yōgaḥ || 50 ||
tan niścayād vā vasudhādhipās tē
rājyāni muktvā śamam̐ āptavantāḥ |
rājyārditā vā nibhṛtēndriyatvād
anāiṣṭhikam̐ mōkṣakṛtābhīmānāḥ || 51 ||
tēṣām̐ ca rājyē 'stu śamō yathāvat
prāptō vanam̐ cāham u niścayēna |
chittvā hi pāśam̐ gṛhabandhusam̐jñam̐
muktaḥ punar na pravivikṣur asmi || 52 ||

Notes.

41c. — *ca sthi[tam̐]* Cowell, *sti* for *sthi* P; the Tibetan translation seems to have been made from a different text as it reads: 'durch planet verwirrt Padma-habend wasser wie'.

42b. — Tib. favours *yathā* 'wie unrein geworden mann-herr(n) frühere'. In fact, *yathā* appears somewhat better as it can answer to *ittham*; it cannot, however, mean 'wie' but 'that; (so) — as'

— c. Tib. favours *parihārya*° 'leider gänzlich aufgeb alter vorzüglich Zeit'. But the negative compound ought to be preferred. Cp. III 33 ab and the preceding lines.

—d. *rājyāni muktvā* as 51 b, 44 a; Tib. favours *rājyam vimuktvā* 'königreich gänzlich wegwerfend'.

43a. *varam* ex conj. from Tib. 'besser', Bt *ciram*.

—b. ex conj.; Tib. 'kleinod wie (= *ratnam iva*) befriedigt best (= *typtim parām?*) nahe-umarmend (= *upaguhya*)'; Bt has *triṣaṅkavō ratnam ivōpaguptaḥ* which is pure nonsense.

44c. *na tūpa*° ex conj.. Bt *nanūpa*°; Tib. not clear.

45a. *hi* ex conj., Bt 'pi. Tib. is silent about either *hi* or 'pi and gives the fourth pāda as 'stadt bewältig auch besuch nicht ist'. So I have thought awhile of *kō 'pi... pāuraṁdaram nāpi puram śrayēta*. But this would be false. There is no room for *na* in d. The whole stanza is an interrogative sentence. 'Is there any one... who... would abide even in...?' With respect to *śrayēta* cp. *śrayēya* 79d (Cowell) in an asseveration hinting at the idea conveyed by our stanza. The anuprāsa *puramḍarasya puram* is repeated XIII 37d *puramḍarasyēva purā*.

46a. *hi mōhād* ex conj., Bt reads *vimōhād* which is favoured also by Tib. ('vollkommen-thorheit').

46d. *ādadīta* ex conj., Bt *ādadhīta*; Tib. supports my conjecture which is, moreover, borne out by the general parallelism obtaining in these stanzas, as well as by a similar phrase in XI 19d viz. *kaḥ kāmasaṁjñam viṣam ādadīta* (C). Besides, *ādadhīta* is rather bad Sanskrit.

47a. Cp. *śaraṇāj jvalanēna dahyamānān na hi niścikramiṣuḥ kṣa-mam grahitum*, V 37cd. Cp. e. g. Sāundarananda VIII 19.

48. 49. 50. are given in the order of Tib., Bt inserts 48 after our 50.

48d. *daṇḍapradhānaḥ* and *rājadharmah* are noticed prima manu in margin of Bt. Tib., too, has 'königs-Dharma'.

49a. °*cchitilam* Bt (printer's error).

50. „Corrected into *sandhiḥ* for *mēlaḥ*, *sandhiḥ* for *prītiḥ* and *sandhiḥ* for *yōgaḥ* on the top of the same words of the verse in Bt. in the same hand as that of the text; but the original readings. though blotted with yellow fluid, are yet clearly visible“. (Mr. Nandargikar's note). Tib., too, gives four times 'verbind' = *sam̐dhi*. This

may or may not be the genuine reading. At any rate, the three synonyms viz. *mēla*, *prīti* and *yōga*, are very cleverly selected.

51. This stanza is somewhat obscure. There is something wrong in the second half of it. Should we read: *vānibhṛtēndriyatvād anāiṣṭhikē mōha°*? This would justify the use of the disjunctive *vā—vā—*. Tib. has only a hiatus here as well as in the first half of the following stanza.

52a. *tēṣāś ca* Bt (printer's error).

—b. *cāham u* ex conj., though I am not sure of it. Bt has *mōham a°* which is meaningless. *ca* is warranted by *ca* in the first pāda, while *aham u* seems to come pretty near *mōham a°*, more so, at any rate, than e g. *asmī tu* or whatever else I tried to put instead of it.

—c. *°samjñam* ex conj. from Tib, Bt *°saṅgam*.

75c. *buddhaḥ parapratyayatō hi kō vrajēj*
(*janō 'ndhakārē 'ndha ivāndhadēśikaḥ ||*)

Read *buddhaḥ* in agreement with the metre. To act *parapratyayataḥ* is said of stupid or silly persons. See f. i.: *yatnēna tu pratyayanēyabuddhir vimōkṣam āpnōti parāśrayēṇa*, *Sāundarananda* V 17cd; *mūḍhaḥ parapratyayanēyabuddhiḥ*, *Mālavikāgnimitra* (ed. Bollensen) v. 2d.; *pañḍidapari-dōsappaccaā ṇaṁ mūḍhajādī?*, *ibid.* 25, 19; *parapratyayatāryapēlavamatīḥ*, *Jātakamālā* 69, 5; *parapratyayanēyabuddhitvāt*, *ibid.* 147, 12 etc. No doubt, the phrase is a standing one, though of course it may be slightly modified. Nevertheless there is perhaps a conclusion to be drawn from the instances quoted above. To be sure, *parapratyaya* is a current compound giving no room for any further remarks. But the case of *parapratyayanēyabuddhi* is somewhat different. This compound is too long to be an independent production of two different authors. Besides it has a distinctly rhythmical turn and must have arisen in a metrical passage rather than in prose, filling as it does almost an entire pāda of an upajāti stanza. It bears a stamp of individuality. And so I think we shall not be wide from the mark if we admit that the second instance from the *Jātakamālā*, quoted above, presupposes the *Sāundarananda*'s and perhaps even the *Mālavikāgnimitra*'s priority to that work. Can its author have been acquainted with the poems of Kālidāsa? All that has been said thus far of

the age of Ārya-Śūra is quite uncertain. We can only assert that he is later than Aśvaghōṣa.

77ab. *imam tu dr̥ṣṭvāgamam avyavasthitam
yad uktam āptāis tad avēhi sādhu iti |*

The idea is very popular in Sanskrit literature. Cp. e. g.:

*atha yadi tē karmavicikitsā vā vṛttavicikitsā vā syāt | yē tatra
brāhmaṇāḥ sammarśinaḥ | yuktā ayuktāḥ | alūkṣā dharmakāmāḥ
syuḥ | yathā tē tatra vartēran | tathā tatra vartēthāḥ |* and so on.

Tāittirīya-Upaniṣad 11, 3—4¹).

or :

*tarkō 'praviṣṭaḥ śrutayō vibhinnā
nāikō munir yasya vacaḥ pramāṇam |
dharmasya tattvaṁ nihitaṁ guhāyām
mahājanō yēna gataḥ sa panthāḥ ||
Mahābhārata III 313, 17 (Southern recension).*

or again :

*matibhēdatamastirōhitē
gahanē kṛtyavidhāu vivēkinām |
sukṛtaḥ parīśuddha āgamaḥ
kurutē dīpa ivārthadarśanam ||
spr̥haṇīyaguṇāir mahātmabhiś
caritē vartmani yacchatām manaḥ |
vidhihētur ahētur āgasām
vinipātō 'pi samaḥ samuñnatēḥ ||
Kirātārjunīya II, 33, 34.*

¹) Some passages of the Buddhacarita show that the Upaniṣads were not unknown to its author. One of them has been pointed out by Cowell viz. XII 64 (*muñjād iṣikēva*) and Kaṭha-Up. II 6, 17. There is another line in our poem which reminds us of the same Upaniṣad viz.:

*punarbhavō 'stīti ca kēcid āhur
nāstīti kēcin niyatapratijñāḥ |
BCar. IX 56 ab.*

Cp. with this :

*yēyam prētē vicikitsā manuṣyē
astīty ēkē nāyam astīti cāikē |
Kaṭha-Up. I 1, 20.*

Canto X.

4. *taṁ prēkṣya yō 'nyēna yayāu sa tasthāu*
yaś cātra tasthāu pathi sō 'nvagacchat |
drutaṁ yayāu yaḥ sadayam sadhīram
yaḥ kaścid āstē sma sa cōtpapāta ||

The entire stanza exhibits a marked parallelism in the construction of its four pādas. Thus we have: *yō yayāu — sa tasthāu*; *yaś tasthāu — sō 'nvagacchat*; *yayāu yaḥ — sa-* (NB!); *ya āstē sma — sa utpapāta*. This parallelism alone would entitle us to look for a correlative pronoun as well as a second verbum finitum in c. Indeed, the conclusion thus arrived at is borne out by the fact that neither *sadayam* nor *sadhīram* can stand the test of a critical examination. The former, while grammatically correct, does not convey an idea opposed to *drutam*. The latter yields a good sense but is grammatically very hard and rather inadmissible in the work of a consummate stylist. All difficulties vanish if we read: *drutaṁ yayāu yaḥ sa jagāma dhīram*. This emendation will appear doubly sure if one considers that *jagā]ma* can be most easily misread as *|sa*.

- 26d. *sadbhiḥ sahīyā hi satām samṛddhiḥ ||*

„Sic CP (i. e. CDP). Should we read *sahīyō* (neut.) for *sahīyasī*?“ (Cowell, foot-note). There is a compound word met with in the Divyāvadāna which can perhaps throw some light on the enigmatic *sahīyā* or *sahīyas*. The whole passage runs: *kimartham dēvaḥ svayam gacchati, ayam Sudhanaḥ kumārō baladarpayuktaḥ, ēṣa daṇḍasahīyaḥ prēṣyatām iti | ... gaccha kumāra daṇḍasahīyaḥ kārvaṭikam saṁnā-maya |* (Divyāv. 446. 2—5). Could we take *sadbhiḥ sahīyā* or *°yaḥ* to mean '(together) with good men?' I don't say yes! I merely ask. The late Prof. Speyer proposed to read *sadbhiḥ sahāyāir hi*.

- 27c. *vyūhāny anēkāni vigāhya bāṇāiḥ*

vigāh in connexion with *bāṇāiḥ* cannot but strike one as somewhat strange. Arrows are discharged from afar but not in immediate vicinity of the foe when one comes to close quarters with one's adversary. I should like to propose *vyūhān anēkān vinigrhya bāṇāiḥ* though I am not sure to have restored the true wording of the

line. *vyūha* is of course masculine in classical Sanskrit. This cannot, however, be regarded as a decisive argument in favour of my conjecture as Aśvaghoṣa often uses such substantives in the neuter-gender, both in this poem and in the *Sāundarananda*.

Canto XI.

39cd. (*duḥkhapratīkāranimittabhūtās*
tasmāt prajānām viṣayā na bhōgyāḥ |)
aśnāmi bhōgān iti kō 'bhyupēyāt
prājñāḥ pratīkāraavidhāu pravṛttān ||

This stanza should be examined along with the next following one:

yaḥ pitta-dāhēna vidahyamānaḥ
śītakriyām bhōga iti vyavasyēt |
duḥkhapratīkāraavidhāu pravṛttaḥ
kāmēṣu kuryāt sa hi bhōgasamjñām ||

It is clear that there is something wrong in the latter half of 39; *pravṛttān* d must be corrected to *pravṛttaḥ* in agreement with 40 c. But then *aśnāmi* cannot be right. It has usurped the place of a substantive dependent on *abhyupēyāt* (just as *śītakriyām* is dependent on *vyavasyēt*) and ought to be thrust out of it. As is often the case, here too the reading of P viz. *aśnāti* comes pretty near the truth. It stands for *annāni* and the whole ought to be read:

annāni bhōgā iti kō 'bhyupēyāt
prājñāḥ pratīkāraavidhāu pravṛttaḥ ||

Canto XII

30. *namaskāraśatkāraṇaḥ prōkṣaṇābhyukṣaṇādayaḥ |*
anupāya iti prājñāir upāyajña pravēditaḥ ||

I read *pravēditaḥ* as the predicate refers to what is enumerated in ab but not to *anupāya* c.

33. *ity avidyā hi vidvan sā pañcaparvā samīhatē |*
tamō mōham mahāmōham tāmīśradhvayam ēva vā ||

The correction adopted by me in the first half of this stanza is due to Speyer. In the second half *mōham mahāmōham* ought to be changed to *mōhō mahāmōhas*. The next half-stanza is given by Cowell as follows:

tatrālasyaṃ tamō viddhi mōham mṛtyuṃ ca janma ca |

The MSS read *mōha* CD and *mōhō* P. It is clear that an inversion has taken place. Two forms, viz. the nominative *mōhō* (*mahāmōhō*) 33c and the accusative *mōham* 34b have changed their respective places just as *punar* and *puram* in V 84, supra.

113c. *(tatas tadānīm gajarājavikramah
padasvanēnānupamēna bōdhitah |)
mahāmunēr āgatabōdhiniścayō
(jagāda Kālō bhujagōttamah stutim. ||)*

Read: *āgatabōdhiniścayāj*. 'After — or: as — the great muni has bent his mind upon the attainment of bōdhi, Kāla, the best of serpents, broke out into praises of him'.

Canto XIII.

21c. *(tāmrāruṇā lōhitabīnducitī āh
khaṭvāṅgahastā haridhūmrakēśāh |)
lambasrajō vāraṇalambakarnās
(carmāambarās cāiva nirambarās ca ||)*

Read: *lambatvacō*, in agreement with the tenor of the whole stanza.

60. *kāṣṭham hi mathnan labhatē hutāśam
bhūmim khaman vindati cāpi tōyam |
nirbandhinaḥ kimcana nāsty asādhyam¹⁾
nyāyēna yuktaṃ ca kṛtaṃ ca sarvam ||*

Cp. the following stanza:

*kāṣṭhād āgnir jāyatē mathyamānād
bhūmis tōyam khanyamānā dadāti |*

¹⁾ Speyer's emendation of *nāsyā sādhyam*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



HISTORY

Tens of thousands of important historical sources, many previously unobtainable, are now available for the first time with a Forgotten Books Full Membership.

Unlimited Access
\$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

a greater parallelism with the preserved portion of the Buddhacarita, chiefly concerned with the Great Renunciation, than the remaining six which dwell at length upon subjects not treated in that poem. And secondly, because the great bulk of the Rāmāyaṇa does not favour detailed investigation of such kind extending over the whole of it.

The story of Rāma is alluded to in the following eight stanzas of the Buddhacarita, four of them referring to Book II of the great epos:

- (1) VI, 36¹⁾. *nāsmi yātum puram śaktō
dahyamānēna cētasā |
tvām āraṇyē parityajya
Sumitra iva Rāghavam ||*

Sumantra (d) is probably the correct reading. The above stanza is spoken by Chandaka, on the occasion of his parting with Siddhārtha, and refers to Sumantra's dismissal by Rāma as described in sarga 52 of Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa. The following three ślōkas are specially concerned:

*sarāmam api tāvan mē ratham dṛṣṭvā tadā janah |
vinā Rāmam ratham dṛṣṭvā vidīryētāpi sā purī || 40 ||
dāiniam hi nagarī gacchēd dṛṣṭvā śūnyam imam ratham |
sūtāvaśēṣam svam sāiniam hatavīram ivāhavē || 41 ||
ārtanādō hi yah pāurāir unmuktas tvatpravāsanē |
saratham mām niśamyēva kuryuḥ śataguṇam tataḥ || 44 ||*

Cp. also the quotations given under (4), *infra*.

- (2) VIII, 8. *niśamya ca srastaśarīragāmināu
vināgatāu Śākyakularṣabhēṇa tāu |
mumōca bāṣpam pathi nāgarō janah
purā rathē Dāśarathēḥ ivāgatē ||*

This reference is probably the most important of all. It is alluding to the following ślōkas of the Rāmāyaṇa (Book II):

*Sumantram abhidhāvantaḥ śataśō 'tha sahasraśaḥ |
kva Rāma iti prcchantāḥ sūtam abhyadravan narāḥ || 57, 9 ||*

¹⁾ The Buddhacarita is quoted from my revised edition of the text, ready in MS.

dēva rājaratham dṛṣtvā vinā Rāmam ihāgatam |
dūrād aśrumukhaḥ sarvō rājāmārgē gatō janah || 59, 11 ||
harmyāir vimānāiḥ prāsādāir avēkṣya ratham āgatam |
hāhākāraḥ nāryō Rāmādarśanakarśitāḥ || 59, 12 ||
āyatāir vimalāir nētrāir aśruvēgapariplutāiḥ |
anyōnyam abhivīkṣantē 'vyaktam ārtatarāḥ striyaḥ || 59, 13 ||

Cp. also 52. 40. 41. 44. quoted above.

(3) VIII, 79. *Ajasya rājñas tanayasya dhīmatē*
narādhipāyēndrasakhāya mē spṛhā |
gatē vanam yas tanayē divam gatō
na mōghabāṣpaḥ kṛpaṇam jijīva ha ||

These are words of king Śuddhōdana referring to the death of Daśaratha, Rāmāyaṇa II 64 (and especially ślōka 77 of that sarga).

(4) VIII, 81cd. *Daśaratha iva Rāmaśōkavaśyō*
bahu vilalāpa nṛpō viśamjñakalpaḥ ||

This half stanza refers to several passages in sargas 58—64 of Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa.

The other four references are rather vague. They may however be quoted for completeness' sake. All of them occur in Canto IX.

(5) *yānam vikāyōpayayāu tatas tam*
purōhitō mantradharēṇa sārddham |
yathā vanastham saha vāmadēvō
Rāmaṁ didṛkṣur munir Āurvaśēyaḥ || 9 ||

(6) *Bhīṣmēṇa Gaṅgōdarasaṁbhavēṇa*
Rāmēṇa Rāmēṇa ca Bhārgavēṇa |
śrutvā kṛtam karma pituḥ priyārtham
pitus tvam apy arhasi kartum iṣṭam || 25 ||

(7) *tathā mahīm viprakṛtām anāryāis*
tapōvanād ētya rarakṣa Rāmaḥ || 60 ||

(8) *gṛhapravēśam prati yac ca mē bhavān*
uvāca Rāmaprabhṛtīn nidarśanam |
na tē pramāṇam (78)

To these may be added a half stanza alluding to the legend of Sagara related in Book I of the Rāmāyaṇa, but known from other sources also.

*vēlām samudrē Sagaraś ca dadhē
nēkṣvākavō yām prathamam babandhuḥ || I, 49 ||*

The Ikṣvākus are named in two or three stanzas more, viz. VII, 6; IX, 4 and XII, 1. Other stray allusions to legends or personages occurring among others in the Rāmāyaṇa will teach us nothing. — So much may suffice with respect to references to the Rāmāyaṇa. It is not unimportant that four of them out of eight are concerned with Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa as well as that almost all of them are limited to two consecutive Cantos of the Buddhacarita. It should be also noticed that with the exception of the vaguer ones all references quoted above are met with in connexion with Chanda's dismissal and his return to Kapilavāstu. It is clear that the corresponding scenes of the Rāmāyaṇa must have impressed themselves very strongly upon the poet's mind. This inference is borne out by a comparison of the parallel stanzas occurring in the both poems. The most interesting ones will of course be found in Canto VIII of the Buddhacarita.

Before turning to them, however, I have thought it worth while to quote the first fourteen stanzas of it in full, in order to make the general parallelism appear more evident. They run as follows :

*tatas turaṅgāvacaraḥ sa durmanās
tathā vanam bhartari nirmamē gatē |
cakāra yatnam pathi śōkanigrahē
tathāpi cāivāśru na tasya cikṣiyē || 1 ||
yam ēkarātrēṇa tu bhartur ājñayā
jagāma mārgam saha tēna vājinā |
iyāya bhartur viraham vicintayam
tam ēva panthānam ahōbhir aṣṭabhiḥ || 2 ||
hayaś ca sāujā vicacāla Kanthakas
tatāma bhāvēna babhūva nirmadaḥ |
alamkṛtaś cāpi tathāiva bhūṣaṇāir
abhūd gataśrīr iva tēna varjitaḥ || 3 ||
nivṛtya cāivābhimukhas tapōvanam
bhr̥ṣam jihēṣe karuṇam muhur muhuḥ |
kṣudhānvitō 'py adhvani śaṣpam ambu vā
yathā purā nābhimananda nādadē || 4 ||*

tatō vihīnam Kapilāhvayam puram
 mahātmanā tēna jagaddhitātmanā |
 kramēṇa tāu śūnyam ivōpajagmatur
 divākarēṇeva vinākṛtam nabhaḥ || 5 ||
 sapuṇḍarīkāir api śōbhitam jalāir
 alamkṛtam puṣpadharāir nagāir api |
 tad ēva tasyōpavanam vanōpamam
 gatapraharṣāir na rarāja nāgarāiḥ || 6 ||
 tatō bhramadbhir diśi dīnamānasāir
 anujjvalāir bāṣpahatēkṣaṇāir narāiḥ |
 nivāryamāṇāv api tāv ubhāu puram
 śanāi rajaḥsnātam ivābhijagmatuḥ || 7 ||
 niśamya ca srastaśarīragāmināu
 vināgatāu Śākyakularsabhēṇa tāu |
 mumōca bāṣpam pathi nāgarō janah
 purā rathē Dāśarathēr ivāgatē || 8 ||
 atha bruvantaḥ samupētamanyavō
 janāḥ pathi cChandakam āgatāśravaḥ |
 kva rājaputraḥ kularāṣṭravardhanō
 hṛtas tvayāsāv iti prṣṭhatō 'nvayuh || 9 ||
 tataḥ su tām bhaktimatō 'bravīj janān
 narēndraputram na parityajāmy aham |
 rudann aham tēna tu nirjanē vanē
 grhasthavēṣaś ca visarjitāv iti || 10 ||
 idam vacas tasya niśamya tē janāḥ
 suduṣkaram khalv iti niścayam yayuh |
 patad vijahruḥ salilam na nētrajam
 manō nininduh saphalāgham ātmanah || 11 ||
 athōcur adyāiva viśāma tad vanam
 gataḥ sa yatra dvīparājavikramaḥ |
 jīviṣā nāsti hi tēna nō vinā
 yathēndriyāṇām vigamē śaīrinām || 12 ||
 idam puram tēna vivarjitam vanam
 vanam ca tat tēna samanvitam puram |
 na śōbhatē tēna vinādya naḥ puram
 Marutvatā Vṛtravadhē yathā divam || 13 ||
 punaḥ kumārō vinivṛtta ity athō
 gavākṣamālāḥ pratipēdirē 'ṅganāḥ |

viviktapṛṣṭham ca niśamya vājinam
punar gavākṣāṇi pidhāya cukruśuḥ || 14 ||
praviṣṭadīkṣas tu sutōpalabdhayē
vratēna śōkēna ca khinnamānasah |
jajāpa dēvāyatanē narādhipaś
cakāra tās tās ca yathāśrayāḥ kriyāḥ || 15 ||
tataḥ sa bāṣpapratipūrṇalōcanas
turaṅgam ādāya turaṅgapālakah |
vivēśa śōkābhihatō nṛpālayam
kṣayam vinītē ripuṇēva bhartari || 16 ||

With the above have to be compared the following ślōkas of the Rāmāyaṇa (sarga 57, 3 sqq.):

anujñātaḥ Sumantrō 'tha yōjayitvā hayōttamān |
Ayōdhyām ēva nagarīm prayayāu gādhadurmanāḥ || 3 ||
sa vanāni sugandhīni saritaś ca sarāṁsi ca |
paśyan yattō yayāu śīghram grāmāni nagarāni ca || 4 ||
tataḥ sāyāhnasamayē dvitīyē 'hani sārathiḥ |
Ayōdhyām samanuprāpya nirānandām dadarśa ha || 5 ||
sa śūnyām iva niḥśabdām dṛṣṭvā paramadurmanāḥ |
Sumantraś cintayāmāsa śōkavēgasamāhataḥ || 6 ||
kaccin na sagajā sāsīvā sajanā sajanādhipā |
Rāmasaṁtāpaduḥkhēna dagdhā śōkāgninā purī || 7 ||
iti cintāparaḥ sūtō vājibhiḥ śīghrayāyibhiḥ |
nagaradvāram āsādyā tvaritaḥ pravivēśa ha || 8 ||
Sumantram abhidhāvantaḥ śataśō 'tha sahasraśah |
kva Rāma iti pṛcchantah sūtam abhyadravan narāḥ || 9 ||
tēṣām śaśaṁsa Gaṅgāyām aham āpṛcchya Rāghavam |
anujñātō nivṛttō 'smi dhārmikēṇa mahātmanā || 10 ||
tē tīrṇā iti vijñāya bāṣpapūrṇamukhā narāḥ |
ahō dhig iti niḥśvasya hā Rāmēti vicukruśuḥ || 11 ||
śuśrāva ca vacas tēṣām vṛndam vṛndam ca tiṣṭhatām |
hatāḥ smaḥ khalu yē nēha paśyāma iti Rāghavam || 12 ||
dānayaajñavivāhēṣu samājēṣu mahatsu ca |
na drakṣyāmaḥ punar jātu dhārmikam Rāmam antarā || 13 ||
kiṁ samartham janasyāśya kiṁ priyam kiṁ sukhāvaham |
iti Rāmēṇa nagaram pitrēva paripālitaḥ || 14 ||

vātāyanagatānām ca strīṇām anvantarāpanam |
Rāmam evābhitaptānām śuśrāva paridēvanām || 15 ||
sa rājamārgamadhyēna Sumantraḥ pihitānanaḥ |
yatra rājā Daśarathas tad evōpayayāu grham || 16 ||
yō 'vatīrya rathāc chīghraṁ rājavēśma praviśya ca |
kakṣyāḥ saptaḥcakra mā mahājanasamākulāḥ || 17 ||

The order in which the events follow each other in both poems is much the same. First, the charioteer's return-journey and his entrance into the capital, sadly changed through the absence of the young prince. Then a vivid scene showing the charioteer assailed by citizens, greedy of news. Their lament and dejectedness. The women's precipitate running at the windows and their withdrawing, in deep depression, to the inner apartments. Finally, the charioteer's entrance into the king's presence. The parallelism is undeniable. It will appear still more striking if a number of stanzas of the Buddhacarita be singled out and examined one by one. Thus we have :

hayaś ca sāujā vicacāla Kanthakas
śatāma bhāvēna babhūva nirmadaḥ |
 BC. VIII 3 ab.

mama tv aśvā nivṛttasya
na prāvartanta vartmani |
uṣṇam aśru vimuñcanti
Rāmē samprasthitē vanam ||
 R. II 59, 1.

athōcur adyāiva viśāma tad vanam
gataḥ sa yatra dvijarājavikramaḥ |
 BC. VIII 12 ab.

tē Lakṣmaṇa iva kṣipram
sapatnyaḥ sahabāndhavāḥ |
gacchantam anugacchāmō
yēna gacchatī Rāghavaḥ ||
udyānāni parityajya
kṣētrāṇi ca grhāṇi ca |
ēkaduḥkasukhā Rāmam
anugacchāma dhārmikam ||
 R. II 33, 16. 17.
 Cp. also II 36, 33; II 37. 25—27.

idaṁ puram tēna vivarjitam vanam
vanam catat tēna samanvitam puram |

vanam nagaram evāstu
yēna gacchatī Rāghavaḥ |

*asmābhiś ca parityaktam
puraṁ sampadyatām vanam ||*
R. II 33, 22.

*nahi tad bhavitā rāṣṭram
yatra Rāmō na bhūpatiḥ |
tad vanam bhavitā rāṣṭram
yatra Rāmō nivatsyati ||*
R. II 37, 29.

Cp. also 71, 24 ab.

*na śōbhate tēna vinādya naḥ puraṁ
Marutvatā Vṛtravadhē yathā divam ||*
BC. VIII 13.

*tatas tv Ayōdhyā rahitā ma-
[hātmanā
Puraṁdarēṇēva mahī saparvatā |
cacāla*
R. II 41, 20 ab.

*vivēśa śōkābhihatō nṛpālayam
kṣayam vinītē ripuṇēva bhartari ||*
BC. VIII 16 cd.

*vinītavīrapuruṣam
praviśya tu nṛpālayam |*
R. II 33, 28 ab.
Cp. also 52, 41 quoted above p. 28.

The evident parallelism of such passages as f. i. the last two quoted above is no doubt very significant. In my opinion it proves that Book II of the Rāmāyana as known to Aśvaghoṣa must have resembled our present text in such a degree that there is no reason to believe it was different from it. But if this inference is correct, as indeed I am sure it is, then we are able to assure the sense of *suduṣkaram*, BC VIII 11 and 77 which has been differently explained by recent interpreters. Here too, we can avail ourselves of some parallel ślōkas :

*idaṁ vacas tasya niśamya tu janāḥ
suduṣkaram khalvitiniścayam yayuḥ |*
BC. VIII 11 ab.

*taṁ vipram agnyagārastham
vanditvā Lakṣmaṇō 'bravīt |
sakhē 'bhyāgaccha paśya tvam
vēśma duṣkarakāriṇaḥ ||*
R. II 32, 2.

*duṣkaram kriyatē putra
sarvathā Rāghava priya |*



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

HOLY BIBLE

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

charīram ōjasvi vanē bhaviṣyati ||
kulēna sattvēna balēna varcasā
śrutēna lakṣmyā vayasā ca garvitaḥ |
prodātum evābhyucitō na yācitum
katham sa bhikṣāṁ parataś cariṣyati ||
śucāu śayitvā śayanē hiraṇmayē
prabōdhyamānō niśi turyanisvanāiḥ |
katham bata svapsyati sō'dya mē vratī
paṭāikadēśāntarītē mahītalē ||

BC. VIII 55—58.

Cp. also:

vimānaśayanārham hi
sāukumāryam idam kva ca |
kharadarbhāṅkuravatī
tapōvanamahī kva ca ||

BC. VI 28.

prasannāḥ pānabhōjanam ||
sa katham nu kaṣāyāṇi
tiktāni kaṭukāni ca |
bhakṣayan vanyam āhāraṁ
sutō mē vartayiṣyati ||
mahārhastrasambuddhō
bhūtvā ciraśukhōcitaḥ |
kāṣāyaparidhānas tu
katham Rāmō bhaviṣyati ||

R. II 12, 95—98.

kva nu vatsyati dharmātmā
vṛkṣamūlam upāśritaḥ |
sō 'tyantasukhitaḥ sūta
kim aśiṣyati Rāghavaḥ ||
duḥkhasyānucitō duḥkham
Sumantra śayanōcitaḥ |
bhūmipālātmaṇō bhūmau
śētē katham anāthavat ||

R. II 58, 5. 6.

Cp. also II, 24, 2. 3.

Such coincidences as f. i.

. *ucitam*
mahārhastra |
katham
. *bhaviṣyati ||*

mahārhastra
. *ucitaḥ |*
.
katham *bhaviṣyati ||*

cannot be due to chance. Aśvaghoṣa was of course an independent poet (he needs no defence!) but he must have read the ślōkas quoted above.

Another stanza of Aśvaghoṣa's occurring in the same Canto and referring to king Śuddhōdana has got an exceptionally convincing parallel in a similar stanza of the Rāmāyaṇa. Compare:

niśāmya ca cChandakakanthakāv ubhāu
sutasya samśrutya ca niścayam sthiram |
papāta śōkābhīhatō mahīpatiḥ
Śacīpatēr vṛtta ivōtsavē dhvajah ||

BC. VIII 73.

and

*saṁraktanētraḥ śithilāmbaras tathā
vibhūtasarvābharaṇaḥ paramatapah !
babhūva bhūmāu patitō nṛpātmajaḥ
Śacīpatēḥ kētur ivōtsavakṣayē ||*

R. II 74, 36, (Cp. 77, 9).

An instance of identical anuprāsa is the following:

gatō nṛdēvaḥ sa hi dēvi dēvavat || *dēvi dēvasya pādāu ca*
BC. VIII 43. *dēvavat paripālaya ||*

R. II 58, 18.

Cp.:

*dēvi dēvaś ca dēvī ca
samāgamyā madantarē |
mantrayētē*

R. II 16, 15.

*papāta sahasā dēvī
dēvatēva divaś cyutā ||*

R. II 20, 32.

We will now turn to instances occurring in the remaining Cantos of the Buddhacarita. Some of them are no less convincing as can be seen from the quotations given below.

*tasyātiśōbhāvisṛtātiśōbhā
raviprabhā vāstatamaḥprabhāvā |*

BC. I 15.

*vyarājayata Vāidēhī
vēśmā tat suvibhūṣitā |
udyatō 'mśumataḥ kālē
kham̐ prabhēva vivasvataḥ ||*

R. II 39, 18.

As an instance of the same simile repeated in a much later work the following half-stanza may be quoted:

*jyōtsnēva candramasam acchavibhēva sūryam̐
tam̐ bhūmipālakam abhūṣayad āyatākṣī ||*

Haricandra, Campūjīvandhara, ed. T. S. Kuppusvami Sastri, Tanjore 1905, I v. 17.

*stēyādibhiś cāpy abhitaś ca naṣṭam̐
svastham̐ svacakram̐ paracakra-
[muktam |*

*nānāvṛṣṭir babhūvāsmīn
na durbhikṣaḥ satām̐ varē |*

*kṣemam subhikṣam ca babhūva tasya
purānaranyasya yathāiva rāṣṭrē ||*
BC. II 15.

*Anaranyē mahārājē
taskarō vāpi kaścana ||*
R. II 110, 10.

tataḥ kṛtē śrīmati rājamārgē
BC. III 6 a.

*rājamārgaḥ kṛtaḥ śrīmān
pāurāi Rāmābhiṣēcanē ||*
R. II 6, 17.

kōkilō yatra kūjati ||
BC. IV 44 d.

kōkilas tāta kūjati ||
R. II 52, 2 d.

What deserves attention in the above instance is the identical position occupied by the same words in the pāda.

*viyuḍyamānē hi tarāu
puṣpāir api phalair api |
patati cchidyamānē vā
tarur anyō na śōcati ||*
BC. IV 61.

*bhidyamānam ivāśaktas
trātum anyō nagō nagam |*
R. II 63, 43.

kutō ratim
BC. IV 98 c.

kutō ratiḥ |
R. II 12, 11 b.

Same remark as regarding the last but one quotation. The position is at the end of a pāda of a vaṁśastha stanza.

*tyaja buddhim imām atipravṛttām
avahāsyō 'tīmanōrathō 'kramaś ca ||*
BC. V 36.

*atīkrāntam atīkrāntam
anavāpya manōratham |*
R. II 87, 17 ab.

*imam Tārksyōpamajavam
turaṅgam anugacchatā |
darśitā sāumya madbhaktir
vikramaś cāyam ātmanah ||*
BC. VI 5.

*gatiṁ khara ivāśvasya
Tārksyasyēva patattriṇaḥ |
anugantum na śaktir mē
gatiṁ tava mahīpatē ||*
R. II 105, 6.

BC. VI 37 reminds us, in a certain way, of R. II 52, 45.

*yō hi candramasas tāikṣṇyam
kathayēc chraddadhīta vā |
sa dōṣāṁś tava dōṣajña
kathayēc chraddadhīta vā ||*
BC. VI 40.

*nahi kaṁcana paśyāmō
Rāghavasyāguṇam vayam |
durlabhō hy asya nirayaḥ
śaśāṅkasyēva kalmaṣam ||*
R. II 37, 27.

*mahatyā tṛṣṇayā duḥkhāir
garbhēṇāsmi yayā dhṛtaḥ |
tasyā niṣphalayatnāyāḥ
kvāhaṁ mātuh kva sā mama ||*
BC. VI 45.

*mayā hi cirapuṣṭēna
duḥkhasaṁvardhitēna ca |
viprayujyata Kāusalyā
phalakālē dhig astu mām ||*
R. II 53, 20.

The purport of the pathological exclamation being much the same in both cases, Aśvaghoṣa has yet succeeded to give it a much deeper turn.

*Sarvārthasiddhō vapuṣābhibhūya
tam āśramam siddha iva prapēdē ||*
BC. VII 1.

*balēna guptō Bharatō mahātmā
.
.
grhād yayāu siddha ivēndra-
[lōkāt ||*
R. II 70, 30.

*...astam ca yayāu vivasvān |
...tapahpraśāntam sa vanam vivēśa ||*
BC. VII 32.

*naṣṭajvalanaśamātāpā
praśāntādhyāyasatkriyā |
timirēṇānuliptēva
tadā sā nagarī babhāu ||*
R. II 48, 34.

So we see that Cowell was right, despite Böhtlingk's objection, when taking *tapahpraśānta* to mean 'where penances had now ceased'. BC. IX 24 reminds one of R. II 59, 28—31.

*pranaṣṭavatsām iva vatsalām gām
BC. IX, 26 c.*

*sāham gāur iva śimhēna
vivatsā vatsalā kṛtā |*
R. II 43, 18.

*śōkāgninā tvadvirahēndhanēna
niḥśvāsadhūmēna tapahśikhēna |
tvaddarśanam vāñchati dahyamānam
antaḥpuram cāiva puram ca kṛtsnam ||*
BC. IX 29.

*ayam tu mām ātmabhavas
tavādarśanamārutaḥ |
vilāpaduḥkhasamidhō
ruditāśruhutāhutiḥ ||
cintābāṣpamahādhūmas
tavāgamanacintajaḥ |
karśayitvādhikam putra
niḥśvāsāyāsasaṁbhavaḥ ||
tvayā vihīnām iha mām
śōkāgnir atulō mahān |*

*pradhakṣyati yathā kakṣyam
citrabhānur himātyayē ||*

R. II 24, 6. 7. 8.

BC. XIII 49 b *cittamōham* has been conjectured by Speyer for the meaningless *mōhacittam* of the MSS. (*mōhacitram*, Böhtlingk). The compound *cittamōha* occurs twice in Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa viz. 12, 2 b and 64, 72 c. Cp. also *buddhimōha*, ib. 73, 24 c.

I have also noticed a rather considerable number of coincidences of minor importance. They reveal to us many an interesting particular concerning the technical side of Aśvaghōṣa's poetry. For this reason I have thought it better to relegate them into a full commentary on the Buddhacarita which I intend to publish along with a revised text of that poem.

What has been said and quoted thus far, enables us to conclude with a sufficient amount of certainty that at the time of Aśvaghōṣa there existed at least Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa, (but most probably the remaining genuine books also) in much the same form as it is known to us to-day. It can be added that the great Buddhist poet was influenced by Vālmīki in no lesser degree than he has himself influenced the greatest classical poet of India, Kālidāsa. Both of them must have devoted a careful study to the works of their respective predecessors. A detailed comparison of the poems of the three great makers of Sanskrit — Vālmīki, Aśvaghōṣa, Kālidāsa — shows, how much patient labour and assiduous exertion, in the course of long centuries, was needed, before assuring to the Sanskrit language the renown of the most refined means of poetical expression the world has ever witnessed.

3. Critical notes on the printed text of the Jātakamālā.

The second issue of Prof. Kern's admirable edition of the Jātakamālā is a stereotyped impression. Accordingly, the editor was obliged to renounce the opportunity of improving the text by adopting the numerous corrections contained in a list of errata prefixed to it. Let us hope that this neglect — for such it is, after all — will be compensated in a third edition, no more a mere

reprint of the present one. This is all the more desirable as the list of corrigenda which is fronting page 1 of the printed text, can be increased by some twenty or twenty five errors which have escaped the revisor's attention. But there is another list of corrections which should be had in view before proceeding to the revision of our text for a future edition. As is well known, the late Prof. Speyer has published an English version of Ārya-Śūra's book, one of the very best translations of a Sanskrit text we can boast. In the course of his work the learned translator (who was more deeply familiar with the Genius of the Language than are most Sanskrit scholars outside India) has brought a rather large number of corrections and conjectural emendations of various passages of the original text. His remarks should not have passed unobserved. But of course neither the editor nor the translator were able to purge the text for good and all of all those minute and yet troublesome defects of reading and deficiencies of style for which the Nepalese MSS. are distinguished. So I have made up my mind to give here a selection from my notes on the Jāta-kamālā taken now and then on the occasion of repeated perusal of that work. In the first place I will point out half a dozen metrical blunders occurring in the printed text and not discovered by Speyer. They are:

- II, 4d. *mahāhradam vanagajā yathāiva.*
Read: *vanyagajā.*
- IX, 20c. *dharmānurāgān nayanīrapēkṣas*
Read: *nirvyapēkṣas.*
- X, 35b. *syāc chīlē 'pi lōkapaktyabhimukhaḥ svargē ca jātasprhaḥ |*
A light syllable is wanting after 'pi. 'pi ca is probably the true reading.
- XIII, 23d. *alam madudpīdanāśaṅkayā tē ||*
Read: *madutpīdanāśaṅkayā.*
- XVII, 13a. *yat pītvā madadōṣavihvalatayāsvatantraś caran.*
Two heavy syllables are wanting after °vihvalatayā, but I am unable to restore the original reading.
- XXXII, 33a. *vyāghrāḥ pibānti rudhirāṇi vanamṛgāṇām.*
Read: *vanē mṛgāṇām.* Speyer's translation 'the deer of the forest' should be slightly modified.

Of course I don't affirm to have discovered all passages which break the metre, but the examples quoted above in addition to nearly as many others corrected by Speyer prove beyond dispute that the printed text of the Jātakamālā is still open to criticism, despite the careful treatment it has received at the hands of Prof. Kern. This fact may serve as the *raison d'être* of the corrections I am going to propose. They should not be regarded as purely arbitrary suggestions. Some of them are sure emendations; some others deserve to be taken into consideration.

V, 25. *sāmpattir ēva vittānām adhruvā sthitir ātmanah |*
iti yācanakam labdhvā na samṛddhir avēkṣyatē ||

The latter half of this stanza has been rendered by Speyer as follows: 'we need not care for riches when getting a mendicant'. The translation is of course irreproachable, but it shows that there is something wrong in the original text. Śakra tries to avert Avisaḥya i. e. Bōdhisattva from giving to the poor his own necessities of life. He says: Don't give away the few you can procure but wait till you have recovered your former wealth and can afford to gratify the mendicants. (Cp. for instance: *itthamgataḥ sann api cēn na dadyā yāyāḥ punaḥ pūrvasamṛddhiśōbhām* v. 9; or: *paryāptavibhavasya... ayam kramō nēmām daśām abhiprapannasya*, p. 25, ll. 5—7 etc.) Now the stanza quoted above contains a refutatory answer to Śakra's arguments. Accordingly, *apēkṣyate* should be read instead of *avēkṣyatē*. The meaning is: 'we must not wait for riches i. e. wait till we acquire some, when a mendicant is there and cries for instant help'.

VIII, 36 ab. *asamstutānām api na kṣamēya*
pīḍām katham kāiva kathā bhavatsu.

katham is wholly superfluous and very hard to explain; moreover, inelegant. It is omitted in Speyer's translation which runs as follows: 'I am not capable of bearing the pain of strangers, how then can you suppose I should bear your suffering?' I think we have to read *pīḍām aham*. *katham* is probably due to the inadvertence of a copyist who anticipated two akṣaras of the following *kathā*.

VIII, 42d. *samcikṣipē na kṣatajam kṣarad vā.*



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



HISTORY

Tens of thousands of important historical sources, many previously unobtainable, are now available for the first time with a Forgotten Books Full Membership.

Unlimited Access
\$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

I should propose *asaṅga* (Loc. absol.) Speyer has 'having lost their hold'.

XI, 6. *tataḥ pravṛttē tumulē sphūrjatpraharaṇē raṇē |*
paṭahadhvaninōtkruṣṭāiḥ sphuṭatīva nabhastalam ||

I read *nabhastalē* because *raṇē* b is the first of a long series of absolute locatives extending over vv. 6—9 and determining v. 10. Moreover, only past tenses are used throughout the description of that battle.

P. 98, l. 14. *pravirurōhatuḥ*

Can this be the reading of the MSS?

P. 102, l. 1. *apūrvāḥ khalv ayam atrabhavataḥ paśya vi-*
krayārambhaḥ |

The position of *paśya* is decidedly suspected. Read: *paṇyavikrayā°* which is warranted by *paṇyānām vikrayakramaḥ* (= *paṇyavikrayārambhaḥ*) in the stanza immediately following and completing the words just quoted (v. 9) as well as by the same blunder detected and corrected by Speyer in v. 15d, viz. *sā paṇyatām* (for *paśya tām* of the printed text) *upagatā nihitātra kumbhē*.

XVII, 28 ab. *laghur api ca vipākō madyapānasya yaḥ syān*
manujagatigatānām śīladṛṣṭīḥ sa hanti |

The plural *śīladṛṣṭīḥ* can be defended (on account of the plurality of its complement) but nonetheless *śīladṛṣṭī* seems better. Speyer has: 'the good conduct and the good understanding'.

P. 111 l. 20 & p. 118, l. 3. *pratinivṛtya*

Somewhat unusual, if not a simple misreading: I should like to change it to *pratinivṛtṭya* ('went back' & 'turned back', Speyer).

P. 120, ll. 6—7. *kāryaśēṣaṇṣamāptyāyācñayā*

This has been changed by the learned editor himself to °*parisamāpti-yācñayā*, a substantive *āyācñā* being unknown (Various Readings, ad locum). I think the true reading lies nearer at hand. Separate: °*parisamāptyā* (Gen.) *yācñayā*.

XX, 29. *nivāraṇārthāni sagadgadāni*
vākyāni sāsṛūṇi ca lōcanāni |

*praṇāmalōlāni śirāṃsi cāiṣāṃ
mānaṃ samānasya yathā karōti ||*

mānaṃ cannot be possibly good. Since the Accusative is excluded by the general structure of the clause and the neuter gender by grammar, we must read *mānaḥ*. Speyer's translation is: 'As sure as it is great regard for their friend deserving regard, that makes their eyes full of tears etc.'

XXII, 33 a. *antaḥ sapatnaḥ kōpō 'yaṃ*

It seems better to take *antaḥsapatnaḥ* as a compound word.

P. 137, ll. 11—12. *tāu haṃsapradhānāu kāñcanapuñjāv iva śriyābhijvalanmanōhararūpāu.*

The last complex of akṣaras must be taken to represent *śriyā abhi-jvalanmanōhararūpāu* (for of course it cannot be divided into *śriyābhijvalan* (Nom.) referring to the king mentioned shortly before and *manōhararūpāu* qualifying the two swans). Now, such a construction might be defended in a less accomplished stylist but not in Arya Śūra. So I think we ought to read *śriyābhijvalantāu*; cp. *śriyā jvalantam* 169, 25. Speyer translates freely.

XXII, 81. *aśaṅkitōktāiḥ praṇayākṣarāiḥ suhṛt
karōti tuṣṭiṃ vibhavasthitasya yāṃ |
na tadvidhāṃ lambhayatē sa tām dhanāir
mahōpakāraḥ praṇayaḥ suhṛtsv ataḥ ||*

Speyer's translation runs as follows: 'A friend expressing his wants in frank speech, causes a greater satisfaction to a wealthy man, than he could obtain from his riches. For this reason, unreservedness among friends is a great benefit'. Neither the text nor the translation can satisfy. The former must be faulty, because *tām* is clearly pleonastic on account of *tadvidhāṃ* in the same line; the latter does not seem correct, because the causative shade of *lambhayatē* c as opposed to *karōti* b should not be neglected. A very slight correction enables us to restore perfect order. I read *taṃ* for *tām* and translate the first three pādas as follows: 'Greater is the satisfaction which a friend expressing his wants in frank terms, prompted by love, causes to a wealthy man, than that which the latter (sa) causes to him (taṃ) by dint of his riches'. The idea is

common in Indian as well as in European literatures. Cp. the following stanza:

*na tathā ratnam āsādyā sujanah parituṣyati |
yathā tat tadgatākāṅkṣē pātrē dattvā prahṛṣyati ||*

‘A noble-minded man takes less delight in procuring a treasure than in bestowing it on a worthy person who has set his heart upon it’. (Bhāsa, Avimāraka, Act IV, v. 14).

XXIV, 42. *imam viditvā nṛpa mitrapakṣē
prabhāvasiddhī sadasatpravṛttyōḥ |
bhajasva mārgam sujanābhipannam
tēna prayātam anuyāti bhūtiḥ ||*

Speyer says: ‘Thus knowing the power and the consequences of good and evil behaviour with respect to friends, O king, hold fast to the road followed by the virtuous. He who goes along on this will attain happiness’. Now, as the text runs, *imam* can be construed only with *mārgam* which is extremely hard. Here again, a very slight and natural emendation viz. *imē* (agreeing with *prabhāvasiddhī*) will at once restore the correct construction as well as the logical connection with the foregoing. In fact, the power and the consequences of good behaviour with respect to friends have been spoken of in v. 41 while those of evil behaviour form the subject of the whole story and quite specially of v. 40. Speyer translates as if there were *evam*[*viditvā* which is virtually the same as *imē*.

XXVII, 10cd. *svasamjñayā yūtham athādidēśa
drumād ataḥ śīghram abhiprayāyāt ||*

„he ordered his tribe, ‘making them a signal proper to his race, to come quickly off the tree’ (Speyer). The peculiar construction of *lin* seems to me very suspected if not incorrect. We have a choice between several ways of emendation. Next at hand there is the imperative *abhiprayātāt* though its use here is a little exposed to syntactical objection (Whitney, Grammar § 571); *abhiprayāta* or *abhiprayāṇē* are likewise possible.

XXVIII, 25. *śubhasvabhāvātisayaḥ prasiddhaḥ
puṇyēna kīrtiyā ca parā vivṛddhiḥ |
atōyasamparkakṛtā viśuddhis
tāis tāir guṇāughāis ca parā samṛddhiḥ ||*

The first pāda of this stanza should be restored to what seems to me the original wording, viz. °*tīṣayā prasiddhiḥ*. This is proved (1) by the rhyme which appears at the end of every pāda in this as well as in the 26-th and 29-th stanzas, (2) by the fact that the predicative epithets of *kṣānti* (l. 7, above), itself a feminine, are feminines throughout the vv. 25—27, (but, of course, a masculine is possible).

XXVIII, 26 a. *parōparōdhēṣu sadānabhijñā*, 'always indifferent to injuries done to them by others' (Speyer). But can *anabhijñā* alone have this meaning? I think not. Should we not read *madānabhijñā*? I think, yes.

XXIX, 18. *yam ēva paśyanti tu savyapatrapam
śamābhijātam vyavahāranāipunam |
gṇam prayacchanti rahō 'pi tadvidhē
tadarpanam hy abhyudayaāvaham dhanam ||*

The last pāda is translated by Speyer 'such a bestowal of money produces bliss'. *tadarpanam*—a bahuvrīhi compound qualifying *dhanam* is grammatically correct, but it cannot be befended from the stylistical point of view, being in fact very clumsy. I think we ought to read *tadarpitam* as shown by *gataṁ hi yat tatra* in the parallel stanza, above 17 d. Translate: 'for money bestowed on him (i. e. on such a man as described in ab) produces bliss'.

XXX, 31. *bhrātā nu tasyāiva mahādvipasya
syād bāndhavō vānyatamō sutō vā |
tasyāiva khalv asya sitādriśōbham
samcūrṇitasyāpi vibhāti rūpam ||*

tasyēva is most probably the correct reading for *tasyāiva*, c.

XXXI, 9. *hatapuruṣakalēvarākulam
rudhirasamukṣitarāudrabhūtalam |
puruṣam iva ruṣāvabhartsayat
sphuṭadahanāir aśivāiḥ śivārutāiḥ ||*

The third pāda is translated by Speyer 'it seemed to threaten everyone'. But *puruṣa* cannot possibly have this meaning. I surmise that we ought to read *paruṣam* (adv.), though it may be granted that *avabhartsayat* should be construed rather with than without on object. The false reading is due to the influence of the first pāda.

225, 5/6. *rājakulē prajānurāgasāumukhyād askhalitābhivṛddhyā ca samṛddhyā samānatadyṛptasāmantayā cābhivyājamānamahābhāgyē. samānatadyṛptasāmantayā* cannot be a bahuvrīhi compound qualifying *samṛddhyā*, because *ca* shows that it is a substantive. I think that the reading of the text (perhaps due to a mere misprint) ought to be corrected into °*sāmantatayā*. Speyer seems to have translated accordingly. He says: 'which (viz. royal family), in consequence of their intentness on possessing the affection of their subjects, was manifested by their increasing prosperity and riches without hindrance, as well as by the submissiveness of their proud vassals'.

XXXII, 2 b. *parasparāślēṣavivṛttaharṣam |*

vivṛddha seems much better. Speyer's translation is very free.

XXX, 10 bc. *jalāni kṛtvā | mēghās*

A rather strange idiom. Should we read *syṣṭvā*? Speyer has: 'the clouds that poured out streams of water'.

XXXII, 28. *dōṣānurūpam prañayanti daṇḍam
kṛtāparādhēṣu nṛpāḥ pārēṣu |
mahāparādhē yadi mṛtyuśatrāu
na daṇḍanītipravaṇā bhavanti ||*

The third pāda is thus rendered by Speyer: 'but if that enemy whose name is Death has greatly sinned against them'. This translation is certainly correct. But then it shows that *yadi* cannot be possibly good. The correct reading is doubtless 'pi tu. In fact, *tu* often recurs in this set of parallel stanzas to which our stanza belongs; 'pi is warranted by *vadhyē* 'pi 30 d, below.

XXXII, 41 ab. *imām avētyāprativāryaraudratām
kṛtāntaśatrōr bhavanē na mē matiḥ |*

matiḥ, b, yields a pretty good meaning but *ratih* is much better. Speyer's rendering shows that it is required by the sense: 'I am no longer pleased with the life at home'.

XXXIII, 3 c. *sa dharmasamjñī 'pi tu (karmalēśāms
tāms tām samāsādyā tathā tathāsīt) ||*

Is *dharmasamjñī* a printer's error? It certainly ought to be corrected into *dharmasamjñō*, a bahuvrīhi that recurs on the

same page, l. 16. *hi* for *'pi* can also be thought of both particles being not seldom interchanged in careless MSS.

234, 21. *tēna hi na tvam asyāḥ kadācit prabādhānāyā mōkṣyasē* |
asya for *asyāḥ* seems to be more obvious; cp. v. 8 cd, above.

XXXIV, 19. *kṛtaś cēd dharma ity ēva*
kas tatrānuśayaḥ punaḥ |
atha pratyupakārārtham
ṛṇadānam na tat kṛtam ||

kṛtam is probably the genuine reading in the first pāda.

4. The epical poems of Aśvaghōṣa and the Divyāvadāna.

1. The collection of Buddhist legends known as the Divyāvadāna and edited by Cowell and Neil, Cambridge 1886, is no uniform work written by one single author. It was compiled from different sources by at least two but probably more writers. The whole thus bearing the character of a compilation its various portions cannot be assigned to one definite epoch. The date of each story or cycle of stories has to be examined separately. So it is the aim of the following lines to fix the *terminus ante quem non* of the interesting cycle of legends which relate to Aśōka's history and are given as Nss. XXVI—XXIX of the collection bearing in their respective colophons the titles Pāṃśupra-dānāvadāna, Kunāla°, Vītaśōka° and Aśōka°. A simple perusal of these stories shows however that the subdivision mentioned above is purely arbitrary. After all we have to do with one great legend extending over pp. 348—434, which, for all one feels tempted to say about its internal incoherence, may fairly lay claim to be called simply Aśōkāvadāna or the Legend of Aśōka.

The *terminus ante quem non* of this cycle of Aśōka-legends can be assured beyond any doubt by the indisputable fact of its author having known both the epical poems of Aśvaghōṣa, the Buddhacarita and the Sāundarananda.

Prof. Leumann was the first to point out that a stanza occurring in the former poem is quoted in a somewhat corrupt form in the Kunālāvadāna of our collection. It reads as follows:

*tatō nṛpas tasya niśāmya bhāvaṃ
 putrābhīdhānasya manōrathasya |
 snēhāc ca yōgyaṃ manasā ca buddhvā
 ājñāpayāmāsa vihāya yātrām ||* ¹⁾

Divyāvadāna p. 408 1 ff.

Now there is always the possibility of interpolation to be considered whenever a single stanza of an earlier poem is quoted anonymously in a later work. But in this case interpolation cannot be thought of as the immediately following prose is a palpable paraphrase of the immediately following stanzas of the Buddhacarita. For convenience' sake both passages are given here on parallel columns:

*atha rājāśōkō nagaraśōbhāṃ
 mārgaśōbhāṃ ca kṛtvā jīrṇā-
 turakṛpaṇāṃś ca mārgād
 apanīya ēkarathē 'bhiruhya
 kumārēṇa saha Pāṭaliputrān
 nirgataḥ |*

Divyāv. 408, 5—7.

*nivartayāmāsa sa rājamārgē
 saṃpātam ārtasya pṛthagjanasya |
 mā bhūt kumāraḥ sukumāracittaḥ
 saṃvignacētā iti manyamānaḥ ||
 pratyaṅgahīnān vikalēndriyāṃś ca
 jīrṇāturādīn kṛpaṇāṃś ca bhikṣūn |
 tataḥ samutsārya parēṇa sāmṇā
 śōbhāṃ parāṃ rājapathasya cakruḥ ||*
 BC. III, 4. 5. ²⁾

It should be noticed that the prose quoted above is an essential part of the story and cannot be left out without serious prejudice to the whole of it.

Having thus gained a strong footing we may proceed to examine other similar reminiscences. If considered along with the above case they must appear much more convincing than taken alone.

First, there is a stanza occurring in an abstract of Buddha's life supposed to be told by the Sthavira Upagupta, which bears

¹⁾ In the Buddhacarita we find *niśāmya* in the first pāda. The second half of the stanza runs differently viz.

*snēhasya lakṣmyā vayasaś ca yōgyāṃ
 ājñāpayāmāsa vihārayātrām ||*

ājñā found in the text of Divyāv. is of course a printer's error.

²⁾ The Buddhacarita is quoted from my own edition of that poem, ready in MS.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

HOLY BIBLE

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

*dēśē jambūcchāyām niṣadya prathamam dhyānam anāsravapra-
viviktaṁ pāpakāir akuśalāir [kāram ||
dharmāiḥ savitarkam savicā- adhigamya tatō vivēkajam tu
ram vivēkajam prītisukham paramaprītisukham samādhijanyam |
anāsravasadyśam prathama- idam ēva tataḥ param pradadhyāu
dhyānam samāpannaḥ | manasā lōkagatiṁ niśamya samyak ||*

Divyāv. 391, 13—16.

BC. V 10. 11.¹).

The Lalitavistara (p. 129) has not the word *anāsravasadyśam* = *anāsravaprakāram*.

In that portion of the great Aśōka legend which is intitulated Kunālāvadāna there is somewhere told of a boy newly born to a certain Gupta, a perfumer, that as far as beauty is concerned he exceeded simple mortals but did not equal gods:

*yāvad Guptasya gāndhikasya tṛtīyaḥ pūtrō jātō 'bhirūpō darśanīyaḥ
prāsādikō 'tikrāntō mānuṣavarṇam asaṁprāptaś ca divyavarṇam |*

Divyāvadāna 352, 1—3.

Now boys and girls are born almost in every legend of our collection. Most of them are generally no less than mere wonders of beauty. And yet their superiority is nowhere stated in so elegant a manner as just here. As far as I am aware the expression of somebody 'being more than a man but less than a god' is not met with elsewhere in Indian literature, at least not in this concise but pregnant form, except in Sāundarananda IV, 6:

*sā dēvatā nandanacārīṇīva
kulasya nandījananaś ca Nandaḥ |
atītya martyān anupētya dēvān
sṛṣṭāv abhūtām iva bhūtadhātṛā ||*

It seems to me that we cannot but assume a direct influence of Aśvaghōṣa on the other author.

The influence thus stated is probably borne out by some circumstances of less importance. There are some two or three words

¹) The Divyāvadāna proceeds to tell us of the well-known miracle of the motionless shadow (s. Lalitavistara p. 132) which does not occur in the Buddhacarita. It is perhaps worth noticing that the same miracle is mentioned later on in connexion with a boy called Śyāmaka, both passages being almost identical. Prof. Hertel has shown that this is no particular trace of Buddhism but ought to be regarded as generally Indian. Cp. his Pañcatantra (Leipzig, Teubner 1914) p. 374.

and forms rather peculiar to the author of the Buddhacarita that seem to occur in the Aśōka portion of the Divyāvadāna but not elsewhere throughout the entire collection ¹⁾. Such are:

sarvaprajānām ayam antakarmā, BC. III 59 b (which, however, can be corrected to *idam antakarma*); *nāyam tātasyāśōkasya karmā*, Divyāv. 412, 3 f. b.

arya (with short *a*) BC. VIII, 34 c (in *aryaputra*); Divyāv. 399, 12, both forms being secured by metre.

Māra is called *kāmapracārādhīpati* ²⁾ BC. XIII 2 c. In the Divyāv. he bears the epithet of *kāmadhātavadhīpati*, 359, 9.

There is also a verbal form met with in Divyāv. which deserves mentioning in this connexion. In a portion of that work specially conspicuous for traces of the influence of the Buddhacar. we read:

nirupasthāyakō vīraḥ praviṣṭāikas tapōvanam ||
p. 391, ślōka.

praviṣṭāikas is probably best explained as *praviṣṭa(h)ēkas*, through *saṁdhir āṛṣaḥ*. Nevertheless it reminds one of *praviṣṭā* (periphr. future) BC. V 84 d, a form which has been rejected as false by Böhtlingk.

Thus we are forced to the conclusion that the author or compiler of legends XXVI—XXIX of the Divyāvadāna must have lived after Aśvaghōṣa. He was surely acquainted with the works of that poet.

It might be added that the word *dīnāra* which does not appear in India before the second century A. D. occurs twice in this portion of the Divyāvadāna viz. 427, 13 and 434, 12 while it is not found in the remaining stories. The inference is perhaps permitted that the main mass of the legends is older than the second century A. D. But of course an argumentum ex silentio cannot be decisive. At any rate the cycle of legends concerned with the person of Aśōka does contrast with the main bulk of

¹⁾ Of course I cannot speak with complete assurance. The Divyāv., extending over more than 650 pages of small print I may have failed in discovering all coincidences.

²⁾ Prof. Minayev conjectures *kāmāvacārādhīpati* in his Очеркъ фонетики и морфологии языка Пали.

the Divyāvadāna by its rather flowery style and artificial exteriors.

2. In the remaining stories of the Divyāvadāna the influence of Aśvaghōṣa's poetry is limited to some stray passages. In one or two of them it is however beyond dispute. So f. i.

*ṭṣṇānilāiḥ śokaśikhāpracandāis Māyāpi tam kuṣigatam dadhānā
cittāni dagdhāni bahuprakāram | vidyudvilāsam jaladāvalīva |
āśāvatām sapraṇayābhirāmāir dānāmbuṣēkāiḥ paritō janānām
dānāmbuṣēkāiḥ śamayāmbabhūva || dāridryatāpam śamayāmbabhūva || ¹⁾*

Divyāv. 586, 6—4 f. b.

BC. I, 22.

Chance coincidence is hardly admissible. It is directly impossible in the case of the following stanza of the Buddhacarita:

*drṣtvā ca tam rājasutam striyas tā
jājvalyamānam vapuṣā śriyā ca |
dhanyāsyā bhāryēti śanāir avōcañ
śuddhāir manōbhiḥ khalu nānyabhāvāt ||*

III 23.

The stanza refers to Siddhārtha's first pleasure-tour through the streets of Kapilavāstu. Now, a certain king Candraprabha, on a similar occasion, is greeted in exactly the same manner by the women of his capital. The passage runs as follows:

*rājā Candraprabhō yēna yēnāvalōkayati tēna tēna strīsaḥsrāṇy
avalōkayanti | dhanyās tāḥ striyō yēṣām ēṣa bhartēti | t a c c a
śuddhāir manōbhīr nānyathābhāvāt ²⁾ | evaṁ darśanīyō
rājā Candraprabhō babhūva |*

Divyāv. 318, 13—16.

The influence of the Buddhacarita is palpable.

Now, both passages quoted above occur in legends distinguished for a pretty careful, not to say artificial style, much in the same manner as those legends that relate to Aśōka's history. So then we come to the conclusion that legends XXXVIII and XXII of the Divyāvadāna are later than Aśvaghōṣa.

¹⁾ śamayāmbabhūva wit C (= CD) and Bt prima manu in margin.

²⁾ Probably corrupt for nānyabhāvāt.

Another inference to be drawn from what has been said thus far is that the Buddhacarita was better and more widely known to the compilers of the Divyāvadāna than the Sāundarananda. But I must admit that it is also better known to myself which makes discovering of coincidences specially easy.

Appendix.

The late Prof. Speyer has drawn attention to a passage occurring in one of the Aśōka legends of the Divyāvadāna in which a description of a dramatic representation — it is called *nāṭaka* — is given¹). Mr. Huizinga in whose well-known book on the Vidūṣaka Prof. Speyer's observation is to be found, seems to attach an undue importance to that passage, even if one considers that he knew nothing definite about the date of the Divyāvadāna. He certainly exaggerates when he says: Deze plaats is als gegeven voor den ouderdom van het drama naast de plaatsen uit Pânini vooraal daarom van zoo groote warde, omdat hier het woord *nāṭaka* zeif voorkomt, dat absoluut bewijst, dat men met een feitelijk tooneelspeel te doen heeft, terwijl *naṭa*, waar het voorkomt, bij sommigen altijd nog den twijfel kan laten bestaan, of men werkelijk aan tooneelspelers moet denken²). The word *nāṭaka* used in the passage quoted above, foot-note¹), can teach us nothing about dramatic representations in olden times, since the legend in which it occurs is later than Aśvaghōṣa. Nevertheless there is an inference to be drawn from it. It has been considered doubtful whether the word *nāṭaka* as occurring in the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa has the same technical meaning as later on or serves only to denote

¹) *yāvat tṛtīyē 'pi divasē sthaviropaguptaḥ pūrvakālakaraṇīyām kathām kṛtvā satyāny ārabdhaḥ samprakāśayitum Mārēṇa ca nātidūre nāṭakam ārabdham divyāni ca vādyāni sampravāditāni, divyāś cāpsarasō nāṭayitum pravṛttāḥ | yāvad vītarāgō janakāyō divyāni rūpāni dṛṣṭvā divyāmś ca śabdāñ śrutvā Mārēṇākṛṣṭaḥ | atō Mārēṇopaguptasya parṣad ākṛṣṭā prītimanasā Mārēṇa sthaviropaguptasya śirasi mālā baddhā.* (p. 357, 11—19).

²) J. Huizinga, De Vidūṣaka en het indisch tooneel, Groningen 1897, p. 14.

a kind of popular entertainments of a baser sort¹). Here we see that after Aśvaghōṣa i. e. at a time when the classical drama was in full blossom, the word *nāṭaka* is still used in a rather ambiguous sense. For despite Mr. Huizinga's assertion the only conclusion we can reasonably draw from the passage in question is that a *nāṭaka* was a kind of dancing academy accompanied by instrumental music. So it is doubly strange that Speyer has neglected to draw Mr. Huizinga's attention to another particular proving past all doubt that the *nāṭaka* hinted at in the said passage presupposes the existence of real actors availing themselves of costumes and other paraphernalia of dramatic characterisation. I mean the word *nēpathya* 'costume, rôle'. It is used twice viz.:

*Māra uvāca | tēna hi mamāpi samayaḥ śrūyatām |
sahasā tam ihōdvīkṣya Buddhanēpathyadhāriṇam |
na praṇāmas tvayā kāryaḥ sarvajñagurugāuravāt ||*
p. 360, 7—5 f. b.

and again:

*Māraś ca vanagahanam anupraviśya Buddharūpaṁ
kṛtvā naṭa iva saruciranēpathyas tasmād vanagaha-
nād ārabdhō niṣkramitum |*
p. 361, 8—10.

5. Critical Notes on the Sāundarananda.

The Sāundarananda of Aśvaghōṣa has been edited in 1910 (Bibliotheca Indica N. S., 1251) by Mr. Haraprasāda Śāstrī from two Nepal MSS, an older (XII cent.) and a younger one (XVIII cent.). At first sight, the printed text of our poem makes a pretty smooth appearance especially when compared to that of the Buddhacarita. And yet it is scarcely better preserved. I am glad to admit that the editor has done his best to prepare a readable text. The conscientious accuracy displayed by him in deciphering the

¹) For a discussion of these problems see my forthcoming essay in Polish on the Origin of the Indian Drama and the Question of Greek Influence.

dilapidated MSS. cannot be appreciated too highly. On the other hand he is no less commendable for having abstained from too many conjectural readings. In fact, conjectures always bear a stamp of subjectivity and ought rather to be avoided in an editio princeps. Later on they are indispensable and their growing amount should be sifted to the bottom by subsequent editors. In my opinion, every reader of the first edition of a difficult work should try to contribute to the final elucidation of the text. In that view I prepared a pretty long list of conjectural suggestions to numerous passages of the Sāundarananda. It was for some time ready for print when Prof. Hultzsich was kind enough to send me his very valuable paper 'Zu Aśvaghōsha's Saundarananda' (ZDMG 1918, v. 72 pp. 111—144)¹). A considerable number of my corrections having been made accessible by the learned professor who found them independently of me, I was obliged to delay printing in order to recast the original manuscript of my little treatise. It now appears in a new form and I can only hope that some at least of my unpretending suggestions will be approved of by the Sanskrit scholars.

Canto I.

NB. I was unable to have a look at M. Baston's translation of this and the next canto.

27 c. (*tad vanam muninā tēna tāis ca kṣatriyapuṅgavāiḥ |*)
śāntām guptām ca yugapad (brahmakṣatraśriyam dadhē ||)

Read *śāntām guptām ca*. It is the forest that is appeased and protected, but not the abstract *śrī*. 'That forest calm as it was on account of that muni living in it and well-guarded by the presence of those noble heroes, assumed a kind of beauty significant at once of both the brahman and the kshatriya castes'.

31 c *tadāśramamahīm yām tu* cannot be good. *yām* has probably to be changed to *tām* (the same correction is proposed by Prof. Hultzsich). Now, *tad° tām* cannot but be called very clumsy.

¹) I could no more utilise his twin paper 'Zu Aśvaghōsha's Budhacharita' (ibid., pp. 145—156) for my second series of corrections to the BC. It came too late.

But *tadā* — *tām* is no less clumsy because of *tataḥ*, a (cp. Hultsch ad IV, 22). Shall we read *sadāśrama°*?

35 d. The words *vyāyatā viddhavāsasaḥ* seem to have been unduly separated by the editor.

37 b. The words *vṛddhān vyāghraśiśūn iva* contain a contradiction in adiecto. I should like to read *kruddhān*.

50 c. *nājñayā cētanōtkarṣāt*. I am not sure whether the change suggested by Prof. Hultsch viz. *akṣayāś* be really needed. The meaning appears to be: 'Not directed by anybody to do so but prompted by his superior intelligence'.

p. 8 l. 11. Read *Kapilavāstu°* and cp. Hultsch ad 57 d, supra.

Canto II.

8 d. *yō'sya*. Read *yasya*, the long series of relative pronouns vv. 5—9 referring to the king; besides it is better style.

13 a. *dhṛtyāraṁkṣīt pratijñām sa sadvājīvōdyatām dhuram* | The editor's paper MS. (i. e. the younger one) has *arāṁkṣīt*. Read *avāṁkṣīt* which, by the bye, is preferable on account of b. *arāṁkṣīt* occurs infra, 15 c.

17 a. *apyāsīt duḥkhitān paśyan*. It is very little probable that *pyā* should be a transitive parasmāipadi as Prof. Hultsch would have it. Besides *duḥkhitān* depends on *paśyan* which will lose any meaning if its object be construed with another verb. Either *amlāsīt* or *aglāsīt* would seem preferable. Both are used in VI, 34 a (*rurōda mamlāu virurāva jaglāu*).

20 a. *nāsrkṣat kalim aprāptam*. Read: *balim* as in Buddhacarita II, 44 a (*na cājihīrṣīd balim apravṛttam*). Cp. also I 56; II 17, 27.

22 cd. *parasvam bhuvi nāmṛkṣan mahāviṣam ivāu(vō)ragam* | The editor's change of *uragam* to *āuragam* is quite superfluous. *mahāviṣam* is used as a bahuvrīhi compound.

23 a. *nākrakṣad viṣayē tasya kaścīt*. Read: *nākrukṣat*. Printer's error?

24 c. (*kṛtāgasō 'pi praṇatān prāg ēva priyakāriṇaḥ* |)
ādarśasnigdhayā dṛṣṭyā (ślakṣṇēna vacasāsicat ||)

Read: *adarśat snigdhayā dṛṣṭyā*.

31 d. Read *sasyam* for *sasvam*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



HISTORY

Tens of thousands of important historical sources, many previously unobtainable, are now available for the first time with a Forgotten Books Full Membership.

Unlimited Access
\$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

Buddhacar. XIII, 62). And yet it is hardly due to case that both in this poem and in the Buddhacar. the simple word has only the form *dāśika* while *dēśika* is used only in the compound *sudēśika*. Cp. *dāśika*, Sāund. III, 42 c; XIII, 28 d; XVIII, 41 a; Buddhacar. XIII, 62 c; *sudēśika*, Sāund. XVIII, 8 d; 50 d; Buddhacar. XIII, 62 d.

Canto IV.

15 c. *bhavēc ca ruṣṭā kila nāma tasmāi*.

This looks suspected. Several guesses can be made but I am unable to choose between them. *bhūtvā ca*?

22 b. (*Nandas tatō darpaṇam ādarēṇa*)
bibhrat tadā maṇḍanasākṣibhṛtam |

Prof. Hultsch reads *tadāmaṇḍanasācibhūtam* and construes *tad* with *vadanam* in d. Now, *bhṛta* is doubtless no more than a printer's error for *bhūtam* just as *bhṛṣaṇam*, supra, 12 d. *tadā maṇḍana°* is falsely separated instead of *tad-āmaṇḍana°*. So far, then, I can agree with Prof. Hultsch. But °*sākṣi°* is quite correct. The mirror was of course witness of Sundarī's toilet. As to the short -i I can only remark that Aśvaghōṣa is very careful about distinguishing nominal and verbal compounds ending in *bhūta*, cp. for instance *kūrmībhūta* 'one that became a tortoise' but *paṇyabhūta* 'that which is (or was, as the case may be) a merchandise' XI, 45 d; 26 d. Cp. also *sākṣikuruṣva*, XVI, 26 b.

35 d. *vibōdhayēyam ca na cālayēyam*.

A second *ca* is missed. Besides, *cālayēyam* is rather pale and says nothing. Read: *cālapēyam*, i. e. *ca ālapēyam*. Sundarī speaks as a loving coquette should be expected to speak.

36 b. (*athāpy anāśyānaviśēṣakāyām*) *apy eṣyasi*

This is of course quite wrong, *api-api* cannot be good and the bahuvrīhi compound in a demands a subject. Read: *mayy eṣyasi* as shown by numerous passages referring to ours, cp. VII 19 a (and my note thereto, infra, ad locum); VI, 13 d.

36 d. Should we read *vibhūṣitēna* (viz. *bhujadvayēna*) for *vibhūṣaṇēna*?

37 b. (*ity evam uktaś ca nipīḍitaś ca*)
tayā sa vēṇusvanayā jagāma |

But the next half-line contains Nanda's answer to the entreating words of his wife. He is not yet going, nay, he cannot go being still embraced by Sundarī (supra 33 a: *sā parisasvajē tam*, and 37 a: *nipīḍitaś ca tayā*). *jagāma* must be corrected to *jagāda*.

43 ab. *adarśanam bhūyagataś ca tasyā*
harmyāt tataś cāvatatāra tūrṇam |

Prof. Hultsch reads: *adarśanībhūya gataś ca tasyā*. He is no doubt quite right in correcting °*nam* to °*nī*. But a change of subject must be indicated by the corresponding personal pronoun. So I should like to read:

adarśanībhūya gatē ca tasmin
harmyāt tataḥ sāvatatāra tūrṇam |

The change cannot be said too violent for a Nepal MS and the text has gained in fluency of style.

Canto V.

3 c. *tutas tatra* — „Wohl ein blosser Druckfehler für *tatas tatra*“ says Prof. Hultsch. But if not, then *tu tat tatra* is likewise possible and just as good. Cp. *snēhāstadā* (paper MS.) for *snēhāt tayā* VI, 44 b.

8 d. *grhasya kakṣā[n] mahatō 'bhyasūyan ||*

This is a conjecture of the editor's. The MSS. read: *kakṣyāmahatō* (palm leaf) and *kakṣāmahatō* (paper). Either of these variants being preferable to the printed text, the Buddhacarita decides in favour of the first and older one (*grhakakṣyām prathamam vinirjagāma ||* V, 67 d). As to the form of the compound it is familiar to our poet, cp. *āryasya ārambhamahataḥ* II, 61 c; *abhijanamahatō manasvinaḥ* VIII, 57 a; *śrutamahatā śramaṇēna* IX, 50 b. This kind of tatpuruṣa compounds is common to elegant style. Cp. the following remark of Bühler: 'Jedenfalls schien dem Dichter (= Hariṣēṇa) das einfachere und natürlichere *prasabhōddharaṇalabdhamahāprabhāvasya* zu trivial und er wählte deshalb das künstlichere °*prasabhōddharaṇōdvṛttaprabhāvamahataḥ*'. (Die indischen Inschriften etc. Wien 1890, p. 43).

10 a. *ity evam uktaḥ praṇayēna tēna*

praṇatēna seems better on account of *nanāma*, supra, 6 d, and °*unmukhalōcanēna*, infra, b.

15 c. *klēśākulān [tān] viṣayān sa tāñ ca*

I surmise *ca pañca* on account of the senses being five in number. Cp. the numerals in the next stanza.

25 c. *jñānāya kṛtyam paramam priyābhyaḥ*

This is sheer nonsense. Read: *kriyābhyaḥ*. Printer's error?

31 c. *tathānapēkṣyōjitalōkamōhō*

anapēkṣyō is decidedly out of place here. As *kṣa* and *kṣya* freely interchange in the MSS. of both this poem and the Buddhacar., we have full right to read *anapēkṣōjita*° which in order to yield a satisfactory meaning must be corrected either to *anapēkṣājita*° or to *anapēkṣōjjhita*°.

37 d. (*jñātīmś ca dṛṣtvā vratinō grhasthān*)
saṁvin na cittē 'sti na vāsti cetaḥ ||

A pronoun referring to Nanda being wanted I suggest the correction

saṁvin na kim tē 'sti na vāsti cetaḥ ||

It is the same *tē* which recurs in the immediately following stanzas 38 a, 39 c, 40 b. Cp. also VI, 40 b (same construction as in 38 a, above) and P. M. ad locum. The phrase *saṁvin na kim tē 'sti* is repeated in VIII, 49 b (*na tu saṁvid asti tē*).

39 d. (*nāivāsti mōktum matir ālayam tē*)
dēśam mumūrṣōr iva sōpasargam ||

This is well nigh unintelligible. Moribund men are not likely to think of going abroad. Read probably: *mumukṣōr*, 'Are you not willing to abandon your house as one wishes to abandon a country infested by calamities?' Another possible emendation is: *dēham mumūrṣōr iva*, but I think *upasarga* is an attribute of a country rather than of the body. Besides, the first argument appears to be more natural considering that Nanda was a worldly youth not like to meditate on the problem of death but attached to life and its contingencies.

41 d. (*yah sarvatō vēśmani dahyamānē*
śayita mōhān na tatō vyapēyāt |
kālāgninā vyādhijarāśikhēna)
lōkē pradīptē sa bhavēt pramattaḥ ||

Shall we read: *prasannaḥ*? The correction is so slight! Only a man who would not abandon a burning house is like to keep quiet

(*bhavet prasannaḥ*) when the world is consumed by conflagration. *pramattaḥ* appears to be due to *mattō* and *pramāḍyan* in the next stanza, if not to mere misreading.

46 a. *varam hitōdarkam aniṣṭam annam*
(*na svādu yat syād ahitānubaddham* |)

Only *aniṣṭam* does correspond with *svādu*. Cp. XI, 16 d; 22 b. *aniṣṭam*, infra 48 a is correct being opposed to *pratikūlam*, c.

47 b. (*bālasya dhātrī vinigrhya lōṣṭram*)
yathōddharaty ātmapuṭapraviṣṭam |

Read : *āsyapuṭa°*. Cp. *vivṛtāsyapuṭāḥ*, Buddhacar. V, 61 a.

52 a. *athō rutam tasya mukham sabāṣpam*.

Read : *athō natam*, as Nanda's head was necessarily bent down while Ānanda was cutting his hair. Besides, the correction is indispensable in order to make the simile complete, *natam mukham* = *vakrāgranālam nalinam*. Prof. Hultsch has rendered *rutam* by 'klagend' which, however, is pleonastic on account of *sabāṣpam* and, moreover, very hard, *ruta* being almost unused as an adjective. Finally, let us remark that *ruta* cannot be referred to the vedic root *ru* 'to break', unknown in classical Skt. and 'not unquestionable' even in the Veda (Whitney, Roots etc. s. v.).

Canto VI.

5 d. (*tiryak ca śīsyē pravikīrṇahārā*)
sapādukāivārdhavidhambapādā ||

It is good English to say that a girl is shaking in her shoes, but it is not equally good Sanskrit to call special attention (*ēva!*) to the fact of her wearing slippers at a moment of distress. So I should venture to read *sapādukāikārdha°*. As Sundarī was lying aslant on a sofa, her one foot, shod in a slipper, was half hanging down. The attention being thus drawn to that one foot, it is quite natural that it has got an epithet.

6 a. *athātra kācit pramadā sabāṣpām*
(*tām duḥkhitām draṣṭum abhīpsamānā* [Hultsch] |)

I suppose *sabāṣpā* (Nomin.) to make it oppose *duḥkhitām* (Accus.). Such slight opposition is, as a rule, peculiar to good style, cp. e. g. *sasmāra tām aśrumukhīm sabāṣpaḥ*, VII, 6 c. In v. 20 d, infra,

the same servant is referred to as *sā strī sabāṣpā* 'that crying woman'.

- 12 b. (*sā strīsvabhāvēna vicintya tat tat*)
dṛṣṭānūrāgē 'bhimukhē 'pi patyāu |
(dharmāśritē tattvam avindamānā)

abhimukhē appears strange as just the contrary is expected. I should propose to read: *vimukhē*. Sundarī was thinking of her husband whose love she could not doubt (*dṛṣṭānūrāgē*) although (*api*) — for the moment — he turned away from her (*vimukhē*). The truth did not occur to her viz. that he took the vows.

- 15 c. *tathā hi rāgō yadi tasya hi syāt*

hi-hi cannot be possibly correct. *tathā hi* is doubtless due to *tathā hi*, infra, 16 c. Read probably: *tathāiva* 'if his affection were just so (as it was before) i. e. unchanged'. *tathā virāgo* (cp. *hṛdayam viraktam*, supra, 15 b) *yadi tasya na syāt* is likewise possible but no doubt less good since *hi* cannot be missing as shown by 16 c, 17c

- 17 d. (*munāu prasādō yadi tasya hi syān*)
mṛtyōr ivōgrād anu tat vibhīyāt ||

This is void of any meaning. One should expect an ablative depending on *bibhīyāt* and making the simile (*iva*) complete. Shall we read: *nanu mad?*

- 18 a. *lēkhārtham ādarśam ananyacittō*
(vibhūṣayantyā mama dhārayitvā |)

lēkhārtham has been conjectured by the editor for *lēvārtham* of his MS. But I am not aware that either *lēkha* or *lēkhā* can be used without further ceremony as synonymous with *viśēṣaka* and so I should like to read *sēvārtham*; cp. *siṣēviṣuḥ* in the very scene of the mirror hinted at by Sundarī, IV, 12 b.

- 22 a. *mā svāminam svāmini dōṣam āgāḥ*

The double accusative depending on *ā-gā* (transitive?) is doubtless wrong. Read: *dōṣatō gāḥ*. The construction is familiar to Aśvaghōṣa. Op. III, 34 c (*asukhatō vimṛśan*); VIII, 48 cd (*śubhatō gacchasi*); Buddhacar. VIII, 49 (*dōṣatō gantum* as restored by myself ad XI, 57 and by Prof. Hultsch ad locum).

43 d. *kim viklavē rōdiṣi harṣakālē?*

There is no reason to prefer the reading *viklavā* as Prof. Hultsch does. *viklavē* is better warranted (palm leaf MS) and yields an excellent meaning. It is of course Voc. Sing.

Canto VII.

1 a. *liṅgaṁ tataś cāstu vidhipradīṣṭam*
(*gātrēṇa bibhran na tu cētasā tat |*)

cāstu is apparently false. Shall we read: *cāśya*, or: *cātma°*?

3 cd. *bhṛśam jajṛmbhē yugadīrghabāhur*
dhyātvā priyam cāpam ivācakarṣa ||

4 ab. *sa pātakakṣōdam iva pratīccha[n]*
cūtadrumēbhyas tanupuṣpavarṣam |

This looks extremely suspected. The words *jajṛmbhē* and *cāpam ivācakarṣa* as well as the mentioning of *cūta* flowers seem to point to Kāma, the God of Love, who was torturing Nanda (cp. Buddha's final words to Nanda: *nirjitya Māraṁ yudhi durnivāram adyāsi lōkē raṇasā[stra]śūrah*, XVIII, 28). But I am unable to restore 3 cd. As to 4 a, *pātaka* might stand for *sāyaka*, but what of *kṣōdam*? Shall we read *kṣōbham*? *kṣēpam*? *pātam*? Nothing is sure.

4 d. *navagrahō nāga ivāvabuddhaḥ ||*

Read: *ivāvaruddhaḥ* and cp. my note to Buddhacar. IX, 6 d (Rocznik Oryentalistyczny I, 1).

16 b. Read *rāukṣyam* as in the immediately preceding stanza, 15 c.

13 a. *yathāiṣy anāśyānaviśēṣakāyām*
(*mayīti yan mām avadac ca sāsru |*)

yathā is neither here nor there. I should like to read *atha* in order to make the quotation more exact: 'But if you come back, before the paint on my cheek is dry...', cp. IV, 36 a and my note thereto.

22 d. Correct: *caṅkramyamāṇāya*.

29 c. *atō 'sya yasyām suṣuvē mahātmā Dvāipāyanō*

This is doubtless wrong. Read: *sutō 'sya* and cp. e. g. *yasyām...* *sutaḥ prasūtō 'sya*, supra, 28 cd. or *yatra* (= *yasyām* i. e. *Sarasvatyām*)

sutō 'sya jajñē, infra, 31 c. Cp. also *sutō* for *ato* Buddhacar. XI, 63a (Windisch).

37 cd. *saṁdṛśya saṁdṛśya jaghānu sarvēn-
driyam na rōṣēṇa tapō rarakṣa ||*

The MSS. have *sarvvāndriyam*. This has been changed by Prof. Hultzscher to *sarpān svīyam* but *sarpān priyam* (viz. *tapah*) would appear to be more in keeping with the reading of the MSS.

46 c. *dhiyā ca sārēṇa ca durbalaḥ sa
(priyam apaśyan kim u viklavō 'ham ||)*

Read *san* as e. g. in XVIII, 68 c.

Canto VIII.

25 d. *na ratam na vidyatē ||*

The MSS. have *na ratinnivintē* which points rather to *na ratir na vidyatē*, the more as it is *rati* and *abhirati* but not *rata* that is found in the immediately preceding stanzas.

34 d. *(praviśanti ca yac camūmukham)
rabhasā tatra nimittam aṅganā ||*

Prof. Hultzscher remarks that we ought rather to read *aṅganāḥ* and he is doubtless right. But it is no less sure that *rabhasās tatra* as given by the MSS. is perfectly correct and should not have been changed by the editor. The adjective *rabhasa* is found VIII, 61 b; XV, 61 c.

42 c. *api bibhrati nāiva yantraṇā*

Read : *cāiva*.

47. *atha sūkṣmamatih priyāśayā
laghutā sā hṛdayam na paśyasi |
kim u kāyam asadgrham sravat
vanitānāñcaritam na paśyasi ||*

laghutā sā has been corrected to *laghu tāsām* by Prof. Hultzscher. *caritam* is a conjectural reading of the editor's. The MSS. have *vratham* or *cratham*. It is true that *caritam* reminds one of *vratham*, but it is no less true that both of them are out of place here. Some adjective qualifying *kāyam* and synonymous with *laghu* is



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

HOLY BIBLE

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

kēcic ca spoils the metre (Vamśastha). Read: *kadā ca* which makes the parallelism between *c* and *d* complete.

22 a. *balam mahad vā yadi yēna manyasē*
(*kuruṣva yuddham saha tāvad indriyāṇi* |)

This can only mean: 'Or, if therefore you think that strength is great'. But *yadi yēna* is stylistically very hard and the simultaneous use of *vā* and *yēna* in one and the same stanza is harder yet. Now, what the poet wanted to say is: 'Or, if you consider yourself very strong, then indeed (make good use of your strength and) wage war with your senses'. In Sanskrit: *balam mahad vā yadi tē ca manyasē*, cp. *aham vapuṣmān iti yac ca manyasē*, infra, 24 a.

25 ab. *yathā mayūraś calacitracandrakō*
bibharti rūpam guṇavat svabhāvataḥ |

Cp. Buddhacar. IX, 52 and Jātaka-Mālā XXIII v. 17 (p. 146). The words *citra* and *svabhāva* (or their derivatives) are common to all three works.

28 d. *jalam nadīnām ca nṛṇām ca yāuvanam* ||

Read: *nṛṇām ca* in order to suit the metre.

34. *idam viditvā [vi]nidhatsva dāśīkam*
jarābhīdhānam jagatō mahad bhayam | •
aham vapuṣmān karavān yuvēti vā
na māna[m ā]rōḍhum anāryam arhasi ||

a. — I read: *vidhivat svadāśīkam*. c. — *karavān* is extremely flat. I think we ought to read *balavān*. Cp. e. g. *mattō balarūpayāuvanāṇi*, supra 30 c, 2 c etc. The triad 'youth, beauty and strength (not: hands!)' is very often mentioned by Buddhist authors.

38 a. *yathā prajābhyah kunṛpō balād balī*
(*haraty aśēṣam*)

balī is pleonastic. I suppose *balim*. Many a similar passage is found both in this poem and in the Buddhacar. Extorting illegal duties is the chief characteristic of a bad king with our poet.

46 d. (*anarthamūlā viṣayās ca kēvalā*)
nanu prahēyā viṣayā yathārayaḥ ||

The repeated use of *viṣayāḥ* is rather clumsy. I read: *viṣamā yathārayaḥ*. This slight correction rendered necessary by the parallelism

of the two parts of the simile (*anarthamūlā viṣayāḥ* = *viṣamā arayaḥ*) is tested by the next stanza, infra 47, where *ripavō vadhātmaḥ* corresponds with *duḥkhaḥetavō kāmāḥ*.

49 b. *vimōkṣadharmō hy upasamhitam hitam |*
vimōkṣadharmābhyupasamhitam? cf. supra, 32 d.

Canto X.

2 c. *sa hrīmatē hrīvitatō jagāda*
I read *hrīvigatō* 'shameless'.

11 d. (*chēttum vilagnaṁ na śaśāka bālaṁ*)
kulōdgataḥ prītim ivāryavṛttaḥ ||

kulōdgatām appears to be the genuine reading. *kulōdgataḥ* as an attribute of *āryavṛttaḥ* is rather pleonastic. *kulōdgatā prītiḥ* means probably 'the hereditary friendship' not likely to be given up by noble-minded men. Cp. Buddhacar. XI, 3.

29 a. *citrāiḥ suvarṇacchadanāis tathānyāiḥ*
(*vāidūryanīlāir nayanāiḥ prasannāiḥ |*
vihaṅgamā śīṇjirikābhidhānāḥ)

Read: *tathānyē* and cp. *rōciṣṇavō nāma patatrinō 'nyē*, infra 31 a.

32 b. *nirārtayō.*

54 c. *asūn vimōkṣāmi vimuktamānasaḥ.*

I prefer to read: *vimuktamānasa*.

56 c. *mumōha Vōḍhō[r hi] calātmanō manō*
(*babhūva dhīmāṁś ca sa Śāntanus tanuḥ ||*)

Read: *hy acalātmanō*. Buddha does not speak of Madana's victory over light-hearted men but mentions two difficult cases viz. Kāma's triumphs over Vōḍhu and Śāntanu who are styled *acalātman* and *dhīmant* respectively.

57 b. *yathā na yāyī (mī) bahusamdiśam diśam |*

Read: *yāyām*.

62 b. *kadācid vilabhēta vā na vā |*

In my opinion *kadācid dhi labhēta* is preferable. *vi* for *hi* is not uncommon in our MSS.

63 b. (*tad apramattō niyamē samudyatō*)
ramasva yady apsārasō 'bhilipsasē |

ramasva cannot be possibly good, Nanda being on the contrary advised to shun the pleasures of love if he care for the apsaras in the next world. Shall we read: *carasva* (viz. *niyamē*)? Cp. XI, 2 cd.

Canto XI.

7 c. *vītarāga ivāstathāu*

It is not easy to explain the prefix *ā-* in *āstathāu*. Either *ivāstathāu* or, less probably, *ābabhāu* would seem to be preferable.

13 a. *duṣkaram sādhanāryeṇa*

This is apparently wrong. Read: *sādhv anāryeṇa* as shown by the other pādas of this ślōka.

18 cd. *tvacchrēyō hi vivakṣā mē*
yatē nārhamy upēkṣitum ||

Prof. Hultsch is probably right in reading *yatō nārhasy* but the first pāda should be left unchanged, *vivakṣā mē* (*asti*) being a construction often met with in our poem, cp. VIII, 11 ab (*ata ēva ca mē viśēṣataḥ pravivakṣā*); V, 40 b; XVI, 25 c; XVIII, 2 d; 33 c.

25 a. *titādayiṣayā dṛṣṭō*
(yathā mēṣō 'pasarpati |)

Read: *duṣṭō*.

35 c. Read together: *yatratatrasthas*.

36 d. (*taṁ tarṣaṁ chinddhi duḥkhaṁ hi*)
tṛṣṇā nāsti ca nāsti ca ||

Read: *tṛṣṇā cāsti* 'for pain and (*ca*) thirst come together into existence and vanish away together (*asti ca nāsti ca*)'.

51 d. *dēvāntasukhasēvinām ||*

Read: *dēvatva°*.

52 d. *ratir bhavati nāśanī ||*

nāśanī (transitive) is at any rate wrong, but *ratī*, too, does not seem satisfactory. I should like to read: *matir bhavati nāśinī*. It is not 'the pleasure (of the celestials falling down on earth that)

becomes destroying' but their superior 'understanding is disappearing', their superhuman 'intelligence is fading away'. Cp. the numerous cases of *vidyābhraṣṭā vidyādharaḥ* in Indian folk-lore. *mati* and *rati* are liable to be substituted for each other by the copyists.

54 c. (*sukham utpadyatē yac ca*
divi kāmān upāśnatām |)
ta(ya)cca duḥkham nipatatām
(duḥkham evāvaśiṣyatē ||)

I cannot understand why the editor has changed *yac ca* to *tac ca*. It is true that in prose one would perhaps expect *tayōḥ* after *nipatatām* but a poet is never so accurate and such as it is the construction must be called wholly correct. The 'pinḍitārtha' of our stanza is this 'The pain of celestials falling down on earth does not balance the pleasures enjoyed by them in heaven: it weighs heavier'. *yac ca*¹ — *yac ca*², (*tayōḥ*) — ²*avaśiṣyatē*.

62 b. Correct: *bhrāmyamāṇam*.

Canto XII.

9. *babhūva sa hi samvēgaḥ śrēyasaś tasya vṛddhayē |*
dhātōr adhir ivākhyātē paṭhitō 'kṣaracintakāiḥ ||

I am unable to restore *c* in a satisfactory manner. Nevertheless the true purport of the simile seems to me unquestionable. The tertium comparationis is the word *vṛddhi* which, as applied to *dhātu*, must have the value of the well-known grammatical term (the second vowel gradation). The meaning of *cd* is therefore probably: as the vowel *a* added twice to a verbal root causes its *vṛddhi*. I am not persuaded by Prof. Hultsch's remarks concerning this verse.

10. Here, too, Prof. Hultsch's remarks are no doubt very keen but yet cannot be approved of. What is the clue of this peculiar simile?

20 a. *ciram unmārgavihato*

I should like to read °*vihṛtō*. Cp. *hṛta* for *hata* (Hultsch) VI, 49 b.

26 a. *anarhasaṁsārabhayaṁ (mānārhaṁ tē cikīrṣitam |)*

I surmise: *anarhaṁ saṁ*°.

26 d. Separate: *dharmōnmukha parānmukhaḥ* ||

27 d. *pathikēna pipāsunā* ||

iva being necessarily wanted I suppose *pānthēnēva*. Cp. the next two verses.

36 b. I should rather separate: *śraddhā viśēṣataḥ* ('quite especially').

Canto XIII.

15 a. *prāṇidhāṇyadhanādīnām*

I suppose: *prāṇighāta°*.

17 a. I am unable to make out the sense of *yathā* in this verse. *tathā*?

19 d. (*ētāvac chīlam ity uktam ācārō 'yam samāsataḥ |*
asya nāśēna nāiva syāt) *pravrajyā na iha sthitā* ||

The words *na iha sthitā* are most suspected. I surmise *na gr̥hasthatā*. Neither monks nor house-holders can do without good conduct.

24 a. *kāyamanasōḥ* seems better.

31 b. (*bhētavyam na tathā śatrōr*) *nākhēr nāhēr na cāśanēḥ |*
(*indriyēbhyō yathā svēbhyas tāir ajasram hi hanyatē* ||)

Prof. Hultsch should like to read *nākhōr*. But rats do not, as a rule, kill men. In fact, they are rather inoffensive animals though no doubt very troublesome. I read: *nāgnēr*. The following is a parallel stanza from the Buddhacar. (XI, 8) which can be said to settle the question:

nāśīviṣēbhyō hi tathā bibhēmi
nāivāśanibhyō gaganāc cyutēbhyaḥ |
na pāvakēbhyō 'nilasamhitēbhyō
yathā bhayam mē viṣayēbhya ēbhyaḥ ||

52 b. (*dṛṣṭvāikam rūpam anyō hi*) *rajyatē 'nyaḥ prahṛṣyati |*
(*kaścid bhavati madhyasthas tatrāivānyō ghr̥nāyatē* ||)

rajyatē cannot be possibly good for, as shown by *bhavati madhyasthaḥ*, a verb opposed to *prahṛṣyati* is wanted. I suppose *rujyatē* 'is afflicted'.

Canto XIV.

12 b. *rathākṣō 'bhyuhyatē yathā |*

Read: '*bhyukṣyatē*. No carriage can go unless the axes be greased from time to time.

16 c, 17 c. Prof. Hultsch is, in my opinion, wrong in maintaining that *yāvat* 'as long as' governs the Instrumental in these two instances. *yāvat tu* has the value of an adversative conjunction (= *param tu*) just as *kēvalam* in v. 18 which is exactly parallel. Translate: 'not that he love it, but just (*yāvat tu*) because he wants to —'

34 c. *bhūyō yōgam manahśuddhāu kurvīta niyatēndriyaḥ ||*

But the mind of the monk in question is not yet purified. I should prefer *manahśuddhyāi*, cp. XV, 69 c and my note thereto.

35 ab. *athāsanagata[ā]sthā na prēkṣitavyā hṛtādiṣu |*

This is sheer nonsense. And yet the MSS. are quite correct. We only need to read the whole as a compound:

athāsana-gata-sthāna-prēkṣita-vyāhṛtādiṣu |

i. e. *sarvāsv avasthāsu*, infra, 37 c.

45 b. *tasmāc caraṇ carō 'smīti sthitō 'smīti ca tiṣṭhataḥ |*

tiṣṭhataḥ is of course false. A Nominative being wanted I should like to read: *tasthivān*. Cp. *tasthuṣaḥ* (= *sthitān*) I, 44 b; *punar upavivēśa tasthivān* III, 22 b (a pretty close parallel).

Canto XV.

15 d. (*āryaḥ kō duḥkham aparam*) *saghrṇō dhātum arhati* |

The whole section where this stanza occurs treating of the *manas*, I should prefer the more pregnant *dhyātum*. The words *dhyātum arhasi* are found in the same position at the end of a line, infra, 19 b.

22 ab. *manah karmasu vikṣēpyam api vā vastum arhasi |*

The whole of this line seems corrupt. At any rate b is. The reading *vāgvastum* (MS.) points rather to *vābhyastum* than to *vā vastum*.

55 c. *svasthāśā jīvitāśā vā*
svāsthyāśā?

69 c. *manah śuddham bhikṣur vaśagatam abhijñāsv api tathā*
(yathēccham yatrēccham śamayati manah prērayātī ca ||)

The repeated use of *manah* is extremely hard. Shall we read: *manahśuddhyāi*? The Buddhist monk subdues (*śamayati*) his mind (*manah*) in order to purify it (*manahśuddhyāi*). Cp. XIV, 34 c and my note thereto.

Canto XVI.

4 c. *duḥkhakṣayō niḥsaraṇātmakō 'yam*

niḥsaraṇātmakō is preferable. I am not sure whether the same correction should be made in XVII, 15 c.

12 b, 13 b. *āuṣṇyam, uṣṇa°* — It is little probable that Aśvaghōṣa should have used two different forms of the same abstract in two consecutive verses. As *uṣṇam* is found in XVII, 22 a and in Buddhacar. IX, 47 c, *āuṣṇyam* is probably no more than a would-be correction of a conscientious scribe.

14 d. *duḥkham tathā nāgatam apy avāhi ||*

Read together: *tathānāgatam* i. e. *tathā anāgatam* the latter being the standing word for 'future' often used in this connexion. It corresponds with *atītam* b just as in v. 23 bd, infra.

18 a. *ēnēna kāraṇēna* looks very suspected. Shall we read *ētēna*?

19 b. *yānāsanādir bhavati prayōgaḥ |*

This may or may not be the genuine reading. °*ādēr* is at any rate more usual. Cp. the not quite dissimilar case, infra, 58 cd.

33 a. *nyāyēna satyābhigamāya yuktā (samyak smṛtiḥ etc.)*

satyādhigamāya is no doubt preferable. Cp. supra, 30 a and infra, 85 a (*tad āryasatyādhigamāya pūrvam* etc.)

34 d. *dōṣā) manah salajjā iva dharṣayanti ||*

This looks strange. I should like to read *varjayanti* as the enemy can make a shameful retreat but is never seen to 'attack as if ashamed'. *dharṣayanti* is due to the mechanical influence of the same word, 35 c. *va* for *dha* MS. ad 43 d, *vivarjjayati* for *vitarkayati* MS. ad XV, 18 b.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



HISTORY

Tens of thousands of important historical sources, many previously unobtainable, are now available for the first time with a Forgotten Books Full Membership.

Unlimited Access
\$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

a. — *aśṇōti* looks more probable as the crops cannot be eaten (*aśṇāti*) without further ceremony. c. — Read *narēndraśriyam* in agreement with the first two pādas (no subject, *śrī* qualified throughout).

Canto XVII.

5 c. *jñānēna lōkyēna śamēna cāiva*

I cannot be persuaded of *lōkyēna* being the proper word wanted in this connexion. Read perhaps: *śīlēna*.

16 a. Separate: *sa rūpiṇam*.

19 c. *duḥkhapratīkāraavidhāu sukhākhyam*

Either *sukhākhyā* (viz. *bhavati*) or *sukhākhyē* (viz. *satī*) would seem preferable to the reading of the text.

21. *yasmān nirīham jagad asvatantram
nāiśvaryam ēkaḥ kurutē kriyāsu |
tat tat pratītya prabhavanti bhāvā
nirātmakam tēna vivēda lōkam ||*

I should have preferred in b the reading of the younger MS. viz. *ēkam*. 'Since the world, indolent and dependent as it is, does not exercise one paramount power over actions, but (different) conditions arise from different causes, he concluded that the world is void of ego'.

24 a. *bōdhyāṅgaśitāttaśastrah*

Mark the irregular position of °ātta°, metri causa.

26 c. *mithyāṅganāgāmś ca tathāṅganāgair (vinirdudhāva.*

Can *tathā°* in composition mean 'true' as opposed to *mithyā* and would not *sadaṅga°* be preferable? For a similar correction see my note to I, 31 c.

28 c. *pratyātmikāc cāpi viśēṣalābhāt*

A slip of the pen for *pratyātmakāc*?

30 c. *jñānāśrayam prītim upājagāma*

I prefer to read *jñānāśrayām* qualifying *prītim*.

34 b. *tathāgatam tattvavid āryatattvaḥ |*

āryatattvam is recommended by good style.

35 c. *vaktrē ghrṇāklēśaviṣṇubhitēṣōr*
(mṛtyōr na tatrāsa na durgatibhyaḥ ||)

vaktrād is perhaps more appropriate.

46 b. *bādhām yathā samjanayanti śabdāḥ |*

The feminine *bādhā* is no doubt more usual than the masculine *bādha*, but yet ought we not to read *bādham* in view of the correspondence between *bādhām yathā* b and *bādhāya tathā* c?

52 b. *mēnē param śāntim aniñjam ēva |*

I should read *śāntam* 'he thought motionless tranquillity to be supreme'. If *aniñja* can be considered a substantive then *param* is the necessary correction (cp. 70 a) 'he thought that freedom from motion is the highest tranquillity'. But I don't believe it.

56 c. *mitram balavantam*

Very odd.

Canto XVIII.

2 ab. *draṣṭum mukham jñānasamādhikālē*
gurur hi śiṣyasya gurōś ca śiṣyoḥ |

This is unintelligible. Luckily enough, the Buddhacarita has a parallel line that enables us to restore the original construction. It runs:

nanu nāiva kṣamam draṣṭum narāḥ strīṇām nṛṇām striyaḥ ||
 IV, 95 cd.

It is thus clear that *mukham* must be changed to *sukham*¹⁾. *samā-dhi* is only a slip of the pen for *samāpti*, cp. *samāpta*, paper MS. (which, by the bye, is perhaps correct). The whole line must run:

draṣṭum sukham jñānasamāptikālē
gurur hi śiṣyasya gurōś ca śiṣyaḥ |

The pupil is glad to see the teacher to return him thanks for his instruction of many years but the teacher too is glad to meet once more the pupil to offer him his congratulations. The instances from Aśvaghōṣa quoted above are a valuable enrichment of Speyer's

1) Or to *kṣamam*? In which case *sukham* would be a gloss.

materials, Sanskrit Syntax §§ 388, 389 where the syntax of *śakyam*, *yuktam* and *nyāyyam* is treated. A third instance can be added to there viz.

*adyōpadēṣṭum tava yuktarūpam Śuddhōdanō mē nṛpatiḥ
pitēti*, infra 31 ab.

10 d. *lōkē prabhūtō 'smi na lōkadharmā ||*

I should like to read *prasūtō* 'though born into this world I am free from its attributes'. It may be granted that *prabhūta* can mean 'come forth'; practically, however, it is misleading because of the sense of 'abundant, numerous' which it has acquired.

11 d. (*tavāsmi gām sādhu nipīya tṛptas*)
tṛṣēva gām uttamavatsavarṇaḥ ||

varṇām is preferable. *tṛṣā* is of course Instr.

14 b. *nātmānam urvyādiṣu tēṣu kimcit* (viz. *vēdmi*, c) ||

I read *kaṁcit* 'I know that there is no ego in these (elements viz.) earth and the others'.

17 c. Can *vivaddham* be a printer's error for *vivṛddham*? But the whole of this line is somewhat clumsy and looks suspected.

27 d. *kūrmē yugacchidra ivārṇavasthaḥ |*

Read perhaps: *kūrmō yugacchit sa*.

36 b. (*unmīlitasyāpi janasya madhyē*)
nimīlitasyāpi tathāiva cakṣuḥ |

nimīlitam and *tavāiva* appear to be sure emendations. *syāpi* is due to the negligence of the scribe who was misled by the first pāda. Shall we read *vāsti* (cp. *tavāiva vēyam*, infra 52 b) or *cāsti*? Cp. *yasyām jāgrati bhūtāni sā nīśā paśyatō munēḥ*, Bhagavadgītā, II, 69.

46 c. *svādhīnam adhyātmasukham*

svā spoils the metre. Read perhaps *svadhītam* 'well learned'.

51 b. *upaśāntamānasah* is perhaps preferable to *mānasam*.

51 c. *ca* being superfluous read *tathāvabudhyasē*, cp. my note to IX, 5 d.

56 a. *iḥōttamēbhyō 'pi mataḥ subhūmō*

I cannot admit the correction proposed by Prof. Hultsch viz. *sa bhūtaḥ* and read *sa tūttamō*.

58. *bravītu tāvat puri vismito janas*
tvayi sthitē kurvati dharmadēśanāḥ |
ahō batāścaryam idaṁ vimuktayē
karōti rāgī yad ayaṁ kathām iti ||

idam in c is of course no grave error but I am not aware that *āścaryam* when used as an interjection can be construed with it. The usual idiom is *āścaryam!* or *ahō batāścaryam!* So I should like to propose a slight correction viz. *imām (kathām)*. 'Just let the inhabitants of the town be astonished and speak while you are delivering sermons: Oh, wonder! that it be even he, that amorous youth, who is preaching this sermon (conducive) to final emancipation!' Not sure.

63. This stanza, rather misunderstood by the editor (Preface p. XI), has been correctly translated by Prof. Hultsch. It is most interesting to state that the simile it contains is found in Western literatures too. Aśvaghoṣa was a serious man who cared very little for poetry and the like. And so he feels obliged to make an apology to his readers for the weakness in which he indulged: To be sure, I know — but who will hear to reason? men are so very much like little children! It is of an absolute necessity to comply with their turn of mind and mix some honey with the medicine in order to make them swallow it! — Now, this is exactly the case of Lucretius, the Roman poet and philosopher. And still more the case of Tasso, a great poet and a fervent catholic whose sad story is too well known to be repeated here. The coincidence is very significant. I do not consider it superfluous to quote in full the two passages in question. Lucretius says:

sed veluti pueris absinthia taetra medentes
cum dare conantur, prius oras, pocula circum,
contingunt mellis dulci flavoque liquore,
ut puerorum aetas improvida ludificetur
labrorum tenus, interea perpotet amarum
absinthii laticem, deceptaque non capiatur,
sed potius tali pacto recreata valescat,
sic ego nunc, quoniam haec ratio plerumque videtur
tristior esse quibus non est tractata, retroque
volgus abhorret ab hac, volui tibi suaviloquenti

carmine Pierio rationem exponere nostram
et quasi musaeo dulci contingere melle.

De rerum natura I, 930—941 = IV, 11—22. (ed. Brieger).

And here are the words of Tasso who, of course, knew the Latin poet:

Sai che là corre il mondo, ove più versi
di sue dolcezze il lusinghier Parnaso;
e che 'l vero condito in molli versi,
i più schivi allettando ha persuaso:
così all'egro fanciul porgiamo aspersi
di soavi licor gli orli del vaso:
succhi amari ingannato intanto ei beve,
e dall' inganno suo vita riceve.

Gerusalemme liberata, I 3.

Zakopane 1915 — Wista 1918.
