A Resurgent Interest in 'Hindu Fiction': On and around the Kathāsaritsāgara, with Special Attention to Buddhism

Silk, J.A.

Review Article

∴

A Resurgent Interest in "Hindu Fiction"

On and around the Kathāsaritsāgara, *with Special Attention to Buddhism*

Jonathan A. Silk
Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands
J.A.Silk@hum.leidenuniv.nl

A review article on Willem Bollée, *A Cultural Encyclopaedia of the Kathā-saritsāgara in Keywords: Complementary to Norman Penzer's General Index on Charles Tawney's Translation* [Studia Indologica Universitatis Halensis 8]. Halle an der Saale: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittenberg, 2015, 513 pp. ISBN 978-3-86977-123-6. € 98,00. Supplemented by Willem Bollée, "Addenda et Corrigenda to 'Bollée, Willem B., *Cultural Encyclopaedia of the Kathāsaritsāgara.*'" *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Südasienstudien* 32/33 (2015/2016): 175–202.

That the first Western introduction to the compendium of tales called *Kathā-saritsāgara*, composed by Somadeva in Kashmir in the last third of the 11th century, appeared more than *two centuries* ago is a fact that should give any scholar of Sanskrit or Indology pause. Just how far have we come in these five or six generations of scholarship? The initial presentation took the form of a relatively short mention in the preface to the *Dictionary of Sanscrit and English* of Horace Hayman Wilson (1786–1860),[1] followed shortly thereafter by

---

1   *A Dictionary of Sanscrit and English: translated, Emended and Enlarged, from an Original Compilation prepared by Learned Natives for the College of Fort William* (Calcutta: Philip Pereira, at the Hindoostanee Press, 1819): ix–xi (he spells the title here *Cat'há Sarit Ságara*) . This is reprinted in *Works of the Late Horace Hayman Wilson*, Vol. V [but on the Table of Contents oddly called Vol. III] (London: Trübner & Co., 1865): 175–179. Janet Um reminds me that we

Wilson's extensive remarks on "Hindu Fiction" of 1824.[2] The broader topic—which we might now perhaps rather refer to as Narrative Literature in Sanskrit and Prakrit[3]—was one central theme of earlier periods of Indology, through roughly the first quarter of the 20th century, before interest waned. During that fruitful period considerable attention was devoted to works such as the *Pañcatantra*, *Tantrākhyāna*, *Hitopadeśa*, *Vetālapañcaviṁśati*,[4] *Vikramacarita*, *Śukasaptati*, and so on (and of these, versions of the *Pañcatantra* and *Vetālapañcaviṁśati* are incorporated into Somadeva's compilation).[5] Although such literature, while never entirely disappearing from scholarly view, for long had

---

should not overlook what does not qualify as a presentation, but may be the first Western mention of the work, found laconically in 1808, in a paper of Captain F[rancis] Wilford (1761–1822), "An Essay on the Sacred Isles in the West, with Other Essays Connected with that Work," *Asiatic Researches; or, Transactions of the Society Instituted in Bengal, for inquiring into the History and Antiquities, and the Arts, Sciences and Literature of Asia* 8: 245–376, within which is found "Of the Geographical Systems of the Hindus," pp. 267–340, on p. 270 of which we read "The *Vrĭhat-Cat'há* is a collection of historical anecdotes, sometimes very interesting, and consists of 22000 *slócas*." As Um points out, given the number of verses cited, this can only refer to the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. In probable contrast to Wilford, however, Wilson very obviously had read the work (and it may be that he did so in a manuscript copied for him at the behest of Wilford).

The following abbreviations are used in the present article:

Br.   Edition of Brockhaus (see n. 9)
D.   Edition of Durgâprasâd (see n. 13)
KSS   *Kathāsaritsāgara*
TP   Tawney and Penzer (see n. 12)

2 "Hindu Fiction," *Quarterly Oriental Magazine, Review and Register* (March 1824): 63–77; (June 1824): 266–287; (Sep 1824): 101–109; (Dec 1824): 194–208; (June 1825): 302–314, and the final portion in *British and Foreign Review; or, European Quarterly Journal* 21 (1840): 224–274. Reprinted in Reinhold Rost, *Essays: Analytical, Critical and Philological on Subjects Connected with Sanskrit Literature by the Late H.H. Wilson* (London: Trübner, 1864) 1: 156–268; 2: 108–159. A portion was excerpted in "Fables Indiennes.–The Katha Sarit Sagara," in *The Mirror of Literature, Amusement and Instruction*, new ser. 8, 25.2 (Dec. 20, 1845): 393–397. It was Wilson's initial publication which first drew the *Kathāsaritsāgara* to the attention of its first editor, Brockhaus (Brockhaus 1839: vii [in n. 9, below]; Wilson 1840: 246).

3 If we are not indeed to include Tamil as well. See below n. 20.

4 This story tradition was the subject of an excellent MA thesis submitted to the University of Copenhagen in 2013 by Jacob Schmidt-Madsen, Repossessing the Past: Authorial tradition and scribal innovation in Śivadāsa's *Vetālapañcamiṁśatikā*, which despite its deceptively restrictive title deals broadly with the *Vetālapañcaviṁśati* corpus. A long-term project on the Vetāla materials is being headed by Adheesh Sathaye at the University of British Columbia, the only published result of which so far seems to be Adheesh Sathaye, "The scribal life of folktales in medieval India," *South Asian History and Culture* 8.4 (2017): 430–447.

5 The names perhaps most associated with this field include Theodor Benfey (1809–1881), Hermann Jacobi (1850–1937), Maurice Bloomfield (1855–1928), Johannes Hertel (1872–1955), and Franklin Edgerton (1885–1963).

fallen largely outside the mainstream of Indological studies,[6] more recently there are signs of resurgent interest. The proximate occasion for the present remarks, then, is the publication by the late Willem Bollée (1927–2020) of *A Cultural Encyclopaedia of the Kathāsaritsāgara in Keywords: Complementary to Norman Penzer's General Index on Charles Tawney's Translation*, and this seems like a good opportunity to, if nothing more, at least notice the growing attention being paid to the genre.[7]

---

6 Just limiting ourselves to that taking the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and related texts as a central focus, work has certainly been produced over the years, including a number of dissertations, such as Colin Max Mayrhofer, Studies in the Bṛhatkathā, Australian National University, 1975. I have seen the following Indian theses: S.W. Chitale, Cultural History as Gleaned from *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Marathwada Univ., Ambajogai, 1975; Regha Rajappan, Morphology of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Sree Sankharacharya University of Sanskrit, Kaladay, 2007; Priya Jose K., Society in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Mahatma Gandhi Univ., Kottayam, 2013. I have not seen: Om Prakash Harsh, Cultural trends in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Saugar, 1964; Vachaspathi Pandey, Study of *Kathāsaritsāgara* from the literary point of view, Agra, 1969; Nirmal Trikha, Faiths and beliefs in *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Delhi, 1979; Omwati Gupta, *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva and *Bṛhatkathākāśikā* of Hariseṇa: A comparative study, Agra, 1978. Another example of more recent interest is Tara Sheemar, "Gardens in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*," *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 69 (2008): 187–195; and as Tara Sheemar Malhan, *Plunging the Ocean: Courts, Castes, and Courtesans in the* Kathāsaritsāgara (Delhi: Primus Books, 2017). A number of other papers could be cited.

7 Several complete (or intended to be complete) translations have been published in (relatively) recent years: Johannes Mehlig, *Der Ozean der Erzählungsströme* (Leipzig: Kiepenheuer, 1991); Fabrizia Baldissera, Vincenzina Mazzarino, and Maria Pia Vivanti, *L'Oceano dei Fiumi dei Racconti* (Torino: Giulio Einaudi, 1993); Nalini Balbir, et al., *Océan des Rivières de Contes*. Bibliothèque de La Pléiade 438 (Paris: Gallimard, 1997); James Mallinson, *The Ocean of the Rivers of Story*. Clay Sanskrit Library (New York: New York University Press and JJC Foundation, 2007)–only 2 vols. of a planned 7 were published. I do not know if the 4 volume Japanese translation is complete, as I have not seen it: Iwamoto Yutaka 岩本裕, *Sōmadēva, Katā saritto sāgara. Indo koten setsuwashū* ソーマデーヴァ『カター・サリット・サーガラ　インド古典説話集 (Tokyo: Iwanami bunko 岩波文庫, 1954–1961). With the exception of that of Mallinson, these are not accessible to me. I regret, therefore, that my comments below are in this respect perforce entirely Anglo-centric. Regarding the translations I have not seen, in reviews, Slaje did not have very good things to say about the German translation (*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 36 [1992]: 243–245), while de Jong thought highly of the Italian rendering (*Indo-Iranian Journal* 38 [1995]: 376–377) and J.C. Wright liked the French (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 61.2 [1998]: 409–409). De Jong mentions, without specifics, the existence of full translations also in Russian (1967–1982) and Czech (1981), but see further Ludwik Sternbach, *Aphorisms and Proverbs in the Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara* (Lucknow: Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, 1980): 26–30n1. His notes constitute probably the most complete accounting of scholarship on the text up to its time of publication (including details of what appear to be the translations noted by de Jong, and information about partial translations, which I have not noticed here). It should also certainly not be forgotten that all of the translators mentioned above had access to Tawney's pioneer rendering;

While my purpose here is not to review either the vast Sanskrit (and Prakrit) bibliography of narrative literature, or the scholarship thereon, some orientation, with a narrow focus on the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, will prove helpful.[8] Wilson read the text in manuscript (perhaps a copy of the manuscript to which Tawney [see below] had access from "Calcutta College" or "Sanskrit College," and which he characterized as excellent), and the editio princeps of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (hereafter KSS) was published by Hermann Brockhaus (1806–1877) in several volumes, beginning in 1839, reaching completion in 1866.[9] (This edition is referred to below as Br.) Shortly after this, and based on this edition, a com-

it would be an interesting study to examine how far they were guided in their understandings of the Sanskrit by his English.

The question of what it means to translate a work like this is interesting. While I cannot, needless to say, comment on those translations I have not even seen, to my mind (and this is certainly a matter of taste) Tawney is a nicer read than Mallinson, although the latter chose a more modern idiom. Neither English version, however, attempted as far as I can see to capture the poetry of the original. There have been efforts to render parts of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* poetically (or at least in verse), such as those of B[iscoe] Hale Wortham, "*The Story of Devasmitâ.* Translated from the *Kathâ Sarit Sâgara*, Tarânga 13, Sloka 54," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland* 16.1 (1884): 1–12 (reprinted in TP I.172–181), and then, first in "The Stories of Jîmûtavâhana, and of Hariśarman," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 18.2 (1886): 157–176, (here 157–172), and reprinted in *The Buddhist Legend of Jîmûtavâhana* (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1911): 1–19. The question was raised by Stacy Merrill Surla Koons in her 1991 Master's thesis for The American University (Washington D.C.), Transcribing the *Ocean of Story*: Rewriting C.H. Tawney's translation of the *Katha Sarit Sagara*, a medieval Sanskrit text by Somadeva Bhatta, whether it is possible to transmit a work of literature from one language and culture to another, and in the course of her work she attempted to put Tawney's English into a more modern idiom. It is a pity she was not aware of the existence of a premodern translation of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* from one language and culture to another, namely a Persian rendering, of which the few remains, and especially its illustrations, have been studied by Heike Franke, "Akbar's '*Kathāsaritsāgara*': The translator and illustrations of an imperial manuscript," *Muqarnas* 27 (2010): 313–356.

8   Although Jan Gonda's *A History of Indian Literature* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, published from 1973) was in some wise meant to update above all Winternitz's *History of Indian Literature*, in the end the series never got around to genres such as narrative literature, and thus far we have no updated reference. A treatment would have found a place in the third volume, Classical Sanskrit literature, of which only one part appeared, Siegfried Lienhard's 1984 *A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit-Pali-Prakrit*. This is far from the only lacuna in the set.

9   *Katha Sarit Sagara. Märchensammlung des Sri Somadeva Bhatta aus Kaschmir. Erstes bis fünftes Buch. Sanskrit und Deutsch* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1839). (Hermann was a son of the publisher, Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus, but during his lifetime the firm was run by his brother, also Friedrich; Hermann was the brother-in-law and close friend of Richard Wagner. See inter alia Frank Neubert, "Innovation amid Controversy: Remarks on the History of Indology at the University of Leipzig, 1841–1958," in Douglas T. McGetchin, Peter K.J. Park, and Damodar SarDesai, eds., *Sanskrit and 'Orientalism': Indology and Comparative Linguistics in Germany,*

plete English translation appeared, that of Charles Henry Tawney (1837–1922).[10] Although this publication was certainly known, it was not well circulated,[11] and its impact was limited. What received more attention, however, although also published in a small number of copies, was the version under which the transla-

---

1750–1958 [New Delhi: Manohar, 2004]: 173–195, and the surprisingly dry treatment in the work of Brockhaus's student and successor, Ernst Windisch, *Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie und Indischen Altertumskunde*. Zweiter Teil. Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 1B [Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co, 1920]: 211–214.) This was followed by *Kathâ Sarit Sâgara. Die Märchensammlung des Somadeva. Buch VI. VII. VIII*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 2 (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1862), and *Kathâ Sarit Sâgara. Die Märchensammlung des Somadeva. Buch IX–XVIII* Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 4 (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1866). Brockhaus seems to have first published on the text in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung* 1 June 1834 (152): 625–627; 2 June 1834 (153): 629–631; 3 June 1834 (154): 633–635, with a discussion of the history and place of the work and already translating several episodes. Almost immediately thereafter (the preface is dated September 1834), Brockhaus published a short booklet of around 30 pages, *Gründung der Stadt Pataliputra und Geschichte der Upakosa. Fragmente aus dem Kathâ Sarit Sâgara des Soma Deva. Sanskrit und Deutsch* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1835; it was on the basis of this booklet that he was awarded the doctorate in 1838 in Leipzig), in which he offers translations and an edition, based as he tells us on manuscripts found in the East India House in London, given without any variants. (In the Vorrede to the first volume of the full edition, he wrote [pp. ix–x]: "Die Varianten und sonstigen Hülfsmittel zur Rechtfertigung meines Textes musste ich leider weglassen; diese Zugaben, für so wichtig und nothwendig ich sie auch halte, würden den Umfang des Werkes und somit die Kosten auf eine zu bedeutende Weise vermehrt haben." This however could hardly have applied in the case of the small pamphlet.) This small extract may be the first modern edition of a part of KSS. Interestingly, although both publications offer translations of the Pāṭaliputra and Upakośa episodes (the former adds "Śakti Deva"), the translations are not the same. Moreover, although the former is very much closer to the translation published in the 1839 edition and translation (after which in the subsequent volumes Brockhaus published only the edition), they are again not identical. In lieu of full translations, Brockhaus gave a summary of book 6 in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-Historische Classe* 12 (1860): 101–162, and of book 7 in vol. 13 (1861): 203–250.

10   *The Kathá Sarit Ságara, or Ocean of the Streams of Story* (Calcutta: J.W. Thomas, Baptist Mission Press) I, 1880, II, 1884 (1887 appears to be the date of the last fascicule). This appeared in the series Bibliotheca India, new series 436, 438, 439, 442, 444, 450, 456, 459, 465, 472, 509, 519, 523, 615. Since when my copy was bound all indications of the individual fascicules in which it was originally issued were removed, I cannot specify the dates of publication of its parts. I have no way of knowing how many exemplars were actually printed, but I believe it was not many. An obituary of Tawney by F.W. Thomas appeared in *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1923): 152–154.

11   That said, it was already reviewed (unsigned) in *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art*, No. 1,387, vol. 53 (May 27, 1882): 666–667, which was noticed by Tawney himself in his "Further Corrigenda and Addenda to Vol. I" in II: 628 (that is, not TP but the original publication), and elsewhere. Likewise, some material was already excerpted by

tion came nearly exclusively to be known in the longer term, being virtually the only one cited, the ten volume presentation of Norman Mosley Penzer (1892–1960), *The Ocean of Story: Being C.H. Tawney's Translation of Somadeva's Kathā Sarit Sāgara* (*or Ocean of Streams of Story*). *Now edited with Introduction, Fresh Explanatory Notes and Terminal Essay*.[12] (This is referred to below as TP.) This is a massive reedition (and a physically lovely example of the bookmaker's art), and contains extensive annotations added by the editor and containing much additional information from experts, including Franklin Edgerton. Although each individual volume is indexed, the series is also furnished with an extensive comprehensive index in its tenth and final volume, a fact to which I will return below.

Some years after Brockhaus's publication, the text appeared in India, based explicitly on his editio princeps, this the work of Durgâprasâd and Kâs'înâth Pâṇurang Parab (hereafter D).[13] The editors state that they based themselves on Brockhaus's work and examined two additional manuscripts, one of which was from Kashmir. Speyer (on whose fundamental contributions, see below) considered: "I suppose that it is from the Kashmir MS the editors took a great deal of the excellent corrections by which their publication surpasses the edition of Brockhaus."[14] This is certainly possible, but we should not overlook an

---

W[illiam] R[alston] S[hedden]-Ralston (1828–1889) in "Some Indian Stories" in *The British Quarterly Review* 156 (Oct., 1883): 307–314 (the article as a whole is 290–319), repeated exactly in *The Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature* 39.1 (Jan., 1884): 37–42, and somewhat remarkably, the translation (and the earlier work of Wilson and Brockhaus) is mentioned even in a far-away newspaper, the *The Daily Province, Vancouver, British Columbia* (June 13, 1910): 24.

12   This was published in 10 volumes in London by C.J. Sawyer for private distribution, limited to 1500 numbered sets. Vol I & II; 1924; III & IV, 1925; V & VI, 1926; VII & VIII, 1927; IX & X, 1928. It has been reprinted several times, beginning with Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1968.

13   Durgâprasâd and Kâs'înâth Pâṇurang Parab, *Kathâsaritsâgara of Somadevabhatta*. (Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sâgar Press, 1889). This was reprinted 1903 (2nd ed.), 1915 (3rd, not seen), and the 4th edition of 1930 specifies that it was revised by Dev Laxman S'âstri Paṇs'îkar. My modern reprint is dated 1970 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), crediting Jagdîś Lāl Śāstrī. It is the 3rd edition which provided the source for the unicode version input by James Mallinson, Elena Artesani, Rabi Acharya, Nirajan Kafle, and Tyler Neill and available on the GRETIL site: http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_sanskr/5_poetry/4_narr/sokss _mu.htm, accompanied by a metrical analysis.

14   Jacob Samuel Speyer, *Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akadademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Afdeeling Letterkunde, nieuwe reeks, VIII.5 (Amsterdam: Johannes Müller, 1908): 62. I have noticed nothing substantial in an earlier Dutch paper by Speyer which is not repeated in his English monograph: "Het zoogenaamde Groote Verhaal (de Bṛhatkatha) en de tijd zijner samenstelling," *Verslagen en mededeelingen van de Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Afdeeling letterkunde 4.9

idea which I find implicit in a remark of V. Raghavan, who in speaking of D says "Here, thanks also to their Sanskrit scholarship, the editors improved the text very much."[15] Even before reading this suggestive statement, I began to suspect that more than a few of the different readings (we cannot, in the absence of reference to manuscripts, speak of variants) found in D might stem from the emendations of the editors, a point to which, again, I will return below. It is worthwhile noting that, at least in the edition I have to hand, there are for the entire text (the extent of which is discussed below, but which covers 597 closely printed pages) a mere 25 notes of variant readings, and three references to Brockhaus (and no references more specific than *pustakāntare* or *pustakāntarapāṭha*, alongside the three to *brokausmudrite pustake*, that is, in the Brokhaus printed edition).

The KSS is generally considered together with the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* of Kṣemendra,[16] the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṁgraha* of Budhasvāmin,[17] and the Jaina Prakrit *Vasudevahiṇḍī*[18] to represent in some way or another retellings of the

---

(1907): 116–146. To my regret, I have been unable to locate Speyer's own copies of the books referrred to in this paper in the Leiden University library; in fact I know nothing about the disposition of his personal collection after his death, but it does not appear to have come to Leiden.

15 Venkataraman Raghavan, "Corrections and Emendations in the Text of the Kathāsarit-sāgara," *Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras* 16.1 (1959–1960): Sanskrit section, 1–5. Here p. 1.

16 On the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, a work the reputation of which is generally not very high, see Sylvain Lévi, "La Bṛihatkathāmañjarī de Kshemendra," *Journal Asiatique*, tome 6, 8ième sér. (1885): 397–479; tome 7 (1886): 178–222.

17 On the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṁgraha*, recipient of much more attention, see in the first place Félix Lacôte, *Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā: suivi du texte inédit des chapitres XXVII à XXX du Nepāla-Māhātmya*. Contributions à l'Histoire des Contes Indiens (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1908), and *Budhasvāmin. Bṛhat-Kathā Çlokasaṁgraha: Texte Sanskrit publié pour la première fois avec des notes critiques et explicatives et accompagné d'une traduction française* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1908–1929). The former was reviewed by Tawney in *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1909): 1127–1133. An English translation of the *Essai* was published by A[ntoine] M[arie] Tabard, first in the *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society* (IV.1 [1913]: 26–32; IV.2 [1914]: 64–73; IV.3: 85–88; IV.3: 89–103; IV.4 [1914]: 141–156; V.4 [1914–1915]: 164–205; VI.8 [1915–1916]: 222–231; XIII [1922–1923]: 93–148; XIV.4 [1924]: 147–228), and then in book form as *Essay on Guṇāḍhya and the Bṛhatkathā, by Professor Félix Lacôte* (Bangalore City: Bangalore Press, 1923). The text itself has more recently been edited and translated by James Mallinson, *The Emperor of the Sorcerers*. Clay Sanskrit Library (New York: New York University Press and JJC Foundation, 2005). I have not seen Claus Haebler's 1958 Leipzig dissertation, Die indischen Lebensverhältnisse nach Budhasvāmins Bṛhatkathā Slokasaṁgraha dargestellt, my knowledge of which I owe to the kindness of Oskar von Hinüber, to whom I also owe several corrections in the present contribution.

18 I follow here the spelling of the editio princeps, but note that more usually the form

lost *Bṛhatkathā* of an author known (perhaps as a nickname) as Guṇāḍhya, itself said to have been composed in Paiśācī.[19] There is also reason to believe that the Tamil *Peruṅkatai* is yet another version, although it has received much less attention.[20] Much of the scholarly consideration given to KSS over the years was directly or indirectly concerned with questions of its putative source in the *Bṛhatkathā*. It is clear, however, that whatever relation KSS may bear to the *Bṛhatkathā*, it is, most basically, inspired by it, taking over its general

seems to be °*hiṇḍi*. See Caturvijayamuni and Puṇyavijayamuni, *Pūjyaśrī-Saṅghadāsagaṇi-vācakavinirmitaṁ Vasudevahiṇḍī-prathamakhaṇḍaṁ* (Bhāvanagara, 1930–1931, reprinted Gandhinagar: Gujarat Sahitya Akadami, 1989); H.C. Bhayani and R.M. Shah, *Dharmaseṇagaṇi Mahattara's Vasudevahiṁḍī Madhyama Khaṇḍa: A seventh century Prakrit recast of the famous Bṛhatkathā narrative*. Part I. L.D. Series 99 (Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1987); Jagadishchandra Jain, *The Vasudevahiṇḍī: An authentic Jaina version of the Bṛhatkathā*. L.D. Series 59 (Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1977). I will not rehearse the bibliography of these three works further here.

19   Much has been written about Guṇāḍhya and his work, also in the works mentioned in other notes here, but see also, for what it's worth, S.N. Prasad, *Studies in Guṇāḍhya*. Chaukhambha Oriental Research Studies 6 (Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia, 1977). The suggestion that the name may be a nickname is that of Ryūtarō Tsuchida, "On the Textual Division of the Original *Bṛhatkathā*," *Indotetsugaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* インド哲学仏教学研究 / *Studies in Indian Philosophy and Buddhism* 14 (2007): 1–24, on p. 1. The same author has also contributed: "Über die direkte Quelle für die kaschmirischen Versionen der Bṛhatkathā," *Indologica Taurinensia* 28 (2002): 211–250; "On the Narrative Structure of the Kashmiri Versions of the Bṛhatkathā," in Publication Committee for Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodō Mori, ed., *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodō Mori* (Hamamatsu: Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai, 2002): 449–474. Tsuchida Ryūtarō 土田龍太郎, *Daisetsuwa Burihattokatā* 大說話ブリハットカター. Chuko sensho 中公選書 25 (Tokyo: Chūōkōron shinsha 中央公論新社, 2017) is an avowedly popular book, but rich with information. See also Shibazaki Maho 柴崎麻穂, "Haracaritacintāmaṇi no Guṇāḍhya densetsu" Haracaritacintāmaṇiの Guṇāḍhya 伝説 (The Story of Guṇāḍhya in the Haracaritacintāmaṇi), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學仏教學研究 46.2 (1998): 1010–1007 (51–54), and id., "Bṛhatkathā-kigendan to shichinin no Vidiyādara tenrinō" Bṛhatkathā 起源譚と七人のヴィディヤーダラ転輪王 (Stories of the origins of the Bṛhatkathā and the seven Vidyādhara cakravartins), *Minami Ajia Kenkyū* 南アジア研究 10 (1998): 74–91. On the Paiśācī language (and not incidentally also much on Guṇāḍhya), see Andrew Ollett, "Ghosts from the past: India's undead languages," *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 51.4 (2014): 405–456, esp. 445–449, for passages related to KSS.

20   Perhaps first noted by Krishṇasvāmi Aiyangār, "Bṛhat Katha," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1906: 689–692. Important studies are Donald Nelson, The Bṛhatkathā: A Reconstruction from Bṛhatkathāślokasaṁgraha, Peruṅkatai and Vasudevahiṁḍī, PhD dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1974; id. "Bṛhatkathā Studies: The Problem of an Ur-Text," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 37.4 (1978): 663–676; id. "Bṛhatkathā Studies: the Tamil Version of the Bṛhatkathā," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 22 (1980): 221–235; R. Vijayalakshmy, *A Study of the Peruṅkatai, an authentic version of the story of Udayana* (Madras: International Institute of

frame story, into which a huge variety of other tales, large and small, have been embedded. These tales and their motives, alongside the realia of eleventh century Indian (or Kashmiri) life depicted in them, have since the beginning of the work's modern appearance drawn the attention of folklorists, and a number of the reviews of TP appeared in folklore journals and focused on such aspects. In fact, the work has drawn somewhat less interest from Sanskritists.[21] One reason for this may be the existence of what is beyond doubt the most important publication on the text of KSS from a philological point of view, *Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara*, published by Jacob Samuel Speyer (1849–1913) in 1908 (see above n. 14). The sheer scope and depth of Speyer's examination of the text may have given scholars the impression that there is little more to be done, despite Speyer's own expressed wish for a future critical edition (p. 93). Another issue worthy of attention is that while Tawney's translation, especially in Penzer's reedition (with some corrections in notes), is superb, it is not perfect, and there is some room for improvement here and there.

Penzer made ample use of the corrections suggested by Speyer, usually with attribution, sometimes not,[22] but there are significant cases in which he overlooked Speyer's essential corrections,[23] such as that (Speyer p. 63) indicating the omission of two ślokas in what is 26.134 in Br. (= D 26.134–136, also notated as 5.3.134–136), found in Tawney's translation at TP at II.227 but without any note from Penzer correcting the text. This may be a moment to remark that

---

Tamil Studies, 1981). My complete ignorance of Tamil prevents me from further consideration of this source. Nelson (1978: 664) wrote that "in general the work has been ignored, understandably so if one considers its forbidding length and difficult style." I fear, however, that rather than the length of the work or its difficulty, it is simply unfamiliarity with the language that has prevented many scholars from taking it into account.

21 Among reviews we might note (extremely selectively), chiefly those of Indologists: Franklin Edgerton, *The American Journal of Philology* 46.4 (1925): 375–378; Jarl Charpentier, *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 58.1 (1926): 127–128, 60.3 (1928): 679–681; Paul Pelliot, *T'oung Pao*, Second Series 25.1/2 (1927): 134–139, 28.3/5 (1931): 436–444; W.R. Halliday, *Folklore* 35.4 (1924): 399–406, 37.1 (1926): 105–108; Otto Stein, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 1925.7–8: 548–550, 1927.2: 127–130, 1929.7: 584–591. Perhaps in this category as well we might note Richard Carnac Temple, "Hindu and non-Hindu elements in the Katha Sarit Sagara," *Indian Antiquary* 57 (1928): 190–196; 58 (1929): 6–11, 41–47, 84–90, 131–137.

22 I have found very few instances in which Penzer corrects Tawney when the correction was not already noted by Speyer. In those cases when I do not find the correction in Speyer, probably the credit should go to Lionel David Barnett (1871–1960), whose help is acknowledged freely by Penzer.

23 And those of others, such as that offered to 9.6–7 already by Charles J. Ogden, "Note on Kathāsaritsāgara 9.7," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 37 (1917): 328, correcting an error overlooked by Speyer. The corresponding place in TP is I.95.

KSS is divided into 18 *lambaka*s, each of which is divided into various *taraṅga*s (waves), the latter indication of textual division of course playing on the very name of the text, in which *sarit* is a river and *sāgara* ocean. Despite Penzer's *The Ocean of Story*, the name under which the text is mainly known in English (but see n. 7 for other renderings), Tawney had called it more literally *Ocean of the Streams of Story*. The title clearly evokes the nearly endless ocean collecting stories which flow into it in vast rivers, but in this sense, at least in the English in which I am most at home, "streams" is an inadequate rendering of *sarit*, since the flows envisioned are evidently not small and insubstantial but rather quite the opposite. Be that as it may, Speyer among others refers to the text by the sequentially numbered *taraṅga*s, which total 124, while others cite the text by *lambaka*, *taraṅga* within that *lambaka* (and thus not sequential *taraṅga* number), and verse. While this can be slightly confusing, D allows one to locate a passage either way (citing on each verso *āditaraṅga* and on each recto *lambaka* and *taraṅga*), but unfortunately the otherwise extremely useful digitized text (see above n. 13) cites only by *lambaka*, *taraṅga* and verse.[24] To aid location, a table may be helpful:

lambaka–taraṅga	Sequential *taraṅga*	TP
1.1–8	1–8	I.1–93
2.1–6	9–14	I.94–193
3.1–6	15–20	II.1–124
4.1–3	21–23	II.125–169
5.1–3	24–26	II.170–242
6.1–8	27–34	III.1–154
7.1–9	35–43	III.155–300
8.1–6	44–50	IV.1–121
9.1–6	51–56	IV.122–251
10.1–10	57–66	V.1–195
11.1	67	V.196–204
12.1–36	68–103	VI.1–VII.193
13.1	104	VIII.1–20
14.1–4	105–108	VIII.21–69

---

24   One should note that on the whole the verse numbers correspond between Br. and D, but this is not always the case, because of differences in the constituted text, and it is not altogether unlikely that any future critical edition will find it necessary here and there to adjust the numbering yet again.

(*cont.*)

lambaka–taraṅga	Sequential *taraṅga*	TP
15.1–2	109–110	VIII.70–93
16.1–3	111–113	VIII.94–131
17.1–6	114–119	VIII.132–209
18.1–5	120–124	IX.1–86

I noticed above the limited attention that scholars have given to KSS from a text critical point of view. Probably the first to offer a substantial contribution was Hendrik Kern, commenting on the second half of the text only one year after its publication.[25] His observations were sometimes explicitly taken into account by Tawney, other times apparently implicitly, but sometimes they were ignored or rejected. It is not appropriate here to examine each case, which will be a task for a future editor, but just to illustrate the fact that Tawney, to his detriment, sometimes ignored Kern, it is worthwhile citing a few examples. Kern points out, for instance, that the difference between *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* vowels is often poorly represented in manuscripts, and Br. far too often slavishly followed those readings (something harshly criticized also by Speyer some half a century later). One example is 61.319, in which Kern points out that Gautama must be Gotama, "for the ṛshi himself is meant, not one of his descendants or followers," yet TP V.96 (and D!) ignore this correction. In 54.161, in which Br. and D print *kiṁ nirarthena dehena jīvatāpi mṛtena me*, Kern suggests *kiṁ nirarthena dehena jīvato 'pi mṛtena me*. TP IV.195 renders "What is the use of this profitless body that is dead even while alive?," while Kern suggested, with his emendation, the much more convincing, "What shall I do with this useless body that is dead, although I still breathe?" In 67.31, TP V.198 glosses over a correction of Kern, *japāpuṣpa* for *jayāpuṣpa*, when the flowers are those of Kāma, which are roses (*japā*), since he seems to skip the first element of the compound altogether. (Here needless to say प was simply misread as य.) In other cases, Tawney might have done well to at least take some account of Kern's views, such as those regarding the *śleṣa* in 53.88.[26] These few examples perhaps suffice to illustrate

---

25 "Remarks on Professor Brockhaus' Edition of the Kathāsarit-Sāgara, Lambaka IX.–XVIII," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, n.s., 3.1 (1867): 167–182.

26 This does not mean of course that Kern was always correct. In 68.8, Br. and D read *tāṁ ca kanyāṁ svapārśvasthāṁ niśi dyotitakānanām | īkṣate sma*. TP VI.1 renders "And he saw that maiden near him, illuminating the wood, though it was night." Kern comments, "Since the

that even in possession of thoughtful text critical notes, Tawney did not always take the fullest advantage of them. But as we will see in a moment, he was certainly not averse to improvement to the text, and it is worth emphasizing again how excellent his translation is from end to end.

As valuable as Kern's early contributions to the correction of the text were, it was the monograph of Kern's student Speyer (see n. 14 above) which made by far and away the biggest impact on the establishment of a more correct text of KSS. This study is divided into two main sections: first a consideration of the *Bṛhatkathā*, including detailed remarks on the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, and second, remarks on the text of KSS and its interpretation. Fully 59 pages (pp. 94–153) are devoted to textual corrections, humbly titled "List of passages, the text of which has been improved in D." As noted above, Penzer took good account of almost all of these, not altering Tawney's text but offering corrections in notes. What appears to have been largely overlooked by Penzer, however, is the section (pp. 154–173) of "Conjectural criticism," in which Speyer offers suggestions for which there is no explicit warrant in D. Speyer first considers the manuscripts available to the respective editors, while observing that there is no critical reference to variants anywhere, and of course taking note of the number of places at which Tawney refers to readings of MSS available to him. I consider problematic, however, that Speyer seems to have assumed that D had manuscript sanction for the changes that it made to Br., since I think it likely that in at least some, if not many, cases of difference, the Indian editors deployed the same skills of connoisseurship that Speyer himself did, and as a consequence Speyer's preferences for readings in D may effectively erase any putative distinction between his own two sets of corrections to the text.

Speyer is no fan of Brockhaus. He writes (p. 67, emphasis in original), "While perusing Br., I was strucken [sic] by the comparatively great number of verses in that edition that sin against the laws of the metre. *All of them, without exception, are edited in D without fault*. In 191 cases his verses are too short, in 60 they are too long." After offering a list, Speyer concludes (p. 68), "The total of these inaccuracies bears on a little more than 1% of all the verses, which proves a want of exactness not so great in itself, yet considerable enough to make us in some measure diffident as to the trustworthiness of Br. as a witness of the tradition of manuscripts." It is only to be expected that Indian Sanskritists would first and foremost notice faults in the metre, and in this regard in particular it seems to me that Speyer's approval is not other than his recognition that the editors of D

girl at his side did not show a forest, but her amorous disposition, we should read *dyoti-takāmanām*." Harunaga Isaacson kindly offers his opinion that here the text as we have it is preferable to Kern's suggestion.

knew how to repair a text as well as he did. I need not repeat here Speyer's cata-
logue of mistakes in Br., but it may be worthwhile quoting his conclusion (p. 75):

> I could fill some pages more with augmenting the list of errors committed
> by Br. and corrected in D—in all the instances quoted D's text is right—
> but what utility may be obtained from it? What I have stated suffices, I
> believe, to prove that the task which Brockhaus took on his shoulders
> was inadequate to his abilities, owing for a great deal, certainly, to the dis-
> favour of the time he lived in, when Sanskrit studies encompassed a very
> limited area and could be neither broad nor deep. Durgaprasad's edition,
> there can be no question about, has superseded nowadays the European
> text of the Kathāsaritsāgara, and has become our sole standard edition,
> to be consulted and quoted up to that future day, when a critical edition
> in the true sense of these words will have been published.[27]

As a rationale for his extensive evaluation of the errors of "an obsolete edition,"
Speyer mentions not only the need to query manuscript readings, but also the
fact that what he excellently calls the Petropolitan Dictionary "is very much
indebted to the [KSS]." He then offers 12 pages of corrections to lemmata of
the longer and shorter dictionaries. Given its very wide use (and unfortunately,
its uncorrected inclusion in digital resources), it will be necessary also to sys-
tematically check the dictionary of Monier Williams, since at least some of the
imaginary forms recorded in the "Petropolitan" have been taken over. For exam-
ple, Monier Williams records *karṇin* in the sense of "steersman," which Speyer
notes rests on a bad reading of Br. accepted by the earlier lexicon from which
Monier Williams "borrowed" so much.[28] Again, "The form *karṇajapa* found in

---

27   Whatever his reasons may have been, I feel that Speyer is being rather unfair here. Brock-
      haus, after all, brought to completion the edition of a text of more than 20.000 verses,
      with *comparatively* few errors, and this is a truly grand feat in itself. (See also Windisch
      [above n. 9, p. 212], "entspricht die Beurteilung, die J.S. Speyer in seiner wertvollen Abhand-
      lung 'Studies …' der Ausgabe von Brockhaus hat angedeihen lassen, nicht der historischen
      Gerechtigkeit.") Were we to apply Speyer's standards to other publications of Sanskrit
      texts, we would find a large percentage lacking, and if I think of the materials I know best,
      Buddhist works, I suspect that Speyer would find little satisfaction in many of the "critical
      editions" we have available today (not to mention what he would think of the reeditions
      published in India under the name of P.L. Vaidya!). (I am aware that Speyer did put his
      money where his mouth was, so to speak, and there is no question that his edition of the
      Avadānaśataka is a master work, in need of almost no corrections.)
28   See Ladislav Zgusta, "Copying in Lexicography: Monier-Williams's Sanskrit Dictionary and
      Other Cases (Dvaikośyam)," *Lexicographica* 4 (1988): 145–164, for a very fair appraisal of the
      relation between the two resources.

Br. is a *monstrum lectionis*, and must be cancelled in PW V, 1258 and in PWK II,"
yet it is still found in Monier Williams (for the correct *karṇejapa*).

Speyer, leading up to his extensive list of suggestions, states (p. 91) that:

> Durgaprasad and his collaborator were better Sanskritists than Brock-
> haus; they availed themselves of his *editio princeps*; moreover they had
> the good chance of having in their possession an excellent manuscript
> not known to their predecessor. So they could carry out an edition of
> the Kathāsaritsāgara, in many respects superior to that of the European
> scholar. I have stated above that nevertheless their work cannot be called
> a critical edition, nor has it the pretension of making this claim. Inaccu-
> racies and bad readings are not wanting in that better text, too. Now and
> then, Br.'s text is even preferable.

To slightly repeat myself, KSS is a *kāvya*, and good Sanskritists with a sense of
an author's style should be expected to be able to correct the text in many
cases, even without reference to manuscripts. In fact, Speyer's own efforts in
this regard were affirmed with great praise by a scholar who knew the text inti-
mately, namely Tawney himself, who in reviewing Speyer's monograph wrote
regarding the section of "Conjectural criticism," "In chapter iii of the second
section of his book Professor Speyer puts forward some conjectures of his own.
Nearly all of them seem to me very probable, and of some of them it may be
said that, if Somadeva did not write what the Professor supposes him to have
written, he ought to have done so."[29] Still, Tawney is not beyond disagreeing
with Speyer, referring (p. 913) for instance to 120.67, in which he favors Br. over
D, against Speyer.

Finally, Speyer deals with the metre of the text, counting a total of 21.388
verses, of which 761 are not in śloka, almost all of these coming at the end of
chapters. While I am sure that this list is almost entirely correct, unless I am
quite mistaken, Speyer overlooked a few verses in *gītī*, namely 86.45=79, and
86.80. As corrections are made to the text, our evaluation of the details of its
metrical construction may also evolve slightly, but only very slightly, I should
think (and see below for some remarks concerning *vipulā*).[30]

---

29 In *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (Jul., 1908): 907–915,
    signed "C.H.T." Here p. 914.

30 Other aspects of what Speyer proposed in his monograph may also be subject to revision.
    For instance, he speculated (pp. 51–54) about the possible date of the *Mudrārākṣasa*, a
    position that has been reconsidered in the PhD thesis of Balogh Dániel, A Textual and
    Intertextual Study of the Mudrārākṣasa, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, 2015: 42 ff.

An issue which has received minimal attention was clearly presented by Penzer in his "Terminal Essay" (TP IX.93–121). This concerns the overall structure of KSS. Penzer argues that at some point parts of the text fell out of order. He presents his ideas concisely on pp. 114–115, and perhaps it is easiest simply to quote his own synthesis (his roman numerals refer to the *lambaka*s):

> Books II, III and IV form a group; V and VIII are unconnected and both Vidyādhara narratives; VI looks like a new beginning, but lacks any explanatory introduction; VII, IX, X and XI are marriages, more or less unconnected; XII and XIII are closely connected, but must come after XIV and XV (also connected), and consequently also after XVII and XVIII, because the events they relate happened during the period covered by XIV. The remaining Book, XVI, must be regarded as of two distinct divisions, the first supplying the necessary introductory matter to VI, and the second being quite unconnected.

Relying heavily on the study of Lacôte (see above n. 17), comparing the present order of KSS with the structure of the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, and the *Bṛhatkathā-ślokasaṁgraha*, Penzer (pp. 116–121) thinks to move further toward the original order, but he is cautious in assuming that this might tell us anything secure about the *Bṛhatkathā* itself. He is content to conclude that (p. 121) "we find that the K.S.S., as we have it to-day, is but a poor and badly arranged version of the original work. This Somadeva must have known; and though we see he has done his best to rearrange certain portions of it, he was well aware that any attempt to reconstruct it entirely would mean little less than composing a new work." Despite this, Penzer concludes his essay by saying of Somadeva, "We must hail him as the Father of Fiction, and his work as one of the masterpieces of the world."

Given the situation sketched above, it should be obvious that there is still ample scope for basic philological work to be done on the Sanskrit text of KSS. We know that a number of manuscripts exist, although to be sure several of these appear to be incomplete and/or inaccessible.[31] Progress, nevertheless, can be made even now, as demonstrated by a very nice paper by Tsuchida, in which he offers a revision to 2.56–59.[32] Probably other advances can also

---

31   See V. Raghavan, *New Catalogus Catalogorum: An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*. Vol. 3. Madras University Sanskrit Series 28 (Madras: University of Madras, 1967): 136–137. This can do no more than give a hint to what may actually be available.

32   Ryūtarō Tsuchida, "An Interpretation of *Kathāsaritsāgara* 1,2 56–59," in Kimura Kiyotaka

be made, for instance by comparing the texts of the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* and *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha* in particular.[33] It is a separate question, however, whether a reedition of KSS would be the best use of limited resources, when so much Sanskrit literature remains entirely unedited and unpublished. An ideal solution might be the provision to correct the text piecemeal, when work is done on a particular story or portion, but this would require in the first place availability of manuscripts.[34] It is certainly to be hoped that in the coming years more and more manusript collections will be digitized, which would greatly aid this effort.

---

hakase kanreki kinenkai 木村清孝博士還暦記念会, ed., *Higashi Ajia Bukkyō: Sono seiritsu to tenkai: Kimura Kiyotaka hakase kanreki kinen ronshū* 東アジア仏教: その成立と展開: 木村清孝博士還暦記念論集 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社, 2002): 702–691 (87–98). Note that Bollée (p. 73) misprints the verse number (it should be 2.56) and turns *guhyarūpa* into "in *liṅga* form"; in his translation Mallinson rendered it with "vagina," probably correctly.

33   It should be noted that other textual corrections have been made, for instance in the volumes of Mallinson (see n. 7, above: vol. 1: 520–525, vol. 2: 569–570), and I assume also here and there in other translations to which I do not have access. It would be a boon to the study of the text if all such suggestions could be collected in one place. Bollée himself offered a few suggestions, which I have collected here since they must be mined from the text within which they are hidden (I omit those cases where I cannot understand what Bollée intended, and errors of *guṇa* for *vṛddhi* vowels, but it remains that Bollée offered surprisingly few corrections; moreover, by listing them here I do not imply that in all cases I necessarily agree):
   – 10.45a and 73b *mṛgāṅka* > *mṛtāṅka*? (Bollée wrongly 10.48 and 51).
   – 18.298d D: *pāśu-rajju*, read with Br. *pāśa-rajju*.
   – 18.315c Br. *ca ārādhitaḥ*, D *cārādhipaḥ* > *cārādhitaḥ*.
   – 22.240d *adaḥ* > *adhaḥ*.
   – 26.14b *adaḥ* > *adhaḥ* [already suggested by Tawney 1880: 220, and TP II.218, apparently overlooked by Bollée].
   – 28.65a D *vṛṣṭair* misread for Br. *vṛkṣair*.
   – 45.127b Br. *dravyājya-yuktitaḥ*, D *dvairājya-yuktitaḥ* > Read: *divyājya-* ? cf. 45.50d *divyābhir oṣadhībhir ghañena ca* (*divya* thus represents *divyāuṣadhi*).
   – 46.121c D *visoḍha-vahneś ca*, Br. *viṣoḍha-vahneś ca* (*viṣa* + *ūḍha* + *vahni*, cf. *viṣāgni*, *viṣānala*); TP IV 57n1 reports MSS reading *soḍhāhidanśasya* and *visoḍhavahneś*.
   – 92,42a D *pakva-phala*, Br. *pañca-phala* is correct (?).
   – 96,26c Br., *buddhyā*, D *baddhvā* > *vṛddhvā* ?
   – 101.180b *nāga-bandha* > *rāga-bandha*?
   – 108.69c *hṛta-vastrārdra-vasanā* > *-vasnā ca*. This solves a problem discussed in TP VIII .58n3. Instead of "with her bathing dress dripping with moisture" Bollée reads "whose skin was wet because her garments were taken away."
   – 121.6b and 13d *khaṇḍa-kāpālika* > *caṇḍa-kāpālika*.
   – 123.216cD *vedo* read with Br. *vedī*.

34   At least some scholars have done their best with what is available. Frederik David Kan Bosch, *De Legende van Jīmūtavāhana in de Sanskrit-Literatuur* (Leiden: S.C. van Does-

1   The Kashmiri Context

KSS is, needless to say, not *sui generis*, and one way to approach it, and related texts, is to examine its environment. As mentioned at the outset, recent years have seen a renewed interest in the literary productions of Kashmir in general, with a particular focus on the famous *Rājataraṅgiṇī* of Kalhaṇa, which has begun to be treated perhaps less as a historical document and more as a literary one, or it might be better to say that the central move is to erase the contrastive choice between history and literature altogether. In other words, the landscape of Kashmiri literature has shifted with the recognition that works need not be boxed into only one particular genre. An important theoretical move was Whitney Cox's theorization of the central *ślokakathā* genre.[35] Cox was far from the first to approach the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* as a *kāvya*, of course; as J.W. de Jong pointed out in a review of the important book of Bernard Kölver on the text,[36] Kölver referred to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* as a "kāvya mit historischem Thema" (Kölver p. 10), but Oldenberg already in 1910 had made much the same

---

burgh, 1914) states (5n1) that although he takes D as his base text: "Enkele corrupte plaatsen in D. hebben wij hierbij uit Brockhaus (B.) verbeterd. Waar de beide teksten belangrijke afwijkingen vertoonden, hebben wij de door ons gevolgde lezing in een noot vermeld en daarachter, tusschen haken, de verworpen lezing gevoegd. In enkele gevallen hebben wij de in Tawney's vertaling (…) medegedeelde lezing van het door hem geraadpleegde 'Sanskrit College Ms.' (C Ms.) gevolgd." While this, then, does nothing more than take careful note of the available published sources, it does seem to represent a more careful approach than some others have undertaken. Note that the story he studies has also drawn the attention of other scholars (see the Wortham references in n. 7 above as well), such as Shibazaki Maho 柴崎麻穂, who has expanded the sources examined: "Jīmūtavāhana monogatari kenkyū: Bṛhatkathā-kei denshō o chūshin ni" Jīmūtavāhana物語研究: Bṛhatkathā系伝承を中心に (The Story of Jīmūtavāhana in the Versions of the Bṛhatkathā), *Bukkyō Bunka* 仏教文化 35 (1996): 19–97 [not seen]; id., "Vāsuki-Purāṇa no Jīmūtavāhana monogatari" Vāsuki-PurāṇaのJīmūtavāhana物語 (The Tale of Jīmūtavāhana in Vāsuki-Purāṇa), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學仏教學研究 44.2 (1996): 931–929 (50–52); id., "Haracaritacintāmaṇi to Jīmūtavāhana monogatari" Haracaritacintāmaṇi と Jīmūtavāhana 物語 (A Story of Jīmūtavāhana in the Haracaritacintāmaṇi), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學仏教學研究 45.2 (1997): 1001–998 (42–45).

35   Whitney Cox, "Literary register and historical consciousness in Kalhaṇa: A hypothesis," *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 50.2 (2013): 131–160.

36   Bernhard Kölver, *Textkritische und philologische Untersuchungen zur Rājataraṅgiṇī des Kalhaṇa* (= *Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, Supplementband 12) (Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1969), reviewed by de Jong in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 16.3 (1974): 225–227, with the cited comment on p. 225. See too Walter Slaje, "'In the Guise of Poetry'–Kalhaṇa Reconsidered," in Walter Slaje, ed., *Śāstrārambha: Inquiries into the Preamble in Sanskrit*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 62 (Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 2008): 207–244.

point, as de Jong quotes him: "Der gestaltende Prozess, den dieser Stoff in der Tat durchgemacht hat, ist nicht der des historischen Denkens, sondern der Dichtung—der Dichtung im indischen Sinn, mit ihren glänzenden Eigenschaften und ihren Schwächen."[37] Cox picked up these ideas and looked at the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* specifically in the context of works such as KSS, suggesting (p. 132) that they belong to "a particularly Kashmirian habit of long works in simple verse," in which by "simple verse" is meant the general eschewal of complex metres. Cox defined the genre of *ślokakathā* (pp. 136, 138) as characterized by works "predominantly cast in the *anuṣṭubh* or *śloka* meter," with a "high incidence of *vipulā* odd quarter-verses," "a penchant for employing the aorist tense," "frequent use of *bahuvrīhi*-type descriptive compounds containing participles as their first element," and noting a "very important commonality of the *ślokakathā*s: all are retellings of existing narratives." With regard to the use of *vipulā*, it is interesting to observe that according to my calculations, out of something like 20.627 *śloka*s in KSS, there are about 6.866 lines of *vipulā*, a rate of exactly 12 %. According to Cox (p. 136n11), Kölver's survey of the *vipulā* in a sample of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* revealed a rate of 20 %. This might indicate that in this respect KSS is less closely linked to this *ślokakathā* genre than some other works, but further study is certainly necessary. Cox goes on to say (p. 137):

> [I]n works that fall within the genre taxon on external criteria (i.e. works of extended narrative verse composed by Kashmirian authors), it is possible to isolate particular verses or passages where some or all of the diagnostic features of metric, form and syntax are present. The calculated use of the register, then, may be taken *ex hypothesi* to mark a deliberate decision on the particular author's part, the conscious recourse to an intensified mode of poetic address.

Of particular interest to us here is Cox's suggestion for a future study (p. 143):

> The two Kashmirian versions of the *Bṛhatkathā* would supply an especially fruitful field of study, in that they provide differential applications of the style to identical narrative materials and given the 'control evidence' supplied by Budhasvāmin's (earlier and probably non-Kashmirian) *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṁgraha*. A stylistic comparison of Kṣemendra's and Somadeva's texts could likely give a firm empirical basis to their relationship in

---

37   Citing *Aus dem alten Indien: Drei Aufsätze über den Buddhismus, altindische Dichtung und Geschichtschreibung* (Berlin: Gebrüder Paetel, 1910): 93.

literary history; not least in that it would allow us to observe a case of the
formation of literary judgment in vivo.

I will not further discuss the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, although it is clear that it must have
a place in comprehensive considerations of the literary culture of "fiction," at
least in Kashmir, and perhaps more widely. One interesting question in terms
of thinking about Kashmiri fiction is that it need not find its settings in Kashmir
itself. In fact, KSS, though composed in Kashmir, places its action in the Cen-
tral Himalayas and the Vindhya forest in central India. If we are speaking of a
particular Kashmiri form of literary composition, how and in what ways can
we set this side by side with, for instance, Buddhist or Jaina narrative literature,
likely composed elsewhere than Kashmir, but sharing the same mise-en-scène
of much if not most of the action of the KSS, at least broadly speaking? When
we study KSS and related works seeking cultural information, should we under-
stand this to reflect 11th c. Kashmir, or the locations of the stories? Judit Törzsök,
in writing about the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, states clearly her position that "Most myths
and legends cited by Kalhaṇa certainly reflect the state of religious currents of
his own time rather than of the past he deals with."[38] I will suggest below that
this is not necessarily the case for KSS.

All of this brings us to an issue which requires consideration, namely the
relationship between the genre of *ślokakathā* and other "Hindu Fiction," a term
perhaps most closely associated with Maurice Bloomfield,[39] whose essays are
incredible models of how one might approach an encyclopedic vision of the
corpus from the perspective of themes. Bloomfield and his followers produced
a string of studies which were meant, rather informally it seems, ultimately to
contribute to an "Encyclopedia of Hindu Fiction," and the scope of materials
taken into account is instructive.[40] Many of these narrative works, however, are
not in verse, not composed in Kashmir, and not always in Sanskrit, since they
certainly include Jaina Prakrit (and in the case of the Buddhist Jātakas, also
Pāli) works. Among those which might be considered, however, is the roughly

---

38   "Tolerance and its limits in twelfth century Kashmir: Tantric elements in Kalhaṇa's Rājata-
      raṅgiṇī," *Indologica Taurinensia* 38 (2015): 1–27. Here p. 2.

39   On whom see Franklin Edgerton, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 48 (1928): 193–
      199. That Bloomfield was an Austrian Jew was reason for Charles Lanman, his own teacher,
      to argue that E.W. Hopkins ("a genuine *American*") was a better choice for a professorship
      at Johns Hopkins, although in the end indeed Bloomfield was appointed, having been
      judged the better scholar (Stephen G. Alter, *William Dwight Whitney and the Science of
      Language* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005]: 211).

40   See TP VII.xxviii–xxix, which follows Bloomfield's Foreword to the volume, which lists
      many of the relevant works of Bloomfield, and a few of his followers.

contemporaneous *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra*, a Jaina work of Hemacandra (c. 1088–c. 1177), the extent of which is even greater than that of KSS, containing, according to my count, 30.128 verses, of which I have the impression that almost all are śloka.[41] This however is a work of Gujarat, and thus an interesting question would be to what extent a work like this might nevertheless qualify in the genre of *ślokakathā*. This raises, or should raise in the future, the question of just what sorts of comparanda should be considered in the quest to contextualize such works. At least my initial impression is that perhaps we have two lobes of a Venn diagram, one of which consists in Kashmiri works, the other of non-Kashmiri "Hindu Fiction," and that an operative question is what the zone of overlap looks like, and what it can tell us about the respective zones which do not overlap.[42] It should not be forgotten that narrative literature includes not only those works already mentioned above, but compendia such as the Buddhist Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya,[43] some of which is preserved in Sanskrit,

---

41   The work has been translated in its entirety by Helen Moore Johnson in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series 51, 77, 108, 125, 139, 140, over a period of many years (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931–1962). Bollée also produced "Hemacandra's Life of Mahāvīra (Triṣaṣṭiśalākā-puruṣacaritra X): Analysed in Keywords from Helen Johnson's Translation VI," *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Südasienstudien* 32/33 (2015/2016): 41–165, followed by Thomas Oberlies, "Appendix: Life and work of Helen M. Johnson," pp. 176–173, constituting an obituary by J.P. Thaker, followed by a bibliography by Oberlies. (Note that this [p. 168] mentions "about 35000 verses" in the *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra*, but I think this cannot be correct; my calculation may be off slighly, but not by that much. Also note, in my impression, that as in KSS, the non-śloka verses appear primarily at the ends of chapters.) In this regard, it might be helpful also to mention another contribution in the same line by Bollée, "Hemacandra's Lives of the Jain Elders (Pariśiṣṭaparvan): Analysed in Keywords based on Richard C.C. Fynes' Translation," *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Südasienstudien* 34 (2017): 1–108. Again in the same vein is "An Important Narrative Collection Available Again: A propos Hemavijaya's Kathāratnākara," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 50 (2006): 69–139.

42   Of course these are not the only "zones" of comparison. A comparison with the Epics, for instance, is undertaken by Danielle Feller, "Travelling through the Millennia: Travels in the Sanskrit Epics and in the Works of the *Bṛhatkathā*-Cycle," in Danuta Stasik and Anna Trynkowska, eds., *Journeys and Travellers in Indian Literature and Art. Volume 1: Sanskrit and Pali Sources* (Warsaw: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa, 2018): 88–108.

43   In this regard see in the first place Jampa Losang Panglung, *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvā-stivāda-Vinaya analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Übersetzung.* Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 3 (Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library, 1981). In terms of the relationships of this collection and other Buddhist narrative sources with Jaina sources, still barely studied, see among others Adelheid Mette, "The Tales Belonging to the *Namaskāra-vyākhya* of the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*. A Survey," *Indologica Taurinensia* 11 (1983): 129–144; Juan Wu, "Parallel Stories in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*: A Preliminary Investigation," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 137.2 (2017): 315–347; id., "Stories of King

and the huge riches of the Jaina literary tradition, for the most part yet hardly touched by scholars, or at least by those publishing in western languages.[44]

Concerning other recent developments in the study, from very early on, attention was given to the author Somadeva, and in particular to what information could be extracted from the incipit and explicit of KSS. The former was discussed in considerable detail by Lacôte (in his *Essai*, see n. 17, above, pp. 123ff.) The latter is what constitutes Somadeva's *praśasti*, found printed probably for the first time in a manuscript catalogue of Albrecht Weber (1825–1901),[45] and edited by Georg Bühler (1837–1898).[46] Bühler bases himself, he tells us, primarily on copies of manuscripts in the Deccan College in Śāradā, and thus presumably of Kashmiri origin. The text is almost always quoted from D, but this is nothing but a reprint of Bühler's edition.[47] It was translated in TP by Barnett (IX.87–89) as the "Author's Epilogue," but a more comprehensive treatment is that of Janet Mijung Um in her excellent Master's thesis.[48] Another

---

Bimbisāra and His Son Ajātaśatru in the *Cīvaravastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and Some Śvetāmbara Jaina Texts," *Indotetsugaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* イント哲学仏教学研究 21 (2014): 19–47; id., "The Story of the Previous Life of Ajātaśatru/Kūṇika in Buddhist and Śvetāmbara Jain Texts," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學仏教學研究 62 (2014): 1173–1178.

44 Perhaps no one has done more in recent years in regard to this literature than Phyllis Granoff, whose many publications include *The Clever Adulteress: A Treasury of Jain Stories* (Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press, 1990) and *The Forest of Thieves and the Magic Garden: An Anthology of Medieval Jain Stories* (Delhi: Penguin Books, 1998), as well as a large number of articles. Apparently still forthcoming is the promised Peter Flügel, ed., *Jaina Narratives*. Routledge Advances in Jaina Studies 8 (London: Routledge, 20??). But this only begins to barely scratch the surface of the Jaina treasury of narrative literature.

45 *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit- und Prâkṛt-Handschriften*, zweiter band. Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin V (Berlin: A.W. Schade, 1886): 161–162, under §1569–1573. (Incidentally, Speyer 1908: 62 remarks "I cannot find that Brockhaus availed himself of MS 1579 in Weber's Catalogue.")

46 It is in "Über das Zeitalter des kaśmīrischen Dichters Somadeva," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 110 (1886): 545–558, the edition on 547–549, with a translation. Bühler was, interestingly, a student of Benfey, one of the true pioneers of the study of tale literature (see n. 5).

47 The smoking gun proving that the version in D is directly reliant only on Bühler's edition is found in verse 8, which is printed in D as *viśvambharā ... na ca nāpi bhṛ* .... Bühler however had the line only with *viśvambharā*, the rest blank, but in a note, referring to the MSS upon which he relied, he wrote: "Dieser Vers fehlt Nr. 112, 113, 115. Nr. 111 hat der dritten Zeile noch einige unzusammenhängende Buchstaben न चनापि भृ°." Upon this evidence it is obvious that, without any attribution, the Indian editors have simply taken over Bühler's edition. The only actual edition of the *praśasti* thus far published is therefore that of Bühler.

48 Crossing the Ocean of Story: The Kashmiri *Bṛhatkathā*s in Literary Context, South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 2014, esp. §§2.3–3.4 (pp. 20–

consideration is that offered by Luther James Obrock in his PhD thesis, which continues along the lines set out by Cox.[49] Since both of these works remain unpublished, however, it seems unfair to comment on or to preempt them by presenting their conclusions here. I hope both will appear in revised form soon.

2　　　Bollée's Contribution

We may now turn to a consideration of Bollée's contribution. He helpfully tells us what is also clear from an examination of the book, namely that it was generated from the notes he made when teaching the text. This has the result that its coverage is uneven, with topics of particular interest being covered well and with detailed secondary references, others passed over in silence. The main challenge to the usefulness of such a volume is that TP has got to be one of the best indexed books I have ever seen, with more than 300 densely printed two-column pages of index. Yet, Bollée tells us (p. 9), "Penzer's articles are, however, often impractically arranged, and many informative details are missing," by which I presume he means, in the index, for in the volumes themselves obviously Penzer dealt with issues and topics as they arose, rather than systematically. But I am not sure that Penzer's excellent index is any way more impractical than Bollée's, and in some respects it is quite less so. Bollée is surely right, however, to say (pp. 10–11), "Given the long time the KSS has been made the object of research, it is surprising how many unresolved problems have remained and were frequently not even recognized as such," a sentiment with which we must agree, without necessarily agreeing that Bollée moves us very far toward solving such problems. Bollée tells us that "this index is in English," but this is only half true. The alphabetical order is English, but a huge proportion (I have no good way to calculate) of the head-words are Sanskrit. Why, I wonder, did the author simply not choose to offer two parts, one in Sanskrit, in the appropriate alphabetical order, the other in English?

In order to use the English portion of the index, one needs to imagine the categories Bollée might have had in mind. Some of them, starting at the

---

41), which offers a translation and commentary of the first 11 of the 13 verses of the *praśasti*. Incidentally, the meaning of the term *kāvyāṃśa* has exercised the imaginations of a number of scholars. I wonder whether Somadeva's (and other authors') use of °*aṃśa* as the final member of a compound in other circumstances could be relevant here. See the discussion below.

49　　Translation and History: The Development of a Kashmiri Textual Tradition from ca. 1000–1500, University of California, Berkeley, 2015.

beginning, are obvious: "abduction," but after this head-word, we get 5 in San-
skrit (*ābhāva-lajjā*, *a-bhaya* [as impunity], *a-bhaya-ḍiṇḍima* [drum beat at am-
nesty], *abhicāra*, *a-bhinnātman*), then coming the next English entry, "Ābhīra
wants sex in exchange for helping woman against monkey, but is cunningly
put off." Yes, that is a head-word. It is hard to imagine anyone actually look-
ing this up. The same page contains "ablutions," also fine, followed by "abrus
precatorious," for which we are instructed to "see *guñjā*." Would not anyone
interested in this particular plant have rather searched for "jequirity bean" or
"rosary pea"? Even this sample from the first two pages of the index indicates
something about its character, namely that it is extremely difficult if not nearly
impossible to use as such. There are places (such as his note, 74n235) where
Bollée was clearly interested in his subject and researched it, but these can
only be discovered by paging though the book. (Even then, though he is clearly
interested in ichor [pp. 218–219, with extensive notes], for instance, he has not
noticed Speyer p. 83 commenting on the word *mada* in 82.33 "hidden under
a corruption in Br." Could it be because TP VI.219 did not notice it?) If the
Cultural Encyclopaedia were online, one could search it, and that would be a
considerable boon. I must also note that, although I have naturally not checked
everything, there are also places where, far from being "complementary to Pen-
zer's index," it repeats entries already found there.

There are other features. What we should have expected to be rather use-
ful is notation of words not in Monier Williams's dictionary, (some of) which
Bollée has noticed, but these references are hidden throughout the text, not
listed separately. In order to make this information clear, I append at the end
of this contribution an alphabetical list.[50] I have, again, certainly not checked,
but sometimes I noticed missing references, such as that to bees at 37.174. There
are also naturally places where Bollée has corrected earlier errors, such as his
definition of *kṣapaṇaka* as a Digambara Jaina monk, but by citing only 39.59
he misses the fact that in verse 62 the individual in question is called *nagna-*

---

50   It is, needless to say, not complete. One might add for instance *nāmagaṇaka*, "would-
be astrologer, one in name only," found in 61.252a. Bollée seems to not notice this word
(again, perhaps because TP did not?). It is confusing because printed by both Br. and D
as two words: *babhūva nāma gaṇakaḥ kaścid vijñānavarjitaḥ*, TP v.90, "There was a cer-
tain astrologer wanting in discernment." I owe the reference to Speyer, p. 81, who says
"Br. failed to see that *nāmagaṇakaḥ* … is one word, he wrongly divided *nāma gaṇakaḥ*."
This is true, but Speyer does not note that his much admired editors of D perpetuated
the error. I am sure that there are also items listed by Bollée that I may have missed.
Among those I did notice, but do not include, Bollée gives *agni-śauca* (defining it wrongly),
but as this term will soon be treated by P. Szanto in this journal, we may leave it aside
here.

kṣapaṇaka, which makes the meaning extremely clear (see also 55.137).[51] Even quite important references are sometimes missing: under "language of demons (*bhūta-bhāṣā*, Paiśācī)," to 8.30 we must add 7.29. Under "omen," we should add reference at least to 121.181, where Speyer offers for *animitta* "evil omen." Given the existence of Sternbach's extensive book on the topic (see above n. 7), I find it hard to understand Bollée's 8 pages (360–367) of "sayings." The bibliography is very comprehensive, and the "Addenda" useful.[52]

3   Buddhism in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*

To see what might be gained by a fresh look at the text, I would like to turn, however superficially, to a topic of particular interest to me, namely the portrayal of Buddhism in KSS. It is quite understandable given the day in which he worked that Tawney sometimes did not understand what KSS was saying about Buddhists, and as others have noted before, of course, sometimes terms Tawney identified as referring to Buddhist mendicants do not have that specific meaning or, as with *nagna-kṣapaṇaka* remarked on above, entirely rule it out.

---

51   There are also of course (and it is surely no more than a matter of one's own interests) references which might have gained his attention but did not, such as the occurrence at 27.116 of *āpatkāla*, time of emergency or more technically a time when normal rules of restraint are suspended. No doubt such things could be be almost endlessly listed.

52   I find it quite disagreeable but somehow essential to take note of what is, at best, an example of incredible tone-deafness on the part of Bollée who, in discussing the word *līlā-vajra* (in a book published in Germany in 2015!), offers the following (254n933): "As *vajra* is a weapon only of gods and heroes, a *līlā-vajra* may be a sports weapon like a *līlā-padma* dignitaries carry playfully in the hand, but it seems rather an emblem of rank or dignity (*vibhava*; imperium) such as the marshall's batton Hermann Göring carried in his left." Though no doubt due primarily to my own sensibilities, this sort of reference is all the more unpleasant when one is aware that one of those most invested in the study of this genre of "Hindu Fiction" was Hertel (see above n. 5), proud signatory to the 1933 "Bekenntnis der Professoren an den Universitäten und Hochschulen zu Adolf Hitler und dem nationalsozialistischen Staat" (Vow of allegiance of the Professors of the German Universities and High-Schools to Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist State), a "distinction" he shared with fellow Indologists Johannes Nobel, Walther Schubring, Emil Sieg, and Friedrich Weller, the Sinologist Alfred Forke, and Martin Heidegger, among others. While Hertel was demonstrably a rabid antisemite, apparently aside from his name on this vow, I confess my relief that there is no indication that Weller, whose contributions to Buddhist philology are so great, took any overt ideological position during the war years (or afterwards when he worked under the DDR). See Neubert (above n. 9), and "Johannes Hertel vs. Mathilde Ludendorff: Prozesse und Diskurse," in Heidrun Brückner and Karin Steiner, eds., *200 Jahre Indienforschung—Geschichte(n), Netzwerke, Diskurse* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012): 45–68.

As I have said above, Tawney's translation is a splendid piece of work, but some corrections may be offered. (We must also keep in mind that at least as the volumes are nearly universally used, some implications of Buddhist influence may be due as much to Penzer as to Tawney, and Penzer by his own admission was no Indologist.)

We may begin with an interesting passage which seems at first glance quite normal, and hence does not appear to have attracted much attention. We read (109.19–24):

> sādhu siddhaṁ **mahāhastiratna**ṁ te cakravartinaḥ |
> iti vāṇī guhāmadhyād aśarīrodabhūt tadā ‖ 19 ‖
> tataḥ khaḍgam ahīndrābhaṁ sa dadarśa nipatya ca |
> cakravartitvalakṣmyās taṁ keśapāśam ivāgrahīt ‖ 20 ‖
> sādhu bhoḥ **khaḍgaratna**ṁ te siddhaṁ jaitram arindama |
> iti vāg udabhūd bhūyo 'py aśarīrā guhāntare ‖ 21 ‖
> tataḥ sa **candrikāratna**ṁ **kāminīratna**m atra ca |
> vidhvaṁsinīti nāmnā ca **vidyāratna**m asādhayat ‖ 22 ‖
> evaṁ dvābhyāṁ sahādyābhyāṁ **sarasā candanen**a ca |
> kāryakālopayuktāni sapta māhātmyadāni ca ‖ 23 ‖
> sādhayitvā sa ratnāni guhāyā nirgatas tataḥ |
> vāmadevarṣaye tasmai siddhaṁ sarvaṁ śaśaṁsa tat ‖ 24 ‖

This is translated (TP VIII.71):

> "Bravo, emperor! Thou hast won the **jewel of the mighty elephant**." Then he saw a sword looking like a mighty snake, and he fell upon it, and seized it, as if it were the locks of the Fortune of Empire. Again a bodiless voice sounded in the cave: "Bravo conqueror of thy foes! Thou hast obtained the victorious **sword-jewel**." Then he obtained the **moonlight-jewel** and the **wife-jewel**, and the **jewel of charms**, named the destroying charm. And thus having achieved in all seven jewels (useful in time of need, and bestowers of majesty), taking into account the two first, the **lake** and the **sandalwood-tree**, he went out from that cave and told the hermit Vamadeva that he had succeeded in accomplishing all his objects.

Not much help is offered by the follow-up passage, in which the hero uses his tools (109.85–88, TP VIII.76):

> tamāṁsi **candrikā**ratnaiś **candane**nāhidṛgviṣān |
> diggajān **hasti**ratnena **khaḍga**ratnena guhyakān ‖ 85 ‖

vighnān anyāṁś **cānyaratnair** nivārya saha senayā |[53]
uttīrya tāṁ guhāṁ codagdvāreṇa sa viniryayau ‖ 86 ‖
dadarśa ca guhāgarbhanirgataḥ pārśvam uttaram |
kailāsasyāpunarjanmajīvalokāntaropamam ‖ 87 ‖
sādhu **ratnaprabhāvā**ptamāhātmyena guhā tvayā |
cakravartinn iyaṁ tīrṇety udabhūd vāk tadā divaḥ ‖ 88 ‖

He dispelled the darkness with the **moonlight-jewel**, the basilisks with
the **sandalwood-tree**, the elephants of the quarters with the **elephant-
jewel**, the Guhyakas with the **sword-jewel**, and other obstacles with **other
jewels**; and so passed that cave with his army, and emerged at its northern
mouth. And, coming out from the bowels of the cave, he saw before him
the northern side of the mountain, looking like another world, entered
without a second rebirth. And then a voice came from the sky; "Bravo,
emperor! Thous hast passed this cave by means of the majesty conferred
by the **power of the jewels**."

Despite the suggestion in Penzer's note to the first passage in TP, this can
have nothing to do with Buddhist notions.[54] Just as in Pāli sources, in those
whose origin is geographically closer to the KSS we find a quite different and
very stable list. Thus in the *Adhikaraṇavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya we
find *cakraratnaṁ hastiratnaṁ aśvaratnaṁ maṇiratnaṁ strīratnaṁ gṛhapati-
ratnaṁ pariṇāyakaratnam eva saptamam*,[55] and in the *Divyāvadāna* we read

---

53   Br. rather: *vighnāṁś cānyān anyaratnair*.

54   Bollée (373n1387) for his entry "seven imperial jewels, of Vidyādharas," citing the first pas-
      sage, writes in a note: "Viz. lake, sandalwood-tree, elephant, sword, moonlight, wife and
      the destroying charm. They are pictured on a pillar in Jaggayyapeta (Andhra Pradesh;
      first century B.C.E.) e.g. in Dallapiccola 2002: 48." I am unable to consult Bollée's source,
      the *Dictionary of Hindu Lore and Legend*, but no matter what Dallapiccola may have said,
      Bollée is here confused. As far as I can see, without exception the iconography to which he
      refers, both at the Buddhist site of Jaggayyapeta and elsewhere, conforms precisely to the
      Buddhist textual list. See for instance the very informative Monika Zin, "Māndhātar, the
      Universal Monarch, and the Meaning of Representations of the Cakravartin in the Ama-
      ravati School, and of the Kings on the Kanaganahalli Stūpa," in Peter Skilling and Justin
      McDaniel, eds, *Buddhist Narrative in Asia and Beyond*. Vol. 1 (Bangkok: Institute of Thai
      Studies, Chulalongkorn University, 2012): 149–164. This reading of the iconography, more-
      over, was clearly articulated specifically with reference to the Jaggayyapeta pillar already
      by Ananda K[entish] Coomaraswamy, "A royal gesture; and some other motifs," *Feestbun-
      del uitgegen door het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen,
      bij gelegenheid van zijn 150 jarig Bestaan 1778–1928*, part 1 (Weltevreden [Jakarta]: G. Kolff
      & Co., 1929): 57–61.

55   Raniero Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu:*

tasyemāny evaṁrūpāṇi saptaratnāni bhavanti tadyathā cakraratnaṁ hastiratnam aśvaratnaṁ maṇiratnaṁ strīratnaṁ gṛhapatiratnaṁ pariṇāyakaratnam eva saptamam.[56] In other words, the Buddhist sources give: wheel, elephant, horse, *maṇi*-jewel, wife, householder and advisor. There is very little overlap with the list in KSS. But this is not the only possible comparator. We move closer to KSS, though only a bit, with three distinct lists found one after another in the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, in which I mark in bold the items which overlap with KSS:[57]

cakraṁ ratho **maṇir bhāryā** nidhir aśvo **gaja**s tathā |
saptaitāni ca ratnāni sarveṣāṁ cakravartinām ‖ 74 ‖
cakraṁ ratho **maṇiḥ khaḍga**s varmaratnaṁ ca pañcamam |[58]
ketur nidhiś ca saptaiva prāṇahīnāni cakṣate ‖ 75 ‖
bhāryā purohitaś caiva senānī rathakṛc ca yaḥ |
mantry aśvaḥ **kalabha**ś caiva prāṇinaḥ sapta kīrttitāḥ ‖ 76 ‖

Here the first list of the jewels of a universal emperor consists in: wheel, chariot, *maṇi*-jewel, wife, treasure, horse and elephant.[59] The second list, of inanimate objects, has: wheel, chariot, sword, coat of mail, banner and treasure, while the third list comprises: wife, royal priest, general, charioteer,[60] minister, horse and elephant. In (non-)conclusion here, it is hard to know what to do with this passage, but in any case, it is must be clear that the Buddhist lists of jew-

---

Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin. Serie Orientale Roma 50 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1978): 65.5–6.

56   E[dward] B[yles] Cowell and R[obert] A[lexander] Neil, *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge: the University Press, 1886): 548.25–27.

57   Bombay: Venkatesvara Steam Press, on GRETIL, 1,29.74–76. Note that Jan Gonda, "Ancient Indian Kingship from the Religious Point of View (continued)," *Numen* 3.2 (1956): 122–155, on p. 129, refers to an almost identical list from the *Vāyu Purāṇa* 57.68 ff., citing the *Brahmāṇḍa* in a note, but as Ludo Rocher, *The Purāṇas*. A History of Indian Literature, vol. 2/3 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1986): 33 has noted, the two Purāṇas are in fact the same text, though on p. 157 he says "We have noted earlier (see 1.3.3) that the *Brahmāṇḍa°* may have been originally identical with the *Vāyu°*, and that it only later separated from it to acquire an existence of its own," but in fact this relative chronology was not made explicit in the discussion to which Rocher refers. For our purposes here, however, this is not relevant: both texts clearly predate KSS.

58   The text is printed *carmaratnaṁ*. Oskar von Hinüber makes the clearly superior suggestion that we read *varmaratna*, "coat of mail," with the common confusion of *ca/va*.

59   At least this first list is found also in the *Matsyapurāṇa* 142.63: *cakraṁ ratho maṇir bhāryā gajas tathā | proktāni sapta ratnāni pūrvaṁ svāyambhuve 'ntare.*

60   What dictionaries might suggest, namely "chariot maker," is quite impossible, as this is an extremely low status position. Is it here perhaps logically parallel with the Buddhist *pariṇāyaka*?

els are irrelevant, and KSS's list as such is seemingly not paralleled elsewhere in any sources known to me. Moreover, the fact that the text itself does not even bother to account for three of the jewels—that is, there is no mention in the sequel to the wife, charms or lake—demonstrates, I think, the non-organic nature of the list. Thus, this list of KSS remains a problem, small though it may be.

Buddhist themes do arise here and there in KSS, but it is not clear how much Somadeva may have processed his sources. An interesting usage which might be characteristic of Somadeva is the addition of °aṁśa to names and epithets. In KSS we find the following, not limited to Buddhist items:

> Kāmāṁśa 21.31c, 35b, 144b; 22.1d; 44.9b; 105.34c.
> Kāmadevāṁśa 15.130b.
> devāṁśa 18.340; 26.296b; 48.14c; 56.131b; 73.250b, 251a; 106.20a.
> devatāṁśa 90.8a; 72.141c.
> bodhisattvāṁśa 22.35a; 41.10b; 65.2b, 14c, 26d, 34a, 45a, 104a, 126c;
>   90.127a, 177c.
> Buddhāṁśa 62.121c.
> Sugatāṁśa 62.237b.
> Śivāṁśa 118.21b.
> Finally, Kārttikeya promises a son who will be (55.172b) *madgaṇāṁśaja*,
>   "the incarnation of one of my Gaṇas" (TP IV.214). Likewise, we see
>   Ambikāṁśajā (=Pārvatī) 120.28b.

By far the most common term here is *bodhisattvāṁśa*. So far I have found this elsewhere only once, in a passage from Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (89.183). That verse reads: *ekas tu bodhisattvāṁśo bhikṣus tasya dayārdradhīḥ | tadā dideśa pravrajyāṁ śikṣāpadavivarjitām*, where the Tibetan translation renders the key term *byang chub sems dpa' cha*. Some years ago I translated "one monk, belonging to the lineage of the bodhisattvas," but cannot now say why, and even wonder whether I may not have somehow misread **bodhisattva-vaṁśa*, as unlikely as this seems (I hope!).[61] It is in any case at least interesting that this other example of this usage comes from very much the same time and place as KSS, namely Kashmir in the 11th c. (There may of course be other examples to be discovered.) At the same time, in KSS we also find *bodhisattva* alone 17 times (65.41b, 71b, 84a, 98a, 108b, 116a,

---

61   J.A. Silk, "The Story of Dharmaruci: In the *Divyāvadāna* and Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 51 (2008): 137–185, on p. 168.

123c, 127c; 72.120b, 315b, 376d, 379c, 383b, 394a), and in compound a further 6 times (72.100c, 154b [*bodhisattvacaryā*], 101c [*bodhisattvamahācaryā*], 161c [*bodhisattvavratayaśas*], 235d [*bodhisattvatā*], 363c [*bodhisattvapadastha*]). We notice that these instances are limited to *taraṅga*s 65 and 72, while *bodhisattvāṁśa*, appearing predominately in *taraṅga* 65, appears also in three other *taraṅga*s. Is this significant? I wonder whether Somadeva's use of °*aṁśa* should be understood as something like a metrical filler, as indicating a sense such as "incarnate," or whether some other explanation is more convincing. In addition, might further scrutiny of this usage be relevant for an evaluation of the much discussed term *kāvyāṁśa*, which appears in the incipit of KSS (1.11; for this see above n. 48)?

The name Māra appears five times in KSS (77.53; 84.9; 91.58; 104.7; 97 [D 96]). Tawney (TP VI.187; VII.5, 70; VIII.1, 8) was content to leave it unremarked, but Penzer identifies it as "the Tempter of Gautama Buddha." This is clearly wrong; as Harunaga Isaacson kindly points out to me, Māra is listed as one of the names of Kāma in the *Amarakośa* (1.27a),[62] and therefore the first, and perhaps only, identification of this name in other than Buddhist sources is as Kāma, the god of love. It is obvious from all uses in KSS that this is the correct meaning.

Another example of a case in which some might detect Buddhist influence is in the remembrance of past lives, *jātismara*. Despite the impression some scholarship might have given to unwary readers used to isolating Buddhism from the rest of Indian mileux,[63] this idea need have nothing religious about it, although in one case in KSS (22.53: *jātismaro 'smy aham*, TP II.141 [again 22.166, TP II.149]) the attainment belongs to Jīmūtavāhana, who is designated (22.35) as *bodhisattvāṁśa*. But there are many more cases where no such conditions apply.[64] The concept is clearly not Buddhist as such.[65]

---

62 Editions seem to vary in their numeration; others have it as 25a, or 1.1.53.

63 For example, Gregory Schopen, "The Generalization of an Old Yogic Attainment in Medieval Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature: Some Notes on Jātismara," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 6.1 (1983): 109–147, which as far as I see mentions only Buddhist sources.

64 There are multiple examples of beings—geese, for instance (3.34a), or horses (18.100)—who recall their previous birth(s). It can also be falsely claimed, as by the female ascetic in the story of Devasmitā (13.134, see below). Other examples include 24.230, 26.60 (where it is part of a curse), and so on.

65 Another example, this time *pace* Tawney, I believe, occurs in 49.177 (TP IV.97), in which he translates *tatrāsti viṣṇuguptākhyo veṇātīrakṛtāspadaḥ | pravrājako bhadantāgryaḥ sa tad vetti savistaram* as "There is a mendicant there, named Vishṇugupta, who has made his dwelling on the banks of the Veṇī; he is the best of Buddhist mendicants, and knows the

While we have now dispensed with several instances in which Buddhism is not actually in question, we do find a small number of cases in KSS in which references to Buddhism actually appear.[66]

One passage (13.88ff., TP I.156ff.) speaks of a female ascetic (*pravrājikā*) who stayed in a Buddhist site (*sugatāyatanasthita*).[67] She is importuned to act as a procuress, but rejects money since she is already rich, having obtained wealth from her disciple (*śiṣyā*) who is a thief and con-artist. The ascetic (or perhaps we had better write "ascetic," for she is anything but) proceeds to try to deceive a woman for the sake of the young men who desire her (and see n. 64 for her false claim to recall her former lives).

---

spell at full length." This is certainly not utterly impossible, but Viṣṇugupta is at the least an unlikely name for a Buddhist monk, but the use of *bhadanta* does draw our attention.

66   I do not intend to pick up every passage in which an individual identifiable as Buddhist appears, including for instance in the vetāla stories, for which one may see Csaba Dezső, "Encounters with vetālas. Studies on fabulous creatures I," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 63.4 (2010): 391–426, esp. 406–407, and Po-chi Huang, "The Cult Of Vetāla And Tantric Fantasy," in Mu-chou Poo, ed., *Rethinking Ghosts in World Religions*. Numen Book Series 123 (Leiden: Brill, 2009): 211–235. Nor do I discuss the much noticed story of Jīmūtavāhana, for which see n. 34 above. Likewise, I will not dwell here on examples of materials that may have been borrowed from Buddhists, such as the Śibi story in *taraṅga* 113, or (as may, however, also be the case with the Śibi story!) may parallel materials which Buddhists (also) adopted from elsewhere, such as the fool stories in *taraṅga*s 61–65, some of which found a home in the *Baiyu jing* (百喻經, T. 209). For the former, a good summary of the sources is found in Étienne Lamotte, *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 25 (1944; reprint Louvain: Université de Louvain, 1970): 255–256. More recent work includes (this list is not meant to be exhaustive) Lidia Sudyka, "The gift-of-the-body motif in South Indian narrative tradition and art. The Śibi legend in Andhra," *Pandanus* 13.1 (2013): 89–108; id., "Generosity at the limits: the King Śibi Story and its versions in the historical and cultural context of Andhra and Tamil Nadu," in Pontillo Tiziana, Bignami Cristina, Dore Moreno, Mucciarelli Elena, eds., *The Volatile World of Sovereignty: the Vrātya problem and kingship in South Asia* (New Delhi: DK Printworld, 2015): 416–440; Balázs Gaál, "King Śibi in the East and the West: Following the Flight of a Suppliant Dove," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 24 (2017): 1–34; Veena Rani Howard, "Lessons from 'The Hawk and the Dove': Reflections on the *Mahābhārata*'s Animal Parables and Ethical Predicaments," *Sophia* 57.1–2 (2018): 119–131. For the latter see Johannes Hertel, "Ein altindisches Narrenbuch," *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 64 (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1912): 1–67. On some connections of KSS with other story treasuries, see for instance Biswanarayan Shastri, "Kathā-sarit-sāgara and the Paurāṇic Literature: The Skandapurāṇa (Some common folk-motifs)," in Biswanarayan Shastri and Pratap Ch. Choudury, eds., *Abhinandana-Bhāratī: Professor Krishna Kanta Handiqui Felicitation Volume* (Gauhati: Kāmarūpa Anusandhāna Samiti, 1982): 158–166.

67   Tawney nicely has "sanctuary of Buddha." In fact, *āyatana* is not a specific term for a type of Buddhist site, and its precise nature is thus unclear.

Perhaps the most Buddhistic of stories in KSS is that found at 27.10–54
(TP III.2 ff.), Madanamañcukā.[68] It is set in Takṣaśilā, whose king is called
paramasaugata, "supremely devoted to the Sugata" (a title adopted also, for
example, by some Pāla kings). His subjects without exception were devoted
to the prosperous Victor, bridegroom of Tārā (? *tārāvarasphītajinabhaktākhi-
laprajaḥ*).[69] The city was filled with precious shrines (*caityaratna*),[70] and a
character is introduced, a rich merchant devoted above all to making offerings
to Buddhist monks (*bhikṣupūjaikatatpara*, in which *pūjā* refers to material sup-
port, not mere devotion or worship). His son criticizes him for his devotion,
saying:

> tāta tyaktatrayīdharmas tvam adharmaṁ niṣevase |
> yad brāhmaṇān parityajya śramaṇāñ śaśvad arcasi ‖ 18 ‖
> snānādiyantraṇāhīnāḥ svakālāśanalolupāḥ |
> apāstasaśikhāśeṣakeśakaupīnasusthitāḥ ‖19 ‖
> vihārāspadalobhāya sarve 'py adhamajātayaḥ |
> yam āśrayanti kiṁ tena saugatena nayena te ‖ 20 ‖

Father, you who have abandoned the duties enjoined by the three (Vedas)
devote yourself to a wrong teaching, which consists in you forsaking the
brāhmaṇas and constantly doing honor to the mendicants (18). They
are without the restraints imposed by bathing and other (ritual purifica-

---

68   This was subject to the attention of Iwamoto Yutaka 岩本裕, "Sansukuritto bungaku ni
      okeru Bukkyō (1)" サンスクリット交學に於ける佛教 (1) [Buddhism in Sanskrit lit-
      erature 1], *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 5.1 (1957): 613–608 (20–25).
      Although this is titled as if it were to be the first in a series, it was in fact the only such
      contribution. The author points out that Buddhist scholars largely ignore non-Buddhist
      Indian literature, something unfortunately still as true today as it was in 1957. Iwamoto
      also offers his opinion that the footprint of Buddhism on ancient and medieval Indian
      society was not great. His paper quotes many but not all verses of the present chapter up
      through verse 54, and he comments on some terms, but offers no translation. Note that
      Iwamoto also published a translation of KSS (see n. 7 above).

69   The exact sense of this compound remains unclear to me. Janet Um writes to me: "This
      compound appears in an etext of another Kashmiri work, the c. 10th century *Mokṣo-
      pāya*: *tāvat tārāvaraṁ reje sainyakānanam uttamam | yāvan na parapakṣeṇa krāntaṁ
      kalpānalaujasā* ‖ (37.53). This second attestation makes the TP translation even less ten-
      able."

70   Not, I would say, as Mallinson has it (ii.305), "jewels on the stupas," even leaving aside that
      caityas are not *per se* stūpas. The whole line (*rarāja sā purī yasya caityaratnair nirantaraiḥ*)
      indicates that the city sparkles with its precious caityas crowded together, like a woman
      would sparkle adorned by a dense array of jewels on her body (it is surely not random that
      city, *purī*, is feminine).

tions), are greedy to eat whenever they wish, and are content with doing away with the remaining hair of/and the top-knot, and with the loin-cloth (19).[71] Each and every one of them, belonging to a vile caste, devotes himself to that wrong teaching out of lust for a room in a monastery. There is nothing in that method of the Sugata for you! (20).

The father responds that teachings do not have only one form: some are supramundane (*lokottara*), others entirely mundane (*sārvalaukika*). Like Buddhism, the tradition of the brāhmaṇas too involves getting rid of lust and other undesirable feelings, truth, compassion toward beings, and not uselessly quarreling about lineage (*na mṛṣā jātivigrahaḥ*, but Tawney [TP III.3n1] reports an MS reading °*nigrahaḥ*, "blaming one's relations without cause.") The father considers the main tenet of Buddhism to be non-harm (*ahiṁsā*, 25) and asserts that it leads to liberation (*mokṣa*). What follows is a lesson from the king to the boy, who is "scared straight" and eventually sees the light.[72] When the king reveals his artifice to the boy, the king says "I have made you realize this" (*bodhito 'si mayā*, 38), and the choice of the verb is surely not coincidental. In his final, classical lesson, the king has the boy carry around the city a pot full of oil; to spill a drop will mean sudden death from the guards who accompany him. When he returns to the palace, he confesses that he saw nothing of the city around him. Then the king says:

> dṛśyatailaikacittena na tvayā kiṁcid īkṣitam ‖ 51 ‖
> tat tenaivāvadhānena parānudhyānam ācara |
> ekāgro hi bahirvṛttinivṛttas tattvam īkṣate ‖ 52 ‖
> dṛṣṭatattvaś ca na punaḥ karmajālena badhyate |
> eṣa mokṣopadeśas te saṁkṣepāt kathito mayā ‖ 53

> With your mind paying attention only to the oil, you saw nothing at all. (51cd) So, with just that same attentiveness practice concentrating on the ultimate. For one (whose mind is) single-pointed, who has retreated from

---

71   Oskar von Hinüber notes: *apāstasaśikhāśeṣakeśakaupīnasusthitāḥ* is correctly understood in the French translation (1997), p. 255 "qui se sentient à l'aise le crâne rasé, mèche comprise, et cache-sexe rejeté" while TP "are content with a mere loin-cloth" is not Buddhist and due to a misunderstood compound. The key point here is that *apāsta-* applies both to the hair and to the loin-cloth.

72   I am not sure that the expression *dharmānuśāsitṛ* (27) has been understood well. TP says "who superintended the religion of the people," Mallinson "the teacher of religion." But given that the king (pretends to) judge the son for his crimes and sentence him to death, "one who punishes by law" might be better here.

external existence, sees the Truth. (52) And having seen the Truth he never again is caught up in the net of karma. With this I have given you a brief exposition of liberation. (53)

This episode is found in an extremely close series of expressions already in the Pāli canon, in the *Saṁyuttanikāya* (47.20), where attention to the bowl filled with oil is a synonym for mindfulness of one's body (*kāyagatāya etaṁ satiyā adhivacanaṁ*), and it occurs in a number of other Buddhist texts as well.

In the next chapter, we find a continuation of the story set in Takṣaśilā. There (28.7) we find a monastery (*vihāra*) with many images of the Buddha (*nānāji-nākāra*). A dharma-preaching monk (*dharmapāṭhakabhikṣu*) taught:

arthapradānam evāhuḥ saṁsāre sumahat tapaḥ |
arthadaḥ prāṇadaḥ proktaḥ prāṇā hy artheṣu kīlitāḥ ‖ 9 ‖
buddhena ca parasyārthe karuṇākulacetasā |
ātmāpi tṛṇavad dattaḥ kā varāke dhane kathā ‖ 10 ‖
tādṛśena ca dhīreṇa tapasā sa gataspṛhaḥ |
saṁprāptadivyavijñāno buddho buddhatvam āgataḥ ‖ 11 ‖
āśarīram ataḥ sarveṣv iṣṭeṣv āśānivartanāt |
prājñaḥ sattvahitaṁ kuryāt samyaksaṁbodhalabdhaye ‖ 12 ‖[73]

They say that in the round of transmigration the very greatest asceticism is to give away all one's wealth. The giver of wealth is called the giver of life, for life is tied to objects of wealth. (9) And the Buddha gave even his own life, as if it were grass, for the sake of others, with a mind filled with compassion—to say nothing of repulsive wealth! (10) Through such solid asceticism he got rid of desire, attained wonderous awareness and became a Buddha, Blessed One. (11). Thus a wise person should, by retreating from all types of wishes for himself, even at the cost of his life, work to benefit beings, in order to obtain Perfect Full Awakening. (12)

Several stories of radical self-sacrifice of the body follow, in which alongside *bhikṣu* we find also *muni*, *ṛṣi* and other non-Buddhist terms. Another Buddhist element is the story of a Nāgārjuna (41.9–59, TP III.252–256), who lives in the city of long life (Cirāyus). This figure is called *bodhisattvāṁśasaṁbhava*, on which see above. He is compassionate (*dayālu*), possessed of generosity and self-restraint (*dānaśīla*), a master of mantras (*mantrin*, *pace* Tawney's "min-

---

[73] I wonder whether we should read here °*bodhi*°.

ister"), and possessed of insight (*vijñānavat*). This Nāgārjuna is of course the alchemist, one of the several Nāgārjunas known to the Indian traditions, as the next verse clarifies, calling him knowledgable in the application of all herbal drugs (*sarvauṣadhiyuktijña*), and a master of alchemy (*siddharasāyana*).[74] Using his skills he frees himself from old age (*vijara*) and confers long life (*cirajīva*) on himself and the king. This is evidently connected with the notion that Nāgārjuna had an extraordinarily long life, as many Buddhist sources maintain. However, one of his sons dies, and as he prepares an elixer to revive him, Indra discovers his plan and has the Aśvin twins challenge him, asking why he wants to upset the balance of gods and men (*evaṁ kṛte viśeṣo hi kaḥ syād devamanuṣyayoḥ*, 18ab). The text goes on to say that "the stability of the world will be shattered by the absence of sacrifice and sacrificer" (*yaṣṭavyayājak-ābhāvād bhajyate ca jagatsthitiḥ*, 18cd), an argument which obviously makes no sense in a Buddhist context. Nāgārjuna agrees out of fear of the repercussions of disobedience, and says that thanks to his former good deeds his son has gone to a place beyond suffering (*putraś ca me prāksukṛtair aśocyāṁ sa gato gatim*, 24cd).[75] The king appoints his son as Yuvarāja, but this prince's mother presses him to realize that it is not likely that his father will actually die, and thus he will never come to ascend the throne. She urges him to ask the generous Nāgārjuna for his head as a gift. Nāgārjuna agrees, but his neck, thanks to his elixer, breaks the swords used to chop it. When the king learns of this, he asks Nāgārjuna not to give away his head, but the latter replies, "I recall my former lives, when I gave away my head 99 times, in life after life" (*jātismaro 'haṁ nṛpate navatiṁ ca navādhikām | janmāni svaśiro dattaṁ mayā janmani janmani*, 47). After Nāgārjuna enables the prince to cut off his head, a disembodied voice from the sky says, "Nāgārjuna will not be reborn; he has gone to a/the destiny equal to that of a buddha" (*nāgārjuno*

---

74 On the figure of this Nāgārjuna see Gerrit Jan Meulenbeld, *A History of Indian Medical Literature*. IA (Groningen: E. Forsten, 1999): 363–368, with notes in IB: 475–488. It is still not without interest to read Giuseppe Tucci, "Animadversiones Indicae," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 26 (1930): 125–160, wherein 139–155 deal with Nāgārjuna. It is further fascinating that Nāgārjuna the alchemist was noticed by Al-Bīrūnī in his so-called *Indica* (*Kitab al-Bīrūnī fī Taḥqīq mā li-al-Hind*), in Edward C. Sachau, *Alberuni's India: An account of the religion, philosophy, literature, geography, chronology, astronomy, customs, laws and astrology of India about A.D. 1030* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1910): I.189.

75 I think Tawney is wrong here; he translated (p. 254) "however, my son, on account of my good deeds in a former life, has gone to the abode of bliss." He apparently inadvertently took *me* twice, but it more logically goes only with *putraś*, and therefore it is the boy's own good deeds that guided him to his reward.

'punarjanmā gato buddhasamāṃ gatim, 53cd). From the point of view of Buddhist vocabulary, I should think it anomalous that *nirvāṇa* is referred to as a *gati*.

In 51.118–183 (TP IV.130–134) we find two śramaṇas, immediately thereafter referred to as bhikṣus, who offer themselves as go-betweens. Using portraits, they succeed in joining a couple. While it is well known that acting as a go-between is forbidden to Buddhist monastics, this is not the only such example portrayed in Indian literature, as Danielle Feller has explored.[76] As she notes, three female ascetic characters in the *Mālatīmādhava*, a play of Bhavabhūti composed in Maharashtra in the 8th century, are Buddhist nuns, named Kāmandakī, Avalokitā and Buddharakṣitā, and they act as go-betweens to arrange a marriage. It is interesting that the story in the play is in fact paralleled in KSS, but not here: rather, the play corresponds to the story narrated at 104.17 ff. (TP VIII.2 ff.), in which no nun, Buddhist or otherwise, plays any part. The existence of this trope in Bhavabhūti's play helps us understand that it is rather dangerous to presume that the circumstances portrayed by Somadeva in his fiction might reflect some factual social situation in the Kashmir of the 11th c. On the contrary, such evidence suggests that such portrayals reflect a poetic or fictional imagination, quite possibly traditional and folkloric. Whether—referring here to the idea of Judit Törzsök above (and n. 38) that the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* authentically depicts religious practices of the time and place of its author—this may be an example of an area in which KSS basically differs from its near contemporary is a question that will require further investigation.

To continue, Buddhist ritual practice is referred to in 63.56–62 (TPV.124). The setting is Kashmir, and the speaker recounts his former life:

> tatrāhaṃ bhavaśarmākhyo grāmavāsī kilābhavam |
> dvijātiputraḥ sāmānyo dvibhāryaḥ pūrvajanmani ‖ 56 ‖
> so 'haṃ kadācit saṃjātasaṃstavo bhikṣubhiḥ saha |
> upoṣaṇākhyaṃ niyamaṃ tacchāstroktaṃ gṛhītavān ‖ 57 ‖
> tasmin samāptaprāye ca niyame śayane mama |
> pāpā haṭhād upetyaikā bhāryā suptavatī kila ‖ 58 ‖

---

[76] Danielle Feller, "Nuns involving in the affairs of the world. The depiction of Buddhist nuns in Bhavabhūti's *Mālatīmādhava*," *Cracow Indological Studies* 14 (2012): 147–168. Feller refers for the KSS connection to V.V. Mirashi, *Bhavabhūti: His Date, Life and Works* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1974): 199–201. Since the same narrative is found also in the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, Mirashi suggests that the origins of the story adapted by Bhavabhūti lie in the *Bṛhatkathā*. As Janet Um reminds me, the theme of ascetics as go-betweens is discussed with many examples by Maurice Bloomfield, "On False Ascetics and Nuns in Hindu Fiction," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 44 (1924): 202–242.

turye tu yāme vismṛtya tadvrate tanniṣedhanam |[77]
nidrāmohāt tayā sākaṁ rataṁ sevitavān aham ‖ 59 ‖
tanmātrakhaṇḍite tasmin vrate 'haṁ jalapūruṣaḥ |
ihādya jātas te dve ca bhārye jāte ihāpi me ‖ 60 ‖
ekā sā kulaṭā pāpā dvitīyeyaṁ pativratā |
khaṇḍitasyāpi tasyedṛk prabhāvo niyamasya me ‖ 61 ‖
jātiṁ smarāmi yad yac ca rātrau bhogā mamedṛśāḥ |
yadi nākhaṇḍayiṣyaṁ tam idaṁ syān me na janma tat ‖ 62 ‖

There [in Kashmir] in a former birth I was just a town-dweller named
Bhavaśarma, an ordinary son of a brāhmaṇa, with two wives. (56) At a
certain moment I gained a familiarity with some Buddhist monks, under-
taking the restrictive vow (*niyama*) called *upoṣaṇa*, spoken of in their
treatises. (57) When this restrictive vow was almost completed, one evil
wife of mine against my will came into my bed and slept there! (58) In the
fourth watch, forgetting that prohibition in respect to that vow (*vrata*),
deluded by sleepiness I enjoyed myself sexually with her. (59) Being only
a tiny bit short of fulfilling the vow, I was born here now as a water-person,
and those two wives were also born here again with me. (60) That evil
woman was born as the untrue wife, this second one as the faithful one.
Such was the power of that restrictive vow of mine, even incomplete, (61)
that I remember all my births and nightly enjoy such pleasures. If I would
not have caused it to be incomplete, I would not have gained this birth I
have now. (62)

As the passage continues (63.75–77), we find the violation of the same *upoṣaṇa*
by the taking of food in the evening (*sāyam … bhojito 'smi*), and shortly there-
after we find the remainder of the list (63.82cd–84):

yuvābhyāṁ matkṛte kāryaṁ vratam etad upoṣaṇam ‖ 82 ‖
satyābhibhāṣaṇaṁ brahmacaryaṁ devapradakṣiṇām |
bhojanaṁ bhikṣuvelāyāṁ manasaḥ saṁyamaḥ kṣamā ‖ 83 ‖
ekarātraṁ vidhāyaitad arpaṇīyaṁ phalaṁ mayi |
pūrṇavrataphalaṁ yena divyatvaṁ prāpnuyām aham ‖ 84 ‖

You must perform this *upoṣaṇa* vow (*vrata*) for my sake (82cd)—speaking
the truth, celibacy, circumambulation of [images of] gods, eating at the

---

77   Reading here with Speyer p. 166.

times permitted to monks, control of the mind, patience. (83) Do this for
one night; the result must be sent to me! Through this I may obtain the
glory which constitutes the fruit of the fulfillment of the vow. (84)

This passage is interesting for several reasons. First, it indicates the idea that, at
least in the imagination of the author, one might relatively casually engage in
Buddhist ascetic practices, that is, ritual renunciations of certain activities. It
is also interesting that the term used here is *upoṣaṇa*, which does not seem
to be known to Buddhist texts themselves, but the sense of which is made
quite clear: the restrictions are on sexual activity, eating in the evening, telling
lies, and again we have then a repetition of restrictions against sex and eat-
ing at improper times, followed by positive injuctions to show honor to gods
(this seems the sense of the otherwise perhaps unattested *devapradakṣiṇā*),
restraint of the mind, and patience. The duration need be only a single night.
These do not correspond to the vows which Buddhist laypersons (upāsaka and
upāsikā) may temporarily undertake, typically the *pañcaśīla*, namely not to
kill, steal, engage in improper sex, lie or become intoxicated. In fact, actually
the only overlap is the restraint from lying, since sex with one's spouse is not
prohibited. However, the abstinences for the Uposatha (Poṣadha) day add not
taking food at inappropriate times, but also eschewal of entertainment and
luxurious beds, neither of which plays any part here. It will be interesting,
therefore, to explore whether the list offered here is paralleled elsewhere.

A passage of particular interest depicts a debate (72.93–99, TP VI.76). A
monk, the bhikṣu Ratnacandramati, challenges a king to a debate (*vādārtha*),
saying:

> tvayā jitena rājendra grāhyaṁ sugataśāsanam |
> mayā jitena śuśrūṣyā viprāḥ saṁtyajya cīvaram ‖ 95 ‖
> etac chrutvā tathety uktvā vādaṁ tena sahākarot |
> sa vinītamatī rājā bhikṣuṇā dinasaptakam ‖ 96 ‖
> aṣṭame 'hani bhikṣus taṁ sa jigāya mahīpatim |
> yenodayavatī vādimuṇḍamudgarikā jitā ‖97 ‖
> tatas tenopadiṣṭaṁ sa bhikṣuṇā saugataṁ matam |
> sattvopakārapuṇyāḍhyaṁ jātaśraddho 'grahīn nṛpaḥ ‖ 98 ‖
> bhīkṣūṇāṁ brāhmaṇādīnāṁ sarveṣāṁ ca cakāra saḥ |
> vihārasattvavasatīr jinapūjāparāyaṇaḥ ‖ 99 ‖

If you are defeated, Your Majesty, you must convert to Buddhism. If I am
defeated, abandoning the monastic robe (*cīvara*) I will study the Brah-
manical teachings. (95) When he heard that, king Vinītamati answered

"Okay," and engaged in debate with that monk for seven days. (96) On the eighth day, the monk defeated the king, by whom Udayavatī, the little shaven-headed hammer of debate [a young woman mentioned earlier in the story], was defeated. (97) Then the king gave rise to faith in the Buddhist ideas expounded by the monk, abounding in the merit produced by being of service to beings. (98) Devoted to making offering to the Victor, he constructed monasteries and places of asylum for everyone, Buddhist monks, brāhmaṇas and the rest. (99)

The text goes on to say that the king wishes to learn how to practice the *bodhi-sattvacaryā*, and the monk instructs him that first he must rid himself even of subtle obstacles. The monk offers him a method of dream-prophecy, and then relates a *jātaka* tale. Later in this sequence we encounter (from 72.218 onwards, TP VI.84 ff.) the six perfections, so named: *dāna-pāramitā* (236), *śīla-pāramitā* (259), *kṣama-pāramitā* (277), *vairya-pāramitā* (238),[78] *dhyāna-pāramitā* (318) and *prajñā-pāramitā* (361). At the end of the series, we read (362): *evaṁ cāruhya nautulyāṁ taranty eva bhavāmbudhim | vatsa buddhoktadānādiṣaṭkapārami-tāṁ budhāḥ*, "Thus the wise embark on these six perfections taught by Buddha, as on a ship, and so cross the ocean of temporal existence" (TP VI.96).

To conclude our considerations, it might be of some interest to briefly consider another passage that illustrates the common property of Buddhist and non-Buddhist traditions in India. We read a pair of verses (64.32–33, TP V.141.):

> kaścic ca pārvaṇaṁ candraṁ didṛkṣuḥ kenacij jaḍaḥ |
> aṅgulyabhimukhaṁ paśyety ūce dṛṣṭanavendunā ‖ 32 ‖
> sa hitvā gaganaṁ tasyaivāṅguliṁ tāṁ vilokayan |
> tasthau na cendum adrākṣīd adrākṣīd dhasato janān ‖ 33 ‖

> A certain dullard who wanted to see the waxing moon was told by someone who had seen the new moon: "Look in the direction of my finger!" (32) He turned away from the sky, and gazed only at that man's finger. Standing there, he did not see the moon, but he did see people laughing. (33).

The sentiment here, perhaps needless to say, has been made famous through the Chan or Zen traditions of East Asia, and there is likewise no doubt that

---

78 This is misprinted in both Br. and D as *dhairya*-. Speyer p. 69 in his few examples of confusion of *v* and *dh* missed this case. I might be tempted to emend to the metrically equivalent *vīrya*, the standard form; but note that we also find *kṣama* (in 259d and 277c) which how-

these traditions adopted the image from a favorite source, the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, which contains a similar verse, and somewhat later, a short prose passage. The Buddha says in the *sūtra*:[79]

> aṅgulyagraṁ yathā bālo na gṛhṇāti niśākaram |
> tathā hy akṣarasaṁsaktās tattvaṁ na vetti māmakam ||

> As a fool grasps at the finger-tip, not at the moon, so those who are fixed on letters do not know my truth.

The prose has the same idea, but somewhat expanded (196.6–11):

> na cāṅguliprekṣakeṇa bhavitavyam | tadyathā mahāmate aṅgulyā kaścit kasyacit kiṁcid ādarśayet | sa cāṅgulyagram eva pratisared vīkṣitum | evam eva mahāmate bālajātīya iva bālapṛthagjanavargā yathārutāṅgulya-grābhiniveśābhiniviṣṭā evaṁ kālaṁ kariṣyanti na yathārutāṅgulyagrār-thaṁ hitvā paramārtham āgamiṣyanti |

> Do not be the one who looks at the finger! As an example, Mahāmati, someone may show something to somebody with his finger, and that person may turn his attention only to the finger-tip. Just so, Mahāmati, those of the group of foolish common people, like those naturally stupid, go to their deaths attached firmly to the finger-tip of literal meaning; not surrendering the finger-tip of the literal meaning of words, they do not understand the highest truth.

It seems to me fairly evident that recent years have indeed seen a waxing of interest as scholars, some quick as hares, have turned their attentions more and more toward the radiant moon of the Classical Indian narrative literature; there is little reason to fear that this resurgent interest will be eclipsed any time soon.

---

ever could also, metrically, be the standard *kṣānti*. Both produce a *pathyā*. While a change of *vīrya* to *vairyā* is easily explainable, *kṣānti* to *kṣama* is much more difficult.

79   Bunyiu Nanjio, *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1 (1923. Reprint: Kyoto: Otani University Press, 1956): 123.18–124.1. The verse is VI.3 = X.715. This Sanskrit text has yet to be sufficiently carefully treated, and here I simply quote Nanjio's edition as such.

Appendix

Scattered through his book, Bollée noted terms found in KSS but omitted in Monier Williams's dictionary. For convenience, I list these here, without having verified them. The translations in almost all cases are those of Tawney.

akṣa-jñāna: dice-skill

agha-hara: destroyer of faults, epitheton of Hari-Viṣṇu

atarkya-tapas: whose penance surpasses imagination (?)

adbhutālaya: home of marvels

adroha-pratyaya: guarantee against treason or injury

adhipa-kula: royal family

ananya-sevin: no vassal of anyone else: independent

analāhuti: burnt offering

anācānta: without rinsing the mouth

anidra-svapna: daydream [but I would say, rather in context, mirage]

antaḥpura-viplava: corrupting the harem

apatyāśā: hope of offspring of a pregnant woman

abhinnātman: without diverting one from his end

amarārṇava: sea of war

amarṣa-kaluṣa: impure passion

amānuṣa-gocara: supernatural

amṛta-seka: watering with nectar:

ambho-vihāra: splashing game, water play

ayo-daṇḍa: iron rod as weapon

aruṇekṣaṇa: with red eyes

arti-ghna: calamity-averting > wishing-tree

arti-harā: remover of sorrows (epithet of Ambikā-Durgā)

artha-saṃdarpa: bribing (?)

alipijña: illiterate

asasya-ghātin: not injuring the crops

ākeka-vilocana: with squinting eyes

ātodya-maṅgala: auspicious drum (music)

ānanda-tūrya: a festive instrument

ānanda-divya-tūrya: divine festive instrument,

āpanna-rakṣaṇa: rescue of the distressed

ābaddha-kakṣa: girding up ones loins

ābaddha-śāṭaka: with wrappers bound around the head (*śiraḥsv ~āḥ*)

ābhāva-lajjā: shame of love

āhavārṇava: sea of battle

indriyāśva: horse of the senses

uttaṅga-nāsika: high-nosed guru

uttamārtha: supreme goal, mokṣa (Pāli *uttam'-attha*)

utpāta-māyā: delusive omen

utsava-tūrya: festal musical instrument

utsāha-śālin: cheerful

udārākṛti: noble appearance

udyāna-latā-gṛha: arbour of creepers in royal garden

udrikta-manmatha: (nymph of night) overflowing with love

unmatta-ceṣṭa: behaving like a madman

kathālāpa: interview, talk, conversation

kandarpa-mātaṅga: elephantlike, i.e. strong, love

kanduka-krīḍā: game of ball

kanyā-saṃbandha: matrimonial alliance of maiden, marrying off

kari-kareṇū: female elephant

karpūrikā: camphor

karma-taru: tree of ones former actions,

kāka-vāśita: cry of a crow

kāñcī-nakṣatra-mālāṅka: with a string of (28) pearls like the (28) constellations

kiṇāṅkita: marked by scars, bruised

kukṣi-koṭara: ocean cavity

kuli: point

kuliśāstra: thunderbolt-weapon

kṛṣṇa-turagī: witch in form of black mare fights other witch in form of bay mare (*śoṇa-vaḍavā*)

kopāndha: blinded with wrath

kaitava-tapas: hypocritical asceticism

kaitava-yukti: gambling rules

kauberī-hāsa: smile of the northern quarter

krama-siddhena mantreṇa: with a regular or relevant spell

krīḍālīna: playful(ly)

krīḍā-hariṇa: toy-deer

kṣatra-vāda: discourse or dispute on the kṣatriya class

kṣaṇa-naśvara: perishing in a moment of the body

khanya-vādin: treasure hunter

gaja-kumbha: large boss, globe, or protuberance on either side of the top of an elephant's forehead

garbha-dohadā: pregnancy whim

guhya-cāriṇ: travelling invisible

go-vāṭa-harmya: cowshed govāṭa-vāhana: cow-house as a vehicle

grantha-lakṣa: consisting of a hundred thousand couplets

ghana-stanī: buxom

cakra-yantra: wheel-machine

calita: kind of heavenly dance

cāraṇarddhi: good fortune of an actor > popularity ?

cūta-pādapa: (made of) mango tree (wood)

cūrṇa-miśra: powder mix (of goats horn flesh as an aphrodisiacum for women)

caura-camū: robber gang; thug(s)

caura-camū-pati: chief of a gang of thugs

caura-pallī: village of robbers

caura-yātanā: punishment for thieving

chāga-bhaṇḍa: mime in the shape of a he-goat

jagat-kṣobha: upsetting the world system

jagat-sthiti: constitution of the universe

jagad-yantra: world as machine

jagad-rakṣamāṇa: protector of the world

jaghana-sthala: hinder part, buttocks

jaghanābhoga: broad hips

janma-duḥkha: labour

jāti-vigraha: quarrelling with ones relatives

jāla-kārālaya: cobweb

jñāni-liṅgin: with the appearance of a fortune-teller, a spy

jvara-ceṭaka: imp / attendant of fever demon, who can remove fever (*jvara-ghna*)

ḍākinī-cakra: coven, circle of witches

tāruṇya-vāta: wind of youth > juvenile tempestuousness

tūrya-kolāhala: loud sound of musical instruments

datta-ḍiṇḍima: for whom the execution drum is beaten

datta-dṛṅ-mantra: who gives someone a look and recites a spell

danta-mālā: row of teeth

darpa-dalana: breaking the pride of Love (Smara) in its beauty

darśana-vaśīkṛta: at merely seeing one, at first sight

divya-kautūhala: celestial marvel

divya-māyā: divine delusion

dundubhi-megha: drums sound like clouds

duḥkhāśani: thunderbolt of grief,

duhitṛ-sneha: love of daughter

dāna-toya: donation water

dāsya-mukti: redemption from slavery

dāha-jvara: burning fever

dṛg-viṣāhi: snake with poisonous look > laming stare

dṛṣṭa-prabhāva: visible power > statue (of Gaṇeśa)

deśa-dūṣaka: destroyer of the realm, revolutionary

deha-sneha: affection for one's body

dyūta-līlā: gambling, play at dice,

dyūta-sthiti: gambling rules

dharmānuśāsitṛ: superintending religion (said of a king)

dhavala-kañcukā: with a white or beautiful bodice, said of bride

dhik-kathā: bloody tale

dhṛta-vartin: pencil-holding, tracing out a form with a ~ hand

nagara-bhrama: lustration of townnagarādhipa: police chief

nabhaḥ-krīḍā: sporting in the air

nara-karaṅkaka: human skeleton

nāṭya-prayoga: dramatic representation

nārī-caṅga: woman-fastidious

nirvrīḍa-yantraṇa: without the restraint of shame

nisarga-niyata: genetically conditioned

nīti-cakṣus: eye of policy, espionage, intelligence

netra-pīyūṣa: nectar as feast to the eyes

netrāgni: eye-fire, flaming eye

pakṣi-vahana: with a bird as mount, who rides on a bird

paśu-nibha: beastlike

pāna-krīḍā: amusement of drinking

pāna-mada: drunkenness

pīna-tuṅga: full and prominent

puṇya-kṣaya: exhaustion of merit

puruṣābharaṇa: male ornament

pulina-sthalī: sandbank

paurāyatta: depending on > under the thumb of the subjects

prakāśanāstra: illuminating weapon

prachanna-kāmuka: paramour

pratāpāgni: fire of wrathpratāpānala: fire; valour

pratta-yoga: communicating the doctrine of mystic contemplation giving supernatural power, i.e. the Yoga system

pradoṣa-jvalita: glowing in the night

prīti-dūtī: messenger of love,

preta-vāhana: chariot drawn by ghosts

prema-durlalita: spoiled by love

prema-pāśa: noose of love

prema-varṣin: raining love

baddhottarīyaka: with upper garment girded around one

bhakṣya-kośalikā: edible present, sweet (mixed with datura)

bhagavat-sāyujya: union with Śiva

bhartṛ-droha: infidelity to / treachery of husband

bhartṛ-vidveṣa: aversion from husband

bhasma-kṣepa: throwing ashes

bhasma-pāṇḍu: white with ashes, said of a skull-bearing ascetic

bhāryā-viyoga: loss of / separation from wife

bhāryā-vyatikara: allying with wives

bhāskarāstra: weapon of the sun

bhikṣu-velā: mealtime of Buddhist monks, 11–12h a.m.

Bhilla-pallikā: village of Bhils = Śabaras
Bhilla-vāṭa: quarter of the Bhillas
bhujaga-hrada: serpent lake
bhūri-keśa: with much or long hair
bhoga-śrī: great pleasure
maṅgala-gaja: state elephant
maṅgalopāyana: present offered to
    secure good luck, welcome present
maṇḍana-vidhi: toilet rites, making one-
    self up
mada-spṛś: beginning intoxication, tipsi-
    ness
madhya-niśceṣṭa: on the hip or waist
mantha-kālābdhi: ocean at the time of
    churning
marakatāsana: emerald throne
marū-kṛta: turned into a desert, deserti-
    fied
mahā-maṭha: asylum, refuge
māṁsa-vyañjana: meat-curry
māṇava: measure > means ?
mānuṣī-saṅgha: (sexual) association
    with a mortal woman
māra-śṛṅkhala: chain of love
māyā-kuśala: hypocritical, said of
    ascetics
māyā-samāhāra: concentrated delusion
muktā-sāra: necklace of pearls
mukha-maṇḍana: face decoration
mukhāgama: oral tradition
mumukṣu-śīla: characteristic of libera-
    tion seekers
mṛgāmiṣa: venison,
mṛta-jāni: whose wife is dead
mohāndha-tamasa: dense darkness of
    bewilderment
yoga-gulikā: magic pill
yoginī-sakha: friend of witches (i. e.
    Mātaras)
yauvana-dvir-ada: elephant of youth

raktāvadāta: red and white
racita-maṇḍana: decorated
rajani-rākṣasā: awful (*ghorā*) night as a
    female demon
rata-lālasa: lewd, lecherous
ratna-Vināyaka: image of Gaṇeśa made
    of a jewel
rāja-jalada: king-like cloud
rājya-pāśa: kingdom as noose
rātry-abhisārikā: woman going to her
    lover at night > nymph of night
rūpābdhi: sea of beauty
rogopaśānti: cure
latā-lāsya: dance of creepers
lāvaṇya-jala-dhi: sea of beauty,
lāvaṇya-nirjhara: torrent of beauty
liṅga-tyāga: giving up ones genitals
loka-loca: eyes of the world, of men
loka-hāsana: laughter of people
lokānukampin: full of compassion for
    men
vadhāhata: near dead, half-dead
vadhya-bhū: place of execution
varṇi-veṣa: disguised as a member of a
    caste
vasāsava: fatty fluid
vastū-karoti: to give bail
vahni-pradakṣiṇa: circumambulation of
    the fire at wedding
vicāra-dolā: swing of doubt
vidyānudhyāna: looking into ... with the
    help of (supernatural) knowledge
vidyā-hasta: protection of a science
vidruma-sad-daṇḍa: bright coral tube
vinayojjvala: distinguished for modesty
vimāna-sādhana: the art of providing
    oneself with magic chariots
viraha-kleśa: sorrow of separation
viraha-jvāla: burning separation
viraha-doṣā: night of separation

viṣa-lālā: poisonous saliva

viṣa-vedanā: poison-agony

viṣoḍha-vahni: *viṣa* + *ūḍha* + *vahni*, after resisting burning poison

vīra-vetāla: heroic vetāla

vṛtta-prāṇodgama: who had resigned, at the rising of the moon, the nectar of his life

śarīra-mūla: based in a body > person

śaṣpa-kavala: mouthful of grass

śākāśin: eating vegetables, vegetarian

śikhā-ratna: crest-jewel,

śīla-tṛṇa: stubble of character

śuddhānta-vidhva: violator of the royal harem

śubhāgama: lucky omen

śūla-kara: with trident in hand

śṛṅga-māṁsa: flesh in the horns (?)

śoka-kanda: lump of grief

śokākrānta: shocked

śoṇa-vaḍavā: bay mare

śramāpanoda: dispelling of weariness

śravaṇa-phala: fruit of hearing

śrotra-dāruṇa: terrible to the ears

saktu-bhāṇḍa: barley-meal bin

saṁkhyā-jñāna: knowledge of reckoning, calculation

saṁgrāma-kāla: demon of destruction

satī-tejas: wifely fidelity

sattva-taru: tree of valour

sattva-sāgara: sea of valour

satyābhibhaṣin: polished speaker

sad-yoginī: good witch

sadyo-mukti: (no translation)

saṁdhyā-prekṣaṇaka: evening spectacle in temple

samāśvasya: having encouraged

samudraka: box

sāgara-varman: cover, envelope, surrounding of the sea

sāhasa-bhūmi: benchmark of violence, etc.

sikatā-pātra: pot with sand

siddha-saktu: charmed barley-meal

siddhāñjana: magic collyrium or unguent

sutā-phala: reward for (giving birth to) daughter

suvarṇa-kamala: golden Nelumbium

sūryoparāga: eclipse of the sun

saudha-hāsin: (palace) compared to a smile

strī-tṛṇa: woman, valueless as a straw

snāna-mṛttikā: (perfumed) bathing earth (as soap substitute)

snāna-velā: bathing time

sneha-graha: demon of love

sneha-śālin: full of oil/affection

smarāugha: love as a stream

smara-taru: love as large as a tree

smara-prekṣaṇaka: to look lovingly

smara-druma: passion as large, strong, etc. as a tree

smara-dvipa: love as large, strong, etc. as an elephant

hata-supta: fallen asleep in death

havya-kavya-bhuk: eater of oblations to gods and ancestors, Agni

hāsya-vibhrama: ridiculous blunder

hema-daṇḍa: gold sticks