



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

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

Silk, J.A.

Citation

Silk, J. A. (2020). A Resurgent Interest in 'Hindu Fiction': On and around the Kathāsaritsāgara, with Special Attention to Buddhism. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 63(3), 263-306.
doi:10.1163/15728536-06303002

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/138525>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

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 Kathāsaritsāgara 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 Südasiastudien* 32/33 (2015/2016): 175–202.

That the first Western introduction to the compendium of tales called *Kathāsaritsāgara*, 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 Sāgara*). This is reprinted in *Works of the Late Horace Hayman Wilson*, Vol. v [but on the Table of Contents oddly called Vol. 111] (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 Prakrit³—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*, *Vetālapañcaviṃśati*,⁴ *Vikramacarita*, *Śukasaptati*, and so on (and of these, versions of the *Pañcatantra* and *Vetālapañcaviṃśati* 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 *Vṛihat-Cat'hā* is a collection of historical anecdotes, sometimes very interesting, and consists of 22000 *ślōcas*." 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 Durgāprasād (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 Vetālapañcamīmśatikā*, which despite its deceptively restrictive title deals broadly with the *Vetālapañcaviṃśati* 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, Kalady, 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 Bṛhatkathāśālikā 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 Devasmitā*.” Translated from the *Kathā Sarit Sāgara*, Tarāṅga 13, Sloka 54,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland* 16.1 (1884): 1–12 (reprinted in TP 1.172–181), and then, first in “The Stories of Jīmūtavāhana, 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 Jīmūtavāhana* (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 Hilfsmittel 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 Kathâ Sarit Sâgara, or Ocean of the Streams of Story* (Calcutta: J.W. Thomas, Baptist Mission Press) 1, 1880, 11, 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. 1” in 11: 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 Durgāprasād and Kāś'īnāth Pāṇurang 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 Durgāprasād and Kāś'īnāth Pāṇurang Parab, *Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadevabhāṭṭa*. (Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sāgar 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'āstri Pāṇs'īkar. My modern reprint is dated 1970 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), crediting Jagdīś Lāl Śāstri. 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_sanskrit/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. Afdeling 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, Afdeling 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 *Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṅgraha* 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 referred 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 Bṛhatkathāmañjarī de Kṣemendra,” *Journal Asiatique*, tome 6, 8ième sér. (1885): 397–479; tome 7 (1886): 178–222.
- 17 On the *Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṅgraha*, 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 Ślokaśaṅgraha: 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 Ślokaśaṅgraha 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 Paisācī.¹⁹ There is also reason to believe that the Tamil *Perunkatai* 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-vācakavinirmitaṇ Vasudevahiṇḍi-prathamakhaṇḍaṇ* (Bhāvanagara, 1930–1931, reprinted Gandhinagar: Gujarat Sahitya Akadami, 1989); H.C. Bhayani and R.M. Shah, *Dharmase-nagaṇi Mahattara's Vasudevahiṇḍi Madhyama Khaṇḍa: A seventh century Prakrit recast of the famous Bṛhatkathā narrative*. Part 1. L.D. Series 99 (Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1987); Jagadishchandra Jain, *The Vasudevahiṇḍi: 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 Bukkyōto Kyokai, 2002): 449–474. Tsuchida Ryūtarō 土田龍太郎, *Daisetsuwa Burihattokatā* 大説話ブリハットカタ. 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* 印度學仏教学研究 46.2 (1998): 1010–1007 (51–54), and id., "Bṛhatkathā-kigendan to shichinin no Vidyādara 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 Paisācī 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 Kṛṣṇasvāmi Aiyangar, "Bṛhat Katha," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1906: 689–692. Important studies are Donald Nelson, *The Bṛhatkathā: A Reconstruction from Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṅgraha, Perunkatai and Vasudevahiṇḍi*, 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 Perunkatai, 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 śloka 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 11.227 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 1.95.

KSS is divided into 18 *lambakas*, each of which is divided into various *taraṅgas* (waves), the latter indication of textual division of course playing on the very name of the text, in which *sarīt* 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 *sarīt*, 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 *taraṅgas*, 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:

<i>lambaka–taraṅga</i>	Sequential <i>taraṅga</i>	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.)

<i>lambaka-taraṅga</i>	Sequential <i>taraṅga</i>	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 *ṛddhi* 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 *kiṃ nirarthena dehena jīvātāpi mṛtena me*, Kern suggests *kiṃ 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 𑀧 was simply misread as 𑀧.) 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 *tām ca kanyāṃ svapārśvasthām niśi dyotitakānanām | ikṣate 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 stricken [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 *dyotitakāmanām*." 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 catalogue 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 systematically check the dictionary of Monier Williams, since at least some of the imaginary forms recorded in the “Petropolitan” have been taken over. For example, 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. Brockhaus, 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 Abhandlung ‘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 Brockhaus; 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. Inaccuracies 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 *kāṇya*, 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 intimately, 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 *vīpulā*).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 *lambakas*):

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 *Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṅgraha*, 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 *Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṅgraha* 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 manuscript 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 *guhya-rūpa* into “in *līṅga* 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 *vr̥ddhi* 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 *ārādhitāḥ*, D *cārādhipaḥ* > *cārādhitāḥ*.
- 22.240d *adaḥ* > *adhaḥ*.
- 26.14b *adaḥ* > *adhaḥ* [already suggested by Tawney 1880: 220, and TP 11.218, apparently overlooked by Bollée].
- 28.65a D *vr̥ṣṭair* misread for Br. *vr̥kṣair*.
- 45.127b Br. *dravyājya-yuktitaḥ*, D *dvairājya-yuktitaḥ* > Read: *dīvyājya-*? cf. 45.50d *dīvyābhir oṣadhibhir ghaṇeṇa ca* (*dīvyā* thus represents *dīvyāuśadhi*).
- 46.121c D *viśoḍha-vahneś ca*, Br. *viśoḍha-vahneś ca* (*viśa* + *ūḍha* + *vahni*, cf. *viśāgni, viśānala*); TP IV 57n1 reports MSS reading *soḍhāhidaṇśāsya* and *viśoḍhavahneś*.
- 92.42a D *pakva-phala*, Br. *pañca-phala* is correct (?).
- 96.26c Br., *buddhyā*, D *baddhvā* > *vr̥ddhvā*?
- 101.180b *nāga-bandha* > *rāga-bandha*?
- 108.69c *hṛta-vastrārdrā-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. *vedi*.

- 34 At least some scholars have done their best with what is available. Frederik David Kan Bosch, *De Legende van Jimūtavāhana 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 *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 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 *śloka-kathā* genre.³⁵ Cox was far from the first to approach the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 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 *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 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: “Jimūtavāhana monogatari kenkyū: Bṛhatkathā-kei denshō o chūshin ni” Jimūtavāhana物語研究: Bṛhatkathā系伝承を中心に (The Story of Jimūtavāhana in the Versions of the Bṛhatkathā), *Bukkyō Bunka* 仏教文化 35 (1996): 19–97 [not seen]; id., “Vāsuki-Purāṇa no Jimūtavāhana monogatari” Vāsuki-PurāṇaのJimūtavāhana物語 (The Tale of Jimūtavāhana in Vāsuki-Purāṇa), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學仏教學研究 44.2 (1996): 931–929 (50–52); id., “Haracaritacintāmaṇi to Jimūtavāhana monogatari” Haracaritacintāmaṇi と Jimūtavāhana 物語 (A Story of Jimūtavāhana 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 Rājatarāṅgiṇī 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: Harrassowitz, 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 *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 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 *śloka-kathā* (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 *śloka-kathās*: 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 *ślokas* 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 *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* revealed a rate of 20 %. This might indicate that in this respect KSS is less closely linked to this *śloka-kathā* 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) *Bṛhatkathāśloka-saṅgraha*. A stylistic comparison of Kṣemendra’s and Soma-deva’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 *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, 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 Central 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 understand this to reflect 11th c. Kashmir, or the locations of the stories? Judit Törzsök, in writing about the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, 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 *śloka-kathā* 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 *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*,” *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 *Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacaritra*, 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 *śloka-kathā*. 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 (Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacaritra x): Analysed in Keywords from Helen Johnson's Translation v1,” *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Südasiastudien* 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 *Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacaritra*, but I think this cannot be correct; my calculation may be off slightly, 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 Südasiastudien* 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 Mūlasarvāstivāda-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-vyākhyā* of the *Āvaśyaka-cūṛṇi*. A Survey,” *Indologica Taurinensia* 11 (1983): 129–144; Juan Wu, “Parallel Stories in the *Āvaśyakacūṛṇi* 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. 123 ff.) 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 Śārādā, 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 (1x.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* 印度學仏教学研究 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 Prākṛt-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 *viśvaṃbharā ... na ca nāpi bhṛ* Bühler however had the line only with *viśvaṃbharā*, 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 Brhatkathās 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 °*amśa* 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 Sanskrit (*ābhāva-lajjā*, *a-bhaya* [as impunity], *a-bhaya-dīṇḍima* [drum beat at amnesty], *abhicāra*, *a-bhinnātman*), then coming the next English entry, “Ābhira 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 looking 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 through 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 Penzer’s index,” it repeats entries already found there.

There are other features. What we should have expected to be rather useful 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 gaṇakah kaścid vijñānavarjitaḥ*, TP V.90, “There was a certain astrologer wanting in discernment.” I owe the reference to Speyer, p. 81, who says “Br. failed to see that *nāmagaṇakah* ... is one word, he wrongly divided *nāma gaṇakah*.” 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 *lilā-vajra* (in a book published in Germany in 2015!), offers the following (254n933): “As *vajra* is a weapon only of gods and heroes, a *lilā-vajra* may be a sports weapon like a *lilā-padma* dignitaries carry playfully in the hand, but it seems rather an emblem of rank or dignity (*vibhava*; imperium) such as the marshall’s baton 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 “Bekennntnis 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 Socialistic 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):

sādhū siddham **mahāhastiratnam** te cakravartinah |
 iti vāṇī guhāmadhyād aśarīrodabhūt tadā || 19 ||
 tataḥ khaḍgam ahīndrābham sa dadarśa nipatya ca |
 cakravartitvalakṣmyās tam keśapāśam ivāgrahīt || 20 ||
 sādhu bhoḥ **khaḍgaratnam** te siddham jaitram arindama |
 iti vāg udabhūd bhūyo 'py aśarīrā guhāntare || 21 ||
 tataḥ sa **candrikāratnam** **kāminīratnam** atra ca |
 vidhvamsinīti nāmnā ca **vidyāratnam** asādhayat || 22 ||
 evam dvābhyām sahādyābhyām **sarasā candanena** ca |
 kāryakālopayuktāni sapta mātmyādāni ca || 23 ||
 sādhayitvā sa ratnāni guhāyā nirgatas tataḥ |
 vāmadevarṣaye tasmai siddham sarvam śaśamsa 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 **candrikāratnaiś candanena**hidrgviṣān |
 diggajān **hastiratnena khaḍgaratnena** guhyakān || 85 ||

vighnān anyāṃś cānyaratnair nivārya saha senayā |⁵³
 uttīrya tām guhām codagdvāreṇa sa viniryayau || 86 ||
 dadarśa ca guhāgarbhanirgataḥ pārśvam uttaram |
 kailāsasyāpunarjanmajīvalokāntaropamam || 87 ||
 sādhu ratnaprabhāvāptamāhātmyena guhā tvayā |
 cakravartinn iyaṃ 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! Thou 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 Mūlasarvāstivādinaya we find *cakraratnaṃ hastiratnaṃ aśvaratnaṃ maṇiratnaṃ strīratnaṃ gṛhapatiratnaṃ pariṇāyakaratnaṃ eva saptaṃ*,⁵⁵ and in the *Dīvyāvadāna* we read

53 Br. rather: *vighnāṃś cānyān anyaratnair*.

54 Bollée (373n1387) for his entry “seven imperial jewels, of Vidyādhara,” citing the first passage, 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, “Mādhātār, the Universal Monarch, and the Meaning of Representations of the Cakravartin in the Amaravati 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, moreover, was clearly articulated specifically with reference to the Jaggayyapeta pillar already by Ananda K[entish] Coomaraswamy, “A royal gesture; and some other motifs,” *Feestbundel uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, bij gelegenheid van zijn 150 jarig Bestaan 1778–1928*, part 1 (Wetevreden [Jakarta]: G. Kolff & Co., 1929): 57–61.

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

*tasyemāny evamrūpāṇi saptaratnāni bhavanti tadyathā cakraratnaṃ hastiratnaṃ aśvaratnaṃ maṇiratnaṃ strīratnaṃ gṛhapatiratnaṃ pariṇāyakaratnaṃ 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

cakraṃ ratho **maṇir bhāryā** nidhir aśvo gajas tathā |
 saptaitāni ca ratnāni sarveṣāṃ cakravartinām || 74 ||
 cakraṃ ratho **maṇiḥ khaḍgaś** varmaratnaṃ ca pañcamam |⁵⁸
 ketur nidhiś ca saptaiva prāṇahīnāni cakṣate || 75 ||
bhāryā purohitaś caiva senānī rathakṛc ca yaḥ |
 mantry aśvaḥ **kalabhaś** 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 *carmaratnaṃ*. 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: *cakraṃ ratho maṇir bhāryā gajas tathā | proktāni sapta ratnāni pūrvaṃ 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 °*amśa* to names and epithets. In KSS we find the following, not limited to Buddhist items:

Kāmāmśa 21.31c, 35b, 144b; 22.1d; 44.9b; 105.34c.

Kāmadevāmśa 15.130b.

devāmśa 18.340; 26.296b; 48.14c; 56.131b; 73.250b, 251a; 106.20a.

devatāmśa 90.8a; 72.141c.

bodhisattvāmśa 22.35a; 41.10b; 65.2b, 14c, 26d, 34a, 45a, 104a, 126c;
90.127a, 177c.

Buddhāmśa 62.121c.

Sugatāmśa 62.237b.

Śivāmśa 118.21b.

Finally, Kārttikeya promises a son who will be (55.172b) *madgaṇāmśaja*, “the incarnation of one of my Gaṇas” (TP IV.214). Likewise, we see *Ambikāmśajā* (=Pārvatī) 120.28b.

By far the most common term here is *bodhisattvāmśa*. So far I have found this elsewhere only once, in a passage from Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (89.183). That verse reads: *ekas tu bodhisattvāmśo bhikṣus tasya dayādradhīḥ | tadā dideśa pravrajyām 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-vamśa*, 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 *Dīvyāvadāna* 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 *taraṅgas* 65 and 72, while *bodhisattvāṁśa*, appearing predominately in *taraṅga* 65, appears also in three other *taraṅgas*. 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 milieu,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 | pravrajako 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 (13.88 ff., TP 1.156 ff.) speaks of a female ascetic (*pravrajikā*) 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 1,” *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 *Jimūtavāhana*, 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 *taraṅgas* 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-Bhārati: 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.2ff.), 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-laprajāḥ*).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 (*bhikṣupūjāikatatpara*, in which *pūjā* refers to material support, not mere devotion or worship). His son criticizes him for his devotion, saying:

tāta tyaktatrayīdharmas tvam adharmanḥ niṣevase |
yad brāhmaṇān parityajya śramaṇāṇ śaśvad arcasi || 18 ||
snānādiyantraṇāhīnāḥ svakālāśanalolupāḥ |
apāstasaśikhāśeśakeśakaupīnasusthitāḥ || 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 literature 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 *Mokṣopāya*: *tāvat tārāvaranḥ reje sānyakānanam uttamam | yāvan na parapakṣeṇa krāntaḥ kalpānalaujasā* || (37.53). This second attestation makes the TP translation even less tenable.”

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 purīyasya caityaratnair nīrantaraiḥ*) 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 supra-mundane (*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.3m] reports an MS reading °*nigrahaḥ*, “blaming one’s relations without cause.”) The father considers the main tenet of Buddhism to be non-harm (*ahiṃsā*, 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” (*bo-dhito ’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:

dr̥śyatailaikacittena na tvayā kimcid iksitam || 51 ||
 tat tenaivādhānena parānudhyānam ācara |
 ekāgro hi bahirvṛttinivṛttas tattvam iksate || 52 ||
 dr̥ṣṭatattvaś 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 *dharmānuśāsitr̥* (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 *Samyuttanikāya* (47.20), where attention to the bowl filled with oil is a synonym for mindfulness of one's body (*kāyagatāya etaṃ satiyā adbhivacanam*), 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 (*viḥāra*) with many images of the Buddha (*nānājinākāra*). A dharma-preaching monk (*dharmapāṭhakabhikṣu*) taught:

arthapradānam evāhuḥ saṃsāre sumahat tapah |
 arthadaḥ prāṇadaḥ proktaḥ prāṇa hy artheṣu kīlitāḥ || 9 ||
 buddhena ca parasyārthe karuṇākulacetasā |
 ātmāpi tṛṇavad dattaḥ kā varāke dhane kathā || 10 ||
 tādṛśena ca dhīreṇa tapasā sa gatasprḥaḥ |
 saṃprāptadivya vijñāno buddho buddhatvam āgataḥ || 11 ||
 āsarīram ataḥ sarveṣv iṣṭeṣv āśānivartanāt |
 prājñāḥ sattvahiṃ kuryāt samyaksambodhalabdhaye || 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 wondrous 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 111.252–256), who lives in the city of long life (Cīrāyus). This figure is called *bodhisattvāṃśasaṃbhava*, 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 (*viññānavat*). This Nāgārjuna is of course the alchemist, one of the several Nāgārjunas known to the Indian traditions, as the next verse clarifies, calling him knowledgeable in the application of all herbal drugs (*sarvaṣaḍhiyuktijñā*), and a master of alchemy (*siddharasāyana*).⁷⁴ Using his skills he frees himself from old age (*viṣāra*) and confers long life (*cira-jīva*) 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 (*evaṃ 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” (*yaṣṭavyayājaka-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 aśocyām 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 ’haṃ nṛpate navatiṃ ca navādhikām | janmāni svaśiro dattam 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*. 1A (Groningen: E. Forsten, 1999): 363–368, with notes in 1B: 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* (*Kitāb 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): 1.189.

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 *Rājataranīni* 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 grāmaṇḍalī kilābhavam |
 dvijātiputraḥ sāmānyo dvibhāryaḥ pūrvajanmani || 56 ||
 so 'haṃ kadācit saṃjātasamstavo bhikṣubhiḥ saha |
 upoṣaṇākhyam niyamam tacchāstroktam 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 tadvrata tanniṣedhanam |⁷⁷
 nidrāmohāt tayā sākaṁ rataṁ sevitavān aham || 59 ||
 tanmātrakhaṇḍite tasmin vrata 'haṁ jalapūruṣaḥ |
 ihādya jātas te dve ca bhārye jāte ihāpi me || 60 ||
 ekā sā kulaṭā pāpā dvitīyeyāṁ pativratā |
 khaṇḍitasyāpi tasyedṛk prabhāvo niyamasya me || 61 ||
 jātīm smarāmi yad yac ca rātrau bhogā mamedṛśāḥ |
 yadi nākhaṇḍayaṣyaṁ 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, undertaking 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 thereafter we find the remainder of the list (63.82cd–84):

yuvābhyāṁ matkṛte kāryaṁ vratam etad upoṣaṇam || 82 ||
 satyābhibhāṣaṇaṁ brahmacaryaṁ devapradakṣiṇām |
 bhojanaṁ bhikṣuvelāyāṁ manasaḥ saṁnyamaḥ 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 eating at improper times, followed by positive injunctions 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 jitenā rājendra grāhyaṃ sugataśāsanam |
 mayā jitenā śuśrūṣyā viprāḥ saṃtyajya cīvaram || 95 ||
 etac chrutvā tathety uktvā vādaṃ tena sahākarot |
 sa vinītamatī rājā bhikṣuṇā dinasaptakam || 96 ||
 aṣṭame 'hani bhikṣus taṃ sa jigāya mahīpatim |
 yenodayavati vādimuṇḍamudgarikā jītā || 97 ||
 tatas tenopadiṣṭaṃ sa bhikṣuṇā saugataṃ matam |
 sattvopakārapuṇyādhyāṃ jātaśraddho 'grahīn nṛpaḥ || 98 ||
 bhikṣuṇāṃ brāhmaṇādīnāṃ sarveṣāṃ ca cakāra saḥ |
 vihārasattravasatīr 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 Brahmanical 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): *evam cāruhya nautulyāṃ taranty eva bhavāmbudhim | vatsa buddhoktadānādiṣaṭkapāramitāṃ 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 pārvaṇaṃ candraṃ diḍḅkṣuḥ kenacij jaḍaḥ |
 aṅgulyabhimukhaṃ paśyety ūce dṛṣṭanavendunā || 32 ||
 sa hitvā gaganam tasyaivāṅgulim tām 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

aṅgulyagrahṇi yathā bālo na grhṇāti niśākaram |
tathā hy akṣarasarṇsaktās 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 kiñcid ādarśayet | sa cāṅgulyagram eva pratisared vīkṣitum |
evam eva mahāmate bālajātīyā iva bālapṛthagjanavargā yathārutāṅgulya-
grābhiniveśābhiniviṣṭā evaṁ kālāṁ kariṣyanti na yathārutāṅgulyagrār-
thaṁ hitvā paramārthaṁ 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 *vairya* 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 v1.3 = 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

atarṣya-tapas: whose penance surpasses
imagination (?)

adbhutālaya: home of marvels

adroha-pratyaya: guarantee against trea-
son 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 preg-
nant 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-saṁdarpa: bribing (?)

alipijñā: illiterate

asasya-ghātin: not injuring the crops

ākeka-vilocana: with squinting eyes

ātodya-maṅgala: auspicious drum
(music)

ānanda-tūrya: a festive instrument

ānanda-dīva-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-gr̥ha: 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-kṛīḍā: game of ball

kanyā-saṁbandha: matrimonial alliance
of maiden, marrying off

kari-kareṇū: female elephant

karpūrikā: camphor

karma-taru: tree of ones former actions,
kāka-vāṣita: cry of a crow
kāñci-nakṣatra-mālānka: with a string of (28) pearls like the (28) constellations
kiṇāṅkita: marked by scars, bruised
kukṣi-koṭara: ocean cavity
kulī: point
kuliśāstra: thunderbolt-weapon
kṛṣṇa-turagī: witch in form of black mare fights other witch in form of bay mare (*śoṇa-vaḍavā*)
kopāṇḍha: 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
cāraṇaraddhi: good fortune of an actor > popularity ?

cūta-pādapa: (made of) mango tree (wood)
cūrṇa-mīśra: 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-līṅgin: 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-dṛi-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
duḥkhāśāni: thunderbolt of grief,
duhitṛ-sneha: love of daughter
dāna-toya: donation water
dāsya-mukti: redemption from slavery
dāha-jvara: burning fever
ḍṛg-viśāhi: snake with poisonous look > laming stare
ḍṛṣṭa-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 townna-garādhīpa: police chief
nabhaḥ-kṛīḍā: 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
nūti-caḥṣus: 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-kṛīḍā: 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-dūti: 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
bharṭṛ-droha: infidelity to / treachery of husband
bharṭṛ-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 = Śabarās

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-sprś: beginning intoxication, tipsiness

madhya-niśceṣṭa: on the hip or waist

mantha-kālābdhi: ocean at the time of churning

marakatāsana: emerald throne

marū-kṛta: turned into a desert, desertified

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 liberation 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-lāsa: 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

rogopasānti: cure

latā-lāsyā: 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

vinayojjala: 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
ṛtta-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
suddhānta-vidhva: violator of the royal
 harem
śubhāgama: lucky omen
śūla-kara: with trident in hand
śṛṅga-māṃsa: flesh in the horns (?)
śoka-kanda: lump of grief
śokākṛānta: 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, sur-
 rounding 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-śālīn: 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-dvīpa: 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
hāsyā-vibhrama: ridiculous blunder
hema-daṇḍa: gold sticks