

9. NOTES ON HARṢA-CARITA VERSE 18, AND ON VERSE
QUOTATIONS BY AŚOKA.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—I venture to submit to you two brief notes.

1. The difficulty in verse No. 18 at the commencement of the *Harṣa-Carita*—

आद्यराजकृतोत्साहैर्हृदयस्थैः स्मृतैरपि ।

जिज्ञान्तः कथमाणैव न कवित्त्वे प्रवर्त्तते ॥

“By the achievements of Ādhyarāja, which, though remembered, abide in my heart, my tongue being drawn inward does not go forward in poetry”—

has been considerably lightened by Professor Pischel, who has convincingly proved (*Nachrichten d. k. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1901, Heft 4*) that by Ādhyarāja Harṣa himself is meant. But I have always been troubled by the *api*, ‘though,’ which seemed to imply that, being remembered, the achievements would not naturally be in Bāṇa’s heart. The same difficulty was no doubt felt by the commentator, who therefore proposed to explain *api* as meaning ‘also,’ quoting Pāṇini, i, iv, 96, अपिः °समुच्चये°. He suggests further a second interpretation, according to which the *utsāhas* were in the heart, not of the author, but of Ādhyarāja.

I have always thought that there might be a reference to some psychological doctrine, according to which memory did not reside in the heart. This seems to be confirmed by a verse in the *Prabodhacandrodaya* (ed. Brockhaus, p. 41):

स्मर्यते स हि वामोरु यो भवेद्बृदयाद्बहिः ।

मच्चित्तभित्ती भवती शालभञ्जीव राजते ॥

“He is remembered, lady, who should be without the heart. On the wall of my mind you stand out like a figure in relief.”

I have not, however, been able to trace this doctrine anywhere in the *darśanas*. The Sāṅkhya makes memory a property of the *buddhi*, while according to the Nyāya it is

संस्कारमात्रजन्यं ज्ञानं. The latter, however, means only that it is produced without *indriyasambandha*, 'sense contact,' and has nothing to do with psychophysical views.

2. Verse quotations in the edicts of Aśoka? As most of the later Indian inscriptions either are composed in verse or quote verses, and the same is true in general of the written literature, it would not be surprising to find Aśoka himself adopting this usage. The following suggestions may therefore perhaps be considered by scholars more immediately preoccupied with the earliest Buddhist literature.

Aśoka constantly expresses a wish to secure the happiness of men in this world and the next. Thus we have the following expressions:—¹

kiṃti hidataṃ ca pālatam ca ālādhayevū ti.

Pillar Edict IV.

kimam kāni sukham avahāmi ti.

Id. VI.

hevaṃ hi anupaṭipajamtaṃ hidata[pāla]te āladhe hoti.

Id. VII.

so tathā karu ilokacasa āradho hoti parata ca amnamtaṃ puṃnam bhavati.

Rock Edict XI.

hidaloka palalokaṃ ca ālādhayevū.

Separate Edicts, Dhauli, ii, 6; cf. ii, 3, and i, 6.

A common phrase in this connection is *svargam ārādhay-*, 'to win heaven,' which occurs in the *Separate Edicts*, Dhauli, i, 16–17; ii, 9 (with the corresponding passages from Jaugada), and in the Sahasrām-Rūpnāth-Bairāt-Brahmagiri edicts, in the *Fourteen Edicts*, ix. We also find in a number of places the nominal phrase *svargārādhi* or *svargasya ārādhi*. It is quite clear that the expression was (at any rate with Aśoka) a common turn.

In the sixth of the *Fourteen Edicts* the phrase runs, according to the Girnar version, as follows:—

“Ya ca kiṃci parākramāmi ahaṃ, kiṃti bhūtānaṃ ānaṃṇaṃ gacheyaṃ idha ca nāni sukhāpayāmi paratrā ca svagam ārādhayamtu.”

¹ I quote according to Bühler's recent texts in *Epigraphia Indica*, ii–iii, so far as they extend; elsewhere from M. Senart's work.

The other versions present slight variations, as *vracheyam*, *sha* (for *nāni*), *sukhayami*, *aradhetu*, and omission of *ahaṃ* (Shāhbāzgarhī), *yehaṃ*, *sha* (for *nāni*), *sukhayami*, *aradhetu* (Mansehra), *kāni*, *yehaṃ*, *sukhāyāmi*, *ālādhayitu* (Kālsī), *yehaṃ*, *kāni*, *sukhāyāmi*, *ālādhayaṃtu* (Dhauri and Jaugada).

It is to be observed that not only the second half of this passage, *idha ca . . . ārādhayaṃtu*, is really a standing phrase, as we have seen, but the same is true of the first part also. Thus, parallel to *ya ca kiṃci parākramāmi ahaṃ* we have *yaṃ tu kiṃci parākramate devānaṃ Priyadasi rājā* (Edict X), and parallel to *ānaṃṇaṃ gacheyam* the *ānaniyam eatha* which occurs in the *Separate Edicts*, i and ii, of Dhauri and Jaugada, in the immediate neighbourhood of *svargam ārādhaya-* (*ānaneyam esatha svagaṃ ca ālādhayisathā*, Dh. i, 16–17; ii, 9 = J. i, 9; ii, 13).

Under these circumstances is it not striking to note that the passage in question can quite easily be made to fall into four lines of ten syllables each—

yaṃ cāhaṃ (or c'ahaṃ) kiṃci parākramāmi
kiṃti bhūtānaṃ ānaṃṇaṃ ehaṃ,
idha ca yāni sukhāpayāmi
pāratra sva(r)gaṃ ārādhayevu—

with but slight irregularity of metre? Such a verse might come from a poem expressing the aspirations of the Buddha, from such a *praṇidhāna*, for instance, as we find in the (northern) *Bhadra-caripraṇidhāna*, which is written in a somewhat similar metre. I may quote (from the MS. of the Royal Asiatic Society) v. 15 :—

— 00 — 00 — 00 — — —
yāvātā kēcid dāśa dīśī sattvās
te sukhitāḥ sada bhontu arogyāḥ |
sarvajagasya[ca] dhārmika artho
bhotu pradakṣiṇa ṛscatu āśāḥ ||

Could not such a verse come from the very *Munigāthāḥ* which Aśoka mentions in the Bhabra Edict?

Might we perhaps in a similar way account for the expression about the faith “increasing at least in the ratio of

one and one-half," which occurs as part of a quoted 'savana' or 'sermon' in the Sahasrām-Rūpnāth-Bairāt-Brahmagiri edicts? Professor Oldenberg has commented (Z.D.M.G., xxxv, p. 475) on the strangeness of such an expression, but it might be defended as proverbial if occurring in a verse. I must confess, however, that the following is a rather irregular anuṣṭubh :—

iyam cāthe vadhisiti vipulam ca vadhisiti |
 diyādhyam { avarārdhyena } diyādhiyam vadhisiti ||
 { avaradhiyā }

But the feeling of the expression is metrical.¹

Iti vijñāpīte śiṣṭāḥ pramāṇam.

Yours faithfully,

September, 1903.

F. W. THOMAS.

10. ELOHĒ HAŠĀMAĪM IS DEVÁ.

Oxford, August 15th, 1903.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—Will you allow me to record my suggestion as to—

(יהוה) אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם

in 2 Chronicles xxxvi, 23 (see also Ezra).

I find the name to be Exilic and to mean 'devá.' The 'God of Heaven' is the 'Heaven-God,' as is the Indian word, which is of course 'the shining one' from the sky (originally Iranian also).

The item, if tenable, has a double application. It assists us in verifying the authenticity of the Edict (see also the Cyrus Vase-Inscription, which speaks of the rebuilding of the Temple-city Eššakil (so spelt from memory)). If the Heaven-God is Devá, then the Edict looks the more native to its asserted place of origin.

But, second, it introduces a valuable item into the discussion of the theology of the Inscriptions of Cyrus's

¹ I must express my acknowledgment to Dr. Fleet, through whom I became acquainted with this passage (see his note above).