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PREFACE.

The sub-title of this book places analysis before speculation. In recent studies of the great epic this order has been reversed, for a method calling itself synthesis has devoted itself chiefly to dwelling on epic uniformity, and has either discarded analysis altogether or made it subject to the results of "synthetic" speculation.

The best way, of course, to take up the historical investigation of a literary product the origin of which is well known is to begin with the source and afterwards to study the character of the completed whole. But if the origin be unknown, and we wish to discover it, we must invert the process, and begin our study with an examination of the character of the work. When the results of our analysis become plain, we may group together those elements which appear to have existed from the first, and thus, on the basis of analysis, reconstruct the past. To begin with a synthesis (so called) of whatever is preserved in the product, and so to postulate for the beginning exactly what we find to be the completed whole, is a process that leads us only to the point from which we started. As vaguely incorrect as is the designation synthesis for the method so called is the method itself, which thus does away with all analysis. Analysis is an examination of constituents. As a method it is, like any other, obnoxious to error, but it is not on that account an erroneous method. It is in fact, as turned upon history, nothing but inevitable critique; and synthesis without such critique becomes merely the exploitation of individual opinion, which selects what pleases it and rejects, without visible cause, what is incompatible with the synthetic scheme.
In the case of the great epic of India, the peremptory demand that we should reject the test of analysis is the more remarkable as the poem has never been completely analyzed. The literature mentioned in it has been ably collected in the well-known memoirs of Professor Holtzmann, who has also indicated what in his opinion may be supplied from allusions; but the poem has not been thoroughly examined to see what literature it reflects from the age of the later Upanishads or Vedic schools; it has not received a careful investigation from the metrical side; its philosophy has been reviewed only in the most haphazard fashion; and its inner relation to other epic poetry has been almost ignored. Yet critic after critic has passed judgment on the question of the date and origin of this poem, of which we know as yet scarcely more than that, before a definitive answer can be given, the whole huge structure must be studied from many points of view. And last of all the synthesist comes also, with his ready-made answer to a problem the conditions of which have not yet been clearly stated.

Thus far, indeed, the synthetic theory has not succeeded in winning over a single scholar to accept its chief conclusions, either as regards the contention that the epic was composed 500 B.C., or in respect of the massed books of didactic material and their original coherence with the narrative. Though the results of the method have not proved to be entirely nugatory, yet they are in the main irreconcilable with a sober estimate of the date and origin of the epic; but the hypothesis is, in truth, only a caricature of Bühler's idea, that the epic was older than it was thought to be. In its insistence upon the didactic element as the base of the whole epic tale it bears a curious resemblance to a mediæval dogma, the epitaph of which was written long ago. For there were once certain ingenious alchemists who maintained that the Legend of the Golden Fleece was a
legend only to the multitude, whereas to the illuminati it was a didactic narrative teaching the permutation of other metals into gold; on the tomb of which brilliant but fallacious theory was finally inscribed: \( \lambda όγος \ δε \ εστι \ η \ μεν \ τολμη \ μεγας \ τη \ ε \ \alphaποδειξει \ κενος. \)

But though this theory has failed as a whole, yet, owing to the brilliant manner in which it was first presented by its clever inventor, and perhaps also to its sharing in the charm which attaches to all works of the imagination, it has had a certain success with those who have not clearly distinguished between what was essential and adventitious in the hypothesis. The Rev. Mr. Dahlmann, to whom we owe the theory, has shown that epic legends and didactic motif are closely united in the epic as it is to-day; but this is a very different proposition from that of his main thesis, which is that complete books of didactic content were parts of the original epic. One of these statements is an indubitable fact; the other, an historical absurdity.

This historical absurdity, upheld by the Rev. Mr. Dahlmann in a rapidly appearing series of somewhat tautological volumes, is of much wider application than has perhaps occurred to the author. For in the later additions, which the Rev. Mr. Dahlmann regards as primitive parts of the epic, are found those sections which reflect most clearly the influence of Buddhism. If these sections revert to 500 B.C., all that Buddha as a personality stands for in the history of Hindu religious thought and practice belongs not to him but to his antecedents, and therewith vanishes much of the glory of Buddha. Though the author has not publicly recognized this obvious result of his theory, yet, since it is obvious, it may have appeared to some that such a darken-

\[ ^1 \text{Almost identical, in fact, is the verdict on the synthetic argument delivered by the veteran French critic, M. Barth: "conclusion audacieuse \ldots theorie absolument manque" (Journal des Savants, 1897, pp. 337, 448).} \]
ing of the Light of Asia added glory to the Light of the World, and this is possibly the reason why the synthetic theory has been received with most applause by the reviewers of religious journals, who are not blind to its bearings. But however important inferentially, this is a side-issue, and the historian’s first duty is to present the facts irrespective of their implication.

On certain peculiarities (already adversely criticised by disinterested scholars) characteristic less of the method of investigation than of the method of dialectics which it has suited the Rev. Mr. Dahlmann to adopt, it is superfluous to animadvert in detail. Evidence suppressed by one seeker, in his zeal for truth as he sees it, is pretty sure to be turned up by another who has as much zeal and another method; nor has invective ever proved to be a satisfactory substitute for logic. As regards the claims of synthesis and analysis, each method has its place, but analysis will always have the first place. After it has done its work there will be time for honest synthesis.

The material here offered is by way of beginning, not by way of completing, the long task of analyzing the great epic. It is too varied for one volume, and this volume has suffered accordingly, especially in the chapters on philosophy and the interrelation of the epics. But the latter chapter was meant only as a sketch, and its worth, if it has any, lies in its appendix; while the former could be handled adequately only by a philosopher. The object of these and other chapters was partly to see in how far the actual data rendered probable the claims of the synthetic method, but more particularly to give the data without concealment or misstatement. For this reason, while a great deal of the book is necessarily directed against what appeared to be errors of one sort or another, the controversial point of view has not seldom been ignored. Pending the preparation of a
better text than is at present available, though Dr. Winternitz encourages the hope of its eventual appearance, the present studies are intended merely as signboards to aid the journey toward historical truth. But even if, as is hoped, they serve to direct thither, they will be rendered useless as they are passed by. Whether they are deficient in their primary object will be for travellers on the same road to say.

January, 1901.
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As most of the references in this volume are to the Mahābhārata, all numbers without alphabetical prefix refer to this epic (Bombay edition, or with prefix C. to Calcutta edition); but when necessary to distinguish a reference to the Mahābhārata from a reference to the Rāmāyaṇa, I have prefixed M., which therefore does not refer to Manu, but to the great epic. To bring the two parallel editions of the epics into line, I have used R. or RB. for the Bombay edition of the Rāmāyaṇa also (rather than for the Bengal text), and for clearness I employ G. for the Gorresio (Bengal) text thus:—

M. or MB., Mahābhārata, Bombay edition.
R. or RB., Rāmāyaṇa, Bombay edition.
C., Mahābhārata, Calcutta edition.

Other abbreviations, such as those usually employed to indicate native texts, or, for example, ZDMG. and JAOS. for the Journals of the German and American Oriental Societies respectively, require no elucidation for those likely to use them. Those using the old edition of RB. must add one to all references to sargas after vi, 88, and two to all after vi, 107. Sanskrit words usually anglicized have so been written.
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THE GREAT EPIC OF INDIA
THE GREAT EPIC OF INDIA.

CHAPTER ONE.

LITERATURE KNOWN TO THE EPIC POETS.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the great epic mentions post-
epical as well as prae-epical works. To solve the paradox
it is necessary to assume that the text has been interpo-
lated, a fact admitted as a last recourse even by him who
holds that the epic was originally what it is to-day. But
interpolations to be referred to when everything else fails
will not suffice. A large part of the present epic is inter-
polation, some of it self-interpolated, so to speak. For, not
content with receiving accretions of all sorts, narrative and
didactic, the Bhārata, in default of other sources of inter-
polation, copied itself. Thus the same story, hymn, and
continuation are found in iii, 83, 116 ff. and ix, 38, 39 ff.
The matter of xii, 223 is simply enlarged in 227, while xii,
248–9 repeats xii, 194 and then reappears again in xii, 286.
An example of reproduction with variations is found in ix, 51,
50, as compared with iii, 133, 12 ff. In one case a youthful
prodigy encounters venerable sages and teaches them the
Veda; in the other a priest and king are instructed, but with
the same setting of proverbial lore. So xii, 185 is a repro-
duction of iii, 213, 1–19; xii, 277 (8), of xii, 175, etc.

It is not strange, therefore, that a work thus mechanically
inflated should have absorbed older literature. But to under-
stand the relation between the epic and the older literature
copied by the epic it is essential to know the whole literature
referred to as well as cited. In this chapter, then, beginning
with the Vedas, I shall follow the course of revealed and
profane literature as far as it is noticed in the epic itself, reserving, however, for the two following chapters the Rāmāyaṇa and the philosophical systems.

The Vedas.

Allusions to Vedic literature, veda, chandas, mantra, ṣruti, are naturally common in every part of the Mahābhārata, but except in the didactic or later epic these are usually of a general character. It may be assumed that the bulk of ṣruti or revealed works, if not all of it, was composed before the epic began. Nevertheless, it is interesting to see which portions of this hereditary literature are especially mentioned, and particularly important to observe how the epic cites from older works. Even the fact that it does cite verbatim the words of the holy texts is of historical moment when it is remembered that in other places even women and slaves are exhorted to hear the recital of the epic.¹ We find indeed in the course of the epic narrative that a woman is taught Vedic mantras,² but the mantras are from the Atharva Veda, which, without being particularly slighted, is less regarded than the older Vedas, as is shown by this incident; for no woman would have been taught Rig Veda verses, for example.

The Vedas are all mentioned by name, though the Atharva Veda is not always recognized in the formal enumeration. The order of precedence is not fixed, though its peculiar holiness, vimala, is not the reason why the Śāma Veda in the Gītā and Anuṣṭāna heads the list.³ Usually the Rig Veda stands at the head and the Atharva, if mentioned, at the foot, though the order Rk, Yajus, Atharvan, Śāman, and even Atharvan, Śāman, Rk, Yajus is found; but the last order occurs only in the didactic or later epic. The four together comprise the vedāc caturmūrtiḥ, or fourfold Veda, which, in

¹ Compare i, 62, 22; 95, 87; iii, 85, 103; xii, 341, 116, etc.
² Tatās tām grāhayaṃśa sa dvijaḥ Mantragrāman... athravācirasī ṣrutam (v. l. athravāçirasī), iii, 305, 20.
³ For in v., 44, 28, it has this epithet, yet stands last in the list: "Not in R. V., nor in Y. V., nor in Atharvas, nor in the spotless Śāmans."
distinction from the threefold Veda, is often joined with the “Veda of the bow.” The epic even has caturveda as an epithet of a man,—“one that knows the four Vedas” (=cāturvāidyā),—as earlier triveda, trāvīdyā, is used in the same way of one learned in the three (cāturvidyām is a pseudo-epic term for the Vedas).1

The tradition of “lost Vedas”2 and “divided Vedas” is well known. There was at first but one Veda, but after the Kṛta age men became men of three, men of two, men of one, and men of no Vedas, triveda, dviveda, ekaveda, anrā, iii, 149, 14–29, and v, 43, 42, cāṅreṣu bhinneṣu being Vedas; bhinnās tadā vedāḥ, xii, 350, 42 (by Apāntaratamas). The last passage is peculiar in the use (ś. 41–47) of vedākhyāne ārutiḥ kāryaḥ, and in the name of Kali as kṛṣṇa (as well as tīṣya).3

The Veda is either recited, declared, or made, srṣṭa, kṛta. The latter word contradicts the dogma declared in the well-known words: na hi chandāṇi kriyante nityāṇi chandāṇi, “the Vedas are not made, they are eternal;” but the sense is

1 The word triveda remains the usual form (tritayaḥ svitaḥ sarvam, ix, 64, 21). Besides caturveda as an epithet of a god (illustrated in PW.), we find in the late passage iii, 313, 110 ff.: pāthakāḥ pāthakāḥ cii ‘va ye cā ‘nye cāstraścintākāḥ sarve vyassānine murkhā, yaḥ kriyāvān sa pāḍitaḥ; caturvedo ‘pi durvṛṣṭaḥ sa cādṛād atiriciyate, yo ‘gnihotraparo dāntāḥ sa brāhmaṇa iti smṛtaḥ. On the order of names referred to above: the lead of the Atharva is found also in the Mahābhāṣya (IS. xiii, p. 432); the epic passage is xiii, 17, 91. The name is here atharvaṇa or Ṛṭarvaṇa, xiii, 93, 138; 94, 44. Examples of the usual order are ṛcō yajūṣi sāmāṇi, i, 1, 66; ix, 36, 34; xii, 252, 2 (ṛcō yajūṣi sāmāṇi yo veda na sa vā dviṣhaḥ); ṛgvedaḥ sāmavedaḥ ca yajurvedaḥ ca atharvavedaḥ ca, ii, 11, 32; iii, 159, 14, atharvaṇaḥ. In v, 18, 5–7, it is said that the name Atharvaṅgiras will eventually belong to the Atharva Veda. The word sāmāṇi is not restricted to this Veda. Thus Dhāumya, a Purohita and, therefore, as Weber has shown, presumably an Atharvan priest, sings incantations of destruction, sāmāṇi rāudrāṇi yāmyāṇi (gāyan), ii, 80, 8. On the expression atharvavede veda ca, see below. For the order of names, compare my Ruling Caste, p. 112; and see Holtzmann, Das Mahābhāṣya-rata, iv, p. 5; for further passages (for the AV. in particular), Bloomfield, SBE. xiii, p. iii.

2 On this aonic occurrence (xii, 210, 18 ff.), compare vedārūtiḥ pranaṣṭā, xii, 346, 9, the story in 348, and the quotation in the text below. The modified vrata, rules, vikriyante vedavādāḥ, are referred to in xii, 233, 38.

3 The former as Kali is still starred in PW. The latter is masculine in R. vi, 35, 14 (also starred as such in PW.). The word occurs also in xii, 341, 86.
not opposed, as the maker is God (vedakartā vedāṅgo vedavāhanaḥ, iii, 3, 19), who only emits the Vedes as he does all else when the new aeon begins. The more decided “make” is found of seers, however, in the Harivañça, mantra-brāhmaṇakartāraḥ, mantra-krtaḥ,1 seers and descendants of seers, just as there is a Mahābhāratakaṛt and Itiḥāsasya kartā, or ποιητῆς ἔπος, though he too is divine.2 The gods who are credited with the making of the Vedes3 are Fire and Sun, as All-God (above), or especially Brahman, and in the later epic Vishnu. It was Brahman who “first recited the Vedes,” vedān jagāu, v, 108, 10. With a natural inversion, “Brahman created brahman” (whereas in reality brahman created Brahman), according to another passage, xii, 188, 1–2. Compare: ya ime brahmaṇā proktā mantra vai proksane gavām ete pramanam bhavata utā 'ho na, v, 17, 9–10. The Self-existent, according to xii, 328, 50, created the Vedes to praise the gods, stutya-tham iha devānāṁ vedāḥ sṛṣṭāḥ svayambhuvā. Kṛṣṇa, who is kṛtāgama, in xiii 149, 97, takes the place of the more general term. Compare xii, 340, 105:

yadā vedaḥrudir naṣṭā mayā prayāhṛtā punāḥ savedāḥ sačrutikāc ca krtāḥ pūrvaiṁ kṛte yuge (atikrantaḥ puraṇeṣu śrutās te yadi vā vacit),

and nirmītā vedā yajñāc cau 'saḥbhīhiḥ saha, ib. 341, 66, with xiii, 145, 61, āgāma lokadharmānāṁ māyādāḥ pūrvanirmitāḥ.4

1 jāvanti 'ha punāḥ pūnah Mantra-brāhmaṇakartāraḥ dharme praṣṭhile tathā, H. 1, 7, 50.

2 Kṛṣṇa Dvāipāyaṇa, also called Kuruvaṇacakara, xii, 347, 13; xiii, 18, 43–44. The recitation of the Vedes is a matter of scientific study. When they are “loudly recited in the proper way,” sačāikṣya, they fill (other) winds with fear, and therefore should not be recited when a high wind is blowing, xii, 329, 23–56.

3 For the gods and especially for the part of Brahman in creating the Vedes and the transfer of his office to Vishnu in the epic, see Holtzmann, ZDMG. xxxviii, p. 188, and Das Mahābhārata, iv, p. 6.

4 The v. l. sarva is wrong. The word āgama usually refers to Veda, but not always. Compare xii, 104, 156, āgamanāṁ hi sarvaśaṁ ścaraḥ creṣṭha ucye; i, 2, 36, itiḥāsaḥ creṣṭhaḥ sarva-gaṁey avam; xii, 59, 139, āgamaḥ paurāṇāṁ. It means any received work, particularly the Vedes.
In late passages the two earliest forms of the text (the latest forms are unknown) together with the accents of the texts are especially mentioned.\(^1\)

In the important numerical analysis of xii, 343, 97–98, the Rig Veda is said to "have twenty-one thousand"; while the Sāma Veda has "one thousand branches"; and the ādhyātmya or Yajus has "fifty-six and eight and thirty-seven (one hundred and one) branches." Probably "twenty-one branches" is the real meaning in the case of the Rig Veda. Here too are mentioned the gītis, songs or verses (a rather unusual word) found in the branches in their numerous divisions, cākhābhedāḥ, cākhāsū gītayāḥ.\(^2\)

It is evident from this statement that, as Weber says of the passage in the Mahābhāṣya, we are dealing with a period when the number of Yajur Veda schools is greater than that recognized in the Caranavyūha, which gives only eighty-six. Another verse of this book recognizes ten thousand reas:

"This ambrosia churned from the wealth of all the dharmākhyānas, and the ten thousand reas," xii,

\(^1\) ṛgvedaḥ padakramavibhūṣitaḥ, xiii, 85, 90; atharvavedapravarāḥ pūga-
yajñīyasāmagalāḥ sanhitām iñayanti soma padakramayutāṁ tu te, i, 70, 40. Gālava, Bābhryavyagotra, Pāñcāla, the grammarian, through the especial grace of the deity and being instructed in the method of Vāmadeva, became a shining light as a krama specialist, xii, 343, 100 ff.; laksanāni svarāstobhā niruktaṁ surapañktayaḥ, xiii, 85, 91 (together with nigraha and pragraha); svarākṣaravayañjanaheṭuyuktaya (girā), ili, 297, 26.

\(^2\) The verse translated above is ekaviṇcatisāhasram (ṛgvedam mām pra-
caṅgāte). Twenty-one thousand what? Not stanzas, for the Rig Veda has only half so many (Müller, ASL, p. 220). On the other hand, the passage agrees closely with one in the Mahābhāṣya (IS, xiii, 430), where the corre-
responding words are "twenty-one fold," after vartma (school): ekacatam adhvāryautyakhāḥ, sahasravartma śāmavedah, ekaviṇcatisdāḥ bāhvrçyam (a word implied in Mbh, xv, 10, 11, "Śamba the bāhvrçah"), navadvā atharvavop 
vedaḥ. The epic text, closely corresponding, is: ekaviṇcatisāhasram ṛgvedam 
... sahasraçākham yat śāma ... śatapaciçātam aṣṭau ca sapta triñcatam 
itutvasmin cākhā yajurvede, so 'ham adhvaryave smṛtaḥ, pañcakalam 
atharvānam kṛtyābhīhi paribrühātam kalpayanti hi mām vipā atharvān 
vidas tathā. There can scarcely be a doubt that for the text above we should read ekaviṇcatisākham yam, as the parallel suggests, for the text as it stands is unintelligible. I regret that Weber has not noticed the epic pas-
sage, so that I cannot cite his opinion.
247, 14, where the commentator says that this is a general number, implying a fraction over 10,580.1

In the account of the later epic we have a parallel to that of the Vāyu Purāṇa, where the latter, xxi, 120 ff., is accounting for the successive editions of the Vedas:

āvartamānā ṛṇayo yugākhyāsu punah punah kurvanti saṁhitā hy ete jāyamānāḥ parasparam aṣṭācitasaḥasrāṇi gṛutarṣaṁnāṁ śrāvani vāi tā eva saṁhitā hy ete āvartante punah punah gṛtā daksinam panthānam ye gmaśanāṁ bhejire2 yuge yuge tu tāḥ cākāḥ vyasyate tāih punah punah dvāparyasya iha sarveṣu saṁhitaṁ ca gṛutarṣibhiḥ teśāṁ gotreṣv imāḥ cākāḥ bhavanti 'ha punah punah tāḥ cākāḥ tatra kartāro bhavanti 'ha yugakṣayāt

The eighty thousand Vedic seers here mentioned are those of the Harivaṇa (loc. cit.): ye gṛuyante divam prṛptā ṛṇayo hy ārdhvaṃcataḥ mantrasrāḥmaṇakartāro jāyante ha yugakṣaye. They are mentioned elsewhere in the Vāyu Purāṇa, viii, 184, and in the epic itself, ii, 11, 54, in the same words:

aṣṭācitasaḥasrāṇi ṛṣiṇāṁ ārdhvaṃcataśām,

a verse found also in the Mahābhāṣya (IS. xiii, p. 483).

1 Compare further the daśa paṇca (ca) yajūṇa, learned from Arka by the author of the Čatapatya Brāhmaṇa, in xii, 319, 21. The word carana, in the sense of school, occurs in xii, 171, 2, praṣaṣ ca gotracaranaṁ svādhyaśam brahmacārikam; xiii, 63, 18, na pṛched gotracaranaṁ. The mantras of the special septs are referred to in the late hymn to the Sun (Mihira), iiii, 3, 39: (tvām brāhmaṇaḥ) svac̣ākhaśvihitāṁ mantrait arcani. The commentator cited above gives as his authority for the number of stanzas in the Rig Veda a lame couplet of the Čakalaka: ṛcāṁ daśasahasraṇi ṛcāṁ paṇcaḥcātāni ca ṛcāṁ aṣṭiḥ pādaṣ cāl-tat pārāyaṇaṁ ucaryata, iti.

2 They are referred to, but not as Veda-makers, in Yāj. iiii, 186, and in Āp. Dh. S., ii, 9, 23, 3-5 (as being mentioned “in a Purāṇa”). Yāj.īavalkya calls them the aṣṭācitasaḥasrā munayaḥ punaraṃvartaṁ ... dharmapraṃvartaḥ. The Purāṇa referred to by Āpastamba may be the one cited above, though in another form, since the words have a different application. There is here a praṇaṃśa of the ārdhvaṃcataśa: aṣṭācitasaḥasrāṁ ye praṣām iṣira ṛṣayaḥ daksināṁ pryaṇaṁ panthānam te gmaśanāṁ bhejire, etc. Compare Praṇa Up. i, 9, ta eva punaraṃvartaṁ tasmād ete ṛṣaya praṇākṣāṁ daksinam pratipadyante.
Divisions of Veda.

Reference is seldom made to Saṁhitā, Brāhmaṇa, or Āraṇyaka. The “peruser of Saṁhitā,” saṁhitādhyāyin, is alluded to in i, 167, 8, and xiii, 143, 56. The word is used also of the epic, Vyāsa’s Saṁhitā, the fifth Veda. In xii, 201, 8, saṅgha may be used in the same sense of collection, but it probably means a quantity. I will give the passage, however, as it enumerates the usual (i, 170, 75, etc.) six Vedaṅgas, though in an order constrained by the metre (they and the Upaṅgas will be discussed below, under Upavedas):

रक्षामसानगान्र्या याजुन्यि सुपि
ेचन्दानिसि नक्षत्रात्रगतिि निरुक्तम
अधित्या व्याकरानायि साक्षापायि
छिक्षायि एि बहुतप्रकृतिि ना वेदि,

“Although I have studied collections of hymns and chants and the sacrificial formulas, and also prosody, astrology, etymology, grammar, ritual, and phonetics, I do not know the First Cause of being.”

Brāhmaṇas are mentioned in xii, 269, 33–34, as the source of sacrifice, and in iii, 217, 21, “the different Agnis named in the Brāhmaṇas,” brāhmaṇaśu. In xiii, 104, 137, “rites declared in the Veda by Brāhmaṇas,” the word means priests. Possibly Gītā, 17, 23, brāhmaṇaḥ (and vedāḥ) may be works, as the epic is not particular in regard to the gender of these words (purāṇa, itihāsa, and mahābhūta are both masculine and neuter). Yājñavalkya’s Çatapatha Brāhmaṇa alone is named, with all its latest additions (kṛṣṇaṁ sarahasyaṁ sasāṅgrahaṁ saparīceṣaṁ ca), xii, 319, 11, and 16. So ib. 24, 25, and 34: “I resolve in mind the Upanishad (BA.) and the Pari-çeṣa (the last part), observing also logic, the best science, ānvikṣikī parā, and declare the fourth transcendental science or science of salvation, sāmparāyikā, based on the twenty-fifth (Yoga) principle.”

Other Brāhmaṇas may be implied in the

1 In the expression, loc. cit., gl. 10, vedāḥ sakhilaḥ so ’ttaraḥ, uttara refers to the Upanishads (not to the philosophy). The Khila Supplement is mentioned again in the Harivaṇca (Holtzmann).
list at xii, 337, 7 ff., Tāṇḍya, Kāṭha, Kaṇva, Tāittiri. As "prose works," gadya, this class of works is perhaps recognized in iii, 26, 3, in the words: "The thrilling sound of yajūṃsi, ṛcāḥ, sāmāni, and gadyāni" (as they were recited).

Whether pravacana, exposition, means Aṅgas or Brāhmaṇas or perhaps Śūtras, I do not know. The (Upanishad) word occurs in a verse found also in Manu, where the commentator explains it as Aṅga, to which the objection may be made that the Aṅgas have already been mentioned. But the passage is not without importance as showing how the didactic or later epic adds elements to the simpler statement of the earlier law-books. In xiii, 90, 36, the pāṅkteyas, or men who may be invited to sit in the row at a funeral feast, are not only the agryāḥ sarvesu vedeṣu sarvapravacaneṣu ca of Manu iii, 184, and the list of iii, 185, triṇāciketaḥ pañcāgnis trisuparnāḥ saṣaṅgavid (v. l. brahmadeyānusantānaḥ chandogo jyeṣṭaṣāmāgah) in 90, 26, but, among others, the atharvaṣrṣo 'dhyetā, 29 (a rare word); "those who cause the Itihāsa to be read to the regenerate," 33; those who are "acquainted with commentaries," bhāṣyavidas (or know the Mahābhāṣya?), and are "delighted with grammar," vyākaraṇe ratāḥ, 34; those who "study the Purāṇa and the Dharmāṇāstras"; those who "bathe in holy pools," ye ca punyesu tirtheṣu abhiṣe-karkṛtrçramāḥ, 30 (a practice not extolled by Manu, whose view seems to be that of Agastya, asti me kaçcit tirthabhyyo dharmasaṃcayāyaḥ! xiii, 25, 5). The bhārate vidvān, xiii, 76, 18, is naturally extolled in the epic, and yet even with this latitude we must see in the list above a distinct advance on the position held by the early law-makers, to whom it was not enough for a man to recite the epic (not to speak of grammar and bhāṣya-knowers as being ipso facto pāṅkteyas) to be deemed worthy of invitation. Even Vishnu's Smṛti is here exceeded, and Manu and the Śūtras have nothing in any degree parallel. Even if we say that the list is on a par with

1 The Tāittiri dispute is referred to in xii, 319, 17 ff.
2 But bhāṣya may mean any reasoned exposition, bhāṣyaṇi tarkayuktāni, ii, 11, 35.
Vishnu alone, although it really exceeds it in liberality, we thereby put this epic passage on a par with a law-book later than any that can be referred to the Sūtra period, later than Manu also and probably Yājñavalkya.¹

Almost as rare as the mention of Brāhmaṇas is that of Āraṇyakas. In the passage cited above, xii, 343, stanza 98 has as elsewhere the singular, gāyanty āraṇyake viprā madbhāktāh. So ib. 340, 8: “Hari sings the four Vedas and the Āraṇyaka” (as forest, e.g., ib. 337, 11, āraṇyakapadodbhūtā bhāgāh); and in xii, 349, 29–31, the Krishna religion has “mysteries, abstracts, and Āraṇyaka.” Compare also v, 175, 38, cāstre cā 'raṇyake guruḥ, “a man of weight in code and esoteric wisdom”; xii, 344, 13, āraṇyakam ca vedebhyaḥ (yathā), where the kathāmṛtaṁ or essence of story of the expanded Bhārata, Bhāratākhyānavistara of 100,000 clokas,² is compared to the Āraṇyaka as the essence of the Vedas (a simile repeated at i, 1, 265). The word is in fact generalized, like Upanishad. But as a literary class it is found in the plural in xii, 19, 17, vedvādāṁ atikramya cāstrāṁy āraṇyakāṁ ca . . . sāraṁ dadṛṣṭre na te, “they ran over the words of the Vedas, the Čāstras, and the Āraṇyakas, without discovering their inner truth.” Here Veda does not connote Āraṇyaka.

Upanishads.

The Upanishads are alluded to in the singular, collectively, or distributively in the plural. They are generally grouped with the Āṅgas and are called Upanishads, rahasyas, mysteries, Brāhma Veda, and Vedānta; while like the Āraṇyakas they are logically excluded from the Veda of which they are supposed in ordinary parlance to form part.³ The

¹ Vishnu, ch. 83; Manu, loc. cit.; Yāj. i, 219; Āp. ii, 17; Gāut. xv; Vas. xi. I doubt whether the “Atharvaçiras-reader” can imply the Čiras-row, but even this is a comparatively late touch, Bā уд. ii, 14, 2, in this regard.

² Note that the number of verses show that the Harivaṁśa already existed when this passage was written. Compare ib. 340, 28.

³ I mean that in the current phrase vedāḥ sāṅgāḥ or sopaṇiṣadāḥ the sa should differentiate as much as it does in the parallel phrase ṛgvedaḥ saya-
word upaniṣad has two distinct but current meanings in the epic. It means on the one hand mystery, secret wisdom, essential truth, essence, as in xiii, 78, 4, gavām upaniṣadvid-vān, "wise in cow-mysteries," and in iii, 207, 67 = xii, 252, 11, vedasyo 'paniṣat satyam, satyasyo 'paniṣad damaḥ, "truth is the secret wisdom (essence) of the Veda, patience the essence of truth." So in the common phrase, vedāc ca sopaniṣadaḥ, xiii, 85, 92, etc., the word may mean mysteries. This I think is the explanation of the employment of the word mahopaniṣad in vii, 143, 34–35, where Bhūricravas devotes himself to praṣya before death in battle. He is a muni here and desires to ascend to the world of Brahman, so he sits down in Yoga contemplation and meditates the "great Upanishad," dhyāyan mahopaniṣadām yogayukto 'bhavan muniḥ. On comparing the scene where Droṇa is in the same situation, vii, 192, 52, we find that he says om, and this mystery of om is probably the meaning of mahopaniṣad, which cannot be a work here, as is mahopaniṣad in xii, 340, 111. But in other cases Upanishad is clearly a literary work, even standing in antithesis to the mysteries with which it is sometimes identical, as it is in the form upaniṣā in the Pāli scriptures.¹

jurvedaḥ, or in yad etad ucyate castrē se 'tīhāse ca chandasi, xiii, 111, 42. But it is very likely that the term was used to mean "including" (as part of the Veda). On the use of singular and plural referred to above, compare sa rājā raṣjadharmaḥ ca brahmopaniṣadaṁ tathā avāptavān, xv, 35, 2; saṣiga-
paniṣadān vedān vipraḥ cā' dhiyate, i, 64, 19, etc. For Vedaṅta and Vedāntāḥ, meaning Upanishads, compare iv. 51, 10, vedāntaḥ ca purāṇāṁ itihāsam (l) purāṇanam; xiii, 16, 43, (Civa) yaṁ ca vedavido vedyaṁ vedante ca pratiṣṭhitam . . . yaṁ viṣanti japanti ca; H. 3, 10, 67, purāṇeṇu vedānte ca. I may mention here also the works called Niṣads, which are referred to (or invented) only, if I mistake not, in xii, 47, 26, yaṁ vākeṣv anuvākeṣu niśatsūpaniṣatsu ca grhaṇi satyakarmāṇāṁ satyaṁ satyeṣu sāmasu.

¹ Kern, SBE. xxi, p. 317. Compare for the use of the word, xii, 245, 15, where it is said that the Upanishads inculcate the four modes of life, caturthāc cān 'paniṣado dharmāh śādharāṇaḥ smṛtaḥ; and xiii, 84, 5, where it is said that Vedopaniṣadas inculcate that earth, cows, or gold must be the sacrificial fee. As we find vedāḥ sarahasyāḥ sasāmgraḥāḥ and vedavedāṅgabhāṣyavit, xii, 325, 22–23, so in viii, 87, 42, reference is made to "all the Vedas, with Tales as the fifth Veda, together with Upavedas, Upanishads, mysteries, and abstracts" (sāmgraha). Nārada is said to be vedopaniṣadān vettā itihāsa-
purāṇajñāḥ . . . śāṅgagavit and smṛtimān, ii, 5, 2 ff. The use in iii, 251, 23,
Upavedas and Upāṅgas.

The Upavedas or subsidiary Vedas are three in number, Āyur Veda, Dhanur Veda, and Gāndharva Veda. To these is added in other works Śtāpattyā Veda, but this term is not recognized in the epic, and the commentator on vii, 202, 75, recognizes only three, those just given, or Medicine, Archery, and Music; but the fourth, Architecture, is known (only in the epic introduction), as Vāstuvidyā. Authors are assigned to these and other works in xii, 210, 20, Brhaspati being the originator of all the Vedāṅgas; Bhṛgu’s son, of Nitiçāstra, law; Nārada, of music; Bharadvāja, of the science of arms (particularly archery); Gārgya, of tales of the doings of seers (devarṣicarita); and Kṛṣṇātreyā, of medicine (cikitsita). They are all contrasted with other Nyāya-tantrāṇi, which like these were created at the beginning of the aeon as an aid in understanding Brahman (expounded by hetu, āgama, and sadācāra, or reason, faith, and common consent of good men, ib. 22). It is noteworthy that Nārada, not Bharata, is found in this connection, and that Kṛṣṇātreyā takes the place elsewhere given to Bharadvāja.

Of the first of these subsidiary Vedas, the epic naturally gives little information, though burdened with much medical knowledge which may be referred to some uncited work on medicine. Native scholars imagine that the corresponding Upanishad passages imply the circulation of the blood, also thought to be recorded in xii, 185, 15, prasthitā hṛdayāt . . . vahanti annarasāṁ nādyāḥ: “The veins convey (all over

would suggest that Upanishad is a sort of Sūtra, for here a spirit is summoned by means of “mantras declared by Brhaspati and Ucānas; by those declared in the Atharva Veda; and by rites in the Upanishad.” yāc co ‘paniṣadi kriyāḥ. I am not certain how to interpret paṭhyase stutiḥbhiṣ cāi ’va veda paniṣadāṁ gaṇāḥ xii, 285, 126.

1 Thus the architect, sātradhāra, sthapati, is vāstuvidyāviśērada, i, 51, 15 (the sūtrakarmacīrada of G. ii, 87, 1). Architectural Čāstras are mentioned in i, 134, 10–11. As a fourth to the three is elsewhere set the Arthaçāstra. These as a group are added to the other vidyās (see note below on the sixty-four arts and fourteen sciences). But in the epic, Arthaçāstra is not grouped with the Upavedas.
the body) the food-essences, starting from the hrdaya” (heart or chest). But a direct citation is the allusion, under the cover of an “it is said,” to the constituents pitta, čeśman, vāyu (also vāta, pitta, kapha), which make the threefold body, tridhātu, according to the Āryurvedins.1 In the epic Khila and in the Kaccit and eleventh chapters of Sabhā, both late additions to the epic,2 the science of medicine is said to have eight branches (ii, 5, 90; 11, 25). Possibly in iii, 71, 27, Čālihotra may represent the veterinary science of iv, 12, 7.

The Dhanur Veda, literally Veda of the bow, is often joined with the regular Vedas, as is to be expected in epic poetry, ix, 44, 21–22, etc. It is called also iṣvastra, weapons, and is said to be fourfold and to have ten divisions. In the Kaccit chapter just referred to it is said to have a Sūtra like other Vedas, and at the time this was written it is very probable that such was the case, though, as I have shown elsewhere, the knight’s study of Dhanur Veda consists in practice not in study of books. This Bow-Veda, archery, is opposed sometimes to the four Vedas alone, sometimes to the Upanishads and Brāhma Veda, while on the other hand it is associated with various Sūtras, arts, and Nitiçāstras. The priority of Dhanur Veda in the phrase dhanurvede ca vede ca, found in both epics, is due partly to metrical convenience and partly to the greater importance of this Veda in the warrior’s education:3 na tasya vedādhayane tathā buddhīr ajāyata yathā 'syā buddhīr abhavā dhanurvede, “His intelligence was more developed in learning how to use a bow than in perusing holy texts,” i, 130, 3; dhanur-

1 xii, 343, 86–87: pittan ċeśma ca vāyuṣ ca ēṣa saṁghāta ucyate, etāī ca dhāryate jantur etāī kṣipāī ca kṣiṣate, āyurvedavidās tasmat tridhātu mām pracaṅṣate. Compare vi, 84, 41, cited in PW., and also xiv, 12, 3, čito nāgā ca jva vāyuṣ ca gunāḥ . . . carirajāḥ, whose equality is health (N. kaphapitte). Some notes on epic anatomy will be given later.

2 The lateness of the Kaccit chapter I have discussed elsewhere, Am. Journ. Phil., vol. xix, p. 147 ff. A noteworthy statement on disease is that of xii, 16, 9, which attributes all mental disease to the body and all bodily disease to the mind, mānasāj jāyate cārīraḥ (vyādhiḥ), “bodily ailment arises from mental (ailment).”

3 The same is partially true of atharvavede vede ca, xiii, 10, 37, etc.
vedaparatvāt, ib. 4. It is the Kṣatra Veda or knightly science par excellence, R. i, 65, 23 (with Brahma Veda).

The science of music, Gāndharva Veda, consists according to iii, 91, 14, in the knowledge of singing, dancing, chanting, and playing on musical instruments, gītaṁ nṛtyaṁ ca sāma ca vāditraṁ ca, not including apparently the Naṭasūtra or manual for actors mentioned by Pāṇini. The seven musical scales, vāṇī saptavidhā, ii, 11, 34, are a branch of study. The three notes of the drum are spoken of and the names of the notes of the regular scale, gamut, are given. Further citations in this regard will be made hereafter.

These Upavedas are associated with the chief Vedas (vedāh and upavedāh, vii, 202, 75, etc.), much as are the Vedāṅgas, Upanishads, and Tales, and are distinguished as well from the Čāstras and Sūtras mentioned in the passage already noticed, ii, 11, 32–33, though Čāstra is a general term including Upaveda. The Aṅgas are the customary six mentioned above, and are generally referred to as in i, 104, 12, vedam śaḍaṅgaṁ prayādyāyata; or without number, as in i, 156, 5, brāhmaṁ vedam adhiyānāḥ vedāṅgāni ca sarvaḥ, nitičāstrāṁ ca sarvajñāh. These again have their subsidiary branches, Upāṅgas, vedāḥ sāṅgopāṅgāḥ savistarāḥ, iii, 64, 17; Ucānas' and Bṛha-spati's Čāstra with Aṅgas and Upāṅgas, i, 100, 36–38. The similarity of phrase in iii, 99, 26 and elsewhere, vedāḥ sāṅgo-paniṣadāḥ, might suggest that Upāṅgas were Upanishads, but they are more probably a species of Upavedas. The term is

1 This Veda is constantly mentioned, e. g. i, 130, 21; 221, 72; iii, 37, 4; ix, 6, 14, daçaṅgaṁ yaç catuṣpādam ṣāyastraṁ veda tatvataḥ, sāṅgaṁ tu caturuvedān samyag ākhyānapaścamān. The phrase dhanurveda ca vede ca occurs, for example, in i, 100, 10. In R. v, 35, 14, Rāma is described as "trained in the Yajur Veda... and skilled in dhanurveda ca vede ca vedāṅgese ca (the Yajur Veda only, to which Yāmikī belonged, is here mentioned). Elsewhere the science takes its proper place, as in M. iii, 277, 4, vedeṣu sarahasaṁ duhunnvedeṣu pāragaḥ, where the plural is noteworthy.

2 iii, 20, 10, triṣṇāmī hanyatām eṣā dundubhiḥ. The viṇā madhurālaṁ, sweet-voiced lyric, is spoken of as gāndharvaṁ sādhu mürchati (= mürcha-yunti), iv, 17, 14. The gāndharvam is the third note of the seven, xii, 184, 39 = xiv, 50, 63.

3 Compare brāhme vede ca pāragaḥ contrasted with astrānāṁ ca dhanurveda, vii, 23, 39. So Brahma Veda, R. i, 65, 23 (above), not as AV.
one associated with Jain rather than early Brahmnic literature, and is not explained by the commentator. Vedas, Purāṇas, Aṅgas, and Upāṅgas are sometimes grouped together, as in xii, 335, 25 (vedēṣu sapurāṇeṣu sāṅgopāṅgeṣu giyase, the prior pada found again, e.g. in 342, 6). The Aṅgas commonly mentioned in particular are the calendar-knowledge, Jyotiṣa, and etymology, Niruktam. The latter word, indeed, generally means only an explanation of the meaning of a word, but it occurs also as the title of a specific literary work in xii, 343, 73, where we find mentioned not only "Yāska’s Nirukta," together with Nāighanta, but vocabularies and lexicographies. A curious contemplation of Krishna as the divine sound in xii, 47, 46 analyzes him grammatically, "with joints of euphony and adorned with vowels and consonants."

Astronomical similes are not infrequent. Thus Arjuna storms about "like Mars in his orbit." An indication that one science is not much regarded is seen in the

1 The later Upāṅgas are the Purāṇas (and upa-); Logic, nyāya and vāi-çeṣika; Philosophy (including Vedānta), māṁsa; and Law-books (including Sāṁkhya-yoga and epics), dharmaçāstra. The epic use, as will be seen from the citation above, differentiates Purāṇas from Aṅgas and Upāṅgas. For the later meaning, see Weber 18. i, p. 13.

2 ib. 83, 88: nāighanta-kapadākhyāne, niruktam vedavidusō vedācabārdha-cintakāḥ. The common meaning, "explanation," may be surmised in xii, 340, 50, caturvaktro niruktagaḥ (in both editions), where the avagraha is certainly required, "inexplicable," despite Tāitt. Up. ii, 6.

3 In xiii, 17, 111 (where siddhārtha, according to Nilakaṇṭha, is siddhānta), Čiva is siddhārthakāri siddhārthaḥ chandovyākaranottaraḥ. Kalpa and Jyotiṣa are united, kalpaprayoga and jyotiṣa, in xiii, 10, 37. In ii, 4, 18, Kālīpa and Kaṭha are mentioned; in R. (not G.) ii, 32, 18, the Kaṭhakālāpūs (after the ācāryas tāittirīyāṃ in 15). M. and G. (only) have Čāndilya and Kāṇḍika (with Gārgya in G.) in the same list, and M. has Tittiri (with Yājña Valkya). In M. they are vedavedāgadāragah; in R., vedapāragah. R. calls Trijaṭa (Pīngala) a Gārgya in 29 (Aṅgirasa in G.; cf. R. 23).

4 viii, 19, 1, vākrātivakragamanād aṅgāraka iva grahaḥ. Compare budhāṅgārakayor iva (a battle-phrase). The Vedāngas and Upavedas are often grouped together, as in i, 1, 67, where cikṣā, phonetics, is grouped with nyāya, rules, and cikitsā, medicine. In i, 70, 40–44, the same passage where pada and krama are mentioned (above), cābda (sāniska), cikṣā, chandras, nirukta and kālajñāna are found with philosophy. A priest who is cikṣākṣaramantrandavīt gets gold nīkās, etc., iii, 23, 2; 38, 42.
fact that the cultivator of the Upaveda medicine and of the Aṅga astrology are both excluded from society, although it should be added that the man intended is one who “lives by the stars,” nakṣatrar īṣ ca jīvati. Such a fortune-teller is classed with rhapsodes and physicians, xiii, 90, 11. The difficulty of reconciling the data of astrology (fortune-telling) and the theory of Karma is alluded to in iii, 209, 21: “Many are seen to be born under the same lucky star, but there is a great difference in their fate.” The most surprising astronomical statement in the epic is to the effect that stars are really very large and only appear small on account of their distance. The kālajāṇa or “knowledge of time,” already mentioned, is attributed especially to Garga, who, as Weber, Lectures, p. 237, has noticed, is associated with Kālayavana: “Kālayavana who is endued with Garga’s (brilliancy or) power,” xii, 340, 95. This same Garga is credited not only with having kālajāṇanagati and jyotiṣāṁ vyatikrama, “thorough knowledge of times and mastery of science of stars,” ix, 37, 14–16, but also with kālajāṇa, or the fine arts. That the epic has a different order of planets from that of the third century A. D. has already been observed by Jacobi.

The Upavedas, however, pass the Vedic stage. There remains a word to say on the older Sūtras, to which may be added an account of those more frequently mentioned Sūtras and other treatises which are quite beyond the Vedic pale.

Sūtras.

A Vedāsūtra, apparently a Črāutasūtra, but perhaps only Veda in general, is mentioned once, in xii, 341, 63. Grhya-sūtras are not mentioned by name, but may be implied in the word Veda, as will be seen in the quotation given below. The Dharmasūtras are apparently implied in one passage of

1 dipavad viprakṛṣṭatvāt tanūni sumahānty api (tārārūpānil), iii, 42, 34.
3 The Supreme Lord says that the god who gives him a share gets by the Lord’s grace a corresponding (Veda-arranged) sacrificial share in (i.e. according to) the Vedāsūtra.
the thirteenth book, where a Sūtrakāra in one verse corresponds to Vedas in the next, in a passage cited from the Māit. Samhitā and Law-books (see below); and in another, where açaknurvantaç caritum kimcid dharmesu sūritam, "unable to do what is sūtrified in the laws," xii, 270, 36, must refer to the general class of legal Sūtras. The Gītā, 13, 4, mentions the Brahmasūtra, which is probably nothing but an equivalent of Vedasūtra, that is, equivalent to Veda in general; but it may be one of the late marks of this poem (the Brahmasūtra being otherwise unknown before the Hari-vançā) and mean the philosophical Sūtra.1 Sūtrakāras and Sūtrakartars, "who will arise," are mentioned prophetically a few times in the didactic epic.2

Profane Sūtras are jumbled together in one of the latest stanzas of the Kaccit chapter, ii, 5, 120, to which I have alluded before; "Dost thou understand the Sūtras on elephants, horses, chariots, catapults, and the Dhanurveda Sūtra?"

As early as Pāñini there were Sūtras of all sorts and the mention of such works has only the special value of indicating that the epic belongs to a time when Sūtra meant works which were probably popular and not written in aphoristic style. They were doubtless the same as the various Čāstra and other treatises to which reference is often made. Some of these works are called Čāstras and are grouped with the fine arts mentioned above as known to Garga. Arthaçāstra and Kāmaçāstra, by-names of the epic itself, are mentioned in the late introduction to the whole work. The fine arts, kalās, are mentioned or implied in three places. First the slave-girls of Yudhiṣṭhira are said, at ii, 61, 9-10, to be "versed in dancing and songs," sāmasu, and "skilled in the

---

1 In xii, 337, 31, there is mentioned a Mokṣaçāstra, inspired by gāthāḥ purī gītāḥ, a treatise which is based on verses recited (by Yayāti) in regard to proper behavior, and it is partly philosophical.
2 xii, 14, 101–104, granthakāra, sūtrakartā (bhavishyati), granthakṛt; 16, 70, sūtrakartar. In xii, 246, 30, svācāstrasūtrāhuttinamravikramaḥ, sūtra may be the thread (a brahma-sūtra as elsewhere), but in the connection seems more likely to mean Sūtra.
sixty-four," which must imply the sixty-four kalās. Then Garga, who knows kālajñāna and omens, utpātas, is also acquainted with kalājñāna catuḥsaṣṭyaṅga, xiii, 18, 38, which shows that the fine arts were not exclusively for women and slaves; as is also indicated by the passage xiii, 104, 149 ff., where, as befitting a king to know, are mentioned treatises on logic (or behavior?), on grammar, on music, and the fine arts; and to hear, Legends, Tales, and adventures of the saints. It is interesting to see that these "sixty-four arts," still typical of culture, are proverbial in India to-day. A Marathi proverb says caudā vidyā va cau-saṣṭa kalā, "fourteen sciences and sixty-four arts." 

Dharmaçāstras.

But if Sūtra literature, except in the few instances cited above, is practically ignored, all the more fully is Čāstra and particularly Dharmaçāstra literature recognized; which I may say at the outset shows that the later epic was composed under the influence of Dharmaçāstras rather than of Dharmasūtras.

The general term Nītīcāstra, code of polity, has already been noticed. A number of such codes is recognized, xii, 138, 196, and Dharma(cāstras) are cited not infrequently;

1 yuktīcāstraṁ ca te jñeyāṁ çabdaçāstrarāṁ ca, Bhārata, gāndharvaçāstrarāṁ ca kalāḥ pariṣṭeyā, narādhipa; purāṇam itihāsāc ca tathā khyānāni yāni ca, mahāmaṇām ca caritām çrotavyām nityām eva te. The yuktīcāstraṁ is not explained. According to PW., it is a manual of etiquette, but perhaps logic; possibly the unique system of logic and rhetoric developed by Sulabhā in xii, 321, 78 ff.

2 Manwarīng, Marathi Proverbs, No. 1175. This is late. Cf. Yājñ. i, 3; and Vāyu Purāṇa, lxi, 78-79. In the latter passage, the four Vedas, six Aṅgas, Mimāṁsā, Nyāya, Dharmaçāstra and Purāṇa make the "fourteen vidyās " or "eighteen" including the three Upavedas and the Arthaçāstra.

3 Or Smṛti, but this word seems of wide bearing. Just as āgama (above) includes more than Veda, so Smṛti includes all tradition. In xii, 200, 30, mahāsmṛti and anusmrṛti seem to be interpreted by the commentator as Sanhi-tās and Vedāṅgas (with Manu and others) respectively, but his first words may refer to the inferred Veda of the preceding japa (the reciters of both go ipso facto to heaven). Besides Manu (above), Yama, Aṅgiras, Bṛhaspati, Uçanas, and Parācara are aptly cited as law-givers.
while a general rule is given as a Dharma-çāsana, e. g., i, 72, 15:

Three fathers have we, for e'en thus

Law's statute says, 'tis meet
To call our sire, and who saves life,
And him whose food we eat.

Manu's Dharmāçāstra is referred to under that name only in one of the latest books of the pseudo-epic. In the early books his Rājadharmas are once mentioned, iii, 35, 21, which might imply a chapter of our present code, but otherwise only his Dharmas are referred to, though generally merely an ipse dixit of Manu is cited, which, however, is often a dictum opposed to the actual words of the extant Manu text. The epic poets do not always recognize Manu as in any wise supreme, often not even as prominent. A typical example is furnished by iii, 150, 29: "Gods are upheld by Vedic sacrifices; men are upheld by the laws (not of Manu but) of Uçanas and Bṛhaspati." But in xii, 336, 39-45, a primeval code, anuçāsana, of 100,000 člokas, gives rise to the "laws which Manu the self-existent will declare and Uçanas and Bṛhaspati," where there is a clear reference to the code of Manu; as in the next stanza, where are mentioned the "laws of the Self-existent, the Častra made by Uçanas and the opinions of Bṛhaspati" (a častraṁ sāṅgopaniśadam, 54).2

The mere order of names, however, is no more indicative of priority than in the case of the Vedas mentioned above. Another list of Rājaçāstra-praṇetāras at xii, 58, 1-3, 13, begins with Bṛhaspati and Uçanas (Kāvyā, cited with two gāthās at xii, 139, 70), and then follows Prācetasa Manu, Bharadvāja, and Gāuraçiras, with the gods between. So in the next section, 59, 81 ff., Çiva reduces Brahman's work,

1 So in iv, 58, 6, Bāhradvāja was "equal to Uçanas in intelligence, to Bṛhaspati in polity," naya; ix, 61, 48: "Have you not heard the instructions, upadeça, of Bṛhaspati and Uçanas?"); xii, 122, 11: "You have perused the opinions, matam, of Bṛhaspati, and the Častra of Uçanas," as the authorities generally recognized. Bharadvāja has three rôles in the epic, as archetypical jurist, physician, and teacher of arms, according to the passage.

2 Compare xii, 50, 80, ff.
which in turn is reduced by Indra, as the bāhudantaka, and then by Kāvya Yogācārya, a work which embraces Itihāsas, Vedas, and Nyāya (141) or laws.

More important is the fact that references to Manu's laws in the early books are seldom verifiable in our present code, while references in the didactic epic more often than not correspond to passages of the extant text.\(^1\) Hence it may be inferred that that part of the epic which agrees most closely in its citations with our code is later than that portion which does not coincide, or, conversely, that the text of Manu was shaped into its present form between the time of the early epic and that of the didactic epic. In the first period, when Manu's Dharmācāstra was unknown, Manu was merely a name to conjure with. The verses thus ascribed to Manu were not all put into the code when it was formed and for this reason the earlier citations are not generally found in our text. Some of them were adopted, however, and the later epic writers therefore agree more closely with the Čāsṭra as it is to-day; though no one who understands how works are enlarged in India will expect to find all the quotations verified, even in the later epic, for there is no reason to suppose that the code was exactly the same two thousand years ago as it is to-day. But in fact, out of eleven quotations from Manu in the thirteenth book, there is only one which does not correspond with our Manu text, and this is of a general character, to the effect that a crāddha with tila is undecaying, "said Manu."

\(^1\) So in the Rāmāyana there are two evidently interpolated chapters at iv, 17 and 18. Rāma in the subsequent chapters is incidentally charged (with great truth) with having violated every knightly rule in slaying Vāli. To offset this clear case of sin on the part of the divine hero, a formal charge and defence is inserted (just the procedure in the Mahābhārata!) in chapters which metrically belong to the classical period, so close is the adherence to vipulā rule. Just here it is that Manunā gītāu ċokāu are cited, viz., Manu, viii, 318 and 319 (inverted order), almost verbatim. Elsewhere Manu is a sage merely, not a cited law-giver, as here, iv, 18, 30-31 (without reference to Manu in G.). These chapters need no further proof than the reading to show their true character. They are simply banal, especially Rāma's speech, as well as contradictory in substance to the preceding and following chapters.
In a previous discussion of this subject in the Journal Am. Or. Soc. xi, p. 239 ff. (where will be found more data on the subject of legal literature in the epic),¹ in order not to force my argument I included as unverified a quotation at xiii, 65, 8, “Manu said that the highest gift is something to drink,” pāṇīyam paramaṁ dānam, because it was in connection with Tīrthas. In this I was certainly over-scrupulous, for the words could easily refer to the passage I there cited from Manu, iii, 202, vāry api graddhayā dattam akṣāyāyo ’pakalpate, “even water given with faith fits for immortality.” I can now add to this another quotation, xiii, 67, 19, toyado . . . akṣāyān samavāṇoti lokān ity abravīn Manuḥ, “a giver of water obtains imperishable worlds.” Further, I rejected as unverifiable the statement that Manu said the king gets a fourth part of the sin of the people (instead of the usual sixth), although, as I pointed out, this proportion actually occurs in Manu, only it is for a specific occasion. Nevertheless as Manu, viii, 18, says pādo rājānam arhati (or ṛchati), it is clear that the quotation caturtham etc. in xiii, 61, 34 cannot be said to be “unverifiable.” It is simply a free rendering verbally of a statement actually found in Manu.²

We have here the incontrovertible fact that, while the other books of the epic before the thirteenth in giving quo-

¹ For example, the fabulous books of divine origin of xii, 59, 80 ff. (like the origin of Nārada’s law-book), called Bārhaspatya, etc., according to the diadochos; the “law and commentary,” savāiyakho dharmah, of xii, 37, 10, etc. (pp. 254 and 248), and other points to which I may refer the reader without further remark than the references already given.

² Besides the quotation given above from the thirteenth book and verifiable in our present code, I may add iii, 92, 10: “By Manu and others (it is said that !) going to Tīrthas removes fear,” manvādibhīr mahārāja tīrthayātrā bhayāpahā, if this be the meaning, which is rather doubtful. In any case it only adds one more to the unverified citations from the early books, but it may mean only that Manu and others have journeyed to Tīrthas. Compare also xii, 266, 5, sarvakarmasya ahīsā hi dharmātmā Manur abravīt, “Manu the righteous proclaimed that one should not injure (animals) at any ceremony.” From the context, killing cattle at a sacrifice is here reprobated. This is a perversion for sectarian purposes of Manu’s rule ν, 43, nā ‘vedavihītāṁ hiḥsāṁ āpady api samācaret, to which perversion some color might be given by the following verses, which speak harshly of all injury to living creatures. I think no other quotations from Manu will be found in the epic.
tations from Manu agree with our present text of Manu only in one third to one half the instances, the thirteenth book has eleven citations, of which ten agree with the statements of our code. To this must be added the fact that only the thirteenth book recognizes "the Çästra declared by Manu." I do not know any other literature where such facts would not be accepted as of historical importance, and they have been so regarded here by competent scholars. In the opinion which I first set forth in 1885, the late Professor Bühler in general concurred, though inclined to believe that the authors of the twelfth and thirteenth books did not know the identical Çästra which we have to-day. As Professor Bühler's position has not always been cited with the reservations made by him, I will cite his own words: "It remains indisputable that the author or authors of the first, twelfth, and thirteenth Parvans of the Mahäbhärata knew a Mänava Dharmäçästra which was closely connected but not identical with the existing text," Manu p. lxxix, and again: "The answer which we are thus obliged to give to the question whence the author of our Manu-Smṛti took his additional materials agrees very closely with Professor Hopkins' hypothesis," p. xci. Nevertheless, despite this admission, Professor Bühler, by a line of argument which is based chiefly on the lack of absolute identity, assumes finally that the authors of the epic "knew only the Dharmasūtra," ib. p. xciii. The arguments other than the lack of total identity are, first, that Manu shows an acquaintance with the epic because he says that in a former kalpa the vice of gambling has been seen to cause great enmity; in regard to which Professor Bühler says: "This assertion can only point in the first instance to the match played between Yudhiṣṭhira and Duryodhana," p. lxx. But why not to the story of Nala, as Professor Bühler himself suggests, or any other story of dicing resulting in "enmity" which may have preceded our epic? Another argument is, that legends referred to in the Çästra are found in the epic, ib. But it is of the very character of the epic that it contains many ancient legends, gathered from all sources. It does not follow in the
least that Manu took them from the epic. On the other hand it is important to observe that in no such passage does Manu refer a single one of them to an epic source. Thirdly, it is claimed that the passages parallel in epic and Çāstra often have verses in a different order, with omissions, etc., that, in short, they are not actual copies one of the other. But Professor Bühler himself has shown that "the existing text of Manu has suffered many recasts," p. xcii, so that we do not know the form of the Çāstra to which the epic explicitly refers and from which it cites as the Çāstra set forth by Manu. For my part, it still is impossible for me to believe that when the pseudo-epic, in particular the Anuçāsana, refers to Çāstras,¹ and cites correctly from "Manu's Çāstra," it really knows only Sūtras.

A Mānava Dharmaçāstra, specifically, must from the evidence be regarded as older than the later epic but later than the early epic, which knew only a mass of royal and general rules, dharmas, generally ascribed to Father Manu but different from those in our extant Çāstra. With this result too agrees the fact that the metrical form of the extant code is distinctly earlier than that of the later epic. Not unimportant, finally, is the circumstance that the extant code only vaguely refers to epic Tales, but recognizes neither of the epics, only legends that are found in the epics. In all probability the code known to the later epic was not quite our

¹ In xii, 341, 74, are mentioned "teachers in Dharmaçāstras," ācāryā dharmarṣṭrēṣu; in xiii, 61, 34, Manu's anuçāsana; in xiii, 47, 35, "the Çāstra composed by Manu," manunā bhīhitam čāstram; in xiii, 45, 17, "those that know law in the law-books," dharmaçāstrēṣu dharmaçāyaḥ, in reference to the subject discussed in Manu iii, 52–53; iv, 88. Similarly, xiii, 19, 89. In most cases here Çāstras are the authority, which in ili, 813, 105, are set beside the Vedas as two standard authorities. In the face of these citations it is difficult to understand Bühler's words, "the authors ... knew only the Dharmasūtras," especially as the words contradict what he says in the same essay on a different page, "the authors ... knew a Mānava Dharmaçāstra" (loc. cit. above). It has seemed to me that the great scholar was unduly influenced in his final word by his general desire to put back the epic as far as possible. Professor Holtzmann, who has collected the material, loc. cit., p. 115 ff., is of the opinion that "our Mānavaadharmaçāstra is certainly much later than the older parts of the Mahābhārata."
present code, but it was a code much like ours and ascribed to Manu, a Čāstra which, with some additions and omissions, such as all popular texts in India suffer, was essentially our present text.

**Vedic Citations in the Epic.**

We have now reached and indeed already passed, in the notice of some of the works mentioned, the point where the epic impinges on the earlier literature. Before going further I will illustrate the statement made at the outset that the epic cites freely or parodies Vedic documents. The free rendition in Veda-like verse of the older hymnology is not uncommon. Thus in RV, 16, the opening hymn is not strictly Vedic, but it is very like a collection of Vedic utterances put into popular form and these verses are called brāhma mantrāḥ, cl. 8. Apart, however, from such instances of more or less exact imitation of general Vedic verses,¹ we find a number of verses plainly imitative of extant Vedic passages or almost exactly reproducing them. This applies to reproductions or imitations² of the chief Vedic literature from the Rig Veda to the Sūtras, as will be seen from the following examples:

Rig Veda x, 117, 6,

mogham annaṁ vindate apracetāḥ

¹ There are, of course, also a vast number of verses such as gāur me mātā vrṣabhaḥ pītā me, introduced, as here, with the flat imāṁ cṛutim udāharet, xiii, 78, 6-7; or with the more usual tag, iti cṛutiḥ, as for example, agnayo māṁsakāṁś (starred in pw.) ca ity api cṛuyate cṛutīḥ, iii, 208, 11; or with smṛta, as in aṁśvinā tu smṛtuḥ cūḍāṇu, xii, 298, 24; as well as such phrases as that of xiv, 61, 26, yas taṁ veda sa vedavit, all of which reflect the literature of the earlier periods.

² The Vedic work most frequently referred to is the Yajur Veda Hymn, trīśīlparnāṁ brahma yajūṣāṁ ċatarudriyam, xii, 285, 138; sāṁvedaḥ ca vedānāṁ yajūṣāṁ ċatarudriyam, xiii, 14, 323; tad brahma ċatarudriyam, vii, 81, 18; veda ca 'syā samāṁśtaṁ ċatarudriyam uṭtalam, vii, 202, 120; grāhṇ brahma param Čakraḥ ċatarudriyam uṭtalam, xiii, 14, 284. It is imitated over and over again, and some of the epic hymns call themselves by the same name, a fact alluded to in the words: vede ca 'syā vidur viprāḥ ċatarudriyam uṭtalam, Vyāseno 'ktāṁ ca yac ca 'pi upasthānam, xiii, 102, 23.
Mbh. v, 12, 20,
motham annam vindati ca 'py acetah
Böhtlingk, Spruch 4980.

Rig Veda vii, 89, 2,
drśir na dhmāto, adrivah

Mbh. iii, 207, 47; xii, 95, 21,
mahādrśir ivā 'dhmātaḥ
(pāpo bhavati nityadā, iii, 207, 47)

Rig Veda i, 10, 1,
gāyanti tvā gāyatriṇo arcanti arkam arkiṇaḥ
brahmāṇas tvā cātakrato ud vaṇçam iva yemire

Mbh. xii, 285, 78,
gāyanti tvā gāyatriṇo arcanti arkam arkiṇaḥ
brahmāṇam tvā cātakratum urdhvam kham iva menire
Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata, iv, p. 12; also for the following parallel, p. 13:

Rig Veda x, 129, 1–3,
nā 'sad asīn no sad āśīd tadānīm ...
no rātriḥ ahna āśīt praketaḥ ...
tama āśīt tamasā gūlham agre

Mbh. xii, 348, 8,
(nidarcanam api hy atra) nāśīd aho na rātrir āśīn na sad āśīn nā 'sad āśīt, tama eva purastād abhavād viqvarūpam

Compare also with Rig Veda, i, 13, 4, asi hota manurhitah, Mbh. ib. 10–11,
tvam agne yajñānāṁ hotā viqvesāṁ hito devānāṁ māṇuṣānāṁ
cā jagata iti, nidarganāṁ cā 'tra bhaveti, viqvesāṁ agne yajñānāṁ
tvam hote 'ti, tvam hito devāir manuṣyaair jagata iti

Rig Veda x, 14, 1,
vāivasvataṁ saṅgamanam janānāṁ

Mbh. xiii, 102, 16,
vāivasvata śaṁyamanī janānāṁ
Further, with Rig Veda i, 164, 46, ekaṁ sad viprā bahudhā vadanti, and x, 114, 5, viprāḥ... ekaṁ santam bahudhā kalpayanti, may be compared Mbh. (v, 16, 2, and) i, 232, 13, maniśīnas tvām jānanti bahudhā cāi 'kadhā 'pi ca. In xv, 34, 11, devayānā hi panthānāḥ ārutās te yajñasaṅīstare¹ is an allusion to Rig Veda x, 18, 1; while in xii, 312, 5, dyāvā-prthivyor iti eṣa... vedaṣu paṭhyate, the citation of a Vedic phrase is acknowledged; whereas in the epic phrases mā rīrīṣaḥ and bhuvanāni viçvā, vii, 201, 77, no indication of Vedic origin is given.

Ṭāitt. Saṁhitā i, 16, 11, 1; Čat. Br. i, 5, 2, 16,
ye yajāmahe

Mbh. iii, 180, 33,

idam ārṣam pramāṇam ca ye yajāmaha ity api

Compare iii, 31, 22, yasya nā 'rṣam pramāṇam syāt, etc. Aufrechte, apud Muir, OST. i, 137. Also Ṭāitt. S. ii, 5, 1, 1 is repeated verbatim Mbh. xii, 348, 28, as shown by Weber, Ind. Stud. i, p. 410.

Māit. Saṁhitā i, 10, 11,

stry anṛtam

Mbh. xiii, 40, 12 and 19, 6–7,

striyo 'nṛtam iti ārutīḥ; anṛtāḥ striya ity evam vedaṣu api hi paṭhyate; anṛtāḥ striya ity evam sūtrakāro vyavasyati.

Compare Bāudh. Dh. S. ii, 3, 46, with Bühler's note, and Manu ix, 18, striyo 'nṛtam iti sthitiḥ (v. l. ārutīḥ). The double reference in the epic, Sūtrakāra and Vedaḥ, may point to the same place, or the writer may have had in mind a Sūtra passage parallel to Bāudhāyana, if not Bāudhāyana himself, whose text here is corrupt.

¹ In the preceding verse is cited an açvamadhačruti, apropos of the açvasamājapana: lokāntaragatā nityam prāṇāḥ nityaṁ çaririśām. With the text cited above, compare dvār etāu pretya panthānāu, etc., xii, 329, 30. The Upanishads would suffice to explain some of these phrases.
Atharva Veda? Mbh. xiii, 98, 30,
ośadhya raktapuspāḷ ca kaṭukāḥ kaṇṭakāṇvitaḥ qatruṇām
abhicārārtham atharveṣu nidārṣitaḥ; viii, 69, 83–86, tvam ity
atra bhavantam hi brūhi . . . tvam ity ukto hi nihato gurus
bhavati . . . atharvāṅgirasī hy eṣā ārūṁnam uttamā ārūtiḥ . . .
avadhena vadhāḥ proktō yad gurus tvam iti prabhūḥ.¹

Āit. Brāh. i, 1,
agnir vāi sarvā devatāḥ

Mbh. xiv, 24, 10 (read vedasya?),
agnir vāi devatāḥ sarvāḥ, iti devasya āśanam

Mbh. xiii, 84, 56,
agnir hi devatāḥ sarvāḥ, suvaṛṇāṁ ca taddātmakam

Çat. Brāhmaṇa in Mbh. xii, 343, 13–15,
yajñās te devāṁś tarpayanti devāḥ prthivim bhāvayanti, Çata-
pathe 'pi brāhmaṇamukhe bhavati, agnau samiddhe juhoti yo
vidvān brāhmaṇamukhena 'hutiṁ juhoti, evam apy agnibhūtā
brāhmaṇa vidvāṇo 'gnim bhāvayanti.

On this and other citations from Saṁhitās and Brāhmaṇas,
compare Holtzmann, loc. cit., p. 14 ff., with especial reference
To these I may add a passage reflecting the Brhad Āraṇ. Up.
of this Brāhmaṇa, Up. 1, 5, 14 (where the chief verbal iden-
tity is in śoḍaçaṭaye kalaye), expressly said to be from the
Rṣi's "more extended" exposition of the subject: viddhi
candramasaṃdarče sūkṣmayā kalaye sthitam, tad etad ṛṣinā
proktam vistarenā 'numiyate, Mbh. xii, 242, 15–16 (compare
śoḍaçaṭakaḥ dehaḥ; and 305, 4). The commentator refers the
passage to this Upanishad, as cited.

¹ According to xiii, 163, 53, tvaṁkāra (to superiors) is vadha, and is em-
ployed only in speaking to equals, inferiors, pupils, etc. Compare Chānd.
Up. vii, 15, 2. Echo arose in the mountains (compare Callimachus, Ep. xxviii)
from the care with which Čuka addressed his superior Vyāsa with bho, bhō, xii,
The citations in the Rāmāyaṇā I have not examined, but have noted by chance two; Rig Veda i, 22, 20; Kaṭha Up. iii, 9; Mātrī, vi, 26: tad viśnoḥ paramam padam (sadda paçyanti sûrayah); G. vi, 41, 25, tad viśnoḥ paramam padam (nihatu gantum icchāmi); and satye sarvam pratiśhitam in Mahānār. Up. 22, 1; satye lokaḥ pratiśhitah, R. ii, 109, 10.

**Upanishads in the Epic.**

Sporadic parallels between the epic, generally the Gitā, Anu-gitā, and Çānti, and various Upanishads have often been noticed. As illustrative material all these passages are valuable, but they give no evidence that the epic has copied, if the mutual resemblance is only of general content or is given by similar or even identical verses, when these are not connected as in the supposed model. As this material has been put together by Holtzmann, *loc. cit.*., p. 21 ff., I may refer the reader to his parallels,1 while pointing out that it is historically of little importance whether the oldest Upanishads are cited if we can satisfy ourselves that the epic draws on Upanishads of the second and third period, not only sporadically but connectedly. In regard to the earliest works, it is enough to refer to the passage condensed from the Brhadāraṇyaka and cited above. This is the only one of the oldest Upanishads certainly cited, though the Chāndogya, Āitareya, and Kau-śītaki have many parallels with the epic, as have among the later works of this class the Kena, Mūḍaka, Praṇa, and a few others. Oddly enough, the Māitrāyaṇa has been scarcely compared,2 but I purpose to show that this and the earlier Kāṭhaka were certainly copied by the later epic poets.

1 Not all the “Vedic” verses are here verified, *e. g.*, Taśīt. iii, 7, has praśo vā annam. This is cited in the epic as Vedic: annam praśa iti yathā vedēṣu paripaṭhyate, xiii, 95, 22. The Gitā distributes older material, *e. g.*, Čvet. iii, 17 = Gitā, 13, 14, but the following pāda, navadvēre pure dehi, is found in Gitā, 6, 13, etc.

2 The verse āve brahmaṇā (as duly recorded by Holtzmann) was located by Hall, and Bühler has compared two more verses with xii, 330, 42–43 (Manu, p. 212), while Telang has illustrated the Gitā with general parallels.
The Çvetāṣvatara Upanishad.

This may be loosely copied, but, except for one parallel, the mutual passages are common to this and other sources. I cite as exemplifying a possible copy (though the Upanishad itself is a copy of the older Kāṭhaka):

UPANISHAD.

iii, 8 = V. S. 31, 18,

tamasah parastāt; nā 'nyaḥ pan-thā vidyate ayanāya.

iii, 10,

tato yad uttarataram tad arūpam anāmayam, ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti.

iii, 13,

āṅguṣṭhamātraḥ puruṣaḥ, see below.

iii, 18,

navadvāre pure dehi haṁsaḥ, see below.

iii, 19–20,

sa vetti vedyam . . . añor añi-yān, etc.

iv, 2 and 19,

tad eva ākraṇam tad brahma; yasya nāma mahad yaĉaḥ, see below.

iv, 5,

ajām ekāṁ lohitaçuklakṛṣṇām.

iv, 6,

Birds and pippal, see the passage from Droṣa, cited hereafter.

iv, 17 and 20,

na sarādṛye; hṛdā maniṣā, see below.

EPIK.

v, 44, 29 and 24,

tamasah parastāt; nā 'nyaḥ pan-thā ayanāya vidyate.

v, 44, 31,

anāmayam tan mahad udyataṁ yaço (Kātha, vi, 2, mahad bhayaṁ vajram udyataṁ) vāco vikāraṁ kavayo vadantī yasmin jagat sarvam idam pratiṣṭhitāṁ ye tad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti (compare BAU. i, 5, 1; Chānd. iii, 12, 2; Kātha, vi, 9).

v, 43, 53; 46, 31 (Gītā, 10, 15),

yo veda vedyam na sa veda sa-tyam; añor añi-yān (Kātha i, 2, 20). In 44, 20, añīyo rūpaṁ kṣu-radhārayā samam (Kātha, iii, 14).

v, 44, 25 and 26,

ābhāti çuklam īva lohitam īvā kṛṣṇam (followed by āyasam arkavaṇgam with v. 1, athā'āja- naṁ kāḍravāṁ vā); Mahānār., ix, 2; also Chānd. viii, 6, 1. On account of the varied reading in the same verse the three first colors may be the only original, but even here the reference is to Prakṛti in the Upanishad and to Brahman in the epic.
These are the best examples of sporadic parallels to be found in the Upanishads. I turn now to the Kāṭhaka.

The Kāṭhaka or Kāṭha Upanishad.

From the Kāṭha, iii, 10, indriyabhyaḥ paraḥ hy arthā, arthebhyaḥ ca param manah, manasas tu paraḥ buddhir, buddher ātmā mahān paraḥ, and ii, 19, nā 'yaṁ hanti na hanyate, the Gītā, 8, 42, has indriyāni paraṁ śūn indriyabhyaḥ param manah, manasas tu paraḥ buddhir, yo buddheḥ paratas tu saḥ (the Sa is higher than intellect); and in 2, 19–20, it inverts and modifies the na jāyate and hanti cēn manyate hantum stanzas. Less precise in rendering, but important on account of the Gītā modifications, are two other stanzas. Kāṭha i, 22, has vaktā ca 'sya tvādvīr anyo na labhyah, etc., a triṣṭubh, whereas Gītā, 6, 39, has tvad anyāḥ saṁcayasyā 'sya chettā na hy upapadyate, a clōka (compare M. ii, 15, 1, saṁcayāṇāṁ hi nirmoktā tavan nā 'nyo vidyate bhuvi, addressed to Krishna). The Kāṭha is older also in the stanza ii, 15,

sarve vedā yat padam āmananti, tapāṁsi sarvāṁi
ca yad vadanti
yad icchanto brahma-caryāṁ caranti, tat te pādaṁ
saṁgrahaḥ brahmī,

as compared with Gītā, 8, 11,

yad aksaraṁ vedavido vadanti, viśanti yad yatayo
vitarāgāḥ
yad icchanto brahma-caryāṁ caranti, tat te pādaṁ
saṁgrahaḥ pravakṣye.

Other parallels will be found between Kāṭha ii, 7,

ācāryo vaktā kuṭastā 'sya labdhā, ācāryo jñātā
kuṭalānuçīśṭaṁ,

and Gītā, 2, 29,

ācāryavat paçeṭyā kaçcid enam, ācāryavad vadati
tathā 'va ca 'nyāḥ, etc.;

between Kāṭha vi, 1 and Gītā, 15, 1 (the idea developed in xii, 255, 1 ff.); and in a few more instances, such as tasya
bhāsā sarvam idaṁ vibhāti, Kaṭha v, 15, and ekaḥ sūryaḥ sarvam idaṁ vibhāti, Mbh. iii, 134, 8.¹

But it is not necessary to dwell upon these, as the third chapter of the Upanishad is epitomized in a section of Čānti. The later feature begins at the start, xii, 247, 1 ff. The vikāras, modifications of Prakṛti, do not know the kṣetrajña, or spirit, but he knows them. Then follows the image of the Upanishad iii, 2 ff. The senses are subservient steeds, and the spirit is the driver who controls them, saṁyantā. After this general imitation follow the three stanzas of Kaṭha iii, 10, 11, 12, one of which appears in the Gītā (above),² but with the substitution of amṛta for puruṣa in the second stanza, and evam for eṣa in the third. Then a general likeness follows between the Upanishad’s next stanza (“restrain mind in knowledge, in self”) and the epic, which says “sinking the senses with mind as the sixth in the inner self,” “endowing the mind with wisdom,” “one that is not mastered (by the senses) gets the immortal place.” The instruction is a mystery, to be repeated to Snātakas (compare Kaṭha, iii, 17), and besides containing the gist of former wisdom, “is recited in the Upanishads” vedāntesu ca giyate, 247, 16, 19, 21. I think there can be no doubt that the epic section is an abbreviation of Kaṭha iii, perhaps under the influence of the Māitrāyaṇa, as shown below. A preceding section may be compared with Kaṭha v, 1–2, where the city of eleven doors is followed by a reference to the hāṃsa, lord, R. V. iv, 40, 5. The epic (see under the “group of seventeen”), like the later Upanishad, admits only “nine doors,” and says in xii, 240, 32, the hāṃsa lord, iḍa, and controller, vaçi, enters the city of nine doors, because it is controlled, niyataḥ, by the senses.

Other stanzas reflecting the last chapters of this Upanishad

¹ Compare in the Up., ib. 9 and 12, agnir yathāi ‘kāḥ and ekaṁ rūpam bahudhā yaḥ karoti, with eka evāgnir bahudhā samīdhyate, just preceding in the epic. Gītā, 13, 30, may be a modification of Kaṭha vi, 6. The Gītā stanza, by the way, is repeated verbatim in xii, 17, 23.

² The last of the three verses is cited again in Vana in a copy of the Māitrāyaṇa Upanishad, which substitutes bhūtātmā for gūḍho ‘tmā, and jñāna-vedībhīḥ for sūkṣmadarçībhīḥ. See the next paragraph.
are found mingled with copies from other Upanishads in the last chapter of the Sanatsujāta Parvan. In every case where evidence exists it points to the epic being a copy of the Upanishad. Thus in BAU. v, 1, we read pūrṇam adāḥ pūrṇam idam pūrṇat pūrṇam udacyate, pūrṇasya pūrṇam ādāya pūrṇam eva 'vačisyate, which in the epic, v, 46, 10, appears as pūrṇat pūrṇāny uddharanti pūrṇat pūrṇāni cakrire haranti pūrṇat pūrṇāni pūrṇam eva 'vačisyate. Again the stanza of Kaṭha vi, 9,

\[\text{na saṁdṛṣe tiṣṭhati rūpam asya, na cakṣusā paçyati kaçcanāī 'nam ādyā hṛda maṇiṣā maṇasā 'bhikṛpto, ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti}\]

is modernized already in Čvet., iv 17 (idem) and 20, hṛḍā hṛdiśṭham manasā ya enam evaṁ vidur amṛtās te bhavanti, and this in the epic, v, 46, 6, appears as

\[\text{na sūḍṛṣye tiṣṭhati rūpam asya, na cakṣusā paçyati kaçcid enam maṇiṣayā 'tho maṇasā hṛḍā ca, ya enam vidur amṛtās te bhavanti,}\]
or, as ib. 20,

\[\text{na darçane tiṣṭhati rūpam asya . . . , ye pravrajeyur amṛtās te bhavanti.}\]

The section begins with an explanation of the çukram brahma which is mahad yaçaḥ and tad vāi devā upāsate, a phrase, prior pāda, metrically borrowed from the licence of the Upanishads, where the epic usually writes upāsante to avoid di-ambus.¹ Here çukram brahma and mahad yaçaḥ are from Kaṭha v, 8; vi, 1; Čvet. iv, 19 (yasya nāma mahad yaçaḥ). Below, cl. 9, the Aćvattha and its birds may be drawn from Kaṭha vi, 1, and, after the pūrṇam stanza cited above, cl. 11,

¹ The later Upanishads resort to a similar device. Thus in the Yoga-tattvop. i, 6 (alle gute Dinge sind drei): trayo lokās trayo vedās trayaḥ saṁdhyaṁ trayaḥ surāḥ, trayo 'gnayo guṇās triiqi (sthitāḥ sarve trayākṣare).
tasmar vai vayur ayatah... tasminc ca praṇa atatam, is a parallel to Kaṭha vi, 2.\(^1\) Then follows, in the epic, cl. 15:

aṅguśṭhamāṭraḥ puruṣo 'ntaratmā, lingasya yogena sa yāti nityam
tam içam idyam anukalpam ādyam, paśyanti maṭhā na virājamānam,

which appears ib. 27 as:

aṅguśṭhamāṭraḥ puruṣo mahātmā, na dṛṣyate 'sāu hṛdi saṁnivistāḥ
ajaq caro divāṛātram atandritaq ca, sa tam matvā kavir āste prasannaḥ,

with which Kaṭha iv, 4 (matvā dhīro na çocati) may be compared, and especially iv, 12:

aṅguśṭhamāṭraḥ puruṣo madhya ātmani tiṣṭhati içāno bhūtabhavyasya na tato vijugupsate,

and Kaṭha vi, 17:

aṅguśṭhamāṭraḥ puruṣo 'ntaratmā, sadā janānāṁ hṛdaye saṁnivistāḥ
tam svāc charīrāt pravrhen muṇjād iva-īṣikāṁ dhāireyaṇa (tam vidyāc chukram)

The last words are found in the epic, 44, 7, as:

ti ātmānam nirharantā 'ha dehān, muṇjād īṣikāṁ iva sattvasaṁsthāḥ,

while just before 46, 27, is found in cl. 25:

evaṁ yaḥ sarvabhūteṣu ātmānam anupaṭyati anyaṭrā 'nyatra yukteṣu kiṁ sa çocet tataḥ param,

which is like Īçā 6–7 in contracted form.

\(^1\) There is here a general resemblance, noticeable chiefly because of the correlation of one idea with the next following, interrupted in the epic by the pūraṇa stanza. With 44, 27, "His form is not in stars, lightning, clouds, wind, moon, sun," compare Kaṭha v, 15, "Not there the sun shines, moon, stars, nor lightnings."
The Māitri Upanishad in the Epic.

Especially instructive is the form in which the Māitri or Māitrāyaṇa Upanishad appears in the epic. In the case of many of the Upanishads there is lacking any characteristic mark sufficiently peculiar to identify the Upanishad when it appears in epic form. But the Māitri, as is well known, contains some special stanzas and above all some special terms not found elsewhere except in still later Upanishads. It is, therefore, more easily identified, and the possibility that we are dealing with material common to the age of the older Upanishads is not so great. In all probability it is a later Upanishad. Deussen, Sechzig Upanishads, p. 312, successfully maintains this view, and in his Geschichte der Philosophie i, p. 24, groups it with the Praṇa and Māṇḍūkya as belonging to the group of “later Prose Upanishads,” regarding it not only as later than the old prose, but even as later than the metrical Upanishads, from both of which earlier groups I have given epic parallels in the list above.

This Māitri Upanishad is found reflected in the epic at iii, 213, and in a later imitation in the twelfth book. The former epic section is based entirely on the Upanishad, and the preceding sections appear to be due to an expansion of the same material. The order followed is in general that of the Upanishad.

The teaching is called brāhmī vidyā, iii, 210, 15. There is an introductory systematization, the assumption of the universe (as Brahman) consisting of five elements,1 earth, water, light, wind, air, which have as their characteristics (in inverted order), sound, touch, color, taste, smell, so related that earth has all five; water, four; light, three; wind, two; air, one (sound), making altogether fifteen in combination in all created things (210, 17; 211, 8). With these five “guṇas” begins a group of seventeen: cetanā or manas, mind,

1 In 210, 17, these are given in reverse order, but in 211, 3, in their usual epic order, bhūmī āpas tathā jyotir vāyur śākaṇam eva ca (reversed, kham vāyur agnir āpas tathā ca bhūḥ).
as sixth; intellect as seventh; egoism as eighth; the five senses; ātman, soul, the fourteenth; and the three guṇas, rajas, sattvam, tamas. This is "the group of seventeen," which has as its designation the Unmanifest (avyakta); to which are added objects of the senses and the manifest and unmanifest, making the category of twenty-four.1

This is the introductory chapter of the discourse, and its likeness to the Māitri Upanishad consists in the initial discussion of the elements (which, however, are not called fine elements, tanmātra, as they are in the Upanishad, iii, 2, mahābhūtāni and guṇas),2 and the statement that this is a brāhmī vidyā, like MU. ii, 3, brahmavidyā. As an indication of the age of the discourse, it may be observed in passing that, in 211, 9, the fifteen guṇas are said to be properly correlated in the remarkable verse:

anyonyam nā ’tivartante sanyak ca bhavati, dvija
where the use of bhavati for bhavanti (subject, pañcadaśa guṇāḥ), though declared by the commentator to be an archa-

1 Otherwise the commentator. Objects of sense and action-organs are not included in the seventeen: ity eṣa saptadaśako rācīr avyaktasaṃjñākah, sarvār ihe 'ndriyārthās tu vyaktāvyaktāṁ susamvṛtāṁ caturviniçaka ity eṣa vyaktāvyaktamayo guṇah (210, 20–21). Guṇa is obscure. The entirely different group of seventeen in xii, 276, 28, casts no light on the subject, but in xii, 330, 46, a similar verse has (in B) sarvār ihe 'ndriyārthāc ca vyaktāvyaktāṁ hi saṁhitāḥ (v. l. saṁjñātāḥ) caturviniçaka ity eṣa vyaktāvyaktamayo gaṇāḥ, which gives the needed gaṇāḥ for guṇāḥ and makes the construction somewhat clearer, though the latter passage is such a careless imitation of the one above that in making up the previous list of seventeen, ātman, ahamkāra, and manas are all omitted from the list (buddhi being represented by mahād yat param āçrayāt) and 5 + 1 + 5 + 3 = 17! The first group is similar to the group of seventeen in the Vedānta-sūtra, though there the organs of action and the breaths are included with the organs of sense, buddhi and manas. The formal definition of vyakta and avyakta in iii, 211, 12, repeated in xii, 330, 40, with āryate for srjyate and with slight v. l. in xii, 189, 15, is that vyakta, the manifest, is what is comprehended by the senses, while avyakta is what is supersensuous, comprehended only by the "fine organs" (liñgagṛhyam atindriyam). If the reading guṇa be retained above, it will imply the interpretation of all the constituents as guṇas.

2 That is, here, as synonym of dhātu or the elements, which after the dissolution of the universe appear in every newly formed body, dhātavah pañcabhūtākāh, iii, 211, 11; xii, 184, 1.
ism, is really a late carelessness. It is further to be observed that though in this introduction, and incidentally in a preceding section, iii, 207, 72, the organs of sense are given as five, yet in iii, 211, 24, they are spoken of as six,\(^1\) in a figure which not only reproduces the exact language of the Gītā, 2, 60 and 67, but contains the imagery of the Māitri Upanishad (ii, 6, rathah çarīram, mano niyantā, prakṛtīmayo 'syā pratodah):

\[
\text{saññām ātmani yuktānām indriyānām pramāthinām}
\]

\[
yo dhīro dhārayed raçmīn sa syāt paramasārathīḥ
\]

\[
\text{indriyānām prasṛṣṭānām hayānām īva vartmasu}
\]

\[
\ldots\text{ indriyānām vicaratām, etc.}
\]

This image of the senses to be kept under control like horses held in check by a charioteer is indeed too general to have any bearing on the relation of the epic to the Upanishad (it occurs, as said above, in the Kaṣṭha Upanishad, for instance, and again in the epic in purely Buddhistic form at i, 79, 2–3 = Dhammapada 222–223) and might pass unnoticed, were it not that the corresponding section of the twelfth book brings the two into somewhat closer relationship. As already observed, the teaching of the Vana in 210 and 211 is more or less closely reproduced in xii, 830, which, however, omitting the stanzas in regard to the six senses, condenses them in the statement that one is “tossed about” by the effects of evil actions, but then closes with a stanza, 58, which has direct reference to transmigration and is in turn omitted from the end of iii, 211, paribhramati saṁsāram cakravad bahuvedanaḥ,

\(^1\) So both groups of organs, those of sense and of action, are sometimes counted as making not ten but eleven, including the thinking faculty, as in xiv, 42, 12. Compare the same image and number in xii, 247, 2 (above), mañaśaṣṭāśr ihe 'ndriyāśi sudāntāśr īva saṁyantā, etc. In the passage above, iii, 211, 13, the sense-organs, indriyaṇī, are defined as apprehenders of objects of sense, grāhakāṇy eṣāṁ çabādāṇām. The word is derived from Indra, xii, 214, 23, tribijam (apapātha nṛbijam), indrādāvatiyān tasmād indriyam ucyate, with a preceding description of the seeds, the ten chief dhamanyāḥ, the three humors, vāta, pitta, kapha, and other medicinal intelligence, with especial weight on the heart-artery, manovahā, and its action as known to Atri.
that is, "like a wheel he revolves through transmigrations." Just so the Maitri Upanishad, ii, 6, says first that the senses are horses and then, after developing the figure, concludes with anena (pratodena) kaly īritaḥ paribhramati 'dām čaṁ čāri- raṁ cakram iva mṛtpacena, "thus goaded he revolves in bodily form like a potter's wheel."

The next chapter of the teaching, iii, 212, discusses the three gunās as (in general) in Maitri, iii, 5. The section before this in the Upanishad, iii, 4, is a close prose prototype of the Čanti verses (omitted in iii) just preceding the group of seventeen (the rest of the section, xii, 330 being parallel to iii, 211). This (xii, 330, 42) verse begins asthīsthūnām snāyuyutam ... carmaṇaḥvanaddham (just as in the Upanishad, carmaṇā 'vanaddham), and in 28-9, koṣakāra iva suggests (against the commentator and Deussen) that in the Upanishad, the ending koṣa iva vasunā should be interpreted accordingly, "filled like a cocoon with (deadly) wealth."

The next chapter of Vana, the special chapter under consideration, begins with the question how the vital flame can combine with earth-stuff to make the incorporate creature, and how air causes activity. To which the answer is that the flame enters the head and directs the body, while air acts by being in the head and in the vital flame. This is like the opening of the Upanishad where it says, ii, 6, that the spirit is fire. The answer continues: "All is established upon breath;" which is identified with spirit, Purusha, intellect, buddhi, and egoism. Then follows a disposition upon the different kinds of bodily airs or breathings. These are named as the usual five, but are incidentally referred to as ten, which makes it necessary to understand with the commentator that the other five are those called nāga, kūrma, kṛkala (sic), devadatta, and dhananājaya, besides the usual (in-) breathing, with-breathing, off-breathing, up-breathing, and through-breathing, which are specifically mentioned.1

---

1 iii, 213, 16, daçapṛānaprapcoditāḥ. The ten are named as above in the Vedāntasāra of Sadānanda, 99, Böhtlingk's Chrest. p. 264. The (usual) five are pṛāṇa, samāṇa, apāna, udāna, vyāna. The same thing occurs in xii, 185,
This also corresponds to Maitri ii, 6, where the five breaths are associated with the vital flame (Agni Vaiśvānara as Puruṣa).

After the breaths are discussed, there is a passing reference to the eleven (not sixteen) vikāras, or transformations by which the spirit is conditioned like fire in a pot; 1 just as Maitri iii, 3, has first yathā 'gvinā 'yaspiṇdo 'nyo vā 'bhībhūtaḥ, etc., and then the transformations, guṇāni (= vikāras). The corresponding passage in Čanti, here 242, 17, has karmaguṇātmakam for nityaṁ yoga-jitātmakam, but then both passages continue with the stanza:

\[
devo^{2} yah saṁsthitas (v. l. saṁcītatas) tasminn, abbindur iva puṣkare
kṣetrajñam tāṁ vijānīhi (v. l. 9yāt) nityaṁ yoga-jitātmakam,
\]

"Know that the divine being who stands in the body like a drop of water on a lotus, is the spirit eternal but overcome by its association." The epic texts vary in the next stanza, but the sense is the same, to the effect that the individual life-spirit, jīva, though conditioned by the three guṇas, has the characteristics (guṇas) of the ātman, while ātman again is one with the Supreme Ātman (parātmakam, 213, 21). The third version of the passage, found in xii, 187, 28-25, explains the individual spirit, kṣetrajña, as ātman conditioned by the guṇas of Prakṛti, and as Supreme Ātman when freed from

15, where the phrase above reappears in a copy of this section. In xii, 320, 31 ff. (and elsewhere) the prāṇas are seven personified creatures, Udāna born of Samāna, etc., as winds, pra, ś, ud, sam, vi, pari, and para (vahās). Compare also xii, 184, 24, below.

1 ekādaśavikārātma kālasambhārasambhūtaḥ mūrtimantaḥ hi tāṁ viddhi nityaṁ yoga-jitātmakam, tasmin yah saṁsthito hy agnir nityam sthālyāṃ ivāhitaḥ ātmānām tāṁ vijānīhi nityaṁ yoga-jitātmakam, 213, 18-19.

2 In xii, 246, 29, deva may be jīva, devaṁ tridhātuṁ trivṛtaṁ suparṇaṁ ye vidyur agryaṁ paramātmāṁ ca, but on the other hand there may be a textual error here of devo for dehe. Compare xii, 187, 24, tasmin yah saṁśrīto dehe hy abbindur iva puṣkare. The Supreme Spirit is devo (nirguṇaḥ), xii, 341, 101, as in Čvet. Up. i, 8 (here called, 90, yajñesev agraharaḥ).
them;\(^1\) with a varied reading of nityāṁ lokahitātmakam and viddhi jīvagunāṁ in the following verses; 26, however, being almost the same as iii, 213, 22:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sacetanaṁ jīvagunāṁ vadanti} \\
\text{sa ceṣṭate ceṣṭayate ca sarvam} \\
(t)atāḥ param kṣetravido vadanti \\
prākalpayad (v. 1. prāvantayad) yo bhuvanaṁ \\
\text{sapta,}
\end{align*}
\]

“They say that the individual spirit is characterized by intelligence; it moves and causes all to move.\(^2\) The wise say, that he who caused the many creations to form is still higher (or the Highest).”

The reading in xii, 187, 23 brings the passage into still closer connection with the Upanishad. The latter, at iii, 2, has ātmā bindur iva puskare followed by sa vā eṣo 'bhībhūtāḥ prākṛtaṁ gurum, while the epic has abbindur iva puskare preceded by ātmā kṣetrajña ity uktaḥ saṁyuktāḥ prākṛtaṁ gurum, where the Vana version keeps (what is here lost) the image of the fire in the pot. Then the stanza above, sacetanam, etc.,\(^3\) closely reproduces the words as well as the thought of the Upanishad, ii, 5: cetanena 'daṁ caṛīram cetanavat pratiṣṭhāpitam pracodayatā vai 'ṣo 'py asya (compare sacetanaṁ caṛīram, ii, 3). The fact that the epic Vana is not based on the lotus-phrase of earlier Upanishads but is following the Mātṛi is shown even more clearly in the phraseology of the following stanza, 213, 23, which at this point does not correspond to Čānti above, but to a later chapter,

---

1 For the text, see the end of the last note. A passage in xii, 316, 15–17 combines freely the two traits mentioned above: “The fire is different from the pot, ukhā; the lotus is different from the water, nor is it soiled by touch of water,” etc.—a fact which is said to be “not understood by common people,” as in the example below.

2 The commentator says that as individual soul the ātmā is active, and as the Lord-soul causes activity (compare xii, 47, 65, yaç ceṣṭayati bhūtāṁ tasmā váyavatmane naman); but the Highest is above both these. In xii, 242, 20, jivayate takes the place of ceṣṭayate.

3 C. has sacetanam in the Vana passage, but both texts in both the Čānti passages have sacetanam, xii, 187, 20; 242, 20.
xii, 247, 5. The Vana passage says: "Thus in all beings appears the bhūtātman (conditioned spirit), but it is seen only by the subtle intellect;" whereas the Čānti passage has not bhūtātmā samprakāṣe, but gūḍha 'tmā na prakāṣe, "concealed it is not apparent," that is, it has the text of the Kāṭhaka.\(^1\) But in Vana there is the characteristic bhūtātman of the Upanishad, which says at iii, 3: "(Pure) spirit is no more overcome (by environment) than fire is overcome when the mass of iron (enclosing it) is hammered; what is overcome is the bhūtātman, which is abhibhūta, overcome, because it is bound up with (the transformations);" and further, iii, 5: "Filled with the effect of the guṇas (which condition it) the bhūtātman is abhibhūta (the same etymological tie), overcome, by them, and so enters different forms."\(^2\) A few more passages contain this word bhūtātman. Of these, two

---

\(^1\) See the analysis above, p. 30, note 2.

\(^2\) The etymological connection between abhibhūta and bhūtātman may have suggested to the commentator his explanation of bhūtātman as an epithet of mahātman in xii, 34, 15, where he says that mahātmane are called bhūtātmane because they have overcome or controlled their thoughts (bhūta = vaśikṛta). In the epic, bhūtātman appears as incorporate spirit in xii, 201, 1, where "how can I understand bhūtātman?" is to be thus interpreted; and as intellect, buddhi, in the reabsorption process described at xii, 313, 12, mano grasaṭi bhūtātmā. Differently employed, the combination appears in Gītā, 5, 7, where one is said not to be contaminated by action if one is sarvabhūtātmahūtātmā, which, as is shown by parallel passages, is not to be divided into sarvabhūtātmā and bhūtātmā, but into sarvabhūta, ātmabhūta, ātmā, where sarvabhūtātmabhūta means one with all, or the All-soul. Compare xii, 240, 23, sarvabhūtātmabhūtasya vibhor bhūtahitasya ca devā 'pi märge mūhyante; xii, 47, 82, sarvabhūtātmabhūtāya . . . namaḥ. Bhūtātman means also elemental spirit, as in xii, 298, 17–19, where it is said that before the disembodied jiva, or spirit, secures a new resting place (āyatana, body), it wanders about as a bhūtātman, "like a great cloud." So in xii, 254, 7, the bhūtātman of Yogins wanders through space and has seven subtle guṇas (according to the commentator, the fine elements, intellect and egoism), like sattvātmā, ib. 6; but here, too, it is the bhūtātman, "standing in the heart," ib. 12. I observe, by the way, that the citation above, "the gods are founded at the track of him who is identical with all created things" (compare the anirdeṣyā gatīḥ, "indescribable course, which the mokṣināḥ foresee," xii, 19, 15), shows, as does xii, 118, 7, apadasya padāśiṇaḥ, that in xii, 141, 88, padām tasya ca vidyate should be changed to na vidyate, as in C. 6477 (sattvāṁ sarvabhūtātmahūtāstham is found in xii, 210, 36). Compare Dhammapada 420, yassa gatiṁ na jānanti devā.
or three deserve particular attention. In xii, 240, 21, it appears in a stanza like one to be cited presently, where another Mātrī word is found, but here the text says merely that the bhūtātman (ceases to be conditioned and) enters Brahman, where it "sees self in all beings and all beings in self." In čl. 11 of the same chapter the bhūtātman appears as the controller of mind in the same simile of the wild horses noticed above, but with a different turn: "Mind, as a charioteer his horses, directs the senses; and the bhūtātman which is seated in the breast directs mind; as the mind, restraining and letting out the senses, is their lord, so the bhūtātman in respect to the mind." In xiv, 51, 1, on the other hand, the mind itself is called bhūtātman, because it rules the mahābhūtas. Finally the same term is used of Vishnu in xiii, 149, 140, where it is said: ¹

erek Visparagus mahad bhūtam pṛthag bhūtānī anekaçañh
trin lokān vyāpya bhūtātmā bhuṅkte viśvabhūg
avyayaḥ,

"Vishnu as one is a great spirit (bhūta), and separately is all beings; he, permeating, enjoys the three worlds as bhūtātman, he the all-enjoyer, indestructible."

It is clear from these passages that bhūtātman is not used in one strict sense in the epic, but its signification varies according to different passages. In one case it is a free spirit of elements,² but in another the conditioned spirit in the

¹ The quotation here given may be the one cited in PW. from ČKDr. s. bhūtātman I, 1. But compare also xii, 207, 8, where the Lord Govinda is bhūtātmā mahātmā. In the "Secret of the Vēdāntas" (Upanishads) the Intelligence as Lord bhūtaṅkṛt, maker of elements, is called Bhūtātman, xii, 194, 7 = 248, 4, and 14 as Buddhī.

² Hence called sūkṣma, fine. This seems to be the sense in xii, 203, 6-7: "As no one has seen the back of Himālaya or of the moon, but cannot say it is non-existent, so the fine bhūtātman which in creatures has a knowledge-soul, jñānātmavāṇ, cannot be said not to exist because it has not been seen." With this jñānātman compare, by the way, what is said of the soul, ib. 240, 22, yāvān ātmani vedātmā tāvān ātma parātmani (just after the verse cited in the text 240, 21, above, on bhūtātman): "The soul is as much in the All-soul as there is knowledge-soul in itself."
body. It is the latter meaning which applies both in the Upanishad and in the epic imitation of it. In these cases bhūtātman is the ātman, spirit, not as being pure Puruṣa, but as being in connection with and conditioned by bhūta, that is, imprisoned in matter. It is apparently a popular (not philosophical) term for spirit in general, and when used in philosophy answers to the ordinary philosophical jīva, incorporate spirit. It is not found in other (old) Upanishads.

But there is still a closer parallel between the epic and the Upanishad. After the verse cited above, it is said, iii, 213, 24–27, that salvation is attained by peace of mind and by perceiving self in self, and that this purified spirit by the aid of the lighted lamp (of knowledge), seeing self as free of self, becomes released. Here again we have a peculiarly Māitri word in nirātman, "free of self," that is, free from the delusion of subjectivity. But the two works are here evidently identical. First, just as the epic says that one must have peace of mind, prasāda, and be pure, and then becomes nirātman, so in ii, 2–4, the Upanishad, after an allusion to samprāṣāda, the same peace of mind, says that one becomes pure and nirātman (cuddhaḥ pūtaḥ cūnyaḥ cānto 'prāṇo nirātmā). The sign of this peace is explained as when one sleeps sweetly, iii, 213, 25 = xii, 247, 11. In the epic the word nirātman occurs again in much the same way, xii, 199, 123, cāntibhūto nirātmavān, like the collocation above in the Upanishad.

1 Compare what is said, Māit. Up. iii, 2. “The bhūtātman is affected by ignorance, and so gives itself up to objects of sense,” it is said in xii, 204, 5.

2 “For self is the friend of self, and even so self is the foe of self," V, 34, 64; Gūḍā, 6, 5.

3 Samprasāda is suṣupti, unconscious slumber. Unconscious existence is the goal of the soul, for the conditioned spirit, jīva, “glorious, immortal, ancient” is a part of this unconsciousness, and on becoming pure enters it. In a preceding section this samprasāda, or unconscious existence, is declared to be the body of the universe: Yaḥ samprasādo (am, C.) jagataḥ ṣarīram, sarvān sa lokān adhitacchati ha, tasmin hitam (hi sam, C.) tarpayati ’ha devāṁ, te vāi trāpaḥ tarpayanty āṣyam āṣya, xii, 246, 33, where the sense seems to be that the reabsorption of the universe pleases the mouth of unconsciousness; that is, the mouth of Time as Lord of all, a metaphor from the preceding verses. So samprasāda is a spirit at peace, in Chānd. Up., cited on the next page.
Another passage reads: “The spirit (ātman, but conditioned) knows not whither it goes or whence, but the inner-spirit, antarātman, is different; it sees all things; with the lighted lamp of knowledge it sees self in self. Do thou, too, seeing self in (or with) self, become freed from self, become all-wise” (nirātmā bhava sarvavit, xii, 251, 9-10). This verse, is in fact, only a different version of the “lighted lamp” verse above. This latter, in turn with its environment, must be compared in the original with the Upanishad to see how close are the two. But for this purpose I take, not the samprasāda passage referred to above, which is parallel to Chānd. Up. viii, 3, 4, but one from the sixth book, where the Upanishad, vi, 20, has

tadā 'tmanā 'tmānam dṛṣṭvā nirātmā bhavati,

whereupon follows a stanza cited, ity evam hy āha, as:
cittasya hi prasādena hanti karma çubhāçubham
prasannātma 'tmani sthitvā sukham avyayam açnute

In the epic, iii, 213, 24, this whole stanza (gloka) appears, cittasya hi prasādena, etc., in exactly the same words, and then, after the definition of prasāda and the injunction that one must be viçuddhātmā, of purified soul, as explained above, come the words, cl. 27, dṛṣṭvā 'tmānam nirātmānam sa tadā vipramucyate.

When this stanza is repeated in the Upanishad at vi, 34, it is preceded by the verse yaccittas tanmayo bhavati, so that together we have:
yaccittas tanmayo bhavati guhyam etat sanātanam
(i.e., the guhyam of Dhammapada 1, mano seṭṭhā manomayā; compare Praçna Up. iii, 10, yaccittas tenai 'ṣa prāṇam āyāti)

1 Here jñānadipena (compare Gitā, 10, 11) diptena; above, pradiptene 'ra dipena manodipena. Compare dipavad yaḥ sthito hṛdi, Māitri, vi. 30 (and 36).
2 In the corresponding Ćánti chapter, in which I pointed out above the simile of the six senses as horses, and guḍho 'tmā for bhūtātmā, this verse is found in a different form, cittaprasādena yatir jahāti 'ha çubhāçubham, vii, 247, 10.
cittasya hi prasādena hanti karma ākābākābham
which the Anugītā takes up xiv, 51, 27, and 36, in inverse order:

27, yaceittam tanmayo 'vacyaṁ, guhyam etat sanā-
tanam
36, prasāde cāi 'va sattvasya prasādāṁ samavā-
puuyat

If all these points be compared, first the general order of
discussion, then the peculiar words which are used in the
same way in both texts, and finally the identical passage just
given, it is clear that one of these texts must have followed
the other. The dispersion of the epic chapter over different
books certainly makes it seem more likely that it is a copy
than an original. This opinion is strengthened by the late
features added in the epic, the freedom in metre, almost
exclusively characteristic of the later epic, and the late Ve-
dānta grouping of seventeen at the beginning. For this
group is not the old Sāṁkhyā group, which occurs often
enough elsewhere in the epic, but a modification of it as in
the Vedāntasāra.

The citation in the Māitrāyāna of the stanza cittasya hi
prasādena from some source might be referred to the epic,
but it seems more likely that this, like a dozen other “some
one says” verses in the same Upanishad, is a general refer-
ence, and it is quite counterbalanced by the fact that the
Vana version in the epic adds a hidden reference to its
source in the words māitrāyana-gataḥ caret, a strange expres-
sion, which is found only in this verse and in its repetition in
the twelfth book; ¹ while the speaker in the last verse of the
Vana chapter confesses that what he has been teaching “is
all a condensed account of what he has heard.”²

¹ iii, 213, 34; xii, 270, 5; with a slight varied reading in xii, 189, 13.
² yathā ċrutam idaṁ sarvaṁ samāśena . . . etat te sarvaṁ ākhyātām, iii,
213, 40. I suppose no one will lay any weight on the statement of xii, 247,
which copies Vana here (see above), that (12-14) this is a “secret not handed
down by tradition,” anāśīhyam anāgāmam (ātmapratyayikaṁ çāstram), but
an ambrosia “churned from dharmākhyānas, satyākhyāna, and the ten
It is perhaps worth noting further that in the Upanishad vi, 20-21, one sees the real soul and becomes isolated (where the goal is kevalatva), whereas in iii, 211, 15 of the epic, the result of this same seeing of self truly is brahmaṇaḥ saṁyogaḥ, union with Brahma; which carries on the antithesis already noticed between the Sāmkhya tanmātras of the Upanishad and the omission of the same in the epic. This special designation of tanmātra in iii, 2 is complemented by the viçeṣas mentioned in vi, 10, and is important as showing that the Upanishad, as a Upanishad, is late, for none of the older Upanishads has either of these terms. Its priority to the epic, however, may be urged on still another ground than those mentioned above. The Upanishad quotes stanzas freely, and it is scarcely possible that if the epic and Manavic verse cited above on p. 27 had existed in verse the prose form of the Upanishad would have been used. As Müller says in his note on the Upanishad passage: “Part of this passage has been before the mind of the author” (of Manu together with the epic poet). So perhaps, too, with the recognition of the eleven (vikāras) in v, 2. The epic has both groups, eleven vikāras and also the system’s sixteen, as I shall show in a later chapter. As compared with the epic, moreover, the Upanishad is distinctly earlier in knowing Yoga as “sixfold,” vi, 18, whereas the epic makes it “eightfold,” xii, 317, 7 ff. as does Patañjali, ii, 29.

I think another circumstance may point to the fact that the epic refers directly to the sixth chapter of the Upanishad. The word tatstha is not, indeed, used in a pregnant sense in the Upanishad. It is simply an ordinary grammatical complex in the sentence vi, 10, puruṣaḥ cetā pradhānāntahsthaḥ, sa eva bhoktā ... bhojyā prakṛtis, tatstho bhūṅkte, “Prakṛti is food; when standing in it (Prakṛti), the Puruṣa enjoys.” But in the epic, xii, 315, 11, we read sa esa (puruṣaḥ) prakṛtistho hi tatstha ity abhidhīyate, “Purusha is designated as tatstha when he is in Prakṛti.” As the expression tatstha thousand Rks,” for this applies only to paçyaty ātmānam ātmani, seeing self in self, not to the exposition.
occurs only in this Upanishad, according to Col. Jacob's Concordance, it seems very likely that the epic verse alludes to the tatstha = prakṛtiṣṭha of the Upanishad, where Puruṣa is expressly puruṣaç cetā, and the epic also follows, 14, with cetanāvāsā tathā cāi 'kaḥ kṣetrajñā iti bhūṣitaḥ.¹

In Up. vi. 15 and Mbh. xi, 2, 24 occurs Kālaḥ pacati bhūtāni; and in the companion-piece to the image of the body as a house, cited above from Up. iii, 4, as the same with xii, 330, 42, namely, Up. i, 3, occurs aniṣṭasamprayoga = Mbh. xi, 2, 28, but I do not think that these universal expressions taken by themselves are of any significance.

On the other hand I cannot regard as unimportant the following stanzas, beginning with the extraordinary, unsyntactical, verse found in the epic, xii, 241, 32,—

ṣaṃmāsāṃ nityayuktasya ābdabrahmā 'tivartate

compared with 237, 8 (Gītā 6, 44, jīvāsur api yogasya, etc.),

api jīvāsamāno 'pi ābdabrahmā 'tivartate

and with xiv, 19, 66,

ṣaṃmāsāṃ nityayuktasya yogāḥ, Pārtha, pravartate

and with Māitr. Up. vi, 28,

ṣaḍbhīr māsāis tu yuktasya nityayuktasya dehināḥ

anantaḥ paramo guhyāḥ samyag yogāḥ pravartate

and with Māitr. Up. vi, 22 = Mbh. xii, 233, 30,

dve brahmaṇī veditavye ābdabraham paraṁ ca yat

cābdabrahamāni niṣṭātaḥ paraṁ brahma 'dhigacchati.

The last stanza occurs only here and in this Upanishad (excepting later copies).² The first is a meaningless compound of

¹ It may be noticed here also that in cāitanyā the vocabulary of the pseudo-epic is that of the Upanishad in its later part, vi, 10 and 33 (the word is found else only in late Upanishads). Compare: acāityamān na vidyate (the tree has a jīva), xii, 184, 17; cetanāvāsau cāitanyāṁ samam bhūteṣu paścātī, "the sage sees one and the same soul in all conscious creatures," xiv, 18, 33. The term is unknown to the Gītā and early epic.

² With the var. lec., dve vidyā veditavye, Munḍ. Up. i, 4; Brahmapindu Up. i, 17 Compare a sort of parody in xii, 100, 5, ubhe prajīve veditavye jīvi vākā ca, Bhrāra. The dve vāva brahmaṇo rupe of BAU. ii, 3, 1, are perhaps the first pair, though there it is higher and lower Brahma in a metaphysical sense.
the “six months” stanza and the “two brahman” stanza. The second is a theoretical advance on the latter, which says that when one is thoroughly conversant with the word-brahman he gets to the highest Brahman. The later Yogi does not think this necessary, and emends to “even one desirous of knowledge (of Yoga, in Gītā) surpasses the word-brahman,” while the “six months” stanza in the epic is adjusted to the occasion (nityayuktasya of the MSS. is to be read in the Upanishad as in the epic). Here again, the Māitrāyana alone has this stanza, nor does nityayukta occur elsewhere except in the same way in the Gītā, 8, 14, nityayuktasya yogināḥ.

In my opinion these parallels together with the cittasya hi prasādādena stanza above indicate that the epic has copied from the sixth chapter of the Upanishad as well as from the earlier portions.¹

The Vedic period, then, is represented in the epic down to a pretty late stage of Upanishads. The tanmātra era of philosophy, the trinitarian era of philosophy, these are represented by the Upanishad and by the epic; but only the latest philosophical and religious chapters of the epic recognize tanmātras (the name) and the trinity, as only the later Upanishads recognize them.

Of still later Upanishads, it is possible that the pseudo-epic may know

**The Atharvaṭīras Upanishad.**

The title is applied to Nārāyaṇa, xii, 339, 113, and the commentator explains it as referring to the Upanishad.² But we must, I think, rest content with the certainty that the epic cites (a) the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up., (b) the Kāṭhaka, (c) the

¹ The general lateness of the Upanishad is shown by its recognition, v, 2, of the trinity (Muir *op. Holtzmann*), which is also recognized in the later epic.

² On this and on 1, 70, 39–40 in the Çakuntalā episode, bhūrundāsāmagramābhir atharvaṭīraso 'dgaṭāḥ ... atharvavedapravṛṣaḥ, compare Weber, Iš., vol. i, pp. 333–4. See also above, pp. 8 and 9 (note 1).
Māitrāyaṇa, or, in other words, copies at least one of each of the three kinds of Upanishads, old prose, metrical, and later prose.

**Āṇvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra.**

In this Sūtra i, 15, 9, occurs a stanza which is found also with varied readings in the Kāuśitaki and BA. Upanishads (ii, 11; vi, 4, 9, respectively) as a single stanza. This is cited in the epic as Vedic, the reading following that of the Sūtra and adding one stanza, which clearly belongs to the citation, i, 74, 63–64:

\[
\text{vedeṣv api vadaṇṭi 'mam mantrāṇam dvijātayaḥ}
\text{jātakarmaṇi putrāṇāṁ tavā 'pi viditaṁ tathā}
\text{añgād añgāt sambhavasi ṭṛdayād adhi jāyase}
\text{ātmā vai putranāma 'si sa jīva āraḍaḥ qatam}
\text{jīvitaṁ tvadadhīnam me santānam api cā 'kṣayam}
\text{tasmā tvam jīva me putra susukhi āraḍaṁ qatam}
\]

The general conclusion to be drawn from these citations is twofold. First, the epic, synthetically considered, post-dates the latest Vedic works. Second, the final redactors were priests, well acquainted with Vedic literature. Of these points there can be no doubt; nor is a third open to serious objection, namely, that the restriction of philosophical citation to philosophical chapters does not prove anything in regard to the date of the epic that preceded the insertion of these chapters.

**Purāṇas and Itihāsas.**

Whether the Purāṇas, ascribed to Romaharṣa (sic) in xii, 319, 21, precede or follow epic literature, is not a question that can be answered categorically. Nothing is commoner than the statement made by some epic character that a story was heard by him long ago in a Purāṇa. But most of the

---

1 Āṇvalāyana is mentioned only in the pseudo-epic, xiii, 4, 54. On this and his mention of the epic, see below, and Holtzmann, loc. cit., p. 27, with other supposed references to Sūtras.

2 For example, xiii, 84, 69, maya āraṇām idam pūrvaṃ purāṇe. For the relation between the extant Purāṇas and the epic, compare Holtzmann, loc. cit., p. 29 ff. There is no earlier allusion to an extant Purāṇa (SBE. ii. p. xxviii)
extant Purāṇas are in their present shape certainly later than the epic. Nevertheless, before the great epic was completed the eighteen Purāṇas were known, since they are mentioned as a group xvi, 5, 46 (not in C.) and 6, 97. Further, a Vāyu Purāṇa is referred to in iii, 191, 16:

\[ \text{etat te sarvam āhyātām atitānāgataṁ tathā} \\
\text{Vāyuproktam anusmṛtya Purāṇam ṛṣisamāyuktam.} \]

This statement, however, implying that the Purāṇa treats of future events, though illustrated in this instance by the epic’s account of later ages, scarcely tallies with the early epic use of the word, which regularly connotes atīta, the past, but not anāgata, (account of) things to be; yet it corresponds exactly to the ordinary contents of the later Purāṇas. On the other hand, the pseudo-epic contains this later sort of Purāṇa, known as Purāṇa as well as āhyāna and mahopaniṣāda, where future events are described.\(^1\) It is to be remarked, moreover, that this reminiscence of Vāyu’s Purāṇa, a work which is referred to again in the Harivaṃśa, is contained in the Mārkāṇḍeya episode, which long interpolation is itself virtually a Purāṇa. That some of the verses in the extant Vāyu are like some in the epic proves nothing in regard to the relative age of either.\(^2\) There is no real iden-

---

\(^1\) xii, 340, 95-125, future avatars, conquest of Kālayavana, etc., called mahopaniṣadham (sic, neuter), in ch. 111, purāṇam in 118 and 124, ākyāṇam in 125. Closely united are “praise and Purāṇas” (known to Sūtas) in xii, 53, 3 (not like the stutiṣṭastra, praise-treatises, of the late passage, ii, 452, where, however, B. 11, 35, has stutiṣṭuṣṭastra).

\(^2\) Even the Garuḍa and Vārāha Purāṇas may precede the final revision of the whole epic, though the evidence for references is far from conclusive; but on the other hand our present Purāṇas may have been so changed as not to agree in any detail with Purāṇas that once bore these names. The arguments are given by Holtzmann, loc. cit. The epic passages supposed to refer to the Purāṇas are H., 3, 33, 5 (above) and i, 31, 3. The epic declaration i, 2, 336, that it is the base of all Purāṇas, presupposes a goodly number already in existence; but this statement is as late an addition to the poem
tity in the account cited from the Vāyu Purāṇa and the extant Vāyu Purāṇa. In the description of the Kali age, for instance, where the epic (in the part said to be from the Vāyu Purāṇa) has, 190, 64, Çudrā dharman pravakṣyaṇti, brāhmaṇaḥ paryupāsakaḥ, the Vāyu, lviii, 41, says Çudrācāryaḥ ca brāhmaṇaḥ, and where the epic, ib. 97, has utsādayiṣyati mlecchagaṇān, the Vāyu, ib. 78, has mlecchān hanti, but here there is nothing characteristic. On the other hand, the most striking features in the epic account, the edukas, and Kalki, with the heavy taxes laid upon priests, cl. 62, 65-67, 93 ff., are not found in the Vāyu at all. Noticeable also is the fact that the epic account not only has more than the Vāyu, but has contradictory statements. Thus in cl. 58, the Vāyu declares one of the signs of the evil age to be that girls less than sixteen will bear children; while in the epic the sign is that girls of five or six will bear and boys of seven or eight will beget children: pañcame vā 'tha şaṣṭe vā varṣe kanyā prasūyate, saptavarśa 'ṣṭavarśaḥ ca prajāsyanti narās tadā, 190, 49. Taken altogether, the epic account seems to be an extended and exaggerated reproduction of that in the Vāyu Purāṇa, but it is impossible to say whether it is really based on the extant text or not. The Puranic version, however, does not seem to be taken from the epic account, and as the latter is expressly said to be from the Purāṇa it is reasonable to suppose that the Märkandeya episode was inserted into the epic after the Vāyu Purāṇa was written, though this must remain only a supposition.

Another long intrusion in the same third book of the epic, this time in the Tirtha stories, iii, 110 ff., leads to a result somewhat more definite in respect of the relation between the particular story intruded into the epic and the Padma as is the mention of the eighteen. I suppose most scholars will accept the “eighteen Purāṇas” as actually referring to eighteen, and I am inclined to do so myself. At the same time the number is more or less conventional in the epic (see the groups of eighteen spoken of below), and even in the period of the Upanishads literary works may have been grouped in eighteens: yajñā- rūpā aṣṭādaçolatam avarām yeṣu karma, with Deussen’s remark on ukta and attempt to explain the number, Muṇḍ. Up. i, 2, 7.
Purāṇa. Here, according to the acute investigation of Dr. Lüders, Die Sage von Ṛṣyaçṛiga, the epic account in its present form is based upon that of the Purāṇa. Dr. Lüders thinks indeed, p. 103, that there was an earlier epic form of the story which antedated the Puranic account. But it is at least certain that the present epic form is subsequent to the present Puranic form, and that the tale is drawn from popular sources that antedate in all probability all the literary versions in Sanskrit.

Leaving the modern Purāṇa, as it is described, e. g., in Vāyu Purāṇa, iv, 10,

sargaç ca pratisargaç ca vañço manvantarāṇi ca
vañçānuçaritaṁ ce 'ti purāṇāṁ pañcalakṣaṇam,

and turning to the meaning of the word in the epic, there is no essential difference between atīta, ākhyāna,¹ purāṇa and itihāsa. Together with the more general kathā, all these words mean ordinarily an old tale, story, legend or incident. Rarely is Purāṇa itself used of cosmogony, but a case occurs in xii, 201, 6, where the phrase tad ucyatām purāṇam refers to the origin of earth, heaven, creatures, wind, sky, water, etc. The birth of Asuras and Suras is a Puranic topic in i, 65, 38. When not an adjective to ākhyāna, which is a common function of the word, it is an equivalent substantive. Thus the Nandinī tale is an ākhyānam purāṇam, i, 175, 2, while in xii, 343, 2, hanta te vartaiśyāmi purāṇam, the word in the phrase takes the place of Itihāsa; as it does in i, 196, 14, çṛuyate hi purāne 'pi Jaṭilā nāma Gāutamī.

From remote antiquity these Purāṇas or tales of old were associated with Itihāsas, legends, whether cosmological or not (the distinction is quite artificial). They were narrations, kathās, composed partly in prose and partly in verse, gāthās. Kathā itself is entirely non-specific, and may be a causerie rather than a tale, as in ix, 38, 16, where are mentioned reli-

¹ Synonymous with this is the word upākhyāna. Thus the Çakuntalā episode and Namuci myth, ix, 48, 33, bear the name upākhyāna, and in v, 18, 16, and 19 it is synonymous with ākhyāna. The Fowler's tale is a dharmākhyāna, iii, 216, 38 (compare a reference to many such, p. 6, above).
gious conversations,¹ citrāḥ kathā vedam prati. A legend, such as that of Agastya, is a kathā divyā, iii, 100, 2. The mahopanisad dam alluded to above is a kathāmṛtam, the essence, sūra, of hundreds of upākhyānas, xii, 340, 127. So the Ćvetādvipa story is a kathāsūra, xii, 336, 16.

But the especial characteristic of the old legend is that it relates the story of great kings or gods² and their acts in the past. In iii, 298, 7, Dyumatsena is solaced “by the help of tales of former kings,” citrārthāḥ pūrvarājām kathāgrañyāḥ, according to the recommendation in the epic itself: “Comfort those afflicted in mind with tales of the past,” yasya buddhiḥ paribhavet tam atitena sāntvaye t, i, 140, 74; an instance being the story of Nala, kīrtana, itihāsa, itihāsāḥ purāṇaḥ, as it is indifferently called, iii, 79, 10, 11, 13, 16.

The word itihāsa may also have the meaning “saying,” rather than “legend.” Thus in iii, 30, 21:

atrā 'py udāharanti 'mam itihāsam purātanam
īgvarasya vaçe lokās tiṣṭhante nā 'tunano yathā,

where itihāsa is equivalent to pravāda, a proverbial saying (in this instance repeated in cl. 25 and in other parts of the epic). But ordinarily the word means a tale, of which the hemistic just cited is the stereotyped introduction, as in iii, 28, 1 and passim.³ It is important to notice that, as itihāsa is used for proverb and gītā gāthā is also used in the same way,

---

¹ So a philosophical discourse of religious content, mokṣadharma, is an Itihāsa, xii, 334, 42; and the tale of a good Brahman is a kathā on duty, xii, 354 ff.

² The tale of Atharvan finding Agni when the latter disappeared is an Itihāsa purāṇa, iii, 217 and 222. In iii, 183, 46, purāvṛttāḥ kathāḥ puruṣaḥ, are “tales of kings, women, and seers.” With purāvṛttā as adj. compare kathayanti purāvṛttam itihāsam, xii, 18, 2; as a noun it is not uncommon, rājām purāvṛttam, “a tale of kings,” etc., as is illustrated sufficiently in PW. (compare vṛttānta). Khāṇḍava’s burning is a paurāṇī kathā rājasmūnta, i, 223, 16. “Men, snakes, and demons” is the subject of a “divine tale,” kathā divyā, in iii, 201, 4.

³ A word of analogous formation is āśiṭhiya, equivalent to traditional report, Veda. It is found, e.g., in xii, 218, 27 and 247, 13, and G. v, 87, 23, as one of a group of sources of knowledge besides anumāna and pratyakṣa. Compare itivṛttā, as legend, in i, 1, 16.
for example, the na jātu kāmaḥ proverb, i, 75, 49-50, so the phrase to introduce a tale, Itihāsa, may substitute gāthās, as in iii, 29, 35, atrā ’py udāharanti ’mā gāthāḥ . . . gītāḥ. Such gāthās refer to action or to ethical teaching (compare the same formula for both, loc. cit. and ii, 68, 65). A difference may be imagined in the element of song of the gāthā, but this is illusory. The gāthās are indeed said to be sung, as in the case just cited (qūl. 34-44 are the gītā gāthāḥ), but singing is too precise a translation. As shown above, even the Āraṇyakas are “sung,” and in point of fact the gāthās are synonymous with člokas and are recited. Stanzas of Purāṇas are thus said to be sung. Conversely, gāthās are not always sung, iii, 135, 45, atrā ’py udāharanti ’mā gāthā devāir udāhṛtāḥ; while ib. 54 is another illustration of the word gāthā meaning only a current proverbial čloka. But in this case it is woven together with the legend of Dhanuṣākṣa, whose direct curse not succeeding in slaying his enemy, he destroyed the mountain, in the life of which was bound up the life of the invulnerable foe. Hence they say “man can never escape his fate:”

ucur vedavidah sarve gāthām yāṁ tāṁ nibodha me
na diṣṭam artham atyetum īcō martyaḥ kathāmecana
mahīśāir bhedayāmāsa Dhanuṣākṣo mahidharān

Such gāthās are even incorporated into the law-books: “Verses recited by Yama” are cited (by those that know antiquity and the law) “in the law-books” on the sin of selling a son or daughter, xiii, 45, 17.

1 Compare Tirtha gāthā and Tirtha čloka, iii, 88, 22; 89, 17; 90, 6; “the čloka sung in a Purāṇa,” purāṇe āryate gītaḥ člokaḥ, v, 178, 47; purāṇaḥ čloko gītaḥ, iii, 300, 35 (a proverb on fame); Holtzmann, loc. cit., p. 29 ff.
2 The reading amartyaḥ in B. would require api. C. has martyaḥ. The proverb appears in a different form, v, 40, 32, na diṣṭam abhyatikrāntum čakyaṃ bhātena kenacit.
3 In the Rāmāyaṇa also, eti jīvantam ānando naram varṣaçatād api is given as a kalyāṇi or pāurāṇi gāthā āunikī, v, 34, 6; vi, 126, 2 (G. 110, 2).
4 atrā gāthā Yamodgītaḥ kīrtayanti purāvidāḥ dharmajāñā dharmacāstreṣu nibaddhāḥ dharmasetuṣu, yo manuṣyaḥ svakam putraṁ vikriya dhanam icchatī kanyāṁ vā jīvitarthāya yah culkena prayacchati, saṁśāvare, etc.
The best known example of the last case, gāthās recited by a divinity, is found in the Harigītās (plural), xii, 347, 11, that is the Bhagavad Gītā (Upanishad). Here the "singing" is that of the Āraṇyakas. As Vedāntas are Upanishads (above, p. 9), so we find in xii, 247, 21, yat tan mahaṛṣi-bhir drṣṭāṁ (= Veda), vedānteṣu ca giyate, "what is revealed in the Veda and sung in the Upanishads."

Such tales and legends are said to be the epic itself, which is called indifferently an Itihāsa, a Purāṇa, or Kṛṣṇa's Veda. As the Chāndogya Upanishad applies the title "fifth Veda" to the Itihāsapuruṣa, so the epic claims the same title:

itihāsapuruṣaḥ pañcamo vedānāṁ, Chānd. Up., vii, 1, 2, 4
(So each is a Veda in Cat. Br. xiii, 4, 3, 12–13.)
adhitya caturo vedān sāṅgān ākhyānapaṇcāmaṁ, vii, 9, 29
sāṅgopaniṣadān vedāṅg catur ākhyānapaṇcāmaṁ, iii, 45, 8
vedān adhyāpayāmāsa Mahābhāratapaṇcāmaṁ, i, 63, 89 and
xii, 341, 21.4

In the opening stanzas5 of the great epic it is described as a Saṁhitā, collection, a grantha, book, a Purāṇa, an ākhyāna, an Itihāsa, a Kāvya, a poem containing various Čātras, full of Vyākhyās (vāiyākhyā) or narrations, and Upanishads. It is true that it is also called a Dharmaśāstra, yet this represents but one side of its encyclopaedic nature, as it is besides Arthaśāstra, Dharmashastra, and Kamaśāstra, i, 2, 383. When the character of the work as a whole is described, it is in

1 bhagavadākhyānam, ib. 2; here a recitation about the Lord, not by the Lord. But the Gītā is a recitation by the Lord, gītā bhagavatā śvayam, ib. 340, 8.
2 i, 62, 16–18, idam purāṇam ... itiḥāsam ... kṛṣṇāṁ vedāṁ vidvān. So the imitation of the Gītā in the twelfth book is called "Kṛṣṇa's Religion," Sātvato dharmāḥ (see below).
3 The other form occurs, e.g., iii, 206, 2, sāṅgopaniṣado vedān adhīte.
4 Compare also v, 43, 41; ix, 6, 14 (as above), and vedāṅg ca 'dhiyāge sāṅgān setihāsāṁ, i, 60, 3; itihāsapuruṣeṣu nāṇgicākṣāṣu bodhitaḥ vedavedāṅgata-tvajñāḥ, i, 109, 20; vedēṣu sapuruṣeṣu rgyvede sayajurvede ... purāṇe sopaniṣade tathāi 'va jyotiṣe āyurvede tathāi 'va ca, xii, 342, 6–9; ye 'dhiyate setihāṣam purāṇam, xiii, 102, 21; yad etad ucyate cāstre setihāṣe ca chandasi, xiii, 111, 42.
5 i, 1, 16, 40, 55, 61, 72.
terms of epic story, not of didactic code. Even the Hari-
vañça poet does not fail to distinguish the two elements.
He boasts that the epic is an ākhyānam bahvartham ċru-
vistaram, but still says that it is the Bhāratī kathā, Bhārata
story, the root of which is the dramatic episode of the Rāja-
sūya, which led to the development of the story (H. 3, 2,
13 ff.). So another poet proclaims: "I will relate the great
good fortune of that great-hearted king the Bhārata, whose
brilliant Itihāsa, story, is called the Mahābhārata," i, 99, 49.
The reason that Kṛṣṇa Dvāipāyana spent three years in mak-
ing the epic was not only that he wished to do a good thing
but that he wished to "extend the glory of the Pandus and
other warriors."¹

Constituting a small but important part of the various
tales told in the epic are found genealogical verses, anu-
vañça-çlokas (or gāthās), which commemorate the history of
the race of valiant kings and great seers of the past. I
shall speak of them again hereafter. Here it suffices to say
that such verses are either sung by professional rhapsodes,
or recited by narrators. The rhapsodes, however, were quite
distinct from the Brahmans, who recited the epic stories.
For a priest to be a professional story-teller or a rhapsode was
as bad for him as to be a juggler or a physician.²

Drama.

There remains only one class of literature which may
doubtfully be included under the head of literature known
to the epic poets, the drama. Whether there was already a
literary drama is, however, chiefly a matter of definition.
It is conceivable that the story-tellers and rhapsodes may
have developed dramatic works before any such works were
written, that is, became literature in a strict sense, and that

¹ i, 62, 27-28.
² xiii, 23, 16, gāyanā nartakāc cāi 'va plavakā vādakās tathā kathakā
yodhakāc cāi 'va rājan nā 'rhanti ketanam; ib. 90, 11, among apāñkteyas
are kucliavas, rhapsodes, and idol-makers (above, p. 15). A priest is insulted
on being called a professional eulogist, bandin, i, 78, 9-10.
the ākhyāna may have been dramatically recited. But it is also true that the early epic does not mention the play or drama. Nevertheless a kind of drama existed before the epic was ended. Compare iv, 16, 43:

akālajñā 'si, sāirandhri, cālūsī 'va virodīśi

From the expression “thou weepest like an actress” one might hastily conclude that we have here a reference to real drama. But pantomime expresses weeping, and no mention of real drama occurs in the epic except in the passage ii, 11, 36, where Drama is personified:

nāṭakā vividhāḥ kāvyāḥ kathākhyāyikakārikāḥ,

which is anything but an early verse. In the Harivaṇça, on the other hand, which probably dates from a time posterior to our era, we find not only pantomime, abhinaya, but even the dramatic representation of the “great Rāmāyaṇa poem,” in which the vidūṣaka, or stage-jester of the regular drama, takes part, H. 2, 89, 72; 92, 59.

But even abhinaya, or pantomime, is not mentioned in the epic proper under that name and no technical dramatic term is found anywhere in it. This is the more surprising as the manner in which the epic is told gives abundant opportunity to introduce both the terms and allusions to dramatic representation. Shows of dances are frequently mentioned, but the spectators never hear the players even when mentioned as nāṭas, a doubtful word which might be actor and may be pantomimist. Not to speak of the absence of çāubhikas and

1 Dramatic recitations are of course another matter, and pantomime must be separated from drama. According to Fick, Sociale Gliederung, p. 188, the same relation exists in the Jātakas, where also nāṭa and nāṭaka do not yet mean actors but pantomimes, as “dramatic performances are nowhere described.” This is, in my opinion, the state of affairs in the epic prior to the writing of the late additions (see the allusion below). ii, 11, 36, belongs clearly to an interpolated scene, and the fact that real drama, nāṭaka, is mentioned only here in the whole epic till the Harivaṇça, should show its age. He who refers the passage to 500 n. c., must ignore its uniqueness and the fact that the rest of the epic knows no such word. See my Ruling Caste, p. 329, and also Professor Rhys Davids’ interesting note on the Brahma-jāla Sutta, Dialogues of the Buddha, p. 7 (with my note below, p. 57, on prekkhā).
others elsewhere mentioned as actors, and of the dramatic viṭas, čakaras, and vidūṣakas, when groups of people of this grade are given, even the granthika appears only as a rhapsode processional singer, and the characters are described merely as “seing,” paśyanto nāṭanartakān, ii, 33, 49; i, 218, 10, etc. The expression “stage” and the various vague terms for actors can be referred to mimes with perfect propriety and in the absence of everything that would indicate real drama ought perhaps to be so referred. In the expression “God treats men as men do a doll on a string,” iii, 30, 28, the reference must be to the sort of Punch and Judy show which is still performed in town and village. Even in xii, 36, 25, raṅgastrī, “stage-woman,” may perhaps most reasonably be explained as the equivalent of the actress mentioned above. Like the Harivaṅga, the Rāmāyaṇa speaks of theatrical exhibitions, nāṭakāṇyā āhuḥ (or cakruḥ), R. ii, 69, 4; G. 71, 4. Rhapsodic drama is alluded to also in the Mahābhāṣya, where, as Weber has shown, the actors are seen and heard and tragedies are presented in costume. But the Mahābhārata neither alludes to such dramatic plays nor does it notice the Nāṭasūtra. All that is heard seems to be songs and instru-

1 Such groups are frequently found in lists of persons who are not eligible, and are generally regarded as vulgar or dangerous, but in all these groups among dancers, singers, rhapsodes, etc., no technical word of the regular drama is found.

2 Compare Weber, IS. xiii, p. 487; Holtzmann, loc. cit., p. 78 ff. The latter scholar says “die ganzé dramatische Literatur ist später als das Mahābhārata.” He means therewith, I presume, the received drama of Kālidāsa and others. There is certainly in the epic nothing like the nāṭakīkṛta Rāmāyaṇa of the Harivaṅga. The chronological value of the Mahābhāṣya data would be greater if one knew to which century they reverted, but Weber himself warns against taking them as of certain worth for any time earlier than the end of the eighth century A.D., loc. cit., p. 320. A Punch and Judy show is implied in r, 30, 1, sūtraprotā dārumayi ‘va yoṣā. The Sūtradhāra appears only in i, 51, 15, where he is a sthapati, or architect, and a Sūtaḥ pāurāñikāḥ. The application of the name here is apparently to the sūtra, lines or plans, drawn up by the architect (xii, 10,983, but B. has mudrā for sūtra, 290, 40). Lists of nāṭanartakāgyāyanas are found in iii, 15, 14; xii, 69, 60; raṅgāvataraṇa, iib. 295, 5. In i, 184, 16, though nāṭas and Sūtas come with dancers and praisers and boxers, niyodhakas, only praisers are heard (Sūtas, 188, 24). So
ments: “The musicians sounded their instruments together; the dancers danced also; the singers sang songs,” nanṭur nartakāṇ caī ’va jagur geyāṇī gāyanāḥ, i, 219, 4.

The conclusion seems inevitable that the technical nāṭaka with its vidūṣaka, etc., that is, the drama in its full form, was unknown to the epic proper. What was known was clearly pantomime. Dramatic recitation like that of the Bhāṣya may be inferred only if one ignores the facts mentioned above, which is possible if the (non-hearing but) seeing of shows be taken as a general expression. On the other hand, the ākhyāṇa-reciters may have been dramatic without the setting noticed in the Bhāṣya. They are heard rather than seen. I have already noticed the fact that Nārada is the representative of Bharata as the genius of music, and that the latter is not known to the epic in his later capacity.¹

in ii, 4, 7, (with vāṭālikas); and in the dānāmahākratu at xv, 14, 17, which is naṭanartakalāṣyāḥhyaḥ. A dance-hall, nartanačāḷā, nartanāgāra, is mentioned in iv, 22, 3, 16, and a prekṣāgāra, “hall for seeing,” is made according to Čātra rule in i, 134, 10–11, a temporary affair for a joust, helped out with maṇcās; a samājavāṭa (more elaborate) in 185, 16; while “spectators at an arena,” prekṣākāḥ . . . raṅgavāṭa iva, iii, 20, 27, are alluded to. Other stage-words, raṅgabhūmi, etc., occur occasionally without specific application to acting. The use to which prekṣā and samāja are put, when they are explained in the epic, should make one hesitate to translate the same words in Manu more specifically than “shows and meetings,” and the same is true of prekṣāḥ in Pāli.

¹ The pseudo-epic, xili, 33, 12, says that some priests are thieves, some are liars, and some are naṭanartakas, which the commentary illustrates by saying that Vālimikī and Vīvāmitra are examples of the thief, while Bharata and others are examples of naṭanartakas (Nārada is an example of the liar, as he is kalahapriyāḥ). Here, and in the quotation above, naṭanartaka is one, “actor-dancer.” For the part played by dolls in the early Hindu drama, see Professor Pischel’s illuminating essay, Die Heimat des Puppenspiels (1900). He also gives references to previous literature on the drama.
CHAPTER TWO.

INTERRELATION OF THE TWO EPICS.

Of the two early epics of India, the Mahābhārata, the great epic, is traditionally attributed to a distributor, vyāsa, who is also credited with the distribution or editing of the Vedas and of several other works. Different editions and former declarers are also noticed. In other words, there was no one author of the great epic, though with a not uncommon confusion of editor with author, an author was recognized, called Vyāsa. Modern scholarship calls him The Unknown, or Vyāsa for convenience.

But if the great epic lacks an author with a real name, the little epic, the Rāmāyana, is the work of a definite personality. Here there is no question of disputed authorship, only of more or less plainly marked interpolation and addition. The great, mahā, Bhārata-epic is really, as it is designated, a collection, Saṁhitā, the reputed author of which, corresponding generally to the parallel figure in Greece, yet out-Homers Homer; while beside the huge and motley pile that goes by Vyāsa’s name stands clear and defined the little Rāmāyana of Vālmīki, as (in this respect) besides Homer’s vague Homeric stands the distinct Argonautika of Apollonius.

As the relation between the two Hindu epics, especially in point of age, has often been discussed, I do not purpose to repeat all the details here, but to take up the study of the great epic from a new point of view. For the reason why so much theorizing in regard to relative age has been spent on the epics without satisfactory result — adhuc sub judice — is that hitherto there has been no recognition of the underlying unity of epic speech. Hence discussions in regard to the possibility of totally different origins of the two epics and the
different ages they represent, while their common base has been ignored.

In regard to the final growth of each, it may be said at once that neither epic was developed quite independently of the other. The later Rāmāyaṇa implies the Mahābhārata, as the later Mahābhārata recognizes the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki. It is not, then, a question of absolute separation, but only of the length we may go in separating.

Neither epic has a definitive text. The question therefore naturally arises whether there is any use in arguing about the original form of either poem. In regard to the Mahābhārata, this question has been answered negatively by Dr. Winternitz, who holds that all work on the epic is useless till we have the text of the Southern recension, of which he has lately published, in the Indian Antiquary, some interesting specimens. But it is doubtful whether the publication of the whole Southern version would result in a text any more definitive than that of the Rāmāyaṇa. At most we should have two versions, more or less independent of each other, each showing omissions and interpolations as viewed in the light of the other. This would be of considerable value indeed, as proving that the text has been freely altered, a conclusion inevitable even without this support, but based with its aid on objective reality. Nevertheless, though the Southern recension would be thus valuable, its absence does not preclude the possibility of obtaining provisional data of importance from the Northern recension alone, either in regard to its relation to the Rāmāyaṇa or in respect of its own development. Such data must finally be checked in detail by a comparison with those of the alternate text; but as a whole they suffice to cast much light on several moot points, and in themselves are useful in demonstrating that the great epic is the result of the labors of different writers belonging to different schools of style and thought; a result diametrically opposed to the view of the method calling itself synthetic, and likely to be rather twice-
proven than disproven by the eventual publication of the Southern text.

In regard to the texts of the Rāmāyaṇa, I need only refer to the invaluable essays of Professor Jacobi, seconded by the recent analyses of Dr. Wirtz and Dr. Lüders,1 especially as this epic is not the chief object of consideration in this volume. It is, however, obvious that exactly the same conditions obtain here as in the case of the great epic, and it may be added that if there were a third epic the same conditions would obtain there. There is no fixed epic text because Hindu epic poetry was never fixed. All epic poems were transmitted at first orally, and the various rewriters treated them exactly as the rhapsodes had previously done, altered and added as they pleased. Reconstruction of the original text is therefore out of the question. All that can be done is to excise the most palpable interpolations in each traditional rendering.

Neither of the epics, as such, is recognized before the late period of the Gṛhyasūtras, and the first epic recognized here and in other Sūtras is the Bhārata. The question has often been raised which epic is the older. In our present state of knowledge it may be said that this question cannot now and probably never can be answered in one word. In the first place, it will always be idle to speak of either epic as the older without specifying whether one means the present text or the original text; for that these, in the case of either epic, are convertible terms is an idea refuted by even a superficial acquaintance with the poems. Assuming, however, that the question implies priority of epic qua epic as a new genus of literature, and whether this form first arose as Rāmāyaṇa or (Mahā) Bhārata, this too cannot be answered categorically, because parts of the latter are older than the former, and the former is older than the mass of the latter, as will be shown. Personally I have no doubt that the Pandu (pāṇḍava) form of the great epic is later than the Rāma epic; but, since one was

1 Das Rāmāyaṇa (together with special studies mentioned hereafter), by Professor Jacobi; Die Westliche Rezension des R., by Dr. Hans Wirtz; Die Sage von Ṛṣyaçṛṛiga, by Dr. Heinrich Lüders, Gött. Nachr. 1897, p. 87.
a slow outgrowth from a Puñjāb Kuru epic, and the other, of unknown antecedents, was developed far to the East, in much more polished form, while only the Bhārata is recognized in Vedic literature, I have as little doubt that there was a Bhārata epic before there was a Rāmāyaṇa; whereof also I shall speak again in a subsequent chapter. Here I wish merely to notice, in passing, the ridiculous claim that the Rāmāyaṇa dates from the "twelfth or thirteenth century" B.C. This claim has been made not only by Hindus but by Occidental scholars. Whether there was a Rāma story at that period or (just as well) twelve or thirteen centuries earlier no man can know. But that Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa can lay claim to no such age the slightest historical consideration will show, not to speak of an examination of the almost classical metre of the poem.

The Mahābhārata, besides giving the Rāma story as an episode, Rāma-upākhyāṇa, has four direct references to the Rāmāyaṇa (apart from an allusion to Great Itihāsas). The first is the citation of a verse actually found, as Professor Jacobi has shown, in the extant poem of Vālmīki, api cā 'yam purā gītāḥ čloko Vālmīkinā bhuvi, vii, 143, 67 (R. vi, 81, 28). The second is the citation of a verse from Bhārgava's Rāmacarita (Bhārgava being, as Professor Weber has shown, a title of Vālmīki), which agrees in sense and words closely enough with R. ii, 67, 11, to indicate that the Mahābhārata poet of this passage, xii, 57, 40, had in mind this or the original form (for it is to be noticed that the name is not fixed) of this verse in the Rāmāyaṇa, and to make improbable the synchronous collection of the former epic at xii, 67, and 68 (cf. ql. 15):

M. člokaça cā 'yam purāgito Bhārgavena mahātmanā ākhyaṭe Rāmacarite nṛpatim prati, Bhārata, rājānaṁ prathamam vindet tato bhāryam tato dhanam
rājany asati lokasya kuto bhārya kuto dhanam

1 na hantavyāḥ striya iti, "Women may not be slain." The general rule is found also in R. ii, 78, 21, avadhyaḥ sarvabhūtāṇām pramāḍāḥ kṣamya-tām iti.
2 Rather than a common source, as I thought previously, AJP. xx, p. 34.
R. arājake dhanaṁ nā 'sti nā 'sti bhāryā 'py arājake
idad atyāhitaṁ cā 'nyat kuto satyam arājake

The third and fourth cases refer to the Rāmāyaṇa without mention of the poet: iii, 147, 11, “Hanumat is very renowned in the Rāmāyaṇa;” xviii, 6, 93 (repeated in the Harivaṇca): “In the Veda (which is) the beginning (of literature), in the holy Rāmāyaṇa (which is) the end, and in the Bhārata (which is) the middle, in all (literatures), Vishnu is besung.”

The Harivaṇca adds three more references, two to Vālmiki, and one to a dramatic representation of the Rāmāyaṇa. Vālmiki in these passages and perhaps in i, 55, 14, as Professor Holtzmann surmises, is credited with being a poet. This is also implied in xiii, 18, 8–10. Everywhere else, and he is mentioned several times, ii, 7, 16; iii, 85, 119; v, 83, 27; xii, 207, 4, he is recognized only as a saint.

In this material, which I recapitulate here only for a view of the chief data, the most striking fact is the antithesis between the notices of the Rāmāyaṇa as found in the early and later Mahābhārata. The Rāma story is referred to over and over, and the whole tale is told independently at iii, 273, ff., but until we come to the much expanded Droṇa and the didactic epic, references to the poem are merely to the Rāma tale, references to the reputed author are merely to a saint recognized as an ascetic but not as a poet. Even as a saint the evidence is conflicting; for, though usually a Vishnu adherent, in the passage cited above from the Anuçāsana, Vālmiki is a Čivaite. The individual allusions prove, therefore, nothing in regard to the general priority of Vālmiki as the first epic poet. They prove only that the Mahābhārata was not completed before Vālmiki wrote, just as the mention of the

1 vede Rāmāyaṇe puṇye (may go with the next word) Bhārate, Bharate-rsabh, ādāu cā 'nte ca madhye ca, Haribh sarvatra giyate. The last clause may be taken more indefinitely, “in V., R., and M.; in the beginning, end, and middle, everywhere.” But such correlation is common (e.g., vede loke grutah smṛtaḥ, R. ii, 24, 28) and seems to me to be implied here.

2 Weber, Ueber das Rāmāyaṇa, first collected it; Jacob, Das Rāmāyaṇa, added to it; Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata, iv, p. 60 ff., has briefly summed it, with other references (omitted here) and independent additions.
Vāyu Purāṇa in the Mahābhārata shows only that there was a Purāṇa of that name not before the Bhārata's beginning but before its end. They show also that no antipathy or wish to suppress Vālmīki's name influenced the Bhārata poets, who, therefore, had they simply retold or epitomized a poem recognized as Vālmīki's would probably (as it seems to me) have mentioned his name in connection with the Rāma-upākhyāna.

Professor Jacobi is of the opinion that a verse of inferior form in the episode points to borrowing because it is inferior. But a great poet is more apt to take a weak verse and make it strong than is a copyist to ruin a verse already excellent. Further, the subject-matter of the Kāvya and episode is treated differently in several particulars (details, loc. cit.), which points to different workings-over of older matter rather than to copying or condensing. Professor Jacobi also emphasizes the fact that the great epic cites Vālmīki but Vālmīki does not cite or refer to the Bhārata. This holds good for the great epic only from a "synthetic" point of view, which Professor Jacobi of course rejects. The normal attitude of a Hindu toward his sources is silence. He is rather careful not to state than to proclaim that he is treating old material, so that there is nothing surprising in Vālmīki's not speaking of a predecessor. Moreover, in the later Rāmāyaṇa, which unquestionably betrays acquaintance with the Mahābhārata, there is no more recognition of the latter than there is in the earlier part of the poem; a fact which weakens considerably the argument of silence as applied to that earlier part.

Apart from vii, 143, 67, the Mahābhārata knows the poet Vālmīki only in the twelfth and thirteenth books; whereas it knows everywhere the Rāma tale, a poem called the Rāmāyaṇa, and a saint known not as a poet but as an ascetic called Vālmīki. It gives the Rāma-episode as it gives other ancient tales handed down from antiquity without having been assigned to a specific author. The Rāma-upākhyāna stands to the Rāmāyaṇa somewhat¹ as the Nala-upākhyāna stands to

¹ Emphatic, of course, as the example is a great exaggeration in difference of age and style.
the Nāiṣadha, in that it is an early tale of unknown authorship which a poet made his own. Long before there is any allusion to Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa, the base of the great epic, the substance of the Bhāratī Kathā, is recognized in Hindu literature; while the latest addition to the great epic refers to Vālmīki himself as a man who is to be, that is, who is already, famous, yaça te 'gryam bhavisyati, xiii, 18, 8–10. Between these extremes lies the Rāmāyaṇa.

The Rāmāyaṇa recognizes Janamejaya as an ancient hero, and knows Kurus and Pāṇcālas and the town of Hāṣṭinapur (ii, 68, 13). The story of the Pandus, the gist of the present epic, is presumably later than the story of Rāma; the former everywhere recognizing the latter as an ancient tale.¹ We must therefore on these data make the following distinctions:

(1) The story of Rāma is older than the story of the Pandus.
(2) The Pandu story has absorbed the Bhāratī Kathā.
(3) The Bhāratī Kathā is older than Vālmīki's poem.

Although we have but two ancient Sanskrit epics, there is no reason to suppose that epic poetry began with the extant poems in our possession. As was remarked above, the Mahābhārata alludes to the "Great Itihāsas," which may perhaps imply other poems of epic character and considerable extent.² Nor can it be supposed that epic poetry was suddenly

¹ ii, 76, 5, asambhaye hemamayasya jantos tathā 'pi Rāmo lulubhe mṛgāya; iii, 11, 48, Vālī-Sugrivayor bhrātror yathā strikāṅkṣiṇoḥ purā; ix, 31, 11, Rāvaṇo nāma rākṣasaḥ, Rāmeṇa nihato rājan sānubandhaḥ sahānu-gaḥ; so ix, 55, 31; sometimes interpolated, as when Rāvaṇa and Indrajit are mentioned in i, 155, 44, but not in C, which omits all 41–44 (after 6081). Other references will be found in iii, 25, 8; 85, 65, etc. Compare Holtzmann, loc. cit., p. 62 ff. According to xii, 340, 85 ff., Rāma comes at the beginning of the last era; Krishna, at the beginning of the present era (Rāma's two adjutant monkeys are here Ekata and Dvīta). Rāma is recognized here as an incarnation of Vishnu, and also in iii, 99, 40.

² I say perhaps only, for "great" is a word often used without reference to extent. Thus the mahād ēkhyāṇam of xiii, 2, 1, is only a philosophical fable (about a snake and Karma), 83 člokas long.
invented by one poet. The numerous "ancient tales" of epic character must have furnished a large body of epic phrase as well as fable, out of which and on the basis of which arose our present epics. This is rendered probable also by the fact that such brief epic verses as are preserved in other works, although not always from the extant epics, yet have the same character as the verses of the Bhārata and Rāmāyaṇa. Furthermore, as said above, the epic itself admits that the present text is not an original work.¹

We cannot suppose then, even if one epic could be shown to be prior to the other, that this prior epic was the first work in epic versification. We must let pass the statement of the Rāmāyaṇa itself that Vālmiki invented the ṣloka verse, for, though Vālmīki may have been the first to set out to write an epic in ṣlokas, it is scarcely worth while to discuss such a palpable bit of self-glorification as that in which the later Rāmāyaṇa here indulges.² As the two Greek epics were both based to a certain extent on the general rhapsodic phraseology of the day, so the two Hindu epics, though there was without doubt borrowing in special instances, were yet in this regard independent of each other, being both dependent on previous rhapsodic and narrative phraseology.

I cannot, in short, think that such a very large number of identical phrases as I shall enlist below can owe their identity simply to one poet's copying of another. For the similarity goes too deep, into the very grain of the verse. The exposition, I fear, will be tiresome in its study of minute detail, but it is necessary to a full understanding of the conditions of the problem.

¹ i, 1, 26: ācakhyuḥ kavayāḥ kecit sampratyācakṣate pare ākhyāsayanti tathāḥ 'vā 'nye itihāsam imam bhuvi (cited by Holtzmann).
² So with the tale of the two rhapsodes who "sang" the poem with musical accompaniment, after it had been composed and taught to them (so that in the first instance it was recited as a narrative). But all this is the product of a later age making up its own fictions and myths, such as the singing sons Kuća and Lava made out of kućalava, an ordinary word for rhapsode. That Vālmiki could not have "invented the ṣloka" is shown by the presence of an earlier form of ṣlokas in the Brahmanic literature retained in Mbh.
A characteristic of the common basis of epic verse may be traced back to the Rig Veda. This consists in a rhetorical duplication of a dissyllabic iambic noun, which favors the diiambic close of the octosyllabic pāda or verse, as in these first three examples, or of the twelve-syllable pāda, as in the last example:

ṛtāvānā jane-jane, RV. v, 65, 2
yac cid dhi tvāṁ grhe-grhe, ib. i, 28, 5
haskartārāma dame-dame, ib. iv, 7, 3; vii, 15, 2
sa daṛcataçrīr atithir grhe-grhe
vane-vane çičriye takvavrīr iva
janaṁ janaṁ janio nā 'ti manyate
viça a kṣetī viçio viçam-viçam, ib. x, 91, 2

With the last, compare also RV. i, 123, 4, where grham-grham, dive-dive, agram-agram stand at the start, not at the end. Sometimes a whole pāda consists of only such composita, as in x, 97, 12, aṅgam-aṅgam parus-parus (cf. v, 58, 11; x, 163, 6). In the Rig Veda, again, pure adverbs thus duplicated are never found at the end of the pāda; only such nominal adverbs as those above, the nearest approach to pure adverbs so used being idam-idam, a pronominal adverb closing a pāda at vii, 59, 1.¹ In the epic, however, the forms are usually adverbs, usually at the end,² usually in çlokas; in the Rig Veda, never pure adverbs, usually at the beginning or in the middle, seldom at the end of the pāda, and usually not in çlokas, but in gāyatrī and especially in jagati or triṣṭubh verses. The first examples given above are, therefore, rather the exception than the rule as far as their position goes. But I think we may see in them the precursors of the epic formula used in closing the hemistich. The Veda puts the form where it best shows the iterative intensity; the epic puts it where it best helps the metre. Thūs:

¹ Compare the list of such composita in Professor Collitz's paper, Abhandl. d. V. Orient. Congress, 1881, p. 287.
² Exceptions of course occur, as in M. vii, 7, 53, punaḥ punar abhajyanta sīuhene 've 'tare mrgāḥ; R. iv, 43, 53, ahany ahani vardhante. So upary upari sarvesām and sānūnām, Nala 1, 2; and R. v, 13, 10, respectively.
The epic uses this metrical convenience constantly, sometimes too often, as in ix, 32, 6, 8, 9, where punah punah is repeated three times. Other adverbs of the same sort in both epics are prthak prthak, muhur muhur, canaih canaih. In a word, both epics close the hemistic in this antique Vedic manner, though the epic style has somewhat changed the relation of the phrase to the pada.¹

Like these stereotyped terminals in their epic application is the countless number of verses ending with the same diiambic form, vocative, nominative, or oblique case, of one compound, and the less frequent (because less needed) common form of the prior pada's pathya ending, such as mahabala, paramatapa, ariindama (prior, mahabaho, prajna, virya, maharaja, rajendra); pratapavan, paraviraha, mahamrdhe, ranajire, ranamurdhani, ranakarkaçaḥ, the oblique cases of mahuṭman (constantly used), and such diiambic phrases as balad bali, suto bali. All of these are used in the same way in both epics, most of them repeatedly. In some, the word passes back of the diiambus and leads us toward the whole pada-phrase though not quite reaching it. Of such sort are ranakarkaçaḥ (above), yuddhadurmada, saŋgrammurdhani, (Varuṇah) satvasaṅgarah, nāma nāmataḥ, catruniśidana, akutobhayāḥ, krodhamūrcchitaḥ. In others, the word falls short, but the position of the adjective is fixed and it is generally preceded by the same combination as in (cāpam, gadām, or dhanur) udyamya vīryavān, and the common final mānada.²

¹ And also extended it in the form gate gate (instead of the noun) in daçāhe vāi gate gate, xiii, 107, 43. Of epic phrases, I have noted also grhe grhe, M. ii, 15, 2; R. v. 26, 20; and (passim) pade pade, yoge yoge, rāne rāne, and in M., jane jane and, in the more unusual initial position, māsi māsi (Vedic and M. ix, 37, 4), kāle kāle, ix, 37, 23. Of the phrases quoted above, muhur muhur occurs often; canaih canaih, e. g., M. ix, 29, 104; R. ii, 40, 22 and G. vi, 111, 13; prthak prthak, e. g., M. ix, 37, 23; G. vi, 54, 59; 77, 1.

² Among those mentioned, paravirahā is converted into hantā in triṣṭubh,
From these compounds, not only in form but in fixed position common to both epics, we may pass to cases like (svatejasā, often) svena tejasā, where the pāda ends with two words which take in more than the diambus, for example, bibhra-tīṁ svena tejasā, jvalantīṁ svena tejasā, the former in M. xii, 325, 2; the latter in R. vi, 107, 11 and G. 80, 33.

The fixed form is shown most conspicuously in similes that are common to both epics, and are of the mechanical form instanced in the last two sorts of examples, namely in dactylic or more than diambic terminals. Thus there are fixed phrases which are different except for the terminal, which again is common (as a fixed terminal) to both epics, for example:

\[
\begin{align*}
dāndāhata ivo 'rāghaḥ, & \quad \text{in M. and in R.} \\
pāncācīrśa ivo 'rāghaḥ, & \quad " \\
dāndahasta ivā 'ntakaḥ, & \quad " \\
pācahasta ivā 'ntakaḥ, & \quad " \\
vyaṭṭānamam ivā 'ntakam, & \quad " \\
jvalantam iva pāvakam, & \quad " \\
didhakṣur iva pāvakah, & \quad " \\
vidhūma iva pāvakah, & \quad " \\
pataṅgā iva pāvakam, & \quad " \\
calabhā iva pāvakam, & \quad "
\end{align*}
\]

Such phrases are common not only to the two epics but to outside literature. Thus the iva pāvakaḥ formula appears in the Dhammapada, 71, as bhasmācchanno va pāvako (epic, bhasmapanno ivā 'nalaḥ), and the same is true of a limited number of whole pāda-phrases, not only in pure proverbs, but

R. iv, 31, 5 (aghaṇa is a common side-form); pratāpavān is perhaps least common in R., but it serves with viryavān; for example, in R. vi, 60, 109; 76, 21, 27, ff., where follow a quantity of mahābalas. Like viryavān is vegavān with vegitaḥ (vegena in the prior pāda). M. has ativiryaṇā, as in iii, 283, 7. The simple form is rare in any other position, e.g., G. v, 2, 23; 3, 71. As a terminal it occurs in R. about forty times in the sixth book, uncounted often in M. The common Mahābhārata terminal mārīṇa, I have not noticed in the Rāmāyaṇa. It appears to belong to later diction and indicates an epic recasting, as does, e.g., the late tatrābhavant of R. ii, 100, 30.
in current similes and metaphors, like kalām nā 'rhanti sōdačīm, xii, 277, 6; Manu, ii, 86; and Buddhistic, Dh. P., 70, kalām nā 'gghati sosāsāsā; or māṁsāçonitalepanam, Dh. P., 150; Manu, vi, 76; Mbh. xii, 330, 42 (Mait. Up. iii, 4).  

In some cases the variety of pādas constructed on a common terminal is very large, such as the various forms of what appears most simply as gantā 'si Yamasādanam, yāto 'si Yama-sādanam. Thus both epics have yiyaṣu Yamasādanam and anayat Yamasādanam, along with other forms more peculiar, Yamasya sādanam prati, R. vii, 21, 1; prāhīnod Yamasādanam, prāhīnop mṛtyulokāya,2 pāraīr ninye Yamakṣayam, M. ix, 26, 29, ninye vāivasvatkṣayam, M. vii, 26, 53, gato vāivasvat-kṣayam, G. vi, 82, 183, yāmi vāicravanālayam, G. vi, 82, 167; nayāmi lokam (with Yamasya omitted, triṣṭubh), M. viii, 85, 31; nayāmi Yamasya gehābhimukham, R. vii, 68, 20; gamiṣyāmi Yamasya mūlam, R. v, 28, 17; mṛtyupathaṁ nayāmi, G. vi, 36, 118; mṛtyumukham nayiṣye, M. viii, 42, 11; mṛtyumukhāgatām (āneyāmaḥ), G. iv, 45, 9. Evidently in these cases the ancient phrases Yamasādanam, Yamakṣayam, are built upon in several ways, and then the desire for variety leads to the pulling away of the base of the old-fashioned phrase, and the superstructure is shifted to a new base, generally in the later epic, the double meaning of kṣaya helping in anayat kṣayam, ix, 27, 48. Like changes occur in the

1 There are also clear traces of dialectic influence in the adaptation of some of these standing phrases. On this subject I shall speak more fully below. Here I will illustrate what I mean by one example from the Rāmāyaṇa. There is a common phrase which begins tam āpatantam sahasā, or some similar final word, the first two referring to a masculine noun (weapon). When we find, in R. vi, 67, 47, this same phrase used of a neuter noun, tad āpatantam, we are justified neither in assuming that the poet was wholly indifferent to grammar nor in agreeing with the commentator that the masculine form is an archaism countenanced by Vedic usage, puñāstam ārṣam. It is simply a case of borrowing a convenient grammatical form (not Sanskrit, but Prākrit), for āpatantam is a regular patois neuter participle. Forms of this sort are adopted into the epic merely for metrical reasons, showing that they were borrowed from the common speech of the day when convenient; which shows again that the epics (both are alike in this particular) were written in Sanskrit and not made over from Prākrit originals.

2 See for references, Appendix A, s. v.
sutumulaṁ yuddham phrases, generally ending with lomaharśaṇam, but occasionally in a new setting, Yamarūstravivardhanam, as in M. vi, 79, 60; ix, 10, 61; 11, 5, etc.; in triśūbh, ṛvardhanāḥ, vii, 145, 97.

Especially is the monotony varied in the conventional phrases of conversation. Both epics have etac chrutvā tu vacanam, tasyāi 'tad vacanaṁ çrutvā, idaṁ vacanam abravīt, çrutvā tu vacanaṁ tasya; and again the phrases are shifted, tatas tad vacanaṁ çrutvā, tad etad vacanaṁ çrutvā (old and rare), G. iv, 38, 46; çrutvā āsāṁ tu vacanam, M. ix, 35, 52; idaṁ vacanam uktavān, G. v, 68, 24; and in many other ways, too tedious to recount.

Herewith we come to the pāda phrase, which fills the whole half-verse with the same locution, as in palāyanaparāyaṇaḥ, parasparajīghiṇasavaḥ. In the Am. Journal of Philology, xix, p. 138 ff., I cited verses of the Mahābhārata which are full of such phrases. Such passages are also easily found in the Rāmāyaṇa, of which I will give but one instance, vi, 71, where cl. 67 alone contains four such phrases: tam āpataṁ niṣitaṁ çaram ācīvisopamam, ardha candreṇa ciccheda Lakṣmanañī paradvirahā (with others following). Here the whole çloka with the exception of the proper name consists of iterata. In the Rāmāyaṇa, too, we find, as often in the Mahābhārata, two iterata enclosing a verse that is new, as in iv, 11, 18, where the independent verse is sandwiched between the iterata tasya tad vacanam çrutvā and krodhāt samāraktalocanaḥ, which arrangement is found again, ib. 73. In G. iii, 57, 15, the hemistich consists of two whole phrases, roṣasaṁraktana-yana idaṁ vacanam abravīt. In G. vi, 27, there are nine iterata in the first eighteen çlokas. I mention this that there may not seem to be any distinction in this regard in the two epics. Both have many chapters which teem with verbal or whole pāda-iterata, the later the more.¹ Noticeable are their

¹ The cumulative style is characteristic, naturally, of later sections. So, for instance, in the late fourteenth chapter of the thirteenth book, within the compass of about thirty çlokas, 240 ff., we find sarvāḥhrāṇaḥbhūṣītam, sarvabhūtahayāvaham, çakratulyaparākramaḥ, triçikhaṁ bhrūkuṣṭiṁ kṛtvā,
extent and variety. There is hardly a field in which Vyāsa and Vālmikī do not echo the same words. General descriptive epithets and phrases that paint the effect of grief and anger, or the appearance of city and forest; the aspect of battle and attitude of warriors, with short characterization of weapons and steeds, are all as frequent as the mass of similes found in both epics in the same words. In the last category, identical similes are drawn from gods, men, animals, and physical phenomena. Again, both poets, as shown above, use the same phrases of speech, as they do also of noises, and of the course of time; and finally there are many didactic verses, almost or quite the same in both epics.

In the list of parallels given elsewhere I have incorporated such examples as I have noticed of identical or nearly identical phrases and verses. Illustrative additions are occasionally added, not to add weight to the general effect, for the number of cases of actual identity is sufficiently large, but to supply material for fuller treatment of this whole subject eventually. The three hundred examples here registered include also some cases where verbal identity is not quite complete, such as

M. iv, 19, 29,
prabhinnam iva mātaṅgam parikīrṇam kareṇubhiḥ

G. v, 14, 28,
kareṇubhīr mahāranye parikīrṇo yathā dvipaḥ

and I have not perhaps been thoroughly logical in the admission or exclusion of such cases; but in general I have sought to establish an equation not only in the thought but in the expression of the thought, and for the most part have omitted such parallels as did not tend to bring out the verbal identity.¹

pācāhastam ivā 'ntakam, dvaviya iva pāvakāḥ (to which one text adds vidhūmam iva pāvakam) all common iterata of both epics, but far in excess of the usual number; as in G. vi, 27 (above).

¹ Appendix A.

² I have omitted, for example, such cases as iii, 30, 42, karmāṇī tena pāpena līpyate nūnam īṭvaraḥ; G. vi, 62, 22, vidhūṭā līpyate tena yathā pāpena karmāṇī (R. vi, 83, 25 quite otherwise), though I have no doubt that the tirades against God and duty (G. 15 ff.) in each epic (as in this case) belong together. Some few proverbs are also entered.
Those I have collected were gleaned incidentally from a field which I traversed with other objects in view, and I have no doubt that these parallels could be largely increased by a close and systematic comparison of the two epics throughout. The alphabetical arrangement followed is merely for convenience of reference. I should have been glad to group the examples according to their content also, that I might have shown more fully the varied fields they occupy, but, as this would have taken too much space, the remarks made above on this subject and the former grouping made in a preliminary study of the question two years ago must suffice.

I will suppose that the reader has now read Appendix A. He will have noticed in so doing that, just as the Uttara Rāmāyaṇa, as well as the real poem of Vālmīki, is recognized in the pseudo-Bhārata, so in the expressions āśid rājā Nimir nāma, ekāntabhāvānugatāḥ, and yasya prasādaṁ kurute sa vāi taṁ draśṭum arhati, we have a direct copy on the part of the Uttara Rāmāyaṇa not only of the early epic but of the pseudo-epic’s episode of the White Country and even of the very words employed in the description of the Whites (Islanders, to retain the usual name, though only country is really meant; Kashmere, I think). There are several such passages in the Uttara reflecting the great epic in its earlier

1 AJP. xix, p. 138 ff., 1898.
2 Thus the story of Rāma āśīraṁghātin, as told in R. vii, 75-76 (G. 82-83), killing Cambaka or Čambūka is recognized with an “I have heard,” grēyatē, xii, 153, 67 (where Jambūka takes the place of Čambūka).
3 So in the prakṝptā pāṣṭha after R. iii, 60, where Śīta demands signs of the god Indra, and he appears with the devāṅgāni: “He touched not earth with his feet, winked not, had dustless garments and unfaded garlands,” as in Nala s, 12-24, which the prakṝpta clearly copies. So, too, in the same book, iii, 60, not in G., evidently an artistic improvement on the preceding sarga, in cl. 26, Rāma says: (drṇaṭa 'si) vṛkṣāṁ śīrāṁ caśmānaṁ kim māṁ na pratibhaftaṁ, as Damayanti says (Nala 11, 9: drṇo 'si) āvāya gūlmāṁ āśīrnaṁ kim māṁ na pratibhaftaṁ; and in cl. 17, Rāma cries out: aśoka ācokāpanudā . . . tvamamānaṁ kurum kṣipram priyāṣadārcanema māṁ, as Damayanti, 12, 104, and 107: viśokāṁ kuru māṁ kṣipram ācokā priyādarčana satyanāma bhavā 'coka aśokāḥ.
parts as well. Compare for instance the division of Indra's sin as related in M. v, 18 with R. vii, 85 and 86. It will be necessary only to cite M. v, 18, 12,

rakṣārthaṁ sarvabhūtānāṁ viṣṇutvam upajagmivān

and from ib. 13–15,
teṣāṁ tad vacanam āryāṁ devānāṁ Viṣṇur abravīt māṁ eva yajataṁ Čakraḥ pāvayiṣyāmi vajrinam punyena hayamedhena mām īṣṭvā pākaçāsanah

punar ēṣyatī devānāṁ indratvam akutobhayaḥ

as compared with R. vii, 85, 18, 20–21, which give exactly the same words.

But this correlation exists not only in the later parts of both epics and in the later part of the Rāmāyaṇa and an earlier part of the Bhārata. It is just as easy to reverse the positions, as for instance in the account of creation at R. iii, 14 (G. 20) and M. i, 66. This passage is instructive as an example of the way complete passages were roughly remembered and handed down with shifting phrases, omissions, and insertions:

M. 66, 58,

dhṛtarāṣṭrī tu haṁśaṁ ca kalahaṁśaṁ ca sarvaçāḥ

R. 14, 19,

dhṛtarāṣṭrī tu haṁśaṁ ca kalahaṁśaṁ ca sarvaçāḥ

M. ib.

cakravākāṇaṁ ca bhadrā tu janayāmāsa sā 'va tu

R. ib.

cakravākāṇaṁ ca bhadram te vijajñe sā 'pi bhāminī

G. 20, 20,

dhṛtarāṣṭrī tv ajanayad haṁśan jalaṁhāriṇaṁ
cakravākāṇaṁ ca bhadram te sārasaṁ caī 'va sarvaçāḥ

M. 59,

çuki ca janayāmāsa çukān eva yaçaṁvinī
kalyāṇaṁgaṇaṁsampannaṁ sarvalakṣaṇapūjitā

G. 21,

çuki çukān ajanayat tanayān vinayānvitān
kalyāṇaṁgaṇaṁsampannaṁ sarvalakṣaṇapūjitān
[R. 20, 
çukī natām vijajñe tu natāyāṁ vinatā sutā]

M. 60, 
navakrodhavaça nāṝḥ praṇajñe krodhasambhavāḥ 
mṛgī ca mṛgamandā ca harī bhadranaṁ api

R. 21, 
daçaṅkrodhavaça, Rāma, vijajñe 'py atmaśambhavāḥ 
mṛgūn ca mṛgamandāṁ ca harim bhadranaṁ api

G. 22, 
tathā krodhavaça nāma jajñe sā ca 'tmasambhavan 
mṛgūm mṛgavatīṁ cāi 'va çārdulīṁ kroṣṭukīṁ tathā

M. 61, 
mātāṅgī tv atha çārdulī çvetā surabhīr eva ca 
sarvalaksanāsasampannā surasā cāi 'va bhāminī
dhātā, surabhīr eva ca sarvalaksanāsasampannā surasā cāi 'va bhāminī

R. 22 (and G.) a, do., but acc.; b, 
sarvalaksanāsasampannā surasām kadrūkām api

M. 62 = R. 23 almost exactly, and the following verses agree 
much in the same way, until one passage which I will cite 
etire, as follows:

**Mahābhārata (i, 66, 67–68):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Rāmāyaṇa (iii, 14, 27–28):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tathā duhitaraṅga rājan</td>
<td>tato duhitaraṅga, Rāma,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surabhīr vāi vyayāyata</td>
<td>surabhīr devy ajāyata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rohiṇi cāi 'va bhadrāṁ te</td>
<td>rohiṇīm nāma bhadrāṁ te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gandharvī tu yaçaśvinī</td>
<td>gandharvīm ca yaçaśvinīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vimalāṁ api bhadrāṁ te</td>
<td>rohiṇy ajanayad gāvo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analām api, Bhārata,</td>
<td>gandharvī vājīnaṁ sutāṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rohiṇyāṁ jajāre gāvo</td>
<td>(see 31, below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gandharvyāṁ vājīnaṁ sutāḥ</td>
<td>surasā 'janayan nāgān,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saptā piṇḍaphalāṁ vṛksān</td>
<td>Rāma, kadruc ca pannagān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analā 'pi vyayāyata</td>
<td>(29) manur manusyān janayat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70, b) surasā 'janayan nāgān</td>
<td>(31) sarvān punyaphalāṁ vṛksān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kadrūkāḥ putrāḥ tu pannagān</td>
<td>analā 'pi vyayāyata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last verse in R. gives the origin of the four castes 
(Ruling Caste, p. 74, note), where G. has manur manusyān . . .
INTERRELATION OF THE TWO EPICS.

janayāmāsa, Rāghava. G. has virtually the same text, inserting Rāma and omitting the mention of Anāla's birth, giving only her progeny. In the last verse G., like M., has sapta piṇḍaphalān vrksān (but) lalanā (sic) 'pi vyajāyata. There is here the same substitution of Rāma and Bhārata observable in the late Kaccit chapter.¹

In my Proverbs and Tales² I have shown that a scene of the Rāmāyaṇa is exactly duplicated in the Harivāṇa. Another similar case is found in H. 18,666 ff.; G. vi, 19, 12 ff. (both full of iterata):

**Harivāṇa:**

(see verses below)

vartamāne mahāghore sanigrāme lohaḥarṣe
mahāberimṛdaṅgānāṁ
papavānāṁ tathā 'va ca
cāṇkhaṁ paṭahānānāṁ ca
sambabhūva mahāsvanāḥ
hatānāṁ svanatāṁ tatra
dāityānāṁ cā 'pi nisvānāḥ
also,
turaṁgakhuḥrotkṛṣṇaṁ
rathanemisamuddhatam

and further,
castrapuṣpopahārā sā
tatrā 'sid yuddhamedinī
durdarśa durvīgāhyā ca
māṁsaçopitakardamā

**RG.**

turaṁgakhuḥridhvastāṁ
rathanemisamuddhatam
vartamāne, etc. (= M.).
tato bherimṛdaṅgānāṁ
paṭahānāṁ ca nisvānāḥ
also,
hatānāṁ stanaṁmānānāṁ
rākṣasānāṁ ca nisvānāḥ

(see the first verse, above)

and further,
castrapuṣpopahārā sā (v.l. ca)
tatrā 'sid yuddhamedinī
duṣprekṣyā durvīcā cā 'va
māṁsaçopitakardamā

R. here (sarga 44) has samutthitam in cl. 10, but in the following, paṇavānāṁ ca niḥśvānāḥ, as in H., and hayānāṁ stanamānānāṁ (with ca for sā in the first pāda of the last stanza). The only important variant is in the last verse, 15, where, instead of the stereotyped pāda of G. and H., stands:

durjñeyā durniveçā ca çoitāsravakardamā

¹ AJP. vol. xix, p. 149.
² ib., vol. xx, p. 35. I showed here a score of proverbs common to both epics, most of which had been previously noticed. Another, not noticed, is ahir eva aheḥ pādañ vijanāti na saṁcayāḥ, R. v, 42, 9; ahir eva hy aheḥ pādañ pāyatī 'ti hi naḥ śrutam, M. xii, 203, 13. See also the note below, p. 83, note 2.
HB. has a few slight changes, 3, 58, 66 ff., with samutthitam like R. (R. indicates the Bombay text only.)

The identity of R. iv, 40, 20 ff., with the geographical passage H. 3, 46, 42 ff. = 12,825 ff., can be established on sight: G. 19, nadīm bhāgarathīṁ cāi 'va sarayūṁ kāučikīṁ api = H., where R. 20, has ramyāṁ for cāi 'va in G. and H.; but for api, R. and H. have tathā. The next stanza, G. 20, mekalaprabhavaṁ çoñām, agrees only in this text with H. 44. The next verse in H., gomati gokulākīṁna tathā pūrva sarasvatī is in G. 24 (in acc.); ib. b in G. reads: nadīm kālamāśīṁ cāi 'va tamasāṁ ca mahānadīm, where HC. and R. both have māhī(m) kālamahī(m) cā 'pi (cāi 'va, HB. kālanadī). So R. and HC. give the Māgadhās the epithet mahāgrāmā ṣah and add pāunḍrá vaṅgās tathāi 'va ca, where G. has māgadhān daṇḍakulaṇc ca vaṅgān aṅgāns tathāi 'va ca (12,831, G. 25), and HB., cl. 49, Māgadhānīc mahāgrāmān aṅgān vaṅgāns tathāi 'va ca. G. 26, a, b, c are identical with H. 12,830, c, d, and 12,831, a; with a slight v. l. in HB. 48. There are here the usual aberrations from any fixed text, but on the whole the two passages are identical.

Another passage, G. 1, 24, 9, 11–12, appears to be one with (M. iii, 52, 15 and) M. iv, 70, 10–12 (after the first verse, it agrees with R. 21, 10–12):

**MAHĀBHĀRATA:**

mā dharmyaṁ nīnaĉaḥ pathaḥ
eṣa vigrāhavāṁ dharma
eṣa viryavatāṁ varaḥ
eṣa buddhyā 'dhiko loke
tapasāṁ ca parāyaṇaṁ (v. l. 8aḥ)
eṣo 'straiṁ vividhaṁ vetti
trāllokye sacarācare
na caiva 'nyaḥ pumān vetti
na vetsyati kadācana
na deva nā 'surāḥ kecin
na manuṣya na rākṣaṁa

gandharvavakṣaparvarāḥ
sakīnaramahorāgāḥ

---

**RĀMĀYANA (G.):**

anṛtam mā vacaḥ kārsir
mā dharmyaṁ nīnaĉaḥ pathaḥ
eṣa vigrāhavāṁ dharma
eṣa vedavidāṁ varaḥ
eṣa viryavatāṁ ċeṛ̃tho
vidyājñanataponidhiḥ
divyāṅya astraṇy aćeṣeṇa
vedā 'ṣa Kuśikātmajāḥ
devaṁ ca na vidur yāni
kuto 'nye bhuvī mānāvāḥ

---

1 This paśa alone appears in iii, 52, 15. iv, 70, 10 has the following verses; G. has both. R. omits G.'s 9 entirely.
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Here R. in the Bombay edition has in general the reading of M., but it omits the first verse and Kućikātmajaḥ, while it has the late astraṇī for astraṇī, with other variations:

\[ \text{eṣa vigrahavān dharmā eṣa vīryavatān varaḥ eṣa vidyā 'dhiko loke tapaśaḥ ca parāyaṇam eṣo 'strāṇi vividhān vetti trādokyā sacarācare nāi 'namā anyaḥ pumān vetti na ca vetsyanti kecana na devā na 'ṛṣayaḥ kecin nā 'marā na ca rākṣasāḥ gandharvayakṣapravarāḥ sākṣināramahorāh} \]

Besides these parallels I have previously\(^2\) compared the extended identity of H. 3, 60, 2 ff., and R. vi, 58, 24 ff.; and three passages already noticed by others, where the great epic seems to have an older form, viz., i, 18, 13 and G. 1, 46, 21; iii, 9, 4 and R. ii, 74 (G. 76); i, 175 and R. i, 54 (compare Holtzmann, loc. cit.) Other parallels noticed by Holtzmann are: the creation, xii, 166 and R. ii, 110; Ganges, iii, 106 and R. i, 39 (later); Ilvala, iii, 96, 4, and R. iii, 11, 55; Rṣyaçṛṣga, iii, 110 and R. i, 19 (see now Lüder’s essay); also a couple of passages in both later epics, origin of poem, i, 1, 57 and R. i, 2, 26; Skanda, xiii, 85 and R. i, 37, which approximate closely with i, 136, 1 and R. vii, 65, 10, and a few more less striking cases in both later epics.\(^3\)

A review of these parallels, proverbs and tales, shows that whereas the former may be said to occur universally, in any part of either epic, of the latter (apart from the Rāma tale itself), as far as formal identity goes, by far the greater part is found where either one or both versions occur in later additions to the poem (R. i and vii, M. i and xii ff.), thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.</th>
<th>R.</th>
<th>M.</th>
<th>R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i, 1, 57, and i, 2, 23</td>
<td>v, 13 and vii, 85</td>
<td>i, 18 and i, 46 (G.)</td>
<td>v, 141 and i, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Here enam is astra(gaṇam) understood (?).  
2 AJP. xx, p. 34 ff. Holtzmann’s Das Mahābhārata, already cited, both adds to and is complemented by the matter given there and here.  
3 I do not include parallel tales without parallel phraseology, as, for example, the allusion in xii, 57, 9, to the tale of Asamañjas told in iii, 107, 39 ff. and in R. ii. 36, 19 ff.
That is, parallel tales are rare in the older, three times as frequent in the later books of each. The additions to one epic are thus on a par with the additions to the other in their mutual obligations.\(^1\) This illustrates again the facts previously observed in regard to the two epics by Jacobi and myself respectively, namely that the Uttarakāṇḍa has many tales of the middle district (Jacobi, R. p. 205), and that the early Mahābhārata shows familiarity with the customs of the Puṇḍrā, while the didactic parts show no familiarity with the holy land, but all the numerous tales with scarcely an exception are laid in Kosala and Videha and on the banks of the lower Ganges (AJP., xix, p. 21). In other words, the two epics in their later development belong to the same locality and probably to about the same time. It is in this later development, then, that the two epics copy each other.\(^2\) The common tales that remain, apart from this phase of the poems, are few, and such as may be easily attributed to the general stock of legendary tradition.

\(^1\) It must not be forgotten, however, that the Rāmāyaṇa, apart from the first and last books, refers to episodes known only from the Mahābhārata. For example, when Sītā says she is as devoted to Rāma "as Damayanti Bhānim to Nāśadha," Nāśadhaṁ Damayanti 'va Bhānimī patīṁ anuvratā, R. v., 24, 12. Then when, ib. 34, 28-30, Rāma is described as satyavādi, āditya iva tejasvi, and kandaśa iva mārtimān (all in one description, as in Nala), which is probably the borrower.\(^1\)

\(^2\) So the later G. agrees more closely with M. in many of the cases in Appendix A. But there is no uniformity in this regard, and R. has parallels enough to refute the idea that similarity is due solely to G.'s later copying.
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When we have peeled off the outer layer (and in it are included with one exception, if it be an exception, all the references to Vālmīki in the great epic), we have left two epics, one of which is a complete whole, the other a congeries of incongruous stories grouped about a central tale; both built on the same foundation of phrase and proverb and in part over the same ground of literary allusion; both with heroes of the same type (whose similarity is striking);¹ and both arranged on the same general plan, a court-scene, where the plot is laid, a period of banishment in a forest-scene, followed by a city-scene,² where an ally is gained, and then by battle-scenes. One of these epics claims priority, but the claim after all is not that the great poet invented epic poetry, but that he first wrote an epic in cloka verse in a Kāvya or artistic style. As the Rāmāyaṇa is mainly in clokas of a more refined style than the Mahābhārata and the Kāvya or artistic element is really much more pronounced, and as, further, it is highly probable that epic poetry was first written in the mixture of rougher cloka and triṣṭubh characteristic of the Mahābhārata, this claim, so stated, may in general be allowed, without impugning the relatively greater age of the other epic.

Professor Jacobi admits that the metre of the Rāmāyaṇa is more refined, but the explanation he gives is that it was a product of that East where poetic art was first developed. In a subsequent chapter I shall show that those parts of the great epic which from a metrical point of view agree most closely with the Rāmāyaṇa are the later parts. Here I would merely raise the question whether the dictum that poetic art was refined in the East before the great epic arose, is not based on the style of the Rāmāyaṇa alone? Products of the same part of the country are Buddhistic and Upanishad verses, with which agrees the versification of the Mahābhārata much more closely

¹ Not merely as being central figures. See for details the article by Professor Windisch, cited in Das Mahābhārata iv, p. 68. The similarity of exploits is increased as we take the whole epics, which plainly have influenced each other in their final redaction.
² Owing to Rāma's oath he does not actually enter the city, but he finds his ally there, as do the Pandus at Virāṭa's town.
than does that of the Rāmāyaṇa. The Purāṇas also are eastern and their versification is in general rather that of the great epic. The distinction then is not sufficiently explained by geographical relations. On the other hand the metrical refinement of U. the Upanishads, B. the early Bhārata, B.² the late Bhārata, R. the Rāmāyaṇa, and K. Kālidāsa is in the order U., B., B.² R., K., with B.² = R. in some cases, which looks to a progressive development.¹

Another moot point in connection with this geographical inquiry is whether the Rāmāyaṇa was written by a poet who really knew anything about Ceylon, where Laṅkā, the seat of action in the Rāmāyaṇa war, is usually supposed to be. Professor Jacobi has expressed the opinion that Laṅkā is not Ceylon, and that, further, Vālmīki did not know the littoral at all, but he was a riparian poet. Unless the allusions in the poem are all interpolations, I cannot accept this view. In the first place, the language of both poems on this point is identical, the images are the same, and they are couched in the same words. If, then, they are all later additions to Vālmīki's poem, they must be copied from the Māhābhārata; which opens a vista (of later Rāmāyaṇa imitating an earlier epic) which Professor Jacobi would scarcely accept. But accepting some copying, there still remains enough sea-scape in the Rāmāyaṇa to show that no poet who did not know ocean could write as does Vālmīki. In both texts, for example, occurs this splendid onomatopoetic description of the rising waves of full flood, which, as the poet repeatedly says, accompanies the filling of the moon:

parvasā 'dīrṇavegasya sāgarasye 'va niḥsvanaḥ

where the swell and filling and very hiss of the combing breakers is reproduced with a power that it is hard to ascribe to a riparian poet. But I must refer the reader to a special

¹ Vālmiki's work holds indisputable right to the title ṣāṅkīvya, or "first elegant poem," a title which the great epic imitates in claiming to be a kāvyam paramapūjitam, "highly revered elegant poem," to which claim it won a right after the more refined versification of the pseudo-epic had been added to it.
paper on this subject for further illustration of our Vālmīki’s intimate acquaintance with the sight and sound of ocean\textsuperscript{1}—
or, if not our Vālmīki, to whom shall we assign the double text?

Again, from the first dawn of critique it has been urged that widow-burning is not practised or known (as sometimes stated) in the Rāmāyaṇa, but it is practised in the Mahābhārata. Yes, in the first book and the twelfth and following books, just as conversely, in the Rāmāyaṇa, the queens announce that they are “devoted” and will die on the pyre with their husband in, 66, 12, or lament that being “not sūttee” they “live an evil life” in not thus dying, v, 26, 7. Does this not imply widow-burning? And if it be said (with truth) that these are interpolations—well and good, but so are Ādi and Čānti interpolations. Both epics ignore the custom,\textsuperscript{2} except in their later form.

One more observation is necessary in this summary account of the mutual relations of the two epics. I have instanced the use of the word mārīṣa in the Mahābhārata as typical of influences not so often to be seen in the Rāmāyaṇa. In the former, as a constant term of address, it is a link connecting this epic with the classical period; and yet it will not do to build too much on the fact that this link is wanting in the

\textsuperscript{1} AJP. vol. xxi, p. 378. Among the tributaries of Ayodhya are mentioned the inhabitants of Malabar, and “sea-men,” in R. ii, 82, 8, where the senseless kevalāḥ must be corrected to the reading of G. 88, 7, Keralāḥ. The sea-men, sāmudrāḥ, may be merchants or the name of a people. The Keralas, or Malabar people, are here expressly “Southerners.” They are mentioned also among the lists of people in R. iv, 40 ff., which takes in the whole of India (41, 12, Pūndras, Colas, Pāṇḍyas, Keralas) and mentions the Yavanas and other outer tribes: “Look among the Mlechas, Pulindas, Čūraṇenas, Prasthalaś, Bhārataś, Kuruś with Madrakas, Kāmboja-Yavanas (cmpd.), and the towns, pattaṇāni, of Cākas,” 43, 11–12 (compare M. vi, 87, 10). Also Yavadvipa, R. iv, 40, 31, that is Java, is mentioned. I fail to see that the Rāmāyaṇa, without such a priori excision as may also be applied to the Mahābhārata, shows less geographical knowledge or hearsay than does the latter poem.

\textsuperscript{2} Elsewhere in the epic, the widow is as much recognized as in Manu, who also knows no sūttee. Compare Ruling Caste, pp. 172, 371, and a paper On the Hindu Custom of Dying to redress a Grievance, JAOS. xxi, p. 146 ff.
Rāmāyaṇa. Such an example shows only that the Mahābhārata has been in this instance retouched. Similar cases are found in the Rāmāyaṇa, one of which I have already cited.

For example, later Sanskrit poetry describes women adorned not only with the nūpura or anklet (alluded to in both epics), but also with the kāṅcī or gold girdle set off with bells. Probable as was the adornment in early times, this name for it does not occur in early literature, and so far as I know it does not occur in the great epic (frequently as women’s adornment is described) till the time of the pseudo-epic, where, xiii, 106, 56, and 107, 67 we find kāṅcīnūpuraçabdā, just as we find the same collocation in R., for example, v, 4, 11; 18, 20; G. iii, 58, 26 (çuçubhe kāṅcanī kāṅci); v, 12, 44. The later epics must have suffered this experience in many cases, another being offered just here by the use of the rare vallaki, xiii, 106, 49, and in vii, 6,665, but not here in 154, 25, where jharjharā takes its place. Just so in G. iv, 33, 26 is found this same vallaki (sic), but it is not found in the corresponding verse of R. iv, 33, 21. In sum, chance lateness of this sort is evidence only for the epic as we have it, tampered with by a thousand diadochoi. It can never show that one epic was produced before the other. So niryāṇa for “death,” xv, 37, 40, is indicative of the age or origin of xv, 37, not of the Mahābhārata;¹ of R. v (13, 41), but not of the epic as a whole.

So, while we must admit that Vālmīki’s mention of Kurus, Janamejaya, and Hāstina-pura, as against his non-mention of Pandus and Indraprastha, looks as if he knew not the latter, we must remember at the same time that Vālmīki’s poem in turn has, quite apart from vocabulary, certain indications of an age not recognized by the poets of the latter epic, of which I will mention particularly two.²

¹ Here, xv, 37, 43, tathāgata seems to mean “dead,” but it may be taken in its usual sense of “in such a state,” as in R. ii, 100, 34, oddly near the Buddhist: yathā hi coraḥ sa tathā hi buddhas tathāgataṁ nāstikam atra viddhi.
² Minor points of lateness in either epic are frequently apparent. Those in Mbh. are perhaps more common, but not in proportion to its extent. In R. may be noticed ships holding one hundred men each and palaces having
The date of the Allabâbâd banyan cannot be carried back with any certainty to a very early date, though mentioned by Hwen Thsang. ¹ Now the place where this tree ought to be is most elaborately described and praised in the great epic, iii, 85, 80 ff., but the existence of such a tree is not even mentioned; whereas the other fig-tree at Gayâ is praised as holy beyond words, for, in the epic interpretation of the modern akṣay bai (baç), its fruit is imperishable. ² This is particularly remarkable as in M. iii, 85, 65, Çrîgaverapur is especially famed as the place “where Râma crossed.” But the Râmâyâna knows the Allâbâbâd tree, ii, 55, 6 and 24. The mention of this tree at Prâyâga, as against its non-mention in the Mahâbhârata, and the latter’s mention of Râma point to an earlier date for the Mahâbhârata Tîrtha stories than for R. ii, 55, and perhaps shows that at this time the Râma story was known, but not just as we have it.

The word Sanskrit in its present meaning is found in the Râmâyâna but not in the Mahâbhârata. The bare statement, however, that the word Sanskrit in this sense is not found in an older period but occurs in the Râmâyâna, does not give quite all the facts. The great epic knows the word but only in its earlier meaning, “adorned,” “prepared,” asâmskṛtam abhivyaktam bhâti, iii, 69, 8; saṃskṛta and prâkṛta, ³ “initiated and not initiated,” iii, 200, 88 (with priests who are suvedâh and durvedâh); saṃskṛtâ mantrâh, xiii, 93, 56. This is also the sense in R. ii, 11, 57, where bhrâтарam saṃskṛtam kṛtā itself (in M. iii, 96, 10, châgaṁ kṛtvâ susaṃskṛtām) is joined

(as in the drama) eight courts instead of three (as in the other epic), R. ii, 84, 8; 57, 17 and 24; iv, 33, 19.

¹ Cunningham, Ancient Geography of India, p. 389.
² This, or “makes the giver immortal,” is the epic interpretation, not (as now) that the tree itself is immortal. Compare iii, 84, 83, tatrâ ‘kṣayavaço nàma triṣṣu lokeṣu viçrataḥ, tatra dattam pitṝbhyaḥ tu bhavaṭy aksaram ucycate. So in iii, 87, 11, and 95, 14 (with iii, 87, begins a recapitulation of Tîrthas already mentioned); vii, 66, 20, where it is (vaṭaḥ) aksayakaranaḥ, as also in xii, 88, 14. Here is found the proverb on Gayâ, as in R. ii, 107, 13, with v. 1, and in M. iii, 84, 97, etc., as given in Spruch 1474 ff.
³ As to this word in R., compare strîvâkyam prâkṛtaṁ çrutvâ, iii, 40, 5 (asāram, comm.), with references in PW. s. v.
with the preceding saṃskṛtaṁ vādan, the former in the Mahābhārata version being “cooking” (saṃskṛtya = paktvā) and the latter not used, which looks as if the Rāmāyaṇa version were later. Several cases in the Rāmāyaṇa do indeed show the older sense, but there are others, such as v. 30, 17, cited by Weber, and again by Muir, Original Sanskrit Texts, ii, p. 157, in which saṃskṛtā vāk means Sanskrit, in that it is the “cultivated speech.” ¹ In this case also the Rāmāyaṇa is later than the Mahābhārata, though the latter epic recognizes dialects, deśabhāsās, iv, 10, 1; ix, 45, 103, etc., and seems (in its introduction) to use the expression brāhmaṇī vāk or “holy speech,” exactly in the sense of the Rāmāyaṇa’s saṃskṛtā vāk. For in this instance a woman recognizes a king because his “form and clothes are regal and his speech is the holy speech,” rājavad rūpaveśau te brāhmaṇīṁ vācam bibharṣi ca, i, 81, 13. But these cases show only that when the Īlava tale was rewritten and the much adorned fifth book of the Rāmāyaṇa was composed, saṃskṛtam vād and saṃskṛtā vāk were used nearly in the modern sense; yet in showing this they indicate again that in our estimate as to the relative age of the epics nothing can be absolute or universal, but all must be stated relatively and partially. If it be said that this judgment lacks definitiveness, the reply is that it accords with the facts, which do not admit of sweeping statements. ²

¹ Also Jacobi, Rāmāyaṇa, p. 115 (PW. s. sam-kar). Other cases show regard for grammatical nicety in the use of language (Jacobi, loc. cit.).
² For the metrical position of the two poems, see Chapter Four. I regret that Professor Jacobi’s long-expected book on the epics is not yet out, as it is sure to contain much valuable matter. As it is, I have had to rely, in citing his opinions, on the work cited above, and a review in the GGA., 1899, p. 890 ff.
CHAPTER THREE.

EPIC PHILOSOPHY.

Sukhād bahutaraṁ duḥkhaṁ jivite nā 'tra saṁçayaḥ, xii, 331, 16.
"There is no doubt that there is more sorrow than joy in life."

Epic Systems.

In the preceding chapters I have shown that from a synthetic point of view the epic as we have it, judged solely by the literature it recognizes, must be the product of a comparatively late period. In this chapter it is my purpose to sketch as briefly as possible the salient features of the great systems of philosophy expounded in the later epic. To regard them as identical is impossible. To see in them a philosophic chaos, out of which are to arise future systems, is equally impossible. Some of them belong to the latest epic and they have their unity only in the fact that they are all colored by the dominant deistic view of an age that, having passed from pure idealism into dualism, sought to identify the spirit of man with that of a personal God and equate this god with the two separate factors of dualism; a dualism which was not that of spirit and matter but of conditioned being, conscious intelligence, as opposed to pure being or spirit (soul), conscious intelligence being itself the only origin of matter, which is merely a form of mind.¹

The importance of a review of this sort lies in the historical background it furnishes to the epic, which represents the last of six approved systems traceable in it: (1) Vedism or orthodox Brahmanism; (2) ātmanism or Brahmaism (properly

¹ See on this point some pertinent remarks by Dr. Everett in the twentieth volume of the Journal of the AOS., p. 300. It is a common error to speak of Sāṁkhya dualism as setting spirit and matter in antithesis, whereas, according to the system, matter is only a development of self-consciousness.
Brahmanism, but this term connotes a different idea), that is, an idealistic interpretation of life; (3) Śāṁkhyā, the dualism spoken of above; (4) Yoga, the deistic interpretation of Śāṁkhyā; (5) Bhāgavata or Pāṇḍupata, different but both sectarian interpretations of Yoga; (6) Vedānta or Illusion-idealism. Some of the epic writers support Śāṁkhyā; some, Yoga; some, the sectarian interpretation; some, the Māyā, Illusion-theory. Besides these are approved sporadically Vedism and Brahma-ism, not to speak of a number of theories not approved.

Heretics.

In the Gītā it is said, 4, 40: “The ignorant and unbelieving man who has a soul of doubt is destroyed; neither this world nor the next exists, nor happiness, for him who has a soul of doubt.” The italicized words are those which, at xii, 133, 14, are put into the mouth of the Nāstika, the negator or repudiator of scripture, spirit, or duties. According to epic interpretation, one saying nāsti, in refusing a gift to a priest, is a “negator” no less than he who refuses assent to the orthodox belief. But ordinarily Nāstika is used in the latter sense and connotes a dissenter from received opinion in regard either to the existence of transcendental things or to the authority of hallowed tradition. Such an unbeliever is threatened with a sudden enlightenment hereafter: “If your opinion is that this world does not exist and that there is no world beyond, the devils in hell will soon change your ideas on that subject.” Any number of these unbelievers is known, who deny everything there is to deny. In ii, 31, 70, an unbelieving or heretic

1 nā 'yaṁ loko 'sti na paro na sukhaṁ saṁcayaśātmanaḥ. Compare Kaṭha Up., ii, 6, ayam loko nāsti para-iti māṁ, punaḥ punar vaçaṁ āpadyate me (Yama).
2 Neglect of Vedic ordinances or denial of Veda is nāstikya, par excellence, according to xii, 270, 67, and xii, 12, 5 (the latter): vedavādāpaviddhāṁ tu tāṁ viddhi bhṛgaṁāstikāṁ (also anāstika, ib. 4), for “rejecting the Veda a priest cannot attain heaven,” ib.
3 Literally, will “make you remember;” yad idam manyase, rājan, nā 'yaṁ asti kutaḥ paraḥ, pratismārayitāras tvāṁ Yamadūtā Yamakṣaye, xii, 150, 19.
king is mentioned among those who pay tribute (in conjunction with a tributary “city of the Greeks”); while in iii, 191, 10, it is said that in the golden age to come there will be “people of truth,” where previously had been established the schools of heretics; from which it may be inferred perhaps that Buddhists or Jains are meant, as irreligious heretics would not have religious orders.¹ The Lokāyata or Lokāyatika (doubtful in i, 70, 46) is perhaps less a Buddhist (like Cārvāka, who appears only as a pretended Brahman Parivraj, or priestly mendicant, and friend of the foe) than a devotee of natural science, as Professor Rhys Davids maintains. The doubter’s scriptures are not, however, referred to Brhaspati. The code of this ill-reputed sage, whom we have seen as a law-giver, is often enough alluded to, generally in connection with that of Ugasas. The worst that is said of Brhaspati’s teaching is that it is drawn from a study of the female intellect, which is full of subtlety and deceit. But he is here only one of many authors of Arthaśāstras, xiii, 39, 10. As a teacher he is extolled.² Materialists and other heretics without special designation appear to fill the whole land. Thus in xii, 19, 23, are mentioned rationalistic Pundits, hetumantaḥ, hard to convince, who are by nature befogged and stubborn, and deny the existence (of a soul). These are opposed to those good men who are “devoted to ceremonies and know the Pūrvaśāstra” (mīmāṃsā?). “These fools,” it is added, “are despisers of immortality and talkers in assemblies of people; they wander over the whole earth, being fond of speaking and learned in revelation.”³ Others are cited to illustrate the unbelief that consists in a denial of the soul’s unity, ekāntavyudāsa. These believe in a soul possessed of desire and hate. An apparent allusion to Jains may be found in the description of the priest who “tramped around Benares astounding the people, clothed

¹ añgamaḥ sahapāśandāḥ satājanāḥ prajāḥ (bhāvīṣyanti).
² xii, 325, 23. His teaching in xiii, 118, is Buddhistic (5 = Dh. P. 132, and 7 is like Dh. P. 420). On Lokāyata, see Davids, p. 169 of op. cit. above, p. 55.
³ vāvadukā bahucṛtāḥ. The denial in nāi’ tud uṣi must from the context refer to the existence of the soul. For anṛtasyā ’vamantāraḥ in B. must, I think, be read anṛtasya.
in air, clothed like a madman;"¹ but we must be careful not to identify the characters of the epic too quickly with special names. This madman priest, for example, would seem to be rather a Čivaite Brahman than a Jain, and digvāsas is applied to Vidura in his last state and to Nala in his distress.² In the same way, the brown and yellow robe does not necessarily refer to a Buddhist, any more than does the statement that one goes to heaven who builds a Vihāra, xiii, 28, 99; for these terms are common property. “What makes you so glorious?” asks one woman of another, who replies: “I did not wear the yellow robe, nor bark-garments, nor go shorn or with matted hair,” xiii, 123, 8. Here quite possibly Buddhists may be referred to; but when I read that Čiva’s devotees are of two sorts, householders, and those “whose sign is tonsure and the yellow robe,” māṇḍyaṁ kaṣāyaça ca, xiii, 142, 22; and see that the yellow robe is also worn as a sign of grief, Nala, 24, 9; R. vi. 125, 34, and that “the wearer of the yellow robe” is excluded from Čāḍḍha, xiii, 91, 48, I am by no means sure that even in the most tempting passage this robe indicates a Buddhist, unless, indeed, for some of these passages we may assume that Čivaite and Buddhist were already confused. But xii, 18, 32, “those who cast off the Vedas and wander about as beggars shaved and wearing the yellow robe,” refers distinctly to Buddhists, as I opine. Similarly, the remark “they that are budhas, enlightened, are devoted to Nirvāṇa,” xii, 167, 46, may be put beside the buddhas of xii, 160, 33, who “have no fear of return to this world and no dread of another;” but in the latter section, and in many others, “enlightened,” budha and buddha, refers to Brahmans; and Nirvāṇa in epic teleology usually means bliss, for example the bliss of drinking when one is thirsty, or the bliss of heaven.³ In short, we see here

¹ caṅkramiti diçaḥ sarvā digvāsā mahayan prajāḥ . . . unmattaveṣam bibhrat sa caṅkramiti yathāsukham Vārāṇasyām, xiv, 6, 18, and 22; compare 5, 6.
² To the author of Das Mbh. als Epos, etc., digvāsas necessarily implies digambara (as Jain), p. 224.
³ In the epic, nirvāṇa is used in both of its later senses, bliss and extinction, brahman nirvāṇa, bliss of Brahman, like the nirvāṇa, bliss, attained by
and in a passage cited further on, that Buddhists are sometimes referred to, but we must not call every beggar a Buddhist. The late passage xiv, 49, 3–12, shows that when the Anuṅgītā was written, probably not before our era, these infidels were fairly rampant. The list of them is quite appalling and we may perhaps believe that the "believer in nothing" is a Buddhist and the "shaven and naked" mentioned in the same place is a Jain; while the svabhāvam bhūtacintakāḥ are perhaps materialists. The "course of right is varied" and the view of the author is here that of tolerance. Some of these philosophers deny a hereafter, some doubt all things, some hold the vyāmiça doctrine of revolution (often mistranslated as evolution) of the universe, and according to the commentator some are adherents of the atomistic theory, bahuṣtvām. Contests of these hetuvāḍins, rationalists, are not discountenanced, but enjoyed as a philosophic treat at the king's court or at a great sacrifice, as in xiv, 85, 27, where "talkative philosophers, eager to outdo each other, discussed many rationalistic arguments."

With all this liberality there is often no quarter given to the heretic, especially the Pāśaṇḍa, who appears to be preeminently a despiser of the Vedas. The reason is the natural one that he who despises the priest's authority naturally despises the priest. "The reason why I was born a jackal," says a character in xii, 180, 47–48, "is that I was a Punditkin, pāṇḍitaka, who was a rationalist, hāituka, and blamer of the Vedas, being devoted to logic and the useless science of reasoning (a telling phrase, repeated in xiii, 37, 12–14), a proclaimer of logical arguments, a talker in assemblies, a reviler and opposer of priests in arguments about Brahman, an unbeliever, a doubter of all, who thought myself a Pundit." The Pāśaṇḍa drinking. On this subject much that is misleading has lately been published, owing to a false historical point of view. But the goal of extinction is also landed. Thus, in xii, 242, 11–12, one attains to that where going he "grieves not, dies not, is not born, nor re-born, and exists not," na vartate.

1 v. 1. in xii, 218, 4; xiii, 23, 67 (other references in PW.); apparently a foreign or dialectic word; especially Buddhists, according to N.

2 ākroṣṭā ca 'bhivaktā ca brahmavākyeṣu ca dvijān . . . mūrkhaḥ pāṇḍi-
and reviler of the Vedas are closely associated, as in xiii, 23, 67, and 72, and like those who here "sell or write down the Vedas," they go to hell. In short, any denial is usually permitted save the denial of the Vedas. The more surprising is it that elsewhere (see below) the Vedas are openly repudiated; but this is only one of the inconsistencies with which the epic teems.

**Authority.**

What then was authoritative? Characteristic of the contradictory views presented in the epic is the fact that in one place the very authority, pramāṇam, which is insisted upon as the only valid authority, is in another rejected as altogether delusive, and this not by heretics, but by the authors of the respective essays whose combined publications issued in one volume form the pot-pourri of the complete epic.

The reason for this is obvious. Several forms of religion are advocated in the epic and each has its own test. Oldest and most widely represented is the biblical test. Over and over again we are assured that scripture is authoritative and those who will not accept scripture as the pramāṇam or teststone of philosophy are damned. But beside these vigorous expressions of orthodoxy stands the new faith, which discards altogether the old scripture as an authority. For sacrifices and rites the Vedas are well enough; they are there authoritative. If one wishes to perform rites one must naturally go to the ritual. Such āśāstraprāmāṇya and vedaprāmāṇya rules,\(^1\) admitting the necessity of rites at all, remain valid, simply because there are no others. But in all higher matters, as for one who sees no use in rites, the scriptures are but a mass of contradictions.\(^2\)

tamāníkaḥ (hence reborn, as a kroṣṭar). Compare Kaṭha Up. ii, 5, sva-yaṁdhiṁ paṇḍitammanyamānāḥ; Muṇḍ. Up. 1, 2, 8; Mālitr. Up. vii, 9. The passage in Anuṣṭāna cited above is a repetition of all these epithets in characteristically free form. Compare, e. g., cl. 13, ākroṣṭā cā śāvaktā ca brāhmaṇānāṁ sadā i va hi (here paṇḍitamāṇi).

\(^1\) xiii, 84, 20, and 37.

\(^2\) One of the minor epic contradictions is that referred to above, p. 46, in regard to the "two brāhmans." The orthodox, but not too liberal man, says:
The old view is best represented in the saying that Veda, Dharmasāstras, and ācāra, custom, are the recognized authorities in every matter, as in iii, 207, 88; xiii, 84, 20, and 37. The confused rule of the Veda is referred to in xii, 19, 1-2: "I know the highest and other Čāstras and the double injunction of the Veda, 'Do acts and abandon them.'" "Untrue, according to casuistic reasoning, is the word of the Veda—but why should the Veda speak untruth?" says Vyāsa, xiii, 120, 9, when inculcating the late notion that a small gift is as efficient as a great sacrifice in procuring salvation, a theory that is certainly untrue in the light of the Veda. "Logic has no basis, the scriptures are divided; there is not one seer whose opinion is authoritative," pramāṇam. "The truth about right is hidden in a cave; the only path is that pursued by the majority," iii, 318, 117. "Deceitful is the Veda," it is said in xii, 329, 6. Both scripture and argument, tarka, are useless in comparison with the enlightening grace of God, which alone can illuminate the "mysterious hidden communication of truth," xii, 335, 5. Such holy mysteries must, indeed, be kept from those who are "burned with books of philosophy," tarkāśāstradadhā, xii, 247, 18.

In the matter of the Veda, the new faith discounts its value by setting beside it the recent books of later cult, exactly as modern sects take as authoritative their own scriptures. Bhīṣma's words, being inspired by Krishna, are "as authoritative as the words of the Veda," vedapraṇāda iva (pramāṇam), xii, 54, 29-30, and Veda, Purāṇa, and Itihāsa are all reckoned as authoritative in xii, 343, 20. But the Gītā is the only authority of the Bhāgavatas, Gītā, 16, 24. Compare also the tirade in xiii, 163, 2-9: "Immediate perception or biblical authority, āgama, what is convincing proof, kārana,
dve brahmanī veditārye ca ṣabdabrahma paraṇa ca yat, caḥdabrahmanī niṣpātaḥ param brahmā 'dhigacchati, xii, 233, 30, "when one is thoroughly conversant with the Veda he attains to Brahman;" but the devotee "even by desire of wisdom surpasses the Veda," api jijnāsamāno 'pi caḥdabrahmaḥ 'tivartate, ib. 237, 8.

1 mahājana, if this be the meaning here; apparently only usage is meant: mahājano yena gataḥ sa pānthāḥ.
in these? Answer: "There is many a text to increase doubt. Rationalists say that perception is the only proof. They are children who think themselves wise and believe only in denial, nā 'sti. Recourse to 'cause' amounts to nothing."

But though philosophy is really interwoven with religion, we may leave for the present the Bhāgavatas and Čivaītes to their religion which is "freed from philosophy," xiii, 14, 198, and consists in identifying the All-god with their special gods (viii, 33, 51 "one God of various forms"), to consider the more strictly philosophic view of authority.

Only one view is held by the real philosopher: "Through inference we learn the truth." 1 Traditional wisdom, āmnāya, as was shown above, is not always recognized, though it is generally admitted. "In āmnāya are established the Vedas; from āmnāya come the Vedas. 2 . . . Universal opinion says that an āmnāya-declaration is truth, and there is no authority at all, čāstratā, when that which is not authoritative is allowed to stand against the recognized authority of the Vedas," xii, 269, 33; 261, 9–10. Thus "inference together with scripture," anumāna and ċruta, are the two most substantial tests of truth, xii, 205, 19 and 210, 23, hetvāgama; for "all that is Vedic is the word of God," xii, 269, 10. 3

The third authority is the one scorned above, perception, pratyakṣa (xiv, 28, 18, pratyakṣataḥ sādhayāmaḥ, and often, as cited below in the course of this chapter). In the mystic religion of the Yogan this pratyakṣa becomes the intuitive insight of the seer and is the only test of truth, answering to "second sight." 4 The Harivaṇaṇa inveighs against the "doubters and curious speculators" who accept any authority save faith, 3, 4, 8 ff.

1 anumānaṁ viśājinaṁ puruṣam, xiv, 48, 6; xii, 206, 23.
2 The commentator becomes confused, and rendering āmnāya by Veda renders vedāḥ by smṛtayāḥ!
3 sarvam āraṁ vyāhṛtam viditātmam ( = paraṁeṣvarasya). The commentator cites Brh. Up. i, 4, 10, nihyvasitam, in support of plenary inspiration as here inculcated.
4 The curious result is thus reached that the crassest materialist and most exalted mystic reject all proofs save pratyakṣa. Only one means by "autopsy" (physical) perception and the other means insight.
EPIC PHILOSOPHY.

Besides these three, to wit, biblical authority, inference, and direct observation, the fourth "proof by analogy" may be implied in the late conversation of Drãupadi, where, after a passing reference to the ārṣam pramāṇam and pratyakṣa, is added "and thy own birth is the proof by analogy," upamāṇam, iii, 31, 11–33. Elsewhere the epic stands philosophically on the Sāṁkhya-yoga basis of three reliable proofs only.

This result is fully borne out by the terminology. The Vedānta philosophy of the epic is not called by that name. Nyāya may possibly be known, but it is doubtful whether the word ever refers to the system, or the system, except perhaps in one or two late passages, is ever recognized. A brief survey of the facts will make this clearer.

Vedānta.

If the philosophical system were known as such the use of the name would occur as such. But Vedānta seems everywhere to mean Upanishads or what is the same thing, Āraṇyakas.¹ No Vedānta system is alluded to, Vedānta may refer to Sāṁkhya in xii, 196, 7 (where it takes the place of the latter in antithesis to Yoga, as the commentator thinks), but the word more naturally means the teaching of the Upanishads, as usual.² The passages cited above in the chapter on literature exhibit the characteristic usage. Thus in Gītā 15, 15, vedāntakṛd vedavid eva cā' ham, where Telang rightly takes the reference to be to the Āraṇyakas. So in viii, 90, 114, vedāntaḥvabhṛthāplutaḥ, where Karṇa appeals to Arjuna

¹ So, for example, in yad uktaṃ vedavādeṣu gahanaṃ vedadarçibhiḥ, tadanteṣu yathā yuktam krama(karma)yogena lakṣyate, xii, 233, 28 (= tad uktam vedavādeṣu . . . vedānteṣu punar vyaktaṃ, 239, 11), a mystery (viz., gambhirāṃ gahanam brahma, 224, 48).

² sāṁkhyaṣyaogā tu yāv uktau munibhir mokṣadarçibhiḥ, sannyāsa eva vedānte vartate japam prati, vedavādāc ca nirṛttīḥ cāntā brahmāny avasthitāḥ, three hemistichs, of which the first is repeated in the next gīloka, where alone it seems to belong. Conversely, in Gītā 18, 13, the word Sāṁkhya is taken by the commentator to mean Vedānta, because here we have a grouping of five karmahetavah not recognized in Sāṁkhya. It may be said once for all that the commentator is often useless in philosophical sections, as he wishes to convert Sāṁkhya into Vedānta on all occasions.
to observe the law of fighting, since the latter knows the law of fighting and is thoroughly acquainted with the holy scriptures, i.e., he is a moral man (not a Vedánta philosopher). So in ii, 53, 1, kings who are declarers of all the Vedas and versed in the Vedánta, paryáptavidyā vaktāro vedántāva-bhrthāplutāh. Durgā is Sāvitrī, vedamātā tatha vedánta ucayate, “mother of the Vedas and famed (not in philosophy but) in the Upanishads,” vi, 23, 12. A Gandharva is “wise in the knowledge of Vedánta,” xii, 319, 27, and asks questions about Veda and logic, which are answered in Sāmkhya terms (vedya is puruṣa, for example). The priest who at xii, 349, 56 is said to transmit the knowledge of the Gītā, knows the Jyeṣṭha Sāman and the Vedánta; and he who knows the names of Vishnu is Vedánta-learned, xiii, 149, 123. Again in xiv, 13, 15: “Whoso would kill me (Kāma) by vedār vedāntasādhanāḥ, power derived from the mysteries of the Veda.” I know in fact only two passages where, perhaps, Vedánta might be fairly taken as referring to the philosophy. One of these is in a triṣṭubh verse which has been interpolated (out of all syntactical connection) in xiii, 69, 20, and even here, late as is the verse, it is perhaps more probable that the word is to be taken in its usual sense.¹ The other is found at xii, 302, 71, where the “island of Vedánta” is a refuge to the saints. The “Secret of the Vedánta” cited below is clearly “Upanishads.” The Brahma Sūtra I have spoken of above, p. 16.

Mīmāṁsā does not occur as the name of a philosophical system. I have referred to the Pūrvaśāstra-vids above, but the word is obviously too general to make much of, though it is used as if it applied to the Pūrva-mīmāṁsā, for the Pūrva-śāstra-īdāḥ are here, xii, 19, 22, kriyāsu nirātā nityāṃ dāne yajñe ca karmanī. This implication is not absolutely necessary, however. The old name for the system, Nyāya, does not seem to be used in the sense of Pūrvamīmāṁsā.

¹ vedāntaniṣṭhasya bahuçrutasya, supposed to be governed by vṛttim (dvijāya) ‘tisṛjeta (tasmā) in the next stanza!
Nyāya.

The argumentative group of five, explained according to the padārtha in xii, 321, 80 ff., consists of sāukṣmya, sāṃkhya-kramāu, nirṇaya, and prayojana, which recall, especially in the definition of the last, the corresponding section in the formal Nyāya. The epic gives the following definitions:

1. Sāukṣmya, subtilty, is where knowledge, in respect to objects of knowledge which are divided, comes from distinction and the intellect rests (on this distinction).

2. Sāṃkhya or saṃkhyaḥ, reckoning, is reckoning the value of weak and valid points and arriving at some conclusion.

3. Krama, order: when it is decided which should be said first and which last, they call that krama-yoga, the application of proper sequence in an argument.

4. Nirṇaya, ascertainment, is a conclusion that the case is so and so, in cases of duty, desire, gain, emancipation, after recognizing them according to their differences.

5. Prayojana, motive: where inclination is produced by ills arising from desire or dislike and a certain conduct is followed, that is motive.

As has been remarked by Mr. K. Mohan Ganguli in his translation, this final definition of prayojana is almost identical with that given by Gāutama i, 24, yam artham adhikṛtya pravartate tat prayojanam: “If one sets an object before one’s self and acts accordingly, that is motive.” So the epic, prakāraṣṇa yatra jāyate, tatra yā vṛttis tat prayojanam, as rendered above. Similarly, the epic definition of nirṇaya is like that of Gāutama in i, 40: “The conclusion reached after hearing what can be said for and against (on both sides) after doubting.” The other members of Gāutama’s syllogism, i, 82, seem to have no connection with the above. The speech to be delivered, it is declared in this passage of the epic, must be nyāya-vṛttam (as well as reasonable, not casuistical, etc., sixteen attributes in all).

1 No explanation is given of the eighteen merits with which the speaker begins. The sixteen attributes may be compared (numerically) with the sixteen categories of the Nyāya.
We may compare further in the late list of Pundits at i, 70, 42, those with nyāyatattvātma-vijñāna, possibly “versed in psychology according to the Nyāya-tattva;” and i, 1, 67, nyāyācikṣa, Nyāya-system, opposed to Vedādhyaätma but also to cikitsā, etc. Also xii, 19, 18, referred to above, p. 87: “Some, rejecting unity, attribute to the ātman desire and dislike,” a Nyāya view. Finally, in xii, 210, 22, nyāyatantrāny anekānī (declared by various people), “systems of logic,” is typical of all remaining cases. Nyāya, then, usually means logic, but occasionally, in the pseudo-epic, the special Logic-system known to us as Nyāya.¹

Vaiśeṣika.

This word is used as an adjective, of guṇas, etc., in the sense of excellent; but the system is unknown in the main epic though it is referred to in the passage cited above, in i, 70, 43–44, and also in ii, 5, 5 (vākya) pañcāvayavayukta, another proof of the lateness of the Kaccit section,² whether the five avayavas here mentioned be terms implying Nyāya or Vaiśeṣika. Kaṇāda’s name appears first in the Harivaṃśa (see below, p. 98, and above, p. 89).

The Four Philosophies.

In xii, 350, 64 ff. (compare 350, 1, prarcaranti) it is said that there are four current philosophies, jñānāni, the Sāṁkhya-yoga, Pāṇcarātra, Vedāranyaka (or Vedāḥ), and Pācu-pata. Kapila declared the Sāṁkhya; Hīranyagarbha, the

¹ For the ordinary use, compare tālā tālā nyāyāḥ, such arguments, passim. All speculation is Tarka. Compare the remarkable statement, xii, 15, 26: “There are minute creatures whose existence can be argued by tarka (so small that) an eyelid’s fall would be the death of a number of them.”

² The former passage, after mentioning those endowed with nyāyatattvātma-vijñāna adds nānāvākyasamāhārasamavāyaviśeṣarādāḥ, viśeṣakāryavibhīṣca ... sthāpanākṣepasiddhāntaparamārthajñānaḥ gatāḥ ... kāryakāraṇa-vedībhīḥ, which may refer to either system. The passages have been cited by the author of Das Mahābhārata als Epos, etc., p. 226, who admits that the five “avayas,” as he call them twice, imply the Vaiśeṣika system.
Yoga; Apāntaratamas is called the Teacher of the Vedas ("termed by some Prācīnagarbha"); Īśva declared the Pāṇḍu religion; Vishnu, the whole Pāṇḍarātra. "In all these philosophies Vishnu is the niṣṭā, or chief thing." 2

Kapila and his System.

Although it is said, as quoted above, that there is no sect whose authority is authoritative, this is merely a teaching of temporary despair. Kapila is authoritative in all philosophical matters and his name covers every sort of doctrine. He is in fact the only founder of a philosophical system known to the epic. Other names of founders are either those of mere gods or disciples of Kapila. Bādarāyaṇa and Patañjali 3 are unknown even as names, and Jāimini and Gāutama appear only as sages, not as leaders of speculation. Ĉāṇḍīya (otherwise said to be known in the epic) is respectfully cited on Yoga, not as founder but as recommending Yoga concentration. 4

1 See the note on this verse just below. As Yoga-teacher of Dāityas, Čukra is mentioned, i, 66, 43. Both Vishnu and Īśva are credited with being Yoga-lords (loc. cit. by Holtzmann, Das Mbh. im Osten und Westen, p. 110).

2 In the Vāsudeva religious philosophy of Krishnism, as expounded in xii, 345, 7 ff., some people, after death, become paramānyabhūtas, very fine sprites, and enter Aniruddha; then as manabhūtas, or mental entities, they enter Pradyumna; hence they go to Jīva (Saṁkarṣaṇa). Such people are "the best priests and Saṁkhyaś and Bhāgavatas." Finally, devoid of all unspiritual constituents, trāṅguṇyāhina, they enter Paramātman (Kṣetrajña, nirguṇātmaka), or Vāsudeva. These are the four forms of God. The name of God is immaterial. Rudra and Vishnu are one being, sattvam ekam, divided in two, xii, 342, 27 (they are synonyms like brhad brahma and mahat, 337 2, paryāyavācākāḥ çabdāḥ; Vishnu may be called Īśva and Brahman may be called Intellect).

3 In the Sarvadarśanasamgraha it is said that Patañjali made (atha yogānuçāsanam, i, 1) an anuçāsa, or secondary collection (as asu is explained) based on earlier Puranic materials. The verse attributed in this connection to the Yājñavalkya Smṛti (168, 17; p. 239 of Cowell’s translation) has caused the Petersburg Lexicon to postulate, s. v., another Smṛti of the same name. I think it is a mere lapsus for Vāasa’s Smṛti, for the verse cited ("Hiranya-garbha, and no other ancient, is the declarer of Yoga") occurs xii, 350, 65. It has occurred to me that this verse may imply Patañjali, and the "no other" be a distinct refutation of his claim, the epic preferring divine authority; but this is perhaps too pregnant.

4 pṛthābhūteṣu saṣṭeṣu caturthāçramakamsam samādhānu yogam evai-tac (maduktam vākyam) čaṇḍīlyaḥ čamam abravit, xii, 254, 14.
a teacher of unconditioned Brahman, Ātreya is lauded in xiii, 187, 3; and in xii, 319, 59, a list of teachers of the twenty-fifth (spiritual) principle is given as having instructed the Gandharva Viçvävasu: Jāigisavya, Asita Devala, Paruçara, Vārsaganyā, Bhṛgu, Pañcaçikha, Kapila, Çuka, Gāutama, Ārṣiśeṣa, Garga, Nārada, Āsuri, Pulastya, Sanatkumāra, Çukra, Kaçyapa, seventeen mixed gods, saints, and philosophers, of whom two are important besides Kapila, namely Āsuri and Pañcaçikha, his pupils; while one system (explained below) is referred also to Asita Devala.

There seems to be no reason to doubt that Kapila was a real (human) philosopher, and not a mere shadow of a divinity. The fact that his name is also given to divinities proves the opposite as little as does his deification, for it is customary to deify sages and for divinities to have sages’ names. A perfect parallel to the use of Kapila in this way is afforded by Kañāda, which, as far as I know, occurs first as an epithet of Çiva as supreme god, in the Harivañça 3, 85, 15-16:

\[
yam āhur agryam puruṣam mahāntam
purātanaṁ sāmkhyanibaddhadṛṣṭayaḥ
\]
\[
yasyā ’pi devasya gunān samagrāṇś
tattvaṁ caturviṣṇatim āhur eke
yam āhur ekam puruṣam purātanaṁ
\]
\[
Kañāda-nāmānam ajam mahēqvaram
dakṣasya yajñāṇam vinihatya yo vāi
vinācyā devān asurān sānātanaḥ
\]

Kapila’s treatise is repeatedly declared to be oldest, but he is not only the oldest, he is the supreme seer, identical with Agni, with Çiva also, and with Vishnu. He is said to have got his wisdom from Çiva.1

1 “Of the treatises declared by metaphysicians that by Kapila is the earliest,” xii, 351, 6; agnih sa Kapilo nāma, sāmkhyayogapravartakah, lī, 221, 21. Hall gives a later v. l., sāmkhyacāstrapravartakah, Sāmkhyasāra, p. 18, where most of the epic allusions are collected. As supreme seer, xii, 350, 65; Çiva, xii, 285, 114, where the commentator interprets Sāmkhya as Vedānta (as often); xiii, 17, 98, and xii, 14, 323, Çiva as kapila. Kapila is identified with Vishnu in lī, 47, 18; Gitā, 10, 26, etc.; with Prajāpati in xii, 218, 9-10, where
I have noticed only one passage, xii, 269, 9, where Kapila is presented in the light of adverse criticism from the point of view of orthodox Brahmanism. On seeing a cow led out for sacrifice, Kapila, filled with compassion, cried out O ye Vedas! an exclamation of reproof against the Vedas, as inculcating cruelty to animals. At this he was attacked by the inspired cow with a long discourse, challenging him to show why the Vedas should be regarded as authoritative in any regard, if not in regard to the slaughter of animals.

Kapila appears in this tale as a teacher of unorthodox non-injury and maintains to the end (so that his view is presented as really correct) that not the sacrifice of animals but the “sacrifice (worship) of knowledge” is the best. Elsewhere also we find the same antithesis between the old orthodoxy and the new science of thought, which not only disregards Vedic ceremonies but condemns them (xiv, 28, 7 ff.).

The best evidence of the authority of Kapila is given not by express statement but by implication in the praise of other systems, which, an important point, are by the same implication looked upon as distinct from that of Kapila, although his name is used to uphold them. Thus Kapila’s own system is called generally the Saṁkhya-yoga, or specifically the Kapilam.¹ The Saṁkhya-yogins are said to be the models even in teaching of other tendency, as in xii, 347, 22, and nothing better can be said of the Bhāgavatas, here extolled, than that their system is “equal to the Saṁkhya-yoga,” not, be it

he is called the supreme seer, incorporate in Pañcaśikha (the first pupil of Āsuri, who in turn was a pupil of Kapila). In xii, 337, 8, Kapila is Cālhotrapitā smṛtaḥ, father of Cālhotra, the veterinary sage (above, p. 12). Kapilaḥ prāha: prītaḥ ca Bhagavān jñānāin tadāu mama bhavāntakam, xiii, 18, 4. The Harivänça, 3, 14, 4, and 20, speaks of Kapila as the “teacher of Yoga, the teacher of Saṁkhya, full of wisdom, clothed in Brahma, the lord of ascetics.” Compare the supreme spirit as Kapila, xii, 340, 68.

¹ “He learned the whole Yoga-çāstram and the Kāpilam,” xii, 326, 4; Viriśca iti yat proktam Kāpilam jñānacintakāh sa Prajāpatis eva 'ham, xii, 343, 94 (Kapila, 95). Also Saṁkhya kṛta, Gitā, 18, 13.
observed, the same, but as good as the system of Kapila. Amid a list of heroes in xiii, 75, 24–25, we find placed beside battle-heroes, gift-heroes, moral-heroes, etc., only Sāṅkhya and Yoga heroes, enrolled to represent philosophy. As between the two, the implication contained in the words at Gītā 5, 5, "the Yoga gets as good a place as the Sāṅkhya," is that it is the Sāṅkhya which is the norm. Sāṅkhya is cited alone as the one system of salvation in i, 75, 7: "Salvation he studied, the unequalled system of Sāṅkhya." In contrast with Veda and Vedaṅga, it is the one type of philosophy: "He became learned in the Atharva Veda and the Veda, in the ritual also, and a past-master in astronomy, taking the greatest pleasure in Sāṅkhya," xiii, 10, 37; "Vedas, Āṅgas, Sāṅkhya, and Purāṇa," xiii, 22, 12.

The two systems are often separated. Yogapradarśināḥ stands parallel to Sāṅkhya-nadarśināḥ, xii, 314, 3–4. "The rules both of Sāṅkhya and Yoga" are mentioned, xii, 50, 33. Nārada "knew the difference between Sāṅkhya and Yoga," ii, 5, 7. Čāunaka is "rapt with metaphysics, adhyātma, skilled in Yoga and in Sāṅkhya," iii, 2, 15. The difference is explained in the Gītā as: "The double point of view, niṣṭhā, of the Sāṅkhya, who have jñānayoga; of the Yogins, who have karmayoga." Sometimes Sāṅkhya-jñāna on the one hand is opposed to Yoga alone on the other, xii, 315, 18. Sometimes the Čāstra is that of the Yoga, as opposed to jñāna of the Sāṅkhya, xii, 319, 67; yogaçāstreṣu, 340, 69, etc. Nevertheless, they are, says the Gītā, essentially one system. And so often we find that Vedic practices and the existence of God are claimed for Sāṅkhya and Yoga, as if they were one system. The same is true of the practice of austerities or asceticism. "The many names of God are declared in the Rig Veda with

1 Sāṅkhya-yogena tulyo hi dharma ekāntasevitaḥ, xii, 340, 74.
2 So in viii, 33, 49, Yoga and Sāṅkhya (Śtmanah) represent philosophy.
3 Compare xiii, 140, 130: yogo jñānaṁ tathā sāṅkhyaṁ vidyāṁ īlpaṁ-karma ca. In the passage cited above, the interesting āriṣṭāṇi tattvāni are grouped with yoga and sāṅkhya-jñāna (as objects of research). They are explained elsewhere, xii, 318, 8, as "signs of death," appearing to one if he cannot see the pole-star or his reflection in another's eye, etc.
the Yajur Veda, in Atharva (and) Sāmans, in Purāṇa with Upanishads, in astronomy also, in Sāṁkhya and in Yoga-çastra, and in Āyur Veda,” to give the bizarre group of xii, 342, 8. “Both gods and demons practise austerity, tapas, which has been argued out, yuktitaḥ, of Veda and Sāṁkhya-yoga,” xii, 285, 192.1

Sāṁkhya and Yoga.

But it must be noticed that the claim for the identity of Sāṁkhya and Yoga comes from the Yoga side, which is deistic and seeks to make the Sāṁkhya so, exactly in the way the Vedānta commentator seeks to make the Yoga passages Vedantic. The distinctive mark of the Yoga, as given above from the Gītā, 3, 3, is, if we translate it in the natural original sense, application to work as opposed to application to understanding; in other words the Yoga laid stress on religious practices, the Sāṁkhya on knowledge.2 It may be that Yoga also, like Sāṁkhya, was originally atheistic and that deistic Yoga was a special development. Nothing could be falser, however, than the supposition that the Yoga and Sāṁkhya differ only in method, or the epic assumption that both are a sort of Vedānta inculcating belief in Brahman as the All-soul. Even the Gītā recognizes the distinction between the two schools in saying that the system that recognizes the All-soul (“one entity eternal, undivided, in all divided existences”) is better than the one that recognizes “separate and distinct entities in all existent beings,” 18, 21–22, clearly referring to the fundamental difference between Brahmaism3 and Sāṁ-

1 It may be observed of the terminology that as Yoga means Yogan as well as the system, so Sāṁkhya means system or a philosopher of that system. Typical of the pseudo-epic is the circumstance that here Sāṁkhya-yogāḥ are personified as two beings along with Nārada and Durvāśa, xiii, 151, 45.

2 Compare the use in xiii, 84, 40, where it is asked: kena vā karmayogena pradānene ’ha kena vā (can I be purified), i.e., “by application to holy works.” Compare krṣiyoga, xiii, 83, 18.

3 As Vedānta is commonly used of Ĉāmākara’s interpretation, I employ Brahmaism to connote a belief in the All-soul without necessarily implying a concomitant doctrine of Illusion, Māyā.
khyāism. The practical difference is that formulated at xii, 317, 2 ff., where it is said: “There is no knowledge like the Sāṁkhya, no power like the Yoga; these are both one in practice, ekacaryāu, because both destroy death. Foolish people regard them as distinct, but we recognize them as one. What the Yogas see is seen by Sāṁkhya; who sees Sāṁkhya and Yoga as one sees truly,” a passage copied from the Gītā, 5, 4-5, and repeated with varied readings in xii, 306, 19.

Though the pseudo-epic is so like the Gītā, its relative lateness, I may observe in passing, is shown inter alia by the use in this passage of yogam as a neuter noun, xii, 317, 27, etad dhi yogam yogānām,¹ as in xiii, 17, 19; one of the many little points ignored in the unhistorical synthetical method.

This passage, in its admission under cover of fools’ opinion, shows clearly that the two systems could be regarded as identical only by insisting on the objective of each. Both systems gave emancipation, therefore they were one. But one way was that of pure science or knowledge, the other was that of pious work (yoga, tapas) added to this science, a practical divergence that existed quite apart from the question whether the goal was really the same.

But the epic in other passages, despite its brave pretence, is not content with Sāṁkhya science or even with Yoga work. On the contrary, the religious devotees named above throw over both systems. It is true they keep the name, just as these philosophical systems themselves pretend to depend on the Vedas, or as European philosophers used to claim that their systems were based on orthodoxy. But this only shows how important and fully established were these philosophical systems when the sects arose that based salvation on faith and the grace of a man-god, while still pretending to philosophy. They could not unite, for the true Sāṁkhya did not teach Brahmaism, but kevalatvam, or absolute separation of the individual spirit from everything else, an astitvam kevalam, or existence apart from all, not apart in Brahman.

¹ Repeating yoga eṣa hi yogānām in 307, 25.
No less irreconcilable with the earlier belief is the later sectary’s view of action, pravṛtta, as due to God. For the older sage was intent on escaping action, which the system regards as due not to spirit but to the inherent quality of its antithesis, Prakṛti. But in the religious substitution of a personal Lord, Íçvara, as synonymous with the Supreme, it is taught that “the Lord created pravṛtta as a picturesque effect” (after electing nivṛtta for himself).1 Here the roots of the Karma doctrine are cut by the new faith of the quasi monotheism which is reflected in the later pseudo-epic.2

Fate and Free-Will.

Another side of speculation presents a varied field of belief. Is there such a thing as free-will? The later epic fixes responsibility in turn on the Lord, man himself, puruṣha, luck, haṭha, and Karma, xii, 32, 12, ff.; where Karma is finally recognized as the only agent, as otherwise God would be responsible for sin; and if man were the sole agent there could be none higher than man. As luck would absolve a man, only Karma is left, associated with Time in a sort of dual fatalism, karmasūrātma.ka. Obviously Fate, as Time is here, really undermines the theory of Karma quite as much as does the interposition of the Lord or any other foreign factor. So in xii, 224, 16 ff. and 226, 13 and 21 ff., we find first the reflex of the Upanishads and Gītā, “he who (in imagination) slays and he who is slain are both ignorant,” and then: “The deed causes the deed; but the deed has another creator, Fate, Time. Fate or what will be will be is the cause.” “Sorrow lies in thinking ‘I am responsible’; for I do that which the ordainers ordained when I was born.”3

1 pravṛttidharmān vidadhe kṛtvā lokasya citratām, xii, 341, 99.
2 This is the “fourfold God,” worshipped by the Ekāntins as having one, two, three, or four forms, identified with Krishna, his son, grandson, and brother, as named above, p. 97. He is maker and non-maker, and takes Prakṛti’s function in “sporting”: yathe ’cchati tathā rājan kriyate puruṣo ’vyayaḥ.
3 So 224, 31; 226, 8; 227, 34 and 35: kālaḥ pacati ... kālaḥ kalayati pra-jāḥ; 226, 12: “Whatever state one obtains he must say bhavitavyam,” “it was fated,” i.e., independently of Karma. For kāla from kal, cf. Gītā, 10, 30.
Elsewhere Fate is the Divine power, dāiva, opposed to human effort and to nature, svabhāva, the latter having the implication of the Karma doctrine. Each of these factors is upheld by one or another theorist, while others claim that they all work together, xii, 233, 19, repeated at 239, 4-5. In other places the same Fate that is elsewhere made responsible is scorned, dāivam klībā upāsate, “only eunuchs worship Fate;” and “there is no Fate, all depends on one’s own nature;” the Karma doctrine, svabhāvataḥ, xii, 139, 82; 291, 13.¹

Sāmkhya is Atheistic.

In the “one-soul” doctrine just referred to, God himself is energy, kāryātman, the soul of all, the saviour, “the Light which Yogins see,” the Ego, eternal, without characteristics of any sort, aham ca nirgunaḥ, xii, 47, 54, 63, 69-70; xiv, 25, 7. He exists “alone with wisdom,” till he makes the worlds, each succeeding œon, xii, 340, 71-72, just as sunrise and sunset follow each other, ib. 75. On the other hand, the epic declares with all plainness that the Sāmkhya system is devoid of a belief in a personal supreme God. In xii, 301, 1 ff., the question is raised, What is the difference between Sāmkhya and Yoga? The answer is: “Sāmkhyas praise the Sām-

¹ According to xii, 239, 20, Time is the origin and controller of all things, prabhavah ... saṁiyamo yamaḥ, and all things produced by duality exist according to their own nature, svabhāvena. The nature of the individual spirit is often rendered by this word, as such a spirit is conditioned by its former acts. Below is cited a case where it is a factor of the body, distinct from organs, mind, and spirit. An interesting critique of heretics leads up to xii, 238, 3 ff. (where the word connotes nature as understood by Buddhists and materialists): yas tu paśyan svabhāvena vinā bhāvam acetanaḥ pūṣyate sa punah sarvān prajñayā muktahetukān, yeṣāṁ cāi 'kāntabhāvena svabhāvāṁ kāraṇam matam, pūtvā trṣam iṣīkāṁ vā, te labhante na kīrteṇa ... svabhāvaṁ kāraṇaṁ jñātvā na čreyauḥ prāpnuvanti te, svabhāvo hi vinācāya mohakarmamanabhavah, “He is a fool who teaches that nature alone exists, or that cause of change is inherent in nature alone” (nature is without intelligence and, cl. 9, only intelligence gives success; hence nature without intelligence would result in nothing; the final opinion given in cl. 6 on svabhāva and paribhāva). C. has a curious v. 1 (for pūtvā, etc.) ċrutvā nṛpāṁ rūpāṁ vā.
khyā system; Yogas the Yoga system. The pious Yogas say, How can one be freed when one is without a personal God (anīḥvāraḥ); while the Sāṅkhyaś say that one who knows truly all earthly courses becomes unaffected by objects, and would clearly get released from the body in this way alone. This is the exposition of release given by the very intelligent Sāṅkhyaś. But one should take as the means of release that explanation which is given agreeably to his own party. . . . The Yogas rely on immediate perception (of truth), while the Sāṅkhyaś determine according to their code. For my part, I approve of both, for either system followed according to its code would lead to the highest course (emancipation). Purity, penance, compassion toward all creatures, and keeping vows, are found equally in both (systems), but the (philosophic) exposition is not the same in both.” The last words, darçanaṁ na samaṁ tayoḥ, “the exposition is not the same,” can point here only to the essential difference just indicated by the speaker, namely, that one admits and one denies God. And it is to be noticed that this is the end of the explanation. There is not the slightest hint that the anīḥvāra or atheistic Sāṅkhyaś believe in God (a personal Lord, Īcvara).

It must also be remembered that the very term here used to describe the Sāṅkhya belief, far from being admitted as one that connotes a belief in Brahman, is reprehended, not only in the pietistic question above (which may fairly be put categorically as “it is impossible to be saved if one does not believe in a personal God”), but also in the Gītā, which links together as a “creed of devils” the denial of “reality, basis, and personal God,” asatyam apratiśṭhaṁ te jagad āhur anīḥvaram, Gītā, 16, 8, an expression which would have been impossible had the anīḥvāra doctrine been accepted as simply a formal modification of deism, implying a belief in a background of Brahman.

I do not think that anīḥvāra can possibly mean here “not

1 The Yoga has the immediate perception of the mystic: pratyakṣahetavo yogāḥ sāṁkhyaḥ pāstraviniçcayāḥ, ubhe cāi te mate tattve mama (Bhiṣmasya), cū. 7.
having the senses as master,” as it does in xii, 247, 7, where it is opposed to indriyānāṁ vaçyātma; a passage mistranslated by the author of Nirvāṇa, p. 96, as “Without the Lord one attains the place of immortality,” though it clearly means: “Not having (the senses as) a master one attains the immortal state, but being subject to the senses one obtains death.”

In the theistic religion, the personal God not only supplants the old explanation of spirit, but even takes the place of Prakṛti, the unmanifest unknown Source of the Śāmkhya, and creates everything, as does egoism in the pure dogma of the Śāmkhya, as “the name made by egoism, which is synony-
mous,” ahamkārakṛtāṁ caī ’va nāma paryāyavācakam, xii, 340, 62. So to the sectary the name is ever indifferent. As to-day he accepts Christ as his own divinity under another name, so he did of old. The passage in the Gitā is well known, which establishes the principle. In xiii, 14, 318, it is said: “In the Śāmkhya system the All-soul is called Purusha,” i.e. the Śāmkhyas recognize only Purusha, but we say that their Purusha is our All-soul. The twenty-fifth, Purusha, is thus identified with wisdom, vidyā, xii, 308, 7 ff. In a preceding section, 303, 119, Hranvyagarbha is intellect, and is called Viriṇca, Aja, etc., “called by many names in the Śāmkhya Čāstra.”

Yoga as Deistic and Brahmaistic.

The ancient Yogan tales in the epic show that there are important differences between the older and later view of Yoga. To stand on one leg for years and keep quiet long enough for birds to nest in one’s matted locks was the “discipline” of the primitive Yogan as he is represented in these tales. But the Yogan of the later epic regards all such practices as crude and unsatisfactory. His discipline is an elaborate course of breathings and mental confinement in bodily postures described as customary in the Yoga Čāstras. So many breathings at such a time and so many at another, minute attention (in a sitting posture) to concentration and meditation, the
whole paraphernalia of Patañjali, exercised for a “limited

time,” not a word about standing on one leg for years. The
difference is more than superficial, however. The one-leg
Yogin strove for one thing only, supernatural powers. Tale
after tale recounts what powers he gained by these exercises,
and these powers were his goal. He was deistic but he had
no thought of “entering Brahman,” only of controlling the
powers terrestrial, celestial, and elemental. On death his
goal is to be a spirit free and powerful, enjoying good things.
On the other hand, the Yogin of the pseudo-epic discipline
learns all these powers, but “he who practises them goes to
hell,” because his goal was not to be a thaumaturge but to be
released. Both experienced the apunarbhavakāma, “longing
not to be born again,” but the first desired bala, or Yoga
“lordship,” āiçvarya, and all his efforts were directed to that
end; while the last desired lordship only as a means soon to
be rejected for something higher, release, mokṣa, or kevalatva,
isolation, and eventually the recognition of ekatva, unity, of
intellect, mind, senses, and universal soul, ātmano vyāpinaḥ,
xii, 241, 2–3.

The Brahmaistic Yogin is an advance on the deistic Yogin.
The latter recognizes only isolation, kevalatva. So under
the influence of Vishnuism a lecture which teaches Brahman
isolation appears revamped as pantheistic Brahmaism.

In xii, 317, 16 ff., the Yogin meditates on the eternal Lord-
Spirit and Brahman, taṣṭhūṣam puruṣam nityam . . . içānam
brahma ca, the Yogin being in concentration and trance, saṁ-
yama, samādhi: “Like a flame in a windless place, like a

1 xii, 241, 22 ff. evam parimitaṁ kālam (six months) ācaraṁ āśino hi
2 The chapter xii, 289, shows that mokṣa may be simply isolation or inde-
pendence and does not necessarily connote absorption.
3 The whole Yogakṛtya is comprised here in this union as “the highest
knowledge.”
4 The compilers are not averse to this practice; it is a common Hindu
method of improvement. Either the text is rewritten and interpolated or it
is allowed to stand and another section is prefixed or added of the same con-
tent differently treated. The rule is that the improvement precedes the
original.
mountain peak (compare kūṭastha), he beholds Brahman, which is like a fire in great darkness." Then "on abandoning his body without a witness," this Yogin, after attaining in life his powers over the breathings and elements, rudrapradhānas, and wandering about with the "body of eight characteristics," enters into the Lord-Spirit who is isolated, kevalāṃ yāti, for "this is the Yogin's Yoga; what else would have the sign of Yoga?" So ends the chapter, without a suggestion that the Yogin is to be identified with Vishnu.

In the imitation and improvement of this passage, thrust before it in the text, the Yogin's release does not end matters, though Vishnuism is inserted rather clumsily, as will be seen from an analysis of the whole section, 301, 11 ff. "Cutting off the five faults by Yoga, people freed of sins obtain that place (or condition), tat padam, like as big fishes cut through a net and get the water (the fish is not identical with the water, tat padam is place or condition, freedom). Even as strong animals, mṛgāḥ, cut the net, so they would get a clean road when they are freed from all their bonds. Endued with strength, Yogas, on cutting thus the bonds made by greed, go the clean way that is highest and auspicious. . . . Those without power are destroyed, those that have power are released, mucyante balānvitāḥ. . . . On acquiring Yoga-power one can oppose the many objects of sense, vyūhate viśayān, as an elephant opposes a great stream. By Yoga-power made independent, avaçaḥ, Yogins enter Prajāpatis and seers and gods and the elements, as their lords. Not Yama nor the End-maker (differentiated here, often as one), though angered, nor Death, fearful in prowess, not all these lord it over a Yoga of unmeasured energy. A Yoga could make himself many thousands when he has got his power, and with these could wander over earth. Such an one could take the objects of sense and then perform hard austerity and again reduce it, as the sun does his beams of light, tejogunās. The Yoga who holds to the power and is lord of bonds obtains in release, vimokse, the fullest lordship, prabhaviṣṇutva. These powers

1 etad hi yogāṁ yogānāṁ kim anyad yogalakṣañam, 317, 27.
obtained through Yoga have been obtained by me. For elucidation I will now tell thee again, O King, also about the subtile powers.¹ Hear from me, O Bharata, the subtile signs of the soul in concentration, samādhāna, and in respect to contemplation, dhāraṇā, O lord. As an archer by being attentive, apramatta, with concentration hits the mark, so the Yogin, properly intent, doubtless obtains release, mokṣa. As a man intent, yuktā, with intent mind would go up a ladder, steadily fixing his thoughts on the vessel full of oil (in his hands), so the Yoga here, intent, O King, steadily makes spotless his soul (till) it looks like the image of the sun.² As the steersman with concentration, samāhita, would guide a ship on the ocean, so by applying self-concentration with intentness, ātmasyamānaṃ yuktṛvā yogena, he that knows the true, tattva, gets a place hard to attain, durgam āsthānam, after leaving his body here. As a charioteer with concentration yoking, yuktṛvā, good horses, quickly brings the knight to the desired place, deṣam iṣṭam, so, O King, the Yogin with his mind concentrated in contemplation quickly gets the highest place, paramā sthānan, just as the arrow when released, mukta, finds its mark. The Yogin who stands steadily seeing self in self destroys sin and gains the unalterable place, padam, of those who are pure. The Yogin who properly joins, yuṅkte, with his soul (self) the subtile self in the navel, throat, head, heart, chest, sides, eye, ear, and nose, quickly consuming his Karma, good and bad, though mountainous (in size), having recourse to highest Yoga is released, if he wishes."

This is the end of the discourse for the present. Nothing is said of the Yogin’s emancipation being other than a release from bonds. The conversation turns to the question of food and means of restraint of the senses, the hard path of auster-

¹ These words are perhaps the mark of interpolation here.
² sneha-pūrṇe yathā pātre mana ādhāya niṣcalam, puruṣo yuktā śrohet sopānāṃ yuktāmānasāḥ, yuktās tathā 'yam ātmānam yogāḥ pārthiva niṣcalam karoti amalam ātmānam bhāskaropamadarṣanam. In 317, 22, tālāpātraṃ yathā pārame kaṅkhyāṇāḥ grhyā puruṣaḥ sopānām aruhev bhītas tarjayamaṇo 'sāpaṇibhīṣa samāyātāṃ bhavāti teṣām na pāṭrā bhide utṣaram uṣrayaṃ tatāḥ 'vo 'taram āgamyam ekāgramanasas tathā, etc.
ities which makes the subtile soul shine forth, but he who follows it "is released from birth and death, ill and weal." "This," it is then said, "is what has been set forth in various Yoga-Çāstras; in the twice-born is admittedly the highest Yoga practice," kṛtyam, čl. 57.

Thus far the člokas and the final stanza seems to show that this is the end. But to this are tagged on five triṣṭubh stanzas, with which the chapter now concludes: "That highest Brahman-made Brahmán and Lord Vishnu, the boon-giver, O great-souled one, and Bhava, and Dharma, and the six-faced (god), and the sons of Brahmán, tamas, rajas, sattva, and highest Prakṛti, and Siddhi the goddess wife of Varuṇa, and all energy, tejas, and patience, and the pure lord of stars in the sky with the stars, all the all-gods, the snakes, and manes, and all mountains, the terrible seas, all rivers with forests and clouds, Nāgas and nagas, troops of genii, spaces, the angel hosts, males and females—one after the other attaining, the great great-souled Yogin would enter soon after he is released. And this narration, O King, is auspicious in that it rests on the god who has great vigor and intelligence. Such a great-souled Yogin, overpowering all mortals, acts, having the self of Nārāyaṇa" (according to the commentator, makes all things as being identical with Nārāyaṇa).¹

It is true that a view which ignores every indication of interpolation may insist that literature is to be treated without critique, overlook the patchwork, and concentrate emphasis on this last nārāyaṇātmā to offset the whole teaching preceding, which is that the soul gets isolation, not absorption into Brahman. But even then Nārāyaṇa is not philosophical Brahman. In the following chapter, which is a new discussion, 302, 55, the Kāpilaḥ Śāṅkhyaḥ are also led to emancipation, in which teaching ātman rests on Nārāyaṇa, Nārāyaṇa rests on emancipation, but emancipation has no support (the same word as above of the narration which rests on Nārāyaṇa), mokṣam saktaṁ tu na kvacit; though the Śāṅkhyya philoso-

¹ yogī sa sarvān abhibhūya martyān nārāyaṇātmā kurute mahātmā, 301, 62.
phers are finally conducted through an unfinished sentence eighteen clokas long to Nārāyaṇa, who bears them to the Highest Soul, when they become fitted for immortality, and return no more, c. l. 78.

These are chapters of a sectarian cult, which seeks to include in its embrace all systems of philosophy, and does so vi et armis. The more precious and reliable are those expositions which show the systems still but slightly twisted from their original form. This last is a system called Vedānta, 302, 71, as I have already remarked, but in point of fact it, i.e., this last chapter, not the preceding exposition, is an exposition of Yoga twisted into sectarian Brahmāism. The soul eventually enters Vishnu, who is unconditioned Brahman, and does not return; but it enters by jīva and videha mukti, in Yoga style. That is, before death the real soul enters Vishnu, leaving behind in a man not soul but only mind and senses. Shortly after, however, one is really “released and gets peace.” This, it is said, is the Sāṃkhya system which is identical with eternal Brahman (302, 96–101; compare 106, amūrtes tasya ... sāṅkhyaṁ mūrtir iti ċrutīḥ). The Sāṃkhya system, which is at first said to be faultless (č. l. 4), is in č. l. 13 declared to have faults as well as virtues, the same being true of Veda and Yoga; that is, this teaching is put forward as an improvement on the old, though the accepted base is the Sāṃkhya. It is pretended that the teachers teach as do the Kāpilas, who are endued with knowledge and “clarified by ratioicination,” kāraṇāir bhāvītāḥ ċubhāḥ, č. l. 17.

**Difference between Sāṃkhya and Yoga.**

As has been shown above, the epic itself teaches that the great difference between the two systems is that the Sāṃkhya does not believe in a personal God, while God is the supreme

---

1 xii, 302, 24–52. Compare 5–17 also one sentence. These interminable sentences are marks of the late style of the pseudo-epic.

2 In č. l. 108 it is said that this Vedānta (č. l. 71) Sāṃkhya embraces all the knowledge found in Sāṃkhya and Yoga (sāṅkhyaṁ tathā ‘va yoge), the Purāṇa, the great Itihāsas (pl.), Arthaśāstra, and the world (Lokāyata).
belief of the Yogan. A further difference is found by the
commentator in the words of xii, 240, 8, where it is said :
"Vishnu in stepping, Čakra in power, Agni in the digestiv
organ (etc.) wishes to enjoy," bhoktum icchati, a stanza
wedged between the statements that bodies come from earth,
etc., and that ears, etc., are organs of sense. What is appar-
etent is that experience is here shifted from pure spirit to the
corresponding divinity.¹

So far as I know, the difference of opinion is nowhere in the
epic stated to involve a distinction between the two systems,
and in this chapter the subject of active and experiencing
spirit is not further touched upon. I doubt, therefore, the
validity of the commentator’s explanation as applied to the
epic, but his words are worth citing: "In the Yoga system
the spirit is not active but experiences only, while in the
Sāmkhya system the spirit neither acts nor experiences. In
this passage the poet repudiates the first doctrine, and ex-
presses approval of the second" (by naming devas as "enjoy-
ers," and thus showing that it is only a false imagina-
tion of the spirit when it thinks itself an "enjoyer").²

According to the epic, all activity resides in Prakṛti, the
Source alone, while experience resides in spirit but only as the
latter is conditioned by its environment, prakṛtisthāḥ, so that
when it is in the body the highest spirit is called enjoyer and
active, but it is not really so, kurvann api na lipyate, na
karoti na lipyate. This is the explanation of the Gītā³
(which denies that there is any speculative difference between
the two systems), and is found often enough elsewhere.⁴ So
God as a conditioned being, spirit, enjoys the guṇas, as in
xii, 340, where the twenty-fifth principle, though "without

¹ As in Māit. Up. vi, 10, bhoktā puruṣo bhojyā prakṛtih, "enjoy" is some-
times sensuously rendered, "Spirit is the eater, Prakṛti the food." Ordinarily
"enjoy" is experience.
² yogamate, ātma bhoktā ’va na tu kartā; sāmkhyamate tu, na bhoktā
na ’pi karte ’ti; tatrā ’dyaṁ dūṣayati, etc.
³ Gītā, 3, 27; 5, 7; 13, 20, etc.
⁴ Compare xii, 247, 1-2: "The spirit supervises modifications (he knows
them, they do not know him), he does what is to be done (only) in conjunc-
tion with the senses and mind, the sixth" (like a charioteer, as above).
characteristics,” is guṇabhuj or en joyer of guṇas as well as the superior creator of guṇas, guṇasraṣṭā guṇādhikah, ifecycle.1 So Čiva is ṣaṣṭibhāga (below). “Like a lamp giving light know the jñānātman, knowledge-spirit, Purusha, to be in all creatures. It makes the ear hear; it hears; it sees. The body is the cause (of perception), but this (soul) is the doer of all acts,” xii, 210, 40. Here the last clause, sa kartā sarvakaranām, means that soul acts only as modified by Prakṛti. In xii, 222, 17 ff.: "Whoso thinks himself an actor, faulty is his judgment. Activity is nature only, the only factor," svabhāva eva tat sarvam (one becomes vitṛṣṇa, cycle. 30, when one knows the difference between the Source and its modifications). In xii, 304, 45, the Source does every act, and it alone enjoys, acñāti. Opposed to this is the Brahmaistic view, which holds that “the inner soul, antarātman, alone smells, tastes,” etc., as an entity separate from elements (below).

A practical difference may be found in the attitude of the two systems toward austerities, though it is stated that this exercise is common to both. Nevertheless it cannot be supposed that the “knowledge-philosopher” admitted as much tapas as did the Yogin, whose practical discipline was almost wholly a “razor-edged path” of austerity. The practice is occasionally pre reprehended, as in xii, 221, 4, where it is said that fasting is not meritorious, as it is injurious to the soul’s discipline, ātmatantropaghātaḥ, a view which is of course contradictory to the mass of teaching in the epic, for example, ib. 233, 23, where penance is the means of “attaining to the being that creates the universe.” The “difference between Sāṁkhya and Yoga,” as admitted and explained in the late passage xii, 237, 29 ff., is mainly a practical one, in that “the Sāṁkhya keeps aloof from objects of sense, controls the senses, and is alike to all creatures, friendly to all, indifferent to all things, injures no creatures, and so attains to Brahman;” whereas that Yoga is released “who, transcending supernatural power, ceases” (from activity). The Yoga is thus described in one

1 The twenty-fifth, not the twenty-sixth principle, is here God.
2 sarvabhūtāsadrī māitraḥ samaloṣṭāçmakāścanaḥ, 38, a standing epithet.
verse: yogāścavayam atikrānto yo nīśkrāmati mucyate, 237, 40. The dependence of the Sāṅkhya on knowledge alone is here merely implied, though the following image of the saving "ship of knowledge" makes it clearer, but the whole passage is a late attempt to interpret Sāṅkhya by another norm.¹

One further practical difference between the systems is pointed out by the commentator at xii, 241, 34, where, after asceticism is described, it is said that a man of low caste or a woman seeking virtue "may attain the highest course by this path" (of the Yoga). The commentator takes pains to remark that this applies only to the Yoga, and not to the Sāṅkhya. A little farther on, in 247, 16, where the same system is still taught, but on the intellectual side, not on the ascetic side, it is, expressly stated that the Cāstra should be told only to men of the higher castes, Snātakas.²

It is expressly charged against the Pāṇḍupata sect that it is subversive of caste: "I, Rudra, formerly for the first time invented the mysterious Pāṇḍupata religion, beneficent to all, facing in all directions, one that takes years or only ten days ³ to learn, one which, though blamed by the unintelligent (because it is) here and there opposed to the rules of the Cāstra and those of the Orders, varṇāśramakṛtaṁ dharmāṁ vīparītāṁ

¹ brahmāṇam abhivartate, a late carelessness, repeated with cā 'dhigacchati, cl. 36 and 41. The four-faced Brahmā and the highest Brāhmaṇ, respectively, is the commentator's ready explanation ("masculine by Vedic licence"). The same sort of thing is found in another later passage, where a double carelessness appears, brahmāṇam adhigatvā (sic) ca, iii, 83, 73. Part of the above description is a copy of the Gitā, nirmamaḥ cā 'nahaṁkāro nirdvandvaṁ chinnasamāgayaḥ nāṁ 'va krudhyati na dveṣṭi, 237, 34, as in Gitā, 5, 3; 12, 13 (= 2, 71); 18, 53, brāhmabhūyaṁ kalpate.

² See below the passage inculating pure Yoga (the twenty-sixth principle), where it is said, xii, 319, 89, that it is a doctrine of emancipation for all, and knowledge is to be got from all, for all castes are Brahmans, all are born of Brahm, and all castes are equal; and compare ib. 188, 10 ff., na viçeṣō 'sti varpaṇāṁ, etc. In 251, 21, ātmajāṁ nam idam guhyam, as in the earliest Upanishads. A "God without characteristics" is responsible for the democratic equality of the "no caste" view. So Cīvārīsm teaches that castes are only indications of position, brāhmaṇ śvabhāvaḥ is everywhere equal, and all men are children of the one God who created them, xiii, 143, 50-3.

³ Instead of ten days, says the commentator, the Gauḍas read "five days."
kvācit samam, is nevertheless appreciated by those of perfected wisdom, gatāntas, and is really superior to the Orders” (atyañcramam, xii, 285, 194–195). In the preceding stanza, this Pācāpata is contrasted with the gods’ and demons’ religion of austerity, the latter being “drawn from the Vedas and Sāmkhya and Yoga by logic,” another mark of difference in the views urged in the epic, not, as often, concealed under a pretended unity, but openly stated.

Sects.

I would say a word here in regard to the sects recognized in the epic, though, except for their philosophy, I do not intend to touch further on them. The epic commentator sees in the epithet pañcamahākalpa, applied to Vishnu, a reference to the scriptures, āgamas, of five diverse sects, Sāuras, Čāktas, Gāneças, Čāivas, and Vaiśṇavas. The epic in reality recognizes only the first and last two, for the allusion to shadow-worship (which the commentator explains as a Left-hand rite) though interesting, does not imply necessarily a body called Čāktas, and Gāneças are unknown, the god himself belonging only to the pseudo-epic introduction, and very likely interpolated there, as has been shown by Dr. Winternitz. Even Durgā seems to be a late addition to the epic as she appears hymned. But the Čāivas are known as having a religion called Pācāpata (above) and the Vaiśṇavas and Sāuras are known in two late passages, xviii, 6, 97 and vii, 82, 16, under these names. I suppose only the synthetic method would claim that the whole epic recognizes the titles of sects so sporadically mentioned. The older Vishnuite sect-name is Pañcarātra or the more personal “devotees of the Lord,” Bhāgavatas, and Bhagavadbhaktas, even though these were rather

1 Rudra says to Dakṣa: bhūyaça ca te varāṁ dami taṁ tvam grhaṇīva suvrata, prasannavadano bhūtvā tad iḥaḥ kamanāḥ cṛṇu; vedā śaḍaṅgād uddhṛtya sāmkhya-yogāc ca yuktītaḥ tapaḥ sapatam vipulaṁ duṣcaraṁ devadānavaḥ, xii, 285, 191–192; and then as above, in contrast, the Pācāpata system, which has overthrown the older systems (Rudra destroys Dakṣa’s sacrifice).
rare. The last, for example, is found in i, 214, 2 (with bhāikṣas or cāukṣas). The same passage that calls Vishnu pañcamahākalpa gives him the titles of Prācinagarbha (below) and Kāuçika and identifies him with the Atharvaçiras Upanishad, xii, 339, 113–125. Though the god is here Vishnu, I venture to think the last epithets were originally applied to Çiva. The “white men” of the White Island, or rather country (dvīpa = the dig uttarā or more exactly uttarapaçīmena, “in the Northwest,” 336, 8–10; 337, 21 ff.) must be Kashmere Brahmans, who are often almost as white as Europeans and whose religion was the worship of Çiva (as a god of culture and letters) in monotheistic form, which is here perverted. The location “Northwest” and “far North” can scarcely be anywhere else than Kashmere, where alone “northern white men,” çvetāh pumāñsaḥ, 336, 10, were to be seen.¹

**The Different Schemata.**

The philosophical schemes elaborated in the epic show three distinct groupings, which must belong to different systems. These are the Sāṁkhya, the Yoga, and a third system, which follows a different series of topics. All three differ essentially from Vedism and Brahmaism, as this latter, in turn, differs from what we call Vedānta. Both of the latter are represented, making six systems, as said above; but of these there are full schemata or topica in three cases at least,² indicating what for convenience I shall call scholastic differences, the three schematizing systems being here termed schools. It is unnecessary to point out that no one set of teachers, much less the one poet of the unhistorical method, would have inculcated six systems, or elaborated three schools, especially as the topics of two of these schools imply a fundamental difference between them.

¹ The “Sea of milk” in the Purāṇas is said to surround a Himālayan mountain, Krāuñca. The second (earlier) account of the “white men” in the epic is quite Sāṁkhyan, God is Purusha, etc.
² Compare also the rather rare recognition of pure Vedānta Māyā-Brahmaism, and above in the first chapter the philosophy copied from the Upanishads without identification of soul with sectarian god.
Common to all three schools is the distinction between the First Cause or Source as manifest and unmanifest. The manifest, or known, is all that is born, grows, ages, and dies, while the unmanifest, or unknown, is “the opposite,”¹ that is, it is devoid of these four marks, lakedānas. Further, Sāṁkhya and Yoga both admit two selves, ātmans, it is said, which are declared “in the Vedas and in the Siddhāntas.”² The first is that born with the four marks, that is, those of the manifest, and has four objects (caturvarga, virtue, pleasure, gain, emancipation). This is the manifest self, born of the unmanifest; it is awakened, buddha, but has not the highest intelligence, cetanā; it is the conditioned sattva soul, in distinction from the pure knowing soul, kṣetrajña, though both are attached to objects of sense. “Both systems admit twenty-five topics,” a statement to be reviewed below.

The Unmanifest is that which cannot be known, aveyam, which has no padanyāsa, leaves no track, and is therefore beyond knowledge, xii, 205, 18; aveyam avyaktam, xii, 319, 42. Kapila calls it the ārtyā, ādya, and says he uses the term First Cause, Source, Prakṛti, merely to escape a regressus ad infinitum. It is therefore merely a name, saṁjñāmātram. It is used of the That: “One could never reach the end of causation, nāk ’vā ’ntam kāraṇasye ’yāt, even if one went unceasingly like an arrow from the cord, yathā bāno guṇacuyutah, and swift as thought. Nothing is more subtle than the

¹ So in xii, 217, 9-10, it is said that Prakṛti creates and has three guṇas, while spirit’s marks are “the opposite” (for the threefold guṇas are only his “turban,” cb. 12).
² xii, 237, 27, 31, siddhānteṣu. Siddhānta is mentioned also in i, 70, 44. In the present passage the commentator takes the Vedas and Siddhāntas as Pūrvamimāṃsā and Uttaramimāṃsā. Another late expression in this section describes the effulgent jīva-yoked car as having all the Tantras as its goad (sarvatantrapratodaḥ, xii, 237, 11, straddles the pādas), where the commentator says Cāstra, and is probably right, as we have Nyāyatantras mentioned, which are doubtless works on logic. Compare with the passage above, xii, 206, 28, avyaktātmā puruṣo vyaktakarmā so ’vyaktatvaṁ gacchati hy antakāle; xii, 199, 125, caturbhir laksanāir hinaṁ tathā saḍhhiḥ saśoḍaśailḥ puruṣāṁ tam atikramya ākāśam pratipadyate (the six are ills and the sixteen are breaths, organs, and mind, according to the commentator), but the four are here said to be cetas and three proofs.
unmanifest That (çl.18); nothing is coarser. Finer than fine, greater than great is That, the invisible end of all things,” xii, 240, 28 (29 = Čvet. Up. iii, 16; Gītā, 13, 13). It is a term used in both philosophies, and is simply equivalent to the invisible unknown First Cause. From its synonym Prakṛti, First Cause, it may be called simply the Source. So also Brahman is avyaktam. Usually this term is defined in such negatives as in neti neti, a superabundance of which appears in this definition: “Brahman has not been explained by mantras; with the world of experience it has not anything in common; it has not sound, touch, not form; it is not comprehended; not manifest . . . not female, not male, not neuter (as in 251, 22), not being, not not-being, not being-and-not-being . . . not perishable,”¹ an imitation of older matter.

This “Unknown,” which forms the common basis of the great philosophical systems, in the Sāṁkhya connotes potential egoism, becomes known first as Ego or self-conscious intellect, and out of this egoism is developed the whole created universe; over against which stands the pure unconscious spirit, the real Ego. This, in outline, is the whole plan of the Sāṁkhya philosophy, which admits nothing outside of pure Ego and self-conscious Ego, and ascribes all apparent other to modifications of egoism. There are here twenty-four principles over against the pure spirit Ego as the twenty-fifth.²

On the other hand, besides these, the Yogin’s system superadds one exalted spirit as Supreme Spirit, or God, the twenty-sixth principle.

The Pañcupatas and Bhāgavatas have a different system of categories, but teach that the Supreme Spirit as a personal God becomes manifest; in the latter sect, as a god-man.

Common to the three schools is the belief in the three constituents of the Unmanifest, called guṇas; but these are sometimes treated as constituents and sometimes as attributes.

¹ na san na ca’ sat sad-asac ca tan na . . . tad aksaraṁ na kṣaraṁ ‘ti viddhi. In 251, 22, Brahman is asukham as well as aduñkham, “not joy, not sorrow.”
² Prakṛti is devoid of the highest intelligence, acetanā, and only when supervised by spirit creates and destroys. Puruṣa has millions or 1,400,000 courses, xii, 315, 12; ib. 2; 281, 36.
The Guṇas.

The Unknown becomes known as a result of energy, tejas or rajas, rousing itself and rousing conditioned being, sattva,\(^1\) out of the equilibrium which is maintained between these two and inertia (dulness, darkness, tamas). These are the three constituents of the conscious Ego, and consequently of all things except pure spirit. That is to say, energy, inertia, and existence (conditioned being), characterize all things, and life begins with energy moving sattva as well as itself. A moral interpretation of these strands, guṇas, as they are called, makes being, as compared with the other two, represent the true and real and good; inertia, the stupid and bad; while energy may be good or bad, but is never the best, as that is devoid of all activity (quietism).\(^2\) These guṇas, constituents, are, to use a term taken from their grammatical application, themselves gunātād or characterized by the presence of certain qualities, a meaning often found employed in the case of guṇa. Thus in xii, 334, 2, one abandons fourfold faults, eightfold tamas and fivefold rajas. What is of most importance, however, from the historical rather than the philosophical point of view, is that in these groups there is no uniformity in the teaching of the epic. Thus in xii, 814, 21 ff., not five, as above, but over twenty faults are given as characteristics, guṇas, of rajas. In the same way, sattva has in xii,

---

\(^1\) Sattva (compare satyasya satyam) is being, but not absolute being, which is free from consciousness of self. We may best render the "three strands" or inherent constituents of creation (everything except pure spirit) by energy, inertia, and conscious-existence, which exist potentially in the undeveloped and actually in the developed universe. I am aware that the guṇas are translated differently by high authorities, but must for the present refrain from further discussion of the interpretation.

\(^2\) Compare Gitā, 17, 26: "Sat is employed in the meaning of existence and of good" (commentator wrong). The avyakta (unknown undeveloped) is gunāted as much as is vyakta, only the equilibrium not being disturbed the guṇas are merely potential, avyaktāṁ triguṇāṁ śnīrtam, xiv, 39, 24. In regard to "darkness," it must be remembered that in the older philosophies, darkness, tamas, is not a quality but a substance (only the Nyāya regards it as absence of light). See the argument in the Aṅgukya chapter of the Sarvadarśana.
342, 13, eighteen gunas, while in 314, 17 ff., nearly double this number are given it, including most of the former group but placed in a different arrangement. Again in xii, 302, 14–16, sattva has ten (unexplained) gunas; rajas, nine; tamas, eight; buddhi, seven; manas, six; nabhas, five; but then, again, buddhi has fourteen; tamas, three; rajas, two; sattva, one. This merely means that each strand has certain attributes. The same list, for instance, is given in the Anugītā, xiv, 38, 2 ff., as indications of sattva. It seems unnecessary to enumerate these varying characteristics. The gist of them all is found in Gītā, 14, 9 ff.: sattva belongs to pleasant things, rajas to activity, tamas to apathy. So in xii, 194, 30, a touch of joy is characteristic of sattva, and “if anything is joined to joy there is the condition, bhāva, of sattva” (only five are given here); while in 35 there are five līngas or signs of energy, rajas, and in 36, five gunas of tamas (= 286, 25 ff., with v. 1 = 248, 19 ff.) As tejas, energy, is attributed to Brahman, the term falls into comparative desuetude, being replaced by the less moral rajas, while tejas is left as a virtuous characteristic: dhūtapāṃ pū tu tejasvī . . . ninīśed brahmaṇaḥ padam (said of the good man), and Brahman is tejomayaṃ, xii, 241, 9 and 13. So tejas is a good quality, Gītā, 16, 3.

In this conception, sattva is as much of a bond as are the other two gunas. Knowledge and pleasure are the attachments with which it binds the soul; while rajas binds with action and tamas with heedlessness, laziness, sleep, the signs of inertia, Gītā, 14, 6–8.

1 The eighteen gunas of sattva, to give an example, are pṛtiḥ prakūṭam udreko laghūta sukham eva ca, ukārpanyam asamrambhah santosah śraddhābhānaṭah, kṣamā dhītrī ahiṁsā ca gāucam akrodha eva ca, ārjavaḥ samatā satyam anasūya tathai 'va ca (those in italics reappear in the longer list, 314, 17–20).

2 The Hindu conception is not quite uniform in regard to the gunas, but there is, I think, no reason for confounding essential constituents with attributes. Joy and sorrow are not the gunas themselves but their objective signs in the moral world. The true opposites are tejas and tamas, light and darkness, as energy and inertia physically, and as goodness and badness morally.

3 But rajas often keeps its pure tejas sense, as in xiv, 30, 9, rajaḥ paryāyakārakam, rajas is energy.
The Source, Prakṛti, is the combination of the three guṇas, represented as a female productive power. As a lamp lights thousands so the Source modifies herself into the many guṇas (characteristics) of spirit. She does it of her own will and desire, and for the sake of sport.¹

According to the proportion of guṇas in a creature, it has a high, middle, or low place, xii, 315, 3–4; Gītā, 14, 18. Evidently, therefore, the Yoga-god must be without guṇas, so nirguṇa is predicated of him and of Brahman, nirguṇasya kuto guṇāḥ, xii, 306, 29, as say the guṇadarśinah, but as God must be everything he is also “with guṇas” as well as “without guṇas,” a contradiction which is on a par with God’s being being and not being being and being neither being nor not-being, the common tangle of metaphysics.² In fact, religious philosophy is hopelessly at sea, not only in regard to the question of a conditioned God but also in regard to the guṇas of the spirit. It is universally admitted that energy and inertia must be dispensed with in order to a full attainment of pure spirituality, xiv, 51, 25. But when spirit has sattva alone or is in sattva alone, sattvam āsthāya kevalam, is it one with this being or not? Some say, “and they are wise,” that spirit and sattva have unity, kṣetrajñasattvayor āikyam, but this is wrong. Still, they cannot exist apart. There is unity and diversity, as in the case of the lotus and water-drop, the fish in water, the fly in the Udumbara plant, ekatvanānātivam, xiv, 48, 9–11.³ In xiii, 108, 7, sattva must be “washed out”

¹ prakṛṭir guṇāṇ vikurute svacchandenā 'tmakāmyayā kriḍārthe tu, xii, 314, 15–16 (prakṛtis tathā vikurute puruṣasya guṇān bahūn).
² God is nirguṇa and guṇatman and nirguṇa alone and tríguṇa, etc., xii, 339, 3 ff.; xiii, 137, 3. Guṇa-made are all existences, Gītā, 7, 13; God is not in them, they are in him, ib., 12. They do not affect God, xii, 340, 22 (in 20 it is said that those devoid of rajas and tamas attain to God, presumably retaining sattva; but elsewhere sattva must also be lost, e. g., 335, 30); viddhi bhāvan madācraśyān, xiv, 54, 2; avyaktāt utpanno mahān ātmā ādir guṇānām, 40, 1.
³ Here Telang is obliged to render sattva as goodness and as nature, according to the verse, e. g., unintelligent sattva, 49, 9, and 12, where the spirit enjoys sattva. Sattva, however, is always conditioned existence or a conditioned being, abstract or concrete. It is the highest, because it may be free
of the soul of pure Yogins, along with rajas and tamas. In these cases we have simply an attempt on the part of theology to utilize the terms of atheistic philosophy, which naturally leads to confusion. For the terms (applicable to Prakṛti) of Śāṅkhya are incompatible with the philosophy which substitutes God for both Purusha and Prakṛti.

When the guṇas are called ātmaguṇas, as in xiv, 12, 4, it is to distinguish them as mental from the bodily constituents, guṇāḥ ca riṣṭajāḥ, with which they are compared. As the three constituents of the body, rūpam vāyuḥ ca (= kapha, pitta, vāta) give a healthy condition when in equilibrium, so the three ātmaguṇas, when equal, produce a healthy condition. Here the three are merely essential elements in a tridhātu or threefold entity. Thus elements are called, as the constituents or factors, dhātavaḥ, inherent in the Source, dhātavaḥ pāñcabhāutikāḥ, iii, 211, 9 ff., just as the essential constituents of a king's concern are called guṇas, xv, 6, 6.

**Plurality of Spirits.**

The passage just cited from the Anugītā on "unity and diversity" reflects an important section in Čānti. Here, xii, 316, 3 ff., a difference is established between Unmanifest Prakṛti and spirit, the former being affected by guṇas, incapable of escaping from them, and inherently ignorant; the latter being both pure and contaminated, because he is associated with the Unmanifest. Causing creation he is called creator. Because of his observing as a spectator and of his from rajas and tamas, but is itself, though "good," not "best." This is what is in the Hindu's mind, but the distinction between this existence and that of God or Brahman is much like that between the highest knowledge of man and that non-knowledge knowledge of God. Both are attempts to release the infinite from the limitation of any definition. To say He is is to put Him in a class, hence we cannot say He is, but of course we cannot say "He is not." He is pure knowledge but this is a limitation; hence He knows without knowing and exists without existing, totally indefinable. The difference between the early Upanishad and epic philosophy in respect of conditioned Atman, is that only the latter uses technical Śāṅkhya terms, just as the later Upanishads use them.
being without a second, ananyatva, and of his false opinion (of himself), abhimāna, Yatis (Yogas) regard him (the same spirit) as both eternal and non-eternal, manifest and unmanifest: “This is what I have heard said; but those who have the religion of compassion and abide by knowledge alone, say that there is unity in the Unmanifest but a plurality of spirits.” Here the last authorities are clearly the Śāṅkhyaś, who are characterized in the epic not only as “devoted to knowledge,” but as especially moral and compassionate. The section concludes: “Puruṣha, spirit, and the Unmanifest (masculine) are different. The latter is called eternal but is not eternal. Spirit’s connection with the Unmanifest is that of the grass blade in its sheath, the fly and the Udumbara, the fish in water, the fire in the pan, the lotus and water-drop; there is connection but not identity. This is the Śāṅkhya view, the best estimate, parisamkhyaṇa.”

So in xii, 351, 1, the question is raised in regard to one or many spirits, only to be answered with the statement that there may be many spirits, but they all have the same birthplace. The answer is really assumed in the question, so that the passage is of interest chiefly as showing a full recognition of the fact that Kapila taught (as above) the doctrine of multitudinous spirits without a common source. This is brought out more distinctly in the following statement, viz., that Vyāsa (the Yoga) teaches that all spirits have a common source, although Kapila and other metaphysicians have declared Āstras in which a plurality of spirits is inculcated: “In the discussion (of this subject) by Śāṅkhya-Yogas there are many spirits assumed in the world and (these philosophers) will not grant that one spirit (exists as the sole source).”

1 ib. ch. 11: avyaktāḥ katvam ity ahr nānātvam puruṣāḥ tathā sarvabhidhā taddayāvantāḥ kevalāḥ jñānam āśhitāḥ. It is worth noticing how frequently the Śāṅkhyaś are called “those who have compassion and knowledge,” a Buddhistic inheritance apparently, though this is a suggestion liable to seem antiquated.

2 bhavaḥ puruṣāḥ brahmaṇaḥ utāho eka eva tu, ko hy atra puruṣah āgriṣṭhaḥ ko vā yonir iho ‘cyate, “Are there many spirits or only one? Which is the best? or which (spirit) is the source?”
this is a mere assumption) and, as a sole source of many spirits is declared (to exist), so will I explain that spirit which is superior to conditions (or has superior characteristics) to be the All. . . . This hymn [Rig Veda, x, 90], the Purusha-Sūkta expounded in all the Vedas as right and true, has been considered by (Vyāsa), the lion among sages. Čāstras with rules and exceptions, utsargena-pavādena, have been proclaimed by sage metaphysicians beginning with Kapila. But Vyāsa has proclaimed spirit-unity, puruṣāikatvam, and his teaching in brief will I declare."

Nothing could show more clearly the absurdity of denying the variegated beliefs reflected in the epic, or the ancient foundation of the Kāpila, not in Brahman but in a plurality of spirits devoid of a common source. In Vyāsa we have a revolt against Kapila, not in absolute rebuttal, but in a denial of his chief principles and in an attempt to show that the time-honored system could be interpreted in accordance with a belief in a personal God.1

Another point of importance is the decision with which the heretical view is attacked: "Unity is a proper view, separate-ness is an incorrect view," ekatvaṁ darčanaṁ nānātvam adar-čanam; again: "The view that the Supreme Soul is one with the individual soul is the correct view; the view that they are separate is an incorrect view," anidarčanam (the commentator says there is another reading anudarčanam, which he interprets as a following or later view, xii, 306, 35–37).2

1 Here the author of Nirvāṇa, p. 97, suppresses the fact that Vyāsa’s view is placed in antithesis to Kapila’s, and, leaping over the intervening verses, says that Śāmkhya-Yoga in this passage teaches only a common source of souls. It is indeed said at the end of the text that Śāmkhya-Yoga is Vishnuism (see just below), but no notice is taken of the fact in Nirvāṇa that the special passage under consideration presents the matter quite differently. The passage above almost seems to imply that Vyāsa is to be regarded as a philosophical teacher especially, perhaps as the author of a philosophical work (Holtzmann opposed, iv, p. 111); possibly of the Vyāsagrantha of i, 70, 45 (commentator opposed). In any case, Vyāsa’s teaching, though not that of Bādarāyaṇa, claims to improve on Kapila’s view.

2 Compare Kaṭha, iv, 11: (He perishes) "who sees, as it were, separateness here," ya iha nāne āva paṭya (the separateness is here that of any part of
Of course the Śāṅkhya-Yogas, being the models, are credited with the view expressly said to be not theirs. So in the exposition above from xii, 351, after Vyāsa has been distinctly opposed to the Śāṅkhya-Yogas and his view is explained to be that the different souls (created by Brahmān) at last are absorbed into their one source, the “subtle entity appearing as four” (Aniruddha, etc.), it is calmly said that this is Śāṅkhya and Yoga, xii, 352, 12–13, 23. But occasionally this flat self-contradiction is avoided, as it is in the second passage cited above, by saying that while Śāṅkhya-Yogas generally hold a view not quite orthodox, the wise among them think otherwise. Thus: “That twenty-fifth principle which the Śāṅkhya-Yogas as a whole, sarvaçāpa, proclaim to be higher than intellect, buddheḥ param, the wise declare is a (personal) Lord, conditioned and not conditioned, identical both with Purusha and with the Unmanifest . . . and this is also the opinion of those who being skilled in Śāṅkhya-Yoga seek after a Supreme,” paramāṁśiṇāḥ, xii, 306, 31–33. In other words, such Śāṅkhya-Yogas as admit that the twenty-fifth topic is a Supreme Being say that he is our personal God.

The Twenty-fifth Principle.

In the passage cited above, xii, 306, 33, the spirit is denominated Pañcaviṁcāti, the twenty-fifth principle. This is the last Śāṅkhya topic. But: “The wise say that the twenty-fifth creation is a topic and that there is something apart from the topics and higher.” Here stands the implication of the twenty-sixth principle, in contradiction to the preceding, as appears still more plainly in the next section, where 307, 43 ff., it is expressly said: “Counting up the four-and-twenty topics with Prakṛti, the Śāṅkhyas recognize a twenty-fifth principle which is apart from the topics; this twenty-fifth principle is said to be the soul without Source or un-Prakṛti-soul, aprakṛtyātmā, when it is enlightened, budhyamānaḥ; and when it thus recognizes self, it becomes pure and apart, Brahman from the whole). On the Yoga anudarçanam, see the note above, p. 07.
yadā to budhyate tmnām tadā bhavati kevalāḥ. This is the correct view according to the topics. Those knowing this attain equablleness. From direct perception one could understand Prakṛti from guṇa and topic and so one can judge from things without gunas. There is something higher than the destructible. They who do not agree to this have a false view and do not become emancipated but are born again in manifest form. The unmanifest is said to be the All. But the twenty-fifth principle is not part of this 'all,' asarvah pāṅcaviṃśakāḥ. They that recognize him have no fear.

Here there is not an indication of any principle higher than the Śāṁkhyya twenty-fifth, except as the commentator reads Brahman into the word self as “soul,” but the word is used of jiva in the preceding verse, and of Brahman there is not a word. The “thing to be known” is the “twenty-fifth principle” as opposed to the Unmanifest, which is here the “field” of knowledge. The view of a Lord-principle is distinctly opposed: “It is said that the Unmanifest comprehends not only the field of knowledge (as has just been stated in ċl. 38) but also sattva and Lord; the Śāṁkhyya-system holds, however, that the twenty-fifth principle has no Lord and is itself the topic that is apart from topics” (that is, the twenty-fifth principle is the supreme principle), 307, 41-42.

This whole chapter, xii, 307, 26 ff., gives as close an approach to Śāṁkhyya as is found in the epic. It is called, ċl. 42, the Śāṁkhyadārṣana, parisatāṁkhyānudārṣana. That is to say,

**Śāṁkhyya is Śāṁkhyāna.**

Even in the Anugītā, xiv, 46, 54-56, we read: “The organs, the objects of sense, the five gross elements, mind, intellect, egoism, the Unmanifest, and Spirit (these are given in nominative and accusative) — on counting up all that properly, according to the distinction of topics, tattva, one gets to heaven, released from all bonds. Counting them over, one should reflect on them at the time of one’s end. Thus one that knows the topics is released, if one abide by the ekānta,
doctrine of unity." So in xii, 316, 19, sāmkhyadarçanam
etat te parisāmkhyānam uttamam, "the Sāmkhya system is
the best enumeration;" evam hi parisāmkhyāya sāmkhyāḥ
kevelatām gataḥ, "the Enumerators by thus enumerating
attain separateness." In the same way the Yogin gradually
emancipates himself by parisāmkhyāya, enumerating the steps
of abstraction, xii, 317, 16. The same thing is found in Gītā
18, 19, where guṇasāmkhyāna or "enumeration of guṇas" is
equivalent to Sāmkhya. Even more strongly is this shown
when Yoga and Saṁkhyāna are antithetic, like Yoga and
Sāmkhya, as in xii, 314, 3 ff., where the saṁkhyañadarçināh
are opposed to yoga-pradarçināḥ; and in xiii, 141, 83: yukto
yogam prati sadā prati saṁkhyānam eva ca.

The Sāmkhya Scheme.

As I have shown above, this system stops with the twenty-
fifth principle. This fact sometimes appears only incidentally,
as when in xiv, 48, 4, we read: "By ten or twelve suppres-
sions of breath one attains to that which is higher than the
twenty-four." In its environment this verse is as significant
as it is grotesque; but it is simply carried over from an older
account: "Turning the senses from the objects of sense by
means of the mind, one that is pure and wise should with ten
or twelve urgings urge the soul to that which is beyond the
twenty-fourth principle," xii, 307, 10-11. Here, at the outset
of the chapter discussed above, it is evident that no twenty-
sixth is contemplated. The conditioned soul is to be urged to
associate itself with the pure soul and abstain from the other
elements which condition it. This pure soul is declared to
be the "inner self standing in the breast," antarātmā hṛdaya-
yāsthaḥ, čl. 19, which in Yoga contemplation appears like a
bright fire. "It has no source, ayoni; it stands in all beings
an immortal thing, and is not seen, but may be known by
intelligence, buddhidravyena drṣyeta. He makes the worlds,

1 The commentator says ten or twelve, vā 'pi may mean and, i.e., twenty-
two. He gives the exercises.
standing beyond darkness, and he is called tamonuda, vitanmaška, the smitter of darkness," 24. So much for the Yoga doctrine, where the inner soul is that "which surpasses the twenty-fourth," and is then treated (as given above) as neuter tad or masculine, but without recognition of the Lord-Soul as twenty-sixth.¹ Then follows the Sāmkhya-jñāna (parisaṁkhyānadarśanam), 307, 26 ff.: "It is the system of the Prakṛtivādins and starts with highest Prakṛti, which is the Unmanifest. From this is produced the Great One (neuter), intellect, as the second; from the Great One, egoism, as the third; and the Sāmkhyaśtamdarśināḥ say that the five elements come from egoism. These together are the eight (forms of) the Source, called the eight sources (because productive). The modifications are sixteen. There are five gross elements, višeṣāḥ, and five senses (or the sixteen are the five gross elements and ten organs with mind).² These (twenty-four) are all the topics, tattvas, as explained in the enumeration of the Sāmkhyas. Inversely as it created them the inner soul, antarātman, also absorbs them, as the sea absorbs its waves. The Source is a unit at absorption and a plurality at creation, ekatva, bahutva. The Source itself has the principle of productivity, prasava. Over this field³

¹ This section, like the one cited above (to which it is a parallel), ends with yoga eṣo hi yogānām. The next verse (though in the middle of a chapter) has the Upanishad mark of a closed account, yogadarśanam etāvat (as in Kaṭha, etāvad anudarśanam). The soul appears as a smokeless fire, vidhūma, as in Kaṭha, iv, 13, adhūmaka; it is anubhyo anu, as Kaṭha, ii, 20, etc. The point of view is wholly that of Ātmaism to the very end without a trace of Vishnuism. It is, however, an intruded section, for the opening of the chapter marks a repetition, the questioner saying: "Now you have told me all about oneness and separateness, but I should like to hear it all again" (just as the Anuṅita is marked).

² So the commentator explains cl. 29-30, etā prakṛtayaça ca śťau vikārāḥ ca 'pi śodaça, pañca ca ca višeṣāḥ vā tatha pañce 'ndriyaṃ ca, etāvad eva tattvānāṁ sāmkhyam āhur maniśaḥ. But see below.

³ Instead of "field" we find also the "pasture": "When the senses (indriyaṃ pramāthini, as in the Gitā) return from the pasture, gocarat, and rest at home, then shalt thou see the highest self with the self, the great all-soul" (self), xii, 251, 6. The principle of productivity, prasava, is synonymous with Prakṛti. Thus we have prakṛtiṃ guṇāḥ (Gitā), and prasavaṃ guṇāḥ, xiii, 85, 105.
stands the Great Soul as the twenty-fifth, called the kṣetrajña, field-knower, also the male, Purusha (avyaktike pra-viçate, 38). The field is the Unmanifest, the knower of the field is the twenty-fifth principle." Then follows the extract given above. It is clear that here the twenty-fifth principle (Purusha) is not a lower principle than a twenty-sixth (not recognized at all). Still more remarkable is the following exposition:

In xii, 311, 8 ff.: "There are eight sources and sixteen modifications. Metaphysicians explain the eight as the Unmanifest, the Great One (masc.), egoism, and earth, wind, air, water, and light. These are the eight sources. The modifications are (the five perceptive organs) ear, skin, eye, tongue, and nose; the five (great elements), sound, touch, color, taste, smell; the five (organs of action) voice, hands, feet, and two organs of excretion. [These differences, viçeśāh, are in the five great elements, mahābhūtas; and those organs of perception are saviçeśāhī, that is, differentiated.] Mind, say the metaphysicians, is the sixteenth." The bracketed stanza¹ interrupts the description (as in the scheme above) with a statement of the "differences" appertaining to the gross elements (as distinct from the fine elements, which have only one characteristic apiece, and are aviçeśa).

Both these schemes² give the Aphorism's list, whereby the tattvas of the Sāṁkhya (the Yoga is here expressly included, cl. 8) appear as follows: —

The Unmanifest

Eight productive forms of Prakṛti.

Intellect

Egoism

Five (fine) elements (not here named collectively; called tanmātras elsewhere).

¹ ete viçeśā rājendra mahābhūteṣu pañcasu buddhindingyāny athāi 'tāni saviçeśāhī, Māithila, 311, 14.
² Compare xiv, 40, 1 ff., where the same creations appear.
Sixteen modifications.

5 Organs of Perception (buddhindriyas, čl. 14).
5 Organs of Action (not here named collectively; called karmendriyas elsewhere).
1 Mind.
5 Gross elements (vičesas, mahābhūtas).

But to the scheme at xii, 311, there is appended the following incongruous account, thus, čl. 16 ff.: “From the Unmanifest is produced the Great Soul, mahān ātmā, which the wise say is the first creation, and call the prādhānika. From the Great One is produced egoism, the second creation, which is called buddhyātmaka, that is, identical with intellect. From egoism is produced mind, bhūtagunātmaka, identical with the elemental constituents, called āhamkārika, that is, egoistic, the third creation, sargāḥ. From mind are produced the great elements, mahābhūtāḥ (sic),¹ the fourth creation, called mānasas, mental. The fifth creation comprises sound, touch, color, taste, and smell, which is called elemental, bhāutika. The sixth creation is the ear, skin, eye, tongue, nose, called bahu-cintātmaka, that is, identical with much thought (matter is only a form of mind). The seventh creation is the group of organs (of action) after the ear, called organ-creation, āndriya. The eighth creation is the up-and-across stream (of breaths) called ārjavaka, that is, upright. The ninth is the down-and-across, also called ārjavaka. These are the nine creations, sargāni, and the twenty-four topics, tattvāni, declared according to the system of revelation (ṣrutinidarca-nāt).” So this scheme ends without hint of a twenty-sixth principle, but with productive mind and a substitution of ātmā, soul, for intellect.

A more striking substitution is found in xii, 204, 10–11, where, instead of the received order as given above, the list from Source to the senses is as follows:

¹ As remarked above, organs and elements are called indifferently indriyāḥ or indriyaṇi, mahābhūtāḥ or mahābhūtāni, as shown here and elsewhere. So in this passage, sargāḥ and sargāni. Compare tattvān, above, p. 98.
The Great Unknown, or Unmanifest, avyaktam, mahat

Knowledge, jñāna

Intellecit

Mind

In the following section, 205, 16 ff., intellect active in mind is mind. It is mind which is freed from the guṇas and, ib. 9, mind, as a form of knowledge impeded by the guṇas, produces intellect, which must be withdrawn into mind again for one to attain the highest. In these cases, there can be, from a synthetic point of view, no unsystematic interpretation of intellect and knowledge and mind, but a loose¹ exploiting of Śāṅkhya in terms of Brahmaism, because elsewhere the Śāṅkhya scheme is fully recognized. So carelessly are the terms employed that, while in one part of the exposition knowledge is Brahman and mind is a part of it, related to it as jīva is to Ātman, in another part we are told that this knowledge comes from something higher, the Unmanifest. Again, Brahman is not the Unmanifest but in the Unmanifest, xii, 319, 1. There is no substitution for egoism in the above, for this is recognized in another stanza which enumerates as the “group called bhūtas,” (created) spirit (!), Source, intellect, objects of sense, the organs, egoism and false opinion, 205, 24.² Here

¹ These para ladders (compare Gitā, 3, 42; Kaṭh. iii, 10) are found everywhere and often contradict the regular schemes: “Soul is higher than mind, mind than senses, highest of creatures are those that move; of these the bipeds; of these the twice-born; of these the wise, of these those that know the soul, ātman; of these the humble,” xii, 208, 19 ff.; “Objects are higher than senses, mind higher than objects, intellect higher than mind, the great Ātman higher than intellect,” xii, 247, 3 ff. (in 249, 2 para mātaḥ for mahaṁ parah); “The unmanifest is higher than the great; the immortal is higher than the unmanifest: nothing is higher than the immortal” (ib.). The stages in xiv, 50, 54 ff., are space or air, egoism, intellect, soul, the unmanifest, and spirit!

² This is called the samūho bhūtasaṁjñākah, or “group of so-called created things,” which is noteworthy as containing Purusha, spirit, and abhimāna, false opinion, as a distinct factor.
the source of the Source and of Purusha alike is Brahman, a view utterly opposed to the passages cited above.

The Anugītā, which, as already indicated, also has the schemes above, continues in xiv, 42, with a parallel to xii, 314, on the relation of the elements to the individual, as organ, to the object, and to the special deity concerned with each action. At the opening of the eighth chapter of the Gītā adhyātma is called the individual manifestation. It is literally that connected with the self or soul, and is often used as a noun in the sense of metaphysics (xii, 194 and 248, etc.).

In xii, 314, 4 and 14, it is said that an explanation as the Sāmkhyas represent it, yatha sāmkhyānadarçinaḥ, is given of the manifestations according to the individual, vyaktito vihūti, which differs somewhat from that in the Anugītā. The scheme is as follows, starting with the elements and with ākāśa, air, as the first bhūta in the latter account:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adhyātma</th>
<th>Wind</th>
<th>Light</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Earth</th>
<th>elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adhibhūta</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>skin</td>
<td>eye</td>
<td>tongue</td>
<td>nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhīdīvata</td>
<td>sound</td>
<td>touch (object of)</td>
<td>color</td>
<td>taste</td>
<td>smell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhyātma</td>
<td>Dīva</td>
<td>Lightning</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Soma</td>
<td>Wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhyātma</td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>pāyu</td>
<td>upastha</td>
<td>hands</td>
<td>voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhyātma</td>
<td>going</td>
<td>excretion</td>
<td>nanda (guṇa) doing, acts</td>
<td>speaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhīdīvata</td>
<td>Vishnu</td>
<td>Mitra</td>
<td>Prajāpati</td>
<td>Indra</td>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhyātma</td>
<td>Mind</td>
<td>Egōsan</td>
<td>abhimāna</td>
<td>understanding, or thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhyātma</td>
<td>thinking</td>
<td>(mantavya, saṅkalpa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhīdīvata</td>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>Rūdra, or Intellect</td>
<td>Keśetra, or Brahman</td>
<td>divinities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Compare the use of these terms in BAU. iii, 7, 14. On adhyātma in this sense, compare also xii, 331, 30, adhyātmaratir āsino nirapekṣaḥ ... ātmanāḥ 'va sahaḫyena yaça careṣ sakṣī bhavet.

2 buddhiḥṣaḍindriyavicārini, "directing the six senses" (usually a function of mind, which is here paścabhūtātmacārakam), xiv, 42, 29, and 31. The function of intellect is here mantavyam, which in Čānti is given to mind. Rudra in the preceding group in Anugītā is replaced by buddhi in Čānti. Where buddhi is both adhyātma and adhīdīvata. The adhīdīvata of intellect is spirit, keśetra, in Čānti: Brahman, in the Anugītā. It is apparent that we have here (a) rather late matter, (b) worked over by two sets of revisors.
This scheme is unknown in the older Upanishads. Even egoism thus appears first (with some variations) in Pṛaṇa, iv, 8 (Deussen). Compare xii, 240, 8, above, where Fire is the divinity to digestion, not to voice, and Sarasvatī is assigned to the tongue. When, as often happens, no egoism is mentioned, it is because the intellect (“the twelfth” as it is called in the very passage which gives thirteen above, xiv, 42, 16, and in the Pañcaśikha schemes given below) is held to imply egoism. The frequent omission, however, seems to point to the fact that there was originally no distinction, or, in other words, that intellect was primarily regarded as necessarily self-conscious as soon as it became manifest at all.

The Twenty-Sixth Principle.

Clearly as most of the schemes given above reveal the fact that the twenty-fifth principle, or in other words pure Ego, was regarded as the culmination of the group of systematized categories, the intrusion into this scheme of a new principle, overlapping the twenty-fifth, is here and there made manifest. This new principle is the one denied in the Sāṁkhya scheme, namely that of a personal Lord, Īcvara, which is upheld in the contrasted Yogin scheme. This twenty-sixth principle is explained in xii, 308; after the speaker says he has disposed of the Sāṁkhya system. Here the male conditioned spirit bewails his intercourse with the female Source, and the fact that associating with her he has not recognized that he has been “like a fish in water,” a foreign element in combination with matter, and consequently is reborn again and again, cl. 24–26; but now he becomes enlightened, buddha, and will reach unity, as well as likeness with the Lord-spirit, the indestructible, 27–40. The twenty-sixth principle is thus recognized not only as the one eternal principle, but as a personal spirit, ayam atra bhaved bandhuḥ, 27. Then follows another exposition, which is based on the system of Nārada, received by him from Vasiṣṭha, who in turn received it from Hiranyagarbha, 309, 40. This system is both Yoga and Sāṁkhya, the systems being double but the teach-
ing being identical (yad eva āstraṁ Sāṁkhyānāṁ yogadar-<br>canam eva tat, 308, 44), the claim usually made when Yoga is<br>advocated. A huge Āstra is that of the Sāṁkhyas, “as say<br>viduṣo janaḥ,” and one “to which, along with the Veda,<br>Yogins have recourse.” In other words, the Yoga teaching<br>is based on Veda and on the Sāṁkhyas as a precedent system.<br>Then follows the admission: “In it (the Sāṁkhyas system) no<br>principle higher than the twenty-fifth is recognized,” (asmin<br>āstraṁ) pañcaviniçāt param tattvaṁ pañhaye na, narādhipa,<br>whereas: “The Yoga philosophers declare a budhyamāna or<br>individual spirit and a buddha or Lord-Spirit to be in accord,<br>ance with their principles, the latter being identical with the<br>former, except that it is fully enlightened,” cl. 48.<br><br>Here also is a perfectly clear and frank statement, which<br>may be paraphrased thus: “In older Sāṁkhyas philosophy the<br>highest principle recognized is that of the pure individual<br>Ego; in the Yoga philosophy this Ego is identified as indi,<br>vidual spirit with the fully enlightened Lord.” Hence Yogas<br>(and not Sāṁkhyas) speak of budhyamāna and buddha as<br>two but identical, budhyamānaṁ ca buddham ca prāhur yoganidārcanam, cl. 48. Elsewhere the twenty-fifth principle is<br>itself the Lord: aham puruṣaḥ pañcaviniçakaḥ.¹<br><br>After this introduction the speaker, Vasiṣṭha, proceeds to<br>describe this Yoga philosophy in detail. The Lord-Spirit<br>“divides himself into many,” ātmānam bahudhā kṛtva, and<br>becomes the different abuddhas, or imperfectly enlightened<br>spirits conditioned by Prakṛti. Thus he becomes conditioned,<br>guṇān dhārayate, and “modifies himself” without true knowl,<br>edge of himself, vikurvāno budhyamāno na budhyate. In<br>this condition, then, he becomes creator and absorber of what

¹ Compare xii, 340, 43, personal God is the twenty-fifth. He is the witness<br>devoid of guṇas, and of kalās, ib. 23; “the twenty-fifth, beyond the twelve<br>twelve tattvas,” ib. 24. In this passage the Unmanifest is resolved into Puru,<br>sha, 340, 39–31. This is worth noting as being in direct contradiction of the<br>theory of unchanging eternal Prakṛti, as enunciated in xii, 217, 8: “Both<br>Puruṣa and the unmanifest Source are eternal, without beginning and with,<br>out end.” In 335, 20–31, Source is both born and indestructible. Compare<br>H. 3, 85, 16, as cited above, p. 98.
he has created. The conditioned cannot understand the unconditioned; it is the Un-understanding, apratibudhyakam (sic, 309, 4). The conditioned spirit can understand the Unmanifest but "he cannot understand the stainless eternal buddha, which is the twenty-sixth principle," šādvīṇcaṁ vimalam buddhaṁ sanātanan, though the latter "understands both the twenty-fifth and the twenty-fourth principles," 309, 7. "This twenty-sixth principle is pure unmanifest Brahma, which is connected with all that is seen and unseen," ib. 8. "When the conditioned spirit recognizes the pure Highest Intelligence, then he becomes clear-eyed, avyakta-locahaḥ, and free of the Source" (tadā prakṛtimān, sic, read apra?). The twenty-sixth is this Highest Intelligence; it is "the topic and that which is apart from all topics," cl. 10 and 13. "The conditioned spirit attains likeness with the twenty-sixth principle when it recognizes itself as the twenty-sixth," šādvīṇcaḥ ham iti prājñāḥ, cl. 16. "That separateness of spirits which is part of the exposition of Sāṁkhya is really (explained by) the conditioned spirit when not fully enlightened by the (fully) enlightened twenty-sixth," šādvīṇcena prabuddhaḥ buddhyamāno 'py abuddhimān, etan nānātvam ity uktam sāṁkhyaśruti-nidarcanāt, cl. 17. The continuation of this teaching points out that unity with Brahman is attained by the individual spirit only when it no longer has any consciousness (of self), yadā buddhyā na budhyate, cl. 18.

In this passage the attempt to reconcile the doctrine of the Sāṁkhya individual spirits, nānātvam, "than which there is nothing higher," with the doctrine of unity, ekatva, is as plain as a reasonable historian could expect to find it. "Thus it is," the account concludes, "that one must understand the (two theories of) separateness and unity," nānātvāṅkatvam etāvad draṣṭavāṁ cāstradarcanāt, cl. 22. And then occurs a very pretty lapsus. The images of the fly encased in the plant, maça-kodumbare, and the fish in water, matsyodake, are constantly employed in Sāṁkhyan philosophy, as shown above, to illustrate the fact that spirit is different from the Source, though externally united. Our good Vasiṣṭha, how-
ever, brings these images in to illustrate the difference, anyaat-
vam, between the individual spirit and Brahman: "The
difference between the fly and plant, between the fish and
water, is to be understood as the combined separateness and
unity of these two," as if, from the historical connotation of
these images, they were essentially different, whereas according
to the exposition they are essentially one. But this is of a piece
with the use of vikurvānas, a Sāṁkhya term applied to the
modifications of the Source, when used above, of Brahman.

This Yoga doctrine, as explained above, is to be taught
(not to the man that bases his philosophy on the Veda, na
vedaniṣṭhasya janasya . . . pradeyam, but) "to any one that
desires it for the sake of wisdom and receives it with sub-
mission," cl. 32.

The Yoga doctrine as here represented stands midway
between Sāṁkhya and Brahmaism. The former side has been
fully illustrated. In regard to the latter it will have been
noticed that while the personal Lord-Spirit is a form of
Brahman, and Brahman in turn is identified with the pure
essence of every individual spirit, it is merely said that
Brahman is connected with the visible as well as with the
invisible, ḍṛṣṭyāḍṛṣṭye hy anugatam, 309, 8. The Brahman here
represented is not the All, but a pure Supreme Spirit into
which fractional spirits, parts of Brahman when he "made
himself many," are reabsorbed. Of the identity of the objec-
tive world with this Brahman there is no word; neither is
there any hint that the objective world is illusion, except that
at the beginning of the preceding section, 308, 2 ff., the gen-
eral opinion, āḥuḥ, is cited that "the Unmanifest is igno-
rance," avidyā, as opposed to the twenty-fifth principle as
wisdom, vidyā. Elsewhere "the Source is knowledge," jñāna,
but also avidyam avyaktam, as opposed to (jñeyo) vedyāḥ
puruṣāḥ, 319, 40.

1 But nā, v. 1, N., "to one wise in the Veda it may be imparted or to," etc. Those excluded are given in the following verses as liars and other evil-
doers, a long list.

2 But ib. 7, the Source as unmanifest is vidyā; the highest is Vidyā (com-
pare pradhānavidhiyogasthaḥ of Čiva, xiii, 14, 423), the Creator.
This doctrine of the twenty-sixth principle belongs only to the later part of the pseudo-epic. The passage given above is found virtually repeated in xii, 319, 56, and 70 ff. Here as Prakṛti the chief-thing, pradhāna, does not know spirit, so spirit does not know Supreme Spirit. "The one that is different (spirit), seeing and yet not seeing, looks upon the twenty-sixth, the twenty-fifth (pure spirit) and twenty-fourth. But the twenty-fifth also does not recognize the twenty-sixth, who recognizes him, and having a false opinion of himself thinks that no one is higher than he" (so 316, 4). And further: "The twenty-fourth should not be accepted by wise men (as the twenty-fifth), any more than, because of mere association, the fish should be identified with the water it has entered (74). The twenty-fifth on realizing that it is different (from the twenty-fourth) becomes one with the twenty-sixth and recognizes (the latter). For though The Best appears different from the twenty-fifth, the saints regard this as due to the conditioned nature of the twenty-fifth and declare that the two are really identical. Therefore, being afraid of birth and death, and beholding the twenty-sixth, neither Yogas nor Sāṅkhyaśas admit that the twenty-fifth is the indestructible."

Here again, with the new notion that jīva is destructible (in Paramātman) there is the attempt to foist on the Sāṅkhya the belief which has been formally denied to them. Similarly in the Aniruddha theology, of the personal Lord Govinda, who is said to "create the elements," xii, 207, 7 ff., it is said: "From him whom Sāṅkhya and Yoga philosophers declare as Highest Soul, Paramātman, and who is called the Great Spirit, mahāpuruṣa, is derived the unmanifest, avyaktam, of which he is the base, pradhānam. From the unmanifest Lord, Iṣvara, came the manifest, and he is Aniruddha, called the great Soul. As egoism he created Brahmān and the elements, and then the guṇas," xii, 341, 28–33.

In this copy of the preceding passage there is also no notion of Vedānta as implying Māyā or illusion. Significant is the fact that the present teaching is represented in the fol-
lowing stanzas, 319, 84–86, as being newly inculcated, and especially designed for those who desire emancipation, in contrast to the Sāṅkhyas and Yogas, who are content with their own doctrines, dharma.

It is thus clear that Sāṅkhyas is merely a name to appeal to, and stands in this regard on a footing with Veda, an authority claimed for the most divergent teaching.

Māyā, Self-Delusion.

The "illusion" theory of the universe is a development from the simple idea of delusion, often self-delusion. The ordinary (non-philosophical) epic māyā is a trick of delusion. Gods indulge in it to overcome their enemy. The illusion-god par excellence, Vishnu as Krishna, thus deludes his enemies by making them think the sun has set when it has not, or by parallel magic tricks. This, in my opinion, is the only meaning in the older Upanishads, Indro māyābhīḥ purūrūpaḥ, Brh., ii, 5, 19 (from the Rig Veda), "Indra multi-form through tricks of delusion;" na yeṣu jihmam anṛtaṁ na māyā ca, "in whom there is naught crooked, nor untrue, nor any trick," Praçaṇa, i, 16. Magic seems to be the meaning (parallel with moha) in Māitrī, iv, 2, where occurs the indra-jāla-māyā of Mbh. v, 160, 55.

In Gītā 7, 14–25, māyā is a divine, dāivī, delusion caused by the guṇas, guṇamayī, characterizing people wicked and foolish; in 4, 6, it is a psychic delusion, ātmamāyā, which causes the unborn God by means of Prakṛti to appear to be born (not, be it noticed, which causes the not-soul to appear to be real). It occurs in one other passage, 18, 61, where it is the equivalent of moha in the preceding stanza (as in Māitrī Up., above). In all these passages, although it is possible to read into māyā the meaning given it by Čaṅkara, for example, yet the simpler meaning suffices of either trick

1 This is called indifferently māyā (chadma) or yoga, v, 160, 54–58; vii, 146, 68, etc.

2 In this interpretation of māyā I am forced to differ from that of Deussen, who holds that māyā is Vedantic Illusion (i.e., the not-soul appears through divine Illusion to be real) even in the earliest scriptures.
or delusion (false understanding) applied to the relation of individual soul and God, and this is probably the meaning, because māyā as illusion plays no part in the development of the scheme. Guṇa-made delusion is the regular Sāṁkhya Prakṛti-made ignorance; it is not Prakṛti's self.

The expression used above of Krishna's māyā that it is "divine," has no special philosophical significance. The same phrase is applied to Duryodhana's water-trick, daivīm māyām imām kṛtvā, ix, 31, 4. When, too, Krishna in the Gītā says that he is born by ātmamāyā, it must be remembered that in describing the parallel situation in the Rāmāyaṇa, where Vishnu is born as Rāma, the word chadman, disguise, cover, is used as the equivalent of māyā, G. vi, 11, 32.

In a very interesting critique of the new doctrine of mokṣa, that is, salvation without Vedic sacrifices, an orthodox objector is represented as saying: "This doctrine of salvation has been brought out by miserable idle pundits; it is based on ignorance of the Veda and is a lie under the guise of truth. Not by despising the Vedas, not by chicanery and delusion (māyayā) does a man obtain great (Brahman). He finds Brahman in brahman" (Veda).\(^1\)

Similarly, when Dṛāupadī philosophizes in iii, 30, 32, her opening words show that she reveres as the chief god the Creator, who, like other creatures, is subject to transmigration, 32, 7, and is in no respect an All-god, though a later rewriting of the scene mixes up Bhagavat, Īyava, and Prajāpati.\(^2\)

This god, she says, has deluded (moha) her husband's mind

---

\(^1\) As the section is occupied in advocating the one-soul (All-soul), ākāśmya, doctrine, it is clear that māyā is here merely delusion or deceit, xii, 270, 50-51. The words of the text are: ċriya vihinnir alasāi pañjītaṃ sampravartitam, vedavādparijñānam satyabhasam ivā nṛtam... na vedānaṃ paribhavān na caṭhyena na māyayā mahat prāparam puroso brahmaṇi brahma vindati, xii, 270, 17, 19. Kapila, to whom the remark is addressed, admits "the Vedas are authoritative," vedāḥ pramāṇān lokānām, 271, 1, but, 43, insists that, though "everything is based on the Veda," the cruel animal sacrifices therein enjoined are objectionable (as cited above), and upholds the thesis that "knowledge is the best means of salvation," jñānaṃ tu paramā gatiḥ, 271, 38 — this by the bye.

\(^2\) The revision appears clearly at the end in Dṛāupadī's conversion. Compare the comments, AOS, Proceed., March, 1894.
and in deluding men generally, mohayitvā, the Lord shows
the power of his delusion, māyāprabhava, which deludes them
by ātmanāyā (the same expression as that of the Gītā, cited
above), making them kill each other as blind instruments of
his will, which act without volition, just as a stone breaks
another in the hands of a man. Man proposes, but God dis-
poses by means of a trick, chadhā kṛtvā, 30, 36, "playing
with men as children play with toys." "Fie, fie," says her
husband, "don't speak so of the Lord, through whose grace
the faithful gets immortality," 31, 42; "for these things are
divine mysteries (devaguhāni, rewards of good and evil),
since the divinities are full of secret tricks," gūḍhamāyā hi
devatāḥ, 31, 35–37. The Čāstras and faith, not magic, māyā,
or sinful works, give faith in Krishna, v. 69, 3–5.

Again, in the account of the Pañcaśālaśīhas, the visiting
Hindus, who look with awe on the service paid to the One
God, say that they could hear the hymn, but could not see
the god, because, as they suppose, they were "deluded by
the god's māyā," mohipas tasya māyayā, xii, 337, 44–48. God in
the following is called the mahāmāyādhara, as he is also called
by the rather modern epithets cāturmahārājika, saptamahā-
bhāga,2 xii, 339, 3 ff. Here māyā is truly illusion, as it is said
in 340, 43–45: "God is he by whom this illusion (of visible
God) was created," māyā hy eṣā māyā srṣṭā yan mām paśyasi,
Nārada; but it is not illusion embracing the world of objective
things, even in this late account (careless enough, for example,
to construe iti vai menire vayam, 337, 38). There is at least
no passage in the epic which says bluntly that "Prakṛti is
māyā," as does Īvet. Up. iv, 10. On the contrary, the great
mass of epic philosophy, though it teaches that the sinner is
deluded "by Vishnu's hundred māyās," 302, 59, teaches also
that this delusion is merely a confusion of mind in respect of
the relation of the pure soul to the conditioned soul. It does
not teach that those things which condition the soul are an

1 anyathā manyante puruṣās tāni tāni ca . . . anyathā prabhuḥ karoti
vikaroti ca, iii, 30, 34.

2 He is also called ākhaṇḍala, which in xii, 337, 4, is still an epithet of
Indra.
illusion, but that they are eternal substance, either in themselves or as parts of Brahman. Take for instance the long account in xii, 196 to 201. It is not suggested that the sinner divest himself of illusion. He goes into moha, that is he becomes confused, and again he enters Brahman, 197, 10; or "enjoys bliss," ramate sukham ("if he does not wish the highest, because his soul is still tinged with desire, āgātāmā, he attains whatever he desires"). Knowledge is Brahman, and hence one must be free of all delusion to be Brahman indeed, and truly immortal, but the objective world is seldom an illusion of Brahman. Moreover, the avidyā of God is clearly an afterthought. According to one section in Čānti, God creates the world "at the point of day" through avidyā or ignorance. First mahat was born, "which quickly became mind" (where mind and not intellect is vyakta, manifest), which is "characterized by desire and doubt." This same account in its first form is found in 232, 32, without avidyā: "The Lord, Īçvara, sleeps during the cataclysm sunk in meditation, dhyāna; but, when awakened at the close of night, he transforms the eternal, vikurute bhūmā 'kṣayam, and produces the Great Being, whence mind, one with the manifest." The following section simply picks up this account, repeats it in almost the same words, but slips in avidyā to explain the expression "creates." The alteration is the more marked as

1 Some very grotesque conceptions are expressed here. In 200, 25, the jīva soul goes to Ātman; or goes to heaven and lives separately. When as a flame the spirit ascends to heaven, Brahman like a courteous host says "Come, stay with me," makes it (or him) conscious and then swallows him!

2 "Sorrow is the end of joy as night is the end of day, joy is the end of sorrow, as day is the end of night" (these succeed each other and each has its end); "only knowledge ends not, for knowledge is Brahman," xiv, 44, 18, 20–21; 47, 1. Not till 52, 0, i.e., after the Anugītā, is finished, is Māyā a factor here. Previously there is only the ghoramohā or horrible misunderstanding of truth, xiv, 45, 4, etc. In xviii, 3, 36, Indra's māyā is an optical delusion.

3 xii, 233, 1 ff. Here is to be noticed a contradiction in epic psychology. Mind in this passage has prārthana and siṣṭkāla, that is it desires, whereas elsewhere desire (the unexplained "seventh," xii, 177, 59) is an attribute of egoistic intellect. Desire is born of imagination, saṃkalpa, xii, 177, 25; it is destroyed by avoiding this, 302, 56; but, "remove mind from saṃkalpa and fix it on self," 241, 17.
many texts make no division of chapters here. In either case the account of creation goes right on, first, 232, 32, stated as (Içvarah):

pratibuddho vikurute brahmā 'kṣayyaṁ kṣapaṅkaśaye srjate ca mahad bhūtam tasmād vyaktātmakam manāḥ

and then as:

brahmatejomayaṁ çukraṁ yasya sarvam idaṁ jagat ekasya bhūtam bhūtasya dvayaṁ sthāvarajāṅgamam aharmukhe vibuddhaḥ san srjate 'vidyayā jagat agra eva mahad bhūtam açu vyaktātmakam manāḥ.

As the seven creators1 mentioned in the following stanza, 233, 3, are explained as intellect, mind, and the five elements, it is clear also that egoism as a distinct factor is omitted. The seven cannot create apart, so they unite and make the body which the “great beings,” bhūtāni mahānti, enter with Karma. The ādikārā, First Creator, is Prajāpati, who acts without Māyā, čl. 13.2 In short, while sometimes recognized, Māyā is generally unknown in the epic, because the epic lacks unity, being now and then Vedantic, but generally Yogaistic.

Pañcaçikha's System.

In the presentation above I have analyzed the three different religious philosophies advocated in the pseudo-epic; the Sāmkhya, which holds to spirit and Source as distinct immortal entities; the Yoga, which adds the Supreme Spirit; and the personal religion of Nārada and others, which makes of the Paramātman or Supreme Spirit a modified form of Brahman known as Aniruddha, etc., and identified with Krishna. In xii, 352, 13, the Paramātman doctrine is declared to be the

1 mānasa, “mind-creatures,” the same epithet as that applied to the eternal Deva in xii, 182, 11. Compare BAU. ii, 5, 7; Gītā, 10, 6.
2 sarvabhūtāny upādāya tapasāc caraṇāya hi ādikārā sa bhūtānāṁ tam evā huḥ prajāpatim. The commentator explains “by means of Māyā” (BAU. ii, 6, 19), but there is not even the suggestion of the Māyā doctrine here. The etymology in čl. 11 (te... caññagraṇyānam prāptās tato puruṣa ucyate) seems to be owing to a confusion with puriṣayam puruṣām ikṣate, Prāc. v. 5.
opinion of some Pundits only, in distinction from that of the knowledge-philosophers, who are said to hold to unity of soul. However this passage may be interpreted, it is evident that it distinctly sets over against each other the Yoga and Brahman interpretation. Paramātman is identified with Vishnu the “unconditioned, All-soul spirit.” The religion taught is expressly opposed, as something higher, to Sāṅkhya and Yoga (cl. 7–8), and by comparison with other schemes is of Pāṇcarātra character. A preceding section states that the same religion is identical with the doctrine taught to Arjuna in the Gītā, 349, 8, and (as already noticed) it is here called “the Krishna religion,” Sātvata dharma, which has mysteries, abstracts, and an Aranyaka (ib., 29–31). It was handed down through the seers, and a priest who was acquainted with the (Jyeṣṭha) Sāman (and) Vedānta. His name was Jeṣṭha (sic). Then it disappeared, to be promulgated again in the Harīgītā, ib. 46 and 53. In it, Vishnu as God is adored in one, two, three, or four forms (the usual group is meant, Aniruddha, Pradyumna, Sāṅkarśaṇa, Vāsudeva). The disciples are called “those devoted to one God,” ekāntinas, and it is hard to find many of them (durlabhāḥ, 349, 62, compare Gītā, 7, 19). They are identified with the Pāṇcarātras (so 336, 25), a sect

1 The words seem to indicate the antithesis not of three but of two beliefs: evaṁ hi paramātmānaṁ kecī icchanti paṇḍitāḥ, ekātmānaṁ tathā ‘tmānam apare jānaṁcintakah, tatra yaḥ paramātmā hi sa nityāṁ nirguṇaṁ smṛtaḥ, sa hi Nārāyaṇo jñeyāḥ sarvaṁapuruṣo hi saḥ. The commentator, however, may be right in taking ātmānaṁ to refer to Sāṅkhya and ekātmānaṁ as brahmabhinnam (Vedānta), though the single subject would make it more natural to take ekātmānam ātmānam as “one spirit which is alone.” Vishnu here is the mantā mantavyam, “the thinker and the thought,” and the eternal forecause, pradhāna, cl. 17–18. In cl. 22, God plays, kriḍati, in his four forms (as often).

2 Čiva, on the other hand, has eight forms (the Puranic view), which, according to the commentator (though mūrti may imply the incorporations, Rudra, Bṛārava, Ugra, Īçvara, Mahādeva, Paçupati, Čarva, Bhava), are the five elements, sun, moon, and Purusha, iii, 49, 8. Such divisions are often unique and apparently arbitrary. See below on the eight sources. “Indestructible Brahman” (like Sattva) is eighteenfold according to (xii, 342, 13) H. 3, 14, 15, aṣṭādaçavidham (or midham). Eight and a thousand (only pseudo-epic) are Čiva’s names, against Vishnu’s even thousand. The “worlds” are eight (see below), or seven, or twenty-one, according to the passage.
the teaching of which is here identified not only with that of the Sāmkhya-Yoga, but also with that of Veda-ranyaka, ib. 349, 81, and with the religion of the “white men” and Yatis, āvētānām Yatinām ca, ib. 85. Compare 336, 19, the white men’s religion, and Śātvata Vidhi, declared by Śūrya.

The difference between religion and philosophy is obliterated in India, and the Pāñcarātra, sect is exalted as a development of the Bhagavadh-bhaktas, as the latter are represented in the Gītā, clearly an indication of posteriority; while their philosophy is rather contrasted than identified with that of the Sāmkhya.

Three expositions are given, which embody the same terminology, and may be called the Pañcaśikha system.

Pañcaśikha Kāpilya (interpreted as a metronymic!) appears in xii. 218, 6 ff., and 320, 2 ff. His punch-name is elaborately amplified in the former passage, where, 218, 10 ff., he is an incorporation of Kapila and the first pupil of Āsuri. In Pañcaśrrotas, where there is a Kāpila maṇḍala, he holds a long “session,” satra, having “bathed in the pañcaśrrotas” (five rivers of the mind? cf. Čvet. 1, 5), and being versed in the Pañcarātra (doctrine), and being called in consequence not only pañcarātraviçārada, but also

pañcaśaṁha pañcakṛt pañca-guṇah pañcaśikhaṁ (smṛtah),

epithets which are duly interpreted by the omniscient Nīlakāṇṭha. He also (below) has the epithet Pāñcarātraṇaḥ, which is the only one that need concern us, as the interpretation of the others is mere guesswork. Pañcaśikha is regarded, then, as the teacher of the new sect of Pāñcarātras.¹

His doctrine rests on the ancient foundation of “disgust with birth, disgust with acts, disgust with all things,” sarvanirveda, and is, in short, the religion of ennui, which consists

¹ The seven Citraśikhaṇḍins are referred to as the author of the Pāñcarātra Čāstra in 336, 27; 337, 3, ṣāstrāṇaḥ citraśikhaṇḍijam. These are the seven Prakṛtis, personified as the seven old sages, whose names are given below, p. 170, to whom is added Manu to make the “eight sources,” 336, 29. In the hymn at xii, 339, the god is called Pañcakīla-kartrapati, Pāñcarātrika Pañcāgni, Pañcayajña, Pañcamahākalpa (as also Citraśikhaṇḍin).
in a little more than mere indifference. The literal meaning is that one “finds oneself out of,” or is sick of, the round of birth and death. Nirvāṇa is attained by nirveda. This disgust and the rejection of that untrustworthy delusion, anācyāsiko mohah, which leads to religious practices and the hope of rewards, xii, 218, 21–22, is the starting-point of the system, which, synthetically considered, should culminate in Krishna-Vishnu, as the be-all and end-all, as in other cases.

The analysis of the system is preceded by a most interesting and historically important review of certain fallacies, as follows. The unbeliever says: “One who relies on tradition (the scripture) says that there is something beyond after the destruction (of the body), as being obvious and seen by all; but such an one is refuted by the fact that death of self is negation, deprivation, of self, anātmah hy ātmano mṛtyuḥ. Death is a weakness induced by age. Through delusion one imagines a soul, and this is erroneously regarded as the “something beyond” (or higher). For practical purposes one may assume what is not true (that there is no death of the soul), just as one may say that “the king never dies,” ajaro yam amṛtyuḥ ca rāja ’sau. But when something is asserted and denied and no evidence is given, on what should one base a judgment? Direct observation (evidence of the senses) is the base of received teaching and of inference. Received teaching is destroyed by direct observation, and (as evidence) inference amounts to nothing.”

The last sentence reads in the original, 218, 27:

pratyakṣaṁ hy etayor mūlaṁ kṛtāntāitiḥyayor api
pratyakṣena ’gamo bhinnah kṛtānto vā na kiṃcana

The commentator takes kṛtānta as anumāna and ātihyā as equivalent to āgama; though in 240, 2, anāgatam anātihyāṁ katham brahmā ’dhigacchati (where the commentator says that āgata is pratyakṣa and anumāna), “How can a good man

1 Compare xii, 189, 16–17: “One cannot know the unknown (if faith be lacking); keep the mind on faith; hold it to the vital air; the vital air to Brahman; nirvāṇa is attained by nirveda;” Gītā, 6, 23, nirvinçacetāsā yogo (yoktavyo niçcayena ca); Muṇḍ. Up. i, 2, 12, brāhmañcirvedam āyāṁ.
attain to Brahman not known to tradition nor revealed in the Veda?"¹ and in G. v, 87, 23, āitihyam anumānaṁ ca pratyaśam api cā 'gamam, ye hi samyak parīksante, it is distinguished from the latter. The word āgama is of sufficient importance to note the epic's own definition given in xii, 270, 43: āgamo vedavādās tu tarkaśastraṇi cā 'gamaḥ, “Received (scriptural) teaching includes the words of the Veda and philosophical codes;” a remarkable definition in view of the fact that some of the latter are heterodox, and that āgama is currently used as equivalent to right tradition. The tarka-vidyā is elsewhere differentiated from logic, ānvikṣikī, though both are called useless, xiii, 37, 12, when not extolled, as often!

The next stanza continues: “Enough of making assumptions based on this or that inference. In the opinion of (us) unbelievers there is no other ‘spirit’ than the body.”

For clearer understanding of the historical value of this I must give the exact words, 218, 28:

\[ yatra yatrā 'numāne 'smin kṛtam bhāvayato 'pi ca \]
\[ nā 'nyo jīvaḥ çarirasya nāstikānām mate sthitaḥ \]

Here kṛtam bhāvayataḥ in the meaning of bhāvanayañlam (N.) is even more careless than the following genitive with çarirasya; but both are indicative of the slovenly style which belongs alike to the Purāṇas and the pseudo-epic.

The unbeliever (according to the commentator) continues with a stanza almost unintelligible in its Sūtra-like conciseness, which can be given only by the original:

\[ reto vaṭakaṇkāyāṁ ghṛtapākādhivāsanam \]
\[ jātiḥ smṛtir ayaskāntaḥ sūryakānto 'mbubhakṣaṇam \]

“The seed in the banyan-flower (accounts for the delusion of soul); butter (is only another form of grass); rum (is but fermented rice). Memory (and other ‘psychic’ functions are identical with the) creature born.² (The ‘soul’ is like the)

¹ Just below, 240, 3, the expression manasaç ce 'ndriya-anātin ca 'kāryam may be noticed as a repetition phrase of iii, 290, 25.
² I take adhivaṇa in the sense of adhivaṇa, home: (consider) the origin of ghee and fermented (liquor); N. paraphrases, adhivaṇaṁ (add in pw.).
magnet (which moves iron not by psychical but by physical potency).\(^1\) The burning-glass (makes fire, and so the fiery, active, soul is but a physical phenomenon). (The fire’s) devouring of water (is typical of the so-called appetite or desire of the soul),” or, in other words: Desire and enjoyment are no proof of a superphysical entity, any more than in the case of a fire gratifying its thirst for water.

The denial of the soul-doctrine next calls forth the following refutation:

“A passing away (of something not physical occurs) in the case of a dead being. Supplication of the gods (proves the existence of incorporeal entities). (There would be besides) in the case of the dead a cessation of acts [the Karma doctrine would have to be given up].\(^2\) This is the proof. (Then again) things incorporate cannot be causes, hetavaḥ, for there is no identity of that which has form and that which has no form,” 218, 30–31.

After this, other sceptics, who the commentator rightly (as I think) says are Buddhists,\(^3\) are introduced with a new argu-

\[Jātiḥ smṛtiḥ, “birth and memory,” would seem to imply that memory argues a former birth, as in Patañjali’s Sūtra, iv, 9. This would be an argument on the other side, as if the stanza were writ to prove the opposite. I follow N., though inclined to think that the words really ought to be put into the mouth of the believer (tree, butter, memory, etc., show soul). See the next note.\]

\(^1\) But compare the (orthodox) view as explained in xii, 211, 3: “As senseless iron runs toward a magnet; so conditions born because of one’s nature and all else similar” (are attracted toward the soul). The passages seem curiously related, as just before stands, čl. 2, yathā ‘vyatthakanikāyām antar bhūto mahādramaḥ nispanno drṣṣyate vyakṣam avyaktām sambhavas tathā, “birth from the unmanifest is as when a great tree born in a flower coming out is seen clearly.” Compare BAU. iii, 9, 28; Čveṭ. Up. i, 15, etc.

\(^2\) This, like the appeal to the existence of divinities, is a presumption of what is to be proved. Of course, the unbeliever believes neither in metampsychosis nor in gods, but he is not allowed to say any more. In xii, 304, 47, the argument for the existence of the Source and the spirit is that both are inferable from effects (as seasons are from fruits, 306, 27). In the latter passage, the spirit “inferred by signs,” īśgas, is called paścaviṇçatima (takāra-lopā ārṣaḥ!).

\(^3\) Interesting, both as showing how the epic repeats itself and Buddhism, are xii, 175 and 277 (where several pādas are identical with those in the Dhammapada), and xiii, 113. The ahuḥsā doctrine is carried on here in xii, 114, 6, which repeats xii, 246, 18, with a varied reading that shows the futility
ment against the existence of soul: "Some say the cause, kāraṇa, of successive rebirth is ignorance, avidyā, desire, confusion of mind, and the practice of faulty acts; ignorance being the field watered by thirst, and acts being the seed planted in it, all of which cause rebirth. They say that (ignorance) is concealed (in the body) and is burned away, and that, when the mortal part is destroyed, another body is born from it and they call this the destruction of being. But (in answer to this), how can it be just the same man in this (new body), since he is different in form, in birth, in good, and in aims? For (if there is no soul) all would be disconnected. (Further) if this is so, what pleasure would there be in gifts, wisdom, or the power gained by religious practices? For another entity would get the fruit of what this man practises, since one man by means of another's nature, prākṛtāḥ, would be made wretched or blessed here on earth. (In this matter) the decision in regard to what is invisible (must rest on) what is visible. If you kill a body with a cudgel would another arise from it? Even so the separate consciousness would be a different consciousness, not the original one. This destruction of being (spoken of above, satvasaṁikṣaya) would be repeated like seasons and years; [there would indeed be no end to it, for if it is argued that destruction of consciousness ever results in a new consciousness, then destruction of being would result, not, as the Buddhists teach, in annihilation, but in new being; so there would be no escape from rebirth. If one says, however, that there is a conditioned soul, it can be only a physical bond of unity] like a house, growing gradually weaker through repeated aging and dying (consisting, as such a 'soul' must) of (mortal) senses, thoughts, breath, blood, flesh, bone, all of which perish and revert in due order to their original bases. And, further, (such a theory) would refute the practice of the world in
respect of obtaining advantage from gifts and other religious acts, since both the words of the Veda and the practice of the world (show that acts are performed) for this purpose (of gain). There are many proofs to be found in the mind, but what with the iteration of this and that cause no clear light is obtained, but men doubt and turn to some one explanation, till their intellect becomes fixed on one point and rots there like a tree. So all creatures, made wretched through (desiring) useless objects, are led away by received teaching, āgamāhiḥ, like elephants led by their keepers. Thus, desiring objects that bring endless pleasure, the dried-up many get instead a greater sorrow on being forced to abandon the bait and enter the power of death.”

The argument is the familiar one that a man gets sorrow through desiring heaven, for after his Karma is exhausted he sinks down again to a lower level. So heaven is a bait which attracts men; but as it is only a temporary pleasure followed by pain, one suffers from it all the more (nessun maggiore dolore che ricordarsi). All this implies unconscious existence as the best goal.

To this it is said, 219, 2, in the words of the great Upani- shad: “If there is no consciousness after death,¹ what difference does it make whether one has wisdom or not, or is careful or not?” Then Pañcāśikha replies with a long exposition of his system, 219, 6 ff., of which I give the chief points:

It is not a system of annihilation, uucchedaniṣṭāḥ, nor one of the soul’s separate existence, bhāvanīṣṭāḥ. The (visible) man consists of body, senses, and perception, cetas. The foundations are the five elements, which are independent and make the body. The body is not of one element, but of five. The aggregate causing activity is knowledge, heat, and wind.² From knowledge come the senses and their objects, separate existence, svabhāva, perception, cetana, and mind; from wind come the two vital breaths; from heat come gall and other

¹ yadi na pretya saṁjñā bhavati; compare tāny (bhūtāni) eva 'nuvinaç- yati, na pretya saṁjñā 'sti 'tī, BAU. ii, 4, 12.
² 219, 9; compare below.
bases, dhātus. The five senses, indriyas, hearing, touch, taste, sight, smell, derive from the mind, citta, and have its characteristics. Eternal cetanā is threefold when united with discernment, vijñāna. This they call sukhaduṣṭkha and the opposite. Sound, touch, color, taste, smell, the forms (mūrtayāḥ, containing these as objects), make a group of six constant constituents, guṇas, to make knowledge perfect. Dependent on these are acts and visarga (?), and judgment in regard to the meaning of all topics. This they call the highest seed, ṣukra; it is intellect, the great undeteriorating (substance). This collection of attributes is not soul but is not-soul, anātman. The true teaching is contained in Renunciation-Čāstras, which enjoin renunciation of all. Having explained the six jānendriyas, organs of knowledge, Pañcaśikha explains the “organs of action, which are five, with bala, power, as the sixth,” ā. 20. There are twelve organs, five organs of knowledge with mind as sixth, and five of action with power as sixth. The eleven organs (with mind) one should renounce by means of the intellect. Ear, sound, and mind (citta, in 23 and 34; manas in 22) are necessary in hearing.¹ Thus for all the senses there are fifteen guṇas (3 × 5). There are also the three guṇas called sattva, rajas, tamas. Ear and sound are forms of air (space); so with the five others. In the ten senses there arises a creation (entity) simultaneous with their activity; this is (the eleventh), mind, citta. The intellect is the twelfth. In deep sleep, tāmase, there is no annihilation (of personality), although there is concerned no such creation simultaneous with the senses (the co-operation being a popular fallacy). (In deep sleep) in consequence of one’s former waking experience, and because one is conditioned by the three guṇas, one imagines that one has material senses, although one can perceive only subtle senses. But though one imagines this, one does not really

¹ Compare Gītā, 18, 13 (threefold urgers to action), knowledge, object, knower, jñānam jāeṣam pariṣṭā trividhā karmacodana; threefold action, organ, act, agent, karaṇāṁ karma karte ‘tī trividhāṅ karmasamgrahaḥ; in 14, the five kāraṇāṁ or karmaṇāḥ hetavaḥ are object, adhiṣṭhāna, agent, organ, action, and the dāiva (said to be Sāmkhya, but interpreted as Vedānta).
co-operate (with the senses. Hence it may be inferred that a soul exists independent of mental processes). But the deep-sleep consciousness is a finite and darkened pleasure. Even the result one derives from traditional teaching, āgama, though not sorrowful, is also merely darkness, revealed lies, as it were.¹ Spirit, kṣetrajña, is the being, bhāva, standing in mind; it is immortal, flowing as a stream to the ocean. For the destruction of existence, satvasaṅkṣaya (the expression used above) is (in Upanishad language) as when rivers run into other rivers and to the ocean, losing their individuality, vyakti (equivalent to form) and name. Consequently, when the individual spirit, jīva, is united (with the ocean of being) and embraced on all sides, how could there be consciousness after death? (219, 48). As the creature that spins out of itself, wrapping itself in its web-house, stays there overpowered, so is the soul; but when freed, it abandons its misery, and then its woe is destroyed, like a clod falling on a rock. As the deer leaves its old horn, and the snake its skin, without looking behind, and a bird leaves the falling tree and flies away unattached, so the freed soul abandons its woe, and leaving pleasure and pain, without even a subtle body, goes the perfect way (47–49 repeats 45).²

For a Sāṅkhya philosopher Pañcapājakha teaches very extraordinary things, the most advanced Brahmaism, which fails only of being Vedānta in its lack of Māyā. Three sets of philosophers are here refuted, — the materialist, the Buddhist,

¹ The commentator reads atha tatārī 'py upādatte tamo 'vyaktam ivā 'nṛtam, ā, 38, which is perhaps better “hidden falsehood.” The meaning is, as explained above, that the joy given by Vedic teaching is a perishable heaven resulting in sorrow (darkness) and the teaching is not the highest truth. Compare, on the other side, the same reproach, Mālit. Up. vii, 10, satyam ivā 'nṛtam paśyanti.

² Compare Prajc. Up. v, 5; Mupṛ. Up. 1, 7 and iii, 1. The first image is clearly not that of a spider (which is not destroyed by its web), but of a silkworm, though the commentator (and PW.) take āṛṣanābhi as a spider, which comparison is common. Compare xii, 286, 40, āṛṣanābhīr yathā sūtraṁ vijñeyās tantvad guṇāḥ (as in BAU. ii, 1, 20). But the silkworm is also common. Compare xii, 304, 4, koçaṭahṛ yathātmanāṁ kitaṁ samavarundhati sūtraṭantuguṇāṁ nityaṁ tathā 'yam aguno guṇāh dvandvam eti ca nirdvandvah, etc.
and the orthodox Vedist. The terms used are those of the Saṁkhya, jīva and kṣetrajña rather than ātman (sthito manasi yo bhāvaḥ sa vāi kṣetrajña ucyate, cl. 40), but this spirit is only part of Brahman.¹

Another point to be noticed is the absence of tanmātras. Before passing to the numerical analysis of the Pāṇcarātra scheme into thirty elements, I would point out also that as in Gītā, 7, 4, so ib. 13, 5–6, there are gross elements, egoism, intellect, and mind (= 8), but also ten organs and five objects of sense plus avyakta (= 24 topics), to which are here added, Gītā, 13, 5–6, desire, aversion, pleasure, pain, and also body, perception, courage (saṁghāta, cetanā, dhṛti) or thirty-one elements of “modified Prakṛti.”

The Thirty-one Elements (Pañcaśikha).

Here there is a formal group of particles called kalās, not sixteen but thirty, but one (God) super-added makes thirty-one topics, the same number ascribed by tradition to the Pāṇcupatas. A most minute description is given in xii, 321, 96–112. This scheme is as follows:²

In order to act, the organs “await the outer constituents,” gunas. In perception, color, eye, and light are the three causes, and so in all cases where are found knowledge and the object of perception, (similar) causes of knowledge exist; between knowledge and the object intervenes the guṇa, constituent, mind, wherewith one judges. [The organs and mind make eleven.]³ The twelfth is intellect, another constituent, wherewith one decides in the case of doubtful things to be

¹ The attribute of Jagatprakṛti applied to Nārāyaṇa in the Pāṇcarātra hymn, xii, 339, 89, “the god who is the Source of the world,” gives the vital difference between this teaching and that which inculcates a Prakṛti distinct from pure soul.

² I italicize below without extended comment the points of contact with the scheme just given.

³ This must be supplied from the context. In the scheme at xiv, 42, 16, “mind must be recognized as belonging to both, and intellect is the twelfth,” only ten organs are recognized, as here, and bala as a separate organ is unknown.
known. The thirteenth constituent is sattva. (It is real) for one is argued to be an individual having much or little sattva (hence it is a real constituent, a guṇa). The fourteenth constituent is egoism (when one says 'I am an agent'), with which one gets the notion of mine and not-mine. Then there is a fifteenth constituent, which is different from the others and is called the totality of the mass of separate factors, prthakkalāsamūhasya sāmagryam (i.e., the general disposition). The sixteenth, a different constituent, is a sort of complex, saṁghāta iva (because it consists, says the commentator, in the union of the three factors of ignorance; the sixteenth is therefore avidyā, or ignorance itself), wherein are combined the Source and the individual manifestation, vyakti, which are respectively the seventeenth and eighteenth constituents, guṇau. The nineteenth is the unification of doublets (opposites), such as pleasant and disagreeable, age and death, etc. The twentieth constituent is Time, the origin and destruction of all things. This complex, saṁghāta, of twenty, and in addition the seven constituents consisting of the five gross elements added to [the origin and relation of] being and not-being, (making twenty-seven, is to be added again to) three more constituents, vidhi, cakra, bala (cause, seed, power).¹ That is called the body in which these twenty and ten are all together. The Source (fore-cause) of these kalās, factors, one philosopher recognizes to be the Unmanifest; another, dull of insight, recognizes (as such) the Manifest. Metaphysicians recognize a Source of all beings, whether it is the Unmanifest or the Manifest or a double or quadruple source. This unmanifest Source becomes manifest by means of the kalās (the factors just enumerated). The individual is the Source so made manifest. From conception to old age there is an uninterrupted momentary splitting up of the factors (particles) of the body, although too minute to be observed (in detail). But this passing away and coming into existence of

¹ According to the commentator, these are right and wrong as originating false ideas, vāsanā; that which incites to wrong ideas; and the effort leading to the attainment of wrong ideas. But see the scheme above.
the separate particles goes on from stage to stage just like the course of a lamp's light. There is, therefore, no connection between the individual existent creature and his members. All creatures are born by the union of particles, kalās, as it were, just as fire is produced by the union of sunlight and fire-stone, maṇi, or by sticks (rubbed together).

This exposition is given for a practical purpose, as is seen in the last paragraph. One should recognize no own, as all creatures are one, distinct from the physical parts. The "body of particles," as it is called in xii, 322, 25, reverts to the unmanifest Source, but the self or soul is but part of the same soul in any other body of particles. The doctrine is none the less that of Pañcaçikha because it is taught by Sulabhā to Janaka, though it is the latter who professes himself the disciple of Pañcaçikha, "the venerable beggar who belonged to the family of Parāçana," xii, 321, 24. For Janaka does not really understand, and so Sulabhā is enlightening him. Pañcaçikha is here said to be a Śāṅkhya leader. There is an imitation and would-be improvement in this late discourse (the metre shows the lateness) of Gītā, 3, 3, loke 'śmin dvividhā niśṭhā. Here cl. 38, the "point of view," is made treble, trividhā niśṭhā dṛṣṭā; not that emancipation is got by knowledge or action, as in the Gītā passage, but by the third (and best view), that of Pañcaçikha, who "rejected both these two," 321, 40. The doctrine is that the vaiçeśikaṁ jñānam or most excellent way, cl. 23, leads one to live a life of renunciation. All depends, says the king, on whether one is bond or free; the pure and good devotee may still be active; asceticism is not requisite; a king is as good as a beggar. "The bond of royalty (says the king in conclusion), the bond of affection, I have cut with the sword of renunciation, which has been sharpened on the anvil of emancipation," ib. 52. But his antagonist intimates that he has not learned the true religion, which is renunciation in deed as well as in thought. As a system, the doctrine of Pañcaçikha is said to be sopāyāh

1 The commentator says that "this expression, (kalānām)īva, has no meaning, and is merely used to fill up the verse," 321, 124.
sopaniṣadaḥ sopāsaṅgaḥ, saniṣcayaḥ, cl. 163, a detailed philosophical exposition.

In xii, 276, 4 ff., there is a third exposition, oddly combined with the Sāṅkhya schedule, while at the end it shows resemblance to that just given. It is referred to Asita Devala, who in xiii, 18, 18, is said to have received glory from Čiva (Čiva is Sāṅkhya-prasādah, xiii, 17, 68), who “gives the goal of Sāṅkhya-yoga,” xiii, 14, 198. In this scheme Time creates the five gross elements. Impelled by Being and Soul, Time creates beings out of these elements, which with Time make a group, rāçi, of six. To these are added bhāva and abhāva, making the “eight beings, bhūtāni, of beings.” When destroyed, a creature becomes fivefold (elements) because of these. The body is made of earth, bhūmimayo dehaḥ; the ear comes from air (space); the eye from the sun; the breath from the wind; the blood from water. The five senses are the “knowledges” (organs of knowledge, jñānāni). Sight, hearing, smelling, touch, taste, are five, distributed fivefold over five. Their constituents, tadgunaḥ, are color, smell, taste, touch, and sound, apprehended in five ways by the five senses. These, their guṇas, the senses do not know, but the spirit knows them (this is a correction of the statement that objects of sense are apprehended by the senses). Higher than the group of senses is citta, perception; higher than citta is mind; higher than mind is intellect; higher than intellect is spirit. A creature first perceives, cetayati, different objects of sense. Then pondering, vicārya, with the mind, he next determines, vyavasyati, with the intellect. One that has intellect determines objects of sense apprehended by the senses. Perception, the (five) senses as a group, mind, and intellect are, according to metaphysicians, the eight jñāne-ndriyas, organs of knowledge. There are five organs of action and bala is the sixth organ of action, cl. 22. Sleep-sight is the activity of the mind when the activity of the senses is suspended. The states, bhāvas, of sattva, tamas, and rajas

1 upāsaṅga for upāsaṅgāḥ? N. defines as dhyānāngāni yamādini.
2 This word means being as entity (and so is equivalent to guṇa, constitu-
(joy, success, insight, virtue, being the causes of one being endowed with sattva), which are associated with activity, whatever their cause of activity, vidhi, are retained (in sleep) by memory. There is an agreeable and constant immediate passage between the two states, bhāvayoh (that is the passage is immediately perceptible between waking and sleeping). The organs and the states are called the seventeen constituents, guṇas. The eighteenth is the eternal incorporate one in the body, dehi ċarīre (spirit).

Here fourteen organs are added to the three guṇas, sattva, etc., for there are "eight organs of knowledge" and six of action (elsewhere there are only five organs of knowledge). Of the group of seventeen I have already spoken, and note here only the intrusion of citta between senses and mind. The account proceeds not very lucidly: There concorporate constituents bound up in body in the case of all incorporate creatures cease to be concorporate on the separation of the body; or the body made of five elements, pāṇcabhāutika, is a mere (temporary) union, saṁnipāta. The one and the eighteen guṇas with the incorporate one and with heat, ṛṣman (the internal heat of the stomach, says the commentator), make the complex, saṁghāta, of twenty composed of five elements, which (twenty) the Great One, mahān, with wind supports. The death of each creature is caused by this (wind). On destruction, the creature enters the five elements, and urged by its good and evil, assumes a body again; and so on from body to body, urged by Time the kṣetrin (spirit) goes, as if from one ruined house to another.\(^1\)

The vinç saṁghātaḥ pāṇcabhāutikāḥ or complex of twenty composed of five elements in this passage is the same with the vinçakah saṁghātaḥ of the preceding, 321, 109. But there

---

\(^1\) viścīraṇād vā (= iva) gṛhād gṛham. The analysis above, 276 (6), 30 : ekač ca daça cā 'ṭāu ca (= 19) guṇāḥ, saha ċarīrinā (dehin in cl. 28) ṛṣmanā saha (besides heat)viścī vā saṁghātaḥ pāṇcabhāutikāḥ, mahān saṁdhārayaty etac chariraṁ vāyunā saha. Compare the first scheme above.
Time is the twentieth, and the twenty are the bodily guṇas. Nevertheless, the employment in each, not only of the group of twenty but also of bala and vidhi, as found above, points to a common basis. In none is there a trace of Vishnuism.

The Secret of the Vedānta.

The united systems of philosophy called "Secret of the Vedānta" and exploited in xii, 194, 248 ff., and 286, which in the following pages I shall designate as A, B, C, present a curious mixture, which on careful analysis show clearly that they are three different versions of an older Śāṅkhya tract, which is worked over into Brahmaiism. There is no clear recognition of egoism, though the commentator so interprets the "maker of bhūtās" in C 9, and, as I have said above, I think it doubtful, both from these and other passages, whether the earlier Śāṅkhya recognized Intellect as other than self-conscious. One of the present three schemes introduces the Bhūtātman as deus ex machina. They all differ slightly and have the Pañcaśikha terminology to a certain extent. In their threefold form they offer an instructive example of how the epic copies itself. They all begin with the same request to the instructor to give a metaphysical, adhyātma, lecture. The first and last versions represent Bhīṣma as teacher and Yudhisṭhira as pupil; the other, Vyāsa as teacher and Čuka as pupil of the same lecture. The two Bhīṣma lectures do not agree so closely with each other throughout (though more alike at first) as do the Vyāsa and second Bhīṣma version,

1 Compare with this saṃghāta or vital complex the jīvaghana, Praçn. v. 5.
2 The closer agreement begins with A 9 as compared with B 9 and C 10; "sound, ear, and holes, this triad is born of air; touch, action, skin, are born of wind; color, eye, digestion, are called the threefold light, tejas." Here B and C have "vital airs" for skin, and jyotis for tejas. In the next group, where A has taste, kleda, tongue, B and C both have sneha. Again "mind as the sixth" organ appears in A 11 but is omitted in B 11 and C 12, to reappear in B 17, C 15. In all these versions, body, with smell and object, is of earth alone, bhūmigunaḥ, loc. cit. Besides these triads, B and C give sound, ghoṣa, (ṣabda) from air, smell alone as bhūmiguna in B, all composite matter, saṃghāta, as earth-guṇa in C; breath (C) or touch (B) from wind, etc.
which lie nearer together in place. It will be necessary to treat these chapters rather fully if we wish to get a clear idea of the manufacture of epic philosophy.

Coming, then, to details, the člokas are intermingled in such a way that part of one čloka in one discourse is part of another in another version. Thus, after the introductory stanza, which names the five elements with but trifling variations, A has: "Whence they are created thither they go, again and again, the great bhūtas, from other bhūtas, like waves of ocean; and as a tortoise, stretching forth limbs, retracts them again, so the Bhūtātman again withdraws the bhūtas he has created." In B, the expression "like waves of ocean" comes in the first stanza, replacing the expression "origin and destruction" in A. In C, as regards this expression, the reading is as in A, but the important lines of the tortoise and Bhūtātman appear here thus: "As a tortoise here, causing his limbs to stretch forth, retracts them, so the smaller bhūtas in respect of greater bhūtas;" while B has: "As a tortoise here, stretching forth limbs, retracts them again, so the great bhūtas, mahānti bhūtāni, modify themselves in the smaller" (younger); and this is repeated, ib. 14, in a stanza omitted in the other versions with the momentous alteration: "As a tortoise here, his limbs outstretching, withdraws them, even so the Intellect, having created the group of senses, withdraws them."

The next change is in A 8, where, after stating that the "maker of bhūtas" put the gross elements differently in all beings, the teacher here adds "but the jīva spirit does not see that difference," which in the other versions appears without mention of jīva, with viṣayān in C for vāṣāmyam. Of the new group of eight sources found here, I have spoken elsewhere. All the versions have the following stanza A 17, B 16, C 18:

\[
\begin{align*}
guṇān (A, C, guṇāir) & \text{ neniyate buddhir, buddhir eve-} \\
& \text{'ndriyāny api (C, ca)} \\
manāḥśaṣṭāni sarvāṇi & \text{ (A, bhūtāni), buddhy (A, tad)} \\
& \text{ abhāve kuto guṇāḥ,}
\end{align*}
\]

that is, Intellect directs the guṇas; the senses are intellect
and their constituents could not exist without it. A and C make the intellect subservient to the guṇas! C, as if to explain the guṇas, inserts “tamas, sattva, rajas, time, and act,” while in 13 it has a verse (mingling cases), “sattva, rajas, tamas, kāla (nom.), and karmabuddhi (nom.), and mind, the sixth, in these (bases) the Lord created.” B, too, has an addition: “Mind, intellect, and nature, svabhāva, these three are born of their own sources; they do not overpass the guṇas on arriving at that which is higher than the guṇas” (13, na guṇān ativartante). So in 316, 2, guṇasvabhāvas tv avyakto guṇān nāi ’vā ’tivartate. But in 249, 8 ff., the continuation of B, the intellect, identified with the bhāvas (states produced by guṇas) does overpass them, “as the sea does the shore.”

The image here is so conventional, saritāṁ sāgaro bhartā mahāvelām ivo ’rmimān (compare A, 23 ff.; C, 23 ff.) that there is no doubt what has happened. The constant unchanging epic simile is that one remains, not over-stepping, “as the sea does not overpass its shore.” In other words, there is in this passage an intrusion of the Yoga idea that the soul can overpass the guṇas (compare Gītā, 14, 21, and xii, 252, 22), and so the ancient simile is introduced without its negative, making the absurdity shown above.

B alone adds, in 249, 3, “the intellect is soul,” ātman,

1 Compare xii, 205, 17: “Mind abandoning guṇas attains freedom from guṇas” (above). Guṇas and bhāvas are here the same thing, for the latter are the result of the presence of the former. They (or the eight sources) “carry the universe but rest on God,” 210, 28, 30. This is a Lord-system, though “Lord” is a form of ignorance: “elements, senses, guṇas, three worlds, the Lord himself, are all based on egoism,” 212, 18-19.

2 svabhāva, nature, is distinct from sadbhāva. One is temporary, the other is eternal, xiv, 25, 22; Gītā, 8, 3. The three texts in describing the modification of intellect “called mind when it desires,” A 20; B (249), 2; C 20, have slight variants; “that with which it sees is eye, hearing it is called ear,” A 19; B 4; C 10, where B and C have çṛutati, etc., but A the verb throughout. In A 13 (and the corresponding verses B 18, C 19) “the mind doubts,” saṁcayam kurute, “the intellect decides,” adhyavasānāya. Compare 249, 1, mano visrjate bhāvam buddhir adhyavasāyini, hṛda-yam priyāpiye veda, trividhā karmacodanā. “The intellect is the chief thing in that which is to be made” (B 15), suggesting egoism, but C 14 has kṛtane and A has no subject at all.
which is in line with the tendencies at work here. So in 249, 20, there is a stanza which must be compared step for step with the parallel passages: "Soul, ātman, puts forth intellect, but never (read nā 'pi) guṇas; the guṇas do not know soul, but soul, sa, knows guṇas always, and it is the observer and in proper order occupies itself with them. Know that this is the difference between intellect and spirit (kṣetrajña for the preceding ātman), one creates guṇas, one does not create guṇas; both being different but joined by the Source, united as a fish to water, or fly to udumbara, or as sheath to grass-blade. Intellect truly creates guṇas, but the spirit, the Lord, superintends, as the guṇas modify themselves; all that is part of its own nature, that intellect creates guṇas; as a spider does his thread, so that creates guṇas."

In A, 38 ff.: "See the difference between intellect and spirit, kṣetrajña; one creates guṇas, one does not create guṇas; as the fly and udumbara so are they joined; both being different, but joined by the Source; as a fish and water are joined so are they; the guṇas know not the soul, ātman, but the soul, sa, knows the guṇas always. But being an observer of the guṇas (the spirit) imagines them created (by himself). The soul, ātman, with the senses and intellect as the seventh, which are moveless and ignorant, illuminates the object, pada, like a lamp. Intellect truly creates the guṇas, the spirit, kṣetrajña, looks on; this is their connection. There is no support for the intellect and spirit. Mind creates intellect but never creates the guṇas . . . A Yogin in his proper nature creates (ṣṛjate) guṇas, as a spider his web."  

C 33 begins as in B, "Know that this is the difference," down to the image of the fish; then, omitting the fly, etc., goes on as in A: "The guṇas know not the soul, ātman, but the soul knows guṇas always, but, being an observer of the guṇas, it imagines itself the creator. There is no support for the intellect . . . 2 the intellect, buddhir antarā, with the

1 Unique. Mind here is for ātman in B.
2 A senseless addition is found here, followed by ṣṛjate hi guṇān sattvam kṣetrajñah paripagyati (as in A). Sattva, itself a guṇa, rests on rajas, xii,
senses, which have no eyes and are ignorant, makes the senses luminous like a lamp (the intellect alone sees, the senses are like lamps) . . . this is even the fulfilment of its nature that (intellcet creates) guṇas as a spider his thread; the guṇas should be recognized as a web." ¹

A Sāṁkhya text is here changed into a later philosophy, with soul substituted for spirit, and the Yogin making guṇas. Hence also the intellect is grouped with senses as ignorant instruments of the soul, while Mind is creative soul. Even apart from the philosophical modifications here visible, it is difficult to see how the synthetic method can account for these three

218, 12, sattvaṁ ca rajasi sthitam, jānādhiṣṭhānam avyaktam buddhyahāmkāralakṣaṇam tad bijaṁ dehināṁ āhuḥ. Compare 215, 25, jānādhiṣṭhānam ajñānam vijñānāṅgataṁ jānām ajñānenā 'pakṛṣyate. But we have in ācārayo nā 'sti sattvasya a phrase in which sattva is equivalent to conscious buddhi. The varied readings show clearly that the text has been tampered with. In ācārayo nā 'sti sattvasya guṇāḥ caṅdo na cetanā in 240, 14, followed by sattvaṁ hi tejāḥ srjati na guṇān vāi kathāṅcana there is still another parallel to our text. So in 241, 3 ff., sattva is buddhi, higher than citta, as it is said "merge citta in sattva" (247, 5 and 9, the Yogn's sūkṣmā buddhiḥ). Elsewhere citta, by the way, is an organ "lower than mind," 276, 16. The version in 194, 44, is ācārayo nā 'sti sattvasya kṣetrajñāsya ca kaċcana, sattvaṁ manah saṁśrjate na guṇān vāi kādācana (after the words srjate hi guṇān sattvaṁ), where manas must represent ātman in the version above. The form guṇāḥ caṅdo na cetanā appears, a scribe's error apparently, in 286, 36, as guṇasargena cetanā, before the meaningless words: sattvaṁ asya srjanty anye guṇān veda kādācana. The epic sattva is well known: "One is fitted for Brahman existence as sattva gradually departs," i. e., as circumscribed jiva becomes pure. Compare also 217, 21–25 (210–217 are a professed adhyātma of Nārāyaṇa), where it is said that jiva quits rajas and goes about like sound but in a body, and then gets established in Source, and finally leaves even that body and enters "end of body which rests on nothing," nirācāraya.

¹ Other common metaphors and similes are that of the cocoon (pp. 36, 151), the "bonds of hope," ācāpaṇca, Gitā, 16, 12; the net, xii, 242, 7 ff.; but unique is the weaver of xii, 217, 36: "As a weaver passes the thread through cloth with a needle, so the thread of transmigration is fastened with the needle of desire, saṁsārayati (saṁsārasūtra) tr̥ṣṇāsūcyā. Compare foam-like body and bird-like soul, xii, 322, 7; as well as the elaborate river-metaphors (taken from the battle-epic), where the bank is truth, waves are untruth, desire is a crocodile, and the river of the unmanifest goes into the sea of transmigration, iii, 207, 72; xii, 251, 12 ff. (Dh. Pad., 251, n' atthi mohasamaṁ jālāṁ n' atthi taṁhāsamā nadi).
conversations. From an historical point of view the problem is of course simple.

The question asked above, "What would become of the guṇas in the absence of intellect?" is taken up and continued at the end of the discussion: "When the guṇas, the strands spun by intellect, are dispersed, pradhvastāḥ, they do not cease to be, na nivartante; a cessation, nivṛtti, is not perceived. This is beyond the sphere of what is immediately perceptible (but) it is ascertainable through reasoning, anumāna. So some decide, while others say they cease to be, nivṛtti. Let one consider both views and decide as one thinks best, loosening the firm knot of the heart (an Upanishad phrase) caused by a difference of judgment," 194, 50–52. B and C have "their activity, pravṛtti, is not perceived," for "a cessation is not perceived."

The Yogin, who according to the teaching of this lecture can overpass the guṇas, is said in the last section, in a supplement, xii, 252, ff., to surpass even the destruction of guṇas, atikrāntaguṇakṣaya, and reach the highest goal.

**Details of Philosophical Speculation.**

It has been shown thus far that there are not only three religious philosophies in the epic, but also three formal systems, one inculcating the twenty-five, one the twenty-six, and one the thirty-two categories.

These broad differences are sufficient to show how entirely lacking in any uniform plan or scope is epic philosophy as a whole, and also to prove that the epic does not represent a preliminary chaos of opinions, but reflects at last three perfected and systematized schemes of philosophy. I turn now to some details of speculation, incongruous for the most part, reflecting different interpretations and different views; but in some cases noteworthy not so much for their lack of harmony with other epic schemes as for the uniqueness of views found only in one or two passages of the pseudo-epic, amid a mass of theories covering the same general subject.
The Sixty Constituents of Intellect.

This group, one of the most elaborate in the epic, is obtained by an "enumeration," parisaṅkhya, which analyzes the elements, xii, 256, 1 ff. They are thus distributed: "Earth has ten, firmness, weight (gurutva), hardness (kāthinya), the function of productivity, scent, density (also gurutva, but explained as prathamānatā, pīṇḍapuṣṭih), ability (to hold scents), compactness, support, endurance. Water has ten, coolness, taste, moistness, fluidity (dravatva), adhesiveness and softness (? snehasāyumyatā), tongue, dispersion, also, and softening (grapaṇa) of earthy things (these make nine, but the commentator supplies 'freezing' from ca, 'and,' which I render 'also'! Probably bhāumānām contains an old error). Fire, ten, dangerousness, light, heat, cooking, brightness, pain, passion (and is) swift; (it has) sharpness and ever upward flaring. Wind (air), ten, tempered touch, (it is) the organ of speech, vādasthāna; (it has) independence, power, speed, emission (of secretions), activity, movement (of breath), life (ātmata, of the vital airs), and birth. The characteristic constituent of air (space) is sound; (it has also) comprehensive-ness, openness, non-support, non-suspension, unmanifestness, steadfastness (avikāritā), non-resistance (apratīghātītā), elementality, and changes (bhūtatvam vikṛtāni ca, 'that is, it causes hearing and apertures in the body,' N.). Thus related are the fifty constituents (guṇāh pañcācātam), which are the essentials of the five elements." To these are added nine constituents of mind and five of intellect, as follows: "Courage, reasoning, memory (so the commentator renders upapatti and vyakti, perhaps individuality), creation (visarga, rendered 'loss of memory' by the commentator), imagination, patience, good, evil, and swiftness, are the nine characteristics of mind. The destruction of the pleasant and the unpleasant (in deep sleep), judgment (vyavasāya), concentration, doubt, and insight are recognized as the five characteristics of intellect." The two last, saṁcaya and pratipatti, are rendered by the commen- tator in just the opposite meanings, namely knowledge in
doubtful matters and the application of other proofs as well as direct perception. In the light of explanations current elsewhere in the epic, where "doubt-making" is an attribute of mind, and judgment that of intellect, "doubt," which is here clearly attributed to intellect, must indeed, from a synthetic point of view, be interpreted by its opposite, or one may fall back on the remark cited below, that this is all nonsense. From an historical point of view, however, the statement may stand beside the many other inconsistencies of the epic.

The section closes with a query on the part of the listener as to how intellect has five constituents and how the five senses are reckoned as attributes, katham pañcendriyā gunāḥ; to which the answer is the stanza: āhūḥ saṣṭhīm buddhiṇāṁ vāi bhūtaviṣṣṭā nityaviṣaktāḥ, bhūtavibhūtīc cā 'kṣaṃsṛṣṭāḥ putra ma nityaṁ tad iha vadanti, "They say that the constituents of intellect are sixty. These are distinguished by the elements; (but) are always attached (to the intellect). The manifestations of the elements are created by that which is indestructible. They say that that is non-eternal." "That," it is added, "which has been declared to you here is foolishness, cintākalīlam, and unorthodox, anāgatam. Learning the whole truth in regard to the meaning of elements, gain peace of intellect by acquiring power over the elements" (bhūtaprabhāvāt, Yogi-power).

The sixty may be got by adding the five gunas of intellect to the five elements plus their fifty characteristic constituents; but the commentator says the true count is seventy-one, five elements with their fifty constituents added to mind and intellect with their nine and five constituents respectively.

Two views are given. One is that there are fifty and nine and five constituents of five (elements), one (mind), and one (intellect) = 71. The other is that intellect has sixty constituents, five of its own, fifty of the elements (as parts of intellect), and the elements themselves (which are different

1 The commentator paraphrases bhūtaviṣṭāḥ with pañca bhūtāny api buddher eva gunāḥ, "the five elements are constituents of intellect."
from the constituents). The latter view is repudiated as unorthodox, and the final injunction is given to turn from this calculation to Yogi-discipline.

This unorthodox enumeration is represented elsewhere by the title of Čiva, who is called ṣaṣṭībāga, xiii, 17, 72, and perhaps also by the mysterious manoviruddhāni in the enumeration of the psychic colors explained below. Seven hundred vyūhas, or forms of activity, are traversed by the soul on its way through red and yellow, to white, when it courses above the eight worlds. Then follows, xii, 281, 46:

\[
\text{aṣṭāu ca ṣaṣṭīṁ ca ṣatāni cāī 'va manoviruddhāni mahādyutinām}
\]

"The eight (worlds) and the sixty and the hundreds (of vyūhas) are impediments to the mind of the illuminate." The sixty are here explained as constituents of existence still adhering to the white soul. The commentator, however, gives an entirely different explanation from the one above, and though much the same in regard to the last two cases, his interpretation is not quite uniform. In the former case, the god enjoys tattvas or topics, experienced as stated at the beginning of the Māndūkyya, in unconscious slumber, wakefulness, and ordinary sleep, each of the latter being the real or illusionary fine and gross elements added to the nineteen "doors of enjoyment," soul, five breaths, and the usual thirteen (ten organs, mind, intellect, and egoism); while two of the sixty are attributed to dreamless slumber, cetas, soul, and subtlest capacity. In the latter case, the three states are surpassed by a fourth state, to which the impeded white soul cannot attain. The impediments are much the same as those above, but include ignorance, desire and acts (the triad mentioned above), and the states themselves.

**The Seventeen.**

In the exposition given in xii, 276, 6 ff., above, p. 156, there is a group of seventeen with an added spirit, making eighteen in all. Further there are "eight beings of beings," which re-
mind one of the "eight sources," but instead of the usual group we find here the gross elements, Time, being, and not-being (egoism is not a factor here at all).  

The group of seventeen plays an important part in epic categories, but it is clear from a comparison of the cases that there is no symmetry of system in the explanation. It is in short, as is the case in other instances, a Śaṅkhyan term used because it is an old term, but explained differently in different cases. One form we have just examined; another I gave in the first chapter, above, p. 33, where was shown a late group of seventeen, containing most of the elements of the same group in the Vedāntasāra, five elements, mind, intellect, egoism, five organs of sense, spirit, ātman, and the three guṇas or constituents of all that is not pure spirit.

On the other hand the Śaṅkhyan group, as in Aphorisms iii, 9, may be understood of the bodily constituents (ten organs, mind, intellect, and five elements) in a praise of Čīva who created the "seven guardians and ten others who guard this city," vii, 201, 76. The city here is the body, as in the Upanishads and Gītā (Çvet., 3, 18; G. 5, 13), elsewhere called "house," as in v, 33, 100, "this house of nine doors, three pillars, five witnesses, under control of the spirit."  

1 This exposition is called "silly talk," duṣṭapralāpāḥ, xii, 280, 23, because it does not recognize that the course of transmigration may be brought to an end. For it is taught in the following chapter that not knowledge, penance, and sacrifice, but only self-restraint, can result in the attainment of Vishnu, the supreme God. For as a goldsmith purifies gold in fire so the soul is purified by many rebirths or by one alone. Hari creates, whose self consists of the eleven modifications, ekādaśavikārātmā, the sun is his eye, his mind is in the moon, his intellect is in knowledge, etc., and the guṇas are essentially of God, 281, 9, 11-12, 19-21, 24. Here, as I have elsewhere pointed out, eleven modifications take the place of the regular sixteen, evidently the organs and mind without the elements.

2 In conjunction with the two birds (spirits) and pippal trees (vikāras), mānasau dvāu suparṇaḥ vācābhāṣyāḥ pippalaḥ sapta gopāḥ daṇḍaḥ pary nyante purāni dharayanti. Compare for the birds and pippal tree Muṇḍ. Up. iii, 1; Çvet. iv, 6.

3 The five senses, mind, intellect, egoism, and the gross body, make the nine; the pillars are restraints, ignorance, desire, action; the house is the body; the witnesses are the senses, says the commentator, who at Gītā, 5, 13, gives a different explanation of the nine. The witness (as in popular style, i,
Another passing allusion is found in xii, 280, 4, "freed from the seventeen," where (since the context excludes objects of sense, guṇas, and the "eight") the seventeen are explained by the commentator as five breaths, mind, intellect, and ten organs (the eight being objects of sense and guṇas). Another passage alluding to the seventeen is taken in the same way: "Who are free of the seventeen, the guṇas, and acts, the fifteen kalās, particles, being abandoned,¹ they are released," xii, 335, 40. So again in xii, 352, 15–16: "The highest spirit is not affected by fruits, as the lotus leaf is not affected by water; but the other, the active spirit, karmāṭman, is bound by the bonds of salvation² and it is bound also by the group of seventeen," where rāçi, group, is used as in the first example above, though the group is a different one.

It follows that the epic is not consistent with itself but interprets the "group of seventeen" in different ways.³

74, 31, ḫṛdi sthitāḥ) is sometimes made sixfold, as the spirit and five senses, xiii, 7, 5. Various poetical modifications occur: "A house, agārakam, of one pillar, nine doors," xii, 174, 59; a city, xii, 210, 37; nine doors again (still differently explained by the commentator) in xii, 240, 32, where the spirit is haṇṣa (compare 240, 29–31). A very elaborate working-up of the body-city, with senses as citizens, buddhi as Lord, etc., will be found in xii, 255, 9 ff. The haṇṣa passage reflects the Upanishads: 240, 29 = Çvet. iii, 16; 30 = v. i. of Çvet. ib. 20; 31 has the unique devadhībhāva (ātmāṇaḥ) of Mātri, vii, 11: 32 = later form of Çvet. iii, 18. On p. 45, I gave kālāḥ pacati in Strīp, as accidental or universal. Not so here, however, where Mātri vi, 15, kālāḥ pacati . . . yasminś tu pacyate kālo yas taṁ veda sa vedavit, appears complete (with the v. i. taṁ veda 'ha na kaścana) in 240, 25. So too cl. 17 = Kaṭha iii, 15; and 26 = Çvet. iv, 19; while in 15, manisā manasā vipraḥ pacyaty ātmānam ātmāni (evami saptadācarī dehe vṛttaṁ śoḍaṣaḥbhir guṇāḥ) there is a direct copy of the older form, Çvet. iv, 17, etc. Cl. 19, 20, 21 copy the Gitā.

¹ ye hināḥ saptadācarī guṇāḥ karmabhir eva ca, kālāḥ pāṇḍacaṭa tyaktāṁ te muktā iti niçayaṁ. Here the commentator takes guṇas as sattva, rajas, and tamas. On the fifteen kalās, see below.

² Mokṣabandhāḥ, perhaps moha should be read, unless mokṣa implies desire.

³ There are of course other groups of seventeen. Thus in xii, 269, 25–26, Agni is seventeenth in the sacrificial group, plants, cattle, trees, withes, butter, milk, sour milk, ghee, land, points of compass, faith, time (are twelve), the three Vedas, the sacrificer (are sixteen), and seventeenth is Fire, the house-lord.
The Sixteen (A) Particles.

What has happened in the mixture just described is obvious enough. The fifteen kalās, mentioned above as something to be abandoned, imply a sixteenth kalā, the not-to-be-abandoned psychic entity itself. The impediments are called indifferently kalās and guṇas, the former being the old designation, as in Muṇḍ. Up. iii, 2, 7, “the fifteen kalās disappear.” Here as in Brh. Āraṇ., i, 5, 15, the sixteenth is the soul; but in Praç. Up. vi, 2–5, the soul is the source of the sixteen, sa puruṣo yasminn etāḥ śoḍaṣṭa kalāḥ prabhavanti, Puruṣa makes them, each from the preceding: “breath, faith, five elements, sense, mind, food, energy, austerity, hymns, sacrifice, the world, and the name (individuality),” and they all flow back into Puruṣa in reverse order. In xii, 47, 53 ff., (where the sāmkhyātman is yogātman, māyātman, viśvātman, goptrātman) God is “the Sāmkhyas’ Seventeenth, having threefold soul (tridhātman, awake, dreaming, in dreamless sleep), standing in soul, enveloped in the sixteen guṇas.” The sixteen in xii, 210, 33 are the eleven organs and five objects of sense, which come from (1) the Unmanifest, producing (2) act-born intellect, which produces (3) egoism, whence come, one out of the other, (4) air, (5) wind, (6) light, (7) water, (8) earth, the eight fundamental sources on which the universe is established (vs. 29, the sixteen modifications, ten organs, five objects of sense, and mind). Compare also above the “freed from six and sixteen.” So in xii, 242, 8 = xiv, 51, 31, where every creature has a body, mūrti, and “consists of sixteen,” murtimān śoḍaṣṭātmakah. The Upanishadie kalās and the Sāmkhyā groups have united, and in turn are affected by other later groups. In xii, 240, 13, there is a group of sixteen “always in the bodies of incorporate creatures,” the five senses and the five objects of sense, the svabhāva or individual nature, intellect, cetanā, and mind added to two vital breaths and to spirit itself; while in 302, 24, svabhāva and cetanā are apparently not included in the “sixteen guṇas” which encompass the body; or, if the sixteen be interpreted as including
them, then in both cases we have a group of sixteen quite distinct from that in the previous section, where organs and objects of sense make the number. Further, in the former of the two last sections, cetanā is distinct from manas, with which it is elsewhere identified (see the section cited on p. 34 from the third book). Compare also the account of creation in xii, 233, 10 ff., already referred to, where the seven mahātmans, intellect, mind, and the elements, unite to make body as a base for spirit, carīraṁ çrayanād bhavati, mūrtimat sodacātmakam, 233, 12, into which enter mahāti bhūtāni. The elements are the gross, as they are described in āl. 8 (gunaṁ sarvasya pūrvasya prāpnuvanty uttarottaram), and there seems no reason for differentiating them from the Great Beings, though the commentator takes them as intellect and tanmātras, and the sixteen as gross elements and eleven organs, explaining the whole process as the creation of the liṅga in the sthūla body.

The group of sixteen plus a seventeenth, as given in the scheme above, is a combination of two schedules, one the regular seventeen of the Aphorisms, the other an earlier group of sixteen only, in which the sixteenth is the permanent spiritual part as contrasted with the fifteen impermanent parts, like those of the moon, xii, 305, 4.

**The Sixteen (B) or Eleven Modifications.**

The epic (as already cited) gives the modifications as eleven in number. Apart from the usual explanations of these eleven, there is a passage, xii, 253, 11: “Three higher gunās are in all creatures, besides the five gross elements, with mind, which is essentially analytic, vyākaranātmakam, as the ninth, intellect the tenth, and the inner soul, antarātman, as the eleventh.” Here the commentator explains the three as ignorance, desire, and action (avidyā, kāma, karma, āl. 9), though in the text bhāva, abhāva, and kāla, are given as three additions (āl. 2), with other departures from the scheme already recognized in what precedes. But apart from this special case, the fact remains that in some parts of the epic, as in iii,
213, 18 (p. 37), xii, 281, 20, only eleven modifications are admitted.

On the other hand, sixteen modifications, eleven organs and five elements, as in the regular Sāṅkhyān system, are fully recognized, as in xii, 311, 8 ff., and elsewhere.

There is, therefore, no uniform epic interpretation of the modifications.

The Eight Sources.

As given above from xii, 210, 28 and 311, 10, the mūla-prakṛtayaḥ or eight fundamental procreative powers are the Unmanifest, intellect (“born of activity,” the result of the equilibrium being disturbed by tejas, energy), egoism, air, wind, light, water, and earth; or in other words (the fine elements being ignored, as usual), the five elements and self-conscious intellect as the first manifest production of the unmanifest produce everything. But in Gītā, 7, 4, the “eight sources” are these elements plus mind, self-consciousness, and intellect. The terminology, it may be observed, is already broken up in the Gītā. In this passage “another source,” prakṛti, is the jīvabhūtā, which is the same with one of the “two spirits,” puruṣas, in 15, 16, one of which is “all beings,” with a “third spirit,” the Lord, Īcvara, paramātman, added in 17, who is not identified with the akṣara but is “higher.” When, however, egoism is rejected in favor of spirit, as in the “Secret of the Vedānta,” then the group of eight appears as the six senses “(the five senses which are perceptive, vijñānāni, with mind as the sixth), intellect and spirit. Other groups of eight, like the last, seem to be based on this early grouping of productive elements. They are assumed in xiii, 16, 54, where Īśvara is “the eight sources (above ‘eight forms’), and he who is above the sources,” and they are personified in the personal creation of xii, 341, 30 ff., as “eight sages,” who are sources, though created from the elements:

Marśir Aṅgirācac ātriḥ Pulastyaḥ Pulahāḥ Kratuḥ
Vasiṣṭhaḥc ca mahātmā vāi Manuḥ Svāyambhuvas
tathā
jāneyāḥ prakṛtayoṣṭau tā yaṣu lokāḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ
Compare 210, 28, mūlaprakṛtaya hy aṣṭau jagad etāsy avasthitam. As already noticed, the system requires that the elements here should be "fine," and this is occasionally expressed (see p. 129), but elsewhere the fine elements are ignored in this group of sources. Then the five (gross) elements are productive, which leaves only eleven modifications.

The Vital Airs and Senses.

In xii, 302, 27, there are seven breaths, the usual five and in addition an adhaḥ anīlāḥ and a pravahāḥ. Instances where ten and five vital breaths are mentioned have already been given. So with two, which are often the only airs recognized, as in xii, 240, 13. These are all old groups, and represent as varied opinions in the epic as in earlier literature.

Generally speaking, plants are ignored in the elaborate analysis of categories, but they are specifically mentioned at times. Thus in xii, 183 ff., there is an account of creation. Water was the first creation after space. Water pressing made wind. The friction of wind and water made fire which became solid and thus formed earth. There are five sense-making elements in all created things. Trees do not appear to possess them, but they really do. They have space or how could leaves come out? They have heat as is shown by withering. They have ears, for at the sound of thunder they lose leaves, and sound is heard only with ears. They have eyes for a wither can wind its way, and there is no path without sight. They can smell, for good and bad smells, of incense, etc., make them flourish or decline. They taste, for they drink water. So all creatures have the five elements. The earth-element is seen in skin, flesh, bone, marrow, sinew; the fire-element, in energy, wrath, sight, heat, and digestive fire; the air (or space) element in ear, nose, mouth, heart, and stomach (usually not as here, 184, 22, but in all the apertures); the water-

1 Even the ten are recognized in Çat. Br. xi, 6, 3, 5, daçe 'me puruṣe ṣr̥na śtmāi 'kadaçaḥ (called rudrāḥ). These can scarcely be the organs, for as such they would include the karmendriyas, which do not "depart" at death. The names are given above, p. 96. Compare the rudras of xii, 317, 5.
element in slime, bile, sweat, fat, blood. There are five vital airs (winds) which cause a person to move, 184, 24–25:

prāṇāt pranīyatē prāṇī vyānād vyāyacchate tathā
gacchatē apano 'dhaq cāi 'va īsamāno hrdy avasthitāḥ
udānād ucchvasiti ca pratībhedač ca bhāṣate
ity eva vāyavah paṇca ceṣṭayanti 'ha dehīnām

The five senses belong to the five elements; one smells by reason of the earth-element; tastes because one has the element of water; knows color through the eye as the fire-element; knows touch through the wind. Smell is of nine sorts; taste is of six sorts; color (and form), of sixteen sorts (color as distinguished from form is of six sorts, white, black, bright-red, yellow, blue, yellow-red); wind has a double characteristic, sound and touch; touch is the characteristic of wind and is of many sorts, viz., twelve; air (space) has but one characteristic, sound. But there are seven sorts of sound (the gamut) called śadja, rśabha, gāndhāra, madhyama, dhāivata, paṇcama, niśāda. Whateover sound of drum, thunder, etc., is heard is contained in this group of seven sounds (notes).²

The more extended account of airs in the next chapter gives ten vital breaths or airs, though it describes but five, nādyo daçapraṇānapracoditāḥ, xii, 185, 15 (as noticed above, p. 36, with the correspondence in the third book). In xiv, 50, 42 ff., the same (duplicated) account says smell is of ten sorts; color (form), of twelve sorts; sound of ten sorts (the gamut and also “sounds which are agreeable, disagreeable, and com-

1 This is the later view that apāna is the anus wind, pāyūpāsthe 'pānam, Praça Up. iii, 5.

2 On the six colors mentioned together in the Rig Veda, and the light of thirty-four kinds, see my article on Color Words in the Rig Veda, Am. Journal of Phil. iv, p. 190. Seven recitations or notes are recognized in the Chānd. Up. ii, 22, 1; the roaring note is the Agni note; the unclear is Prajāpati’s; the clear or definite is Soma’s; the soft smooth, is Vāyu’s; the smooth strong, is Indra’s; the heron-note is Brhaspati’s; the inharmonious, is Varuṇa’s. The names here are indefinite and apply vaguely to seven divinities. They are found also in other early literature. The epic names have no analogy in the Upanishads till the Garbha. On the other hand the epic grāma, gamut, is late. Compare above, p. 13, vāṇi; also saptatantri vīṇa, iii, 134, 14, “the seven-stringed lyre,” called ṣadgrāmarāgādidasamādhīyuktā, in H. ii, 89, 68.
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pact"), although the two descriptions are almost identical. Each, however, has added new factors. The Anugītā list betterers the careless text above, whereby the sound called "Fifth," pañcama, stands in the sixth place (xii, 184, 39).

The Five Subtile Elements. Gross and Subtile Bodies.

The word for subtile element, tanmātra, is late and, as I think, its equivalent is not often to be understood. The earlier schemes were content with "elements"; the later, or a divergent interpretation, introduced fine elements, sūkṣmāṇi, the latest have the classical term tanmātrāṇi. Of course the commentator often interprets fine elements where none is mentioned. Thus, in xii, 205, 15, "as the elements disappear on the destruction of the gunas, so intellect taking the senses exists in mind," where subtile forms may be inferred, as they may be in xiv, 51, 13, where viçvasṛj is doubtful (v. l.). In xii, 252, 21, aviciçeṣāṇi bhūtāni, and in xii, 311, 8 ff., where the modifications of the five elements are again elements (above, p. 129), fine elements are recognized. In xiii, 14, 423, viditvā sapta sūkṣmāṇi sāḍaṅgaṁ tvāṁ ca mūrtitah, "knowing thee as having in bodily form the subtile seven, and having six limbs," the commentator may be right in analyzing the seven as intellect, egoism, and five tanmātrāṇi, as he does in the case of the Yogin’s liṅga, soul, also said to have "seven sūkṣmas," xii, 254, 7.¹ Elsewhere there are eight (powers?) characteristics of the subtile body of the Yogin, xii, 317, 6.

But it must have caused surprise in the many schemes given above, that a clear indication of this theory is so often lacking where it would be most in place. The elements are simply mahābhūtās (sic, or bhūtāni). Only the latest part of the epic has the technical word, i, 90, 13–14, where the

¹ Perhaps, however, the sevenfold knowledge of the Yogin is meant as in Sūtra, ii, 27. The passage above, xiii, 14, 423, is a copy of xii, 254, 15, where the seven are explained as senses, objects, mind, intellect, mahat, the unmanifest, spirit (the six are here explained as all-knowing, content, knowledge without beginning, independence, ever-clear sight, endless power).
spirit, kṣetrajña, is connected with the tanmātras before birth in the body; and xiii, 14, 202, where the order of Čiva's creation is "mind, intellect, egoism, the tanmātras, and the organs."²

In xii, 202, 18 ff., when the soul leaves the body and takes another, it is said: "A man leaving his body enters another unseen body. Abandoning his body to the five great (gross) elements, bhūteṣu mahatsu, he takes up a form also dependent on these, tadāçrayanaḥ⁸ cāi 'va bibharti rūpam. The five (senses) exist in the five great elements and the five objects of sense, in the senses." Here there is another body, but it is composed of the same great elements and no other elements are recognized. The new body is called a liṅga,⁴ but so is the old, çrotrādiyuktāh samanāḥ sabuddhir liṅgāt tathā gacchati liṅgam anyat, "possessed of hearing and other senses and having mind and intellect he passes out of one body to another," cl. 14.

Elsewhere it is said that the beings that pass out of the gross body pass into a subtle, sūkṣma, body, and are called sūkṣmabhūtāni sattvāni, "fine beings," which "wander about like sunbeams," superhuman, atimānuṣāṇi, xii, 254, 1–8 (sattva is bhūtatman). The passage in xii, 345, 14 ff. has already been referred to. Here the sun is the door (as in the Icā) and the dead become paramāṇubhūtāḥ, then manobhūtāḥ, and then

---

¹ Here mati stands for buddhi, as it does in xii, 202, 21, sarvāni caī tāni manonugāni, buddhim mano 'nveti matiḥ svabhāvam, "the senses follow mind, mind follows intellect, intellect follows the pure entity (here equivalent to paramāḥ svabhāvaḥ of 203, 1).

² The word tanmātra occurs only in late Upanishads, according to Col. Jacob's Concordance (his reference s. paśca includes Māitrī, iii, 2). To the last, Garbe, in his Sāmkhya-Philosophie adds (p. 230) Kaṭha, iv, 8, referring to Regnaud, Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie de l'Inde, ii, 31, 32. This is an error. The Kaṭha knows nothing of tanmātras. Praçna must be meant, where mātrās are mentioned, iv, 8.

³ Compare tan-mātram, but in the passage cited, tad must refer grammatically to the great elements.

⁴ So in xii, 307, 18, the Yogin, still in his gross body, becomes quiet as a lamp in a windless place, shines like a lamp (or is like a stone or piece of wood). When he shines forth and is nirliṅgaḥ and moveless, he would not be reborn. Here liṅga seems to be merely a distinguishing mark.
trāiguṇyāhīnāḥ, and enter Vāsudeva (nirguṇātmaka), the sarvāvāsa (compare Īcāvūṣya), the home of all (or dwelling in all). We may compare Vāsudeva derived from sarvabhūta-kṛtāvāsa, xii, 348, 94. The Yogin soul, “clothed in seven subtle things,” has also been referred to above, p. 39.

In these cases there is evidence of a general belief in a subtle body, but evidence against a general belief in subtle elements, negative, of course, but rather strong when the elements called great beings (not necessarily gross, implying antithesis of subtle)¹ are said to be the constituents of the second body. I add another similar case where no mention is made of subtle elements, though the elements and the subtle post-mortem body are discussed, since it is an interesting passage in itself and also offers a particularly convenient opportunity for the introduction of the idea of subtle elements, but no such idea is suggested.

The discussion begins with an account of creation, explains the five elements, and proceeds with an argument in regard to the psychic agent. Life, it is said, is invisible and the question comes whether there is any vital, jīva, spirit, and how it survives apart from the body, when the latter “passes into the five elements” (i.e., into the gross elements, tasmin pañcatvam āpanne jīvāḥ kim anudhāvatī, xii, 186, 10). “When a man’s body has been eaten by birds, or has fallen from a cliff, or has been burned, how can life come to him again, kutāḥ saṁjīva-nam punaḥ, 13. If the root of a cut-down tree does not grow again, but only the seeds of the tree grow, how can the man (cut-down) reappear? The seed alone, which has been started previously, that remains in existence; the seed comes from a seed, but dead men perish when they die,” 15.² “No,” says the teacher, “there is no destruction of the vital spirit, jīva. The vital part of a man, prāṇī, enters another body; the body

¹ The application of great in mahābhūta is expressly said to be (not in antithesis to subtle, but) on account of their unlimited character, anītaṁ mahācaṇḍo yānti bhūtāni sambhavam, tatas teṣāṁ mahābhūtaçabdo 'yam upapadyate, xii, 184, 3.

² Compare BAU. iii, 9, 28, retasa iti mā vocata ... martyaḥ svit mṛtyunā vṛkṣāḥ kasmān mūlāt prarohati. With the fire-simile, cf. Čvet. i, 13.
alone is destroyed. The vital spirit supported by the body, ċārīṇaḥ jīvaḥ, is not destroyed when the body is destroyed; for it is like the flame when the wood is burned” (implying that though invisible it exists). “Just so,” says the objector, “it is like the flame, but no flame is apprehended when the wood is used up, and I regard such a fire, when the wood is used up, as destroyed, since it has no visible course, nor proof (pramāṇa), nor thing to hold to,” saṁsthāna. To this the answer is: “The fire is not apprehended, because it has disappeared into air without a support. So the vital spirit, on abandoning the body, exists like air, but like fire it is not apprehended, because of its subtility, sūkṣmatvā; the vital breaths are upheld by fire and this fire must be regarded as the vital spirit. When breathing is restrained, the breath-upholding fire is destroyed. When the bodily fire is destroyed, then the body (deham, n.) becomes senseless and falls and becomes earth, yāti bhūmitvam; for earth is the place it goes to, ayana. Breath and fire go to air, for these three are one; the pair (of other elements) is fixed on earth. These (elements) assume form only in connection with bodies (either mobile or immobile, 187, 9–10). . . . The five senses are not universally found (and the body’s resolution into elements does not affect the soul); the inner soul alone carries the body, it alone smells, tastes, hears, etc. The inner soul is (not local but) found in all the parts of the body, presiding over that (mind) which has five (characteristics), in that (body) which consists of five (elements) . . . . The soul does not die when the body perishes.”

This is Paramātman doctrine, ib. 23, and since from the

1 xii, 187, 6, jīvo hy ākāśavat sthitah (sarvagato nityaḥ ca, comm.), reminds one of BAU. iii, 2, 13, ākāśam ātmā, only the strange Buddhistic assumption (of Karma alone remaining) is here carefully guarded against, though the preceding simile suggests the soul’s fate to be that in the Upanishad.

2 Literally: “In respect to what you are saying (whether the operation of mind and senses indicates an agent) there is no general application of the five,” 187, 19.

3 mityāḥ 'tad āhur mṛta ity abuddāh: daśārdhatāi vā 'syā carirabhedaḥ, 187, 27.
beginning of the discussion where the elements are introduced, 184, 1 ff., to the close as given above, there is every opportunity to introduce the fine elements, it is evident they have no place in this system. We must either assume, therefore, that they are known in some parts of the epic and are not known in others, owing to a difference historically, or that they are taught and not taught in different passages, owing to a fundamental doctrinal difference. The synthetic interpreter is welcome to either horn of this dilemma.

The orthodox popular belief, which of course is also taught in the epic, is that one can go to heaven with a “divine form,” as in xviii, 3, 42. In xvii, 3, 22–28, one goes to heaven “with his (human) body.” The reason may be that explained in the words1 “because of God’s residence in them, the gross elements are eternal.” These life-breaths and so forth exist eternally even in the other world, for a Čruti says so, in the words: “Even when gone to the other world the life-breaths of incorporate beings always (exist),” xv, 34, 10 (text, above, p. 25).

The body comes, according to the epic, from earth alone or from various elements. According to the scheme given above from xii, 184, 4, the body is made of earth. So the ear comes from air; the eye from the sun, etc., xii, 276, 11, tasya bhū-mimayo dehaḥ. Compare xii, 240, 7, “from earth the body, from water the fat, from light the eyes.” Here wind is the support of the two vital breaths, prāṇāpānāṃya vāyuḥ, and air (or space) is in the holes, kheṣv ākācām, of corporate beings, a scheme of creation which attributes the “great beings” (elements) to the “first creation” of a personal creator.

In xii, 306, 5, the characteristics of male and female parents are traditionally2 three each, as inherited by the offspring:

1 mahābhūtāni nityāni bhūtādhipatisaḿrayīt, xv, 34, 5.
2 çṛūrama . . . vede āstre ca paḿhya-te. It is added: “Authoritative is what is declared in one’s own Veda, svavedoktam, and what is read in the Častraś, a restriction as to the Veda not elsewhere admitted.
bone, sinew, marrow from the father; skin, flesh, and blood from the mother. But in ċl. 24 it is said that skin, flesh, blood, fat, bile, marrow, bone, and sinew are all eight produced by the male,¹ ćukreṇa prākṛtāni. Here tradition is set aside for the sake of the new philosophy.

The growth of the body is described in xii, 321, 114 ff., the seed and blood, male and female, uniting produce a flake, kalala, which becomes a bubble, budbuda, which develops into a lump, peçi. From this lump come the limbs; from the limbs, nails and hair. At the end of the ninth month, “name and form (individuality)” are born.²

Besides one subtle body, the epic may recognize two, as do the Vedāntins and later Sāṃkhya philosophers (Garbe, Sāṃkhya Phil., p. 267). But the following text, I think, scarcely supports this interpretation of the commentator: “When the spirit in a body is out with rajas, it would wander about, like sound, with a body; having a mind unaffected by the result of action (the spirit) is established in Prakṛti because of its freedom from affection.”³ The commentator thinks that when the spirit is in Prakṛti it has a very minute body, different from the span-long or thumbkin body.⁴ This is his explanation also of the unfinished sentence in xii, 254, 18. In 12 one sentence ends with the statement that unclarified spirits “do not see the bhūtātman in bodies.” Then in 13, “those who are devoted

¹ Apparently a clear contradiction of the preceding, but excused by the author on the plea of understanding the inner meaning, and not the words alone, of Veda and Čāstra, granthārthataatvā!

² The same process is described in late Sāṃkhya texts (Garbe, p. 273). Compare the Garbha Upanishad. “Name and form” is a phrase sometimes amplified: “The Lord creates name and form and acts,” xii, 233, 25-26 (as in Brh. Up., i, 6, 1, nāma rūpaṁ karma, which may be referred to here, yaduktam vedavādeṣu... tadanteṣu).

³ rajovarjyo ’py ayaṁ dehi dehavāḥ chadbavaḥ caret, kāryāy avyāhata-matir vairāgyāḥ prakṛtāṁ sthitāḥ, xii, 217, 21. The next half-stanza, ādehād apramādāca ca dehāntād vipramucyate, is interpreted by the commentator to mean “the three bodies (sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa) being abandoned, the soul (without body), because of its mental freedom, is released definitively.”

⁴ The subtle body is “span-long” in xii, 200, 22; “the size of a thumb,” it wanders by reason of its connection with the līṅga, v, 46, 15, and 27; xii, 235, 175, aṅguśṭhamātrāḥ puruṣā dehaṁṣtāḥ. See above, p. 32.
to Yoga-Çastra, desirous of seeing that soul, — (things) without breath, (things) without form, and what (things) are like thunderbolts." Here the commentator takes the three, anucchvāsāni, amūrtāni, yāni vajropamāny 'pi, as bodies devoid of intelligence, sūkṣma or subtile bodies, and, thirdly, bodies indestructible even in the aonic destruction, or kāraṇa-çarīrāni, with atikramaṇti, overpass, to be supplied in the text. If anything is supplied it is "they see," but the passage is clearly without sense as it stands and probably represents a later and awkward interpolation of the three bodies.

The Colors of the Soul.

The color of the soul is assumed through its union with the body, in the same way as when one near a fire gets a red color, xii, 202, 17. The incorporate spirit, dehin, is said to be without color, but it is tinged with the fruit of acts, and so is said to attain to color, varṇa, which is of course specifically "darkness." "But when the creature by means of knowledge puts off darkness, born of ignorance, then appears eternal Brahman" (pure, without color, 201, 26). "As wind," it is said, "becomes colored with dust and so itself colors all the air (space), thus the spirit, jīva, without color, because of acts' fruits becomes color-tinged," xii, 280, 9 ff.

This simple idea of pure white soul (as in Čvet. Up. iv, 1) being darkened by contact with impure darkness-born not-soul, and eventually becoming clear and colorless again, is worked up into a confused theory of spirit-color in the next chapter, where jīva, spirit, has six colors, sadjīvavārṇāh, xii, 281, 33, as follows: "Spirit has six colors, black, yellow-green (or grey), and blue, the middle color; red, more helpful and good, bright yellow, and, best of all, white. White is best, spotless, without sorrow, leading to success. . . . The course creatures take is made by their (spiritual) color. Color is caused by one's former acts (Time, as often, represents the Karma). The dark color leads to a low course and hell. After hell the spirit attains yellow-green (harit = dhūrna). When jīva is endowed with sattva it casts off tamas (darkness) by means
of intelligence, and after blue attains to red and lives as a human creature.” Then the spirit attains to yellow as a god, returns to hell, and goes on in the same way to white, finally surpassing the three states (guna). The inner meaning of this passage, according to the commentator, is that when the spirit has the three gunas, tamas, rajas, sattva, in quantitative proportion to this sequence, the result is that the spirit is black; but in the order tamas, sattva, rajas, yellow-green (or grey); rajas, tamas, sattva, blue; rajas, sattva, tamas, red; sattva, tamas, rajas, yellow; sattva, rajas, tamas, white. The whole theory, which is alluded to again in 292, 4 ff., seems to be an elaboration of the simple thesis of the preceding section given above. In the passage following, the “higher color” is gained by “pure acts,” varnotkarsam avapnoti naraḥ punyena karmanā. The identification of light with heaven (“bright-yellow gods,” above) is as natural as that of darkness with hell. Thus xii, 190, 1 ff., after it is said that “truth is light and darkness is lies,” we read: “Light is heaven and darkness is hell; man gets a mixture of both in this life, truth and lies.” Compare Patañjali’s Aphorisms, iv, 7: “Yogin’s work is neither white nor black.” I see no support in the text for the elaborate explanation of the commentator, as recorded above.

In xii, 303, 46, there are “three colors, white, red, and black, with which are affected all things in Prakṛti.” Here these are set parallel to the gunas (red apparently corresponding to energy, rajas), as signs of the soul, which goes to hell if it is tāmasa, humanity if rājasa, heaven if sāttvika; apparently an intermediate view between the six colors and the simple antithesis of pure and impure, white and dark. The tricolored being is known in a phrase common to epic, v, 44, 25, and Upanishad, Çvet., iv, 5.²

¹ The commentator, instead of taking the states to be gunas, takes them as waking, sleeping, and deep slumber, ending in turya, the fourth state.

The Five Faults of a Yigin.

In xii, 241, 3 ff., the faults of Yoga as known to the seers, Kavis, are desire, wrath, greed, fear, and sleep, kāma, krodha, lobha, bhaya, svapna, two added to an ancient trio. In xii, 301, 11, the five Yoga faults to be “cut off” are registered as rāga, moha, sneha, kāma, krodha. In xii, 302, 55, the “path-knowing Kāpila Śāṅkhyas” give as the five faults, kāma, krodha, bhaya, nīdrā, ṣvāsa. In xii, 317, 13, the five faults are simply the actions of the five senses. See also the list above, p. 119.

Patañjali, i, 3, recognizes five kleças “to be abandoned” (heyyāḥ), avidyā’’smītā rāgadveśā ‘bhiniveçāḥ. Five to be “cut off” and “to be abandoned” are also recognized in the Dhammapada, 370, pañca chinde, pañca jahe. In the epic the “five” are known as such, but different expositions explain them differently.

Discipline of the Yigin.

The perfected Yigin, who, by means of the sevenfold dhāraṇās, methods of fixing the mind, has overcome seven, the elements, egoism, and intellect, attains to “complete and faultless illumination,” pratibhā, in which state he surpasses the gunas and performs miracles. These technical terms of the Yoga are only two of many found in the later epic. Pratibhā, upasargas, the eightfold power, the various comfortable “sittings,” calculated to induce concentration of thought, e. g., virāsana, the codanās, “urgings” (by which one controls the breaths), the “pressing of breaths” into the heart-canal, or into the space between the brows, the fixed hours of exercise in mental discipline—all this Yoga-machinery is as well known to the epic rewriters as to Patañjali. That the epic here precedes the Sūtra-maker may be inferred from the fact that in the matter of “faults” (above) and in other technical terms it does not always follow the latter, though it has the Sūtra terminology to a certain extent. But, on the other hand, there can be little doubt that the epic-writers were steeped in Yoga-terms and used to Yoga-
practices of extreme refinement, for they reveal a very intimate acquaintance with Yoga-technique. Over against these adepts, or scientific Yogins, stand the vulgar ascetics, whose practices consist simply in the austerity of painful posturing. The latter forms are antique, and continue, of course, through the whole epic, as indeed they continue till now in India; but in contrast with those who practise the scientific rules of the skilled Yogan, the “one-legged, up-arm” ascetic belongs to the vulgar cult, inherited as “Veda-enjoined penance,” where the wretch is not so much engaged in control and samādhi, graduated concentration, as in mortifying himself to get power or win God’s grace. Even Vishnu thus stands by his “eight-finger-high-altar,” and performs austerities, “standing on one leg, with upturned arm and face;” and it is the worshippers of such gods who retain as their sole means of winning divine grace the same sort of practices. No sharper contrast can be imagined than the two disciplines, that of the votary and that of the scientific student of psychology (whose theology rests in Brahmanism), as presented in the epic.¹

The Destructible and Indestructible.

Both spirit and the Source according to the Sāṁkhya system are eternal and indestructible, xii, 217, 8; Gītā, 13, 19. They are therefore not created things. But spirit in other passages is a “created thing” and so is the source, xii, 205, 24. For according to the Brahmanic interpretation, both of these are destructible so far as their entity goes. The twenty-fifth is reabsorbed and the twenty-fourth is also absorbed into Brahman, xii, 308, 7 ff. See above, pp. 134, 137. “Lord Time’s Retaking” pratyāhāma, is the name given to the cosmic re-absorption as explained in xii, 234, 1 ff. The universe becomes subtle and metaphysical, adhyātma. All things are first burned and enter the condition of earth, till earth looks bare

¹ The chief chapters to be compared will be found in Čānti (237, 241, 317; also pp. 44, 107, above), but for details I must refer to a paper read at the Meeting of the Oriental Society in April, 1900 (to be published in the Journal, vol. xxii).
as a tortoise shell. Then water takes up earth; fire, water; wind, fire; air, wind; mind, air (with sound, etc., i.e., manifest mind passes into unmodified mind); the moon, as sanskalpa or fancy, swallows mind, citta; then Time swallows this as knowledge.

Up to this point the retroaction is at least intelligible but it is interrupted here by a revealed text: kālo girati vijñānaṁ kālam balam iti ċrutih, balam kālo grasati tu, taṁ vidyā kurute vaçe, "Time swallows knowledge, power swallows Time, and Time swallows power; then Wisdom overpowers Time." Finally: "The Wise One puts into himself the sound, ghoṣa, of air or space." That is unmanifest, highest, eternal Brahmā, "and so Brahmā alone is the recipient of all creatures." ¹


The orthodox Brahmān’s insistence on the four stadia of life is found in the normal attitude of the poets. Opposed to this is the direct teaching that these stadia are quite unnecessary, xii, 327, 26–27: "In the first stadium one can be perfected, what use is there of the other three?" Compare iii, 297, 25, mā dvitiyam, etc.

In some passages the god Brahmān is indestructible and self-created; in others he is a creation; in some he is below Vishnu, in others above him; in some, he is below Čiva; in others above him.² Brahmān, again, appears as the equal of

¹ cl. 17: evam sarvāṁ bhūtinī brahmān 'va pratisamācaraḥ. This absorption is the counterpart to the personal creation of Brahmān (see p. 142), from the "Seed made of Brahmān-glory, whence all the world," 233, 1. I do not pretend to understand the final process of reabsorption described above: ākāśasya tadā ghoṣāṁ taṁ vivāṁ kurute 'tmāni, tad avyaktam param brahma tae chaçvatam anuttamam. The eternal sound here implicated in Brahmā may be that "Word without beginning or end, Wisdom, uttered by the Self-existent, from which, as Veda-sounds, the Lord (as cited in the note, p. 178) in the beginning creates names, forms, and acts," xii, 233, 24–26.

² In xii, 340, 116, Brahmān knows that Vishnu is greatest; but in xii, 285, 165, Vishnu is unable to comprehend the greatness of Čiva. Compare on the mixed ideas concerning Brahmān, Holtzmann’s essay, ZDMG. xxxvii, p. 167 ff. I cannot agree with the author in the opinion that Brahmān is the chief God of the "older epic," but only of the older tales incorporated into the epic.
the other two gods in the trinitarian theosophy, which is represented in the epic, but only sporadically and in its latest additions. He is sometimes looked upon as the chief of all gods, but his supreme attributes are in other passages taken by his later rivals. Three stages are clear, with a top story added last of all. The earliest tales received into the epic know no god higher than Brahmān, the later pseudo-epic knows no god equal to (a Pāṇćapata) Čiva. Between the two lies the mass of the epic teaching, where supremacy is given to a sectarian Vishnu. The very latest additions to the epic adopt a synthetic view and make of this religious olla podría one harmonious whole, where all three great gods are one.

Arjuna is a form of Vishnu. He is taught this with wonder and great amaze in the sixth book. But our amazement at his amazement is still greater, for this doctrine, apparently so new to him, was revealed to him long before, in the third book, and on that earlier occasion he appeared fully to appreciate the fact that he was divine and identical with Krishna, facts which in the sixth book he has totally forgotten.

Heaven and Hell. Death.

Inconsistent as is the Karma doctrine with the notion of heaven and hell, the Hindu, like Pindar, successfully combines the two beliefs by imagining that metempsychosis follows the

1 For the usual caturmūrti, compare iii, 203, 15; vii, 29, 26; xii, 335, 8. In iii, 272, 47, is found the only definite expression of the late trinitarian belief in a trimūrti, an interpolated section (compare my Religions of India, p. 412); though it may be implied in i, 1, 32 and xiii, 16, 15, but only here till we reach the Harivaṇa, 2, 125, 31. It appears first in the later Upani-

shads, or in late additions, as in Mātṛī v (as distinguished from the close of iv), above, p. 46. Among other religious novelties the pseudo-epic introduces Citragupta, Death's secretary, xii, 125, 6; 130, 14 ff. In several points, such as in this and in grammatical peculiarities, the Anučāsana shows itself later in some parts even than Čandi, all ignored, of course, by the synthe-

2 Compare iii, 12, 16. In this passage, Arjuna exalts Krishna as the supreme Lord of the universe, and Krishna in turn identifies the two: yas tvāṁ dvēṣṭi sa māṁ dvēṣṭi, etc., ib. 45 (Vishnu says the same thing almost to Rudra in xii, 343, 133; yas tvāṁ vetti sa māṁ vetti, yas tvāṁ anu sa māṁ anu). Arjuna's godhead is proclaimed to him in iii, 41, 35, 43; 47, 7. On the hymn, iii, 12, compare Lassen, Ind. Alt., i, p. 489.
penalty of hell, or reward of heaven. The two views stand sometimes separate, however, and the hero is promised an abode in Indra's heaven without any allusion to metempsychosis; or one is promised a high or low birth hereafter without allusion to the older teleological fancy. Ordinarily in the former case, the rule is that a good man goes to heaven and a bad man goes to hell, as in the Upanishads, e. g., Mund. i, 2, 10, and in the epic generally. But in one exegesis quite a different view is taken. The idea here is that a fairly good man goes first of all to hell; while a man who on the whole is rather sinful than good goes first of all to heaven. Afterwards the good man goes to heaven and the bad man goes to hell.  

The popular notion of the Yogin is not at all that of absorption into Brahman. "Grieve for the living, not for the dead; this pious hero after his death, like a Yogin, has become a being with a human body and shines glorious like a king."  

"In heaven there are cool breezes and perfume, no hunger, thirst, toil, old age, nor sin, but "eternal happiness," in heaven, which is here, in contrast to hell, the "highest place." xii, 190, 13-14. So in the Sabhās. The Yogin "revels in joy, knows no sorrow, and rides around on high in a heavenly car, attended by self-luminous women," xiii, 107, 130 (compare the rāmāh sarathāḥ of Kaṭha Up. i, 25). This is the happiness of a Yogin after death, a view of course diametrically opposed to that of the philosophy taught elsewhere, for it is taught as final, not as preliminary.

In various passages it is taught that a good man should aim at attaining to heaven. This too is not put forth as a half-view with a reservation, as in the case of the Upanishads. But in other cases it is expressly just such a half-view.  

Heaven is
here a good place for good but unintelligent people, but it is scorned by the philosopher. "I have done with heaven, away with thee, heaven, whither thou hast come," says an enlightened king; "let the priest receive my merit if he wishes," xii, 199, 77–78. The priest, orthodox, is recognized as still striving for heaven and likely to go to hell, in the old way: "Hell is where priests go," it is said rather bluntly, ib. 14–15, nirayam nāī 'va yātā tvām yatra yātā dvijarṣabhāḥ, yāsyasi Brahmaṇaḥ sthānam. For of all the heavens of all the gods it is said, "these are but hells to the place of the Highest Soul," xii, 198, 6.

All kings but one go to Yama's heaven in the Sabha account;1 in the battle-scenes most of them go to Indra's heaven. But in vi, 16, 20, they go to the Brahma-world. Again, the heaven one goes to depends either on one's guṇas (as explained above), or, according to where one dies (Tīrtha), or, as a third explanation, according to the place in the body through which the soul escapes at death. If it goes through the feet, one goes to Vishnu's place; if through the arms, to Indra's place; if through the crown, to Brahmān, etc., xii, 318, 1 ff. (with viçvedevān in 5, common in the pseudo-epic).

Death, it may be observed, is usually a male; but in vii, 53, 17 and xii, 258, 16–21, a female. There are here two accounts which, though together opposed to the view held everywhere else, are of critical value, not on this account (for a poet may perhaps be allowed to unsex death), but on account of their being almost identical, two versions of one tale, one bearing traces of greater antiquity than the other.2

In one part the warrior auditors are taught the deepest mysteries, in another they are taught what is not taught in the Upanishads except as introduction to true teaching. Synthetically considered, the epic teaches nothing systematic in these varying expositions.

1 Yama's home is here a heaven of delight, elsewhere in the epic it is a hell of horrors.

2 The account in Droṇa is here the later of these two similar scenes, as has been shown by Holtzmann, ZDMG. xxxviii. p. 218. In philosophy, death is the dissyllabic Ego as opposed to the eternal, immortal, three-syllable non-ego, or mama versus namama ("this is mine" is a thought deadly to truth, and untruth is death), xii, 13, 4 and xiv, 13, 3 (identical passages).
The Cosmic Egg and Creations.

According to the old belief, the universe comes from a cosmic egg. The philosophical schemes, of course, discard this egg, but we hear of it in the popular accounts often enough and meet it in the first verses of the epic. Occasionally, however, in the personal creation, which stands in so sharp contrast with the more philosophical schemes, this becomes a subject of controversy. Thus in xii, 312, the "Unmanifest" is a person, who first creates plants as the food of all incorporate things. "Then he produced Brahmán, born in a golden egg. Brahmán lived in the egg a year. Then he came out and put together the four forms of all beings, and earth and heaven above—as it is said in the Vedas, dyāvāprthivyoh— and then the middle space. After this he created egoism, a being, bhūta, and four sons besides, who are the fathers' fathers. The gods are the sons of the fathers; by the gods the worlds were filled. Egoism, he that stands in the highest, created fivefold beings, earth and the other elements." Several verses follow on the impossibility of the senses acting alone ("the organs do not perceive, etc. Mind alone sees. Mind is the lord of the senses," etc.). Here the egg-born creator is acknowledged in a scheme which is a mixture of mythology and philosophy. But in xiii, 154, 16 ff.: "Some fools say that Brahmán was born of an egg ... but that is not to be regarded. How could the unborn be born? Air-space is the egg, according to tradition, and out of that was born Brahmán, the forefather. (He required no support, for he is) personified consciousness, the Lord. There is no egg; there is Brahmán ... the unmanifest eternal Creator Lord" (15). This passage is not merely an allegorical interpretation of the egg-myth; for in the former, Brahmán creates space after he is born of the egg from which he is born, while here the egg is space. The number of crea-

1 That is, the Vedic form implies the truth of heaven and earth as here stated.
2 In this passage, etc viçeśa mahābhūteṣu, 312, 12, repeats the first half-stanza of 311, 14, cited above, p. 129.
tions in philosophy I have already discussed. They are given as nine, or again as five.¹

The Grace of God.

The belief in the saving grace of God is found only in the later Upanishads. It asserts that one sees the Self (or Lord) by the grace of the Creator, Kaṭha Up., i, 2, 20 ff.; Čvet., iii, 20; vi, 21; Muṇḍ., iii. 2, 3. One is chosen, and cannot get salvation by knowledge alone. This general view is that maintained by the epic poet, who says: "The Vedas and Orders, though established on various opinions, naṁmatasamasthitāḥ, unite in worshipping Spirit as the personal God by whose grace one is saved." So again: "That man can see Him, to whom He gives His grace," yasya prāsādaṁ kurute sa vai taṁ draṣṭum arhati, xii, 337, 20, (a verse found also in the pseudo-Rāmāyaṇa). The grace of God is here the chief element of salvation, opposed to what is recognized as the severer school of those who attain salvation scientifically either by knowledge of soul or of God. This older system in the Upanishads is represented by those who are saved by knowledge alone; in the epic, by like-minded men, who have worked out a system or science of salvation, and depend wholly on this science, jñāṇa, or on ascetic practices, tapas, yoga, super-added to this science. Both of these are recognized as older systems in the epic, compared with the grace-of-God theory, and practically they are thrown over by the adherents of the latter school, who, however, differ from their ancestors in the Upanishads by a clear mark of lateness, in that they specify that the God whose grace saves is Krishna alone. Salvation not through knowledge, even of God, not through the grace of God, but through the grace of the man-god is the saving way, the easier way, or as it is called in the Gitā, the "less troublesome way," 12, 5.

Side by side stand in the epic these two great modern modi-

¹ These are the modifications of God, avidyāsargas and vidyāsargas, five in number in xii, 303, but when the account is repeated in 311, nine in all.
fications of the older Upanishads: there, knowledge, wisdom, jñāna, vidyā, contrasted with the later grace of the “Creator-Spirit,” at most recognized as Ēva. Here, the Sāmkhya-Yoga system, contrasted with the later Krishna cult. “I will release thee from all thy sins, grieve not,” says the mangel, Gītā, 18, 66. But the Yogin replies: “Sink or swim, let one put his trust in science alone,” xii, 237, 1 and 238, 1, and claims that he is purified not by Krishna but by Yoga knowledge, rejecting even the purity induced by bathing in the sacred pools (for his purity is “obtained by knowledge”), which elsewhere in the epic are said to purify from all sin. But inasmuch as the Yogin’s science postulated what the Sāmkhya denied, a personal God, the former became a bridge between the atheist and the devotee, a bridge, however, occasionally repudiated by the latter, who does not always, as usually, claim that he is thus philosophic, but exclaims: “By Sāmkhya and by Yoga rule I meditate the way of God and find it not,” xii, 352, 7–8.

The irreconcilable difference between the Sāmkhya and the faith of the Krishnaite could be removed only by modifying one of these extreme views. Either the atheistic (or even Brahman) philosopher had to win over the adherents of the man-god to renounce him and return to the “ship of salvation of knowledge,” or the devotee, having admitted that the Yogin’s Spirit was God, had to identify his Krishna with that Purusha Ṭīvra. Late as are all the purely philosophical chapters of the epic, they still show which power prevailed.

1 There is of course, further, the Ēvaite, who worshipped not Krishna but another as the highest God, not to speak of those that remained true to Vedic tradition and went for salvation no further than sacrifices and gifts. There are also, within the group of philosophers, those who recognized only the earlier twenty-five principles, and those who recognized twenty-six, as explained above. There is also the fractional sectary, who regarded Krishna as the “half of the fourth” of the “root-abiding Mahādeva” (as tatatha, p. 44, he creates existences, xii, 231, 61–62). All these divergent beliefs are represented in startling and irreconcilable antagonism in an epic concerning which the unhistorical view is dass es fäche zu einer einheitlichen Auffassung abgerundete Elemente sind, welche das Epos bietet, Nirvāṇa, p. 84!
Faith absorbed unfaith. The religious philosophy of the epic is a successful attempt to uphold Krishnaiasm not only against the science of atheism, but against a deistic science that postulated God but saw no godship in Krishna; a science which in its turn is technically elaborated, a long advance on the vague speculations of the Upanishads, but not yet as uniform as in the completed system. Krishnaiasm stands to Sāṁkhyā-Yoga chronologically as stands the later grace-of-the-Creator theory to the earlier knowledge of the Upanishads. But both epic Sāṁkhyā-Yoga and Krishnaiasm are later even than this modification of Upanishad teaching. Latest of all is trinitarianism. Side by side stand all these creeds, each pretending to be a definitive answer, each forming part of the contents of a poetic vessel, into which have been poured the vinegar and oil of doubt and faith; but:

οὔτε τ’ ἄλειψι τ’ ἐγχέας ταῖτῷ κότει
dεχοστατοῦντ’ ἄν οὐ φιλω προσενέποις.
CHAPTER FOUR.

EPIC VERSIFICATION.

\textit{alak\text{\textsuperscript{r}}ta\text{\textsuperscript{m}} \text{\textsuperscript{c}}ubh\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{i}}\text{\textsuperscript{h}} \text{\textsuperscript{c}}abd\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{i}}\text{\textsuperscript{h}}}
\textit{samay\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{i}}\text{\textsuperscript{r}} divyam\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{n}}\text{\textsuperscript{u}}\text{\textsuperscript{s}}\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{i}}\text{\textsuperscript{h}}}
\textit{chandovr\text{\textsuperscript{r}}t\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{i}}\text{\textsuperscript{c}} ca vividh\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{i}}\text{\textsuperscript{r}}}
\textit{anvita\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{m}} vidu\text{\textsuperscript{s}}\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{m}} priyam}

A Tale adorned with polished phrase
And the wise lore of gods and men,
With verses turned in various ways
Replete, a joy to scholars' ken.

\textbf{Epic Versification.}^1

The poetry of the epic is composed in metres, chandas, of three sorts. The first is measured by syllables, the second by morae, the third by groups of morae. These rhythms ran the one into the other in the following course. The early free syllabic rhythm tended to assume a form where the syllables were differentiated as light or heavy at fixed places in the verse. Then the fixed syllabic rhythm was lightened by the resolution of specific heavy syllables, the beginning of mora-measurement. The resolution then became general and the number of morae, not the number of syllables, was reckoned. Finally, the morae tended to arrange themselves in groups and eventually became fixed in a wellnigh unchangeable form. Part of this development was reached before the epic began, but there were other parts, as will appear, still in process of completion. Neither

\footnote{1 I wish to acknowledge in beginning this chapter on epic metres the great help afforded me by Professor Cappeller of Jena, who put at my disposal a manuscript on the metrical forms in the epic, in which all the metres were located and the tri\textsuperscript{\text{\textit{t}}}ubh\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{i}}\text{\textsuperscript{h}}s of the first three books were analyzed seriatim. I need hardly say that this loan has materially lightened the labor of preparing the following sketch, a loan the kindness of which was the more appreciated as it was entirely unsolicited, though most gratefully received.}
of the chief metres in the early epic was quite reduced to the later stereotyped norm. The stanza-form, too, of certain metres was still inchoate.

The mass of the great epic (about ninety-five per cent) is written in one of the two current forms of free syllabic rhythm; about five per cent in another form of the same class; and only two-tenths of a percent in any other metre. The two predominant rhythms, āloka and tristubh, are in origin the oldest Indic or pre-Indic rhythms, while of the others some are in turn early developments from the first epic rhythms. For convenience of reference, before discussing these rhythms in detail, I give a list of all those used in one or both of the two epics according as they are free syllabic (āloka, tristubh), fixed syllabic (akṣaracchandas),<sup>1</sup> mora-metre (mātrāchandas), and group-rhythms (gaṇacchandas).

āloka: a stanza of two verses (hemistichs) of sixteen syllables each, restricted to a certain extent as to the place where heavy and light syllables (or long and short vowels) are permitted. Originally the stanza consisted of four verses of eight syllables each and many traces of this division, by independent "quarters," pādas, survive in the Mahābhārata.

tristubh: a stanza of four verses of eleven syllables each, arranged with very little restriction (and consequently of various types) in the Mahābhārata; reduced to one prevailing type in the Rāmāyaṇa. Increased by one heavy syllable in each pāda, this metre is called jagati, but the two types are interchangeable in the same stanza. Fixed types of this metre are common in verse form, but rare in stanza form<sup>2</sup> except as given in the next group (of four-verse stanzas).

<sup>1</sup> The fixed syllabic is called also varṇavṛtta, "syllabic verse" (vṛtta = versus).

<sup>2</sup> That is, pure in the form (a) and (b), ṣ — ṣ — ṣ — ṣ ṣ — ṣ ṣ ( );
(c) ṣ — ṣ — ṣ — ṣ — ṣ — (f) ṣ — ṣ — ṣ — ṣ — ṣ — . These are called (a) upendravaṇjra; (b) vaṇḍastha(bila); (c) ḍalini; (f) vaṭormi; or (a) and (b) with the opening ṣ — ṣ — , called (c) indravaṇjra and (d) indravaṇča, as they have eleven or twelve syllables, respectively. When (a) and (c) or (b) and (d) are mingled, the stanza is called upajati.
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with the verse fixed as

rathoddhatā, a triśubh  

bhujajāngapravāya, a jagati  

drutavilambita, a jagati  

vaiśvadevi, a jagati  

ruci, an atijagati 1  

praharṣaṇi, an atijagati  

mṛgendramukha, an atijagati  

asambādhā, a čakvari 2  

vasantatilaka, a čakvari  

mālini, an atiçakvari  

čārdulavikrīḍita, an atidhṛti  

puṣpitāgrā and āupacchandasika, stanzas of two verses, each verse having sixteen and eighteen more in prior and posterior pāda, respectively, the more being arranged in syllables more (puṣpitāgrā) or less (āupacchandasika) fixed.

aparavaktra and vātāliya, the same in catalectic form, each pāda being shortened by two more.

mātrāsamaka, a stanza of four verses, each verse having sixteen more.

(aśyā, aśyāgiti, upagiti), stanzas of two verses, each verse containing eight groups of more, the group of four more each, but with the restriction that amphibrachs are prohibited in the odd groups, but may make any even group and must make the sixth group, unless indeed this sixth group be represented (in the second hemistic) by only one more or four breves; and that the eighth group may be represented by only two more. The metre is called aśyāgiti when the eighth foot has four more; upagiti, when the sixth foot irregularly has but one more in each hemistic.3

1 That is, a jagati with one syllable over, ati, or with thirteen syllables in the pāda. The second atijagati above is sometimes called praharṣaṇi.

2 That is, having fourteen syllables in the pāda, fifty-six in 'the stanza. The atiçakvari and atidhṛti have fifteen and nineteen syllables in the pāda, respectively.

3 Brown, Prosody, p. 17, points out that this metre is almost that of Horace, Odes, iii, 12: miserar | est neq a- | mori | dare lu- | dum neque | dul- | ci mala | vino, etc.; and sic te | diva po- | tens Cypri | sic fra- | tres Helec- | nae | lucida | sidera, etc., save that the sixth group is here of two more.
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The number of verses in a cloka or triśṭubh stanza may be decreased or increased by one or two, respectively; but in the great majority of cases, two in a cloka and four in a triśṭubh constitute a stanza. Sometimes, however, where one or three hemistichs make a stanza, it is merely a matter of editing. Compare, for instance, i, 90, 22; i, 93, 19–21 with 3,682–83; iii, 4, 17 with 234; iii, 111, 14 ff., with 10,040, ff. But, on the other hand, no arrangement can always group the hemistichs into uniform stanzas. Thus in xii, 350, 49 ff., five triśṭubh hemistichs follow three cloka hemistichs. A stanza of three hemistichs is apt to close a section, as in vii, 54 and 187. In G. vi, 49, 55, there is one hemistich in excess because 53 a-b were added to the original, and this is doubtless the cause of many such cases; though it is also true that a half stanza is often found where there is no reason to suspect a later addition. Six pādas in a triśṭubh occur occasionally.

But in the case of the cloka, the pādas are metrically linked in pairs, while triśṭubh pādas are metrically independent. The cloka, therefore, is a couplet. Its two halves are metrically disjunct and may be treated as independent wholes. Each hemistich is a complete verse. The two halves of this verse, the quarters, pādas, of the whole stanza, are sometimes knit together into euphonic combination and a syntactical whole. But, relatively speaking, this is seldom the case. The unity consists rather in the fact that one half of the verse is metrically different from the other and cannot be substituted for it, whereas in the triśṭubh any pāda can be substituted, if the sense permits, for any other. The different fall of the cloka pādas may be seen very well when the words are almost identical:

1 In some forms of the triśṭubh, however, there is a restriction in the final syllable ances of the first and third pādas, not found in the second and fourth pādas. In such cases (discussed hereafter) the triśṭubh, like the cloka, consists of two parts (hemistichs) and the perfect independence of the pāda is modified. This does not affect the free epic triśṭubh.
amitrāṇām bhayakaro mitrāṇām abbhayāṅkaraḥ
çalabhāḥ iva kедāram maçakā iva pāvakam
nā 'tāntri vidyate vinā nā 'cakro vidyate rathaḥ
rükmapuṅkhāir ajihmāgrāi rukmapuṅkhāir ajihma-
gāiḥ (G. vi, 20, 26 and 19, 68)†
kīṁ nu me syād idaṁ kṛtvā kīṁ nu me syād akur-
vataḥ
yato dharmas tataḥ Kṛṣṇo yataḥ Kṛṣṇas tato jayaḥ
paṇyan çṛṇvan sprṇan jighrann açnan gacchan svapan
cvasan
japate japyate cāī 'va tapate tapyate punaḥ

The final syllaba ancep of all pādas indicates, however, that the çlōka, like the triśtubh, originally permitted the same metrical fall in both pādas, and such we know to have been the case in the older metre from which the çlōka derives. The Mahābhārata retains this identical measure here and there, as in

tad vāi devā upāsate tasmāt sūryo virājate,

but such cases, usually reflecting or imitating the older verse of the Upanishads, as in this example, v, 46, 1, are regularly avoided, even by the substitution of irregular or dialectic forms. Thus in viii, 84, 12, where the same verb is employed,

Duryodhanam upāsante parivārya samantataḥ

The çlōka verse (hemistic) does not often indicate its unity by its form. Generally its prior half, or the pāda (to retain this word for the division of eight syllables), is not united with the posterior pāda. Verses that do unite the two usually give lists of objects, which is the ordinary case in the early epic, though the later epic does not hesitate to make freer use of this unit-verse. But on the whole, though common enough in post-epical writing, this is by no means typical of the epic itself. The great bulk of the poem does indeed furnish a goodly number of examples, but relatively speaking cases like the following are rare:

† The other verses are found in R. vii, 36, 22; 7, 3; ii, 39, 29; M. iii, 62, 10; vi, 23, 28; 29, 8; xiii, 14, 159.
mahāmaṇiḍilāpaṭṭabaddhaparyantavedikām, ii, 3, 32
ākyasāmyogananātvasamavāyaavācāradāh, ii, 5, 3
vayaṁ hi devagandharvamānuṣyoragarākṣasān, iii, 53, 29
jambvāmralodhrakhadirasālavelasamākulaṁ, ib. 64, 4
cīṇhačārādulamātānaigavarāharkṣamṛgyutam, ib. 39
badareṇgudakāṃcaryapalakṣācyvatthabhībhitakāh, ix, 37, 61
gadāmsalanārācaṣaktitonarabhaṣṭayā, ix, 46, 66
ṛṣyate hi dharmarūpeṇā 'dharmam prākṛtaq caran,
xiii, 261, 6
ajāyata mahārajaavānçe sa ca mahādyutih, xiii, 10, 35
sa bhavān daṇḍasāmyogena 'nena hṛtakilbiṣah, G. iv, 17, 58
bhavadbhīr niçcayasa tattvavijñānaukuçalāir mama, G. iv,
32, 5.1

The hemistich of the cloka is also generally independent of
the rest of the stanza in sense as well as in metre, but it is not
infrequently united with it syntactically, as in vi, 19, 12,
na hi so 'sti pumāṇī loke yaḥ saṁkruddham
Vṛkodaram
draṣṭum atyugrakarmāṇam viṣaheta nararṣabham.
Not a mortal on earth exists, who deep-incensed
Vṛkodara,
Mighty, a chief of awful strength, could a mo-
ment behold in war.

So samalamāṛtam: ṇatam, in the first chapter of Nala, 11;
krodhasya ca vinigrāhaḥ: kāryaḥ, xii, 330, 10; asambhāvyaiṁ
vadhaim tasya Vṛtrasya vibudhāhipaḥ: cintayāna jagāmā 'chu,
R. vii, 85, 15, etc. Inside the hemistich, the pādas are fre-
quently euphonically independent (hiatus);

Prajañgho Vāliputrāya abhidhūrvā, R. vi, 76, 22.
na kīmeid abhidhātvāyā aham, R. vi, 118, 10
mā vināqaṁ gamiṣyāma 2 aprasādyā 'diteh sutam,
R. vii, 35, 63

1 R. (Bombay) has cæsura between pādas and avoids both these forms
(sāmyogāt in 18, 64, for sāmiṣyogena, etc.).
2 G. here, 38, 113, has the future imperative, gamiṣyadhvam. Other ex-
amples of hiatus may be seen in R. v, 60, 8; vi, 60, 8; vii, 11, 42, etc.,
besides the ample collection of Böhtlingk for the first four books.
Sāumitraṁ sampariśvajya idāṁ vacanam abravīt,
R. vi, 23, 1
nihanyād antarāṁ labdhvā ālūko vāyasāṁ iva, R. vi,
17, 19
çaraṇāny açaranyāni açramāṇi kṛtāṁ naḥ, R. vii, 6, 5

In G. the hiatus is usually avoided, but it is sometimes kept
here, as where R. vii, 21, 19 has gorasāṁ gopradātāro annam
cai."va (adrākṣit) and G. rectifies the grammar but keeps the
hiatus, gopradāṭīc ca annam.¹ In the last book of the poem,
hiatus in G. is more common than in the earlier epic; for
example, G. has the hiatus of R. vii, 6, 40, svadhitaṁ dattam
iṣṭāṁ ca aiçvaryam paripālitam. On the other hand, within
the pāda attempts are sometimes made to avoid hiatus at the
expense of form, as in R. vii, 109, 4, brahman (cf. 88, 20)
āvaratayam param. Contrast is often the cause of hiatus, both
in the pāda, as in apāyaṁ vā upāyaṁ vā, R. iii, 40, 8, and in the
hemistich, as in hīnām mām manyase kena āhīnām sarvavikra-
māṁḥ, R. vi, 36, 5.² So in the Mahābhārata, satyanāmā bhavā
'çoka, 'acokaḥ çokanaçanaḥ, iii, 64, 107. The latter epic
otherwise presents the same phenomena:

yeśāṁ mūtram upāgrāya api bandhyā prasāyate,
iv, 10, 14
upāvartasva tad brahma antarātmāni viçrutam, v,
43, 59
viveça Gaṅgāṁ Kāuravya Ulūpī, xvii, 1, 27
devā 'pi mārge muhyanti apadasya padāśiṇāḥ, xii,
270, 22
anāhūtaḥ praviçati apṛśto bahu bhāṣate, v, 33, 36, etc.

There is nothing peculiarly epic in hiatus. It is found in
precedent and subsequent poetry. Its occurrence in the

¹ R. in the second hemistich has gṛhāṇaṁ ca gṛhadātāraḥ (acc.) svakarmaphalam açñataḥ, aç for bhuj, as in M. iii, 32, 6.
² Emphasis also may cause hiatus, as in dharmāṁā iti, R. i, 21, 7; na tu vaktūṁ samartho 'ham tevāy ātmagataṁ guṇān, R. iv, 8, 5; or it may be em-
ployed to save the life of a word, as in dakṣiṇārthe 'tha śvīgyhayāḥ, xiii, 93, 25
(the commonest hiatus is this before ṛ, as in sarve ca ṛtavaḥ; kārayasva ṛṣe;
anye ṛkṣavataḥ, etc.).
Mahābhāṣya, as in çayāṇā vardhate dūrvā āsīnaṁ vardhate viṣam, IS., xiii, p. 461, may be epic.

The cadence of the člokà, like that of all other poetry, depends on the sense, and the cæsura cannot be determined by rule. In most cases there is a cæsura at the end of the pāda, but it is frequently shifted, as in kvā 'ṛjunah nṛpatiḥ? çīghraṁ samyag ākhyātum arhatha, R. vii, 31, 11. A complete sentence seldom exceeds the limit of a stanza, and when it goes further it may be set down as a mark of lateness. Quite anomalous in epic style are those long sentences, usually relative, which, as in Gītā 2, 42-44 and 6, 20-23 run through twelve or fourteen pādas. Still more awkward are the sentences found in the later epic. Thus in xii, 302, occurs a sentence, not of fourteen pādas as in the Gītā, but of fourteen člokas (5-17): yet this is surpassed in the same section by a sentence of thirty člokas, which even then has no finite verb and in reality never comes to an end at all (24-52). Such monstrosities, however, belong only to the pseudo-epic.

Like the čloka, the triṣṭubh, in euphony and sense, may be a couplet, the first two and last two pādas making a unit, as in iii, 118, 20 c - d, anyāṇaḥ ca Vṛṣṇī upagamya pūjām: cakre; vii, 2, 33 a - b, na tv eva 'haṁ na gamiṣyāmi teṣām: madhye čūrāṃ. Euphonic unity is illustrated by the elision in vii, 163, 14 of a in adṛçyanta at the beginning of the pāda after o; by tāṇc cāpy: upopaviṣṭān between c - d in i, 191, 19; and by the complete hemistichs:

yadā 'črāuṣam Bhīmasena 'nuyātenā 'gyatthāmnā paramastram prayuktam, i, 1, 213
uddhātālāṅgālamahāpatākadhajottamāṁsākulabhīṣaṁ-āntam, iv, 54, 27.

Ordinarily, however, disjunction and not conjunction of pādas is the rule. Thus between b - c, iii, 132, 5, a + a, and
even between a — b and c — d. Here also hiatus appears even in the pāda, as in i, 1, 214 b, svasti 'ty uktvā astram astreṇa āṅtam (so must be read); or in i, 74, 30 c, ahaŋ ca rātriŋ ca ubhe ca saṅkhya. It may then be expected between pādas, as in

\[\text{yadā 'vamaṅsthaḥ}^1 \text{ sadṛṣṭaḥ čreyasaṅ ca, alpīyaśaṅ ca, i, 88, 3 a — b} \]
\[\text{vānapatīn oṣadhiṇa 'viṣṇuṇta, āpo (= apo) vāyum,} \]
\[\text{i, 90, 11 a — b} \]
\[\text{santi lokā bahavas te narendra, apy ekāi 'kaḥ, i, 92,} \]
\[\text{15 a — b} \]

So in Yājñaseni: ekāṃbara, ii, 67, 34 a — b; utsahāmi: āyuṣmān, iii, 192, 67 c — d; putri: Ikṣvāku, ib. 70 c — d; tapaça ca: amāṭsāryam, v, 43, 20 a — b; ācāryena: ātmakṛtam (text -nāt), v, 44, 14 a; āpo 'tha adbhyaḥ salilasya madhye, v, 46, 3 a. B. occasionally rejects (betters) the text of C., as in vi, 129 c — d, stands na ca 'pi te madvaṃgaḥ maharṣe, 'nugrahaṁ kartum arhā hi me matīḥ, where B. 8, 61, has na ca 'dharman, etc. So in viii, 4,340, paçcād vadhiṣye tvām api, sampramūḍha, ahām, etc., where B., 85, 33, has muḍham. Both, however, continue with aham haniṣye 'rjuna ājimadhye, and in the next verse both have prasahya āsya 'va in c — d.\textsuperscript{2} Other cases are: caṭruḥaṅtā: uvāca, viii, 85, 30 c — d; madam ca lebhe ṛṣabhaḥ Kurūṇām, ix, 17, 18 d; uttāna-āsyē na āhav juhoti, xii, 246, 27 a; bibheti: aṅgradhayaṃ, xiv, 9, 27 c — d; Madam namā asuraṁ viṣvarūpam, xiv, 9, 33, c (from the text in B., nāmāsuraṃ, and in C. 251, Madam namānām); Tilottamaṃ ca 'py atha Menakā ca: etās, H. 2, 89, 71 a — b. Examples from the Rāmāyaṇa are given by Böhtlingk, or may be seen in the conjunction of mahārathasya: Ikṣvāku, R. vi, 14, 12 a — b; abhyupetya: uvāca, R. vi, 59, 45 c — d. In both metres, to

\textsuperscript{1} The first foot consists of five syllables.

\textsuperscript{2} B.'s reading in iii, 112, 15 d, calīteva ca 'ṣit for caliteva āsīt, 10,065, may be to avoid hiatus. In ii, 63, 6 d = 2,116, both texts have acintītī 'bhimaṅsthaḥ svabandhunā, where hiatus may be assumed, though not necessarily, as also in iii, 197, 13 b, na (vā) vāsamā pitaro (a)yasya kurvita. Ib. 15 a — b, both texts have hiatus, uksāṇam paktvā saha odanena asmāt kapotat prati te nayantu (give you for).
avoid hiatus, irrational particles are often inserted. A good example is: purā kṛtayuge tāta hy āsid rājā hy Akampanāḥ, vii, 2,029, where B., 52, 26, omits the first hi.

**Rhyme.**

Connection of pādas by rhyme is not uncommon. It is less noticeable in člokas than in triṣṭubhs on account of the alternate trochaic and iambic cadence employed in the former, and some, for example, may think that in iii, 65, 65–66,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vasasva mayi kalyāṇi} \\
\text{pritir me paramā tvayī . . .}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ihāi 'va vasatī bhadre} \\
\text{bhartaram upalapsyase}
\end{align*}
\]

the rhymes of the nameless queen are practically unfelt, but this is scarcely possible when alternate rhymes occur, as in R. ii, 88, 7:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{prāsādavaravaryesu} \\
\text{cītavatsu sugandhiṣu} \\
\text{uṣītvā Merukalpesu} \\
\text{kṛtakāṇicabhattiṣu}
\end{align*}
\]

In cl. 13 of the same section, three successive pādas end in -am; in 14, two end in -ā; and in 23–25 seven end in -ām, or -ām, with some inserted besides:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bāhuviṛyābhirkṣitām} \\
\text{cānyaśaṃvaraṇārakṣām} \\
\text{ayantritahayadvipām} \\
\text{anāvṛtapuradvārām} \\
\text{rājadbānāṃ arakṣitām} \\
\text{aprāhṛṣṭabalām nyūnāṃ} \\
\text{viśamasthāṃ anāvṛtām}
\end{align*}
\]

So in triṣṭubhs, rhymes are both irregular and regular, as in R. iv, 24, 13,

1 Compare, however, the affected initial assonance (with the same difference) in R. iv, 33, 62:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tārayā cā 'py anujñātas} \\
\text{tvarayā vā 'pi coditaḥ}
\end{align*}
\]
acintanīyam parivarjanīyam aupsanīyam svanavēkṣanīyam

and in R. vi, 73, 55, where three pādas end in -dhāṇi, -bhāṇi, -kāṇi, respectively; the same (in -tāṇi, -jāṇi, -nāṇi) appearing also in a puspitāgrā stanza, R. v, 20, 36. In R. iv, 28, 41, we find:

pramattasainādītabharṇāṇi
saçakragopākulaçādvālāṇi
caranti nīpārjunavāsitāṇi
gajāḥ suramyāṇi vanāntarāṇi
navāmbudhārāhatakeçarāṇi
dhruvam pariśvajya saroruhāṇi
kadambapuspāṇi sakeçarāṇi
navāṇi hṛṣṭā bhramarāḥ pibanti

In the following passage the effect of rhyme is given by simple repetition of the whole word, R. iv, 28, 25 (not in G.):

nidrā çanāḥ keçavam abhyupaṭī
drutam nādi sāgaram abhyupaṭī
hṛṣṭā balākā ghanam abhyupaṭī
kāntā sakāma priyam abhyupaṭī

words put into the mouth of love-sick Rāma (kāmapradhānāḥ, as he is called) by some late poetaster, who, not content with the last stanza, adds to it (27):

vahanti varṣanti nadanti bhāṇti
dhyāyanti nṛtyanti samācvasanti

Compare also in the same section, weak rhymes in -tāṇāṁ, -vāṇāṁ, -kāṇāṁ, -rāṇāṁ (at the end of the pāda in 31). This reaches its height in the ridiculous (late) section R. v, 5, where the same word is repeated at the end of each pāda till even 6 is a relief, where occurs the alternation: -paṅko, -paṅkaḥ, -lāṅko, -cāṅkaḥ. But elsewhere in R., e. g., ii, 16, 47, three pādas of a triṣṭubh end in -am, the other in -am(d); and in the preceding stanza three pādas end in -āih-, though jagati pādas are here interchanged with triṣṭubh.

Foot may rhyme with foot or with alternate foot in the
çloka, just as pāda rhymes with pāda, that is, either with a modification of the precedent syllable, thus, x, 15, 34,

evaṁ kuru
na ca 'ṇyā tu

or even with alternate rhyme, as in R. v, 59, 24,

pativrata
ca sukroṇī
avāṣṭābdhā
cā Jānakī

but the same sound may also be repeated without any such precedent difference, as in x, 15, 14,

adharmaṃ ca
kṛto 'nena

Such light fundamental rhymes cannot be said to be produced without design. They are, in fact, the vulgar rhyme of the common proverb, such as is conspicuous in all popular sayings. Compare for instance the following Marathi proverbs:

(a) icchi parā
    yei gharā
dwitiya kātra
    tyāṣe puḍhe
tertiya kātra
    vāṣṭārdhā
terōde kātra
    tase phala

Alliteration.

Alliteration, according to the native rhetorician Daṇḍin, is affected rather by the Gāṇḍas than by the Vidarbhas, the

1 (a) what is wished for another will come to one's own house; (b) evil is in front of an evil man (honi soit qui mal y pense); (c) in heaven the river Vāṭarāṇī (the river of death precedes the joy of heaven); (d) as is the tree, so the fruit. Manwaring, Marathi Proverbs. The earlier anusṭubh shows the rhyme better on account of the iambus in the prior pāda, e. g., RV. v, 86, 5: aṛhanta cit puro dadhe aṇḍeva devāv arvate.
latter preferring cognate sounds to mere repetition. The reference is rather to classical affectations than to epic style, where alliteration is a common trick, but is not so overdone as it is in the works of later poets. A great deal of it is probably unconscious, or at least required and almost unavoidable. Still, the later epic writers certainly affect the anuprāsa which Daṇḍin says is not liked by the Vīdarbhas. Thus in vii, 118, 16,

\[ \text{mudā sametalḥ parayā mahātmā} \]
\[ \text{rarāja rājan surarājakalpaḥ} \]

and in viii, 94, 54,

\[ \text{nihatya Karṇaṁ ripum āhave 'rjunāḥ} \]
\[ \text{rarāja rājan parameṣa varcasā} \]
\[ \text{yathā purā vrtravadhe qatakratuḥ} \]

So in ix, 35, 24,

\[ \text{deče deče, tu deyāni dānāni vividhāni ca} \]

and in iii, 63 21,

\[ \text{jagrāḥ 'jagaro grāhaḥ} \]

or iii, 64, 118,

\[ \text{kā 'si kasyā 'si kalyāṇi, kim vā, etc.} \]

Cf. iv, 14, 12,

\[ \text{kā tvam kasyā 'si kalyāṇi, kuto vā, etc.} \]

or iii, 64, 99,

\[ \text{phalapuspopacabhitāḥ} \]

The taste for jingling is clearly seen in such examples from both epics as the following:

Tāro 'bravit tatas tatra, G. v, 1, 49
çuśāṇām çayane çubhe, R. v, 10, 50
pralāṁnamakramām, vii, 146, 3
Kuruṇḍeṣṭha Kurukṣetre kuruṣva mahatmā kriyām,
ix, 37, 57.

Alliteration is sometimes built on a foundation of older phrase, such as bhīmo bhīmaparākramaḥ, Rāmo ramayatām varaḥ. Thus in R. vii, 42, 22–23,
mano 'bhirāmā rāmās tā
Rāmō ramayatāṁ varaḥ
ramayāmāsā dharmātmā

A good deal of this is due to the later revisors. Thus R. v, 56, 51 (also a pun in sa lilaṁ), not in G.,

sa lilaṅghayiṣur bhīmaṁ saṁlaṁ lavanārṇavam
kallolāśphālavelāntam utpapāta nabho harīḥ

As it is quite impossible to tell what proportion of such verses reverts to the original epic, it must suffice to show that epic poetry as we have it, while not attaining to the perfected abominations of classical works, nevertheless employs alliteration to portray situations. Thus the rāudrarasa in R. vi, 65, 41,

rāudraḥ čakaṭacakraṅkṣo mahāparvatakasaṁnibhaḥ

where the "harsh thunder-sound" is well given by čakaṭacakraṅkṣo. Admirable, too, is the phonetic imitation of motion, stumbling, falling, and dying in Mbh. vii, 146, 86:

babhramuṇaḥ caskhaluḥ petuḥ, sedur mamluṇaḥ ca, Bhārata

The rhapsode's clay is moulded variously, but it is the same stuff, the last example being a studied improvement, to suit the situation, of viii, 19, 2:

vicelur babhramurar nequḥ petur mamluṇaḥ ca, Bhārata,

repeated in 21, 16, with varied reading, but leaving (tresuḥ) petur mamluṇaḥ ca (sāṁnikāḥ), and varied in 19, 15 with the fatal māriṣa of the later poets (here in place of Bhārata). The examples given above show both the Northern and the Southern style used in both epics.

That Vālmīki was copied by his successors goes without saying. The pseudo-Rāmāyaṇa shows, e. g., vii, 32, 64:

1 One of the signs that the completed Mahābhārata is posterior to the Rāmāyaṇa. Compare A. J. Phil., vol. xix, p. 142. It is a Buddhistic term, māriso, foreign to the Rāmāyaṇa but current in the Mahābhārata and later Sanskrit works. The word, be it noted, is as old as one pleases, but its stereotyped employment in the Bhārata puts that whole work from a synthetic point of view on a par with other non-Buddhistic literature using it.
and this atrocity in G. v, 32, 45 (not in B.):

suvarṇasya suvarṇasya suvarṇasya ca bhāvini
Rāmeṇa prahitani devi suvarṇasyā ’ṅguriyakam,

where the poetaster alliterates the whole word in an attempt at pathetic repetition. Though this is not in B., yet the latter countenances iii, 39, 18, where “words beginning with R” frighten Rāma’s victim:

ra-kārādini nāmāni Rāmatrastasya Rāvaṇa
ratnāni ca rathāq cāi ’va vṛtāsam janayanti me.

Similes and Metaphors. Pathetic Repetition.

On epic similes and metaphors an interesting essay remains to be written. As these subjects lie quite apart from a study of the verse itself, I shall at present make only one or two observations touching on the significance of these figures. First of all, the presence in the epic of rūpakas, metaphors, of this or that form, no more implies acquaintance with a studied ars poetica than do such phenomena in other early epic poetry. The pseudo-epic has a disquisition on rhetoric, as it has on every other subject, but rhetoric is older than Rhetoric, and I cannot see that illustrations of later norms found in the epic prove acquaintance with those norms.

In the rewritten Gitā, unquestionably one of the older poems in the epic, though not necessarily an old part of the epic, we find that the current dīpo nivātasthaḥ simile is introduced as a “traditional simile,” upamā smṛtā, 6, 19. Such stock similes belong to neither epic, but to the epic store in general, as may be seen by consulting the long list of identical similes in identical phraseology common to both epics. But the epics lack the more complicated figures of classic form, just as they lack the later complicated yamakas. What they have

1 Compare G. iv, 42, 12 = 44, 12 (aṅguliyaṃ, sic, in the latter), where the ring is “engraved with the mark of Rāma’s name” (as arrows are marked in M.). So R. v, 36, 2, (aṅguliyaṃ) Rāmanāmāṅkītām.
in abundance is (a) the simile; (b) the simple metaphor; (c) the double metaphor. They have also a most atrocious mixture of metaphor and simile, as in R. vi, 41, 45, te tu vānaraçārdulāh ċārdulā iva daṇśṭriṇāḥ, "those ape-tigers like fanged tigers." The simile is sufficiently illustrated in Appendix A. I note only that it may be doubled, Rāhur yathā candram īva, "he, like Rāhu, him, as if the moon" (overcame). Illustrations of the double metaphor are found, for example, in xiii, 107, 33, sarasvatīḥ gopayāṇāḥ, keeping silence ("herding fluency"); xiv, 90, 95, svargaṛgalaṁ lobhābījam, "heaven's bar has greed as its seed!"

For my present purpose it is necessary only to point out that the later part of the epic exceeds the earlier epic in involved metaphor. Nothing, for example, in the early epic is quite equal to xiii, 107, 26, where after mentioning billions, sāgara, in 21, the poet adds:

āvarantanā catvāri tadā padmāṇi dvādaça
çārgniparimāṇam ca tatrā 'sāu vasate sukham,

which means that one remains in bliss fifty-one padmas of years, sixteen plus the aggregate of the (five) arrows (of Love) into the (seven) 1 flames = 35 (+16). 2 But parallels almost as extravagant (including the gopay simile above) have been noticed by Professor Lanman in the interesting essay referred to in the last note. Not so striking, though in style more rhetorical than is found in the love-passages of the early epic, is the metaphor of iv, 14, 25:

ātmapradānavarṣeṇa samigamāmbdhohareṇa ca
çamayaṣva varārohe jvalantam manmathānalam,

"O graceful maid, quench the mind-shaker's (Love's) glowing fire with the rain of self-surrender and the water of union."

1 PW., s. çārgni, says three fires. But compare yad agne te āvam rūpaṁ ye ca te sapta hetayāḥ, i, 232, 10, and saptārcis, passim: and Muṇḍ. Up. ii, 1, 8. Besides, the result is 35 and one multiple is 5, so the other must be 7 (flames).
2 These high numbers, while not confined to the pseudo-epic (Ind. Streifen, i, p. 97 ff.), receive fresh additions there in names of numbers before unknown. Compare xiii, 107, 63, for example, where occur the çāṅku and patākā: tathā çāṅkupatāke dve yugāntaṁ kalpam eva ca, ayutāyutaṁ tathā padmāṁ samudraṁ ca tathā vaset. On similes, cf. Lanman, JAOS. xx, p. 16.
Another rhetorical trick, which appears not to have been noticed in the epic, is the occurrence of distinct attempts at “pathetic repetition.” A comical example is given above. I have noted cases but rarely, and only from late parts of the great epic, but I cannot say they are not found elsewhere. The first is from viii, 75, 6–7 a:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rathaṁ} & \text{ sasūtaṁ sahayāṁ ca kaṁcit} \\
\text{kaḷ cid} & \text{ rathī mṛtyuvaçaṁ nināya} \\
\text{nināya cā } & \text{'py ekagajena kaḷ cid} \\
\text{rathān} & \text{ bahūn mṛtyuvaçe tathā 'qvān} \\
\text{rathān} & \text{ sasūtān sahayān gajāṇa} \\
\text{ca sarvān} & \text{ arūn mṛtyuvaçaṁ cāraūghāiḥ}
\end{align*}
\]

Another is found, H. 8, 118, 9 = 15,776:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{adrākṣam} & \text{ adrākṣam} \text{ 2 ahāṁ sunirvṛtaḥ} \\
\text{piban pibaiś} & \text{ tasya vapuḥ punaḥ punaḥ,} \\
& \text{(B. has purātanam)}
\end{align*}
\]

and in the next stanza:

\[
\text{saṁśmṛtya saṁśmṛtya tam eva nirvṛtaḥ.}
\]

This differs from simple repetition, such as that of jānāmi in R. iv, 33, 53 ff., but only in the effect aimed at. Perhaps the yadā 'cṛauṣam passage may be included.

**Cadence in Čloka and Triṣṭubh.**

The gibberish of xii, 10,399 (v. l. in 285, 125),

\[
\text{hāyi hāyi huvā hoyi huvā hoyi tathā 'sakṛt}
\]

is interesting as showing the epic’s recognition of this form of interjectional piety (gāyanti tvāṁ suraçıreṣṭha sāmagā brahmavādinalaḥ); 3 but I introduce it here as illustrating the

---

1 Without the attempted pathos, mere repetition is an ancient trait exhibited as early as the Rig Veda, as pointed out, e. g., by Weber, Vedische Beiträge, 1900, p. 7, on RV. ii, 11. Repetition of the same words in succeeding stanzas is perhaps best illustrated by R. ii, 28, where duḥkhham ato vanam is the pathetic refrain.

2 Compare RV. i, 25, 18, dār̥çaṁ . . . dār̥çaṁ.

3 Compare the stobha ib. 105: hūṅ hūṅ hūṅkārapāraṇya, etc.
common occurrence of the repetition of the final foot of the prior at the beginning of the posterior pāda. This extreme example duplicates even the syllables, but in the pathyā form of the ęloka the duplication of the whole foot, while not reproducing the syllables, may extend backward as well as forward, thus giving three identical feet, as in R. vii, 28, 6,

na bhetavyāṁ na gantavyāṁ nivartadhvaṁ rāne surāḥ

Such a verse, however, is often modified as in iii, 168, 80:

nibodhata mahābhāgāḥ Čivaṁ cā 'cāsta me 'naghāḥ,

or, if the first two are maintained, by making the third foot _ _ _ or _ _ _ . The different possibilities concern us here only as they affect the cadence, for the monotony of the pāda is varied quite as much by the rhetorical cadence as by the foot. Even the stereotyped diiambic close of the posterior pāda is constantly broken by a choice of words which, far from lending themselves to iambic rhythm, impede it. So instead of the posterior _ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ the pāda must often be read as _ _ _ _ _ ; while in the prior pāda _ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ _ _ _ is frequently to be read as _ _ _ _ _ _ _ . Pronounced cetics and dactyls often claim recognition, as at R. vi, 17, 12,

Rāvaṇo, nāma, durvṛţto, rākṣaso, rākṣaseśvarah,¹

or ib. 17, 67, vidyate tasya saṅgrahaḥ; ib. 18, 7, iti ho 'vāca Kākutstho vākyāṁ, satyaparākramaḥ. Hence even in the more rigid posterior pāda the ęloka presents great variety. The effect, for example, of the diiambic ending is quite lost in the following typical examples:

balād ādāya, vīryavān
nava, pañca ca, sapta ca
sandhiṁ Rāmeṇa, Rāvana

To read such pādas mechanically, as if they had a pause before the diiamb (as Occidental scholars almost always read

¹ A stock phrase, the parallel to Rāvaṇo lokarāvaṇaḥ, R. vi, 20, 21, etc.
them), is vicious. The čloka, more than any other metre, must be read by sense rather than by scheme. The latter method is bad enough in all metres, but peculiarly so in the short čloka, where, unless the stress jibes with the words, the result is a peculiarly painful tum-tum, which in no way gives the rhythm; for in reality the čloka is a metre of great subtlety and force, in which neither iambic nor trochaic cadence has ever held sway, but both interchange with pleasing variety even in pathyās,¹ often uniting in a dactylic or choriambic measure, as in iii, 56, 24,

\[
\text{kim abrāvīc ca naḥ sarvān,} \\
\text{vada, bhūmipate, 'nagha}
\]

or R. vi, 65, 11,

\[
\text{gaccha çatruvadhāya tvam,} \\
\text{Kumbhakarṇajayāya ca}
\]

or ib. 59, 47,

\[
\text{tam abrāvin mahātejā} \\
\text{Rāmah, satyaparakramaḥ,} \\
\text{gaccha, yatnaparaç ca 'pi} \\
\text{bhava, Lakṣmaṇa, saṁyuge}
\]

With the same freedom at the outset, the triṣṭubh, instead of embracing all forms, as it might have done, continued on a more and more restricted path. It kept the iambic cadence much more closely than did the čloka and contracted its middle to an almost unvarying shape. It thus grew more and more monotonous, and not having even the advantage of hemistich-unity it became a mere collocation of hendekasyllabic verses, each pāda having the same unvarying quantity:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{◌} & \text{◌} & \text{◌} & \text{◌} & \text{◌} & \text{◌} & \text{◌}
\end{array}
\]

¹ Still greater variety is given by the melodious vipulās, of which I shall speak below. But seven-eighths of epic verse are in pathyā form, that is, half the syllables in the verse are unalterably fixed as ◌ ◌ and ◌ ◌ ◌ ◌, so that it is of interest to see how with this self-imposed restriction the Hindu poet still manages to make verses so melodious, energetic, and varied, when read properly.
(called upajñāti), as in Horace's

trahuntque siccas machinae carinas.¹

The only way to save from dead uniformity a rhythm so stereotyped was to shift the cæsura frequently.² In the Rāmāyaṇa, where upajñātis are the rule (the Mahābhārata triṣṭubh did not reach the same level of monotony), there is often a constant play from fourth to fifth or a remoter syllable, as the place of rest. With the usual pause at the fifth, the dactylic middle foot is converted into an ana-pæstic iambic slide, as in the following examples from R. iv, 48, 62; 44, 16; v, 32, 10, the last two examples showing also the lighter cæsura not of sense-pause but of breathing:

(a) tataḥ kṛtārthaḥ
    sahitāḥ sabāṇdhavā
    mayā 'reitāḥ
    sarvagunāir manoramāiḥ
    carisyatḥo 'rvīṁ
    pratičāntāqātravah
    sahapriyā
    bhūtadharāḥ plavamgamaḥ

(b) sa tat prakarṣan
    hariṇām mahad balaṁ
    babhūva vīrāḥ
    pavanātmajāḥ kapiḥ
    gatāmbude
    vyomni viçuddhamandalaḥ
    çaçī 'va nakṣatraganopagobhitāḥ

(c) svapno hi nā 'yaṁ
    na hi me 'sti nidrā

¹ Brown's Sanskrit Prosody, p. 9. On the other hand the jagati corresponds in outer form to the iambic trimeter with twelve syllables. I treat the jagati throughout as a triṣṭubh with one syllable added (the final syllaba aniceps of the former becoming fixed as brevis), ṝ — ṝ —; not assuming this as a genetic fact but as a convenience, the same body appearing in both and the pādas being interchangeable except in the aksaracchandas.

² On the derivation of types fixed in respect of the initial syllable (the upendra and indravajrā being derived from the upajñāti and not vice versa), see below, the section on the Stanza.
çokena duhkhena ca
pādītāyāḥ
sukham hi me
nā 'sti yato vihmā
tene 'ndupūnapratimānanena

But this tendency ran to extremes also, and as the syllabic arrangement became fixed, so the cæsura became stereotyped, till stanzas showed an almost unvarying cæsura of the painful type of R. v, 47, 30,

iti pravegaṁ tu
parasya tarkayan
svakarmayogāṁ ca
vidhāya vīryavān
cakāra vegam tu
mahābalas tadā
matāṁ ca cakre 'syā
vadhe tadāṁṁ

or of R. vi, 126, 55,

tataḥ sa vākyāir
madhurāir Hanūmato
niçamya hṛṣṭo
Bharataḥ kṛtañjaliḥ
tvāca vāñṁ
manasah praharsṁṁ
cirasya pūrnāḥ
khalu me manorathāḥ

Even if Vālmīki did not write these stanzas, which may be doubted, a greater poet than he is guilty of the same sleepy iteration of cadences, as may be seen in Raghuvaiṣṭa iii, 30; v, 18; vii, 19 (cæsura after the fifth in all pādas); vii, 16 (after the fourth in all pādas).

Tags.

Alternation of triśṭubh and jaṭāti pādas in the same stanza helped somewhat to mitigate the weary effect of this metre; but it gradually yielded before the cloka or passed into other
forms. One of its decadent uses was to furnish new tags for the end of chapters of ṇlokas. This was an old use, but it is extended in the later epic. The different texts show no uniformity in the insertion of these tag-triṣṭubhās, one text having several, where another has one or none, just as in the case of other tag-metres, for example, a puṣpīṭāgra, G. iii, 39, 42; two rucirās between G. iii, 56 and 57, but none in R. Plainly a late insertion, for instance, is the imitation-stanza which serves as a tag to G. iii, 43, 42 (not in R.),

kālasya kālaṃ ca bhavet sa Rāmah
saṅkṣipyā lokāṇcq ca srjed athā 'nyān,

Manu, ix, 315; Mbh. ix, 36, 40,

sa hi kruddhaḥ srjed anyān devān api mahātapāḥ

xiii, 152, 16,

adāivaṁ dāivataṁ kuryur, dāivataṁ ca 'py adāivatam
lokāṇ anyān srjeyus te

Such tags may, in fact, be made of adjacent ṇlokas. An instance is given below where a rucirā has thus been created. As regards triṣṭubhās, G. iii, 62 ends with a tag made out of a ṇloka omitted in this text but kept in the other, na ṇārma labhate bhūruḥ and na vindate tatra tu ṇārma Māithilī. A good example is found in R. vii, 75, 18 ff., where a triṣṭubh tag is added in almost the same words with those wherewith the following chapter begins, showing that with the division into two chapters a tag was simply manufactured out of the next stanza; as is still more clearly indicated by the fact that 76, 2 answers the question of 75, 18, vāciyas tṛīyo varṇo vā čūdro vā ('si)? čūdrayonyām prajāto 'smi. Evidently only one verse intervened, the ṇloka: tasya tad vacanām ċrutvā avākṣīraḥ . . . uvāca ha.¹

¹ The same thing occurs in R. iv, 50, where the chapter closes with the ṇloka: papraccha Hanumāna tatra kā 'ei tvam kasya vā bilam. Then follows the tag: tato Hanumāna girisāṁnikāṣaḥ kṛtājaṁlaṁ tám abhivrādyā vrīddhām, papraccha kā tvam bhavanam bilam ca ratnāni ce 'māni vadaṣva kasya, simply repeating the last ṇloka in triṣṭubh form. G. very properly drops the ṇloka; but it is clear that originally the ṇloka closed the question.
The tag-function of the triṣṭubh is also known in the Mahābhārata, notably in the one triṣṭubh found in the Nala, iii, 76, 58, which has been regarded as spurious on account of its isolation. But the following sections, after the Nala episode, show just the same conditions, the end of chapters 83 and 100. So, too, at the end of ix, 24 and 28. Hariv. 2, 66, and 69 end with one jagatī each; 2, 68, with three.

The present text of the Rāmāyaṇa shows many cases of triṣṭubhs and jagatīs interpolated into the middle of a cloka section. Some of these at least are clearly the finale of former chapters. Thus R. vi, 69, 15 looks like an inserted jagatī, but its function is to close the chapter in G. 48, 13. So R. vi, 69, 88–96 appear as a group of interpolated triṣṭubhs; but in G. the same group is a tag to chapter 49. Probably the break in R. vi, 69, 44, G. 49, 31, is the original finis of a chapter. Occasionally, when one edition breaks a chapter, only the new division is found to have triṣṭubh or jagatī, as an accepted sign of conclusion, as in R. iii, 11, after 70; G. 16, 41.

A special function of the later triṣṭubh is to produce pathetic effect. In this guise it wins new life and makes whole chapters, as in R. v, 28, where the burden of the chapter is expressed by hā Rāma hā Lakṣmana hā Sumitre, etc.; or in R. iv, 24 (not in G.), a lament, the dolorous style of which may be illustrated by the reminiscent verses, 13–14:

prāpto 'smi pāpmānam idāṁ vaiyasya
bhrātuvardhāt Tvāṣṭravadhād ihe 'ndraḥ
pāpamānam Indrasya mahī jalaṁ ca
vṛksāq ca kāmaṁ jagṛhūḥ striyaq ca, etc.

Closely allied is the employment of the triṣṭubh to describe not mental conditions but operations of nature. The Vedic pra vātā vānti patayanti vidyutah, RV., v, 88, 4, appears in

1 This begins in the Mahābhārata as an extension of the tag-function. Compare the illustrations given in A. J. Phil., vol. xix, p. 18 ff. A good example of the sentimental effect, intensification of horrors, etc., deputed to the triṣṭubh by predilection, is found in R., v, 54, 30 ff. The action is in clokas. The moral effect is given by the following triṣṭubhs.
R. iv, 28, 45 as varṣapraveṅa vipulāḥ patanti pra vānti vātāḥ samudirṇaveṅaḥ, in a long section wholly descriptive. Another example is found in R. iv, 30, 28–57.

Cālokas and triṣṭubhs are not often commingled, save in a few late passages of the great epic, i, 232, 10 ff.; Hariv. 3, 82, 3 ff.; and in R. v, 41; G. 37 (chiefly upendras), throughout a section. In R. a few long passages occur in the sixth book, 59–61, 67, but apart from these books the exchange of the two metres is avoided. In the Sanatsujātīya, v, 46, there is, indeed, a regular cāloka refrain besides other cālokas intermingled with triṣṭubhs, but this is because the author is reducing Upanishad stanzas, and at the same time adding some of his own. The practice belongs to those scriptures, and is not generally kept up in the epic, though occasionally a cāloka or two appears among triṣṭubhs, as in ii, 64, 9–10. In xii, 350, 49 ff., two triṣṭubhs (the second having three hemistichs) are inserted between cālokas (after a cāloka of three verses).

Common Forms of Cāloka and Triṣṭubh.

From a mechanical point of view, the prior pāda of the cāloka and the triṣṭubh are identical, except for the fact that to the eight syllables of the cāloka pāda the triṣṭubh appends a scolius or amphibrach. The natural division of the eight syllables in each case is into groups of four or five, followed respectively by four or three. For convenience the group of four, which is found oftenest, is usually called a foot, and to have a name I shall so designate it. Now in epic (Mahābhārata) poetry, every foot of the cāloka pāda is found in the triṣṭubh, and, vice versa (as will be seen from the following table), every prior foot and every last foot of the triṣṭubh’s eight syllables is also a corresponding cāloka foot:

1 G. ii, 110, 3 ff. is not in R., and appears to be an interpolation. The parallels to G. v, 89 are also lacking in R. Verse 7 in G. vi, 34, is praksipta (the passage is not in R., but compare R. iv, 33, 53).
Prior foot of Cloka and Triṣṭubh.

| 1. | ☞ _ _ ☞ |
| 2. | ☞ _ _ _ |
| 3. | ☞ _ _ ☞ |
| 4. | ☞ _ _ _ |
| 5. | ☞ _ _ _ |
| 6. | _ _ _ _ |
| 7. | _ _ _ _ |
| 8. | _ _ _ _ |

Last foot of Cloka and Triṣṭubh.

| 1. | _ _ _ _ |
| 2. | _ _ _ _ |
| 3. | _ _ _ _ |
| 4. | _ _ _ _ |
| 5. | _ _ _ _ |
| 6. | _ _ _ _ |
| 7. | _ _ _ _ |
| 8. | _ _ _ _ |

But, curious as is this purely mechanical identity, it is subject to three limitations, which prevent the effect one might think would be caused by it. First, the triṣṭubh's eighth syllable is long, while in the cloka, since the pāda ends here, the same syllable is anceps. Second, the scolius of the triṣṭubh is usually closely united with the second foot, while in the case of upajātis and some other triṣṭubhs the casura occurs in a majority of cases after the fifth syllable, so that the feet are not in reality what they are in the measured division given above; but the pāda appears, for example, as ☞ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ ☞ , whereas in the cloka the usual casura is after the fourth, and only in certain cases falls after the fifth syllable. But the third difference, that of the general effect given by the cloka cadence and that of the corresponding syllables in the triṣṭubh, is produced by the interrelation of the first and second foot. Here there is a wide divergence, and it is the preference for one combination over another that makes the greatest difference between the form of the cloka as a whole and the triṣṭubh as a whole. Although it is true, as has been remarked by Professor Jacobi, that the essential difference in metres lies not in the opening but in the close of the pāda, yet in this case the interrelation just referred to is almost as important. Thus, to take a striking example, while ☞ _ _ _ is a second foot both in cloka and triṣṭubh, in the former it is pathyā, “regular,” in all combinations, the commonest of all, while in triṣṭubh it is a rarity in any combination. So _ _ _ _ occurs after four or five forms of the first foot in cloka, yet is never a favorite, in triṣṭubhs after six forms, and is here everywhere common.
It is, however, interesting to see how many cases a permissible form of both metres is used, so that one cannot tell which metre one is reading till the pāda is nearly complete. Ordinarily the general rhythm determines the anticipation and the expected metre is duly met; but not infrequently is the justified anticipation deceived, and the metre, still keeping on the lines of the preceding form, suddenly changes. A penultimate verse, for example, in R. ii, 38, 14, begins mayā vihīnāṁ varada prapannam, but we no sooner learn that this is a cāloka verse, not a triṣṭubh tag (as we might expect from its form and position), than in 15 we read imāṁ mahendropamajatagardhinīṃ, the real tag of the section.

The form just cited is the usual one in which the cāloka coincides with the body of the triṣṭubh. Sometimes, as in set phrases, the same words are used; thus in G. ii, 18, 33, and 55,

\[
\text{prasādaye tvāṁ cīrasā kariṣye vacanam pithuḥ}
\]

\[
\text{prasādaye tvāṁ cīrasā yatavrate (triṣṭubh)}
\]

or in R. vi, 106, 4 and 59, 36,

\[
\text{tam āpatantaṁ sahasā svanavantam mahādvajam}
\]

\[
\text{tam āpatantaṁ sahasā samīkṣya (triṣṭubh)}
\]

With the prevalent upajāti cæsura and almost after a system of upajātis (one cāloka intervening), appears in R. vi, 69, 130, sa vāyusūnuḥ kupitaç cikṣepa cikharāṁ gireḥ, a perfect upendravajrā pāda in a cāloka verse. Such alien pādas are not very common in the midst of a cāloka system,1 but are common in close conjunction with triṣṭubhs, as if the poet either wished to trick or could not himself get the last metre out of his ear. Another instance like the one above is found in R. v, 54, 48 ff., where only a cāloka hemistich intervenes between a triṣṭubh system and the triṣṭubh-like cadence of the cāloka: vyarājatā 'ditya ivā 'reimāli; Laṅkāṁ samastāṁ sampīḍya lāṅgūlāṇim mahākapiḥ, nirvāpayāṁ āsa tadā samudre (haripūṅgavaḥ). Cases where a whole cāloka is interposed

---

1 But compare R. v, 2, 31, anena rūpeṇa mayā na čakyaḥ rakṣasāṁ puri; R. vi, 43, 17, cāriñsaumghāṭavahāḥ prasusruḥ çońitāpagaḥ; Nala, 3, 1, tebhyaḥ pratijāya Nalaḥ kariṣya iti, Bhārata; and ib. 12, but no more cases till 6, 8.
are not at all rare. In R. vi, 67, 99–101, 99 ends in a triśṭubh, 100 is a cloka pathyā, 101 begins sa Kumbhakarṇasya ṭarān ẓārīre (ṣapta, viṛyavān). Less striking is the case where only one pāda of a cloka of choriambic form (second vipūla) corresponds to the triśṭubh it follows, for here the former’s cadence is not kept up. Such a pāda needs no intervening pathyā, but may follow directly on the triśṭubh, as in R. vi, 67, 21–22,

pradṛduvḥ saṁyati Kumbhakarṇāt
tatas tu Niło balavān (paryavasthāpayan bālam)

When an unimportant word or a superfluous adornment, an unnecessary adverb or epithet, is added, it arouses a suspicion that some of the clokas may be reduced from an older form. Thus vidyunmāli appears to stop a jagatī in R. vi, 43, 41 a,  

qilāprahārā 'bhihato (vidyunmālā) niçācarah

So in R. vi, 69, 138 a,  

khaḍgaprahaḥ 'bhihato Hanūmān (mārutātmajāḥ)

So, too in the verse cited above, haripuṅgavaḥ fills out the verse where mahākapiḥ precedes, a sufficient subject. In G. iv, 60, 2, nivedayāmāsa tadā mahārsīm (samhatāñjaliḥ); in the other example above, ṣapta, viryavān; and in the following example both terminals (even the accusative) are unnecessary, R. vi, 71, 37,

tato 'tikāyo balavān praviṇya (harivāhinīm)  
visphārayāmāsa dhanur nāṇāda ca (punah punah)

And very likely, since an inspection of epic phraseology shows that there were many stereotyped turns of expression, there were phrases used first in the triśṭubh which were preserved in a crystallized form in the general cloka solution in which the epic was immersed. But to say, except in the case of such stereotyped phrases, whether this happened in any one instance, would be at best rather an idle expression of opinion.¹

¹ In sādhu sādhu iti (te) nedaç (ca) drṣṭvā caturm (or rakṣah) parājitam, R. vi, 44, 31, G. 19, 37, a stock phrase in either form, an old triśṭubh,  omnium, might be preserved, but a varied reading is more likely.
Certain verbal forms lend themselves best to one cadence and it is not surprising, for instance, that one turn should go to make both ṇloka and triṣṭubh (R. v, 47, 10; vi, 106, 14), or that the exact form here is elsewhere, G. vi, 89, 25 (R. has hayān), used as part of another triṣṭubh, so that we find:

pracodayāmāsa rathaṁ sa sārathīḥ
pracodayāmāsa rathaṁ surasārathīḥ uttamaḥ
pracodayāmāsa citāiḥ ċaśais tribhiḥ
pracodayāmāsa citāiḥ ċaśair hemavibhūṣitāiḥ

On this point I have only to add that a complete jagatī pada, as well as a triṣṭubh pada, may thus appear in a ṇloka, as in the example above and in R. v, 57, 15 b,

sa pūrayāmāsa kapir ḍiḍo daça (samantataḥ)

and that, next to the choriambic form, the old triṣṭubhs in ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ, and ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ are most often incorporate in ṇlokas, as in Nala, 4, 28, varṇyamāneṣu ca mayā bhavatsu; 9, 4, vyadīryate 'va hṛdayaṁ na cāi 'nam; and 12, 39, patatribhir bahuvīdhāḥ samantād, etc., etc. Professor Jacobi has suggested that the ṇloka has borrowed such forms from the triṣṭubh. This seems to be a reasonable suggestion, yet it should be said that the argument advanced in favor of it is scarcely valid. Professor Jacobi bases the derivation of the second vipulā from the triṣṭubh on the assumed fact that in this form of the pada “ॐ ॐ ॐ almost never takes the place of ॐ ॐ,” IS. vol xvii, p. 450. This statement, however, is based on a rather restricted area of examples. In the Bhārata ṇlokas, ॐ ॐ ॐ is not uncommon except in late passages, and even there two or three cases out of twenty-five to thirty are not very unusual. All that we can say is that final brevis is much less frequent than in the first vipulā.
The Epic Čloka.

The Prior Pāda of the Čloka.

The Pathyā.

The pathyā, or ordinary form of the first pāda, should exclude sporadic cases, but including them for convenience we may say that the pathyā foot  is preceded by five kinds of feet, sporadic choriambus or proceleusmaticus; iambic,  ; pyrrhic,  ; trochaic,  and  ; spondaic,  and  . The frequency of these feet advances in the order here given. With the exception of a sporadic choriambus or other wild irregularity, all these forms occur passim, even that with precedent iambus. This last is sure to be found so many times in a given number of člokas and it must therefore be marked as occurring passim rather than as common; but it is far less frequent than the other forms, often less than half as frequent as the pyrrhic, as this is often only half as common as the precedent trochee. The relation between the trochee and spondee is from one-half to two-thirds. A curious fact in regard to the avoided iambus (before the iambus of the pathyā, as in the posterior pāda) is that when used it is sometimes preferred in its double form. Thus in xii, 312 ff., for about two hundred hemistichs, the precedent spondees, trochees, pyrrhics, and iambbs are (respectively) 82, 54, 29, 11; but of the 11 iambbs, 10 are double  (against  ). On the other hand, in xiv, 59 ff., these precedents are 73, 38, 31, 20; and of the 20 iambbs, only 8 are double; while the opening stanzas of the Gītā (introduction, ch. 13) show 96, 62, 27, 14; but only 6 double iambbs out of the 14. The precedent double iambus is characteristic also of Pāli verse. It does not seem to me that any great weight is to be laid on this or that ratio in the use of these feet, since all are used by epic writers everywhere, and the only striking distinction as regards their employment is that spondees naturally (it is a matter of nice ear to a great extent) occur oftenest before an iamb, and iambbs least often; while
trochees and pyrrhics lie between. But very often a double trochee (\(\_\mathcal{o}\_\mathcal{o}\)) is preferred to a spondee (\(\_\mathcal{o}\_\_\)).\(^1\) As regards minor differences, as for example whether \(\_\mathcal{o}\_\_\mathcal{o}\) or \(\_\mathcal{o}\_\mathcal{o}\) is used more frequently, I have not thought it worth while to gather the statistics. Only the curious preference in later writers for three successive iambics seemed worth noticing, as it leads to the hemistich of eight iambics sometimes affected by doggerel epic poets.\(^2\) Such a combination regularly occurs only at the beginning of a prior pāda, being tabooed in the posterior pāda, though occasionally found there. The general (not inviolate) rule for the pathyā is that any foot may stand before \(\_\mathcal{o}\_\_\mathcal{o}\) which does not make tribrach or anapæst after the initial syllaba anceps of the pāda. The final syllable of the pathyā is long in about two-thirds of the cases.

More important are the facts in regard to the preference for certain forms combined with the vipulās, although these make but a small proportion of prior pādas.

The Vipulās.

The vipulās (syllables five to eight) are four in number: (1) \(\_\mathcal{o}\_\mathcal{o}\_\mathcal{o}\_\mathcal{o}\), (2) \(\_\mathcal{o}\_\_\mathcal{o}\_\mathcal{o}\), (3) \(\_\_\_\mathcal{o}\), (4) \(\_\_\_\mathcal{o}\). Only the third (as indicated) has an almost invariable cæsura. In respect of the general rules for these vipulās, from an examination of a considerable mass of material, I would state first that the epic ċloka generally conforms, as far as I can formulate them, to the following conditions:\(^3\)

\(^1\) The preference for \(\_\mathcal{o}\_\_\mathcal{o}\_\mathcal{o}\) instead of \(\_\mathcal{o}\_\mathcal{o}\_\mathcal{o}\) is illustrated below. Cases of double iambus before the pathyā seem to me rather characteristic of the popular and late scholastic style than an archaic survival (the late scholastic often coincides with the popular through a common carelessness or ignorance). To be compared are Simons, Der Čloka im Pālī, ZDMG., vol. xlii, p. 84 ff., and Oldenberg, ib. liv, p. 194. The latter seems inclined to see (with due caution) evidence of antiquity in the precedent iambus. I regard this combination rather as a sign that the writer is more careless.

\(^2\) Besides the articles above, see Colebrooke; Gildermeister, ZKM. v, 260; Weber, IS., vol. viii; Oldenberg, Bemerkungen zur Theorie des Čloka, ZDMG. xxxv, p. 187; and Jacobi, IS., vol. xvii, p. 443; Das Rāmāyaṇa; and Gurupūjākāśumūḍī. Professor Jacobi’s rules given first as “valid for the older epics”
EPIC VERSIFICATION.

1. The first vipulā, ఙ ఙ ఙ usually follows ఙ ఙ, ఙ ఙ, or ఙ ఙ, though it is sufficient to have the preceding syllable long (even this restriction is not always observed). The later style has fewer cases of the first of these combinations. The cæsura is after the (pāda’s) fourth or fifth syllable, sometimes after the sixth. The last syllable of the vipulā is prevailinglly long but not infrequently short, especially apt to be short after the diisim opening. When the cæsura is after the fifth syllable of the pāda the last syllable of the vipulā as a rule is long (which would indicate that this cæsura is later than the one after the fourth).

2. The second vipulā, ఙ ఙ, usually follows ఙ ఙ, though a preceding ఙ ఙ or even ఙ ఙ is not a great rarity. Any other precedent foot is sporadic only. The cæsura is after the fourth or fifth syllable of the pāda, inclining to the latter place (at times twice as frequent). The last syllable of the vipulā is sometimes short, most often when the cæsura is after the fourth syllable of the pāda, but is prevailinglly long, especially in the later epic, where a short final is often rather rare (rarer than in the first vipulā).\(^{1}\)

3. The third vipulā, ఙ, ఙ ఙ usually follows ఙ ఙ. The cæsura is very rarely after any other syllable than the fifth, and is seldom neglected. The last syllable is indifferently short or long. This is the most rigid form, both in

were modified in the later articles cited (1884, 1893, 1896). Professor Oldenberg’s observations give an excellent comparison of Manu’s practice with that of an epic passage. The statements in Colebrooke’s and Weber’s works mentioned above, based on the rules of native metriists, often conform, through no fault save that of the metriists, neither to epic nor to classical usage and historically considered are useless as regards the extant epic clokas. Professor Jacobi’s rules, as modified by him, though not exhaustive, are generally quite unimpeachable and give the best (as did Gildermeister’s in his day) presentation of epic conditions. I follow his order in numbering the four vipulās, and his rules, with some revision.

\(^{1}\) The age of the piece affects the quantity of the final syllable. For example, of the two lotus-theft versions, the prior (as is often the case) is the more modern (xiii, 93). Here there is no case of ఙ ఙ ఙ, but fourteen cases of ఙ ఙ (one hundred forty-nine clokas). But in 94, in the compass of forty clokas, ఙ ఙ ఙ occurs six times (against ఙ ఙ, four times).
respect of cæsura and of precedent foot, so that the pāda is almost always igeria, igeria, igeria.

4. The fourth vīpulā, igeria, usually follows igeria, but in some sections is found quite as often after igeria and igeria. The cæsura rarely changes from the fourth syllable. The last syllable of the vīpulā is generally long.

5. The Mahābhārata has what may be called a fifth vīpulā, igeria. It occurs sporadically in all parts of the epic and is not very uncommon, though not so current as in the Upanishads. This form crops up occasionally in the Purāṇas, but is ignored by Vālmiki and later Kavis.

These epic conditions may be condensed into one short rule of general usage: All vīpulās are found after igeria, but with occasional exceptions 1 only the first vīpulā after igeria and igeria, and no other precedent feet are admitted before vīpulās. The cæsura is free (usually after the fourth or fifth syllable) in the first and second vīpulā; after the fifth in the third; after the fourth in the fourth vīpulā.

The chief difference between the normal type of the epic pāda and that of classical writers lies in the circumstance that, as contrasted with the facts stated above, in classical works there is

1) almost complete absence of the fourth vīpulā,
2) greater rarity of the first vīpulā after diiambus,
3) greater strictness in the cæsura of the third vīpulā,
4) very rare exceptions in the employment of other precedent feet (e. g., the third vīpulā after igeria, Ragh. xii, 71),
5) almost exclusive use of long finals in first and second vīpulās. 2

Thus it will be seen that there is still an appreciable advance

1 The commonest exception is found in the case of the fourth vīpulā. On an average half-a-dozen exceptions occur in the course of a thousand hemistichs, but excluding the fourth vīpulā only one or two exceptions, generally in the form igeria, igeria.

to be noticed in the classical style as compared not only with the style of older parts of the epic but also with the normal epic. Fewer vipulās (especially fewer second vipulās) in general, avoidance of the fourth vipulā, and greater strictness in the use of vipulās mark in some passages an advance even on the normal epic.

There is no "epic usage" in respect of the proportion of vipulās to pathyās. The fact that there is considerable variety proves little in regard to difference of authors, since many conditions affect the ratio. Not only is there apt to be a larger number of vipulās in scenes of excitement, as Professor Jacoby, I think, has somewhere observed, but also a monotonous list develops vipulās, partly because it is apt to be composed of names which, as they are harder to manage, always receive a certain latitude of treatment, partly because the dulness of the subject requires the livelier effect of the skipping vipulā. The vipulā (in excess of the normal) may then be due to a) personal style; b) intensity; c) formality; d) avoidance of dulness; to which must be added imitation or actual citation of older material. For this reason there is, in mere ratio of vipulās to pathyās, no especial significance, as may be further shown by the fact that on an average this ratio is about the same in the Rāmāyaṇa and Bhārata, though each poem shows great variations within itself. Thus in the first thousand verses (hemistichs) of the Rāmāyaṇa's third and fourth books respectively the vipulās are 125 and 118, or one-eighth. But twenty thousand hemistichs, which I have examined from all parts of the Bhārata, give twenty-six hundred vipulās, or a trifle over the same ratio. I do not then lay much stress on the presence or absence of vipulās in an epic section unless it shows remarkable extremes. Thus if we compare the 1098 ɢloka verses of the Raghuvāṇa and the 1070 which make the first half of Nala, we find that in Nala the ratio of vipulās is one-sixth, while in the Raghuvāṇa it is one-fourteenth (184 in Nala, 76 in Raghuvāṇa). But this paucity of vipulās, though common to most classical writers, is not found in Māgha (according
to Professor Jacobi because he was a Westerner, loc. cit. p. 444), so that in itself it is no criterion of lateness.

The number of vipulās gives the general average (of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent) already noticed. But this ratio is sometimes almost halved and sometimes nearly doubled, small sections of two hundred verses (hemistichs) not infrequently showing from fourteen to forty-six non-pathyā forms; while in special cases even greater disproportion may be observed, some of which when taken into consideration along with other elements may still be worth noting. Thus as between the old tale, Upākhyāna, of Namuci, as told in ix, 48, 33 ff., and the following account, hanta te kathāisyāmi, of Skanda, in 44, 5 ff., the weight of probable seniority lies with the Vedic tale. Here there are vipulās enough to make the ratio $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent, instead of the average $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; whereas in the Skanda tale there are only half as many. But again, the list of Skanda’s followers, ib. 45, 86 ff., shows fourteen vipulās in fifteen clokas, as the list of Mothers in 46 shows forty-six in one hundred clokas, and the list of nations in xii, 101, 8 ff., has thirteen vipulās in twenty clokas, all of these, however, being names and therefore exceptional. There are, on the other hand, good reasons, apart from vipulās, for considering that the conversation of Sulabhā and Janaka is not an ancient part of the epic (bad grammar is one item), and here in nearly four hundred cases there are but eight vipulās, or less than 3 per cent; instead of the average $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Not the number of vipulās per se, but the use of vipulās may be a determining factor. The refined classical style differs, however, not from the epic alone but from the Purāṇas, where obtains even greater freedom than in the epic, especially in the nice test of the fourth vipulā. Thus, fifteen fourth vipulā is not a high number in a thousand Puranic verses, e.g., exactly this number is found in Vāyu

---

1 In simple narrative, with no disturbing factors, the compass ranges from fourteen to thirty vipulās in one hundred clokas (two hundred cases), three times more often above twenty than below it, and seldom exceeding thirty, for instance, only once in the first 4,000 cases of the ninth book.
Pūrāṇa, ch. 4–9, five hundred člokas; and in the epic section of Čānti from the end of the prose in 243 to the end of 351 (13,224–13,740). The Agni Pūrāṇa has as many as fifty-seven fourth vipulās in the same number of verses, the first twenty chapters, five hundred and five člokas. But if we compare the use of the vipulās we see at once a striking difference in these passages. The epic selection has fifty second vipulās and thirty-two third vipulās; the Vāyu selection, thirty-three second and fifty-one third; the Agni selection, twenty-six second and fifty third; withal, despite the carelessness in the last, which gives four cases of the second after \( \omega \circ \_ \_ \_ \_ \) and three of the third after \( \omega \_ \_ \_ \_ \). That is to say, even the late and careless Puranic style still inclines to the third instead of second vipulā, which is the classical preference. If, however, we revert to an older selection of the epic, we find, for instance, in the heart of the Bhagavad Gītā (830–1,382), that the second vipulā (in the same number of verses, hemistichs, namely one thousand, which in all the examples now to be given is the number to be assumed) has twenty-nine cases and the third but eleven; that is, the proportion is not only reversed but is in very striking contrast both to the norm of the Rāmāyaṇa and Raghuvāṇa on the one hand and the Purāṇas on the other. Coincident with this is the further fact that, whereas Vālmīki and Kālidāsa have proportionally few first vipulās after diāmbus, both epic selections above have more first vipulās after diāmbus than after any other combination; while the Puranic specimens are quite classical in this regard, the Vāyu having only one-fourth, the Agni only one-third of all the first vipulās after diāmbus. An extract from the Anuśāsana Parvan of the epic, ċl. 3,782–4,240, shows also an approach to the classical model (ten first vipulās after diāmbus, twenty-three after \( \omega \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \) and \( \omega \circ \_ \_ \_ \) each). The last case has thirty-six second vipulās against fifty-four third vipulās and only seven fourth vipulās (whereas the Gītā extract has twenty-two fourth vipulās).¹

¹ The five texts, Gītā, Nala, Anuś. P.; Rāmāyaṇa iv, 1–11, and Raghuvāṇa show as fourth vipulās (in 1000 verses) 22, 10, 7, 2, 0, respectively.
A curious fact is, further, that, while this extract of the Anuçãsana, which is a medley on the gifts of cows, origin of gold, and other late stuff, has but seven fourth vipulās in five hundred člokas, the following chapter on Črāddhas, the basis of which is old (rules expanded from Manu’s list of guests), has four in sixty člokas. Another interesting fact is that the thousand verses which lead up to and follow after the extract from the Gītā given above, 495–830, 1,382–1,532 do not keep the ratio between the second and third vipulās, but approach the later norm, having an equal number of each vipulā. The Anugītā itself contains only one-half as many “irregular” forms as does the Gītā in the same amount of matter;¹ but following this the epic narrative is expanded in modern form, and here, where the subjects are the mountain festival, recapitulation of the Bhārata war (xv, 61, 1), digging for buried treasure, Parikṣit’s birth, demise, and restoration to life, loosing the white horse, and Arjuna’s renewed battles, the metre becomes almost classical, with scarcely a single violation of vipulā rules and with only five cases of the fourth vipulā to the thousand verses. Compare for instance the vipulās in Raghuvaiçça, the Rāmāyana (iv, 1–11), and Āçvamedhika² Parv. 59–77, according to vipulās:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ii</th>
<th>iii</th>
<th>iv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ragh.,</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rām.,</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āçv.,</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vipulās of the first thousand verses (hemistichs) of Nala are, in their order, 91, 33, 60, 10. Though modernized, the irregularities in Nala are antique: 3, 13, iva prabhām; 12, 105, Nalaṁ nāmā ‘rimardanam (changed to damanam); 16, 37, kathaṁ ca bhraṣṭā (1) jñātiibhyah; 20, 18, tvam iva yantā (now eva); in 12, 55, and 91, vilapatīm must be read (grammar is of no importance here, as will be shown below).

¹ They are three cases of the second vipulā after ३ ४ ५ and ३ ४ ५ respectively; five and one each of the fourth vipulā after the same feet respectively.

² The strictness here may be measured by the fact that there is only one case of final brevis in the second vipulā and only three in the first; no case of second or third vipulā after any precedent foot save ३ ४ ५ (and only one of the fourth vipulā). Further, only one-third of the first vipulās follow a dīiambus.
Also in the first thousand hemistichs of Āçrama there are only four cases of the fourth vipulā. Like Māgha of the West, the Māusala, on the other hand, which treats of Dvāraka and was probably a clan-tale of the West, comes much nearer to the antique standard, having ten fourth vipulās in five hundred hemistichs, three of them irregular, besides one further vipulā irregularity (stz. 47, 132, 211, 253).\(^1\)

It should be added too that, though (as just stated) there are four fourth vipulās in the first thousand hemistichs of the fifteenth book, yet they are all found in the first seventy-seven verses, and from this point on there is not another case of fourth vipulā for one thousand hemistichs, which is as classical as Vālmīki. This last selection is, in fact, almost precisely on the classical model, and differs from it anyway only in having two second vipulās after ऋ. ऋ. This would imply an acquaintance with the classical norm, which can perhaps scarcely be doubted in the case of the writers who finally completed the poem.

A very interesting example of how the antique will make the poet hark back to an older norm is given by the Sāuptika. It will be remembered that this is almost pure narrative, but that at one point Ēiva is addressed with a hymn and his demons are briefly described. This occurs just at the middle of a selection like those above of one thousand hemistichs. Now up to this point there is no fourth vipulā at all, but with the hymn and names come five fourth vipulās within thirty-five clokas. Then the narrative is resumed, and till the end of the thousand hemistichs appear only three more. Some smaller points here also deserve attention. The num-

\(^1\) In the next Parvan, there are four fourth vipulās in two hundred verses, but three are at the beginning and in three successive hemistichs, and of these, two are forced by proper names. That proper names are quite important may be shown by the catalogue at the beginning of the Harivānṣa, where the names force up the fourth vipulā to twelve (seven of these being in nom. prop.), and a third vipulā occurs after सङ्ग सङ्ग (in a name); as contrasted with the next thousand verses, where there are only four fourth vipulās. Bhaviṣya, partly owing to imitation of Gitā and Smṛti, partly to names, has nine in its first thousand verses.
ber of first and second vipulās with cæsura after the fifth is
double that of those with cæsura after the fourth, and there
is only one first vipulā, and no second vipulā, with final brevis.
Finally, there are only fourteen cases of first vipulā after
\( \underline{\underline{\text{c}}}_{\text{c}} \) out of fifty-four in all. Thus from every point of
view the same result is obtained. The little Parvan is com-
paratively refined in style (number of vipulās, 54, 30, 35, 8).

No doubt this parisaṅkhya philosophy is tiresome reading,
but as it is even more tiresome to obtain the facts than to
glance at them, I shall beg the reader to have patience while
I give the results of a few more reckonings, since I believe
they are not without a certain value. What I want to show
is that the treatment of the fourth vipulā goes hand-in-hand
with that of other factors involving a more or less refined
style, but not necessarily with all of them. I will take as
my first illustration the tent-scene from Droṇa 72–84, and
ib. 51–71, a group of apparently old stories on the “sixteen
kings that died” and allied tales. In the former there are
four, in the latter twenty-one fourth vipulās to the thousand
hemistichs; in the former there is but one slight irreg-
ularity (\( \underline{\underline{\text{c}}}_{\text{c}} \text{c} \)); in the latter there are six.
But in the former there is one more second vipulā than
there is third; in the latter these stand thirty to forty-
seven; while after diiambus in the former there are nine
out of forty in all, and in the latter sixteen out of fifty-five
in all. In other words, in the last test there is scarcely
any difference, but in that of second and third vipulās
such evidence of antiquity as is furnished at all by this
test is in favor of the former, whereas in the other tests it
is in favor of the latter specimen. I have not selected these
specimens, however, to show that all these tests are use-
less. On the contrary, I believe they may be applied, but
all together and with constant reference to all other factors.
The modifying factor here, for example, is that though the
tales of the “kings that died” are undoubtedly old, yet they
are told (or retold) in such modern careless Sanskrit that
final i is here kept short not only before br but even before
vy. It is not enough then to say that a story in Droṇa or Anuṣāsana is "undoubtedly old," because perhaps it smacks of antiquity or even is found in a Buddhist record. It is not the age of the story but the age of the form in which it is couched that marks the age of the literature. This specimen, for example, enumerates earth's islands as eighteen in number, a sure mark of lateness, but here supported by other data. Another extract from Droṇa, an ordinary battle-scene, adhy. 92-100, has, to be sure, thirteen fourth vipulās, but the vipulās, in their order, run 44, 14, 37, 13, with not a single irregularity of any sort, while only ten of the forty-four are after diambus; in other words, as clean a scheme as might be met in Vālmiki, except for the fourth vipulā, and even here eight of the thirteen are in proper names. Less classic in appearance, but still far removed from the free epic type, is the passage dealing with the deaths of Bhūričravas and Jayadratha (vii, 141-146, not quite a thousand verses), important because of its mention of Vālmiki, 143, 67. Here the vipulās run 43, 33, 18, 11 (four of these in nom. prop.), with three irregular forms of the second vipulā. A fourth of the first vipulās follow iambus. On the other hand, in the death of Droṇa and the following scene, vii, 190-198 = 8,695-9,195, only one-sixth of the first vipulās follow iambus and there are no certain exceptions. The scheme of vipulās is here 30, 28, 43, 9 (two in nom. prop.), that is, a more modern preponderance of third vipulās. Several other features show modern touches. Thus in 192, 7, Rudrasye 'va hi kruddhasya is either a very careless vipulā or contains an example of the Pauranic licence (taken from Pārkrit) of short vowel before kr; while in the same passage, cl. 13, eso or esa hi pārṣato vīraḥ, we have to choose between careless sandhi or careless metre. In 190, 33, the antiquity of o o - is in an inherited name, Jamadagnih, where, as in similar cases, the old licence persists even into Pauranic writings. 1

1 In 146, 7, occurs the rare combination o - o, o o o - - - . The reading of C. 6,345 = 146, 92 is vicious, and is corrected in B.

2 Names, formulae, and numerals often retain this licence, e. g., ṛṣayaḥ ca,
kṛtya is a late phrase, and in 191, 37, the stereotyped manœuvres are twenty-one in number (the earlier epic having fourteen). Here, then, the vipulās (110 in number, slightly below the average) do not badly represent the period of the selection, which is a worked-over piece, intended to save the heroes from blame, and is often incongruous with the rest of the epic; as in the humbug of the war-car "not touching the ground hitherto." When Yudhiṣṭhira tells a lie his car drops to the earth for the first time! But "hitherto" there has been no mention of this conscientious chariot, which here is represented as having floated just above the earth.

In Karna we may compare the thousand verses of 18–29, where there is late battle-action (guṇa for jyā for example), with the five hundred fifty verses of old tales in 33–34. Each has seven fourth vipulās, though one is only half the length of the other. In Sabhaḥ the interest centres on the gambling-scene, certainly the kernel of the old tale. Here, ii, 50 ff., for a thousand verses, there is the greatest number of fourth vipulās (thirty-six, nine of which are in proper names) and the most irregular forms; three cases of a third vipulā after a spondee, one case of a prior pāda ending in iambus, two cases of the "fifth" vipulā, ṽṛ – ṽṛ, one case of first vipulā after a brevis, besides six cases of ordinary exceptions (second vipulā not after ṽṛ – ṽṛ), all of which remove the piece far from the almost classical norm found in some of the cases given above. It is in fact Puranic.¹ Of course the scene is intense and exciting; but I opine that no poet who had once learned to walk the straight and narrow way of the later stylists would ever get so excited as to use thirty-six fourth

xii, 349, 78; daça devāḥ, Ag. P. xvii, 6. The same cause induces the fourth vipulā in many cases of the Rāmāyana. For example, the only fourth vipulā in the first thousand verses of R. iii, vāikhānasāḥ vālakhilyāḥ, 6. 2.

¹ Compare for instance the 505 chōkas or 1010 verses in the first twenty chapters of the Agni Purāṇa, where the vipulās in their order are 41, 26, 50, 57, with six irregular second vipulās (not after iambus); five third vipulās not after iambus; and only nineteen of the fifty-seven fourth vipulās after iambus. The first vipulā in the gambling-scene is run up by the repetition of one phrase. They are in order, 60 (odd), 34, 51, 36.
vīpulaṃs in a thousand verses! Besides, there are other passages almost as dramatic. If we compare the Jaṭugrha and four hundred verses of the Hiḍimbā stories, which together make about a thousand verses, we find eleven fourth vīpulās, half of which are in proper names, only one case of a third vīpulā not after \( \overline{\overline{5}} \), and three ordinary exceptions in the case of the second vīpulā. The Kīcaka in Virāṭa is also a lively scene, which with a slight addition of circumjacent verses contains a thousand verses (325–825), and here the vīpulās are in order, 42, 24, 52, 6, with no unusual exceptions and only three ordinary exceptions in the second vīpulā;¹ while five of the six fourth vīpulās are in proper names and in the title rājaputri.

But since it may be objected that the subject matter is after all the essential factor, I will compare a philosophical section where the matter is that of the Bhagavad Gītā, for example Cānti, adhy. 311 and following for one thousand verses. Here the vīpulās in their order are:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gītā</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cānti</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare R. iii, 1-16, 60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that the extract from Cānti is almost on a metrical par with the ordinary narrative of the Rāmāyaṇa (1010 verses). But further, of the three cases of fourth vīpulā in Cānti, one is in a proper name and there are no anomalous forms of unusual character, and only two ordinary exceptions (second vīpulā), while the Gītā has a dozen irregularities of all kinds (including “fifth vīpulā”). I may add to these specimens the instructive opening of Udyoga, where for nearly two hundred ālokas there is epic narrative followed by the old tale of Nahuṣa and Indra. The vīpulās, for one thousand hemistichs, are here 55, 25, 46, 10, respectively, but nine of the ten are in the old tale, adhy. 9 ff., cl. 227, the other one being in a proper name. In the old-style didactic

¹ By ordinary exceptions I mean cases where the second vīpulā does not follow an iambus.
verses, v, 35, 60 ff., on the other hand, there are six fourth vipulās in only five člokas.

Whether we are entitled to draw from these data conclusions in regard to the time when the several selections were written may be doubted in all cases when the percentage of fourth vipulās is not sustained by other factors. But it seems to me, as I have said, that it is not unreasonable to assume a more modern authorship in the case of a sustained refinement of style. Even in cases where the data are not of an extreme character I think it is legitimate to question whether a comparative refinement is not of significance. Take for example the thousand verses of Udyoga, 119–133 (4,000–4,500). Here the subject-matter of the selection is the Bhagavadyāna. Nothing in the account seems antique; on the contrary, the whole story appears on the surface to be a late addition. Now, going beneath the surface, we find that the vipulās are in order 48, 23, 39, 13, but that eight of the last are in proper names. The collateral evidence agrees with the two factors here shown (preponderance of third vipulā over second, comparative scarcity of fourth vipulā); for of the forty-eight only twelve are after iambus; of the twenty-three, nineteen are after iambus; while of the four ordinary exceptions (after \(\ldots\ldots\)) two are in the same phrase, yathā Bhūṣmaḥ Čāntanaḥ; the third vipulā is perfectly regular or has at most one exception, mānena bhraṣṭaḥ svargas te (though, as a matter of fact, there cannot be much doubt that we have here the late light syllable before bhṛ); the five fourth vipulās not in proper names are all after iambus except one, contained in an hereditary phrase, eṣa dharmah kṣatriyaṃ. Here then, though there is not the striking classical smoothness found in parts of the pseudo-epic, the few fourth vipulās agree with the other data in marking the piece as rather refined, perhaps modern, when compared with the oldest epic style.

When, however, the data are contradictory, as often happens, we may imagine a rehandling, as in the suspected 1 Nārāyaṇa exploitation in Čānti, from the end of the prose in

1 Compare Bühler in Indian Studies, No. ii, p. 52.
343 to the end of 351, about a thousand verses, 13,224–13,740, where the scheme of vipulās is in order 80, 50, 32, 15; thirty-one of the eighty being after iambus; with five cases of irregular second vipulā and perfectly regular third vipulā (save for a slightly neglected causura, dharmapratīṣṭhāhetu ca). The fourth vipulā here owes its large number solely to names, numbers, and an old phrase. Thus we find, not after iambus, tasmin yājñē vartamāne (like the regular phrase tasmin yuddhe vartamāne); Vāsudevam (second foot); Sānikhyām Yogam Pañcarātram; Saikhyayogam (second foot); Pañcarātram (second foot); Vāikhānasāh phenapebhyaḥ; Sarvapkēchram (name of vrata); aṣṭadaṇṭrāu; leaving two cases, dūrvijñeyo dūskaraç ca and jāyamānam (as second foot) after स. with five more after iambus.

Rather a striking example of the mixture of styles is given by ix, 48, where Indra and the jujube-girl are concerned. This is plainly interpolated with a Čiva parody. Compare, for instance, prīto 'smi te āubhe bhaktyā tapasā niyamena ca, in the Indra dialogue, with cl. 45 (in the interpolation), prīto 'smi tava dharmajñē tapasā niyamena ca. Now the original Indra tale has fifteen vipulās in the first thirty odd verses; but the same number of ālokas in the following Čiva parody shows only five vipulās.

Again it must be remembered that some rather modern selections are interspersed with old material. In the six hundred odd verses of the Čakuntalā episode, for instance, the style is modern to a certain extent, the first vipulā being less common after iambus than after spondee, and only one ordinary exception occurring in the second vipulā, while there are no unusual anomalies. But the passage has thirteen fourth vipulās, which is not a refined ratio and may be explained only partly by the presence of Dharmacāstra material, hṛdi sthitāh karmasākṣi, bhāryām patiḥ sampravicya (Manu, ix, 8). In my opinion the episode is old, but, like many ancient tales in the epic, it has been rewritten and in its present shape is not so old as the vaṇça and Yayāti episodes following, where there are as many fourth vipulās and more
anomalies. This episode has recently been made the subject of an interesting study by Dr. Winternitz, who believes that it is of very doubtful antiquity, because it is lacking in the Southern manuscript examined by him and because the knot is untied by a "divine voice," instead of by a ring. One point not noticed by Dr. Winternitz must be remembered, however, namely that the Harivaṇça recognizes the episode and cites from it, apropos of the "divine voice," so that it existed in the present version, if not in its exact form, before the Harivaṇça was added to the poem; though I should not deny on that account that it was of doubtful antiquity.

I think I have now shown sufficiently that the different parts of the epic cannot revert to one period, still less to one poet, and will leave this minute analysis with a repetition of the statement that, whereas the parts already cited clearly reveal more styles than we may attribute to one age or man, occasional freedom of style in respect of vipulās does not in itself indicate antiquity; but when all the elements agree in refinement, this sustained refinement certainly points to a different environment and may imply that some parts of the epic are later than others. There is a refined style and there is a careless style, but the latter is late Puranic as well as antique, and mere carelessness proves nothing beyond the fact that the poet either did not know or did not regard classical rules. On the other hand, even the careless Puranic writers generally show a greater number of first vipulās after spondee than after iambus and more third than second vipulās. When, therefore, even these rules are not upheld and we find besides other irregularities, such as the three cases of the fifth vipulā in the Gītā, we may rest assured that the writer was rehandling material more antique than that of other passages. I say rehandling, because the Gītā has clearly been rewritten by a modernizing hand, as is shown not only by the circumstance already noticed that the heart of the poem differs in style from its beginning and ending, but also, for example, by the

1 Indian Antiquary, 1898, pp. 67 and 136 ff.
2 i, 74, 111 = H. i, 32, 12.
fact that in Gitā, 12, 15 we read yasmān no ’dvijate lokah, a metrically bettered form of yadā cā ’yāṁ na bibheti, a phrase found intact in other parts of the epic.1

The usual epic cloka, apart from occasional variations, differs, as I have said, from the classical model most conspicuously in vipulā licence; as will clearly be seen at a glance on comparing the normal epic forms with the classical in the following tables, where is given first the average epic usage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Foot</th>
<th>Second Foot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◼ ◼ ◼ ◼ ◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◼ ◼ ◼ ◼ ◼</td>
<td>passim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◼ ◼ ◼ ◼ ◼</td>
<td>passim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◼ ◼ ◼</td>
<td>passim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and then the forms permitted and almost never exceeded in Kālidāsa (“common” here means not unusual yet not passim):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Foot</th>
<th>Second Foot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◼ ◼ ◼ ◼ ◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◼ ◼ ◼ ◼ ◼</td>
<td>common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◼ ◼ ◼</td>
<td>passim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◼ ◼ ◼</td>
<td>passim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Per contra, in the Sanatsujāta Parvan, v, 46, 26, yatho ’dapāne mahati is a metrical improvement on Gitā, 2, 46, yāvān artha udapāne. Other later features in the Gitā are the long sentences already referred to; the sporadic intrusion of the Māyā doctrine (discussed above in Chapter Three), and perhaps also the recognition of the Vedānta Sūtra.
The usual Rāmāyaṇa cloka agrees with this later scheme, except in admitting sporadic cases of the fourth vipulā after an iambus.1

But, to get a comprehensive notion of the epic cloka, in its rarer forms as well as in its normal or average appearance, one must contrast these tables with the next, which gives, I believe, about all the Bhārata combinations for the prior pāda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Foot</th>
<th>Second Foot of Prior Pāda of Cloka in the Mahābhārata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pathyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>──────</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: p, passim; c, quite common; r, rare; s, very rare, sporadic. The interrogation marks indicate doubtful cases, for which the illustrations (as numbered in the table) must be consulted in Appendix B. For the corresponding table of tristubh forms, see below.

1 For the few exceptions to these much more restricted forms of the Rāmāyaṇa, see Jacobi’s Rāmāyaṇa. There is to this uniformity not a single exception, for example, in the two thousand hemistichs found in R. iii, 1-10; iv, 1-11. Final brevis is rare in the second, but not in the first, R. vipulā.
Midway between the classical and the normal Bhārata cloka stands that of the Rāmāyaṇa. The latter does not admit many forms found in the Mahābhārata. Some of these are older, some are later. But in its aberrations from the subsequent type of the classical writers the Mahābhārata is much freer than the Rāmāyaṇa; freer not only in admitting other types of cloka than those found in the Rāmāyaṇa, but also in the way of handling clokas common to both epics. The cloka of the Upanishads (Kaṭha, Kena, Iśā) admits as prior pādas,

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{∥∥∥∥} \\
\text{∥∥∥∥} \\
\text{∥∥∥∥} \\
\text{∥∥∥∥} \\
\text{∥∥∥∥} \\
\text{∥∥∥∥} \\
\text{∥∥∥∥} \\
\text{∥∥∥∥} \\
\end{array}
\]

Quite so free the Mahābhārata cloka is not, but it admits here and there as second foot ∥∥∥∥ and ∥∥∥∥, and as first foot, ∥∥∥∥, which is also found as first foot of the second pāda. So free as this the Rāmāyaṇa is not. From the occurrence of these freer forms we are entitled, however, to say only that the Mahābhārata is occasionally freer in its cloka-foot than is the Rāmāyaṇa. But it is generally freer, and much freer, in the non-observance of vipulā rules. This “characteristic stamp” of the Mahābhārata, as Professor Jacobi calls it,¹ in distinction from the Rāmāyaṇa, is one that it shares to a great degree, as I have said above, p. 79, with the early Buddhistic and Upanishad cloka, which is so wide a province that the explanation given by Professor Jacobi seems to me to be inadequate.

Yet if, as I think, the cloka of the Rāmāyaṇa shows that it is in its present form not only more refined (which is conceded) but also later than parts of the Mahābhārata, the latter no less is later than the Rāmāyaṇa in other parts. There are five sorts (perhaps stages) of cloka reflected in epic and pre-

¹ Gurupūjākāumudi, p. 53.
epic literature (besides its parent Vedic anuṣṭubh). The first is the free cloka of the Upanishads. The second is the less free, but still unrefined, cloka of certain parts of the Mahābhārata. The third is the current Bhārata cloka. The fourth is the cloka found in parts of the pseudo-epic, a cloka which stands on a par with the cloka of the Rāmāyana. The fifth is the continuous iambic cloka, which is found only in the Mahābhārata and is certainly later than other epic forms of cloka. Nearly forty stanzas of this type, consisting of iambics only (allowing final aneups), that is, over six hundred successive iambics — evidently a late tour de force — occur in xii, 322, 38–71, written by a poetaster who presents old ideas in a new style, as in this specimen:

purā vrkā bhayaṃkara manuṣyadehagocarāḥ
abhidravantī sarvato yataḥ ca punyaśīlane
purā hiraṃmayān nagān nirikṣase ārimūrdhāni
na mātrputrabāndhavā na saṁstutaḥ priyo janaḥ
anuvrajantī saṁkate vrajantam ekapātinām
yad eva karma kevalam purākṛtam śubhāśubham
tad eva putra sārthikam bhavaty amutra gacchataḥ
ihā 'gniṣṭuryavāyaḥvaharīram acordo trayaḥ
ta eva tasya sākṣino bhavanti dharmarūpamah

So far as I have observed, although the prior pada may end either in ॐ or in ॐ, the union of both in one cloka is unknown to the epic. This is a combination of one freedom with another. The forms, therefore, were felt as liberties and consequently were not multiplied in narrow compass. Such clokās, however, are found in the early style, and even the Mahābhāṣya gives us a sample, apparently from some defunct epic source, where one prior pada is aharahar nayamāno and the following is Vāivasvato na tryati. This

1 Found, for example, in the Vedāntasāra of Sadānanda: saṭattvato 'nyathāprathā viśāra ity udīritaḥ, 162, etc. For the single pada, diambic prior, see vii, 55, 49, cited below under Diambus. A single pada of this sort is both Vedic and Puranic.


may indicate that our epic has been metrically refined; otherwise we should perhaps find in it the same freedom. Noticeable also, I may say in view of the paragraph below on the posterior pāda, is the absence of any certain case of a hemistich ending like the prior pāda in \( \overline{\text{O}} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \). This Gāthā form is found in the examples from the Bhāsysa (compare, for instance, रात्रिम रात्रिम स्मारिषयतो रात्रिम रात्रिम अजानात्ति\(^1\)); but the utmost freedom of the epic is \( \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \) at the end of a hemistich, except in the semi-prose example given below (on the Diāmbus); a circumstance that makes it impossible to believe that the epic in its present form is older than the second century B.C.

**THE POSTERIOR PĀDA OF THE ČLOKA.**

Owing to the prevailing diiambic close of the hemistich there is little variety in the posterior pāda. The first foot may have (sporadically) any one of seven forms, that is, with the exception of the unique opening of the prior pāda in prose-clausal, the first foot of the posterior pāda may be identical with any of those of the prior pāda. The second foot is a diiambus, or sporadically \( \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \); and \( \overline{\text{O}} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \) (doubtful).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Foot</th>
<th>Second Foot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ( \overline{\text{O}} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
<td>regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ( \overline{\text{O}} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
<td>( \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} ) sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ( \overline{\text{O}} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
<td>( \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ( \overline{\text{O}} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
<td>( \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ( \overline{\text{O}} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
<td>( \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ( \overline{\text{O}} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
<td>( \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ( \overline{\text{O}} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
<td>( \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these forms, the first three and the fifth occur also as prior pādas (with diiambic close). The seventh form is avoided because it is the jagatī measure; but in general three final iambics are avoided. The first form is an oddity. Illustrations of all the forms of prior and posterior pādas will be found in Appendix B. The rules for this pāda are given below.

\(^1\) Weber, loc. cit., p. 485.
Of the forms of the first foot (third of the hemistich), all except Nos. 1 and 7 are found passim in both epics; of the forms of the second (fourth) foot, with rare exceptions only the diiambus is found. The commonest forms are Nos. 2 and 3 (ending in spondees). After the first vipulā both of these are equally common and each is about twice as frequent as No. 4, and from two to four times as common as No. 5 (final trochees). No. 6, ending in a pyrrhic, is sometimes surprisingly frequent after this vipulā; but at other times is lacking for whole test-sections of a thousand verses. After the second vipulā, which usually ends in an iambus, as after the first vipulā (also iambic), Nos. 2 and 3 are favorites; No. 3 being perhaps a little more frequent. Here Nos. 4, 5, 6, are much less common; No. 6, however, is rarest of all. After the third vipulā, No. 2 sometimes yields in frequency to No. 3; but in other sections this foot still holds its own, and as in the former examples is even twice as common as other combinations, though it practically repeats the vipulā, — — — —. Here Nos. 4 and 5 are about on a par, sometimes only a third as common as No. 2, sometimes more frequent, with No. 6 half as common as Nos. 4 and 5.¹ After the fourth vipulā, however, No. 6 is as common as any other, sometimes slightly in excess, with the others about on a par; No. 4 being perhaps the rarest.

Such varying ratios are not worth tabulating. They show that while the posterior pāda is not absolutely uninfluenced by the form of the prior, yet the determining factor is rather the inevitable presence of the former’s diiambus, since the only marked choice is for spondees before it, as in the first pāda before an iambus (pathyā). The other cases reveal merely a shifting predilection for one of several forms, all of which are used pretty freely, the strongest influence of the preceding vipulās being simply that the usual prefer-

¹ For example in one text case of a thousand verses, there were twelve cases of No. 2; four each of Nos. 4 and 5; and two of No. 6. In another, nine of No. 2; eleven each of Nos. 4 and 5; four of No. 6.
ence for a spondee before the final diiambus is changed into a natural aversion after a spondaic vipulā, \(-\quad -\quad -\quad -\) or \(-\quad -\quad -\quad -\quad -\) but this is what might have been predicated in advance. After pathyās one foot is as permissible as another. Occasional variations here are of even less significance than in the case of precedent vipulās.

As all the forms of the prior and posterior pādas may have syllaba anceps, both initial and final, each pāda may appear in four forms.\(^1\) Not to speak of the important modifications introduced by a varying cæsura, the syllabic combinations resulting from joining any one of the four kinds of each form of the posterior pāda with any one of the four kinds of each form of the prior pāda results in a large number of possible verse (hemistiχ) forms; while, since any form of the first hemistiχ may be united with any form of the second hemistiχ — to take only the commonest eighteen forms of prior pāda\(^2\) and the five current forms of posterior pāda — the resultant variations in the form of the verse (hemistiχ) are 1440; in the case of the whole stanza (c³loka), 2,073,600; so that one could write twenty Mahābhārataś in c³lokas (the present one in the Calcutta edition contains 95,739 c³lokas) and never repeat the same metrical stanza. Despite this latitude, however, the poets are not at all shy of repeating the same syllabic hemistiχ in juxtaposition, showing that they were indifferent to the vast possibilities before them and cared, for cæsura more than for syllables. Thus Nala v, 45 b–46 a:

\[
\text{Damayantyā saha Nalo vijahārā 'maropamaḥ}
\text{janayāmāsa ca Nalo Damayantyā mahāmānaḥ}
\]

\(^1\) In explanation of the number of examples in Appendix B, I would say that, for the sake of showing the truth of this anceps theory, I have given the four forms, syllaba anceps at both ends of the pāda.

\(^2\) That is, the first six pathyās, the first four forms of the first and second vipulās respectively, the first form of the third vipulā, and the first three forms of the fourth vipulā. These, by the way, are the forms "approved" by modern native scholars, according to Brown, Prosody, p. 6.
The Diambus

The rule of diambic cadence appears to be violated in the epic. Far from regarding this as an archaism on the part of epic poets, one should recognize in such cases only a Puranic licence or adaptation of the Gāthā freedom conspicuous in all popular and therefore loose composition. Not only is that rule for Sanskrit which allows a syllable to remain light before kr, pr, br, hr, valid for the later epic, but the extended Prākrit licence is also found, whereby almost any conjunct ¹ may be treated for metrical purposes like a single consonant. Examples are found both in the Mahābhārata and the later Rāmāyaṇa. For the latter epic, Jacobi, Das Rāmāyaṇa, p. 25 ff., should be consulted, where are given examples in br, pr, mr, ml, tr, hr, kl, and čr, e. g., kiṁ tu Rāmasya prītyartham, R. v, 58, 13; vināçayati trāilokyaṁ, ib. 1, 65, 13. From the Mahābhārata (in the appended illustrations of epic çloka forms) I have drawn several examples which are doubtful, because they may be regarded either as irregular (unusual) forms without this licence or regular forms with it. Such are daça pañca ca prāptāni (No. 25); hate Bhīṣme ca Droṇe ca (No. 22); sarvaçāuceṣu Brāhmaṇa (No. 23); abhijānāmi brāhmaṇaṁ (No. 41); mānena bhraṣṭaḥ svargas te (No. 22); Rudrasye ’va hi kruddhasya (No. 24). But further, in a few cases, čr also seem to leave the syllable light behind them, as in R.; e. g., adyaprabhrīti črivatsaḥ (Nos. 15, 26, 39). Nor are we aided as much as we should like to be, when, turning from these doubtful priors, we examine the posterior pādas. For though at first it seems decisive that such a pāda appears as putram īpsanti brāhmaṇaḥ, vii, 55, 21; toṣayiṣyāmi bhrūtaram, viii, 74, 30; yet it is not quite settled whether we have here a syllable to be read light because, as in Greek, mute and liquid really make insufficient position, or whether the syllable is heavy but is allowed to stand for a light. For there are other cases where mute and liquid are not the

 COMPONENTS OF THE CONJUNCT. First we have double semi-vowels, which ordinarily make position, but fail to do so, for example, in vii, 55, 50, abhi Čvāitye 'tī vyāharan, which appears after a cloka with a diāmbic prior pāda (sa cen mamāra Śrījaya). So the syllable remains light before cch and ks and dv, or the metrical rule is violated. In the Rāmāyāna and in the Mahābhārata, cases of liquid and ks are found more rarely in triśṭubhs, but often enough to show that they are occasionally allowed. Thus in R. iii, 68, 6 b, ०ेत्या klecaṁ (triśṭubh).\(^1\) In M.:

viii, 37, 24 d, tyaktvā prānān anuyāsyāmi Dronām
xii, 73, 7 a-b, yadā hi\(^2\) brahma praṇahātī kṣatram
kṣatraṁ yadā vā praṇahātī brahma
xii, 319, 89 b, sarve nityāṁ vyāharante cā brahma

In sum, the cases where this licence may be assumed for the later epic style\(^3\) are before dr, br, bhr, mr, kr, pr, kl, tr, cr, hr, ty, vy, cy, dv, cch, ks. For dv, compare striyaç ca kanyāç ca dvijāç ca suvratāḥ, iv, 37, 33; āvartanāni catvāri tathā padmānī dvādaça, xiii, 107, 26; for cch, yugeśv iṣśu chatreṣu, vii, 159, 36, where the texts avoid the third vipulā by writing ch for cch. But whenever a short syllable is needed before cch it is got by dropping c (sometimes in one text, sometimes in another). For ks, ca kṣyate, xii, 343, 87; raṇabhitāḥ cā kṣatriyāḥ, vii, 73, 39 (apparently an interpolated passage); exactly as we find the same licence in Vāyu Purāṇa, viii, 155, where the cloka ends ॐ sā kṣatriyān, or as ib. v, 28, we find the common licence before br, lokān sṛjati brahmātve. For cy, see below on the triśṭubh scolius; mr, ml, ty, tr, I have not found in the Mahābhārata. They seem to belong to the latest parts of the Rāmāyāna.

1 Jacobi, Rām. p. 27, gives cases from the later R. In G. v, 28, 5, na tyajet (B. correct v. 1.); G. ii, 27, 24, tvayā sāham (B. correct v. 1.).

2 This section is free; but in xii, 202, 22 b, there is an upajāti-group where we find tad evā pratyādaṁ svadeha (ॐ अ अ being demanded).

3 Examples of regular (heavy) position before mute and liquid are found everywhere, e. g., ix, 17, 41, 43, 44, 47, 51, 62; xii, 63, 8, 27; 64, 16, 18, etc. This is the rule; failure to make position or neglect of quantity is the exception and is characteristic rather of the later epic, as shown by the examples above.
We may, I think, assume that the liberty in respect of liquid and consonant was first introduced into epic Sanskrit, and that then in the later epic this was extended, with Gāthā freedom, to cases where the precedent syllable cannot be light, but is reckoned so. Therefore, while the early epic has only dīiambic close, the later epic (like the Purāṇas) admits _ _ ò _ as an equivalent; not of course generally, but sporadically, where the writer is late and careless, as is indicated by the character of the sections where such illegitimate freedom is found. So in the triṣṭubh scolius, there are a few cases of careless writing where a heavy syllable stands in the place of a light one. To say that this heavy syllable is light because it ought to be, is misleading. The weight may be ignored, as in Prākrit (though there mutilation explains much that appears of this nature), but it must exist. Even the Greek poets occasionally pretended that a heavy syllable was light. In fine, _ _ ò _ must be admitted as an occasional fourth foot of the hemistich, though it is avoided whenever possible.\(^1\) For the foot ò _ _ _ _ I have only the hemistich etac chrutvā tu Kāuravyah Čibim pradakṣiṇam kṛtvā, iii, 194, 7, but this is apparently an accidental verse in a prose narration.

Poetic Licence.

In general, however, while the epic poets are here and there rough and uncouth in their versification, the normal epic style sacrifices a good deal to what is regarded as good metrical form. Such a sacrifice, which culminates in the classical rule that one may use bën for bean (maṣa for māṣa) if one only follows the metrical norm, is found most clearly exemplified in this very case of the dīiambic close; a proof that the dīiambus was regarded in general as obligatory.\(^2\) But it is also to be noticed in the observance of preferred vipulā forms at the sac-

\(^1\) Its restitution in Praṇa ii, 6, ṛo yajũṣi sāmāni, yajũḥ kṣatram [ca] brahma ca, is at least probable.

\(^2\) Compare even in the Rig Veda the regular irregularity of yavīṣṭhiam, for yavīṣṭham, for the sake of the dīiambus; and see now an article by Professor Bloomfield on this very point, JAOS. xxi, p. 50 ff.
rifice of (Sanskrit) grammatical accuracy. There are, indeed, cases where word-structure appears to be needlessly sacrificed; but the vast majority of cases in which Sanskrit grammar is violated have to do with metrical necessity or predilection.

As already stated, the most frequent cause of such violation is the well-nigh obligatory diiambus at the close of a verse, as in phullaṁ Gomati-tīrājam, iv, 17, 12. The diiambic rule, as ordinarily stated, is included in this presentment of cloka restrictions: “The second, third, and fourth syllables of a posterior pāda should not form a tribach, anapaest, or amphimacer, and the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth syllables should make a diiambus or second pæon, while the tribach and anapaest rule apply also to the prior pāda.” Obviously, in the posterior pāda, the tribach rule, forbidding

\[ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \]

is to avoid a succession of four or five short syllables; while the anapaest and amphimacer rule, forbidding

\[ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \]

is to avoid the (jagatī) close of three final iambms. The rule then for the even pāda is simply: Posterior pādas must end with diiambes, but must not end with triiambes, and must not contain a proceleymaticus.

The following examples illustrate how secondary is Sanskrit grammar to this metrical rule: yaç ca cūṇyam upāsate (for upāste),¹ v, 33, 39; na sa ma paçyāma lāghavat, vii, 146, 5 (necessarily present); bhāryāyi gacchatī vanam, R. ii, 32, 8; setihāse cā chandasi, xiii, 111, 42; kathākhyāyikākārikāḥ, ii, 11, 36, and svadhā ca svadhābhōjinaṁ, R. vii, 23, 23; yathā hi kurute rājā praṇās tam anuvartate,² R. vii, 43, 19; madhūni dṛṇāmātrāṇi bāhubhiḥ parigṛhyate, R. v, 62, 9 (not in G.); apākrāmat, ix, 11, 62.

¹ So we find at the end of a triṣṭubh pāda, upāsate yah, iii, 5, 19b. Less common is the second person, mokṣadharmanam upāsate, xii, 315, 15.
² This is simply a case of sacrifice to metre by a pedant who imitates Manu viii, 175, where praṇās tam anuvartante is the close of a prior pāda. Another form of this proverb, by the way, is shown in R. ii, 109, 9: yadvṛttāḥ santi rājānas tadvṛttah santi hi praṇāḥ (Spr. 1,643, 1,652, 5,768).
These examples comprise different classes, where, metri causâ, are changed (a) the conjugation or mode; (b) the temporal termination; (c) the feminine participle; (d) the euphonic rule; (e) the gender; (f) the syntactical combination; (g) length of root-vowel and other sporadic cases.

Of these, by far the commonest are irregularities in the temporal termination, and in the ending of the feminine participle. Of these two, the usual changes are the substitution of preterite for present endings and ati for anti; less often, present for preterite and anti for ati. The participial change is the commonest of all, and what is most important is that scarcely any of the irregular participial stems are irregular from any other cause than that of metrical preference, and the greater number are fashioned simply to give diiambus at the end of the hemistich. I lay especial stress on this because in the lists of such changes occasionally published either no weight at all has been laid on the motive of the change, or the motive has been only incidentally acknowledged, or thirdly the lists have been made with reference to the class of the participle, as if the conjugation were especially important. The only thing of importance, however, is the metre. What has been lost sight of, or not seen, is that not only the obvious diiambic rule but also the vipulâ preferences come strongly in play, especially in the Râmâyâna. A few examples will illustrate this.

First for the diiambus: cā 'nyâîm gatîm apaçyatî, R. vi, 47, 10; kurarîm iva vaçatîm, Nala, 11, 20; so elsewhere in Mbh., abhilapsatî, cikîrșatî, nîdayatî, avekșatî, anvesatî; and in Râm., parigarjatî, yacatî, anudhâvatî, janayatî mama, etc. Likewise in the verbal ending: adho gacchâmâ medinîm, i, 13, 18; duhkham prâpsyâmâ dârunam, ix, 59, 30; yuddhe kim kurmâ te priyam, ix, 32, 62; kathâ drakṣyâmâ tâm purîm,

1 See below, on dialectic Sanskrit.
2 At the same time I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to the following lists as collections of material: For four books of the Râmâyâna, Bohltingk, Berichte d. philol. histor. Classe d. Konîgl. Sâchs. Gesell. d. Wiss. 1887, p. 213; Holtzmann, Grammatisches aus dem Mahâbhârata.
R. ii, 47, 11; na ca paçyāmā Maithilīm, R. iv, 50, 15; 56, 13. Compare also the striking example in R. ii, 91, 59: nāi 'vā 'yodhyām gamisyāmo na gamisyāmā Daṇḍakān. These ordinary irregularities might be exemplified with hundreds. 1 Other cases are less frequent; but to the same cause is due the close of hemistichs in tāv akurvātām, i, 176, 9; the frequent change of voice, as in svargam īhantī nityaçāh, vii, 71, 14; the change of vowel-length in upākrāmat, apākramat, parākramet, vii, 54, 58; ix, 11, 47; 11, 62; xii, 140, 25; so pi niskrāman, R. iv, 50, 9; Lakṣṇīvardhanah (passim) and the frequent loss of augment. 2 One of the most striking verbal changes is in na bibhyati for na bibheṭī in i, 75, 53; na bibhyase, R. iii, 46, 30.

The other half of the rule for the posterior pāda is kept by avoiding three iambs and a succession of four breves, with a sacrifice of the normal quantity, in prācetasa daça (so explained in PW. s. v.); sakhīgaṇāvṛtā, Nala, i, 24; na cīrī jahāti vīi tanuḥ, xi, 25, 5 (jahanti for jahati, below); upāsante mahāujasaḥ, R. vii, 37, 19 (upāsate in 20) and 21; āyatīhitam ucyaṭe, G. iii, 44, 11; and instead of adhārayam (mahāvratam), samadhbāram, R. vii, 13, 25. Compare also na svapāmi niçās tadā, Nala, 13, 61, patoiś for svapīmi; and the middle drakṣyase vigatajvaram, ib. 12, 93, with drakṣyasi in 92 and 95; drakṣyase surasattamam, v, 14, 5. 3

In the prior pāda, to avoid the anapæt the same form is used, drakṣyase devarājānam, v, 11, 24; the sandhi of eso hi

1 One of the commonest cases is the substitution of sma for smaḥ. This is found oftenest in the prior pāda but also in the posterior, e. g., R. iv, 65, 11, anuprāptāḥ sma sāmpratam.

2 Compare also the endings patuṣu, prakṛtijanaḥ, R. i, 37, 6; 42, 1; gṛhagṛdhunām, R. vi, 75, 14, manyūnām, ib. 15 (dīrghābhāva āraṇ̄a says the scholiast); kopenā 'bhiparivṛtāḥ, R. vii, 58, 22 (below); anūdaram, xiv, 40, 47.

3 Here too belongs the use of the future imperative in ix, 25, 44, drakṣyadhvaruḥ yadi jīvati, followed by yudhyadhvaruḥ sahitāḥ sarve. Bōttlingk, loc. cit., denies to the epic a future imperative. The case I have cited, however, is not in Holtzmann's list (loc. cit. § 983), on which B. draws for his material, and it seems to me conclusive in favor of such a form (and meaning). Were it not for the breves the poet would have used paçyata (not drakṣyatha), as is shown by yudhīathvam and the general situation.
pārṣato viraḥ, vii, 192, 13; the long vowels in Pūṣāṃnam abhyadravata, vii, 202, 59; črutāvatī nāma vibho, ix, 48, 2; and the change of conjugation in dadanti vasudhāṁ sphiṭāṁ, xiii, 62, 46. To avoid diāmbus at the close of the prior pāda we find, for the genitive, dadarṣa dvāirathāṁ tābhīyāṁ, vii, 98, 26; the participial exchange noted above, kusumāny apacivantī, R. iii, 42, 82; jānantī, R. ii, 10, 35 and Mbh. i, 78, 6; and various sporadic irregularities in the latter poem: pradakṣiṇam akurvanta, vii, 72, 12; puspaṁy āuṣadhayāḥ sarvāḥ, i, 78, 40; Duryodhanam upāsante, viii, 84, 12; čayānam samupāsanti, vii, 72, 40 (so G. vii, 41, 2); vālukām, pattībhiḥ, etc., R. iii, 73, 12; iv, 25, 23; ṣaktībhiḥ, R. vi, 71, 14. For a like reason, but to avoid a final minor Ionic, we find paṭyate rājā, R. vii, 32, 25; drakṣyase tatra, ib. 34, 10, etc.

Less generally have been recognized irregularities due to vipulās. But here too Sanskrit grammar yields to the decided tendency to have an iambus or diāmbus precede in three of the four forms and also to less marked tendencies. Even the pathyā shows similar cases, though in this foot more latitude is allowed. But there often is, for example, in the pathyā a decided preference for the opening अं.−.−. rather than अं.−.−, and in accordance with this we find arditāḥ sma bhṛṭāṁ Rāma, in R. iii, 10, 11, and āgatāḥ sma, ib. 15, 2; where sma must be for smaḥ (in some cases this is doubtful). Of the vipulās, the third is naturally chiefly affected. In the last passage, for example, cl. 19, we read iha vatsyāma Sāumitre, which is changed as certainly for metrical reasons as are the similar cases in the diāmbic ending. So in R. ii, 17, 10; 40, 22, etc. So, too, loss of augment in sa praviṣya ca paṭyad vāi; the participle in -ant, tathaḥ rudantāṁ Kausalyāṁ, R. ii, 40, 44; duḥkhāṁ asahatī devī, R. ii, 12, 89; kācic cintayati tatra, R. vii, 24, 11 (as opposed to sā cintayanti buddhyā 'tha, Nala, 5, 12); and shortening of a long vowel, sapatnīvṛddhāu yā me tvam, R. ii, 8, 26; pitur iṅguḍiṅpanāyā-

1 In upāsanta mahārājam, iv, 18, 16, the form is chosen not from any aversion to अं.−.−.−, but for variety, because this foot precedes in the same śloka. In R. i, 4, 4, agrhitām ("Vedic") is merely an error.
kam, R. ii, 104, 8; so 'marāvatīsañkācām, R. vii, 33, 4. The commonest form here is the sma just referred to: pitṛmatyāḥ sma bhadrāṃ te; kṛtāpyuṣyāḥ sma bhadrāṃ te, R. i, 33, 3; ii, 55, 12. So, adharmaṁ vidma Kākutṣtha asmin, R. vii, 63, 2. Offensive is the heavy third vipulā preceded by a succession of heavy syllables, and so we find: aho trpaṭāḥ sma bhadrāṃ te, R. i, 14, 17; nūnāṁ prāptaḥ sma sambhedam, R. ii, 54, 6; vyaktam prāptaḥ sma tuṁ ḍeṃ, ib. 98, 7.¹

The Mahābhārata is not so strict in its vipulā regulation, but even here we find the same condition of things, though in less careful observance. Thus, tvavy adhīnāḥ sma rājendra, v, 8, 22; tvadādīnāḥ sma rājendra, xv, 3, 54; upācikṣāma te vṛttam, xii, 16, 2;² ihāi 'va vasatī bhadre, Nala, 13, 66. Both texts, merely in accordance with the vipulā rule or predilection, have kim māṁ vilapatiṁ ekāṁ in Nala, 12, 55, and 91, which modern editors, sure of grammar but ignorant of metre, change to vilapantīm (compare R. iv, 20, 22, kim māṁ evam pralapatīm); evaṁ vilapatīṁ dīnāṁ, vii, 78, 36. Other examples are tato rudantīṁ tāṁ dṛṣṭvā, Nala, 16, 33 (as in R. vii, 80, 18, araṇā 'pi rudantī sā, to avoid the Ionic; but visamīnākalpāṁ rudatīm, vii, 78, 39, etc.); māṁ anusmatī cetē, viii, 44, 17; paitīm anveṣatīm ekāṁ, Nala, 12, 34. Most participial changes of this sort not due to the diiambus (avoided or sought) are due here as in the Rāmāyaṇa to the natural disinclination to heap up long syllables and the grad-

¹ About half the cases of sma for smaḥ are due to metre. This word before sonants on account of its monosyllable would lose its character, and for this reason most of the cases not due to metre are before sonants to avoid smo. Of all the cases in Bōhtlingk's list only two are before surds. At the pāda-end, where length is indifferent, sma stands only before sonants. With the exception of sma, in the first four books of the Rāmāyaṇa (according to Bōhtlingk's list) the only examples of ma for mah which appear to be independent of metre are vidma pūrvaṁ and praveṣyāma at the beginning of posterior pādas. The first is not in G.; the second appears in G. as vekṣyāmi. I may add of sma, as indicative of the pseudo-epic, that the thirteenth book has three forms of this word, smaḥ, sma (perhaps dialectic), and smahe. The last, a modern form, is found not only in xii, 1, 13, but in 63, 41, na smahe mandāvijānā na smahe mandabuddhayāḥ . . . pratibuddhā sma jāgṛma.

² Holtzmann, at § 548; but I should not entertain the notion that any of these forms (as here suggested) was other than indicative.
ual creation of the iambic rule for the third vipula.¹ The change to antī, illustrated by muṣṇantī and kurvantī in Nala, 5, 8, and 16, 11, respectively, and āyāntī, R. vii, 26, 47; 96, 11, etc., is in part explained by preferred combinations and in part by analogy, the great mass of verbs making the form antī. The best case of change for metre is furnished, however, by the triṣṭubh in ii, 67, 53 (ॐ ॐ ॐ begins a triṣṭubh only before ॐ ओ ॐ ):

tathā bruvantīṁ karuṇaṁ rudantīṁ

The first vipula is responsible for the form upāsanta in ix, 38, 53, tvām upāsanta varadām; the second, for aho mūḍhāḥ sma sucirām, xiii, 16, 27; the third, for vicarisyāma loke 'smin, viii, 33, 12. For the fourth I have no sure case.

In regard to the augment, it is omitted so freely that only in pronounced cases are we sure that it is dropped for metre, especially as the endings ta and tha are interchanged (as they are in the later Upanishads). Thus in R. iv, 53, 8 kiṁ na budhyata may be present, or, as the commentator says, stand for nābudhyata (dīambus); but again there appears to be no reason for samantāt paridhāvata in R. vii, 28, 17, for the augmented form would serve as well. But in this category, besides the influence of patois, we have a more than usual source of pseudo-archaisms. For in many other cases we can but assume that copyists have tampered with the text, correcting after their wont, sometimes for grammar and sometimes for metre, according to their individual taste; a process that explains in our printed texts the frequent divergences that depend on these points.² But with the augment it is especially easy to give an archaic effect, since, while Sanskrit

¹ In Holtzmann's list, for example, the only case of ati for antī that does not come under these rules is carati in Nala, 12, 10; which may be attracted by anveṣati in the same verse (the latter caused by the dīambic rule).
² Holtzmann registers rudantī for i, 6, 5, where B. has rudati; and for Nala, 17, 12, but B. has rudatyān.
³ For this reason I have elsewhere called them "unguarded texts," meaning of course that they were not protected, as were the poems of sacred character, by artificial methods of transmission.
kept the augment, most of the other forms dealt with are current side-forms as well as antique. So we find, for example, in R. vii, 28, 26, nānāvadyāni vādyanta, but in G. 36, 26, 3ny avādyanta, and here, as in parallel cases, it is quite impossible to say whether we have a grammatically emended text or a mere imitation of the antique on the part of a copyist.

Instances of alteration in triṣṭubh verse are of the same sort as those just mentioned and need not be specifically detailed. Here too we find the same imitation of the antique. One example will illustrate both cases. In xiii, 102, 55 a — b, occurs, budhyāmi tvām Vṛtrahaṇaṁ cātakratum, vyatikrā- mantam bhuvanāni viqvā.¹ Compare also na cā 'pi jānimā tave 'ha nātham, iii, 265, 4 d; nā 'bhūtikāleṣu phalaṁ dā- danti, xii, 25, 7 a; and the following examples:

na tāṁ vaded uṣatim pāpalokyām, xii, 300, 8 d
prayāma sarve caṇam bhavantam, i, 197, 4 d
Karṇam bhādevuḥ sahitaḥ prṣatkāḥ, viii, 82, 16 c
jahāra pāpas taruṇāṁ viceṣṭatīm, R. iii, 53, 26 c
apaçyati Rāghava-Lakṣmaṇāv ubhāu, R. iii, 52, 44 c
hatāḥ sma sarvāḥ saha mantribhiṣ ca, R. ii, 61, 26 b

Here, as will be seen from the structure of the triṣṭubh, the cases of grammatical irregularity are of the same type and character as those in śloka. The prevailing type, namely, is the patois substitution of ma for mas as verbal ending, and the alternate participial form. The change here also, as in śloka, induces a preferred or "regular" form against a more unusual, more disliked, or more irregular form. The last example above, for example, gives a cadence common to both epics; but to have smaḥ for sma would be a cadence of the Mahābhārata, not of the Rāmāyaṇa.

To sum up for the śloka: In the occasional modification of accepted Sanskrit forms purely for the sake of metre and in the lack of a thorough observance of metrical laws, which have

¹ This form occurs also in i, 3, 57 bhuvanāni viqvā; and vii, 201, 77, bhuvanāni 'ha viqvā, in the same formula. Generally sapta takes its place.
yet obviously affected certain parts of the epic, we can see the rules themselves in process of making. For the greater part of the Bhārata there is no fixed rule, but the foundation of the rule is there in popular liking and dislike. Thus cases do exist, and they are not infrequent, of से से before a second vipulā, but there is a decided tendency against such a combination, and as a result we find bhakṣayiṣyāva sahitāu, i, 152, 13; to explain which we need only say that the first vipulā favors, while the second does not favor, this precedent foot; just as ib. 154, 35, gī invaded gacchāma bhadrain te is merely a present indicative with a preterite (patois) ending, substituted because the Sanskrit ending would oppose a metrical combination to which there is a growing though not yet thoroughgoing aversion.

Finally, as already abundantly illustrated, the statement that “the laws of the cloka are the same in the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the classical poets”¹ is certainly much too strong. What is quite fixed in the last is not so rigid in the first, and is much looser in the Bhārata than in either of the other two.²

The Hypermetric Cloka.³

A ninth syllable is often attached to the octosyllabic prior cloka pāda, regularly prefixed, sporadically incorporated; the hypermetric syllable in the former case being, with the next also, a brevis, while the third is long before an iambus, the whole foot preceding a pathyā or any vipulā, thus: —

¹ Das Rāmāyaṇa, 1893, p. 24.
² It is indeed enough if the vipulā be preceded by a heavy syllable or long vowel, as has justly been remarked by Jacobi, in his article Ueber den Cloka im Mahābhārata, but this rule does not mark the distinction between precedent iambics and spondees. The rule is to have a precedent iamb, and a spondee is always exceptional; but in R. it is a very rare exception; in Mbh. a very common exception.
³ Analogous to the freedom in triṣṭubh we might expect to find also cases of catalectic, or more properly abridged, cloka-pādas, such as, e.g., puraṇ cakre dvipadah, BAU. ii, 5, 18 (cakara?); but I have not noticed any such epic pādas.
pathyā:
anubhūyatām ayaṁ vīrāḥ, Nala, 2, 9

first vipulā:
prakṛtir guṇān vikurate, xii, 314, 15

second vipulā:
katham Ārṣṭiśeṇo bhagavān, ix, 40, 1

third vipulā:
navañcataṁ kaśrodāḥ, xiii, 80, 6

fourth vipulā:
çarañcataṁ na tyajeyam, v, 12, 16

The regular hypermeter thus coincides in its opening with the irregular and unusual octosyllabic pāda, OOOOOOOO. For instance, akṛtvāraṇaḥ çubhāir vākyāḥ, v, 184, 14, is hypermetric, while apakārinam māṁ viddhi, xiii, 96, 7, is an acatalectic pāda; for which reason, probably, the latter is so rare.

Such hypermeters are not unusual in the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa, though more frequent in the former, not only on account of the mass, but in the same amount of matter. They seem to be at times rather affected by the later epic poets; perhaps to give an appearance of antiquity, whereby, as often, the effect is overdone. I know at least of no passage in either epic where, as in Harivaṁśa, 1, 3, 54, and 87, and 91, and 108, four hypermeters can be found in the space of fifty odd çlokas. They are common too in the Purāṇas.

Certain phrases are apt to appear in this form. The commonest is abhivādayanti or some similar derivative, which often introduces hypermeters in çlokas (as also in triṣṭubhs). Thus, for example:

abhivādayanti bhavatīṁ, v, 90, 98
abhivādayanti vṛddhāṇuc ca, v, 47, 16
abhivādaye tvāṁ rājendra, iii, 291, 37
abhivādaye tvām bhagavan, iii, 207, 13 and R. iii, 11, 72
abhivāditah kanṭyobhiṁ, iii, 257, 8
abhivādyas caî 'nam vidhivat, v, 179, 13
abhivādayitvā čirasā, v, 176, 28
abhivādayita vrddhāṇic ca, xiii, 104, 65
abhivādayisye hrṣṭe 'ti, xiv, 68, 19
abhivādayāmas tvāṁ sarvāḥ, R. vii, 49, 15

Although avamanyase māṁ nṛpate, v, 189, 22, might suggest the possibility of pronouncing omanyase, and abhivādentī in the examples above, yet this explanation is almost excluded by the fact that parallel examples, in overwhelming majority, admit of no such solution. Many of the cases have been collected by Gildermeister in his excellent article in the fifth volume of the Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, p. 269. It is easy to add many parallel examples. Thus abhiṣektukāmas tam rājā, G. ii, 74, 55, is a parallel to abhiṣektukāmaṁ nṛpatim, Mbh. i, 85, 19, and caraṇāgatam is an opening used repeatedly, e. g., v, 178, 9; viii, 90, 112; xiii, 32, 2 and 34 (but in 38b, caraṇāgatasakṣaṇam). Some difference of texts is to be noticed. Thus in xiii, 98, 119, caraṇāgataṁ hantu sa vāi, C. omits vāi, an impossible pāda. On the other hand, in xiii, 94, 27, anṛtāu vratī jaṭī cāi 'va, of C. 4,573 is converted into anṛtāu ca vratī cāi 'va. So in G. v, 63, 2, abhayaṁ dadāmi te vīra; but in B., abhayaṁ te pradāsyāmi. The commonest words thus employed, owing perhaps merely to opportunity, are abhivādayanti, or an equivalent, caraṇāgata, and Janamejaya. Those mentioned by Benfey, in the notes to his Chrestomathie, are chiefly of the same character, but he also adduces long initials, of which I shall speak presently. Although, as shown above, any form of vipulā or a pathyā may contain the hypermetric pāda, and the fourth vipulā is very common, yet the pathyā is the usual place for it, so that the last may be regarded as itself the pathyā or regular form of this irregularity.

Besides the cases noticed by others, to which references will be found loc. cit., Janamejaya, abhiṣaryamāṇam, aditir

1 Compare also Jacobi, Das Rāmāyaṇa, p. 24 and in the Gurupūjākāūnumūdī.
2 In v, 12, 16, and 16 (cited above), caraṇāgataṁ 'smi te brahman, and caraṇāgataṁ na tyajeyam, respectively. But in v, 16, 33, caraṇāṁ tvāṁ prapanno 'smi.
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ditih, balavat sapat-, upajivanan, vrsalipatih, purusam tv idanim, arunodaye, tam aham smayann iva rane (one of the repeated phrases, v, 179, 22, etc.), atithivrati (also repeated, iii, 260, 4, etc.), akrtavranaprabhrtaya (repeated opening, v, 180, 17, etc.),1 and a few more hitherto cited, I add with references:

aparajito jyotika ca, i, 35, 13; upaglyamanah nabhibhih, etc., ii, 58, 36 (iii, 158, 83; vii, 82, 28); kapilava tam, iii, 84, 31; (kapilasya goh, xii, 269, 5); bhagavan anekaah, iii, 99, 39; 188, 9; viyunajmi dehat, i, 142, 26; paricaranke, iii, 200, 9; amitaujase, v, 4, 12; Sumanomukho Dadhimukha, v, 103, 12 (in i, 35, 8, as Sumanakhyo Dadhimukha); krtakilbiha, v, 165, 22; purushah sanatanamayah, vi, 21, 14 = 773, v, 1.;2 madanugrahaya paramam, vi, 35, 1; avamanyamano yan yatih, vii, 73, 30; arunam Sarasvatim prpya, ix, 5, 51; Garudananaah kaakamukha, ix, 45, 83; madadhiitvatvat samare, ix, 62, 18; Cakune vayanma deva vai, iii, 300, 4; avyaktarup bhagavan catadha ca sahasradha, catadh sahasradhah ca 'va tatha catasahasradha, xii, 315, 2; tadanantaram ca Rudrasya, xii, 319, 62; aran mamanta brahmaarihi, xii, 325, 9; Ucanah Brhaspati caa 'va, xii, 336, 45; ayajad dhariin surapatim, xii, 338, 30; paramanubhattah bhtv tu, xii, 345, 15; sahasa jaghratur vedan, xii, 348, 29; tridaasaktrikaladhik karma, xiii, 17, 62; animantrito na gacheha, xiii, 104, 143; Viduraadayac ca, xv, 3, 76; atavibalam, xv, 7, 7; Upadanaativ sutambi lebhe, H, i, 32, 8; asatimi Vapustamam etam, H, 3, 5, 21; dhvajinah patakinac caa 'va, R, v, 4, 20; Amaravatin samasadya, R, vii, 5, 26; Yamalarjunau, R, vii, 6, 35; Krtavan Pracetasas putraha, R, vii, 111, 11.

It will be observed that Yamalarjunau and Amaravatim (these Ramaayana passages have already been cited by Jacobi) are exactly of the same type as are dhvajinah patakinah, abhivaday, and abhisektukama, though the first two occur together in a late addition to the epic and the other three examples are in the body of the work. As the type per se

1 These are complementary references.
2 Ends, yatah Kranas tato jaya, variant on the older phrase, just preceding, yato dharmas tato jaya.
is old (Upanishads),¹ the occurrence of hypermetres denotes rather lack of refinement than lack of antiquity, so that the phenomena as a class stand parallel to the care or carelessness in the making of vipulās.

When on two short syllables a third short follows, the phrase is rudely adapted to metrical needs. Hence aho manyata for ahar amanyata in R. iv, 35, 7.² Some exceptions occur to mar the uniformity of the phenomena, but for the most part they are in words or phrases which are forced upon the poets and which they have to handle as best they can. So we find a variant on the daça proverbs³ in the form daçaçrotiyasamo rājā ity evam Manur abravit, i, 41, 31, where there are two departures from the norm and the verse is a hypermetric form of the pathyā ṣ _ _ ṣ ṣ ṣ.⁴ A similar case occurs in R. iii, 35, 9, where we find daçaçrīvo viṅçatibhujah. Here I can scarcely agree with Professor Jacobi in regarding daça as monosyllabic (Rām., p. 24). So in the case of Daçakandhara-rājasunvoh, cited by the same author (in Gurupūj, p. 52) from iii, 290, 19, which is like pratibodhaviditam matam, simply hypermetric but answering to the type ṣ _ _ ṣ ṣ ṣ (not to be read as Daçakandharā, as Jacobi suggests). Either this or the explanation offered below of suppressed a seems to me most probable.

Hypermetres with long initial syllable are sometimes found. They are of two sorts and should be carefully distinguished. The first is where the pāda corresponds exactly to those just discussed save that a long syllable takes the place of the first brevis. So far as I know, this occurs only in the later epic portions (also Puranic). It is a clumsy or careless form which, induced generally by proper names, regards only the mechanically counted syllables and entirely disregards the

¹ For example, pratibodhaviditam matam, Kena, ii, 4; abhayāṁ titirṣatāṁ pāram Kaṭha, iii, 2. Gildemeister, loc. cit., p. 275.
² Compare Böhtlingk, loc. cit., p. 214 ad fin. So puno pi, Gāthā and Pāli.
³ Compare xii, 106, 16, daçāi 'va tu sadā 'cāryah çrotiyān atiricyate ; xiii, 106, 14, daçā 'cāryān upādhīyāḥ.
⁴ The partial parallel, uttarāyāṇam from Mana vi, 10, cited by Gildemeister, loc. cit., p. 272, is a later text for turāyāṇam (see Jolly's text).
essence of the hypermetric light dissyllable. This consists in
a mora measurement of two breves, or light syllables, as a
substitute for one long vowel or heavy syllable, which is im-
possible in pādas that have such initials as

Ekata-Dvita-Trītaṁ co ’cuḥ, xii, 337, 20
Āṇvamedhikāṁ samāsādyā, xviii, 278, corrected in
B. 6, 69 to āsāya.¹
Nāmiśāranyo kulaptiḥ, H. 1, 1, 4 (C. 11)
dakṣināyanaṁ smṛtā rātrih, H. 1, 8, 9 e²

Where a short vowel follows (as in other parallel cases
mentioned hereafter) it is practically suppressed. So asthīn
antarato dārūṇi, BAU. iii, 9, 28 (asthīn antar ’to)³ and in
the epic:

pākṣivānararutajñāīq ca, i, 70, 45 (vān ’ra),
or the two breves must be read as a mora-equivalent. It is a
mark of the popular style, as in Agni Purāṇa, iii, 11, bibhrata
kamanḍalam pūrṇam; ib. x, 28, brahmaṇā Daśarathea tvam.
Prefix ed extra metrum is āum in xii, 348, 38, āum, namas te
brahmahṛdaya, and elsewhere.

The cases of long initial cited from the older epic are of
quite different character from the form with initial long.
The supposed parallel from Manu vi, 10, adduced by Gilder-
meister, and cited above, being removed in the revised text,
there remain only a few pādas of entirely different formation.
Instead of having a long syllable prefixed they follow a dis-
tinct type of trisūbh. The pāda does not begin with a long
syllable and then continue with a short, but begins with two
long vowels or heavy syllables, or a short followed by a long:

(a) retodhāḥ putra unnayati, i, 74, 111; H. 1, 32, 12
(b) Bhīṣmo vasūnām anyatamah, v, 185, 18
(c) ṣrāddham pitṛbhya na dadāti, v, 33, 35

¹ Compare Amarāvatiṁ samāsādyā, v. 1. āsāya, R. vii, 5, 26.
² In Manu i, 67, rātrih syād dakṣināyanaṁ. Compare the similar “Pur-
anic” verse, dakṣiṇena ’ryamnah panthānam, cited above, p. 6, note 2.
³ Compare the subsequent pādas: retasa iti mā vocata: dhānāruha iva vāi
vrksah, though here we may read a(h) + i = e, as also occasionally in epic
verse.
One case (cited like these by Jacobi) is found in the later Rāmāyaṇa, vii, 21, 14,

saṁtāryamāṇān Vāitaranaṁ

with the first syllable short and second long, e. g., v, 43, 11,
(d) kathāṁ samṛddham asamṛddham

It will be noticed that the cesura is after the fifth syllable. The forms in the corresponding (a, b, c, d) triṣṭubh pādās, where the initial length is indifferent, may be illustrated by:

(a) na cena māṁ Jiṣṇur | āhvayītā sabhāyāṁ
(b) āmantraye tvām | brūhi jayaṁ rañe me
(c) yasyā 'vibhaktaṁ | vasu rājan sāhāyaṁ
(d) samānam mūrdhni | rathayānaṁ viyanti

Many cases of these forms will be shown in the next section on triṣṭubhs. The two formations are evidently identical; but what occurs passim in the triṣṭubh is sporadic in the člōka. The pāda in each case consists of a complex of two metrical groups, _ _ _ _ or _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .

An extra syllable in the posterior pāda is indicative merely of late carelessness under the power exerted by names and titles which are hard to coerce into normal metrical form; as in the spurious verse cited by Professor Jacobi from R. vi, 105, 10, Hīranyaretā divākaraḥ. Such cases as Pulastyovāca rājānam or Lakṣmaṇas tu tatovāca indicate not a precedent hypermeter but the looseness of epic sandhi. They are very common.

There is, however, a more regular interior hypermeter which is old. Thus in Kātha Upanishad, vi, 8 and vi, 11, respectively, we find

avyaktāt tu paraḥ puruṣaḥ
apramattas tadā bhavati

1 The references for the triṣṭubh pādās will be given below. The pāda cited from the Mahābhāṣya, 18. vol. xiii, p. 450, avidvānsaḥ pratyabhīvade is without parallel, I believe, in the epic. The same rule appears in Manu ii, 123 with abhīvāda, which may have stood here originally, unless abhi was monosyllabic.
It was suggested by Gildermeister, loc. cit. p. 274, that in such instances in the epic, bhavati might be read as two syllables, but he seems inclined to reject the notion. Professor Jacobi, on the other hand, favors this reading, and says of such cases, “All is in order if one pronounces bhavati as bhoti” (Gurupûjã, p. 52). But he is forced to add immediately, “It is more difficult to decide how one could have managed with kiûnsvit suptaâm na nimišati and kathã sam¬
řddham asamřddham.”

The explanation lies, I think, in the fact that mora-
measurement was at work in syllabic verse. This is very clear in triñtubh; in fact, it is the only possible explanation for a mass of forms which from a syllabic point of view are wildly irregular but with this admission of mora-measurement are easily understood. The çloka cases are generally found at the end of pãdas, where caesura aids the reading of two breves as equivalent to one long. In the case of bhavati itself and a few similar forms, where we know that bhoti or hoti is a dialectic equivalent, there is, to be sure, no great objection to reading bhavati as bhoti, but the general explanation of the phenomena as a class is not that ō ō is contracted, for some of the intervening consonants would make this impossible, but measured as the metrical equivalent of one long. In the examples above bhavati and puruṣâh and nimišati are thus parallel cases. In Kañtha iii, 5–6, both pãdas are hypermetric:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yas tv avijñānāvān bhavaty} \\
\text{ayuktena manasā sadā} \\
\text{yas tu viññānāvān bhavati} \\
\text{yuktena manasā saddā}
\end{align*}
\]

I see no reason to separate these cases from their epic ana-
logues.¹ Here we have the oft-cited examples of prior pãdas ending in -triyo bhavati, priyo bhavati, nivartayitum, unnayati, iii, 313, 45–48.² In the cases cited above from this passage,

¹ For more examples from the Upanishads, compare Gildermeister, loc. cit., p. 275, ff.

² The irregular use of swit in this passage probably explains the impossible pãda, kena [svit] dvitiyavān bhavati, ib. 47. In the following question, swit
313, 61, and from v, 43, 11, the same principle is extended, exactly as we shall see it in triṣṭubh verse, where the second foot after the first dipody, $\overline{\text{终究}}$, may be resolved from $\overline{\text{终究}}$ into $\overline{\text{终究}}$. So here, kiṁ svit suptama na nimiṣati may be on the triṣṭubh model, $\overline{\text{终究}} \overline{\text{终究}} \overline{\text{终究}}$, which passes into and appears as $\overline{\text{终究}} \overline{\text{终究}}$, $\overline{\text{终究}} \overline{\text{终究}}$, as in the triṣṭubh, v, 16, 5, prāpte kāle pacasi punah samiddhaḥ, tvam evā 'gne bhavasi punah pratiṣṭhā. So we shall find labhate in a triṣṭubh, where it must be equal to $\overline{\text{终究}}$, just as in the čloka of the Dhammapada, No. 131, we find pecca so na labhate sukham, where the two breves must be measured as one long (so the MSS., but changed in the new text), but is not contracted (compare in prior, prajāpatiḥ carasi garbhe, Praśna ii, 7; ṇāci ca prajñāṁ ca vidhehi nāṁ, ib. 13).

A very interesting phase of this question is the relation of the Sanskrit to the Pāli. We have a proverb in R. ii, 103, 30,

*yadannaḥ puruṣo bhavati tadannās tasya devatāḥ,*

which Professor Lanman at the Meeting of the Oriental Society in 1899 argued was from the Pāli form because there hoti actually occurs in the same proverb.¹ But against the certainty (though not the probability) of this conclusion stand the facts that the form of the verb is undetermined in Pāli and the hypermeter of this sort is just as common there as in Sanskrit. It is clear, for example, that in such verses as neta bhikkhuḥ hoti, Dhammapada 266, must be read (as the text now stands) bhavati (compare tārāyam ādi bhavati, sic, in 375, and in other verses of the same collection); while on the other hand, in 387, sannaddho khattiyu tapati (= tap’ti) stands parallel to similar uncontractile forms in Sanskrit čloka is omitted, as it should be here. The other cases are all parallel to kena svic chrotiyo bhavati, ārtena chrotiyo bhavati, 47–48.

¹ Since publishing an article on the Parallel Proverbs of the two epics in A. J. Phil., vol. xx, p. 22, ff., I have found a parallel to this yadannaḥ proverb in the Mahābhārata, viz. yadannaḥ hi nārā rājans tadannās tasya devatāḥ, where tasya is still preserved though the plural noun precedes! It is (of course) from the careless pseudo-epic, xiii, 60, 61.
EPIC VERSIFICATION.

and triṣṭubh forms. There is then no real necessity for changing the latter to khatyō (a possible form.)

Nevertheless, in the case of bhavati itself, which like bhos may have been current as bhoti in Sanskrit as well as in dialectic form, the latter may have been used, and a dual pronunciation may be accepted and given as a probable reason for its frequent recurrence in apparent hypermeters. In other words, pādas with this word may possibly not be true hypermeters, as must be other forms which are not thus contracted or contractile. That a hoti in Pāli may stand for an original bhavati, may be seen by comparing Dhammap. 260 with Mbh. iii, 183, 11:

na tena thero hoti [bhavati] yen’ assa phalitaṁ siro
na tena sthaviro bhavati yenā ’syā palitaṁ qiraḥ

Compare Manu ii, 156, na tena vṛddho bhavati (v. l. sthaviro in some of the commentators). Another of these numerous bhavati proverbs is found in Dhammap. 263, na monena munī hoti, Mbh. v, 48, 60, māunān na sa munir bhavati.2

Dialectic Sanskrit.

Accepting bhoti (= hoti) as a possible dialectic Sanskrit form, I have next to show that the maṣa for māṣa principle, as illustrated in the paragraph above, is subject to an important restriction. It would be quite wrong to suppose that the mass of grammatical irregularities are of a form entirely arbitrary, or that, in general, a grammatical modification that is found repeatedly in one category may be utilized for metrical purposes in any other of the same outer appearance. I say in general, because I admit that here and there in the epic occur grammatical monstrosities and forms not subject to metre, though irregular, but what is of moment is that most of the grammatical irregularities in the epic are merely dialectic

1 Thus xii, 233, 12, ṣarīraṁ ṣravaṇād bhavati, mūrtimat ṣoḍaṣṭātmakaṁ, and often.

2 On the variant to the yadannaḥ proverb contained in the words yaccittas tanmayo bhavati, see p. 42.


variations. For this reason in the paragraph above, headed Poetic Licence, I have been careful to state that the modifications were those of Sanskrit forms, not that they were absolute alterations of received forms, independent of any grammatical basis. I believe the latter cases to be excessively rare, while on the contrary there is some sort of grammatical authority for most of the changes so abundantly introduced. Metre surpasses Sanskrit grammar but not grammar altogether. What then? Where Sanskrit grammar fails, the poets had recourse to patois.¹

As I have already shown, a large majority of the cases under consideration are comprised under the head of feminine participles and first plurals of verbs, with a smaller number of various forms.²

Some of these, like brūmi, are at once dialectic and yet accepted as Sanskrit. There is no reason why we should not regard kurmi, Gāthā kurumi, in tathā kurmi and kim kurmi 'ti kṛtānjaliḥ, iii, 142, 44; H. 3, 14, 12, as on a par with brūmi. The latter occurs not only in R. vi, 9, 20 (where G. reads bravīmi, v, 80, 22), but also in R. ii, 19, 4; iii, 13, 17; iv, 7, 14. So R. ii, 12, 36, aṅjaliṁ kurmi; vii, 78, 20, āhāraṁ garhitāṁ kurmi. So too vedmi and dadmi, e. g., R. ii, 53, 21; vi, 124, 17, aham apy atra te dadmi, which in the later Bhārata is more and more frequent. Others appear to be gross violations of grammar, like ोऽnāti and vidūṣaḥ, nominative, as in parallel forms, tashthuṣam puruṣam, xii, 317, 17, etc.,³ but they may be not only Vedic but dialectic, as Pāli ोऽnī and vidū (= vidvān) may imply. Doubtless some are pure archaisms,

¹ So far as I know, this important subject has only been touched upon in a note by Kielhorn, JRAS., 1896, p. 18, who says: “In the so-called epic Sanskrit there are not a few forms and constructions which seem to me to be Pāli rather than Sanskrit.”

² Lengthening of a vowel metri gratiā is called āśam almost invariably by the commentators. Some of the cases are really archaic; others are clearly a sacrifice of form to metre, generally for the diiambus, as in R. v, 36, 21, sukhaṁ nām ucito nityam asukhaṁ añcitaṁ.

³ To Prof. Holtzmann’s list I add (the reduplicated forms, § 803) tashthuṣi, x, 8, 70, and nedaśām (apsarasām), ix, 57, 68.
as in vićvä, lack of augment, vā for iva, and varying final vowel length (athā parī, nā, etc.); but when we consider that the participle is indifferently bhavati and bhavanti, and that the first plural verb ends regularly in ma in all forms,¹ that, for instance, asma is regular, we shall hesitate to speak of any general grammar-sacrifice save that of Sanskrit. Thus krāmati (for krām) is Prākrit.² In the older epic, arbitrary changes were not introduced at will, but dialectic forms were borrowed. Even upāsante for upāsat (compare the older hiṃsate for hiṃste, R. iv, 53, 16) is merely a dialectic change of conjugation, just as is the case with the forms dadanti, jahanti (compare Dhammap., hiṃsati and dadanti, okam okain jahanti te, etc.). These forms, it is important to observe, cannot be explained on the assumption that epic Sanskrit precedes the differentiation of correct (Sanskrit) and vulgar (Prākrit) forms, because, were that the case, they would appear passim; whereas they appear usually, as in svapāmi for svapimi and grhya for grhītvā (cited above, pp. 205, 247), only when the metre requires them. Take, for instance, the clear case of patois, geha for grha. It occurs in iii, 69 (Nala 17), 15–16 to prevent a diiambus at the end of a prior pāda (though grha is used in the preceding verse); again at v, 36, 34, to prevent the minor Ionic; in ii, 68, 1, to prevent a third vipulā from following a brevis, bhavanti gehe bandhakyah; in iii, 303, 13, to prevent an anapest, mama gehe mayā cā 'sya (for the same reason in R. vii, 68, 20); in xii, 336, 25, to avoid triambus in an even pāda. Dialectic are further, in all probability, the exchange of weak and strong perfect forms

¹ The change is not really grammatical but phonetic, as Dr. Thorp has shown, since the preterite is not used for the present but the primary ending is reduced from mas to ma (and may be contracted, as in na jānīme 'ty athā 'bruvan, v, 120, 21).

² Pischel. Grammatik der Prākrit Sprachen, § 481. For svapāmi, compare ib., § 497; for asiṣā as na syāt, § 404; for neuter instead of masc., § 357. Professor Pischel’s mine of wealth came to hand only after this book had gone to press, or I could have given a more systematic as well as fuller treatment of a comparison based chiefly on Sanskrit and Fāli, and such few dialectic forms as chance furnished. But I think the more the epic is studied the more Prākrit will be found.
and perfects without reduplication, when needed for metre, ākārṣatuh, i, 153, 44; bibheduḥ, viii, 82, 16 (to avoid a brevis before a second vipulā); the exchange of nominative and accusative, auṣadhayaḥ (acc.),\(^1\) though this is also Vedic.

But the epic took long in making, and while the earlier poets drew on dialectic forms (thereby creating a sort of Gāthā dialect, though not so gross as the genuine article), the later poets did exactly what the later Greek hexameter poets did, viz., copied their predecessors instead of borrowing from the life. Consequently they made blunders. The early poets, for example, used, metri causā, optative for indicative, viii, 89, 22, and often (as in late Upanishads, e.g., Čvet. v, 5) a vulgar confusion; and ma for mas and dadanti for dadati; because they knew that these were spoken forms, if not the polite forms (which they used by preference when convenient); but the later poetaster knew only that the old epic poets had mixed up ma and mas and anti and ati, and so he used the un-Sanskrit forms not only more frequently but more incorrectly. Thus he said apacyāmas, ix, 1, 20, and did not hesitate to use bhavati for bhavanti, of course only in the later epic, as in iii, 211, 9 (a late chapter, above, p. 34), anyonyaṁ nā 'tivartante samyak ca bhavati, dvija. Compare the wisdom to be learned at Mithilā, in the preceding copy of Vālmiki's proverb, striyo hy avadhyāḥ sarvesān ye dharmam abhivindate, iii, 206, 46 (na hantavya striya iti, vii, 148, 67). So in xiii, 145, 20 (alpabuddhayaḥ), bubhūṣate (for diiambus); and, in the later Rāmāyaṇa, prajās tam anuvartate, R. vii, 43, 19 (v. 62, 9, interpolated? above, p. 245).

\(^1\) Both in Mhb., puṣṇāmy auṣadhayaḥ sarvāḥ, i, 78, 40; and R. drakṣayasy oṣadhayo diptāḥ, vi, 74, 32. Compare sarvāḥ prakṛtayaḥ canāḥ ... samjāhāra (Jaṭugṛha Parvan) and lb. 145, 4; with R. vi, 112, 19, sāntvayitvā prakṛtayaḥ. Carelessness in the length of vowels in declension is also a mark of patois (epic examples above). The Rāmāyaṇa has some genders which may be dialectic. They certainly are not Sanskrit: parikṣāh (?) pūrayantaḥ ca, R. vi, 42, 16; cikṣipūr vividhān āstraḥ (!), R. vi, 53, 20 (both lacking as such in p.w.), etc. As remarked above, some of this may be scribe's work. Thus yadā vedācṛutiṁ naṣṭāḥ, xii, 340, 105; vedācṛutiṁ yathā, G. iv, 5, 4; but in R. 6, 5, naṣṭāṁ devaṛcṛutim ("ārṣa") īva. But merely for metre is doṣam for doṣaḥ, R. v, 28, 5; G. vi, 33, 30.
In the careless writing of the pseudo-epic, Sanskrit grammar is flung to the winds. I do not mean that irregular forms are not found outside of it. Substitution of the a-conjugation is found in adadāt, iii, 178, 8; 275, 40; ix, 51, 10; though the last is an evident interpolation, and as the forms are not required metrically in the other cases it is still open to question whether they do not contain just such copy-slips as are found, e.g., in the Vāyu Purāṇa, where viii, 163 has vyadadhāt prabhuh, while 165 has adadat prabhuh. The cases in the older epic are, however, not frequent (in xi, 25, 5, jahūti is 3d sg.), but in the late epic they flourish like reeds (compare jahanti in i, 172, 8; dadanti in xii, 25, 7; 341, 16; xiii, 62, 46, etc.), and it is just here that new irregularities are found. Thus viqvedevān āpnoti, xii, 318, 5; viqvedevbhyaḥ, xiii, 97, 14. Even such a syntactical monstrosity as the Gāthāism iti vai menire vayam (with similar cases there) is not shunned, xii, 337, 38, to say nothing of the syntactical confusion in aṣṭibhyāḥ patayē cāṁ 'va marutām patayē tathā, xii, 341, 103. In the thirteenth book, besides kurvāṇas, xiii, 17, 131, we find smahe, xiii, 1, 13; 93, 41; stām for astām, ib. 98, 7; the first instance of a finite negative verb,1 another Gāthāism (compare ajānehi for mā janaya), afterwards somewhat affected: driyate 'driyate cā 'pi, xiii, 14, 160. Here also, another Gāthāism, the popularized change of the r-declension, apaharta and harta (together with Atharva, which, however, is in late Upānishads, Muṇḍ. i, 1, epic atharvāya namaḥ), sraṣṭārāya namaḥ, ib. 309–310 and 313–314. So etān for etāni, xiii, 62, 55. Such neologisms go far beyond the current interchange in upāsante and vilāsīnyāḥ (acc.),2 also found here, xiii, 104, 19;

1 With the infinitive, e.g., xv, 11, 16, nā 'dātum. The negative finite verb (given here in C, and required by the sense) is not recognized in the grammars as occurring before the classical period.

2 In Gītā 10, 16 and 19, ātmavibhūtayah may be nominative. The form as acc. can scarcely be a Vedic reversion. The Gītā still uses no = na u, and so in iii, 34, 11: but in xiii, 51, 10, yad etad api no mūlyam, no is simply late and careless for na. Editors or copyists have tried to change bhavati and acc., the text in C. xv, 375 (= 11, 21), but they cannot in xiii, 62, 30, and in bhūmir bhavati bhūmidam, it still governs the accusative.
107, 39, and bring us into the field of slovenly adaptation from any source, which characterizes the slipshod Sanskrit of later epic and Purâñas alike.

Prose-Poetry Tales.

In the *Verhandlungen der Philologenversammlung in Gera*, 1878, attention was called by Professor Windisch to a "pre-epic phase of poetry," consisting of prose narration interspersed with gāthās or verses of popular form which helped on the story. One epic tale, which has gone over into later verse-form, has been shown by Professor Oldenberg, in his article on the old-Indic Ākhyāna,¹ to exist in a prototype of this kind. Such mingling of prose and verse, as remarked by the latter writer, is found in the epic itself, in i, 3. There is also, though not of epic content, a kind of rhythmic prose which is half metrical, as in xii, 190, 5 ff.: tatra yat satyaṁ sa dharmo, yo dharmah sa prakāço, yah prakāṣas tat sukham iti . . . yat tamas tad duḥkham iti, atro 'cyate (three clokas); tat khalu dvividhāṁ sukham ucyate ( . . . to 13): susukhāḥ pavanāḥ svarge, gandhaç ca surabhiṣ tathā, etc. Here the epic Upanishad glides in and out of metre, the last verse before the resumption of cloka being again metrical, in a form of triṣṭubh found elsewhere in the epic: na cāi 'te dośāḥ svarge prādur bhavanti.

The next chapters to this have alternate prose and clokas, the latter appearing either, as at the end of 191, without warning, or introduced with the words "there 's a stanza about that," bhavati cā 'tra clokaḥ. In 192, one unannounced cloka follows the introductory prose, then more prose, and with the words bhavanti cā 'tra clokaḥ follow one cloka and two triṣṭubhs.² after which clokas are again resumed.

It happens that a late poet runs on in triṣṭubhs till he

¹ ZDMG., vol. xxxvii, p. 54 ff.
² The cloka here, xii, 7006, is another form of a proverb given elsewhere in the epic, abhayair sarvabhūtebhyo dattvā, and may be added to Sprüche, 485, 486. Člokāḥ here scarcely connotes triṣṭubhs (as in the Bṛāhmaṇa), but includes them with the cloka.
stumbles and ends in prose, xii, 336, 10, after several triśṭubhs: 

\[ \text{cēvētāḥ pumāṁso gatasarvāpāpi cāksurmuṣalḥ pāpakṛtāṁ naṛ-} \\
\text{nāṁ, vajraśthikāyāḥ samamānonmāṇā divyā(ṃ) -vaya(va)rū-} \\
\text{pāḥ cēbhasāropetāḥ, etc., in pure prose. There is, further, a} \\
\text{good deal of plain prose narration in the first, third, and} \\
\text{twelfth books and in a hymn in H. 3, 68 (praise by titles).} \\

But a tale of the prose-verse variety exists complete in the 
story of the Frog-girl, iii, 192. In this apparent prose there 
are not only metrical and half-metrical pādas and hemistichs, 
such as ramaṇīyāṁ sarō drśtvā, but even regular epic pādas, 
such as mudā paramayā yutaḥ, the latter being indeed a stereo-
typed epic phrase, as in iii, 256, 20; 295, 16. The verses here, 
as was to be expected, are freer than in the regular epic style.¹ 

The tale begins:

2. athā 'caṣṭa Mārkandaṇḍeyāḥ (apūrvam idaṁ śuṣṭatām)

The opening line of C., 13,148, is not in B. From the 
openings in the following tales, parv. 196 and 198, the phrase 
athā 'caṣṭa Mārkandaṇḍeyāḥ was stereotyped and united with the 
preceding, thus:

bhūya eva mahābhāgyaṁ kathyatāṁ iti abravīt 
 athā 'caṣṭa Mārkandaṇḍeyāḥ 

In the present tale the former appears as: bhūya eva brāh-
manaḥmahābhāgyaṁ vaktum arhasi 'ti abravīt.

In the following mixture of prose and metre it is sometimes 
difficult to say whether the rougher metrical parts ought to be 
touched. For instance, at the beginning, Ikṣvāku-kulodvahāḥ 
parthivaḥ Parīksīṁ nāma mrγayāṁ agamati may have been 
prosed out of Ikṣvāku-kulavardhahā Parīksīṁ nāma pārthivaḥ 
mṛγayāṁ gatavāṁ nṛpaḥ, or some such turn. So in the next 
sentence, tam ekāśvena mṛgam anusarantam, from tam acśvena 
'atusarantam; while for the ninth stanza or paragraph it would 
be a sin of omission not to note how easy it is to read: atha

¹ In another case, iii, 194, the section begins and ends in prose, but has 
člokas between, the last hemistich of which, before the narration closes in 
prose, has the free measure cited above, p. 244, _ _ _ _ , ī _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , 
_ _ _ _ , etac chrutvā tu Kāruvayāḥ Čibim pradakṣiṇāṁ kṛtvā.
kanyāṁ āyantīṁ ca puṣpāṇi ca 'vacinvatīṁ; āpaṭyad, atha sa rājñāḥ samipataḥ paryakramat; all with freedom not unknown to the epic cloka. But any change would in the first place be pure guesswork, and besides why should clokas have become prose? Again, these tales are built with prose bricks and metrical mortar and it is not strange that the mortar occasionally runs over the brick. I therefore abstain except in two or three cases (in some, as will be seen, where the length of prose invites verse) from the temptation to make cloka pādas out of clauses more or less metrical, and write the story as it stands (with prose omissions as indicated below):

1–4, Ayodhyāyām Ikṣvākukulodvahāḥ pārthivah Parīśim nāma mṛgayām agamat, tam ekaçvena mṛgam anusarantam mṛgo dūram apāharat (5, prose)

6, ramaṇīyaṁ saro dṛṣṭvā
sāqva eva vyagāhata

7, madhurāṁ gītam aṃṇot

8, sa ṣrutvā 'cintayan ne 'ha
amusyagatim paçyāmi

kasya khalv ayaṁ gītaçabda iti. 9, athā 'paçyat kanyām para-
marūpadarçanīyām puṣpāṇy avacinvatīṁ āyantīṁ ca, atha sa rājñāḥ samipe paryakramat. 10, tāṁ abravid rājā

kasyā 'si bhadre kā vā tvam (iti) a
sā pratyuvāca kanyā 'smi (iti)

1 That is to say, as in the case given in the last note, a more or less regular verse may incidentally and accidentally be shaped in prose narration without its being intended as regular verse, though the poetic style of the environment may have induced such prose-poetry subconsciously. As for the metaphor above, except as illustrating my meaning very roughly, I cannot defend it. On the contrary, as the verse-element in tales was fixed and used in many buildings, while the prose was crumbled up and renewed in each new edifice built of the same brick, it would not be quite unhistorical to invert it and speak of poetic bricks and prose mortar.

2 Was this: kasya khalu ayaṁ çabdaḥ?

a This or kā 'si kasya kutaç ca tvam is an ordinary epic (verse) formula. With the preceding, compare (Śītā) kusumāṇy apacinvanti (prior pāda), and kusumāṇi vicinvati, R. iii, 42, 32; 43, 1.
tām rājō 'vāca arthā tvayā 'ham iti. 11, atho 'vāca kanyā
samayena aham ċakya
tvayā labdhum na anyathā

iti, rājā tām samayam aprccchat, kanyo 'vāca
no 'dakam me darçayitavyam (darçetavyam ?)

iti, 12, sa rājā tām bādhham ity uktvā tām upayeme, 2 kṛtoddvāhaq
ca rājā Parikṣit kriḍamano

mudā paramayā yutah 3
tuṣqīṃ saṅgamya tayā sāhā 'ste. 13, tatas tatrāi 'vā 'sine
rājani sena 'nvagacchat(a). 14, sā seno 'paviśṭaṃ rājanaṃ pari-
vārya 'tisṭhat, paryāvastaq ca rājā tayā 'va sāha cibikaya prāyād
avaghoṭitataya sva(m) nagaram anuprapya rahasi tayā sāhā 'ste. 4

15, tatra 'bhyācatho 'pi kačcin nā 'paçyad atha pradhānāṁaṭyo
'bhyācaraśa tasya striyo 'prčchat. 5

16, kim atra prayojanaṁ
vartate (vartata) ity, athā 'bruvāsī tāh striyah. 6

17, apūrvam idam paçyāma
udakaṃ nā 'tra niyata(e)

ity, athā 'mātyo 'nudakam vanam kārayito 'dāravṛkṣam, etc.

18, vanam idam udārakam 7
sādhv atra ramanatām iti

1 Perhaps samarthi tvayā bhadre 'ham (compare 33).
2 More natural would be: sa rājā bādhham ity uktvā tām kanyāṃ upayeme
ha.
3 A regular epic phrase in various forms, mudā, cṛiyā, prityā, etc., with
yutah or yuktaḥ, according to the pāḍa. Compare the references above and
ii, 53, 23; Nala, 20, 40; ix, 27, 6; 36, 42; prityā paramayā yuktaḥ, ix, 55, 4; R.
i, 52, 11, etc.
4 The texts give 'nvagacchat and 'nvagacchata, svanagaram and svam
nagaram. This may point to a corruption. Leaving out the fine palanquin:
tatas tatrāi 'vā 'sine (tu?) rājī sena 'nvagacchata sā (tu) seno 'paviśṭaṃ (ha)
parivārya atiṣṭhata, paryāvastaq ca (sa) rājā anuprapya svanagaram rahasy
āste tayā sāha. The long stretch of prose favors this. Compare uvāca ca
tayā sāha, an epic phrase, e. g., i, 73, 20.
5 There is no object to the first verb. Was it not: tatrā 'bhyācatho 'pi
kačcin rājanaṁ na apacyata, atha pradhānāṁaṭyas tu tasya striyaḥ aprccchata?  
6 The more probable form is vartate kim prayojananam; kim prayojananam is
a regular epic close of a hemistich. Compare for example, xiii, 93, 81, kasyā
'rthe, kim prayojananam.
7 Sic, B.; C., udāram anudakam.
After this, prose to 23-25,

kruddho ajñāpayāmasya (sa rājā)...
yathā vṛttam nyavedayan

... 27, iti, člokāu cā 'tra bhavataḥ (28-29). Compare v, 64, 5, where, although the whole text is in člokas, one stanza is especially mentioned, člokenā 'nena, Kāuravya, papraccha sa munis tadā.

30, tam evam vādinam iṣṭajanaçokaparitātmā rājā 'tho 'vāca

31, na hi kṣamyate tan mayā
hanisyāmy etān etāir durātmabhīḥ, etc.; prose to

32, sa tad vākyam upalabhya
etc., prose to 33.

In the following I omit references to the intervening prose and give the metrical pādas in their order:

33, tam abravid rājā tayā
samarthī,1 sā me diyatām

34, athāi 'nām rājñē pitā 'dād ²
abravid ca enām enām
rājānaṁ çucrūsasve 'ti ²

35, evam uktā duhitaram

36, harṣeṇa bāspakalayā
vācā ⁴ prapatyā 'bhīpūjya
māṇḍukarājam abravid
anugṛhito 'smi iti (sc. te, omit iti)

37, yathāgatam agacchat(a)

¹ In C., asmy aham arthi.
² In C., dadāu. Perhaps sa dadāu.
³ Perhaps: abravid ca duhitaram enāṁ rājānaṁ çucrūṣa, iti.
⁴ A stereotyped phrase, either straddling the pādas of a verse, Nala, 0, 25; or in a pāda (after one syllable), as in sā, iv, 20, 28; R. ii, 82, 10. Perhaps here: sa bāspakalayā vācā prapityā 'bhīpūjya ca.
38, atha kasyacit kālasya

tasyāṁ kumārās (te) trayas
tasya rājñāḥ sambabhūvuh

dalo dalo balaq ce 'ti

tatas teśāṁ jyeṣṭhaṁ ṣalaṁ

samaye pitā rājye 'bhisiṣcyā tapasi dhṛtātmā vanāṁ jagāma,

prose through 39. In the following Tale of Ḍala:

40, sūtaṁ co 'vāca, cīghram māṁ

vahasva [iti], sa tathā uktaḥ

sūto rājānam abravit

41, na kriyatāṁ anubandho

nāi 'sa çakyas tvayā mṛgo

'yāṁ grahitum, yady api te

rathe yuktāu vāmyāu syātām (iti)

tato 'bravid rājā sūtām

42, athāi 'nam evam bruvāṇam

[abravid rājā]

vāmadevāqramaṁ yāhi (iti)

43, bhagavan, mṛgo [me viddhah] palayate

sāṃbhāvayitum arhasi

[vāmyāu dātum, iti, tam abravid ṣir
dadāni te vāmyāu]

kṛtakāryena bhavatā

mamāi 'va vāmyāu niryātyāu

[kṣipram iti]

... antahpure asthāpayat

44, atha 'ṛṣīq cintayāmāsa

taruṇo rājaputro ('sti)

calyāṇam pattram āsādyā

1 An epic phrase with variations, kasyacit tv atha kālasya, H. 3, 5, 11, etc.

2 Possibly: pitā rājye 'bhyaśecayat tataḥ tapasi dhṛtātmā vanāṁ jagāma

(sa rājā); or: pitā rājye 'bhisiṣcyā ca. Both are formulas, as in i, 74, 120 and

75, 55.

3 The text has: vahasveti sa tatho 'ktah, perhaps as much of a verse as is

the form above. As in 36, the iti pādas are, I admit, particularly bad.

4 B. prayāhi.

5 So B.
ramate na (me) pratiniryātayaty, aho kaśtam iti (prose to 48, ff. triṣṭubhās).

Though far from epic verse, this is not exactly prose,¹ which, though often rhythmical, is not metrical to such an extent as this. Further, the actual presence of epic pādas in the narrative shows beyond question that it is meant to be couched more or less in metrical form. Of what sort then is this metrical prose? It is, I think, an early form of popular verse, older than the present epic ċloka, which, as I have remarked above, is probably more refined than it was when first written and is less free even than the Mahābhāṣya epic ċloka. It is not, however, necessarily antique, nor necessarily modern. It is, in short, the instrument of the perpetual story-teller, a naïve form, running in and out of prose like rhymes in fairy tales.²

¹ Benfey, Panchatantra (translation), vol. i, p. 259, says that with the exception of the two ċlokas (28–29), “the rest of the narrative is in prose.”

² The same tendency to the creation of pāda verse (not arranged in ċloka form) may be seen in the prose tale of i, 3, where, besides the regular verses in the prose narration, are found such metrical combinations as:

Janamejaya evam ukto
devaṣunyā Saramayā . . .
etasminn antare kaṣcid
paśir Dhāumyō nāmā ‘podas . . .
sa ekaṁ śiśyam Ārūṇim
Pāṇcāłyam prāṣayāmāsā . . .
sa upadhyāyena saṁdiśṭa Ārūṇih,

the last being a respectable triṣṭubh pāda. If, however, this and the tale of Suṣobhanā be regarded (as Benfey says) as pure prose, what difference is there between the other parts which will not give any rhythmical cadence and such a rhythmical complex as, e.g., ramaṇīyaṁ saro dṛṣṭvā, sāgva eva vyagāhata, krudho ājñāpayāṁ āsa, and yathā vṛttam nyavedayan! And how does it happen that kasyā ‘si ‘bhadrā kā vā tvam, and madā paramāyā yutaḥ and . . . bāṣpakalyāṁ vācā are actual verses found in the epic? There is a literary product which is neither prose nor poetry, but a middle genre, a sort of dog-trot between walking and running, into which a narrator may drop without the conscious campū alternation of padya and gadya (poetry and prose) found in more precise literature. It is perhaps not extravagant to say that beneath the cultured verse of the literati this kind of style may have existed for centuries and even have been the foundation of the earliest literary
The Epic Triṣṭubh

i. The Regular Triṣṭubh in the Mahābhārata

The rarest forms of the epic triṣṭubhs are those that in the corresponding syllables answer to the commonest forms of the cloka, namely the pathyā and first and third vipulās. The commonest forms of triṣṭubh are those that answer to the second and fourth vipulās (decadent in the more refined cloka) and to the minor Ionic, a form of cloka almost extinct in the later epic style. Both metres have besides the diiambic and major Ionic forms, but in both they are exceptional.

Measured by their precedent combinations, the triṣṭubh forms thus corresponding to the clokas in second and fourth vipulās and minor Ionic, outclass the others as decidedly as they do in the number of their occurrences; for whereas before the triṣṭubh feet corresponding to the pathyā and first vipulā forms stand only \( < > < > \) and \( < > < > < > \), before the second and fourth vipulā forms stand five, and before the minor Ionic form stand seven combinations, respectively.

In thus grouping the triṣṭubh cloka-wise I have wished merely to contrast the general structure of this metre with that of the cloka,\(^1\) and have included only the hendekasyllabic triṣṭubh. For the sake of convenience, I shall call regular all forms of the eleven-syllable triṣṭubh (pāda), however unusual, in distinction from other forms, and will now give a scheme of these regular triṣṭubh forms (omitting the scolius or terminal amphibrach).\(^2\)

\(^1\) Of course, as previously explained, the syllaba anceps of the eighth syllable must be given up; but the initial syllable is anceps, as it is in the cloka, in the usual forms.

\(^2\) The jagatī occurs in the same forms as the triṣṭubh and needs no special table (though separately discussed below). Mechanically, it is merely a triṣṭubh with an extra syllable added, making the close with diiambus instead of amphibrach.
### Combinations of the Regular Epic Triśṭubh in the Mahābhārata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Foot</th>
<th>Second Foot of Triśṭubh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p 1</td>
<td>p 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p 12</td>
<td>c 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 21</td>
<td>s 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 24</td>
<td>s 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p 2</td>
<td>p 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p 13</td>
<td>r 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 22</td>
<td>r 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 7</td>
<td>c 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 4</td>
<td>c 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 10</td>
<td>s 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the abbreviations, compare the table above, p. 236. For — व — as a second foot in a hypermetric pāda, see the paragraph in the list of illustrations in Appendix C, under No. 11. For व — व as second foot, see under No. 15. The hypermetric forms indicated in Appendix C, when references are not given, will be found illustrated in the following paragraphs. Triśṭubhs of catalectic and hypermetric form are not included in this table.

The Illustrations in Appendix C give a full discussion of the occurrences of these forms as they appear in combination with the cæsura, now after the fourth now after the fifth syllable. Here I will point out that, as is shown by the table, all cases of pyrrhic and most cases of trochee in the syllables immediately preceding the fourth syllable are merely sporadic, whatever be the cæsura; but that the trochee before the vātomic middle, व — व, is not uncommon; and add that the cæsura is here after the fourth syllable (No. 15). The prevailing types of the great epic are (as is also shown by the table) an iambic or spondaic opening, व — व, followed by
_○○_ , _ ○ _ , ○○ , all three of which are found in the same stanzas. They are always commingled in the older parts of the epic and even in later parts, but, on the other hand, the first, or choriambic middle, is the stanza-form often exclusively employed in late sections, as is shown below in the paragraphs on the Stanza.

**Bird’s-eye View of Triśṭubh Pādas.**

The regular Mahābhārata triśṭubh, which is of the hendeka variety (i), appears then in three (four) principal phases (all others being rare or sporadic), thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & (a) \underset{\text{○}}{\underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} , \text{passim, but restricted as in (b).} \\
\{ & (b) \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) common} \\
\{ & (c) \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) common} \\
\{ & (d) \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) common}
\end{align*}
\]

Besides these, as will be shown below, there are other Bhārata types, thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ii} & \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) catalectic, dekasyllabic.} \\
\text{iii} & \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) catalectic, dekasyllabic.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iv} & \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) hypermetres, dodekas (with still other sporadic ar}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{v} & \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) hypermetres, dodekas (with still other sporadic ar}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vi} & \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) hypermetres, dodekas (with still other sporadic ar}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vii} & \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) Double hypermetres, thirteen syllables.} \\
\text{viii} & \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) Double hypermetres, thirteen syllables.} \\
\text{ix} & \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \underset{\text{○}}{\text{○}} \text{) Double hypermetres, thirteen syllables.}
\end{align*}
\]

Jagatī forms of these pādas will be discussed below.

The epic triśṭubh, then, is not (as has been affirmed by a distinguished scholar) of one uniform type. On an average, about one-fifth of the Bhārata triśṭubhs of the regular mixed type have twelve-syllable pādas, which, however, are not jagatīs, since they have the triśṭubh finale. A noticeable point is the common (not passim) occurrence of the trochaic opening, _○○_ , in some sections of triśṭubhs, and also in such sections the comparative rarity of the choriambic triśṭubh as compared with the triśṭubhs which have forms of ṭālinī, _○○_ , or vātormī, _○○_ , character (though not strictly ṭālinī or vātormī pādas). Thus in the hundred odd pādas
that complete in triṣṭubh form the story of the Frog-girl given above, there are only a dozen of choriambic form; while only one stanza out of the twenty-five is of upajāti (อาศูส) form throughout, though two others have two consecutive choriambic pādas.

The Rāmāyaṇa Triṣṭubh.

Very different is the scheme presented by the Rāmāyaṇa. Here the upajāti is almost exclusively the form of triṣṭubh employed, and all the variegated pādas of the Bhārata are practically reduced to one type. In fact, the exceptions, given under Nos. 7, 13, 19, 23, of the Illustrations, Appendix C, are so few as scarcely to modify the statement that the Rāmāyaṇa employs only one kind of triṣṭubh,¹ which is (อาศูส) with variable cæsura, as in

R. vi, 128, 122:

āyuṣyam ārogyakaranāṃ yaçaṣyaṃ
sāubhrātṛkam buddhikaraṇāṃ cūbhāṁ ca
çrotavyam etan niyamana sadbhir
ākhyānam ojaskaram yuddhikāmāiḥ

R. ii, 82, 32:

tataḥ samutthāya kule kule te
rājanyavaiyayā vṛṣalē ca viprāḥ
ayūyujan usṭrarathān kharāṇiṣ ca
nāgān hayaṇiṣ cāi ⁴va kulaprasūtān

¹ I pass over some obvious errors, noticing their place: typographical, G. iv, 43, 69, vicetum; R. vi, 59, 12, patākā; G. vii, 7, 48 (acānī in R.). These affect the fourth syllable. R. iv, 28, 66, affects the eighth, nigrhe for nigrhe. Other palpable errors affecting the metre are: G. ii, 80, 24, kṣudhā ca tandryā (ca?) vipannatāṃ gataḥ, not in R.; G. iii, 63, 28, jahāu tādā rṛtsamudbhavaṁ klāmam (in R., kṣudhā duḥkhaha); ib. 29, pāda ends čaṣ tadā (compare end of R. iii, 63, 6 b, etya klečam, where, however, kl probably does not make position); G. v, 14, 66, priyāṃ avikṣamāṇo Raghunandasya, corrected by R., priyām apaśyan Raghunandanasya tām; ib. 19, 34, evān sa tām hetubhir anuvikṣya, for anuvakeṣa (the form, though with v.1, in R.); naçati for naçati in v, 80, 24, is noticed under No. 19; G. vii, 20, 44, tam arcayitā niṣācaro jagāu (not in R.) has apparently lost a ca (cf. 3); G. vii, 40, 19, Hanūmatāḥ kaḥ sthāṣyati purastāt, for sthāṣyati kaḥ (R. 38, 46). In R. vi, 50, 12, nānāpatākā dhvajachatrajusṭam (gastra in G. 35, 6), cch becomes ch as in Mbh. i, 3,658, pṛchāi tvām. Contrast sāvyadhvaṇjacchatramahāpatākam, R. ib. 135.
R. iv, 11, 93:

yathā hi tejahṣu¹ varaḥ sadā ravir
yathā hi čāilo Himavān mahādriṣu
yathā catuspatsu ca kesarī varas
tathā naraṇāṃ asi vikrame varaḥ

This uniformity of metre, resulting in an almost classical triṣṭubh, places the Rāmāyaṇa on the same plane, when compared with the Bhārata, as we saw it occupied from the point of view of the čokā. The more antique forms of regular triṣṭubh are found in the Bhārata.²

Yet if this is the case in the regular triṣṭubh, still more striking is the difference between the two epics in respect of the catalectic, hypermetric, and other irregular triṣṭubh, which are antique and found in the Bhārata, but are unknown to the Rāmāyaṇa. But before taking up these three classes as they appear in the great epic, I have a few words to say in regard to the final amphibrach or scolius.

The Scoliōs.

The many examples given in Appendix C sufficiently illustrate the fact that after the long eighth syllable (very rarely short)³ the ninth syllable of the triṣṭubh is regularly

¹ In G. 11, 11, yathā hi tejasvivaro divākaro, etc., followed by a stanza not in R., with na sarvayakṣeṣadhanēçvaro vibhuḥ, the other pādas having cāsura after fourth or fifth.
² One cannot, however, claim as evidence of antiquity the antique čālinī and vātormī type of pāda, either pure or in parti-form, ☒ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ and ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐, without noting that these are also Purānic, though rare here, and chiefly loans. Thus in a pure single (separate) upendra stanza at Vāyu P. v, 19, stands pravartate codyamānāḥ samantāt. So ib. ix, 113, where a, b, d, have čālinī form, and c has: dičaḥ ċrotre caraṇāu cā 'sya bhūmiḥ. Most of this is epic, e. g., ib. xvii, 7 d, na jāyate mriyate vā kaďcita (Gitā, 2, 20). Still rarer (as in Gitā, 8, 9) is the form in the same Purāṇa, xiv, 7 c, kavim purāṇām anučāsitāram. I take this opportunity of stating that I shall hereafter use upendra and vaṇcāsthā as shorter forms of upendravajṛa and vaṇcāsthabila, though I believe only the latter has authority.
³ See Appendix C, under No. 15, ekaṁ sāma yajur ekām rg ekā, xii, 60, 47 c.
short, the tenth is long, and the eleventh is anceps. This rule
is seldom violated, but in the Čibcarita, iii, 197, 8, we find:

\begin{verbatim}
gadāmi vedān vicinomi echandleh
sarve vedā aksaraso me adhitāh
na sādu dānāṁ crotriyasya pradānam
mā pradāḥ cyenāya na kapoto 'smi
\end{verbatim}

Here we find, in pāda a, the phenomenon discussed, above,
in relation to the close of the čloka. Before echandleh the
vowel should weigh heavy, but it is doubtless reckoned light.
In b, me 'dhitāḥ is more probable than the (hypermetric)
pāda, as it appears in both texts (above); but since this is a
possible form, the pāda cannot be cited for a long ninth.
Pāda c is regular. In d, the pāda may be corrupt, the
necessary mā (= mām) apparently being lost after the pro-
hibitive mā, though a long ninth cannot be avoided in any
circumstances with the rest of the text as it is. I suspect
that cyenāya has taken the place of a vocative, and that the
verse read originally: mā mā pradā nā 'smi rājan kapotaḥ;
but it may be a specimen of the group of six before cæsura,
like yatra devī Gaṅgā | satatam prasūtā, and the other
cases of the sort cited below, if the hiatus may be assumed
to leave a short vowel, mā pradāḥ, cyenāya na kapotō asmi
(hypermetric), as in xiv, 9, 9 a, just below. The tale, how-
ever, is a popular story, doubtless handed down in rough verse,
and since the long ninth is actually found in such verse, it is
not necessary to assume that the pāda must be correct. In the
following stanzas, in the same way, we find the vowel appar-
ently reckoned as still short (light) before ċy. The cases are:

\begin{verbatim}
iii, 197, 15 c, yasmin deçe ramase 'tiva, cyena
ib. 18 b, sāumyo hy ayaṁ, kiṁ na jānāsi, cyena
ib. 24 b, prochāmi te,1 ṭakume, ko nu cyenah2
\end{verbatim}

1 Perhaps accusative. I refer to C. only when the reading differs.

2 On ċyena as ċyena in 19 c, see the paragraph on Defective Triśtubha below. Above I have cited cases where the vowel is short (light syllable) before mute and liquid in člokas and also given examples in triśtubh, where ċa brahma, ṛt kṣatram, and ṛnt Droṇam make the scolius. The latter is, as it were, strengthened to make position in vii, 170, 47 b, antarmanāḥ kuruṣu prādravatsu (C. 8,161, prā).
In v, 44, 24 d the long ninth is admitted into an old pāda: nā 'nyāḥ panthā ayanāya vidyate, in VS. 31, 18; Ṙvet. Up. 3, 8: vidyate (a)yanāya (perhaps in the epic for: na anyāḥ panthā ayanāya vidyate).

Another apparent example is found in the stanza¹ xii, 270, 23:

caturdvāram puruṣam caturmukham

caturdhā cāī 'nam upayāti vācā

bāhubhyāṁ vācā udarād upasthāt

teṣāṁ dvāram dvārapālo bubhūṣet

But here the first pāda is perhaps a jagatī, either with ca lost before puruṣam or (but this is unlikely) with resolution of the semivowel: caturduāram puruṣaṁ caturmukham (as in RV. iv, 51, 2, vi ū vṛjasya tamaso duārā); though as it stands it is a metrical duplicate of nā 'nyāḥ panthā (above).

Two metrical irregularities appear in xiv, 9, 4 c:

saṁvarto yājayati 'ti me çrutam

This pāda also is of the same form as the two last, with the irregular -o- o as second foot and _-o_ as the scolius; yet to read çrutam me corrects them both. But in iv, 8, 8 a, çr certainly fail to make position, though not before a scolius. The first section has another example, xiv, 9, 9 a, aham gacchāmi maghavan dūto 'dya, where hiatus, as in the first example above, may perhaps be assumed with a short vowel: aham gacchāmi | maghavan dūtō adya, unless an inversion has taken place, adya dūṭaḥ, with maghavo (or bhagavo, C.) before it. Below, ib. 31 b, sahā 'çvibhyāṁ somam agraṅṇād ekaḥ, B. saves the metre and C. 249 saves the grammar.

In the Harivaṁśa is found one case at 7,598 c, which is corrected in B.:

prāhur viprās tvāṁ guṇināṁ tattvajñāḥ

Though of the same class with the Anuçāṣana pāda (cited below) ending in prāyacchat, yet, while the latter may be easily emended, tattvajñāḥ is intractable, and the hypermeter

¹ For the meaning, compare ib. 28; v. l. in 300, 28: caivāri yasya dvārāṇi suguptāṇy amarottamāḥ, upastham udaram hastāu vāk caturthi sa dharmavit.
of B. 2, 74, 32, is probably correct: prāhur viprās tvāṁ | guṇi-
namāṁ tattvavijñāḥ. Another apparent case in H. 14,732 d, where yadā ve 'cqvanah ends a triṣṭubh, is a mere misprint for yādaveçvaram, 3, 82, 13. But xii, 292, 22 d, antye madhye vā vanam āgriya stheyaṁ, has a clear case of _ _ _ for _ _ _.

A secondary cæsura is more likely not to be found before the scolius than to be found there. Examples of both cases are given (incidentally) in the examples of the different sorts of triṣṭubh. Calling the scolius an addition is, then, merely a mechanical device, to show the pāda forms free of their uniform close. In reality, the scolius, because it is always the same, is the most important part of the pāda, since it seals the triṣṭubh. To show how the second cæsura does not divide off the scolius as a sort of tail tied on to the pāda proper, may be taken vii, 179, 13 a-b:

āsthāya taṁ kāñcanaratnacitram
rathottamam siṅhavat saṁnanāda

The form _ _ _ is then the only form of the epic scolius, except for a few cases of seeming carelessness, as in prāyacchat and vidyate, where special reasons may have induced the extant form, or, as in cases before ks, cch, etc., where advantage appears to have been taken of a Gāthā freedom in reckoning a heavy syllable as light in certain cases. Of the scolius type _ _ _ , which Fausbōll (previously) set up for the Dhammapada, the epic has parallel examples, but I doubt whether the single example to be found in the Dhamma, vs. 306:

yo vā 'pi ka- | tvā na karo- | mī 'ti cā 'ha

will be found on second thought really to support this interpretation. For in this case, as in all similar epic examples, the division is not, as Fausbōll assumed, _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _, but (as a hypermeter) _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _, exactly as in the common hypermeters of the epic, e.g., sa vāi rājan nā | 'bhyaḍhiṅkaḥ kathyaṁ ca, where the only difference between the scansion and that of the more usual hypermeter, e.g., yasyā 'vibhaktam | vasu rājan saḥāyāṁ, is that in the latter
case the caesura is normal, while in the former it is neglected. ¹ On such cases, see the section just below, on Hyperimeters.

The epic, then, as a whole, has passed far beyond the Vedic stage, where the final syllables of a triṣṭubh are (अ) ॐ ओ ॐ; nor is it likely that the few cases above are to be explained as archaisms rather than as further examples of such slovenliness as has been met before in the examples already given. For even the Rig Veda poets are already tending to a stricter form, ओ ॐ, as is shown, for example, by the substitution of maṇśiṇya for maṇśiṇya, RV. x, 53, 4, merely to win an amphibrach.

Catalectic and Hypermetric Triṣṭubhs.

A short form of triṣṭubh is where a syllable is omitted, but in such a way as to preserve the characteristic final cadence, giving the pentad form familiar to the Rig Veda; as in Mbh. iii, 195, 3, tam tvāṁ prāchāmi | kathāṁ tu rājan, like RV. i, 67, 8, ya īm cīketa | guhā bhavantam. Although catalectic is a name more properly applied to a pāda cut off at the end, I shall yet call the double pentad a catalectic triṣṭubh.

In a jagati, by the addition of a syllable, the final trochee or spondee of the triṣṭubh’s amphibrach is converted into a diambus; in a hypermetric triṣṭubh, the final cadence is preserved intact, the triṣṭubh’s nature is not lost, but a syllable is prefixed or inserted elsewhere. It may be said that any dodeka is a jagati pāda. I shall not quarrel with this (native) definition, but the difference here is one of metrical character, and must be strongly marked in name. Admitting then that it is somewhat arbitrary, I shall designate as a jagati only the diiambically closed pāda; the other, as a hypermetric triṣṭubh.

¹ This interpretation, anyway, seems to be merely a slight oversight on the part of the learned editor. In No. 329, eko care mātaṅg’ araṅgne va nāgo, the first foot is correctly given as ओ ॐ ॐ. The choriamb doubtless caused the different interpretation; but the middle foot ओ ॐ ॐ is parallel to ओ ॐ ॐ, as shown in the examples cited below. [The new text in 306 omits it; but I keep the remark above, written prior to the new text’s appearance, as the old text has authority and need not be changed metri causā.]
Besides the prefixed or inserted syllable, which gives two varieties of the hypermetric triṣṭubh, a triṣṭubh pāda may have both the prefixed and inserted syllables. The triṣṭubh, then, as shown in the bird’s-eye view on p. 275, may consist of ten, eleven, twelve, or thirteen syllables, without losing its characteristic cadence. Unique, however, and not typical (I may add) is a fourteen-syllable triṣṭubh. Apart from all these forms lies the mātrā-triṣṭubh, of thirteen syllables, but with two breves reckoned as equivalent to one long syllable. Postponing the examination of these forms, I take up now, reckoning the regular triṣṭubh (above) as i, the catalectic and simple or dodeka hypermetric triṣṭubh, ii–vi.

ii–iii. The Catalectic Triṣṭubh.

ii. In this form the caesura falls after the fifth syllable. The pāda is one of a triṣṭubh stanza. Examples are iii, 113, 28:

Arundhatī vā subhagā Vasiṣṭham
Lopāmudrā vā yathā hy Agastyam
Nalasya vāi Damayantī yathā ’bhūd
yathā Čacī Vajradharasya cāī ’va

Here b can be scanned only as Lopāmudrā vā | yathā hy Agastyam. Another case, referred to above, is found in the stanzas at iii, 195, 3–4:

3, vidveṣāṇam paramaṁ jīvaloke
kuryān naraḥ pārthiva yācyamānaḥ
taṁ tvāṁ prēchāṁ kathaṁ tu rājan
dadyād bhavān dayitaṁ ca me ’dya

4, na cā ’nukīrtayed 1 adya dattvā
ayācyam arthaṁ na ca saḿcṛnomi
prāpyam arthaṁ ca saḿcṛutyā
taṁ cā ’pi dattvā susukhī bhavāmi

In 3 d and 4 a, the caesura is shifted, and the pādas can be read as

dadyād bhavān da- | yitaṁ ca me ’dya
na cā ’nukīrtā- | yed adya dattvā

1 This seems better than anukīrtaye (he) dadya (N.).
In 4 c, there is a cloka pāda; unless d be rent of its opening, to leave another pentad: prāpyam arthanā ca samgrutya tam ca, which would leave d as: api dattvā su- | sukhī bhavāmi.

The dekasyllabic pāda is particularly striking when united with the hypermetric pāda (10 + 12.) An example occurs in the same story, iii, 197, 26, c-d:

etad vo laksma | āvām karomi
hiraṇyavarṇam | ruciram puṇyagandham

The ten-syllable pāda ib. 17 b, has, perhaps, lost a syllable, (tam) te paśyantu:

(a) uksānaṁ vehatam anūnaṁ nayantu
(b) te paśyantu puruṣā mamā i'va
bhayāhitasya āyam mamā 'ntikāt tvām
pratyāmnayantu tvām hy enam mā hiṁśiḥ

(a) — — — — — — — — — — — — (No. 13, hypermetric)
(b) — — — — — — — — — — — — (No. 20)

For c and d, see No. 23 and No. 7, in the Illustrations of Appendix C. It is possible, however, that b belongs under another head (below). Giving a patois pronunciation, pasiantu, would make the verse quite smooth. In the subsequent stanza, 19 c, there appears to be a case of resolved semi-vowel (ciēna for cyena), a regular pāda:

yatatha ciēna priyam eva kuryām,

though it may be read as catalectic.1

A case in C. viii, 4,545 d, is corrected in B. 89, 22:

C.: vāyavyāstreṇa, tataḥ sa Karnāt
B.: vāyavyāstreṇa 'patataḥ sa Karnāt

In xii, 322, 72 = 12,115, where C. has kim te dhanena bandhubhis te, B. has the dekasyllabic pāda:

kim te dhanena, kim bandhubhis te, the other pādas being hendekas. A combination of hyper-

---

1 For the verse in the same stanza, yathā māṁ (hi) viśi sādhuvādāḥ prasannaḥ, see below, The Hypermetric Triśūbh.
metric, catalectic, and hyper-hypermetric pāda occurs in H. 7,448:

\[ \text{yasmād bhūtānām} | \text{bhūtir anto 'tha madhyām} \]
\[ \text{dṛṣṭir vibhūtīh} | \text{ṣrutīc ca Rudraḥ} \]
\[ \text{grahā (sic) 'bhibhūtasya puruṣasye 'qvarasya} \]

Compare¹ H. 8,399:

\[ \text{taṁ kūrdamānam madhusūdanaḥ sa} \]
\[ \text{dṛṣṭvā mahātmā | harṣānvītas tāḥ} \]
\[ \text{cukūrda satyā sahito mahātmā} \]
\[ \text{balasya dhīmān | harṣāgamārtham} \]

iii. This pāda is what may be called cæsurally catalectic. Like the last, it is antique, in Veda and Upanishads, and the epic has but few examples. The pause follows the fourth syllable, which is usually heavy. Here the cæsura, so to speak, costs a syllable and, unless read with sufficient time allowance, the triṣṭubh appears to be crippled. Of this sort are:

\[ i, 3, 61 d, \text{ māyā 'çvināu samanakti carṣaṇī (so 66 c)} \]
\[ i, 92, 14 a, \text{ pṛchāmi tvāṁ, sprānīyarūpa} \]

In the latter example there may be corruption. Compare \( i, 88, 10 c, \) tat tvām pṛchāmi sprānīyarūpa, but the opening phrase, pṛchāmi tvāṁ is stereotyped, \( i, 98, 21 a; v, 48, 1 a, \) etc. We may compare RV. \( i, 120, 4, \) vi pṛchāmi pākiā na devān.²

The next case is

\[ iii, 197, 27 b, \text{ suraśṛnām atha sammato bhṛçam} \]

Although this pāda has eleven syllables, it is not a triṣṭubh, but a catalectic āgātri, analogous to the triṣṭubhs of the same nature. The whole stanza consists of syllables \( 13 + 11 + 12 + 11 \), but a is doubly hypermetric (explained below), so that there is no alternate symmetry but chiastic symmetry, thus:

\[ 13 (= 11) + 12 + 12 + 11 \]

¹ In the Bombay edition, 2, 72, 59: dṛṣṭir bhūtir vaç ca guhā çrutīc ca guhā 'bhū, etc. (on this, see below). The following 8,399 = 2, 89, 17, also avoids the same cadence by reading: dṛṣṭvā mahātmā ca mudānvito 'bhūt . . . harṣāgamārtham ca balasya dhīmān.

² C. in 3,964 has pṛchāmi (sic) tvām.
It is, however, possible, perhaps, to resolve the āṁ.

v, 42, 5 a, pramādād vai asurāḥ parābhavan (jagati)
v, 42, 21 a, ya etad vai bhagavān sa nityo

In this case, although there is no possible objection to reading the pāda as it stands, it is possible that a bhāti has been lost after etad. The sense is yaj jagad iva bhāti sa nityo 'vikāri bhagavān (N.). Compare 48, 7, jagad bhāti.

v, 46, 3 c, atandritaḥ Savitur vivasvān

The same criticism. Before Savitur, sa may have been dropped, as in C. viii, 3,343 c, çete pāpaḥ suvibhinnagātraḥ, where B. restores the metre with çete sa pāpaḥ. So C. omits su in the aparavaktra, xii, 9,085 b, but corrects it in repeating the verse at 10,530. Nevertheless, I prefer the text as it stands, especially as any correction would have to be extended into the next stanza, where we find:

ib. 4 b, diçaḥ çukro bhuvanam bibharti

Here it is easy to suggest sambibharti, but emendation is otiose.

v, 48, 37 c, Matsyāiḥ sārdham anrčaṅcarūpāiḥ

The next stanza has jyeṣṭham Mātsyam anrčaṅsāryarūpam, which makes it rather doubtful whether this form may not have stood in 37 c.

v, 67, 6 c, ānayasva pitaram mahāvrataṁ (jagati)

viii, 68, 7 a, apy ācīṣma vayam Arjuna tvayi

C. 3,386 has athā 'ācīṣma. Possibly ācīṣāma should be read but it is not necessary. The brevis is noticeable (compare above, in § ii, iii, 197, 17 b).

xiii, 76, 7 a (after the injunction in the half-clōka, vs. 6):

6, praviṣya ca gavāṁ madhye imāṁ ērutim udāharet
7 a, gaur me mātā vrṣabhāḥ pitā me
divam çarma jagatī me pratiṣṭhā, etc.
xiii, 102, 55 d:

budhyâmi tvâm Vṛtraḥanaṃ çatakratuṁ
vyatikramantam bhuvanâni viçvâ
kacchin na vakå vṛjinaṁ kadâcîd
akârṣaṁ te manaso 'bhiṣaṅgât

iv–ix. The Hypermetric Triṣṭubh.


The first form, iv, is the initial hypermeter; a light syllable appears to be prefixed to an iambic opening. The same effect is produced, in some cases with the same words, as that already described in the account of the çokola. The pâda starts with an anapæstic slide. The difference is one of frequency, since in the case of the triṣṭubh the initial hypermeter is not very common. Most of the cases have a brevis and in fact, to my ear, the long (heavy) initial belongs in another category (vi); but I admit that in yatra devå Gâṅgâ satatam praśutâ and the few similar cases it is doubtful how we should regard the extra syllable. I have noticed with short initial the following cases (iv):

i, 3, 147 b, vayatas tantūṃ satatam vartayantyaū (No. 13)
i, 76, 55 a, asurâḥ surâyām bhavato 'smi dattaḥ (No. 1)

Here the preceding pâda ends in i, but it is scarcely possible that the two triṣṭubhs should have been read as a unit. The same thing occurs occasionally in the examples of hypermetric çokolas.

i, 92, 6 c, kuta âyâtaḥ katarasyâūṃ dîci tvam (No. 13)
iii, 5, 10 a, tata utthâya Viduram Pânda-vêyaḥ (No. 15)
v, 42, 6 c, pitřloke râjyam anucâsti devâḥ (No. 20)
v, 44, 18 b, dhanam âcâryâya tâd anuprayâcechet (No. 20)
xii, 63, 4 c, vrâslipatiḥ piçuno nartanaç ca (No. 12)
xiii, 76, 14 d, pratîghânan vâi gopradåne vidhîjñâñ (No. 7)
xiii, 102, 19 a, atithivrataḥ suvratâ ye janâ vâi (No. 6)
ib. 35 c,(jagat), Varuṇasya râjâñ sa çadane mahâtmânañ (No. 1)
xiii, 126, 33 a, bahule samâṅge hy akutobhayê ca (No. 1)
H.2, 72, 33 b, kṛtinaṁ viram (C, 7,422 dhîram) dâna-vânam ca bâdham (No. 7)
All these cases have an anapaestic opening; all but one have the fifth syllable heavy. Some have been given under the examples referred to above.

v, a. Much more frequent is the inserted fifth. I do not mean, of course, that a regular triṣṭubh is first made and a syllable is then inserted, but that the cadence does not have the rhythm of iv, to wit, \( \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \), but (with the cæsura regularly after the fifth syllable) \( \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \), so that the effect is that of a syllable inserted at the place of cæsura. This measure produces rather a pleasing alternation and is frequently found in regular triṣṭubh stanzas, scanned exactly like the other pādas with the modification thus indicated. The form is Vedic, and is found also in the Upanishads and in the Buddhist texts. Examples are:

i, 71, 40 d, yathā tvadarthaṁ | raksiṭā ‘haṁ careyam
v, 48, 101 d, saṁyudhyamānā | Dhārtaraśťrā na santi

The effect of this measure I have endeavored to reproduce from the following extract, v, 48, 75–76:

ayaṁ Gāndhārāṁs tarasā sampramathya
jitvā putrāṁ Nagnajītaṁ samagrān
buddham mumoca vinadantam prasahya
Sudarśanaṁ vaṁ devatānam lalāmam
ayaṁ Kapāte ś niṣaghāna Pāṇḍyaṁ
tathā Kaṇḍāna Dantakūrē mamārda
anena dagdīha varṣapūgān vināthā
Vāraṅasī nagari śambabhūva

And yon Gāndhāraṁ, at a blow Krishna vanquished,
And conquered all Nagnajita’s descendants,
Their plaining victim, as he lay bound, releasing
(Of gods the jewel, “Beautiful” called, a fair man);

1 On this case (tata utthāya), see below, p. 290.
2 Compare with this example, Rig Veda, i, 120, 3, tā no vidvāsā | manma vocetam adya, and for other Vedic parallels, Oldenberg, Hymnen des Rig Veda, vol. i, p. 66 ff. (ZDMG. vol. xxvii, p. 75).
3 v. 1, kapāṭena jaghāna. Below, the scholiast explains dantakūre as in battle rather than as a proper name. Perhaps Dantakrūraṁ jaghāna (ā before kr), as in vii, 70, ५.
He at Kapāt slew in a war the Pândya,
He smote Kalingas, Dantakār's men a-fighting,
He too, that hero, burned and enslaved a long time
Benares town, city sans help unaided.

It will be observed that the first part of this measure is that of the regular triṣṭubh with the cæsura after the fifth, as in Yamo 'bravin¹ māin: na mṛto 'si sāumya, xiii, 71, 18 a, which form may have led to the establishment of the hypermeter on the one hand and the cæsurally catalectic pāda on the other.

The texts sometimes show variations, like those found in the simple triṣṭubh forms.² Thus in vii, 179, 45 d, where C. has the hypermeter, B. omits the extra syllable: sampaç-yanto (vāi) vijayaṁ rākṣasasya.

Of the different hypermetric forms, the commonest are those in which the fifth syllable is followed by _ _ _ or _ _ _ ; less often by _ _ _ _ _ . All three occur at i, 76, 50 ff.:

50, kacasya mārgam pratipatsye na bhokṣye
53, garor hi bhuto vidyayā co 'pahūtah
54, smarāmi sarvam yac ca yathā ca vṛttam

The extra syllable, like the initial, may be heavy or light; but except when followed by _ _ _ _ _ the latter is rare. The second and fourth syllables are rarely light. I give below examples of the different forms. First of the common varieties (but _ _ _ _ _ as second foot is the rarest of these):

_ _ _

yaço na nāgyej, jūtiphedaç ca na syāt, iii, 4, 8 a
vadhāya rājan, Karṇasūtasya saṁkhye, viii, 85, 36 b
mā vāi dvitiyam mā tṛtīyam ca vānce(t), iii, 297, 25 c

¹ On page 186, note 1, I have referred to Yama's world as portrayed in Sabhā in contrast to "elsewhere." The remark is correct, but elsewhere is not everywhere else; e.g., this account of Nāciketas represents it as blissful. Usually, of course, it is a hell.

² These changes I have discussed in A. J. Phil., xx, p. 18 ff. as affecting vii, 163. In vii, 179, 24 a, B. has _ _ _ _ _ for _ _ _ _ _ in C., with several similar changes close by; strikingly in 32 d = 8,146, where B has no babhūvuh (C., na).
So in v, 44, 24 c; vii, 2, 33 b; viii, 42, 17 c; xii, 278 (7), 6 a, etc.

A case of fifth brevis and also fourth brevis is found in i, 1, 217 c, dyūnā viṃcātir āhata 'ksāuhiṁinām; and fourth brevis in iii, 197, 12 d, na traṃam labhet traṃam icchan sa kāle; where, however, C. has labhate (labh'ete) which may be correct. All five syllables are heavy in ii, 77, 10 b; kanyām Pāncalīm Pāṇḍāvebhyaḥ pānāya. Unique (I think) are breves in the third and fourth syllables: datvā 'naḍuhaṁ sūryalokam vṛmajanti,2 iii, 186, 8 b (No. 10).

Preceded by brevis (fifth syllable):

samānām mūrdhni rathayānam viyanti, i, 3, 64 b
tathā titikṣur atitikṣor viṣiṣṭah, i, 87, 6 b = xii, 300, 15 b
yas tv evam brahma tapasa 'nveti vidvān, iii, 192, 56 c
dharmam purāṇam upajīvantī santaḥ, viii, 45, 16 c
tāṁ vāi manyeta pitaram mātaram ca, xii, 108, 22 c
garbho 'mṛtasya jagataḥ 'syā pratiṣṭhā, xiii, 76, 10 b

So i, 1, 212 c; 1, 213 c; 89, 6 c; 232, 16 c; iii, 4, 18 a; viii, 42, 16 b; etc.

Preceded by a heavy syllable:

hataṁ saṅgrāme Sahadevena pāpam, i, 1, 208 c
idāṁ ca rājan hitam uktaṁ na cet tvam, iii, 4, 12 c
tathā caṅkītār asy adhamāṁ ghorarūpāḥ, v, 181, 9 d
tathā vāyugunā pramimāṇam jagac ca, vii, 201, 67 b
yasā 'vibhaktāṁ vasu rājan sahāyāḥ, iii, 5, 20 a
tāṁ āha sarvāḥ rṣimukhyān Agastyaḥ, xiii, 94, 9 a

So iii, 5, 18 b; 113, 6 b; v, 42, 15 a; 48, 46 c; vii, 179, 42 a; viii, 37, 30 b; 42, 9 d, etc.

Cases of fourth brevis are ii, 56, 15 c, paçeōt tapasye tad upākramyasya vākyam; and i, 1, 216 b, tathā bandhūbhīḥ- pitr-bhir bhṛātṛbhiḥ ca.

1 Compare also iii, 13,291 a, yathā māṁ hi vāi sādhuvaṁ prasannāḥ, where, however, B. 197, 19, omits hi, which makes, when retained, a bhujam-gaprayāta pāda; q. v. below, under the head of Aksara Chandas.
2 Compare RV. viii, 59, 7, indrāvaruṇā | sāumanasam adṛptam, cited by Oldenberg, loc. cit., p. 68.
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For v, 516, prayaceha mahyam bhavatsahyaṁ kariṣye, B. 16, 32 d, has tava sahyam. In vii, 200, 82 a, B. has tasya 'syatas tān niṣcitān pūtadhāran, where C. 9,839 has suniṣcitān. All five syllables are heavy in ii, 77, 7 a; citrān saṁnāhān avamunīc-antu cāi 'śām.

Preceded by brevis:

na cēn māṁ Jīṣnur āhvayītā sabhāyām, ii, 58, 16 b
tāṁs te dadāni mā praṣāta prapātām, i, 92, 11 a = 93, 3

Preceded by a heavy syllable:

gomāyur ucchāīr vyāharad agnihotre, ii, 71, 22 b
amanyamānaṁ ksatriya kiṃcid anyat, v, 42, 15 c
āmantrye tvām brūhi jayaṁ rāne me, vii, 67, 22 c
anarthakam me darcītavān asi tvam, viii, 68, 8 c
prayacehā 'nyasmāi Gāṇḍivam etad adya, vii, 68, 28 a
nāi 'ko bahubhyo Gāutami rākṣitavyah, xiii, 1, 30 b

There is, I believe, only one other case of this form in the thirteenth book, 103, 42 e. It is rare as a triṣṭubh hypermeter, but it occurs also (see below) as a jagatī.

Besides these forms are found: ○ ○ ○ ○, of which I have but sporadic examples: sa yatre 'echasi, Vidura, tatra gaceha, ii, 64, 11 c (note to No. 20); aham karte 'ti, Vidura, mā ca maṁstāḥ, and na tvām prṛcchāmi, Vidura, yad dhatam me, ii, 64, 7 a and c (C. has mā 'vamaṁstāḥ); prātas trivargā ghrτa-

Between divisions iv and v stand a couple of cases in which the initial syllable is heavy but the second is light. They belong neither to iv with its anapaestic opening, nor to v with its iambic or spondaic opening: açvināv indum | amṛtam vṛttabhūyāu, i, 3, 63 a; atra Kāunteya | sahito bhrūṭpbhis
tvam, ii, 134, 41 a. Compare above p. 286, tatā utthāyā
tiduraṁ Pāṇḍaveyāḥ (No. 15).²

¹ This pāda is followed by tvatvo yo 'strār abhyadhiko vā narendraḥ, with the casura ignored. Pāda a is virtually repeated in viii, 69, 72 c-d, anyasmāi tvāṁ Gāṇḍivāṁ dehi Pārtha, tvatvo 'strār vā vṛtyato vā vṛciṣṭaḥ.
² Such Vedic cases as this last are grouped by Oldenberg, loc. cit., with those just mentioned, e. g., abhi kṛṣṇena rajasā dyām rṣot, RV. i, 35, 9,
Quite exceptional, though corresponding to recognized (but unusual) forms of the regular triṣṭubh, are further:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{dadarca} 'sīnaṁ dharmātmānaṁ vividkete, iii, 5, 6 \text{c} \\
& \text{(No. 27)} \\
& \text{kim vidviṣo vāi māṁ evāṁ vyāhareyuh, ii, 71, 7 \text{c}} \\
& \text{(No. 26)} \\
& \text{dhṛtāyudhāḥ su-krśīṇāṁ uttamānjuḥ (v. l. sukrśīṇāṁ),} \\
& \text{H. 7,442 \text{c} (No. 24; v. l. in ii, 72, 53).}
\end{align*}
\]

Compare also a case of No. 23, below, p. 294.

The hypermeter beginning with an anapaest, iv, is found also in popular Buddhistic poetry, where also a long syllable rarely takes the place of the initial brevis. There are, for example, in the Dhammapada, half a dozen cases with anapaest, but none with long initial (vs. 40 has naga-, in the new text). Examples of jagatīs like the triṣṭubh hypermeters given above\(^1\) are:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{athā āyaṇaḥ vajrahastāḥ caeṭpatih, iii, 197, 25 \text{b}} \\
& \text{bhītam prappanaṁ yo hi dadāti cītrave, iii, 197, 12 \text{c}} \\
& \text{svādhīnāyaśīla guruṣuṣrāne ratāḥ, xiii, 102, 33 \text{a}} \\
& \text{satye sthitāṁ vedavidāṁ mahātmamanāṁ, xiii, 102, 34 \text{c}} \\
& \text{bale na tuṣya yasya pumāṁ na vidyate, ii, 65, 25 \text{a}} \\
& \text{(a has 13 syllables; b, 12; c–d, 11 each)}
\end{align*}
\]

Occasionally a triṣṭubh and jagatī occur in the same stanza in hypermetric form, as in iii, 134, 39:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{tato 'stāvakramā mātur athā 'ntike pitā} \\
& \text{nādīṁ samaṅgāṁ āgāṁ imāṁ viśasva} \\
& \text{(provāca cāi 'naṁ sa tathā viveṣa)}
\end{align*}
\]

The unique triṣṭubh-pāda of fourteen syllables, of which I spoke above, runs, ii, 64, 1 \text{d}:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{bālān āvā 'śmaṁ avamanyase nityam eva}
\end{align*}
\]

perhaps better so than with the initial hypermeter, as the latter, except for this example, is characterized by a heavy fifth, as stated above.

\(^1\) Also Vedic, e.g., viśvāsu dhūṛṣu viṣjakṛtyeṣu satpate, RV. x, 60, 2 (included under triṣṭubhis in Oldenberg’s list, loc. cit.).
The scholiast, who rarely touches on purely metrical phenomena, explains this as “redundant and archaic,” recognizing the pāda as it stands. But it is impossible to suppress the suspicion that avamanyase stands for an original manyase, a regular hypermeter (\(\text{——} \ulcorner \text{—} \text{—}\)), “thou regardest us as children,” strengthened by some one to “thou despisest us.” Another, but doubtful, example is given below.

The distribution of these hypermetric forms, va, is somewhat uneven. The examples run in groups, showing clearly the effect of different styles. A baker’s dozen of hypermeters, for example, are found in the seventh book, which has three hundred and twenty triśṭubhs; but half of the dozen are in the fifty-seven triśṭubhs of adhy. 179. On the other hand, the fourth book, which has two hundred triśṭubhs, has no example. The second book, which has only one hundred and fifty-five triśṭubhs, has thirty examples. In the thirteenth book the older parts have most examples. Thus in the few triśṭubhs that tell of the seers’ oath, adhy. 94, there are twelve hypermeters in thirteen triśṭubhs, a much greater proportion, as the tale is much more ancient, than is found in any other part of equal length in this book.

As an illustration of the epic free triśṭubh with hypermeters may be taken the following stanzas from the continuation of the story of the Frog-girl in iii, 192, 48 ff.:

[Vāmadeva uvāca]
prayaccha vāmyāu mama pārthiva tvam
kṛtaṁ hi te kāryam ābhīyaṁ açakyaṁ

1 He seldom comments on unusual rhythms, although often remarking on archaisms real or fancied, as for example on prasthe dattvā vipinam brāhmaṇeyah, at i, 93, 23 b, explaining prasthe as for prasthe “with Vedic loss of reduplication.”

2 The fourth book is writ like the Rāmāyaṇa, in the refined style, and has scarcely a dozen pādas of the free triśṭubh type, almost all its triśṭubhs being upajītaṁ.

3 Two such hypermeters in one stanza are not unusual in old tales, e. g., iii, 102, 63 a—b, jānāmi putraṁ daçavaṛṣaṁ tava ’ham jātam mahiśyāṁ ājena-jitam narendra.

4 Compare what was said above, in the note on p. 221, regarding the clōkās in this section.
mā tvā 'vadhīd Varuṇo ghorapācāir
brahmakṣatrasya 'нтare vartamānam

[rājo 'vāca]
anadvāhau suvratāu sādhudāntāv (— — —)
etat viprāṇāṁ | vāhamaṁ Vāmadeva (— — — —)
tābhyaṁ yāhi tvāṁ | yatra kāmo maharṣe (— — — —)
echandāṇi vai tvādṛgaṁ saṁvahanti (— — —)

[Vāmadevaḥ]
chandāṇiś vai mādṛgaṁ saṁvahanti
loke 'muṣmin pārthiva yāṇi santi
asmīn tu loke mama yānam etad
asmadvidhānām | aparesāṁ ca rājan (— — — —)

[rājā]
catvāras tvāṁ vā | gardabhāḥ saṁvahantu (— — — —)
creṣṭḥācyataryo | harayo vātaraṁhāḥ (— — — —)
tāis tvāṁ yāhi kṣatriyasāi 'ṣa vāho (— — —)
mamāi 'va vāmyāu | na tavāi 'tau hi viddhi (— — — —)

[Vāmadevaḥ]
ghoraṁ vratam brāhmaṇasyāi 'tad āhur
etad rājan yad ihā 'jivamānaḥ
ayasmayaḥ ghorarūpā mahāntaḥ
catvāro vā yatudhānāḥ surāudrāḥ
mayā prayuktās | tvadvadham īpsamānā (— — — —)
vaṁhantu tvāṁ qitaqūlaq caturdhā

And so on (the last stanza has six pādas, as not infrequently happens).¹

As seen in some of these stanzas, there is sometimes accord between the hypermeter and its environment. This is not rare. Thus in ii, 58, 9, three pādas have the form ∞ — ∞ — ∞ — ∞ — ∞ — ∞, and these are followed by pāda d as a hypermeter of the same sort; ity āgato 'haṁ nṛpa te taj ju-ṣasva. The hypermetric cadence to close a passage is not unusual. Thus to close a stanza, xiii, 159, 11: sa eva pūr-vaṁ nijaghāna dāityāṁ, sa pūrvadevaq ca babhūva samrāṭ, sa bhūtānāṁ bhāvano bhūtabhavyaḥ, sa viçvasya 'syā jagataq.

¹ That is, it is a strophe of two three-pāda triṣṭubhas (above, p. 194).
cā 'bhigoptā. Again, in i, 90, 5 d: bhūyaq ce 'dānīṁ vada kim te vadāmi; then Aśṭaka uvāca. As hypermeters I should explain the difficult pādas, 1, 3, 123 c–d, the latter having (affectation of the antique?) choriambic opening before ० ० ० (No. 18 has ० ० ० ० ० ०):

vān navanītam | hṛdayāṁ tīkṣṇadhāram(iti).

The preceding pāda is, I think, to be read as:

tad viparītam | ubhayāṁ kṣatriyasya,

instead of tad ubhayam etad viparītam. Then all the pādas are metrical, after a fashion.

There is a regular triṣṭubh with the movement ० ० ० ०,

० ० ० ०, and hypermetric in bhayāhitasya dāyam mamā ūntikāt tvām (cited under No. 23). Like this, but with a different hypermetric opening, is the apparent pāda found in 1, 3, 63 c: hitvā | girim aṣṭi- | nāu gā mudā carantāu, ० ० ० ० ० ०, with neglected cēsum.

This brings me to the comparatively few cases of different cēsura in this form of hypermeter. As shown in the examples given above, the cēsural pause comes after the fifth syllable. When this is neglected (but the practice is observed in a large majority of the cases), we have an approach to the shifting cēsura of the former division, iv, and, as I have said already, it may seem simpler to regard such cases as initial hypermeters with long instead of short initial. But the difference of cadence between the opening ० ० ० ० ०, and ० ० ० ० ०, seems, as in the case of the ċloka, to mark an important though not a radical distinction, between these groups. While the ictus of the former, as in vṛṣalipatiḥ, is ० ० ल ० ०, that of the latter, as in hataṁ saṅgrāme is ० ल, ० ल. Nor does the shift of cēsura in asurāḥīḥ surāyāṁ bhavato 'smi ṣaṭtaḥ, etc., change this. But when the second class shifts the cēsura to the sixth syllable, as in yatra devi Gaṅgā satatam prasūtā, then, instead of coinciding with the ictus of iv, we still have necessarily the same opening with that of v, but still differentiated in the following. For in
the whole tristubh, we certainly cannot read hataṁ saṁgrāme Sahadevena pāpam as ā ṛā ṛā ṛā, etc., whereas in the other case the only way, as it seems to me, to read the pāda is yatrā devī Gaṅ | gā | satatām prasūtā. I prefer, therefore, not to call these cases long initial hypermeters, but to class them separately, as vi. There are, as I have shown, cases which bridge the distinction and connect these classes in their extreme varieties, so that some may choose rather to consider them as radically identical openings; but it is certainly convenient to distinguish these forms. Of vi I have the following examples, the type being antique, as in Munḍ. Up., iii, 1, 6, yatra tat satyasya paramaṁ nidhānam, as distinguished from ib. ii, 2, 10, na tatra sūryo bhāti na candratārakaṁ, ne 'mā vidyuto bhānti kuto 'yam agniḥ, etc. I unite with them the sporadic cases where the caesura, instead of coming after the sixth, where it is usually found, is neglected or falls after the fourth syllable, except where, in the latter case, two light syllables follow:¹

i, 89, 3 b, sa vāi rājan nā 'bhyadhikaḥ kathyaṁ ca
(No. 13)
i, 197, 10 d, yatra devī Gaṅgā satatam prasūtā
(No. 3)
ii, 64, 11 b, viçeṣataḥ kṣattarahitam manusyaṁ
(No. 19)
iii, 134, 7 a, evam Aṣṭāvakraḥ samitāṁ hi garjan
(No. 3)
ib, 27 c, bāleṣu putreṣu kṛpanaṁ vadatsu
(No. 19)
iii, 13,193 a (B. 192, 54) mamāi 'va tāu vāmyāu parīghya
rājan
B. omits eva, but both texts immediately after have —
iii, 192, 55 b, na tvā 'nuçāsmy adya prabhṛti hy asatyam
(No. 1)
v, 42, 9 b, tatrā 'nu te yānti na tatarṇi mṛtyam ²
(No. 19)
v (42, 17), 1,592 d, etad vidvān upāiti kathamūn karma
(No. 2)
B. has no 'pāiṁ—
v, 44, 10 a, gurumī čiṣyo nityam abhivādayita
(No. 20)
v, 44, 28 c, rathamātre bāhradrathe vā 'pi rājan
(No. 6)
v, 48, 77 c, vegenāi 'va čāilam abhihatya jambhaḥ
(No. 20, note)
¹ For these cases see below.
² C. 1,584 has te tatrā 'nuyānti.
vii, 2, 1 b, bhinnām nāvam ivā 'tyagādhe Kurūpām

vii, 179, 26 b, caktyrṣitiprasamanusalany ayudhāni

But C. 8,140, has caktyaḥ prāsā (regular) —

viii, 4,546 b, prāduṣ cakre vajrapratimaprabhāvam

Here B. 89, 23 has vajram atiprabhāvam, but C.'s form (words) is a stereotyped triṣṭubh ending, as in viii, 89, 61 d; ix, 17, 19 d; 35, 37 c; xii, 112, 21 b, etc.; e. g., in the last case, purā mahendra pratimaprabhāva.

[xii, 108, 33 a, etat sarvam anirdeṇaṁ 'vam uktam]

xiii, 94, 13 d, na hy utsahe draṣṭum iha jīvalokam

xiv, 9, 34 c, sahasraṁ dantāṇām cātyojanānām

H. 2, 72, 31 c, virūpākṣaṁ sudarśanam puṇyayonim

ib. 32 d, somapāṇāṁ marciṇpāṇāṁ varisṭhāḥ

ib. 44 a, vi-añjano jano 'tha vidvān samagraḥ

(Note to No. 9 in Appendix, with the pāda tri-ambakam puṣṭidam, etc., another case of resolution.)

Compare also the pāda cited above p. 278, mā pradāḥ cyeṇāya, etc.

In the explanation of the pādas given above, I have partially accepted the analysis of Kühnau, who in his book, Die Trishtubh-Jagati Familie, has divided yatraḥ tat sātyasyāḥ paramāṁ nidhānāṁ; but I cannot carry this out in tāṁs te dadāni, mā prapata prapātam, and therefore separate the classes, reading the latter as tāṁs te dadāni | mā prapata prapātam. The pāda with caesura after the sixth syllable,

1 Perhaps vā for iva (as below).
2 On this pāda also, see below.
3 This extraordinary verse, though anirdeṇa is vouched for by the commentator, seems by metre and meaning to have been originally a sample of No. 27 (with nirdeṇa in its usual sense), ṛṣ ṛṣ ṛṣ ṛṣ ṛṣ ṛṣ. As it stands it must have fourth brevis (hypermeter), ṛṣ ṛṣ ṛṣ. ṛṣ ṛṣ.
4 Kühnau's schemes (loc. cit., pp. 104, 159) find a place even for the pāda: yadā 'crauṣāṁ Droṇaḥ Kṛtavṛmṇa Kṛpaṣ ca, which does indeed stand in C. 196 a, but is corrected in B. i, 1, 198, 'crauṣam having been taken over from the circumjacent pādas, but being properly omitted (as in C. 201, yadā Droṇa), leaving a regular triṣṭubh. See, however, viii, below.
examples above, may, however, be grouped for mechanical clearness with the regular triśṭubḥs, the numbers of which I have added to the various specimens.

As in the case of triśṭubḥ versus čloka pāda, one cannot always say just which measure one has in hand when regular and hypermetric triśṭubḥs run together. Thus in xiii, 80, 11 a–b:

\[ \text{dhenuṁ savatsāṁ,} \\
    \text{kapilāṁ bhūriçñgīṁ} \\
    \text{kāṇsyopadohāṁ,} \\
    \text{vasanottarīyām;} \]

or in iii, 34, 21 c–d:

\[ \text{mitrāni cāi 'nam | acirād bhajante} \\
    \text{devā īve 'ndram | upajīvanti cāi 'nam,} \]

like a váitāliya.

The hypermetric syllable may be only apparent (elision) in some cases. In the older epic I have noticed only a elided thus, as in v, 44, 10 d:

\[ \text{eśa prath 'mo brahmacaryasya pādaḥ} \]

In the later epic, such elision takes place as well in the case of u and i, unless we assume a freer use of hypermetric syllables; as in:

i, 55, 11 d, \[ \text{tvaṁ vā Varuṇo dharmarājā Yamo vā} \]

vii, 201, 65 b, \[ \text{paraevadhinaṁ gadinaṁ cā 'yatāsim} \]

ib. c, \[ \text{ṣubhraṁ jaṭilam musalinaṁ candramāulim} \]

vii, 9,455 d (=ib. d), \[ \text{vyāghrājīnam paridadhānaṁ daṇḍapāṇim} \]

But here B. has parighinam.

xiv, 10, 2 a, \[ \text{Dhṛtarāṣṭra! prahito gaccha Maruttam} \]

H., 2, 79, 9 c, where the whole stanza reads:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a,} & \quad \text{āpo devya | ṛṣīnāṁ (hi }^{2} \text{) viçvadhātryo} \\
\text{b,} & \quad \text{divyā madantyo yāḥ | çanikarā dharmadhātryaḥ} \\
\text{c,} & \quad \text{hiranyavarṇāḥ | pāvakāḥ çivatamena} \\
\text{d,} & \quad \text{rasena çreyaso máṁ juśantu} \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ ^{1} \text{Read gacch' (a common type, No. 14).} \]

\[ ^{2} \text{C., 7,794, omits hi, and in b reads dharmarātryaḥ.} \]
If yāḥ followed rasena it would improve both pādas; but on this see the next paragraph. In c, hypermetric, cīvatamena must be read as cīv’tamena. In the next stanza (after apām eṣa smṛto mantraḥ, intervening), C., d, has (sc. mā)

bhārtur bhaveyam ruṣatī syān ca vaçagā
but here B., 11, has syān vaçāṅgā, which smacks of B.’s usual improving process.

vii–ix. Double Hypermeters or Triśṭubhs of Thirteen Syllables.

vii. Sporadically appears an “inserted fifth” in addition to the initial hypermeter:

xiii, 94, 3 a, ṛṣayaḥ sametāḥ | paçcime vāi prabhāse
xiii, 102, 39 a, cātavārṣajīvī | yaç ca çuro manusyaḥ
If the reading is right, this is found, but with different opening, in

iii, 197, 27 a, etāsām prajānām | pālayitā yaçasvī.

viii. But in the last case (though tāsām may be suggested for etāsām) a combination seems to be at work which is like that wrought by the caesura after the fifth, in cases where the triśṭubh then builds up its second half independently. Thus pālayitā yaçasvī would be a regular second half and etāsām prajānām would be a rough metrical equivalent of the type yatra devi Gaṅgā. The cases are:

(1) ii, 67, 4 c, sā tvam prapadyasva | Dhṛtarāṣṭrasya veçma
(2) iii, 5, 20 c, sahāyānām eṣa | samgrahane bhyupāyaḥ
(3) v, 46, 27 c, ajaç caro divā- | rātram atandritaç ca
(4) viii, 76, 18 a, prāsaç ca mudgarāḥ | çaktayaç tomarāç ca
(5) xiii, 159, 26 a, sa eva pārthāya | ēvetam açvam prāyacchat
(read prāyacchat ?)
(6) xiv, 9, 10 b, balāni sarvāṇi | vīrudhaç cā ’py amaṛdnan

1 Possibly, however, prapadya has been altered here by a grammarian.
2 In 30, ajaç caro divārātram atandrita ’ham, where C., 1,790, has ajaç cā ṭhorāṭram. The stanza is Upanishadic: aṅguṣṭhamātraḥ puruṣo mahātmā na dṛṣyaṭe ’saḥ hṛdi saṁniviṣṭaḥ, ajaç (etc.), sa tam matvā kavir āste pra-sannaḥ (as in Kaṭha vi, 17, etc.).
(7) H. 2, 72, 32 a, bhuṅkte ya eko (pronounce yāiko) vibhur |
      jagato viqvam agryam

(8) ib. 47 d,       abhi triviṣṭapamaḥ | caraṇaṁ yāmi Rudram
(9) ib. C. 7448 c,   guhā 'bhībhūtasya | puruṣasye 'qvarasya

And so, perhaps, in the case cited above from H., 2, 79, 9 b,
divyā madantyo yāḥ | caṁkarā dharmadhātryaḥ (when, after
rasena in d, tāḥ may be supplied).

The number of cases (all I have found) is considerably
reduced by reading in the etāsām verse above,

   tāsām prājānām
   in (1) sā tvam prapadya
   in (4) prāsāc ca mudg'raḥ
   in (5) sāiva pārthāya
   in (6) balāni sarvā (analogous to viqvā)
   in (8) triviṣṭapam (omitting abhi)

But the type seems to be established by bhuṅkte yāiko vi-
bhuḥ in (7), and guhā 'bhībhūtasya in (9); so it may seem
better to stick to the text than to adopt an explanation which
would demand still further changes, such as omitting eṣa in
(2), and vibhuḥ in (7); or rejecting the form of (9). Other
examples of thirteen-syllable triṣṭubhs exist, but they seem
to belong to another category, as shown below, where, however,
chandovidas te | ya uta nā 'dhītavedāḥ differs from adyāī'va
puṇyā 'ham | uta vaḥ Pāṇḍaveyāḥ only by cāsura, the latter
(from i, 198, 5 b) belonging here.

Defective Triṣṭubhs.

Considering the extent of the epic, the number of defective
(impossible) triṣṭubh pādas is small. Some of these I have
already noticed incidentally, and need not take up again. The
others I group in their order:

i, 197, 23 d,  adyā 'cqeṣasya bhuvanasya tvam bhavā 'dyāḥ
      Omit Bhava, Civa (No. 13, hypermetric).

1 Here B. (59) has puruṣeçvarasya.
THE GREAT EPIC OF INDIA.

v, 42, 15 d, nā 'dhīyīta nirṇudann ivā 'sya ca 'yuḥ
Read vā for iva.¹

v, 44, 3 c, anārabhyāṁ vasatī 'ha kāryakāle
Omit iha (= ātmany eva).

v, 44, 25 a, ābhāti āklaṁ ivā lohitam ivā 'tho
krṣṇam athā 'njanaṁ kādravaṁ vā (v. l. in 26 a,
kṛṣṇam āyasam arkavaṁ). Read vā for ivā 'tho and atho kṛṣṇam aṅjanam. In 26 a, a like change. So v, 48, 86 d, ākāče ca 'psu ca te kramaḥ syāt, for ca apsu.

v, 44, 28 a–c, nāi 'varkṣu tan na yajujṣu nā 'py atharvasu
na dṛṣyate vāi vimaleṣu sāmasu
rathāṁtare bārhadrathe vā 'pi rājan

For c, see the list above, p. 295. In a, read nāivarkṣu tan nā 'pi yajujṣyv atharvasu, or as hypermetric with yajūṣu?

viii, 3,338 c, dītsuḥ Karṇaḥ samare hastisāṭkam yaḥ
B. 66, 30, has hastisāḍgavam and omits yaḥ

xii, 60, 46 c–d, adharo vitānaḥ saṁsṛṣṭo vāīgyo brāhmaṇas triṣu
varṇesu yajjasṛṣṭaḥ

The preceding pādās make metre and sense. These make neither.

xii, 226, 18, na tat sadaḥ satpariṣat sabhā ca sa
prāpya yāṁ na kurute sadā bhayam
dharmatattvam avagāhya buddhimān
yo 'bhuyupaiti sa dhurarmdharaḥ pumāṇ (v. l. narāḥ)

Read (?)

na tat sadaḥ satpariṣat sabhā ca sa
samprāpya yāṁ na kurute sadā bhayam
tad dharmatattvam avagāhya buddhimān
yas tv abhyupaiti sa dhurarmdharo narāḥ

The sa has caused the loss of the following sam, a copy-error. Just so, bhavātmakam parivartamānam has lost sam before the

¹ The form vā for iva is found everywhere, e. g., xiii, 90, 42 c, sa vāi muktah, pippalam bandhanād vā (cyavate). So R. vii, 34, 15; 36, 42.
last word, xii, 10,544 a = 287, 13. The parallel proverb, v. 35, 58, has na sa sabha yatra na santi vrudhah (Manu, xii, 114).

xii, 285, 26 d, mam adhvaresh caimsitaraḥ stuvanti
rathamātaram sāmagāc ca 'pāgānti
mam brāhmaṇā brahmavideo yajante
(d) mamā 'dhvaryavaḥ kalpayante ca bhāgam

Varied readings in xiii, 159, 16, where d appears as tasmāi havir adhvyaryavaḥ kalpayanti, but tasmāi here is offensive. Read me 'dhvaryavaḥ.

H. 2, 74, 27 b, caṇva ca chreyaḥ kāṅkṣibhir varadāmeayāvīraḥ(ḥ)¹
(sc. pūjyase)

v, b and ix. Mora-Tristubh.

v, b. In the form of the hypermetric triṣṭubh shown above in tathā titikṣur atitikṣor viṣṇuḥ or na tvām pṛchāmi, Vidura, yad dhitam me, the scheme is

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{I} \\
\text{II} \\
\text{III} \\
\text{IV} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{VI} \\
\text{VII} \\
\end{array} \]

Now, as soon as the caesura in such a combination of syllables shifts back to the fourth syllable, \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{I} \\
\text{II} \\
\text{III} \\
\text{IV} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{VI} \\
\text{VII} \\
\end{array} \]

as in

tēṣāṁ kramāṁ kathaya tato 'pi ca 'nyat, v, 42, 26 c,

it is evident that, although such a pāda may be mechanically equated with No. 19 (as a hypermeter), it is on the other hand nothing but a mora-equivalent of the form (No. 1) \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{I} \\
\text{II} \\
\text{III} \\
\text{IV} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{VI} \\
\text{VII} \\
\end{array} \]

Again, in the case of neglected caesura (above), where two light syllables follow the "extra" syllable, we may as well take cakyrṣtiprāsmusalāny āyudhāni as an equivalent of \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{I} \\
\text{II} \\
\text{III} \\
\text{IV} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{VI} \\
\text{VII} \\
\end{array} \]

like the regular pāda with \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{I} \\
\text{II} \\
\text{III} \\
\text{IV} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{VI} \\
\text{VII} \\
\end{array} \]

in the second foot (No. 6); or, to give an example where the caesura is clearly marked, sa māṁ jīhmain, Vidura, sarvam braviṣī, iii, 4, 21 a, may be scanned as \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{I} \\
\text{II} \\
\text{III} \\
\text{IV} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{VI} \\
\text{VII} \\
\end{array} \]

Such pādās stand parallel to the regular forms, as in the Gītā, 2, 29, imitation of Kaṭha Up. ii, 7:

¹ The commentator asserts that this is really a "fourteen-syllable pāda," but, as nityaṁ precedes, caṇva may be omitted, leaving a dodeka hypermeter.
ācāryavat pañyati kaścid enam
ācāryavat vadati tathāī 'va ca 'nyaḥ
ācāryavac āśi 'nym anyaḥ āḥvati.

As resolution may take place in several places, we get quite a variety of rucirā-like pādas. The common alternation of the _ - _ - _ and _ - _ - _ pādas is thus represented:

xiv, 10, 19 a–b, ayam indro haribhir āyāti rājan
devāḥ sarvās tvarītāḥ stūyamanāḥ

ib. 10, 23 c–d, ayaṁ yajñāṁ kurute me surendra
Bṛhaspate ravaṇa viśramukhyāḥ

But the choriambus-equivalent is more common, as in

iii, 134, 28 c, hastī 'va tvam, Janaka, vinudyamānaḥ
xiv, 26, 1 ff. (refrain), yo ṛechayas, tam aham anubravīmi

Two or three pādas together are not unusual:

iii, 132, 9 d–10 a, bhāryāṁ ca vāi duhitaraṁ svāṁ sujātām
tasyā garbhaḥ samabhavan agnikalpaḥ

viii, 68, 7 d and 8 a–b, phalāṛthināṁ viphala ivā 'tipuṣpaḥ
prācchāditaṁ badācām ivā 'miśena
samchāditaṁ garalam ivā 'qanena

So in the jagaṭi-pāda iii, 133, 10 d, kasmād bālaḥ sthavira
iva prabhāṣase. Here it needs only the iambic opening to make a true rucirā, _ - _ - _ - _ _ - _ _ - _ , and this pāda is found repeatedly, not in complete rucirā-stanzas alone, but in jagaṭi stanzas. For example, iii, 3, 31 is a vańcāsthabhāla stanza, where three pādas are regular, but b has:

prakārtayee chucisumanāḥ samāhitāḥ

On the other hand, in i, 34, 26, the first pāda alone is of vańcāstha type, while three rucirā pādas follow, e. g., pāda d:

mahāτmanāḥ patagapateḥ prakārtanāt

These are both tag-stanzas, embellishing the close of a chapter.

1 The naïve pādas 10,000 b–7 a, following this stanza, are omitted in B. The embryo here says: vedāṇ āśi gāsa sarvaśāstrāṁ upetād adhitavān asmi
viva prasādāḥ, etc.
and of benedictive content. 1 A similar case occurs in iii, 3, 75 a, where, after praise, is said:

imāṁ stavaṁ prayatamanāḥ samādhinā
pāthed ihā 'nyo 'pi varāṁ samarthayan, etc.

But this arrangement is found also apart from such employment. So in viii, 66, 47, a, b, d are of this rucirā type; c is of upendra form, thus c–d:

hato mayā so 'dyā sametya Karna
iti bruwan praçamayase (v. l. me) 'dyā Phālguna

Here eleven syllables do not equate twelve (thirteen), but d equals ॐ ॐ ॐ. In viii, 84, 20 a, B. has sphātikacitra, where C. 4,281 has (tato dhvajāṁ) sphātikavicračakānacukam, probably the original, as B. is apt in varied readings to have the more uniform (improved) types.

As upendra and vañcastha pādas alternate, so rucirā pādas alternate with vañcasthanas. Thus in xii, 244, 29, a and c are of rucirā form; b and d, of vañcastha form. In a stanza of mixed upajātis, xii, 341, 119 b has

mahātmanāḥ puruṣavarasya kirtitam 2

The seventh book has a number of these combinations of rucirā pādas and stanzas and upajāti pādas and stanzas, usually as pāda tags at the end of chapters, for example, adhy. 26, 29, 30, 32; but it has also incorporated complete rucirās as parts of an upajāti system, as in 2, 15 and 16.

I give now—reverting to the triśṭubh—a few more examples:

ii, 58, 16 a, na cā 'kāmaḥ Čakuninā devitā 'ham
iii, 4, 17 a, tvāya prṣṭaḥ kim aham anyad vadeyam
iii, 4, 18 a, etad vākyam Vidura yat te sabhāyām

1 In xii, 219, 52, two or three pādas in a benedictive stanza are of this type. The first pāda in C. begins imāṁ yaḥ pañhati vimokṣaniçcayam, for B.'s imāṁ hi yaḥ pañhati (vi ?) mokṣaniçcayam. In xii, 114, 21, a benedictive stanza, rucirā pādas appear in a and d, e. g., the latter: na vāṁmayāṁ sa labhati kinicid aprīyam. xiii, 77, 32 has a whole rucirā in benediction.

2 Compare Gītā, 8, 10, sa tam param puruṣam upātimi divyam, etc.
In this example, ii, 71, 17, the much affected pāda symmetry is shown, b and d having "", a and c having "":

atidyūtaṁ kṛtam idāṁ Dhūrtarāṣṭrā
yasmāt striyāṁ vivadadhvam saḥbhāyām
yogakṣemāṁ nāgyato vaḥ samagrāṁ
pāpāṁ mantrāṁ Kurāvo mantrayanti

Similar is ib. 3, only the first pāda is jagatī. But the second foot corresponds to that of the third pāda; and so the fourth pāda has "" corresponding to "" in the second pāda:

anyāṁ vṛnīśva patim ācubhāvini
yasmād dāsyaṁ na labhāśi devanena
avācyā vai patīśu kāmaṃvṛttir
nityaṁ dāsye viditaṁ tat tavā 'stu

Contrast this, for example, with the following pādas, 20 a, 24 a, 26 c, of the same section:

Bhīmasya vākye tadvād evā 'ṛjunasya
tato Gāṇḍhārī Viduraḥ cā 'pi vidvān
Kṛṣṇāṁ Pāṇcālim abhavāt sāntvapūrvam

The last is a pure vāiṣvadevī pāda, as above nityaṁ dāsye viditaṁ tat tavā 'stu is a pure vātormī pāda, and yogakṣemāṁ nāgyato vaḥ samagrāṁ is a pure cālīnī pāda.

In pādas of the rucirā or rucirā-like type, the same word appears in the triśṭubh, which has caused a discussion in the āloka:

iii, 192, 56 d, tena ċreṣṭho bhavati hi jīvamānah

v, 44, 18 c-d: sa tāṁ vṛttim bahugunāṁ evam eti
guroḥ putre bhavati ca vṛttir eṣā

xii, 300, 27 d, moghaḥ ċramo bhavati hi krodhanasya

Here bhavati need not be pronounced bhoti, as it is a perfect parallel to bahu gu- in this stanza and to pacasi (bhavasi) in the following:
i, 232, 14, sṛṣṭvā lokāṁs trīṁ śāyāṁ havyavāha
kāle prāpte pacasi punah samiddhaḥ
tvam sarvasya bhuvanasya prasūtis
tvam eva 'gne bhavasi punah pratiṣṭhā

A monosyllabic pronunciation cannot be claimed for all these cases, though it might be maintained for special words:

i, 197, 42 a, tāṁ cāi 'vā 'gryāṁ striyam atirūpayuktām
iii, 4, 1 c, dharmatmānāṁ Viduram agādhabuddhim
iii, 4, 3 a, evaṁ gate Vidura yad adya kāryam
iii, 26, 11 d, labdhvā dvijāṁ nudati nṛpaḥ sapatnān
iii, 34, 9 b, yathākāmaṁ viditam Ajātaçatro
iii, 34, 20 c, mahāgūnaṁ harati hi pāruṣeṇa
iii, 111, 10 d, vratam brahmaṁ carasi hi devavat tvam
xii, 302, 114 b, mahārṇavaṁ vimalam udārakāntam
xiii, 71, 16 a, dṛṣṭvā 'va mām abhimukham āpatantam
xiii, 93, 136 a, advhavyave duhitaraṁ vā dadātu
xiii, 102, 36 b, tathe 'ṣṭināṁ daçacatam prāpnuvanti
xiii, 103, 35 b, tathā 'vā 'nyān anuṣhuho lokanātha
H. 2, 72, 33 a, Atharvāṇaṁ suçirasam bhūtayonim
H. 2, 74, 23 b, khyāto devaḥ paçupatiḥ sarvakarmā

But the great objection to a monosyllabic pronunciation is that the rucirā pāda interchanges up to three pādas with the ordinary triśūtbh pāda, and must therefore be identical in structure with the same pāda when four times repeated, in a perfect rucirā stanza. But in the rucirā stanza, no one can maintain for a moment that CCCCC is to be read with crasis. Why then when a stanza has three pādas of the same type or even one?

It may be said, however, that the mora triśūtbh pāda differs in no respect from the "inserted fifth," when the latter is a light syllable. For example in this stanza:

iii, 4, 21, sa mām jihmam, Vidura, sarvam braviṣī
mānaṁ ca te 'ham adhikaṁ dhārayāmi
yathe 'echakam gaccha vā tiṣṭha vā tvāṁ
susantvyamānā 'py asati stri jahāti

1 All the other pādas here are of strict cālinī type, — — — — C

2 ib, 94, 44, idem, but vā fails.
Here it is clear that susantvyamānā 'py is a complete foot of the inserted fifth variety; but pāda b is indifferently an inserted fifth or a mora pāda, the cāsura pointing but lightly to the latter explanation. One reason, however, against such an identification is that the mora explanation in almost all cases is indicated, as in most of the examples given, by a plain cāsura before the fifth. Another is that this explanation brings the various pādas of a stanza into symmetry, as in iii, 192, where _ _ _ is employed with predilection throughout, and we find in

iii, 192, 69, yathā yuktā | vāmadevā ḫam enaṁ
dine dine | saṁdiṇcānti nṛçıṁsam
brasmaneñhīyo | mṛgayati sūrtāṇī
tathā brahman | punyalokāṁ labheyam

Here mṛgayati sū _ _, as _ _ _ _, accords with the structure of the other pādas. So in jagatīś, e. g.,

vii, 26, 65–66, sa nāgarājaḥ pravarāṅkuçāhataḥ
purā sapañko 'drivarō yathā nṛpa
bhayaṁ tadā ripuṣu samādadhad bhṛcaṁ
vaṇijjanānāṁ kṣubhito yathā 'ṛnavah

tato dhvanir dviradarathāväpārthivaḥ, etc.

vii, 50, 14 a–b, tathā tadā yodhanam ugradarçanām
niçāmukhe pitṛpatirāṣṭravardhanam ¹

vii, 109, 37 c–d niçamya tam pratyanaṁ tu Pāṇḍavāś
tato dhvanir bhuvanapathā 'spṛçad bhṛcaṁ

Compare the close of vii, 155, four stanzas of rucirās and of vaṇcaṣthas, with the same mora-pādas.

A third point to be noticed is that the “inserted fifth” as brevis, and with its cāsura there, is always a rarity (as indicated in the lists above) unless followed by two (or three) other breves, so that we have finally two chief classes to explain, one with cāsura after the fifth heavy syllable, and the other with cāsura after the fourth, followed by breves equiva-

¹ Variant on the old stereotyped yamarāṣṭravardhana, of battle, hero, etc. as in vii, 145, 97 d; ib. 98 d.
lent in more to the rucirá pāda. There are a few cases bridging these classes and showing that the metrical equation was not always in harmony with the cæsura, but this is no more than was to be expected. We are not to imagine that the poets set themselves to compose pādas by categories; but we can hardly escape the conclusion that a pāda identical with a rucirá pāda was felt to be the same with it, though the characteristic pause of the rucirá may be absent; for in the regular rucirá the sense-pause and rhythmical pause are not always identical. Hence, when we find samānam mūrdhni rathayānaṁ viyanti in one stanza, and yuvāṁ varṇān vikurutho viçvarūpān in the next, i, 3, 65 a, we may explain them as belonging to two categories cæsurally distinct, or put them into one category, remarking that usually the cæsura is after the fourth in such syllabic combinations; for even with two breves following (the commonest case with the cæsura after the fifth) the examples are rare in comparison with the rucirá-like or true rucirá pāda, वऽ्-वऽ्-वऽ्-वऽ्-वऽ्; वऽ्-वऽ्-वऽ्-वऽ्-वऽ् (rucirá-like); वऽ्-वऽ्-वऽ्-वऽ्-वऽ् (rucirá). It is perhaps in each case merely a question of how the pāda is naturally to be read. Some will scan only one way, e.g., mārge bhagnaṁ çakaṭam ivā 'calākṣam in iii, 133, 28 d, irrespective of the stanza; while others may be read either way, as in the stanza ib. 19:

so 'ham çrutvā brāhmaṇānāṁ sakāçe
brahmādyāitaṁ kathayitum āgato 'smi
kvā 'sāu bandī yāvad enaṁ sametya
nakṣatṛāṇī 'va savītā nāçayāmi

or when united with the five-syllable foot, as in i, 89, 20:

tatra sthitam māṁ devaśuṣu saktaṁ
kāle 'titte mahati tato 'timātram
dūto devānām abravid ugrarūpo
dhvanise 'ty uccāis triḥplutenā svareṇa

ix. The māṭrā or ati-triṣṭubh pāda may even be combined with the pāda having inserted fifth, where the breves following the cæsura seem to be only rucirá-like resolution. It is a treiskaideka measure:
1, 89, 23 b, samūksya ce 'mām | tvaritam upāgato 'smi
(i, 198, 5 b, adyai 'va puṇyā 'ham | uta vaḥ Pāṇḍaveyāḥ 1)
v, 43, 50 c, chandovidas te | ya uta nā 'dhitavedāh
xvii, 3, 13 b, yad dattam iṣṭaṁ | vivṛtam atho hutaṁ ca
In xiii, 1, 32 d, kṣipraṁ sarpaṁ jahi, mā bhūt te viçaṅkā, as
compared with caṅkā rākṣo jahi Kṛṇā 'dya tuṁam, vii, 179,
48 c; tapantam enaṁ jahi pāpaṁ niṣṭhe, ib. 49 b, te may be
thought to be an intrusion, but it has a sort of parallel in iii,
4, 22 d, ne 'dam asti 'ty atha Viduro bhāṣamāṇaḥ (where C.
has atho!).

The mora rhythm in general is early, being found not only
in the epic but in the Upanishad and Buddhist verse. But
it is found also in imitative parts of the Purāṇas, as in Vāyu
P., xiv, 7, in a section where upendra pādas interchange
with the cālinī-like pāda (_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _...
abhiṣṭutah suravaraḥ siddhasaṅgār
  gato rauri suruciram astaçāīlam
  tvam apy ato Raghuvara gaccha saṁdhyām
  upāsitum prayatamanā narendra

This may be called a rucirā-triṣṭubh. On the rucirā stanza, see the section on akṣamechandas below.

The Triṣṭubh Stanza.

UPEJĀTIS. UPENDRAVAJRĀS AND INDRAVAJRĀS.

As stanzas, the forms that begin with a diiamb and continue with a choriamb are not particularly common. They are generally modified as upajātis, by combination with the indra varieties, which begin with a spondee, indravajrā and indravanā. Sometimes the perfect form appears as a mere later addition. Thus in iii, 23, only one stanza, 14, is upendra in sixteen upajātis (pāda a has final brevis). So iii, 111, 17–18 = 10,044; while in iii, 295, 9 and 10 are two perfect vaṇṭasthas, interpolated among čokas. In iii, 232, 14, an almost perfect1 upendra is enconced in a stuti of Skanda, where the environment is upajāti. Again, in iii, 286, in an upajāti system of thirty-one stanzas, one, 15, is pure upendra, except that pāda a ends in a brevis; and 19, 25, 27 are also pure upendras,2 except that in 27, pāda a ends in brevis. In xii, 201, out of twenty-seven triṣṭubhs, two, 6 and 23, are pure upendras. A pair of pādas occurs in viii, 89, 47, tato mahāṁ sāgaramekhalāṁ tvam sapattanāṁ grāmavatiṁ sampl-dhāṁ. But two pādas together is a large number except in late passages, like iii, 176 and 177, where they are not uncommon (176, 7, 15, 16; 177, 11, 21, 22); vaṇṭasthas in vii, 109, 36–37, with a rucirā pāda, etc.

As the vaṇṭastha(bila) is merely an upendra with a sylla-

1 The third pāda, however, ends in a brevis. On this point is to be noticed that such a brevis is not uncommon in the Bhārata, but in the Rāmāyaṇa is rare enough to deserve a special notice of R. vi, 74, 54, where every pāda ends in brevis. Here the stanza itself is upendra, but the system is upajāti.
2 Here only eight pādas are not of upajāti form, but VV VV VV.
ble added, so the jagatī corresponds to the different forms of the triṣṭubh. Thus in i, 197, 25, it takes the place of a vātornī, tatra hy ekam bhavitāro na saṁcayo, yonim sarve mānuṣīm āviçadhvam, tatra yūyaṁ karma kṛtvā 'viṣahyam, bahūn anyān nidhanam prāpayitvā; and just below, 53 b, pañcānām ekā svakṛtene 'ha karmanā, where it is hypermetric. Here a and d have eleven, c, 12, and b, 13 syllables. A near approach to a perfect vaṇcaṣtha is found in i, 198, 8, where all four pādas are normal, except that in b, — _ — , takes the place of the opening diamb. In ii, 64, 5, all pādas are perfectly regular. The interchange of an occasional vaṇcaṣtha pāda with the other pādas of an upajāti triṣṭubh is too common to call for further remark. Two instances will be found in i, 198, 20 and 22. In the former, the stanza would be a perfect upendra, but pāda c is of vaṇcaṣtha form; in the latter, which is an upajāti triṣṭubh, pāda c again is of pure vaṇcaṣtha form. So in i, 197, 11, an indravaṇca pāda heads and closes a triṣṭubh stanza. The cæsura is after the fifth or fourth, passim; or after the sixth, as in i, 197, 17 a, yadā tu paryāptam iha 'sya 2 krīḍayā; or a second occurs, as in iii, 5, 19 c, saṁvardhanay stokam ivā 'gnim ātmavān. The sixth place is often half as common as the fifth.

The cæsura in the pādas of the upajāti system is found most frequently after the fourth or fifth. The former, perhaps, in isolated pādas, as in xii, 64, 18 d, tatas te 'ham dadmi varān yatheṣṭam, and i, 92, 9 a and 11 d; but the forms in the Bhārata, though inclining largely to the fifth place, vary constantly, as they do in the Rāmāyaṇa. Examples from the latter have been given above in the introductory paragraph. I add some specimens from the other epic:

tad vai nṛpaṁsaṁ tad asatyam āhur
yāh sevate dharman anarthabuddhiḥ
artha 'py anīcasya tathāi 'va rājan, i, 92, 5 a–c
nilotpalabhā suradevate 'va
Krṣṇā sthitā mūrtimati 'va Lakṣmī, iv, 71, 17 c–d,

1 That is for _ _ _ , _ _ _ , mechanically considered.
2 On the light syllable before mute and liquid, see above, p. 242.
where a–b have caesura after the fifth and fourth respectively. Not infrequently where the triṣṭubhs pause after the fifth, the jakati, in the same stanza, pauses after the fourth, as in iii, 268, 19:

saçaṅkhaghoṣaḥ satalatraghoṣo
gaṇḍivadhanva muhur udvahaṅc ca
yadā ṇarān arpayitā tavo’rasi
 tadā manas te kim ivā ‘bhavisyat

But in pure vañcasthas, the caesura is apt to vary almost with the pāda, as in xii, 108, 40:

na sāmadaṇḍopaniṣat praçasyate
na mārdavaṁ çatṛsuṣa yātíkaṁ sadā
na sasyaghāto na ca saṅkarakriya
na cá ’pi bhāyāḥ prakṛter vicāraṇa

So in viii, 18, 12, the caesura of two pādas falls after the fourth and fifth respectively, and then comes the pāda: ativa eukṣo-bhavyiṣur janārdanam; while the fourth pāda is cut after the fourth syllable. Alternation is common, as ib. 14–15 (ções and ions alternately). Sometimes there is no caesura:

vāditraçaṅkhasvanasiñhanāda이
çarasiśaktyṛṣṭinipataduḥsaham, viii, 88, 3–4

or it is irregular:

alaṁ virodhena ṛ. dhig astu vigraham, ib. 21 b.
kṛtyām atharvāṅgirasim ivo ’grām, viii, 91, 48 = ix, 17, 44.

Upajātis are sometimes used to close systems, as are also upendras and vañcasthas. Pure vañcasthas may end a system of upajāti triṣṭubhs, as in viii, 76 and 79, xii, 167, 49–51, just as upajātis close a scene composed in old triṣṭubhs. The analogy with the tag-measures (discussed below) is here complete; the scene is set off with something better than the ordinary. As an example of the way in which upajātis are thus used may serve the end of iii, 154; or in i, 197 and 198,

1 Upaniṣad is here secrecy. So perhaps in xii, 271, 30, (apetatṛṣṭanāṁ, etc.) caturthopaniṣaddharmaḥ sādhāraṇa iti smṛtiḥ.
where the first part of the wedding scene at Drupada’s is in irregular old triśṭubhs, but regular upajātis conclude the scene; the latter beginning just where the actual wedding is described, and taking in the statement that the heroine was first married to Yudhīṣṭhira, then to the other brothers; that she preserved her virginity day by day; and that Drupada in conclusion gave most extravagant gifts. The smoothness of the statement babhūva kanyāī 'va gate gate 'hani, etc., 198, 14, stands with its surrounding verses in at least metrical contrast to the part that goes before, where triśṭubhs of vātornī and čālinī pādas and every sort of irregular combination is the rule. Whether the uniform upajātis conform to the uniforming of the poem is certainly a proper question to raise, though no signed and sealed statement to that effect is extant.

Another interesting example will be found at the end of the gambling scene, where from ii, 67, 24, almost regular upajātis continue to the end. This happens to be the passage where the heroine puts the legal question to which Bhīṣma is unable to reply, and where Karṇa joins in the laugh. The question is implied in what follows (68-70), but the passage in its present form is certainly open to the suspicion of having been rewritten by a more modern hand.

The first chapter of the Rṣyasatīnga episode is in old triśṭubhs. With the beginning of the sensuous description in the second chapter begin the upajātis, iii, 111, 112.

In the systems of the older epic, 2 ṭ ṭ ṭ, ṭ ṭ ṭ ṭ, ṭ ṭ ṭ, and ṭ ṭ ṭ, are used as interchangeable second feet. So universal are ṭ ṭ ṭ and ṭ ṭ ṭ that they must be considered as the chief triśṭubh measure of the older epic, greatly in excess of ṭ ṭ ṭ. But in the fourth book and most later parts, these recede before the upajātī forms. Jagatī pādas are inserted occasionally in all the free triśṭubh sections. 1 It is perhaps worthy of remark that, for example, in the Dyūta Parvan, the diiambic opening, or even, it might be said, the

1 The process elsewhere of making a jagatī pāda is sometimes patent, as in viii, 90, 72 d: bhindhi tvam enam Namuciṁ yathā Hariḥ (for yath ‘endrap); here in an upajātī system of jagatis.
whole upendra form, is found par excellence in the final pāda(s), though found also in a, b, c, especially as the section gradually passes (towards its end) into regular upajātis, 67, 26 ff. For example, at the beginning of the scene, 56, 12–16:

\[
\begin{align*}
12, & \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \\
13, & \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \\
14, & \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \\
15, & \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \\
16, & \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \\
\end{align*}
\]

I have remarked in the list of examples given above that some of the older forms of the triṣṭubh are practically confined to the early parts of the epic. The fourth and seventh books are considered to be late, or, what amounts to the same thing, modern expanded forms of older material. The middle foot \( \circ \circ \circ \) occurs not infrequently in the older epic, but in the whole fourth book it occurs but once, and in the seventh only twice in 1280 pādas. Upajāti systems, except, as just observed, as a sort of tag, are not frequent in the older epic, where the systems are of the type \( \circ \circ \circ \) and \( \circ \circ \circ \) with interspersed choriambics. The latter part of the third book, however, and all of the fourth book prefer the upajāti system (the cesura being after the fourth in only one-third of the cases in the latter), and blocks of upajātis appear in the much-expanded battle-books. As a system, the upajāti marks late passages, such as the song of Ćṛī in the eleventh section of the thirteenth book, and the praise of gifts in the fifty-seventh section of the same book, where only two pādas are not upajātī. This book is also marked by the large number of its ḍālinī stanzas (not single pādas), which keep up an old measure in a new fixed form. Old as is the choriambic pāda, the stanza form of the choriambic triṣṭubh employed in great groups to the exclusion of other forms of triṣṭubh appears to be an innovation. A form once given persists, and so we have late passages with
as the second foot, just as this and  are still met here and there in the Purāṇas, but when the choriamb is employed continuously in a long system the passage may be set down as late, or, if one prefers the expression, as more refined, as in the whole Rāmāyaṇa and in the later books of the Mahābhārata.

Another mark of lateness appears to lie in the absence of an indiscriminate mixture of triṣṭubh and jagātī forms. Later passages are rather apt to show uniformity in this regard; earlier passages show none, though an harmonious commingling in alternate or chiastic form (12 + 11 + 12 + 11 or 11 + 12 + 12 + 11) is at all times somewhat affected, and late passages sometimes show no uniformity; but the tendency is in the other direction.

The Syllaba Anceps.

In respect of the pāda syllaba anceps, the epic permits this not only in free triṣṭubhs, but also in upajātis, and even in isolated pure choriambic stanzas. But even the classical poets share this freedom. That is to say, as Professor Capeller has shown, although the rule is that pure upendras and indravajrās or the corresponding jagatīs shall have final anceps only at the end of the hemistich, yet if these stanzas, though complete

1 Solitary cālīnī stanzas also occur in the Purāṇas. For example, Vāyu P. vi, 71, repeated in ix, 113, where occurs the stanza: vakrād yasya brāhmaṇī samprasūtāḥ, yad [tad] vakṣataḥ kṣatriyāḥ pūrvabhāge, vāicyaḥ ca rvor yasya padbhyaṁ ca çūdāḥ sarve varṇā gātrataḥ samprasūtāḥ, a pure cālīnī.

2 A choriambic verse or stanza is a different matter. This may be as old, or older, than a corresponding stanza of other form. For example, the prose proverb of Gāut. xxiii, 20, appears in the form pañcāñ śṛṇvā āhur apātakaṁ first in Vas. xvi, 35, as an upajāti stanza. The oldest version in the epic is in i, 82, 16, where there is no exception in the case of a teacher, as in Gāutama (for an untruth here is a mortal sin, not venial), nor is the priest included, as in Vas.; but the five venial lies are in case of wounds, about women, in case of marriage, death, and robbery, couched in upajāti. A second form occurs, however, in xii, 105, 30, where the teacher is mentioned in the same way as is the priest. The other difference between the epic versions is that the latter begins na narmayuktam aṁrtaṁ hīṇasti; the former, vacanaṁ hīṇasti, as choriamb. Spruch 3,321 has only one of these forms (ascribed to a Purāṇa), Manu, viii, 112, is in ṭloka.
in themselves, form part of a general system of upajātis, the freer form is permitted. Thus in Raghuvaṃśa vii, 9, a pure indravajrā occurs with the third pāda ending in brevis, but it is in an upajāti chapter. Examples from epic poetry are:

ii, 56, 21 a (a triśṭubh stanza), tato vidvān Viduram man-trimukhyām

ii, 63, 10 a (ditto), jānīmahe devitaṁ Sauabalasyā

So in these pure choriambic stanzas, found in a general upajāti system:

    iii, 176, 7, tava pratijñāṁ Kururāja satyāṁ
cikirṣamāṇas tad anupriyāṁ ca
tato na gacchāma vanāny apāsyā
guṣodhanaṁ sānucaṛaṁ nihantum

and ib. 15,

tavā 'ṛthasiddhyartham api pravṛttāu
Suparṇaketuṣ ca Çīneç ca naptā
tathāi 'va Kṛṣṇaḥ pratimo balaṇa

tathāi 'va ca 'haṁ naraṇeva varya

iv, 11, 9, c, 
Brhannālām māṁ naraṇeva viddhi

ib. 54, 17 a, 
caçāra saṁkhye vidiço diçaç ca

This is very rare in Viṣṇu. In jagati:

iii, 268, 19 c, 
yadā ċarāṇ arpaṇitā tavo'rasī
xiii, 70, 9 c-d, 
tvayā purā dattam itī 'ha çurumā

nṛpa dvijebhyāḥ kva nu tad gataṁ tavā

Examples in the Harivaṃśa may be found at 2, 95, 1 ff. (= 8781 ff.); ib. 6 a; ib. 10 and 11 c: ib. 14 a and c; ib. 24 c; ib. 29 c (na vēti); 2, 124, 53 a (= 10,625), etc.

Epic usage, however, keeps the final syllable long in the prior pādas. Exceptions like those just given are not uncommon, but are distinctly exceptions. I have no statistics, but perhaps the general condition may be stated well enough in saying that one has to hunt for final breves in prior pādas of pure upendra and indravajrā stanzas and does not have to hunt for final longs; while in upajātis the final breves are not so uncommon as in the pure stanzas of uniform type.
In this regard I see no special difference between the two epics. Perhaps the Rāmāyaṇa poet is a little more shy of the brevis but it occurs there also, not only in pure upendras standing in an upajāti environment, but even in isolated tag-stanzas where the upendra stands alone. Thus where G. ii, 33, 27 has a varied reading which converts the stanza to an upajāti, the Bombay text of R. ii, 33, 29, presents (in an upajāti environment) a pure upendra stanza, with the first pāda ending in brevis, pratīkṣamāṇo bhijanam taddā 'ṛtām. Another example will be found in vi, 69, 92 = G. 49, 77. In upajātis it will be enough to refer to R. ii, 15, 44 a; 21, 52 c; 37, 34 a; 36 a; v, 28, 4 ff., etc. In the case of isolated tag-upendras, examples may be found in R. vi, 61, 39, where c ends in a brevis, although the isolated stanza is pure upendra, and in R. ii, 115, 24 (not in G.), where both a and c end in breves:

\[
\text{taddā hi yat kāryam upāiti kīncid}
\]

\[
\text{upāyanam co 'pahṛtam mahāram}
\]

\[
\text{sa pādakābhyām prathamam nivedyā}
\]

\[
\text{cakāra paqe cāy Bharato yathāvat}
\]

One fact seems certain from the treatment of upajātis versus upendras and indravajrās or vaṇḍasthābhilas and indravaṇcās, namely, that the native metricists in calling the upajāti a mixture of upendra and indravajrā or of vaṇḍasthā and indravaṇcā, and treating it as a derived form are historically incorrect. Of course, the upajāti stanza is a stanza in which some pādas are of one type and some are of another; but it is not a mixed development from pure stanzas of either type. On the contrary, the upajāti is the prius, and the pure upendra and pure indravajrā stanza is a refinement on the mixed type. Historically the choriambic triśṭubh begins with syllable anceps like the cloka,\(^1\) and upendras and indravajrās are differentia-

\(^1\) For this reason, in the Illustrations, though giving examples of each, I do not separate (as is usually done) the types of opening, e. g., \(\bigcirc \quad \bigcirc \quad \bigcirc \quad \bigcirc \) and \(\bigcirc \quad \bigcirc \quad \bigcirc \quad \bigcirc \). Only in complete forms of stanzas, like the cālinī, vātormī, and rucirā, is the first syllable fixed. In the free triśṭubh and upajāti stanzas the initial syllable is quite indifferent. Then comes the upendra stanza,
tions of the earlier mixed types. They had the same development as had the câlini, which began, as in the epic, with \( \_ _ \_ \_ \), and settled at last into \( \_ \_ \_ \_ \) as a first foot.

The upajāti stanza in its turn is derived (as a more refined form) from the mixed triṣṭubh of the early epic type, which unites into one stanza not only pādas of the choriambic type and of the types \( \_ \_ \_ \_ \), \( \_ \_ \_ \_ \), but also of the type of the rucirā or mora-pāda; of which, together with the special stanzas of fixed form derived from these measures, I shall speak hereafter. It is to be observed that this mixture of vātormī, câlinī, choriambic, and resolved-syllable pādas in one stanza is Vedic and Bhārata, non-classical and non-Rāmāyana,\(^1\) but also, in a very limited degree, Puranic. That is to say, the Bhārata, the oldest extant Purāṇa, on the one hand preserves the old Vedic type, which is still kept up in a measure in the later Puranic diction, while on the other it has the clear-cut upajāti system favored by Vālmīki, the former both in early and late parts; the latter only in late parts, according as the different poets preserved the old style, or, like Vālmīki, cut loose from it and wrote only in upajāti form.

**Emergent Stanzas.**

Of peculiar interest is the growth of the completed stanza of other triṣṭubh forms. In the great epic, we can, as it were, see the gradual emergence of the complete câlinī, vātormī, and vāiçvadevi stanzas (of four identical pādas) from the single, double, and triple pāda of this form in triṣṭubh stanzas, till at last a few complete câlinī stanzas are found and one perfect vāiçvadevi.

The occasional pāda is indefinitely antique. It is the fourfold-combination that is emerging; just as upajātis emerge from mixed triṣṭubhs, and upendras from upajātis. In the completed refined pāda the opening is spondaic; in the emerg-

\( \_ \_ \_ \_ \), as distinguished from the indra-vajrā, \( \_ \_ \_ \_ \), both secondary, not as pādas, but as stanzas, to the upajāti.

\(^1\) The Vedic usage is illustrated in Kühnau, Die Triṣṭubh-Jagati Familie, p. 52.
gent type it is indifferently iambic or spondaic like other triṣṭubh forms. This sporadic appearance calls for no special remark here, as examples may be found in the list of examples of triṣṭubh pādas. The first stage beyond this is where two pādas appear of half-çālinī form but with iambic opening. This is either “regular” or hypermetric,¹ as in

iii, 5, 16 c–d: yathā ca parne puṣkarasyā ’vasiktaṁ
    jalaṁ na tiṣṭhet pathyam uktaṁ tathā ’smin

The hypermetric çālinī pāda of this sort (vāiçvadevi) is common, as in i, 55, 12 b, trātā loke ’sminś tvamī tathē ’ha prajānām (so ii, 77, 10 b, etc.), as shown below.

Again, in mixed triṣṭubhs, where we have half a stanza of almost pure çālinī form, as in vi, 3, 65 c–d; or even an almost complete stanza, as in

i, 58, 19: etac cbrntvā priyamānāṁ sametā
    ye tatrā ’san pannagā vitamohāḥ
    Āstike vāi prītimanto babhūvur
    úcēs cāi ’nāṁ varam iṣṭaṁ vṛṇīṣva

Here the çālinī is complete save for the last pāda. So in

iii, 4, 4, there is a perfect çālinī save for the first syllable of a. In iii, 5, 13, the stanza is nearly vātormī, but three pādas begin with a short syllable and the first has the çālinī trochee. In v, 40, 29, three pādas are pure çālinī and one is vātormī. These forms are often symmetrically united. Thus in i, 58, 20, the pādas run çālinī + vātormī + çālinī + vātormī, save that in b and c the third syllable of the first foot is brevis. Sometimes the arrangement is chiastic, as in i, 197, 30, where the pādas are vātormī — çālinī, çālinī — vātormī, etc. These forms are again mixed freely with upajāti pādas, as in i, 187, 6, this combination being too common to need further illustration. The vātormī or çālinī pāda often closes the stanza in such a combination. Thus in i, 76, 47, a is upajāti, b is jagati, c is çālinī, d is vātormī; ib. 64, d is çālinī, the others

¹ This form is sometimes effaced by varied readings. Thus in vii, 54, 43, pāpena ’tmānam mañjāyisyaty asantam, of C. 2116, appears as pāpe ’tmānam.
are upajəti pādas. Alternation of upajətis, çalini-pāda tri-
śṭubhs, and clokas is found in the dramatic Ċārāgopākhyāna,
i, 232, 8 ff.

A goodly number of specimens of stanzas showing a close
approach to the çalini is found in vii, 2, where finally, in 26,
appears one whole çalini stanza:

a PVān agryān pāṇḍurābhrapākācān
puśtan snātān mantrapātābhīr adbhīh
aptā’īr bhāndāḷī kāṁcanāīr abhyupetān
çīghrān çīghraṁ sūtāputrā ’nayasva

So in vii, 54, 40 ff., there is a number of almost complete
and quite complete çalinis.

A complete çalini occurs in i, 58, 21; another in v, 33,
115 (toward the end of adhy. 40 there are çalini pādas).
The usual order in the epic, however, is a mixture of single
pādas. The pseudo-epic, on the other hand, heaps up com-
plete çalini stanzas. Thus in a little system of ten stanzas at
xii, 24, 25 ff., çalini, vātormī, and upajəti pādas are all mixed
up together but lead up to perfect çalini stanzas in 29, 30, 32.
In Anuṛçasana, complete stanzas are common, e. g., xiii, 73,
39; 77, 31 and 33 (with a rucirā between), on giving cows
to priests. In Čāntī may be compared also xii, 63, 9–10 (two
complete çalini stanzas); 259, 39–42; 319, 86 ff. (five out of
seven stanzas). The prior pāda of the hemistich may end
in brevis, as in some of the last examples, e. g. in 319, 89,
where the stanza from a Brahmanic point of view is as late
as the sentiment:

sarve varṇā brāhmaṇā brāhmaṃjāc ca
sarve nityam vyāharante ca brāhma
tattvām āśtram brāhmabhūdhyā brāvunī
sarvam viṃśam brahma ca ’t tat samastam

The vātormī stanza, if I am not mistaken, is not yet com-
plete in the epic; but its pādas come near to making a com-
plete stanza, as in vii, 201, 78:
astâusâm tvâm tava sammânânam icchân
vicinvan vâi sadrçâmâ devavarya
sudurlabhân dehi varân mame 'ştân
abhiśçutaḥ pravikârśâq ca mâyân

still closer in ii, 58, 12:

ke tatrâ 'nye kitavâ divyamânâ
vinâ râjño Dhṛtarâṣṭrasya putrâḥ
prochâmi tvâm Vidura brâhi nas tân
yâir divyâmah çataçâh samînipatya

The hypermeter is not so common as that of the cālinî. A
case occurs in iii, 134, 14 b: sapta cchandânâsî kratum ekaṁ
vahanti; and another, ib. 12 b: yajñâh pañcâi 'vâ 'py atha
pañcendriyâni. So in ii, 77, 7 a; v, 35, 42 a. The last case
reads:

nâî 'nâîm chandânâsî vrjînât târayanti
(in 43, 5, as: na cchandânâsî vrjînât târayanti)

As said above, the isolated væîçvadevî pâda is not unusual.
Such pâdas are reckoned as triṣṭubh pâdas, as in i, 1, 205 c;
216 a; and so very often elsewhere. For example, xii, 319,
91 d:

ajñânataḥ karmayonîm bhajante
tâm tâm râjaṁs te yathâ yânty abhâvam
tathâ varnâ jûnâhînâh patante
ghorâd ajñânât prâkṛtaṁ yonijâlam

In i, 1, 212 b, there is a pâda identical with this save that it
has initial brevis, hatân Pañcâlân Drâupadeyânuç ca suptân,
followed in 217 d by a pure pâda, tasmin saûgrâme bhâirave
kṣatriyânâm. In i, 89, 12 b, _ _ _ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ _ _ _ , the
væîçvadevî appears as an irregular hypermetric cālinî. This
stanza is almost a væîçvadevî:

anityatâm sukhaduḥkkhasya buddhvâ
kasmât saûtàpam Aṣṭakâ 'hâm bhajeyam
kim kuryâm vâi kim ca kṛtvâ na tapye
tasmât saûtàpam varjyâmy apramattâḥ
Half a complete stanza appears in xii, 292, 22 (a tag):
rajña jetavyāḥ castravaṇaḥ ca 'nnataḥ ca
samyak kartavyam pālanaṁ ca prajānām
agniḥ ceyo bahubhīṇ ca 'pi yajñair
antye madhye vā vanam आविर्य stheyam
(where the scolius is — — —, above, p. 280)

A vaiśvadevi pāda appears also in a benedictive verse in vii, C. 5,045 d, cūdrā ārogym prāpnuvantī 'ha sarve, but B. 96, 63 has cūdrā 'rogym. The complete stanza occurs but once in the great epic and twice in the Rāmāyaṇa, as will be shown in the next section.

The Fixed Syllabic Metres.

The title ākṣaraacchandhas or its equivalent, varṇavṛttta, "syllabic verse" covers, properly speaking, all metres fixed by syllabic measurement, but it is used only of such stanzas as have a fixed number of syllables arranged in a fixed order in each pāda, all four pādas being alike. The čloka, therefore, is not included, nor the free triṣṭubh of the Mahābhārata. On the other hand, the triṣṭubh in several of its fixed forms, when these are used throughout the stanza, is an ākṣaraacchandhas. Such are the upajāti forms, the cālinī, vātormī, vaiśvadevi, and rucirá. In the scheme of classical metres, there are from twenty to thirty each of such hendekas and dodekas, called triṣṭubhs and jagatīs because of the number of syllables in them.

Of this large number, about a dozen are found in epic poetry. They include those just named, in regard to which it will be necessary to speak further only of two, the vaiśvadevi and rucirá. Besides these, the additional epic rhythms of this class will now be reviewed, arranged, according to their syllabic value, as triṣṭubh, jagatī, atijagatī, cakvarī, atiçakvarī, and atidhṛti, that is in stanzas of four pādas, each pāda having eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, and (in the epic case) nineteen syllables, respectively. They are distributed between the two epics as follows:

---

1 On their numerical distribution in the Mahābhārata, see below.
The upajātis, including their four components, as also the čalini and vātormī, have already been sufficiently discussed. The vātormī does not reach stanza form, but its pāda is frequently found alone, duplicated, or trebly; the last case, which is rare, giving three-fourths of a complete vātormī. The čalini is found not only often in pāda form but occasionally as a complete stanza, sometimes grouped in small numbers in the later books of the great epic. The jagatī pramitākṣaraṇa pādas, isolated in the Čaṇti Parvan, will be spoken of below, under the head of mātrāchandās; where will be discussed also the free praharaṇākaliṭā found in the same part of the pseudo-epic.

Rathoddhatā.

Having eleven syllables to the pāda, this metre is called a triṣṭubh. Its scheme is - O - , O O O - O - O - ; for example, tasya taj janayātī 'ha sarvataḥ. It may be regarded, therefore, as a jagatī without the initial syllable, its final dīambus giving the true jagatī cadence. Compare under No. 19: (ku-)
lambharān anāduhaḥ cātaṁ cātān. There are three and one half stanzas of this rhythm, though the actual occurrences are more numerous; but the same stanza appears repeated. Thus xii, 250, 13–14 is a repetition of xii, 194, 61–63.
Here there are two and one half stanzas, arranged in B. in groups of four, two, and four pādas; in C., as four, four, and two; as if the hemistich were a whole in itself. In xii, 286, 46, one of these stanzas is repeated again with slight changes. In the first instance, the group forms a tag with an aparavaktra, as it does also in the second instance; while in the third it appears in the same way after a puṣpitāgrā. The third separate stanza of this sort is found as a tag after člokas in xii, 247, 23. All these cases are regular; only the hemistich ends in brevis. The metre is found only in Çānti Mokṣa and not in the Rāmāyaṇa. The last case may serve as an example:

\[
\begin{align*}
yac \text{ ca te manasi vartate param} \\
yatra ca 'sti tava saṁcayaḥ kvacit \\
cṛyatam, ayam abhām tavā 'grataḥ \\
putra kiṁ hi kathayāmi te punaḥ
\end{align*}
\]

The (meaningless) diiambic name may at least be a reminder of the rathoddhatā’s presumably original opening, and its diiambic close.

**Bhujamgaprayāta.**

This twelve-syllabled rhythm is called a jagatī, but it has the final triṣṭubh cadence. The latter part of the pāda is in fact identical with that common triṣṭubh form which has the middle and end \( \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \); but before this are five syllables, the fourth being a brevis \( \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \). Such a form as this, however, is actually found in one text as the pāda of a hypermetric triṣṭubh, as already pointed out (p. 289), and is nearly equalled (long initial) in the corresponding pāda,

\[
\text{na tṛānām labhet tṛānām icchan sa kāle,}
\]

But the specimens in the epic show that the caesura is not that of the pāda just cited, but rather that of a series of bacchii:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sa ādiḥ | sa madhyaḥ | sa ca 'ntah | prajānām} \\
anādyo hy amadhyas tathā ca 'py anantah
\end{align*}
\]

This metre appears once as a tag in a Tīrtha story, ix, 41, 40, and twice in the twelfth book in an identical hymn in the
middle of two chapters, xii, 341, 100 and 343, 90, the first and third pādas of each version being those just cited, one being a repetition of the other with variations.

There is only one case in the Rāmāyaṇa, vi, 77, 24. In R. this is part of a tag after a puṣpitāgrū, which appears in both texts, while the bhujāṅgaprayāta itself is lacking in G. Here also the cadence is distinctly bacchić: caçāle 'va co 'rvī | paṣāte 'va sā dyāur | balaṁ rākṣasānām | bhayaṁ cā 'viveça.1 In both epics, the hemistich alone has final brevis (anceps), as above, and in ix, 41, 40 d, dhūτāmā jītātmā samabhya-jagāmā. This metre is expressed by its name bhujāṅga-prayātam, 'the snake-slide,' ː ː ː ː ː ː, which, in the stanza, is repeated (as a whole) eight times.

Drutavilambita.

This measure, having twelve syllables to the pāda, is called a jāgati. But although it ends as well in a diiambus, it is yet far from the cadences already examined under the name of jāgati. The rhythm is in fact dactylic, so that the trisyllabic measurement suits it; but the first foot has a tribrach as a substitute for a dactyl, and the final syllable is long: ː ː ː ː ː ː ː ː ː ː. Only two of these stanzas are found in the great epic, and none in the Rāmāyaṇa. The two are together in vii, 184, 47-48; the latter, for example, as follows:

haravṛṣottama-gātrasamadyutih
smaraçarāśana-pūrṇasamaprabhāh
navavadhūṣmita-cārumanoharaḥ
praviśṛtaḥ kumudākarabāndhavaḥ

These are not exactly tags, but they are close to the end of the chapter. The prevailing cæsum2 may indicate that the metre is a catalectic form of triṣṭubh with resolved opening;

1 A rough English equivalent would be (of the hymn): "Beginning and midst he, and end of creation;" (of the description): "and terror then entered the huge host of demons." The trisyllabic native measurement is here the most accurate.

2 The last pāda above may of course be read as anapestic with anacrusis; the preceding, more naturally, with dactylic cadence.
but this genesis is by no means so certain as in the case of other triṣṭubh derivatives. To judge from the epic, it is a later metre, and may be either an experiment in resolution (of No. 2), or a new independent invention. It is not necessary, I conceive, to derive every metre from some other, and I incline to the latter view. All the pādas in the two epic specimens end in heavy syllables. The sound drutavilambitāṁ, \( \overline{\text{O O O -- O O}} \), may serve to remind of the opening cadence; but the other form of the name (in "taṁ") really agrees with the meaning, "rapid and dilatory," indicating the beginning and end of the pāda.

**Vāicvadevi.**

Rare in both epics, this metre occurs but once in stanza form in the Mahābhārata, a tag followed by a supplementary triṣṭubh. The first hemistich end in brevis. Sporadic pādas of the vāicvadevī type, \( \overline{\text{- - - - -}} \), \( \overline{\text{O O O - O O}} \), are not infrequent. The twelve syllables do not make a jagatī, though the metre is so called, but a hypermetric triṣṭubh of the type described above (see No. 7). The native method of measuring by trisyllables in all cases is well shown in this metre to be absurd. For example, in the pāda cited above, Kṛṣṇāṁ Pañcālīṁ abravit sāntvapūrvam, the cæsura and natural division is in groups of five and seven syllables respectively. So in the one stanza of the great epic, xii, 291, 25 = 10,721 (Mokṣa):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bhūra rājanyo, brāhmaṇaḥ sarvabhaksyaḥ} \\
\text{vāicyo 'nīhāvān, hinavarno lasaḥ ca} \\
\text{vidvāniḥ cā 'cīlo, vṛttahinaḥ kulīnāḥ} \\
\text{satyād vibhraśto brāhmaṇastrī ca tuṣṭā}
\end{align*}
\]

(26, rāgī yuktaḥ pacamāno 'tmahetor \\
mārkho vaktā nrpahinaṁ ca rāṣṭram \\
ete sarve čocyatāṁ yānti rājan \\
yaḍ ca 'yuktaḥ snehahinaḥ prajāsu)

1 This is the reading of B. In C., brāhmaṇaḥ stri ca duṣṭā.
In the Rāmāyaṇa, a single pāda is found in R. (above), and one whole stanza also (lacking in G.), v, 65, 28 (both hemistichs ending in brevis). There is, further, a half stanza in v, 63, 33, united with a hypermetric triṣṭubh hemistich, not in G. but following a tag-triṣṭubh common to both texts; an interesting example of the equivalence of the vāiśvadevī and free triṣṭubh pādas:

prāthsphitāksān samprahṛṣṭānān kumārān
āṃstvā siddhārthān vānarānanām ca rājā
aṅgāiḥ prahṛṣṭāiḥ kāryasiddhiḥ vidītvā
bāhuvā saṃnām atīmātraṁ nananda

For the two pādas of the second hemistich, see Nos. 6 and 13 in the Illustrations of triṣṭubhs. The only difference between them and the vāiśvadevī lies in the syllables marked short. For another form of vāiśvadevī, see the mālinī below.

Atijagatis.

Rucirā.

Of the fifty-one stanzas of rucirās in the Mahābhārata, almost all are regular. One or two slight irregularities occur in the thirteen cases found in the Rāmāyaṇa. Independent pādas of this type scattered among ordinary triṣṭubh pādas are not uncommon in the former epic. They have been discussed above as mora-jagatiś and triṣṭubhs. The type of the pure rucirā, ०-०-०-०, ००००-०-०-०, has long been held ¹ to be merely a jagatī with resolution, and, as was said above, this seems to be the only possible explanation of the pāda, whether it happens to occur four or three times, twice, or only once in a stanza.

Less common than the substitution of a rucirā pāda for a triṣṭubh or jagatī pāda, yet still not infrequent, is the harmonious alternation of pādas. The converse of the former case is found in the occasional substitution of a vaṁcaśasthabila pāda in regular rucirā stanzas, as in the group of ten tag-

ruciṁś at i, 19, 22–31 (hemistichs end in brevis; so in xii, 52, 34). Here the stanzas are all regular ruciṁś, four pādas each of the type given above (final ancesp only at the end of the hemistic), with the exception of stanzas 27 and 30, in which the second pādas are vānçasthabila-pādas; thus, 29–30:

tato mahīṁ lavanajalaiṁ ca sāgaram
mahāsurāḥ praviviçur arditāḥ surāiḥ
viyadgataṁ ķvalitahutāçanaprabham
sudarçanam parikupitaṁ niçanyate
tataḥ surāir vijayaṁ avāpya Mandarāḥ
tva eva deçam gamitaḥ supūjitaḥ
vinādyai khoṁ divam api cāi 'va sarvaças
rato gataḥ saliladharā yathāgataṁ

In i, 23, 21–26, there are six tag ruciṁś, as stuti, but in stanza 23 only one pāda is of ruciṁ form, the others being upajātis; while in i, 34, 26, one vānçastha pāda is followed by three ruciṁ pādas.

It is very unusual to find this stanza except as a tag, as in the examples just given. In i, 56, 1, however, is found a stanza consisting of one ruciṁ pāda and three triṣṭubh pādas, the first being peculiar in opening with a spondee: bālo 'py ayaṁ sthavira ivā 'vabhaṣate, nā 'yam bālaḥ sthaviro 'yam mato me, etc. Such a pāda in such a stanza confirms the view that the whole ruciṁ is merely a resolved jagatī.

The alternate arrangement, referred to on the last page, may be seen in the tag at vii, 29, 51:

nihatyai taṁ narapatim indrivikramaṁ
sakhāyaṁ indrasya tad āindrir āhaye
tato parāṁś tava jayakāṅkṣino narāṁ
babhaṅja vāyur balavān drumāṁ īva

1 At iii, 25, 5, a ruciṁ stanza appears among the group of triṣṭubhs with which the chapter begins. Its first pāda is an echo of the one cited above, tam āgatāṁ ķvalitahutāçanaprabham. In vii, 2, 15–16, two ruciṁs appear in the same way among vānçasthas. At the end of vii, 148, the tag-effect is done away with by the addition in C. 6,443 ff. of five chokas (not found in B.) after the two vānçasthas, which in B. complete the tag begun by the ruciṁ, 56.
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The same arrangement has already (p. 303) been noticed in xii, 244, 29. Another stanza in this book, xii, 52, 34, forms the finale of a short system of pure (tag) vaṁcasthabillas. One fifth of all the rucirā stanzas in the epic are in the Hari-
vaṁca, inserted as tags, and they are all perfectly regular, with the substitution of one vaṁcastha pāda each in 2, 123,
35 c and 3, 34, 48 d, respectively. In addition to these, there
is half a rucirā at C. 10,274 (after vaṁcasthas and before
clokas), the prior pāda of which ends in brevis: namo 'stu
te mahiṣamahāsurārdini, namo 'stu te bhayakari vidviśām
sadā. Here B. 2, 120, 43, inverts the pādas, permitting the
brevis at the end; but it also has a varied reading, bandhana-
mokṣakārini, which leaves only one rucirā pāda. The other
cases call for no special remark. The cæsura is after the
fourth syllable.

In the Rāmāyaṇa there are but four rucirās common to the
two texts, R. and G., two of which are in the seventh book;
but there are four in G. not found in R., and five in R. not
found in G. As in the Mahābhārata, the cæsura is regularly
after the diambus, the gaṇa division o o, o o, o o,
o o, o not corresponding to any text. Here the position
of the rucirā is always that of a tag, usually after uṣajātis.
The second hemistich occasionally ends in brevis, e.g., G. ii,
68, 56; vii, 68, 25; R. vi, 62, 22; but, as in the Mahābhārata,
even this liberty is seldom taken. In R. v, 7, 15–17 (not in
G.), of the twelve pādas, all are regular save the first, which
has an extra syllable: iti 'va tad gṛham abhigamyā çobhamā-
nam. In G. vi, 39, 33, pāda b has yaçaskaram priyakaram
bāndhavapriyam, where R. 62, 22, is regular, yathā priyam
priyaraṇa bāndhavapriya. R. omits the tag of G. vii, 68, 25
(continuing with lokas). The case is interesting, because it
is evidently an instance of breaking a chapter by means of
a tag (perhaps as an aid in recitation), and because the rucirā

1 P.W. s.v. mahiṣa 2 c, gives a var. lec. I give the readings of the Calcutta
and Bombay, 1895, Harivānca.

2 It is easy to suggest çobhitam; but this half-rucirā half-prahrāśini pāda
really needs no emendation. See just below.
tag thus employed is highly irregular (pāda b: haniṣyasi, Raghuvana, nā 'ta saṅgayah) in making the cæsum answer for a long syllable; thus showing that there is a late (careless) freedom as well as the freedom of early (undeveloped) forms. With one exception, no such substituted pādas as equate upajītis in the other epic occur in the Rāmāyaṇa.¹

Praharṣini.

Having thirteen syllables to the pāda this metre is called an atijagatī, though its finale is that of a triṣṭubh, O _ ɔ. As to the relation of the measure, it is clearly of the puspitāgrā class, in closing in O _ O _ O _ , as will be seen below; and as clearly of rucirā nature, both in its middle and even in its opening; for it begins with a mora-equivalent, _, _, of the rucirā's diiambus, O _ O _, and continues with the rucirā's resolved triṣṭubh form. In fact, as we have seen that a rucirā pāda may appear with the extra syllable of the praharṣini, we can supply all the links from triṣṭubh to puspitāgra with actually extant measures (see also below, under mātrāchandās, p. 337):

triṣṭubh-jagatī, O _ O _, O O O _ O _ O _
rucirā type, O _ O _, O O O O _ O _ O _
rucirā freak, O _ O _, O O O O _ O _ O _
praharṣini, _, O O O O _ O _ O _
puspitāgrā, O O [O O], O _ O O _ O _ O _

The secondary cæsum sometimes makes the pāda coincide very closely with the rucirā, for example in R. ii, 79, 17 a-b:

ucus te | vacanam idam | niçamya hṛṣṭah
sāmātyah | sapariṣado | viśātaçokah,

but in other cases this cæsum causes a trochaic cadence to be struck with the beginning of a new word after the procelematicus, as is clearly shown in R. ii, 107, 17 c-d:

gaccha tvam | puravaram | adya sampahṛṣṭah
sānñhṛṣtas | tv aham api | Dañḍakān praveksye

¹ For this exception in the Rāmāyaṇa, see above, p. 300.
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Do thou now | to the city | fare with heart rejoicing
while meantime | merrily I | will to Dandakās go

It is rather striking that in both these examples the name of the metre seems to be implied in it, hrṣṭāḥ and saṁhrṣṭas like prahārṣini (or -ānī) "rejoicing," but I do not know that this is more than an accident.¹ There is a parallel in the rucirā-like pāda cited above from the Rāmāyaṇa, G. vii, 88, 22:

gato ravir suruciram astacālam

The Rāmāyaṇa has one more case of this metre, G. vi, 25, 41, sa krodhād vipulayaṇā mahānubhāvo, etc. The only short finals are at the end of the whole stanza.

In the Mahābhārata there are twelve cases, all regular (but the first hemistich as well as the second may end in brevis), with the same norm and varying cæsura, −−−−, −−−−−−, −−−−−−, or −−−−, −−−−−−, −−−−−−. They are not all tags. For example, that at vii, 143, 48 and the group of four in xii, 322, 24–27; but that at i, 2, 396, is the tag of a tag, apparently merely a scholiastic addition:

ākhyānam tad idam anuttamam mahārtham, etc.,
as are those in i, 21, 18; 22, 12; 25, 17 (tag to a rucirā tag, b ends in brevis), vedāṅgāṇy abhigamayanti sarvayatnāḥ, etc. The first two of these just mentioned are akin: in 21 c, vistīrṇāṁ dadiṛcatur ambaraprakāṇam; in 22 b, gambhirāṁ vikasitam ambaraprakāṇam. In the specimen at xiii, 7, 28, the prahārṣini is by one cloka stanza² removed from the end of the section, and is a moral excrescence added to the tale:

¹ I may add that in the first example there is not only hrṣṭāḥ in R. ii, 79, 17, but in the vaṇḍastha which precedes this tag we find: prahārṣajāś tam prati bāspabindavo, etc. See a case like this from the other epic cited in the next note.

² This final cloka says: "I have repeated what the seer proclaimed in regard to the getting of good and evil fruit. Now what do you want to hear?" The cloka before the prahārṣini is: Bhīmasyāṁ 'tad vacaḥ crenvā vismitāḥ Kurupūñgavāḥ, āsan prahṛṣṭamanasaḥ pritimanto bhavān tādā. See the last note.
yan mantre bhavati vr̥tho ’payujyamāne
yat some bhavati vr̥thā ’bhīṣyamāne
yac ca ’gnāu bhavati vr̥thā ’bhīhūyamāne
tat sarvam bhavati vr̥thā ’bhīdhīyamāne

The tendency to restrict the final syllaba ances to the close of the stanza is observable in several of these cases. For instance, in the group cited from the twelfth book, the only final breves are at the end of whole stanzas, not at the end of the first hemistic. In i, 2, the first hemistic ends in a short vowel, but before two consonants (d ends in ã); in i, 21 and 22, no final is short. The only exception is the one noticed above, i, 25, 17 b. The two cases in H., C., 6248 and B., 3, 7, 25 are tags, and have no final brevis. The former has hiatus in pāda d (avoided in B., 2, 53, 57, manujendra ca ’tmaniśṭham):

yad yuktam, kuru manujendra, ātmaneśtaṁ

The latter, instead of C.’s amṛtam, 11,308, has

yat satyam yad amṛtam ādimaṃsaraṇāu vāi,

where (ādima and kṣara are kāraṇa and kārya) ādima is a late adjective.

On the verse goptā samīkṣya sukrūnāṁ dadāti lokān, see below under mātrāchandas.

Mṛgendramukha.

Another atījagati, not found in the Mahābhārata, but in one text of the Rāmāyaṇa, is the mṛgendramukha of R. vi, 101, 55, which takes the place of a puspītāgrā tag in G. 85, 13. The posterior pādas of the latter metre have regularly the form illustrated by G. at this place, muditamanāḥ samudrīkṣituṁ tvārāmi, ōōōō ōōōōōō. This form is simply quadrupled in order to make the mṛgendramukha; the cadence of which is often made trochaic through the caesura, as in this epic example, a and d:

1 In the next pāda, B. has yad bhūtam bhavati mithaṣ ca yad bhaviṣyam, where C. has yad bhūtam bhavad amitaṁ ca.
yadi vadham icchasi | Rāvaṇasya saṁkhye
yadi ca kṛtān hi tave 'cchasi pratijñām
yadi tava rājasutābhilāsa, ārya,
kuru ca vaco mama | cīghram adya vīra

The native division of the pāda of course is O O O, O O, O O, O O, O, which fits pāda b. The brevis at the end of either pāda, as in this case, is probably due to the fact that the metre is a stereotyped posterior pāda in repeated form.

**Asambādhā.**

The remaining akṣara tags are longer metres, the cākvarī, of syllables 4 × 14; the atiākvarī, of 4 × 15: and the ati- dhṛti, of 4 × 19. Of the first, there are two varieties, of which one is the asambādhā, found only in the Bombay R. ii, 116, 25, with the norm (according to the example, — , — — O O O, O O O, — —) violated as follows (prior hemistic):

Rāmah saṁsādhyā ṛṣigaṇam anugamanād
deçāt tasmāt kulapatiṃ abhīvādyā ṛṣim
samyak prītāis tāir anumata upadiṣṭārthaḥ
puṇyaṃ vāsāya svanilayam upasampede

To this is added a supplementary tag, a peculiar stanza (where G. iii, 1, 85, has a vaṅcaṣṭha tag), in which the last pāda differs from the three preceding; a, b, c, being alike in having each the fourteen morae of the even vāitāliya pāda (explained below), and eleven syllables, but not in a fixed order; against seventeen morae and twelve syllables in d. Pāda b is aparavakte, but I do not know what to call the whole (R. ii, 116, 26):

ācramam ṛṣivirahitam prabhuh
kṣaṇam api na jahān sa Rāghavaḥ
Rāghavaṃ hi satatam anugatās
tāpasāq cā ṛṣacarite dhṛtaguṇāḥ

---

1 The stress, but not the quantity, is Saturnian: kuru ca vaco mama | vṛum mihl Čāmena | cīghram adya vīra | īnsecé versusum. The name mṛgendra- mukha comes from the mnemonic verse: kṣudhitamṛgendramukham mṛgā upetya (Brown).
EPIC VERSIFICATION.

Vasantatilakā.

The second čakvarī called vasantatilakā (or ०कम) is found twice in the Rāmāyana, but only in the last and latest book, vii, 8, 28, where it is followed by a jagatī upajjati as a final tag, and vii, 96, 23, also a tag. In the latter case, all pādas have heavy final syllables. In the former, pāda c has final brevis, but this liberty is taken in the case of the vasantatilakā even by the classical writers. The metre is clearly hypermetric triṣṭubh: _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ _ _ or _ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ . In the first example, three pādas have caesura after the fifth, like other hypermetric triṣṭubhs:

eśā mayā tava narādhipa rāḵasānām
utpattir adya | kathitā sakalā, yathāvat
bhūyo nibodha | Raghusattama, Rāvaṇasyā
ejnam prabhāvam | atulāṁ sasutasya sarvam

The Mahābhārata has twelve occurrences of vasantatilakās, but only eight separate stanzas, the others being vain repetitions of old material. The first three are in the tag-group at the end of i, 2, 391 ff., which ends in a praharṣiṇī. The second of this group has short finals in b and d; the third (which follows immediately after two čokās) has final brevis in a. The stanzas are benedictive and are partially repeated at the end of xviii, 5, 67–68, where B. has the third of this group (omitted here in C.), and this again is found at the beginning of the Harivaṇca. In all these occurrences of the same stanza, dadāti is left at the end of pāda a; but in c the reading varies between satataṁ črṇotī in xviii and črṇuyac ca nityaṁ or tadvat in i, 2, 395 and Harivaṇca, i, 1, 4. In xiii, 151, 80, the same stanza has kathayec ca nityaṁ. I give it in full on account of its universal interest:

1 Compare the note to Vāmana’s Stilregeln by Professor Cappeller, p. 23. The final brevis in prior pādas is found also in inscriptional poetry. Compare e. g., the third and tenth stanzas in Vatsabhaṭṭi’s poem, fifth century, given in Bühler’s essay on Indian inscriptions, p. 91, where pādas a and c respectively close in brevis; or the fifth and twenty-fifth, where, in each, both the prior pādas end in brevis. In fact, the tendency here is to close the hemistich in heavy syllables and the prior pādas in light syllables (25, 27, 31, 32, 40).
yo goçataṁ kanakacṛgamayaṁ dadati
viprāya vedaviduṣe subahuṇgrutāya¹
punyāṁ ca bhāratakathāṁ satataṁ ṣṛṇoti
tulyam phalam bhavati tasya ca tasya cāi 'va

In the thirteenth book (as in the case of the Rāmāyaṇa, this metre is found only in pseudo-epic or late books), there are two new cases of vasantatilakā. The first, 14, 189, is unique in not being a tag (only d has final brevis); the other (with a çārdūlavikṛidita) being a tag, as usual. The latter is united with the benedictive stanza above, and like it has final brevis in the first pāda, 151, 80–81 (80 being the stanza quoted above).

The Harivaṇca has a tag-group (followed by one çloka) of three more vasantatilakā stanzas at 3, 114, 39–41, the last of which also has final brevis in c:

41, c, jyotis trilokajananaiṁ tridaćāikavandyam
d, akṣnor mamā 'stu satataṁ hṛdaye 'cyutākhyam

Mālinī.

This is an atičakvari, 4 × 15 syllables, having syllaba anceps regularly only at the close of the hemistich, but in one instance at the end of a prior pāda, a freedom found among classical works only in the Mṛchakaṭikam, according to Professor Cappeller.² The metre is found in both epics; but the Rāmāyaṇa has only one case common to R. and G., and that is in the last book, vii, 59, 23 = G. 61, 21, the stanza only ending in brevis. It is a tag. In R. vi, 40, 29–30, there are two cases, not in G., both regular, a tag couplet (in the former case both hemistichs end in brevis). G. ii, 106, 29–30, has two stanzas, not in R., a tag (final brevis only at the end of the first stanza). The natural division is often O O O, O O O, ——, ——, ——, ——, with caesura after the spondeee. The Mahābhārata has eleven cases,

¹ v. 1. bahuṇgrutāya in the Bombay H. Also ca for su, and other variants in Anuçāsana.
² Loc. cit.
and (like the one case in both texts of the Rāmāyaṇa) they are all in the later epic: vii, 73, 48; viii, 85, 1-4; 90, 24; xiii, 6, 45-47; H. 2, 105, 84; and 3, 132, 100. The one in Droṇa unites with a puspitāgrā, but, although both are almost at the end of a chapter, they are rather a tag to a speech than to the chapter itself. Those in Karna are at the beginning and in the middle of their respective chapters. Those in Anuṇāṣana are a tag, except that two clokas follow. In the group of viii, 85, all the pādās end long except the posterior pādās of the third stanza, both of which have final brevis. The two cases in Hariv. are tags (one cloka following in the latter) with brevis only at the close of the stanza. An irregularity appears in xiii, 6, 46 c-d:

bahutarasamanrdhdhyā mānuṣānaṁ grhaṇī
pitṛvanabhavanābhaṁ dṛgyate cā 'marāṇām

In 47, the hemistichs end in brevis; in 45, only the first hemistich. The plural grhaṇī is remarked upon as Vedic by the scholiast, who thus supports it; but grhaṁ (vai?) is probably right.

A very common cadence, whereby the end of the pāda assumes the fall \( C-C, C-C \), rather than \( C-C \), \( C-C \), is illustrated by H. 8, 132, 100 a-b (cited above):

ajaram amaram ekāṁ dhīreyam ādyantacāṇṇyāṁ
saguṇam aguṇam ādyam sthūlaṁ atyantasūkṣmaṁ

Another kind of mālinṛ, not found in the epics, begins with \( C-C, C-C \), \( C-C \), showing that the epic form is a further resolution of an original triṣṭubh, which may be represented by \( C-C \), \( C-C \). This is, of course, the vaiśvadevi form of the hypermetric triṣṭubh, the close relation of which with the puspitāgrā is well shown in vii, 73, 48-49:

48 a-b: asurasuramanusyaḥ pakṣino vo 'rago va
pitrājaničarā vā brahmadevārsayo vā
49 a-b: yadi vičati rasātalam tad agryaṁ
viyad api devapuraṁ Diteḥ puraṁ vā

1 Compare Professor Jacobi's learned essay, Entwickelung der indischen Metrik in nachvedischer Zeit, ZDMG. vol. xxxviii, p. 600.
The content of this mālinī appears a little further on, 77, 26, in the form of a puspitāgrā:

\[ yadi ca manujapannagāḥ piśācā \\
rajaničarāḥ patagāḥ surāsurāḥ ca \]

and in viii, 37, 36, in aparavaktra: asurasuramahoragān narān.

**Cārūlavikriḍīta.**

The only remaining aksaraacakhas in the epic is the atidhāṛti (4 × 19) cārūlavikriḍīti, which occurs in the eighth and thirteenth books of the Mahābhārata. The chapter of the former book graced with a mālinī is also enlivened with the "tiger's play," viii, 90, 42 (two lines in C., 4668-9). It is not a tag and is perfectly regular, four times _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ ; _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ . There are also one and a half stanzas at xiii, 14, 229, and a whole stanza ib. 234; neither of which is a tag. This position of a fancy-metre in a chapter instead of at its end always shows a late section (affected in the Harivaṇaṇa). In xiii, 151, 79, the cārūlavikriḍita joins with vasantatilakās to make a tag. All the specimens are regular. The metre may be a late development from the triṣṭubh. The intermediate phases, however, are not very clear, though the genesis may tentatively be assumed as; _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ (as in the vāatāliya, below), _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ _ _ _ , or two stanzas to the strophe, as in the classical grouping of ñokas, with shift of caesura. This metre is not found in the Rāmāyaṇa.

**Ardhasamavṛttta (Mātrāchandas).**

**(A) Puṣpitāgrā and Aparavaktra.**

These metres, as is indicated by their name "semi-equal," are uneven in their pādas. They are not quite mora-metres, since the number and position of their syllables, heavy or light, are regularly fixed; but on the other hand they are not like aksara metres, for their pādas are not identical. In the epic, however, the rule of fixed syllables is not strictly preserved. The cadence of the hemistich, with its unequal
pādas, has either wholly trochaic close or alternate trochaic and iambic. The first is illustrated by R. vi, 33, 36 c-b:

\[
\begin{align*}
tam \ iha \ cara\text{\text{\text{\text{n}}}am} \\
abhyupālhi \ devī \\
haya \ iva \ maṇḍalam \\
āçu \ yah \ karoti
\end{align*}
\]

Rapid as a charger is,
Hasten, hurry quickly.

As already remarked, the second pāda of this puspitāgrā, when quadrupled, makes the migendramukha (above, p. 331), which also has trochaic fall. The aparavaktra, which has one syllable (usually two more) less than the puspitāgrā, shows more clearly the derivation from the triśṭubh, R. ii, 39, 41:

\[
\begin{align*}
murajapaṇava-meghaghoṣavad \\
Daśaratha-veṇma \ babhūva \ yat \ purā
\end{align*}
\]
or, again, in M. viii, 37, 42:

\[
\begin{align*}
bhavatu \ bhavatu, \ kim \ vikatthase, \\
nanu \ mama \ tasya \ hi \ yuddham \ udyatam
\end{align*}
\]

There is one form of triśṭubh which actually corresponds to the second verse of the puspitāgrā, when its breves are equated with heavy syllables, thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{triśṭubh} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
mānam \ na \ kuryān \ nā \ \text{dadhitā} \ \text{roṣam} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\text{puspitāgrā} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{svaparamatāīr} \ \text{ghana} \ \text{pratarkayadbhiḥ}
\end{array} \right.
\end{align*}
\]

Professor Jacobi also sees in the jagatī or triśṭubh the origin of the puspitāgrā, though he is inclined to adopt a more complicated development (from a Vedic verse of 12 + 8 syllables).¹

The puspitāgrā and aparavaktra are used only as tagmetres; sometimes, as in R. v, 16, 30 (not in G.) inserted

¹ ZDMG. vol. xxxviii, p. 591 ff. Professor Jacobi, p. 596, regards the puspitāgrā as a development from a pure māṭrāchandas, which in turn he refers to the satobhratī (4 × 12 + 8). Compare also the same author, IS. vol. xvii, p. 449.
among upajati tags common to both texts; sometimes, as in G. iii, 54, 28 (not in R.) after a common triṣṭubh-tag; or in other similar situations.¹

The puspitāgrā occurs much more frequently as a tag-metre than does the aparavaktra. For example, in the Rāmāyana, the puspitāgrā is found four times as often. There are, however, only thirteen cases common to the two texts, R. and G. Besides these, G. has fourteen, and R. has twenty-one cases not found in the alternate text.

The mark of the posterior pāda, as distinguished from the prior, is the apparent insertion of a heavy syllable (in terms of mātrā metre, two morae), at a point which is usually fixed as after the initial four breves. This, however, is not always the case. Thus in G. v, 31, 62 b, corresponding to d, which latter, vacanam idam mama Māithili pratihī, is regular, appears as posterior pāda of a puspitāgrā:

\[
\text{lavaṇajalaridhir goṣpadikṛto me},
\]

where the heavy syllable is put after all the breves, perhaps merely on account of the awkward phrase (in śloka, ib. 33, 23, goṣpadikṛtaḥ). Later rule especially forbids this arrangement for all mātrāchandases: “In the opening of prior pādas, \(\circ \circ \circ\), and of posterior pādas, \(\circ \circ \circ\) and \(\circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ\) and \(\circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ\), are forbidden.”²

Further, for the prior pāda may be substituted a different cadence, almost that of the vāitāliya, \(\circ \circ \circ \circ \circ\), \(\circ \circ \circ\), \(\circ \circ \circ\). This occurs in G. vi, 62, 44 a (where R. 83, 44, has the normal \(\circ \circ\), \(\circ \circ \circ\), \(\circ \circ \circ\)) thus:

G., ayam adya vibho tava ca priyārtham
R., ayam anagha tavo 'dītaḥ priyārtham

Compare G. vi, 92, 83 b: svabala 'bhivrto ranḍe vyarājataṁ,

¹ In G. vi, 30, 32, where R. has only a rucirā, there is a puspitāgrā inserted before the rucirā. These two names, by the way, appear together as ordinary adjectives “blooming and shining” (trees), supuspitāgrān rucirān (vṛksaṇ), R. v, 14, 41.

² Weber. IS. vol. viii, p. 309.
where R. 108, 34, has svajanabalā 'bhivṛto rāne babhūvā.

The prior pāda may be hypermetric. Thus R. vi, 107, 68 a–b:

Daçarathasutarākṣasendrayos tayor
jayam anaveksya rāne sa Rāghavasya

A parallel case or two occurs in the other epic (see below).

Occasionally there is a quasi inversion, o.o.o.o., of the ending _ _ _ _ _ _ __. This occurs twice in R., but only in Ādi and Uttara. The first case presents varied readings. In G. i, 22, 20, there is simply the not unusual equivalence of a and c puṣpitāgrā and b and d (aparavaktra) catalectic. But in R. the same stanza, i, 19, 22, has, besides, the irregular pāda a:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ \\
\circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ \\
= b
\end{array}
\]

that is, instead of iti hṛdayavidārāṇam tadānīṁ in G. a, R. has iti sahṛdayamanovidārāṇam. This can scarcely be a mere lapsus, as the finale occurs again in the Mahābhārata and in R. vii, 29, 38 c–d:

\[
yad ayam atulabalas tvayā 'dya vai
tridaçcapatis tridaçcā ca nirjitaḥ
\]

In the latter passage, 37 a has o.o.o.o. as close:

\[
\text{atha saraṇavigatam uttamāujāḥ}^2
\]

While posterior pādas have syllaba ancepts, as in G. vi, 92, 83 b, cited above, a prior pāda has this only in R. vi, 33, 36,

\[1\] Another case of variation, R. vi, 84, 22 d = G. 63, 22, where G. has asuravaro 'numthanāya yathā mahendraḥ may be corrupt (for asuravaro 'numthane yathā mahendraḥ?). B. has divijaripumathane yathā mahendraḥ (for ripor?).

\[2\] In b, compare G. v, 33, 77 b, Janakanrpatmajādhṛtam; but R. 38, 70, has Janakanrpatmajayādhṛtam prabhāvac, which is correct. In R. vii, 29, 37 and 38 are puṣpitāgrā; 39 and 40 are aparavakra. In G. the only irregularity here is in (37) 38 c, svasutasya vacanam atipriyam tat. Here in 40 = R. 39, a is aparavakra and b is puṣpitāgrā, though the latter may have added the unnecessary tvam that makes the change. The same is true of R. 38 a. I have noticed besides only the following puṣpitāgrā irregularities, which seem to me more grammatical than metrical, or mere errors: G. ii, 29, 29 b, o.o.o. for o.o.o., read apraṭimarūpa? G. iv, 34, 35 c, read anṛtamadhura? Neither stanza is found in R.
devī (cited above), where, however, G. has Śīte (here, 9, 39, abhayāṃkaram is to be read). In posterior pādas, final syllable aneṣa is found about a dozen times in the forty-odd puṣpita-grās of the Rāmāyaṇa text.

The aparavaktra is a puṣpita-grā shortened by one long syllable, two more, in each pāda; or in other words, its pāda is a catalectic puṣpita-grā pāda. To native prosodians, as to European scholars, the shorter is the type, and the puṣpita-grā is an expanded aparavaktra; a view that appears to me erroneous. The aparavaktra occurs in the Rāmāyaṇa, as said above, not quite one-fourth so often as the puṣpita-grā.² Like the latter, it is used alone, or with other metres to make tags. The final syllables are always long. Irregularities are rare; a substitute like that in the puṣpita-grā occurs in G. ii, 82, 15 a:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{○○○○, ○○○● ○ ○ } \\
\text{○○○○, ○○○● ○ ○ } \\
\text{○○○○, ○○○● ○ ○ } \\
\text{○○○○, ○○○● ○ ○ (ca satī omit ca?)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Here R. has a regular aparavaktra, ii, 81, 16. In G. iv, 62, 25, the second pāda is plavagapuṅgavāh paripūrṇamānasāh, for R.’s (63, 15) plavagavarāh pratilabdhaḥparuṣāḥ; and in G. 63, 29, plavaṅgamāḥ paripūrṇamānasāh.

There is only one passage in the Uttara, vii, 29, 37–40, where puṣpita-grā and aparavaktra are found. Otherwise these metres are distributed pretty evenly over the Rāmāyaṇa, except that the first book has no aparavaktra,² and only one puṣpita-grā common to both texts, but R. here has four not in G. The reason is that the later epic prefers pure mātrāchandas.

Interchange of aparavaktra and puṣpita-grā pādas occurs occasionally, as in G. ii, 15, 36 (R. has upendra here), where a

² There are only six cases common to both texts; besides, two in R. not in G.; three in G. not in R.; twelve in all, as G. at iv, 62, 25 and 63, 29 has the one at R. 63, 15. In the last case, the first pāda is the same in the three stanzas; in R. all the other pādas are normal, but in G. 62, 25 d is a puṣpita-grā pāda, as is c of 63, 29. The missing stanza in the alternate text is due merely to the latter having a puṣpita-grā in G. iii, 7, 36; R. vi, 68, 24.

² The fifth book has no aparavaktra, but it has half a dozen puṣpita-grās. The sixth book has the greatest number of puṣpita-grās.
and c are puṣpitāgrā pādas and b and d are aparavaktra pādas in regular interchange; or as in G. v, 36, 77, where only the last pāda of the stanza is catalectic (of aparavaktra form).

It is clear that the puṣpitāgrā, a form of triṣṭubh, and the aparavaktra, a catalectic puṣpitāgrā, are not regarded as separate but as interchangeable in pāda formation. As complete stanzas, the latter compared with the former, are rare. The pāda type is not absolutely fixed.

Before comparing the usage in the Mahābhārata, I shall complete this description of the phenomena in the Rāmāyaṇa with an account of the

(B) Āupacchandasika and Vāitāliya.

In the later part of the Rāmāyaṇa — if one may dare suggest that any epic poem in India was not all written at the same moment — the place of the puṣpitāgrā and aparavaktra, as tag-metres, is taken by pure māṭrāchandases, namely, the āupacchandasika and vāitāliya, which bear to each other the same relation as that held by the former pair; that is to say, the vāitāliya pāda is a catalectic āupacchandasika pāda. These two pairs are essentially identical, as may be seen by comparing the posterior pādas, which in each are increased by a long syllable. The posterior pāda of the āupacchandasika is

```
\n\n```

which, when catalectic, should have final syllaba anceps; but this never happens at the end of the first hemistich, only at the end of the stanza, an indication that the vāitāliya is the derived form. Again, the āupacchandasika is really the epic stanza metre. The vāitāliya is used but once as a stanza, all the other cases being merely catalectic pādas of an āupacchandasika stanza. The prior pāda in āupacchandasika may also end in brevis, and, as the spondee is usually resolved into an anapest in both pādas, we get the norm (16 and 18 moræ):
THE GREAT EPIC OF INDIA.

(a) ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ
(b) ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ
or (b) Ṭ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ

This is evidently a variety of the puspitāgrā. That is, it reverts to a triṣṭubh origin.

R. vii, 57, 21 = G. 59, 22, may be taken as the typical form:

ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ
ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ
ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ

G. adds te to R.’s pāda a, iti sarvam aḍesato mayā (te). The final syllable of the stanza in vii, 61, 24 = G., 66, 24, vāṭāliya, is short in R., long in G. Prior pādas do not usually end in brevis, but they do occasionally, as in G. vii, 87, 18 (not in R.), where in b the spondaic type of opening is illustrated:

iti karma sudārunam sa kṛtvā
Daṇḍo daṇḍam avāptavān ugram
çṛṇu sarvam aḍesatas tad adya
kathayisyey tava rājasīnāhvṛttā

The close of b, however, shows an unusual phase of the type of the equivalent variant with spondee; but it is not necessary to suppose that a brevis is lost before ugram. Both posterior pādas may begin with a spondee (but end in ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ), as in R. vii, 55, 21 = G. 57, 22 (all pādas end long), e. g., tulyavyādhitgatān mahāprabhāvāu, apparently an older form than the usual resolved type.

As in the case of the puspitāgrā and aparavaktra, the catalectic (vāṭāliya) pāda may take the place of the full measure. Thus in R. vii, 95, 17 (not in G.), the spondee type (b) is used as a catalectic pāda:

iti sampravicārya rājasīnāhāḥ
çuvobhāte çapathasya niçcayam
visasarja mūnīn nṛpāṇc ca sarvān
sa mahātmā mahato mahānubhāvaḥ

¹ Compare the form cited above, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, ॐ, as a variant of puspitāgrā (b).
In R. vii, 86, 21 (G. 93, 21), a-b show a new form of this combination:

\[
\text{iti Lakṣmaṇavākyam uttamaṁ}
\n\text{nṛpatir ativamanoharam mahātmā}
\]

that is, a vaiṭālīya prior and puspītāgrā posterior pāda. Compare the only case not in the Uttarakāṇḍa, where in G. ii, 81, 33 (not in R.), a lame aparavaktra hemistich is followed by a lame mātrā hemistich (fifteen morae):

\[
\text{∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞}
\n\text{∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞}
\n\text{∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞}
\n\text{∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞}
\]

The patois metres show that the mātrā-form was used early, but how much earlier than the third century B.C. it is impossible to say. The vaiṭālīya itself is a common metre of the Dhammapada.¹

**Mātrāchandás in the Mahābhārata.**

The many “semi-equals” in the great epic form a fair parallel to the state of things in the little epic. But there are no regular vaiṭālīya or āupacchandasika stanzas at all. In a late passage of Vana and in Čanti there is a sporadic approach to vaiṭālīya form. On the other hand, there are over ninety-one puspītāgrās and aparavaktras. They are found chiefly in the later part of the epic and appear more in groups than they do in the Rāmāyaṇa. The interchange of puspītāgrā and aparavaktra pādas, of which I have spoken above, is met with in the very first example at the end of i, 30:

\[
\text{anupamabalavīryatejāso}
\n\text{dhṛtamanaṇaḥ parirakṣaṇe 'mrtaśya}
\n\text{asurapuravidāraṇaḥ surā}
\n\text{jvalanasmiddhavapuḥprakāśinaḥ}
\]

¹ The type here has in the posterior pāda either anapæst, spondeo or amphimacer as an opening; but both here and in the choriambus much greater freedom is allowed than in the epic, where, despite the occasional irregularities noticed above, the form is much more systematized than in Pāli.
iti samaravaraṁ surāḥ sthitāṃ te
parighasahasraçatāhiḥ samākulaṁ
vigālim iva cā 'mbarāntaraṁ
tapanamarcivikāśitaṁ babhāse

In the first stanza the pādas are aparav., puṣpit., aparav., aparav.; in the second, puṣpit., aparav., aparav., puṣpit. Almost the same as the latter is the arrangement in a tag to a dānakathana (followed by three triṣṭubhs), at the end of iii, 200, 126, where a puṣpit. pāda is followed by an aparav. pāda in the first couplet; but the second begins with the posterior puṣpitāgrā pāda, and is followed by the posterior pāda of an aparavaktra:

c-d: bhavati sahasraguṇaṁ dinasya rāhor
visuvati cā 'ksayıma açṇute phalam

as if the posterior pāda were used originally in either position as the norm; which would agree with the identification with the triṣṭubh ventured above.

Of the eight puṣpitāgrās in the seventh book, six (all tags) are perfectly regular (2 × 16 + 18) and require no notice (for C. 2731, rajani°, read rajani°, as in B. 77, 26). Here only hemistichs end in brevis. Two cases deserve notice. In vii, 1622 = 37, 37 b, C. has pitṛsuracāraṇa-siddhasaṅghāiḥ, in B., siddhayakṣasaṅghāiḥ. But B. is often less better than bettered, and here the net result of three corrections is to make a perfect puṣpitāgrā out of C.'s scheme, which is

\[
\begin{align*}
0 & 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 & 16 + 15 \\
0 & 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 & 17 + 17
\end{align*}
\]

but this is attained by adding yakṣa in b; changing avanitalavigatāiç ca to avanitalagatāiç ca in c; and inventing the word ativibabhāu for abhibabhāu in d (B, ativibabhāu hutabhūg yathā 'yjasiktaḥ). Mates to pāda c were shown above from the Rāmāyaṇa. Irregular too as is d, it is not lightly to be rejected, since it has its perfect parallel in the eighth book (below), as also in Hariv. C. 11,269 d (3, 6, 4 d)

(iti sa 'ṛpatir ātmavāṇus tādā 'sān)
tad anu(vi)eintya babhūva vītamanyuḥ
where, for C.'s anucintya, anuvicintya of B. may be a corrected reading, as above it is easy to propose abhivibabhū and refer to the Rig Veda for the form.

The case at vii, 182, 27 = 8273, shows a better reading in B., where hi is required (accidentally omitted in C.). The pādas here are regular, the stanza's end having brevis (in 77, 26, the first hemistich ends in brevis). The chief peculiarity here is that the passage stands in the middle of the chapter, the other cases in Droṇa being tags.

Once ० ० ० ० ० takes the place of ० ० ० ० ०, producing in pāda a the choriambus equivalent to that in b and d. This happens in one of the two great groups of late aparavaktras in the eighth book, viii, 30, 3 (almost at the beginning of the chapter) 1:

०००, ० ० ० ० ।
००० ० ० ० ।
००० ० ो ो ।
०० ो ो ।
०० ो ो ।

The rest of the twenty-five “semi-equals” in the eighth book are all grouped together in 37, 31 ff., where, after one puṣpitāgrā pāda, follow, as in the last group after a stanza, aparavaktras only. In this group of twelve stanzas, breves occur but rarely at the end of the hemistich, in (31), 40, and 42 at the stanza’s end, in 35 alone at the end of b. Only two of these stanzas require a word. In 37 c–d, where the first of the two pādas has seventeen more (for fourteen),

dinakarasadṛṣṭāḥ çarottamāya yudhā
Kuruṣu bahūn vinihatya tān arin,

it seems simple to drop the hypermetric and unnecessary yudhā; but it is in both texts (Nīlakaṇṭha says that this particular stanza is viṣamaṁ chandas) and has a parallel in Hariv. 11,269, where (C. only) a puṣpitāgrā begins:

1 The first stanza of the chapter is a ṇloka; the first stanza of the group is a puṣpitāgrā; then follow aparavaktras to 9, where the first half is catalectic (aparavakra) and the second half is puṣpitāgrā (as in 13, b ends in brevis); 10 is a regular aparavakra; 12–14, regular aparavaktras; 11 is regular in B.a, but irregular in C. (çinivṛṣabhaçaraçpitās for çarāir nipitāt). Here d ends in brevis.
vidhivihitam açakym anyathā hi kartum

1 A similar case has been shown above in the Rāmāyana.

The other stanza deserving notice is the first of the group, viii, 37, 31 = 1737. Both texts have a puṣpitāgrā pāda in a; an aparavakra pāda in b; and in c-d

jugupiṣava ihā 'dyā Pāṇḍavaṁ
kim bahunā | saha tāīr jayāmi tam

that is, _○_○ for ○○_ of the resolution in vāitālīya (but the cæsura in d is after the choriambus: "Though the gods may wish to guard the Pandu here to-day, what then? I shall conquer him, gods and all").

In Čānti, the puṣpitāgrās are generally too regular to be interesting. A big bunch of them in Mokṣa makes a tag at the end of adhy. 179, thirteen in all. They have an unusual number of final breves, but only because vratam idam ājagaram çuciq carāmi is the final refrain of ten of them (only twice has b brevis). Of the twenty-one stanzas of this class in Čānti (Mokṣa), sixteen are puṣpitāgrās; five, aparavaktras. About the same proportion obtains in Harivaīca, where there are twenty-two stanzas of ardhasamas, of which only three are aparavaktras. All those in Čānti are tags, either following triṣṭubhs or followed by another supplementary tag (as in the case of a rathoddhatā mentioned above). In xii, 250, 12 b = 9035 (yad aviduṣām) mahadbhayam (paratra) in C. appears to be a lapsus; in B. as sumahadbhayam, and in 10,530, yad avidusām sumahadbhayam bhavet; but compare the parallel below in H. The following is a parallel to the case above in the Rāmāyana in its late form (_○_○_○_○): xii, 319, 112 = 11,836 (the order of morae is 17 + 18 + 16 or 17 + 16); where B. has:

yad upaniṣadam upākarot tathā 'sāu
Janakanṛpasya purā hi Yājñavalkyaḥ

1 This is in the stanza referred to above. In this case, H, 3, 6, 4 a has only vidhivihitam açakym anyathā, to which C. adds kartum. The fact that the same superfluity of syllables is found in the Rāmāyana must at least make doubtful an instant acceptance of the more usual form given in what is so often a clearly improved text.
yad upagañitaçayatatavyaṁ tac
chubham amṛtatvam açokam archati
(here C. in c has ṣgaṇitam). Both texts have thus in a:

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

and C. has in c:

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

The last stanza in the book, 366, 9 = 13,943, has, as an aparavakta tag, more 14 + 18 + 14 + 18, alternate catalectic verses, of which I have spoken above.

The remaining mātrāchandases in Čānti are discussed below. The thirteenth book has no aparavaktras but nine puṣpitaṅgrās, all of which are perfectly regular (the hemistich ends in brevis, e. g., 76, 81). All except those in the extraordinary (late) section, 14, 180, and 190, are tags, though 26, 101–2 are followed by four člokas.1

Apart from the pādas already noticed, the Harivañca has little of interest. Interchange of the two forms (a, catalectic) occurs in 3, 6, 3. In the puṣpitaṅgrās at 12,705–6, the latter has in b, ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○, as in the lapsus above. Here sa has been dropped, (8, 42, 21) dititanayaṁ (sa) mṛgādhipo dadarca. As usual in the later books, several of the stanzas are not tags: 2, 123, 32 is followed by člokas and rucirās, but is near the end of the section; at the beginning are the three of 3, 6, 2 ff.; in the middle of the section are 3, 49, 31 = 12,960, and 3, 50, 12 = 12,989; as are the four in 8, 51, vss. 18, 29, 42, 49 = 13,024–35–51–58. Many of the final stanzas are benedictive, as in 3, 6, 10, where puṣpitaṅgrās are interwoven in an upajāti kāvyastuti:

vijayati vasudhāṁ ca rājavarṭtir
dhanam atulaṁ labhate dvīṣajjayaṁ ca
vipulam api dhanaṁ labhec ca vāciyāṁ
sugatim iyāc chravanāce ca cāḍrajātiṁ
purāṇam etac caritam mahātmanāṁ
adhītya buddhir labhate ca nāistikīṁ, etc.

1 Here C., 1800 b, has the meaningless words: cilataraye tripathagānuyogāgarūpān, for cīlataye ... pathānuyogā in B.
It will be convenient here to put together the forms of ardhasamavṛttas thus far exhibited in the two epics. In the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa the general types of aparavaktra and puspitāgrā are:

(a¹) ○○○○○○, _○_○_ (_), 14 (16) morae
(b¹) ○○○○_○○, _○_○_ (_), 16 (18) morae

These may be called the types, because the following variations are proportionally insignificant. But, though few in number, they are important as showing that there was no absolute line between the fixed mātrāchandas and the free mātrāchandhas, for these variations may just as well be regarded as, e.g., vāitāliya pādas as variants of aparavaktra pādas. But it must be remembered that they do not represent pādas of, e.g., vāitāliya stanzas; only equivalent pādas of, e.g., aparavaktra stanzas, which I call variants on account of their position:

In M. and R. both are found the following variants of (a¹):

(a²) ○○○ ○○○ ○_○_○_ (_)
In both texts of both epics, two cases in M.; three in R. In M. both cases are in pāda c; in R., only in aparavaktra.

(a³) ○○○ ○○○ _○_○_○_ (hypermeter)
In M., in both texts and also in Harivaṇa; in R., one case. In M. alone:

(a⁴) ○○○_ ○○_○_○
In R. alone:

(a⁵) ○○○ ○○○, ○_ ○_ _ (B., vii)
(a⁶) ○_ _ ○○○ ○_ ○_ _ (G., 17 morae)
(a⁷) ○○○ ○○○ _○_ ○_ ○_ (doubtful, pāda c, 15 morae)
(a⁸) ○○○ ○_ ○_ _ (only in G., pāda c, 15 morae)

In M. and R. both is found the following variant of (b¹):

(b²) ○○○○_ ○○_ ○_ ○_ (only in C. and G., 15 morae)
In M. alone:

(b³) ○○○_ ○_ ○_ _ (only in C. and Harivaṇa, pādas b and d, 17 morae)
(b⁴) ○○○○_, ○_ ○_ ○_ ○_ (sic, bis in C.)
(b⁵) _○_○_ ○_ ○_ ○_
In R alone:

(b 6)  o o o o o o o _ _ o o o _ _ (only in G., forbidden by rule)
(b 7)  o o o _ _ o _ _ o o o o _ _ (only in G.)
(b 8)  _ _ _ _ _ o o _ _ o _ _ (only in G.)
(b 9)  o o _ _ o o _ o _ _ o o _ _ (only in G., a prior āupacchandasıka)

The complete vāitāliya and āupacchandasıka stanzas, of perfect mora form, found only in the later Rāmāyaṇa, have the scheme:

(a)  o o _ _ o o o _ _ o o _ _ (≈)
(b 1)  _ _ _ _ _ o o _ _ o o _ _ (≈)
(b 2)  o o _ _ _ o o _ o _ _ o _ _ (≈)
(b 3)  _ _ _ _ _ o o _ _ o _ _

Before taking up the odd cases remaining, I cannot refrain from departing somewhat from a purely metrical point of view, to express admiration for the art with which these metres are handled. The poets of the later epic play with them skilfully. They are not apprentices but master workmen. I give two illustrations. In one, the metre is employed to give a list of fighters and weapons, the names of which are cleverly moulded together to form half a perfect stanza. In the other the poet is indulging in satire at the expense of the philosophers:

viii, 30, 5,  
parighamusalaçaktıtomatārīr  
nakharabhuçṇaçadigadacatārīr hatāh  
dviraçanarahayāh sahasraço  
rudhiranadpravahās tadā 'bhavan

xii, 179, 35,  
bahukathitam idaṁ hi buddhimadbhiḥ  
kavibhir abhipraçhayaadbhīr ātmakīrttim  
idam idam iti tatra tatra tat tat 1  
svaparamatārīr gahanam pratarkeadbhīh

I have now given seriatim all the mātrāchandas cases in the great epic, with the exception of one case in Vana, to be

1 v. l. hanta.
mentioned immediately, and two or three peculiar groups in Çanti, also to be discussed below. It will have been noticed that in the later books great heaps of stanzas of this metre are piled together. Thus all the twenty-five in Karna (a late book in its present shape) are in two sections, thirteen stanzas in one, twelve in another; while in Çanti another group of thirteen is found. This stupid massing of adornments—for these tag-metres were used originally only as fringe-work—the still later thirteenth book exceeds by uniting together in one heap, first, a puspitāgrā, xiii, 14, 180, then four āryās, ib. 181–4, then two ċlokas, ib. 185–6, then an āryā, ib. 187, then an upajāti, ib. 188, then a vasantatilakā, ib. 189, then a puspitāgrā, ib. 190, then an āryā, ib. 191.

Despite this profusion of puspitāgrās and aparavaktras, the Mahābhārata has no such regular vāitāliyas and āupacchandāsikas as has the later Rāmāyaṇa. But the following interesting verses occur in the popular story of Yudhiṣṭhira and the daemon, who required him to answer certain questions. They are not tags, iii, 313, 112–113; they are late; and they are an approach to vāitāliyas:

priyavacanavādi kiṃ labhate  
vimṛṣitakāryakaraḥ kiṃ labhate  
bahumitrakaraḥ kiṃ labhate  
dharme rataḥ kiṃ labhate kathaya

●●●●● ●● 15
●●●●● ●● 16
●●●●● ●● 14
●●●●● ●● 16

priyavacanavādi priyo bhavati  
vimṛṣitakāryakaro 'dhikaiṁ jayati  
bahumitrakaraḥ sukhaṁ vasate  
Yaś ca dharmarataḥ sa gatiṁ labhate

●●●●● ●● 15
●●●●● ●● 16
●●●●● ●● 15
●●● 17
In C., 17,397–98, the same text. This is the kind of story which, because it appears Buddhistic, is often labelled as a matter of course ‘certainly old.’ But the tale, on general principles, is just as likely to be late as early; perhaps more so, when one considers that kings interviewed by spirits who ask conundrums are merely stalking-horses, and must first be famous as kings before such stories are fastened upon them. This particular tale bears all the marks of a late inset.  

Although the great epic lacks the regular vāitāliya of the Rāmāyaṇa’s Uttarākanda, yet Čanti offers a type of metres which shows forms ending in the close of this measure. For besides the usual ending _○○_ of the mātrā form, the close may also be _○○_ (called āpāṭālikā). Also the beginning of the verses given below is of mātrā-formation, but the mātrās are not regular. The group xii, 322, 28–32 = 12,071–75, follows a group of praharṣiṇīs (4 × 13 syllables):

28, rājā sadā dharmaparāḥ śubhāśubhasya
goṣṭā samīksya sukhṛtām dadhāti lokān
bahuvidham api caraṇi praviṣṭati
sukham anupagatoḥ niravadyam

○○○○○○○○○○○○○

○○○○○○○○○○○

○○○○○○○○○○○

Morré 20 + 21 + 14 + 14, the first hemistich bridging the preceding praharṣiṇīs, _○○○○, _○○○○, _○○○○, and the āpāṭālikā (c–d scheme also in 30, below).

29, ēvāno bhīṣaṇakāya ayomukhāni
vayaṁi balagrhdra[kula] paksiṇāṁ ca saṅghāḥ
narakadane rudhirapā guruvacā
nanudam uparataṁ viṣャtanty asantaḥ

○○○○○○○○○○○○○

○○○○○○○○○○○○○

19 + 19 + 15 + 16

1 Compare Holtzmann, who rightly says that the story is a late addition to the third book to connect it with the fourth, Neunzehn Bücher, p. 95.
30, maryādāniyatā svayambhuvā ya tāhe 'māh prabhīnattī daṃagunā manonugatvāt nivasati bhṛcām asukham pitṛvisa — ya-vipinam avagāhyā sa pāpaḥ

\[\text{22 + 18 + 14 + 14}\]

31, yo lubdhaḥ subhṛcām priyānṛtaḥ ca manusyaḥ satatanikṛtvavacanāḥ-bhiratiḥ syāt upanidhibhir asukhakṛt sa paramanirayago bhṛcām asukham anubhavati duskrātakarmā

\[\text{22 + 17 + 19 + 18}. \text{ Here c has the resolved equivalent of the } \text{close of a, b, d. The choriamb of a is all resolved in d, } \text{in c only the first syllable, } \text{(as if sa were interpolated).}\]

32, uṣṇāṃ Vāitaraṇīṃ mahānadvīṃ \text{avagādha 'sipatravanabhinnagātraḥ paracuvanaçayo nipatito vasati (ca) ca mahāniraye bhṛcārtāḥ}

\[\text{22 (19) + 13 + 16 + 13}\]

1 C. vacana, but N. vañcanā cāuryādi.
2 C. omits mahā.
Mātrāsamakas.

In xii, 336, 11–12 = 12706–7 occur two lines, as printed in C., which seem to be rather rhythmical prose than poetry; but in 347, 18–22 = 13444 there are five mātrā stanzas, of which I give the scheme alone (they are not arranged in the same way in both texts):

18, ○○○○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○ (16 × 2)
○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○ (16 + 17)
B. adds ○○○ ○○○, which C. gives to the next stanza.

19, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○ (16 + 14)
C. adds ○○○ ○○○, which B. gives to the next hemistich.

○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○ (16 × 2)
20, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○ (16 × 2)
○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○ (16 + 17)
21, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○ (16 + 22 or 17)
○○○ ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○ (15 + 16)

Perhaps purāṇaṁ in 21 is to be omitted. The text is:

tāṁ lokasākṣiṇam ajam puruṣam puraṇaṁ ravivarṇam īcvarāṁ gatim bahuṣaḥ
pṛṇamadhyam ekamanaśo yataḥ salilodbhavo pī
tam ṛṣim prañataḥ

22, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○ (16 + 17)
○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○ (16 + 18)

The āryā form is clear in stanzas 18 and 20. On the other hand, the first stanza is an almost pure praharaṇaṅkalitā pāda, ○○○ ○○○, while the pramitāṅkṣaṇā pāda, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, prevails in the following stanzas; not, however, as pure caṅkvarī or jagatī stanza, but with mātrā resolution. The stanzas, if they are treated as one group, may perhaps be considered as rather rough mātrāsamakas (four pādas of six-

short verse in each hemistich. The full eighth foot, āryāgīti, is found only in 183b (if left uncorrected). There are no irregularities in the use of the amphibrach. Brevis may stand at the end of the first hemistich.1

Two cases occur in Harivaṃśa. I give the text:

1, 1, 3, jayati Parāṣarasūnuḥ satyavatihṛdayanandano Vyāsah yasyā 'syakamalagalam vāṁmayam amśtam jagat pibati

1, 1, 7, yo Harivaṃśaṃ lekhayati yathā vidhinā mahātapaḥ sapadi

(in C.) sa yati Hareḥ padakamala[m] kamalam yathā madhupop lubdhaḥ

(in B.) sa jayati Hari padakamalam madhupo hi yathā rasena samlubdhaḥ

The first stanza is regular. The second neglects the usual caesura after the third foot in the first hemistich in both texts; while C.'s text is impossible in the second, though the metre may be set right by omitting the antecedent and reading (without sa):

_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ ; _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

The text of B. is regular, with _ _ as sixth foot, where (in the second hemistichs) stands _ in the cases above.

On page 164, I cited in full a stanza beginning: āhuḥ ṣaṭṭim buddhigunān vāi (the sixty Sāukhya guṇas); the scheme (unique in the epic) for the whole stanza being (xii, 256, 12):

_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Although this lacks the marked characteristics of the āryā, both in its early and in its later forms, it is yet a gaṇa metre which may be reckoned either as āryāgīti, or as mātrāsamaka, but not pure.

As to the origin of the gaṇacchandas, the metre seems to me to be rather a species than a genus. As seen in the speci-

1 There is here no case of four breves in the sixth foot of the second hemistich, which occurs in classic writers and inscriptive āryās, e.g., Vatsabhāṭṭi, loc. cit., vs. 39.
mens above under mātrāsamakas, they are interchangeable
with the latter, of which they are only a more special type,
with  " " " " ,  " " " " ,  " " " " ,  " " as the last four feet of the
hemistic (compare 183 a, only this is not in the āryāgīti
form, but has the alternative one heavy syllable for two, or
two more for four). The mātrāsamakas in turn are the
equivalent in morae of the āloka strophe (that is, a unit com-
posed of two ālokās, such as the classical writers affect),
the thirty-two syllables of the half strophe answering to the thirty-
two morae of the hemistic in the mātrāsamaka and āryāgīti
(the one mora of the sixth foot and two morae of the eighth
foot being special modifications). 1

The Distribution of Fancy-Metres in the Great Epic.

The relation of āloka and triṣṭubh, 2 which in the whole
Mahābhārata stand numerically in the rough proportion of
95,000 to 5000 (out of 101,900 stanzas or prose equiva-
Ients, the sum of the whole), varies enormously from book
to book, one triṣṭubh to three hundred and ten ālokās in the
eighteenth book, almost nine hundred triṣṭubhs to four thou-
sand ālokās in the eighth book, the extremes in absolute
number of triṣṭubhs as well as in their proportion to ālokās.

From reasons quite apart from metre, I have elsewhere
maintained that the first part of book i, and book xiii, with the
Harivānača were late, as compared with books vii, viii, xii,
but that these in their turn contain very late additions to

1 One may, indeed, take the āloka hemistic in the form  " " " " " 
 " " " " " " and reckon it in morae, 15 + 14, as a hemistic of a
mātrāsamaka, which is as nearly correct, that is as near to a real samaka,
as are the cases above, where the pāda may have 15, 16, or 17 more. But I
prefer to rest with the fact that the mātrāsamaka is a parallel in terms of
more to the āloka-strophe in terms of syllables, without attempting a deriva-
tion. For particular studies of the gaṇacchandhas, see Professor Cappeller's
Die Gaṇacchandhas, and Professor Jacob, ZDMG. vol. xxxviii, p. 506 ff. The
latter scholar believes the āryā to have been a musical adaptation, and to
have come into Sanskrit from Prākṛt poetry. The metre can be traced back
to the time of Aṣoka.

2 That is triṣṭubh and jagati. There are just about the same number of
triṣṭubh-jagati stanzas in the Mahābhārata as in the Rig Veda.
the original epic, often palpable intrusions. The use of the fancy-metres seems to illustrate the general correctness of my former analysis. Thus the rucirā occurs in i, iii, vii, xii, xiii, Hariv.; the vasantatilakā only in i, xiii, xviii, Hariv.; the mālinī only in vii, viii, xiii, Hariv.; the āryā only in xiii, Hariv. The tag-metres of Ādi are confined to the first quarter (two thousand) of the eight thousand in the whole book. They cease after Sarvasatra (almost after the beginning of Āstika), or, in other words, they occur almost entirely in the most modern part of the book. Books ii, v, and vi have no fancy metres at all; book ix has but one, a bhujangapraṇaya. On the other hand, books iv, x, xi, xiv, xv, xvi, and xvii have none also, which however, need not surprise us much, as most of them are short supplementary books, and the fourteenth is mainly an imitation of the Gītā. That the fourth book is not adorned with these metres indicates perhaps that it was written between the time of the early epic and the whole pseudo-epic. The much interpolated eighth book would be comparatively free from these adornments were it not for its massed heaps of ardhasamavṛttas, twenty-five in all (otherwise it has only one çārdulavikriḍita and five mālinīs). The seventh book, on the other hand, has two drutavilambitas, nine rucirās, one praharsini, one mālinī, and eight ardhasamavṛttas,—twenty-one in all. The first book, that is, its first quarter, has thirty-one, of which twenty-two are rucirās; four, praharsiniś; three, vasantatilakās; two, ardhasamavṛttas. The pseudo-epic shows the greatest variety, as well as of course the greatest number, the books represented (with the exception of one vasantatilakā in the eighteenth) being the twelfth, thirteenth, and Harivaṅga, with 48½, 28½, and 43, respectively.

1 Compare the paper on the Bhārata and Great Bhārata, AJP., vol. xix, p. 10 ff. That there are antique parts in books generally late, no one I believe, has ever denied. Nor has any competent critic ever denied that in books generally old late passages are found. Ādi, Vana, and Anuṣṭāna, and in a less degree Karṇa, are a hodge-podge of old and new, and the only question of moment is whether in each instance old or new prevails or is subsidiary.
The number of occurrences of each metre, according to the books in which they are found, is given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akṣara</th>
<th>Cases occurring in books.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathoddhatā</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhujangiaprayāta</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drutavilambita</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇuvaśiṣṭha</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucirā</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praharāsiṇī</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasantiśātakā</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālinī</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čārdulavikriṣṭīta</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puṣpitāgrā</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aparavaktra</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mātrāsamaka</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaṇa</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total...</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How are we to account for these fancy-metres? Let us imagine for a moment—to indulge in rather a harmless fancy—that the whole epic was written by one individual, not of course by Vyāsa the arranger, but by Krit the maker, even as the pseudo-epic says; though the latter sets reasonable bounds to the human imagination and very properly adds that the maker of such a poem must have been divine.

This superhuman being, Krit (Bṛhārata-kṛt or better, Mahā-bṛhārata-kṛt) must have had from the beginning a well-developed ear for fancy-metres. When he writes them he writes them very carefully, seldom opposing the rules that later
writers, say of 500 A.D. and later, impose upon themselves, except in the case of the ardhasamavṛttas. These at one time he writes correctly and another loosely, as if he occasionally failed to grasp the distinction between this class of metres and that of the strict mātrāchandás; which is rather peculiar, when one considers how correctly he writes at other times. But, passing this point, how are we to account for the distribution of these metres? Evidently there is only one way. Having started out with the statement that the poem was to glitter with various fancy-metres, the poet first gave an exhibition of what he could do, reserving, however, the more complicated styles for the end of the poem. Then, settling down into the story, he got so absorbed in it that he forgot all about the fancy-metres, till after several thousand stanzas he suddenly remembered them and turned off three rácirās and six ardhasamavṛttas, e. g., as tags, lauding Čiva’s gift and Arjuna’s glorious trip to heaven; but then, becoming interested again, again dropped them, while he wrote to the end of the sixth book. With the seventh book, feeling that an interminable series of similar and repeated battle-scenes was getting a little dull, he sprinkled five different kinds of fancy metres over his last production, and in the eighth emptied a box of them in a heap, which lasted till the first part of the poem was complete. On resuming his labors (we are expressly told that he rested before taking up the latter half of the poem) he decided that, as all interest in the story itself was over, the only way to liven up a philosophic encyclopaedia would be to adorn it with a good many more fancy-metres, and toward the end he brought out the āryās, which he had had concealed all the time, but kept as a final attraction. In this last part also he emptied whole boxes of metres together, just as he had done so desperately in the eighth book.

This seems to me an entirely satisfactory explanation, granting the premiss. But in case one is dissatisfied with the (native) assumption of a homogeneous Homer, one might consider whether it were not equally probable that the present
poem was a gradual accumulation and that fancy-metres were first used as tags\textsuperscript{1} to chapters in the later part of the work, as an artistic improvement on the old-fashioned triṣṭubh tag (to cōloka sections); and so find the reason why the masses of fancy-metres are placed in the middle of sections in a later exaggeration, a vicious inclination to adorn the whole body with gewgaws, whereas at an earlier date it was deemed a sufficient beauty to tag them on to the end of a section. The only difficulty in this assumption is that it recognizes as valid the delirium of believing in the historical growth of the epic.

As regards the āryā, it makes no difference whether it was a Prākrit style known before the epic was begun or not. Just as in the case of the Rig Veda, the point is not whether such and such a form existed, but only whether (and if so, in how far) the poets admitted the form into hymns;\textsuperscript{2} so here, the question is simply as to when Sanskrit writers utilized Prākrit melodies. It is somewhat as if one should properly try to define the decade in which a piece of X’s music was composed by considering that it was in rag-time. One might object that rag-time melodies have been used for unnumbered decades by the negroes. The reply would be: True; but it is only in the last decade of the nineteenth century that rag-time has been utilized by composers; ergo, X must have published his composition in that decade or later.

When then did the vulgar āryā (i.e., melody used as a

\textsuperscript{1} The expression tag-metres answers exactly to the function of the fancy-metres in the Rāmāyaṇa, and pretty closely to their function in the Bhārata. I have indicated above the few cases where in the latter poem they have been inserted in other positions. There can be no serious doubt that such medial position simply shows how late is the passage where are found such stanzas thus located. The bhujamgapravāta appears in medial position in Čānti; the drutavilambita, in Droṇa; where also the rucirā (usually only tag); the praharṣini (medial), only in Droṇa and Čānti; the vasantatilakā, generally a tag, medial only in Anuṣṭāana; the mālini, medial in Karṇa; the cārdulavikṛdīta, medial in both these last.

\textsuperscript{2} The all-sufficient answer to the unsatisfactory contention that, because certain Vedic forms are pre-Vedic, therefore their employment by Vedic poets cannot be used in evidence of the age of certain hymns.
frame for literature) appear in Sanskrit poetry? The author of the Rāmāyaṇa, using freely the aksaracchandas and ardha-
samavṛtta as tag-poetry, either knew it not or ignored it. The later poets of the Mahābhārata, doing the same, ignored it also. Only the poets of the latest tracts, the fourteenth section of Anuśāsana and benedictions in Harivaṇca, used it, whether inventing or utilizing is a subsidiary question. The employment of this metre, if borrowed from the vulgar, stands parallel, therefore, to the adoption of Prākrit licence in prosody.¹

Further, the sometime intrusion into the middle of a chapter of metres used originally only as tags, shows that parts of the Mahābhārata reflect a later phase than that of the Rāmāyaṇa, which still confines them to their earlier function. In fact, the Mahābhārata is here on a level with the poems of inscriptions where all metres are flung together,² and, like these poems, its later parts show a predilection for long compounds and for long sentences extending over many verses.

The total result of a comparison of the various metres in the two epics shows in outline:

In the Mahābhārata
(a) early (Vedic) cloka
    early (Vedic) triṣṭubh
(b) almost classical cloka
    classical triṣṭubh
(c) late cloka stanzas (pure iambics)
    late triṣṭubh stanzas (cā-
    lini)
    late use of fancy metres

In the Rāmāyaṇa
(b) almost classical cloka
    classical triṣṭubh
(c) early use of fancy metres

A review of the results obtained in regard to the chief metre of the epic makes it clear that the presence in the

¹ Only xiii, 14 is really affected. The benedictive Harivaṇca verses are an addition too late to affect dates. Even the native (Bombay) edition omits them from the text proper.

² See on this point, Bühler's essay, Das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie, with examples at the end.
Mahābhārata of गोलकas of an older and also later type than are found in the Rāmāyaṇa indicates not only that the style of the Mahābhārata is more antique in one part than in another, but also that this difference is not due to conscious metrical variations on the part of one poet; or, in other words, that the epic was not made all at once. For the general shape of गोलकas might voluntarily be shifted, though even here it is not probable that a poet who wrote in the refined style common to the Rāmāyaṇa and to parts of the pseudo-epic Mahābhārata would shift back to diiambic close of the prior pāda or a free use of the fourth vipulā. But even granting this, there remain the subtle differences which are perceptible only with careful and patient study, elements of style not patent to the rough-and-ready critique which scorns analysis. The poet who had trained himself to eschew first vipulās after diiambs and renounce a syllaba anceps would not write first in this particular style and then in the careless old-fashioned manner. The very presence of the more refined art precludes the presumption that the same poet in the same poem on the same subject would have lapsed back into barbarism. For the distinction is not one that separates moral discourses from the epic story. Except in the case of a few obvious imitations or parodies of Ćruti texts, topics of the same sort are treated with a difference of style attributable only to different authors and in all reasonable probability to different ages.
CHAPTER FIVE.

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE EPIC.

We have now reached a point where an intelligent opinion may be formed in regard to the general make-up of the Mahābhārata. It is based, as was shown in the second chapter, on a more or less stereotyped diction, and contains adventitious matter common to both epics. It contains allusions to the latest pre-classical works, as was shown in the first chapter; while its didactic parts recapitulate the later Upanishads; and it shows acquaintance with a much larger number of Vedie schools than were recognized even at a late date. Its philosophical sections, as was shown in the third chapter, reflect varied schools and contradictory systems, some of which are as late as our era. Its metres, as have just been explained, preclude the probability of its having been written by one poet, or even by several poets of the same era. It appears to be a heterogeneous collection of strings wound about a nucleus almost lost sight of. The nucleus, however, is a story.

This story is in its details so abhorrent to the writers of the epic that they make every effort to whitewash the heroes, at one time explaining that what they did would have been wicked if it had not been done by divinely inspired heroes; at another frankly stating that the heroes did wrong. It is not then probable that had the writers intended to write a moral tale they would have built on such material. Hence the tale existed as such before it became the nucleus of a sermon. There are then two elements in the epic, narrative and didactic.

In its present didactic form the epic is recited. At its own close we learn that it was not given as a dramatic recitation, still less as a rhapsodic production. A priestly reciter, vācaka,
pāṭhaka, “speaks” or “reads” the epic as “he sits comfortably and recites, carefully pronouncing the sixty-three letters (sounds) according to their respective eight places of utterance” (as gutturals, etc.). He reads from manuscripts, samhitāpustakas, which, after the performance is over and the gentleman has been dismissed with a brahmasūtra and a handsome fee, are wrapped in cloth and piously revered. The recitation takes four months, and should be performed by Brahmans during vasso, the rainy season, xviii, 6, 21 ff. (i, 62, 32).

Such recited stories are recognized elsewhere. A knight leaves town to go into the woods accompanied with “priests who know the Vedas and Vedāṅgas,” and “priests who recite divine tales,” divyākhyānāni ye cā 'pi pāṭhanti, but also, and distinguished from these, with sūtāḥ pāurāṇikāḥ and kathakāḥ (besides hermits, śramaṇaḥ ca vanāukasaḥ), i. 214, 2–3. The story-tellers here named may be represented again by knights who tell each other, as they sit and talk, “the glorious deeds of old and many other tales,” or, as it is expressed elsewhere, “tales of war and moil and genealogies of seers and gods.”

But buried with the story-nucleus are elements also more or less concealed. The first of these is the genealogical verses, anuvaṇṭa-cloka, or anuvaṇḍyā gāthā, which in the extract

1 sanśkritaḥ sarvaśāstrañānaḥ . . . asamāktaśāraṇapadaṃ svarabhāvasamany-itarā tṛīṣaṭāśvarasamānyuktam aṣṭāśāstrasamāndritam vācyayed vācakaḥ svasthaḥ svāśinaḥ susamāhitaḥ, xviii, 6, 21, and H. loc. cit. in PW. s. varṇa. In the enumeration of parvans following, the Anucaṣana is omitted, as it is in one of the lists in Ādi, whereas the other list makes it a separate work: “After this (i.e., after Čanti as rājadharmaniṣṭāsana, āpaddharma, and mokṣa) with 329 or v. 1. 339 sections and 14,732 clokas [our text has 13,943 stanzas of all kinds] must be reckoned the Anucaṣana with 146 sections and 8000 clokas” [our text 7796]; where ataḥ ārdhvam shows, with the figures, that the Anucaṣana is not included with Čanti (the former is also called ānucāṇikanam parva), i, 2, 70–78, 328–331. On the list i, 1, 88 ff. which omits the thirteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth books, see AJP. xix, p. 5.

2 tatra pravṛtyatitāni vikrāntāni tarāṇī ca bahūni kathayitvā tāu remāte, i, 222, 29; pravṛtya tām sabhāṃ ramyaṃ vijāhrāte ca, Bhārata; tatra yuddhakathāc cītrāḥ parikleśāṇāḥ ca, Pāṛthiva, kāthāyoge kāthāyoge kathayām āsatuḥ sadā, ṛṣīṇāṁ devatānāṁ ca vaṇḍaṁ tāv āhathuḥ sadā, xiv, 15, 5–7.
just referred to are recited; as, again, in iii, 88, 5, is found: Mārkīṇḍeyo jaṅgū gāthām (anuvāṇyām). Such memorial stanzas in honor of the family either are strictly genealogical, “Devayāṇī bore Yadu and Turvasu,” or characterize a man, as in i, 95, 46 (the other, ib. 9), where Čaṅtana’s name is derived, on the strength of such a stanza, from his having the healing touch (the careless compilers a little later, i, 97, 19, give another derivation). Such stanzas are sometimes inserted in prose narration ¹ in honor of the family, though occasionally of very general content. On the other hand, really genealogical stanzas may be introduced without any statement as to their character, though the poets usually quote them from rhapsodes, “men who know the tales of old here sing (or recite) this gāthā,” apy atra gāthāṁ gāyanti ye purāṇavido janāḥ, i, 121, 13; vii, 67, 14.

Though, as was shown in a previous chapter, the word for sing is scarcely more than recite, yet it reflects conditions where bards actually sang songs in honor of kings. The ancient age knew, in fact, just such a distinction as underlies the double character of the epic. On the one hand, it had its slowly repeated circle of tales (sometimes mistranslated by cycle of tales),² and on the other, impromptu bardic lays, not in inherited form but improvisations, where the rhapsode, as is especially provided for in the ritual, on a certain occasion was “to sing an original song, the subject of which should be, This king fought, this king conquered in such a battle.” The song is here accompanied with the lute or lyre, which in the epic is called seven-stringed, saptatantrī vīṇā (ἐπτάτονος φόρμας; see above, p. 172). Such song as “hero-praising verse,” nārācāṁśi gāthā, are recognized in the Gṛhyā Sūtras

¹ Compare the illustrations by Lassen and Weber and Holtzmann himself, summed up in the last writer’s work, loc. cit., p. 2.
² The tales of a (year’s) circle, pāriplavam ākhyānam, have no cyclic element. For literature on the early rhapsodes and reciters, see Cat. Br. xiii, 4, 8, 3, 5; Weber, IS. i, p. 186. Compare Pār. G. S. i, 15, 17. The traditional legend in the epic is called (pāram) paryāgatam ākhyānam kathitam, xii, 340, 125, 138. The early improvised lays are called svayaṁsambhṛtā gāthāḥ (loc. cit., Cat. Br.).
as traditional texts, differentiated from "legends," and were probably genealogical stanzas preserved in the family. Besides the single singer, there were also bands of singers who "sang the (reigning) king with the old kings."  

In these Brähmaṇa stories, the rhapsode-lay took place at the very time of the priestly recited tale, which circled round a year. There is no difference of date between them. The rhapsode and the reciter were contemporary. So in the epic, although the recitation of tales is noticed, yet rhapsodes are constantly mentioned. In xiv, 70, 7, praise is rendered by dancers and luck-wishers and also by rhapsodes, granthikas, "in congratulations that uttered the praise of the Kuru-race," Kuruvaiṇacavākhyābhir ācīrbhīḥ. In parallel scenes we find "story-tellers," who could praise only by performing their business, as in iv, 70, 20: "Eight hundred bejewelled Sūtas along with māgadhas (singers) praised him, as the seers did Čakra of old;" ib. 72, 29: "Singers, gāyanas, those skilled in tales, ākhyānaçīlas, dancers, and reciters of genealogical verses, nāṭavāṭālikas, stood praising him, as did Sūtas with māgadhas." Again in vii, 82, 2–3: jagur gītāni gāyakaḥ Kuruvaiṇacavārthāṇi: "Singers sang songs which lauded the Kuru-race," where the rhapsode, granthika, above, appears as singer, gāyana. For the history of the poem it is worth noticing that, though the Pandus are the present heroes, the stereotyped phrase is always of "praise of the Kuru race," even where a Pandu is praised.

We have in the epic the names of what are to-day the epic reciters, kuçīlavā and kathaka, and the repeaters of genealogical verses (in distinction from the Sūtas), called vāṭālikas.


2 So in ii, 4, 7, nāṭas, Sūtas, and vāṭālikas wait on the king along with boxers and wrestlers. Such epic professionals are called (besides pāṇivānīkas) māgadhas, nāṇivādyas, bandins, gāyanas, sāukhyāçīyikas, vāṭālikas, kathakas, granthikas, gāthins, kuçīlavas and pāṇīnakas (Sūtas).

3 So xii, 37, 43, where a king is praised by Sūtas, vāṭālikas, and (subhāśīta) māgadhas. Compare the distinction in R. vi, 127, 3, with Comm.: the Sūtas "know praise and Purāṇas" the vāṭālikas recite genealogical verses. Both epics have the group (phrase) sūtāmāgadhabandinaḥ.
When the lyre is mentioned, it is to wake up sleepers by means of "sweet songs and the sound of the lyre," gīta, vīnācābdā, i, 218, 14. Only Nārada, a superhuman archetypical bard, comes skilled in dance and song with his melodious mind-soothing tortoise-lyre, ix, 54, 19.¹

There is then in the epic, though a musical accompaniment is unknown, a distinct recollection of the practice of reciting lays, gītāni, the sole object of which was to "praise the Kuru race," as opposed to reading or reciting conversationally stories of ancient times. To neither of these elements can a judicious historian ascribe priority. The story and the lay are equally old. Their union was rendered possible as soon as the lay, formerly sung, was dissociated from music and repeated as a heroic tale of antiquity. This union was the foundation of the present epic.

Traces of the epic quality of the early poem cannot be disregarded. The central tale and many another tale woven into the present narrative are thoroughly heroic. To this day, warped and twisted from its original purpose, it is the story, not the sermon, that holds enthralled the throng that listens to the recitation of the great epic. Be it either epic, its tale is still popular in India. But the people cannot understand it. Hence the poem is read by a priest, while a translator and interpreter, of no mean histrionic talent, takes up his words and renders them in forcible patois, accompanying the dramatic recital by still more dramatic gestures and contortions. Such a recitation, without the intermediate interpreter (the modern dhāraka) was undoubtedly the performance given (not by the later paṭhaka, but) by the earlier epic gāthin, gāyaka, and granthika, just as they are depicted about the second century B.C. on the Sānchi Tope.²

¹ The pāṇisvanikas mentioned above may be pantomimists or simple "hand-clappers." The latter is the meaning in the cognate pāṇivādaka at R. ii, 65, 4 (compare Brahmajāla Sutta, Rhys Davids’ note, p. 8). In the passage above, ix, 54, 19, the prakartā kalabhānāṁ ca nityāṁ ca kalahapriyāḥ is represented as kacchapāṁ sukhācābdāntāṁ gṛhyā vīṇām, a late passage, apparently.

² Lévi, Le théâtre indien, p. 309.
But though it is a gross exaggeration of the facts, as well as a misapprehension of poetic values, to make the epic a poem that was from the start a moral and religious narrative, yet, inasmuch as in the hands of the priest the latter element was made predominant, there is no objection to the statement that from the point of view of the epic as a whole the Mahābhārata is to-day less tale than teaching. That this double character was recognized by those who contributed the introduction to the poem itself is indisputable (above, p. 53). The "tales" are counted as separate. The original Bhārata was only a quarter of its present size. Then, as later, the different elements were still distinguished, and the poem was not regarded as wholly a Smṛti or instruction-book, but as an artistic poem, Kāvyā, per se. So the pseudo-epic vaunts its own literary finish: cābde cā 'rthe ca hetāu ca eśā prathama-sargajā (sarasvatī), xii, 336, 36.

The particular school of priests in whose hands the epic was transformed was probably that of the Yajurvedins. The Yajur Veda is "the birth-place of the warrior caste," according to a well-known verse, and it has been shown by Weber that the Catapatha, a Yajur Veda text, stands in peculiarly close relation to the didactic epic.¹ As has been shown in the first chapter, the Catapatha is the only Brāhmaṇa praised, perhaps even mentioned, in the epic; while the Yajur Veda Ṣatarudriya is exalted above all texts (except perhaps where Indra sings this, Vishnu sings the jyeṣṭha sāman, and Brahmā, the rathamūtara, xiii, 14, 282, but even here the Ṣatarudriya is not slighted). In dividing the Itihāsa from the Purāṇa, moreover, the epic groups the former with the Yajur Veda, as against the Purāṇa with the other Vedas, viii, 34, 45. Here the Itihāsa represents the epic, as it does in the similar antithesis of xii, 302, 109: yac cā 'pi drṣṭam vividham purāṇe yac ce 'tiḥāseṣu mahatsu drṣṭam,

¹ Vālmiki too belonged to this school. Compare Weber, IS., xiii, p. 440, and as cited by Holtzmann, loc. cit., p. 18; Muir, OST., i, p. 17, citing TB. iii, 12, 9, 2, where the Viṅgyas are derived from the Rig Veda, the Kṣatriyas from the Yajur Veda, and the Brāhmans from the Śāma Veda.
where, as already observed, the Great Itihāsas point to several epic poems. Lastly, the Upanishads especially copied in the epic are those belonging to the Yajur Veda.

But while this is true of the completed epic, there is nothing to show that the Bhāratī Kathā was the especial property of any school, and no preference is given to the Yajur Veda in the later epic, for in the Gītā the Śāma Veda stands as the best, "I am the Śāma Veda among Vedas," 10, 22, and this is cited with approval and enlarged upon in xiii, 14, 328: "Thou art the Śāma Veda among Vedas, the Čatarudria among Yajus hymns, the Eternal Youth among Yogas, Kapila among Sānkhyaas."

In the epic itself the Śūtas called paurāṇikas are recognized as the re-writers and reciters of the epic. They probably took the epic legends and arranged them in order for the popular recitation, which is also recognized when "priests recite the Mahābhārata at the assemblies of warriors," v, 141, 56, a passage recently cited by Professor Jacobi, as evidence of a difference between the manner of handing down the heroic tales and the recitals of legends.¹

The method of narrating the epic stories is that of the old priestly legend, where the verse-tale is knit together, as in the epic, by prose statements as to the speaker. So in the epic, a narrative, not a rhapsodic or dramatic, delivery is indicated by such phrases. In the Rāmāyaṇa, on the other hand, the verse is knit more closely together, and the speakers are indicated almost always in the verse. The one exception is a late addition (G. ii, 110, 4–5).

The Mahābhārata is not only a Veda, it is so important a Veda that to read it is to dispense with the need of reading other Vedas.² In the dynamic alteration consequent on the attaining of such an ideal, we may expect to find that the tale, as a tale, is full of the grossest incongruities; for to fulfil its

¹ Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeige, 1800, p. 877 ff. I fully agree with the author's view in regard to the "Puranic" Śūtas being the compilers of the epic mass.
² vijācyayāḥ sa ca vedānām pār ago bhāratam paṭhan, i, 62, 82.
encyclopedic character all is fish that comes to the net, and scarcely an attempt is made to smooth away any save the most glaring inconsistencies. Tale is added to tale, doctrine to doctrine, without much regard to the effect produced by the juxtaposition. If we take these facts as they stand, which is the more probable interpretation, that they were originally composed in this incongruous combination or that they are the result of such a genesis as has just been explained? As for the facts, I will illustrate them, though to any Bhāratavid they are already patent.

In i, 214, Arjuna protests that he is a brahmaçārin for twelve years, in accordance with the agreement (chapter 212) that he has made with his brother, which is to the effect that he will be "a brahmaçārin in the woods for twelve years." This can have only one meaning. A brahmaçārin is not a man wandering about on love-adventures, but a chaste student. Above all, chastity is implied. Now the first thing the hero Arjuna does is to violate his agreement by having a connection with Ulūpi, a beautiful water-witch, who easily persuades him to break his vow; after which he resides in a city, taking to himself a wife with whom he lives for three years. After this he has a new adventure with some enchanted nymphs and then stays with Krishna; when, in a new vikrānta or derringdo (the hero's rape of Subhadra, chapter 220), all the talk of brahmaçārin wandering in the woods stops inconsequently. When he marries (in town) not a word is said of his vow; but when he approaches Krishna on the subject of Subhadra the poet makes the former say "how can a wood-wanderer fall in love?" This is the only allusion, and one entirely ignored, to the matter of the vow; which in the earlier Mañipur scene is absolutely unnoticed. Each of these feats is a separate heroic tale and they are all contradictory to the setting in which they have been placed by the diadochoi and later epic manipulators. As heroic tales they are perfectly intelligible. Certain feats in separate stories were attributed to the hero. They had to be combined and they were combined by letting him go off by himself under a vow
of wandering in the woods. The wood-wanderer was usually a chaste ascetic, so he was given this character, but this rôle is kept for only one of the noble deeds. For after he has protested once at the outset, all pretence of his being a brahmaćarīn vanishes and the next we know he is comfortably mated and living in town, while still supposed by the poets to be a brahmaćarīn in the woods. The independent origin of these stories is seen at the beginning in the formula "Hear now a wonder-tale of him," tatra tasyā 'dbhutam karma çṛṇu tvam, 214, 7. Such formulae of special tales are found frequently, idam yaḥ çṛṇuyād vṛttam is another, used for the Urvācq episode, iii, 46, 62. Another is like our "once upon a time," pura kṛtayuge rājan, e.g., ix, 40, 3.

The fact that Arjuna is here banished for twelve years is not without significance. The epic has been completed on rather formal lines. Agni is satiated for twelve years at Khāṇḍava. Arjuna's banishment is for the same length of time as that of the brothers as a family. So the epic is divided into eighteen books, as there are eighteen Purāṇas (p. 49); and there are eighteen armies battling for just eighteen days, and eighteen branches of younger Yādavas;1 while finally there are eighteen islands of earth. The number of islands deserves particular notice, as it is one of the innumerable small indications that the poem has been retouched. Earth has four, seven, or at most thirteen islands in all literature of respectable antiquity. Seven is the usual number in the epic as it is in the older Purāṇas, but in the hymn to the sun at iii, 3, 52, "earth with its thirteen islands" is mentioned.2 The mention of eighteen is found, of course, in one of the books where one who distinguished between the early and late elements would be apt to look for it, in the much inflated and rewritten seventh book, where (above, p. 229), with customary inconsistency, it stands beside another reference to the usual seven islands, sarvān aṣṭādaça dvipān, vii, 70, 15; sapta dvipān, 21.

1 ii, 14, 40, 55; also 18,000 brothers and cousins, 56.
2 The same passage calls the sun, cl. 61, vivasvān mihirah pūṣā mitraḥ.
Another tale which bears evidence of having been rewritten and still shows its inconsistencies is found in iii, 12, 91 ff. Here Bhima and his brothers and mother are surrounded by fire, and he rescues them by taking them on his back and leaping clear over the fire. No suggestion is given of any other means of escape. On the contrary it is emphasized that he can fly like the wind or Garuḍa, and the escape is due entirely to his divine power and strength. But in i, 2, 104; 61, 22; and 148, 12, 20 ff., the same story is told with an added element which quite does away with the old solution. Here (in the later first book) the party escape through an underground tunnel, suruṅgā (cf. 12) or suruṅgā, and after they are well off in the woods far from the fire, Bhima is made to pick them up and carry them. The old feat was too attractive to lose, so it was kept postponed, but the later version with the Greek word to mark its lateness takes the place of the older jump. No one can read the account in Vana and fail to see that it is not a mere hasty résumé omitting the suruṅgā, but that the original escape is a feat of the wind-god's son. But the first part of this same section in Vana contains a laudation to Krishna-Vishnu which is as palpable a late addition as one could find in any work.

The suruṅgā, "syrinx," is not the only Greek word added in the later epic. As such must certainly be reckoned trikoṇa = τρίγωνος. There are in fact two koṇa. One is Sanskrit or dialectic for kvāṇa, the "sounder," or drumstick of the Rāma-yāna, vi, 32, 43; 42, 34, and elsewhere (not in the Mahābhārata). The other is found in the pseudo-epic xiv, 88, 32: catuṛcītyaḥ...aṣṭādaçakarātmakāḥ sarukmapakṣo nicītas trikoṇa garuḍākrītih, of an altar (the corresponding passage in R. i, 14, 29, has triguṇāḥ), where the word must mean angle and be the equivalent of τρίγωνος.

The question of the character of the epic is so intertwined with its date that I will not apologize for pausing here a moment to speak of another geographical and ethnographical feature. The apologia published under the title Genesis des Mahābhārata omits to reply to the rather startling conclusion
drawn by Weber in a recent monograph on the name Bāhlika, or Bāhlīka, as it appears in the epic. In the Sitzungsbericht of the Berlin Academy, 1892, pp. 987 ff., Weber claims that any work containing this name or that of Pahlava must be as late as the first to the fourth century A.D. I cannot but think that the escape from this conclusion, in part suggested by Weber himself, is correct. In the rewriting of foreign names it is perfectly possible that later copyists should have incorporated a form current in their own day rather than conserved a form no longer current, which it was easy to do when not forbidden by the metre. Again, that there was actual confusion between the forms Vāhīka and Bāhlīka, the former being a Puṣṭākā clan, the latter the Bactrians, it is not difficult to show. According to tradition, a drink especially beloved by the Bāhlīkas is sāuvīra, or sāuviraka. This can scarcely be anything else than the drink suviraka, said to be lauded in the epic by degraded foreigners. But here the foreigners are not Bāhlīkas but Vāhīkas, whose Madrikā (woman) sings, vii, iv, 40, 39–40, "I will give up my family rather than my beloved suviraka."

mā māṁ suvirakaṁ kacecid yacatāṁ dayitam mama
putram dadyāṁ patiṁ dadyāṁ na tu dadyāṁ suvirakaṁ

It is possible that the epic arose further to the north-west, and in its south-eastern journey, for it ends in being revised in the south-east,1 has transferred the attributes of one people to another, as it has transferred geographical statements, and made seven Sarasvatīs out of the Seven Rivers of antiquity, ix, 38, 3. As an indication of the earlier habitat may be mentioned the very puzzling remark made in iii, 34, 11. Here there is an apparent allusion to the agreement in ii, 76, which agreement is that on being recognized before the expiration of the thirteenth year, either party shall give up his kingdom (svarājyam, ch. 14); and it is assumed throughout that the two kingdoms are those of Hastināpur on the Ganges and

1 See on this point the evidence presented in my paper on the Bhārata and the Great Bhārata. Am. Journ. Phil. vol. xix, p. 21 ff.
Indraprastha on the Jumna. But in the passage of Vana just referred to there is an (old) triṣṭubh résumé of the situation, which makes the Kuru say:

bravīmi satyaṁ Kurusaṁsādi 'ha

tavāi 'va tā, Bhārata, paśca nadyaḥ

Here we get an account where the Pandus are lost in the older Bhāratas, and to them the Kuru king says, "If we break this agreement, yours shall be all this Puṇjāb." But what has the Puṇjāb to do with the epic in its present form? It is a land of Vāhikas and generally despised peoples (who morally are not much better than barbarians), and also a holy land (another little inconsistency disregarded in the synthetic method); but, whatever it is morally, it has nothing to do politically with the present epic heroes, except to provide them with some of their best allies, a fact, however, that in itself may be significant of earlier Western relations.¹

To return to the evidence of remaking in the epic. Passing over the passage ix, 33 to 55, a long interpolation thrust midway into a dramatic scene, we find that chapter 61 begins with the repetition of the precedent beginning of chapter 59, which latter, after 15 člokas, together with chapter 60, is taken up with a moral discourse of Yudhiṣṭhira, who reproaches Bhīma for insulting the fallen foe. Then Rāma joins in and is about to slay Bhīma, when Krishna defends the latter, saying that his ignoble insult was entirely proper. This argument of Krishna is characterized by Sañjaya as dharmacchalam, or, in other words, Krishna is said to be a pious hypocrite (60, 26); Rāma departs in disgust, and the virtuous heroes "became very joyless" (31). Then Krishna, who has all along been approving the act, turns to Yudhiṣṭhira who reproved it, and says,

¹ Jacobi touches on the significance of these Western allies in the review mentioned above. The "land of the Bhāratas" extends northwest of the Puṇjāb even to the foot of the Himalayas, for in coming from Hemakūṭa to Mithilā one traverses first the Hāmavata Varṣa, then "passing beyond this arrives at the Bhārata Varṣa, and (so) reaches Āryāvarta" (seeing on the journey "different districts inhabited by Chinese and Huns," cinahūpāniṣe-vitān), xii, 326, 14-15. But this is the Varṣa or country in general.
"Why do you approve of this sin?" Yudhiṣṭhira answers, "I am not pleased with it, but (because we were so badly treated by this man therefore) I overlook it. Let Pandu's son take his pleasure whether he does right or wrong" (38). And when Yudhiṣṭhira had said this, Krishna answered "as you will," and Yudhiṣṭhira then "expressed gratification at what Bhīma had done in the fight." In the next chapter, Krishna is openly charged with violating all rules of honor and noble conduct (61, 88); to which the god at first replies by specious reasoning (tit for tat), and then, throwing off all disguise, says: "This man could not be killed by righteous means, nor could your other enemies have been slain, if I had not acted thus sinfully," yadi nāi 'vaṁvidhain jātum kuryāṁ jihmam aham rane (64).

Here there is something more than dramatic incongruities to notice. For is it conceivable that any priests, setting out to write a moral tale which should inculcate virtue, would first make one of the heroes do an ignoble thing, and then have both their great god and their chief human exponent of morality combine in applauding what was openly acknowledged even by the gods to be dishonorable conduct? Even if the act was dramatically permitted for the purpose of setting its condemnation in a stronger light and thus purging in the end, can we imagine that the only vindicator of virtue should be Rāma, and that Krishna and Yudhiṣṭhira of all others should cut so contemptible a figure? On the other hand, is not the whole scene explicable without any far-fetched hypothesis, if we assume that we have here the mingling of older incident, inseparable from the heroic narrative, and the later teaching administered by a moral deus ex machīna? As the scene stands it is grotesque. Krishna's sudden attack on Yudhiṣṭhira is entirely uncalled-for; and the latter, who has first denounced the deed, then joins with the former in approving the very thing of which Krishna himself half way through the scene disapproves.

But to those who think that the epic was built on a moral didactic plan this is only one of many cases where a satisfactory
explanation in accordance with the theory will prove difficult. They must explain why polyandry, in which the heroes indulge, while it is condemned, is permitted. Ludwig explains this “sharing of the jewel” (i, 195, 25) as a “Mythisches Element;” others hark back to the old-fashioned allegorical treatment. But why is allegory with a bad moral seriously defended if the heroes are merely to be represented as models? On the other hand, it is known that polyandry was no uncommon thing on the borders of Brahmanic civilization, and Bühler recognized the custom within its pale; while the Pandus have no Brahmanic standing, and are evidently a new people from without the pale. As a simple historic element it is perfectly natural, explained otherwise it remains an inexplicable mystery. So too with all the violations of the ethical code which are enumerated in the chapter referred to above. As characters in an historical epic, the heroes’ acts are easily understood; as priestly models, dummies for sermons, their doings are beyond explanation.

Apart from the ignoble conduct of heroes, there are other items. Getting drunk at a picnic, for instance, is not proper conduct for an exemplary Hindu lady. But in the later epic the most virtuous ladies get so drunk that they cannot walk straight, madaskhalitagguminyaḥ, i, 222, 21, madoṭkate, 28. Such shocking behavior belongs to the revelry of the Harivāṇa and the probably contemporaneous tale here jovially recorded. It is not a moral episode of the fifth century B.C. Elsewhere ladies are supposed to be “unseen by the sun and wind,” not only before they are married, but afterwards. Drinking surā

1 i, 158, 36; 195, 27, 28.
2 This follows from the sharp contrast presented by the Kurus and Pandus in Brahmanic literature. While the Kurus are a famous folk in ancient records, the Pandus are there utterly unknown.
3 ii, 69, 4 ff.; iii, 62, 21. The formal phrase here is noticeable. Drāupadi says: yāṁ na vāyur na cā ‘dityo dṛṣṭavantu purā grhe, sā ‘ham adya sabhāmadhiye dṛṣṭyāṁ janasāṁsadi (she was one of the ladies who got drunk at the outdoor picnic). So Damayanti, of whom Nala says: yāṁ na vāyur na cā ‘dityaḥ purā pāgyati me priyāṁ, se ‘yam adya sabhāmadhīye ēte bhuvāv anāthavat.
is especially forbidden by the codes, but it is drunk without compunction by the heroes.¹

The subject of meat-eating is not a trivial one to the Hindu. I need not cite the numerous passages describing the slaughter and eating of animals by the epic heroes, more especially as I have elsewhere illustrated the fact very fully.² What I wish to point out particularly at the present time is the impossibility of supposing that the same plan of moral teaching is carried out not only in the tales of meat-eating, but in the orthodox teaching that meat may be eaten at a sacrifice, and in the strict vegetarian diet even at sacrifices, which is insisted upon in the ahiṁsā doctrine of the later epic.³ Here, not only is the substitution of a deer for a horse a new feature in the Aśvamedha sacrifice, xii, 343, 52; but a king is held up as a model because there was no killing of animals at an aśvamedha. For this model king was ahiṁsraḥ ākṣudraḥ, that is “he did no harm to any living thing, he was pure and not cruel” (ākṣudra = akrūra), xii, 387, 10. The parts of the sacrifice were all wood-growth, for there is a vādikī ārutiḥ which says bijāir yajñesu yāṣṭavyam; ajasan-

¹ The codes are early Sūtras as well as Čāstras, e.g., Gāut. xxi, 1-7. In iv, 72, 28, at a wedding, surāmāitreya-pāṇāṇi and meat of all kinds, mṛgas and medhyāḥ paṇavaḥ. Karṇa’s asuravrataṃ (surārahitaḥ, N.) indicates his habitual use of surā, iii, 257, 17. Both Krishna and Arjuna are drunk when they receive an ambassador, v, 50, 5.

² Ruling Caste, p. 119. Further illustrations also are here given of the other vices mentioned. My position in regard to these points I find it necessary to restate, owing to the misrepresentation of them in the so-called Genesis des Mahābhārata. The author simply parodies when, on p. 55, he says, “these passages cannot belong to a time” (etc.). In the presentation thus caricatured I separated no parts of the epic; but simply pointed out that the statements of the moral code are not in harmony with the action of the heroes.

³ To this, perhaps, is due the intrusion into epic sacrifices (among aśva-medha, rājasūya, and other ancient rites) of the so-called puṇḍarika sacrifice, or sacrifice of lotus(-roots), which is frequently mentioned, but appears to be unknown before the epic. The graciousness of the Vishnu cult is illustrated by its insistence on vegetal and not animal offerings. The orthodox Brahman (also the Čākta) demands blood-sacrifices; Krishna prohibits them. The difference, still marked, appears in the epic and no “synthesis” can explain it otherwise.
jñāni biḷāni echāgān no hantum arthaḥ (you must not kill goats at a sacrifice; sacrifice with vegetables and call them goats) nāī 'ṣa dharmāḥ satāṁ devā yatra vadhetya vāi paṇuḥ (it is not the rule among good men to kill animals), xii, 388, 4. Now this whole teaching is opposed not only to the formal codes and to the practice of the epic heroes, but also to the formal teaching of the epic itself, which says expressly: “No man does wrong in eating food prepared with the sacrificial verses,” yajuśā sanskrātam māṁsam upabhuṣjan na dusyati, xiii, 163, 43. Animal sacrifices are inveighed against in one part of the epic and praised in another (iii, 30, etc.). Even human sacrifices are not only mentioned but also enjoined on the model heroes: “Sacrifices are the chief means of success. Do thou therefore institute a Rājasūya, a horse-sacrifice, an all-sacrifice and a human sacrifice,” xiv, 3, 6–8.

As to hunting, all epic heroes hunt and eat the meat of their victims; but since this practice is opposed to the ahiṁsā doctrine the casuist has a good deal of difficulty in reconciling the practice of the model heroes with that doctrine. It is said to be permissible, because sacrificial animals may be eaten, and deer are brought under this head by a reference to Agastya who “sanctified them.” But while Rāma is quite content to say that hunting even with traps is permissible, because the saints of royal blood practised it of old; the teacher in the Mahābhārata is still uneasy, even after contending that the quarry is “sacrificial;” so he says that really the hunter is contending for his life and it is a matter of fighting, which takes it out of the category of “injury,” since the hunter himself is as likely to be killed as to kill. All

1 The chine is excepted, prṣṭhaṁśam, 43. This and vrthāṁśam is the same as putramāṁśam, that is, it is as bad to eat meat not used for sacrificial purposes as it is to be a cannibal, for amṛtam brāhmaṇā gāva ity etat trayam ekataḥ, cows are as holy as Brahmans, 42. Compare also xiii, 115 and 116 (below).

2 Compare xiii, 103, 32 ff., “ārkāyaṇas, turāyaṇas, human sacrifices” (and others).

3 The passages of the two epics are related. Compare: ato rājaṛṣayaḥ sarve mṛgayeṁ yānti, Bhārata, with yānti rājaṛṣayaḥ ca tatra mṛgayeṁ dharmakvidāḥ, xiii, 116, 18, and R. iv, 18, 40, respectively. The law is laid down
of this is good sense, but it does not save the teacher from the weakness of advancing two excuses, and thus betraying the fact that the whole ahimsā received from Buddhism and half accepted, is a late modification of the practice of the model heroes, who disregard the real ahimsā. Yudhiṣṭhira says frankly that he likes meat, and Bhīṣma agrees that it is a most pleasant and strengthening food; but he says that those who indulge in it go to hell, and then explains that warriors may practise hunting for the reasons given above. It is no wonder that the model meat-eating hero says “my mind is befuddled on this point.” Formal Brahmanic law accounts hunting one of the four worst vices a king may have.

Such contradictions are not those of a “great-hearted poet” who scorns the narrowness of accuracy. Of this latter class of contradictions the poem is full. The Hindu Homer nods continually. He forgets that his puppet is addressing Bhīṣma and makes him use the customary vocative, Yudhiṣṭhira, because the latter is his ordinary dummy, iii, 82, 64; 85, 111. He says that even a wise man who sells soma goes to hell, and that the sale of soma by one who is wise is no fault, xiii, 101, 12 ff., xii, 34, 31. His gods have no shadows in a well-known passage of Nala, but elsewhere “the gods’ vast shad-

in Manu, vii, 50. The whole of xiii, 115 and 116 is an awkward attempt to unite hunting-morality with non-injury, na ca doṣo ‘tra vidyate (Rāma), bhūjaṇa na duṣyati (M.). Rāma goes so far as to say that to kill a monkey is no crime, for the reasons given above, a peculiarly unbrahmanic argument. Due to the influence of Buddhism sporadically represented is also the passage so similar to the Dhammapada (Dh. P. 385, tam aham brūmi brāhmaṇam, and 393, yamhi saccañ ca dhammo ca, so sukhi so ca brāhmaṇo) in iii, 216, 14-15, yas tu cāḍro dame satye dharme ca satatottithaḥ tam brāhmaṇam aham manye vṛttena hi bhaved dvijaḥ, and the parallel passage in xii, 44, 46 ff., which declares that a Cūdra not only may become a samskrto dvijaḥ hereafter, but that he should be revered, sovyah, like a regenerate person, if he is “pure of heart and of subdued senses,” since “not birth, nor sacrament, nor learning, nor stock” (santathi) make one regenerate, but only conduct” is the cause of regeneracy (dvijatvasya vṛttam eva tu kāraṇam). We have from Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras a pretty clear idea of what Brahmanism taught in regard to the Cūdra. But it never taught this even in the Upanishads. It is pure Buddhism, taught as Brahmanism.
ows" are seen, ix, 87, 9. His saints are stars, but again only "like stars," and finally "not stars," iii, 25, 14; 261, 13; xii, 245, 22; 271, 25, etc. I lay as little weight on such contradictions as would any one familiar with the history of literature, and it is a mere travesty to say that to this class belong such fundamental differences as those which are characteristic of the precept and practice of the epic. No poem composed to teach certain doctrines would admit as its most virtuous characters those who disregarded these doctrines systematically.

Whether the fact that only the pseudo-epic puts the Atharva-Veda first in the list of Vedas be worthy of consideration or not, it has an interesting parallel in the fact that only the pseudo-epic places the Atharvan priest before the others. In early works the Ācārya, who taught gratis all the Vedas, is declared to be worth ten Upādhyāyas, Vas. xiii, 48; iii, 21–22; Manu, ii, 140–145. This Upādhyāya is the direct etymological ancestor of the modern ojha, wizard. In ancient times he was a sub-teacher, who taught for a livelihood one part of the Veda and Vedaṅga, and he is identified in the epic with the Purohita, who, as Professor Weber has shown, is essentially an Atharva-Veda priest, or magic-monger, whom seers regard as contemptible. The pseudo-epic inverts the ancient ratio and makes the Upādhyāya worth ten Ācāryas, xiii, 105, 14–45.

1 One example of magic recorded in the epic is particularly interesting, as it is referred to the Kāulika-çāstra, or left-hand cult, and is a parallel to the practice recorded in Theocritus’ second idyll. It is called chāyopasevāna or shadow-cult, and consists in making an image of an enemy and sticking pins into it to cause his death, iii, 32, 4.

2 The Jātakas, too, regard the Purohita as a mere magic-monger, though they call him also ācārya, Fick, Sociale Gliederung, p. 110. On the Purohita Upādhyāya, see the story of Marutta, xiv, 6, 7 ff. Here (and in xiii, 10, 36) the office is hereditary. The king in the former passage insists that his family Purohita shall serve him with an incantation, but the priest tells him he is engaged elsewhere, and says "Go and choose some one else as your Upādhyāya." So in i, 3, 11 ff., where a proper Purohita is sought "to kill bad magic" and is installed as Upādhyāya. On his practical importance and honors, compare i, 183, 1, 9; 6-7; v, 126, 2; 127, 25; ix, 41, 12. On the contempt with which he is regarded, xiii, 10, 36; 94, 33; 135, 11.
The epic in its present form is swollen with many additions, but they are all cast into the shade by the enormous mass added bodily to the epic as didactic books, containing more than twenty thousand stanzas. I have elsewhere fully explained the machinery by which this great appendix was added to the original work through suspending the death of the narrator, and shown that there are many indications left in the epic pointing to the fact that the narrator in the original version was actually killed before he uttered a word of the appendix. As this one fact disposes of the chief feature of that theory of the epic which holds that the work was originally what it is to-day, and as no sufficient answer has been given to the facts adduced, there can be no further question in regard to the correctness of the term pseudo-epic as applied to these parts of the present poem. There has been, so far as I know, no voice heard in favor of the so-called synthetic theory in regard to the nature of these late books, except certain utterances based apparently on a misconception. Thus it has been said, I think, by Professor Oldenburg, that the discovery of the lotus-stalk tale among the early Buddhistic legends tends to show that the epic book where it occurs is antique. On this point this is to be said: No one has ever denied that there are early legends found in the late parts of the epic; but the fact that this or that legend repeated in the pseudo-epic is found in other literature, no matter how old, does nothing toward proving either the antiquity of the book as a whole, which is just what the "synthetic" method contends for, or the antiquity of the epic form of the legend. The story of the Deluge, for example, is older than any Buddhistic monument; but this does not prove that the epic version in the third book is old. The same is true of the

2 In this view I am glad to see that Professor Jacobi, in the review cited above, fully agrees. So also M. Barth, Journal des Savants, 1897, p. 448.
3 I am not sure that I have here cited the well-known Russian savant correctly, as I have seen only a notice of his paper; but I believe the essential point is as given above. The Lotus-Theft, however, perhaps the same story, is alluded to as early as Ait. Br. v. 30.
first book, where the pūrāṇī kathā of Khāṇḍava, for example, is a justifiable and instructive title, set as it is in a late book. A special "ancient tale" is just what it is; intruded awkwardly into the continuous later narration, 223, 14–16, but still bearing traces of its heterogeneous character, as I have shown elsewhere. Knowing, as we do, the loose and careless way in which epic texts have been handed down (compare the way in which appear the same passages given in different editions of the same epic or in both epics), and the freedom with which additions were made to the text, we are in such cases historically justified in saying only that certain matter of the epic stands parallel to certain Bhāṣya matter or Buddhistic matter. A tale is found in the epic. Its content is pictured on a stone or found in different form in a Jātaka. What possible guarantee have we that the epic form of the tale is as old as the Jātaka, still less that it is as old as the stone, least of all that the book in which the epic tale appears must as a whole be antique? Only paucity of solid data could make eminent scholars build structures on such a morass.

Having already given an example or two of late features in the pseudo-epic, I would now point to some of the characteristic marks of the later poem in other regards. Midway in the development of the epic stands the intrusion of the fourth book, where to fill out an extra year, not recognized in the early epic, the heroes live at court in various disguises. Here the worship of Durgā is prominent, who is known by her Purānic title, maḥiṣāsuranācīnī, iv, 6, 15, whose "grace gives victory," ib. 30 (though after the intrusion of the hymn nothing further is heard of her). The Durgā here depicted bears a khetāka (as she does when the same hymn is repeated in vi, 23, 7), iv, 6, 4. This word for shield amid innumerable passages describing arms, is unknown in the epic except in connection with Durgā, but it is found in post-epical literature. It stands in the same historical position as does the epithet just mentioned. In these cases we have

1 Bhārata and Great Bhārata, p. 15.
general evidence of the lateness of the book as well as of the hymn to Durgā. Matter and metre go hand in hand.

A very striking example is given further in the show of arms which are described in this book. Although Arjuna is still a young man, yet, when the exhibitor comes to show his bow, Gāṇḍīva, he says “And this is the world-renowned bow of the son of Pṛthā, which he carried for five-and-sixty years” iv, 43, 1–6. Nothing could be plainer than this passage. The exhibition of arms was composed when the later poet had in mind the actual number of years the hero carried the bow according to the epic story. He forgot that he was composing a scene which was to fit into the hero’s young manhood and not into the end of his life. In iv, 71, 15 Arjuna is recognized as still a “dark-featured youth,” ¹ and some time after this scene it is expressly stated that it was even then only thirty-three years since the time when Arjuna got the bow, v, 52, 10 (referring to the Khāṇḍava episode, i, 225).²

While it is obvious to one who is willing to examine the

¹ Here there is another inconsistency. In iv, 44, 20, instead of being a gyāma yuvā as in 71, 15, he is called Arjuna because of his white steeds and complexion, “which is rare on earth,” where the “white” complexion matches steeds and deeds, “pure (white).” In v, 50, 10, Arjuna is also dark.

² According to v, 82, 40, and 90, 47 and 70, respectively, the time from the exile to the battle is thirteen years past (“this is the fourteenth”). Ignoring the discrepancy between twelve and thirteen years of exile, we must allow at least twenty-nine years for Arjuna to live before the Khāṇḍava incident, which, added to thirty-three, makes sixty-four, which would be Arjuna’s age when “a youth,” before the war begins! If, however, we overlook the statement of v, 52, 10, and add the years of exile to twenty-nine, we still get forty-odd years as his life-limit when he has carried the bow sixty-five years. It must be remembered that Arjuna was twenty-four years in exile, twelve years before the dicing and twelve or thirteen after it, and that Abhimanyu was sixteen when the war broke out (forty-four years for Arjuna if he won Drāupadī when he was sixteen, and he could not have been twenty years older at that time). The synthesist may say “How narrow! Poets do not regard such discrepancies,” but even poets are generally aware that a hero less than fifty cannot have carried a bow for more than sixty years, especially when he got it at the age of forty or thereabouts! Krishna dies in the thirty-sixth year after the war (xi, 25, 44), which should make Arjuna about thirty at the beginning of the war. This throws a sidelight on the intrusion of the twelve-years exile as a brahmacārin, spoken of above.
epic with careful analysis that the Gītā and the thirteenth book, for example, are purely priestly products, and that one of them is on the whole as early as the other on the whole is late, it is not easy to decide what is the relation between these great groups of verses and the heroic epic, with which neither has any inner connection. Nevertheless, although there can be as a result of the inquiry only the historical probability usual in answering the problems of ancient literature, and not such a mathematical quod erat demonstrandum as the synthetist demands, we are not wholly at a loss to reply to this question. In the first place we have a very instructive analogy in the intrusion into both epic texts of an incongruous didactic chapter found both in the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, which bears on its face evidence of its gradual expansion. But even without this evidence it will, I think, be clear even to the synthetist that the same chapter cannot have arisen independently in both epics; so that in this instance we have a plain case of the dynamic intrusion into an epic text of foreign didactic material.

Again, the presence of a huge volume of extraneous additions, containing both legends and didactic stuff, now tagged on to the epic as its nineteenth book and recognized in the last part of the epic itself, is an object-lesson in dynamic expansion which in itself shows how the pseudo-epic may with perfect regard to historic probability be supposed to have been added to the epic proper. The Rāmāyaṇa too is instructive, as it shows that whole chapters have been interpolated, as admitted by its commentator. The great epic itself admits that there is a difference between the main epic and the episodes, in saying that the former is only one-fourth of the whole, and relegating seventy-six of its hundred thousand stanzas to the domain of the episodic epic.

1 Compare the chapter on metres.
2 This chapter is the Kaccit section ii, 5 and R. ii, 100, previously referred to, discussed in detail in AJP. xix, 147 ff.
3 As an interesting example of the growth of Sanskrit popular poems, Mr. Grierson informs me that there is extant a vrddha or bṛhadr Vishnu Purāṇa, which contains large additions to the received text.
That the priests developed the epic for their own interests, goes without saying; hence the long chapters of priestly origin on the duty of charity— to priests. That they added legends has already been shown, and the metre still attests the approximate age of a Nala or a Sulabhā episode. But besides didactic and legendary masses, it was necessary, in order to popularize the poem, to keep some sort of proportion between the tale and its tumors. Hence the fighting episodes were increased, enlarged, rewritten, and inserted doubly, the same scene and description occurring in two different places. For this reason, while there is an appreciable difference in the metre of the different episodes which were inserted whole, the fighting scenes are chiefly of one čloka-type,— a type later than that of some of the episodes, but on a par with that of the later didactic and narrative insertions.

Whether the original tale was occupied with the Pandus or not, the oldest heroes are not of this family, and the old Vedic tradition, while it recognizes Bhāratas and Kurus, knows nothing about Pandus. The Kuru form of epic may perhaps be preserved in the verse (restored) of one of the oldest Upanishads, Chāнд. Up. iv, 17, 9:

\[
yato yata āvartate tad tad gacchati mānavaḥ \]
\[
Kurūn aṣyaḥ bhirakṣati, \]

a gāthā restored by omitting an evident interpolation. The style is like the usual epic turn, e. g., R. vi, 106, 22,

\[
yena yena ratho yāti tena tena pradhāvati. \]

Nevertheless, a Pandu epic of some sort existed as early as the third century B. C., as is shown by the testimony of Pāṇini and the Jātakas (which may indeed give testimony for an era even later than the third century), though in the latter literature the epic story is not presented as it is in our epic. This takes us from the form to the date of the Mahābhārata.

1 Compare Müller, SBE. i, p. 71. See also the Sūtra verse on the Kurus' defeat, cited by Professor Ludwig, Abb. Böhm. Ges. 1884, p. 5.
CHAPTER SIX.

DATE OF THE EPIC.

First, to define the epic. If we mean by this word the beginnings of epic story, as they may be imagined in the "circling narration," in the original Bhāratī Kathā, or in the early mention of tales of heroes who are also epic characters, the time of this epic poetry may lie as far back as 700 B.C. or 1700 B.C., for aught we know. There are no further data to go upon than the facts that a Bhārata is mentioned in the later Sūtra, that the later part of the Čatapatha Brāhmaṇa mentions the "circling narration," and that ākhyāna, stories, some in regard to epic personages, told in prose and verse, go back to the early Vedic period.¹ We must be content with Weber's conservative summary: "The Mahābhārata-saga (not the epic) in its fundamental parts extends to the Brāhmaṇa period."²

If, on the other hand, we mean the epic as we now have it, a truly synthetical view must determine the date, and we shall fix the time of the present Mahābhārata as one when the sixty-four kalās were known, when continuous iambic pādas were written, when the latest systems of philosophy were recognized, when the trimūrti was acknowledged, when there were one hundred and one Yajur Veda schools, when the sun was called Mihira, when Greek words had become familiar,

¹ On the early prose-poetic ākhyāna of the Vedic and Brahmanic age, compare the essays by von Bradke, Journal of the German Oriental Society, xxxvi, p. 474 ff.; and Oldenberg, ib. xxxvii, p. 54 ff., and xxxix, p. 53 ff. Ballad recitations, akkāna, are mentioned in early Buddhist works, which we may doubtfully assign, as Professor Rhys Davids does undoubtedly, to the fifth century B.C.

and the Greeks were known as wise men, when the eighteen islands and eighteen Purāṇas were known, when was known the whole literature down to grammars, commentaries, Dharmācāstras, granthas, pustakas, written Vedas, and complete MSS. of the Mahābhārata including the Harivaṇaṇa. But this is a little too much, and even the inconsistent synthetist, who draws on a large vituperative thesaurus whenever another hints at intrusions into the epic, may well be pardoned for momentarily ceasing to be synthetic and exclaiming with reason Da liebt doch die Interpolation vor Augen!¹

That the complete Mahābhārata, for the most part as we have it to-day, cannot be later than the fourth or fifth century of our era, follows from the fact, brought out first by Professor Bhandarkār and then by Professor Bühler, that it is referred to as a Smṛti in inscriptions dated not much later than this, while by the fifth century at least it was about as long as it is now.² But we may go further back and say with comparative certainty that, with the exception of the parts latest added, the introduction to the first book and the last book, even the pseudo-epic was completed as early as 200 A.D. For the Roman denarius is known to the Harivaṇaṇa and the Harivaṇaṇa is known to the first part of the first book and to the last book (implied also in the twelfth book); hence such parts of these books as recognize the Harivaṇaṇa must be later than the introduction of Roman coins into the country (100–200 A.D.); but though coins are mentioned over and over,³ nowhere, even in the twelfth and thirteenth books, is the denarius alluded to.

¹ Genesis des Mahābhārata, p. 129.
² Quite important, on the other hand, is the fact recently emphasized by Dr. Cartellieri, WZ. xiii, p. 60, 1899: “Für Subandhu und Bāna war das Mahābhārata . . . kein dharmācāstra, sondern ein Kāvya,” which the poem itself proclaims itself to be, i, 1, 61.
³ The money recognized is gold and silver “made and unmade” and niśkas, though chests of precious metal are mentioned and a great deal of money is found when excavating for treasure (perhaps near Taxila). When the realm is prosperous the soldier’s pay is “not copper.” For references to money, coins, etc., see i, 61, 2, 8, 20–30; iii, 15, 22; 255, 17; iv, 18, 18; 22, 10; 38, 43; xii, 328, 46 (threefold test of gold); xiv, 65, 20 (amount of treasure). On the
Another interesting item is contributed by the further negative evidence afforded in the matter of copper-plate grants. Gifts to priests are especially urged in the Anuçasāna, and the gift of land above all is praised in the most extravagant terms. We know that by the second century of our era, and perhaps earlier, such gifts to priests were safeguarded by copper-plate grants, bearing the technical name of paṭṭa (paṭa) or tāmrapaṭṭa, and elaborate instructions for their making are given in the law-book of Nārada and Vishnu, while they are mentioned in the code of Yājñavalkya, but not before; for Manu, though he mentions the boundary-line being "recorded," nibaddha, has no suggestion of plate-grants. The epic, however, at least the pseudo-epic, speaks of writing down even the Vedas, and recognizes rock-inscriptions, but in the matter of recorded grants to priests says nothing at all; much less does it recognize such a thing as a tāmrapaṭṭa. The only terms used are parigrāha and agrahāra, but the latter, which is very rare, is never used in the sense of a land-grant, though grāmāgrahāra occurs once in the later epic, xv, 14, 14. Even the general cāsana is never so employed. 1 It is true that this negative evidence does not prove the epic to have been completed before the tāmrapaṭṭa was known; but on the other hand, it is unlikely, were the tāmrapaṭṭa the usual means of clinching a bhūmidāna when the Anuçasāna was composed, that this mode would have passed unnoticed.

1 Legal documents appear first in Vas. Dh. S., xvi, 10, 15, under the name lekhita. Probably the first deeds were written on cloth or boards, phalaka, as a board-copy precedes the rock-inscription, ASWL, iv, p. 102. The epic has picture-paṭṭa, as in xv, 32, 20, dārāge citram paṭgataṁ yathā (ācarya-bhūtām) and often. Rock-inscriptions are mentioned only in xiii, 139, 43, ciraṁ tiṣṭhati medinyāṁ căile lekhyam ivā 'ṛpitam. Written Vedas are alluded to only ib. 23, 72. Seals are used as passports, iii, 15, 19. Compare also ii, 55, 10, na lekhyam na ca māṭrākā; v, 148, 23, citra-kāra ivā 'lekhyāṁ kṛtvā; ib. 189, 1, "lekhyā and other aris;" vii, 99, 7, nāmaṁkītāh (compare above, p. 205), of arrows. The conjunct gaṇapākā lekhaṁkā occurs only in xv, 14, 8, and in the verse of the Kaccit section, ii, 5, 72, which is a subsequent addition even to this late chapter; AJP., xix, p. 149.
and we may conclude that the gift-sections of this book were at least as old as the oldest copper-plate grants to priests.¹

The time of the whole Mahābhārata generally speaking may then be from 200–400 A.D. This, however, takes into account neither subsequent additions, such as we know to have been made in later times, nor the various recastings in verbal form, which may safely be assumed to have occurred at the hands of successive copyists.

For the terminus a quo, the external evidence in regard to the Pandu epic, Mahābhārata, though scanty, is valuable. It shows us first that the Mahābhārata is not recognized in any Sanskrit literary work till after the end of the Brāhmaṇa period, and only in the latest Sūtras, where it is an evident intrusion into the text. For the Gṛhya Sūtras belong to the close of the Sūtra period, and here the words Bhūrata and Mahābhūrata occur in a list of authors and works as substitutes for the earlier mention of Itiḥāsa and Purāṇa in the same

¹ The verse xii, 56, 52, which the author of Das Mahābhārata als Epos und Rechtsbuch, p. 187, adduces to prove that written deeds were known, is given by him without the context. When this is examined it is found that the verse refers not to land but to a king's realm. Neither does the text nor the commentator necessarily (as asserted, loc. cit.) make it refer to land-grants. The word used is viṣaya, a king's realm or country (as in xiv, 32, 8) and the poet says that ministers who are given too much liberty "rend the king's realm by counterfeits" (or falsifications). The situation and the analogy of 59, 49, and 69, 22, and 100, 6, where general deceit and dissension are the means employed to destroy a realm, make it most probable that the word pratirūpaka is used here to distinguish the forged laws and edicts of the usurping ministers from the true laws which the helpless king would enact. Such suppression of the king and substitution of false edicts are thoroughly Oriental, and may easily be illustrated by the use of this very word, pratirūpaka, in the Lotus of True Law, where pratirūpaka means just such "false laws" substituted for the real king's true laws (iii, 22; SBE., xxii, p. 68, note, with Iranian parallel). The commentator says "corrupt the country by false edict-documents," that is, he gives a general application to the words, which may be interpreted as referring to land-grants, but this is not necessary. Possible would be the later law-meaning of frauds of any kind, perhaps counterfeit money. Certain it is that the passage is not "a direct proof for forged documents," still less for "false documents by means of which any one gets land."

² Cis-indic evidence is negative and without weight. Megasthenes, c. 300 B.C., has left no fragment on Hindu epics, and the source of Dio Chrysostomos (100 A.D.), who mentions a Hindu Homer, is unknown.
place, so recent a substitution in fact that some even of the latest of these Sūtras still retain Itihāsa and Purāṇa. But when the words do actually occur they are plainly additions to the earlier list. Thus in Čāṇkhāyana iv, 10, 13, the list is Sumantu, Jāimini, Vaiśampāyana, Pāila, the Sūtras, the Bhāṣya, Gārgya, etc., with no mention of the epic. But the Ācvalāyana text, iii, 4, 4, inserts the epic thus: Sumantu, Jāimini, Vaiśampāyana, Pāila, the Sūtras, the Bhāṣya, the Bhārata, the Mahābhārata, dharmācāryas, Jānanti, Bāhavi, Gārgya, etc. The next step is taken by the Čāmbavya text, which does not notice the Bhārata and recognizes only the Mahābhārata (whereas some texts make even the Ācvalāyana Sūtra omit Mahābhārata altogether, reading Bhārata-dharmācāryāḥ). When it is remembered that these and other lists of literature are not uncommon in the Sūtras, and that nowhere do we find any other reference to the Mahābhārata, it becomes evident that we have important negative testimony for the lateness of the epic in such omission, which is strengthened by the evidently interpolated mention of the poem, withal in one of the latest Sūtras. ¹

Patañjali, it may be admitted, recognizes a Pandu epic in the verse, asiddvitiyo 'nusasāra Pāṇḍavam, and in his account of the dramatic representation of the sacred legend, indissolubly connected with the tale.² This takes us at farthest back to the second century; but this date (p. 56) is doubtful.

Pāṇini knows the names of the epic heroes, and recognizes the Ārjuna-Krishna cult in giving a derivative meaning “worshipper of Ārjuna” (Krishna). He also, which is more important, recognizes the name Mahābhārata. It cannot reasonably be claimed, I think, that this name does not refer to the epic. It stands, indeed, beside mahā-Jāhāla, and might (as masculine) be supposed from this circumstance to mean “the

¹ That these lists, anyway, are not of cogent historical value, has lately been emphasized by Dr. Winternitz in his last review of Dahlmann. They certainly cannot help in dating the epic before the fourth century. The intrusion of the genus itihāsa-purāṇa into such lists is illustrated even in the Upanishads. Compare Muṇḍ. Up. i, 5, with the note at SBE., xv, p. 27.

² Compare Weber, IS., i, pp. 147-149; xiii, pp. 356-357.
great descendant of Bharata,” yet not only do other words in the list show that this is not necessary, but further, there is no instance, either in the epic itself or in outside literature, where Mahābhārata means a man, or where it does not mean the epic. In this particular, therefore, as it gives me pleasure to state, I believe that the Rev. Mr. Dahlmann is right, and that Pāṇini knew an epic called the Mahābhārata. That he knew it as a Pandu epic may reasonably be inferred from his mentioning, e. g., Yudhiṣṭhira, the chief hero of the epic.¹

But no evidence has yet been brought forward to show conclusively that Pāṇini lived before the third century B. C.

Again, it is one thing to say that Pāṇini knew a Pandu Mahābhārata, but quite another to say that his epic was our present epic. The Pandu epic as we have it represents a period subsequent not only to Buddhism 500 B. C., but to the Greek invasion 300 B. C. Buddhistic supremacy already decadent is implied by the passages (no synthesist may logically disregard them) which allude contemptuously to the eḍūkas or Buddhistic monuments as having ousted the temples of the gods. Thus in iii, 190, 65, “They will revere eḍūkas, they will neglect the gods;” ib. 67, “the earth shall be piled with eḍūkas," not adorned with god-houses.” With such expressions may be compared the thoroughly Buddhistic epithet, cāturmahārājika, in xii, 339, 40, and Buddhistic philosophy as expounded in the same book. More important than this evidence, however, which from the places where it is found may all belong to the recasting of the epic, is the architecture," which is of stone and metal and

¹ He mentions him not as a Pandu but only as a name, like Gaviṣṭhira; to distinguish the name from the expression (e. g. R. vi, 41, 65) yudhi sthirah, I presume.

² Lassen, loc. cit., p. 490. So, iii, 188, 56, vihāra; 40, pāṇaṇḍa; 67, seven suns; all found in one place (p. 88). See final notes.

³ Buddhistic buildings with wooden fences and walls of brick and stone are alluded to in Cull. vi, 3, 8. In connection with this subject it must be remembered that even the late Grhya Sūtras in giving directions for house-building know only wooden thatched houses. The Greek account states that the Hindus used only mud, wood, and brick. This makes it improbable that wood architecture had almost disappeared in the third century.
is attributed in all the more important building operations to the demon Asura or Dānava Maya, who, by his magic power, builds such huge buildings as are described, immense moated palaces with arches and a roof supported by a thousand pillars. There is in India no real architecture that goes back of the Buddhistic period, and of both Buddhistic and Jain architecture the remains are distinctly influenced by Greek models.

The Greeks are described as a western people (northwestern, with Kāmbojas), famous as fighters, wearing especially fine metal armor, and their overthrow is alluded to. The allies engaged in the epic battles are not only native princes but also Greek kings and Persians, who come out of the West to the war. In one passage the Greeks are described as "all-knowing," though I think this to be a late interpolated chapter. But rāci, iii, 190, 90, surely implies the zodiac.

But even if the passage mentioning all-knowing Greeks be an interpolation, the fact that the "Greeks," who must here be the real Greeks, bear the name Yavanas, shows that the

---

1 So the great walls and palaces of Patna, which are especially mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya, are attributed by tradition to demoniac power (Fa-hien), and the great architecture of Mathurā is also ascribed to superhuman power. On Maya's māyā, to which is attributed the most extensive building, compare ii, 1; v, 100, 1-2; viii, 33, 17 (Asura cities); K. iv, 51, 10. It is possible that the Benares ghāts are referred to in vii, 60, 1 (Gaṅgā) cayanāh kāśicanaśī cītā. "Golden" buildings may be only gilded wood (as they are to-day). Plated stone is mentioned in ii, 3, 32. Old Patna's noble "walls and palaces" are now unfortunately under the Ganges, in all probability.

2 The cāitya and stūpa mounds (only R. has a cāityaprāṣāda, v, 43, 3), like the caves, are not to be compared with roofed palaces of stone and marble. A statue of iron is mentioned, āyaso Bhūmah, xi, 12, 15; iron bells in temples, xii, 141, 32. In ii, 4, 21-22, the Greeks are compared to Kālakaya Asuras. Here, along with the king of Kāmboja, is mentioned one king, (the) Kampana, "who was the only man that ever frightened, kamp, the Yavanas, (men) strong, heroic, and skilled in weapons. Like as Indra frightened the Kālakaya Asuras, so " (K. frightened the Greeks). Compare also Kālayavana who had the Garga-glory (p. 15) in xii, 340, 95, Weber, loc. cit.

3 Compare ii, 14, 14; iii, 254, 18; xii, 101, 1 ff.; Ruling Caste, p. 305; viii, 45, 36, sarvajñā Yavanāś, in the expansion of the preceding vituperative section, where from hanta bhūyo bravāni te, in 45, 1, Karṇa bursts out again in new virulence, which looks almost too much like a later adornment.
Yavanas elsewhere mentioned\(^1\) are also Greeks and not some other people exclusively. It is a desperate resort to imagine that, in all these cases, well-known names refer to other peoples, as the synthesist must assume in the case of the Greeks, Bactrians, Persians, Huns, and other foreigners mentioned frequently throughout the poem. A further well-known indication of Greek influence is given by the fact that the Kṣudrakas and Mālavas were united into one nation for the first time by the invasion of Alexander,\(^2\) and that they appear thus united under the combined name kṣudrakamālavās in the epic, ii, 52, 15. The Romans, Romakas, are mentioned but once, in a formal list of all possible peoples, ii, 51, 17 (cannibals, Chinese, Greeks, Persians, Scythians, and other barbarians), and stand thus in marked contrast to the Greeks and Persians, Pahlavas, who are mentioned very often; though in the account of Krishna killing the Yavana whose name was Kaserumata, iii, 12, 32, it has been suggested by Weber that the name was really of Latin origin. It is clear from this that, while the Greeks were familiar, the Romans were as yet but a name. Further, the distinct prophecy that "Scythians, Greeks, and Bactrians will rule unrighteously in the evil age to come" (kali-age), which occurs in iii, 188, 35, is too clear a statement to be ignored or explained away. When this was written the peoples mentioned had already ruled Hindustan. If this were the only place where the names occurred, the Mārkāndeya episode, it might be regarded as part of an interpolation in mass. But the people here described as foreign oppressors are all mentioned repeatedly as barbarians and warriors, associated generally, as in the passage just mentioned, with other peoples of the West, such as Abhiras and Kāmbojas. Thus in iii, 51, 23, "Singhalese, Barbaras, Barbarians,\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Yavanas or Yāunās (xii, 207, 42-3), i.e., Ionians. So Jacobi, loc. cit.


\(^3\) That is both the Hindu and native name for Ceylon, and the Greek and Hindu name for barbarian! Sīthalān Barbarān Mlechchān ye ca Lāṅkānivāsinah. The word barbarās (= ol Bāρbāros) occurs in both epics but not in literature of an earlier date. Weber, Ind. Lit., p. 257, note, calls attention
and the inhabitants of Laṅkā" are grouped together, in contrast to the "Western realms, those of the Persians, Greeks, and Scythians" (with the folk of Kashmir, Daradas, Kirātas, Huns, Chinese, Tuṣāras, Indus-dwellers, etc.). So in xii, 207, 43, opposed to sinners of the South, are the Northern sinners, Greeks (Yāunas), Kāmbojans, Kandahar-people (Gāndhāras), Kirātas and Barbaras, who are here said to be wandering over this earth from the time of the Tretā age, having customs like those of wild animals or of the lowest castes.

Such allusions as these can mean only this: the Pandu-Epic, in its present form, was composed after the Greek invasion. I have suggested above that the form of the name Bactrian does not compel us to accept Professor Weber's conclusions in regard to the date of passages now containing this form. If this seems inconclusive, there is nothing for it but to refer the epic in its present form to a post-Christian era. But even otherwise, the presence of the Greeks and Bactrians as warriors and rulers in India cannot be explained out of the poem by a loose reference to the fact that India had heard of Yavanas before Alexander.

This brings us to another point of view. A stanza following the one last cited proclaims that "even Nārada recognizes Krishna's supremacy," an utterance which points clearly to a comparatively recent belief in Krishna as All-god, a point long recognized. On the basis of the Arjuna cult implied by Pāṇini, the synthetist urges that the whole epic, in its present Smṛti form and with its belief in the all-godhead of the Krishna-Arjuna pair, is as old as the fifth century B.C. But even if an Arjuna cult were traced back to this date, to this constant union of Greek with other Western peoples in other literature as well. The name was extended to Indo-Scythians and later even to Persians and Arabians. Weber, loc. cit.

1 As has long ago been suggested, of the Greeks mentioned in the epic among the allied forces, Bhagadatta may be Apollodotus the founder of the Greco-Indian kingdom (100 a.c.). Weber, Ind. Lit., p. 204 ff. This Greek is especially mentioned not only as "ruler of the Yavanas," but as the friend of the epic hero's father, that is, as known to an older generation, ii, 14, 15; von Schroeder, Lit. und Cultur, p. 463 (with other references).

2 Narado 'py atha Krṣṇasya param mene . . . ċātvatattvam, xii, 207, 48.
there would still be no evidence in regard to the cult of the twain as All-god. And this is the claim of the present epic, except where, as in the case just cited, incredulity is involuntarily manifested or plainly stated (as in the reviling scene in Sabha). The Gitā itself admits that those who worship Krishna as the All-god, or recognize him, are few in number: vāsudevaḥ sarvam iti sa mahātmā sudurlabhaḥ, 7, 19; “Me (as All-god) in human form, not recognizing my godhead, fools despise,” 9, 11. The Mahābhāṣya does not recognize Krishna as All-god, but as hero and demigod. The cult is growing even in the epic itself. So, too, no Smṛti can be implied by Pāṇini’s words. The Jātakas may

1 Mathurā in the whole epic is the birthplace of Vāsudeva, who seems to herd his cattle there; while in the Mahābhāṣya it is bahu-Kurucarā Mathurā and the chief city of the Pañcabāla, clearly the older view. See ii, 14, 34, 45 ff.; xii, 340, 90; i, 221, 46 (cows, māthuradevyāḥ); IS. xiii, p. 379 ff.; on Krishna as sot Vishnu in the Bhāṣya, ib., pp. 340, 353. In ii, 14, Krishna (as All-god?) “could not injure his foe even in three hundred years,” 36 and 67.

2 The state of mind that in the face of the “evidence” of Pāṇini can lead one to say Pāṇini was acquainted with a Pāṇḍava-Mahābhārata peculiarly didactic (Das Mbh. als Rechtsbuch, p. 155) is inconceivable. The whole “evidence” at its most evincing is that Pāṇini knew a Mahābhārata in which the heroes were objects of such worship as is accorded to most Hindu heroes after death.

3 So the later Rāmāyaṇa is turning into just such a moral and didactic work as the other epic. I have already instanced the intrusion of the Kaccit section. So Rāma, in vii, 55, 3, sets himself to telling homilies, with a familiar sound, kathāṁ paramadharmaśīṣṭaṁ vyāhārataṁ upacākrame (just as in xv, 29, 14, kathā divyā dharmiṁśiḥ sā "bhavan, nṛpa"); and R. ib. 37, 24, kathāṁ kathyante dharmasanyuktāṁ purāṇajāhir mahātmabhīḥ. In the same way, the late (gradual) identification of Rāma with Vishnu—stands parallel to the change of the demigod Krishna to the All-god Vishnu, for Krishna is never mortal — there is no such antithesis — but he nevertheless is often not supreme god but only demigod in the epic.

4 So of law-rules in epic language, e. g., āśāṁ gṛṣṭeṣv anāgatam vyavasyanty anu rājānaṁ dharman, R. iii, 50, 9 (G. has nāyāṣṭreṣu).
go back to the third or fourth century, or they may not, so far as their present form is concerned. At any rate, they show no knowledge of the epic as such. What they show (the material has been sufficiently collected by the Rev. Mr. Dahlmann) is that the epic characters were familiar and the story of the Pandus was known, although the characters do not occupy the position they do in the epic. But no date of an epic, still less of our epic, can be established on casual references to the heroes of the epic found in literature the date of which is entirely uncertain. Perhaps it is negatively quite as significant that the Jātakas do not refer to the epic at all, but only to people mentioned in it.

The present epic, if it records anything historical, records the growth of a great power in Hindustan, a power that could not have arisen before Buddhistic supremacy without leaving a trace of the mighty name of Pandu in the early literature. There is no such trace. Moreover, even the idea of such a power as our epic depicts was unknown before the great empire that arose under Buddhism. For this reason it is impossible to explain the Pandu realm described in the epic as an allegory of the fifth century, for we cannot have an allegory in unknown terms. The Pandus, be it remembered, rule all India, and the limits of their empire, as geographically defined in the epic, far surpass the pre-Aśokan imagination, as it is reflected in the literature. Even Manu has no idea of an empire. His king is a petty rāj. 2

Before the Mahābhārata there were tales of Kuruś and Bharats known to antiquity. Incongruous as the name appears to be, Bhārata yet designates the Pandu epic. How

1 The latter point proves nothing, for even in Sanskrit literature, as I pointed out long ago, the heroes of the two epics are mixed up confusedly, and we cannot suppose a Buddhist would be more careful than a Brahman in verifying references to Brahmanic literature.

2 "Great kings" and "emperors" are indeed known even in pre-Buddhistic times, but what was the "empire" of any king before Aśoka? Certainly not that of the Pandus. It is significant, in view of the great importance laid by some scholars on the cakravartin idea, that this word does not occur before the later Upanishads, although "great kings" are mentioned; nor is it an early epic phrase.
the Pandus succeeded in attaching themselves to the tales which told of the old national heroes is unknown. All theories and hypotheses of development are pure guesswork. What we know is that the tales which told of Kurus and Bhāratas became the depository of the Pandus, who appear to have substituted themselves for Bhāratas and may in fact have been a branch of the tribe, which from a second-rate position raised itself to leadership. There is a theory that the epic story has been inverted, in favor of the Pandus; there is another that it is what it pretends to be, the strife of Pandus, calling themselves Bhāratas, with the scions of the old Kurus. With the former, that so persuasively advanced by Professor Holtzmann, I have never been able to agree; but my own theory I have from the beginning put forward merely as one of probable epic growth.

While, however, it is necessary to recognize the doubtful character of speculation in regard to the exact course of epic development, it is not desirable to blink the truths that are made clear in view of the facts we actually possess, the evidence of remaking, the base of the poem resting on old Kurus and Bhāratas, the present structure of Pandu material; the age of the Pandu poem as a whole (synthetically considered), evinced inter alia by its recognition of late philosophical writers such as Pañcaçikha (c. 100 A.D.), by a growing modernness of metre, by acquaintance with Greeks and Greek art, etc.

Putting these facts together with those gleaned from other works than the epic itself, we may tentatively assume as approximate dates of the whole work in its different stages: Bhārata (Kuru) lays, perhaps combined into one, but with no evidence of an epic before 400 B.C. A Mahābhārata tale

1 The Bhāratī Kathā (never "Pandu-tale"), as the received name of the epic, certainly favors this view.

2 This I was careful to point out at its first presentation in my Ruling Caste (now nearly fifteen years ago) with mays and mights and seems, and other useful words. As a theory I still consider this the best yet offered, but I have never held it to be demonstrable, only more or less probable, in outline and detail respectively.
with Pandu heroes, lays and legends combined by the Puranic diaskeuasts, Krishna as a demigod (no evidence of didactic form or of Krishna’s divine supremacy), 400–200 B.C. Remaking of the epic with Krishna as all-god, intrusion of masses of didactic matter, addition of Puranic material old and new; multiplication of exploits, 200 B.C. to 100–200 A.D. The last books added with the introduction to the first book, the swollen Anuṣāsana separated from Çanti and recognized as a separate book, 200 to 400 A.D.; and finally 400 A.D. + : occasional amplifications, the existence of which no one acquainted with Hindu literature would be disposed antecedently to doubt, such as the well known addition mentioned by Professor Weber, Lectures on Literature, p. 205; and perhaps the episode omitted by Kṣemendra, Indian Studies, No. ii, p. 52.

In the case of these more precise dates there is only reasonable probability. They are and must be provisional till we know more than we know now. But certain are these four facts:

1; That the Pandu epic as we have it, or even without the masses of didactic material, was composed or compiled after the Greek invasion; 2, That this epic only secondarily developed its present masses of didactic material; 3, That it did not become a specially religious propaganda of Krishnaism (in the accepted sense of that sect of Vaiṣṇavas) till the first century B.C.; 4, That the epic was practically completed by 200 A.D.; 5, That there is no “date of the epic” which will cover all its parts (though handbook makers may safely assign it in general to the second century B.C.).

The question whether the epic is in any degree historical

1 We cannot, however, be too cautious in accepting the negative evidence of one mañjari, or précis, as proof that the original work lacked a certain passage. I dissent altogether from the sweeping statement, made loc. cit., p. 27: “The importance of the condensations lies in the fact that by means of them we are enabled to determine the state of these works (epics, etc.) in his (Kṣemendra’s) time.” Two or three compendia agreeing on one point of omission might “determine,” but one résumé alone can only create a possibility, as in this case (p. 53 note).
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seems to me answerable, though not without doubt, and I cannot refrain from expressing an opinion on a point so important. As I have remarked above, there is no reflex of Pandu glory in Brahmanic literature before the third or fourth century. It is, further, impossible to suppose that during the triumph of Buddhism such a poem could have been composed for the general public for which it was intended. The metre of the poem shows that its present form is later than the epic form of Patañjali's epic verses, but this indicates simply recasting; so that a Pandu Mahābhārata may have existed previously, as implied by Pāṇini. But while a Buddhist emperor was alive no such Brahmanic emperor as that of the epic could have existed, no such attacks on Buddhism as are in the epic could have been made, and the epic of to-day could not have existed before the Greeks were personally familiar. In other words, granted a history, that history must have been composed at least as late as the history was possible. Pāṇini's allusions and those of Buddhistic writers show that the Pandus were known as heroes. It is, further, most improbable that the compilers, who made the poem represent Pandu virtues and victories, would have chosen them for this position had they been mythical. In their reassertion of Brahmanism they would have chosen rather the well-known ancient Brahmanic heroes of the older tale, Bhāratī Kathā; yet to appeal to the people something real and near was necessary. But while before the second century the conditions were lacking which could have produced the poem, with the second century they became possible;¹ and there was already the Pandu tribe

¹ As this book goes to press I receive Kirste's essay Zur Mahābhāratafrage, who says, p. 224, "It is incredible that the work could have been undertaken so long as a royal family favoring that sect (of Buddhists) reigned. This (state of affairs) suddenly changed when the Maurya dynasty (of Bṛhadratha) was overthrown by Pusyamitra in 178 n. c., for the new ruler opposed the Buddhists." Professor Kirste thinks, indeed, that the polyandry of the heroes is not an historical trait, and gives a very ingenious explanation of it as a myth of divided divinity, which, however, scarcely seems to me probable. But I am glad to find my own suggestion, of the improbability of the anti-Buddhistic epic being cast in its present shape before the second century n. c., supported by this independent reference to actual historical data.
with its perhaps justified claim to be considered a branch of the Bhāratas, its own later heroes, its cult of anti-Buddhistic type. In so far, then, as we may discern a historical germ in the midst of poetic extravagance, it would seem that the poem represents an actual legend of a real tribe, and in so far as that legend persists in its adherence to polyandry as an essential part of the legend, a tribe which, like so many others in India, had been brahmanized and perhaps become allied by marriage to the old Bhārata tribe, whose legends were thus united with its own.

Finally, I would speak shortly of the poem as a literary product of India. In what shape has epic poetry come down to us? A text that is no text, enlarged and altered in every recension, chapter after chapter recognized even by native commentaries as prākśipta, in a land without historical sense or care for the preservation of popular monuments, where no check was put on any reciter or copyist who might add what beauties or polish what parts he would, where it was a merit to add a glory to the pet god, where every popular poem was handled freely and is so to this day. Let us think ourselves back into the time when the reciter recited publicly and dramatically; let us look at the battle scenes, where the same thing is repeated over and over, the same event recorded in different parts of the poem in slightly varying language. The Oriental, in his half-contemptuous admission of epic poetry into the realm of literature, knows no such thing as a definitive epic text. The Vedas and the classics are his only real care. A Bhāratavid in India is even now more scorned than honored.

If the epic as a whole belongs to no one era, and this remains an incontroversible fact, it is then in the highest degree probable also that no one part of the whole can be assigned to a certain period. I mean, not only must we admit that old books contain more recent insets, as for example chapters five and eleven of book ii, and that late books contain old passages, as for example the rape of Subhadrā and the burning of Khāṇḍava in book i, or the lotus-theft in book
xiii, but we must admit further that the smaller divisions, these special scenes themselves, have in all probability not remained untouched, but that the tale, the language, and the verse of the epic have been subjected to an evening process irregularly applied since first the poem was put together as a Mahābhārata; great liberty being taken with the poem both by reciters and copyists, the establishment of the text by commentaries (noticed as early as the introductory chapter of the poem itself) proving no bar to occasional alterations and additions. Such changes were not introduced of set purpose (or the metre would have been made more uniform), but incidentally and illogically. The same tale was told not in identical language but with slight variations; intrusions were not shunned; grammatical and metrical forms were handled freely, but with no thorough revision of form or sustained attempt at harmonizing incongruities of statement. It is for this reason that there is not a still sharper metrical line between old and new in the epic itself, and it is for this reason that the epic verses of the Mahābhāṣya are freer than those of the Mahābhārata. The former were fixed by their function as examples in a grammar; the latter were exposed to constant though sporadic modification, and appear to-day as they survive after having endured the fret and friction of innumerable reciters and pedantic purists. One by one, and here and there, the transmitters, working neither in concert nor continuously, but at haphazard and at pleasure, have trimmed this mighty pile into a shape more uniform, though they have not altogether hid its growth, except from eyes that, seeing the whole as a thing of power and beauty, are perhaps less apt to mark the signs of varying age.

But if this be so, it may be asked, and I think it will be asked, perhaps triumphantly, by those lacking in sobriety of judgment, what becomes of the results of the analysis of metres, of the discovery of late elements in this or that section? What do they signify?

They signify and proclaim that the Great Epic was completed in just the way the synthesist proclaims it was not
completed. Pitched together and patched together, by the diaskeuasts and priests respectively, the older parts, though not free from rehandling, bear a general stamp of antiquity lacking in later parts. For this reason, the Gīśa and Gambling scene are, as wholes, metrically and stylistically more antique than are the Anugīśa and the extravaganzas in the battle-books; and for this reason, the pseudo-epic comes nearest in syntax and forms to the hybrid language that is preserved in literary monuments immediately preceding and following the Christian era. But it is true that no one can prove the relative antiquity of the Gīśa and Gambling scene so absolutely as to prevent one devoid of historical sense from clinging to the notion that these parts of the epic are in origin synchronous with the pseudo-epic. Fortunately, however, the judgment of scholars is in general sane, and the determination of values may safely be left in their care.
APPENDIX A.

PARALLEL PHRASES IN THE TWO EPICS.

[M. is prefixed to Mbh. references only where confusion with R. is possible.]

1, acireṇāi 'va kālena, ix, 2, 58; R. v, 26, 23; vi, 61, 20; acireṇa tu, R. ii, 80, 11.

atitāyām, No. 94.

2, atha dirghasya kālasya, iii, 70, 1; v, 160, 20; R. iv, 9, 17; vii, 99, 14; atha dirghena kālena, G. vi, 24, 3; R. vii, 24, 5, 72; tato dirghena kālena, M. ix, 1, 50; sa tu dirghena k., ib. 48; 36, 10; atha kālena mahatā, G. i, 40, 16 = R. 38, 19, v. l., atha dirghena kālena; atha k. m., also G. i, 40, 22 = R., 38, 23, tataḥ kālena mahatā. See above, p. 271.

atha rātryām, No. 94.

atha 'nyad dhanur, No. 56, and No. 80.

3, anayad Yamasādanam, vi, 54, 81; vii, 19, 15; G. iii, 34, 31; 75, 28. See No. 225.


anyat kārmukam, No. 80.

anyonyavadha°, No. 157.

5, abhidudrāva vegena, vi, 100, 49; 104, 34–35, etc.; R. vi. 69, 99; 76, 46. See No. 97.

6, abhivādaye tvā(m) bhagavan, iii, 207, 13; R. iii, 11, 72.

7, amṛṣyamāṇas taṁ ghoṣam (tat karma), etc., H. iii, 60, 3; R. vi, 67, 142; 69, 141, etc.

8, alātacakra-pratimā(m), iv, 61, 9; R. iv, 46, 13; vi, 93, 28. The first and last refer to weapons, R. iv, 46, 13 to earth, prthivi, alātacakra-pratimā drṣṭā gospadavat krṭā.

9, alātacakravat sāinyāṁ tadā 'bhramata, viii, 81, 40; alātacakra-vac cakram bhramato 'rinivāhaṇam (sic!) G. iv, 5, 25. Compare, of persons, vi, 59, 22; vii, 7, 53; xiv, 77, 30.
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10, avapluty'a rathāt tūnām, vi, 94, 22; 96, 39; G. vi, 18, 47; avatīrya, G. vi, 36, 87; rathād avapluty'a tatah, M. vi, 59, 99, etc. For other forms, see AJP. xix., p. 143.

11, avasāndanti, me prānāh, iv, 61, 12; pārīśkdanti me prānāh, G. vi, 82, 6 = R. 101, 6, avasāndanti gātrāni.

11b, acokah ckaṇācanaḥ, iii, 64, 107; acokah ckaṇavrddhanaḥ, R., iv, 1, 59.

aqvānām khura° No. 247.

12, astrāni vividhāni ca, vii, 7, 1; castrāni, R. vi, 103, 29. The terminal is fixed, васāni, vastrāni, bhāṇḍāni, etc., preceding, e. g., ix, 47, 24;
asmin hate, No. 328.

ākarna, No. 170.

13, ākṛida(m) iva Rudrasya ghnatah kālātyaye paćun, vii, 19, 35; ākṛida iva Rudrasya kruddhasya nighnatah paćun, G. vi, 73, 38; ākṛidadhāmih kruddhasya Rudrasye iva ma-hātmanah, R. vi, 93, 35. Compare ix, 14, 18, Rudrasya 'krīdanām yathā.

14, ākhyātum upacakrama, xviii, 5, 7; R. iii, 11, 10; iv, 8, 46; 52, 3; G. v, 66, 2, where R. 65, 2 has pravaktum upacakrama. Compare vaktum samupacakrame, xiii, 87, 2. The phrase is common in R.; rarer in M., owing to the use in the latter of the dramatic uvāca, extra metrum. Both epics have also the similar phrase vyāhartum upacakrame, e. g., xii, 350, 15; R. vi, 115, 1; vii, 51, 1. See No. 57.

15, ājaghano 'rasi kruddhaḥ, vi, 61, 36; R. vi, 69, 152; 76, 29; passim in M. See l. c., No. 10, p. 142, and note to No. 35.

16, āditya iva tejasa, iii, 53, 2; R. vi, 55, 9; āditya iva tejasvi, R. v, 34, 28, metrical. See No. 176.

17, ālikhantam ivā 'kācaṃ, iv, 38, 3; R. vi, 99, 12.

18, āvarta iva samjaiṇe balasya mahato mahān, H. iii, 60, 4; G. vi, 32, 21; āvarta iva gāṅgasya toyasya, G. v, 50, 16; āsīd gāṅga iva 'vartaḥ, M. vii, 36, 13.

19, āviṣṭa iva yudhyante, vi, 46, 3; āviṣṭa iva kruddhaḥ te (cakrus tumulam uttamam), G. vi, 54, 64.

20, aṣīva iva kruddhaḥ, vii, 10, 31; R. v, 67, 7.

aṣīt kilo°, aṣic catacaṭā, etc., No. 334.

21, aṣīd rājā Nalo nāma, iii, 53, 1; aṣīd rājā Nimir nāma, R. vii, 55, 4. With Virasena-suto bal at the end of the first
verse, compare Dyumatsenasuto bali, M. iii, 294, 18; suto bali, R. iii, 12, 2; Ayodhyāyāṁ purā rājā Yuvanāğvatasuto bali, R. vii, 67, 5; Prajāpatatisuto bali, R. vii, 90, 23 (in G., 'bhavat').

22, iti me niñcitā matiḥ, iii. 78, 6; G. v, 8, 25 (R. v. l.); 68, 36 (R. v. l.).


24, idāṁ vacanam abravīt, iii, 69, 17, etc.; R. i, 26, 33; iv, 8, 1, etc. Sometimes tato for idam, ix, 3, 51 (= C. 176, idam). About forty times in Rām., unnumbered in Mbh. See No. 237.

25, Indrādhvaja ivo 'echritah (tato nipatito bhūmāu), ix, 17, 53 and often; Indraketum ivo 'echritam, ix, 4, 16; Čakra-
dhvaja ivo 'echritah, R. v, i, 59. Compare utthāpyamaṇaḥ Čakrasya yantradhvaja ivo 'echritah, R. ii, 77, 9; mahā-
merum ivo 'echritam, ix, 37, 20; ubhāv Indrādhvajāv iva (petatuḥ), ix, 12, 24; dhvajāv iva mahendrasya (nipetatuḥ),
R. vi, 45, 17–18; jagāma vasudhāṁ kṣipraṁ Čakrasye 'va mahādhvajah, G. iii, 34, 25; apatad devarājasya muktara-
qmīr iva dhvajah, R. iv, 17, 2; Indrādhvaja ivo 'tṛṣṭo yantranirmuktabandhavah (papāta), M. vii, 93, 70; yan-
tramukta iva dhvajah (papāta), M. vii, 92, 72; yantracyuta iva dhvajah (papāta), G. ii, 84, 8.

Indrācani, No. 275.

25b, ihā 'va prāyam āsīṣye, x, 11, 15; R. iv, 53, 19.

26, uttiṣṭha rājan kim cease, xi, 2, 2; G. vi, 95, 37; rājann uttiṣṭha kim cease, G. ii, 81, 10; uttiṣṭho 'ttiṣṭha, Gāndhāri, xi, 26, 1; uttiṣṭho 'ttiṣṭha, kim cease, R. vi, 111, 81 (preceded by No. 45); uttiṣṭho 'ttiṣṭha, bh德拉m te, M. i, 172, 4; R. i, 35, 2; preceded in Mbh. by uvāca madhuraṁ vākyam, with which compare ix, 36, 50, uvāca parusāṁ vākyam; ucaḥ sumadhuraṁ vāṁ, R. vii, 70, 1; bh德拉m te being current ad nauseam in both epics.

uvāca . . . vākyam, No. 26.

27, ekāntabhāvopagatāḥ, xii, 337, 28; ekāntabhāvānugatāḥ, R. vii, 38, 5. In both, of the men in Čvetadvipa, preceded
in M. by tatra Nārāyaṇaparā māṇavāc candravarcasah; in R., by ananyamanaso nityam Nārāyaṇaparāyaṇāḥ tadā rādhanasaktāḥ ca taccittās tatparāyaṇāḥ (ananyamanasaḥ is a Gītā phrase, 9, 13, bhajanty ananyamanasaḥ; 8, 14, ananyaśatāḥ satatam).

28, etat chruṭvā tu vacanam, vi, 48, 98; G. iv, 56, 19, and passim.
29, etat te kathitam sarvam and (in prior pāda) etat te sarvam ākhyātām; ix, 46, 108; G. vi, 82, 167. In M. preceded by yan māṁ tvaṁ pariprechasi, as in xii, 334, 40; xiii, 14, 139, etc.

30, etasminn antare vīrāḥ, vi, 48, 96, and often; R. iii, 30, 37; vi, 50, 7; vii, 28, 19; G. vi, 36, 99. The phrase here is etasminn antare, which is filled out with various words, as Rāmah, R. vi, 111, 91; tatra or tasya (v.1.), R. vi, 92, 58; kruddhaḥ, R. vi, 100, 13; krodhāt, 102, 47. Compare also etasminn antare cūne, M. vii, 17, 7; xii, 330, 1; cāi 'va, vii, 19, 38; cūraḥ, ix, 28, 17; G. vi, 32, 15, etc. A combination of this and the next (No. 31) is found in etasminn antare kāle, "in the meantime," R. vi, 20, 33.

31, etasminn eva kāle tu, like the last, a standing phrase, e. g., i, 149, 1; iii, 54, 13; 168, 13; 298, 1; v, 121, 9; vi, 74, 36; ix, 51, 25; xii, 328, 3, etc.; R. i, 9, 7; 33, 11; G. 21, 1, etc.

32, evam uktah pratyuvāca, or tathe 'ty uktvā, vi, 59, 47; vii, 202 70; ix, 35, 68; G. vi, 36, 102. Compare evam astv iti (with pratyuvāca), ix, 48, 52; G. vi, 109, 18 (co 'vāca); (kṛtvā sa), ib. 82, 56.

33, kakṣam agnir iva jvalan, ix, 24, 62; kakṣēṣv agnir iva jvalan 4, 36 (C., kakṣe 'gnir iva samjvalan); vanāṇy agnīs ivo 'tthitaḥ, R. vi, 66, 12; kakṣam agnir ivo 'tthitaḥ, G. v, 85, 24; kakṣēṣv iva hutaṇam, G. ii, 106, 25. Compare also (dahantam) kruddham agniṁ yathā vanam, M. vii, 21, 30; vanam agnir vāi 'dhitaḥ, R. ii, 63, 44, where G. 65, 39, has quśkaṁ kāṣṭham iva 'nalaḥ, like R. v, 41, 11, quśkaṁ vanam iva 'nalaḥ. The iva 'nalaḥ ending is common to both epics, e. g., dahan kakṣam ivā 'nalaḥ, M. vii, 14, 1 (followed in 2 by sākṣad agnim ivo 'tthitam, C. vrkṣam); tan me dahati gātrāṇī quśkavrksam iva 'nalaḥ, M. vi, 95, 7, etc. See also Nos. 75, 99, 117, 196, 226, 256, 291.

34, kaṅkapatrāir ajihmagāḥ, vi, 103, 11 and often; R. vi, 52, 4.
Frequently close together with svarna, rukma, or hema puñkhāir ajihmagāiḥ, vi, 114, 11; vii, 18, 18, hema; G. vi, 19, 68. In G. vi, 20, 26, rukmaṇē ajihmagārāḥ, metrical (v. 1. in R.). The common terminal 迦梨 ajihmagāiḥ is sometimes inverted in jagatis, as in G. iv, 30, 22, though the regular cloka order is also found in this jagati metre, ib. 34, 34. See No. 234.

35, Kandarpa iva rūpeṇa, mūrtimān, iii, 53, 15; rūpavrāṇ . . . kandarpa iva mūrtimān, R. v, 34, 30. This with āditya iva tejasvī, is a description of Rāma, 28, as the two phrases, and also satyavāḍi (R. 29), here describe Nala.

36, kampayānī iva medīnīm, ii, 29, 7; viii, 34, 58; ix, 18, 26, etc.; kampayāṇaḥ cā 'pi, ix, 30, 60; sa kampayānī iva mahīm, iii, 78, 3; kampayānī iva medīnīm, G. vi, 37, 101; R. vi, 56, 13; 67, 115; kampayantar 'va, G. iii, 62, 31; kampayantar 'va parvatān, M. vii, 181, 11; cālayannī iva medīnīm, R. iii, 67, 13; dārayannī iva, R. iv, 15, 5 (G. kampayannī); dārayannī iva parvatān, M. iv, 46, 21; nādayannī iva medīnīm, G. vi, 46, 91. pūrayannī iva medīnīm, M. iii, 73, 8 (pūrayanto dīco daça, ix, 46, 77), etc., etc. For dīgo daça, see No. 114.

karaṃ kareṇa, No. 163.
karṇāyata, No. 170.

37, karmanā manasā vācā, iii, 65, 32, 41; ix, 50, 2; xii, 327, 34; manasā karmanā vācā caaksusa ca, R. vii, 59, 1, 24. Compare Sprüche, 1,559 ff., 2,222; Dhammap. 391.
kalaṃ nā 'rhati, No. 196.
kalpyatātam me rathāḥ, No. 230.

38, kaśayikr̥talocanāḥ, 'am, i, 102, 23; 131, 3; G. vi, 33, 17; 37, 68. In M., sakrodhāmaśajihmabhṛḥ precedes in each instance. Compare Nos. 50, 51.

kasyā 'ṣi. See above, p. 268.

39, kaśicānaśśiṇaḥ tatra vetrājharjharapāṇayāḥ, vi, 97, 33; kaśicānaśśiṇas tatra vetrājharjharapāṇayāḥ, R. vi, 114, 21. Compare G. vi, 33, 10 and 13, vetrājharjharapāṇibhiḥ.

40, kāmabānaprapāditaḥ, i, 220, 7; G. iii, 61, 2 (R. 55, 2, bānāḥ); kāmabānapābhisaṃtaptah, iii, 280, 3; kāmabānapaṇaṃgataḥ, R. vii, 88, 12.

41, Kālacakram īvā 'dyatam, vii, 7, 31; īvā 'param,'G. vi, 73, 33 (R., 33, 30, īvā prajāḥ); kālarāṇḍam īvā 'param (R., īvā
'ntakah); G. vi, 51, 89 = R. 71, 85. For the var. lec., compare s. daṇḍahasta, No. 104, and kālāraṭrim ivā 'ntakah, R. vi, 69, 134. Compare kālāraṭrim ivo 'dyatām, ix, 11, 50; o'sūryam, xiii, 14, 270.

Kāladaṇḍopama and Kālapācopama, No. 220.

Kālānanam, No. 272.

Kālāraṭrim, No. 41.

42, Kālāntakayamopamah, iii, 22, 31; 27, 25; iv, 33, 25; vi, 54, 47; G. iii, 32, 5; vi, 49, 36; R. vi, 57, 32; 60, 94; 82, 7; 95, 41. See No. 220; and for Kālāntakopama, see Nos. 104, 105.

43, Kālo hi duratikramaḥ. While not generally including in this list the proverbs common to the two epics, I enter this particular proverb because of the similar environment in imām avasthāṃ prāpto 'smi, Kālo hi duratikramaḥ, ix, 64, 9 (C. vāi); so 'yam adya hataḥ cete, Kālo hi duratikramaḥ, R. iii, 68, 21. For the rest, compare Am. Journ. Phil., vol. xx, p. 26, and add (besides the above) Kālo hi durati-kramaḥ in M. ii, 46, 16; also H. iii, 2, 30, and 5, 36; dāvaṁ hi duratikramam, R. vii, 50, 18; dāivaṁ tu, ix, 65, 31; and the later version, lekhaḥ hi kālalikhitāḥ sarvātha duratikramaḥ, H. iii, 2, 27.

44, kiṅkiṇṭjālasainvṛta, ix, 23, 13, o'āśiḥ rathāiḥ; R. vii, 23, 1, 2, o'āśiḥ nagaram. Ordinarily in M., kiṅkiṇṭjālamālinam, etc., i, 221, 45; ii, 24, 18; viii, 86, 4; in R., kiṅkiṇṭjātahbhūṣita, vi, 102, 9; but I cannot say whether or not mālin appears in R. in this combination. See No. 113.

45, kim mām na pratiḥbāṣase, part of a lament (see uttiṣṭha, above, No. 26), iii, 63, 9; 64, 19 ff.; xi, 20, 13–14; R. iii, 60, 26; vi, 111, 80 (doubled in G. 95, 36, and v. l. 37). In R. vi, 115, 15 (= G. 98, 12) kiṃ ca mām na 'bhibhāṣase, v. l. as in G. 95, 37.

46, kučalam paryaprechata, ix, 34, 17; R. i, 52, 4.

47, kṛtakāutukamaṅgalah, i, 129, 24; viii, 1, 11; R. i, 73, 9.

kṛtapūrvāhinjakriyā, No. 49.

48, kṛtvā karma sudūskaram, vi, 14, 14; vii, 8, 32; R. ii, 101, 5; vi, 76, 70; G. vi, 21, 11; 30, 37; 55, 36. Variations are naturally many, e. g., kṛtaṁ karma sudūskaram, R. vi, 67, 55; 127, 47; G. vi, 88, 17; karma kuvranti dukkaram, R. vi, 65, 4; tat
kṛtvā duṣkarāṁ karma, R. vi, 126, 14; kariṣyan karma duṣkaram, G. iv, 15, 20. Similar in R. are mahat karma kṛtam tvayā and kṛtam tvayā karma mahat suduṣkaram, G. vi, 112, 100 and G. vi, 36, 118, respectively; aho mahat karma kṛtam nirartham, R. v, 48, 50; sādhu, Lakṣmāna, tuṣṭo 'smi, karma te sukṛtam kṛtam, G. vi, 70, 80; suduṣkarāṁ tu tat karma, G. iv, 11, 7. Somewhere in M. ix (verse lost) occur together the two phrases, kṛtvā na su-skaraṁ karma, gato Vāivasvata-kṣayam (No. 55).

49, kṛtvā pāurvāhnikāṁ kriyāḥ, iii, 168, 2; 296, 10; 6kam karma, R. iii, 17, 2; 6kīṁ kriyām, R. vii, 59, 1, 1; kṛtapūrvāhnikakriyāḥ, viii, 1, 13; R. i, 35, 3 (with the phrase, tae chrutvā vacanām tasya).

50, krodhasaṁraktanayanāh, i, 78, 35; vii, 1, 19; R. i, 62, 15; G. v, 89, 1; vi, 76, 11. In M. v, 9, 45, united with idaṁ vacanam abravīt. See note to No. 51.

51, krodhasaṁraktalocanāh, v, 178, 40; vi, 100, 52; ix, 42, 13; R. v, 44, 19; vi, 95, 3; krodhāt samā, R. iv, 9, 22; vi, 98, 1. Both forms, No. 50, No. 51, are common in both epics. They are the same phrase differentiated according to metrical requirements, and interchange with the similar kopa- and roṣa-forms, which it is unnecessary to give in detail. Variants are common, e. g., krodhāparyākulekṣanaḥ, v, 178, 94; G. iv, 15, 17; often united with another iterate, e. g., roṣasaṁraktanayanā idaṁ vacanam abravīt, G. iii, 57, 15; samärktanayanāh krodhād (G. kopād) idaṁ vacanam abravīt, R. vi, 59, 56 = G. 36, 33. Compare tam krodhāraktanayanāṁ kurvantaṁ bhrūkuṭīmuḥkham, G. iv, 33, 40; sa kṛtvā bhrūkuṭīṁ vaktre roṣasaṁraktalocanāḥ, G. vi, 86, 46, where R. 102, 38, has sa kṛtvā bhrūkuṭīṁ kruddhaṁ kiṁcit samārktalocanāḥ. See Nos. 106, 123, 190, 198, and s. v. PW., where they are illustrated sufficiently.

52, kroṣcantāṁ kurārīṁ iva, i, 6, 12; G. ii, 68, 43; R. iv, 19, 29; yathā, vi, 32, 3; plural, xi, 12, 10; 16, 18; variants, G. ii, 67, 16; iv, 19, 4; v, 18, 12; R. vi, 49, 9, etc; kurārīṁ iva vācātim, M. iii, 63, 20. That in G. ii, 67, 16, the unusual form kurāryas trasita iva follows the exclamation hā nātha hā mṛto 'st 'ti in 12, just as hā nātha in N. 11, 23 follows kurārīṁ iva vācātim in 20 (above), is perhaps worth
noticing, especially as this chapter of R. G. is not in the Bombay text and may be supposed to be late. The correspondence is not remarkable enough to prove copying, though it may be due to the influence of the Nala passage, as this episode is well known to the later Rāmāyaṇa.

53, kṣitikampe yathā cañilaḥ, vii, 174, 23; yathā 'calah, vii, 36, 29; kṣitikampe yathā nagah, G. vi, 30, 30, where R. has kṣitikampa iva drumaḥ, 56, 31. See No. 248.

khuraneśvanena ca, No. 247.

54, gatapratāgatani ca, term. tech., vii, 19, 6; R. vi, 107, 32. See mandalāni, No. 201.

55, gato Vāivasvatakṣayam, or ninye, vii, 26, 53, and s. kṛtvā karma, No. 48, above; R. vi, 82, 183.

56, gadām adaya viryavān, ix, 11, 49; 32, 37; 55, 24; 56, 27, etc.; R. vi, 69, 33. In G. vi, 49, 18, vipulām. See l. c. No. 10, p. 142, and No. 80, for parallel variants.

57, gamanāyo 'pacakrame, i, 151, 14; R. vii, 25, 51; gamanāyā 'bhicakrāma, R. i, 77, 18 (G. 79, 4, upa²). See No. 14.

58, Garuḍah pannagam yathā, vii, 87, 96; R. vi, 69, 6, 6gān iva, where G. 48, 6, has 6gām yathā; G. vi, 46, 3 has 6gān iva. Many var. lec., e. g., Garutmān iva.

59, garjantau iva toyadāu, ix, 55, 38; 6tam, G. vi, 3, 19; garjanti na vrthā ćūrā nirjala iva toyadāḥ, R. vi, 65, 3. See Nos. 77, 217.

60, giriḥ prasravaṇāir iva, iii, 279, 5, with cakāra rudhiram bhuvi preceding; R. vi, 67, 89, with rarāja çonitotsiktaḥ preceding. G. vi, 46, 75 has giripra, an error. Compare G. ib. 109, giriḥ prasravaṇām yathā; R. vi, 67, 121, giriḥ prasravaṇāir iva. In R. vi, 58, 55, gireḥ prasravaṇo yathā, where G. 32, 43 has jalam prasravaṇād iva, as in R. vi, 45, 21, jalam prasravaṇād iva, and R. vi, 88, 61.

gārikam, No. 318.

61, cakāra kadamam mahat, vii, 21, 37; R. vi, 86, 24; 95, 50; G. vi, 46, 108; karomi, M. iv, 21, 2; kurvāṇah, ix, 61, 30; akāri, G. vi, 49, 43; kṛtvā ca, G. vi, 110, 50; akarot, M. vii, 32, 41; ix, 44, 3; cakāra kadanam ghoram (metre), R. vi, 58, 24; H. iii, 60, 3; kadanam sumahat cakruḥ, R. vi, 55, 32.

62, caksur-visayam āgataḥ: In vii, 17, 14, sa no diṣṭyā 'strasam-pannaç caksur-visayam āgataḥ; R. vi, 103, 19, diṣṭyā 'si
mama mandātamāṇaṇaṃ caṅṣurviṣayam āgataḥ (G. 88, 24, mama durbuddhe).

63, candraśūryāḥ iva 'ditān, ix, 55, 22; G. v, 53, 25 = 69, 23; sūryaandrānasāv iva, M. iii, 288, 26. See Nos. 33, 189.

cayāṭṭālaka, No. 186.

caled dhi Himavān sthānāt, ii, 77, 35; cāilaḥ, v, 82, 48; caled api ca Mandaraḥ, G. v, 58, 9 (R. 59, 14, Mandaraḥ pracaeled api). See No. 153.

65, cāmikaraṇāvibhūṣitām, gadām, x, 9, 11; cāpam, R. iii, 20, 6.

66, cittapramāthini (bālā devānam api) suntarī, iii, 53, 14; trāilokya-suntarī (kāntā, sarva-) cittapramāthini, R. vii, 37, 1, 29 (compare R. ii, 10, 30, mama cittapramāthini). As said above, the Uttara recognizes the Nala, and this (praksipta) may be imitation. At any rate it may support pramāthinī against the Mbh. Bomb. and Calcl. reading here, cittaprasādanī, which, however, is found in xii, 133, 13, janacittaprasādinī; compare naracittapramāthibhiḥ, R. i, 10, 4.

67, citraṃ laghu ca sūṣṭha ca, vii, 145, 77; laghu citraṃ ca sūṣṭha ca, R. vi, 88, 65.

68, cintā me vardhate 'tīva mumūrṣa ca 'pi jāyate, Karṇasya nidhanam'qrutvā, viii, 9, 6; cintā me vartate tīrṇa mumūrṣa 'pi ca jāyate, bhrātaram niḥataṁ ḍrṣtvā, R. vi, 101, 7. See No. 213.

69, cintācakaparāyanāḥ, vii, 1, 6; xv, 16, 18; G. iii, 52, 17; variants, viii, 96, 58; xv, 21, 7. See Nos. 27, 116, 161, 293.

70, chāye 'vā 'nugatā pathi, iii, 65, 57; chāye 'vā 'nugatā Rāmaṁ, R. vii, 37, 3, 24, after rupeṇā 'pratimā loke (No. 236), also a Nala phrase. Compare No. 66.

chinnamāla iva drumaḥ, No. 248.

71, chinne 'va kadali vane, xi, 17, 1, uyapatad bhūmāṇu; G. vi, 8, 6, papāta bhūmāṇu (both of grief-stunned woman) = R. vi, 32, 6, but here jagāma jagatim bālā chinnā tu kadali yathā. See Nos. 135, 136, 180, 248.

jarjarikṛta, Nos. 184, 235.

72, jalaṁ sūrya iva 'nēubhiḥ, vi, 109, 33; meghaṁ sūrya, G. vi, 18, 40 (R. 43, 29, karair megham iva 'nēumān); tamaḥ sūrya iva 'nēubhiḥ, M. vii, 18, 24.

jalaṁ prasraṇaṇād iva, No. 60.

jājvalyāmaṇa, No. 176.

jātarūpaparīkṛta, No. 335.
APPENDIX A.

73, jīmāṭa iva bhāskaram, vi, 64, 44; o'tam iva o'ah, G. vi, 21, 43; nīhāram, R. i, 55, 25; toyadād iva bhāskarah, G. iv, 12, 24 (papāta). See No. 326.

74, jīrnāṁ tvacam ivo 'ragah, xiii, 62, 69; R. iii, 5, 37; sarpo jīrnāṁ iva tvacam, xii, 265, 15; G. vi, 21, 40; tvacāṁ sarpa ivā 'muṣya, M. v, 40, 2. See Nos. 106, 139; Praq. v, 5.

jvalantam iva tejasā, No. 176.

75, jvalantam iva pāvakam, jvalantā iva pāvakāḥ (and jvalitā iva), vi, 16, 12; 18, 6; xi, 25, 16, etc.; R. iii, 32, 5; vi, 50, 36; 70, 19; 95, 33; G. 68, 36. Compare prajvalitām ivo 'lkām, M. v, 181, 5; prajvalantam ivā 'nalam, G. iii, 18, 23; jvalantam iva pannagam, M. vi, 82, 36; ix, 13, 21; G. iii, 18, 39, pannagāḥ (but R. 12, 34, pāvakāḥ): also parvatam, M. vii, 80, 37, apacyata (on fire as it were). See Nos. 111, 176, 226, 255. For ivā 'nalah, see Nos. 33, 99, 196, 291.

76, jhillikāgaṇanādītam, iii, 64, i; R. iii, 2, 3. The two descriptions (of a fearful forest) are similar also in the adjacent verses, e.g., nānāpaksīganākīrnam, in M.; nānāmrighananākīrnam, in R. I have not entered others.

77, ta enaṁ caradhārābhīr, dhārabhīr iva toyadāḥ, vii, 26, 54; athāḥ 'naṁ caradhārābhīr, dhārabhīr iva toyadāḥ, R. vi, 71, 92 (in M., siśicuh; in R. abhyavarsata); abhyavarsat tadā Rāmaṁ dhārabhīr iva toyadāḥ, R. vi, 100, 59; vavarṣa caravarsena dh. i. t., M. vi, 58, 26. Compare mahendra iva dhārabhīḥ carāṁ abhivavarṣa ha, R. vi, 56, 11. See Nos. 59, 158, 217, 244.

tataḥ kilakīlā, No. 334.

78, tataḥ prajavitāṛṣṇena rathena rathināṁ varaḥ. This hemi-stich H. 3, 59, 5 and also G. vi, 30, 6 (= R. 56, 6, but here pracalitāṛṣṇena). The prior pada in M. vii, 116, 30; G. iii, 33, 27; R. vi, 95, 42 (with rathena). See No. 287.

79, tataḥ prabhāte vimale, viii, 1, 9; xiv, 64, 16; R. vii, 59, 1, 1, with kr̥tvā paurvāṅkiṁ kriyām (No. 49); 68, 2. Compare prabhāte vimale sūrye, R. ii, 86, 24. The first phrase is in triśūlbh as well as in cūka, loc. cit.

80, tato 'nyad dhanur ādāya, vi, 48, 67; G. iii, 34, 16, and 22. In the former of G., followed by praśipta iva manyunā (as in M. iii, 63, 13, praśipta 'va ca manyunā). The usual phrase in M. begins with athāḥ 'nyad, e. g., vi, 45, 33; 77, 68; 114, 28; vii, 21, 17; ix, 10, 34; 15, 21. Compare anyat kārmu-
kam ādāya, and so 'nyat kārmukam ādāya, vi, 45, 29; 110, 40; ix, 10, 45, etc.; R. as cited loc. cit., No. 56.

tato muhūrtam, No. 214.

81, tato halahalācabdaḥ prītidaḥ samajāyata, i, 58, 9; tato halahalācabdas tumulāḥ samajāyata, R. ii, 16, 33; the prior pāda, M. vii, 21, 2; xiv, 74, 26; R. ii, 81, 14; vii, 21, 24; 32, 33; 96, 12; G. iii, 31, 41 followed by the late trait, punah koldā-halo mahān (not thus in M. or R.); G. ii, 82, 13, followed by sumahān samajāyata. Compare No. 334.

82, tatrā 'sīt sumahad yuddhaṁ tumulāṁ lomaharṣaṇaṁ, vi, 58, 13; R. vi, 43, 16. For other forms, see l. c. No. 10, p. 144 ff. In R., roma for loma, but according to Winternitz, loc. cit., these forms interchange also in MSS. of M. See Nos. 23, 83, 84.

83, tad abdhutam īvā 'bhavat, iii, 167, 17 and 31; v, 131, 25; vi, 47, 28; 54, 82; vii, 7, 53 (with alātacakravad rājan); 14, 27 and 38; 21, 14; ix, 12, 13; xii, 334, 2 and 4 and 11, etc., etc. G. i, 75, 28. Compare G. iii, 33, 22, tad abhūd abdhutam yuddhaṁ tumulāṁ lomaharṣaṇaṁ; R. iii, 51, 3, tad bahūvā 'dbhutam yuddham; R. vi, 102, 18, tad bahāvū ca 'dbhutam yuddham . . . romaharṣaṇam; M. xi, 16, 4, rāṇājirām nyārānām abdhutam lomaharṣaṇam; ix, 15, 28, tatrā 'dbhutam apacyāma, and 15, 41, tatrā 'dbhutam paraṁ ekre. In M. iii, 76, 41, tad abdhutatamaṁ drṣṭvā; R. vii, 79, 1, tad abdhutatamaṁ vākyam ċrutvā. See also Nos. 82, 84, 110.


tapantam, No. 175.

85, taptakānīcanabhūsanāṁ, xii, 326, 34; R. iv, 17, 2; G. v, 24, 24 (hāṭaka, R. iv, 3, 18); preceded in M. by sūkṣmaraktaṁ-baradharah, in G., by raktāmbaradharah ċṛimaṁs. See No. 280.

86, tam antakam īva kruddham, vii, 8, 11 (āpantantam); R. vi, 56, 24 (sadrutam). See Nos. 104–105.

tamah śūrya īvā 'ṛṇubhiṁ, No. 72.

87, tam āpantantaṁ sahasā, vi, 116, 49 and 50; R. vi, 59, 36; 106,
4. Further examples, l. c. No. 10, p. 141. vegena in prior pada, R. vi, 76, 36, etc.
88, tam dipta i va kalaquin, vii, 15, 5; sa dipta, R. v, 67, 12.
Compare kalaqniriva murtimän, R. vi, 95, 3.
89, tam mumociaysi vajri, i, 227, 9; tam mumociaysiwm virah, G. vi, 80, 26.
90, tarunanqnitasrähäi çocăngauraiç ca vänaräi, ii, 284, 28; taruanqnitävärnaaiç ca ççigauraiç ca vänaräi, R. iv, 39, 13.
talaĩ talena, No. 163.
91, tasthau girir iwa 'calah, vi, 94, 22; vii, 15, 7; sithinam câilam
iwa 'calam, G. vi, 79, 49; sithinam câilam iwa 'suram and
v.1. sithinam câilam iwa 'param, R. iv, 48, 17 = G. 48, 18.
In M. another standing phrase is tasthau Merur iwa 'calah,
vi, 48, 34; 63, 8. Another iwa 'calah phrase is ççigro
väyur iwa 'calam (nâ 'kampayata), M. vii, 14, 36; väyvey-
gäiir iwa 'calah (na prakampan), R. iii, 67, 8. See Nos.
218, 240.
tasthau mtyur iwa, Nos. 104–105.
tasmin jite and hate, No. 328.
92, tasmin vimarde tumule, i, 101, 9; vimarde tumule tasmin, R.
vi, 43, 46; tasmin pravytte tumule vimarde, R. vi, 69, 66.
93, tasya tad vacanaã grutva, ix, 33, 56; 56, 42; 65, 21, etc.;
R. iii, 69, 46, etc.; G. vi, 37, 21, etc.; rarer is tasya tad
bhâsitam grutva, M. vii, 19, 22; G. iv, 38, 17. The first
and tac chrutva vacanam tasya are found passim in both
epices (tasya, tasyâ, tësâm, tayos, etc.; l. c. No. 10, p. 144).
94 and 95, (a) tasyãm râtryãm vyattâyãm, iii, 150, 1; 175, 1;
299, 1, etc.; R. iv, 64, 11; G. ii, 82, 1; atha râtryãm, G. ii,
67, 3; v, 1, 12; atha râtryãm pravrttâyãm, R. vii, 67, 1;
atitayãm ca çarvaryãm udite suryamançale, M. v, 35, 12;
vyattâyãm tu çarvaryãm âdityasyo 'daye tatah, R. ii, 67,
2; vyattâyãm rajanyãm tu, M. ix, 8, 1; rajanyãn tu prab-
hâtâyãm, R. vii, 99, 1 (G. 106, 1, sa rajanyãm prabhâ-
tyãm); (b) prabhâtâyãm tu çarvaryãm, M. iii, 2, 1; R. ii,
52, 1; 54, 36; vyushtâyãm ca 'va çarvaryãm, xv, 10, 53;
tato raj. vyusht, 11, 1; similar is G. i, 30, 1.
96, tarâjalam iwa 'mbarë, viii, 27, 35; G. vi, 68, 19; in M. of
decapitation; in R. of breastplates!
97, tištãh tishtë 'ti ca 'bravût, vi, 111, 41 and 45 and often (l. c.
No. 10, p. 142); R. vi, 79, 37; ca 'vadat, M. iv, 33, 24; ca
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'bruvan, G. i, 43, 25; cukroça, ib. ii, 39, 46. United with the phrase (No. 5) abhidrāva vegenā, in M. vi, 101, 9.

98, tuṣārāvṛtmanḍalām, ix, 65, 7 (pūrṇacandraṃ iva vyomni); tuṣārenāvṛtāṃ sābhram pūrṇacandraprabhāṃ iva, G. i, 50, 16 (R. 49, 15, satusārāvṛtām). Compare pūrṇacandraṃ ivo 'ditam, R. iv, 10, 3. Compare No. 169.

99, tālāraṇiṃ ivā 'nālaḥ, vi, 75, 32 (vyadhamat); vii, 21, 24 (vyadhamat); R. vi, 88, 7 (vidhamisyanti); trāṇāraṇiṃ ivā 'nālaḥ, G. vi, 64, 26 (vidhamisyanti); trāṇa-, ib., 67, 8 (vidhamisyanti) = R. 88, 7, tālā° (above). In the former passage, R. has the verb but not the simile. See Nos. 33, 75, 196, 291.

100, trāṇam antaraṭaḥ kṛtvā, iii, 281, 17; R. iii, 56, 1; v, 21, 3. Compare trāṇikṛtya ca tad rakṣaḥ, R. vi, 40, 9; saṁgaṭiṃ, M. i, 189, 2; matvā trāṇena tāṇaḥ tulyaḥ, M. vi, 113, 36; trāṇavat tāṇaḥ apaśyata, G. iv, 48, 19.

trāṇāraṇiṃ, No. 99.

101, trāṇāḥ kūpaḥ ivā 'vṛtāḥ, iii, 207, 59; kūpa iva, R. iii, 46, 10; G. iv, 16, 17. In M., adharmā dharmā-rūpeṇa; in R. (abhavyo bhavyarūpeṇa) sa pāpas tena rūpeṇa, and dharmāvaitañśikāḥ (the same, R. iv, 17, 22, with the bracketed words also in 28), also Mbh. phrase (PW.).

101 b, te vai nirayagāmināḥ, xiii, 23, 60 ff.; R. sarve n., iv, 17, 36 (similar list).

102, totā raṅgita iva dvipāḥ, vi, 54, 69; vii, 146, 55; ix, 21, 16; 25, 21; G. ii, 39, 43 (v. l. in R., totārīr nunnaḥ). See Nos. 149, 215.

103, totārīr iva mahādvipam, vi, 101, 13; ix, 13, 29; R. iii, 28, 10; totārīr iva mahāgajam, M. vi, 111, 7.

trīṣu lokēṣu, No. 252.

104-105, (a): danḍahasta iva 'ntakah (and acc.), vi, 102, 36; vii, 15, 5; viii, 29, 30; ix, 3, 26, etc.; G. vi, 65, 25; iii, 32, 17; 34, 11 (where R. 28, 11, has pācahaṃ); danḍapāṇir iva 'ntakah, M. iv, 22, 66; vi, 48, 90; 62, 55; dhanurduṇḍanām iva 'ntakah, G., iv, 31, 11 (R., dhanuḥ kālaṇṭakopamaḥ). Similar and in part interchangeable are the phrases (b): pācahaṃ iva 'ntakah, vi, 109, 11; vii, 36, 32; ix, 12, 2; R. iii, 39, 15; vi, 53, 25; G. vi, 39, 30; vii, 28, 21. In G. vi, 46, 36, pācahaṃ yathā Yamaḥ, where R. 67, 38, has pācahaṃ iva 'ntakah.
The epithet is used of Varuṇa, R. iii, 12, 19; iv, 42, 45; = G., 43, 58 (nilayaḥ paṇahastasya Varuṇasya). Compare M. vi, 112, 41, dahati vai mahācaµūṁ yuddheṣu sādṛṣcas tāta Yamasya Varuṇasya ca. Compare also sākṣāt kālāntakopamah, M. iii, 157, 50; sthitah kālāntakopamah, R. vi, 88, 2; cāraḥ kālāntakao, G. vi, 45, 19; sākṣāt kāla ivā 'ntakah, G. iv, 14, 25; tathāu mṛtyur ivā 'ntakah, M. vii, 16, 38. For kāladaṇḍam ivā 'ntakah, see No. 41. See also Nos. 42, 86, 220, 250, 272.

106, daṇḍahata ivo 'ragah, ix, 14, 40; R. vi, 54, 33. The člōka in M. is worth noticing in its entirety: cukopa samare Drāuṇir | daṇḍahata ivo 'ragah | triçikham bhṛukutin kṛtvā | srkkinī pariṣamlihan, where c = ix, 32, 46 a; and srkkinī, etc., is a frequent phrase, No. 320; that is, the whole člōka consists of iterata except for the first words. See No. 150, ad finem.

107, dadarca Dwārakāṁ viro mṛtanātham iva striyam, xvi, 5, 4; dadṛṣus te tadā Laṅkām ... narim iva mumūrṣatim, G. vi, 15, 27.

108, darçayan pāṇilāghavam, vi, 48, 66; 54, 73; 59, 22; 62, 28 (C. 2, 743, hastalāghavam); vii, 145, 70; ix, 26, 30; R. vi, 99, 20; G. 36, 55. Compare darçayan viryam ātmanah, M. vii, 14, 57; d, svaparākramam, vi, 100, 34, etc.

109, darçayā 'tmānam ātmanā, iii, 64, 57; smara cā 'tmānam ātmanā, R. vii, 37, 5, 47. Better parallels might, I think, be shown, but I have at hand only Gītā, 6, 5.

110, Daçagṛivasya paçyataḥ, iii, 290, 4; R. vi, 41, 89. This type, especially in M., is common. Compare vii, 17, 7, Drṣṭadyumnasya; ix, 11, 13, Dharmarājasya; ix, 16, 40, Bhīmasenasya; xi, 14, 19, Vāsudevasya; R. vi, 38, 12, tasya Rāmasya paçyataḥ. But the M. type sarvalokasya paçyataḥ, which occurs repeatedly, e. g., vi, 48, 69; 58, 44; ix, 5, 7, and sarvasānyasya paçyataḥ, e. g., vii, 18, 28; sarvakṣatrasya paçyataḥ, ix, 7, 24; 14, 37, is found in R., if at all, only as a rarity. I have noted G. vi, 93, 5, (Rānam) lokasya paçyataḥ; G. vi, 25, 35, paçyataṁ sarvarakṣasām; vi, 121, 16, sarvesām eva ṣṛṇvatām. In M. these correspond rather to paçyataṁ sarvasānyānam, vii, 144, 20; 195, 9; paçyataṁ sarvoyodhānam, vii, 145, 70 (with darç. pāṇiv., No. 108); sarvalokasya ṣṛṇvataḥ,
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ix, 31, 27; paçyatâm sarvasaînyânâm ( tad adbhutam ivâ 'bhavat, No. 83), ix, 10, 50.

111, didhakṣanâna paçvâkaḥ vi, 94, 7 (krodhena 'bhiprajajvála, also phrase of M.); didhakṣur iva paçvâkaḥ, xi, 12, 13; acc., G. iv, 38, 15 (with jájvallyâmanâna kopena, phrase, No. 176). See also Nos. 75, 226, 255.

112, divi 'vâ 'bhrañi màrutaḥ (vyadhâmat), vii, 30, 35; mahâbhrañi 'va màrutaḥ (vidhaman), R. vi, 96, 4; the same with karṣan, G. vi, 49, 58.

113, divyâbharanâ (and sarvâbharanâ) bhûsitâ(h); lâjjamâne 'va lalana divyâbharanâbhuśitâ, i, 152, 22; divyaratnâmbaradharo divyâbharanabhûsitâ, ii, 9, 6; divyamâlyâmbaradharo divyâbharanabhûsitaḥ, v, 122, 2; the prior also vi, 35, 11, and here also divyagandhânulepanâ, with which compare divyasraganulepana, in the same stanza with the titular pâda, R. vi, 50, 44 (also G. vi, 112, 8); divyamâlyavibhuśitâm divyâmbharmadharâñ devîm, iv, 6, 4; krśnarâktâmbaradhara . . . divyakundalasampannâ divyâbharanabhûsita, xii, 258, 16; divyârâpasamâyuktâ divyâbharanabhûsitaḥ divyamâlyâmbaradharâḥ, xv, 33, 23; sarvâbharanabhûsita, iii, 53, 12; 277, 19; in G. iii, 15, 14–15, divyâbharanaabhûsitaḥ . . . lalanaḥ (as in M. above); divyā, G. iii, 23, 42; R. i, 16, 13; v, 24, 25; vi, 50, 44; divyângarāgâm Vâidehîm divyâbharanabhûsitaṁ, 114, 7; sarvâ, R. i, 73, 9, where G. 75, 9 has mahâbharmabhuśanâh; R. iii, 47, 31; G. iii, 25, 15; R. vi, 47, 9; 50, 44, without similar neighboring pàdas. Compare also nânâbharanabhûsito, M. vi, 23, 6; sarvâbharanâdhaṅgâh, v. l. sarvâbharanâsarvângâh, R. vi, 65, 31, where G. 44, 24 has citrângâh; sarvâ samyukta and sampanna, M. i. 153, 14; G. iv, 44, 108, respectively. The form with divyā, Raghuv. x, 11. R. is generally content with the pâda, M. often adds, as above, similar pàdas. See No. 44.

divyamâlyâmbara, No. 113.

114, diçaç ca (pra and) vidiçaç cài 'va: ii, 38, 26; H. 2, 127, 127; G. vi, 90, 28 (where R. 106, 30 has pradiçaḥ sarvâh); vidiças tathâ, G. iii, 28, 41 (where R. 22, 23 has diçaḥ sapradiças tathâ); G. vi, 58, 38 (where R.
79, 28 has diçaça ca pradiças tathā). The shorter terminal diço daça, vii, 20, 52 (etc., often); R. vi, 75, 38; G. v, 55, 13; G. vi, 77, 30 (G. 93, 1; R. 115, 18 = G. 100, 18, not terminal; the last, daça diço). In C. to ix, 15, 17, the same v. l. as above in R., namely, vidicaça cai 'va in BM.; pradiçaça cai 'va in C. 769. See also under No. 36.

115, diṣṭya diṣṭye 'ti cā 'bruvan, i, 129, 31; abравіт, G. iv, 10, 23.

116, dināc cintāparā cai 'va, ii, 49, 4; tataq cintāparā dinā, iii, 54, 2; dināc cintāparāyanāh, G. vi, 74, 6 (= R. 94, 4, opariplutāh); iti cintāparo 'bhavat, R. vii, 79, 12. See Nos. 69, 161, 293.

117, dīptām agnicikham iva, iii, 63, 36; vii, 14, 78; R. i, 49, 14; vi, 118, 17; vii, 30, 29; G. vi, 80, 20, where R. 100, 19 has pradīptām akanām iva; dīptāv iva hutaćanāu, R. vi, 97, 25. See No. 33.

118, dītāsyān uragān iva, v, 151, 25; 180, 7; G. iii, 69, 24 ( instr.). See Nos. 74, 106, 141, 150.

119, dīrgham uṣṇam ca nihevyasa, ix, 4, 51; 32, 8; x, 1, 4; G. vi, 34, 1; 99, 5, where R. 114, 6 has sa dīrgham abhinihevyasa. This phrase appears in a variety of forms, very likely in more than I have noted. The prevailing type is the titular one above. Compare the variant in C. 238 to ix, 4, 51 (above), dīrgham uṣṇam ca niqeṣṇaṁ mumoca ca mumoha ca (B. cuṣāca ca mumoha ca); a form not unknown in R., dīrgham uṣṇam ca niqeṣṇaṁ vimuṣicantam muhur muḥub, G. iv, 33, 41. This is followed (the next verse!) in M. by ix, 5, 1, nihevyasa dīrgham uṣṇam ca tūṣṇam āśī; sa for ca in ix, 2, 55 (but C. 109, ca); like the form above in R., M. iii, 313, 3, sa dīrgham uṣṇam nihevyasa, cokabāspapariplutāh (phrase, see Nos. 120, 190); R. v, 34, 13, abravid dīrgham ucchvyasa, where G. 31, 33 has dīrgh. uṣ. ca nihevyasa; R. vi, 95, 2, sa tu dīrghaṁ vinihevyasa, where G. 75, 3, as before, followed by muhurtam dhyānam āśītah (phrase, compare No. 214). The likeness, when given, is to snake or elephant. Thus G. iv, 33, 41 (cited above) continues: kupitaṁ saptāqirasasasā jvāḷarudhham ivo 'ragah; ib. 33, 31–32, nihevyasa dīrgham uṣṇam ca kopād raktāntalocanaḥ babhūva naraçārdulo vidhūma iva pāvakaḥ (phrase, see
No. 255) taṁ dīptam iva kālāgniṁ nāgendram iva kopi-tam; 35, mahendram iva durjayam (a fine mixture!). The turn dirgham uṣṇaṁ ca niḥvvasan is so common that in G. ii, 15, 7 it stands for the accusative! niḥvvasantaṁ yathā nāgaṁ, dirgham uṣṇaṁ ca niḥvvasan (rectified with v. l. in R.). For other corresponding phrases, see below, Nos. 133, 141-143, 205.

120, duḥkhāmohapariprulutaḥ (v. l. çokamoha, duḥkhāçoka, çoka-bāspa, bāspaçoka), R. ii, 99, 29; G. 108, 26; 16, 33; C. vii, 96, etc.; tattāṁ çokapariprulutaḥ, M. iii, 76, 46; duḥkhāçokasamanvitāḥ, M. iii, 70, 22; xiv, 77, 17; xv, 21, 1; xviii, 2, 31; R. vii, 74, 4; spāraṇaḥ, xv, 10, 18. The ending occurs in all sorts of phrases, e. g., çonītāughapa-pariprulataḥ, vi, 103, 10. B.'s v. l. for C. (above) is, vii, 3, 8, bāspa-vākulītaśaṁ. See Nos. 137, 190.

121, duṣṭahastī 'va hastipāṇ, viii, 53, 17; R. vi, 67, 131.

122, devā iva çatakratum, iii, 78, 33; devār iva çatakratuḥ, G. vi, 92, 80. The situation is the same, king restored to people; omitted in R. (Bombay).

devānām (iva) dānavāiḥ (iva), No. 84.
dāvam . . . duratikramam, No. 43.

123, dviguṅkṛtavikramaḥ, vii, 19, 9; G. vi, 82, 179. There follows baddhvā ca bhrukuṭīm vaktre (M. 10); sa baddhvā bhrukuṭīm vaktre (G. 180). On these phrases see Nos. 51, 198. Compare R. vi, 100, 26, vimukhikṛ-tavikramaḥ.

124, dvīṭṭa iva (sāgarah, etc.), ix, 30, 55, etc.; R. vi, 4, 104; 26, 41; pāvakah, ix, 46, 54; xiii, 14, 278.
dhanuraṇḍam, Nos. 104-105.

125, dhanurveda ca vede ca, i, 109, 19, etc.; G. v, 32, 9, etc.
dhārābhīr iva toyadāḥ, No. 77.

126, na kālasya priyāḥ kaṇcīn na dveṣyāḥ, Kurusattama, xi, 2, 23; na kālasya priyāḥ kaṇcīn na dveṣyo 'sti, Kapāṭvara, G. iv, 18, 28. Compare Gitā, 9, 29, na me dveṣyo 'sti, na priyāḥ, Nos. 43 and 131.

127, na ca tāu yuddhavāimukhyam qramaṁ vāpy upajagmatuḥ; copied H. 1, 54, 49 from R. vi, 88, 77 = G. 68, 37; almost the same in H. 2, 36, 25.

128, na tvāṁ qoṣitum arhasi, vi, 26, 27, etc.; R. iv, 7, 14; G. iii, 71, 10 (v. l. in R., vyathitum), etc.; many occurrences
and many v. l., e. g., G. iii, 71, 11, qocitum nárhase deva (= Ráma), where RB. has vira. See No. 147.

129, nanu náma mahárája, iii, 63, 4; mahábáho, R. vi, 111, 3. Compare M. iii, 64, 19, nanu náma 'ham ištá tava, and G. iv, 24, 37, tave 'štā nanu námái 'tāh (R. has nanu cái 'va).
Namuci, No. 250.

130, na hi çakṣyāmi jīvītum, iii, 249, 20; nái 'iva çakṣyāmi jīvītum, G. ii, 17, 32; na hi çaknumi, G. v, 26, 23. See No. 134.

131, nā 'kāle vihito mṛtyuḥ, nā 'prāptakālo mriyate, iii, 63, 7; 65, 39; akāle durlabhō mṛtyuḥ, R. v, 25, 12; nā 'kālam- mṛtyur bhavati, G. v, 28, 3. Compare ix, 64, 10 and xi, 2, 5, kālam prāpya mahābāho (mahárāja) na kacēd ativartate. See Nos. 43 and 126. The (new) references here given to M. are to be added to those in Journ. Phil., vol. xx, pp. 25–26, where will be found other parallels.

132, nāgāḥ . . . siddhāc cakracarās tathā, iii, 85, 72; nāgāḥ . . . cakracarāc ca siddhāḥ, R. v, 48, 23 ("the sun and other heavenly bodies" are the blessed cyclists).

133, nāgendra 'iva niḥēvasan, ix, 32, 38; bhujānga 'iva, R. v, 22, 30. See Nos. 119, 141–143, 205.

134, nā 'ham jīvītum utsahe. This is a commoner form than that above in No. 130. It occurs repeatedly, e. g. iv, 19, 13; vii, 24, 11; x, 4, 26; xvi, 8, 23; R. v, 26, 4 (= G. v, 26, 33, v. 1.); vi, 116, 18; G. ii, 80, 9; vi, 24, 18; with many variations, e. g., katham jīvītum utsahe, G. vi, 34, 8, and above in No. 130.

135, nikṛttā 'iva kimūkāḥ, xiii, 30, 43; R. vi, 67, 29; pādāpāh, R. iv, 17, 1; G. ii, 45, 5; G. iii, 31, 48; etc. See Nos. 71, 136, 168.


nityān ār drmara parakramah, No. 293.
nipātā, No. 148.

137, nimagnāh çokasāgare, vii, 1, 11; 193, 34; R. iv, 20, 9 (compare 10, 34); G. ii, 37, 22 (R. prapannā). Compare duḥkhasāgarasampluta, G. vi, 9, 7; patitā çokasāgare, R. vi, 111, 31; G. vi, 95, 20, and 34. See Nos. 120, 190.

138, nimēṣāntaramātrenā, iv, 64, 28; v, 15, 31; xii, 334, 21, etc.; R. iv, 39, 11; v, 62, 36; vi, 44, 19; 45, 16; G. vi, 13, 9.
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139, nirmuktāv iva pannagaḥ, vii, 136, 29; inst. pl., ix, 15, 40; fem. sg., G. vi, 34, 23; nirmuktān bhujagāv iva, G. (ref. lost). See Nos. 74, 140, 150, 243.

140, nirmokam iva pannagaḥ, vii, 168, 5; R. vi, 33, 33; G. v, 3, 45; pannago yathā, G. ii, 91, 12. See Nos. 74, 139.

141, nihēyasann urago yathā, vi, 121, 10; ix, 64, 5; R. vi, 51, 18; jihmaga iva, ix, 1, 49 (C. pannaga); iva pannagaḥ M. ii, 65, 42; yadvat for yathā (metre), vii, 193, 70; papāta bhuvi saṁkruddho nihē. iva pannagaḥ, R. ii, 74, 35. See Nos. 118, 119, 133, 139, 142, 143, 150.

nispiṣya, No. 163.

142, nihēyasaṁtan punah punah, vii, 15, 30; G. vi, 55, 77 (dual, gajāv iva); R. vi, 76, 81 (v. l. of last, gajāv iva) nihēyasaṁtan muhur muhuh; as in G. ii, 110, 14 (sg.), while here R. ii, 101, 15 has punah punah. See Nos. 141, 143.

143, nihēyasaṁtan yathā nāgam, vi, 106, 71; xii, 224, 1; R. vi, 49, 1, dual; G. ii, 15, 7 (R. 18, 5, mahārājan); G. vi, 21, 5. The usual R. form is qaṁsaṁtan iva pannagaḥ, vi, 108, 10; with v. l., nihēyasaṁtan ivo 'ragaṁ, G. ii, 19, 1; o tān ivo 'ragaṁ, M. vii, 77, 1. C. vi, 3478, qaṁsa.; B., jval. See Nos. 119, 133, 141, 142, 205.

144, nilakuṇḍcitamurdhajah, iii, 277, 9; 280, 50; G. vi, 37, 61, with another phrase, mttamātasaṅgāgānānim (No. 203); nilakuṇḍcitakeṭi, M. ii, 65, 33.

145, nilāṃjanacayapakhyaḥ, vii, 20, 18; o prabhuḥ, G. vi, 24, 43 = R. 49, 32, but here o cayopamaḥ, as in G. vi, 94, 7 = R. 110, 6.

146, nilotpalamayīm mālām, vii, 139, 8 (dhārayan); mālāni nilotpalamayīm iva, G. vi, 79, 62 (dhārayan), v. l. in R.; in both cases of a wreath of arrows.

147, no 'tkaṇṭhām kartum arhasi, iii, 216, 10; xii, 170, 11, etc.; G. v, 36, 76 (not in R.), but in R. ii, 46, 2, na co 'tkaṇṭhitum arhasi (tvam no 't in G. 44, 2); and R. ii, 53, 2, tām no 'tkaṇṭhitum arhasi (nāi 'vo 't in G. 53, 3). R. here has the classical turn. See No. 128.

148, nyapatanta mahītale, ix, 56, 11; sa papāta, R. vi, 59, 88 = nipapāta, G. 36, 67; G. vii, 111, 47 (not in R.); petatus tān, R. vi, 97, 24, 26. The usual variant is papāta dharaṇītale, ix, 27, 46; R. iii, 52, 26; 66, 18; G. iv, 19, 3; passim in both epics. See also No. 167, 240, 309.
149, paṅke magnā iva dvipaḥ, vi, 100, 9; paṅkamagnā iva dvipaḥ, G. iv, 15, 30; v, 87, 26. R. iii, 61, 13 extends the phrase, paṅkam āśāya vipulāṁ sīdantam iva kuñjaram (= G. 68, 2, sīdann iva mahādvipaḥ); a new turn in ix, 58, 33 gives anyonyaṁ jaḥṅnatur vīrāu paṅkasthāu mahiśāv iva. See Nos. 102, 215.

150, paṅcaćīṛṣā iva 'ragāh, iii, 57, 6; iv, 22, 56; R. v, 10, 18; vi, 99, 40 (of arrows, ćvasantaḥ). Compare paṅcaśāyāh pannagāṅ chinnair Garudene 'va, vii, 36, 27; paṅcaśāyāv iva pannagāu, G. iii, 74, 22. This variety of snakes is recognized together with those having four and seven heads in Hariv. 3, 46, 38. The seven-headed variety, together with those having three and ten heads respectively, is recognized in i, 27, 51, while the saptaćīṛṣa (qīṛṣan) sort, pannago mahān, is taken as the form of the divine weapon, xiii, 14, 257. G. iv, 33, 41, saptaćīras, has been cited above under No. 119. For the ending iva 'ragāh. See also Nos. 74, 106, 118, 141.

151, pataṅgā iva pāvakam, v, 130, 21; vi, 117, 35; pataṅgān iva pāṣakaḥ, ib. 37; R. iii, 28, 14; vi, 44, 23; 97, 6; 102, 62; G. v, 38, 36; G. vi, 54, 53; pataṅgā jvalanaṁ yathā, C. ix, 152 (where M. ix. 3, 27 has pataṅgā iva pāvakam); R. vi, 66, 26; 96, 2; interchanges with ṣaḷabhān iva pāvakam (q. v. No. 283), R. vi, 65, 43 = G. 44, 38; pataṅga iva ć 'gnāu te, xvi, 3, 42 (prior pāda); triṣṭubh, yathā pradiptāṁ jvalanam pataṅgā viḍanti, M. vi, 35, 29. See also Nos. 181, 258, 283.

152, patākadvajamālinī (śnam), iii, 77, 6 (açobhayac ca naga-ram); G. ii, 42, 12; G. iv, 25, 38; G. vi, 14, 20. The corresponding verses in R. are sūcehrītadvajamālinī, ii, 43, 10; patākadvajācaḥbhita, iv, 26, 41; and a complete v.l., vi, 38, 11 (G. v, 9, 17 also has patākadvajācaḥbhita). But R. has the titular phrase at vi, 47, 14 = G. 22, 21 (both śnālinī); and at vi, 57, 3, where G. 31, 4 has bahudvajapatākinīm.

patidarçanalālasā. No. 165.

153, pated dyāur himavān ṇīryet, iii, 12, 130; idem but prthivi, G. ii, 15, 29. In M. follows prthivi ḍakali bhavet ṇiṣyet toyanidhiḥ; in G., ćoṣaṁ jalanidhir vrajet. In v, 82, 48, dyāuḥ patec ca sanakṣatrā; in iii, 278, 38, and vii, 13, 10,
prapated dyānḥ sanakṣatrā prthivī cakalī bhavet; in iii, 249, 31–32, vidiryet sakalā bhūmir dyāuq ca 'pi cakalī bhavet... himavāṅq ca parivrajet čuşyet toyaṁ samudreṣu (with other like expressions). See Nos. 64, 327.

153 b, papāta ca mamāra ca, passim. See Nos. 148, 167.

param (–aṁ) vismayam, No. 264.

154, param kautāhalam hi me, iii, 296, 26; ix, 35, 39; 40, 2; xiii, 75, 7; R. i, 1, 5, etc., etc.; bhūyaḥ k. h. m., ix, 47, 3.

155, parasparajayāśiṁañu, vii, 14, 46; R. iv, 11, 42; vi, 89, 1; G. 76, 32; G. 79, 33. Interchanges with "jighāṅsavaḥ and vadhaśiṁañu, q. v. below.

156, parasparajighāṅsavaḥ, vi, 46, 5, 15; G. vi, 29, 16, where R. 55, 17 has jighāṅsayaḥ, which is found also in G. vi, 49, 42, but here R. 69, 54 has jayāśiṁañu (No. 155). So G. i, 77, 19 has jighāṣayaḥ, where R. has jayāśiṁañu; G. vi, 77, 27, jighāṅsinaḥ, where R. 97, 27 has jaghnatuq ca parasparam. See Nos. 155, 157.

157, parasparavadhaśiṁañu, vii, 7, 32; ix, 12, 38; 55, 23 (with the phrase krudhāv iva mahādvipāu); and passim; G. vi, 69, 1, where R. 89, 1 has jayāśiṁañu (No. 155); G. vi, 67, 31; 79, 33. Compare anyonyavadhakāṅkṣiṇu, R. vi, 99, 31. I have noticed vadhaśiṁ only in G., but cannot say that it is lacking in the Bombay edition. Nos. 155–157 might perhaps all be put under one head as simple variants of one phrase. See l. c. No. 10, p. 143.

158, Parjanya iva vṛṣṭimān, vi, 63, 25; vii, 89, 4; ix, 12, 59; 17, 2; xii, 67, 32; 69, 32, etc.; vṛṣṭibhiḥ, R. iii, 28, 7; G. vi, 54, 34; iva j̤mūtāih (metre), R. vi, 27, 8; Parjanyam iva karsakāh (yeśām dārāḥ pratikṣante), xiii, 60, 15; tvām eva hi pratikṣante Parj. i. k., R. ii, 112, 12, where G. 122, 12 has tvām eva pratikṣante Parj. i. k. See No. 217.

159, parvanī 'va mahodadhiḥ, ix, 26, 28; jalaṣayaḥ, G. ii, 87, 5, where R. 80, 4, has sāgaraśye 'va parvanī.

160, parvatān iva niradāḥ, vii, 89, 4; G. vi, 66, 28, where R. 87, 25 has toyadāḥ.

161, palāyanaparāyanāḥ, vii, 22, 15; 103, 32; 192, 83, etc.; G. v, 33, 31. See l. c. No. 10, p. 143, and Nos. 69, 116, 293. palācāir iva, No. 168.

162, pačum račanayā yathā, iv, 22, 74, etc.; R. vii, 23, 1, 40. paqyatām sarvasāinyānām, No. 110.
163, pāṇim pāṇau vinīspiṣya, vii, 73, 19 (with dantān kaṭaka-thayya ca); R. ii, 36, 1; vii, 69, 2 (pāṇau pāṇim sa nispiṣya). Compare nispiṣya pāṇinā pāṇim, iv, 22, 81; pāṇau pāṇim nipiṣya ca (v. l. ha), ix, 65, 33; karaṁ kareṇa nispiṣya, i, 151, 42; karaṁ kareṇa 'bhiniṇḍyā virāḥ, iii, 236, 19; talaṁ talena nispiṣya, vii, 193, 70.

164, pāṇḍureṇā 'tapatreṇa dhriyamāṇena mūrdhāni, v, 178, 77; xiii, 14, 175; xiv, 64, 3; 75, 7; xv, 23, 8; R. iv, 38, 13 (G. pāṇḍareṇa); chatreṇa dhriyamāṇena pāṇḍureṇa virājatā, ix, 9, 2. Four references are here added to those cited, l. c. No. 10, p. 138.

pācaḥasta itvā 'ntakaḥ, Nos. 41, 104–105.

165, putradarcanalālasā, i, 122, 29; G. i, 9, 56; bhārtṛdarcanalālasā, iii, 64, 124; 282, 60; G. ii, 26, 5; Rāmadarcanalālasā, iiii, 289, 27; R. v, 14, 42; lālasā as terminal, qoka, i, 2, 229; G. iv, 18, 19; pati, M. iii, 65, 1; patidarcanalālasā, G. v, 29, 6, where R. 30, 6 has kāṅkṣiṇ; yuddhalālasāḥ, G. vi, 27, 25, where R. 51, 25 has nardanto jaladā yathā. See also PW. s. v.

166, punarjatam itvā 'tmānam (mene), viii, 96, 47; R. vi, 39, 15; R. vi, 65, 15, and G. 44, 12. In R. vi, 69, 8, manyate kālacoditaḥ, where G. 48, 8 keeps mene; in R. vi, 74, 25, manyate plavagottamaḥ, where G. 53, 30 keeps mene.

167, puspavṛṣṭaḥ papāta ha, iiii, 76, 40; papāta puspavṛṣṭic ca, R. vii, 110, 6. See also No. 148.

168, puspitav īva kiṃcukau, iiii, 280, 32; vi, 45, 14; ix, 12, 15; 57, 4; dadṛgāte Himavatī p. i. k., ix, 58, 34; plural, vii, 19, 14; ix, 9, 24; R. vi, 45, 9; 80, 34; 90, 37; G. vi, 32, 33, where R. 58, 46 has prabhinnāv īva kuṇārāṇ, a phrase, No. 178; extended in M. vi, 101, 17, saṁstṛṇa īva parvataḥ; kiṃcukau puspavān īva, ib. 110, 36; puspitav īva nispatrau, yathā cālmalikīcukāu, G. vi, 68, 31; kiṃcukāu īva puspitau, viii, 29, 18; palaścāir īva puspitaiḥ, R. vi, 58, 28, where G. 32, 25 has puspitāv īva kiṃcukāiḥ as in R. vi, 75, 27, and G. 54, 24. See Nos. 177, 178.

pūrayann īva, No. 36.

169, pūrṇacakrādandrabhānanā, iiii, 68, 26; R. vii, 33, 14. See also No. 98, for a similar phrase.

170, pūrṇāyatavatisṭhena caṇenā 'nataparvāṇa, vi, 95, 72; R. vi,
71, 72 (G. 51, 75, karṇāyata°). The hemistich consists of two iterata, the last pāda being often used independently, vi, 64, 52; 88, 29; ix, 16, 39; G. iv, 17, 23; v, 31, 30. Compare caṇāiḥ samīnatanarpabhīh, M. vii, 14, 30; akarṇapūrṇam āyamyah, R. iv, 11, 91.

171, prthivī sasyāmālinī, vi, 3, 19; R. iii, 16, 5 (sasyaçaśālinī, in the other texts, C. vi, 86; G. iii, 22, 5); trīṣṭubh, mahīṁ īva prāvṛṣi sasyaçaśālinīn, G. v, 80, 31 (not in R.).

172, prthivyāṁ caturantāyām, iv, 44, 20; R. v, 31, 4.
prakīrṇa, No. 251.

173, praghya saçarāh dhanuh, iii, 282, 34; 288, 10; G. v, 93, 14.

174, prajākāmaḥ sa cā prajāḥ, iii, 53, 5; R. i, 58, 2; G. i, 14, 28.
prajvalam, No. 176.

175, pratapāntam īvā 'dityam, vi, 59, 66; vii, 40, 24; G. ii, 117, 16; pratapāntam īvā 'dityam madhyāhne diptatejasam, R. vi, 128, 9; madhyāngataṁ īvā 'dityam pratapāntaṁ svatejasā, M. vi, 106, 80. Compare tapantam īva bhāskaraṁ, R. iv, 11, 86.
pradīpta īva manyunā, No. 80.

176, pradīptaṁ īva tejasā, R. iv, 35, 1; G. iv, 33, 3; G. v, 80, 5 (tā); vi, 46, 87. Compare prajvalann īva tejasā, xii, 325, 11; jvalantam īva tejasā, R. vi, 71, 70; G. v, 89, 44; G. vi, 46, 130; pradīptaṁ īva pāvakam, xiv, 73, 4 and 6; G. iv, 44, 53; pradīptaṁ īva sarvaçāḥ, G. iii, 78, 30; vapuṣā ... jvalantam īva tejasā, R. vii, 37, 2, 8; jājvalyamaṇaṁ vapuṣā, M. i, 97, 27; iii, 100, 19; R. vi, 108, 7; G. vi, 19, 49; jājvalyamaṇaṁ tejobhī (pāvakārkaśaṁprabham), M. iii, 188, 108; jājvalyamaṇaṁ kopena, M. iv, 22, 42; G. iv, 38, 15. See Nos. 16, 75, 80, 111, 177.

177, praphulla īva kimcukah, v, 179, 31; G. vi, 68, 20; pradīptāṁ īva kimcukān, G. ii, 56, 7; iii, 79, 33. See Nos. 168, 176. prabhātāyām, No. 94; prabhāte, No. 79.

178, prabhinnā na kuñjaram, vi, 92, 4; vii, 21, 52; 22, 4; 39, 29; ix, 57, 62, etc.; R. vi, 28, 8; G. ii, 116, 42; dual as v. l. in R. vi, 58, 46 for puspitāv īva kimcukān, No. 168; prabhinnāv īva mātāngū, M. vii, 10, 8; R. vi, 89, 1; prabhinnām īva mātaṅgam parikīrṇāṁ kareṇubhīh, M. iv, 19, 29; kareṇubhir mahārānye parikīrṇo yathā dvipaḥ, G. v, 14, 28.

179, prabhūtakamalotpala, iii, 280, 1; R. iv, 26, 16.
180, pravāte kadali yathā, v, 13, 3, prāvepata; R. ii, 117, 18, pravepiā; R. iii, 2, 15; G. v, 26, 1. See Nos. 71, 136.

181, praviveca mahāsenām makaraḥ sāgaraṁ yathā, i, 138, 30; viii, 77, 10; ix, 18, 10, etc.; G. vi, 77, 6 (v. l. ripoh sāniyam); (sāniyam) mahārṇavam mīna iva 'viveca, R. vi, 69, 67. In R. vi, 97, 6, pataṁga iva pāvakam (No. 151) takes the place of makaraḥ sāgaraṁ yathā in G. 77, 6.

182, prasannasalilāṁ cūbham (nadīm), iii, 64, 112; prasannasalilāṁ sarah, R. vii, 38, 21.

182b, prasadāṁ kartum arhasi, ix, 35, 72; R. iv, 8, 19; G. ii, 110, 7.

183, prahasann iva, Bhārata, vi, 45, 23; (uvāca) prahasann iva, (pratyuvāca) hasann iva, M. passim; R. iv, 5, 25, etc.; G. i, 41, 3; 53, 12; 74, 19; 33, 36; G. v, 1, 52, 62, etc.

184, prahārārjjarjarikṛtaḥ, vii, 94, 60; viii, 56, 28; R. iv, 12, 22. See No. 235.

185, prahṛṣṭenantarātmanā, iii, 57, 30; 72, 42; G. vi, 112, 21 (R. 128, 18, prahṛṣṭa putravatsalā); R. vii, 11, 19.

186, prakāramaṇā, terminal, dṛgha°, iii, 284, 2; xv, 5, 16; xvi, 6, 23; sattta°, G. v, 35, 35. Compare cayāṭṭālakaparyāntam, G. i, 72, 3; cayāṭṭālakāçobhinā, M. iii, 160, 39. On these terms, see my Ruling Caste, p. 174, note.

187, prānāḥ samtvarayanti mām, G. ii, 66, 57 = G. iv, 21, 24 (neither in R.); in xii, 52, 8 ca for mām, but the latter is implied, as balam me prajahātī'va precedes. In M. i, 172, 8, prānā hi prajahanti (sic!) mām:
pravṛṣī'va, No. 217.
phullāqoka, No. 228.

188, baddhagodhaṅgulitrāṇāu, and plural, iii, 283, 17; iv, 5, 1; R. i, 22, 9; ii, 23, 36; baddhagodhaṅgulitravān, x, 7, 52; khadgagodhaṅgulitravān, iii, 278, 19.
baddhva ca bhrukuṭhim, Nos. 51, 123.
babhūva tumulah cābdhaḥ, No. 23.

189, babhāu sūrya ivo 'tthitaḥ, vii, 18, 18; bhāti candra ivo 'ditaḥ; R. vi, 127, 29; kālasūrya ivo 'ditaḥ, M. vii, 16, 15; divākara ivo 'ditaḥ, R. vi, 60, 58; jvalan sūrya ivo 'ditaḥ, G. iii, 69, 1; bālasūrya ivo 'ditaḥ, G. v, 41, 36; bālacakanda ivo 'ditaḥ, G. iii, 38, 15. See ivo 'tthitaḥ, ivo 'ditaḥ, as terminals also under No. 63; babhāu, No. 228.
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189b, bahutālasamutsedhāh, iii, 158, 91 (waterfalls); R. vi, 26, 5 (a palace).

bāspa, all under Nos. 51, 119, 120, 190; bāspagadgada, No. 331.

190-193, bāspavāyukulalocanah, vii, 1, 3 (also C. 97); ix, 65, 31; xv, 16, 9; R. vi, 46, 6; G. ii, 68, 51; vi, 46, 27, where R. 46, 30 has krodhavyāyukulalocanah; G. vi, 83, 57, etc.; R. vi, 117, 1 = G. 102, 1; G. vi, 103, 1. This (a) is the usual parallel among these lachrymose pādās. Another (b) is cokavavyāyukulacanah, M. vii, 78, 14; G. ii, 83, 31; and cokabāspapariprutah, M. iii, 313, 3; G. v, 66, 20. In R. the commonest form is bāspaparyākuleksana, G. iii, 7, 32; R. vi, 114, 3 (G. 99, 3, with 4, Ṛśabbāspapariprutah); R. vi, 101, 46 (v. l. to G. 83, 57, above); G. vi, 26, 27, where R. 50, 45 has harṣa (No. 331). Varieties are bāspācokapariprutah, G. iv, 26, 9; R. iii, 2, 22; cokavegariprutah, G. v, 75, 18; cokabāspasamakulah, M. vii, 52, 7; bāspācokasamanvitah, ix, 65, 32; bāspasamidghayā vācā (see No. 331), xv, 8, 23. A third (c) case of identity is found in tataḥ sā bāspakalayā vācā and sā bāspakalayā vācā, M. iii, 61, 25; iv, 20, 28; R. ii, 82, 10. Perhaps others will be found, of which I have given one side above, and finally in these: cokavipulalocanah, G. v, 39, 5; bāspopahatacetana, R. iv, 27, 32; cokenāvistacetanā, G. vi, 9, 3; bāspapiplulocanah, G. ii, 96, 2; bāspadāśitalocanah, R. iv, 8, 29; bāspavyākuleksanah, R. vii, 98, 2; bāspapūrnamukhāh sarve, R. ii, 40, 21. See Nos. 51, 119, 120, 290, and especially the same compounds with harṣa, No. 331, where too are put the bāspagadgada compounds.

bijam uptam, No. 219.

194-195, Brahmapālokapitāmahah, ix, 2524 (= 45, 22, sarva, as in 47, 15 and in R. i, 63, 17; vi, 61, 21); R. i, 57, 4, etc.; sarvabhūta, M. i, 64, 39.

bhayagadgada, No. 331.

bhartṛdarçanalalasā, No. 165.

196, bhasmacchannah ita 'nalah, iii, 278, 32; R. iv, 11, 81; 27, 40; G. iv, 16, 17; bhasmacchanno va pāvako, Dh. Pada, 71. For the terminal ita 'nalah, see Nos. 33, 75, 99, 291.

A pāda in the cloka preceding this in Dh. P., as Prof.
APPENDIX A.

Hardy has reminded me, is also an epic phrase, kalāṁ nā 'gghati soṣāsim, Dh. P. 70, kalāṁ nā 'rharti soṣācīn, M. i, 100, 68; ii, 41, 27; iii, 257, 4 (kalāṁ arhati); vii, 197, 17, yaḥ kalāṁ soṣācīṁ pūrṇāṁ Dhanaṁjaya na te 'rharti; xii, 174, 46, and 277, 6, (ete) nā 'rhatah ṣoḍaṅhā kalāṁ; so Manu ii, 86.

197, bhīmo bhīmaparākramaḥ, ii, 30, 30; iii, 53, 5; 73, 19; iv, 22, 85; ix, 57, 47, and 61; R. vi, 55, 5; G. v, 35, 30; 38, 44; G. vi, 64, 23; 82, 181; bhīmaṁ bhīmapratisvanam, R. vi, 107, 19. Bhūṣmam bhīmaparākramam, M. vi, 14, 17. See No. 206.

bhujāṅga iva, No. 133.

bhūyaḥ kāutūhalaṁ, No. 154.

198, ṇhrūkutkutiṭilānanah, iii, 150, 5; G. vi, 65, 33. See Nos. 51, 106, 123.

makarah āgaraṁ yathā, No. 181.

199, Mahāvaṅ iva Čambaram (jahe raṇe Čalyam), ix, 7, 35; Čambaram Mahāvaṅ iva (Bāλīnaṁ jahe), G. iv, 12, 8. Compare Mahendreṇe 'va Čambaraḥ (tena vikramya), G. v, 18, 29.

200, manğalyam maṅgalam Viṣṇum, i, 1, 24; maṅgalyam maṅgalaṁ sarvam, R. vi, 112, 21 (G. 97, 20, maṅgalyam).

201, maṅḍalāṇi vicitrāṇi, iii, 19, 7; ix, 57, 17, etc.; R. vi, 40, 23. Here also gatapratyāgatāni ca, as in both cases in M. and elsewhere and in R. vi, 107, 32 (above, No. 54). The whole passage ix, 57, 17 ff. is the same with R. vi, 40, 23 ff. (not in G.), with slight changes. See JAOS., vol. xx, p. 222, and my Ruling Caste, p. 253, note (the gomutraka there mentioned is found R. loc. cit.).

202, maṅḍalikṛtakārmukaḥ, i, 133, 3; R. iii, 25, 16.

203, mattamātaṅgagāminam, iii, 80, 14; 277, 9; R. ii, 3, 28; G. vi, 37, 61. Compare matttanāgendravikramah, M. i, 188, 10, and mattmātaṅgavikramah, R. vi, 3, 43. See No. 314.

204, mano vihvalatī 'va me, i, 1, 218; iv, 61, 4; xi, 14, 14; G. ii, 71, 21.

martukāma, No. 213.

205, mahāṅga iva ṇvasan, ix, 32, 35; 57, 59; G. ii, 92, 26; maṅhāśarpa, R. iv, 16, 13; krudhaḥ sarpa, R. vi, 88, 38; ruddho nāga, R. iii, 2, 22. See Nos. 119, 133, 141–143.
mahāpāpapraṇaśanī, No. 301.
206, mahābalaparākramaḥ, vii, 10, 72; ix, 45, 49, etc.; G. v, 1, 49; G. vi, 70, 6; 75, 49; 110, 40. Terminal, Nos. 273, 293.
207, maholkā pataṭi yathā, vii, 15, 20; maholke iva petatuḥ, G. vi, 70, 18; maholke 'iva nabhaṣṭalat (apatat), M. vi, 48, 85; divyolke 'iva nabhaṣṭeyutā, G. iv, 19, 31; nyapataq dharaṇīprasythe maholke 'iva mahāpṛabhā, M. vi, 104, 32; sā jvalantī maholke 'iva ... nipapāta, M. vii, 92, 67.
208, māṇḍaṇaṇita-kāraham(m), vi, 54, 103; vii, 20, 53; 21, 43; ix, 14, 18; xi, 16, 56; xviii, 2, 17; R. vi, 42, 47; 69, 70; 125, 4; G. vi, 19, 16; 6phenilam, R. vi, 69, 148 (compare uṣṇiṣavara-phenilam, M. vii, 14, 11; māṇḍaṇaṇita-kāraham ... patākavara-phenilam, vii, 187, 16–17).
209, mā dharmyān nīnaqāḥ pāthaḥ, iii, 52, 15; G. i, 24, 9.
210, māṇuṣaṁ vigraham krāvā, i, 98, 8; R. iv, 66, 10. muktaraqmir iva, No. 25.
211, mudā paramayā yuktāḥ, ii, 53, 23, etc.; R. i, 52, 11. This is a phrase of various forms, yuktāḥ or yutāḥ, according to position; mudā, cāryā, prityā, according to sense. Other examples are given above, pp. 267, 269.
212, munayaḥ saṁcitavrataḥ, xiii, 6, 41; R. iv, 13, 18. In G. iv, 13, 24, ṛṣīṇām saṁcitatmanāṁ = mahārṣin saṁcitavratān, M. i, 1, 3.
213, mumūrṣur (śor) iva bheṣajam, vi, 121, 57; ix, 5, 5 (na mām prīṇāti tat sarvam); G. iii, 45, 19; auśhadham iva, M. ii, 62, 2; martukāma ivāu 'ṣadham, R. iii, 40, 1; G. v, 89, 57, where R. vi, 17, 15 has viparita ivāu 'ṣadham. Compare mumūrṣur naṣṭacetanāh, M. v, 53, 12; and na priṇayaṁ mām bhuktam apathyam iva bhajanam, G. v, 76, 6 (paretalpā hi gatāyuṣo narā hitaṁ na gṛṇanti, R. iii, 41, 20). See No. 68.
214, mūhūrttam iva ca dhyātvā, iii, 282, 66; sa mūhūrtti iva dhyātvā, R. vi, 101, 38; sa mūhūrttam iva dhyātvā bāspa-paryākulekṣanaḥ, two pāda phrases (Nos. 190–193, compare also s. No. 119), G. v, 19, 2; tato mūhūrttam sa dhyātvā, ix, 5, 2. mūle hate, No. 328.
215, mṛgā vyādhārīn iva 'ṛditāḥ, xii, 332, 31; mṛgāḥ kokair iva 'ṛditāḥ, G. vi, 28, 19. In M. usually mṛgāḥ siṁhārditā
iva, vii, 37, 36; ix, 3, 7; 19, 3, etc.; siühārdita iva dvi-pah, G. v, 37, 19. See Nos. 271, 316.

216, mekalaprabha-va cāi 'va ḍono maṇinibhodhakah, H. 3, 46, 44, perhaps from G. iv, 40, 20 ("e. a. maṇin adnam mani"); the passage entire.

meghaṁ sūrya, No. 72.
yathā devāsura yuddhe, No. 227.

217, yathā prāvrṣi toyadāḥ, vi, 81, 39; R. iii, 18, 23; prāvrṣi 'va balāhakah, R. v, 1, 180; prāvrṣi 'va mahāmeghaḥ, R. iv, 11, 25 (compare 8, 43); prāvrṣi 'va ca Parjanyah, xiii, 68, 71. See Nos. 59, 77, 158.

218, yathā bhūmicale 'calā, C. ix, 614 (vicious); 'calah, R. vi, 59, 61; 77, 13. In M. corresponding to 614, rāṇabhūnita- tale calān. Both R. passages have samuddhuto preceding. See Nos. 91, 240.

219, yatho 'ṣare bijam uptram (na rohet), xiii, 90, 44; sunīṣphalam bijam iva 'ptam 'uṣare, R. ii, 20, 52; bijam uptram iva 'ṣare, R. iii, 40, 3. Compare Mann, ii, 112, āuhammad bijam iva 'ṣare.

yantramukta (cyuta) iva dhvajah, No. 25.

220, Yamadāṇḍopamāṁ rāne, vi, 116, 49; Yamadāṇḍopamāṁ gurvīṁ Indrāṣanim iva 'dyatāṁ, ix, 57, 12; Yamadāṇḍopamāṁ graṭkācāṁ Kālāratārim iva 'dyatāṁ ... dehāntakaraṇāṁ ati, ix, 11, 50 (gadām); Kāladaṇḍopamāṁ gadām, R. vii, 14, 14; 27, 48; G. iii, 35, 43; Yamadāṇḍopamāṁ bhīmam, R. vi, 77, 3; Kālapāṇḍopamāṁ rāne, G. iii, 31, 16; Kāla- dāṇḍopamāṁ rāne, M. vi, 45, 8; vaṃrasparṇopamāṁ rāne, ix, 63, 21. See Nos. 42, 104-105.

221, yasya nā 'stī samo loke, xi, 23, 14 (cānure virye ca); yasya nā 'stī samo yudhi, G. vi, 33, 24; yeśāṁ nā 'stī samo virye, ib. 49.

222, yasya prasādaṁ kurute sa vai taṁ draṣṭum arhati, M. xii, 337, 20; R. vii, 37, 3, 14 (copied). This is in the Čvetadvīpa interpolation of R.

223, yāvat sthāsyanti girayo, v, 141, 55; R. i, 2, 36; adding yāvat sthāsyanti sāgarah, xii, 334, 37; G. vi, 108, 15-16 (sāgaraḥ); in Činti, correlated with tāvat tava 'ksaya kṛtiḥ ... bhaviṣyati; in G. with kṛtir eṣā bhaviṣyati. Compare No. 224.

224, yāvad bhūmir dharisyati, iii, 291, 50; viii, 86, 20; ix, 53.
21; R. vi, 100, 57; G. vi, 92, 76; 112, 102; yāval lokā dhariṣyanti, R. i, 60, 29; vii, 84, 13; yāval bhūmir girayaça tištheyuh, xii, 343, 51; yāvat prāṇa dhariṣyanti, ix, 24, 40; yāvac ca me dhariṣyanti (prāṇa dehe), M. iii, 57 (N. 5), 32. See No. 223.

225, yiyāsur Yamasādanam, i, 163, 10; G. vi, 57, 23. See No. 3, and l. c. No. 10, p. 143 ff.

226, yugantāgnir ivā jvalau, i, 138, 37; R. iii, 24, 34; v, 21, 25; G. vi, 80, 40, where R. 101, 38 has yugánta iva pāvakaḥ (bhāskaraḥ in R. iv, 11, 2). Compare yugantāgnir iva prajāh, R. v, 58, 158; G. vi, 50, 50, where R. 69, 150 has iva jvalan. See Nos. 33, 75, 111, 176.

227, yuddham devāsuropamam, vii, 15, 2; yuddhe devāsuropamah, G. vi, 4, 3; yathā devāsure yuddhe, M. vi, 116, 36; vii, 14, 48; purā devāsure yathā, iii, 285, 11. yuddhe yuddhavicāradāh, No. 307.

228, raktacoka ivā 'bhbhau, vi, 103, 10; phullacoka ivā 'bhbhau, R. vi, 102, 69. Compare babhāu Rāmo'coka iva raktastabakamanāditāh, M. v, 179, 31. See No. 189.

230, rajanyām, Nos. 94-95.

rathanemisvanena ca, No. 247.

229, rathena 'dityavarcasā, iii, 290, 12; 291, 51; R. vi, 71, 16.

229 b, rathopastha upāviçat, vi, 94, 19, etc.; R. vi, 59, 114.

230, ratho me kalpyatām iti, iii, 289, 33; kalpyatām me rathah ċīghram and ratho me yujyatām iti, R. vi, 95, 21; ii, 115, 7. Rāmadarcanālalāsā, No. 165.

231, Rāma-Rāvaṇayor iva, R. vi, 107, 53; Rāma-Rāvaṇayor cai 'va, Vāli-Sugrivayos tathā, ix, 55, 31; Rāma-Rāvaṇayor mṛdhe (yādṛṣaṁ hi purā vṛttam), M. vii, 96, 28. Compare Nos. 267, 274.

232, Rāmo rājivalocanah, R. iii, 61, 29, etc., and passim; M. iii, 148, 10; xiii, 84, 31 (Jāmadagnyah!)

233, Rāvaṇaḥ krodhamūrecchitaḥ, iii, 277, 47; 284, 17; R. vi, 26, 6; 90, 57; G. i, 1, 51; vi, 75, 10; 88, 1; rākṣast duhkhamūrecchita, M. iii, 277, 46. The terminal is found often in both epics, e. g. in M. iii, 46, 48, Urvaśī krodhamūrecchita.

234, rukmapunkhāhs taśladhāntāiḥ, ix, 24, 60 (karmāraparimārjitaḥ); G. vi, 34, 24; svarṇapunkhāḥ ciladhāntāiḥ, ix, 15, 14. See Nos. 34, 337.
235, rudhirenā samukṣītāḥ, iii, 287, 14; iv, 22, 92; ix, 65, 4, etc.; G. vi, 75, 54; cōṇitena samukṣītāḥ, M. iii, 12, 62; jarjarikṛtasarvāṅgāṃ rudhirenā 'bhisamplutāṃ, ix, 58, 34; compare R. iv, 12, 22, klānto rudhirasiktāṅgāḥ prahārār jārjarikṛtāḥ (phrase of No. 184).

236, rūpenā 'pratimā bhuvi, i, 152, 17; iii, 62, 25; ix, 35, 47; 48, 2; xiii, 82, 4; G. i, 40, 4; R. i, 32, 14; iii, 34, 20, Sitā; 35, 13; 72, 5, viii, 58, 7 (last three, neuter with kanyā- or bhāryā- dvayam); vii, 80, 4; 87, 26; with loke for metre, xvii, 2, 14; R. v, 12, 20; Sitā cā 'pratimā bhuvi, R. vi, 110, 22; rūpenā 'sadrēt bhuvi, Hariv. 1, 12, 7; with bala, balenā 'pratimam bhuvi, iii, 275, 7. The prevailing form in both epics is rūpenā 'pratimā bhuvi, as above and in R. iv, 66, 9, here after the pāda, vikhyātā trīṣu lokesu, with which compare M. iii, 53, 15, where Nala is lokesv apratīmo bhuvi, but with rūpeṇā following, which in turn takes the place of mūrimā (No. 35) in another R. phrase. In R. vii, 37, 3, 24, the phrase is united with chāye 'vā 'nugata, No. 70, and sarvalaksanālakṣita, No. 303. It is slightly modified on occasion, jānarty apratimām bhuvi, ix, 42, 20; rūpenā 'pratimā rājan, M. v. 35, 6.

laghu citerāṃ ca, No. 67.


238, vajranispegāuravam, iii, 11, 40; G. vi, 76, 27; o'niśvanam, G. vi, 36, 105 (o'nisthuram, R. 59, 126).

vajrasparopamā ranā, No. 220.

239, vajrahasta ivā 'surān, viii, 9, 5 (mohayitvā ranē); o'tam i. 'āḥ, vi, 108, 35; vajrapāner ivā 'surāḥ (saṁtrasisyanti), vii, 3, 15; asurān iva vāsavaḥ, G. vi, 14, 8; vajreṇe 'ndra ivā 'surān, G. v, 50, 19; vajrahasto yathā Čakraḥ, R. vi, 67, 38; vajrāṅv vajraṃ dānaveśv iva vāsavaḥ (krodham mokṣye), R. vi, 25, 25; surānām iva vāsavaḥ, ib. 26, 37; nibudhān iva vāsavaḥ (pātu), M. vii, 6, 4; tridaçā iva vāsavaṃ, M. vi, 97, 24; vasavo vāsavaṃ yathā (v. l. iva), R. iv, 26, 36, etc.; marutām (maruddhir) iva vāsavaḥ, G. v, 31, 57; R. ii, 106, 27; sahasrākṣam ivā 'marah, R. iv, 26, 23. See No. 250.
vajrāçani, No. 275.

240, vajrāhata ivā 'calah, vii, 26, 16; R. vi, 69, 162 (ib. 95, yathā 'calo vajранipātabhagnah); papāta sahasā bhūmāu, v. i. aealāh, R. vii, 69, 36 (No. 148); G. iv, 48, 22 (R. 48, 21, v. l., paryastaiva parvatah); vajrakṛttā ivā 'calāh, R. vi, 69, 73. See Nos. 91, 218.

241, vajrāir iva girī hatah, vii, 15, 26; vajrēne 'va māhāgirihih, R. iv, 16, 23 (nihatāh.)

vanam agnir, No. 33.

242, vane vanyena jivatah, xii, 13, 10; xv, 11, 23; R. ii, 37, 2; 63, 27, and G. 80, 11; G. iv, 20, 7. Compare vane vanyena vartayan, Raghuv. xii, 20.

243, valmīka(m) iva pannagāh, vi, 117, 43; vii, 139, 7; R. iii, 20, 21; 29, 11. See Nos. 74, 139 ff., 150.

244, vavarṣa čaravārṣāni ('ena), vi, 47, 20 and 67; ix, 16, 33-34; etc.; R. vi, 58, 40, etc. Compare čaravārṣāni vavarṣa sah (or ca), common in M.; R. vi, 93, 18; čaravārṣāir avākīrat, M. vii, 18, 19; G. vi, 30, 11; R. vi, 100, 25; 103, 23. See No. 77.

vasavo, No. 239.

245, vākyajñō vākyakovidāh, iii, 278, 2; G. v, 7, 40; R. vi, 111, 97.

246, vākyam vākyaviṭāradāh, ii, 15, 10; v, 13, 10; R. v., 52, 4; 63, 15; vii, 87, 1; G. i, 60, 17; G. vi, 82, 46. Compare vākyam vākyavidām creṣṭaḥ, R. i, 70, 16; vi, 3, 6; vākyajñō and vākyavid vākyakucalāh, R. iv, 3, 24; vi, 17, 30; G. v, 81, 2 (G. 81, 46, castrāvid vākyakucalāh); sarve vākyaviṭāradāh, G. vi, 27, 11 (v. l. vākyakovidāh). Compare No. 307.

247, vājināṁ khuraqabādena rathane mishavanena ca, ix, 9, 14; G. vi, 111, 17, but with aśvānām for vājināṁ, where R. 127, 20 has khuraqabḍaṣ ca. In G. ii, 111, 46 (the second pada only) khuranemisvanena ca, where R. 103, 40 has rathane misamāhatā; rathane mishavanena ca is common in M., vii, 38, 12, etc.

248–249, (a) vātarurgha iva drumah, iii, 286, 4; C. xi, 611 = 21, 9, where is found a bhagna, as in vi, 13, 13; 14, 16; vii, 16, 4, but rugna occurs again in vii, 79, 25 (C. bhguna). Other forms in M. are vātahata, vāyurgha, vii, 9, 5; agnidagdha (all with iva drumah), iii, 63, 39; vāteritah
çāla ivā 'driçṛṇgāt, viii, 85, 38; iii, 16, 20, vātarugna iva kṣuṇno jīrṇamūlo vanaspatiḥ (vegavān nyapat-ad bhuvi). (b) Besides these, chinnamāla, iv, 16, 12; viii, 96, 54 (like chinne 'va kadali, No. 71). In R. the last (b) is the favorite form, though in iii, 20, 21, bhinnamūlā iva drumāḥ stands for G. 26, 24 chinnamāla; papāta sahaśā bhumānu chinnamāla i. d., G. ii, 74, 19; R. vi, 58, 54 = G. 32, 42; in R. iii, 29, 7, cīrṇamūla (= G. 35, 8, chinn) etc. Compare also vātanunna, M. vii, 190, 27 (vātanunna iva 'mbudāh, viii, 24, 27); chinnas tarur iva 'ranye, G. vi, 82, 115; drumā bhagnacikā iva, M. vi, 62, 44; vajrarugṇa iva 'calah, xiv, 76, 18. Other forms in R. are mūlabhraṣṭa, bhūmikampa, vātoddhūta, vajrāhata (all with iva drumah); bhagnā iva mahādrumāḥ. I enter only two as identical, but there may be more. Compare Nos. 53, 71, 136, 240. I add here another like interchange of ptc.: bhagnaduṣṭa iva 'ragah, R. i, 55, 9; cīrṇā, ix, 3, 7 (cf. 19, 3).

250, vāsavo Namuciṁ yathā, ix, 7, 38 (jahī cai 'nam); G. vi, 51, 102 (jaht 'nam); Čakreṇa Namucir yathā, G. vi, 18, 16 (compare 30, 17); Namucir vāsavaṁ yathā, G. iii, 31, 36 (= R. 25, 31, kruddham kruddha iva 'ntakah, Nos. 104–105); Namucir yathā Hariṁ! (samabhyaḥhāvat), G. iii, 32, 36; sa vrtra iva vajrēṇa phonena Namucir yathā Balo ve 'ndračanihaftaḥ, R. iii, 30, 28 (vā for iva, as often); dvandvyuddham sa dātmūn te [samarthah] Namucer ivā vāsavaḥ, R. iv, 11, 22. See No. 239.

251, vikṛṁ iva parvatāḥ (and instr. pl.), vi, 116, 39; iii, 172, 18; vii, 20, 50; G. iii, 56, 39; G. vi, 37, 30; 52, 37; interchanges with viṣṭṛṇa, viii, 27, 38; G. iv, 7, 23, viṣṭṛṇa = R. iv, 8, 24, viṣṭṛṇa; so viṣṭṛṇa in G. v, 87, 4; also prakṛṇa, R. iv, 5, 29; G. vi, 76, 13. Compare nirāhūta iva, G. v, 8, 4; patita, G. vi, 32, 24. See Nos. 75, 111.

252, vikhyātā triśu lokeṣu (above, No. 236); triśu lokeṣu viṣṛuta, iii, 84, 83; 85, 74; ix, 38, 38, etc.

253, vidyutā sādāmanī yathā, iii, 53, 12; 96, 22; R. iii, 52, 14, where G. 38, 19 has vyonmi, as in G. vi, 80, 24, where the v. l. is diptācanisamaprabā; also R. iii, 74, 34 (not in G.); R. vii, 32, 56 = G. 21, 57.
254, vidhidrṣṭena karmanā, iii, 166, 8; ix, 47, 10; R. i, 49, 19; Compare ṛṣidrṣṭena vidhinā, ix, 50, 12.

255, vidhūma iva pāvakaḥ, vi, 109, 35; 117, 48; xii, 251, 7; 325, 12; R. iv, 67, 7; vi, 77, 7; 88, 20. See Nos. 75, 111, 226, 283.

256, vidhūmo 'gnir iva jvalan, i, 102, 38; ix, 14, 20; xii, 334, 3; R. iii, 28, 19. See Nos. 33, 226.

257, vinādyā jalado yathā, vi, 49, 35; nādayan jalado yathā, R. iii, 70, 10; vineduh . . . jaladā iva, G. vi, 21, 22 (v. l. jaladopamāḥ); G. vi, 50, 36; jaladā iva ca 'neduh, R. vi, 60, 35.

258, vinirddgadhama pataṁgam iva vahninā, ii, 42, 19; vinirddghaḥ ċalabho vahninā yathā, G. vii, 23, 48. For another case of interchange between pataṁga and ċalabha in the same phrase, see No. 151.

vimarde tumule, No. 92.
vimukhikṛṭavikrama, No. 123.

259, vivatsāṃ iva dhenaṅaḥ (dhenukām), vii, 78, 18; R. ii, 41, 7. Compare gāur vivatste 'iva vatsalā, G. ii, 66, 28.

259 b, vivarṇavādanā kṛcā, iii, 54, 2; R. ii, 75, 7.

260, vivyāḍha niqiṭāḥ ċaraīḥ, vi, 45, 77; and passim; R, v, 44, 6; G. vi, 19, 55; and passim. See l. c. No. 10, p. 141, for variants.

261, vićālyakaranaṁ quḥām, vi, 81, 10: G. vi, 82, 39; 83, 9, etc. The passage in M. should be compared as a whole with G. vi, 71, 23. In M.: evam uktvā dadāv asmāi vićālyakaranaṁ quḥām oṣadhiṁ viṛyasampannāṁ vićālayaṁ ca 'bhavat tadā; in G.: evam uktas tu . . . vićālyakaranaṁ nāma . . . quḥām dadāu nasayām sa tasya gandham āghrāya vićālayaṁ samapadyata (all explained again in G. 82, 39).


262 b, viṣam agniṁ jalaṁ rajjum āsthāsyे tava kāraṇāt, iii, 56, 4 (Nala, 4, 4), where the situation is the same as in R. ii, 29, 21 (not in G.); viṣam agniṁ jalaṁ va 'ham āsthāsyē mṛtyukāraṇāt.

visphārya ca, No. 308.

263, visphūrjitaṁ iva ċaneḥ, iii, 51, 13, and often; G. iv, 5, 24; G. v, 23, 19 (R. 21, 24, nirghoṣam açaṇer iva).
264, vismayam paramaṁ gataḥ, ix, 54, 11; R. iv, 12, 5; R. v, 32, 3; gatvā, xiii, 14, 368; yāyān, M. iii, 71, 24, etc.; prāpā, G. vi, 16, 95; jagmuḥ, M. v, 131, 22; ix, 38, 10, 57, 9, etc.; R. vi, 107, 3; G. 99, 45; paraṁ vismayam āgataḥ, M. iv, 22, 93 (sarve); R. i, 69, 16; R. vi, 107, 3 (sarve); G. vi, 4, 44; paramaṁ vismayam gataḥ, G. iii, 30, 38; sarve vismayam āgataḥ, G. vi, 86, 11; ārutvā tu vismayam jagmuḥ, R. vi, 130, 40.

265, vismayotphullanayanāḥ, i, 134, 28; R. iii, 42, 34; G. v, 9, 60; olacanāḥ, M. i, 136, 1; xiii, 14, 386; Hariv. 3, 10, 45; R. vii, 37, 3, 29; G. iv, 63, 10; G. vi, 105, 21, where R. has kiṁ tv etad iti vismitāḥ; vismayākulacetasah, G. iv, 50, 14. See No. 332.

266, viro ranavicāradaḥ, vi, 57, 16; G. vi, 60, 4.

267, vrītravāsavayor iva, vi, 100, 51 (tayōḥ samabhavad yuddham); R. vi, 99, 31 (tayor abhūn mahāyuddham). Compare Nos. 231, 274.

268, vedavedāṅgaparāgāḥ, iii, 64, 81; xiii, 14, 62; G. ii, 70, 16; ottattvajñāḥ, metrical, M. vi, 14, 44, etc.

269, velām iva mahodadhīḥ, vii, 197, 6; R. vi, 76, 63; 118, 16; G. ii, 30, 30; velām iva samāsādyya, M. i, 227, 28; velām ivā 'sādyya yathā samudrāh, R. vi, 109, 21; velām iva mahārṇavaḥ, M. iv, 19, 22; ix, 3, 18; vele 'iva makara-layam, iv, 52, 19; vi, 108, 60, etc.

vyāttāyām, No. 94.

270, vyāghrakesariṇāv iva, vii, 14, 68; G. vi, 67, 32.

271, vyāghraḥ kṣudramṛgam yathā, iii, 10, 25 (jaghaṇa); vyāghṛat kṣudramṛga iva (trastāḥ), G. iii, 33, 21. Compare (trāsayan) sīnaḥ kṣudramṛgan yathā, M. iii, 288, 10; (drśtvā no 'dvijate), R. iii, 28, 13; sīnaḥ kṣudramṛga yathā (saumāstrāh), M. vi, 19, 10; vyādhibhiḥ ca vimathyante vyādhāiḥ kṣudramṛga iva, xii, 332, 29. See also Nos. 215, 316.

272, vyāttānanam ivā 'ntakam, vi, 63, 26; 107, 99; R. iii, 32, 6; and G. iii, 7, 8, where R. iii, 2, 6 has vyāditāyam; which phrase occurs also in M. vi, 114, 39. Compare viii, 91, 42, Kālānanam vyāttam ivā 'tighoram. For ivā 'ntaka see No. 104.

vyāhartaṁ upacakraṁ, No. 14.

vyuṣṭāyām, Nos. 94–95.
vyomni sādāmant, No. 253.

273, Cākratulyaparākramah. The common terminal is parākramah, to which is prefixed Yama, Vāyu, Cakra, etc., as in ix, 15, 10, Yama; G. vi, 83, 39, Vāyu; G. vi, 75, 2, Cakra. The last is naturally the most frequent, Cākratulyaparākramah, viii, 27, 27, etc.; G. iii, 42, 19; R. iv, 11, 43; 32, 11; vi, 69, 10 and 82; 71, 1; Cākratulyabalo 'pi san, G. iii, 47, 2. See Nos. 206, 293.

Cākradhvaja, No. 25.

274, Cākračambarayor iva, R. vi, 76, 77; (yathā yuddhe) Cākračambarayoḥ purā, M. vi, 100, 54. See Nos. 231, 267.

275, Cākračanisamasparcāṇ (carāṇ), vi, 108, 35; G. vi, 68, 6, where R. 88, 42 has sarpāṇ iva visolbāṇān; Indrācāni°, ix, 24, 57, etc.; R. vi, 98, 21; vajrācāni°, R. vi, 43, 32. So Cakra, Indra, and vajra, in Cākračanisamasvanam, Indrā°, vajrā°, M. vi, 44, 11; 62, 61; G. i, 42, 5 (mahā°, 33, 12); vajrā° also R. vi, 100, 32; G. iii, 26, 20; Cākračanisamprabhā, R. vi, 54, 2. Compare carāṇ aśanisamaspārcaḥ, M. vi, 117, 22 with Cākra° vajračanisamāśah carāṇ, R. vi, 88, 46 = G. 68, 10; also vajrānasamaspārcaḥ, G. vi, 70, 15 (= 90, 44, vajrānasamāśah).

Cākračanisvanam, ib. 61, 1, etc.

276, caṇkhadundubhiniḥsvanāḥ, i, 69, 6; nirghoṣaḥ, R. vi, 42, 39.

277, cātaço 'tha sahasraśaḥ, M. iii, 288, 24; vi, 35, 5; 57, 23; 59, 10; vii, 16, 5, etc.; R. ii, 57, 9; G. i, 56, 6; G. iii, 34, 14; G. iv, 50, 18; G. v, 73, 23; 95, 24; G. vi, 99, 14. Common is the terminal cātasahasraśaḥ, M. i, 134, 28; G. ii, 57, 9, etc.

cāravarsaṁ vavarṣa ca, etc., No. 244.

278, cāravarsaṁ srjantaṁ (two pādas), vi, 59, 66; 106, 53; srjantam cāravarsaṁ, G. vi, 18, 36.

279, cāraç cāpād iva cyutaḥ, R. iv, 11, 14; cāraç cāpagnacyutāḥ, G. iii, 33, 16, where R. 27, 13 has gunāc cyutān. M. has cāpacyutāḥ carāḥ, vi, 48, 79; 116, 51, etc., but not I think cāpagnacyutāḥ, guna for jya being rare in M., though it occurs a few times, e. g., viii, 25, 39; 26, 30; iii, 282, 12. cāreṇa 'nataparvāṇa, No. 170.

280, cāraḥ kanakabhūṣanāḥ (or 'ñāḥ), vi, 64, 15; ix, 13, 43; R. vi, 71, 40; G. vi, 18, 45, where R. kaṭekaṇa (as in G. vi, 86, 30); G. vi, 55, 28; cāraḥ hemavibhūṣitāḥ, R. iv, 8, 22;
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united with phrase No. 87 in ix, 28, 41. See Nos. 85, 336.
281, carái£ açvisopamãih (or oãah), vii, 37, 12; ix, 16, 11; R. vi, 88, 42; G. vi, 76, 25; jvalitãçvisopamãän, M. vi, 100, 5. For other references, see l. c. No. 10, p. 146.
282, caráãh sarpaçvisopamãih (or oãah), vi, 117, 22; R. vi, 88, 18.
283, çalabhã iva pávakam, vii, 36, 21; viii, 24, 61; 27, 7; xi, 25, 14; G. vi, 44, 38, where R. 65, 43 has pataãgan; çalabhãã iva márutah (vyadhamat), M. vii, 145, 70. Compare also the close resemblance in çalabhânam iva vrajãh or vrajã iva, M. ix, 11, 25; 13, 42, where C. 697 has çakunãam (in the former, one of a group of similes of arrows, bhramaranãã iva vrâtãh çalabhãnam iva vrajãh hrãdindya iva meghebhyaã, scil. nyapatan caráãh), and in R. vi, 41, 49, çalabhãnam ivo 'dgamaã; ix, 13, 41, ivã 'yatim (with vrajã iva above), perhaps for 'valim? Compare hañsåvali, R. vi, 69, 37. Another favorite simile is the lamp, on which, however, I have at hand, besides the iva pávakam phrases above, only çalabhã iva te diptam agnim prãpya yauh ksayam, M. vii, 146, 14; te pávakam ivã 'sadya çalabhã jivitaksaye jagmur vinãçaã sarve vãi, G. v. 39, 12; çalabhã yathã dípaãm (piñayeyuã) mumùr ñavaã (sùryam abhragaãã iva), M. vii, 22, 26. See Nos. 151, 181, 258.
284, cãrdãla iva kuñjaram, vii, 14, 67; also in G., but ref. lost. Terminal, No. 297.
285, çiro bhraãjãñukundalam, iii, 289, 23; çiro jvalitakundalam, R. vi, 100, 15; 103, 20. See No. 317.
286, çîghragãm ùrmimãlinm, R. ìi, 55, 22, of Yamuna (cf. 113, 21); Vîtastâm (for çîghragãm), xiii, 25, 7; ùrmimãlinam aksoãbyam ksubhyantam iva sãgaram, R. ìi, 18, 6; which adds upaplutam ivã 'dityam, a phrase found also in xiv, 11, 2, in the same situation.
287, çîghram prañavitãr hayãih, M. vii, 98, 10; G. ìi, 70, 3, and 6, where R. 68, 6 has çîghrama çîghrañavãr hayãih. See No. 78.
288, çubhaãã vã yadi vã pãpam, v, 34, 4; R. iv, 30, 72. This phrase introduces in these passages two different proverbs. The same occurs xvii, 3, 31, etc.; R. ìi, 18, 25, in a general relation. The first vã is often omitted in such turns, as in G. v, 64, 6 = Manu xi, 233, ajñãnãd yadi vã
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jñānāt (followed in G. by na kaçein nā 'parādhyati = R. vi, 113, 43, where G. 98, 34 has na kaçeid apa').

cuşkam vanam, No. 33.

289, çṛṅgābhyaṁ vr̥ṣabhāv iva, ix, 14, 25 (tatakasatus tadā 'nyon-
yam); govrśo yathā, G. iii, 32, 4. In the latter case the
warrior thus receives arrows! The reading is nimīlīta
iva 'ṛṣabhāh, R. iii, 26, 4. Compare çṛṅgināu govrśāv iva,
v. i. vr̥ṣabhāv, ix, 57, 2.

çokabāspaparipluta and some other çoka-forms, Nos. 137,
190.

290, çokopahatacetanāh, iii, 59, 14; R. iv, 1, 124; "etetamas, M.
vii, 191, 1; ix, 41, 25. These to add to No. 190.

vyasantam iva, No. 143.

291, saṁvartako iva 'nalah, vi, 95, 54; G. iii, 70, 1; G. v, 8, 7;
G. vi, 83, 16. See Nos. 33, 75, 196.

292, sakhe satyena te čape, i, 131, 46; G. iv, 13, 34. Compare,
among other variants, vīra satyena te čape, G. ii, 48, 4,
where R. 51, 4 has satyenā 'va ca te čape; satyenā 'va
čapāmy aham, R. iv, 7, 22; satyena vāi čape devi, G. v,
34, 7. See No. 294.

293, satyadharma-parāyaṇaṁ, iii, 64, 83; vii, 12, 26; xii, 278, 39;
337, 63; R. vii, 74, 19 (where G. has puraskṛtya); G. i,
59, 7; G. ii, 74, 26; G. ii, 19, 6, where R. 22, 9 has nityaṁ
satyaparākramaṁ; wherewith compare nityaṁ dharmapa-
rayaṇaṁ, G. iv, 38, 43. Compare satyavrata-parāyaṇaṁ,
M. i, 109, 6; xiii, 107, 122; G. ii, 21, 3. Compare also sat-
yaparākramaṁ, terminal after dhīman, M. iii, 73, 23; after
Rāmaḥ, G. iii, 33, 10; G. v. 66, 21; after satyaṁ, R. vi,
119, 12. For the terminals parāyaṇa, parākrama, see Nos.
69, 116, 163, 206, 273.

294, satyam etad bravmi te, i, 73, 17; iii, 56, 14; 57, 32; xiii,
14, 178, etc.; G. ii, 15, 19; G. v, 6, 13; 36, 70; G. vi, 98,
15; etat satyam, G. vi, 23, 32; tattvam etad, often in R.;
satyenā 'ham, R. v, 38, 65; satyam pratiṣñomi te, R. v,
1, 148; vi, 100, 48; satyam etan nibodha me, G. iv, 61,
4; satyam etan nibodhadhvam, M. iii, 298, 13; satyam
etad vaco mama, ix, 35, 75. See No. 292.

295, saṁdaçya daçanāir oṣṭham, vi, 91, 31; R. vi, 95, 3 (in M.
with the phrase srkkiṁ parisaññihan; in R., with kro-
dhasaṁraktañcanaṁ); R. vi, 69, 88, where G. 49, 76 has
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sampūdyā daçanāir oṣṭhāu ; ix, 11, 49, samdaṣya daçana-cechadam (C. 577, samdaṣṭa²).

296, sapakṣāv iva parvatau, vii, 14, 71 ; R. ii, 89, 19. Compare saṅrūgāv iva parvatau, M. vii, 14, 25 ; ix, 12, 22 ; 55, 40 ; Kālāsam iva çrūgniṇam, vi, 62, 33 ; 94, 23. See Nos. 76, 111, 251.

saptacirśan, No. 150.

297, samadāv iva kuññarāu, i, 134, 33 and 34 ; R. vi, 66, 9 (plural) ; samadā iva hastināh, G. v, 81, 35.

298, samantād akutobhayāh, xii, 68, 30 ; G. iii, 11, 17 ; both after yathākāmam, but with different application ; that of M. being found elsewhere, R. ii, 67, 18 (A. J. Phil. vol. xx, p. 33).

299, samudraṁ saritāṁ patim, ix, 50, 15 ; R. iv, 11, 8.

300, sarvakāmamasṛḍdhini, ii, 21, 25 ; ix, 38, 7, inā, etc. ; R. iii, 47, 4, etc.

301, sarvapāpapranaçanam (parva) i, 2, 79, etc. ; R. vii, 83, 4 (dharma-pravacanam) ; mahāpāpapranaçanì (kathā), R. vii, 37, 4, 7.

302, sarvabhūta (bhayaṁkara and) bhayāvaha (the former, ix, 36, 26 ; the latter), G. vi, 60, 49, where R. 69, 149 has sārvabhāuma ; xiii, 14, 259. Also Manu viii, 347, sarvabhūtabhayāvahān. See also No. 304.

303, sarvalakṣaṇalakṣitā(ḥ), xii, 337, 35 ; R. vii, 37, 3, 24 ; sampannām, ix, 6, 13, etc. In R. with phrase No. 236.

sarvalokapitāmahāh, No. 194.

304, sarvalokabhayaṁkaram, iii, 65, 20 ; R. iv, 8, 19 ; G. vi, 91, 1, where R. 107, 1, has sarvalokabhayaṁvahām ; R. vi, 108, 30 ; bhayāvahām also in xii, 68, 38 ; R. i, 9, 9 ; vii, 22, 6 ; trāṭokasya bhayāvahāḥ, ix, 49, 14. See No. 302.

305, sarvalokavigarhitam, i, 118, 22 ; R. vi, 94, 9 ; G. ii, 76, 5 and 13 ; G. iii, 75, 15, etc.

sarvalokasya pagyatah, No. 110.

306, sarvaçāstraviçāradah, ii, 5, 8 ; ii, 73, 15 ; vi, 14, 51 ; xiii, 32, 1 ; R. ii, 43, 19 ; iii, 5, 32 ; iv, 54, 5 ; G. vi, 51, 26 (where R. vi, 71, 28 has sarvaçāstravidusām varah) ; Manu, vii, 63. Compare G. v, 2, 2, sarvaçāstrārthakovidam, where R. iv, 66, 2 has sarvaçāstravidām varah. Compare No. 266.
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sarvābharaṇabhūṣita, No. 113.
307, sarve yuddhaviśaradāh, āt, 276, 13; vii, 23, 18; G. vi, 29, 2. Compare yuddham (or yuddhe) yuddhaviśaradāh, R. vi, 65, 10; G. vi, 31, 7; 42, 11; 76, 31; yudhi y°, ib. 77, 26. Compare No. 246.
308, sa visphārya mahāc cāpam, vi, 49, 26; G. vi, 51, 5; 79, 9 (ib. 43, visphārya ca). In R. vi, 71, 5 (= G. 51, 5) tada cāpam, where as often, the fact may be remarked that G., mahāc cāpam, is more stereotyped than R.
309, savisphuliniā nirbhidya nipapāta mahātale, vii, 92, 67; savisphuliniān sajvalam nipapāta mahātale, R. vi, 67, 23. In M., sa jvalantī maholke 'va precedes. See No. 148.
sāttā°, No. 186.
311, sāgara makaralayaḥ, vii, 77, 5; sg., ix, 47, 7; G. iv, 9, 38.
312, sādhuvādo māhān abhūt, vii, 100, 3; R. vii, 96, 11; jajñe, ix, 13, 3; sādhu sādhv iti cūkruquḥ, M. vii, 14, 84; cā 'bravit, R. iv, 8, 25; vi, 19, 27; G. v, 56, 35; sādhu sādhv iti Rāmasya tat karma samapūjayan, R. vi, 93, 36; sādhu sādhv iti te nedaḥ, ib. 44, 31; iti saṁhṛṣṭāḥ, G. ii, 88, 22 (with vičukruquḥ); sādhu sādhv ite te sarve pūjayaṁ cakrire tada, M. v, 160, 36; sādhu iti vādinaḥ, R. vii, 32, 65.
313, sāyakaśīr marmabhedibhiḥ, vii, 21, 10; G. iv, 15, 9; iṣu- bhir, G. vi, 75, 65; nārācāir, M. vii, 16, 7.
314, sīnhekhelagatiḥ (çrīmān), i, 188, 10; sīnhekhelagatim (vā- kyan), G. i, 79, 10. Compare in triśṭubh, gajahelagāmin, xv, 25, 7, with mattagajendragāmin in 6. See No. 203.
315, sīnhanādāṇaḥ ca kurvantah, vi, 64, 84; kurvatām, R. vi, 75, 41; G. vi, 32, 13, where R. 58, 17 has nardatām; sīn- hanādāṇa naṇada ca, ix, 13, 27; athā 'karot, ix, 3, 3; pracakrire, ix, 8, 19, etc.
sīnhaḥ kṣudramrgan yathā and sīnhārdita, Nos. 215, 271.
317, sumṛṣṭamāṇikundalāḥ, i, 78, 17; iv, 18, 19; G. vi, 37, 56; pra°, M. iii, 57, 4; sumṛṣṭamaṇitoraṇam, G. v, 16, 39. See No. 285.

318, susrāva rudhiram gātrār gārikam parvato yathā, ix, 13, 14; susruvā rudhiram bhūri nagā gārikadhātuvaṭ, G. vi, 59, 13. With the first pādā of G. here, compare cakāra rudhiram bhūri M. iii, 279, 5; and compare also G. v, 83, 12, rudhirasravaṇaṅī santu gārikānām iva 'kāraḥ.

319, sūtāmaṇagadhahabandinām, vii, 7, 8; G. ii, 26, 14, nom., where R. 26, 12 has bandiha ... sūtāmaṇagadhah.

320, srkkiṇī parīsamlihan, iii, 157, 50; iv, 21, 51; vi, 91, 31; 111, 11; vii, 146, 120; ix, 14, 40, etc., v. l., parilelihan, C. vi, 4,094 = 91, 31; samlihan rājan, ix, 55, 24; in iii, 124, 24, lelihan jihvāyā vaktram (vyāttānano ghoradrāṣṭir grasann iva jagad balat sa bhakṣayiṣyam) samukraddhah, as in R. vi, 8, 22 = G. v, 79, 12, kruddhaḥ parilihan srkkiṇī (G. vaktraṁ) jihvayā. In R. vi, 67, 140, jihvāyā parilihyantain srkkiṇī coniteksite, where G. 46, 86 has lelihanam asṛg vaktraṁ jihvāyā conitokṣi-tam. Compare, also in R., oṣṭhau parilihan quṣkau (netrār aniśiṣaḥ iva mṛtubhūta iva 'ṛtas tu). In M. vi, 64, 31, srkkiṇī, where C. 2,840 has srkkiṇīm; in other cases, srkkiṇī is the Bombay reading, as observed PW. s. v. where srkyv° is preferred. The type is not yet stereotyped in R., as it is in M.'s titular phrase. See Nos. 106, 295.

321, se 'ndraiḥ api surāsurāḥ, vii, 12, 28, etc.; R. vi, 48, 30. In M. preceded by na hi cakyo Yudhiṣṭhirah grahītum samare rājan; in R. by ne 'mānuḥ cakyaṁ raṇe jetum. The phrase is not infrequent.

sthitaṁ ċāilam, No. 91.

322, sphurate nayanaṁ savyaṁ bāhuḥ ca hṛdayaṁ ca me, R. iii, 59, 4; sphurate nayanaṁ ca 'syā savyaṁ bhayanivedanam bāhuḥ prakampate savyaḥ, H. 2, 110, 25.

323, smitapürvāvhibhasīṇī, iii, 55, 19; xii, 326, 35; H. 2, 88, 35; R. vi, 34, 2; G. iii, 49, 5; "bhāṣita, M. i, 140, 55; nityāṁ susmitabhāṣīṇī, R. v, 16, 21 (G. sa°); smitapūrvam abhāṣa, G. v, 92, 12; smitapūrvāvhibhāṣaṇam, Raghuv. xvii, 31.
324, svabāhubalam āgṛitaḥ, iii, 285, 10; G. iii, 63, 13; G. vi, 84, 20; āgṛitya, M. i, 140, 38; v, 133, 45. Compare Manu ix, 255, rāṣṭraṁ bāhubalāgṛitam.

325, svabāhubalavīreyaḥ, vii, 4, 5; G. vi, 25, 35.

svaṇapuṇkhāḥ, Nos. 34, 234.

326, svarbhānur iva bhāskaram, iii, 11, 52, paryadhāvata; G. iii, 30, 44, abhyadhāvata. See No. 73.

327, svāireśv api kutāḥ capan (nā 'ham mrśā bravīmy evam), i, 42, 2; svāireśv api na tu brūyām anṛtaṁ kaceid apy aham (after pated dyauḥ No. 153), G. ii, 15, 29; nā 'ham mithyā vaco brūyāṁ svāireśv api kuto 'nyathā, xiii, 51, 17.

328, hate tasmin hataṁ sarvam, R. vi, 65, 45; tasmin hate hataṁ sarvam, ix, 7, 37; mūle hate, etc., G. vi, 79, 6; tasmin jite jitaṁ sarvam, R. vii, 20, 17; in triṣṭubh, R. vi, 67, 71, asmin hate sarvam idāṁ hataṁ syāt (G. 46, 57, vipañnam).

329, hanta te kathayisyāmi, i, 94, 4; iii, 201, 9; vii, 12, 1; ix, 44, 5; xii, 341, 18; H. 1, 4, 31, etc.; R. i, 48, 14, etc. Compare hanta te 'ham pravakṣyāmi, M. vi, 101, 5; hanta te kirtayisyāmi; hanta te sampravakṣyāmi, G. vi, 3, 1. In Kāth. Up. v, 6, hanta ta idam (te 'dam) pravakṣyāmi guhyam brahma sanātanaṁ; kath., Gītā, 10, 19.

330, harīṇāṁ vātaraṇāhasāṁ, iii, 42, 7 (daça vājisahasrāṇi); 284, 23; sahasram api cā 'qvānāṁ degyānāṁ vātaraṇāhasām, G. ii, 72, 23.

331, harṣagadgadayā vācā, iii, 167, 2; xiii, 14, 342; R. vii, 33, 9; G. vi, 98, 13, 109. There are many harṣa” compounds like those in bāspa above, Nos. 190–193; harṣavyākula-locaṇaḥ, R. iv, 5, 21; harṣabāspākuleśaṇa, G. vi, 112, 100; harṣaparyākuleśaṇa, R. vi, 50, 45; harṣagadgadam uvāca or vacanam, M. iii, 138, 12; G. iii, 3, 13. The common phrase of G. bāspagadgadyā vācā or girā is frequently unrepresented in the other text: G. i, 79, 24; ii, 35, 30; bāspagadgadabhāṣīnī, G. iv, 19, 29 (but this occurs R. vi, 116, 17); G. v, 33, 2; G. vi, 101, 19; also R. v, 67, 33, where G. has saṃdīghayā girā (noticed above in Nos. 190–193); but R. has bāspagadgadyā girā in v, 25, 2; 39, 7; 40, 21; vi, 113, 16; with a new turn (compare iv, 8, 16, harṣavyākulitākṣaram) in v, 38, 11,
baspapragnathitakṣaram, where G. 36, 10 has bāṣpagaṆa-
gadabhāṣīṇaḥ; both have roṣagadgadaya vācā, R. vi, 29, 6, = G. 5, 4. M. has haṁṣagadgadabhāṣīṇī, iv, 9, 10; xi, 18, 14, etc., as also abhravid bāṣpagaṆagadamaṁ, iii, 259, 12; bāṣpasamīdigdhaya girī and vācā, iii, 64, 101; 74, 24, etc. G.'s bāṣpagaṆagadaya tataḥ, after vācā, ii, 58, 13, is in R. sabāṅgaraṇībhāṣīṇaḥ. Compare R. iv, 7, 1 (vākyam) sabāṅpoṁ bāṣpagaṆagadahaṁ. In R. vii, 6, 3, bhayagadgada- bhāṣīnaḥ. In R. iv, 8, 29, etāvad uktvā vacanāṁ bāṣpa-
duṣitālocanaṁ bāṣpaduṣitaya vācā no 'ceaiḥ čaknoti bhāṣītuṁ. See Nos. 190–193.

332, harsenotphullanayanaṁ, vii, 39, 9; G. ii, 74, 3; harsūṁ ut, ix, 60, 42. See No. 265.

333, hāhākāram pramuṇcantaḥ, iii, 65, 11; vimuṇcatāṁ, G. vi, 54, 11. A common form is hāhākāro mahāṁ āsīt, vi, 48, 84; 49, 38; ix, 44, 42, etc.; tadbhavat, ix, 16, 44; hāhā-
kāro mahāṁ abhūt, R. vii, 69, 13. Compare also hāhā-
bhūtam ca tat sarvam (āṣīd nāgaram), xiii, 53, 41; hāhābhūtaṁ tadbhavat sarvā Lāṅkā, G. vi, 93, 4. The Hāhā-
hūḥ pair of G. vi, 82, 50 are found xii, 325, 16, hāhā-
hūḥaṁ ca gacchadi vacanāṁ tuṣṭuvaṁ.

334, hāhā-kilakilacabdaṁ, vi, 112, 35; atah ku, G. v, 65, 12; tataḥ, viii, 28, 11; hrṣṭāṁ, ix, 18, 30, etc.; āsīt, M. i, 69, 8; āste caṭacatcaṭabdaṁ, C. ix, 1,249 = B. 23, 70, kaṭakaṭā. Compare No. 81.

335, hemajalaparikṣrtaṁ, iii, 312, 44; R. vi, 102, 11; jātarūpa, ix, 32, 39.

336, hemapaṭṭavibhūsitaṁ, ix, 14, 30; G. vi, 106, 23 (padma in R. for paṭṭaṁ); hemapaṭṭanibhāṣīṇaṁ, ix, 32, 63; 6 parisha-
kṛtaṁ, vii, 29, 35; usually of club or car. The ending hemaparikṣṛtaṁ is found passim, ix, 16, 39; 21, 22; 57, 46; G. iv, 11, 4, when R. 12, 4 has svarṇa; G. vii, 14, 7; 18, 8. See No. 280.

337, hemapunḵhāṁ cilācitaiṁ, vii, 29, 4; rukmapunḵhāṁ cilāci-
taiṁ, G. iii, 8, 7; cf. ix, 25, 7; 28, 5, etc. For svarṇapuṅkhaṁ, see No. 234.

In presenting this list, I must again call attention to what has been said on p. 72. The phrases have been collected at haphazard and cannot be used to determine the relation of one
text of one epic, but only to show the general base of epic phraseology. A more complete list would be needed for special critical purposes. Under No. 196, I have acknowledged a contribution from Professor Hardy. Eighteen parallels were also kindly sent me by Professor Jacobi, two of which, Nos. 153 b and 229 b, I had not previously enrolled. The parallels were slowly collected by memory, chance, and often, as I wish particularly to acknowledge, from the ample store of citations in the Petersburg Lexicon, which has given me many a trail to follow. But even in correcting the proofs I find more cases. Thus the simile of No. 149 is the same as that of Dhammapada 327, and the stanza on repentance, na tat kuryām punar iti, iii, 207, 51, is comparable in wording with Dh. P. 306. But on this field specialists can doubtless find many more cases. A long (omitted) parallel is that of M. xvi, 2, 6, cīcikucī 'ti vācanti sārikā Vṛṣṇi-veṇmasu, and R. vi, 35, 32, cīcikucī 'ti vācantaḥ čārikā (sic) veṇmasu sthitāḥ, with the circumjacent stanzas. For one beginning upaplutam (not in place), see under No. 286.
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ILLUSTRATIONS OF EPIC ČLOKA FORMS.

Prior Pāda of Epic Čloka.1

The pathyā, ॐ - ॐ - ॐ, sāha tvayā gamiṣyāmi; āvighnam astu Sāvitrīyāḥ; dyūte sa nirjītaq cāi 'vā; puṇyāhāvacane rājñāḥ. For cēsura, further: ṛcarāh kadambakīrṇtya, vii, 146, 124; ādād bubhukṣito māṁsaṁ, R. vi, 60, 63. This measure is found passim but is less frequent than No. 6, q. v.

1, ॐ - ॐ - ॐ - ॐ, kārīṣyāmy etad evām cā; kāthāyoge kathāyoge; āsīd rājā Nimir nāmā; ācēs tān vāi munin sarvān. To avoid third vipulā after spondée, yugeśv Ṭāsāu chatresu (sic, vii, 159, 36 = 7,077). For cēsura: madhunī droṇamātraṁ; nā 'taḥ paṇḍyasti kācīd.

2, ॐ - ॐ - ॐ - ॐ, abhigamyo 'pasaṁgṛhyā; bāhudeyaq ca rājānah; nā 'ṛjunaḥ khedam āyātā; tatra gacchanti rājānah. For cēsura: rākṣasāḥ stūyamānah san; tam ajāṁ kāraṇātmānāṁ.

3, ॐ - ॐ - ॐ - ॐ, nā caṣṭreṇa na caṣṭreṇa; tātas trpta iti jñātvā; bhūtāc cāi 'va bhaviṣyaq cā; vedasyo 'paniṣat satyaṁ. For cēsura: saṁgraṁe samunpoḍhe ca (R. ii, 75, 39, cf. Āṣṭ. G. S. iii, 12, 1); rudantau rudatī duḥkhāt;

4, ॐ - ॐ - ॐ - ॐ, nā caṣṭreṇa na caṣṭreṇa; tātas trpta iti jñātvā; bhūtāc cāi 'va bhaviṣyaq cā; vedasyo 'paniṣat satyaṁ. For cēsura: saṁgraṁe samunpoḍhe ca (R. ii, 75, 39, cf. Āṣṭ. G. S. iii, 12, 1); rudantau rudatī duḥkhāt;

1 Some of the examples, especially in the case of rare forms, have already been given by Jacobi in his Rāmāyaṇa, and in the Gurupūjakāumudī. For the following lists I have sometimes drawn also on examples furnished by Gildemeister, Böhtlingk, and Benfey. References for usual cases are not necessary, and have not been given. Sporadic and rare forms, or those of special interest, are referred to their place.
udāśānavād āśino; teśām āpatatām ābdaḥ; mantrabrāhma-\nvakartāraḥ. This foot is sometimes duplicated, as it is both \nmetrically and verbally in viniḥvasya viniḥvasya, and \nmay be repeated a third time, not only with initial syllaba \nanceps, as in viii, 45, 19, dharmam Pāñcanadām dṛṣṭvā dhig \nity āha pitāmahāḥ, but even syllable for syllable, as in vii, \n201, 62, ānīyāṁśām ānubhyāc ca bhādadbhyāc ca. Not in- \nfrequently, however, this measure seems to be avoided in \nfavor of No. 6, as in vasāma (sic) susukham putra, i, 157, 12. \n5, \n\n\n\nvāyī tiṣṭhāti deveqā; viditam bhavatāṁ \nsarvāḥ; sākṛti āha dadānī ’tī (iii, 294, 26 = Manu ix, 47); \nkā ’si devi kuto vā tvām. For caesura: kuru me vaca- \nnaṁ tāta; jagati ’ndrajīd ity eva; dhruvam ātmajāyam \nmatvā; kṣatajokṣitasarvāṅgāḥ; mṛṣṭakāñcānakoṣānam; \nlāṅgalaglapitagrīvāḥ. This arrangement is popular, often \nappearing in groups, as in daksīṇena ca mārgena . . . gaja- \nvājīsamākīrṇām . . . vāhayasva mahābhāga, R. ii, 92,13–14, \netc. Contrasted trochaic and iambic opening is somewhat \naffected (Nos. 5 and 3), as in: yo balād anucāstī ’ha . . . \nmīratāṁ anuvṛttam tū . . . pradīpya yaḥ pradīptaṅnim, \ni, 64, 9–10. The pyrrhic opening is generally preferred; \nthe amphimacer, although not shunned (mā ācīro, nara- \ncārdūla, ix, 63, 53, etc.) is often avoided when in one word, \nas in Nala, 5, 8, muśaṅtanī (sic) prabhaya rājīṇām; so \nkurvantīm, ib. 16, 11, etc. This may be due, however, to \ngrammatical unifying (p. 250). Many examples give an \nanapestic fall according to the natural division of the \nwords, as in vii, 54, 57, asiṇā gadayā čaktyā dhanausā ca \nmaḥarathah. On na bibheti yadā ca ’yaṁ, see below the \note to No. 35. \n6, \n\n\n\nānēkačataabhāumāṇī; vānaṁ kusumitaṁ \ndraṣṭum; br̥hyāsta janaśaṁsatiḥ; yat tae chr̥ṇu mahā- \nbāhō. For caesura: dole ’va muhur āyāti; kim ābharaṇa-\nkṛtyena; antahpuracarān sarvān; mā bhāir iti tam āhe \n’ndraḥ. This also is a favorite combination, though less \nfrequent than Nos. 4 and 5. It appears in groups, as in \ni, 12, 14, where three successive pādas begin – – – (– – – ; or R. ii, 94, 4–5, 7, where three neighboring \nhemistichs begin thus (the last, nānāmṛgagaṇṇair ḍvīpita-\nkṣvyakṣagaṇṇair vṛtalḥ). See No. 4, ad finem.
7, सूचितम अनान्गाम cā, vi, 9, 35; रा०मिनतम vā 'दियाय v, 156, 12; एसा हि धार्षतो विरो, C. vii, 8, 821, एसो in B. Compare No. 33, note.

8, पा०सकाशाहायस tu, xiii, 93, 79; phalakaparidhānaq ca, xiii, 304, 14 (parallel to चिंहांशापरिद्वायह, etc.; metrically bettered in C., phalaka than).

First vipulā, सूचितम. Cæsura usually after the fourth or fifth. Final brevis not unusual even in R.; and common in Mbh. All forms are found in both epics, except No. 12, which is sporadic in both, and No. 13, unique. See p. 221.

9, अथ 'त्थितेशु बाहुः; याथा याथा हि नरपाति; तव द्रव्याद्वा गाणयति; गतवा, Sudeva, nagarīm. For cæsura: sa kampayan iva mahīm; anekavakrāṇayanām; daṇṭrākaraśāvadanasam; satvarah rajas tama iti; tvayā hi me bahu krtaṁ yad anyāḥ (triṣṭubh, Nala, 18, 20).

This combination, common in the older and freer style, declines in Rāmāyaṇa and classical poetry. As an example of the refinement of G., it is interesting in view of this fact to notice that No. 9 is often adhered even in the later R., when omitted (or altered) in G. For example, both āpītavāṇavaṇadānām, R. ii, 76, 4 (not in G.); sukho-śitāḥ sma bhagavān, R. iii, 8, 5 (smo in G.); mahodaraq ca cāyitaḥ, R. v, 48, 8 c (not in G.); Vibhūṣāṇena sahito, R. vi, 85, 35 (not in G.); avaçyam eva labhate, R. vi, 111, 25 (not in G.); and also ahāṁ Yamaq ca Varuṇaḥ, R. vii, 6, 6 (otherwise G.); mātuḥ kulaṁ pitṛkulaṁ, R. vii, 9, 11 (otherwise G.); nihatya tāṁs tu samare, R. vii, 11, 17 (otherwise G.); sanakramīnamakarāsamudrasya, R. vii, 32, 35 (otherwise G.); tasmāt purā duhitaram, R. vii, 12, 10 (otherwise G.). But in the (interpolated?) passage, G. vii, 23, 45 and 46, the form occurs twice.

10, नā hantavāyā śtriya iti, vii, 143, 67; na čačaḥ sā jayātim, R. iv, 6, 7; bhāveyar vedaviduṣhaḥ; yogi yuñūta satatām; yah pujyāh pujayasi mām. For cæsura: tataḥ sā bāṣpakalayaḥ; nā 'yaṁ loko 'sti na paro; putraḥ ca me vinihaṭāḥ; hūḥa rājann iti muhūr; mrgīv-

1 In R. iv, 43, 16 vicinata (čtha in 12) mahābhāgam may be for vicinuta; but more probably the verb was ab initio modernized to the a-conjugation, like inv, jinv, pinv. The usual epic form is middle vicinudhram.
otphullanayanā; chāyāsamsaktasalilo; kim kāryam brūhi bhagavan. To avoid second vipulā after spondee, vayām pacīyāma (sic) tapasā. See p. 248.

11, ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ, uṣītāḥ smo ha vasatīm; Dāmayantyā saha Nalāḥ; yatra tad brahma paramām; yena doṣo na bhavitā. For cāsura: candralekham īva navām; annasaṃskāram api cā; kuṇjaradvīpamahiśa; brāhmaṇaṇksatriyaviścām; āgrato vāyucapalāḥ; Sarayūṃ punyasadāḥ. When ending in brevis often followed by another or two: salilasthas tava sutva, idāṁ, ix, 31, 37; sa tatho 'ktvā munijanam, arāj-; uṣītāḥ smo ha vasatīm anujānātu, R. ii, 54, 37. Nos. 10 and 11 prevail over No. 9 in the later style. There is no general preference for either of the former two in the Mbh., but in R. No. 11 is more common than No. 10, as it often is in parts of Mbh.¹

12, ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ, pradīptāc ca qikhimukhāḥ, vii, 146, 7; viddhi tvam tu naram ṛṣīm, xv, 31, 11; tan no jyotir abhīhataṁ, ii, 72, 7; tadā vartmasu calitāḥ, R. vii, 16, 30 (v. l. in G.). The last example is peculiar in not having the cāsura after the fourth syllable, where, as Professor Jacobi has shown, irregular forms are usually (but, it may be added, not by any means invariably) cut.

13, ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ, jalacāraḥ sthalacāraḥ, G. i, 13, 29. Second vipulā, ॐ ॐ ॐ. Cāsura usually after fourth or fifth syllable; final prevailing long (brevis quite rare in R.). No. 14 is the only form usually found in R. but Nos. 15 and 16 are common enough in Mbh.; all the other forms except a sporadic No. 18 being absent in R. and sporadic only in Mbh. See p. 221. I give here several examples of final brevis and therewith variant cāsuras. The cases I take chiefly from R., because they are anomalous there and not so easily found as in M.

14, ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ, sārāṁ surāpāḥ pibatā, R. ii, 91, 52; anāhitāgni çatagūr; yāto yato niçearati; anor anṛyān su-manāḥ, v, 46, 31 (also a triṣṭubh opening); ávidhyad ácaryasuto; jāgarti cāi 'va svapīt; rājādhārajo bhavatī; dino yayāu nāgapurāṁ; tvām eva sarvāṁ vīcāti; viro

¹ So far as I have noticed, this form of vipulā least often has final brevis in R., as in iii, 16, 22, nā 'vagāhanti salīlām, out of twenty-nine with long final (in a thousand verses).
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jananya mama ca, R. v, 39, 2; hā Karna hā Karna iti; somena sārdham ca tavā; vāsānsi yāvanti labhe; Rāmāyaṇaṁ vedasamaṁ, R. vii, 111, 4; dāvāgndīptāni yathā; sā cintayāmāsa tadā; udvejite me hṛdayāṁ.

15, सच्छ, bhāvān dharma dharma iti; Ghṛtācīṁ nāma 'psarasām; dūravāram durvisamaṁ, R. vi, 90, 66; tato vāyuḥ prādur abhūt; tātaḥ kruddho vāyusutaḥ, R. vi, 59, 112; pārı̄ṛāntam pathy abhavat, R. ii, 72, 9; pānāvāḥ kīṁ vyāharase; sāhasrayāṁā nrpane; yāvad bhūmer āyur ihā; ko māṁ nāṁma kirtayat; jñātvā rakṣo bhimabalām R. vi, 60, 15; praty ādityam praty analaṁ; drṣṭve 'maṁ Vṛṣṇiprajaram; vedādhīyaṁ dharmaparāḥ; Viṣāvatāmī Dīṛghatamaṁ, R. vii, 96, 2.

16, सच्छ, āpaviddhaic ca 'pi rathāiḥ, R. vi, 43, 43; iti loke nirvacanāṁ; ātmayāṁ so 'maratīr; sāi 'va pāpam plāvayatī; ċrāntayugyaḥ ċrāntahayaḥ; vāyuvego vāyubalo; ċūrdhvaḍṛśīr dhyānaparā; hemaṛīga rāupyakharāḥ; nityamālā nityaphalaḥ, R. vi, 128, 102; ekasāle sthānumatim, R. ii, 71, 16; tāryamāṇān Vāיתaranim, G., vii, 25, 11; krūraṇastraḥ krūrakṛtaḥ. This combination is found in Manu, v, 152. Compare Oldenberg, ZDMG., xxxv, 183; and Jacobi, Rāmāyaṇa, p. 25; Gurupāj, p. 50. It occurs oftenest in the older texts, e. g., four times in Dyūta, with cesura always after the fourth, as far as I have observed. But it is not necessarily old (e. g., R. ii, 71, 16, is "interpolated"). I happen to have on hand no example of two breves (initial and final).

17, चच्छ, gṛhaṁtas tvam ṛaṁrīmaṁ, xiii, 14, 319; yathā vartayan puruṣah, xiii, 104, 5; brahma 'dityam unnayaṁ, iii, 318, 46; agrāhyo 'mrto bhavat, xiv, 51, 34.3

18, सच्छ, niḥ inātī na 'rabbate, xii, 269, 31; āpamājya buddhimataḥ, v, 38, 8; sātato nīvāritvān, vi, 96, 3; Kūrūpaṇḍavapravarāh, vii, 137, 16; viṣamacacchadāī racitaṁ, iii, 146, 22; dvīpinā sa siṁha ivā, R. vii, 23, 5, 14 (unique in R.). This irregular combination also is found in

1 So, tato varṣaṁ prādur abhūt; tato vṛṣṇi prādur abhūt, etc.
2 Professor Jacobi regards this as "irregular" and proposes to scan it as pādṛāntam, but in view of the other examples this seems unnecessary, though ċi do not always make position. Compare Nos. 26 and 30. R. has the same measure in iii, 30, 23; v, 4, 19.
3 Perhaps originally agrāhyo amṛto bhavati.
Manu. See Oldenberg, l. c. Jacobi has most of the examples.

19, _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ , saṁskṛtya ca bhoyayati, iii, 96, 8. Also in Manu v, 47 (cited by Oldenberg, loc. cit.) and i, 88, adhyāpanam adhyāyanaṁ (cited by Oldenberg, through an oversight, as a first vipulā). Not in R.

20, _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ , ajagavaṁ nāmadhanuḥ, iii, 126, 34; dvādaśapūgaṁ saritaṁ, v, 46, 7. Compare Jacobi, Gurupūja, p. 51. The type is old; compare nā 'virato duṣcecaritāt, Kaṭha Up. ii, 23. Not in R.

Third vipulā, _ _ _ _ _ _ . Caesura usually, and in R. almost invariably, after the fifth syllable. The only general form is No. 21, but in Mbh., while not common, No. 22 is found more frequently than are the last four cases. Final syllable long or short. Except Nos. 25, 27, all irregularities are found sporadically in R.

21, _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ , tāto bravāṁ māṁ yācāntām; śloṅcha-vṛttir dharmātmā; pālāyamāṇo vadhīyetā, R. ii, 75, 39; saptasaṅgo māṁ vakṣyantī; na sthānakālo gacchāmaḥ; jāne ca Rāmaṁ dharmajñāṁ, R. ii, 90, 22. For caesura: bhaveyur, açvādhyakṣo 'sti, Nala, 15, 6; bhavanti virasyā 'ksavyāḥ, iv, 43, 13; tasmāt tu Māndhāte 'ty evāṁ, vii, 62, 71; grhaśṭhādharmane 'nena, xiii, 2, 87; tathāi 'va viçevedevbhyaḥ, xiii, 97, 14; sa vardhamānadvāreṇa, xv, 16, 3. This form of third vipulā is more common than the second vipulā in later texts. It is sometimes grouped, as in ix, 11, 28–29, where occur three successive hemistichs with this opening. In Nala 18, 21, the reading is sa evam ukto 'thā 'qvācyā, for which evam ukto 'thā 'qvācyā tām is read by some, an improbable change.

22, _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ . In several of the examples (see p. 242 ff.) it is questionable whether position is made by the lingual, that is whether the pāda is not pathyā; hāte Bhīṣme ca, Droṇe ca, ix, 4, 11; sthīrā buddhī hi Droṇasyā, vii, 190, 43; tathā Bhīṣmena Droṇena, ii, 58, 28; kim arthanā Vālī cāi 'tenā, R. vii, 35, 11 (v. l. Vālighātena); kṣāyaṁ nā 'bhuyeti brahmaṁre, R. vii, 78, 21 (v. l. in G.); bhakṣyāṁ bhojyaṁ ca brahmaṁre, ib. 24 (also G., 85, 28); 1

1 Compare Jacobi, Rāmāyaṇa, p. 25, who gives also mā bhāṣiś Rambah bhadraṁ te, and tam anvārohat Sugrīvaḥ, R. i, 64, 5 and vi, 38, 8 (with v. l.).
so 'yam matto 'ksadyūtenā, ii, 62, 6; dāivam hi prajñām muśūtā, ii, 58, 18; jānānu vai nāma pratyakṣam, v, 43, 48; nityodyogāgī ca kriśadbhiḥ; pr̥ṣṭhaechnīn pār̥ṣechnīn, x, 8, 116; tasyā 'cu kṣiptān bhallān hi, vii, 92, 9 (short before kṣ?);¹ brahman kiṁ kurmaḥ kiṁ kāryām, R. vii, 33, 12 (kurmahe in G.).² In vi, 16, 22 = 629, B. has āy̥etośiṁsāṁ āy̥etahayaṁ, where C. has āy̥etośiṁsāṁ āy̥etaeçchātraṁ. As regards the licence, in ix, 4, 31, appears (after _ _ _ _ _ ) ca te bhṛata instead of the ca bhṛata te of C. Compare v, 121, 7, where bhṛ may fail to make position, mānena bhṛastaḥ svargas te. In Nala 16, 37, both B. and C. have katham ca naṣṭa jāñābhyāḥ (for bhṛasta). The type is antique, withal with cēṣura after the fourth syllable, as in some of the examples above, and in Manu ii, 120 = Mbh. v, 38, 1 = xiii, 104, 64, ārdhvam prāṇā hy utkramaṇti (v. l. vyutkramaṇti in Mahābhāṣya, IS. xiii, p. 405).

23, _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ 23. The same question arises here in regard to the length of the first syllable of the second foot. Other examples are extremely rare: preṣayāmāsā rājaṁ, i, 141, 14; bhagaṁ devaṁ śīnaṁ tvāṁ, iii, 273, 4; sarvaṣeṣeṣaṁ brāhmaṇa, xiii, 104, 12; kiṁ tu Rāmasya prītyaṁ, R. v, 53, 13; yam prāvaṁtēyaṁ saṁgrāmam, G. vii, 38, 12.² This combination also is found in Manu, iv, 98, ata ārđhvaṁ tu eceedāṁsi. In vii, 6,245, C. has prapalāyāntah saṁtrastāḥ, where B. 146, 92, has prāpalaṁyantaḥ. This form occurs also R. ii, 36, 23 (with v. l.).

24, _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ 24. na cēd vāśhasti tvāṁ dyūtaṁ, Nala, 26, 8; Rudrasye 'va hi kruddyāsa, vii, 192, 7. The form given by Oldenberg, loc. cit., from Manu is due to an oversight. Once in R. v, 23, 17, with v. l. To avoid this form and wrong cēṣura, Nala 16, 18 has dehaṁ dhāraya(n)tiṁ dinām. In hi (kruddyāsa), hi is probably to be read as a light syllable.

¹ This licence is Puranic and may be assumed here.
² Perhaps kurma should be read here for kurmaḥ, as in ix, 32, 62, kiṁ kurma te priyam. In Mbh. vii, 62, 45 = 2,048, B. has kiṁ kurma and C. has kiṁ kurmaḥ kāmaṁ kāmāraṁ.
³ Perhaps for pravarteya, the middle, as in R. vii, 36, 30, evamvīdhāni karmāṇi pravartata mahābalaḥ.
ILLUSTRATIONS OF EPIC ČLOKA FORMS.

25, ४४४५ ४ २ २ २, dāća pañca ca prāptānī, xii, 319, 21; śapakāriṇaṁ māṁ viddhi, xiii, 96, 7; yājuṣāṁ reśāṁ sāmnāṁ ca, iii, 26, 3; naraka-pratisthās te sūwh, v, 45, 8.¹

26, ४४४५ ४ २ २, adyaprabṛti ṛṛivasah, xii, 343, 132 (perhaps pathyā).² The only case cited by Jacobi from R. is i, 65, 13, also of the same form, vinācaśayati trāilokyāṁ. Both are in late additions.

27, ४४४५ ४ २ २, tvam iva yantā nā 'nayo 'sti, Nala 20, 18; saptadaçe 'mān rājendra, v, 37, 1. The texts have eva for iva in Nala, which is impossible. Odd as are these forms they are not without Manavie authority and it is far more likely that iva was changed to eva than that eva was written for iva. Oldenberg, loc. cit., xxxv, p. 184, gives examples from Manu (iii, 214; iv, 154). Not in R.

Fourth vipulā, ० ० ०. No. 28 is the usual form, though Nos. 29–32 are not uncommon in Mbh. and are found occasionally in R. On the cesura, usually after the fourth syllable, see Jacobi, Gurupūjī, p. 51.³

28, ० ० ० ०, Bṛhaspatīc co 'canā ca; māhur mruh mruyamānāḥ; ānantaraṁ rājadārāḥ, R. ii, 89, 14; vāyasyatāṁ pujayaṁ me, R. iv, 7, 14; so 'vastratām ātmānaṁ cā; aksapriyaṁ satyavādi; Viṣṇoḥ padam preksamānāḥ, R. ii, 68, 19. Vāikhanaṁ vālakhilyāḥ, R. iii, 6, 2. Cesura: tadāi 'va gantā 'smi tirthāṇy, iii, 92, 17; Yudhiṣṭhiraṁ 'vam ukto, iii, 201, 8; Yudhiṣṭhirasyā 'nuyātrāṁ, iii, 233, 50; Dhanañjayaṁ 'ṣa kāmaḥ, v, 77, 19; rajas tamaq cā 'bhibhūya, vi, 38, 10.

29, ० ० ० ०, pārisvakaṁ cā 'rjunenaḥ; ānādītvāṁ nirgunatvāt; āpṛuche tvāṁ svasti te 'stū; ekāh panthā

¹ The first example may be pathyā and the three last are so good hypermetres that the change may be at least suspected, yajuṣāṁ reśāṁ (ca); śapakāriṇaṁ (tu); naraka-pratisthās te tu sūwh.

² Compare the second note to No. 15, and p. 242 ff.

³ Jacobi, Rāmāyaṇa, p. 25, states that in R. ii–vi there are only thirty-eight cases of fourth vipulā, and of these all but seven follow ० ० ०. In the Mahābhārata the same vipulā occurs on an average as many times as this in a compass equivalent to only half the sixth book of the Rāmāyaṇa. This statement therefore must restrict the somewhat Rāmāyanaesque utterance of Oldenberg, who in ZDMG. vol. xxxv, p. 184, Bemerkungen zur Theorie des Čloka, says that this metre in general is common in Manu, but "much more restricted in epic poetry," a statement which is true of the Rāmāyaṇa and of parts of the Mahābhārata. Compare above, pp. 224 ff.
brāhmaṇānām; ete nāgāḥ kādramayāḥ, R. vi, 50, 49;
Vidyutkeśād garbham āpa, R. viii, 4, 18, and 23. The
measure is grouped in v, 35, 60–62, pāpaṁ kurvan pāpakītīḥ...
puṇyaṁ kurvan puṇyakīrtīḥ...
naṣṭaprajñāḥ pāpam evā, etc.

30, संक्षेपं जातारुपायः द्रोणमयम्; अत्र गाथा किरतयांति; अत्र गाथा भुमिगिताः;
राजापुत्रा प्रत्यावेक्षा; कामा एषा क्रोधा एसा; Dhrṣṭake-
tuṇa Kacīrījaḥ, vi, 25, 5; evam uktē Nāśadhena;
evam uktā Rāvaṇena, R. vii, 23, 5, 34; ekavānān eka-
veṣān ekarūpaṁ, ib. 40; prapnayāmo brahma-lokaṁ, R. vi,
66, 24. The measure occurs ofte
est in such repetitions
as udravātā udravālingā, lokavṛttaṁ rājavyṛttaṁ, etc.;
proper names (as above); and in some set phrases,
of which the commonest is an instrumental after evam uktah
or uto (which also is a common triṣṭubh opening, evam
ukte Vāmadevena, etc.) or the stereotyped evam uktah
pratyuvāca, e. g., i, 145, 27; viii, 24, 5; 34, 144, etc.

31, संक्षेपं कामेष्टि कादा उष्यताम पव, iii, 216, 12;
munocai iva pārthive 'ndraḥ, R. vii, 33, 17 (v. i. in G.).

32, संक्षेपं 'कल्प प्रचुस्मनाः एक मवार्शां, iii, 167, 33;
avicālyam etad uktam, iii, 294, 31; kim nimittam icheyā
ta, R. vii, 16, 5; pakṣina catuśpado vā, R. vii, 30, 10
(v. i. in G.), cited by Jacob for abhorrent cesura.1

33, संक्षेपं यजुर्मया रंमयात कर, C. xii, 10,400, cor-
rected in B. 285, 126, to yajurmayo;2 tathā 'çramavāsi-
ke tu, C. xv, 1,105. This latter is in a benedictive stanza at
the end of Açrama Parvan. It is not in B.

Minor Ionic, संक्षेपं। These forms are all separately spor-
adie. They are found both in the earlier, Upanishad, and
the later, Purāṇa, cloka.3 I have called the measure the
fifth vipulā merely to indicate that, while each special

1 A Paranic measure; compare jītadevayājābhāgaḥ, Ag. P. iv, 4, etc.
2 A clear case of sacrifice of grammar, sandhi, to metre, as above in No. 7.
3 For example, Agni P. x, 23, where the pāda ends daça devāḥ. Here too
is found the major Ionic, e. g., ib. xiv, 1, a pāda ending in Dāuryodhāni (so
Vāyu P. vii, 27); also the dilamab, e. g., Ag. P. iv. 11. The older of these
Purāṇas has three cases of minor Ionic in the compass of two short sections,
Vāyu, v, 34, paraç ca tu prakṛtātu; vi, 16, sa vedavyād upadāṣṭīfr; and
again, ib., 17. In Vāyu xxi, 108, ṛgyaṣṭhānāthārava (ṛūpiṇe brahmaṇe
nāmaḥ), we must read sāma-atharva, as minor Ionic.
combination is sporadic, the ending itself is not a great rarity in Mbh., though not found in R. (except as shown in No. 36).

34, अऽु - य - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ, Bhāgrathāṁ yajamānāṁ, vii, 60, 8; tato īrjuno ċaravarsam, iii, 39, 36; 46, 52; hayān dvipāns tvarayanto, ix, 9, 47; satyavrataḥ purumitraḥ, vi, 18, 11 repeated from v, 58, 7; yan māmakāiḥ pratipannām, C. vii, 8,133 (emended in B. 179, 20); tapasvino dhṛtimantah, xii, 269, 10.

Jacobi, Gurupūj., p. 51, gives other examples of this and of No. 35, from the Mahabhārata.

35, अऽु - य - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ, yādā ca 'yam na bibheti, i, 75, 53; xii, 26, 14; 252, 5; 263, 15; gāttārikān ṛṭarājyān, iii, 267, 17; kāmāṁ devā ṛṣayaq ca, xii, 349, 78; svayaṁ yajñāir yajamānāḥ, xii, 341, 60; etat dharmaṁ kṛtavatāḥ, xii, 245, 18; māurvīghoṣastaṇayitvāḥ, vi, 14, 27; ċakṛnūmśre nivasatvam, xii, 82, 24; Vīqmìtro Jamadagnīḥ, vii, 190, 33; xiii, 93, 21; Jārāsandhir Bhagadattaḥ, xv, 32, 10. Here belongs the mutilated pāda of Nala 24, 13, sāksād devān apahāya, which now appears in both texts as apahāya (but apahāya tu ko gacchet, in ġl. 11). A similar case will be found under No. 36. The measure has suffered the same fate in Manu ix, 101, where abhicāro has been changed to abhīcāro (though अऽु - य occurs in Manu ii, 85). The same change may be suspected in xii, 300, 44, asādhatuvaṁ parivādaḥ; 297, 25, atrā teśām adhīkāraḥ. See No. 36.

36, अऽु - य - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ - ऑ, parivittīḥ parivettiḥ (Manu iii, 172), xii, 34, 4; 165, 68; uṣṭravāṁis triçatāṁ ca, ii, 51, 4; pāṅgurā-śtrād vasudāno, 52, 27; Kurukartā Kuruvāṣi, xiii, 17, 107. Perhaps also amaratvam apahāya, texts apahāya as above in No. 35, iii, 167, 48; and the pāda cited above, in No. 35, atrā teśām adhīkāraḥ. It is to be observed, however, 1

1 This is an old form incorporated into the epic, which has it also in the pathyā form, na bibheti yadā ca 'yam, xii, 21, 4 (No. 5). Another form of this pathyā is found in xii, 327, 33, na bibheti paro yasmān (na bibheti paraḥ ca yaḥ). Compare vi, 36, 15, yasmān no 'dvijate loko lokān no 'dvijate ca yaḥ, with v. 1. in xii, 293, 24.

2 So H. 1, 9, 26 = 570, se 'yam asmān apahāya. The Dhammap. has kaṁhaṁ dhannam vippahāya. Jacobi gives another example, v. 90, 44, putralokāt patilokam.
that the analogous pratikāraḥ and parīvāraḥ occur both in Mbh., R., and Raghuv. (xv, 16; xvii, 55) as pathyā forms, and all these cases may be such (but in abhiśāraḥ the older MSS. have this form). In vii, 81, 13, B. has aprameyam praṇamato, where C. 2,898 has praṇamantāu. G. ii, 5, 24 has yatprasādād abhiśiktaṃ for yatprasādenā (Jacobi, Rām., p. 25); and G. vi, 70, 15, vajrasaṃsparçeṣa–māns trīṃ (v. 1 in R.).

37, ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, drāṣṭā ’sy adya vadato ’smān, ili, 133, 14; adhastāc caturaṭītrī, vi, 6, 11; yāvān artha udapāne, vi, 26, 46 (compare v, 46, 26, yatho ’dapāne mahati).

38, ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, bhūcarāya bhūvanāya, xiii, 14, 305.

Major Ionic, ॥ ॥ ॥. Cæsura after fourth or fifth. Sporadic and only in Mbh.

39, ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, Ūmāsahāyo vyāladhrīk, ili, 167, 44; āhaçcaro naktāṁcaaraḥ, xiii, 17, 47; atrāi ’va tiṣṭhan kṣatriyaḥ, v, 45, 21; tāṃ prekṣyamāno ’pi vyathām, x, 7, 51; etān ajītvā śaṭ rathān, vii, 75, 29. In R. vi, 111, 93, vimṛgya buddhyā praçritam, prā is light; v.1. with third vipulā, dharmañjñāḥ.¹ In C. ii, 2,107, tadarthakāmaḥ Pāṇḍavān mā druḥaḥ Kurusattama, where B. 62, 14 has tadarthakāmas tadvat tvām mā druḥaḥ Pāṇḍavān uṇpa, apparently changed for the metre. Similarly, in vii, 2,513, C. has aṣṭhayataς tasya svanaṃ, changed in B. 72, 37, to svanaṃ tasya.

40, ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, gāyanti tvā(ṃ) gāyatrīṇaḥ, xii, 285, 78 (Rig Veda, i, 10, 1).

[॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, evam ukto ‘thā ’ṛṇaṃ tāṃ (?) ; see No. 21 (ad finem)]

41, ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, abhijānāmi brāhmaṇam, v, 43, 56, but perhaps to be read with diëambic close (No. 46).

42, ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, adṛguntā saṃprṣayatā, ili, 187, 46.

Diëambus, ॥ ॥ ॥. A few sporadic cases (identical with posterior pādas). One case, No. 45, in R.

43, ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, sa cen mamāra Sṛṇjāya, vii, 55, 49; 67, 20; āvisthālam, vṛkasthālaṃ v, 72, 15; 82, 7; tasmāt Samantapaṇeacakām, ix, 55, 9: anvālabhe hiraṇmayaṃ, v, 35, 14. Compare also the long extract, described above on p. 238, from xii, 322.

¹ Probably (Jacobi, loc. cit., pp. 25-26) ċr fail to make position here. So perhaps tr and vy in M. Compare note to No. 15 and No. 26.
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44, ❍ _ _ _ _ _ _ , Nalaṁ nāma 'rimardanam (B. and C. have damanam), Nala, 12, 105; tad vāi deva upāsate, v, 46, 1 (but in viii, 84, 12, Duryodhanam upāsante, as elsewhere); brahmānaṁ tvā qatakratum, xii, 285, 78 (as in No. 40).

45, ❍ _ _ _ _ _ _ , yatra gatvā na ṭocatt, iii, 180, 22; (sāṁ or) ākṣipantām iva prabhām, Nala, 3, 13. With the first (antique) example compare in the triṣṭubh specimens below: yatra gatvā nā 'nuṣocanti dhīrāḥ. The case in Nala has been unnecessarily emended. It may belong here, or pr may fail to make position. No. 41 may belong here.

46, _ _ _ _ _ _ , yā ca vāi bahuyājīnām, vii, 73, 43 (but in a passage wanting in C.).

Professor Jacob's list of "metrically false" pādas in Gurupañj, p. 53, includes praha (sic) vaco brhattaram, which would give another form; but it has been taken up through an oversight, as the words form part not of a clōka but of a jagati. Yudhiṣṭhirāḥ praha vaco brhattaram, viii, 71, 39. So from vi, 23, 8 is cited a "metrically false" pāda, but it is a perfectly regular posterior pāda.

**Posterior Pāda of Epic Clōka.**

1, ❍ _ _ _ _ _ _ , manusyadehagocarāḥ, etc. (above, p. 238). Also in Manu, ix, 48, as posterior pāda, _ _ _ _ _ _ .

2, ❍ _ _ _ _ _ _ , krātvāṁ daśiṇāvatām; ekāhaṁ jāgaris-yati; samyak cāī 'va praçāsitā; sarve āṅgavantu daivataḥ (sic!), R. ii, 11, 16 (devataḥ in G.); māhāprasthānīkam (sic) vidhīm, R. vii, 109, 3.

3, ❍ _ _ _ _ _ _ , nṛpate dharma-vatsalāḥ; āṅgura me narot- tamaḥ; toṣayasyāmi bhrātarām, viii, 74, 30; kārayāmāsat- tur nṛpau. Between this and No. 5 there is sometimes only a difference of editing, as in yad akurventa tac chṛṇu, xviii, 3, where B. has the grammatically correct form.

4, ❍ _ _ _ _ _ _ , tvāyā ṛṇgaçatāir nṛpāḥ; bhavadbhir pra- tibodhitaḥ; Punyaclōka itī grutaḥ; bhidyante bahavaḥ (sic) cīlāḥ, R. vi, 66, 11.
5. ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, yūgapat samahanyatā; kālusīkṛtalocanaḥ; Viśasena iti sma hā;¹ na svapāmi nicās tadā (Nala, 13, 61, grammar sacrificed); mṛgayāṁ upacakrame (common terminal). Cāsura: surasārathir uttamaḥ; Viśṇunā prabhaviśṇunā, R. vii, 11, 17. Apparently avoided in mṛdnantī (sic) kuḍakāṇṭakān, R. ii, 27, 7; bruvantīm mantharāṁ tataḥ, R. ii, 8, 13; 12, 57; tapasā sma for smaḥ, R. i, 65, 19, etc.

6. ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, nikṛntata nikṛntatā; ākampayata medinīm; yaḥ paḍyati sa paḍyati; saṁjīva čaradaḥ ṣatam; Viśnu tvam upajagmivān. Cāsura: taṁ vāi naravarottamam; samāqvasihi mā quaḥ; jagāma diçaṁ uttarām; kṛiḍāpayati yoṣitāḥ, R. vii, 32, 18. In R. vii, 22, 2, rathome (sic) upanīyatāṁ, the metre seems as unnecessarily avoided as sought in the preceding example.

7. ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, madhumaṭīṁ trivartmagām, xiii, 26, 84; caturaṇīṁ uccritāh, vi, 6, 11 (v. 1. in C.); Kāṇḍiki pītavāsint, vi, 23, 8. In R. the pāda paitṛpitāmahāir dhruvāiḥ has a v. 1. that destroys its value.²

For — — — (and — — —) as last foot of the hemistich, see above, p. 242 ff.

¹ N. 1, 1, suto balī, is a stereotyped ending.
² These cases (except the first) are cited by Jacobi, Rāmāyaṇa, p. 25, etc.
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ILLUSTRATIONS OF EPIC TRIŚṬUBH FORMS.

1, ॐ-ॐ-ॐ-ॐ-ॐ, passim, cæsura after the fourth or fifth syllable, inclining to the latter place, often irregular or neglected: ॐ himātyaye kaksagato yathā 'gniḥ, tathā daheyaṁ saganāṁ prasahya, viii, 74, 56-57; na Pāṇḍavāṇ ्रे-ṣṭhatarāṇ nihanti, i, 1, 188 c; čāmena dharmena nayena yuktā, ii, 75, 10 a; prabrūhi me kiṁ karaṇīyam adya, i, 3, 176 c; Bhīṣmaṭya gacchāmi hato dviṣādhibh, vii, 2, 30 d; yo veda vedān na sa veda vedyam, v, 43, 52 c; Madrādhīpāya pravarah Kurūṇām, ix, 17, 41 d; sa cāntiṃ āpnoti na kāmakām, vi, 26, 70 d. Cæsura after second, in na cen, nighṛṇasya sutam sukhāya, iii, 4, 13 d; after fourth, in refrain of vii, 118, 11 d; 140, 15 d; or elsewhere in: yāc cīttam anveti parasya rājan, vīrah kavīḥ svām avamanyā dṛṣṭim, ii, 63, 4 a-b; artho 'py anīcasya tathā 'va rājan, i, 92, 5 c; vāsaṁsi disyāni ca bhānumanti, ii, 77, 7 b; evain kariṣyāmi yathā bravīṣi, iii, 5, 22 a; gadasibhādrāvanām ca te 'sti, viii, 76, 17 d; ye cā 'qvamedhāvahṛthe plūtān-gaḥ, xiii, 102, 41 c. In jagatī: Kanādanāmānam ajam maheqvāram; H. 3, 85, 16 b; taṁ dharmarājo vīmanā īva 'bravīt, iii, 25, 7 a. The only triṣṭubh in Nala has this form, iii, 76, 53. Also hypermetric.

In the Rāmāyaṇa this is the typical pāda.

2, ॐ-ॐ-ॐ-ॐ-ॐ, passim, cæsura after fourth or fifth: yadā ċrāusām Vāiçraṇānena sārdham, i, 1, 166 a; vimucya 'ran ye svacariradhātān, i, 91, 7 d; bhittva 'nikaṁ lakṣyavaraṁ, dharāyāṁ, i, 187, 22 b; kāuceyām bṛsyāṁ āsva yatho 'pa-jośam, iii, 111, 10 a; mamāi 'tān vāmyāu parigṛhya rājan, iii, 192, 54 a; na mitradhruṁ nāikṛtikāh kṛtaghnāḥ, xiii,

1 On the cæsura here, see above on the upajāti stanza.
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§•••••••

3, §•••••••••, common, cæsura after the fourth: yadi lokāḥ Pārthiva santi me 'tra, i, 92, 9 b; na prthivyāṁ tiṣṭhati nā 'ntarikṣe, v, 44, 26 e; tam asahyaṁ Viṣṇum anvānaṣṭenā, v, 48, 88 a; maghava 'haṁ lokathan pra-jānāṁ, xiii, 102, 56 a; taṁ jahi tvam madvacanat pranu-nnaḥ, iii, 192, 63 c; nā 'syā varṣam varṣati varṣakāle, nā 'syā bijaṁ rohatī kāla uptam, iii, 197, 12 a–b; hriniśevo Bhārata rājaputraḥ, viii, 7, 18 a; dyauḥ prthivyāṁ dhāsyati bhūri vāri, xiii, 159, 41 d. Change of cæsura in jagati: eka evā 'gnir bahuddhā samiddhyate, iii, 134, 8 a. Also hypermetric.

§••••••

4, §•••••••••, antique and sporadic, cæsura after the fourth (with long initial, as far as I have observed): sarvāṁ rātrīṁ adhyayanam karosi, iii, 132, 10 c; acaryena atmakṛtaṁ vijānaṁ, so to be read, v, 44, 14 a; yam man-yeta tam pratihiṣṭabhuddhiḥ, C. v, 1,697 e (B. 44, 14 c, manyate); akāče ca apsu ca te kramaḥ syāt, so to be read, v, 48, 86, d.

§•••••••

5, §•••••••••, antique,¹ and I think unique: antavataḥ ksatriya te jayanti (lokāṁ janāḥ karmaṇā nirmalena), v, 44, 24 a. See No. 11.

Between Nos. 4 and 5, in the order of the schedule, should be found the triṣṭubh pāda §•••••• but I am unable to give any example from the Bhārata, and the only case known to me in the Rāmāyaṇa, G. vii, 89, 19, vimāṇavaram bahu-ratnamandaṁ, is added to a late book (not in RB.). It is, however, not unknown in Buddhist verse, e. g., Dh. P. 144, pahassatha dukkham idaṁ anappakam, with the cæsura to be expected for such a form. [The new ed. (not MSS.) has pahassathā.]

§••••••

6, §••••••, passim, often mixed with upajātis, cæsura after the fourth: paraspasmaṁ spardhayā prekṣamānāh, i, §••••••

¹ E. g., BAU. iv, 3, 13, jaksad ute 'vā 'pi bhayāṇi paçyan.
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187, 3 a; tato 'bravid Vāsudevo 'bhigamya, i, 191, 20 a; devārsayō guhyakāg cāraṇaṁ ca, i, 187, 7 b; prajñā ca te Bhārgavasye 'va cūddhā, iii, 4, 2 a; čatruḥ qadeḥ qāsater ṣāq yater vā, viii, 42, 32 c; Karṇas tvaran mām upāyāt pramāthā, viii, 67, 12 d; yat tat Prthūṁ vāg uvācā 'ntar-ıkṣe, viii, 68, 10 a, etc. In jagatī, xiii, 102, 44 c, etc. Also in hypermetric form, atithivrataḥ suvratā ye janā vāi, ib. 19 a; sadā Kumāro, yatra sa plakṣarājaḥ, ix, 43, 49 d, etc. If pr make position, divyena rūpeṇa ca prajñāya ca, iii, 186, 25 c (but caesura indicates that ca is to be read, No. 1).

7, $\infty$ - - - - $\infty$, passim, especially in upajātis, caesura after the fourth or fifth when the initial is short (light); after the fourth when the initial is long (heavy) as a čālinī verse (pāda), which is even more common than the vātormā pāda, both in its full form and in its party shape $\infty$ - - - - $\infty$. In hypermetric form this pāda with a heavy initial is a vāɪqvadevi pāda (common as such and found also as a complete vāɪqvadevi stanza): raṇe čāraṁ dharmarājena sūta, i, 1, 207 b; nihannī 'maṁ vīram adya pramathya, iii, 192, 65 b; Nalo hy aksair nirjītaḥ Puśkareṇa, viii, 91, 13 b; satāṁ vṛttam ca 'dadita 'rya-vṛttah, i, 87, 10 d; hatam pārthena 'haveṣy apradhṛṣyam, i, 1, 205 b; no 'taraksye 'hain Vāmadevasya vāmyau, iii, 192, 58 c; mitram minder nandateḥ pṛyater vā, viii, 42, 31 c; with an unusual word-division, muniṃśeṣṭhā rgbhir ānareur ṭeṇam, xvi, 4, 28 b. As vāɪqvadevi also, pratyāmāntyau tvam hi enam mā hiṃśiḥ, iii, 197, 17 d, where hiatus must be read (C. has prāpayantu); rāja Gāndhār-yāḥ skandhadece 'vasajjya, xv, 15, 9 c, etc. In C. xiii, 4,863 c, ye 'dhiyante se 'tihāsam purāṇam, the grammar is corrected in B. 102, 21 (No. 6). See also the note following No. 11, where $\infty$ - - $\infty$ appears as the second foot of the hypermetric pāda. With initial hypermeter, kṛtinaṁ vīram (v. l. dhīram) dānavaṇāṁ ca bādhham, H. 2, 72, 33 b.

1 One pada, c, of the half-vāɪqvadevi in R. v, 63, 33, is of this form, aṅgār prahṛṣṭāḥ kāryasiddhīṁ visītvā. See above, p. 326.
In the Rāmāyaṇa, saṁsidhārthāh sarva eva 'gravīryāḥ, B. vi, 11, 30 b (with a case of No. 13), not in G.; also in a proverb, R. (B.) vii, 59, 3, 33 d (prakṣipta): na tat satyaṁ yac chalena 'nuviddham, where G. vii, 64, 33, has satyaṁ na tad yac chalam abhyupāiti. Mbh. v, 35, 58 d, has na tat satyaṁ yac chalena 'bhyupetam.

8, — — — — — — — —, rather common, cæsura after the fourth, used chiefly in phrases and proper names, but often without constraint: pratikūlaṁ karmanām pāpam āhuh, i, 89, 4 a; bahuवत्त Pāṇḍavaṇc eṣa jayas tvam, ii, 63, 9 c; paribhūte pāuruṣe Dhārtarāṣṭre, C. vii, 72 b (B. 2, 21, parabhūte); ¹ asaṁ vai brāhmaṇacchadmanā 'ham, viii, 42, 4 a, etc.; but the long (heavy) initial is more common: yatra gatvā nā 'nujocanti dhīrāḥ, i, 93, 8 d; tatra yūyām karma kr̥tvā 'viśahyam, i, 197, 25 c; evam ete Pāṇḍavaḥ sambalbhuvaḥ, ib. 35 a; durvibhāsam bhāṣitaṁ tvādṛṣṭena, ii, 66, 2 a; ko hi divyed bhāryyā rājaputra, ib. 67, 5 b; tasya duḥkhe 'py ançabhājāh sahāyāḥ, iii, 5, 20 b; nā 'nuyogā brāhmaṇanāṁ bhavanti, iii, 192, 56 a; evam ukte Vāmadevena rājan, ib. 57, a; so ib. 62, c; 64, a; v. 48, 96 b; 71, 2 a; vi, 20, 1 c; vii, 2, 31 c; viii, 37, 22 c, etc.; Ṛayantam bhāratim bhāratinām, v, 71, 2 a; brāhmaṇanāṁ hastibhir nā 'sti kr̥tvam, xiii, 102, 13 a; duṣkr̥taṁ vā kasya hetor na kuryāt, xii, 73, 22 d. In jagati, sa mahendrabhuh ṛtuyaṁ vai mahādvare, xiii, 159, 28 c. Also in hypermetric form.

This measure is often divided by the words (as in some of the examples above, or in iii, 134, 36 a, mahād aukthyaṁ giyate, sāma ca 'gryam) in such a way as to make a second cæsura after the seventh syllable, with the last three (5–7) syllables included in one word. It is an antique measure of the Upanishads and Buddhistic writings ² and is clearly decadent in the epic, being far less common than the two preceding combinations, Nos. 6 and 7.

¹ The case in vii, 9,468 a, daça ca 'nye ye purāṁ dhārayanti, is also uncertain, as B. 201, 76 c, has daça 'py anye.
² It is the only form found with trochaic opening in the Dhammapada; vs. 354, sabdādānaṁ dhammādānaṁ jīnāti.
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9, ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ, sporadic, but also found in hypermetric form; caesura after the fourth: yada 'qrāṣam Arjunaṁ devadevam, i, 1, 162 a (165 a); na hi jñānam alpakālana çakyaṁ, iii, 133, 10 c; vānaspatyam āyasam pārthivaṁ vā, iii, 186, 25 b; in vii, 179, 24 c, B. has apaṣyāma lo. hitābhaprakāçām, where C. 8,138, has tām paṣyāmaḥ. The corresponding measure with the vātormī cadence, No. 15, is more frequent.

(9 b), Note: Between Nos. 9 and 10 should stand examples of ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ, but I have only Hariv. 2, 72, 44 a, vyāñjano jano 'tha vidvān samagraḥ, and in this case it is clear that we may have a resolved semi-vowel and hypermeter: vi-añjano ja-no 'tha vidvān samagraḥ. Similar hypermeters are given in the discussion above, p. 288. Compare the resolution ib. 45 a, tri-ambakam puṣṭidam vo bruvāṇam (texts, also 7,434, tryambakam).

10, ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ, sporadic, caesura after the fourth: yene 'echasi tena kāmaṁ vṛajasva, iii, 133, 2 b; nā 'nivyara īḍṛṇaṁ jātu kuryāt, iii, 197, 24 c. Not rare in Vedic rhythms. Sporadic also as hypermeter, p. 289.

11, ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ, questionable. The text of v, 44, 25 b has kṛṣṇam athā 'ndjanaṁ kādravāṁ vā, which can be read only with hiatus. I suspect that originally atho or athā stood in the verse. Compare p. 300, and the choriambic opening which precedes this passage, cited above as No. 5. Possibly the prose in xii, 343, 20 may have once been verse. It begins with vedapurāṇetihāsapramānyāt.

Note: To these cases of party-formed cālīṁ pādas must be added the hypermetric analogue of the cloka's fourth vipulā with final brevis, which from its first foot belongs more particularly under No. 7, to wit, yas tvam devānām mantravitsu purodhāh, xiv, 9, 5 b.

12, ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ, passim, caesura after fourth, common in upajātis: sa ca 'pi tad vyadadhāt sarvam eva, i, 197, 32 a;
APPENDIX C.

na hi tvayā sadrṣī kācid asti, iii, 186, 23 a; vāci kṣuro nīgitas tkṣādadhrāh, i, 3, 123 b; paścād ayaṁ Sahadevas tarasvī, i, 191, 9 b; yasmāt striyaṁ vivadadhvain sabhāyām, ii, 71, 17 b; satye rato guruṇührūṣāya ca, xiii, 73, 26 b. In jagati, kaccit sukhaṁ svapīṣi tvam Bṛhaspate, xiv, 9, 1 a. To this category belongs perhaps iii, 192, 58 a; but see No. 24. Not rare (e.g. iii, 197, 11 c; 16 d; v, 42, 6 c; 44, 14 d, etc.) are the hypermetric forms ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, as shown above (initial and inserted), pp. 286, 289.¹

13, ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, passim, cēsura after fourth, common in upajātis: idāṁ īreyāḥ paramam manyamanāḥ, also sāṁkhyā yogāḥ paramām yam vadanti, iii, 186, 26 a and e; svarge loke śyavatām nā 'sti dhiṣṇyam, xvii, 3, 10 a. Other examples under the vātormī stanza (also hypermetric).

In the Rāmāyaṇa, vi, 11, 30 (with a case of No. 7): bhartuḥ sarve dadṛṣu cā 'nanaṁ te, not in G.; hypermetric, ib. v, 63, 33 d.

14, ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥, common, cēsura after the fourth: navanītam hṛdayam brāhmaṇasya, i, 3, 123 a; tata esām bhavītāi 'vā 'ntakālāḥ, i, 197, 7 d; yadi cā'ī 'vam vihitāḥ Čaṅkaraṇa, i, 198, 4 a; upasaṛgād bahudhā śudate ca, viii, 42, 33 a; yadi daṇḍāḥ sṛṣate 'punyapāpam, xii, 73, 22 a; so in xiii, 159, 27, and 42 (initial的样子 and ॥); santi lokā bahavas te narendra, i, 92, 15 a; eṣa dharmah paramo yat svakena, iii, 4, 7 c; agnihatrad ahum abhyāgata 'smi, iii, 186, 22 a; tasya mūlāt saritaḥ prasravanti, ib. 28 c; nāī 'va ċakyaṁ vihitasyā 'payānam, C. i, 7, 329 c (but B. 198, 1, na vāi); kasya hetoh sukṛtām nāma kuryāt, xii, 73, 22 c; samprahārāṇī śyaṅvanasyā 'tīghoram, xiv, 9, 32 b; 10, 22 a and 30 b. Also hypermetric.

¹ I think that this is the way such early stanzas must be read as appear, e. g., in Praśna iv (10), 11, c, where b–c read: (b) pṛṇaḥ bhūtānā | sampratiśṭhanti yatra; (c) tad ākṣaram ve- | dayate yas tu somya. The alternative is a choriambus with the scollus ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥; but on this see the remarks above, p. 281.
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15, \( \text{common, cæsura after the fourth: tato divyam ajaram prápya lokam, i, 89, 17a; purodhya sukṛtam duśkṛtaṁ vā, i, 90, 18 b; tad eve 'dam upapannam vidhānam, i, 198, 1 d; tad evai 'tad avaçasyā 'bhupāti, ii, 56, 16 c; praçetāram ṛṣabham Yādavānām and draṣṭāro hi Kuravas tāṁ sametāh, v, 71, 3 b and 4 a; tad icchāmi na sa tāṁ yājayeta, xiv, 9, 4 d; so iii, 5, 22 b; v, 48, 57 c; vii, 145, 94 a, etc.; with long or heavy initial, tat tat prápya na vihanyeta dhīraḥ, i, 89, 7 e; prāptaṁ rājyam asapataṁ punas tāih, i, 1, 216 d; tāṁ sarvasya bhuvanaṁy prasūtīṁ, i, 232, 14 c; tatra dyūtam abhavan no jaghanyam, iii, 34, 13 a; tam manyeta pitarām mātaram ca, v, 44, 9 c; hiñsāvēgam udaropasthavēgam and nindā ca 'syā hrdayaṁ no 'pahanyāt, xii, 279, 17 b and d; durgāṁ janma nidhanāṁ ca 'pi rājan, xii, 319, 110 a; in C. i, 3,662 d, kuryād eva, where B. 92, 18 d, has evāṁ. Other cases in iii, 4, 22 b; 197, 9 a and 16 b; vii, 2, 21 c; xii, 73, 26 c; 206, 27 c and 29 d; xiii, 71, 18 d; 94, 43 b; 159, 19 d, etc., all with cæsura after the fourth syllable. Rarely hypermetric.

In xii, 60, 47 c, the second foot ends in brevis! It is, however, forced by the meaning: ekaṁ sāma | yajur ekām | ṛg ekā. In regard to nā 'nyaḥ panṭhā ayanāyā vidyate, see the paragraph on the scolius, p. 279, where also is cited caturdvāram puruṣāṁ caturmukham. and another similar pāda.

16, \( , quklam ekam aparaṁ ca 'pi krṣnam, i, 197, 32 d. I have no other examples of this opening.

17, \( , antique and sporadic, cæsura after the fourth: çamārthiṁ upayātaiṁ Kurūṁā, i, 1, 175 b; rjur mṛdur anṛṣaṁ kṣamāvān, xii, 63, 8 c; ye tad vidur amṛtas te bhavanti, v, 44, 31 d; 45, 18 d. BAU. iv, 4, 14, etc. (ya etad).

1 This is the only case where the fourth syllable is a brevis in a common combination.
18, **000**—000—0, antique and unique, virajaso vitamaskā viçokāh, xiii, 102, 32 b. The same repeated below has, in 35, supunyagandhā virajā viçokāh (hypermetric in 42, supunyagandhā virajā vitacokāh). Compare ib. 38. Imitation of Chānd. viii, 1, 5; Māitri, vi, 25, etc. With choriambic opening in a sporadic hypermeter, p. 294.

19, 000—000, common, cæsura after fourth or fifth: yuvaṁ diço janayatho daçāgre, i, 3, 64 a; ajo hi çastram agilat kilai 'kaḥ, ii, 66, 8 a; (after iyaṁ Gaṅge 'ti niyatam pratiṣṭhā, xiii, 26, 88 a, No. 20), ib. c, in hypermetric form, prātasa trivarga ghrātavahā vipāpmā (the same without cæsura, ib. 94, 13 d, below); te bhānavo 'py anusrāç caranti, i, 3, 65 c; te mām yathā vyabhicaranti nityam, i, 76, 52 b; rājā 'ham āsam iha sarvabhūmaḥ, i, 89, 15 a; jānimahe Vidura yatpriyas tvam, ii, 64, 1 c; iço bhaviṣyad aparājītāmā, ii, 71, 18 d; brahmadvigāghnam amṛtasya yonim, vii, 201, 67 d; Vāivasvatasya sadane mahātman, xiii, 102, 14 c; also i, 90, 6 c; ii, 63, 6 c; iii, 4, 12, a; 186, 8 d; 186, 25 d; xiii, 90, 48 a, etc. In jagatī: evam bruvānam ajnāṅir vivāsitam, ii, 77, 19 a; parājīteṣu bharateṣu durmanāḥ, vii, 2, 8 c; kulambharān anuṣṭhaḥ çetaṁ çatān, xiii, 93, 32 a. In i, 90, 24 c—d = v, 35, 45 this measure is combined with that of the next number: mānāgniḥotram uta mānāmañnam (etc., see No. 20). The tendency is to give up this measure for the choriamb, and so grammar suffers, as in ix, 59, 10 b: ye cā 'py akurvanta sadasya-vastrām. This old metre, which is Vedic and is found in the Upanishads, is already passing away in the epic, though it can scarcely be called rare. In some parts it is rarer than in others, and it still survives in the Purāṇas. In the seventh book's three hundred odd triṣṭubhs, for example, it occurs only in the two places cited above; the fourth book in its two hundred has only one case (in jagatī form), iv, 14, 51 d; the thirteenth, with three hundred odd triṣṭubhs, has eight cases; the second, in one hundred and fifty-odd, has five. Other jagatī cases are in i, 197, 20 a; iii, 134, 10 c; xiv, 9, 30 c (all with cæsura
after the fourth); and v, 71, 5 a, ṛṣiṁ sanātanatanaṁ vipācētītam.

In the Rāmāyaṇa, this metre is found in G. ii, 25, 42, and 79, 40, where occur respectively the pādas:

athaí 'vam aqruparipūrtalocanā
tam ārtam aqruparipūrṇanetram

In the former case, B. has aqrupratipūrṇa. This is the usual phrase, as in R. vii, 40, 31, viyogajāqrupratipūrṇalocanaḥ (in ṣloka, aqrupūrṭatalocanaḥ, R. vi, 45, 27). The latter of the two pādas above is not in B. at all. There is also a varied reading in R. vii, 77, 21, sarvaṁ tādā ca 'kathayan mame 'ti, for here G. 54, 19 has sarvaṁ tādā kathitavān mame 'ti. The measure, however, is not entirely confined to G., though it appears in B. only in two prakiṣṭa passages, iii, 56, pr. 25, Īndṛat pravṛttim upalabhiya Jānakī or Sītā (where G. has pratilabhya); vii, 37, 3, 9; vidyotati jvalati bhāti lokān. In G. v, 80, 24, na ced iyam naçati vānarārditā (not in B.), naçyati is probably to be read (as usual). This measure is found in hypermetric form also in G. vi, 43, 37, çriyāṁ ca kīrtiṁ ca samavāpnuhī tvam, where B. has çriyāṁ ca kīrtiṁ ca cirāṁ samaçnute, but perhaps samāpnuhī ought to be read in G. (or avāpnuhī, as in R. vi, 59, 57, sthirāṁ kīrtiṁ avāpnuhī). Such an hypermeter is found sporadically in Mbh. xiii, 26, 88 c (above); also with neglected caesura.

\[\text{\text{\text서}}\]_\[\text{\text서}}\]_\[\text{\text서}}\]_\[\text{\text서}}\]_\[\text{\text서}}\]_\[\text{\text서}}\], rather rare, caesura after fourth or fifth:

avācyā vāi patiśu kāmavṛtthiḥ, ii, 71, 3 c; Viśno retas tvam arthaṁ āṅshīya nābhī, iii, 114, 27 b; mānenaśhitam uta mānavajñā, i, 90, 24 d = v, 35, 45; sabhāyāṁ yatra labhate nuvādām, xii, 73, 16 b; caturdāhā cāi 'nam upayāti vācā, xii, 270, 23; nāi 'ṣam (!) ukṣā vahati no 'ta vāhāḥ, xii, 343, 19; iyam Gāṅge 'ti, etc. (No. 19, line 3). Also in hypermetric form.

Like the last number, this is a decadent metre in the epic.\(^1\) The late fourth and seventh books have no certain

---

\(^1\) In the Dhammapada, triṣṭubha with \(\text{\text서}}\) as second foot are numerically equal to those with \(\text{\text서}}\) (eight each, as contrasted with ninety-six with choriambic middle).
examples. In the former there is none at all; in the latter, vii, 200, 83 a, āsannasāya svarahāṃ tivratejāḥ stands for C.'s reading, 9,340, svarahām ugratejāḥ, but it may be one of B.'s frequent improvements.

I have not noticed any epic pāda with the form _ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_, such as is found in the earlier versification, e. g. ākram ādāya punar eti sthānam, BAU. iv, 3, 11; nor with fourth brevis, except as hypermetres, p. 290, when three breves follow (qloka, Nos. 11, 12).

Sporadic, or at most rare, are all the remaining forms.

_ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_, sporadic, caesura after fourth or fifth:
purā jagāu mahārṣisaṅgha eṣāḥ,¹ v, 43, 50 b; Sanatsujāta yām imām parām tvam (brāhmaṁ vācaṁ vādase viyvarā-ṃ), v, 44, 1. In iii, 197, 13 a, and 13,285 (this has a vai which is omitted in B., apparently because sadā in B. is regarded as belonging to b) there is a parallel jagatī, which I read:

(a) jātā hrasva praṇā pranilayaḥ sadā
db) na vai vāsāṁ pitaro (a)ṣṣya kurvā

The version of B. abandons a as too unmetrical, and omits vai, to make of b the pāda: sadā na vāsāṁ pitaro 'ṣṣya kurvata; while C. abandons b, and also refuses to recognize the hiatus, but keeps vai, which, however, with hiatus makes of the hemistic two pādas, as given above. Compare the corresponding form in qloka measure. There is a parallel in the Mahābhāṣya:

no Khaṇḍikān jagāna no Kaṅgān,
but Weber, IS. vol. xiii, p. 368, reads jagāma, perhaps a warranted emendation (compare jagrāha, ib. c).

_ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_ _ū_, sporadic or unique: svasti 'ty uktvā mahārṣisiddhaṁ saṅghaḥ. I have lost the reference.

These diëamboic middles appear to be almost as rare in other popular verse. Only one case is found in the

¹ The whole stanza runs: chandaṁi nāma kṣatriya tāny Atharvā purā jagāu mahārṣisaṅgha eṣāḥ, chandovidas te ya uta nā 'dhītavedā na vedavedyāṣya vidur hi tattvam. Pāda c is explained under hypermetres. Both of the passages from which the two first extracts are taken are antique.
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Dhammapada and that is rather doubtful (vs. 281): käyena ca akūsalam na kayirā, with kayirā for kayrā.\(^1\)

\(\sim \sim - \sim \sim - \sim - \sim \sim\), antique and sporadic, variable cæsura: tadvṛṣṭimahna prasthitān balasya, i, 3, 63 d; vedān adhīyitā 'nahanūkṛtaḥ syāt, i, 89, 7 b; māmaṁ na kuryān na 'dadhīta roṣam, v, 44, 10 c; in hypermetric form, bhavāhitasya dāyam mamā 'ntikāt tvāṃ, iii, 197, 17 c.

In the Rāmāyaṇa G. iii, 75, 74, Sumerucūṇgāgre gatām aninditām, where B. has ṛṇgāragatām; G. vi, 11, 10, mattapramattānāṁ samākulāni, where B. has mattapramattānī; G. vi, 46, 74, sa bhūtale nyastāḥ kapipravāraḥ, where B. has bhīmabalā 'bhāpiṣṭaḥ; G. vi, 51, 108, jagāna çaktībhūr vinaṣṭacetāḥ, where B. has çaktīryṣṭigadākuṭhāraḥ. I have noticed no example in RB.

In the Dhammapada this measure is also rare, though sometimes employed, as in No. 143 b: asso yathā bhadrakāsānivīthho atāpino saṁvegino bhavātha.

[23 b, See the note to No. 25.]

\(\sim \sim - \sim \sim - \sim - \sim \sim\), sporadic or unique; ubhānu ca te jara-mṛtyuḥ vyatītān, xiv, 9, 5 c; Ikṣvākavyo yadi brahmaṇa Dalava, iii, 192, 58 a (or with I before br, No. 12.) Perhaps hypermetric in Hariv. C. 7,442 c, dhrītyudhah suktinām uttamāujāḥ, but B. 2, 72, 53, has suktinām.

\(\sim \sim - \sim \sim - \sim - \sim \sim\), rare, cæsura after the fourth: tadā devīm rudantāṁ tām uvāca, i, 7,292 b in C., but rudatīm in B. 197, 17; na ca 'bhakṣye kvacit kurvanti buddhim, xii, 141, 78 b; so 'haṁ nāi 'vā 'kṛtam pūrvam careyam, i, 3,657 c in C., but ○○○○ in B. 92, 13; nā 'cāryasya 'napākṛtya pravāsam, v, 44, 15 a; tasmād etāṁ dārāṁ avīcya āçeṣa, i, 197, 24 d (but in C. 7,299, avīcya 'trāi 'va āçeṣa); vimucyo 'cēāir mahānādaṁ hi sādho, xv, 15, 6 c.\(^2\)

\(^1\) More probably: käyena ca akūsalam na kayirā. ○○○○ ○○○○. [So the new ed., but with ca akūsalam suggested.]

\(^2\) For ○○○○ ○○○○ ○○○○. I have only H., loc. cit., p. 297, āpo devya rśīnāṁ viyadhdātryo (No. 25 b), where B. inserts hi after rśīnāṁ, or a form with ○○○○ after ○○○○ ○○(○), that is, hypermetric opening.
26, sporadic:

samāhvayat saṁrambahāc cāi 'va kāvyah, i, 76, 51 b; mahac ca rūpaṁ tad vāi parvatebhyah, v, 44, 29 d. Also hypermetric, p. 291.

27, sporadic and questionable: maheśvāsāh Kālkeyāc cā 'pi sarve, C., iii, 15,654 b, but B. 268, 16, has Kekāyaś; rajo dhvastaṁ Gāndīvena pravrīttaṁ, C. v, 1,869, but B. 48, 61, has Gāndīvena. At the cost of grammatical nicety, xii, 24, 27, avoids the cadence by having caturāḥ for catvāraḥ: caturhotraṁ caturu vājimukhyah. For the hypermeter, see p. 291.

[Note: etat sarvam anirdeṣenāi 'vam uktam, xii, 108, 33 a, would be hypermeter of _ _ _ ( _ ) _ _ _ _ _ _, but see the note on p. 296.]
FINAL NOTES.

To pp. 44-45: On the Mātrīra Upanishad. Compare also mātrā, “matter,” in Mātrīra vi, 6; the later Gītā, 2, 14; and possibly xii, 271, 12. The image of spirit as a “smokeless flame” is found in Kātha Up., iv, 13, jyotir ivā ’dhūmakah; Mātrī (i, 2 and) vi, 17; and the epic, xii, 251, 7 (307, 20; 325, 12): sarvātmānam mahātmānam vidhūnam iva pāvakan; as is also the phrase tām āhuḥ paramām gatim, Kātha, vi, 10; Mātrī, vi, 30; Gītā, 8, 21. On a closer resemblance to Mātrī vi, 15, see the note on p. 167. The tree of desire is in this passage called the hrūdī kāmadrumaḥ citrō mohasāmceyasaambhavaḥ, the image, like that of the following “town of the senses,” being very fully expanded, xii, 255, 1 ff. The “wheel of transmigration” is found in other passages also: yathā kāṣṭhaṁ ca kāṣṭhaṁ ca (R. ii, 105, 26) sameyātōm mahodadhāu...samsāre cakravadgatāu; sukhadadhka manusyaḥ nam ca kāṛvata parivartataḥ, xii, 28, 36-41 (= 174, 15 ff.); 174, 19.

To p. 117: On Kapila’s adya. Compare ādyā prakṛtiḥ, xii, 299, 34.

To p. 118: The reference to the negative definition (omitted from the first paragraph) is xii, 201, 27.

To p. 159: Cf. xii, 28, 46: na mṛtyum ativartante velām iva mahodadhiḥ.


To p. 186: On Yama’s abode. The first note is restated, more carefully, on p. 288.

To p. 191: On the help derived from Professor Cappeller’s MS. By “in the epic” is of course to be understood in the Mahābhārata. It should perhaps have been stated that all cases have been re-examined, and that the MS. contained nothing in regard to ēlokas and no discussion of the various other metres. Without qualifying my indebtedness, I should not wish to make Professor Cappeller responsible for the further analysis.

To p. 213: On the scapegoats. According to xii, 343, 53, Indra’s sin was distributed over women, fire, trees, and cows.
The distribution of this sin is parallel to that of Nahuṣa (here said to be cow-killing), which was divided into one hundred and one parts (generally, but not always, an inauspicious number), as diseases among men, xii, 263, 49.

To p. 217: On the conversion of ṇokas and triṣṭubhs. I ought here to have referred to the attempt at wholesale excision of triṣṭubhs in the work published in 1883 by Sörensen, Om Mahābhārata's Stilling i den indiske Literatur, pp. 211 ff. The theory, despite the ingenuity of the author, never seemed to me convincing. The early forms of triṣṭubh found in the epic, and the fact that Patañjali cites epic triṣṭubhs, seem to me decisive evidence that the latter measure was a primitive form of epic expression.

To p. 238: On Patañjali’s epic verses. M. Barth, in his review of Dahlmann’s first book, Journal des Savants, 1897, very properly questions whether Professor Ludwig is correct in claiming that “all citations in Bhāṣya verses referring to the epic are in other metre than that of the epic” (p. 8 of the study entitled Ueber das Verhältniss des mythischen Elementes zu d. hist. Grundlage d. Mbh., Abh. d. Böh. Ak., 1884). Neither scholar gives illustrations in support of his statement. The examples given above, on p. 239, sufficiently illustrate the partial correctness of Professor Ludwig’s observation. At the same time, the half-ḥloka cited above, on p. 6, is found in both Bhāṣya and Bhārata, and Patañjali’s triṣṭubh pāda, asidvitīyo ‘nusāsāra Pāṇḍavam, is in regular Bhārata metre. The truth seems to be that Patañjali’s epic verse is not wholly different; but it is on occasion freer than that of the Bhārata.

To p. 263: On the Prākrit original of the epic. It is possible that the epic tales may have been composed first in patois; but it is not probable that the philosophical sections, for example, the Gītā and parts of Čanti, have suffered such a transformation.

To p. 264: On pseudo-epic atrocities. An early epic writer would have said (in prose) jīvān aham dṛṣṭavān. The poet of the pseudo-epic, just after using the word jīva (masc.), employs, in xii, 280, 20, not only jīvāni but adṛṣṭavān:

\[ \text{evaṁ saṁsaramāṇāni jīvāṇi aham adṛṣṭavān} \]

From the context it is evident that, as Nīlakaṇṭha says, the real meaning is “I have seen” (aham vedmi), though the commentator derives the sense through the idea of not-seeing being
equivalent to knowing not by sight but by insight. The form, however, is simply an irregularly augmented verbal, and the sentence means literally, “thus in course of transmigration have I seen spirits.” The form stands on a par with the augmented imperative of R. iv, 3, 27, where some late pedant, to avoid the metrical irregularity of an anapest after the first syllable, has handed down tam abhyabhāsa, “speak to him,” as the opening words of a verse (just before na kimci apacaśabditaṃ!). The difference between such freedom as this and that found (for the same reason) in R. v, 13, 41, where occurs samyag āpaḥ pravekṣyāmi, is that, whereas the later metricist employs an unheard-of liberty, the second poet simply harks back to the legitimate interchange of āpaḥ and apaḥ, which, to avoid another irregularity, are exchanged in the already stiffening verse of the Rig Veda; for here also we find in RV. x, 121, 8 (to avoid in a triṣṭubh an opening choriambus): yaṇcid āpo mahinā paryapagyat. Similarly, in syntax, we find in the pseudo-epic the genitive after a comparative, as in xiii, 14, 5 (cited by Holtzmann), and xii, 218, 28; nā ’nyo jivah caṅrasya; exactly as we find it in the later Rāmāyana; for G. vi, 24, 28 merely indicates that the text is late (since the alternate text, R. vi, 49, 20, has the ablative here); but the genitive occurs at R. i, 47, 22, nā ’sti dhanyatara mama. That the Rāmāyana was also influenced by Prākrit forms, may be shown by R. iv, 17, 49: (māṁ yadi tvam acodayah) Māṭhilīm aham ekāhāvā tava ca ’nītāvān bhaveḥ. Here bhaveḥ must be for the dialectic optative bhave (as the commentator says, “bhayeṛam”). Whether cādhi, in yatra na cādhi (= cīkṣayasi), is due to dialectic form, I must leave to experts to decide, R. ii, 105, 10:

eṣo ’pamā mahābāho tadarthāṃ vettam arhasi
yatra tvam asmān vrṣabho bharta bhṛtyān na cādhi hi

In R. ii, 111, 25, occurs anuçāsāmi, sic, and it is difficult to see why çasasi is not found here.

To p. 265: Note on bhaṅati with the accusative of specification. The only case of this construction in respectable Sanskrit known to me is in Māṭrī Up. vi, 10: athe ‘ndriyārthān paṇca svāduni bhavanti, “the five (senses) become (operative, as regards) the objects of sense, in tasting.” The preceding phrase has svāduni bhavanti without object, and the scholiast supplies prati with indriyārthān. In no circumstances, however, could the sixth
chapter of Māitri prove an early use for a construction otherwise unknown in good Sanskrit. Probably the Petersburg Lexicon is quite right in questioning the reading altogether.

To p. 358: The table is (revised) from Professor Cappeller's MS.
To p. 373: On sāuvira. For the Bāḥlikas' (Vahlikas') sāuvira, see IS. xiii, p. 369. Both Bhārata and Bhāṣya recognize Čākala, the chief town of the Madras.

To p. 374: On the Puṇjab. Compare the grouping of Kashmir and Puṇjab as places of pilgrimage: Kāqmiramaṇḍale nado yāḥ patanti mahānadam, tā nadiḥ sindhum āsādyā qilavān svargam āpnyūt, xiii, 25, 8 (with Candrabhāgā and Vitastā in 7).

To p. 378: On human sacrifices. The inferred antithesis is, of course, the horror elsewhere felt at the very sacrifice here ordered. So in ii, 22, 11, it is said that "human sacrifice has never been recognized" (seen). But Čiva is here worshipped with human sacrifices, as has always been the case with this God and his consort. On the "blamable vice" of hunting, compare also ii, 68, 20; xii, 28, 31.

To p. 387: On the denarius. In a passage published some years ago (AJP. vol. xix, p. 24) I called attention to the fact that, though the Roman denarius is not directly mentioned in the epic itself, yet it is mentioned in a later addition to the epic, and this addition is in turn recognized (so late are some parts of the epic itself) in two (I might have said three) books of the epic; whence followed the conclusion that those parts of the epic itself which recognize the addition that in turn recognizes the denarius must naturally be later than the introduction of the denarius into the country, and this implies for these parts of the epic a date later by half a thousand years than the date assumed by the synthetic method for the whole epic in its present condition. When in Die Genesis des Mahābhārata, p. 45, the author comes to discuss this awkward point, he simply says, without referring to the source of his information or to the actual state of the case: "This poem contains no such evidence of late origin" (as is implied in the recognition of the Roman coin), words of especial significance when one considers that the author everywhere insists on regarding "this poem" as a complete whole, and that they are put immediately after the remark: "No book in which it (the denarius) occurs can belong
to a remote antiquity." The passage as a whole is thus liable to give readers unacquainted with synthetic methods the erroneous impression that the historical facts, instead of disproving the contention of the author, favor the conclusion drawn by him. Compare i, 213, 34: na vyājena cared dharmam.

To p. 391, note: On Buddhistic traits. The Pāṇḍyas in this passage are set next to those who ācrameṣu vṛthācārāḥ . . . iha laukikam śhante māñsaçoñitavardhanam, iii, 188, 48-49. The last verse, bahupaśaṇḍasaukīrṇāḥ parāṇagupavādīnah āgramāḥ . . . bhaviṣyanti, is the converse of the one cited above on p. 87 from iii, 191, 10. In the former passage, Professor L. de la Vallée-Poussin has just called my attention to the significance of the world-destroying "seven suns" as a term "well-known in Pāli and Nepalese books." I had space only to note the item, as his card came while I was correcting page-proof. The particular importance of this observation lies not in the fact that "seven suns" are Buddhistic (for they are also Brahmanistic), but in these two facts combined, first that (in distinction from seven rays) seven suns are rare in Brahmanism and common in Buddhism, and second that they are here associated with Pāṇḍyas, whom the epic scholiast regards as "unbelievers, particularly Buddhists," and with vihāras, another term somewhat more closely associated with Buddhists than with Brahmins. I have pointed out above, p. 49, that the duplicate form of this section is probably later than the Vāyu Purāṇa. In this section, the parent-children are a little older than in the parallel verse at 190, 49 = 188, 60, the age of the girls being that of the boys as cited above. The former is the zodiac section (p. 392).

To p. 392: On some later traits in the epic. The passage (in note 3) from Vana gives the rare adjectival form Yavana nṛpāḥ, "Ionic kings out of the West." The same section, iii, 254, has a verse, 7 a (not in C.) on the kings of Nepal, Nepāla-viśaya, a name unknown in early literature and presumably interpolated here. The Mongolians, mentioned in vii, 11, 16, also seem to belong to a late period, a fact M. Barth has emphasized. The Huns, too, while common in the Bhārata, are strange to the Rāmāyana (probably unknown altogether). I really do not know how the synthesist explains such cases, whether as dating from 500 B.C. or as interpolations. The theory is so elastic, with its extrusion of unwelcome data and illogical recourse to
interpolations whenever convenient, that it is perhaps otiose to try to refute it on historical grounds. Again, in regard to late words, merely as words, any one may say that any word may have any age; but there is still a reasonable suspicion that a number of words found in unique combination or only in certain parts of the epic and in later literature may indicate a somewhat close connection between these parts and that literature: anvavāya, family, i, 209, 2; vii, 144, 6; atyatikrāmat (rathavarān), vii, 146, 40; kāmdīqkāh (prādravan), ix, 3, 9; x, 8, 102; nā 'yaṁ kīlbayitum kālah, ix, 5, 27 and v. l. to vi, 96, 12 = 4,334; aṣṭāpada, gold, xii, 299, 40, etc. Compare also in mythology, only three world-protectors, xiii, 159, 31 (effect of trinity ?); Varunā's wife, Siddhi, xii, 301, 59; Citragupta (p. 184).

To p. 396: On the date of the Jātakas. In respect of the importance to be attached to the circumstance that epic tales are recognized in the Jātakas, it must not be forgotten that for the form of the Jātakas, as we have them, there is no evidence whatever of a very ancient date, and since the oldest sculptured tale does not antedate the third century B. C., even the matter they offer can only doubtfully be referred to so early a century. It is of course quite possible, and some may think it probable, that at least the content, if not the form, of the extant Jātakas, is still earlier; but in using the tales for literary and historical comparison it is obviously unsafe to base much upon a double uncertainty, of date and of form. The fact that Buddha always appears in these stories as a Bodhisattva makes it possible indeed that the Jātakas may be much later than the third century. M. Barth, in the review referred to above, has with his usual clearheadedness called attention to the fact that the custom, generally recognized in these stories, of sending young men to Taxila to complete their education, is anything but an antique trait.

Correction.—On pages 55 and 57, prekkhā (prekṣā) is a lapsus for pekkhā.
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Absorption, 182 ff., 185.

Accents, 5.

Accusative with bhavati, 265, 473.

Ages, 3.

Allahabad, 83.

Alliteration, 202 ff.

Annihilation, 89.

Arabians, 394.

Archery, 11, 12.

Architecture, 11, 391 ff.

Art, 349; arts and sciences, v. Upaveda.

Assonance, 200.

Astronomy, 14, 15, 392.

Atheism, 104, 189.

Augment, 248, 251.

Authority, 90 ff.

Bactrians, 373, 394.

Banyan, 83.

Bards, 365 ff.

Barth, vii, 381, 472, 475 ff.

Benfey, 254, 272, 446.

Blood, circulation of, 11.

Bloomfield, 3, 244.

Body (growth of, etc.), 153, 173 ff., 177.

Böthlängk, 246, 247, 249, 256, 446.

(von) Brade, 386.

Breaths, five, seven, or ten, 36, 171 ff.

Brown, 193, 210, 241, 332.

Buddhists, 87 ff., 123, 147, 176, 391 ff.

Buddhistic works, 386, 395; verses, v.

Dhammapada; 79, 204, 237, 291, 308,

343, 379; traits in epic, 351, 379, 391,

475.


Cadence, 207 ff., 210 ff.

Casura, 198, 210 ff., 216, 310. See also under each metre.

Callimachus, 26.


Cartellieri, 387.

Ceylon, 80, 393.

Chinese, 393.

Clava, 88, 97 ff., 113 ff., 143, 165, 183,

189, 474.

Coins, 387.

Colebrooke, 220, 242, 354.

Collitz, 66.

Colors, 172; of soul, 179.

Creations, 130, 142, 182.

Cunningham, 83.

Custom, 90.

Dahlmann (v. Synthesis), Preface, 391,

396.

David, Rhys, 55, 87, 367, 386.

Death, 184.

Denarius, 387, 474.

Destructible, 182.

Dialectic forms, 69, 247, 251, 261 ff.

Didactic epic, 381.

Dihambus, 242, 248.

Dio Chrysostomos, 389.

Documents, 388.

Drama, 54 ff., 62.

Drinking, 377.

Dualism, 85.

Echo, origin of, 26.

Egg (cosmic), 187.

Eighteen —vidyās, 17; Purāṇas, 48, 49;

(fold), 143; books, islands, armies,

etc., 371.

Eighty thousand, 6.

Elements, five, 33, 149; tanmātra, 34,

44, 46, 129, 156 ff., 172, 173 ff.

Emergent stanzas, 317.

Everett, 85.

Fa-Hien, 392.

Fate, 183.

Faults, 181.

Fausböll, 280.

Fick, 55, 380.

Free-will, 103.

Frog-girl (tale), 267 ff.
**ENGLISH INDEX.**

**Ganguli,** 95.
Garbe, 174, 178.
Geography, 81, 371, 373 ff., 393 ff.
Ghâsî, 392.
Gildemeister, 220, 254, 256 ff., 326, 446.
Gods (v. s. nom.), 4, 183, 379.
Grace of God, 188.
Grammatical forms (v. Sanskrit, Pârâkrama, dialecical forms), of later epic, 264 ff.; 472 ff.
Greek, 87, 387, 397; words, 372, 391 ff., 399.
Grierson, 384.

**Hardy,** 428, 445.
Heaven and hell, 184.
Hemistic, 196.
Heretics, 86 ff.
Histories, 197, 199.
Homer, Hindu, 379, 389.
Huns, 393, 475.
Hunting, 378.
Hwen Thasang, 83.
Hypermetres, 252 ff., 275 ff.

**Imperative future,** 196, 247.
Inscriptions, metre of, 333, 355, 361; on rock, 388.
Inspiration, plenary, 92.
Islands, number of, 229, 371.

**Jaco,** 45, 174.
Jains, 87 ff.

**Kambojas,** 392 ff.
Kashmere, 72, 116, 394, 474.
Kern, 10.
Kirste, 399.
Kielhorn, 262.
Knowledge and soul, 40.
Kühnau, 296, 317.

**Lamp,** 42.
Land grants, 388.
Lamman, 206, 260.
Lassen, 326, 356, 393.
Letters, sixty-three, 364.
Lévi, 367.
Literature, 1 ff.
Logic, 7, 11.
Lord-spirit (v. yoga), 134.
Lotus, 37 ff., 121; lotus-theft, 221, 381.
Lotus of True Law, 389.
Lüders, 50, 60, 77.
Ludwig, 376, 385, 472.

**Magic,** 380.
Manuscripts of epic, 364, 387.
Meat-eating, 377.
Medicine, 11, 12, 14, 35.
Megasthenes, 389.
Metaphors, 205 ff.
Metre, affects grammar, 246 ff.
Metres, 191 ff.; tables of, 193, 358.
Mind, 33 ff.; sixth sense, 112, 166.
Mongolians, 475.
Mora-verse, 259, 343.
Morals, 376 ff.
Muir, 46, 54, 368.
Müller, 5, 44, 385.
Music, 11, 13, 172, 365.
Mute and liquid rule, 242.

**Name and form,** 178, 183.
Nepal, 475.
Numbers, 206.

**Ocean,** allusions to, 80 ff.
Oldenburg, 381.
Organs, 34 ff., 129, 149 ff., 155 ff., 166.

**Pâli,** 260, 262 ff.
Pantomime, 55.
Pathetic repetition, 205, 207.
Patna, 392.
Persian, 392; word, 371.
Philosophy, 85 ff.
Physician, 84.
Pictures, 388.
Pischel, 57, 263.
Plants, 171.
Poetic licence, 244 ff., 251, 261 ff.
Polyandry, 376, 399.
Prākrit, 69, 83; metre, 242, 244, 263, 366, 360, 472, 473.
Principles, twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth, 113 ff., 125 ff., 133 ff., 189.
Prose-poetry, 266 ff.
Proverbs, 75, 83, 245, 260, 261, 266.
Pseudo-epic, 260, etc., 331, 472.
Pun, 204.
Punjāb, 78, 874, 474.

Rhapsode, 5, 54, 56, 365.
Rhyme, 200 ff.
Romans, 393.

Sacrifices, plants, beasts, human, 377 ff., 474.
Sanskrit, 69, 83; grammar, 245 ff.
Sāńchi, 367.
Saturnian verse, 332.
Scapgoats, 213, 471.
(von) Schroeder, 394.
Scythians, 394.
Self-existent, 4, 18.
Seven, creators, 142; breaths, 171; suns, 391, 475.
Seventeen, group, 30, 33, 165 ff.
Ships, 82.
Shiva, v. Čiva.
Silkworm, 36, 151.
Similes, 205 ff.
Sixteen (groups), 168.
Sixty, v. gunās.
Sixty-four arts, 16.
Sørensen, 472.

Soul (v. Purusha), 42.
Sound, 172; eternal, ghoṣa, 183.
Stadia, 183.
Statues, 392.
Suttee, 81.
Syllaba anceps, 194 ff., 314.

Tags, 211 ff., 360.
Taxila, 387 ff., 475.
Telang, 27, 93.
Terminals, 67.
Theocritus, 380.
Thorpe, 263.
Time, 41, 45, 103, 182 ff.
Tuṣārās, 394.
Trinitarian doctrine, 46, 184.

Vallée-Poussin, 475.
Vedic forms, 360.
Vishnu, 62, 64, 97, 183.
Vowel-changes, 248.

Whites (white men), 72, 116, 144.
Windisch, 79.
Winternitz, ix, 60, 115, 234, 391.
Wirtz, 60.
Writing, 205, 388.

Zodiac, 392.
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Akkhāna, 386.
akṣaracchandaś, 192, 193, 321.
agrāhāra, 388.
atijagati, 193, 326.
atidhṛti, 193.
atīçakvarī, 193.
Atri, Kṛṣṇātreyā, 11, 35.
Atharvan (v. Vedas), 51.
Atharvaçīraś, 9, 40.
adhyāyāma (scheme), 132.
Aniruddha, 143.
anuprāśa, 203.
anumāna, 51, 92, 93, 145.
anuvaśā, 54, 304.
Anuñāsana, 304, 308.
aparavaktra, 193, 336, 340 ff., 358.
apavarga, 107.
Apāntaratamas, 3, 97.
abhinaya, 55.
arisṣṭāni tattvāni, 100.
Arthaçāstra, 16, 80, 111.
ardhasamavṛtta, 193, 330; epic variations, 348.
avidyā, 138, 148.
avyakta (v. Prakṛti), 34, 134 ff.
Açoka, 356, 393.
Açvaghoṣa, 395.
ācyasamajāpana, 25.
Asamañjās, 77.
asambādhā, 193, 322.
Asita Devala, 98, 155 ff.

Ākhyāna, Bhārata, 9, 386; dharma-satya, 6, 43, 60.
āgama (v. kṛta), 4, 11, 43, 145, 395; of sects, 115.
āśāra, v. custom.
āśman (v. soul), 130, etc.
āpātālikā, 351.
āśmāya, 92.
Āryurveda (v. Medicine), 53.
Āranyaka, 7, 9 (“sung”), 52.
Ārēṣā, 193, 353, 354 ff., 350, 358, 360.
Ārīṣā, 193, 354 ff.
Āśvalāyana, 47.
Āṣuri, 98, 99, 144.

Itīvṛttā, 51.
Itihāsa, 4, 7, 10, 47 ff., 50, 64 (great), 111, 308.
Indra, 213, 471.
indravājī, 192, 300.
indravajrā, 192, 210, 309.
indriya (from Indra), 35.
Īśvara (v. Lord-spirit), 105, 139, 187, 189.

Uttara (mīmāṃsā), 7.
upagūś, 163, 354.
upajīti, 192, 210, 216, 303, 309, 316.
Upanishads (v. Vedanta), 9 ff., 13, 25, 27, 79; 145 ff.; secret, 311; metre, 237; Atharvaçīraś, 46; Kaṭha, 29, 31, 40, 90, 471; Chānd., 42, 385; Tāltt., 49; Praçāna, 6, 27; B.A., 28, 45, 46; cited, p.149, etc.; Brahmabindu, 45; Mahā, 10, 48; Mahānār., 27; Māitri, 27, 30, 33 ff., 45, 90, 167, 471; Mund, 90, 300; Yogataṭṭva, 31; Čvet., 28, 167.
upanisā, 10.
upamā, 205 ff.
upamāna, 90.
Upaveda, 7, 10, 11, 13.
upasarga, 181.
upākhyāna, 50.
upādhyāya, 380.
Upānga, 7, 10, 13.
upendravajrā, 192, 210, 309, 316.
Uçanās (v. Brhaśpati).
ūṣman, 156, 171.

Ekāntin, 143.
edūka, 49, 391.

Āṃtihya, 43, 51, 145.
SANSKRIT INDEX.

OJHA, 380.

KUPOOCHANDASIKAI, 193, 341, 349 ff.

KACCHIT chapter, 12, 16, 75, 384.
Kañāda, 96, 98.
Kathaka, 54 ff., 304 ff.
Kathā, 50 ff.
Kathaka, 54 ff.
Kāpila, 96, 97 ff., 117, 369.
Kapha, 12, 35, 122.
Karma, 106, 149.
Karṇendriya, 130.
Kālījñāna, 15, 16, 168; sixty-four, 17, 386; thirty-one elements, 162.
Kāścī, 82.
Kāpila, 90.
Kāma čāstra, 16.
Kāla, v. Time.
Kāla jñāna, 14, 15.
Kālayāvan, 16, 48, 392.
Kālidāsa, 64, 80, 225.
Kāvyā, 63, 79, 80.
kīrtana, 51.
Kūra, 61, 376.
Kūṭalā, 65, 366.
kṛtāgama, 4.
kṛtānta, 99, 145.
kṛṣṇa (age), 3.
Kṛṣṇa, 4 (religion of), 9, 14, 53, 143, 175, 184, 189; as Dwāpāyaṇa, 4, 54, 97; nature of, 374 ff., 384 ff.
Kṛṣṇātreyya, 11.
Kevala, Kevalatra, 44, 102, 108.
Kopa v. triś.
kosakāra, 30, 151, 161.
Kosala and Videha, 78.
Kāullika-čāstra, 380.
Kaučika, 14, 119.
krama, 5, 14.
kṣetrajña (v. jīva), 160.
Ksemendra, 398.

KHEṬAKA, 382.

GANACCHANDAS, 192, 354 ff.
gadha, 8, 272.
Gayā, 83.
Garga, 15 ff.
Gānecas, 115.
gāthā, 52, 305 ff.; epic, 385; verse, 239, 244, 264.
gāthīn, 306.

Gāndharva (Veda, v. Music), čāstra, 17.
gāyana, 306.
Gārgya, 11, 14.
Gālava, 5.
gīti, 5.
guṇa for jīva, 230, 437 (No. 279).
geha for grha, 263.
Gāujas, 202.
Gāutama, 96, 97.
Gāuračiras, 18.
grantha, 16.
granthika, 360.

GAHOŠA, 183.

CAKRAVAṬTA, 396.
caturmūrti, 184.
campū, 272.
cana, 6.
Canaṇayūha, 5.
citta, 161.
Citra gupta, 184, 476.
cetana, 150.
cāitanya, 46.
cāitya, 392.

CHANDAS, 191 ff.
chāyopasevana, 380.

JAGARI, 192, 193.
Jātaka, 65, 390, 392, 386, 396, 475.
jīva, 97, 137, 146 ff., 152, 175.
jīva and videha mukti, 111.
Jāmīni, 97.
jyeṣṭha sāman, 388.

tatrābhavant, 68.
tatśatha, 44.
tapas, 188.
tarkačātra, 90, 146.
tāṃrapaṭṭa, 388.
tīśya (age), 3.
Tīrthas, 8, 20, 40, (gāthā) 62.
trikopa, triśyop, 372.
tristubh, 192, 200 ff., 214 ff., 273 ff.; bird’s-eye view, 275; of Rāmāyana, 276; scholi, 277; catalctic, 282; hypermetric, 280, 290; defective,
Patañjali, philosopher, 97, 147, 180 ff.;
grammariam, 390, 399; metre, 239, 472.
pathyā, 219 ff., 446.
padakrama, 5.
padyā, 272.
Pāñcarātra, 96, 97, 143, 144 ff.
pāṭhaka, 394.
Pāṇini, 13, 16, 390, 395.
pāṇiśavāki, 393 ff.
Pāṇḍava, 376 ff., 385, 397.
pārīplava, 385.
Pārjupata, 96, 97, 114 ff., 118.
pāda, 191, 193.
Pāśaṇḍa, 89, 391, 475.
pitta, 12, 35, 122.
purāṇa, 4, 7, 10, 17, 47 ff., 80, 111, 398;
Vāyu, 6, 48 ff., 63; Bhavīṣyat, Gauḍa, Vārāha, 48; Vighnā, 384; met-
tre of, 224 ff., 229, 234, 256 ff., 314.
purāvṛtta, 51.
Puruṣa, 39, 106, 113 ff., 118; plu-
rality of, 122; eternal, 134, 138.
Purohitā, 380.
puspātigra, 193, 336, 340 ff., 358.
pustaka, 364, 387.
Puṣyāmitra, 399.
Pūrvaçastra, 87.
Prakṛti, 44, 106, 112 ff., 117 ff., 121;
ādyā, 471; eight, 129; eternal, 134, 170, 182; seven, 146, 170; colors of,
28, 180.
pratibhā, 107, 181.
pratirūpaka, 389.
pratyakṣa, 51, 92, 105, 145.
pratvāhāra, 182.
prabhavīṣṇuvā, 108.
pramāṇa, 51, 90.
pramāṇīkṣara, 322, 363.
pravajana, 95.
pravacana, 8.
pravesa, 128.
prasāda, 42, 188.
praharanakālī, 323, 353.
praharsī, 103, 329, 358.
Prākrit, v. English index.
praksā (and pekkhā), 55, 57, 476.
BANDIN, 366.
bala, sixth organ, 150 ff.
bhāvyā, 5.
Bādarāyana, 97, 124.
Bāhīka, 373, 474.
Buddha and buddhiyamana, 132, 134 ff.
Buddhi (v. Sāmkhya), 158; has sixty
guṇas, 163.
Buddhindrishyas, 130.
Bṛhaspati (with Ucānas), 11, 18, 87.
Brahmajāla sutta, 55, 57.
Brahman, 11, 90, 104 ff.
Brahmā, 4, 163, 187.
brahmaṣṭra (thread), 364 (v. Sūtra).
Bṛahmana, 7; Āit., 29; Čatapatha, 6,
7, 26, 308; Tāndya, Kātha, Kāṇya,
Tāttiri, 8; Kālpa and Kaṭha, 14.

Bhagavadgītā, 53, 205; metre of, 219,
225, 234 ff., 384, 402.
Bharata, 11, 57.
Bharadvāja, 11, 18.
bhavati with acc., 265, 473.
bhave(ḥ) for bhavayam, 473.
Bhāgavatā, 91, 115, 117.
Bhāratī kathā, 54, 64, 386 ff.
bhujangaprayāta, 193, 289, 323, 357,
358.
bhūtātman, 39, 40.
bhoti, 259.

Mathurā, 395.
Manu, 8, 9, 18 ff., 22, 25, 57, 69, 144,
388.
manovahā, 35, 181.
mantra, 4, 11.
Maya, 392.
mahātmā, 39.
Mahābhārata, 4, 54; -krt, 358, 380 ff.;
date of, 307 ff.
Mahābhāṣya, 3, 5, 6, 8, 56; verse, 238,
258, 290, 401, 468, 472.
mahābhūta, 34, 130 ff., 175.
māgadhās, 386.
Māgha, 223, 227.
mātrāchandas, 192, 330, 343.
mātrāsamaka, 193, 351, 353 ff., 355 ff.
mārija, 68, 294.
mālā, 193, 334, 357, 358.
Mīhira, 371.
mīmāṃsā, 87.
mṛgendramukha, 193, 331, 337.
mokṣadharma, 51.

mokṣaṃḍstra, 16.
mleccha, 49, 333.

Yama, 136, 238.
yamaka, 205.
Yāsaka, 14.
yuṅkīcāstra, 17.
Yudhisṭhirā and yudhi sthirā, 391.
yoga, (eightfold) 44, 86 ff., 111, 136,
159, 188.
yoga-çāstras, 110, 179.
yogin, seven guṇas, 39; practice, 107;
body of eight guṇas, 108; faults,
181; discipline, 107, 181, 189.

Rathañtaka, 398.
rathañdhata, 193, 322, 358.
rhasaya, 9, 10, 13.
Rāma, 64, 78, 79, 305.
Rāmāyaṇa, 10, 27, 32, 55, 56, 58–84,
183; metre of, 226, 231, 236 ff., 242,
247 ff., 264, 316, 317, 349 ff., 354, 301,
384, 395; also the Appendices, pas-
sim. and 473.
rucirā, 193, 302 ff., 326, 358; in R., 309.
Rudra-Ciṇa, 115, 184.
rudras, 108.
rūpaka, 205 ff.
Romaharpaṇa, 47.
rūdrarasa, 294.

Lokāyata, 87, 111.

vaṃśasthābila, 192, 309.
Vatsabhāṭṭi, 333, 355.
varṇavṛttā, 192, 321.
vasantatilakā, 193, 333, 357, 358.
vasso, 364.
vācaka, 363.
vāṇi, 172.
vāta, 12, 35, 122.
vātara, 192, 304, 317 ff.
Vāmana, 333.
Vālmiki, thief, 57; poet and saint,
58 ff., 61 ff.; copied, 204, 225, 229,
264; yajurvedin, 328.
Vāhika, 373.
vikāra, eleven, 37, 44; sixteen, 128 ff.,
168 ff.
Vidarbhās, 203.
vidūṣaka, 55 ff.
vidyā, 130, 133.
vipulā, rules, 220 ff., 248; examples, 448 ff.
viṣeṣas, 44, 129, 187.
viṣyā(ni), 251.
vihāra, 88, 301.
vīṇa, 172, 305.
Veda, 2 ff., 101; made, 3; vedakartar, 4; lost, 3, 4; size and branches, 5; Saṁhitā, 7, 53; other names, 2, not including Aranyaka, 9; Atharva, 2, 3, 5, 12, 26, 380; Brahma and Brahma, 9, 12, 13; Rk, 2, 5, 23 ff., 124, 207, 356; Yajus, 2, 5, 25, 368; Sāman, 2, 3, 5, 309; fourfold, divided, etc., 3; Čīkālaka, 6; fifth, or Vyāsa's Veda, 7, 10, 53.
Vedāṅgas, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14.
Vedānta, 9, 43, 53, 93 ff., 111, 143, 150; Secret of, 157.
Vedāntasāra, 34, 238.
Vedāranyaka, 90.
vātālika, 300.
vātāliya, 193, 341, 349 ff.
vāciṣṭika, 96.
vāciṣvetavē, 193, 304, 317 ff., 325, 358.
Vāṣṇava, 115.
vāṣṇava, 58, 71, 123, 124, 157.

ČAṪVAKI, 193.
Čaturdīya, 24, 308.
čiṭḍācāstra, 17.
Čambūka, 72.
Čāktas, 115.
čākhā, v. Veda.
Čāndi, 14, 97.
čārudūla, viṛuddita, 193, 330, 357 ff.
čāndī, 192, 304, 314, 318.
Čālihotra, 12, 90.
čāstra, 9, 12, 13, 17.
čikṣā, 4 (sačālkṣyam), 7, 14.
čukra, 153.
Čūdra (in later epic), 379.
ČāIVA, 115.
česi, 12.
čloka, 192, 194, 214 ff., 219 ff.; scheme of metre, 235, 236; prior pāda, 219 ff.; iambic clōka, 238; posterior pāda, 239; hypermetric, 252 ff.; compared with mātṛa, 366.

ŚAṬṭHAYOG, of Čiva, 113, 165.

SAMAYA, 57.
samādhi, 109.
samākhyā, 126.
sampradāya, 41, 42.
Sāmkhya, 86 ff., 93, 110, 111, 124, 127 ff.; scheme, 129, 180; sixty guṇas, 164 and 355.
Sāmkhyayoga, 90, 90, 101; difference, 111, 124, etc.
sāman (v. Veda), 16.
siddhānta, 117.
siddhārtha, 14.
Śiddhi, wife of Varuṇa, 475.
suruṅga, 372.
Śūta, 56, 394 ff.
Śūtra, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17; epic verse in, 385; mention of epic, 390; Veda-śūtra and Brahma-śūtra, 15, 16.
śūtradhāra, 66.
saukhyacāyika, 366.
Śāuras, 115.
sāuvira, 373, 474.
stuticāstra, 48.
stūpa, 302.
stoḥhas, 207.
smā and smahe, 249.
Śmyti, 306.

HAṪIOITĀS, 53.
Harivaṇca, known in Čānti, 9.
Hiranyagarbha, 96, 113.
Mahābhārata - Criticism
Criticism - Mahābhārata
"A book that is shut is but a block"
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