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PREFATORY NOTE BY PROFESSOR LANMAN.

On February 18, 1898, Professor Pischel, in reply to a suggestion that he should undertake a revision of his first edition (of 1877) of Kalidāsa’s Śakuntalā, wrote to me from Halle as follows: Ihre Anfrage wegen der Śakuntalā kann ich nur mit einem freudigen „Ja“ beantworten. Es ist der sehnlischste Wunsch meines Lebens, eine korrekte Ausgabe zu machen, und ich hoffe, alte Manuskripte aus Calcutta zu erhalten . . . . Mit der Prakritgrammatik hoffe ich um Pfingsten herum fertig zu werden. Dann will ich gleich nach Manuskripten schreiben und dann zur Neubearbeitung schreiten.

The Prakrit grammar appeared in 1900. In the spring of 1902, Pischel was called from Halle to Berlin as Professor of Sanskrit. And he died in India just after Christmas of 1908. His tenure of the Berlin chair was all too brief, something over six years, and those years were filled not only with the very distracting business-preparations of the Prussian Expedition to Chinese Turkestan, but also with the labor of winning from the rich finds that were brought back, the splendid results that his learning and insight were able to win. In spite of these difficulties, he somehow managed to embody his revision of the Śakuntalā in an interleaved copy of his first edition, and it is from that copy that the text of this second edition has been printed.

Finally came the appointment from the Government of India to deliver a course of lectures on Prakrit at the University of Calcutta before an audience of Hindu scholars – an extraordinary distinction, and for Pischel a fatal one. After Pischel’s death, Professor Ernst Windisch suggested that the conduct of the printing be entrusted to our common friend, Professor Carl Cappeller of Jena. This work of pietas Professor Cappeller most kindly undertook, and for the proofs of the text he has had the help of our colleagues, Professors Geldner and Konow and Hertel. To all these scholars the thanks of Indianists are due.

To Professor Cappeller’s learning and pains we are chiefly indebted (apart from our debt to Pischel) for whatever new merits this edition may show. His were the laborious tasks of preparing for press the „Sanskrit Equivalents of the Prakrit Words“ (pages 111–147), and of sifting the Variants and of recasting the report of those worth reporting (pages 151–249), and of making the Table of Divergences of this
edition from the first edition (pages 249–255). He has written for this edition a Preface, in which he says what needs to be said about the Text and about the other matters just mentioned. And he has added a section giving an account of the metres. To this I have added a list of the metres in the order of the stanzas.

An essay entitled „A Method for citing Sanskrit Dramas“ was written by me and prefixed to Belvalkar’s Translation of Rama’s Later History, volume 21 of this Series, pages xvii–xxvii. The essay points out the annoyances and hindrances and waste of time occasioned by bad methods or lack of method, and discusses the essential features of a good one. The method, in briefest statement, is as follows:

Method of citing the metrical parts of a play. — These are cited by act, and by stanza as numbered from the beginning of that act, and by quarter or pāda, the pāda being indicated by a or b or c or d.

Method of citing the prose parts of a play. — The prose lines between any two consecutive stanzas are numbered from the prior to the latter stanza, starting always anew from the prior stanza. A given line is cited by number of act and by number of prior stanza (counted as above) and by number of line as counted from said prior stanza. — If there is no prior stanza (that is, if the act begins with prose), a zero is put in place of the stanza-number.

This is the method used in this volume. For examples, see the head-lines of the pages of the text. A reprint of the essay may be had free on application to the Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A. Since uniformity of method is in itself highly desirable, I earnestly hope that this method will be widely accepted and followed by future editors and scholars of India and the Occident.

Pages 1–208 (sheets 1–26) of this volume were printed before the outbreak of the World-war. For the admirable execution of this part of the work, the most generous thanks are due to the honored House of W. Kohlhammer of Stuttgart, who has already laid Orientalists under great obligations. — In the pages that follow 208, I fear that errors and other lapses from the standards of this Series may be found. If so, the death of Professor Pischel, the distresses of the War, the effects of war-prices, the disappearance of part of the printer’s copy, and the difficulties of printing in these times at an office thousands of miles distant, may seem to be reasons enough.

Harvard University
February 22, 1922.

C. R. Lanman.
PISCHEL'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

The present edition of Kālidāsa's Śakuntalā is based on the following manuscript material:

Z = an excellent ms., Wilson, no. 233; Aurecht, Cat. Cod. Oxon., no. 253. The ms. is incomplete, beginning with suṇādu ajjo at page 21. 4 of this edition (= i.24.48 of ed. 2). It was written in 1710 by lavadevaka.

EPILOGUE
Written January 12, 1924

The title-page of this volume is dated 1922, and the prefatory note (page viii, opposite) is dated February 22, 1922. The printed sheets from Stuttgart arrived in Boston on the steamship Fuerst Buelow, November 28, 1923, and were released from the Custom-house just after Christmas. In February, 1922, the printing of this book was so very nearly completed that a further delay of twenty-odd months, or even of ten, in its appearance, seemed as improbable as do the Buddhist stories (H.O.S. 30.307; 29.216) of babes born after a stay of seven years and seven months and seven days in their mothers' belly. The reader may be spared the whys and the wherefores of the long gestation. But he may at least be told that this book has been in very deed the Schmerzenskind of the Harvard Oriental Series.

It is therefore a solace to be able to say that, trying as have been the circumstances attending the issue of this work, there has never been any jarring or friction between those concerned in its production, nor ever an unkind word said. It is pleasant to think of the departed Pischel, and of his friendly and helpful colleagues, and of the faithful Swabian printers in Stuttgart.

Before the refractory material of the apparatus criticus was all in type, Professor Cappeller's eyesight failed. At this juncture, Professor Geldner, now of Marburg, came to my aid. It is an especial pleasure for me to thank him publicly for his kindness in reading the proofs of pages 209 to 260. On August 8, 1873, for the first time, Geldner and I sat together in Tuebingen, at the feet of that truly great teacher and master of the interpretation of the Veda, Rudolf Roth. Thus for more than half a century Geldner and I have been friends. One of the bonds between us has been our admiration and love for Roth. And so it is peculiarly fitting that, in thanking Geldner, I wish him — as I heartily do — health and strength to finish the printing of what is sure to be his best claim upon the gratitude of Indianists, his Translation of the Rig-Veda.

C. R. LANMAN
than C. Candraśekhara’s text is the basis of the present edition. In the Appendix I have added his version of the Prakrit passages, and his various readings as far as they could be ascertained from his commentary. To make the meaning more clear, I have enclosed in brackets his explanatory notes which occur very often in the middle of the version, and have not corrected the numerous passages in which the laws of sandhi are neglected in the mss.

Ś = Śaṅkara’s commentary (Wilson, no. 40; Aufrecht, Cat. Cod. Oxon., no. 254 B). From folio 108 b the ms. contains Candraśekhara’s gloss; the last folios, however, again belong to Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara’s readings have for the most part been incorporated into Prof. Böhtlingk’s edition, and I have therefore abstained from quoting them. Besides, Śaṅkara can hardly be called a commentator of the Bengali recension. His readings are generally quite modern and not supported by the best Bengali mss.

All these manuscripts—ZSNRI and CCaŚ—are written in the Bengali character.

D = a ms. of the Royal Library at Berlin (Chambers, 308) written in the Devanāgarī character. Of this ms. the various readings are given only to the beginning of the second act. I have elsewhere [De Kālidāsae Čakuntali recensionibus, p. 14 sqq.] described the ms. at full length.

y = Chézy’s edition, Paris, 1830. I have had no opportunity of collating the Paris ms., but it may easily be seen where Chézy has misread it. It is true that Chézy’s edition is „a very imperfect work“ and that „it abounds in typographical and other more serious errors“, but this is not so much the fault of its editor as of the time and circumstances under which it was accomplished. Chézy is indeed worthy of much praise for his energy and zeal, and I look on this book as a second issue of his edition which I have been fortunately able to bring out in a more correct shape. After all, Chézy’s edition has been to the present day the only one from which a true idea of Kālidāsa’s Śakuntalā could be obtained. The editions prepared by Indian Pandits which have come under my notice and which profess to be editions of the Bengali recension, are all based on mss. of doubtful value and are altogether uncritical. They are as follows:


These three editions have constantly been consulted, while I was preparing my text, but I have hardly ever admitted a reading from them into it, unless it was supported by one of my mss. or at least by Šaṅkara.

I have examined again all the Devanāgari mss. used by Professor Bohtlingk, the ms. Walker, no. 201 e (Aufrecht, Cat. Cod. Oxon., no. 252), and the ms. Chambers, no. 272 (Weber, Catalog, no. 546). I have collated three mss. written in Telugu character (FHI\(^3\)), one written in the Grantha character (L), and one in the Malayālam character (V). I have gone through the commentaries of three Dravidian scholiasts, Abhirāma, Śrīnivāsācārya\(^1\) (these two are written in the Grantha character), and Kāṭayavema (written in Devanāgari, though copied from a Telugu original). Of all these Dravidian mss. I have given a full account in my papers: „Über eine südindische Recension des Çākuntalam“ (Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1873, p. 189 ff.), and „Die Recensionen der Çākuntalā“ (Breslau, 1875, p. 10ff.). I have lately got possession of an edition of the Dravidian recension published at Madras, together with Śrīnivāsācārya’s commentary in the Telugu character. The text of the latter differs much from the London ms. I shall be glad to publish the Dravidian recension, should this be thought desirable by competent judges.

I need not expatiate here upon the principles according to which this edition has been prepared, as I have already stated these in the papers mentioned before, and also in another paper, „De Kālidāsaë Çākuntali recensionibus“ (Breslau, 1870). I have further shown in an article published in the „Beiträge zur vergleichenden Sprachforschung“ (vol. 8, p. 129 ff.), that in the Dravidian and Devanāgari recensions the Prakrit is not Śāuraseni, but a wild mixture of various dialects. My edition of the Vikramorvaśīyam (Berlin, 1875) has fully confirmed this view, and has proved that it is in South-India that Sanskrit dramas have been adulterated and abridged.

I have given special attention to the Prakrit passages, and I trust that this edition will contribute to a better knowledge of scenic Prakrit than it has been hitherto possible to acquire. I have added in the margin and at the end of the stanzas the numbers of Prof. Böhtlingk’s edition. [These are cancelled in the second edition.]

\(^1\) So, and not Nivasācārya: see Burnell, Indian Antiquary, 6. 233 (1877).
Prof. Kern of Leiden has laid me under deep obligation by revising the last proof.

A German metrical but literal translation of this text will shortly be published by Mr. L. Fritze, already well known by his version of the Hitopadeśa as an able and elegant translator of Sanskrit works. [This appeared at Schloss-Chemnitz, 1877.]

My edition was finished on the 30th of March, 1875, and I have not since then altered a single word in deference to the criticisms of any other scholar.

PREFACE BY CAPPELLER TO THIS, THE SECOND, EDITION.

This revised edition of Pischel's Šakuntalā is made from an interleaved copy of his first edition of the text, in which copy he had entered variants and emendations. For the work of revision, Pischel has not utilized much new manuscript material. Variants of a ms. H have been noted by Pischel at the beginning of act ii, the monologue of the Vidūṣaka; but they are not of consequence enough to warrant any conclusion as to the critical value of that ms. And in addition to the manuscripts described in the preface to the first edition, only one new codex, manuscript B, has been collated throughout.

Even this ms. B is of no special value. It abounds with blunders of every kind. One of these blunders, the senseless āmuṣmān for the common word āyuṣmān, may suffice as an index of the learning or intelligence of the scribe. Of the mss. used for the first edition, N is the one with which the new ms. B agrees the oftenest. As appears from the Variants, pages 151 to 249, it seldom happens that ms. B presents an original reading. This is however sometimes the case; and as examples may be cited ahiariadu, the reading of B for the ahiṇṭadu of i.4.4; its āsāṃstadi for the jaāviṇāsi of i.2.2; its praviṣāmi for the gacchāmi of i.18.11; and its sālaḥ throughout the prelude to act vi instead of nāgarakaḥ—see vi.0.10 on page 209. — It is moreover worthy of note that four passages appear in ms. B only as marginal additions secunda manu. These are: imaṃ, i.20.14, to mūlādo, i.20.18; rājā, i.24.54, to tiṣṭhati, i.25.1; amī vedim, iv.10.2, to -taravāḥ, iv.10.6; aṅgulīaassa, vi.1.24, to bhaṭṭiṇā, vi.1.30.

In ms. B, moreover, two passages are entirely missing. One is the brief passage rājā, vii.5.1, to eṣaḥ, vii.6.d; the other is the long passage paricidō, iii.28.4, to rūpayant, iii.35.8. This second lacuna corresponds almost completely (so far as it goes) with a long love-passage which is usually missing in the briefer mss., and of which only the last part (namely, rājā. ayi madirekṣaṇe, iii.35.9, to vaktraṃ dāhukate, iii.37.2) appears in ms. B. It would be very strange if this lacuna coincided exactly with missing folios of B, and Pischel would probably have said so explicitly in his interleaved copy if such had been the case. In fact he says: „In B all from cido to rū inclusive is wanting.“
We may therefore assume that, beginning at iii. 28. 3, B reads porava. anicchāpūrao vi saṃbhāsaṃamettaṇa paricido[?] viramati. This senseless collocation does indeed convict the scribe of gross negligence; and yet it seems to me quite possible that he had a vague feeling that the second part of the dialogue in question was spurious or at least superfluous. Taken by and large, the new text has not gained much by the collation of ms. B.

The advantages of the new text over the old are due to a more careful working up of the old material, and, above all, to Pischel's Prakrit studies. The results of those studies are embodied in his Prakrit Grammar (Grammatik der Prakritsprachen, Strassburg, Truebner, 1900), and they appear in this text at every step.

It is a matter of course that the new text is printed exactly as Pischel left it in his interleaved copy. The divergences of the new text from the old are given in summary form together near the end of this volume.

Candraśekhara's Sanskrit version of Prakrit words or phrases, and his Variants, together with his explanations of words or phrases, are put by Pischel in his first edition immediately after the text (page 171: atha śrīcandraśekharasya prakṛtacchāyā pāṭhāntarāṇi ca). It seemed to us that we could better meet the needs of the beginner by giving in this volume, at pages 111 to 147, the approximate Sanskrit equivalents of the words of the Prakrit passages in the order of those words. This table of equivalents follows exactly the Prakrit text of this edition. It disregards entirely the rules of phonetic combination, and treats each word as an isolated unit.

Thus, taking Śakuntalā's request at i. 17. 3 as an example: for tā sīchilehi dāva ṇaṁ, we give, at page 112, as equivalent, tat śīthilaya tāvat enat, and not tasmācchithilaya tāvadenat. The prior equivalent, in its external look, corresponds better with the Prakrit; it is clearer for the eye; and it is on the whole more easily and quickly comprehended. Our procedure saves the trouble of first making the combination, and then saves the student the trouble of unmaking it. Both processes are here gratuitous and useless.

A knowledge of only the most important phonetic correspondences between the Prakrit and the Sanskrit is here presupposed; and accordingly, for difficult cases, references to Pischel's Prakrit Grammar have been given in the foot-notes of pages 111 to 147. In some cases the Sanskrit „equivalent“ given by us is not the phonetic equivalent of the
Prakrit word, but merely its sense-equivalent. Thus in the example just cited, the form tat, given on page 112 as the Sanskrit equivalent of tā, is not its phonetic equivalent, but merely its sense-equivalent 'therefore, so'. The Prakrit here, as often, is the reflex of an older stage of the language, of the Vedic, and the phonetic equivalent of tā is tāt, one of the normal Vedic forms āt, yāt, tāt, replaced in classical Sanskrit by asmāt, yasmāt, tasmāt. This is all made clear by the foot-note and the reference to § 425 of the Prakrit Grammar.

In some cases Candraśekhara's explanation of words or phrases is reported in our foot-notes. See, for examples, the foot-notes to pages 144 and 145.

The Variants. These were given in the first edition on the same page with the text and immediately under it. In this edition they have been put by themselves in a separate part of the volume and have been reduced in extent by about one half. Any one who will take the pains to examine a few pages of the variants of the first edition will readily admit that Pischel has given far more than is necessary or desirable.

Thus, to begin with, I have simply left out manifest blunders due to the scribe's carelessness or lack of intelligence or to the peculiarities of the Bengali alphabet. These Pischel had registered in great numbers, with conscientiousness, but probably not with entire completeness. Examples of such blunders follow (the citations refer to this edition): āmuṣmān for āyuṣmān, i.7.2,6; 9.2; nāṣa for nāma, i.20.30; sāuravasya for pāuravasya, i.24.29; sāhū for sahē, i.24.45; goramī for godamī, i.32.5; vibhāt for vṛtyaṁ, iii.2.a; tecah for cetaḥ, iii.30.c; duṇo for puṇo, iii.37.16; dāra for dāva, iv.0.7.

As for the variants of the Prakrit speeches, many forms which once passed for variants worthy of consideration and registration, may now with the help of Pischel's Grammar be recognized as mere blunders and ignored accordingly. This holds especially for peculiarities of the Śāurasenā and Māhārāṣṭrī and Māgadhī and for the orthography of the particles khu kkhu, jeva jjeva, tāva dāva, and so on.

The numerous variations of the manuscripts among one another in the matter of stage-directions are in like manner quite unworthy of full registration. (Such are the vacillations of the mss. as between svāgamata and ātmagamata; avalokya and ālokya and vilokya; sadṛṣṭi-śepam and sadṛṣṭivikṣepam; praviśati and praviśya.) And it is of equally little consequence to record just which mss. use a hā dikh or a bhōbh a single time and which mss. repeat it, or which mss. leave out and
which mss. put in a superfluous vocative like deva or svāmin. In all this we can draw no hard and fast line; but if we have erred, we believe that we have erred in giving too many rather than too few of these blunders and arbitrary peculiarities of the scribes.

The proper names of the play call for special notice, in particular the three names Anusūyā (name of an attendant of Śakuntalā), and Mādhavya (the jester) and Duḥṣanta (the king). In the Devanāgarī mss. these names appear as Anasūyā and Māṭhavya and Duṣmanta, and there has been much discussion as to the original forms. It will be more useful to give here a comprehensive summary of the manuscript variants of these names than to report the variants confusedly and repetitiously at the places where the names chance to occur.

For Anusūyā or Aṇusūṭā Pischel registers Anasūyā or Aṇasūṭā as the variant reading of ms. S at 37 places, that is, at nearly all occurrences in ed. i up to page 70.2, where his note says "S Ana- and so always". The reading Anasūyā appears also in his ms. I at 9.10 = i.16.3 and at 20.1 = i.24.31. We may therefore say that all of Pischel's ms., with the exception of S, and with the exception of I in two places, give this name as Anusūyā.

The jester's name appears in the Sanskrit form Mādhavya in six places (ii.4.3,4; ii.7.10; vi.28.9,17; vi.35.2); and the Prakrit form Mādhavva or Māhavva appears in three places (vi.18.2; vi.26.3; vi.28.10). Only one of the six places shows variants for the Sanskrit form, namely ii.4.3, where the ms. I reads Madhavyena and where D prima manus reads Māṭhavyena. For the Prakrit form the mss. are at odds in all the three places, but they favor the reading Māḍhavva (so BSR at vi.18.2; so Ry at vi.26.3; so BSNIR at vi.28.10).

The Sanskrit form is given in both editions as Mādhavya. The Prakrit form is given in the first edition as Māhavva, and in this edition as Māḍhavva.

The king's name, Duḥṣanta, appears in the mss. with the most variations. It occurs in 13 Sanskrit passages and in 2 Prakrit passages. And at 91.2 (ed. 1) = iv. 22. b (ed. 2) we have its vṛddhi-form, Dāuḥṣantim. The passages (with the citations for both editions) follow. The first 13 are Sanskrit. The last two are Prakrit: the last but one is Śāuraseni, and the last is Māgadhī.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>9 = i. 5.c</th>
<th>46.</th>
<th>2 = iii. 0.2</th>
<th>141.</th>
<th>2 = vi. 26. 6</th>
<th>169.</th>
<th>8 = vii. 33. 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>13 = i. 30.2</td>
<td>78.</td>
<td>5 = iv. 6.a</td>
<td>145.</td>
<td>3 = vi. 32. d</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>12 = i. 23. 2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>15 = ii. 8.1</td>
<td>107.</td>
<td>11 = vi. 24. 1</td>
<td>164.</td>
<td>10 = vi. 26. b</td>
<td>160.</td>
<td>10 = vii. 20. 39M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preface by Cappeller to this, the second, edition.

Pischel's manuscripts treat the Sanskrit form as follows:
S reads Duhṣva in 11 places, Duḥṣma in 1, Duḥṣama in 1, and Dāuṣma.
I reads Duḥṣa in 13 places, and Dāuṣa.
N reads Duṣva in 13 places, and Dāuṣva.
RZY read Duṣma in 13 places, and Dāuṣma.
D reads Duṣma at 3.9 and 25.13.

B reads Dussa in 5 places, Duḥṣa in 3, Duḥṣma in 2, Duṣma in 2, Duvṣa in 1, and Dāussa.

Pischel's manuscripts treat the Prakrit forms as follows: For the Śāuraseni form, all mss. read Duṣṣanta. For the Māgadhī form, the ms. S reads Duḥṣvante, I Duḥṣantaḥ, NB Dussante, R Duṣmanto, Z Duṣmante, y Dussanto.

In both editions and in all occurrences Pischel prints the Sanskrit form as Duḥṣanta (Dāuḥṣanti), the Śāuraseni form as Dussantaḥ, and the Māgadhī form as Duṣśante.

The Table of Divergences of the second edition from the first. In this, the procedure follows the same principles as with the Variants. Only matters of essential importance have been put into the Table. Many things are left quite unnoticed. As to the divergences left unnoticed in the Table, several summary statements need here to be made.

1. Punctuation. Marks of punctuation are lacking in ed. 1 after vocatives and interjections and often elsewhere. In ed. 2 such marks have been inserted.

2. Orthography. The spelling of single words is often bettered. Thus for patra, kośa, veṣa, aṅgulīya of ed. 1, the second edition has pattra, kośa, veṣa, aṅguriya.

3. The use of final m in the pause is consistently regulated in ed. 2. Often in ed. 1, and especially throughout the first act, anusvāra is made to do duty for m in Indian fashion.

4. Separations and collocations. These concern matters more or less arbitrary. For example, in ed. 1 tatrabhavān is written as two words, while in ed. 2 it is written as one word. In ed. 1 atha kim or adha im is written now as one word and now as two; in ed. 2 it is written as two words.

1 But at 139.13, Duṣya prima manus.
2 At 41.13 are two variants for N—the first probably an oversight.
3 At 3.9 no variant is given for Z.
4 The readings of D are given only as far as 35.4 = ii. 5. b.
5 But D has rāa-Dūṣantam.
5. Prakrit words. Simple orthographic improvements have not been noticed in the Table. Only those cases are registered where Pischel in the face of several possibilities decided to make a change. For example, ed. 1 has Māhavva (133.8; 140.15), which Pischel has changed in ed. 2 to Mādhavva (vi.18.2; 26.3). The pāava of ed. 1 (13.2) is printed pādava in ed. 2 (i.20.4) and a reference to § 186 of the Prakrit grammar is made in the Table. So kada of ed. 1 (36.16; 140.13) is changed to kida in ed. 2 (ii.7.6; vi.26.2) and a reference to § 49 is added.

6. Enclitic particles. A careful discrimination between the varying forms of these particles (cf. page XV above) is consistently carried out in ed. 2, but the details are not given in the Table. The critics are probably few who will condemn this as a sin of omission.

Conclusion. — And so we hope that this unpretentious work, in its new form, will accomplish its purpose, and that it will win among students of Sanskrit and among Indianists the same recognition and wide circulation which it attained in such ample measure many years ago.

University of Jena
Saxe-Weimar, Germany.

Carl Cappeller.
TEXT OF THE DRAMA,
SANSKRIT AND PRAKRIT.