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The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute was founded in 1915. The first verse of the Mahābhārata was written by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar on 1st April 1919 while inaugurating the work of the Institute on the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata. On 4th August 1925 Dr. V. S. Sukthankar took charge of this work as its General Editor and reorganized it on a sound basis. For the subsequent 17 years he worked on it with an eagle eye and mature scholarship bringing international honour to himself and to the Institute. In 1940, the British Academy, London, put its seal of approval on Dr. Sukthankar's work on this edition. On the 4th January 1943, the Institute conferred on Dr. Sukthankar a Distinguished Services Medal in recognition of his unique services to the Institute as the helmsman of its work on the Mahābhārata on the occasion of its Silver Jubilee celebrations. On 5th January 1943, Dr. Sukthankar read his statement on the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata before the delegates for the Silver Jubilee celebrations and other audience in the Tata Hall of the Institute. This statement has proved to be his last testament more valuable than Aristotle's will as it is a national testament. I quote from it a few sentences which contain Dr. Sukthankar's message about the Mahābhārata:—

"The part of the Epic critically dealt with so far is, I imagine, in bulk about four times as great as the Greek Epics, Iliad and Odyssey put together and one and a half times as our Rāmāyaṇa."

"All good work costs money now-a-days! Good manuscripts cost money. Good printing costs money. Good editors cost money."

"Amid the deepest strands that are woven in the thread of our civilization there is more than one that is drawn originally from Bhaṛatavarṣa and from Sanskrit literature and well in the centre of this vast mass of literature, there stands this deathless traditional book of divine inspiration, unapproachable and far removed from possibilities of human constitution."

"We must therefore grasp this great book with both hands and face it squarely. Then we shall recognise that it is our past which has prolonged itself into the present. We are it: I mean the real We! Shall we be guilty of strangling our own soul? Never!"

These stirring words were read out by Dr. Sukthankar on the evening of the 5th of January and within a fortnight he passed away after a brief illness on the evening of 21st January 1943! Truth is stranger than fiction!!

Such in brief is the outline of Dr. Sukthankar's association with the Institute's Critical Edition of the Great Epic, which he aptly styled as "the Content of our Collective Unconscious," and in which he
finally merged his being after spending every moment of his conscious life in revising his type-script of the last of his lectures on the Mahābhārata he was to deliver before the University of Bombay on the following day!

In striking him down within sight of his chosen goal, Death pierced the base of consciousness, cutting at the very joint of body and mind. No preparation for the end, no inspiring last words, were possible. Yet, those of us who knew SUKTHANKAR intimately cannot doubt that the sentiments of Valiant would also have been his own had he received the summons of an approaching end to life's journey. "Though with great difficulty I am got hither, yet now I do not repent me of all the trouble. My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in the pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me, that I have fought His battles Who will be my Rewarder." This memorial volume represents the sword, the keen splendid-tempered image of his intellect, that he bequeathed to him that has the courage and skill to wield it. If there be such a person, undaunted by the forces of darkness, let him grasp firm the hilt and smite on.

Side by side with his text-critical work on the Mahābhārata Dr. SUKTHANKAR kept on studying its content and inner meaning and for that purpose studied many books on Philosophy and Religion. While I was editing the Review of Philosophy and Religion between 1930 and 1937, I received numerous books on these subjects for review. Dr. SUKTHANKAR seemed very much interested in many of them and he actually ordered some of them for his own library. I was first under the impression that Dr. SUKTHANKAR perused these books with a view to get a little diversion to his mind after his fatiguing work on the text of the Mahābhārata day after day for years without rest. I was however thoroughly surprised when he disclosed to me his scheme of lectures on the Mahābhārata which he finally prepared for being delivered before the University of Bombay and before completing which he took our final leave with a "Forget-me-not" emphasis! The mystical vein noticed by the audience in those lectures was mainly due to the psychological changes gradually brought about in the mind of the great Savant during the ten years prior to these lectures.

The idea of bringing out a Memorial Edition of Dr. SUKTHANKAR's published writings was first discussed by myself and my learned friends Dr. S. M. KATRE and Prof. D. D. KOSAMBI with Dr. Mrs. Malinibai B. SUKTHANKAR, M.B.B.S. and the sons of Dr. SUKTHANKAR immediately after Dr. SUKTHANKAR's demise. With the substantial support promised by the Sukthankar family a Memorial Edition
Committee was formed with Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, B.A., the Raja Saheb of Aundh as its Chairman and Diwan-Bahadur K. M. Jhaveri, M.A., LL.B., J.P. as its Vice-Chairman. With the assured support of these two great friends of Dr. Sukthankar and with the guaranteed voluntary co-operation of my esteemed friends Dr. Katre and Prof. Kosambi, it was easy for me to secure the support of the innumerable friends of Dr. Sukthankar all over India and outside for the work of the Memorial Edition as will be seen from the Personnel of the Memorial Edition Committee which accompanies this Preface. A printed Appeal was subsequently issued by me on behalf of the Committee and circulated among scholars and institutions interested in the Memorial Edition. The response to this appeal from the numerous friends and admirers of Dr. Sukthankar was extremely encouraging and the First Volume of the Memorial Edition that is being presented to the public today is a visible embodiment of this spontaneous response and a permanent Souvenir of the good will left behind by an Indian scholar who sacrificed himself on the altar of the Mahābhārata.

The valuable and scholarly contents of the present volume speak for themselves and will continue to speak with greater resonance as years pass by. As observed by Prof. Edgerton they are the product of Dr. Sukthankar’s knowledge and experience (Jñānam Sāvijñānam) and his native ability which made reputation in three Continents. Dr. Sukthankar’s literary life was a life of planned action, in which every detail was scrupulously worked out and revised many times before it saw the light of the day. Every page of the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata and the Critical Epic Studies that are being presented to the scholars to-day under one cover bear the stamp of his scholarship and fully illustrate the common adage:—“If a thing is worth doing, it is worth doing well.” His Prolegomena to the Adiparvan of the Mahābhārata, the bed-rock of the Mahābhārata Textual Criticism, was much in demand since its publication. It is being published separately for the first time in the present volume along with the other Epic Studies of Dr. Sukthankar and thus brought within the means of individual research scholars through the favour of the authorities of the B. O. R. Institute. I feel confident that this First Volume of Dr. Sukthankar Memorial Edition will stimulate the study of the Indian Textual Criticism on which the attention of Indian scholars has been now focussed by Dr. Katre’s able Introduction to Indian Textual Criticism (1940), which owes much to Dr. Sukthankar’s inspiration and guidance.

It now remains for me to record my feelings of gratitude for the unstinted co-operation I have received from several friends and learned
bodies in bringing out this First Volume of the V. S. Sukthankar Memorial Edition. My cordial thanks are due to the authorities of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, many of whom are members of the Memorial Edition Committee, for their kind permission to include in the present volume the *Prolegomena* and other *Introductions* to the *Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata* as also Dr. Sukthankar’s *Epic Studies* published in the *Annals* of the Institute. Special thanks are due to Principal J. R. Gharpure, B.A., LL.B., the Chairman of the Executive Board and Dr. R. N. Dandekar, M.A., Ph.D., the Secretary of the Institute who is also the Editor of the *Annals*, for their uniform courtesy and kindness in securing the above permission. To Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, M.A., Ph.D., the present General Editor of the Mahābhārata, I am particularly thankful for keeping at my disposal a copy of *Epic Studies No. VI* which he found in Dr. Sukthankar’s office papers at the Institute. This copy duly revised by Dr. Sukthankar in his own hand has been incorporated in the present volume. Evidently Dr. Sukthankar had an intention to revise all his *Epic Studies* in course of time and then publish them in their final form after the completion of his work on the Great Epic. Providence, however, decreed otherwise! As regards the other contributions of Dr. Sukthankar included in the present volume I tender my most grateful thanks—

(1) To the authorities of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay, and the Editorial Board of Sir J. J. Modi Volume for permission to include Dr. Sukthankar’s paper on “Arjunamiśra” in this Edition.

(2) To Mr. B. T. Anklesaria, M.A. the Hon. Secretary of the K. R. Cama Institute for drawing my attention to the two papers of Dr. Sukthankar viz. (i) Arjunamiśra and (ii) An Excursion on the Periphery of Indological Research and in securing the necessary permission of the authorities of his Institute for their inclusion in the present Edition, Mr. Anklesaria had collaborated with Dr. Sukthankar for a number of years in connection with his work for the Cama Institute and his hearty co-operation in this work by the free supply of the press-copies of the two papers of Dr. Sukthankar mentioned above deserves my best thanks.

(3) To the Editors of the *Festchrift* Prof. P. V. Kane and Dr. R. N. SardeSAI, L.C.P.S., Proprietor, Oriental Book Agency, Poona, its publisher, for permission to include Dr. Sukthankar’s paper on “Rāmopākhyaṇa” in this Volume.

(4) To the authorities of the Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute, Poona and in particular Dr. S. M. Katre, M.A.
PH.D. its present Director and Editor of their Bulletin for their permission to include Dr. Sukthankar’s paper on “Epic Question I—Did Indra assume the form of a Swan?” in this Volume.

(5) To the Editors of Feschrift Dr. F. W. Thomas and its publisher Mr. M. N. Kulkarni, the Manager of the Karnataka Publishing House, Bombay for their permission to publish Dr. Sukthankar’s paper on “Rāmāyaṇa and Nalopākhyāṇa” in this Volume.

(6) To the authorities, Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society for permission to include Epic Studies I: ‘Some Text-Critical Notes’ in this Volume.

Every scholar who came into personal contact with Dr. Sukthankar knows quite well how he loved not only the substantial contents of any scholarly publication but also its scientific and dignified presentation. He believed in the identity of Truth, Beauty and Dignity in the publication of all scholarly work worth the name. The volumes of the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata are a visible embodiment of Dr. Sukthankar’s ideal in this respect. A good edition according to Dr. Sukthankar must be good both within and without, and we have tried to make the present Memorial Edition as good as possible within the means at our disposal. But good Editions cost money, said Dr. Sukthankar in his last public statement and the credit of achieving any good ness in the present Memorial Edition must go to those donors, subscribers and contributors who have contributed their mite towards this Edition out of sheer love and appreciation for the national work of the departed scholar as will be seen from the list of these contributors (vide Appendix). Space forbids me to thank all these contributors individually. I shall however, be failing in my duty if I do not indicate here the generosity of the following contributors but for whose spontaneous response it would have been impossible for the Memorial Edition Committee to proceed with the work of the Edition:

Rs. 650—Dr. Mrs. Malinibai B. Sukthankar, M.B.B.S. and other members of the Sukthankar family, Bombay.
Rs. 150—University of Bombay.
Rs. 100—Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, B.A., Raja Saheb of Aundh, Aundh.
Rs. 100—Right Hon’ble Dr. M. R. Jayakar, Bombay.
Rs. 100—B. J. Wadia, M.A., LL.B., Vice-Chancellor, University of Bombay, Bombay.
Rs. 100—Sir Chunilal B. Mehta, KT., J.P. and Lady Tapibai C. Mehta, Bombay.

On the completion of the Memorial Edition it is proposed to
publish a full report of the work of the Committee where all contributions and donations will be specified in detail.

I started my work in connection with the Sukthankar Memorial Edition with the assured initial support of Dr. Mrs. Malinibai B. SUKTHANKAR and other members of the Sukthankar family. This support was further strengthened by the formation of a representative Memorial Edition Committee consisting of numerous friends and admirers of Dr. SUKTHANKAR in different parts of India and outside. This support, encouraging as it was for an inexperienced man like myself, made me confident enough about the success of this enterprise but I became absolutely fearless in my work when the two great friends of Dr. SUKTHANKAR, I mean Shrimant Raja Saheb of Aundh and Dewan Bahadur K. M. JHAVERI agreed to guide me in this work as the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Memorial Edition Committee respectively. Their high regard for our National Epic and its Epic Editor Dr. SUKTHANKAR has been responsible in no small way for the publication of the Epic Studies of Dr. SUKTHANKAR appearing today in the form of the First Volume of the Sukthankar Memorial Edition. On 5th January 1943, Dr. SUKTHANKAR referred to the Rajasaheb of Aundh in the following glowing terms:—

"If you want me to point out just one man who is responsible for originating and furthering the project (of the Mahabharata) he is sitting in front of you, I mean Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, the Raja of Aundh."

We are fortunate in having in our midst today, the first anniversary of Dr. SUKTHANKAR's demise, this very enlightened Rajasaheb, now in the 76th year to guide all our literary projects with undaunted zeal and optimism. I cannot adequately thank the Rajasaheb and other friends for their spontaneous and active co-operation in the work of this Edition.

I began my work in connection with the Memorial Edition with the guaranteed collaboration of my personal friends Dr. S. M. KATRE, M.A., PH.D. and Prof. D. D. KOSAMBI, M.A. These friends have fulfilled their guarantee to the very letter as they have been responsible for the entire editing of the First Volume and all credit for the careful and accurate editing of the Volume goes to them. During their personal contact with Dr. SUKTHANKAR they knew perfectly well what good editing meant according to Dr. SUKTHANKAR's highly critical standards and consequently the good editing of the present Volume owes everything to them as they have carried out at great inconvenience to themselves all the arduous work of seeing the Volume through the press. Though these friends have done all this labour of love out of their high sense of appreciation and respect for the work
of Dr. Sukthankar and though they are the members of the Memorial Committee, I take this opportunity of thanking them most cordially for their disinterested service to Indology in helping the Memorial Edition Committee to bring out the present Volume in the best possible form and get up.

Dr. Sukthankar was connected with the University of Bombay in several capacities for more than two decades. His cordial relations with all the authorities of the University are evident not only from the grant sanctioned by the Syndicate towards the costs of this Edition but by the personal generosity of the Vice-Chancellor, the Registrar, the Deputy Registrar, the Librarian and many other office-bearers of the University. I am deeply touched by their prompt and spontaneous response to my appeal regarding this Edition and I convey to all these friends of Dr. Sukthankar at the premier academic body of the province the grateful thanks of the Memorial Committee for their sincere appreciation of the work of the Committee.

In concluding this preface I must record the valuable services rendered to the Memorial Edition by Mr. M. N. Kulkarni, the enterprising Manager of the Karntak Publishing House, Bombay, but for whose high regard for Dr. Sukthankar and spontaneous cooperation on the very day this scheme was discussed we would not have dreamt of undertaking this Edition at a time when the extraordinary high cost of printing and the scarcity of paper had chilled all academic enterprises in this country. Like my esteemed friends Dr. Katre and Prof. Kosambi, Mr. Kulkarni has fulfilled his guarantee also to the letter by publishing this First Volume of the Memorial Edition most promptly and efficiently and thus kept up the high traditions of his Publishing House for excellent printing and typography, which are absolutely essential for good editing according to the standards of Dr. Sukthankar.

In presenting this first volume of the Sukthankar Memorial Edition to-day, the first anniversary of Dr. Sukthankar's lamented demise, the Memorial Committee has completed half of its promised work. Though I am thankful to all my colleagues on the Memorial Committee for their continuous co-operation so far, I must reserve my final thanks to them to a future date when the Second Volume of this Edition is completed and presented to the public.

P. K. Gode

Poona 4
21st January, 1944.

Hon. Secretary and Managing Editor
Dr. V. S. Sukthankar Memorial Edition Committee.
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FOREWORD1

An elaborate introduction containing a comprehensive account of the manuscript material as also a detailed discussion of the principles of Mahābhārata textual criticism will be published with the last fascicule of the Ādiparvan. The following cursory remarks are intended merely to guide the reader meanwhile through the labyrinth of a very complicated *apparatus criticus*.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

In the Mahābhārata manuscript tradition, perhaps as much as in any literary tradition, the textual critic is faced with a bewildering profusion of versions as well as an amazing mixture of versions. Divers elements have been working from the earliest times in favour of the development of different types, on the one hand: on the other hand, there were not wanting elements that operated against the evolution of sharply differentiated types. To understand the phenomenon of this luxuriant growth and indiscriminate fusion of versions, one must appreciate clearly certain details of historical moment, certain special factors in the transmission of the Mahābhārata—traits which distinguish our work from every other known text except the Rāmāyaṇa and possibly the Homeric epopees. Notwithstanding the fact that we know so little that is certain and definite about the early history of the text, we may, it seems to me, with confidence assume that after its composition the great epic was for centuries handed down (in differing forms and sizes) from bard to bard merely by word of mouth. It is moreover extremely probable that even after the text had been written down, large portions of it, especially such portions as were popular, continued to be committed to memory, by itinerant *raconteurs* for purposes of recitation. It is further easy to believe that no great care was lavished on the text by these custodians of the tradition to guard it against partial corruption and elaboration or against arbitrary emendation and normalization: to reproduce the received text with any great precision would be neither attempted by these bards nor required of them. It was then inevitable that the protean oral tradition should in one form or another react on the written tradition and *vice versa*. One important and necessary consequence of such antecedents as these is the impossibility of retracing all extant versions to any fixed and authentic archetype; since some of the modern editions could not be descendants of fluctuating oral versions reduced to writing in some distant past, independently of each other, at different epochs and in different circumstances. In

---

1 *Adiparvan, Fascicule I, 1927.*
other words, even in its early phases the Mahābhārata text tradition must have been not uniform and singular, but multiple and polygenous. To complicate matters [2] further there appears to have followed a period in which there was a free comparison of manuscripts and extensive mutual borrowings, operations which in the course of indiscriminate crossing and re-crossing have completely confused the differentiae and produced a perfect wilderness of hybrid types. These are, at least in part, still mere surmises. But the assumption of some such complicated derangements, beyond the normal vicesitudes of transmission, is necessary, to account for the strange vagaries of the Mahābhārata manuscript tradition: to explain why in the best manuscripts one comes across at every step readings that are manifestly inferior and additional lines that are incontestably spurious: to elucidate how textual alterations, especially interpolations, starting from the most inconspicuous source of diaskeuasis, could extend over large areas with comparative ease and rapidity.

This state of things, if true, would make it impossible to apply to the Mahābhārata the special canons of textual criticism which are derived from a study of classical (Greek and Latin) texts and which depend ultimately upon there being a more or less complete concatenation of copies and exemplars reaching finally back to a single authentic (written) archetype. The conflation of codices may, moreover, have been carried to such an extreme that we may even have to renounce all pretensions to disentangle completely, by means of purely objective criteria, their intricate mutual relationships. It would, therefore, be well not to ignore entirely the possibility that a wholly satisfactory restoration of the text to its pristine form—even the late so-called śatasāhasrī saṁhitā form—may be a task now beyond the powers of criticism.

Even though the problem be insoluble on the ideal plane, yet a partial solution of it is by no means impracticable and may with considerable gain be attempted. This fascicule will, I hope, demonstrate that a considerable portion of the inherited text can be incontestably proved to be authentic and unimpeachable; and that on the other hand certain portions of the “vulgate” can, equally indisputably, be shewn to be spurious. In other words, we seem entitled to assert that notwithstanding the existence of what may be termed “original doublets” (fluctuations inherited from a period of purely oral transmission), as well as a vast number of secondary variants (brought in through corruption and emendation during the period of mainly written transmission),—that despite the vagaries which surround a small part of the poem with a haze of uncertainty, the unification of the tradition could in regard to the major part of the epic be carried to a degree of approximation which may be deemed sufficient for all intents and purposes.

Ordinarily in text reconstruction a safe expedient is to take as basis the oldest of the “best family” of manuscripts and to authenticate it in the
critical edition. This expedient, though unquestionably safe and in most cases indubitably effective, fails totally in the present instance, assuming what has been said above about the fusion of types to be true: because by following any manuscript, even the oldest and the best, we shall be authenticating just that arbitrary mixture of versions which it should be the aim of criticism to avoid. The peculiar conditions of the transmission of the epic force upon us an eclectic but cautious utilization of all manuscript classes. Since all categories of manuscripts have their strong points and their weak points, each variant has to be judged on its own merits. When the criteria at our disposal fail to give a positive result, we have to content [3] ourselves with a stop-gap that will give the required sense or at least complete the metrical line. A text prepared, with due circum- spection, on eclectic principles will, I am fully persuaded, present a more faithful picture of the elusive "original" than any single extant codex could do. That in these circumstances the editor will occasionally make mistakes—at times perhaps gross mistakes—is as certain as inevitable; for it is to be feared that there is no royal road to success in this incomparably difficult field. The method of Mahâbhârata textual criticism can be evolved only from a special study of the Mahâbhârata manuscripts and of the Mahâbhârata manuscript tradition. More than one attempt will probably have to be made before the ideal is attained. It will, therefore, be prudent not to expect too much from the first critical edition, nor to claim too much for it.

MANUSCRIPT MATERIAL.

The manuscripts utilized for this edition of the first two adhyâyâs of the Âdiparvan are as follows:

I. N(ORTHERN) RECENSION

Kâśmîrī (or North-western) Version in Devanâgâri transcript (K).
K₀ = Poona, Govt. MSS. Collection, MS. No. 229 of 1895-1902.
K₁ = London, India Office Library, MS. No. 2137.
K₂ = Poona, Govt. MSS. Collection, MS. No. 182 of 1891-95. Dated V. Sâm. 1694 (ca. 1637 A.D.).
K₄ = Poona, Govt. MSS. Collection, MS. No. 565 of 1882-83.
K₅ = Lahore, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, MS. No. 1.
K₆ = Poona, Govt. MSS. Collection, MS. No. 209 of 1887-91.

Maithili Version (V).

Bangâli Version (B).
B₁ = Bolpur, Viśvabhârati Library, MS. No. 1.
B₂ = Bolpur, Viśvabhârati Library, MS. No. 258.
B₃ = Bolpur, Viśvabhârati Library, MS. No. 264.
B₄ = Bolpur, Viśvabhârati Library, MS. No. 415.
Devaṇāgarī Versions (D).
Devaṇāgarī Version of Arjunamīśra (Da).

\( D_1 := \) Poona, Govt. MSS. Collection, MS. No. 30 of A 1879-80.
\( D_2 := \) Poona, Govt. MSS. Collection, Viśrāmbāg Coll. I, MS. No. 468.

Devaṇāgarī Version of Nilakanṭha (Dn).

\( D_1 := \) MS. belonging to Sardar Kibe of Indore.
\( D_2 := \) Mysore, Oriental Library, MS. No. 1064.
\( D_3 := \) Poona, Govt. MSS. Collection, MS. No. 234 of 1892-1902.

Devaṇāgarī Version of Ratnagarbha (Dr).

\( D_1 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1264.
\( D_2 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1199.
\( D_3 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1315.
\( D_4 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1339.

Devaṇāgarī Mixed Versions.

\( D_1 := \) Poona, Govt. MSS. Collection, MS. No. 29 of A 1879-80.
\( D_2 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1152.
\( D_3 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1360.
\( D_4 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1128.
\( D_5 := \) Lahore, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, MS. No. 4.
\( D_6 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1223.
\( D_7 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1269.
\( D_8 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1329.
\( D_9 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1176.
\( D_{10} := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1293.
\( D_{11} := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1340.
\( D_{12} := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 1373.
\( D_{13} := \) Poona, Govt. MSS. Collection, Viśrāmbāg Coll. II, MS. No. 191.
\( D_{14} := \) Poona, Govt. MSS. Collection, Viśrāmbāg Coll. II, MS. No. 266.

II. S(outhern) Recension.

Telugu Version (T).

\( T_1 := \) Yadu Matḥ Collection MS. (without No.)
\( T_2 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 11865.

Grantha Version (G).

\( G_1 := \) Yadu Matḥ Collection MS. (without No.)
\( G_2 := \) Yadu Matḥ Collection MS. (without No.)
\( G_3 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 11823.
\( G_4 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 11838.
\( G_5 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 11851.
\( G_6 := \) Tanjore, Palace Library, MS. No. 11860.

Malayālam Version (M).

\( M_1 := \) MS. belonging to Chief of Idapillai, Cochin.
\( M_2 := \) Cochin, State Library, MS. No. 5.
\( M_3 := \) Cochin, State Library, MS. No. 1.
\( M_4 := \) MS. belonging to Kallenkara Pisharam of Cochin.

In addition to the above, two Baroda Library MSS. of the commentary by Devabodha (without the epic text) were collated; the important readings found in this commentary have been cited with the symbol Cd.
FOREWORD

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MANUSCRIPTS
AND THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONSHIP

An important advance made in the classification of the manuscripts is the separation of archetype K (which represents Devanāgarī transcripts of the Kāsmīrī or North-western version) from other so-called Devanāgarī versions. The affinity of K is documented by the following agreements:

1. 1. 2°: K (except K₁) महाभारत; D₄ महाभिष; the rest (inclusive of K₁) महाराज.
1. 1. 8°: K लोमाराणव; V₁ लोमाराण ॐ; the rest सौतित; दूत ॐ or दूत.
1. 1. 49°: K V₁ B₁ m संक्षेपलोकवीर; the rest संक्षेपप्रमो or संक्षेप्य चाब्रम.
1. 1. 51°: K विचक्षण; V₁ विशेषत; the rest मनोविषण.
1. 1. 192°: K (except K₅) धूतपालम; the rest (incl. K₅) धूसरकणः.
1. 2. 23°: K (except K₁-6) यथाविदिष संहितय; the rest (incl. K₁-6) संहितालब्ध-विदो जन.
1. 2. 76°: K (K₆ missing) यशाराणम रक्षसो; N₂ दैत्यानाम र°; the rest यशारण च महोजसा.

Only K₀-₁ represent archetype K in a comparatively pure form. Next to these in purity stands K₅; while K₆-₁₀ are nothing but misch-codices, K₅ being conflated with the “vulgate” and K₄-₁₀ with some Southern version (cf. 1. 1. 26 and 22*, 25*). K₀-₁ contains a text which is shorter and more archaic than either the Bangāli or the [5] “vulgate.” It is worthy of note that while these two manuscripts (K₀-₁) have more readings in common with manuscripts of the Southern recension than either of the two latter groups, yet they contain not a single “additional” line which could be considered as a characteristic Southern interpolation.—V₁ stands, as is to be expected, nearest to the Bangāli version, but it is noteworthy that in a few cases V₁ and K agree in opposition to all other manuscripts, where it is impossible to consider the agreement as purely accidental (cf. 1. 1. 8, 49°).—The Bangāli version is slightly superior to the “vulgate,” in so far that it is not interpolated quite so heavily as the latter. Bangāli omits (like K) not only the Brahmā-Ganeśa episode in the first adhyāya, but (unlike K) also the short dialogue between Parasurāma and his ancestors in the second, both unquestionably spurious and both found in the “vulgate.” Occasionally Bangāli manuscripts agree with Southern manuscripts in opposition to K and the “vulgate” (cf. 1. 1. 22°, 42°). In these cases I have adopted as authentic the concordant readings of the Bangāli and Southern manuscripts in preference to those of K. Bangāli alone has in a few cases preserved the correct reading as compared with all the other manuscripts (cf. 1. 1. 62°).—Closely connected with the Bangāli is the version of Arjunamātra. It not only agrees with the Bangāli in the omission of the Brahmā-Ganeśa episode and of the dialogue mentioned
above, but it shares with the Bangali quite a number of isolated readings against all other manuscripts. The (epic) text in the Arjunamisra codices is frequently contaminated from the "vulgate" and has to be corrected with the help of Arjunamisra’s commentary (cf. 1. 1. 17\(^b\), 22\(^b\)).—Ratnagarbha’s text is eclectic, standing palpably under the influence of the Southern recension (cf. 24\(^a\), 25\(^a\), 27\(^a\)).—Nflakaṇṭha’s version (which may conveniently be styled the “vulgate”) presents a smooth text, with an inconsiderable amount of Southern element. It may be noted that in rare cases the Bombay edition (of Gānapati Kṛṣṇāji) contains readings which have no manuscript support at all or have at best very weak manuscript support.—Next we have the mixed Devanāgarī group represented by \(D_{1-14}\), misch-codices of small trustworthiness and of no special value for critical purposes. \(D_{214}\) contain a very large number of old readings in common with manuscripts of the K group, but \(D_{14}\) shows at the same time some Southern readings and some unique readings not found elsewhere (cf. 1. 1. 50\(^d\); 63\(^cd\); 2. 101\(^b\)). \(D_{9-12}\) are palpably under the influence of the Southern tradition.—Telugu manuscripts have been placed in the Southern recension, but they belong in a sense to both recensions; they are eclectic on no recognizable principles.—It is difficult to define precisely the relationship between the Grantha and the Malayālam versions, which are very closely allied; each of them exhibits nevertheless certain features not found in the other (cf. 1. 1. 184\(^d\)). On the whole the Grantha version produces the impression of being less interpolated and more archaic than the other. This version has two sub-groups, \(G_{1-3}\) and \(G_{4-8}\); numerous cross-agreements between the two sub-groups show that our manuscripts are conflated. \(G_{7}\) does not belong to either of these groups; in point of fact, it is a misch-codex contaminated from the Northern tradition and closely allied to \(T_{3}\) (cf. 1. 1. 63, 64).—\(M_{1}\) often stands in antagonism to \(M_{2-4}\), sometimes agreeing with manuscripts of the Northern recension (cf. 1. 1. 32\(^ad\), 41\(^ed\), 71\(^a\), 128\(^a\)). The Southern recension, as already remarked, agrees with archetype K more closely than with any other Northern version.

[6] The Southern version of the first two adhyāyas is on the whole shorter than the “vulgate”; but the shortest version of these two adhyāyas is that preserved by \(K_{0,2}\), \(K_{0}\) being probably even shorter than \(K_{1}\). The naive Brahmā-Ganaṇa episode, the longest as well as the most obvious interpolation in the text of the “vulgate”, has been relegated to the Appendix (cf. 1. 1. 26, 53, 60, 62, 64). Its spuriousness has now been placed beyond the domain of sane criticism through its absence in \(K_{0,3}\ V_{1} B Da D_{1} M_{1}\). In the Southern manuscripts (and in some conflated Devanāgarī manuscripts) Brahmā alone is introduced; in these there is no talk of Ganaṇa, who is unquestionably a late Northern intruder. The yadāśrausuṇam section is also evidently an interpolation, but a considerably older one. Being merely a string of stanzas summarizing some of the most important incidents and episodes of the epic, it lent itself easily to being further interpolated by revisers who wanted to
supply the omissions and thus make the summary as complete as possible. To present the oldest form of this section now recoverable, I have deemed it sufficient to accept as genuine only such stanzas as are found verbatim in both the recensions. Here again K\textsubscript{a,1} have the fewest interpolations. The "table of contents" in the second adhyāya is preserved in two versions, a longer and a shorter. K\textsubscript{a,1} S (except G\textsubscript{r}) have the shorter version, which has been adopted in the constituted text as the authentic one.

Since I have not been able to discover any traces of "secondary interrelationship" between archetypes K and S, I consider the agreement between these two archetypes as "primitive", that is depending upon their primitive connection through the Ur-Mahābhārata. This concord is a factor of supreme importance for the reconstruction of the text. The originality of the agreement is established, in my opinion, by the following considerations. The concordant readings of K and S represent as often as not a lectio difficilior (cf. 1. 1. 19\textsuperscript{d}, 94\textsuperscript{d}, 158\textsuperscript{d}). Frequently such a reading best explains the other variants (cf. 1. 1. 1. 2\textsuperscript{a}, 14\textsuperscript{b}). Furthermore the "additional" stanzas which are found in the "vulgate" but are missing in K and S have all the appearance of being interpolations, lengthening and weakening the text (cf. 19\textsuperscript{a}, 29\textsuperscript{a}, 35\textsuperscript{a}-38); the same remark applies to the additional stanzas that are found in the Southern recension but are missing in K and the "vulgate" (cf. 21\textsuperscript{a}, 22\textsuperscript{a}, 27\textsuperscript{a}). The high position of K seems confirmed by its being the shortest of the known versions.

THE CONSTITUTED TEXT

In preparing the constituted text of the first two adhyāyas, I have endeavoured to balance the eclecticism advocated in certain matters with a rigid conservatism insisted on in others. I have been most averse to reject or correct the readings of good manuscripts. Interpretation has throughout been given precedence over emendation; in the first two adhyāyas, no emendation seemed absolutely necessary, nor any absolutely certain. Solecisms, when shewn to be original by a clear agreement on this point between (what appeared to be) independent versions, have been allowed to stand uncorrected (cf. 1. 1. 5\textsuperscript{a}, 170\textsuperscript{d}). As a general rule, preference is given to a reading which best suggests how other readings might have arisen. When such a reading was not available the choice fell upon one which is common to (what prima facie appeared to be) more or less independent versions and which is supported by intrinsic probability; the presumption of originality in such cases is frequently confirmed by a lack of definite agreement between the dis-

[*-7]-cordant versions. Occasionally one comes across variants where the matter is identical but the wording of a large part or of the whole of the line is different; one and the same primitive reading cannot in these cases account for the divergence. In the presence of such alternatives, neither of which can have come from the other and which have equal extrinsic support and equal intrinsic
merit, the criteria mentioned above fail to give a positive result. A particular instance of the variation contemplated here is that of a puzzling form of a cross-agreement between the Northern and Southern versions; when, for instance, some Kāṣmīrī and Malayālam manuscripts agree in opposition to say, Bangālī and Grantha (cf. 1.1, 60’e). In such cases, I have, owing to the much greater correctness of the K version, mostly adopted, as stopgaps, the readings of $K_{a,1}$, the manuscripts which present the archetype $K$ in a relatively pure form.

I have given in the constituted text whatever in each case appeared to be supported by the balance of probabilities, indicating all the important elements—lines, phrases, significant words and word-parts—of the text that are less than certain by a wavy line printed below them. Insignificant differences of spelling (e.g. Naimiṣa-Naimiṣa) are ignored for this purpose.

Doubt which cannot be resolved by a consideration of the documentary or intrinsic probability, entailing the use of the wavy line, arises in the following cases: (a) when the transmitted readings appear to be corrupt and no satisfactory emendation can be suggested; (b) when there are several readings of equal merit; in particular where the Northern and the Southern recensions offer two different readings of equal value; lastly (c) when the evidence pro et contra of documentary and intrinsic probability is equally balanced.

As regards interpolations, the additional lines are so ingeniously fashioned and cunningly fitted in, that in any given case the intrinsic evidence is generally inconclusive. In other words, if we leave out of account the documentary evidence, no convincing proof can in general be brought forward to establish either the originality or the spuriousness of the added lines. We cannot, however, entirely ignore the evidence of tradition. Everything points to the fact that what the epic has suffered from is inflation and elaboration, and not depletion or curtailment. On principle, therefore, lines that are peculiar to one recension, having nothing whatsoever corresponding to them, at the same point, in the other recension, are to be viewed with grave suspicion. Unless there is overwhelming evidence to prove their originality, they should be treated as spurious; because, the probability of error is far greater in admitting as authentic such one-recension lines on insufficient evidence of originality (both recensions being placed on an equal footing and treated with impartiality) than in rejecting them on insufficient evidence of spuriousness. It may be added that the presumption of unauthenticity is frequently confirmed by the fact that in the recension in which such lines do occur, they are found inserted in different manuscripts (or different versions) at different points of the text.

I am greatly indebted to Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, Chief of Aundh, for uniform kindness and courtesy; but still more for the absolute confidence he is pleased to repose in me. I must also record my thanks, for help of various kinds, to
my colleagues on the Mahābhārata [8] Editorial Board: Prof. Valjnath K. Rajvade, M.A.; Mr. Vishwanath P. Vaidya, Bar-at-Law; Prof. Dr. R. Zimmermann, S.J., Ph.D.; Prof. Dr. V. G. Paranjpe, M.A., D.Litt.; and Mr. N. B. Utgikar, M.A. But I desire to make a special mention of my indebtedness to Mr. Vaidya and to Rev. Fr. Zimmermann, whose advice and ready help have accompanied my labours from the time I first accepted the responsibilities of the work. Nothing has encouraged me more in this arduous and fascinating task than the unwavering interest with which they have followed it. In connection with the help the Editorial Board has received from collaborators outside the Institute, I have to record the indebtedness of the Board to: Pandit Vidhushekhar Bhattacharya, M.A.; Principal of the Viśvabharati, Bolpur; Rajaguru Pandit Hemraj, Director of Public Instruction, Nepal; M. R. Ry. Sambamurti Row, Honorary Secretary, Palace Library, Tanjore; and Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti, M.A., Principal of the Sanskrit College, Tripunithura, Cochin. These gentlemen have been good enough to supply the Institute with carefully prepared collations of manuscripts which are in their charge or which were kindly procured for the purpose by them. The Nirmaya Sagar Press has rendered ungrudgingly every assistance in carrying out the typographical arrangements which appeared to me best suited for the purposes of the work. The illustration accompanying this fascicule is prepared from a water-colour painting kindly supplied by the Chief of Aundh.

In conclusion, I may be permitted to remark that the renown of the Bhāratavarsa, of its Princes and its People, is for all time inseparably linked with the Mahābhārata, which is, in more senses than one the greatest epic the world has produced. It must be manifest to anyone who bestows a thought on the subject that the monumental work of preparing the first critical edition of this colossal encyclopaedia of ancient India could be carried on and completed by the young Institute by which it has been undertaken only if it can count upon substantial aid from other sources and upon co-operation on a much wider scale. If the Princes and the People of India were to associate themselves with this imposing enterprise, they would indeed be supporting a national work. On behalf of the Institute which I represent, I appeal to all true Indians to ally themselves with the Institute in supporting the publication of a work which is in a unique manner bound up with the history of the Indian people and the prestige of Indian scholarship.

January 1927.

V. S. Sukthankar.

POSTSCRIPT

Since the manuscript of this fascicule was sent to the press, I was able to make arrangements for securing collations of Šaradā and Nepāli manuscripts of the Adiparvan. These collations will be published later. Here it may just be remarked that the collations so far received wholly support the constituted text, especially as regards the interpolated stanzas, proving the correctness of the method adopted in setting the text.

May 1927.

V. S. S.
PROLEGOMENA *

The need of a critical or as it was sometimes called a “correct” edition of the Mahābhārata has been felt (at first, of course, rather vaguely) by Sanskritists for over half a century.1 It was voiced, however, in a clear and emphatic manner, for the first time, by Professor M. WINTERNITZ, at the XIth International Congress of Orientalists, held at Paris, in 1897, when he read a paper drawing attention to the South Indian manuscripts of the Great Epic and ending with the remark that a critical edition of the Mahābhārata was “wanted as the only sound basis for all Mahābhārata studies, nay, for all studies connected with the epic literature of India”.2 The idea received a concrete shape in his proposal for the foundation of a Sanskrit Epic Text Society, which he laid before the very next session of the Oriental Congress (XIIth), held in Rome (1899). Again, three years later, at the following session of the Congress (XIIIth), held in Hamburg (1902), Professor WINTERNITZ reiterated his requisition and endeavoured to impress again upon the assembled savants that a “critical edition of the Mahābhārata was a sine quâ non for all historical and critical research regarding the Great Epic of India”.

The reception accorded to the various proposals made by Professor WINTERNITZ in connection with his favourite project was not as cordial as might have been expected from an enlightened, international assemblage of Sanskritists. “At first”, writes Professor WINTERNITZ himself,3 “the idea of a critical edition of the Mahābhārata met with great scepticism. Most scholars were of opinion that it was impossible to restore a critical text of the Great Epic, and that we should have to be satisfied with editing the South Indian text, while the North Indian text was represented well enough by the Calcutta and Bombay editions. Only few scholars were in full agreement with the plan of one critical edition”.

Notwithstanding this general apathy, a committee was appointed by the Indian Section of the International Congress of Orientalists in Rome (1899) to consider the proposal of Professor WINTERNITZ for the foundation of a Sanskrit Epic Text Society, already mentioned. This committee was not in favour of the said proposal. It recommended instead that the work of preparing the critical edition should be undertaken by the International Association of Academies. The London session of this Association, held in

---

* [To the Adiparvan.]  
1 See below.  
3 ibid. p. 58.
1904, adopted the above suggestion and resolved "to make the critical edition of the Mahābhārata one of the tasks to be undertaken under its auspices and with the help of funds to be raised by the Academies." In pursuance of this decision, the Academies of Berlin and Vienna sanctioned certain funds earmarked for the Mahābhārata work, with whose help the preliminary work for the critical edition was actually begun.

[2] In furtherance of this project, then, Professor H. Lüders prepared a "Specimen" of a critical edition of the Mahābhārata (Druckprobe einer kritischen Ausgabe des Mahābhārata, Leipzig 1908) with the funds provided for the purpose by the Königliche Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. The Specimen, which was meant only for private circulation, consisted of 18 pages, comprising the constituted text (pp. 1-11) of the first 67 stanzas of the Ādiravan with their various readings (printed as footnotes), an Appendix (pp. 12-17), on a similar plan, containing the text of the Brahmā-Gāṇeśa interpolation (with its variants), and finally a list (p. 18) of the 29 manuscripts, selected exclusively from European libraries, which formed the specimen apparatus criticus. This little brochure, which must rank in the annals of Mahābhārata studies as the first tentative critical edition of the Mahābhārata, was laid before the Indian Section of the XVth International Congress of Orientalists, held in Copenhagen (1908). The tender seedling, planted with infinite care, did not, however, thrive in the uncongenial European soil. Twenty years later, in 1928, at the XVIIth International Congress of Orientalists, held at Oxford, Professor Winternitz reported that, under the scheme of the International Association of Academies, "except this specimen (Druckprobe) nothing has been printed".

However, in the interval some preliminary work, such as the classifying and collating of manuscripts had been done by Professor Lüders and some of his pupils (among them my fellow-student and friend Dr. Johannes Nobel, now Professor in the University of Marburg), by Professor Winternitz and his pupil Dr. Otto Stein, and by Dr. Bernhard Geiger (Vienna). The last great World War gave its quietus to this ambitious project, sponsored by the Associated Academies of Europe and America, and finally diverted the attention of European scholars from the Mahābhārata Problem.

---

1 It was printed by the firm of W. Drugulin.
2 Professor Winternitz had sent me, in 1926, his copy, on loan, for perusal, which I returned to him almost immediately afterwards.
3 The brochure did not contain any preface, or explanatory notes.
After the war, the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, then in its early infancy, enthusiastically undertook the work, making a fresh start, fortunately without realizing fully the enormousness of the project or the complications of the problem. At a meeting of the General Body of the Institute, held on July 6, 1918, Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, Chief (now Ruler) of Aundh—the liberal and enthusiastic patron of diverse projects calculated to stimulate research, advance knowledge, and enhance Indian prestige—the president elect on the occasion, easily persuaded by a band of young and hopeful Sanskritists who had returned to India after completing their philological training abroad, with their heads full of new ideas, urged upon the audience the need of preparing a Critical and Illustrated Edition of the Mahābhārata, offering to contribute, personally, a lakh of rupees, by annual grants, towards the expenses of producing the edition.1 The donor was warmly thanked for this princely [3] gift and the offer was gratefully accepted by the spokesmen of the Institute, who in their turn undertook to prepare an edition that would meet with the high requirements of modern critical scholarship. In accordance with this decision of the General Body of the Institute, the late lamented Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, the doyen of the Sanskritists of Western India and the inspirer of the critical and rigorous scholarship of the present day, inaugurated, in April 1919, this monumental work by formally beginning the collation of the opening mantra of the works of the ancient Bhāgavata sect, which is found also at the beginning of some manuscripts of the Mahābhārata :2

नारायण नमस्कर्त्य नरं चैव नरोच्चमम्।
देवी सरस्वतिः चैव ततो जयमुदीर्येत्॥

Then, on the basis of the promise of the donation of a lakh of rupees by the Ruler of Aundh, the Institute appealed for the very large financial support needed to Indian governments, princes, and men of wealth. Not as many favourable responses were received as might have been expected; but very generous aid was and is being given by some, whose names are recorded elsewhere.

The reasons which have induced Sanskritists both here and abroad to undertake this gigantic enterprise are easy to understand. The pre-eminent importance of the epic is universally acknowledged. Next to the Vedas, it is the most valuable product of the entire literature of ancient India, so rich in notable works. Venerable for its very antiquity, it is one


2 For instance, the stanza is foreign to the entire Southern recension of the epic. Cf. also Bühler-Kirste, Ind Stud. No. 2, p. 4, 2; and Sylvain Lévi, R. G. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, p. 99.
of the most inspiring monuments of the world, and an inexhaustible mine for the investigation of the religion, mythology, legend, philosophy, law, custom, and political and social institutions of ancient India.

As a result of researches that have been carried on during the last thirty-five years or so, there is now no doubt whatsoever that the text of the Mahābhārata has undergone numerous changes. The texts of the Northern and Southern manuscripts—to mention only two of the manuscript classes—are widely divergent, and much uncertainty prevails regarding the correctness and originality of the texts preserved by them. The existing editions—which either merely reproduce the version of a particular type of manuscripts, like the Bombay edition, or else are eclectic on no recognizable principles, like the Kumbhakonam edition—fail to remove the uncertainty of the text.

The present edition of the epic is intended chiefly to remedy this unsatisfactory state of things. What the promoters of this scheme desire to produce and supply is briefly this: a critical edition of the Mahābhārata in the preparation of which all important versions of the Great Epic shall have been taken into consideration, and all important manuscripts collated, estimated and turned to account. Since all divergent readings of any importance will be given in the critical notes, printed at the foot of the page, this [4] edition will, for the first time, render it possible for the reader to have before him the entire significant evidence for each individual passage. The value of this method for scientific investigation of the epic is obvious. Another feature of the new edition will be this. Since not even the seemingly most irrelevant line or stanza, actually found in a Mahābhārata manuscript collated for the edition, is on any account omitted, this edition of the Mahābhārata will be, in a sense, more complete than any previous edition. It will be a veritable thesaurus of the Mahābhārata tradition.

Under the scheme outlined above, a tentative edition of the Virātaparvan was prepared by the late Mr. Narayan Bapujī Utgikar, M.A., and published by the Institute in 1923. Copies of this edition were distributed gratis among leading Sanskritists—Indian, European and American—with a view to eliciting from them a frank expression of their opinion on the method worked out by the then editor-in-chief. The opinions received were very favourable and highly encouraging. The valuable suggestions made

---

1 The earliest systematic study of the subject seems to have been made by BURNELL in his Aśīdrā Grammaríças; cf. also his Classified Index to the Sanskrit MSS. in the Palace at Tanjore (London 1879), p. 180.
2 Representing the Nilakantha tradition.
3 The Institute intends to publish, as a supplement to this edition, a Pratika Index of the Mahābhārata, which will be an alphabetical index of every single pāda of the text of the epic.
by many eminent authorities have been to a great extent followed in the subsequent work.

COLLATION OF MANUSCRIPTS

Collation of the manuscripts is being done, regularly, not merely at the Institute, but also at the Visvabharati of Rabindranath Tagore in Bengal under the supervision of Pandit Vidhushekhar Bhattacharya, and at the Saraswati Mahal in Tanjore under the supervision of M. R. Ry. Rao Saheb T. Sambamurthi Rao Avl., B.A., B.L. These outside centres were at first intended chiefly for the collation of the Bengali and the Telugu-Grantha manuscripts respectively. But provision has now been made at the Institute itself for the collation of manuscripts written in any of the seven scripts (Saradā, Nepālī, Maithili, Bengali, Telugu, Grantha and Malayālam), besides Devanāgarī, which are ordinarily required for our Mahābhārata work.

The entire Mahābhārata stands now collated from a minimum of ten manuscripts; many parvans have been completely collated from twenty manuscripts; some from thirty; a few from as many as forty; while the first two adhyāyas of the Adi, which have special importance for the critical constitution of the text of the entire epic, were collated from no less than sixty manuscripts.

The collation is done by a permanent staff of specially trained Shastris (Northern as well as Southern) and University graduates. For the purposes of collation, each Mahābhārata stanza (according to the Bombay edition of Ganpat Krishnaji, Saka 1799) is first written out, in bold characters, on the top line of a standard, horizontally and vertically ruled foolscap sheet. The variant readings are entered by the collator horizontally along a line allotted to the manuscript collated, akṣara by akṣara, in the appropriate column, vertically below the corresponding portion of the original reading of the "Vulgate". On the right of each of these collation sheets, there is a column four inches wide reserved for remarks (regarding corrections, marginal additions etc.), and for "additional" stanzas found in the manuscripts collated, either immediately before or after \[5]\) the stanza in question. Very long "additions" are written out on separate "ṣodhapatras" and attached to the collation sheets. The collations are regularly checked by a batch of collators different from the one which did the collation in the first instance, before they are handed over to the editor for the constitution of the text.

THE CRITICAL APPARATUS

GENERAL ACCOUNT OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

It is by no means easy to answer the question how many manuscripts of the Mahābhārata there are in existence; firstly, because, no complete list of these manuscripts has ever been compiled; and, secondly, because the expression "Mahābhārata manuscript", as ordinarily used, is ambiguous in the extreme; it may apply to a small manuscript of the Bhagavadgītā alone, as well as to a complete manuscript of the Mahābhārata, in several volumes, containing all the eighteen parvans. Moreover, the parvans are mostly handed down separately, or in groups of few parvans at a time, at least in the oldest manuscripts now preserved. Therefore, in taking stock of Mahābhārata manuscripts, it is best to take as unit of measurement a manuscript of a single parvan.
As a very approximate computation, I may state that there are known to be about 235 manuscripts of the Adi, counting only such as have come within my knowledge from catalogues of private and public libraries accessible to me, as also those manuscripts whose owners have sent them to the Institute for collation or inspection. But this is probably by a long way not the total number of extant manuscripts of this parvan, because there must be quite a large number of manuscripts in private hands, of which we know next to nothing. It has been the experience of most manuscript collectors in India that when one takes the trouble to look for the manuscripts, they turn up in quite astonishing numbers, though they are as a rule late and of questionable worth. Of these 235 manuscripts of the Adi, a little less than half (107) are in the Devanāgarī script alone. The other scripts are represented in this collection as follows: Bengali 32, Grantha 31, Telugu 28, Malayālam 26, Nepāli 5, śāradā 3,¹ Maithili 1, Kannada 1, and Nandīnāgarī 1.

Of these manuscripts of the Adi about 70 (i.e. a little more than 29 per cent of the total) were fully or partly examined and collated for this edition. And of these again about 60 were actually utilized in preparing the text. The critical apparatus of the first two adhyāyas gives the collations of 50 manuscripts. Many of these were, however, discarded in the sequel as misch-codices of small trustworthiness and of no special value for critical purposes. At the same time a few other manuscripts (such as the śāradā and Nepāli codices), which were not available in the beginning, were added to the critical apparatus subsequently. A table given below supplies all the necessary details of the critical apparatus as to where the collations of the different manuscripts begin, where they end, and so on and so forth.

[6] The choice of the critical apparatus is not easy matter, owing to the astonishing bulk and the amazing variety of the material. The number of exact duplicates among these is decidedly small and almost negligible. An exception to this rule is formed only by manuscripts of commentators' versions, which show inter se little difference. So that what has been said by KOSEGARTEN with respect to the manuscripts of the Pañcatantra, applies, generally speaking, equally well to the Mahābhārata manuscripts: quot codices, tot textus. Notwithstanding these difficulties, the choice of our critical apparatus has not been entirely arbitrary. Efforts were made to secure manuscripts written in as many different Indian scripts as possible, which is the same as saying, manuscripts belonging to as many different Indian

¹ Of these three, our Śi is one, while the other two are paper manuscripts, written in modern śāradā characters, with Nilakantha's commentary, in the Raghunatha Temple Library; cf. STEIN'S CATALOGUE (1894), p. 196, Nos. 3712-32, 3951-79. They represent probably the Nilakantha version.
provinces as possible. Old manuscripts, even though fragmentary and partly illegible, were selected in preference to modern-looking manuscripts, though complete, neatly written and well preserved. Within the version, discrepant types were chosen in preference to similar types. Of the Nilakaṇṭha version, only three were selected, though it is by far the most numerous group; because, firstly, it is one of the latest versions; and, secondly it has been edited several times already, though not as well as it should be; and, thirdly, there is little difference between the individual manuscripts of the group. The only important scripts unrepresented in our critical apparatus are: Kannad, Uriyā and Nāndināgarī.

Besides the manuscripts collated specially for this edition, I have made occasional use of the collations of manuscripts preserved in European libraries made by Theodor Goldstücker, photographic copies of which were presented to the Institute, for use in connection with this project by the University of Strassburg, through the kind offices of the late Professor Emile Senart, as also of the collations intended for the edition planned by the International Association of Academies and made by the pupils of Geheimrat Professor Dr. Heinrich Lüders, which have been placed at the disposal of the Institute in pursuance of a resolution on the subject passed by the Indian Section of the XVIIth International Congress of Orientalists, held at Oxford, in 1928.

Sixteen of the manuscripts collated bear dates, ranging from the 16th to the 19th century. The oldest dated manuscript of our critical apparatus is a Nepālī manuscript (N₃) which bears a date corresponding to A.D. 1511.* The other dates are: A.D. 1519 (K₃), 1528 (V₅), 1598 (D₃), 1620 (Da₃), 1638 (K₄), 1694 (K₄), 1701 (Dr₃), 1739 (K₃), 1740 (B₃), 1759 (B₅), 1786 (B₃), 1802 (D₃), 1808 (D₃), 1838 (M₃), and 1842 (M₅). The Nilakaṇṭha manuscripts are not all dated, but they can scarcely be much anterior to the beginning of the eighteenth century, since Nilakaṇṭha himself [7] belongs to the last quarter of the seventeenth. Many of the Grantha

---

1 Consequently, our critical apparatus tends to reflect greater diversity in the material than what actually exists, but that was unavoidable.

2 The Resolutions were worded as follows:

No. 2. That in view of the eminently satisfactory manner in which the work is being done by the Institute, this Congress is of opinion that the MSS. collations made, and the funds collected, for the critical edition of the epic planned by the Association of Academies, be now utilized for the purposes of the critical edition being prepared in India, without prejudice to the original project of the Association of Academies.

No. 3. That this Congress therefore recommends that: (a) such collations of the Mahābhārata text as have already been prepared by the Association of Academies be placed, on loan, at the disposal of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

[* See now Epic Studies VII, infra.]
manuscripts do bear dates, but since they refer to a cyclic era, it is difficult to calculate their equivalents.

CLASSIFICATION OF MANUSCRIPTS

The manuscript material is divided naturally into recensions by the scripts in which they are written. Corresponding to the two main types of Indian scripts, Northern and Southern, we get two main recensions of the epic. Each of these recensions is again divided into a number of sub-recensions, which I have called "versions", corresponding to the different provincial scripts in which these texts are written. This principium divisionis is not as arbitrary as it might at first sight appear. The superficial difference of scripts corresponds, as a matter of fact, to deep underlying textual differences. It is common experience in India that when we have a work handled down in different versions, the script is invariably characteristic of the version. The reason for this concomitance between script and version appears to be that the scribes, being as a rule not conversant with any script but that of their own particular province, could copy only manuscripts written in their special provincial scripts, exception being made only in favour of Devanāgarī, which was a sort of a "vulgar" script, widely used and understood in India.

While the principle mentioned above is not entirely mechanical or arbitrary, it is also not ideal or perfect. It is often contravened in practice, mainly through the agency of the Devanāgarī, which is the chief medium of contamination between the different recensions and versions. Thus we come across Devanāgarī copies of the commentary or version of Arjunamīśra, who was an Easterner; similar copies of the commentary or version of Ratnagarbha, who was a Southerner. There are again Devanāgarī copies of the Grantha and the Śāradā versions. On the other hand, a popular version like that of Nilakaṇṭha may be copied in any script. I have come across manuscripts of the Nilakaṇṭha (Devanāgarī) version written in Śāradā, Bengali, Telugu and Grantha scripts. Another cause of disturbance was this. Along the boundaries of provinces speaking different languages or using different scripts, there are invariably bi-lingual and bi-scriptal zones. In these zones there was an ever operating impulse, tending to introduce innovations, obliterating the differentiae and normalizing the text. Nevertheless, though nothing is impossible, it would be passing strange if we were to find a copy of the pure Śāradā version written, say, in the Malayālam script, or of the Grantha version in the Nepāli script.

1 Cf. Lüders, Deutsche Literaturzeitg, 1929, 1140.
2 Like our K1 (India Office, No. 2137).
3 There are two such MSS. in the Raghunatha Temple Library, Jammu, Nos. 3712-32, 3958-79.
4 Some of them were collated for the Institute at the Visva Bharati.
[8] LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS FORMING THE CRITICAL APPARATUS

The manuscripts utilized for this edition of the Adi are as follows:

I. (Northern) Recension.

(a) North-western Group (v).

Sarada (or Kaśmīrī) Version (S).

S₁ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 159 of 1875-76.

Devanāgarī Group allied to the (Sarada or) Kaśmīrī Version (K).

K₀ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 229 of 1895-1902. Dated V. Saṁh. 1795 (ca. A.D. 1739).

K₁ = London, India Office Library, No. 3226 (2137).

K₂ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 182 of 1891-95. Dated V. Saṁh. 1694 (ca. A.D. 1638).


K₄ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 209 of 1887-91.

(b) Central Group (γ).

Nepālī Version (N).

N₁ = Nepal, in private possession.

N₂ = Nepal, in private possession.


Maithili Version (V).


Bengali Version (B).


B₂ = Santiniketan, Visvabharati Library, No. 258.


B₄ = Santiniketan, Visvabharati Library, No. 413.


B₆ = Dacca, University Library, No. 735.

Devanāgarī Versions other than K (D).

Devanāgarī Version of Arjunamiśra (Da).

Da₁ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 30 of A 1879-80.

Da₅ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI, Viśrāmbīg I, No. 468. Dated V. Saṁh. 1676 (ca. A.D. 1620).

Devanāgarī Version of Nilakanta (Dn), the “Vulgate”.

Dn₁ = MS, belonging to Sardar M. V. Kibe of Indore.


Devanāgari Version of Ratnagarbha (Dr.)
Dr₁ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1246.
Dr₂ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1199.
Dr₃ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1313. Dated Śaka 1623 (ca. A.D. 1701).
Dr₄ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1339.

Devanāgari Composite Version.
D₁ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 29 of A 1879-80.
D₃ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1360.
D₄ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1126.
D₅ = Lahore, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, No. 4. Dated V. Saṅ. 1858 (ca. A.D. 1802).
D₆ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1223.
D₇ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1269.
D₈ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1329.
D₉ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1176.
D₁₀ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1293.
D₁₁ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1340.
D₁₂ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1373.
D₁₃ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), Viśrāmbāg II, No. 191.
D₁₄ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI) Viśrāmbāg II, No. 265.

II. S(outhern) Recension.

Telugu Version (T).
T₁ = Melcote, Yadugiri Yatiraj Math Library MS. (without number).
T₂ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11865.
T₃ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11809.

Grantha Version (G).
G₁ = Melkote, Yadugiri Yatiraj Math Library MS. (without number).
G₂ = Melkote, Yadugiri Yatiraj Math Library MS. (without number).
G₃ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11823.
G₄ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11838.
G₅ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11851.
G₆ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11860.
G₇ = Melkote, Yadugiri Yatiraj Math Library MS. (without number).

Malayālam Version (M).
M₁ = MS. belonging to Chief of Idappalli, Cochin.
M₂ = Cochin, State Library, No. 5.
M₄ = MS. belonging to Kalāṅkara Pisharam of Cochin.
M₅ = Cochin (Jayantamangalam); property of the Paliyam family.
M₆ = Malabar (Narerī Mana); in private possession.
M₇ = Cochin (Avanapparambu Mana); in private possession.
Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 159 of 1875-76. Total number of folios 114 (some fragmentary), with about 24 lines to a page; size 12" × 9½". Clear śaradā characters (of perhaps the 16th or 17th century), Birchbark (bhūrijapatra).

This unique and valuable MS. was purchased for the Government of Bombay, by BÜHLER, in Kaśmīr. It is listed on p. xi, and cursorily described at p. 64, of his Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS. made in Kaśmīr, Rajputana and Central India, a report printed as Extra Number of the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1877. The lines of writing of the MS. run parallel to the narrow side of the leaf. There are, on an average, 24 lines on a page, and 36 aṅkāras (i.e. a little over a śloka) in a line. A page, therefore, contains, on an average, 26 (anuśṭubh) stanzas. Each folio bears, on its reverse, in the left-hand margin, near the bottom, a cipher representing the serial number of the folio and a signature indicating the title of the work, as well as the name of the parvan.—The MS., which is unfortunately incomplete and fragmentary, must have originally contained at least the first three parvans (Ādi, Sabhā and Arāṇya), written, as far as one can judge, by the same hand. The extant portion contains the Sabhā in its entirety, but only fragments of the other two parvans, the beginning of Ādi and the end of Arāṇya being lost. The Ādi, which appears to have extended from the beginning of the volume up to fol. 154, is particularly fragmentary; a continuous text begins only from fol. 63 (our adhy. 82). Of the first 62 folios, the extant portion contains only the lower segments (with 10 to 15 lines of writing on each page) of fol. 24-25, 36-37, 39, 47-48, 53-57 and 61-62; the initial 23 folios as also 15 other intermediate folios (viz. 38, 40-46, 49-52, 58-60) are entirely missing; while only 10 of these folios are complete. Folio number 96 is repeated. The Ādi ends at fol. 154a. The colophon repeats the stanzas of the Parvasamgraha giving the number of adhyāyas (230) in this parvan, as also its extent in "ślokas", i.e. granthas (7984). The writing is neat and careful; erasures and corrections are few and far between. Occasionally one comes across variant readings (cf. fol. 115b), entered (probably by the same hand) in yet smaller letters between the lines; on fol. 116a, there is a stanza written in the upper margin, which is meant to be added after 1, 162. 15, and which is found, otherwise, only in K1, in other words is an interpolation peculiar to S1 K1. Many of the marginal additions are glosses, which are rather numerous in the first 15 (extant) folios, evidently notes made from some commentary by a student who intended making a careful study of the text. In a few places—perhaps about half a dozen—corrections have been made with yellow pigment. Some of the adhyāyas bear (serial) numbers, written probably by a different hand; the first (legible) figure that we come across is 43, corresponding to adhy. 32 of our edition, involving a difference of 11 in our
enumerations of adhyāyas! The last adhyāya number noted in this parvan is 100, corresponding to our adhy. 87: the difference between our enumerations thus rises to 13 in 55 adhyāyas. The Purānic rāconteur is here called, throughout, Sūta, not Sauti. Moreover, the prose formula of reference generally omits the [11] (resp. ṛṇ: ), and gives, as in S MSS., merely the name or designation of the speaker, such as ग्रंथावधि: . However, from the fact that towards the middle and end of the parvan, the full forms containing उत्तर (resp. ṛṇ: ) do occur sporadically, e.g. 1. 94. 64 (fol. 73a); 98. 1 (fol. 75b); 99. 36 (fol. 77a) etc. : it follows that the usual ग्रंथावधि: etc. are only abbreviations. The names of the sub-parvans are generally added, in the colophons, agreeing mostly with the corresponding divisions of our edition. The extant fragment begins (fol. 24a) with the words काल्पन: प्रदिप: इति. A facsimile of the folio (154) containing the end of the Adi and the beginning of the Sabhā is given, facing p. 880.

K₀

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 229 of 1895-1902. Folios 181, with about 15 lines to a page; size 14.7" × 6.7". Devanāgarī characters; dated V. Samvat 1795 (ca. A.D. 1739). Old Indian paper.

The MS. contains the first three parvans written in the same hand, the date coming at the end of the Aranyā. The writing is clear and fairly correct; a few corrections of scribe’s errors are noted in the margin, probably by the same hand; otherwise the margins are clean. The colophons give adhyāya numbers sporadically, and names of adhyāyas, sub-parvans or upākhyānas generally. On the last folio (181) of the Adi is given, in different hand, a list of major parvans with the corresponding number of their adhyāyas and stanzas, in a tabular form.

K₁

London, India Office Library, No. 3226 (2137). Folios 169, with about 33 lines to a page; size 16½" × 9½". Devanāgarī characters; dated (possibly) 1783 A.D. Indian Paper.

A moderately trustworthy, though somewhat modern and very incorrect transcript of a Sāradā exemplar. Even the outward form and get-up of this MS. are suggestive of Kaśmirī origin. The lines of writing, as in Sāradā (bhūrjapatra) MSS. run parallel to the narrow side of the folio. The signatures in the margin are like those found in Kaśmirī books. The numerous clerical errors, which disfigure every page, betray the writer to be a professional scribe, not thoroughly familiar with the awkward Sāradā script, and still less so with the language of the text, easily misled by the deceptive similarity between certain letters of the Sāradā and Devanāgarī alphabets. He frequently writes म for च (e. g. चक्तल्क for चक्तल्क); दुः for त and ष for ष (e. g. लष्ण for लष्ण); न for न्द (e. g. हन्द्या for हन्द्या); ए for ए (e. g. प्रकाश for प्रकाश) or for ए (e. g. चन्द्रिका for चन्द्रिका); medial ष for subscript ष (e. g. षण्व for षण्व),
PROLEGOMENA

...

Besides Ādi, the codex contains also Virāṭa, Bhīṣma and a portion of Anuśāsana (Dāṇadharma), breaking off at the first half of stanza 39 of adhy. 83 of the Bombay ed. According to statements at the end of the Bhīṣma and the beginning of the Anuśāsana, the MS. was written in V. Saṁvat 1839 (ca. A.D. 1783), by a Brāhmaṇa named Gopāla, residing in Lakṣmīmatā; but the writing of the volume is not quite uniform. It is, therefore, uncertain, in my opinion, whether the Ādi was written by this same Gopāla, in the said year; contra Eggeling, Catalogue of the Skt. MSS. [12] in the Library of the India Office, Part VI (1899), p. 1158, who regards the entire volume as written by the same scribe. The colophons, which are short, sporadically give the adhyāya numbers. This is the only MS. of the Ādi belonging to a European Library that was available for collation at the Institute and used for this edition!—The reference ॥ ॥ ॥ before stanza 8 of adhy. 1 indicates the intention of the scribe to “illuminate” the MS. by writing the alternate letters ( ं, ः, ः ) which are missing, in red ink.

K₂

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 182 of 1891-96. Folios 296 (of which 220, 226-30, 232-33, 239-40 appear to be written by a different hand), with about 11 lines to a page; size 10 8" × 4 8". Devanāgarī characters (with sporadic prsthnamātrās); dated V. Saṁ 1694 (ca. A.D. 1638). Indian paper.

Marginal corrections, as also other corrections in the body of the text, are made by using yellow pigment; the colophons give names of sub-parvans, adhyāya names, and adhyāya numbers sporadically. In the marginal notes one occasionally comes across variants and glosses, and additional passages from MSS. of the central sub-recension (γ). The first folio and a part of the second (the latter stuck on to the original torn) are written in a different hand. On fol. 186b, three lines are left blank by the scribe. After the four stanzas of “phalasruti” mentioned on p. 879, there follow two stanzas of the parva-samgraha, giving the number of adhyāyas (218) and slokas (8984) and, finally, the date: संवत् 1694 वर्ष मासवदि १० रजा निजिततिसि

K₃


This MS. is from Gujarat. At the end of the MS. is given the date: Saṁvat 1575, śrāvana, dark half, 5th day, Abhinandana. MS. written by Nañjika, son of the Nagar Pandit Kalidāsa of village Kāndalāja, under Saṁ-
khetäkapura (modern Sankheda, in Baroda State). For further details, see the colophon given on p. 879.

**K₄**

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 566 of 1882-83. Folios 237 (not counting the suppl. folios), with about 15-16 lines to a page; size 14.9" × 6". Devanägarī characters; dated Saka 1616 (ca. A.D. 1694), at the end of one of the subsequent parvans. Old Indian paper.

A carelessly written complete MS., with Ṛ for Ṛ throughout, which is a Southern trait; written by one hand, but preserved in the Collection in two bundles numbered 565 and 566. Supplementary folios at 2, 114, 150, 151, 205 include certain long passages (some from Southern sources), copied by the same hand; notable among them being the Brahmā-Ganēśa interpolation, whose point of insertion is indicated by a small mark made in the body of the text, and the marginal remark क्षण शोधयनमेकं (cf. v. 1. 1. 1. 53). There are some excerpts in margins, intended as glosses. Marginal additions of lines and stanzas are frequent only in the first 35 folios, afterwards few and far between. Corrections are made with yellow pigment. Colophons frequently contain adhyāya names, sub-parvan names, but no adhyāya number. The copyist was Ganēśa, son of Trimbaka.

**[13] K₅**

Lahore, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College Library, No. 1. Folios 28 (numbered 1-7 and 9-29), with about 11-13 lines to a page; size 12" × 6". Devanāgarī characters, (said to be) about 350 years old. Paper.

This MS. is incomplete, ending with 1. 3. 152. It was collated at the Visva Bharati, up to 1, 2. 40, and was then reported to be missing.

**K₆**

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 209 of 1887-91. Folios 386, with about 8-10 lines to a page; size 12.2" × 5.8". Devanāgarī characters. Partly old Indian paper and partly modern European paper.

Folios 359 to end are of different paper (modern European, with watermarks) and are written by a different hand. In the margin, corrections of scribe's errors, additional lines and stanzas (some of them probably omitted while copying), and various readings, which are decidedly more numerous in the beginning. On some folios (after fol. 105) yellow pigment has been used for correction. Here and there, lacunae mark the syllables which the scribe could not decipher, or which were missing in the exemplar. The colophons generally give the adhyāya or sub-parvan names; the adhyāya numbers were added afterwards, perhaps by a different hand, and are often crowded out or squeezed in with difficulty.—Collated up to the end of adhy. 2 only.

**N₁**

MS. in Nepāli characters from Nepal, in private possession. No specifications of the MS. (such as measurements, number of folios etc.) are available.
It begins with a short eulogy (praśasti) of king (śrīmān bhūmahendra) Jayasīṁharaṁa, at whose bidding the MS. was copied. For a king of that name we have the date (Nepāli) Saṁ. 516 (ca. A.D. 1395). In the praśasti, he is stated to have built (?) a temple of Paśupati in Nepal. Collations of the MS. were kindly supplied by Rajaguru Pandit Hemarañ, C.I.E., D.P.I., Nepal, who had it collated, for the Institute, by local Pandits.—The Praśasti reads:

ॐ नमः समवते बाहुःदेवाय | ॐ नमः प्रजापतिभ्यः | ॐ नमः कुञ्जनःपाणयाय

'Nārāyaṇa namo vam caiva mārca tatho jaya duḥśīryayet. II

वर्णप्राप्तयोऽस्माय श्रवेदयोऽस्माय सर्वसुरायोऽस्माय

[सूक्ष्मर्य] विचारणिकलप्युक्तो सिता श्रीजयसिंहराय: II

मल्ल तत्क्षणमहुःत्वं जनगिरिः विवृत्तिचञ्जल

आर्यान् विविभेद्य चर्मिकरणां द्वाराकिस्वरस्वतः II

येनास्वतस्मत्तरेण मनासा नित्यं हरि: ध्यायता

* * * * * * [३ श्री] भारतं हरिवितम् II

कायें बाचा मनसा च यथापर्यं क्षतं तस्य विनादानाय II

सुखवदर्णा श्रीजयसिंहरामो व्हर्लिखिष्ययत्तमतुष्टम ततुः II

प्रेते विषुवसमवामाय नरकज्ञारोपोधाय च

कुञ्जनस्यान्तराध्यदर्शनान्तः स्म पुष्णिनिमं श्रीसाधारस्य महत्तः

पार: श्रीजयसिंहरामसुक्तो सत्वार्थविन्दात्मकाय: II

[१४] कान्यावाहिनायेत्रितिविधियो भर्तिकरोति योः II

स एव भववान्विषुवस्तुस्मै नियत्य नमो नमः II

द्वाराकिस्वरस्वतं विवृत्तिपरं प्रक्ष्या यो विजित्य

शौचदेवाण्यपदवर्ग स्वस्कतरस्य हृदयभ्रातमाद्या II

दुर्देशिण्यो श्रीमं बनस्करस्य स्वर्गमानं: प्रतत्वायः

स श्रीमान्भूमहेंद्रो जयति पञ्चपतिस्थापनेनामरेण्ठम् II

Collations begin at adhy. 3. Collated in Nepal.

N2

MS. in Nepāli characters from Nepal; in private possession. No further details of the MS. are available.

Collations of the MS. were kindly supplied by Rajaguru Pandit Hemarañ (Nepal), who had it collated for the Institute by local Pandits.—Collations begin at adhy. 3,
From a private library in Nepal. Nepālī characters, written in ink on palm-leaf.

Besides the Ādi, the MS. contains also Sauptika-Aśīka and Viśoka-Strī. The last folio of this bundle bears the date (Nepālī) Sam. 632 (ca. A.D. 1511). Sent to the Institute for collation, through the kind offices of Rajaguru Pandit HEMARAJ (Nepal). The MS. was returned to the owner after a hurried collation, and further details of the MS. are unfortunately not available.—Collations begin at adhy. 14.

V₁


No further details of the MS. are available. The MS. has two lengthy lacunae: 1. 68, 74 to 92. 13, and 96. 37 to 127. 21.—Collations of the MS. were kindly supplied by Rajaguru Pandit HEMARAJ (Nepal), who had it collated, for the Institute by local Pandits.

B₁


The name of the scribe, as given in a stanza following the last colophon, is Kṛṣṇarāmadvija.—Collated at the Visvabharati.

B₂

Santiniketan, Visvabharati Library, No. 258. Folios 82, with about 5-6 lines to a page; size 25.4″ × 21″. Bengali characters. Palm-leaf.

This fragmentary MS. breaks off at 1. 43. 13, in the middle of the Āstika.—Collated at the Visvabharati.

B₃


Name of the copyist, as given at the end of the MS., is Khelārāma Vipra.—Collated at the Visvabharati.

[15] B₄

Santiniketan, Visvabharati Library, No. 413. Folios 164, with about 7-9 lines to a page; size 20″ × 5-2″. Bengali characters. Paper.

This fragmentary MS. breaks off at 1. 90. 88, in the middle of Sāmbhavaparvan.—Collated at the Visvabharati.

B₅

Dacca, University Library, No. 485. Folios 366, with about 7 lines to a page; size 17″ × 3.4″. Bengali characters; dated Saka 1708 (ca. A.D. 1786). Much faded old Indian yellow paper.
The MS., which is well preserved and neatly written, containing a few corrections noted in the margins, was obtained from Malatinagar, Bogra District, Bengal. Collations begin at adhy. 3.—Collated at the Visvabharati.

B₆

Dacca, University Library, No. 735. Folios 346, with about 7 lines to a page; size 19" × 4½". Bengali characters. Old Indian yellow paper.

Appearance, as well as the script of this MS. (which was obtained from Ula Bisnagar, Nadia District, Bengal), is somewhat more modern than that of B₅; belongs apparently to the beginning of the 19th century. Neatly written and fairly correct; contains occasional brief glosses on margin, apparently by the same hand as that of the copyist.—Collations begin at adhy. 54. Collated at the Visvabharati.

Da₁

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 30 of A 1879-80. Folios 416, with about 7-10 lines to a page; size 15½" × 6¼". Devanāgarī characters. Old Indian glossy paper.

Text with commentary of Arjunāmīśra; written neatly but extremely corrupt and unintelligible in places, on account of the scribe's inability to read the exemplar correctly. The MS. has many short and long blanks in the text, which support the latter surmise. It has very few glosses and corrections, but a large number of variants noted in the margin. The text is written in three strips: the upper and lower ones comprise the commentary, while the central band, which has generally a still wider margin, is the (epic) text. The references to speaker (such as ज्ञेयपायत उवाच ) and colophons are written in red ink. The colophons give generally adhyāya and sub-parvan names. Ślokas are generally numbered; adhyāyas are almost regularly numbered from adhy. 45 to 109. The MS. is almost consistent in writing जानेवालय (for जाने) उवाच. Punctuation is most imperfect. In the numbering of the folios, number 2 is repeated.

Da₂

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), Viśrāmbāg I, No. 468. Folios 415, with about 10 lines to a page; size 15½" × 6½". Devanāgarī characters; dated V. Saṁ. 1676 (ca. A.D. 1620). Indian paper.

Text with commentary of Arjunāmīśra. The MS. is from Dambal, a Jagir in the Kanarese District of the Deccan, and the last folio contains several stanzas in praise of a certain Gopālabhaṭṭa, a learned Pandit of great fame, who got the MS. written:

[16] भावायात्मकार्थमार्थनामुपयुक्तविद्विधार्योष्णवर्णं फलोऽस्यमाप्रवृत्तायिन्यमितिुपनविययोज्यसत्कर्मणि।
स्वरूपनित्तचिन्तार्थार्थंपन्वंते गोपालविद्विध्वरोऽश्वाय परमतिते तेन जीवनमिदं लोकान्तरं कलिपतम्॥
The date of the MS. is given as a chronogram corresponding to V. Saṃvat 1676 (ca. A.D. 1620). Double dandas in red ink are inserted indiscriminately in the middle of the text. The writing, which is full of mistakes, is uniform but not neat. No corrections are, however, to be seen, the MS. being, perhaps, not much used. Notwithstanding the fact that this MS. agrees, page for page, with Da₂, there are many small differences between them; neither can be a direct copy of the other; they must go back to a more remote common source. It appears to be older, and is less corrupt, than Da₂. In the numbering of the folios, figure 1 is repeated. The colophons contain the names of adhyāyas and sub-parvans generally; but śloka numbers or adhyāya numbers only sporadically. The MS. has a few blanks in the text and commentary.

Dn₁

Ms. belonging to Sardar M. V. Kibe of Indore. Folios 446, with about 8-10 lines to a page; size 18-2″ X 7-3″. Devanāgarī characters. Thick Indian paper.

Text with commentary of Nilakanṭha. Folios 439, 442, 444-5 are written by a different hand. The commentary, and even the text, is sometimes continued on the margin. Sporadically one comes across corrections or readings noted in the margin; occasionally also corrections in the body are made by scoring out the portion to be deleted or by writing over, or with yellow pigment. The MS. is, on the whole, correct and very clearly written. Dāndas are marked in red ink. What would have been blanks in the space left for the text or commentary are often filled up by the addition of pious invocations such as Śrīrāma jñāna-mārṣya śrīśri-sūkṣma-vatvam ātma: 1 etc. Adhyāyas are sporadically numbered and ślokas are regularly numbered in both the text and the commentary. The colophons give, in general, the adhyāya name or sub-parvan name. The last colophon contains the date: Isvāra saṃvatsara, mārga-sīrṣa suddha 13, which cannot be identified.
Mysore, Oriental Library, No. 1064. Folios 448, with about 22 lines to a page; size 15½" × 6½". Devanāgari characters; dated V. Sarvat 1864 (ca. A.D. 1808). Paper.

Text with commentary of Nilakantha.

Dn₂

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 234 of 1895-1902. Folios 683, with about 9 lines to a page; size 15½" × 7½". Devanāgari characters. Thick Indian paper.

Text with commentary of Nilakantha. Bold and clear letters; generally correct; margins are almost clean. Slokas and adhyāyas are throughout numbered. As in Dn₁, blanks were filled with invocations and names of various gods. The lemmata do not always fit the (epic) text. Colophons and the references to the speakers (and for some initial folios even danças) are in red ink, but only up to fol. 470.

D₁

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1246. Folios 448, with about 11 lines to a page; size 15" × 6½". Devanāgari characters. Paper.

Text with the commentary of Ratnagarbha.—Collations end at adhy. 2. Collated at Tanjore.

D₂

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1199. Folios 306, with about 10-13 lines to a page; size 16" × 6½". Devanāgari characters. Paper.

Text with the commentary of Ratnagarbha.—Collations end at adhy. 2, Collated at Tanjore.

D₃


Text with the commentary of Ratnagarbha. MS. dated, in the Śaka year 1623 (current) corresponding to Vṛṣa, Sunday the 13th (of the bright half) of the month of Āṣāḍha.—Collations end at adhy. 2. Collated at Tanjore.

D₄


Text with the commentary of Ratnagarbha. This fragment contains only about 90 adhyāyas of this edition. The number of lines of each folio fluctuates with the amount of commentary which each folio contains, and
which of course, varies considerably.—Collations end at adhy. 2. **Collated at Tanjore.**

[18] **D₁**

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 29 of A 1879-80. Folios 230, with about 16-17 lines to a page; size 12" × 7-15". Devanāgari characters. Fine cream-coloured paper.

For the first 140 folios or so, colophons and part references to speakers (such as न्यायःप्रवर्तित) are generally in red ink; then occasionally. Colophons sporadically give adhyāya or sub-parvan name and number of adhyāyas (especially towards the end of the parvan); stanzas are not numbered. The MS. is generally correct; margins are clean.—*This is a complete MS. of Mbh.*, copied apparently from different exemplars; some parvans have the commentary of Nilakaṇṭha, while others contain some old text tradition (e.g. “M” of the Tentative Edition of the Virāṭaparvan). The MS. is of modern date, being written on paper with water-marks. Some of the parvans bear dates at the end, but these seem to be copied from the originals; thus, Śānti (Moksadharmā) has Śaka 1680, while Dānadharmā has Śaka 1675. The last parvan bears the date: १६७५ युवानात्मकवत्ते.

**D₂**


The MS. was written on Friday the 13th of Asaḍha śuddha of V. Sarh. 1654, at Benares by a Brāhmaṇa called Govinda, and belonged to Vāsudevabhaṭṭa.—*Collated at Tanjore.*

**D₃**

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1360. Folios 120, with about 10 lines to a page; size 14" × 6½". Devanāgari characters. Paper.

Incomplete, breaking off at the end of adhy. 76 (of our edition), in the middle of the Yayāti episode which, in this MS. (as in S MSS.), precedes the Śakuntalā episode.—*Collated at Tanjore.*

**D₄**

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1126. Folios 235, with about 11 lines to a page; size 16" × 6½". Devanāgari characters. Paper.

Many corrections and additions, the MS. being compared with another of the Southern recension, extracts from which have been written out on the margin, and on supplementary folios.—*Collated at Tanjore.*

**D₅**

Lahore, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College Library, No. 4. Folios 246, with about 12-14 lines to a page; size 12" × 5". Devanāgari characters; dated V. Sarh. 1858 (ca A.D. 1802). Paper.—*Collated at the Visvabharati.*
[19] D₆

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1223. Folios 293, with about 12 lines to a page; size 14" × 6½". Devanāgarī characters. Paper.

An old MS., but with clear and legible writing; well preserved.—Collations end at adhy. 53. **Collated at Tanjore.**

D₇

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1269. Folios 262, with about 11 lines to a page; size 14" × 5½". Devanāgarī characters. Paper.

Clear and legible writing; well preserved.—Collations end at adhy. 53. **Collated at Tanjore.**

D₈

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1329. Folios 196, with about 16-18 lines to a page; size 15½" × 7". Devanāgarī characters. Paper.

A comparatively modern MS.—Collations end at adhy. 2. **Collated at Tanjore.**

D₉

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1176. Folios 279, with about 11 lines to a page; size 15½" × 5½". Devanāgarī characters. Paper.

Fol. 1-2 are badly damaged.—Collations end at adhy. 2. **Collated at Tanjore.**

D₁₀

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1293. Folios 352, with about 10 lines to a page; size 13½" × 5½". Devanāgarī characters. Paper.

Last leaf torn; well-preserved; clear and legible writing.—Collations end at adhy. 2. **Collated at Tanjore.**

D₁₁

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1340. Folios 290, with about 11-18 lines to a page; size 14" × 5¼". Devanāgarī characters. Paper.

Written, perhaps, by four different scribes.—Collations end at adhy. 2. **Collated at Tanjore.**

D₁₂

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 1373. Folios 21, with about 12 lines to a page; size 14½" × 6". Devanāgarī characters. Paper.

Incomplete, containing only the first two adhyāyas.—**Collated at Tanjore**

[20] D₁₃

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), Viṣṇāmbāg II, No. 191. Folios 221, with about 13 lines to a page; size 14-25" × 6-05". Devanāgarī characters. Old Indian glossy paper.
Fragmentary, folios 1-7 wanting; begins with अलमकारसंहिता पांच (1.1.205). Text very similar to Arjunamiśra's; neatly written and generally correct; marginal corrections are few and far between. Adhyāya names or sub-parvan names are given, but the ślokas or adhyāyas are not numbered. The reference to narrators is, at first, given at random as सौतिलकार and सौतव न, but then the scribe settles down to सौतव न. The collations are given, as a matter of fact, only from 1.1.205 to the end of adhy. 2.

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), Viśrāmbāg II, No. 266. Folios 1-121 (fol. 122-189 of this MS. are found under Viśrāmbāg II, No. 86), with about 15 lines to a page; size 18" × 62". Devanāgarī characters. Old Indian unglazed paper.

MS. No. 267 of the same Collection is of Sabhā with commentary and written by the same hand.—Folio 79 is wanting. Carefully written, has very few corrections, which are made by use of yellow pigment, and a few marginal additions; gives, as a rule, numbers to ślokas and adhyāyas; also mentions generally sub-parvan and adhyāya names,—Collated up to the end of adhy. 2 only.

Melkote, Yadugiri Yatiraj Math MS. (without number). Folios 195, with about 11 lines to a page; size 16-1" × 2-3". Telugu characters. Palm-leaf.

MS. kindly lent by His Holiness the Yatiraj Swami, Contains Adi and Sabhā, written probably by the same hand; writing clear and correct; adhyāya ends are shown by a small floral (or spiral) design engraved in the right and left margins of the MS.; adhyāyas are regularly numbered, but not the ślokas. It is one of the few Southern MSS. which contain the (Northern) salutatory stanza नारायण नमस्कार etc.

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11865. Folios 400, with about 6 lines to a page; size 21" × 1¾". Telugu characters. Palm-leaf.

Fragmentary; breaking off at the end of our adhy. 181 (corresponding to its adhy. 140); from adhy. 182, it is replaced in our critical apparatus by the next MS. T₃.—Collated at Tanjore.

T₃

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11809. Folios 164, with about 12 lines to a page; size 29¾ × 21¾". Telugu characters. Palm-leaf.

An old MS., containing the first five parvans; script small, but clear.—Collations begins at adhy. 182; used only to supplement the portion missing in T₂. Collated at Tanjore.
[21] \( G_1 \)

Melkote, Yadugiri Yatiraj Math MS. (without number). Folios 110, with about 16-21 lines to a page; size 18-7" × 1-8". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.

Leaves are very brittle, and worm-eaten in places; large pieces have broken off, leaving many lacunæ. The holes for the string have enlarged. perhaps from constant use, destroying some parts of the text written round them.

\( G_2 \)

Melkote, Yadugiri Yatiraj Math MS. (without number). Folios 202, with about 15-17 lines to a page; size 14-5" × 2-1". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.

The MS. contains the first 4 parvans: Adi, Sabhā, Aranyā and Vīrāta, written probably by the same hand. Slightly worm-eaten; but on the whole, a well preserved old MS. with clear and legible writing.

\( G_3 \)

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11823. Folios 316, with about 10 lines to a page; size 16½" × 1½". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.—Collated at Tanjore.

\( G_4 \)

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11838. Folios 477, with about 6 lines to a page; size 19" × 1½". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.

An old and well-preserved MS., with clear and legible writing, but many corrections.—Collated at Tanjore.

\( G_5 \)

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11851. Folios 320, with about 8 lines to a page; size 19" × 1½". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.

The MS. contains the Sabhā also, probably written by the same hand. A well-preserved old MS., with clear and legible writing.—Collated at Tanjore.

\( G_6 \)

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11860. Folios 324, with about 8 lines to a page; size 18½" × 1½". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.

MS. written by Kāśipati, on the 22nd of the month of Kumbha, in the year Krodhi.—Collated at Tanjore.

\( G_7 \)

Melkote, Yadugiri Yatiraj Math MS. (without number). Folios 217, with about 12-14 lines to a page; size 19-2" × 2". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.

[22] Clear and legible writing; worm-eaten in places. Being a conflated MS., it was discontinued after adhy. 2. It is one of the few Southern MSS. which begins with the (Northern) salutatory stanza, नारायण समस्कृत्य etc. added later in the narrow upper margin of the first folio, in very fine writing. Its place of insertion is indicated by a “hamsapāda”, inserted immediately after its first maṅgala stanza (9*).—Collated up to the end of adhy. 2 only.
PROLEGOMENA

M1


Secured on loan and got collated kindly by Prof K. Rama Pisharoti. No further details of the MS. are available. Incomplete MS., ending with adhy. 53, the final adhyāya of the Āstikaparvan.—Collated at Sanskrit College, Tripunithura, Cochin.

M2


The MS. was returned to the Cochin State Library after collation. No further details of the MS. are available. Incomplete MS., ending with adhy. 53, the final adhyāya of the Āstikaparvan.

M3

Cochin, State Library, No. 1. Folios 166, with about 12-13 lines to a page; size 19-9” × 1-6”. Malayalam characters; dated Kollam 1013 (ca. A.D. 1838). Palm-leaf.

A modern MS., perhaps less than 100 years old; adhyāya numbers and śloka numbers are given. The adhyāya ends are shown by a floral design, inscribed in the margins.

M4

MS. from the private library of Kallenkara Pisharam, Cochin. Folios 57. Malayalam characters. Palm-leaf.

The MS. was returned to the owner immediately after collation. No further details of the MS. are available. Incomplete, ending with adhy. 53, the final adhyāya of the Āstikaparvan.

M5


Secured for collation by courtesy of Mr. P. Anujan Achan, now Superintendent, Archaeological Department, Cochin State.

M6

MS. from the private library of Nareri Mana, Malabar. Folios 163, with about 10 lines to a page; size 18” × 1-6”. Malayalam characters. Palm-leaf.

[23] Incomplete MS., adhy. 1-53 wanting (i.e. begins with the Adivamśāvatarāṇa sub-parvan) writing clear and legible; generally correct; margins are clean.—Collations begin from adhy. 54.

M7

MS. from the private library of Avanapparambu Mana, Cochin. Folios 170, with about 10 lines to a page; size 20-5” × 1-8”. Malayalam characters. Palm-leaf.
Clear and legible writing; leaves are in perfect preservation, not a single leaf being worm-eaten; probably not very old. Scribe has left many blanks in the writing space, whenever the surface of the leaf was uneven or rugged. —Collated from adhy. 54.

Ms


In view of the great unevenness of the critical apparatus, and of the consequent difficulty likely to be experienced by readers using the critical notes (printed at the foot of the page) in ascertaining what manuscripts have been added, discontinued, or discarded at different points of the text, I append, on the following page, a table which shows at a glance just what manuscripts have been actually collated for different portions of the text. Even the larger lacunae of the manuscripts, which cannot be easily ascertained, have been exhibited in this table. Only such (small) omissions have been, as a rule, ignored as are specifically mentioned in the footnote itself pertaining to the particular stanza, and which are therefore brought to the notice of the reader as soon as he reads the footnote.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhyāya &amp; Śloka.</th>
<th>Northern Recension MSS.</th>
<th>South, Rec. MSS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1-204</td>
<td>K₀-6 V₁ B₁-4 Da Dn Dr D₁-12.14</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-7 M₁-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 205-2. 39</td>
<td>K₀-6 V₁ B₁-4 Da Dn Dr D₁-14</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-7 M₁-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 40-191</td>
<td>K₀-6 V₁ B₁-4 Da Dn Dr D₁-14</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-7 M₁-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 192-243</td>
<td>K₀-6 V₁ B₁-4 Da Dn Dr D₁-14</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-7 M₁-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1-44</td>
<td>K₀-6 N₁₂ V₁ B₁-3 Da Dn D₁-7</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-0 M₁-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 45-13, 45</td>
<td>K₀-6 N₁₂ V₁ B₁-5 Da Dn D₁-7</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-0 M₁-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 1-26. 9</td>
<td>K₀-6 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-5 Da Dn D₁-7</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-0 M₁-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 15-43. 13</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-5 Da Dn D₁-7</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-0 M₁-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. 14-47. 19</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. 20-53. 36</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. 1-4</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. 45-55. 3⁴</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. 3⁶-60. 61b</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. 65-61. 84ᵃ</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. 84ᵇ-62. 2</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. 3-68. 19</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. 20-74ᵃ</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. 74ᵇ-69. 41ᶜ</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. 41ᵈ-51</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. 1-71. 17ᶜ</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. 17ᶜ-72. 8ᵇ</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. 8-22</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. 23-74. 4</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. 5-76. 35</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. 1-78. 20ᵇ</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. 20ᶜ-90. 88</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. 89-92. 13ᵈ</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. 13ᶜ-96. 3⁷ᵇ</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. 3⁷ᶜ-127. 2¹ᵃ</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. 2¹ᵇ-181. 4⁰</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182. 1-225. 1⁹</td>
<td>S₁ K₀-4 N₁-3 V₁ B₁-3-5 Da Dn D₃-5</td>
<td>T₁₂ G₁-6 M₃-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. D₃ added at 1. 205.—K₄ discontinued from 2. 40.—G₄ has lacuna from 2. 192 to 3. 44.—K₄ Dr. D₈-1₄ G₇ discontinued, and N₁₂ B₈ M₅ added, from 3.1.—N₃ added at 14. 1.—S₁ added at 26. 10.—B₄ ends at 43. 13.—K₄ has lacuna from 47. 20 to 54. 4.—D₈ M₃₄₄₅₄ discontinued, and B₈ M₅₆₈ added, from 54.1.—S₁ has lacuna from 13.—K₃ has lacuna from 47. 20 to 54. 4.—S₄ has lacuna from 55. 3ᵇ to 60. 6₁ᵇ, and from 61. 8₄ᵇ to 68. 19.—D₉ (which transp. the Sakuntala and Yayati episodes) has lacuna from 62. 3 to 69. 5₁.—V₄ has lacuna from 68. 7₄ᵇ to 92. 1₃.—K₃ has lacuna from 69. 4₁ᵇ to 7₁. 1₇ᵇ, and from 72. 8ᶜ to 7₄. 4.—S₁ has lacuna from 72. 2₃ to 7₈. 2₀ᵇ—D₉ ends at 7₆. 3₅.—B₄ ends at 9₀. 8₈.—V₄ has lacuna from 9₆. 3₇ᵇ to 127. 2¹ᵇ—T₃ ends at 1₈₁. 4₀.—T₃ begins from 1₈₂. 1.
As testimonia, or aids of a partial or subsidiary character, there are available, besides the numerous commentaries, the following three important epitomes of the eleventh century: (i) the Javanese adaptation Bhāratam (ca. A.D. 1000), (ii) the Telugu adaptation Āndhra Bhāratamu by the Telugu poet Nannaya Bhattā (ca. A.D. 1025), and (iii) the Sanskrit adaptation Bhāratamahājāri by the Kāśmirī poet Kṣemendra (ca. A.D. 1050); as also an important Persian rendering made some centuries later (ca. A.D. 1580) at the instance of that enlightened and sagacious Emperor of India with catholic sympathies, the great Akbar.

The commentaries collated for this edition are dealt with below, under the Devanāgarī versions. Here it will suffice to observe that, even when accompanied by the (epic) text, the commentaries are, for reasons which will be explained later on, evidence only for the actual lemmata and the pāṭhāntaras cited. The absence of commentary on a stanza or a group of stanzas or even on an adhyāya is, in general, no proof that that particular passage was lacking in the text used by the commentator. For, clearly, his text may have contained the passage in question, but he may not have deemed it necessary to comment upon any portion of it. Nevertheless when the commentary ignores a lengthy and difficult passage, then there is a strong presumption that the text of the commentator did not contain the passage. A case in point is the Kaṇikanīti, a passage of 186 lines, which is entirely ignored in Devabodha’s commentary (but has evoked lengthy comments from both Arjunāmīśra and Nilakaṇṭha), and which is missing in the Kāśmirī version.

As regards the old Javanese adaptation, from the reports of Dutch scholars who have studied the original Javanese text, it appears that only eight out of the eighteen parvans of the Mahābhārata have been traced so far; namely, Ādi, Vīrāṭa, Udyoga, Bhīṣma, Āśramavāsa, Mauṣala, Mahāprasthāna and Svargārohaṇa. Three of these (Āśramavāsa, Mauṣala, Mahāprasthāna) were the subject of a doctor dissertation, submitted to the Leyden University by Dr. H. H. Juynboll, as early as 1893. The Javanese original was edited by the doctor in Roman characters and rendered into Dutch. Thirteen years later (1906) the same scholar published the text of the Ādi (with different readings) in Roman transcript. Of the old Javanese Ādiparvan, only a few episodes have been as yet translated, to wit: the Parvasāṅgraha, the Pausya, the Amṛtamanthana, the story of Parikṣit and

---


2 Adiparva, Oudjavaansch Prozageschrift, uitgegeven door Dr. H. H. Juynboll. S’Gravenhage 1906.
the Sauparna. Unfortunately these translations are not available in India; at least they were not available to me.

The chief value of the Javanese adaptation for us lies in the fact that throughout the old Javanese text are scattered Sanskrit quotations, which appear to have "served as landmarks for writers and hearers or readers." The text prepared by Dr. JUYNBOLL, which is based upon eight manuscripts, is reputed to be very accurate. But it is admitted that the Sanskrit excerpts in the extant Javanese manuscripts are extremely corrupt, and it is a [26] question how far the conjectural restorations by the editor correctly represent the original readings. It seems to me likely that in his reconstructions Dr. JUYNBOLL was to a certain extent influenced by the wording of the Vulgate, which is certainly not always original. To give only one instance. On p. 70, the Javanese manuscripts read (in the "Sakuntala" episode):

paripatya\textadhatu sunu, \text{hara}nire\textadhatu gun\text{hitat}\text{a} ,

which is corrupt; it conveys no sense. In the text the editor gives:

pratipada\textadhatu pada\text{sunur}, dhara\text{ni}\text{re\textadhatu} gun\text{hitat}\text{a} ,

which is nearly the reading of the Calcutta edition (3040). Though the Javanese manuscripts are palpably corrupt, yet they have preserved the correct \textit{paripada\text{a} (for pratipada\text{a} of the Vulgate)}, which is the reading of the \textit{Sara\text{da}} and K manuscripts of our edition. We have here to thank the Vulgate for the \textit{pratipada\text{a}} of Dr. JUYNBOLL'S text!

Notwithstanding, that the period from which this adaptation dates is comparatively speaking recent, it yet precedes the known date of the manuscripts by several centuries and is hence of considerable importance for critical purposes, as a witness\textsuperscript{1} independent of and uninfluenced by the main line of our extant Indian witnesses. Most of the Sanskrit quotations of the Javanese text can be traced both in the Northern and the Southern recensions, as may be seen from our Appendix II, at the end of this volume, which contains a concordance of the Javanese extracts with the Critical Edition, the Calcutta Edition, and SASTRI'S Southern Recension. A few of the quotations are to be traced to the "additional" passages in the Northern manuscripts, but none to the specific Southern "additions." The conclusion is inevitable that the text of the Sanskrit Adiparvan used by the Javanese writers must have belonged to the Northern recension, a conclusion already suggested by the sequence of the "Sakuntala" and "Yayati" episodes, which is the Northern sequence. This does not necessarily mean that the entire Javanese Bharatam represents the Northern recension. It is quite likely that some of the parvans utilized by the Javanese adapters belonged to the Southern recension. The late Mr. UTGIKAR\textsuperscript{2} was inclined to think that the Javanese Virataparvan

\textsuperscript{1} Particularly valuable, as the Indian MSS. are mostly conflated.

\textsuperscript{2} The Virataparvan (Poona 1923), Introduction, p. XIII, and \textit{ABJ}, 2, 167 f.
was of the Southern type. The point will have to be re-examined in the light of further evidence. The books were preserved and handed down separately; consequently the genesis of each parvan must be investigated separately.

The Telugu adaptation, the Andhra Bhāratamu, is a metrical epitome of the Mahābhārata, commenced by Nannaya Bhaṭṭa, a court poet of the Eastern Cālukya king Viṣṇuvardhana, who had his capital at Rajahmundry, on the East Coast of India, and who appears to have ruled between 1022 and 1066. The torso of the Telugu rendering left behind by Nannaya, consisting of a version of the first two parvans and of a part of the third, was completed many years later by two other poets. Nannaya’s version is valuable for the light it throws on the condition of the Southern recension—or, strictly speaking, of the Telugu version—in the eleventh century of the Christian era, especially in view of [27] the fact that Nannaya has included in his poem an accurate rendering of the Parvasanāgraha, giving the number of ślokas in each of the parvans of his Mahābhārata. The figure for the stanzas of the Ādi is 9984, which shows that the text used by Nannaya must have been substantially of the same size as that preserved in the extant Southern manuscripts. The poet is reported to have followed the original fairly closely. Notable is consequently his omission of Brahmā’s visit to Vyāsa.

Curiously enough, the third old important epitome of the Mahābhārata which we possess, the Bhāratamoṇiḥari by Kṣemendra, belongs to the same century as the two epitomes mentioned above, since this Kaśmīrī poet must also be assigned to the middle of the eleventh century. BÜHLER and KIRSTE have given in their Indian Studies, No. 2 (pp. 30 ff.), the results of a careful comparison of Kṣemendra’s abstract with the Bombay text of the Mahābhārata. They show that Kṣemendra’s text contains both additions and omissions as compared with the latter. Of the omissions they note: adhy. 4, 24, 45-48, 66, 94, 139, and parts of adhy. 141 and 197 of the Vulgate. Of these, adhy. 4 is, as pointed out by BÜHLER and KIRSTE, a short introductory chapter, a variant of adhy. 1; adhy. 45-48 are a repetition (with variations) of adhy. 13-15; adhy. 66 is a variant of the preceding adhyāya; adhy. 94 is a variant of adhy. 95 (prose), which is selected by Kṣemendra

* [In this connection see the Introduction to Dr. Raghu VIRA’s Critical Edition of the Virāṭaparvan, pp. xi-xv.]

1 V. Ramasvami & Sons, Madras 1924-29.
2 Cf. Venkatachellam IYER, Notes of a Study of the Preliminary Chapters of the Mahābhārata (Madras 1922), pp. 97-100.
3 The figures of Nannaya’s Andhra Bhāratamu are now given by Professor P. P. S. SASTRI in his edition of the Mahābhārata, Southern Recension, Vol. II, Introduction, p. xxx (Scheme of Ślokas). They were first published by Venkatachellam IYER, op.cit. p. 311.
4 Cf. Venkatachellam IYER, op. cit. p. 99. 5 Ed. Kāvyamālā, No 64 (1898).
for his purpose; \footnote{1} finally, stanzas 44 to end of adhy. 197 are a repetition of a part of adhy. 169. The reason for the omission of these adhyāyas is thus clear: they are mere repetitions. The remaining adhyāyas, which are missing and whose omission BÜHLER-KIRSTE could not account for, namely, adhy. 24, 139, and 141 (stanzas 1-19) are also missing in many of our Mahābhārata manuscripts and have accordingly been omitted in the constituted text as well. To these must be added the important omission of adhy. 140 of the Vulgate, the Kaṇikanīti, which is likewise omitted by Kṣemendra, an omission which appears to have been overlooked by BÜHLER and KIRSTE.

The collaborating authors felt justified in concluding that the omissions and additions "are just such liberties as any Kāvya poet would take in making a similar abridgement." They were also of opinion that the original cannot have differed very essentially from our current texts, that is, the Vulgate. This is correct up to a certain point. A comparison with the different versions shows that Kṣemendra’s version agrees, as was to be expected, most closely with the Sāradā. On comparing the divisions of the Mañjari with those given in Bombay or Calcutta editions of the Mahābhārata, BÜHLER and KIRSTE were struck by the fact that the Mañjari divisions agreed better with the course of the narrative; and they give examples to show that the arrangement of the Mañjari is more logical. That is quite natural, because the old Northern manuscripts, which this edition \footnote{26} follows, fully support the arrangement of the Mañjari, whereas the divisions adopted in the Vulgate are secondary and quite corrupt.

The Persian translation\footnote{8} of the Mahābhārata, made in the reign of Emperor Akbar, being still unedited, could not be consulted. A very full account of this rendering has, however, been given by the late Dr. Sir Jivanji Jamshedji Modi in a paper read before the First Oriental Conference at Poona in November 1919 and published in the Annals of this Institute.\footnote{8} Of all the Sanskrit works Akbar got translated, the Mahābhārata, it appears, had his most earnest attention.

Several eminent poets and scholars had a hand in translating the Great Epic of India into Persian. The A’in-e-Akbari gives the following names: Naqib Khān, Maulānā ‘Abdu’l-Qādir Badayūnī, and Shaikh Sultan of Thanesar, to which the Muniakhab-u’t-Tawārikh adds the names of Mullā Sherī, and Shaikh Faizī (the brother of Abu’l-Fazl).

"Badaoni translated," we are informed by Sir Jivanji,\footnote{4} on the author-
ity of contemporaneous chronicles, "two out of the eighteen sections. Mullā Sherī and Naqīb Khān did a part of the work and the rest was completed by Sultān Hājī of Thanesar. Shaikh Faizī converted their 'rough translation into elegant prose and verse, but he did not complete more than two sections.' Sultān Hājī then revised these two sections and verse. Not only did he do so, but he also revised his work which formed a large share of the work." Quoting Badāūnī, Sir Jīvanji continues: "The Hājī aforesaid revised these two sections, and as for the omissions which had taken place in his first edition, those defects he put right, and comparing it word for word was brought to such a point of perfection that not a fly-mark of the original was omitted"! The preface to this translation was from the pen of that gifted courtier of Akbar who has left us such an admirable account of the Emperor's reign, Abu'l-Fazl. This Persian version appears to have been a free rendering of the original, made by Muslim poets and scholars at the Court of Akbar, to whom the sense of the original had been explained by Hindu pandits, under the orders of the Emperor.

There are numerous other vernacular abstracts of the Mahābhārata besides the Telugu abstract mentioned above, but most of them are of a late date. Moreover, they are all far too free to be of much use to us in reconstructing the text of the Mahābhārata.

Besides these abstracts and adaptations, there are parallel versions of certain passages or even of whole episodes to be met with in other works. Thus we have a parallel version of the Śakuntalā episode (adhy. 62 ff.), in the Padmapurāṇa; of the Yayāti episode (adhy. 71 ff.), in the Matsyapurāṇa; of the story of Ruru (adhy. 8 ff.), in the Devībhāgavata; of a portion of Samudramanthanha (adhy.. 16 f.), again in the Matsyapurāṇa; of a portion of a cosmogonic passage (I. 60. 54 ff.), in the Rāmāyaṇa. [29] There is more distant connection between our Sauparna (adhy. 14 ff.) and the pseudo-vedic Suparnādiḥyāya. Some of the stanzas of the Ādi are cited, with or without mention of the source, in the Tantravārttika of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (e.g. our 1. 1. 209), as also in the Bhāṣyas of Ācārya Śrīṅkarā (e.g. our 1. 1. 37). A few of the sententious stanzas (e.g. our 1. 74. 1 ff.) recur, with variation, in Buddhist literature, while stray stanzas are to be found again in the Khīlas of the Rgveda (e.g. our 1. 53. 22 f.), the Manusmṛti (e.g.

6 2. 111.
our 1.3.94) and the Brhaddevatā (e.g. our 1.59.12). One of our stanzas (1.119.6) has been cited in the Dhvanyāloka of Anandavardhana, as by Mahārṣi Vyāsa. There are probably many stanzas which remain to be identified.

It is perhaps well to add in this place that a certain amount of caution is necessary in making any critical use of citations of stray Mahābhārata stanzas we meet with again in other works. We must, in the first place, bear in mind that most of the other works have yet to be properly edited. Even in critically edited texts we must take into account the various readings of the passage in question in the manuscripts collated. Then in the case of citations we must allow for failures of memory; since in ancient times the stanzas were almost invariably quoted from memory, and the quotation was never compared with the original. Moreover we must never forget that probably from time immemorial there have existed local versions of the Mahābhārata. The citations made even by very old writers were from these local versions. A citation by a writer of the eighth century or even the sixth century proves nothing for the Ur-Mahābhārata, that ideal but impossible desideratum; though the citation is far older than our manuscripts, it is evidence only for the text of the local Mahābhārata in the eighth, respectively the sixth century, notwithstanding that the differences between the various recensions and versions of the Mahābhārata must diminish as we go back further and further.

[30] PEDIGREE OF ADIPARVAN VERSIONS

Vyāsa's Bhārata

Ur-Mahābhārata

\[\text{\[N\]}\]

Sāradā K Nepāli Māthilī Bengāli Devanāgarī Telugu Grantha Malayālam (other than K)

PROLEGOMENA

EXPLANATION OF THE SIGLA USED IN THE ABOVE PEDIGREE

N is the ultimate source from which all versions of the Northern recension are, directly or indirectly, derived.

\( \nu \) is the lost archetype of the North-Western group, appreciably shorter than any of the other known versions (textus simplior).

K is a specific Devanāgarī version allied to the Sāradā (or Kaśmīri) version (sharply distinguished from other Devanāgarī versions), of which one MS. (K₁) is the direct copy of a Sāradā original. The version is largely contaminated from MSS. of the (central) sub-recension (\( \gamma \)), and in part, also from some unknown Southern sources. Exact provenance of the version is unknown.

\( \gamma \) is the intermediate (inflated) source from which all versions of the central sub-recension are derived (comprising the Eastern and Western groups), occupying a position intermediate between the North-Western and the Southern groups. It contains a considerable number of secondary additions (including repetitions), as also a very large number of verbal alterations and corruptions.

\( \sigma \) is the lost archetype of the Eastern group (comprising the Nepāli, Maithilī and Bengali versions), which is free from the additions and alterations made later in certain Devanāgarī MSS.

S is the ultimate source from which all versions of the Southern recension are, directly or indirectly, derived and which is appreciably longer than N, and far more elaborate (textus ornament).

\( \sigma \) is the lost archetype of T G, containing a large number of corruptions and secondary additions, from which M is free.

[31] A CRITICAL SURVEY OF THE RECENSIONS AND THEIR VERSIONS

THE TWO RECENSIONS

The textual criticism of the Mahābhārata proceeds from the incontrovertible fact that the text of the Great Epic has been handed down in two divergent forms, a Northern and a Southern recension, texts typical of the Āryāvarta and the Dakśināpatha. With the realization of this patent contrast began the Mahābhārata textual criticism nearly fifty years ago, when Protag Chandra Roy brought out his popular edition of the Mahābhārata (1883-96), under the auspices of the Dātavya Bhārata Kāryālaya. A brief account of the controversy to which the publication of this edition of the Mahābhārata gave rise is to be found in Roy's writings.² We are told there

² Cf. the letter addressed by Roy to the Editor of The Hindu (Madras) and published on the cover of fascicule XXIX of his translation of the Mbh, (1887). See also HOLTZMANN, Das Mahābhārata, 3, 33,
that the appearance of his edition was hailed by *The Hindu* of Madras, that great bulwark of Dravidian Hinduism, in its issue dated November 22, 1885, with the publication of a bellicose letter, headed "Another edition of the *Mahabharata*," purporting to give an account of the proceedings of a public meeting held at Mayaveram, and containing an outspoken and trenchant criticism of Roy's edition by one Mr. Sreenivasa SASTRIAL. This worthy gentleman thought Roy's edition to be "sadly defective in the text and that this defect is detrimental to the religious interests as many portions supporting the *Advaita* and *Vāsishta-advaita* (sic) doctrines, but unfavourable to the Sakti worshippers of the North, have been omitted". "It was sad, therefore," bemoaned this aggrieved protagonist of the Southern Recension, "that the generous gentleman of the North, Protapa Chandra Roy, that undertook to edit the text, should decline the responsibility of editing the text as correctly as possible and to compare various manuscripts of the text from Southern India." Mr. Sreenivasa SASTRIAL, it is reported, "instanced one or two portions of the *Mahābhārata*, omitted in the Calcutta edition, which can be proved by indisputable testimony to have existed in the earliest copies of the work." One wonders, where and how this estimable gentleman could have got hold of "the earliest copies" of the work; or rather, just how early were the copies he was referring to. "Again, many verses", complained this Vaiṣṇava propagandist, "quoted by the great philosophers of the South in support of their respective doctrines, are not to be found in Mr. Protapa Chandra Roy's edition!"

The reply of Protap Chandra Roy is not altogether without interest. He ruefully admitted—what we must even now admit—that "there can be no edition of the *Mahābhārata* how carefully edited soever, that would please scholars of every part of India.... Like other ancient works that have come down to us from century to century by the method of manual transcription, *large interpolations have been inserted in this great work.*" To settle, at this fag-end of the nineteenth century, what portions are genuine and what otherwise, is, except in a very few instances, simply impossible". With highly commendable [32] objectivity, Roy then proceeds to enunciate a critical principle, which, simple—nay, obvious—as it is, many a reputable scholar of India will find it difficult to appreciate even at the present day. "I know of no method", wrote Roy, nearly fifty years ago, "except that of taking that only as undoubtedly genuine which occurs in all the manuscripts of the East, the North, the West, and the South"! "As far as my edition is concerned", he continued, "it is substantially based on that of the *Royal Asiatic Society* of Bengal, published about forty-five years ago under the superintendence of a few learned Pandits of Bengal aided, as I believe, by an English orientalist of repute.... Manuscripts had been procured from all parts of India (the South unexcepted) and these were carefully collated. Although edited with

---

3 Italics mine!
such care, I have not, however, slavishly followed the Society's edition. I have compared it carefully with the Maharâjâh of Burdwan's text in the Bengalee character which was edited with still greater care. About 18 manuscripts procured from different parts of India (the South not excepted) were carefully collated by the Burdwan Pandits before they admitted a single sloka as genuine. I have very frequently referred to this Burdwan edition also for checking the Society's text. Besides the published texts, I have now and then referred to certain manuscripts. These, however, are all of Bengal. I am willing to consult any approved manuscript of Southern India.... I conclude by repeating that I have no complaint against Mr. Sreenivasa. On the other hand, I freely admit that an edition like the one projected by him will be a valuable accession to the libraries of all scholars in India and in countries out of India. Only the same remarks that he has applied to my edition will, I am confident, apply to his, when a Pundit of Northern or Western India takes it up for notice or review, unless, of course, the learned SASTRIAL includes, without critical examination, every passage bearing on both the Advaita and the Çâkêta worship. I may assure Mr. SASTRIAL, however, that in that case, in his attempt to please everybody he will, like the painter in the fable, please none, particularly among readers of judgment and critical discrimination. The fact is, that the divergences of manuscripts are so great that it is perfectly impossible to produce an edition that could at once satisfy both Aryâvarta and Dâkshinâyâ. That edition, alas, so bravely and enthusiastically planned by Mr. Sreenivasa SASTRIAL, to which reference is made in the above extract, appears never to have seen the interior of any printing establishment!

I have quoted Protap Chandra Roy in extenso, not merely because of the interesting sidelight his remarks throw on the question of the different editions of the Mahâbhârata, projected or planned, in or just before his time, but also because of some remarkably sound principles of textual criticism, briefly, but clearly, propounded therein by him. Protap Chandra Roy had grasped the Mahâbhârata Problem in all its essentials. But the time was not yet ripe for the actual preparation of a critical edition of the Mahâbhârata.

The differences between the two recensions of the Mahâbhârata must not be underrated. Between them there lies, to start with, the irksome barrier of scripts. It is no exaggeration to say that in India to the Northerners, the Southern versions written in Southern scripts, ordinarily speaking, were and are sealed books; on the other hand, the Southerners, with the possible exception of a few learned Pandits—who, in fact, after a half-hearted admission of epic poetry into the realm of literature, cheerfully leave the [33] study of the bulk of the Mahâbhârata text to their less gifted brethren—could not and cannot decipher the Northern scripts, perhaps with the exception of the Devanâgarî.

When one laboriously surmounts this initial obstacle, and starts to com-
pare the two recensions, one finds, to one's surprise, that the difference between them begins, as a matter of fact, with the very division of the Mahābhārata into its various parvans! Against the commonly accepted, conventional division of the epic into eighteen books (parvans), there is the Southern division into twenty-four.² More surprising still is the fact that the Adi-parvan itself, the very first book of the epic (with which alone we are, in fact, here concerned), is sub-divided in Southern manuscripts into three (Adi, Āstīka and Sambhava), or at least into two (Adi and Sambhava) separate major parvans.² Let me emphasize that it is the main large divisions (parvans) of the epic I am here referring to, and not the hundred (sub-)parvans (also called upaparvans or antahparvans). The sub-parvans, in point of fact, could not come into question here at all. Only the Northern manuscripts, as a rule, mention in their colophons the names of the sub-parvans; the Southern manuscripts ignore (as far as I can say at present, uniformly) this detail, very rarely mentioning, in their colophons, the name of the corresponding sub-parvan.³ We have, therefore, no means of knowing precisely the number and the limits of the sub-parvans in the Southern scheme, except, of course, the meagre and ambiguous data of the Parvasaṅgraha (Adi 2) itself.⁴

It is true that the Southern (printed) editions (not excepting Professor P. P. S. Sastri's critical edition of the Southern recension, as far as it has gone) follow the division of the epic uniformly into the conventional eighteen books.⁵ But in so far as they do that, the editors, it seems to me, must be overriding knowingly (but without giving the fact inexpedient prominence) the clear and unmistakable testimony of Southern manuscripts. They prefer to sacrifice the Southern manuscript tradition and make their editions harmonize with the data of the Parvasaṅgraha: always a grave blunder; because, clearly, the data of the Parvasaṅgraha can be manipulated far more easily than those of the manuscripts of the text. The Parvasaṅgraha, if

---

¹ See the remarks of Burnell, A Classified Index to the Sanskrit MSS. in the Palace at Tanjore (London 1879), p. 180; and Winternitz, Ind. Ant. 1898. 122.

² In most Southern manuscripts the adhyāyas of these different parts of our Adi-parvan are separately numbered. In our critical apparatus a new beginning is made with (our) adhyāya 54 in all Southern MSS. except T₁ (which is a misch-codex), an adhyāya which marks the beginning of our Adiavahśāvataramparvan; in the colophons of the Southern MSS. it is called the first adhyāya of the Sambhavaparvan.

³ On the other hand, the Southern MSS. (and in fact even most of the Northern MSS.) frequently mention the name of the Upākhyāna or the name of the adhyāya; but even this is never done regularly and systematically.

⁴ The Parvasaṅgraha gives only the names of the (100) sub-parvans, and the contents of the (18) major parvans. But from these data, we cannot say from what adhyāya to what adhyāya a particular sub-parvan extends.

⁵ Thus, from these Southern ed., one can never elicit the fact that in the Southern Recension our Adi is divided into two parts (parvans) and that these parts have separate numbering of adhyāyas.
compiled, originally, on the basis of some Northern version,¹ would certainly
not fit the Southern recension exactly, even when the Parvasamgraha was first
compiled.

[34] The difference between the recensions does not end there by any
means, unhappily. The manuscripts of the two recensions show numerous
other, big and small, discrepancies : discrepancies in the spelling of most ordi-
nary words (e.g. N शीता: S शीत या शीत), especially of proper names (e.g.
N चित्रितम: S चित्रितम); in the readings of words, phrases, lines, stanzas, groups of
stanzas (passim); in the sequence of all these elements (passim); in the rela-
tive position of single adhyāyas or of a small group of adhyāyas (passim); in
the relative sequence of whole episodes (e.g. the Śakuntalā and Yayāti episodes,
Adi, 62 ff., and 70 ff.). What is more disconcerting still is that the recensions
show also complicated displacements of portions of adhyāyas; cf., for ex-
ample, the long notes on 1. 106. 11 (p. 474 f.), and 1. 144. 20 (p. 624).
Besides these variations in spellings, readings and sequences, there are addi-
tions (or omissions, just as one may happen to regard them) of single lines
(often “inorganic”, i.e. such as can be added or omitted with no effect upon
the grammar or continuity), of short passages (passim) and long passages
comprising more than a hundred lines (cf. App. I, No. 55, a passage of 125
lines, setting forth the story of the Kāśi princess Ambā). These additions
(respectively omissions) and verbal variants sometimes go to such a length
that, at times, there emerges in the end an entirely different story. Compare,
for instance, the two versions of the highly popular episode “Rape of Subha-
drā” (Subhadṛāhararaṇa) in adhy. 211-212 of our edition and passage No. 114
of App. I (comprising over 460 lines !).² We find that the Southern version
of this story is enriched with many entirely novel and startling features, such
as Arjuna’s masquerading as a peripatetic monk (yati), or his fierce battle
with the Yādaṇa forces led by Vipṛthu, which he, of course, routs, alone and
unaided, or rather merely with the help of his newly acquired, valiant and
resourceful wife, who acts as his charioteer!

A notable feature of the Southern recension is that it is considerably
longer than the Northern. The constituted text of the Parvasamgraha (1. 2.
96) gives 7984 “ślokas” (that is, probably, what is technically called
granthis) as the extent of the Adi:

शत श्रोकसहस्राणि तथा नव शातानि च |
श्रोकाध्व चतुरदशीतिर्द्वयो अन्यो महात्मना ||

¹ This is clearly suggested by the fact that the longer Table of Contents (1. 2.
72-233) follows the eighteen-parvan division, which does not harmonize with the
data of the colophons of the Southern MSS, which have the twenty-four-parvan
division.

² Even the Śakuntalā episode gets a somewhat different colouring in the
Southern recension.
The extent of the Vulgate is computed to be about 8460 "stanzas". The length of the Southern text of the Ādi edited by Professor P. P. S. SASTRI is given by himself as 9984 "stanzas", slightly in excess of his own Parvasāṅgraha figure (M. 1. 2. 102), which differs as regards this figure (as in many other figures in adhy. 2) from our edition. This latter figure (9984) is perhaps a trifle in excess of the presumable extent of the (normal) Southern recension, since P. P. S. SASTRI's text contains some clear instances of interpolation (from Telugu, Tamil and even Northern sources), which need not necessarily be put down to the already swollen account of the Southern recension. The difference between the Vulgate and SASTRI's text is about 1524 "stanzas". But even the common Southern text, which will be appreciably shorter than SASTRI's, may confidently be reckoned to contain approximately 1300 "slokas" (i.e. granthas) more than the longest Northern version of the Ādi!

This excess in the Southern recension is not due to the addition of any single lengthy passage or just a few of such passages even, though there are undoubtedly among them some fairly long passages. The excess is due to additions, large and small, distributed almost evenly throughout the parvan.

Not only is the Southern text thus appreciably longer than the other, the story itself of the Southern recension, as compared with that of the Northern, is, owing to many of these additions, much richer in details, leaving little or nothing to the imagination of the reader or the hearer. Thus, for example, in the Northern recension, the father of Satyavati or Matsyagandha (Vyāsa's own mother) is a nameless king of fisher-folk, making a living, on the banks of the Yamunā, by fishing. This is rather unsatisfactory. That the name of Matsyagandha's father—he is really only her foster father—according to the fable—should not have been preserved, seems a shocking piece of negligence on the part of the historian, that is, the story-teller, since history as it is narrated (as has been well said) is a kind of *roman à thèse*. The Southern recension here comes to our help. It has carefully procured the name of the foster-father of Kāli Matsyagandha alias Satyavati: it was Uccaihśravas (a high-sounding Aryan name), if we are to believe the Southern recension. He was named after the great snow-white Stallion of the Gods, which came out of the ocean when it was being churned for Ambrosia by the Gods and the Titans.

Then again, the Purohita sent by the Yādavas to the forest retreat of Pāndu in the Himalayas was a Kāśyapa. He was required, of course, to perform all the little Aryan rites for the Pāṇḍavas. Moreover, it is best that kings always have their Rājaṇguru by their side, to advise and help them on all occasions. The Northern recension does not even tell us that the Yādavas

---

1 For instance the Ṣvētakī episode (M. 1. 214, 29-384), which, in the form printed there, is missing in all MSS. of his own critical apparatus!
had sent any Purohita at all to Pându's hermitage; so there, no question of his name arises.

But a really illuminating instance of the richness of information furnished by the Southern recension is supplied by an "additional" adhyāya in this recension, which gives us some new and interesting chronological details about the Pândavas themselves. These details disperse that haze of uncertainty and vagueness which overspreads the ordinary account.

The Southern recension informs us that when the Pândavas first arrived at the Court of Hāstina-pura from the forest retreat, after the death of their father, Yudhiṣṭhira was exactly sixteen years old, Bhīma fifteen, Arjuna fourteen, the twins thirteen. We are further told exactly how long the Pându brothers stayed at the Kaurava Court, in the Lac House (Jatugṛha), in Ekacakra, at the Court of the Pāṇcāla King, then again at the Kaurava Court, then in Indraprastha, and so on. Yudhiṣṭhira died at the ripe old age of 108, which is a mystic number. Arjuna was younger than Kṛṣṇa by three months, which was also exactly the difference between the ages of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma. And so on and so forth. Almost all these useful details are lacking in the Northern recension, and I doubt whether they can even be reconstructed from the meagre data of this recension on these points.

[36] The Southern recension impresses us thus by its precision, schematization, and thoroughly practical outlook. Compared with it, the Northern recension is distinctly vague, unsystematic, sometimes even inconsequent, more like a story rather naively narrated, as we find in actual experience.

The Southern recension of the Ādi at least is thus not merely longer, but also fuller, more exuberent, more ornate than the Northern. It may therefore be fitly styled, in relation to the Northern, the textus ornator.

Notwithstanding these and other discrepancies, there persists throughout, between the recensions, a distinct and undeniable family resemblance, and there cannot be the slightest doubt that they both spring from a common source, albeit a distant and somewhat nebulous source. Follow the course of these divergent streams as far back as one will, the elusive source seems to recede still further and lose itself in the mists of antiquity.

It was pointed out above that a noteworthy feature of the Southern recension was that it was appreciably longer than the Northern. The character of the principal additions may be seen from the following list of some of the more important and lengthy passages peculiar to the Southern recension, whose texts are given in Appendix I.

(1) No. 9 (S except M₁) : God Śiva (Rudra) drinks up the poison (hālāhala) which exudes from the mouth of Vāsuki, while the Devas and Asuras are churning the ocean for Ambrosia (samudramanithana) ; comprising 19 lines.

---

No. 45-48 and 51: Additions to the Sakuntalā episode (together 231 lines).

(3) No. 52: Mādhavī is introduced on the scene during the discourse between Yayāti and his grandsons, in the Yayāti episode (43 lines).

(4) No. 55: Anticipation of the story of the Kāśi princess Ambā (125 lines).

(5) No. 59: Sūrya persuades Kuntī to have sexual intercourse (21 lines).

(6) No. 67: Details of the early life of the Pāṇḍavas in the Himalayan retreat (46 lines).

(7) No. 68-69: Pāṇḍu's death and many funeral orations (together 123 lines).

(8) No. 78 (S, and by conflation K, Da, Dn Dn, 4/5): Details of a battle between the Kurus and the Pāṇḍālas, and capture of Drupada (119 lines).

(9) No. 79: Anticipation of the account of the birth of Draupadī and Drṣṭadyumna; and account of the birth of Drupada (together 194 lines).

(10) No. 87-89: Additions to the Hiṣṭimba episode (69 lines).

(11) No. 91-93: Additions to the Bakavadha episode, including a detailed account of the fight between the two well-matched giants, Baka and Bhūma (106 lines).

(12) No. 95: Drupada bemoans the loss of the Pāṇḍavas, and is consoled by his Purohita; decides, at the advice of the Purohita, to celebrate the Svayamvara of Kṛṣṇa, in the hope that the Pāṇḍavas might turn up (74 lines).

(13) No. 100: Story of Nālayānī narrated by Vyāsa to the Pāṇḍāla king, to justify the polyandrous marriage of the Pāṇḍavas (118 lines).

(14) No. 101: Story of Bhaumāsvi related on the same occasion (22 lines).

(15) No. 103: Mimic warfare between the Kauravas and Pāṇḍavas aided by Pāṇḍālas (219 lines).

[37] (16) No. 108: Dr̥ta-rāṣṭra crowns Yudhiṣṭhira king before despatching the Pāṇḍavas to Indraprastha (58 lines).

(17) No. 111: Description of Nārada, who comes to visit Yudhiṣṭhira (55 lines).

(18) No. 113-115: Expansion of the Subhadrāharaṇa (562 lines!).

(19) No. 116: Arjuna's welcome on his return from exile (28 lines).

These passages alone comprise 2250 lines or 1125 stanzas approximately!

The discrepancies between the two recensions, as already observed, are so numerous and so multifarious, that any attempt to enumerate and classify them must remain incomplete and unsatisfactory. Nevertheless it may be useful to begin a cursory survey of the divergences, noting at the same time the typical characteristics of the Southern "additions", characteristics which recur with fair frequency in the Adi, and which are likely to reappear in other parvans. These notes may prove useful for distinguishing between the different "hands" which have been at work in shaping this imposing monument of Indian antiquity, when the entire text has been treated in the manner proposed here, and we have sufficient data for undertaking a minute and systematic study of the variations and evaluating them.
The deviations of the Southern recension from the Northern (taking for purposes of exposition the latter to represent the norm) are of the following kind.

1. Variants of isolated words or phrases, (a) unimportant and (b) important.

(a) Unimportant, such as one comes across in line after line. They are far too numerous to be listed even approximately completely, but from among them we may single out these for specific mention:

(i) fluctuations in the spelling of proper names, e.g. S नैसिन्ध (N नैसिन्ध), रोमहर्षण (दोमहर्षण), अस्तित्व (आस्तित्व), हिरिच (हिरिन), हस्तिनापुर (हस्तिनापुर), उचर्थ (उचर्थ), महाशिन्ध (महाशिन्ध), नस्त्र (तंद्र), etc., etc.

(ii) variations mainly due to mere transpositions of words, e.g. S महेश्वर सवेनकृष्ण धातूलुम: (N धातूलुम: पूजितवेह सवेनकृष्ण मो) 1. 1. 23; प्रतीयज्ञ तरतो राजा (तत: प्रतीयो राजा स) 92. 1; etc., etc.

(iii) unremitting variation of: monosyllabic particles and verse-fillers, which are among the most unstable elements of the received text, such as अ, दे, हृ, हिं, [अ]; common adverbs and conjunctions, such as तत:, तदः, तद, तदः, ततः, तत्त्व:, तत्त्व:, निः, निः, निः; and prepositions श्रव-अभिस-वि-अति, प्रति-परि, अति-उः, etc., etc.

(iv) substitution of metrically equivalent synonyms, or words and phrases of similar significance; e.g. रोष-कोश-सोप; कृष्ण-मुनि; महः-विषु- (अ)सिम्बु; द्रिजः-निम; राज्य-राज्य; प्रभार-पुज्ञ; नरेश्वर-नरेश्वर-नरेश्वर-नरेश्वर; श्रद्धेऽस्त्र-द्विज्ञस्त्र-द्विज्ञस्त्र-द्विज्ञस्त्र; राज्योहरु-राज्योहरु (and similar compounds with विद्वाय and नोमाद); आरुविस्तार-शालविस्तार-शालविस्तार-शालविस्तार-शालविस्तार; शाक्तिसन-तागोपन्-तागोपन्; समरुद्वेन्द्र-समरुद्वेन्द्र; कथविधास्थ-संप्रवधास्थ-संप्रवधास्थ; अभिम-वेदाः-अभिमवेदाः; महाशृङ्ग-महाशृङ्ग-महाशृङ्ग-महाशृङ्ग; वराज्य-वेदविशिष्ट; चाहदस्मी-चाहदस्मी-चाहदस्मी-चाहदस्मी- (अ)जयविजय-हरस्व-ब्रह्मविजय-हरस्व-ब्रह्मविजय; etc., etc.

(v) substitution of equivalent epic iterata; e.g. जयविजय तदन्तर, पुत्रे-धर्मविजय-धर्मविजय; परस्परविजय-परस्परविजय; निःश्रवस्त्र यथा नार्य, क्षत्रन्तर नार्य; etc., etc. For other examples, see [38] S. Hopkins's collection of "Parallel phrases in the two Epics" in the Great Epic, pp. 403 ff. (Appendix A).

(b) Important variants, which make a considerable difference in the sense, and of which the critic must take account. Of such variants, relatively speaking, there are only a few; e.g. discrepant divisions of the epic into parvans and adhyāyas; variants of the titles of the sub-parvans (e.g. S प्रायोमान: N सृष्टमान), of the numbers of adhyāyas and ślokas in the Parvasanagraha (the figures for ślokas differ, at times, by thousands).
—An example of a different character from another part of the Adi is the variant वर्ण in the stanzas which refer to the duration of Arjuna’s exile. According to the Northern recension it is thirteen years; according to the Southern, only thirteen months! Cf. 1. 204. 28. त भी ब्राह्मण वर्णणि (S धर भाई, भाईनि etc.) ब्रह्म (S धर) चारी वरण वास्त; 205. 30 वरण द्रुवस्त वर्णणि (S भाईनि, भाईनि, भाई भी). — Then we have in 1. 3. 21 the variant द्रुवस्त-वन्द. How was the infinitive really made? — And so on.

2. Larger variations between continuous passages, as a whole, the total extent remaining approximately the same.

We find them (a) mostly in the long lists of names: e. g. of the hundred sons of Dṛtarāśtra (adhy. 108), of ancient kings (1. 1. 166 ff.), or serpents (1. 52. 5 ff.), of kings present at Draupadi’s svayamvara (adhy. 177); but (b) also when there are transpositions of whole or parts of adhyāyas (e. g. the prose genealogy, adhy. 90); or again (c) when there is free paraphrase of a passage (passim).

3. Expansion of the text in S without materially altering the nature of the contents or the course of the narrative.

(a) By multiplication of the items of a list. For instance:

In adhy. 20, S (with K, marg. Dn D, marg.) adds seven lines of praise to an existing hymn (लोक) addressed to Garuḍa. In these lines, Garuḍa is identified, in turn, with all the principal gods, and with everything that is pre-eminent in the world:

299* तं विसुत्तपति: सूर्य: परमेश्वर प्रजापति: ।
विशिष्ठस्तव द्रवस्तवम्ब: शरस्वत्वं जनावपति: ।
तं मुखं प्रवरो विभास्वमकिं: पवनस्वत्वा ।
तं हि धाता विधाता च तं विष्णु: सुरस्तनम: ।
तं महानिम्लस्त: श्रद्धाबुद्धत्वं महद्यशा: ।
तं भास्वममोभिरते तं नक्षत्रमुत्तमम् ।
तं गाति: सततं लत्तं कथं न: प्रासुयाद्यं ।

In adhy. 64, S (with K, Dn D, ) gives an additional short list of sciences in which the Ṛṣis in Kaftva’s penance grove were proficient:

586* यशवृक्षश्वरस्वरूपरस्कृत: काठशाकाचिशारे: ।
इत्यकारणाविधिः काठशाकाचिशारे: ।
जाति: जातिः ब्रह्मणाविधिः ।
नानाशास्त्रैसुवृद्धशुभाच राजनीतिं ।

---

1 Cf. HOPKINS, Ruling Caste in Ancient India, p. 342 (footnote).
[39] In adhy. 74 an additional passage (of 7 lines) in S (with D₈) harps on the well-worn theme of the evils that attend on anger:

745* तस्मादक्रोधः श्रेष्ठः कामक्रोधः न पृजितां।
कुश्यां निष्फलान्येव दुनयास्तापितः च।
तस्मादक्रोधः यद्यस्तपो दानं महत्पदम्।
पर्यन्त न तपस्वी च न यत्वा न च धम्मित्।
कोघस्य ये वर्ष गण्धे त्वस्य कोघयं न च।
पुज्यामुखङ्गिनिमात्मार्यं धर्मां तत्यतः।
तस्मैतान्यपावस्यन्ति कृधीरस्य निर्मथितम्।

In adhy. 165, a Southern passage expands in hyperbolic language the list of edibles and other commodities (such as wines, clothes and blankets) furnished by Vasiṣṭha's Kāmadhenu, by the addition of 6 more lines:

1753* भाष्यांश्यस्यौदत्तस्येव राशयः पर्यतोपमाः।
तिलःश्रीविः सुपांश्य द्विकुप्यास्तथायेव च।
कुश्यां घृतसंपूर्णाः स्थायतः राष्ट्रायरस्या।
भोजनानि महादार्णानि तत्र तत्र सहस्राः।
इत्यादिच यो लाजाक्ष्य मैरेयांश्य वरासवान्।
व्रजानि च महादार्णां कर्मावलि सहस्राः।

In adhy. 213, the Southern recension furnishes us with a supplementary list of items in Subhadra's dowry, which, taken along with what has gone before, exhausts almost all the things worth possessing in this world:

2082* काश्चोजार्केुवाहि कक्षविन्युजातान्यं भरत।
सुमुखेश्वरसंलोक्याश्वपन्नामातिरितितान्।
श्वेतचार्मसंश्वशर्स्ववातीर्ष्वविश्ववधनः।
जात्रयनां सहस्राणि पश्चातात्मदृश्य तदां।

2088* भुदानां नु मुखानां शात्मानं दृढ़ं स्थनम्।
मुक्काह्यापणि श्रुतांश्वताणि केशव।
प्रवाहानसंहस्तं च तथायानं भारत।
सुमुक्काह्यापणां महादार्णां सहस्राण्तिः।
पर्यमुक्नाणां सहस्रां च दृढ़ं कन्याधिनं तदां।

(b) By anticipation or repetition of stories, motives or discourses. For example:

(i) the miraculous birth of Kṛṣṇa and Dhṛṣṭadyumha is narrated twice in S; in adhy. 155 and in App. I., No. 79 (after adhy. 128);

(ii) the theme of the amusing experience of a maiden, who, on praying to Mahādeva for one husband five times, was granted, as a boon, five husbands at one time—a story which seems to have been very popular in the South—is used, with
variation, in S, no less than three times in the course of the Ādi; cf. adhy. 157, 189 and passage No. 100 (of App. I) ².

(iii) account of the tragi-comic experiences of the Kāśī princess Ambā, who was passed on in turn by Bhīṣma to Sālva and Sālva to Bhīṣma, repeatedly, like a shuttle-cock, a story which is really the subject-matter of the Ambopākhyaṇā in Ud- 
yoga 173 ff. (Bom. [40] ed.), apparently a favourite piece, is anticipated in passage No. 55 of App. I (cf. adhy. 96) and forms a bulky addition of 125 lines!

(iv) the future of the royal family, which is the subject-matter of the additional dialogue between Bhīṣma and his step-mother, Satyavatī, in S, in passage No. 57 (of App. I) is only a continuation and repetition (with v. 1.) of the discourse between the same parties in adhy. 99.

(v) Sūrya’s warning to Kāma about the designs of Indra to supplicate Kāma in the disguise of a Brahman, in passage No. 60 of App. I, which is an anticipation of the story told in Aranyak 300 (Bom. ed.).

(c) Additions in S, due to the explicit mention of the observance of the correct and complete Brahmanic ritual and ceremonial on the proper occasions. Thus, in adhy. 68, at the birth of Bharata:

625* यथाविचि यथाल्यायं किया: स्वर्णस्वकार्यतलः।

In adhy. 92, at the birth of Saṃtanu:

921* तस्य जातस्य कर्मयानि प्रतीयोऽकार्यत्रशुः।
   जातकार्यमि विषेण बेदोकैः कर्मरस्ततात्शः।
   नामकर्मि च विपश्यतु चकुः परमस्तक्ततमः।
   शतनौरसनीपाणि बेदोकैः कर्मरस्ततात्शः।

In adhy. 100, at the birth of Dhrtaarāṣṭra and Pāṇḍu:

1084* तस्योक्तमक्रिया: स्वर्ण यथावद्यदुपवेदवः।
   कर्मायमस्य वै भीमो ब्राह्मणवेदपारणः।

In adhy. 115, we have, likewise, with reference to the Pāṇḍavas themselves (App. I, No. 67, lines 13-14, 20-27):

न भद्रेष्टिक्रियाहीनः पाण्डोः पुत्रा महाभद्रः।
पाण्डोः भद्रिहिताभ्यमपि प्रेयय ल्यं पुरोहितम्।
* * * *

तमागतं द्विजक्रेण काष्ठयं वे पुरोहितम्।
पुजयामस्य विषेषतानुपु: परपुरंजयः।
पुथा मानी च संह्ये चासुधे च प्रांसस्ततमः।
तव: पाण्डः क्रिया: सावः पाण्ड्वानामकार्यततः।
गम्भीरायानविद्वायाति चौहोपत्यनाति च।
काष्ठप: क्षतिस्वर्यवपाकमें च सारतः।

² In SASTRi’s edition these stories occur in adhy. 164, 189 and 191.
In adhy. 124, at the royal tournament:

(d) Expansion in S of existing scenes by the addition of speeches or detailed descriptions and by other digressions. Examples:

[41] (i) in App. I, No. 9, in the account of the churning of the ocean (samudramanthana), we are incidentally told of the drinking of poison by Siva, which had exuded from the mouth of Väsuki during the churning;

(ii) in 998*, we have nine additional lines depicting the humiliating treatment meted out to Bhīṣma at the court of the king of Kāśi, during the Svayamvara of his daughters;

(iii) passage No. 59 (of App. I) depicts the persuasion of the shy and reluctant Kunti by Śūrya for intercourse, by alternate threats and promises, like a real Don Juan;

(iv) in passages No. 68-69, the Southern recension has tried to develop a very pathetic scene indeed, depicting the death of the father of the heroes, Pāṇḍu: an incident which must have been considered as deserving fuller and more sympathetic treatment than the perfunctory notice we find preserved in the Northern recension. At the sight of the corpse of her husband, Kunti falls to the ground in a swoon, like a felled tree. Then the five brothers come up in a single file, and in the order of their ages, and recite their little mournful dirges: Yudhiṣṭhira gets 8 lines, Bhīma 7, Arjuna 4, the twins (in chorus) only 3 lines together.¹ Then follow long-winded farewell orations by Kunti, Mādhri and the rest of the company, which are followed by a touching scene describing Mādhri mounting the funeral pyre;

(v) passage No. 78 gives, in 119 lines, the details of a fight, which, in the Northern recension, at least originally, is disposed of in two lines! The latter I consider adequate treatment, taking everything into consideration;

(vi) passage No. 93 is a Southern addition of 37 lines giving fuller details of the titanic struggle between Bhīma and the cannibal Baka;

(vii) 1737* adds a hymn (in Tristubh metre and pseudo-vedic style) by Vaśīṣṭha, addressed to Śūrya, when Vaśīṣṭha presents himself before that luminary on behalf of Sarīvāraṇa;

(viii) 1828* ff. describe in turn the discomfiture of each of the suitors for the hand of Draupadi;

(ix) passages No. 100-101 add to the existing stock two new anecdotes—alternative explanations—narrated by Vyāsa to prove to Drupada and his son, that

¹ This schematic treatment perhaps betrays the hand of the interpolator more clearly than anything else.
the polyandrous marriage proposed by Yudhiṣṭhira, though apparently immoral and illegal, is a most righteous and necessary union, being pre-ordained by the gods themselves for the accomplishment of their cosmic plans: these are the well-known legends of Nāḷaṇī and Bhauṁāsvi;

(x) passage No. 106 gives an almost complete inventory of the presents Drupada gave to the Pāṇḍu brothers when they left with Draupadī, for the Kaurava Court, at the invitation of Dhṛtarāṣṭra. The Northern recension ignores this huge mass of presents completely!

(xi) passage No. 110 is a farewell scene containing short orations by Kṛṣṇa, Yudhiṣṭhira and Kunti, when Kṛṣṇa sets out for Dvārakā;

[42] (xii) passage No. 112 contains the farewell of Arjuna to Citrāṅgadā, telling her that she must not give way to sorrow in his absence, as they would meet again soon at the Rājasūya, which is going to be performed by Yudhiṣṭhira: a prophetic utterance! And so on and so forth.

(e) Additions of little ethical, moral and sententious maxims, to which S, permeated as it is by a conscious didactic purpose, is particularly partial. We meet with the same old proverbs over and over again in S:

595* अन्यथा सन्त्मात्मानमन्यथा सत्तु माषिते । ।
स पापेणान्तरो सुर्वस्तेन आत्मापहारकः । ।
605* पिता रक्षाति कौमारे भतो रक्षाति योवने । ।
पुजस्तु स्थविरे भावे न खो स्वातन्त्र्यमहति । ।
* * * *
मन्युप्रहरणा विधा न विधा: शाक्षपाण्यः । ।
अशिर्दद्धि तेषोम्यः सूर्यो दृढ़ति पद्मसि: । ।
राजा दृढ़ति दण्डेन ज्ञास्यो मन्युना देहेत । ।
कौधियो मन्युना दृष्टि वज्रपञ्चरिवायुराणः । ।
780* परमार्या स्वस्ता ज्येष्ठा संगीता पतिता स्वन्तः । ।
अपरा मिश्रकास्वस्य अगस्या: कौतिता हुः: । ।
782* कृतिवधिविवो हन्यास्मात्मन्यत निहन्तति । ।
यद्यास्मात्मप्रिन्ति सन्तस दृष्टि वै द्रिजः । ।
804* पुजार्य भर्त्तिपरं खियः स्वयः स्वयंभुवः । ।
अपत्तिधापि या क्षमा अपपत्त्यः च च देवतः । ।
तस्या जमु भुषा लोकं गतिस्तस्य न विचलेत । ।
833* गुरोऽव बचनेन पुष्यं स्वर्यभयुष्करं नृणाम् । ।
गुरुप्रसादाचैतत्क्रमस्मास्यास्माच्छूक्षतः । ।
856* न च कुर्मात्रो वै वन्यं शार्यं नोचां तथवच च । ।
जैलय च मस्तिः वैं सर्व्येतियशा कार्वेदः । ।
मात्रां पितां चैव विविहां स तपोघनम् । ।
कषायवधः च देवेन्द्र नायामन्येत भुक्षिसारः ।
Additional stanzas in S with, perhaps, a certain amount of sexual appeal, bearing the taint of later decadence. Examples:

App. I, No. 89 (lines 3-4) with reference to Hiḍimbā:

शुभे हि जयभन्त तस्याः सुचनमोहिमेव शक्तम्।
न तत्त्व पुदा सुद्रं हीमश्च युध्युधः।

No. 48 (lines 78-79), describing Śakuntalā:

क्षत्रिमिति तां नुकेशी संहतस्तनीम्।
जयभन्त नुवियां वे औह करिकोपमो।

No. 55 (lines 46-47), describing Ambā:

पोखोन्तलकचाक्रस्य विद्यान्तगनेक्षण।
श्रीमदसाराण्डसमा राकान्ते प्रेमिनान।

Then also 929* खातमात्रामध्योऽवश्यं गुरुतीर्थवृक्षेऽक्षे।
प्रकर्णकेश्वरैं प्राणियं संवुकाश्च नीरोधयान।

1189* पुर्ण्व वा किंठ पौर्ण्व न भासांविद्धावतं तथा।
श्रीमद्वृ नरं दृष्यं योनिविकृतचे ततः।

More sentiments of this type, occurring in the Grantha version alone, are:

1937* पाकाशालोऽवतरः पवित्रोजातिनिभुवण।
पशुगृहः पशुसुः पशुपन्निमेक्षण।
The lengths to which the Muses lead these Southern poetasters may be judged from the following interpolation in certain Grantha manuscripts of the Adi. 1334* with 1335* reads:

\[\text{Vypadhyaswas} \quad \text{Dvavagam} \quad \text{Rama} \quad \text{Yugdharstham} \quad \text{Ke} \quad \text{Ne} \]

\[\text{Pindochhadveyac} \quad \text{Dvavagam} \quad \text{Taramadhyakam} \quad \text{Tat} \]

Cf. also lines 73-74 of passage No. 100 (of App. I):

\[\text{Mare} \quad \text{Ma} \quad \text{Babhitetrethate} \quad \text{Ramayu} \quad \text{Mahat} \quad \text{Ma} \quad \text{Bhawan} \]

\[\text{Tarpana} \quad \text{Mamashan} \quad \text{Shbbh} \quad \text{Ma} \quad \text{Babhitetrethata} \]

4. Southern additions which alter the purport of the fable as narrated in the Northern recension.

Made apparently with the object of correcting the laxity of sexual relations implied in the old narrative. In adhy. 67, the royal Purohit, a handy person, quickly but surely and secretly, performed the marriage of Duḥṣanta and Śakuntalā, in order to legitimize Bharata, the eponymous ancestor of the Bhrārataṇas, who has given his name to the country of his birth and to the Great Epic of India, altogether an important personage in ancient Indian history:

\[\{44\} 610^* \text{Purūhilvat Samāhaya Bakotī Chetuvahīvita} \]

\[\text{Rajapujya Yudhuṃ bhi N Vṛtta Karantum UKhihe} \]

\[\text{Kriyāhīno hi N Bhavem Puno Mahādūt:} \]

\[\text{Tatha Kuṛuṃ Śāraṅkāṃ Vichārāṃ Ma Chīre Kuṛ:} \]

\[\text{Pavamukho Bhupatinha Chīja: Pravamanā:} \]

\[\text{Shōsant Rājaraṭaṃ Viśīna Huṭṭavāṇdhja:} \]

\[\text{SāhasāḥMahīṃśahucyam Huṭṭaukaṃduṃkruit} \]

In adhy. 77, the marriage of Yayāti and Śarmiṣṭhā is celebrated semi-secretly, in a secluded corner of the Asoka grove, in the palace grounds, with the usual baksheesh to the Brahmins, in the presence of counsellors, chaplains, priests and so on, but unknown to Devayāni! All this was done to legitimize Puru, the eponymous ancestor of the Pauravas:

\[1 \text{These lines occur in three MSS. (क, ग, घ) of SASTRI's edition (vol. 2), p. 1209.}\]
In passage No. 114 of App. I, Subhadra and Arjuna were likewise secretly and hastily married in the presence of gods, ṛṣis, and elders, while Balarama was away from the scene, to legitimize Abhimanyu (the father of the famous Parikṣit and grandfather of Janamejaya, to whom the epic was narrated). Cf. lines 281-286 of the passage:

Most Grantha manuscripts (G₁, G₂ and G₃ of SASTRI’s) have a passage to show that Parāśara and Matsyagandha were secretly but regularly married. Cf. passage No. 36 of App. I, which is a somewhat lengthy passage describing with circumstantial detail the nuptial ceremony at which the ancestors of both the bride and the bridegroom are invoked, all the details of the regular Hindu maritai rite are scrupulously gone through, and the marriage is solemnized in the presence of Vasiṣṭha, Yājñavalkya and other great ṛṣis living in the Naimiṣa forest!

5. *Additions in S, due to the filling out of lacunae (real or imaginary).* Examples of such additions are:

482* which gives a summary of the last five parvans of our Mahābhārata text, and passage No. 79 (of App. I) giving an account of Drupada’s birth. It appears, from the latter account, that Drupada was born in the same miraculous way as two of his contemporaries Drona and Kṛpa, due to the perturbation of his father at the sight of a beautiful Apsaras. Ascetics involuntarily emitting semen at the sight of heavenly nymphs, broad-hipped, fat-breasted, fair-clad, pleasure-fraught, and the miraculous germination of the semen into human beings, is the regular Purānic apparatus for the generation of the great men of the past, about whose birth nothing exciting was specially known to the chronicler.


I have drawn attention above to the expansion of the description of a battle (in which the Kurus and the Pāṇḍus capture Drupada), and of a fight (between Bhīma and Baka).¹ Analogous to it is a battle scene described in

¹ App. I, Nos. 78 and 92-93 respectively.
an additional adhyāya in the Southern recension (App. I, No. 103). This stages a little war between the cousins, a miniature replica of the Great War to come. Here also Kurus plan the destruction of the Pāṇḍavas, who are residing in Kāmpilya as the guests of Drupada. A regular council of war is held, in which Śakuni and Karna advocate hostilities, while the nameless son of Somadatta counsels peace and conciliation. The bellicose party has the upper hand in the council chamber. The Kuru army marches against the Pāṇḍavas with their allies, the Pāṇcālas. The Kaurava forces are, of course, easily repulsed. No great damage is done. The status quo is immediately restored: things go on just the same as before, as though no battle had ever taken place. There is also no other reference to this battle in the whole of the Mahābhārata. The present parvan does not offer much scope for the full development of this tendency. We shall probably meet with it again in the battle-books (6-9).

7. Omissions in S, as compared with N.

These are quite numerous and scattered almost evenly over the whole parvan, but short and contextually unimportant, as a rule. An exception is the somewhat lengthy Śvetaki episode (App. I, No. 118). Since, on the one hand, all reference to the episode is missing in the whole of the Malayālām version, as also in some manuscripts of each of the remaining two versions (T G) of the Southern recension, while, on the other hand, those T G manuscripts that do contain some mention of it insert a variant version at an entirely different place, therefore the episode may legitimately be considered a Northern interpolation which has insinuated its way, by conflation, into some Southern manuscripts. It is a story in true Purānic style. King Śvetaki sacrificed with such phenomenal zeal and keenness that his priests, in the end, refuse to sacrifice any more! Śvetaki practised penance on the Himalayas with the object of making Rudra his sacrificial priest. Rudra, however, excused himself, asking Śvetaki to apply to Durvāsas, who was his part-incarnation (ānśa). Durvāsas completed the sacrifice, and Śvetaki poured libations of clarified butter into the fire for twelve years continuously. As a result, Agni had a severe attack of indigestion! He refused after that every offering, and became enfeebled. At Brahmā's direction, he set the Khāṇḍava forest on fire, and tried his best to burn the forest down; but the denizens of the forest put the fire out, over and over again. He reported his discomfiture to Brahmā, who then asked him to betake himself to Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa, the part incarnations of Nara and Nārāyaṇa, with whose help alone Agni would be in a position to burn the Khāṇḍava forest.

It should be made clear that the variants and passages cited here are merely by way of illustration, and comprise only a small fraction of the total number of deviations.

The presence of an astonishingly large number of additions, some of which are undoubtedly late and spurious, should not be allowed to impair
our appreciation of some real merits of the Southern recension. It would be, in fact, a grievous error to ignore on that account the Southern recension or underestimate its value. This recension is an indispensable aid for controlling the deviations of the Northern recension, both in point of readings and sequence. In comparison with the Southern recension may, considerably, have preserved a very large number of original readings, proved by actual agreements between S and y, as well as by their intrinsic merits. The superiority of the Southern recension in comparison to the Vulgate may be said to be quite evident. It may, however, quite easily happen that in a particular instance, the whole of the Southern recension is corrupt, and the true reading is preserved only in the Southern recension.1 An instance of this is 1. 214. 5. The Vulgate reads (B. 1. 222. 5):

अच्येतारं परं बेदान्योक्तारं महाध्वरे
रक्षितारं ब्रम्हाल्लोकालीनमेऽति जनाधिपम्

Nilakantha's gloss is: परे अच्येतारं परस्पर्महाध्वरं विगतारम्। बेदानं, बेदानाम्।

The stanza has been translated by Mannath Nath DUTTA as follows: "Having obtained him as their king, they obtained a monarch who was devoted to the study of the Vedas, who was a performer of great sacrifices, and who was the protector of all good works." Protap Chandra Roy's translation reads similarly: "And the subjects having obtained Yudhishthira as their king, obtained in him one that was devoted to the study of the Vedas, one that was a performer of great sacrifices, and one that was the protector of all good people."

But the translations of both these scholars are generally free and arbitrary. As it stands, the stanza can be translated only as follows:

"They, (i.e. the people) obtain for a king, one who studied Brahma (para), employed the Vedas in a great sacrifice, and protected the blessed words."

This pedestrian stanza will satisfy most people as it has satisfied a long succession of critics, commentators and translators in the past. About it one can only say that there are worse stanzas in the Mahābhārata. Only a reader endowed with a fine sensibility and critical acumen will feel that there is something amiss here. We are face to face with the danger of acquiescing in a sense which might satisfy us, but which would not have satisfied the ancient writer. The Northern variants do not offer much help; even the śāradā and K manuscripts have substantially the same readings. It would, consequently, not be easy to reconstruct from this sad wreck of a Dīpaka, the episgrammatic original, which is preserved intact only in the Southern recension, which the constituted text here follows (1. 214. 5):

---

1 For examples from another parvan, see LÜDERS, Granthasrecension, pp. 52 ff.
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No glosses, translations, exegetical notes, and such other accessories are necessary for the elucidation of this stanza; for it is self-luminous. The correctness of the Southern reading is confirmed by the very next stanza (1. 214. 6), which is also an epigrammatic period of the same type:

It should thus seem that the infidelities of the Southern recension are confined mainly to a tendency to inflation and elaboration. In parts unaffected by this tendency, [47] it is likely to prove, on the whole, purer, more conservative and more archaic than even the best Northern version. The Southern variants, therefore, deserve the closest attention and most sympathetic study.

After this brief survey of the interrelationship between the two recensions, we shall proceed to the consideration of the various provincial versions, into which each of the recensions breaks up.

CHARACTER AND MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE VERSIONS AND THEIR MANUSCRIPTS

THE ARCHETYPE ν

The archetype ν comprises the two versions: Śaradā and “K”.

The Śaradā version is represented in our critical apparatus by the fragmentary codex Ś, belonging to the Bombay Government Collection (No. 159 of 1875-76), which seems to be the only extant genuine representative of the old version of Kaśmīr. The manuscript, which is undated, may be three to four centuries old. For reasons which will appear in the sequel, I have made the Śaradā version the norm to follow.

The text of the Adi (as of other parvans of the Mahābhārata) according to the different printed editions, as is well-known, varies considerably, not merely as regards the readings, but also as regards the extent. The length of the Adi, according to the Calcutta edition, as already observed, is estimated to be about 8460 “stanzas”, of the Bombay edition, 8620,1 of the Madras edition (i.e. SASTRI’S Southern Recension) 9984 (according to SASTRI’s data), of the Kumbhakonam edition 10889.2 Now, in a statement following the colophon (or forming part of the long colophon) of our Śaradā manuscript, the length of its text is given as 7984 in a stanza cited from the

1 This is the figure given in LELE’S edition of the text with Marathi translation (Wai, Saka 1818).
2 See the volume of Index etc., Descriptive Contents, p. 4.
Parvasamgraha; cf. the accompanying facsimile of fol. 155 a of the Šaradā codex. To judge by the amount of textual matter which an average folio of the fragmentary Šaradā codex holds, this estimate of its extent appears to be approximately correct.* Assuming then that to be the length of the Šaradā version, it becomes the shortest known version of the Adi, and may, therefore, appropriately be called the textus simplicior.

While it is the shortest extant version, it is a demonstrable fact that it contains relatively little matter that is not found, at the same time, in all other versions of both recensions. It is clear, therefore, that it must contain, relatively, less spurious matter than any other known version. That is precisely the main reason why it is taken as the norm for this edition.

Since our codex (Ś,) is fragmentary, it must be considered a piece of singularly good fortune that there has been preserved at least one nearly complete Devanāgarī manuscript of the Adi, namely, India Office No. 2137, that may, as will presently be shown, be used, without hesitation, to supplement the missing portions, since it undoubtedly is a moderately trustworthy, though comparatively late and slightly contaminated and incorrect transcript of a Šaradā exemplar.

Further particulars of the Šaradā version will be found under the account of the “K” version.

The accompanying facsimile of a page of the Šaradā codex (fol. 155a) contains the end of the Adi and the beginning of the Sabhā. The Parvasamgraha stanza, mentioned above, giving the extent of the Adi, will be found in lines 2-3 of the facsimile.

The “K” Version.

This version, as already explained, is a specific Devanāgarī version, closely akin to the Šaradā version and clearly differentiated from the (so-called) Devanāgarī version.

The affinity of the manuscripts comprising this version is illustrated by the following concordant readings, selected at random. The references are to adhyāyas and ślokas.

1. 2 K0. 2-8 महर्षीनृः: rest (mostly) नवनारीणः.
1. 8 K V1 कोमास्वरः: others सूत देहः, शैविः, सूतः.
1. 49 K V1, B1 मंजिष्टोणोदवर्धः: others संक्रमणम्, संक्रमण चानः.
1. 51 K विच्छिन्न: rest (mostly) मन्निधिः.
1. 192 K0-8 दुःप्राणाः: rest दुभक्षणां.
2. 76 K ग्निर्हायमय रक्षसा: rest (mostly) ग्निर्हायणं च महोहस्ता.
4. 10 K ुपुरुस्क्रताः: rest ुपुरस्तरव.

* [Actual counts of the critical text give 7964 ślokas of 32 syllables each.]
PROLEGOMENA

8.2  K D₂ युनकत्व यतोस्मभः: others युनकत् समझौजान्त, युनकत्व यतोस्मभः, etc.
8.16 K अह्योऽः: others अह्योऽः, etc.
10.2 K D₁-8 (by transp.) सदैव भुजगं हन्यः: rest हन्यः सदैव भुजगं.
13.1 K D₂-9 ब्रवीहः: rest ब्रवीहः.
13.25 K D₂-9 बानतौः: others बानतौः, etc.
17.9 K D₁-8 ततो नानाप्रयःः: others नानाप्रयःः, etc.
19.4 K D₂-9 संहतं बनहुआःः: सत्यावैनाविवेचारं: others सत्यदेव बहुसाह्यस्नानाहैः
समाहूः, etc.
24.1 K D₂ विच्छामिः: rest om. यं.
24.14 K D₂-8 महाबुद्धिः: rest महाबुद्धिः.
55.8 K भुदः: others भुदः, कुशः.
55.35 K जातवेशसः: rest हन्यवाहः.
56.14 K कीर्तिपथः: rest अवपेतः.
57.2 K चेतिपरित्वरः: rest पौर्ववन्दनः.
57.8 K D₀ रस्यः: others पुष्यः, etc.
57.43 K D₀ गुहानः: rest गुहः.
58.3 K D₀ कीर्तिप्रभामिः: rest कथाप्रभामिः.
58.40 K D₀ समाहः: rest संजातः.
59.29 K D₀ वीरःःः: others वीरःःः, etc.
60.6 K N₀ D₀ अन्यः: पुनःस्व पञ्चः: (by transp.): rest अनेकः पञ्चः: पुनः.
60.52 K संध्यः: rest संध्यः.
62.6 K D₀ राज्यः प्रशासः: rest राज्यः प्रशासः.
64.29 K D₀ दवःः: rest दवः.
67.30 K D₀ निीयः भाषकः लघः: others विनियाि ततो भाषः, etc.
68,69 K D₀ वच्चतः (or वच्चतः): rest वच्छा.
71.41 K D₀ वसः: rest विग्रः.
74.7 K alone transp. कमारः and कमारः.
76.33 K D₀ चारित्रभारं: rest चारित्रभारं.
150.18 K वास्त्यः: rest विग्रः; etc., etc., etc.

Further examples of the concordant readings of the K version will be found below.

It was remarked above that K₄ (= India Office 2137) was a manuscript of Kaśmirī origin, exhibiting specially near affinities with S₁, so much so that K₄ may be regarded as a copy of some Śāradā original. The Kaśmirī character of K₄ was already fully recognized by Professor Lüders, who had utilized it in the preparation of his specimen¹ of a critical edition of the epic men-

¹ Druckprobe einer kritischen Ausgabe des Mahābhārata, Leipzig 1908.
tioned above, although he had no genuine representative of the Kaśmirī or Šāradā version to compare it with.

The affinity between Ś₁ and K₁ is documented by a mass of readings, of which the following (selected at random) will serve as illustrations. The references are to adhāyas and ślokas.¹

27. 15 Ś₁ K₁ पुरेंद्रः : rest बलकदः: (synonym!).
28. 24 Ś₁ K₁ ततः : rest नवीः.
29. 4 Ś₁ K₁ ब्रा बरेण : others अरातरण, etc.
30. 7 Ś₁ K₁ प्रदेशानलः : others प्रतिगृहथान, प्रगṛह, संप्रगṛह, आग्रह, etc. (original hypermetric!).
31. 6 Ś₁ K₁ पंजवकः (corrupt) : others पिज़रः, पंज़रः, etc.
37. 25 Ś₁ K₁ रस्खिलत्वः: पिता वित्ति (corrupt) : others रस्खिलत्वः: प्रजातथा etc.
42. 7 Ś₁ K₁ नेरारं रोचयास्यः : others न भरेयं च तामः, etc.
44. 2 Ś₁ K₁ भगातः: others तदा, तथा, ततो, etc.
45. 5 Ś₁ K₁ अवबनः : rest अबुवः (synonym).
45. 19 Ś₁ K₁ तथोऽविपः : others ताविपः, etc.
131. 3 Ś₁ K₁ प्रभुमते, (corrupt) : rest पञ्चपते:
131. 13 Ś₁ K₁ चरनः : rest श्लेषः.
154. 24 Ś₁ K₁ भावयः : rest भावीरस्यः (original has double crasis!).
206. 3 Ś₁ K₁ एकः (corrupt?) : rest कथः: (G₁ अबः:).
218. 48 Ś₁ K₁ मन्दरचिन्तः सहस्त ( = 47⁵) : rest निरेषः श्रुङ्गर सहखः. (or श्रः).

The above are examples of concordant readings of Ś₁ and K₁. As instances of adhāya division and numbering may be pointed out that adh. 42-44 and 46 of the constituted text (comprising adh. 46-48 and 50 of the Vulgate) are numbered in Ś₁ K₁ 54-56 and 59 respectively, and are so numbered in no other manuscript hitherto collated; further, after only the third stanza of our adh. 40, both manuscripts (Ś₁ K₁) interpolate the figure 51, Ś₁ marginally inserting, at that place, an additional colophon: इह्मादिकार्यंऽक्षयावर-ब्राहातमोऽचारः. Likewise, after 1.165.34, Ś₁ K₁ insert, an additional colophon, not found in any other manuscript.

Among “additional” passages peculiar to Ś₁ K₁ may be mentioned 1735*. Ḡ₁ is, however, by no means, a direct copy Ś₁. There are numerous discrepancies between them. Notably, there is a big lacuna in K₁ in adh. 47-48, where Ś₁ is intact. [50] Again at 1. 107. 26; 154. 10, 11; 175. 4 and other places: Ś₁, which generally omits the verbs उच्चार (resp. अच्छुः) in the short prose formulae of reference to the speaker, does show these verbs,

¹ It should be noted that Ś₁ begins only at 1. 26. 10.
while they are lacking in \( K_1 \); 1. 208. 14 is an exception where both \( S_1 \) and \( K_1 \) have उज्जवल. \( S_1, K_1 \) exhibit also numerous minor differences in their readings; e.g. 1. 36, 22; 38. 21, 36; 41. 29; 46. 11; 98. 9; 125. 3, 16; 128. 2; 138. 24; 195. 11; 200. 3. After 1. 144. 17, \( S_1 \) has a colophon which is missing in \( K_1 \).

These agreements and differences show that while \( S_1 \) and \( K_1 \) are closely akin, their text is not identical. Neither \( S_1 \) nor \( K_1 \) is a direct copy of the other. They are independent witnesses, a circumstance which adds greater weight to their arguments.

I shall now cite some readings (also selected at random) which \( S_1 \) shares with the \( K \) version, \( S_1 \) and \( K \) standing together against all other manuscripts (barring, of course, conflated specimens). The references are to adhyāyas and ślokas.

28. 18 \( S_1 \) \( K \) क्षणेन : rest क्षणेन.
29. 1 \( S_1 \) \( K \) ततो जाम्बूनदेशी भूवा : rest जाम्बूनादकों भूवा
32. 3 \( S_1 \) \( K \) द्वारणेन : rest गोकणेन.
32. 12 \( S_1 \) \( K \) या : rest मे.
33. 20 \( S_1 \) \( K \) तुष्णेते (\( K_2 \) तुष्णेते) : rest तुष्णम.
36. 21 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) गङ्ग जाते : rest तिमाते.
38. 2 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) कलोऽक्षणा : rest कल: शरण,
38. 14 \( S_1 \) \( K \) गुणाशिवं : rest समाहिते.
42. 7 \( S_1 \) \( K \) हि : rest न.
94. 31 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) प्रहःनिमो : others प्रहःनितं, गङ्गे विभ, etc.
94. 93 \( S_1 \) \( K \) सहिताम : rest समेताम.
118. 1 \( S_1 \) \( K \) यस्य विधि : rest विदेशत.
123. 23 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) मन्तुमया : rest मन्त्रमया.
128. 12 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) जार्ज्यांमहस्तेरे : rest भागीर्थ्यां (double crasis !).
128. 15 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) कालिन्त्रा : others भक्तिदी, माणधी, etc.
142. 23 \( S_1 \) \( K \) सुजात्य वाल्यने देवन : others सुजातो: सारसेव, etc.
155. 13 \( S_1 \) \( K \) पुनः परिचर्युदा : rest सं परिचर्युनः.
162. 6 \( S_1 \) \( K \) सोकामास्ते : rest om. सः.
163. 7 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) ोमवत्ं : others ोम कमो, etc.
168. 3 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) पार्श्विन : rest पारसत.
169. 18 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) ते ततः कोपात : others ते महेज्ञाता; etc.
170. 9 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) सर्वेऽकेकस सत्तम : rest सर्वालकरपालव.
177. 5 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) प्रकृतितत्त : rest समागतान.
181. 37 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) कै व दियेरे : others कैसिमिच्चाति, etc.
181. 40 \( S_1 \) \( K \) \( D_6 \) प्राणिवस्त्र बीतमधु : others प्राणाय: प्राणवास्त्र; etc., etc.
These concordances are sufficient for postulating the archetype \( \nu \), comprising the versions Śāradā and \( K \), a hypothesis which will be confirmed by further agreements which are mentioned below.

The \( K \) version, though comprising manuscripts akin to each other and clearly distinguishable from those of the Devanāgarī version, is by no means—as is natural—quite homogeneous. Only \( K_{0,1} \) represent the version \( K \) in a comparatively pure form, while the \([51] \) remaining manuscripts of the group (i.e. \( K_{2-6} \)) are really nothing more than misch-codices, being conflated either with \( \gamma \) or with \( S \). On the other hand, just owing to this conflation, some of the other composite Devanāgarī manuscripts (particularly \( D_{2,3} \)) have so many features in common with \( K \), that they may as well be separated from \( D \) and classed under \( K \).

The contamination of \( K_{3-6} \) with \( \gamma \) is illustrated by the following passages: No. 14 of App. I (found in \( K_{1} \) marg., and \( N V_{1} B D \) ); No. 41 (in \( K_{3-4} \) and \( N_{2,3} V_{1} B D \) except \( D_{5} \) ); No. 42-43 (in \( K_{3-4} \) and \( N V_{1} B D \) except \( D_{5} \)). \( K_{4} \) includes passage No. 61 (of App. I) and 1131*, like \( N B D \). The contamination of \( K_{2-4,6} \) with \( \gamma \) is illustrated by 116*, 119*, 122*, 124*, 125*, 128*, 132*, 137*, 139*, 142*, 143*, 144*, 145*, 151*, 157*, 160*, 162*, 166*, 167*, 168*, 172*, 173*, 189*, 190*, 191*, 221*, 228*, 245*, 281*, 305*, 354*, 372*, 405*, 416*, 417*, 438*, 487*, 490*, 523*, 536*, 564*, 692*, 694*, 824*, 1000*, 1035*, etc., etc.

The contamination of \( K_{4-6} \) with \( S \) is exemplified by the following among other facts. \( K_{3,6} \) contain 22*, \( K_{4,6} \) 25*, \( K_{4} \) 49*, \( K_{4} \) (suppl. fol.) passage No. 55 (125 lines) and No. 100 (118 lines), of App. I: all of these are Southern passages.

\( K_{4-6} \), moreover, contain the Brahmap episode\(^{1} \) in adhy. 1 (a slippery passage, which migrates from place to place), while \( K_{4,6} \) have found place even for the venerable elephant-headed Ganesa, who is unquestionably a late Northern intruder. In \( K_{4} \) these interpolations are written out on separate folios (called here \( सोपप्त \)), and inserted at appropriate places, which shows the interpolations on the high road to recognition as genuine parts of the Mahā-bhārata.

Important omissions which distinguish \( \nu \) (really only \( S, K_{0-3} \)) from all other manuscripts are these:

(i) the adhyāya giving a naïve account of the birth of Duhṣalā (Bom. adhy. 116), which uncommonly looks like being an afterthought (App. I, No. 63);

(ii) a passage of about 25 lines describing how Droṇa's son Aśvatthāman is given flour mixed with water, which he drinks in the belief that it is milk (App. I, No. 75);

---

\(^1\) See notes on passage No. 1 of App. I.
(iii) an adhy. (Bom. adhy. 139), in which there is an incidental allusion to the installation of Yudhiṣṭhīra as Yuvarāja, and which is repetitious and incoherent (App. I, No. 80);

(iv) the so-called polity of Kaṇī(ṅ)ka, Kaṇī(ṅ)kanīti (Bom. adhy. 140), which is a replica (naturally with many additions, omissions and variant readings) of the advice given by Bhāradvāja (apparently a gotra name of this very individual) to Śatrūṣājaya, and duly communicated by Bhīṣma to Yudhiṣṭhīra in the Sāntī (App. I, No. 81);

(v) the crossing of the Ganges by the Pāṇḍavas (Bom. adhy. 149), a superfluous adhyāya, which only serves to confound the already confused geography of the narrative (App. I, No. 85).

These five passages are found in all manuscripts collated except Ś, Ka, and but it is worthy of note that even apart from their omission in v the documentary evidence with regard to at least two of them, is confused and unsatisfactory. No. v (crossing of the Ganges) is inserted in different groups of manuscripts at different points of the text. In No. iv (Kaṇīkanīti), on the other hand, most of the Southern manuscripts repeat, after the interpolation, the immediately preceding portion of the original, apparently in order to restore the context broken by the intrusion of extraneous matter.

Of important additions in v, I can recall only one, that of an adhyāya of 42 lines, at the very end of the Adī (added probably as an Appendix), which is a variant, abbreviated version of the Śvetaki interpolation. It is found only in Ś, Ka, and therefore cannot even be said to be characteristic of the whole of v (App. I, No. 121). Instances of small additions are Nos. 349*, 449*, 451*, 516*, 565*, etc. etc. found in K with or without some Devanāgarī manuscripts; while 969*, 1855*, 2077*, etc., are found in Ś, K, with or without some Devanāgarī manuscripts: all these passages are missing in B. S.

That Ś, and K are not identical but independent (though allied) sources, may be concluded, for example, from 449*, 452*, 491*, 492*, 516*, 565*, 750*, 866* etc., which are found inserted in some or all manuscripts of the K version, but which are conspicuous by their absence in Ś (sometimes with Ka).

It was remarked above that v is the shortest of the extant versions of the Adī. Let us examine, without bias, this feature of v. Those passages that are lacking in v in comparison with the other versions, cannot all be omissions in v whether accidental or intentional.

---

1 Cf. remarks of HOLTZMANN, Das Mahābhārata, 2, 33.

2 The reason of these repetitions has been explained by JACOBI, Das Rāmāyaṇa, p. 34, with reference to the Rāmāyaṇa. The same explanation is applicable here, mutatis mutandis.
They cannot be intentional omissions, notwithstanding that these missing passages are mostly of inferior character, intrinsically worthless, repetitious, superfluous, or finally such as scholars have already (even before the discovery of this version) marked as likely interpolations. For, this Śāradā (Kaśmīrī) version of the Ādi is not an abstract or an adaptation. It claims to be the unabridged text itself, in all its fullness, and I see no sufficient reason to doubt the a priori presumption that it is not an abridged version.

The explanation that primarily with the very object of excising what seems to us to be superfluous or repetitious matter, and abridgement might have been intentionally made in the past by some Kaśmīrī redactor or a syndicate of redactors, would be a grotesque distortion of Indian literary and religious tradition. No one in the past found the epic text too long. Far from it. It was perhaps not long enough.

Taking away something from the received text of the Mahābhārata and passing it off as the original work is a thing categorically different from adding something to it. To add small details here and there, embellishing and amplifying the original, would be merely a gentle and lowly service ad majorem gloriam dei. Even long pieces may sometimes be added, if they are actually found in other Mahābhārata manuscripts; and occasionally, even if they are not found in the current manuscripts, provided there is at least oral tradition to support their claims.

[53] No doubt the received text contained difficulties and obscurities and repetitions. But they would be merely due to corruptions of the text; the difficulties could be solved and the purpose of the repetitions explained by a really learned Pandit, who knows and understands everything.

That the omissions cannot be the result of a preconceived plan to shorten or to improve the text, follows further from two other facts: firstly, enough digressions and superfluities still remain in v, which would have all been swept away in pursuance of the alleged plan; and, secondly, v has its own interpolations, albeit they are few in number and short in extent, such as 349* (in K V₁ Da D₂ d), 451* (K D₆), 516* (K except K₃ Dn D₁), 565* (K except K₂), 1499* (S₁ K D₅), 1735* (S₁ K₁ only), 1855* (S₁ K N₁), 2077* (S₁ K except K₂ and N₂, 3 V₁ D₂ d), etc.

While these so-called “omissions” cannot be all intentional, they can also not be all accidental. The text is continuous and complete in itself. It has no apparent lacunae, as it surely would have had, if the omissions had been due to fortuitous loss or destruction of some intermediate folios of a parent manuscript.

---

² Cf. HOLTZMANN, Das Mahābhārata, 2. 33, on adhy. 139 of the Vulgate; or the surmises of various scholars regarding the Ganeśa episode (for literature see the next footnote).
It may further be pointed out that many of the apparent "omissions" of $v$, in relation to $\gamma$ or the Vulgate (i.e. Nilakantha's text) are confirmed by the rival recension, the Southern recension; e.g. the Gaṇēśa episode (App. I, No. 1), or the anticipation of the list of the hundred sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra (No. 41), or again the story of the birth of Abhimanyu (No. 42), or finally the anticipation of the story of the birth of Karṇa (No. 43) in the Saṁbhavaparvan. These passages are omitted in $S$ no less than in $K$.

In these instances, moreover, the intrinsic probability is wholly on the side of those manuscripts that lack these accretions. It is unnecessary to dilate on the Gaṇēśa episode, which, on the face of it, is a later addition, and which has been dealt with so often by different critics. As for the two passages, Nos. 42-43 of App. I, it is sufficient to observe that the adhyāya in which they occur is meant to be a mere list of the dramatis personæ, in which each actor in the great drama is identified as the incarnation of some god, goddess, or titan, taking this or that part in one momentous phase of an all-embracing cosmic movement. The adhyāya being originally a mere (metrical) list (as it is in the constituted text and the Southern recension), such stories as the account of the birth of Abhimanyu and Karṇa are wholly out of place here, and could not possibly have belonged to the original scheme of the adhyāya. The contrary supposition only stultifies the original writer, making him out to be an irresponsible lunatic, scarcely a desirable conclusion from the orthodox view-point.

Likewise many of the apparent omissions in $v$ in relation to the Southern recension are confirmed by other Northern versions; e.g. the anticipation of the birth of Kṛṣṇa and Dhṛṣṭadyumna (App. I, No. 79), or the Nālāyani episode (No. 100), or the account of a battle between the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas (No. 103), which are peculiar to $S$. In other words, these "omissions" are documented by the whole of $N$.

[54] One notable feature of $v$ to which I must now draw attention is its frequent agreement with $S$ against $\gamma$, especially in the matter of isolated and even unimportant readings, scattered throughout this parvan. I shall cite a few (out of the hundreds of possible) instances to exemplify this interesting and important characteristic of $v$. The readings of conflated manuscripts which serve only to confuse the issue, have been ignored; the references are, as usual, to the adhyāya and śloka.

1. 138 K V₁ S दुर्योधन (Text) : B D दुर्योधन.
2. 144 K S पाण्डुवर भुवनमान : B D कपिलश्वरसङ्गः.
3. 208 K S बलाय एकत्र वेदः : V₁ B D एकत्रबन्धुसः वेदः.


2. See adhy. 58 of Saṅkṛti's Adiparvan in the Southern Recension.
Such extensive agreements in *petty verbal details* must necessarily be, in the main, an *original inheritance*, and could never be, in their totality, the result of contamination or conflation, as one may vaguely imagine they are because to achieve them would necessitate more expenditure of energy than an ancient Indian redactor or reciter or commentator of the epic would bargain for. And even if one or the other of them had the requisite amount [55] of energy to use in this way, it would appear to him to be a ludicrous waste of it. We in the present century are apt to get nervous and irritable over misprints and *variae lectiones*. But an ancient Indian scribe, redactor

---

1 Note that the fragmentary *Saradā* codex begins at 1. 26. 10.
or even commentator, not to speak of the common reciter (pāṭhaka)—if I read aright Indian literary history—was not perturbed in the least by a little difference in wording or in sequence, especially if the variant did not give an appreciably better or appreciably worse sense. The enormous and complicated critical apparatus assembled here, moreover, can leave us in no doubt as to the attitude of the custodians of the epic tradition towards paltry verbal details: it was that of total indifference.

Addition or omission of passages is, I may add, a variation of an entirely different order. If a reciter or commentator came across, in another manuscript, an additional passage, there was every chance of his copying it down somewhere, either in the margin of his own copy, or on a supplementary folio; for there would be, in his mind, always present the possibility that the passage in question was some part of the original that his own manuscript had unaccountably lost. How else, forsooth, could the passage get into the other manuscript?

In my opinion, therefore, this fact of the concord between ν and S in small details, coupled with the almost entire lack of agreement as regards the additions peculiar to ν or S, is the strongest argument imaginable for the independence of these two versions, and consequently for the primitive character of their concordant readings. It is needless to point out that this is a factor of supreme importance for the reconstruction of the original.

The text of ν is throughout of such a character as to inspire confidence. Its conservatism is proved by its preserving archaisms and the lectio difficilior (e.g. अभिन्नः 1. 2. 144; क्रोक्षय 1. 2. 177, 189; कामया adv. "frankly" 1. 10. 6; कण्या 1. 98. 13; समुद्रूः 1. 98. 18), often in a corrupt form, while other manuscripts have discarded them in favour of modern forms or easy paraphrases. It is well known that, for purposes of textual reconstruction, the mechanical corruptions of a stupid but faithful copyist are to be preferred to the intelligent copying of a less faithful one.

Again, ν is often the only version that has preserved the correct reading: e.g. 1. 2. 102:

यत्र शून्ताणि महान्द्रौपदीपृति नौरिवार्णवातः।
तारयमास्त तांस्तीणिन्द्राश्वाला दुर्योधनो वृषः।
पुनेवेच ततो चूते समाहयत पाण्डवान्॥;

where the Vulgate version reads (1.3.138 f.):

यत्र शून्ताणि महान्द्रौपदीपृति नौरिवार्णवातः।
धृतराश्री महाप्राण शुच्यं परमधृचिताम्॥
तारयमास्त तांस्तीणिन्द्राश्वाला दुर्योधनो चूषः।
पुनेवेच ततो चूते समाहयत पाण्डवान्॥;

1 Devabodha paraphrases the word with क्रोक्षया.
while SAŚTRI's reading is (1. 2. 108 f.):

�ञ चूतास्वे मण्य दौःपी नीरिबारिः
गच्छजातातिरिचातृ धात्ता दुर्विधानो नूपः ||
पुरैर्वत ततो चूते समाहयत पाण्डवान ||

[56] It is Draupadī who, like a canoe, rescues the Pāṇḍavas, who were submerged in the ocean of the dice-play. The correctness of the text reading, which is based on that of K, is proved by a stanza in the Sabhā (B. 2. 72. 3)*, which is the source of our stanza:

अतः अभ्यासमति मद्यानामपित्र निम्जतामाः
पाण्डुरुपाणां नौरेषां परतामवत ||

Compare also the following three versions of 1. 166. 23 (=B. 1. 176. 27; M. 1. 174. 29):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
K_2 & N_2 & V_1 & B & D & = \text{Vulgate} \\
\text{ततो राजा परिःक्ष्य} & \text{गति गतिः तद्रासः} & \text{अत्तुरुपं गतो राजा} & \text{अत्तुरुपं गतो राजा} & \text{अत्तुरुपं गतो राजा} & \text{अत्तुरुपं गतो राजा} \\
\text{यथाकाम यथाशुभम्} & \text{तदा ब्राह्मणासाधितम्} & \text{स्रोतस्य दक्षिणायथ} & \text{स्रोतस्य दक्षिणायथ} & \text{स्रोतस्य दक्षिणायथ} & \text{स्रोतस्य दक्षिणायथ} \\
\text{नित्योऽन्तःपुरे पार्थ} & \text{प्रविष्टःशाखा} & \text{संविदेशं नराधमिः} & \text{न सम्मान नराधिपः} & \text{न सम्मान नराधिपः} & \text{न सम्मान नराधिपः} \\
\text{प्रविवेशा मध्यानम्} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Obviously, the stumbling block was अत्तुरुपे of the constituted text, which is a \textit{lect. diff.}; here it means "forgotten", a meaning cited in our dictionaries generally as an uncommon meaning given only by Indian lexicographers! Unless one here assumes $v$ to be original, it is impossible to explain this divergence of $v$, $γ$ and $S$, both of which give a possible though weak sense.

An unbiassed comparative survey of the different versions leads one to the conclusion that the Šāradā (Kaśmīrī) version is certainly the best Northern version, and probably, taken as a whole, the best extant version¹ of the Ādi, a conclusion not based on abstract considerations, but one that may be verified inductively and pragmatically. As is natural, this version is, not by any means, entirely free from corruptions and interpolations. These must be carefully corrected and controlled with the help of the other versions, particularly of those of the rival recension.

**SUB-RECESION $γ$.**

This sub-recension comprises the four versions: Nepāli, Maithili, Bengali and Devanāgarī, and is represented by a very large number of manu-

---

* [See now Crit. Ed. 2.64.3.]
² Cf. Lüders, \textit{Deutsche Literaturzeitung}, 1929. 1141: "Das ist um so mehr zu begrüssen, als die Kaśmīrī-Version den relativ ältesten Text des Epos bietet." (Italics mine!)
scripts; it is, in fact, the most numerous group. Instances of reading which
distinguish γ from υ S, have been adduced above (p. liv), to show the agree-
ment between υ and S against γ. The versions comprising this sub-recension
have, moreover, quite a considerable number of "additional" passages in
common, which clearly differentiate it from other versions. Noteworthy is
the substitution of a lengthy passage of 56 lines (App. I, No. 61) for 1. 105.
4-7, giving a detailed account of the marriage of Pāṇḍu with Kuntī and
Mādrī. This detailed account is obviously secondary. On no other supposi-
tion can one, it seems to me, account for the circumstance that S, K o-3 and
S should agree in having a short version for the episode for which K, N B D
substitute a considerably longer and more elaborate version, both versions
being embedded in a portion of descriptive text with minimal variation. For,
while it is inconceivable that two (more or less) independent groups of manus-
cripts such as S, K o-3 and S could arrive at the same short account indepen-
dently of each other, it is, at the same time, extremely improbable that either
group (S, K o-3 or S) should have copied the short summary from the other,
discarding altogether its own original detailed account.

[57] The secondary interrelationship of the various versions comprising
subrecension γ is documented sufficiently clearly by their having in common
quite a large number of lengthy passages which are missing in υ S, and which,
on independent (intrinsic) grounds, have been or may be declared spurious.
The following passages, given in App. I, are instances of such interpolations :

(1) No. 12 (N 1-2 V 1 B D), a duplicate and superfluous description of
the ocean, a similarly worded description having occurred only in the
preceding adhāyā;

(2) No. 14 (K 4 N V 1 B D except D 6, D 3 on suppl. fol.), a short Purā-
nic story relating how Sūrya resolves to burn the world down, whereupon
Garuḍa, at Brahmā's behest, brings his brother Aruṇa, over the east that he
might act as Sūrya's charioteer, shielding the world from the heat of the
enraged Sun—a digression suggested by the casual mention of Aruṇa in
adhaya. 14;

(3) No. 41 (K 4 N V 1 B D except D 6), a list of the hundred sons
of Dhṛtarāṣṭra—an anticipation of adhaya. 108, whose occurrence here (like
that of the two following interpolations in the same adhāyā), as has been
explained above, is obviously contrary to the original plan of the adhāyā;

(4) No. 42 (K 4 N V 1 B D except D 6), an account of the scene which
was enacted in heaven before the birth of Abhimanyu, a story which is really
meant to explain the mystery of his premature death;

(5) No. 43 (K 4 N V 1 B D except D 6), the open secret of the mysteri-
ous birth of Karṇa, which is an anticipation of adhaya. 104; and, finally,

(6) No. 81, lines 193-230 (K 4 N V 1 B D T 1), meant to be a summary
of the Jatugrha episode, which is, however, a garbled and incoherent version of the original story.

The view that \( \nu \) and \( \gamma \) may stand in genetic relation to each other does not receive much support from the facts of the case. Neither \( \nu \) nor \( \gamma \) can be derived from the other. Each possesses original features that the other lacks, as is evidenced by their alternate agreement with \( S \), even in the matter of petty verbal details. All these coincidences need not, of course, be original. Some could be indeed secondary changes, made independently in the same direction; others again may possibly be explained as the result of contamination. There will remain still an obstinate residue of agreements between \( \nu \) and \( S \), or between \( \gamma \) and \( S \), that must be set down as the expression of the ultimate connection of the respective concordant versions through the lost original source.

Contamination between \( \nu \) and \( \gamma \), owing to the contiguity of the areas in which the respective versions were current, was inevitable, and must, in any case, be assumed to have existed; on the other hand, contamination between \( \gamma \) and \( S \) cannot be altogether denied.

Particularly interesting is a small group of passages of doubtful character, to which reference has already been made. These are certain passages that are common to \( \gamma \) and \( S \), and are missing in \( S_1 \ K_{0-3} \) only; in other words, they are found in all manuscripts collated except \( S_1 \ K_{0-3} \); for example, the Kaṃikanitī. There is usually other evidence against the passages. Thus the secondary character of the Kaṃikanitī is quite unexpectedly confirmed; firstly, by the illogical repetition in certain Southern manuscripts (\( T_2 \ G_{2-4} \)) of two preceding adhyāyas (129-130); and, secondly, from the fact there is no reference to the Kaṃikanitī in Ksemendra's Bhāvatamanājari, in the Javanese version, as also in Devabodha’s [58] commentary. It may, of course, happen that in particular cases there is no collateral (confirmatory) evidence of this character available; e.g. in the puerile account of the birth of Duḥśalā (App. I, No. 63). Here the evidence of documentary and intrinsic probability is almost equally balanced; and documentary probability points in one direction, while intrinsic probability points in the other.

I have in such cases hesitatingly followed \( \nu \) (=\( S_1 \ K \)), taking into account, on the one hand, the superiority of \( \nu \) in general trustworthiness, and, on the other hand, the special characteristics of \( \gamma \) and \( S \), which are versions rather of the inclusive than of the exclusive type, prone to amplification and elaboration. Fortunately for us such cases are comparatively rare.

The rejection, on the evidence of \( \nu \) alone, of the whole of the incoherent adhy. 139 of the Bombay edition (our App. I, No. 80), an adhyāya which contains only some needless repetition, besides minor absurdities, would not have called forth any comment from me, but for the fact that with its omission disappears the only reference, I think, in the whole epic to this alleged
installation of Yudhīśṭhira as heir apparent to the throne of Hāstinapura. The Kasmīrī version, which omits the entire adhyāya containing the reference, unexpectedly justifies the indignant outburst of HOLTZMANN (Das Mahābhārata, Bd. 2, p. 33): “Geradezu Fälschung ist es, wenn 1, 139, 1=5517 behauptet wird, der blinde Dhṛtarāṣṭra habe mit Uebergehung seiner eigenen Söhne den Yudhīśṭhira zum Kronprinzen (yuvarāja) ausrufen lassen.” One of the main objects in interpolating this adhyāya seems to have been to exonerate Arjuna from the blame or sin of fighting with his own guru (Acārya Droṇa) in the Great War, by making the Acārya himself exact from his pupil in the presence of all his kinsfolk—for no reason that is adduced or can be seen—the solemn but senseless promise that he (Arjuna), when challenged, would not refuse to fight with Droṇa. Cf. B. 1, 139, 13:

There is no reference to this alleged promise in the sequel. And originally a different solution of the dilemma was obviously imagined. To Arjuna’s question (Gītā 2. 4):

the reply of Bhagavān Śrī Kṛṣṇa is (Gītā 2. 19, 32, 38):

This archetype is represented, in our critical apparatus, by the three closely allied versions Nepāli, Maithili and Bengali; probably together with Uriyā (belonging to Orissa), of which version, however, no manuscripts were available for collation.

The Nepāli Version.

The Nepāli version is represented in our critical apparatus by the three
manuscripts \( N_1 \), \( N_2 \) and \( N_3 \). The version is closely allied to the Bengali, with which the agreement of one or the other of the three manuscripts is almost constant. That even the manuscripts of distant Nepal are not wholly free from contamination from some Southern source or sources (direct or indirect) follows, for instance, from 224*, 263*, 819*, 991*, 998*, 1096*, 1246*, 1470*, 1569*, 1748*, 1768*, 1788*, 1828*, 1910*, 1957*, 2133*, etc., etc. as also passage No. 112 of App. I—interpolations common to \( S \) and some of the Nepālī manuscripts. One of these manuscripts (\( N_3 \)) happens to be the oldest of the dated manuscripts (A.D. 1511) belonging to our critical apparatus.

The Maithili Version.

Of the Maithili version, which is the version of North Bihar, only one manuscript (\( V_1 \)) was collated for this edition. \( V_1 \) and \( K \) agree sporadically against all other manuscripts (cf. for instance, 1. 1. 8, 49, 162), but such agreements are few and far between, and it would not be safe to draw from them any far-reaching conclusion regarding the relationship of \( V_1 \) and \( K \). As in 306*, 321*, 328*, 346*, 378*, 418*, 450*, 541*, \( V_1 \) agrees, on the other hand, with the typical Bengali-Devanāgarī group against all other manuscripts. \( V_1 \) contains 1548*, a Southern passage, found otherwise only in Dn D_{14.5}.

The Bengali Version.

The Bengali version of sub-recension \( \gamma \) was studied more carefully than either the Nepālī or Maithili. The study of this version was facilitated by the extreme courtesy and kindness of Pandit Vidhushekhar Bhattacharya, who has, now for many years, kindly and unselfishly supervised the work of our collation centre at the Visvabharati, a centre organised by Professor M. Winternitz, when he was residing at Bolpur as a Guest Professor in Rabindranath Tagore's University. With the co-operation of a select batch of advanced students, Pandit Vidhushekhar has been good enough to supply the Institute regularly with carefully prepared collations of a large number of valuable old Bengali manuscripts in the rich collection of the Visvabharati, as also of other manuscripts placed at his disposal by different Bengali Institutes and scholars, among the latter, my kind friend Professor Sushil Kumar De, of the University of Dacca. Of the large number of manuscripts thus collated, ultimately five were selected for inclusion in the critical apparatus

---

1 I may mention here that, unfortunately, in the footnotes to the constituted text, towards the end of this volume, the diacritical mark of \( N \) has broken off in many places; but, on examining the passages carefully I found that the context almost invariably shows whether one has to read \( N \) or \( \bar{N} \).

* [See now Epic Studies VII *infra.*]
of the edition. Notwithstanding considerable variation in these manuscripts as regards petty verbal details, the material appears sufficient to settle the text of this important version.

[60] The Bengali version is closely allied to the Vulgate, but is unquestionably superior to the latter in so far that it is happily free from a large number of late accretions which encumber the Vulgate. Of such "omissions", exhibiting the superiority of the Bengali version, the following will serve as illustrations:

1. The entire Brahmā-Gaṇeṣa complex in adhy. 1, of which the Bengali version contains not the remotest trace. The spurious character of this passage has been discussed and demonstrated so often that it is unnecessary to dilate upon it here.¹

2. The short dialogue of 8 lines (*71*) between Pārashurāma and the shades of his ancestors, in the beginning of adhy. 2, which is wholly unnecessary here, and is, as a matter of fact, only an excerpt from a detailed description of the principal Indian tīrthas, which occurs in the Aranya (B. 3. 83. 29 ff.).²

3. A short passage of only six lines (cf. App. I, No. 13), which represents a somewhat feeble attempt (as unnecessary as it is unsuccessful) to fill out an apparent lacuna in the original.³

4. A long interpolation (App. I, No. 78) of 119 lines in adhy. 138 (Bom. ed.), which gives an inflated account of the defeat and the ultimate capture of Drupada by the Pāṇḍavas. It is one of the miniature Bhārata-yuddhas—mere by-play for the benefit of the gallery—which expand and embellish the Southern recension and the Vulgate. The older version disposes of the battle in two lines, which, taking everything into consideration, is after all perhaps not a very inadequate treatment, as already remarked.

5. More than usual interest attaches to another omission in the Bengali version, which concerns a well-known and popular scene describing the discomfiture of Kṛṣṇa at Draupādi’s svayaṁvara, which is commonly believed to be one of the main reasons why he always entertained feelings of such deep and implacable hatred towards Kṛṣṇa (Draupādi), and lost thereafter no opportunity to hurt and humiliate her.

This passage deserves a detailed consideration. Ramesh Chandra Dutt, who had to make a very careful selection of the incidents of the epic in compressing the story, has made this scene the centre of his poetic account of

¹ Cf. p. LIII. footnote 1, above.
² [See now Crit. Ed. 3.81.24 ff.]
³ See F. Belloni-Filippi, "L’episodio di Kadrū e di Vinatā nell’edizione critica del Mahābhārata" (Traduzioni di epica indiana), published in the Ascoli Memorial Volume, Silloge Linguistica (Torino 1930).
the marriage of Draupadi, and given a vivid rendering of the passage in his *Epic of the Bharatas*:

"Uprose Karna, peerless archer, proudest of the archers he, 
And he went and strung the weapon, fixed the arrows gallantly, 
Stood like Surya in his splendour and like Agni in his flame,—
Pandu's sons in terror whispered, Karna sure must hit the aim! 
But in proud and queenly accent Drupad's queenly daughter said:
'Monarch's daughter, born a Kshatra, Suta's son I will not wed.'
Karna heard with crimsoned forehead, left the emprise almost done, 
Left the bow already circled, silent gazed upon the Sun!"

The situation is, undoubtedly, full of dramatic possibilities. Just at the moment when the prize was going to be snatched away from the heroes of the epic by an upstart, [61] the brave little Draupadi comes to the rescue and snubs openly, in the presence of the assembled princes, the semi-divine bastard, the understudy of the Villain of the piece, the unwanted suitor, who thereupon withdraws discomfited; and everybody breathes a sigh of relief. A tense scene!

Unfortunately, this melo-dramatic interlude, to judge by the documentary evidence, appears to be the handiwork of a very late Vyāsaíd, as it is found only in K₄ N₂ Dn D₂. 4. 5, that is, one manuscript of the K group, one Nepālī manuscript, and three composite Devanāgarī manuscripts, besides the Nilakarṣṭha version! All of these are late and inferior or conflated manuscripts. It is missing, on the other hand, not only in the Sāradā version and the Southern recension (as in the case of many of the interpolations of the Vulgate), but for once, also in the entire Bengali version!

It might seem a piece of sheer vandalism or perverseness to omit this seemingly beautiful little passage, which has won its way into people's hearts, from any edition of the Great Epic of India, relying merely upon documentary evidence. A little reflection will, however, convince any one that the loss to the epic is not as serious as one might, at first, suppose, since it is a palpably *faked and thoroughly unreal* situation. If one thinks about it at all, one fails to understand how Draupadi, who was, after all, then only an inexperienced maiden in her teens, had recognized the King of Aṅgas (whom she had probably never seen before) and known him for the son of a coachman, unfit to wed a princess. He had been invited by her father. At least he was given a seat of honour among the princes. He is specifically named by Dhrṣṭādyumna among the suitors (1. 177. 4). Moreover, it does not appear as if the bride elect had much choice or voice in the matter, at the time of these elaborate and formal state functions notwithstanding that they were called *svayamvaras*. She had to wed any competitor who excelled in the particular proficiency test which had been arranged by her father or guardian. She was *vīryaśulkā*; she was given by her guardian to the highest bidder,
the price paid being heroism, or rather proficiency in marksmanship. This is quite evident from the words of Yudhiṣṭhira, addressed later to the Purohita of Drupada (1. 185. 23 f.) :

प्रतिगुणका दुधनेन राजा सानेन जीरण तथानुक्रमतः।
न तत्र वणेशु ह्वता विवक्षा न जीविष्णुपे न कुले न गोचे॥

दुधनेन सानेन हि कामेकुण्व विचेन्द्र खस्येन च संनिश्चाटः।
स्वर्य तथानेन महास्तमानेे छृणाजिता पार्थिवसं मध्ये॥

We accordingly find, as a matter of fact, that without murmur or hesitation, she follows an unknown and apparently undistinguished Brahman boy—Arjuna in disguise—who happens to have hit the mark. She does not know him from Adam, but she makes no inquiries about his status or lineage. Even if these were regarded as a case of romantic love at first sight for the handsome and heroic bowman (which it certainly is not), she never opens her lips when Yudhiṣṭhira proposes that she should be the common wife of the five brothers, which must have shattered her romance to smithereens, but quietly submits to (what is made to appear) as most unusual and unnatural, if not a shocking, proposal, and from which even her old father and brother recoil with perplexity and amazement. It seems to me, therefore, that the documentary evidence is amply supported here by intrinsic probability.

[62] Examples of other important “omissions” in the Bengali version which distinguish it from the Devanāgarī are: 54*, 60*, 71*, 152*, 171*, 274, 277*, 689*, 1171*, 1205*, 1270*, 1614* (proverbs, one of them being a citation from Manu), 1714* (a short list of sacred rivers), 1788*, 1827*, 1841*, all of which occur in the Vulgate, but are missing in the Bengali version.

Occasionally Bengali manuscripts agree in their readings with the Southern recension, standing in opposition to S. K (with or without D); e.g.:

1. 22 B S छवि : K (mostly) D (mostly) विवि.
1. 42 B S आमवानि : K0.5-4 D (mostly) प्रिवच.
7. 3 B D (mostly) S पराण : K कणान.
39. 10 B D (mostly) S तत्त : S, K (with a few D) पुनः.
64. 29 N B D S जगाम : K द्ृष्टे, etc., etc., etc.

Other examples have been cited under the description of the K version. In these cases, I have, as a rule, given preference to the agreement between B and S, on the postulated principle of the originality of the agreement between independent versions, adopting in the constituted text, the concordant reading; but owing to the circumstance, that sporadic contamination between B and S, as a whole, cannot be altogether denied and that there are, as a matter of fact, some Bengali manuscripts that stand, palpably, under
the influence of the Southern tradition, even in the matter of minor readings, it is impossible to be perfectly certain about the originality of a reading common to B and S. I am, however, of opinion that the probability is always on the side of the concordant reading, though the evidence of this agreement may be rebutted by other considerations, such as intrinsic probability or the evidence of pertinent testimonia.

**The Devanāgārī Version.**

The Devanāgārī script plays in the Mahābhārata textual tradition the important rôle of being the commonest medium of the contamination of different Mahābhārata versions. A Devanāgārī manuscript of the Mahābhārata may, in fact, contain practically any version or combination of versions.

Of the four “Devanāgārī” scholiasts whose commentaries were collated for the Ādi, Arjunamiśra is certainly an Easterner, and bases his commentary on the Bengali text; Ratnagarbha appears to be a Southerner, and his text is evidently a blend between the Northern and the Southern texts; while Nilakantha is quite definitely a Westerner, though he seems to have written his commentary in Benares. The provenance of the fourth and the last commentator mentioned above cannot be determined with certainty; but it might be surmised that Devabodha was a “Northerner”; in any case, his text (to judge by the lemmata in his commentary) shows remarkable affinities with the North-western or Kaśmīrī version (v).

Most of the Devanāgārī manuscripts, as already remarked, are eclectic on no recognizable principle: now they approach the Southern tradition (S), now the purer Northern (v). If any one were to maintain that just this composite text was the original, a patchwork of disjointed ancient passages, which had later split up into the Northern and Southern recensions (as might easily be implicitly assumed by the protagonist, say, of Nilakantha’s version), it would be a thesis difficult to substantiate. It [63] seems more natural to regard, as already observed, the Devanāgārī as a sort of “vulgar” script (like the Latin, in Europe), the script understood by the savants all over India, into which many of the local versions were, from time to time, transcribed, a circumstance which facilitated contamination and conflation.

It has been mentioned above that the Devanāgārī version contains many more interpolations than even the Bengali. It would be no exaggeration to say that the Devanāgārī manuscripts, which are by far the most numerous of Mahābhārata manuscripts, are, at the same time, the least important of them, with the possible exception of those of the adjoining version, Telugu.

**The Devanāgārī Version of Arjunamiśra.**

This is in a sense a misnomer, because this Devanāgārī version, as already remarked, is nothing but a Devanāgārī transcript of the Bengali version.
Instances of the concord of B and Da will be found under: 1. 4. 6; 7. 13; 8. 22; 10. 2; 11. 7; 26. 38; 33. 25 f.; 111. 4; 141. 21; 143. 6; etc., etc.

The name of the commentary is variously given as (Mahā) Bhāratārthā- (pradīpikā and Bhāratasaṅgrahadīpikā.1 The commentary on the different parvans has been handed down singly or in groups of a few parvans at a time. Complete manuscripts of the commentary are said to exist in Bengal, but even there they are not common. The manuscripts, which are written in Bengali or Devanāgarī characters, have various dates in the seventeenth or later centuries; the earliest hitherto reported date is V. Sārvat 1676 (ca. A.D. 1620). Arjunamiśra, who styles himself Bhāratācārya in the colophons of his commentary, was the son of Iśānā, who was a “Reciter” (pāṭhaka) or “Prince of Reciters” (pāṭhakarāja) of the Mahābhārata, and who appears to have borne, like his son, the title Bhāratācārya. Arjunamiśra is cited by name by Nilakanṭha once in his commentary on the Mahābhārata (ad B. 3. 291. 70) and was, therefore, certainly anterior to Nilakanṭha, who belongs to the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Arjuna, in turn, mentions, among his predecessors; Devabodha, Vimalabodha, Sāndilya, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa (also known as Nārāyaṇa-Sarvajña or merely Nārāyaṇa). He appears to have based his scholium closely on that of Devabodha, from whose commentary Arjuna often cites, verbatim long extracts, without specifically naming the source. Arjuna wrote also a commentary on the Puruṣasūkta, to which he himself refers in the Dīpikā on B. 14. 25. 26. Telang2 surmises that he is posterior to the Vedantist Śaṅkarācārya; and Holtzmann3 assigns him to the thirteenth or fourteenth century, both without mentioning any cogent reasons for their assumptions. Arjuna has treated the Harivaṃśa as an integral part of the epic, elaborately defending this position; his commentary, therefore, embraces the Harivaṃśa also.4

[644] Following the example of my predecessors, I have utilized Deva- nāgarī manuscripts of his commentary and treated his version as a sub-division of the Devanāgarī version. The two Devanāgarī manuscripts utilized by me are, however, extremely corrupt. Moreover, the text they contain is evidently contaminated from the Vulgate, as proved by the glaring discrepancies that exist between the readings of the text and the lemmata in the commentary

---

2 The Bhagavadgītā (S. B. E. vol. 8), p. 204.
3 Das Mahābhārata, 3. 67 f.
4 Haraprasada Shastri, op. cit. p. xxvi, wrongly assumes that it was Arjunamiśra who “boldly made the proposal of including the Harivaṃśa 12,000” in the Mbh. This fact is already implied in the Parvasaṅgraha, which calls Harivaṃśa the Khila and includes it in the list of the 100 sub-parvans |
(e.g., 1, 17, 22). This corruption of the Arjunamisra manuscripts, I could not explain at first, but now it is clear that it is due to their being faulty transcripts of Bengali originals. Two such Bengali manuscripts¹ (unaccompanied by the epic text) were sent to me subsequently by my kind friend Professor Sushil Kumar De of the University of Dacca from the collection of the Dacca University. These manuscripts are far superior, as is but natural, to the Devarāgāṛ manuscripts. It would seem, therefore, expedient to secure and use, whenever possible, good old Bengali manuscripts of Arjunamisra's commentary, treating his version as an offshoot of the Bengali version (with the symbol Ba); or, still better, such Bengali manuscripts of his commentary as are unaccompanied by the epic text. The reason of the last precaution will be presently explained.

A word of caution is here necessary in regard to what are cited in the critical notes as the readings of Arjunamisra. The readings found in the (epic) text accompanying the commentary have, as a rule, been taken to represent the readings of Arjunamisra. The commentary was consulted by me only occasionally, in case of doubt or difficulty, or when a pāṭhāntara was noticed during a hurried perusal of the commentary. It is, therefore, more than likely that, since the (epic) text of our Arjunamisra manuscripts is conflated with various types of texts, in particular with the Nilakantha type, some errors in our readings have crept in.² Such errors can, however, be rectified only by carefully working through the whole commentary word for word, and comparing the lemmata with the (epic) text of the manuscripts. Even then one can, of course, be sure only of the words and passages actually cited by the scholiast.

In passing, it may be mentioned that the practice of combining text and commentary in one manuscript is probably not very old. It is almost certain that the autograph copy of the commentator was not made up on the tripartite system of combining the epic text and commentary in such a way that [the] text occupies a central strip of the folio, while the commentary is written in two narrow strips, one at the top and the other at the bottom of the folio, which is the prototype of the Bombay pothi-form editions. The scholiast must have written his commentary, certainly at first, on separate leaves, especially in the case of voluminous texts like those of the two epics. Accordingly the commentaries of Devabodha and Vimalabodha have been handed down always unaccompanied by the epic text. Those of Arjunamisra and Nilakantha, on the other hand, are generally accompanied by the epic text, but the two Dacca manuscripts (lent to me by Professor De), as was mentioned above, contained only the commentary. The two elements—text and

¹ Dacca University Collection, Nos. 989 A, and 2318 (dated Śaka 1689).
commentary—appear to have been combined into the tripartite form by professional scribes. If this combination was done under the supervision of the commentator or at least in his lifetime, there is some chance of the scribe’s reproducing, in an approximately correct form, the text of the commentator. But if the combination is made independently of him and especially if made some time after the death of the commentator, there is every chance that the scribe would combine the commentary he was copying with some text known better to himself than to the scholiast. In the latter case, therefore, it must remain doubtful how far the epic text of such a manuscript resembles the text actually commented upon by the scholiast. It is consequently best to use always texts of the commentary unaccompanied by the epic text, though it is an extremely laborious process to collate such a manuscript with any given Mahābhārata text; but we eliminate in this way automatically all chances of avoidable errors of commission and omission.

The Devanāgarī Version of Nilakantha: the Vulgate.

Nilakantha, considered until lately, at least in India, as the most trustworthy guide for the exposition of the Mahābhārata, was a Brahmin scholar of Mahārāṣṭra, with the surname Caturdhara (modern Chaudhari), son of Govinda Sūri and Phulāmbikā, residing at Kūrparagrāma (modern Kopargaon) on the Godavari. Nilakantha wrote his commentary on the Mahābhārata (and another work called the Ganeśagīṭā), in Benares, in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. He appears to be the author also of a work called Mantrarāhasya-prakāśikā.

At the beginning of his commentary on the Great Epic, Nilakantha tells us that before writing his scholiast, the Bhāratabhāvadīpa, he had compared many copies of the Mahābhārata, collected from different parts of India, with a view to determining the “best” readings and even consulted the scholia of old authorities:

वहृत्मांसामाध्यम विभिन्नदेवयक्षणायांनःर्विनिश्चित्य च पाठमध्यमम्।
प्राचे गुरूप्राणस्य वाच्यामार्थ्यं भारतमानव्ये॥

We accordingly find that he occasionally mentions (in about 125 places) variant readings and additional passages found in different provincial versions (most of which can be identified among the readings of the manuscripts comprising our critical apparatus), and cites (as a rule, without naming the source) the explanations given by other scholiasts — information, scanty though it is, yet of immense interest and value for the history of the received text. Variants cited by Nilakantha will be found in the footnotes under: 1. 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 13, 19, 22, 41, 80, 100, 118, 129, 185, 188; 2. 6, 64, 243;

---

1 See PRINTZ “Bhāṣā-wörter, in Nilakantha’s Bhāratabhāvadīpa,” Einleitung, KZ. 44. 70 ff.
Nilakantha refers to Devabodha, Vimalabodha, Arjunamiśra, Ratnagarbha, and Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa, in the course of his comments on the different parvans. Devabodha, who is one of the oldest (if not the oldest) commentators of the Mahābharata hitherto known, he refers while commenting on 1.158.14 (= B.1.170.15):

न नहसः शृङ्गेण वान च देवाज्ञनस्मृतेः।
कुवित्रस्य यथोपिः फिं मा समुपस्पर्शवः॥

\[\text{श्रीति श्राचीनः पाठी देवोपादिःभिंवियोऽपततः।} \]

Not a single word of this stanza, as cited here, is commented on, however, by Devabodha! The only word in Devabodha's scholium which might possibly have been taken from some reading of the stanza before Devabodha is श्राचीनः (श्राचीनः) and that does not occur in the reading of the stanza cited by Nilakantha. The mention of Devabodha by Nilakantha here, is, therefore, surely honoris causa. Such mistakes by commentators are far too frequent to cause surprise or need comment.\(^1\) It is, however, noteworthy that the reason Nilakantha assigns for considering this as an ancient variant is that it had been commented on by Devabodha and others. This shows that Nilakantha held Devabodha in high esteem, and reckons him among the ancient authorities. What Nilakantha regards as "ancient" (prācīna) is of course a matter for speculation. Nevertheless I do not think that he would have called Devabodha a "prācīna" commentator, unless the inter-

val between them was at least four or five centuries. Nilakantha refers to Devabodha again in B. 7. 82. 2: महुपदन्ति: महुपदन्ति: पर्यायः श्रीत्वा देवबोधे. Arjunamiśra he cites in his comment on B. 3. 291. 70: जाभास्त्र निगुणादिक्षणान्
हयंजनमिस्व:.

Since Arjunamiśra also cites Devabodha, we can arrange the three commentators in an incontrovertible sequence: Devabodha—Arjunamiśra—Nilakantha.¹

The text used or prepared by Nilakantha is a smooth and eclectic but inferior text, of an inclusive rather than exclusive type, with an inconsiderable amount of Southern element.

As instances of simplification in the Vulgate, I may cite: 1. 2. 144 Text क्विदमो: (Vulg. वा विदोऽ; cf. 1. 13. 20; 41. 21); 2. 189 शोकाम (शोकाम); 10. 6 मामु (मामु; cf. 1. 187. 6); 37. 10 दिवं स्तर्येव विद्यतः (दिवं स्तर्येव विद्यतः); 39. 16 दिस्त (दिस्त); 45. 16 बाल एवानिजातिः (बाल एवानिजातिः); 62. 12 सर्वं (सर्वं); 96. 16 दुर्गणां (दुर्गणां); 122. 5 प्रभूति (प्रभूति); 122. 42 तद्वादि (तद्वादि); 139. 18 विनितामलेव स्थता (विनितामलेव स्थता); 150. 8 ब्हस्ती (ब्हस्ती); 221. 1 श्रेण (श्रेण); etc., etc.

Instances of the correction of solecisms in the Vulgate are: 1. 2. 93 Text श्या (Vulg. श्या); 9. 2 चिन्ता (स्मृता); 119. 8 श्रीस्य (श्रीस्य); 181. 25 श्रव्यं (श्रव्यं); 184. 1 ब्रह्महत (ब्रह्महत); etc., etc.

I add a selection of the Southern passages which were interpolated into the Northern recension by Nilakantha or by one of his immediate predecessors in the field: 263*, 299*, 473*, 513*, 598*, 700*, 701*, 722*, 857*, 863*, 963*, 977*, 1037*, 1054*, 1062*, 1066*, 1069*, 1100*, 1101*, 1169*, 1211*, 1548*, 1768*, 1828*, etc., etc., as also passage No. 56 of App. I.

Nilakantha’s text has acquired in modern times an importance out of all proportion to its critical value,² to the utter neglect of far superior texts, such as the Kaśmirī or Bengali.

Nilakantha’s guiding principle, on his own admission, was to make the Mahābhārata a thesaurus of all excellences (culled no matter from what source). At the beginning of his commentary on the Sanatsujātiya, Nilakantha naïvely remarks (Böm. ed. Udyoga 42):

1 Many of these facts were communicated by me in a paper read before the International Congress of Orientalists, Leiden (1931), and entitled “Miscellaneous Notes on Mahābhārata Commentators”; cf. the summary in Acts des XVIIe Congress International des orientalistes (Leiden 1932), p. 156. [See now Epic Studies—III below.]

2 Even HOLTZMANN, Das Mahābhārata, 3. 74: “Für die Erklärung der Einzelheiten ist er von grosser Bedeutung “.
That Southern manuscripts were utilized by him is incontrovertibly proved, for instance, from the fact that he cites at the end of his comment on Adi 196 (Bom. ed.), the Nālāyanaṇi and Bhaumāśvī episodes (in two adhyāyas), which are typical Southern interpolations, not found in any Northern manuscript:

Latin

The (printed) editions of Nilakaṇṭha’s version leave much to be desired. They have arbitrarily changed many of the readings and added a certain number of lines which are not found in the Nilakaṇṭha manuscripts hitherto examined.

Instances of lines of stanzas with which modern Pandits have enriched most of our (printed) Northern editions and which are lacking even in the Nilakaṇṭha manuscripts, are besides a (Southern) passage of 21 lines given in App. 1 (No. 112) and another of 9 lines (998*), the following short interpolations:

[68] 27* इदं दातसहस्त्रायं श्रोकानाः पुण्यकर्मणास् ।
उपाख्याने: सह भय आहव्य भारतभुव्यम् ।
B. 1. 1. 101 f.

146* संशात्तकानं चौरंणां कोठोंयो नव महतस्मान् ।
किरीडिनामिनिष्कम्य गमिता यमसादनम् ।
B. 1. 2. 261
It would, however, hardly repay, now, the trouble to re-edit, from manuscripts, the version of Nilakantha, as there are far better versions that could be edited instead, for instance, the Kaśmīrī.

The manuscripts of the Nilakantha version (which show among themselves slight discrepancies) contain a number of lines which are not found in any of the other versions (except occasionally in a few manuscripts of the composite Devanāgarī version); e.g. 102*, 147*, 276*, 412*, 493*, 574*, 699*, 765*, 838*, 1270*, 1457*, etc. They belong perhaps to the oral tradition which, at one time, had probably as great value and authority as the written text.

Nilakantha has misunderstood the text, and given doubtful, far-fetched or fanciful interpretations at: B. 1. 1. 52 (ङ्गऽ=वन्तः!); 275 (वकवः); 2. 33 (श्रीनक = उज्ज्वल!); 17. 12 (कर्त्ता); 23. 15 (Vedantic interpretation); 27. 8 (मनः=शुद्धेज्जः); 37. 15 (the difference between हेतु and कारण); 43. 22 (गैः); 47. 11 (अक्षराकीड़ीः); 50. 3 (ढ़ारणं=आचार्य!); 61. 11 (कृत्सं:); 63. 90 (संहिताः); 131. 52 (अवसीदत); 164. 9 (context); 166. 10 (एकुलम्); 232. 1–7, 19 (esoteric meaning); etc., etc.

Nilakantha’s stanza (B. 1. 145. 20):

प्राणः श्रापमलापः प्रद्धापममिदं वचः।
प्राणेण प्राणः प्रद्धापः प्रद्धापि च चोऽचवीच्।

which appears to be sheer nonsense is so in fact. No other version, as far as I know, contains this mystifying repetition. The explanation of the stanza by Nilakantha is childish, to say the least.
The stanza containing the unintelligible word कुकिन्द्र (v. l. ककिन्द्र) which Nilakaṇṭha has great difficulty in explaining:

ततो दुर्योधनः शूरः कुकिन्द्रस्य मते स्थितः ।
पाण्डवानिविविधोपथेऽराय्येतोत्तरिद्यतः ॥

looks uncommonly like one of the kūta-slokas, said to be interspersed by Vyāsa at different places in his poem, in order to puzzle and confuse his divine amanuensis, but is, un-[69]-fortunately, nothing of the kind. The passage is only one of the common instances of “conflate” readings. The stanza cited above is the Southern variant (473*) of the Northern stanza, which, in our edition, reads (1. 55. 8):

ततो दुर्योधनः शूरः कर्णोऽसः सहस्रोऽसः ।
तेषां नियाद्विचात्सामन्तियान्ते समासनन् ॥

The ककिन्द्रस्य in the former stanza is only a mislection of the original ककिन्द्रस्य (often mis-written ककिन्द्रस्य, ककिन्द्रस्य), which is the Southern equivalent ककिन्द्रस्य, the reference being, no doubt, to the minister or statesman (mantrin) Kaṇika (named after the famous authority Kaṇika or Kaṇiṅka cited in the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya), who appears only once in the epic, and that expressly for the purpose of expounding his political philosophy to the Kauravas.

As another instance of conflation which has had a rather disastrous effect on his text, I may cite Nilakaṇṭha’s version of the story of Dīrghatamas. The addition has been made in such a manner that one sentence of the original has remained hanging in the air and cannot be construed at all! The story begins at ब. 1. 104. 9. All goes well till stanza 28:

अहोऽयं सिद्धमयांशः नाथमेव वस्तुमार्गति ।
तस्मादेन्च च वर्यं सर्वं पापात्मां व्याजामहें ॥

Then we read घृः:

इत्ययोऽयं समाभाष्य ते दीर्घायोऽयं मुनिम ।
पुष्पाम च सा पञ्ची न तुतोप पञ्ची तथा ॥

“Having spoken thus among themselves, they [scil. the inmates of the hermitage] to the anchorite Dīrghatamas. Then that wife also, having (already) obtained sons (?) (from him) did not (seek to) please the husband.”

Bhīṣma, who is narrating the story, then goes on quite unconcernedly to speak about the wife (of Dīrghatamas) Pradeśī or Pradeśiṇī; about the maryādā made by the exasperated Dīrghatamas, and so on. But what the inmates of the hermitage (āśramavāsinaḥ) did to Dīrghatamas, we never learn from the Vulgate. All modern translators try to eke out a sense by interpolating into the text some words to complete the sense. A reference to
the constituted text and the critical notes will, however, show that the text of the Vulgate is conflated; it is a most clumsy blend of interpolations from two entirely different sources (γ and S), which, as is but natural, alters the situation considerably and confuses the narrative hopelessly. By athetizing either passage we get a tolerable text; by athetizing both we get the original, which is the constituted text.

The Devanāgāri Version of Ratnagarbha.

The critical notes contain only specimen collations of this version, which is a blend between the Northern and Southern recensions. Like the Telugu manuscripts, which will be described presently, it is eclectic, following now the Northern tradition, now the Southern. It seems to be an attempt to combine the two recensions by superposition, like the Kumbhakonam edition. Its composite character may be seen from 24*, 25*, 27*, 114*, 138*, 149*, 170*, etc., etc. It contains the additional passages of the Southern recension, as well as the Gaṇeṣa episode, which latter is found only in late Northern [70] (Devanāgari) manuscripts: exactly like the Kumbhakonam edition. The collation of this version was discontinued after the second adhyāya. The version may be safely ignored as useless for critical purposes.

The Devanāgāri Version of Devabodha.

A commentary older and more important than the Arthadīpikā of Arjunamiśra, and one more neglected still, is the Jñānadīpikā of Devabodha, cited here as Cd. Devabodha is certainly earlier than Vimalabodha, Arjunamiśra and Nilakanṭha, all of whom cite him with great respect, and probably earlier than Sarvajñā-ñārayaṇa and Vādīrāja. He is, therefore, most likely, the earliest commentator of the Mahābhārata hitherto known, and, in my opinion, also the best. The commentary is in any case most valuable, and its evidence, both positive and negative, of supreme importance for the constitution of the text.

The Jñānadīpikā is a concise tīkā; that is, a running commentary, explaining, as a rule, only the difficult words and passages in the text. Occasionally it offers explanations of constructional obscurities and grammatical difficulties, and gives the gist of passages; in the latter case, usually, under citation of entire verses (i.e. half ślokas) from the text. The extent of the commentary on the Ādi is given in one manuscript as 1400 granthas. The homage which Arjuna pays to Devabodha in the Introduction to his scholium is not a mere matter of form. Arjuna has in fact based his commentary largely on that of his predecessor. He has copied very large portions of Devabodha’s commentary, sometimes verbatim, sometimes in extract. Moreover even when the two commentaries differ, the influence of Devabodha is plainly discernible. In fact, the Arthadīpikā may be considered as a revised and
enlarged edition of the Jñanadipikā. The similarity of the names is suggestive and worthy of note.

Unlike the commentaries of Arjunamīśra, Nilakanṭha and Ratnagarbha, that of Devabodha is unaccompanied by the epic text. The question what was Devabodha’s text cannot, therefore, be answered with any high degree of certainty. The entire Southern recension and even the Vulgate may, however, be definitely ruled out. There remain the Bengali, Śāradā and “K” versions. With the latter two, the pratikas of Devabodha seem to show greater affinity than with the Bengali version. For instance, Devabodha has no comment on any of the six adhyāyas (including the Kaṇikanīti) of the central subrecension (γ), which are missing in Śāradā and K. Worthy of special note is the absence of all reference to the Kaṇikanīti in Devabodha’s commentary, since the passage has evoked lengthy comments from both Arjunamīśra and Nilakanṭha. Still greater probative value has an addition which is peculiar to the Kaśmirī version. This version adds at the very end of the Ādi a supplementary and superfluous adhyāya,—an addition which is only a variant of the well-known Purānic tale of Śvetakī’s sacrifice, occurring earlier in the course of the same parvan. Curiously enough, the king who is called Śvetaki in the first version is here called Śvetaketu! That the version of Devabodha contained this additional adhyāya is revealed by the concluding remark of Devabodha’s commentary on the Ādi: शेषविनिर्देश शेषकेतरितिनाम् This remark will not apply to any version which has not the additional adhyāya peculiar to the Kaśmirī version. These considerations tend to show that the version of Devabodha was of the Śāradā-K type. And the inference is confirmed by many minor agreements, which need not be cited here.


The fourteen manuscripts (D_2-14) comprising this version are misc- codices of small trustworthiness and of no special value for critical purposes. Consequently, half of them (D_8-14) were discontinued already after adhyāya 2. The characteristics of these manuscripts may be briefly noticed here.

D_1 is akin to Dn and looks uncommonly like a Nilakanṭha manuscript minus the commentary. Yet it differs conspicuously from the ordinary Nilakanṭha manuscripts by the unaccountable omission of the entire Brahmā- Gāṇeśa complex (that is, both the visit of Brahmā and the employment of Gāṇeśa as a scribe, which arises out of the visit) as well as the description of the battle in which the Pāṇḍavas capture Drupada and hand him over as gurudakṣiṇā to their preceptor, Ācārya Droṇa (App I, No. 78). The omission of these episodes points rather in the direction of Bengal, since Kaśmir is excluded by the mass of other interpolations which D_1 contains, as also by the almost complete lack therein of readings peculiar to Ś, K. The manuscript may be a blend of Bengali and some composite Devanāgarī manuscript.
or manuscripts. — $D_2$ (like $D_3$) is akin to $K_{3-5}$ and might have been with advantage classed with them; see, for instance, the critical apparatus pertaining to the list of the contents of the Aranyapravan in adhy. 2. — $D_5$ is palpably under Southern influence, to prove which it is sufficient to point out that it transposes the Sakuntala and Yayati episodes, a transposition which is quite peculiar to the Southern tradition. — $D_4$ contains notably large additions from Southern manuscripts, additions which are either entered on the margin or, when the marginal space would not suffice, written on supplementary folios. The Southern influence is illustrated by the following passages: 587*, 594*, 596*, 598*, 599*, 602*, 603*, 604*, 605*, 609*, 610*, 611*, 612*, 613*, 617*, 621*, 623*, 624*, 628*, 629*, 630*, 633*, 634*, 635*, 637*, 670*, 671*, 713*, 715*, 1255*, 1256*, 1257*, and scores of others. Cf. also the following passages given in App. I: 35, 46-48, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 64, 67-69, etc., etc. — $D_5$ (like $D_2$) often stands in opposition to other manuscripts of this composite class, agreeing with $K_{3-5}$, with which it might have been with advantage classed. Like $K_{4-9}$, it contains Southern additions as well, e.g. 1565*, 1579*, 1580*, etc., and passage No. 89 of App. I. — The manuscripts $D_{6,7}$ were discontinued after adhy. 53. Frequently they are found to be in opposition to the Vulgate and agreeing with the manuscripts of the $a$ group. They also show 230*, which is a Southern passage.

$D_{8-14}$ as already remarked, were collated only as specimens for the first two adhyāyas and discontinued thereafter. — Of these, $D_{8-12,14}$ are palpably under Southern influence, as is evidenced by their containing one or the other of the following typical Southern insertions: 18*, 21*, 22*, 24*, 32*, 42*, 45*, 48*, 49*, 56*, 80*, 81*, 89*, 114*, 117*, 138*, 149*, 170*. — $D_{12}$, which is a fragmentary manuscript, beginning almost at the end of adhy. 1, is used in this edition practically only for adhy. 2, as it is discontinued at the end of that adhyāya. The text shows strong affinities with the version of Arjunamīśra. — The text of $D_{14}$ is a complex. It contains some old readings such as are preserved only in the Kāśmirī manuscripts, but also an extraordinarily large number of individual readings, not found elsewhere (cf. 1. 1. 50, 63; 2. 101, etc.). At the same time, it is contaminated from some Southern source, perhaps the Malayālam version!

[72] The Devanāgarī manuscripts of the Mahābhārata in the Tanjore Library seem to have been all copied during the regime of the Maratha Chiefs of Tanjore, and are a blend of the Northern and Southern recensions, and as such, of little value for text-critical purposes.

The Telugu Version.

The Telugu version, situated as it is on the boundary line which divides the Northern from the Southern recension, was particularly open to contamination from the Northern tradition. We accordingly find that the majority of Telugu manuscripts are eclectic on no recognizable principles, presenting
somewhat the aspect of a mosaic of the texts of the Northern and Southern recensions, not unlike the Kumbhakonam edition. $T_1$ is one of the extremely few Southern manuscripts which contain the (Northern) salutational stanza नारायण नमस्कृत्य etc. For the Northern element in the make-up of $T_1$, cf. 29*, 30*, 95*, 97*, 98*, 106*, etc., etc. As compared with $T_1$, $T_2$ shows a purer Southern tradition and has distinct leanings towards the Grantha version.—$T_3$ only replaces the fragmentary manuscripts $T_2$, which breaks off at the end of adhy. 181.

Important variants of one other Telugu manuscript (Tanjore 11809) are now given by Professor P. P. S. SASTRI in his edition of the Southern recension. It does not differ appreciably from our Telugu manuscripts.

The Grantha Version.

The Grantha version is the version of the Tamil country, and is written in the so-called Grantha script. It is one of the two important Southern versions, the other being the Malayālam. The Grantha version—to judge by the manuscripts utilized for the Critical Edition, and for Professor P. P. S. SASTRI’s Southern Recension—is more heavily interpolated than the Malayālam, and is also more influenced, on the whole, by the Northern recension.

For the beginning of the Ādi, we get, temporarily, the sub-groups $G_{1-3}$ and $G_{4-6}$, but soon the configuration changes to $G_{1, 2, 4, 5}$ versus $G_{3, 6}$. The latter group ($G_{3, 6}$) represents the purer Southern tradition, agreeing with $M$ against the other Southern manuscripts, whereas the four MSS. $G_{1, 2, 4, 5}$ are not merely heavily interpolated but stand palpably under Northern influence. All Grantha manuscripts are probably contaminated (directly or indirectly) from Northern sources in different degrees. $G_6$ shows, on the whole, little Northern influence, but 419*, 494*, 693*, 1310*, 1312*, 1885*, 1975*, and passage No. 73 of App. I, show that even $G_6$ is probably not entirely free from contamination, since all these (Northern) passages are missing in $M$.

SASTRI’s edition of the Southern recension gives the (most important) variants of five Grantha manuscripts of which three, $K$, $K$ and $K$ (the latter being SASTRI’s “principal text”) are identical with our $G_4$, $G_3$ and $G_6$ respectively. Extracts from a Grantha manuscript belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (Whish Collection, No. 65) have been given by Professor WINTERNITZ and compared with the text of the Bombay edition (şaka 1799). The passages which differ from the Bombay edition [73] have been underlined in his extracts, and the corresponding passages of the latter are given opposite each line: a convenient arrangement which shows, at a glance, the relation of the two texts to each other for the

---

* Ind. Ant. 1898. 69 ff., 92 ff., 124 ff.
passages excerpted.  

The clearest proof of the contamination of $G_{1-2-4,5}$ from some Northern source is furnished by 294*, a Northern passage, added in this sub-group irrelatively before I. 20. 1. The two lines comprising this passage must have been interpolated in a remote ancestor of $G_{1-2-4,5}$ by a clumsy scribe, who had missed the right place by four stanzas, and have remained there ever since, fortunately. Another rather transparent interpolation in $G_{1-2-4,5}$ from a late Northern source is a passage referred to already, No. 14 of App. I, which describes the circumstances under which Aruna becomes the charioteer of the Sun, an irrelevant digression. Cf. also 1373*, 1375*, 1377*, and passage No. 76 of App. I.

The sub-group contains an amazingly large number of interpolations, which have not been found, so far, elsewhere, and of which a few may be mentioned as illustrations: 320*, 322*, 326*, 330*, 337*, 345*, 351* (third line!), 357*, 363*, 364*, 368*, 371*, 373*, 382*, 386*, 387*, 388*, 406*, 519*, 584*, 636*, 705*, 706*, 741*, 755*, etc., etc.


$G_7$, which is one of the few Southern manuscripts containing the (Northern) mantra नराक्षण नमस्कृत्वे etc. is, like T, a typical blend of the Northern and Southern tradition, and was, on that account, discontinued after adhy. 2. Its composite character may be seen from: 29*, 30*, 96*, 97*, 98*, 106*, 145*, etc., etc.

The Malayalam Version.

This is the version of Malabar, the Southernmost extremity of India. It is, in my opinion, the best Southern version. It is not only largely free from the interpolations of $\sigma$ (= T G), but appears to be also less influenced by N than $\sigma$, wherein lies its importance for us.

1 The collation of the text is accompanied by notes in which WINTERNITZ draws attention to the most striking points of difference between the two versions, without entering into a full discussion of all the various readings. The notes contain nevertheless many valuable text-critical observations.

2 Cf. SUKTHANKAR, "Epic Studies III", ABI, 11. 269.

[74] M₂ often stands in antagonism to M₄-₅, sometimes agreeing with manuscripts of the Northern recension; and is, therefore, an untrustworthy guide. M₁₂₄ are incomplete manuscripts, ending with adhy. 53; in other words, with the Astikaparvan. M₆-₉ replace these manuscripts in the Saribhavaparvan, which is the name under which the remaining portion of the Adi is known in the Southern recension. This practice of writing the two portions of the Adi in separate volumes is worthy of note, as an archaic survival. It is, in my opinion, the reflex of some half-forgotten factor connected with the compilation of the Adi, and seems to me to be text-critically highly important. It should seem that the South has never completely assimilated the (Northern) division of the epic into the conventional eighteen parvans.

Instances of additional passages which distinguish M from all other versions are: 407*, 453*, 800*, 801*, 842*, 970*, 1051*, 1052*, 1278*, 1437*, 1438*, 1613*, 1678*, 1709*, 1871*, etc.

M₆-₉ constitute really one manuscript, as is proved, for instance by their repeating the following indubitable clerical errors: (i) in 1. 85. 25, M₆-₉ repeat inconsequentially the words पुजयत्वनीहोऽके नासाधव; (ii) in 1, 154. 13, they omit 13ᵃ and 13⁴, transposing 13ᵇ and 13⁵, which they read as one line; (iii) in 1. 193. 1, they all read the meaningless व्याघ्रां विभ्रं धुरे (Text वाकारं विभ्रं प्रति); (iv) they read 1. 213. 4ᵃ-5ᵇ erroneously after stanza 31 of adhy. 212; (v) in 1, 213. 6, M₆-₉ omit the words च-यज्ञसिद्ध: of the text, for which M₇ shows a lacuna. Instances of readings peculiar to M₆-₉ are (reference to adhyāya and śloka):

58. 6 M₆-₉ समाजस्मि: rest समापेतुः.
106. 2 M₆-₉ सत्त्वत्वते: rest समापेतुः.
157. 9 M₆-₉ शक्तिस्वत्तुः: rest समवेतुः.

Conflation in M₆-₇ is suggested by 1. 209. 19, where M₆,₇ have both the Northern reading and the Southern reading.

It may be added that the cases cited are merely by way of illustrations. A careful study of the critical apparatus would easily furnish scores of other instances.
This version has several striking agreements with $S_1$, a fact all the more impressive, because M, a Southern version, hails from the province at the opposite end of India from the province of $S_1$, a Northern version; for instance, Malayalam supports $S_1$ (against T G) in omiting the spurious parts of adhy. 128-129 of the Bombay edition.

WINTERNITZ has published, in Devanāgarī transcript, portions of a fragmentary Malayalam manuscript belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (Whish Collection, No. 158), which contains twelve chapters of the Sāmbhavaparvan.\(^1\) The extracts contain the beginning of the Pūruvarśānuṅkūrtana (our adhy. 90), the passage referring to Śakuntalā and the birth of Bharata (our I. 90. 27-34), and the end of the adhyāya (our I. 90. 93-96). The manuscript correctly shows the Southern transposition of the Śakuntalā and Yayāti episodes. It is interesting to observe that this manuscript also further shows the anticipation of I. 89. 1-16, before the Yayāti episode, which is found in our Malayalam manuscripts (cf. note on p. 282) and in the conflated MSS. $G_4$, 5 (cf. note on p. 992), and which is text-critically highly important.

\[75\] Readings or features which are peculiar to M or such as distinguish M from G (with or without T) will be found under: 1. 1. 3. 35, 45, 122, 128, 168, 176, 179, 184, 189; 2. 160; 4. 4; 7. 10; 24. 1; 36. 3; 39. 2, 16; 53. 31; 54, 6, 7; 57. 81; 61. 98; 67. 28; 68. 16, 51; 69. 9; 73. 33; 77. 9; 78. 23; 80. 2; 84. 14; 86. 1; 92. 45; 93. 14; 94. 9, 27, 32; 95. 8; 96. 2, 57; 98, 5, 12; 113. 22; 117. 5, 23; 119. 30; 123. 39; 129. 9-11 (om. in M); 132. 1; 136. 1; 138. 10; 139. 11 (om. in M); 142. 19; 150. 10, 26; etc., etc.

With regard to the versions described above, it must be frankly admitted that they do not, by any means, form water-tight compartments. The isoectional boundaries, as is natural, do not coincide, but are independent of each other; in other words, the textual peculiarities, which are, in final analysis, the real basis of our classification, never have, as a matter of fact, an identical area of distribution. The manuscripts cannot always be squeezed into the same moulds consistently. Thus, for instance, in the beginning of the Adi, the Grantha version, as already remarked, shows two sub-groups $G_{1-3}$ and $G_{4-6}$; but soon the configuration changes and, from about adhy. 25 onwards, we get the grouping $G_{1,2,4,5}: G_{3,6}$. Not only that. Individual manuscripts, groups, or even versions often overstep the boundaries of their particular recension. Thus, for example, on the one hand, $G_{1,2,4,5}$, frequently agree with $N, V_1, B, D$; $M$ agrees with $S_1$; $S_1$ and $Dn$ agree with $S$; against other manuscripts of their respective recensions.

These discrepancies, as is shown in the sequel, are due chiefly to two different causes: firstly, initial fluidity of the text; and, secondly, subsequent

\(^1\) WINTERNITZ, Ind. Ant. 1898. 134 ff.
contamination or conflation. As regards fluidity: to conceive of the Epic of the Bhāratas—or for that matter, of any true epic—as a rigid or fixed composition like the dramas or poems of Goethe or Milton, or even of Kālidāsa or Bhavabhūti, would be manifestly grotesque. Such a view can originate only in a fundamental misconception of the origin, growth and function of epic poetry.

In the case of the Mahābhārata, we find, however, the fact of the fluidity of the original reflected in the tradition as preserved even to this day. Only a very late interpolation in some inferior Devanāgarī manuscripts speaks of the text as having been written down by Gaṇeśa to the dictation of Vyāsa, a fantastic story that we may ignore with an easy conscience. On the other hand, we are plainly told that the epic was first published, at an elaborate sacrificial session, in the form of a free recitation by Vaiśampāyana, a direct pupil of the author, before king Janamejaya and the assembled guests. It was again recited by Sūta (or Sauti), who had heard it only at the first recitation, and somehow committed the whole poem to memory. After just one single hearing, he obviously could not reproduce such a voluminous text verbatim et literatim. In the beginning, therefore, it is clear that the poem, which was committed to memory, was recited freely, as faithfully as the particular reciter could contrive. This mode of transmission is not calculated to preserve rigid textual purity in any high degree, without stringent precautions, such as were adopted in the case of Vedic texts, but which never existed, as far as one knows, in the case of the epics. This fact also we find unexpectedly preserved by tradition (1. 57. 74 f.). Vyāsa, we are told, taught his Bhārata to his five pupils: Sumantu, Jaimini, Paila, Śuka, and Vaiśampāyana. And the five rhapsodists—the direct pupils of the author—it is reported, published five separate versions of the epic:

[76] संहितास्ति: पृथक्क्रेव भारतस्य प्रकाशित: ।

As is well known, there is preserved a work which actually passes for the Aśvamedhaparva of the Bhārata of Jaimini (whether it is actually so or not) and which is totally different from our Aśvamedhaparvan.

Here, I think, we have a clear glimpse of the early history of the text. Two facts emerge rather clearly out of the chaos: firstly, the text was originally committed to memory and recited freely; secondly, different rhapsodists recited differently. This has indeed been assumed by many writers on the subject. All that is quite natural and intelligible. As a matter of fact, from generation to generation, from place to place, from bard to bard, the wording, even the contents, would vary a little, until the text is committed to writing, which is the beginning of a different phase in its history. The view that the epic has reached its present form by a gradual process of addition and alte-

---

1 For instance, WINTERNITZ, Geschichte der ind. Literatur, 1. 396.
ration receives strong support from the fact that this process is not stopped even by scriptal fixation. The study of the manuscripts themselves, which belong to a very late phase in the evolution of the text, shows that texts must have been constantly amplified and altered by conflation. Such derangements, it may be observed, do not totally destroy, as might be imagined, the value of our division of the manuscript material into recensions and versions, but merely complicate its use and interpretation.

CRITICAL PRINCIPLES FOLLOWED IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE TEXT

As already remarked, the Mahābhārata versions when they first come within our ken appear already dispersed in several distinct groups. The original, from which all these versions are derived, is itself preserved in no authentic copy contemporaneous with, or even reasonably close to, its period of composition. We can only reconstruct the original, approximately, by comparative methods. We recognize today, as already explained, two recensions, descended from the original, each recension embracing a plurality of versions, each version being divided into a multiplicity of sub-groups. The ultimate problem is to unify, as far as possible, this manuscript tradition: to evolve, by comparative methods, a form of the text that will explain this phenomenal wealth of divergent and conflicting texts, and justify it.

Before I elucidate the critical principles followed in preparing the constituted text of the Adi, I must review briefly other principles of textual criticism and textual reconstruction, and discuss the applicability of these principles to the Mahābhārata Problem.

THE CLASSICAL MODEL

The method that naturally presents itself first to our mind is the time-honoured method of Classical Philology. The older school of classical philologists distinguished four stages in the work of preparing a critical edition of a classical text: (1) Heuristics, i.e. assembling and arranging the entire material consisting of manuscripts and testimonia in the form of a genealogical tree; (2) Recensio, i.e. restoration of the text of the archetype; (3) Emendatio, i.e. restoration of the text of the author; and, finally, (4) Higher Criticism, i.e. separation of the sources utilized by the author.

Excellent as this method is for the purpose for which it is devised, it should not be forgotten that it depends ultimately upon there being a more or less complete concatenation of copies and exemplars reaching finally back to a single authentic (written) archetype; and, consequently, can be applied to

---

1 LÜDERS, Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1929, 1143.
2 See RUBEN, "Schwierigkeiten der Textkritik des Mahābhārata"; Acta Orientalia, 8, 240-256; and SUKTHANKAR, ABI, 11, 259 ff.
the Mahābhārata with great limitations. Indeed our ideal is the same as that of the classical philologist: restoration of the text, as far as possible, to its original form. But the original of a Sanskrit poem and that of a classical poem: how entirely different they are! Particularly, in the case of the Mahābhārata, where, one may well ask, is the original of a whole literature?

In the Mahābhārata we have a text with about a dozen, more or less independent, versions, whose extreme types differ, in extent, by about 13,000 stanzas or 26,000 lines; a work which, for centuries, must have been growing not only upwards and downwards, but also laterally, like the Nyagrodha tree, growing on all sides; a codex which has been written in nearly a dozen different scripts assiduously but negligently copied, chiefly as a source of religious merit, through long vistas of centuries by a legion of devout and perhaps mostly uneducated and inefficient copyists, hailing from different corners of a vast sub-continent, and speaking different tongues; a traditional book of inspiration, which in various shapes and sizes, has been the cherished heritage of one people continuously for some millennia and which to the present day is interwoven with the thoughts and beliefs and moral ideas of a nation numbering over 300 million souls! The classical philologist has clearly no experience in dealing with a text of this description, an opus of such gigantic dimensions and complex character, with such a long and intricate history behind it.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF MAHĀBHĀRATA TEXTUAL CRITICISM

The capital difficulty of the Mahābhārata problem is just this that there are hardly any clear objective criteria which may enable us to discriminate with precision and certainty between the data of the rival recensions, to evaluate correctly and confidently the amazingly large mass of variants. Only an inconsiderable fraction of these variants represents clear "mistakes", which can be corrected with confidence. As a rule, the variant readings, if they are not mere synonyms, convey a slightly different meaning, but almost always a possible meaning. From the grammatical point of view also, they are both equally valid. One of the variants may be a trifle more suitable than the other; for instance, in the discrimination between the Simple and the Periphrastic Future, or the Parasmaipada and the Ātmanepada. But can we legitimately premise that the original must necessarily have been quite flawless from the point of view of the Paninian grammar? Is it not at least likely that the supposed solecism may be a genuine lapsus calami of the author, or (should that supposition be considered inadmissible or unacceptable) that the usage fluctuated?

Then again, as we have seen, there are numerous passages, short and long, that are found in one recension and are lacking in the other, what I call

---

1 Cf. WINTERNITZ, Indol. Prag. 1. 61; and CHARPENTIER, Orient. Literaturzeitung, 1932, 276f.
"additional" passages. No [78] convincing proof can in general be given to establish either the originality or the spuriousness of any given passage of this type. What may fairly be regarded as interpolations are in general so ingeniously fashioned and so cunningly fitted in that, except under very favourable circumstances, the intrinsic (contextual) evidence is inconclusive.

For these and other reasons it is not always easy to correlate the divergent recensions, to discriminate between the variants, and to constitute a wholly unobjectionable single text.

This difficulty has its origin in the circumstance that in the Mahābharata manuscript tradition, perhaps as much as in any literary tradition, the textual critic is faced with a bewildering profusion of versions as also with an amazing mixture of versions. Contrary tendencies have been at work in the evolution of the text. While, on the one hand, some elements have been working, from the earliest times, for the development of different types; on the other hand, there were not wanting elements that operated against the evolution of sharply differentiated types. To understand the phenomenon of this luxuriant growth and indiscriminate fusion of versions, one must appreciate certain details of historical moment, certain special factors in the transmission of the Mahābharata, traits which distinguish our work from every other known text except the Rāmāyāna and perhaps other similar ancient epics.

Let us examine closely the character of the differences between the two recensions to start with.¹ The differences are of three kinds. Broadly speaking, each recension differs from the other, firstly, in point of readings of the common stanzas; secondly, in point of additions (or omissions) of short and long passages; and, thirdly, in point of sequence of the text-units. How do these differences at all arise?

Our first thought would be to attempt to explain the additions or omissions as the result of conscious editorial revision, or of clerical error, or partly of one and partly of the other. But the frequent differences in sequence, especially when no material gain is perceptible in either arrangement, rather support the explanation suggested above that both recensions are, in final analysis, independent copies of an orally transmitted text. The suggestion is confirmed by the consideration of the variation of the first type, namely, minor differences in the readings of the stanzas common to the two recensions, which confront us step by step throughout the parvan, nay, throughout the epic, as the partial collations of the other parvans now available at the Institute clearly show.

It will be found for one thing perfectly useless to try to derive mechanically one set of readings uniformly from the other. Hundreds and thousands

¹ The conditions are analogous to that of the Rāmāyana recensions, as revealed by the researches of Jacob; see particularly, Das Rāmāyana, pp. 3 ff; and Lüders, "Ueber die Grantharecension" (1901).
of the minor readings are nothing more than mere synonyms or paraphrases, grammatically and semantically equivalent, but graphically totally unrelated. They, therefore, cannot be all corruptions, in the ordinary sense of the word, of a written archetype. The vast majority of these variants cannot again be due to the zeal of a purist trying to correct the solecisms of the received text, or to the whim of a minor poet endeavouring to polish its diction or style. Had that been the case, we should find that the enthusiasm of the reformer had evaporated long before he had reached the middle or at least the end of the first parvan. The [79] Herculean task of cleansing the Augean stables would be child's play compared to a systematic purification of the Mahābhārata text, according to later standards. Under these circumstances, however great might be the divergence between the two recensions in the beginning, it is bound to vanish or at least diminish towards the middle or the end of the poem. We find, on the other hand, as already remarked, that the stream of variation flows with unabated volume from the beginning to the end of the epic. This fact can in no way be reconciled with the hypothesis of a single uniform revision (or a series of them either) of a fixed and rigid text.

All the difficulties in the explanation of this phenomenal variation vanish, however, as soon as we assume that the epic was handed down from bard to bard originally by word of mouth, as is clearly implied by tradition. That would explain, without any strain or violence, the existence of the mass of variants, of differences in sequence, and of additions or omissions. If the text has been preserved, for any considerable period of time, only in memory and handed down by word of mouth, those are just the changes that could not possibly be avoided. It is evident that no great care would be lavished on the text by these custodians of the tradition to guard it against corruption and elaboration, or against arbitrary emendation, and normalization: to reproduce the received text, which was not guarded by canonical authority or religious sanction, with any degree of precision would be neither attempted by the bards nor required of them. Whenever and wherever the text was then written down—and it was probably written down independently in different epochs and under different circumstances—these transmissions by word of mouth must have contaminated the written text and introduced innumerable variations in it. The assumption of some of such complicated derangement, beyond the normal vicissitudes of transmission, is necessary to account for the abnormal discrepancies and strange vagaries of the Mahābhārata manuscript tradition. In other words, we are compelled to assume that even in its early phases the Mahābhārata textual tradition must have been not uniform and simple, but multiple and polygenous.

Moreover, a study of the critical apparatus shows that there has intervened a long period in the history of the Mahābhārata in which there was a free comparison of manuscripts and extensive mutual borrowings. A natural and inevitable source of confusion of the tradition has always been the
marginalia, comprising glosses, *variae lectiones* and additions. The copyist of a manuscript with such accretions copied sometimes the original readings and sometimes the marginal. It may be incidentally remarked that an examination of the marginalia shows that the variant readings are taken *mostly* from manuscripts belonging to the same version, or at least the same recension. But there is no reason, theoretical at any rate, why readings of the rival recension could not creep into a manuscript of the text by the medium, say, of a popular commentary such as Nilakantha's. And, as a matter of fact, we do find, occasionally, readings of the opposite recension noted in the margins of manuscripts. Under these circumstances it was inevitable that the true reading, especially if it was a *lectio difficilior* or an archaism or a solecism, would be partly suppressed, being preserved to us in one or two manuscripts only.

Furthermore, the texts may be improved by a comparison of manuscripts is not by any means a modern discovery. The process has been known and practised for ages: [80] the difference is merely in our ideas of what is meant by "improvement" of the text. I have cited above the instance of Nilakantha, who himself says that he had collected and compared Mahābhārata manuscripts from different parts of India in order to ascertain the "best" readings. The other commentators also, Devabodha, Arjunamīra and Ratnagarbha, cite *pāṭhāntaras* and speak *apopāthas* ("bad readings"). These they could have got only from a comparison of different manuscripts.

The text favoured by the ancients appear to have been of the inclusive, rather than of the exclusive, type. This is proved in the case of Nilakantha by a remark of his cited above, where, he naïvely admits that he had put together the stanzas which had been commented on by the ancient Bhāṣya-kāras, and others he had found in modern manuscripts, with the idea of making a "thesaurus of excellences." The remark does not apply by any means exclusively to the Sanatsujāta episode, to which it is appended, at any rate as far as Nilakantha is concerned. In the Adi, we have abundant evidence that he has borrowed, according to his fancy, passages, short and long, from the Southern recension. The critical notes will show that his text includes a large number of Southern passages which are not found in any other Northern version, such as, for example, the catalogue of forest trees, which serves in a modest way for a description of the sylvan scenery amidst which Uparicara Vasu finds himself:

513* **अध्रोकृष्णमकसुत्रतिलककैतिष्किरुषकः।**

**पुरानेऽसकिरकल्पितकक्षुकिलिखितप्रादेशः।**

**पन्नेनिरौषिकोकिखि चन्द्रनेष्माैैष्ऽनिर्माताः।**

**पर्यायवैर्यमहादुःः पुण्येऽस्मातुपपूर्वैैैैतम।**

At one place, as was shown above, Nilakantha has disfigured his text in his frantic attempt to squeeze into it a lengthy (Southern) passage con-
taining some details which did not fit into his own text. This he has done, be it noted, at the risk of making his text wholly unintelligible, without a word of apology or explanation. Professor WINTERNITZ, while criticizing DAHL-MANN’S Das Mahābhārata, has pointed out this incongruity: “The story... which relates how Dīrghatamas is insulted by his wife Pradvesī, and how he consequently establishes the fixed rule (maryādā) that henceforth a woman shall always have to adhere to one husband, whether he be alive or dead, and that a woman who goes to another man shall go to hell, thus forbidding any kind of remarriage of widows... is strangely out of place in a chapter treating of Niyoga.” As was pointed out above, in consequence of the intrusion of this foreign matter, the first half of the stanza of the original text is separated from the second half by 27 lines! That in itself is, however, not a very serious matter in Mahābhārata textual tradition, where such transpositions are a common occurrence. But in the present instance, this transfer has had the unexpected and undesirable result that the subject of the sentence, which was left behind in the first half of the stanza, remains to the end without its predicate, which latter, being shunted off to such a remote distance, was furnished with a new and entirely different subject! The effect of this arrangement on the original story may be easily imagined.

[81] Conflation is in general not so easy to detect and prove as in the case of Nilakantha. We can date Nilakantha with fair accuracy. Again, Nilakantha, who is one of the latest of our commentators, has himself vouchsafed some information as to how he has prepared his text. We have no such reliable data in the case of the majority of the manuscripts or versions of our critical apparatus.

Take, for instance, the case of the sub-group G₁245 of the Grantha version. In opposition to other manuscripts belonging to the same recension and even the same version, G₁245 contain, as shown above, an astonishingly large number of passages which are found otherwise only in some inferior manuscripts of the Northern recension. Now is this a case of contamination of the four MSS. G₁245 from a Northern source; or are the common passages a remnant of the lost archetype, which were somehow lost in the remaining manuscripts of the Southern recension? There is apparent agreement here between independent versions. But is this agreement original? The clumsy interpolator of a remote ancestor of G₁245 happens to have supplied us with the means of answering these questions. He has left behind, quite unintentionally, an impress of his “finger-prints,” so to say, by which we can easily and confidently trace him and examine his handiwork. The said manus-
scripts contain a Northern stanza (belonging to manuscripts of class \( \gamma \))—a mere string of attributes of Garuḍā—wedged in at a place where it can be construed neither with what precedes nor with what follows. This proves incontrovertibly that these four manuscripts \( G_{1,2,4,5} \) have been compared with some Northern manuscripts, and makes it highly probable that the other doubtful stanzas, which they have in common with the Northern recension, have crept into their text in the same surreptitious way. At least this is the most plausible explanation of the anomaly. But even such confirmatory evidence is not always available.

The reader need not be sceptical about the possibilities of such indiscriminate conflation and addition. The critical apparatus, if closely scrutinized and properly understood, will reveal numerous instances of a similar character. Even a close study of the Kumbhakonam edition, prepared in our own times by two excellent Southern Pandits, will throw some light on the mentality of the old redactors of the Mahābhārata: parallel and even contradictory versions are placed quite unconcernedly side by side, regardless of the effect on the reader, regardless of the fact that sentences are left hanging in the air, that passages do not construe. Here one notices above all the anxiety that nothing that was by any chance found in the Mahābhārata manuscript should be lost. Everything was carefully preserved, assembled in a picturesque disarray.

Another important fact that must be kept in view in dealing with these interpolations is this. The older the borrowal and the more interesting the passage borrowed, the wider will be the area over which it will spread in its new habitat. It then becomes difficult to prove the borrowal.

Thus there is a certain group of passages which are found in all versions except in §1 and K (that is, in the group \( \nu \)), for example, the Kaṇikanāṭī.\(^1\) In the particular case of the Kaṇikanāṭī, there appears to be sufficient extrinsic and intrinsic evidence to make it [82] highly probable that the passage is spurious, and the corresponding agreement between some of the (more or less) independent versions is unoriginal.

There are indeed yet more difficult cases, where the evidence pro et contra of documentary and intrinsic probability is equally balanced, as far as we can at present judge. In such cases we are forced to look for small things which look suspicious and lead us to probabilities, not facts.

The problem is clearly not solved by formulating a priori a hypothesis as to the interrelationship of the different versions and fix the text in terms of some preconceived formula; for instance, by assuming as absolutely independent a certain number of these divergent versions, and laying down an arithmetical rule that whatever is common to two or more of such and such

\(^1\) App. I, No. 81.
versions must be original. In this method, we can easily deceive ourselves and others; for the results arrived at will appear sounder than in reality they are. Even though the formal operations may be a piece of flawless logic, nevertheless the results, being based on premises possibly unsound though apparently clear and definite, may be wholly fictitious. The study of the manuscripts themselves must first teach us what their interrelationship is. And they unmistakably indicate that their interrelationship is of most complex character. The critical apparatus is a veritable labyrinth of complicated and intermingled versions, each with a long and intricate history of its own behind it. We have unfortunately no single thread to guide us out of the maze, but rather a collection of strands intertwined and entangled and leading along divergent paths. With the epic text as preserved in the extant Mahābhārata manuscripts, we stand, I am fully persuaded, at the wrong end of a long chain of successive syntheses of divergent texts, carried out—provendentially—in a haphazard fashion, through centuries of diachronic activities; and that with the possible exception of the Sāradā (Kaśmīri) version, which appears to have been protected by its largely unintelligible script and by the difficulties of access to the province, all versions are indiscriminately conflated.

Now it goes without saying that the genetic method (operating with an archetype and a stemma codicum) cannot strictly be applied to fluid texts and conflated manuscripts; for, in their case, it is extremely difficult, if not utterly impossible, to disentangle completely, by means of purely objective criteria, their intricate mutual relationships. The documentary evidence is no doubt supremely important, but the results, arrived at from a consideration of the documentary probability, must be further tested in the light of intrinsic probability. No part of the text can be considered really exempt from the latter scrutiny, when we are dealing with a carelessly guarded text such as we have in the present instance. A careful study of the critical notes will show—if, indeed, the foregoing remarks have not made it abundantly clear—that all the problems which present themselves for solution in editing any text from manuscripts are present in the case of the Mahābhārata on a colossal scale and in an intensified form. We must, therefore, clearly recognize that a wholly certain and satisfactory restoration of the text to its pristine form—even the so-called satasāhasrī samhitā form—may be a task now beyond the powers of criticism.

CRITIC EDITIONS OF THE DIFFERENT VERSIONS

No doubt, in view of some of these difficulties, one scholar has suggested that to expedite and facilitate the work, we should, as a first step, before any attempt is made [83] to constitute the final text of the Mahābhārata, critically edit all the different versions.\(^1\) That, it must be said, is a

\(^1\) Cf. Lesny, Archiv Orientālā, vol. 5 (1933); p. 159.
that difficulty, the six same Great satisfactorily, critic. of could flated a dozen or more lakhs of stanzas comprising the dozen or more versions of the Great Epic. There remains, however, yet another and a more fundamental difficulty, which appears to have wholly escaped the attention of the learned critic. The difficulty is that it is practically impossible to edit even a single version of the Mahābhārata—or for that matter of any other text—wholly satisfactorily, without considering the entire evidence, that is, without, at the same time, consulting the readings of all other versions. Suppose we examine six manuscripts of a version (Grantha) in order to prepare a critical text of that version. It may happen that four of them ($G_{1,2,4,5}$), which are conflated manuscripts, have a “secondary” reading, while only two ($G_{6,8}$) have the correct reading. In these circumstances, the true character of the variants could never be inferred from the readings of this version ($G$) itself; it would be shown only by other versions ($T$ or $M$ or $N$). In fact, there is no way of finding out whether any of the manuscripts of a particular version are conflated (if they happen to be conflated) without consulting the other versions. And, if for the editing of each of the individual versions, we have to scrutinize and weigh the entire evidence, we might as well get busy with the work of preparing the final text, assuming of course that a final (critical) text has to be prepared.

That consideration apart, even if we assume, for the sake of argument, that all the dozen or more versions lie before us in a critically edited shape, our main task is not made any easier on that account. One has to go through the same mental processes in picking out or reconstructing the correct readings, whether, as at present, the variae lectiones are concentrated on a single page of the critical edition or have to be searched in a dozen or more different provincial editions, arranged round about the critic in a semi-circle. Preparing all these different editions would not by itself give us the correct readings. Some of them, moreover, would but slightly differ from each other, for instance, the editions of the Bengali and the Devanāgarī versions, and it would mean useless duplication of labour. All that is really needed to facilitate our work is a critical edition of the Southern recension. An attempt to supply that need is now being made by Professor P. P. S. Śastri in his edition of the Mahābhārata, referred to already.

THE VULGATE AS BASE

Another high authority, while full of apparent admiration for the way in which the work is being done at present at the Institute, has with much pathos and eloquence deprecated this hastily prepared, eclectic text. All that we need to do at present, according to this scholar, is to reprint the Vulgate, giving merely the variae lectiones of the manuscripts collated and
leaving each individual reader to constitute his own text, unh hampered and uninfluenced by the obtrusive personality of some editor who stands like a monitor between the reader and his author. The learned critic is evidently of opinion that any average reader, who picks up an edition of the Great Epic for casual study is better qualified to reconstruct the text than the editor who has made a special study of the problem! That is a paradox natural to the subtle mentality of the learned critic. But we need not take it too seriously. Whatever the Average Reader might or might not be able to do, I beg to submit that the Critical Reader, like the learned scholar whose opinion I am quoting, would not be any the worse off, if he is put in possession of this "Recension of Poona". For, who and what is to prevent him from constituting his own text from this critical edition? Whoever makes the text—even if Brhaspati himself were to come down and constitute the text—the Critical Reader would undoubtedly reject it as it would surely not fit in with his ideas of what is right and what is wrong. The Critical Reader has the same freedom of action whether he has before him the critical text or the Vulgate. The Vulgate, as far as I can judge, is no better suited for serving as the base than the present text.

It may, however, be that the hesitation of the learned authority is really due to a categorical objection to interfering in so definite a manner with the received text. Should that be the case, it is certainly difficult to appreciate the veneration of this scholar for the form of a text which was made up, probably, also in great haste but with inadequate and insufficient materials, only in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, that is, only about 250 years ago. It is surely illogical to assume that a text which has been built up largely on unscientific conjecture is now beyond the reach of conjecture.

A simpler and more probable explanation still of the hesitating attitude of the learned critic might perhaps be that his theoretical misgivings are based on a rather hasty study of both the Vulgate and the critical text. For, the text of the Vulgate is so corrupted and so obviously contaminated that it would be a criminal neglect of his duty for any intelligent editor now to reprint the Vulgate, when he has at hand the material to control its vagaries and to correct its absurdities.

ONE SELECTED MANUSCRIPT AS BASE.

No doubt to remedy the inherent defects in the last method as also to avoid the dreaded sanikara of pramanas, it has been suggested by other scholars that the best course would be to select one manuscript, the best manuscript extant (of any version presumably) and print it, with minimal change, correcting only the obvious and indispensable clerical errors and adding the variants of the collated manuscripts. This expedient, though un-
questionably simple and "safe," and in most cases indubitably effective, fails totally in the present instance, for two reasons: firstly and chiefly, owing to the negligible age of our manuscripts, which are barely five hundred years old; and, secondly, owing to the systematic conflation which has been carried on through ages of revisional and amplificatory activity. By following any manuscript—even the oldest and the best—we shall be authenticating just that arbitrary mixture of versions which it is the express aim of this method to avoid!

This suggestion, however, has special interest, because the principle underlying it has now been, partly and timidly, put into practice by Professor P. P. S. SASTRI, in preparing his edition of the Southern recension, whereas the three foregoing methods are mere castles in the air of theoretical critics.

[85] A CRITIQUE OF PROFESSOR SASTRI'S METHOD

Professor SASTRI's edition is an excellent demonstration of the inadequacy of the underlying principle, which has been repeatedly advocated, showing up its defects as nothing else could. What Professor SASTRI set out to do is (to quote his own words): "to print the text as it is in the original palm-leaf, liberty being taken only to correct scriptorial blunders," to weigh the different readings in the additional manuscripts and choose the more important ones [scil. readings] for being added to the text by way of footnotes." How difficult it is to carry this out verbatim in practice and at the same time to present a half-way readable text may be realized when we see how SASTRI has had to doctor his text. A few examples may be added to elucidate the point. To begin with, SASTRI does not follow the parvan division, nor the adhyāya division, of his basic manuscript, adding and omitting colophons arbitrarily, in order to reach some imaginary norm. Secondly, he adds an adhyāya of 40 lines after his adhyā 164, which is not found in his manuscript! Thirdly, he omits one whole adhyāya of 40 lines, after his adhyā 180, where all Southern manuscripts, without exception (including his own exemplar) have it, and is moreover unaccountably silent about the omission! Fourthly, in one place (his adhyā 122) he has omitted fourteen lines of the text of his manuscript and added instead thirteen lines which are not found in any Southern manuscript! Fifthly and lastly, in yet another place (his adhyā 214) he has added an interpolation (upākhyāna) of 114 lines of which not a single line (as actually printed in SASTRI's edition) is to be found in any of the six manuscripts utilized by him! These are some of the things that an extremely orthodox Southern Pandit actually does when he sets out with the avowed object of printing up a Southern manuscript as it is, correcting only "scriptorial blunders." I will not here speak of a certain number

1 Italics mine!
3 SASTRI'S ed. 1, 122, 214-215 (page 803 f.).
of spurious lines which appear to have crept insidiously into his text from the Vulgate and whose existence even he probably does not suspect. The changes mentioned first are of a different order: they have been made by SASTRI consciously and intentionally.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not blame SASTRI in the least for taking such liberties with his manuscript, which is a tolerably good manuscript (though probably not very old), but has its faults like any other manuscript. I myself have had to proceed similarly, only more thoroughly, more systematically. Our methods are similar in practice, though not in theory; that is, in his theory. SASTRI’s text is eclectic (an epithet often used by critics with a tinge of reproach, the ground of which it is not easy to perceive): as eclectic as any other Mahābhārata text, printed or in manuscript, that I have seen. I have adduced the above instances chiefly to show what correcting merely “scriptorial blunders” in Mahābhārata textual criticism really ends in.

Thus it will be seen that the method of printing a Mahābhārata manuscript as it is, viewed as a rigid principle, is a deplorable failure. The lateness of our manuscript material [86] and the peculiar conditions of transmission of the epic are responsible for the defection. They force upon us an eclectic but cautious utilization of all manuscript classes. Since all categories of manuscripts have their strong points and weak points, each variant must be judged on its own merits.

**WHAT IS THEN POSSIBLE?**

The Mahābhārata problem is a problem sui generis. It is useless to think of reconstructing a fluid text in a literally original shape, on the basis of an archetype and a stemma codicum. What is then possible? Our objective can only be to reconstruct the oldest form of the text which it is possible to reach, on the basis of the manuscript material available. With that end in view, we must examine as many manuscripts—and above all as many classes of manuscripts—as possible, and group them into families. We must try to ascertain and evaluate the tradition of each family, eschewing late and worthless material. We may then consider the relation of these traditions in regard to the variae lectiones, and the genuine and spurious parts of the text. Beyond that, we have to content ourselves with selecting the readings apparently the earliest and choosing that form of the text which commends itself by its documentary probability and intrinsic merit, recording again most carefully the variants, and the additions and omissions. A little critical re-

---

3 e.g. I. 22. 28ab; 58. 1cd; 82. 4ab; 184. 27ab (S has v. 1.); 194. 62½ (no Ms. has this line !); 203. 28ab; 212. 66½; 215. 54ab; 216. 41, 43 (found only in N9, Dn and printed editions); etc. References are to SASTRI’s edition of course. It must be admitted that, when compared with the mass of the text these interpolations are really negligible.

2 Cf. LÜDERS, Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1929, 1145.
manipulation of the text need cause no alarm. For, as I have already observed, it is hardly logical to assume that a text which is largely based on conjecture is now beyond the reach of that principle. Of course there will always remain many doubts, but that consideration should not prevent us from correcting those parts which can be corrected with confidence; moreover, that limitation applies to our comparatively well preserved classical texts, despite the guarantee of the careful editings they have undergone. However, owing partly to the fluid character of the original and partly to the fragmentary and inadequate information we possess as regards the origin, growth and transmission of the text, it is incumbent on us to make Conservatism our watchword. We must abstain from effecting any change which is not in some measure supported by manuscript authority.

**THE METHOD OF RECONSTRUCTION EXPLAINED**

The method I have followed in reconstructing the text cannot, unfortunately, be presented in the shape of short general rules. I shall endeavour, however, to explain it as briefly as possible.

The main principle underlying all speculation as to authenticity is the postulated originality of agreement between what may be proved to be (more or less) independent \(^{[87]}\) versions. The principle I have tried to follow religiously—and I hope I have never deviated from it—is to accept as original a reading or feature which is documented uniformly by all manuscripts alike \((N=S)\).

For instance, we frequently come across three-lined stanzas, one of whose lines is an "inorganic line", that is, a line which can be added or omitted without detriment to sense or grammar. These seemingly superfluous lines, if proved by both recensions, have *not* been deleted; they have been kept scrupulously intact. A more important instance is of the initial adhyāyas of this parvan. The connection between adhyā. 1-3 and what follows, as also the connection between the three adhyāyas *inter se*, is of most loose character. There is further the suspicious circumstance that adhyā. 4 begins precisely in the same way as adhyā. 1; both adhyāyas have in fact the *identical* opening (prose) sentence:

\[
\text{तोमाद्विद्युत उपन्यः सुतः पौराणिको शैविकरण्ये वैदिकोऽनुलक्षोऽकुलेतेद्विद्वाराणि सबे}
\]

\(^{1}\) Few scholars, I imagine, would endorse the view of Pandit Vidhushekhar Bhattacharya (Modern Review, Calcutta, for August 1928, page 176), that the first prose sentence of our Mahābhārata (तोमाद्विद्युत उपन्यः सुतः etc.), though found in *all* MSS. without exception, should be *deleted* from the Critical Edition, because it is *intrinsically inappropriate* in the context. He writes: "They [said those lines] are to be found in *all* the different versions of which MSS. are collated for the present edition, though with some variant readings, but *can we be satisfied only with this ground as to their being genuine*? That is a little too radical! This edition cannot and should not proceed so far.
In other words, adhy. 4 begins as though nothing had gone before! The prose sentence seems to fit better the context of adhy. 4 than the context of adhy. 1; but that is not material to my argument. It would have been possible to athetize the first three adhyāyas in order to remove this anomaly, relegating them to the Appendix. But as all the four adhyāyas are handed down in exactly the same form (with the usual amount of variants) in all manuscripts of both recensions, they were left perfectly intact. Here we have an old conflation of two different beginnings. They were not harmonious in juxtaposition, but each was too good to lose, in the opinion of the ancient redactors. They therefore put both in, making but a poor compromise.

Another passage that may be thought to need some radical treatment is the account of the cremation of Pāṇḍu and Mādri. We are first told that the king died in the forest, and Mādri mounted the funeral pyre and was burned with him (1. 116. 31). After this we read that their "bodies" (sāvīre) are brought to the capital of the Kurus (1. 117. 30), and an elaborate royal funeral takes place. In the account given in the following adhyāya (118), from the description of the anointing and dressing of the king's body, and from the remark that the king looked as if he were alive (1. 118. 20):

आचछाद: स तु वासोभिर्वचन नरस्म:|

it is clear that no former burning is imagined. After Pāṇḍu had been burned with his favourite queen Mādri on the funeral pyre, there could not have been (as HOPKINS\(^1\) has justly pointed out) much corpse left or not enough to dress and smear with sandal paste! But the manuscripts do not render us any help here. The passage is handed down in identical form in all manuscripts of both recensions.

The above examples will show that the diaskeuasts did not always employ any great art—I may add, fortunately—in conflating two discrepant accounts of an incident, which is by no means an easy task. To resolve such anomalies, however, is beyond the scope of this edition, since the entire manuscript evidence unanimously supports the conflation, which is too old and deep-rooted to be treated by the ordinary principles of textual criticism. If we went about, at this stage of our work, athetizing such passages as were self-contradictory or as contradicted the data of some other part of the epic, there would not be much left of the Mahābhārata to edit in the end.

[88] I give in a footnote\(^2\) the text of a hundred selected stanzas for

---

1 Ruling Caste in Ancient India, p. 172, footnote.
2 Adhy. 1
आचछाद: स तु वासोभिर्वचन नरस्म: |

Adhy. 26
वद्वि ते पिता नापि दिव्यसः विहंगमः |

रेजेवाशैक्लोपति मनोभासारहस्म: || ६

| तमामतमभिनिष्पाद भगवत-कपस्तवः |
| बिदित्या चाष्ट्र संकलपंसिद्व वचनस्माविदः || १० |
| प्रजाहितायामारमो गहिदश्य तपोशणः: |
| चिकित्स कहलमें तद्वुजातमहें || ११ |
| पुष्कानिल्यिंतक्षोऽप्यम प्रक्षपत स शैवसः |
| सिमोऽन्न पुष्पवर्गः च समागलितस्तवः || २२ |
Prolegomena

which no variants, or only unimportant variants, have been recorded in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>कर्मस्य हिन्दुस्तान तथा वै पवित्रार्थ मृत्यु: ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अन्तः : सभीभूतानामन्तप्तामण्डलयाः। ॥ २</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विषयोऽदृश्य गुरुशय च विपर्ययवचि: ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न्यू वेद तथा : सभीभूतास्तेष्टोऽदृश्यः ॥ ४</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ब्रह्मान : पुनरात्मात्मा कर्मस्य द्रष्टे।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्यरूपोऽदृश्योऽदृश्य गुरुशय दशुःकृः। ॥ ५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अतिनेव काले ते देवी दर्शायणी शूराः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विनयान्त्रकारादिका शुचिवनी। ॥ २४</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तपस्तर्या बनतरा ब्राह्मण रूपस्य शुष्की।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उपवाक्यां भर्तरं तत्तुराचार्य कथम: ॥ २५</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>तमुवाचार्ययो देवो वर्णोस्रीति वेदरूप।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स बोधे तव तिश्रेयस्यपुरुषस्य विछिन्नां। ॥ १२</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>भुर्भुजामतो शर्यस्य मात्रा च चैभिभुजन च।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विनायकायस्य प्रेक्षयो कारण शुचिवनी। ॥ १</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>तत्त्र प्राच्यां तत्त्र वेदस्य वाहकं।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्ञातां गुर्वात्रृते वे परं हर्षस्यां ॥ २</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>संबंधाय दक्षायिकमात्रेवादो च।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रीश्य गौरसुर्यक श्रीशुश्रस्य समाहितां। ॥ १४</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अयुक्त: स नागोंः: कार्तिके महानाम।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अद्वायस्य न्यों व्ययोऽस्य परम्पराः। ॥ ७</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भस्मीरूत्तत्वत: दृश्य गुरुशय देशसा।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भस्म सर्व समाभास्य काद्रयो वात्स्यमहति। ॥ ७</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवाहमेव परम्पराय पयाचेत्यमन्वन्तया।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अहू संजीवग्राम्यां पुष्यस्य सुगंभर। ॥ ८</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ततो गुरुं तद्या कर्मचर्या हते।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रभुः सवः: परर्के पक्षिकः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>शुचिदलो राज्यहरतादस्य।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तत्त्वत्ते तत्त्वा नृस्य विन्द्रणत्त:। ॥ ५</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>भावमार्को निराहारः: श्रुत्तनाहरद्वीणि।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स देवी प्रत्ययेऽदृश्यस्य गुणमानान्तरस्य। ॥ ३</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>पुत्र दिष्टविन्दु संभाष्ट इव देवो यदस्य।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कर्ममेव च तव तयो ब्रह्मण कृतो दशस्य।। ॥ ३</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>एवं हेष्ठ हु भवत: भक्तितविन्दु कृत:।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मया नियतिता शुद्धिष्ठविन्दुप्रियामहाः। ॥ ५</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>वादर्श्य शुचमेक्ष्य न दुःखा पर्यक्षत।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रेल्यो यद्य्यज्ञवर्त्मा धर्मी विमानान्त। ॥ १३</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>तत्त्वस्य दिष्टाती विवेके सामे संपूविते।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>राजां सम्प्रति वाराणस्य: काश्यो गुणम्वेचल। ॥ १४</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>तत्कस्म त: नागः: पुत्रमेवविशेषाः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गत: गुरुवै राजां दशिनिता जनमेक्षित। ॥ १४</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अमहं नित्यान्ताश्च नागो दथुः स्वपन्धित:।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अपेक्षयपहिदारावां वाहकं: पैयेत्तय। ॥ १५</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhy. 49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>तत्त्र आद्वृत घुर्ण वे जस्तः जार्जात्सुवंजम।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आद्वृततानागरज्ञय वचालविम्बीवी।। ॥ १</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तत्त: स आद्वृतापरमाविन्दु नंदोः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आचाय वादावशकोड़ यतागम लाभितो भक्ति। ॥ २५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>याज्ञवल्क्यस्य कथा स्वपः समुत्ति गुरौः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सोक्ष्य शुचमेवनामामालों विन्दुमाल:। ॥ २५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स गह्यमेवविशेषाः: कह्यं जार्जात्सुवंजम।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्ञातु सदेशैणुमास: सुच्याविन्दुस्मासः। ॥ २५</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adhy. 53
स यदि: पाण्डवेश्वर राजः परिशिष्टम्य इ। प्रीतिमाध्यमवादानि भारति जननेवायः ॥ १० । चिकित्स: सत्तास्थः च तद्भाषनास्वारामाताः ॥ ॥
[३८] तेषां ब्रह्मचर्या विवेक दत्तोष्कृत असहस्वः॥ ॥ ॥
पुनरागमनं कार्यार्थम् चैव बलोजनविरुद्धः।
भिन्नसंस्कृत सदर्व्यो मे वातश्रेये महाकृतः ॥ ॥ १९ ॥

Adhy. 54
तमोपमिश्रश्च बर्देहै देशविशेषप्रदेशः ॥
पुनरागमनं राजेन्द्र: शाल्यशंक क्रमणः ॥ ॥ ४ ॥

Adhy. 55
श्रेय राजन्याया मेदे: कृपाण्डवयोग्यः।
राज्येन बुद्धस्यृतो बनवासस्त्रिवेच च ॥ ॥

Adhy. 56
कार्यम् ये सामान्यत त्यथा सबं द्विजोत्तमः ।
महाभारतमाध्यायने पुराणं चरितं महतः ॥ ॥ कथे थरसृपतो भ्रेष्ट: सुदृढः नरसंभन्तः।
अन्तःः परसं कोणो सोद्रते सुतरिहर्षः। ॥
एतद्वचनं से संबंधित तौपरायणः।
गयच्छ कुत्रान्तरे तत्र तत्र महारथः। ॥ ॥
मयः सब्जकेयेशु पुजपतय भारमः।
प्रकर्ष्यानि मर्य त्ये व्यस्यस्त्रिभोजः। ॥ ॥

Adhy. 58
तीसास्त्रोऽः दृष्टिवृत्त दृष्टिविश्विनसायुः।
जातिसम्बलस्यपि महेनैव पवित्रमातमः। ॥
कद्विणे च नरसाहु भोमोतिततानि मनवः।
भर्गमेवाणुस्वस्तसूरिकृतमर्यादायः। ॥ ॥
इत्युत्तर उस महीने देते भवव ज्ञानविश्ववः।
आदिदेवतः त्यथा संविश्ववकृतहस्तरम्। ॥
अथ शाकायनः सब्जः शुभा महुःश्रीवेचः।
तथायथच ं पथयच तस्मां तेषां जगुःस्तदः। ॥ ॥

Adhy. 59
भाग्यो मानसः: पुनः विविधः। धमवहरेः।
भण्डिर्मसोश्रीस्य पुनस्स: पुरुषः: कुः। ॥ ॥
प्राहाः: पुरुषाणाः संविश्ववकृतहस्तरम्।
अंवदसहस्तीसुभूमृतवाच शिवविषाधिकः। ॥ ॥

रचयितः ब्राह्मणः गावति: गन्नव्यस्तरसस्ताः।
अपरतं कृपान्नवासु पुराणे परिअन्तितमः: ॥ ॥

Adhy. 61
तेषामयस्वतः बहुः चढ़े: परिकरितः।
अणिकारिति विविधः। हि दीर्घो राजविष्यातः। ॥
हृदतोहुःत्वहृलीतेवेन्द्रियः भ्रात्यः।
अंवाण्डःसंसारसमुपश्च भाराजम्योगनिहः। ॥ ॥
शाकुनिन्त्राः सस्तवार्तीज्ञाया लोकेऽवहारः।
नारिञ्चायस्त य: पुनो हंस: इत्यस्मिन्विषुः।
स गन्नव्यस्तिज्ञाः कुरुविश्वशायनः। ॥ ॥

Adhy. 64
नरारायणरघं गावलोप्योपि भिन्नमिष्टम्।
समविश्वणंतुं भवविलेन भारमः। ॥ ॥

Adhy. 71
तान्त्रिकवाशादान काण्यो विवचारश्चारातः।
तस्मात पुनरागमन योधवंचिकरे दुरानतः॥

Adhy. 73
खत्तिकेशे कर्णं महे दृष्ट्स्त्वमहोदृष्टसः।
क्षार्भवीयं तो विश्व त्तारः भिन्नरेण्यः। ॥
हृदु: दुहितरे काण्यो देवविश्वमेति वने।
भाद्रां संसंप्रिच्च सुविश्वो वान्यविश्ववः। ॥ ॥

Adhy. 76
इहं न मे सबी दासी वगाम कर्ता गामिनः।
हृदु: दानंत्रेयवस्य अधिने युग्मविश्वः। ॥ ॥

Adhy. 81
तपं वर्तीण्यवचः राजविष्याते सुभिन्नमातमः।
चरितं प्रागुलिच्छ्यामि दिवं चेष्ट च सर्वेः। ॥

Adhy. 91
अथ गहा सारकेश्वा समवापाप्तिवामः।
तर्थम् व न: समुपवं माहेतेन वालिग्रामः। ॥
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Adhy. 93
स वाहिनिःतपत्तेपे विवाहसंतस्रवं
बधे पुष्पकुंद्रां श्रेष्ठम् शास्त्रोपमादिके ॥ ७
अस्या क्षीरे चित्राण्ये वाहिनी तो वै कृष्णमे
विध वृषसहस्राणां सारोत्सप्तप्रभुवन् ॥ १९
एतदेववास पुराणा तदानुभयेतमस्मारः
तमुवाचारवचारी वतारी विन्दसामः ॥ २०

Adhy. 94
स कदाचिहृदे याहो यथागमामितो नतीमौ
महापतिरिवेद्यावज्ञ प्रजातिसृष्टिनिः ॥ ४१
ततस्य कदाचिच्छिद्विवतः व्याहं धानामार्यं
पुनरं देववतीमेव पिरंते वाक्यमानविना ॥ ५४

Adhy. 96
हुईं यतमानानामसः सह निकलस्तः
जगाणामार्यान्तः कौरण्यो भस्यायामः ॥ ५८

Adhy. 102
हानानि प्रहस्ति इत्तता सुपहिष्ठः
गन्वस्तिः च मायायिः रहस्तिः फलानि च ॥ ३

Adhy. 117
तथा विश्वाकुलाणं महान्वितकोरभवति
न कविद्विरोधीयामायामिता मुदयिः ॥ १२

[९०] Adhy. 125
अश्वमार्याः च सहिते आत्रुणां भारुङ्गजायम्
हुयोवनमात्रायमुल्लितं पर्णवार्यति ॥ ३१

Adhy. 127
समालोकं चं ततुस्त्याक्षं पितुगौरवयशितानि
कणोंविन्याख्याति: शरसं वसवन्तु ॥ २
ततं गार्जवश्चाय पदार्थे समाहि: ॥ ३
हुनेति परिप्रथायात्मसाध्यकरः ॥ ३
ततो हुयोवन: कौपाशुपन्त महाकालः
आतुपचनात्मसामायांस्य इस ध्रुवः ॥ ५

Adhy. 132
पाण्डवा उत्तराणं श्रीवद्यावक्तमाः
उस्तर्वे किकतमानं पुत्रानां शासनादात ॥ ६

Adhy. 138
सत्मानुवात्व वर्य इत्तहि महादुपालिता: ॥
कां विद्यां प्रत्येकस्यां प्रहासम: हैदासमृतसमः ॥ १५

Adhy. 139
वेण्ण जामालिः के कविते श्रेष्ठं वान्मार्याः
मात्रेते बल्बानांस्य धर्मं हत्यायेज्यात ॥ ८

Adhy. 152
स तदात्मुपादम गतो बभवन् प्रति
तेन नुम बन्धेदतन्त्रे लोकक्तते हतमः ॥ १७

Adhy. 158
विरोहेण जयः महायानं धर्मसमः
चातुर्मात्रिः च चक्रवर्धीसताद्विमसः ॥ ३०
अश्रुप्रलस्य निविष्येक्ये दृश्ये मे रथ उदयः
सोइ निश्चर्धे सुधा नाम दशवराये: भवमः ॥ ३४

Adhy. 159
नवं च बल्मस्मार्य भूया आभारकेष्टे
पल्लताः तां कौन्तेय हिवारे महापरिशास्त्र: ॥ १६

Adhy. 161
सहवंशो तयो विश्वासार्थित: इत्तताधिपथितः
वशिष्ठनिपिति प्रियता च चासाने नवेदमाः ॥ १५

Adhy. 170
गमीनिः पयत्र युथं युस्मां प्रति हुतं
तदात्मुपासना गमेन्य मया चैव श्रीवद्यावक्त ॥ ३

Adhy. 192
अथ हुयोवनो राजा विनम्यां आत्रुणिः सह ॥
अश्वस्तमार्यां मात्तेन फलम न दोषम च ॥ ९

Adhy. 194
विक्रमं च श्रव्योवतिः श्रव्येष्य विश्वि पते ॥
वक्रो हि द्यमे: शुरुणां विवेशां पार्श्वक्रामः ॥ १८
ते च वेलां कर्ष जयि महागहां नवेदाया
प्रभावं हुप्रस्तुत्रां नीत्तमायमस्त: पाण्डवाः ॥ १६
critical notes; of these about [91] thirty have no variants at all, while the remaining (seventy) show only insignificant variants, such as transposition, substitution of synonyms, and so on. The number of the latter class of stanzas could naturally be easily augmented, by increasing the latitude of permissible variation. Being handed down uniformly in all manuscripts alike, they may be regarded as authentic (as least as far as manuscript evidence goes), forming so to say, pieces of firm bedrock in the shifting quicksands of Mahâbhârata poetry. As such they will be valuable for the study of epic style, diction, vocabulary and so on.

To return to the question of text reconstruction. The rule arising out of the agreement between independent recensions or versions is easy to comprehend and simple to apply; only its sphere of operation is rather restricted. Difficulties arise when there is fluctuation; and that is the normal state. When there was fluctuation, the choice fell, as a corollary of the previous rule, upon a reading which is documented by the largest number of (what prima facie appear to be) more or less independent versions, and which is
supported by intrinsic probability. Diagrammatically we might represent the types as follows:

(i) \( N_1 = S = \text{Text.} \) (ii) \( N = S_1 = \text{Text.} \) (iii) \( N_1 = S_1 = \text{Text.} \)

\( N_2 \quad S_2 \quad N_2 \quad S_2 \)
\( N_3 \quad S_3 \quad N_3 \quad S_3 \)
\( \text{etc.} \quad \text{etc.} \quad \text{etc.} \quad \text{etc.} \)

The presumption of originality in these cases is frequently confirmed by a lack of definite agreement between the discrepant versions. The commonest application of this rule is when \( S, K \) or \( B \) (with or without \( D \)) agree with \( S \) against their own agnates. Numerous examples of this type of agreement have been adduced above (pp. LIV, LXII).

Occasionally we get “double” agreement, that is, agreement between two or more groups of each recension \( (N_1 = S_1 \text{ and } N_2 = S_2) \); for example, when

(1) \( S, K = M \), and simultaneously \( B = TG \),
(2) \( S, K = TG \), and simultaneously \( B = M \).

Here one of the agreements must, generally speaking, be accidental, since both can hardly be original; and either may be adopted, if they have equal intrinsic merit. Owing to the much greater correctness and reliability of \( S, K \), I have, as a rule, adopted the readings of this group, other things being equal.

When the two recensions have alternate readings: neither of which can have come from the other and which have equal intrinsic merit \( (N : S) \), I have, for the sake of consistency and with a view to avoiding unnecessary and indiscriminate fusion of versions, adopted, as a stop-gap, the reading of \( N \). This rule is of very common application, since one constantly comes across readings which are but paraphrases of each other and between which it is impossible to discriminate. Examples of such alternative readings are:

\[ \begin{array}{l|l}
N & S \\
--- & --- \\
1. 23 & \text{महर्षः पूजितस्येद्य सर्वलोके महात्मन:} & 1. 23 & \text{महर्षः सबैोकेकु पूजितस्य महात्मनः} \\
1. 51 & \text{धन्यं भारविन्दु परे} & 1. 51 & \text{केषभाद्रस्य भारणि} \\
54. 3 & \text{तैतत्त्विकाद्यमहात्म्यः} & 54. 3 & \text{तैतत्त्विकाद्य महात्म्यः} \\
57. 30 & \text{मृत्युकामशेष्य भार्यतः} & 57. 30 & \text{सर्वेच्छादश्य भूमकः} \\
60. 9 & \text{द्राक्षिण्यात्तत्त्विकाद्यमहात्म्यः} & 60. 9 & \text{अङ्कुशाशिरिणात्तत्त्विकाद्यमहात्म्यः} \\
60. 10 & \text{बामाद्या तत्त्विकाद्यमहात्म्यः} & 60. 10 & \text{महात्म्यस्य भार्यां तत्त्विकाद्यमहात्म्यः} \\
[92]65. 20 & \text{एतत्त्विकाद्यमहात्म्यः} & 65. 20 & \text{द्वारस्य भार्यां तत्त्विकाद्यमहात्म्यः} \\
65. 35 & \text{एतत्त्विकाद्य:} & 65. 35 & \text{चौन्याणिकं कर्मः} \\
65. 35 & \text{तथाज्ञापन मौ विप्पो} & 65. 35 & \text{विभेद्यास्मात्} \\
65. 35 & \text{तथा पत्यज्ञापन} & 65. 35 & \text{विभेद्यास्मात्} \end{array} \]
When the above tests break down or when they give only a negative result, the expedient adopted by me was to find a reading which best explains how the other readings may have arisen. The true reading in this case has often proved to be a lectio difficilior, or an archaism or a solecism, the desire to eliminate them being the cause of the variation. Here follow some examples of variation due to the lectio difficilior:

57. 7 ऊँ : "udder" (v. l. ऊँ, ऊँ, ऊँ, ऊँ, ऊँ, ऊँ, ऊँ, ऊँ, ऊँ)

57. 29 मांजल: proper name (v. l. मांजल, मांजल, मांजल, etc.)

96. 16 चाहिया from चाहि "shining" (v. l. चाहें, हैमाना)

98. 13 कन्या (doublet of कन्यासु) "younger" (v. l. कन्य, मा गम: कन्यासु)

98. 18 सुख्दृ (v. l. सुख्दृ, सुख्दृ, सुख्दृ, etc.)

102. 18 चामिलो (v. l. वा लिमो, बालिता, चामिलता)

103. 13 नान्यश्रीयां (v. l. नान्यश्रीय, नान्य धमे, नान्यसौरां, नान्यधियां, etc.).

**Emendation**

Emendation has played a very inconspicuous rôle in the preparation of the constituted text. Interpretaion has in general been given preference over emendation. Even in the case of corrupt passages, the reading of some manuscript or other gives sense, though it may not be the original sense, not even a wholly satisfactory sense. Precipitate emendation is, however, to be deprecated; for experience has shown that but a small proportion of scholars' corrections are really amendments. Moreover, in this special case, we know, as yet, too little about the epic idiom and the epic world altogether; as also about the vicissitudes of the epic text. Besides, who can say that the original was linguistically uniform, and conformed to any particular norm?
would be the style of a work which in the main is obviously a compilation?

The text, as it has been fixed by me, contains about 35 emendations. The corrections are generally very slight, being concerned mostly with single isolated words, never with whole passages. Wherever even a single letter has been added, omitted or altered, without the authority of any of the manuscripts, I have inserted an asterisk (*) in the text.

Only in very few instances do the emendations effected in this edition make any difference to the sense, e.g. 1. 41. 5 गतेः तां तां लक्षणिणिच्छति, where the word (श)तान् has been [93] added to the pāda, a word found only in D2; the other readings are: गतेः तां लक्षणिणि, गतेः लक्षणि, गतेः लक्षणिणि, गतेः लक्षणिणि, गतेः लक्षणिणि (hypermetric!), गतेः लक्षणिणि, गतेः लक्षणिणि, गतेः लक्षणिणि, seven combinations, each having a different syllable between त and ना। In a few cases the emendation affects merely some grammatical form of the stanza in question; e.g. 1. 86. 5 अवतिपँजीः नाप्रहस्ति, where the readings for नाप्रहस्ति are विप्रहस्ति, अप्रहस्ति, वाप्रहस्ति, (corruption of last?), गुणात्मकः, गुणावैश्वर्ण, न गुह्ष्टाः (hypermetric!).

But the large majority of our emendations concern merely metre and sandhi. My study of the manuscript material led me to the conclusion that there was an ever growing antipathy, firstly, to hypermetric pādas, in fact to any form of metrical irregularity; and, secondly, to forms of sandhi not sanctioned or countenanced by Pāṇini’s great grammar. In particular, there is noticeable a strong aversion to hiatus, even where it was permitted by rules of grammar. HIatus between pādas also came to be disapproved and was removed by such expedients as that of adding a meaningless हे, त् or न at the beginning of the posterior pāda.

Manuscripts betray the surreptitious efforts of the scribes and redactors to eliminate hiatus (sometimes even when it is grammatically permissible) in the following instances among others: 1. 2. 91 (between pādas) ज्ञाताः। उद्देश्या पाँच संगमः; 2. 130 दशवचा धातुरक्षितः (8 readings); 2. 150 यत्र राजा ज्ञाताः। 2. 212 तत्त्वं ज्ञाताः। 9. 11 (between pādas) अभाषण। विनिविहः; 15. 2 ईन्द्रः धातुरक्षितः। 21. 3 काल धातुरक्षितः। 33. 18 ध्वनिक्षत्वस्य क्रियः; 33. 22 बा अर्धे न नित्ये एवः। 36. 7 सः क्षयः (v. 1. सः हृदेः, सः तृतीयः); 41. 8 गतेः अनिलायोल्यः; 41. 21 गतेः दीना अवोल्यः (v. 1. अवोल्यः); 45. 13 (between pādas) कुछु। उत्तरायणायहार (v. 1. चौतरः, सीतारः, धृतरः); 50. 17 राजा वधः क्रियान्तः (v. 1. चौतरः) हस्ताः; 60. 4 निचिन्त्राय बक्षः (v. 1. रावणाय, रा हाषः, रायनाः); 65. 24 (between pādas) हृदेः। उदः (S चेष्टाः; 72. 22 न त्रयेः इसः (S देवादेवः); 76. 18 भक्तिः भक्तिपुरस्त (v. 1. भक्तिपूर्वः, भक्तिपूर्वः, भक्तिपूर्वः, स्वक्तिः); 83. 3 तौलका अनातव (v. 1. हानः, बनः, चानः); 84. 13 महती त्रयः वैः; 85. 8 तथा अत्यातशीतिः परिस्तारणः (v. 1. तथात्वातीत घो च पर्यं); 94. 38 नेन्या गणाय (धानः, सीताः, चानः); 96. 42 (between pādas) काठेन। अत्यक्षाशः (v. 1. भस्माकः, लत्यकः, सीताकः, त्वस्तकः, सोम्यकः); 98. 8 अस्त्वचेती अहः (v. 1. नाहः, बहः, त्यहः
It is evident that sandhi was originally more flexible. It is only in later phases of literature that writers make a shibboleth of it.

Similar efforts to correct hypermetric lines may be seen from:

20. 2 विनततं विगणवदनं (v. 1. विगणश्च विनतं, विनता दीनवदनं, विगणवदनं कंदु:)

78. 23 लवित सकावस काव्यस्य (v. 1. शीर्षं and हतं for लवितं; also पिछु: लवितं लवितं, लविता काव्यस्य)

92. 4. करवाणी किं ते करवाणी, (v. 1. किं ते करोभि करवाणी, करवाणी किमांि, किं ते करवाणी करते)

94. 74 बलवत्सपलतसम्र (सापत्वम् बलवत्, तव सापत्, भई सपत्).

Owing to the increasing sensitiveness to solecism, we find likewise different efforts made, independently of each other, to purge the text of what came to be regarded as stylistic blunders or corruptions in the ancient text. Examples of attempts made to [94] remove solecisms are: 1. 1. 190 श्र श कङटित (v. 1. वैनाने च, वे बताते च); 2. 93 यद्रण यथ यं धरण प्रश्ने, यथा चायरण तत्सै; 7. 26 पुलोकस्य (v. 1. पुलोकस्य, अंग्रेजी, अंग्रेजी); 9. 2 सन्यम्य (v. 1. सन्यम्य, मला); 21. 6 पक्षभावावन (फ़ारोस अर्केथस); 43. 14 इत्यादि (v. 1. इत्यादि); 46. 37 शास्त्रीय (v. 1. शास्त्रीय); 48. 24 छा बायसमान (v. 1. बायसमान); 96. 44 यथा इटिताविश्व (v. 1. इटिताविश्व); 123. 16 तस्यकारणं यथा (v. 1. कारणामात्र); 124. 24 उद्धारो पशु पशु पशु (v. 1. उद्धारो पशु पशु पशु); 141. 7 नक्काराय (v. 1. हि or हि नक्काराय); 151. 23 यथा राशिः (v. 1. राशिः); 154. 24 मार्गमार्गायास्त्रायाम (v. 1. मार्गमार्गायाम); 165. 24 बलवत्सपलतसम्र न नन्द्र dn. 1. हिंदू च बलवत्सपलतसम्र etc.); 169. 20 शास्त्र तालाव (v. 1. श्रेष्ठ महीनां श्रेष्ठ महीनां etc.); 184. 18 धरति (v. 1. धरति, कदवालि, चरवाणी, धियाणी; जीवनि, वधति, हरस्ति); etc., etc.

I add examples of hypermetric पदाः (generally with the scheme बलवत्सपलतसम्र), which are the result of emendation: 1. 30. 7 प्रतिक्षुषाति भूति (०; 1. 155. 35 अन्धितं श्रेष्ठ महीनां).
And, finally, examples of *hiatus* as the result of emendation:

| 51. 8 अथः*इतः: स्वयोचाज्ञाम  | 110. 28 यदि *अवां महाबल  |
| 57. 20 फिरस उत्तरः दृष्टः  | 116. 25 तथ्येष्यां *अनुमन्तां  |
| 98. 8 अन्यायकी *अहिन्दा  | 119. 11 तथेऽतुरे *अभिवक्या  |
| 99. 15 त्यो च *अभितुरः  | 147. 2 तौराणीश्च *आनायतः  |
| 100. 2 लिखिते *आगमिष्ठति  | 148. 1 विदिता *अपकृष्टः  |
| 103. 5 शूर्ते द्वारः कन्या *अनुस्पः  | 157. 13 वषबद्यक्स्वरः *उजः  |
| कुलस्य न: ।  | 207. 17 कुजे *अभिमन्नभूष्टः  |
| 110. 20 नाय तापरस्ते मर्यम *अवीयेभ्यजो-  | 214. 9 धमराजे *अतिभोगः  |
| चिते ।  | 224. 5 संतप्यमाना ( sing. ) *अभिनो  |

It is important to remember that emendation has been resorted to merely for the purpose of unifying divergent and conflicting manuscript evidence, never in opposition to clear and unanimous testimony of manuscripts. The emendations are thus not amendments of the text in the ordinary sense of the word, made in order to eke out a better sense when the manuscripts yield no sense or an unsatisfactory sense; they are rather an effort to find, so to say, a hypothetical focus towards which the discrepant readings converge.

**THE "ADDITIONAL" PASSAGES**

The uniformity of the interrelationship of the different manuscripts, versions or recensions, as has been already explained, is disturbed chiefly by comparison and conflation of manuscripts. A constant and fruitful source of confusion, as was pointed out above, has always been the marginalia. A more dangerous and troublesome source was the practice of incorporating into one's text—without stating the source and without much explanatory comment—passages found in other versions. It may be surmised that celebrated places of pilgrimage like Ujjayini, Rāmeśvaram, Kāśi, and others, with recitations of the epics held periodically in their famous shrines, have played an important rôle in the dissemination of the knowledge of local versions among the pious visiting pilgrims, whose number undoubtedly included the bards and the professional reciters of the epics.

[95] Much light is thrown on the origin of these misch-codices by the MS. K₄, a manuscript belonging to the Bombay Government Collection deposited at the Institute. In this manuscript we find long extracts from other cognate versions (such as γ) as also from the Southern recension, written out on separate folios and inserted at appropriate places in the body of the manuscript, with the words अन्यौऽययमेव written on the margin of the original

---

1 Bāpa’s Kādambari (ed. Peterson, p. 61) refers to a recitation of the Mbh. on the fourteenth day of the half month in the temple of Mahākāla at Ujjain, which the queen attends.
folio, near the place where the passage is to be interpolated. Should this manuscript happen to be copied again and should the copyist insert the passage at the place indicated by the previous scribe, the interpolation would become an integral part of the new text which is externally absolutely indistinguishable from the rest of the text.

This leads us to the question of "additional" passages in general. Our attitude with regard to them is quite clear, in my opinion. The first and foremost source of our knowledge as to what the Mahābhārata comprises, is and must remain the manuscript evidence itself. For example, the question—which seems to trouble a great many people, judging by the inquiries on the point received at the Institute—whether the Uttaragītā, Gajendramoksā and Anusmṛti are parts of the Mahābhārata, must be answered by the manuscripts themselves. If none of our manuscripts contain these passages, it is prima facie evidence that they are not parts of the Mahābhārata. There is nothing to suggest that our Mahābhārata manuscripts have suffered any serious loss at any time. There never was any lack of manuscripts, many of which were preserved carefully in temples, and which must have been copied repeatedly, for the enhancement of merit. There is no evidence of any break in the tradition at any time or any place, within the confines of India at least. The probable inference is that our manuscripts contain all that was there originally to hand down, and more. What late writers and commentators have said about passages not found in our manuscripts is always a matter of secondary importance; it cannot ipso facto nullify or override the primary evidence of manuscripts. Such extrinsic testimony has only local or personal value; it can always be rebutted by the evidence of the Mahābhārata manuscripts.

Likewise, whether an episode, adhyāya, passage, stanza or line may be regarded as belonging to the Mahābhārata or not must primarily depend upon whether the manuscripts contain it. Extrinsic evidence, in so far as it is valid, will principally hold good only for the period or locality to which it belongs. Intrinsic evidence may be considered; but, being of a subjective character, it must be used with caution. Our primary evidence being the manuscripts themselves, we are bound to view with suspicion, as a matter of principle, any part of the text which is found only in one recension, or only in a portion of our critical apparatus. Therefore, the evidence for such passages as are contained only in one manuscript, or a small group of manuscripts or versions, or even in a whole recension must be pronounced to be defective. Consequently, all lines belonging to one recension only, and a fortiori such as pertain to a combination of manuscripts amounting to less than a recension, for which there is nothing corresponding in the other recension and which are not absolutely necessary for the context—all lines, in short, with a defective title—have been placed in the footnotes or the Appendix, pending further inquiry regarding their credentials.
Such passages are not all necessarily spurious. There might be a hundred good reasons why the questionable passages are missing in a particular recension or version. It might conceivably be, for instance, that the shorter recension represents (as certain [96] scholar has said) “a mutilated and hastily put together composition of the Middle Indian Redactors, who could not lay their hands on all manuscripts of the Mahābhārata.”¹ The shorter version might again be, theoretically, a consciously abridged or expurgated version. Or, more simply, the omission might be due to mere oversight of some scribe who had quite unintentionally omitted the defaulting passage and this mistake of the first scribe had been perpetuated by the other copyists. And so on and so forth. But all these are mere possibilities. All these reasons in general and particular must be adduced and proved, or at least made probable, in any given case. Moreover, the manuscripts clearly show that there has been in progress, through centuries, constant comparison of manuscripts. In view of this circumstance, the explanation that the omission of a passage in a whole version might be due to a scribe’s omission loses much of its force. Omission is as much a fact in Mahābhārata textual tradition as addition. And it is fair to demand of a person who alleges the authenticity of such one-recension passages why the rival recension does not contain it.²

The general condemnation of a recension or version that it is mutilated, merely on the ground that it lacks certain passages that are found in a rival recension or version, is entirely meaningless; for the argument might easily be reversed, so that the controversy will resolve merely into mutual vituperation. What I mean is this. From the fact that one of the recensions, say N, does not contain a certain passage or a certain set of passages found in another, say S, it is illogical to argue that N is a mutilated version; because such an argument can with equal cogency be applied to S, in regard to certain other passages that are missing in S but found in N. The point is so important and at the same time so difficult to grasp that I shall endeavour to make my meaning clearer with the help of a concrete illustration. My contention is this. From the fact that the Southern recension contains, say, the Nālāyanī episode (App. I, No. 100), which is missing in the Northern recension, it would be illogical to argue that the Northern recension is defective

or mutilated; because one can, with equal cogency, seek to establish the mutilation or deflection of the Southern recension by pointing, say, to the Gapeśa passage, which is found only in certain Northern manuscripts and is entirely missing in the Southern manuscripts. The argument could have been employed with greater semblance of reason and plausibility, had there been only a mere plus or minus on either side, but is entirely without cogency in the present instance where there are both additions and omissions on both sides.

[97] Originality and authenticity are, unfortunately, not the prerogative of any single recension or version or manuscript. They must be established, laboriously, chapter by chapter, line by line, word by word, syllable by syllable. The optimistic view that any extant manuscript, however old and trustworthy, of some favoured version or recension, could give us, with a few additions and alterations, the text of Vyāsa’s Bhārata or Mahābhārata is the index of a naïve mentality and does not need any elaborate refutation.

The argument in favour of any particular recension or version or text is frequently sought to be strengthened by a reference to the authority of the Parvasaṃgraha (Adi 2), a week reed on which every tyro leans rather heavily in the beginning, and it would be well to examine the argument here.

THE PARVASAṂGRAHA ARGUMENT

Until lately high hopes had been entertained that the Parvasaṃgraha-parvan (Adi 2) would supply the clue to the solution of the perplexing question of the reconstruction of the original Mahābhārata. But the paradoxical situation created by the circumstance that two different editors of the Virāṭaparvan, both of whom rely mainly on the data of the Parvasaṃgraha for establishing the originality and authenticity of their respective texts, have produced critical editions of that parvan which differ by no less than 1467 stanzas, has created grave misgivings in the minds of unbiassed critics as to whether the Parvasaṃgraha can render us any help at all in reconstructing the text of the Mahābhārata, and these misgivings appear justified by the facts of the case.

The exaggerated importance which the late Mr. Utgikar was inclined to attach to the numerical data of the Parvasaṃgraha, was, I believe, mainly, if not wholly, due to his mistaken belief that there was complete agreement between the two rival recensions in all material particulars as regards the text of this adhyāya. This erroneous and wholly unfounded notion seems to

---

2 Lüders, op. cit. p. 43, justly asks: "Wenn aber die Grantha-recension Zusätze erfuhr, warum sollen wir denn annehmen, dass die Nāgarī-recension von ihnen verschont geblieben sei?"


3 Mr. Utgikar’s text contains only 2033 stanzas; while in Professor Sastri’s Southern Recension, the Virāṭaparvan has 3500 stanzas! And both are said to be supported by manuscript authority.
have been induced by the ambiguous and thoroughly misleading character of the text of the Khumbhakonam edition, which claims to be an edition "mainly based on South Indian texts", but presents a version of this adhyāya which has been unblushingly copied from the Bombay and Calcutta editions, ignoring wholly the Southern divergences, which are quite considerable.

Not only are there discrepancies between the two recensions as regards the numbers of the adhyāyas and the ślokas in the various parvans, there is no complete agreement even between the different versions of the same recension. Take, for instance, the case of the Ādi parvan itself. Our constituted text (following the Sāradā codex) gives (1. 2. 96) the number of ślokas in the Ādi as 7884. But this is not the only reading of that number. For the digit representing the thousands alone, the choice lies between seven, eight, nine and ten! There can, therefore, be no doubt that the text of this adhyāya also has been tampered with and designedly altered, from time to time in various ways, in order to make it harmonize with the inflated version of a later epoch. It will thus have to be admitted that the Parvasamgraha argument is of secondary importance and must not be pressed too far.

Be that as it may, it is extremely problematic whether we could make any use whatsoever of the Parvasamgraha enumeration of ślokas in the case of the Ādi at least, because it will be difficult to compute the extent of this parvan and that for two reasons. Firstly, because this parvan, as is well known, contains two lengthy prose adhyāyas (3 and 90). Taking the figure of the Parvasamgraha to represent the exact extent of the whole of the Ādi, it is not clear how the prose portions were computed by the compilers of the Parvasamgraha. Most of the modern computers add the numbers of stanzas to the number of their respective prose sections, and arrive at the length of the Ādi in ślokas! But this is bad arithmetic. P. P. S. SASTRI offers a solution which is more ingenious than convincing. He holds the compiler of the Parvasamgraha down to the letter of his statement. The Parvasamgraha tells us, says SASTRI, merely the number of ślokas which the different parvans contain. Nothing is said about the prose sections. He therefore ignores the prose adhyāyas in computing the extent of the Ādi, and is satisfied that his text exactly agrees with the data of the Parvasamgraha!

The other difficulty in the way of using the Parvasamgraha figure in the case of the Ādi is that this parvan contains a large number of Tristubh stanzas, which again introduce an element of uncertainty in the computation. Was each Tristubh stanza counted as one śloka; or did the Bhārata-cintakas (mentioned in 1. 2. 172) compute the exact equivalent of the long-metre stanzas in ślokas? It is difficult to say. The difference in the reckoning will be, however, between 40 and 50 per cent. of the total! As a very rough estimate, the Ādi may contain something like 500 long-metre stanzas. This factor alone would introduce a difference of about 225 stanzas!
These are some of the obvious difficulties in the way of making any practical use of the figure recorded in the Parvasaṁgraha for text-critical purposes. The computation may have some value in the case of a parvan in which there is no prose at all, which is almost wholly in anuṣṭubh metre, and for which finally the Parvasaṁgraha figure is certain, the manuscript evidence being unanimous.

It is quite within the range of probability that the apparent extent of the critical text of a parvan may fall appreciably below or rise appreciably above the figure recorded in the Parvasaṁgraha, as is actually the case with other editions. Moreover, unless it can be made probable that the compilation of this "Table of Contents" is nearly contemporaneous with the present redaction of the Great Epic, these discrepancies will be without much cogency in matters relating to the constitution of the text. The value of a manuscript, version, or printed text of the Mahābhārata must not be thought to depend exclusively or even mainly upon its agreement with or discrepancy from the numerical data of the Parvasaṁgraha. It must in final analysis be regarded as depending upon the place it occupies in a logical and convincing scheme formulated to explain the evolution of the different extant versions and types of Mahābhārata manuscripts.

It should further be carefully borne in mind that even if there be exact agreement as to extent between the Parvasaṁgraha and any constituted text, this fact alone is no guarantee of the absolute correctness of the entire text, line for line, because the same number of stanzas could be made up in innumerable different ways by accepting and rejecting stanzas of doubtful authenticity and uncertain documentation, of which there is always a plentiful supply in every parvan. The difficulty will finally not be solved even if we happen to light upon a unique manuscript which agrees with the Parvasaṁgraha exactly as to the number of stanzas in any particular parvan and we should adopt its verbatim; because there is every probability that while it satisfies the one criterion of extent given by the Parvasaṁgraha, it may not satisfy, in every respect, other and more exacting critical tests, when compared line by line and word by word with other extant manuscripts.

In the above discussion I have implicitly assumed, as is done by most writers on the subject, that the word stōka in the Parvasaṁgraha chapter has the usual meaning "stanza". This interpretation was called into question, by the late Mahamahopadhyaya Haraprasad Shastri, who offered a new interpretation, which I cannot but think is far more plausible, although I do not agree with all the conclusions he deduces therefrom.

The really valuable discovery of the Mahamahopadhyaya, in my opinion, is that the word stōka cannot mean here stanza or verse or anything of the kind, but must denote (as in the parlance of scribes and vendors of manuscripts) a unit of measurement of written matter, comprising 32 syllables
of akṣaras.\textsuperscript{1} The difficulty of computing prose passages and the long-metre-stanzas mentioned above finds a satisfactory solution at once in this interpretation of the word “śloka”. And that is moreover the only interpretation of the word which, as far as I can see, can successfully solve that difficulty, in view of the circumstance that the text is heterogeneous, consisting of ślokas, prose, and long-metre stanzas. But in this supposition we shall have to count, not only the actual text (consisting of prose and verse), but the whole of the written matter. And that enumeration, whether it be 7884, 8884, 9884 or 9984, will include not only the text properly so called but also the colophons and the hundreds of the prose formulaic references (like \textit{वेदप्रायण उत्तर}) besides perhaps the captions of adhyāyas, sub-parvans and parvans, and even the numerical figures denoting the numbers of ślokas, and so on.

The number of adhyāyas in our edition (225) does not tally with the number given in the Parvasaṅgraha (218), any more than in any of the previous editions: the Calcutta edition of the Ādi has 234 adhyāyas, the Bombay editions vary between 234 and 236, while the Kumbhakonam edition reaches the astonishing figure 260, though the Parvasaṅgraha figure in the case of each of these latter editions is the same, 227.

It may be pointed out that the adhyāya division in our extant manuscripts is extremely arbitrary. The average length of our adhyāyas should be about 35 stanzas; but adhy. 12 and 22 of our edition contain only 5 stanzas each, while adhy. 57 (to mention only one instance) has over 100 stanzas. As regards the contents of the adhyāyas also there is much inconsistency. Thus we frequently find that one adhyāya ends with the remark that a certain person spoke as follows, and his speech, which may be quite short, forms the beginning of the following adhyāya. Then again the manuscripts are far from being unanimous in the matter of marking the colophons: they show in fact wild \([100]\) fluctuations. Even the reading of the Parvasaṅgraha figure is not entirely free from doubt (e.g. our Ṣāradā codex gives the number of the adhyāyas as 230!), though the reading 218 seems highly probable.

Under these circumstances, nothing would be easier than to manipulate the colophons, by arbitrarily combining the conflicting data of the different recensions or versions or even manuscripts and arriving at \textit{any required} figure. This has actually been done by Professor P. P. S. SASTRI in his edition of the Southern Recension, which thereby achieves the dubious distinction of being the only edition of the Ādiparvan in which the adhyāya number agrees exactly with the Parvasaṅgraha figure but the colophons are mostly at the wrong places. This procedure is the less excusable in his case.

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. Haraprasada SHASTRI, \textit{A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal}, Vol. 5, Preface, pp. xxxii, xxxv, xxxvii, xlix.
as he is at great pains to create the impression that he is just reproducing the text of one selected manuscript, correcting only "scriptorial" blunders. Now his basic manuscript (I or = our $G_5$) divides the Adi into two separate major parvans, Adiparvan and Sambhavaparvan, with 40 and 200 numbered adhyayas respectively, which makes a total of 240 adhyayas, and which is nearer the Kumbhakonam figure (260) than the Parvasamgraha figure (218). While correcting "scriptorial blunders", Professor SASTRI has, so to say, spirited away 22 colophons before our very eyes.

A more careful study of the manuscript evidence may tend to reduce the discrepancy between the constituted text and the data of the Parvasamgraha as regards the number of the adhyayas, or at any rate may enable us to account for the difference, though at present it seems impossible to harmonize the manuscript evidence (consisting of the actual colophons) with the Parvasamgraha.

**INTERPOLATION.**

There has been an extraordinary reluctance among scholars to face the fact that the Mahabharata manuscripts may contain and do contain quantities of spurious matter. But there is now no excuse for such recalcitrance. The critical apparatus of this edition contains a unique record of hundreds of lines which are evidently and unquestionably spurious. Here is a list of passages from our Appendix, each found in one manuscript only: App. I, No. 2 (in K₄ marg.: containing 4 lines); No. 4 (K₃: 14 lines); No. 5 (B₄: 23 lines); No. 7 (G₁: 4 lines); No. 16 (K₄: 9 lines); No. 25 (D₅: 4 lines); No. 26 (B₄: 6 lines); No. 31 (K₄: 27 lines); No. 34 (K₄: 6 lines); No. 44 (D₃: 24 lines); No. 49-50 Da₁: 21 lines); No. 66 (D₄: 47 lines); No. 70 (G₁: 8 lines); No. 74 (B₄: 9 lines); No. 94 (D₄: 31 lines); No. 98 (D₄: 50 lines); etc., etc. These are passages from the Appendix alone, to which many of them have been relegated on account of either their length or their irrelevancy; but the foot-notes contain hundreds, nay thousands, of lines of precisely the same character. Then there are also lines which are found in only two or three manuscripts, of which I have counted some 300 instances. A number of new additions have been now given by Professor SASTRI, who has examined other Telugu and Grantha manuscripts for his edition of the Adi in the Southern recension. And I am fully persuaded that if we examine yet other manuscripts, we shall still find fresh passages which had never been seen or heard of before. No sane person would maintain that these are all original passages lost in all manuscripts except the few late and inferior manuscripts in which they happen to occur.

[101] It is not always easy, as has already been remarked, to prove that these "additional" passages are interpolations. The epic metre is easy to imitate; the epic grammar is flexible; the epic style is nondescript. The additional lines are generally fashioned with skill, and fitted in with cunning.
The following interpolated stanzas, by a poet aspiring after higher things, in fancy metre and classical style are rather exceptional:

1859*

भीम उच्चाच।
रे मुहुर्तो यदि भुवोऽविविष्ठं न किंचि-चाँक स्युहाजनि शुटां भ्रति पार्ष्टस्य।
जने स्युहाध कथमाणतमागां वा प्राणाथिके धनुरि तत्कथमाणहोज्यूरु।
कस्य द्रोणो धनुरि न गुहि स्वसित देवमर्ताय मन्द्राम्यसः कुचपितर्य श्रीसमुत्र्योविठाः।
रे कर्णः अश्वसूत महुरां ग्राहाणस्यायु वारणी राधा यत्रे रजव्यतु एवर्यतिध्यस्यस्यविहिम्।

An interesting instance of a passage which is betrayed by its contents is an extravaganza in some Grantha manuscripts. This bizarre interpolation describes among other things, with circumstantial detail, the marriage of Pārāśara and Satyavati (alias Matsyagandhā). At this ceremony, the shades of the ancestors of both the bride and the bridegroom are invoked, all the details of a regular Hindu marital rite are minutely observed, and the marriage is solemnized in the presence of Vasiṣṭha, Yājñavalkya and other great Rṣis living in the Naimiśa forest, with the distribution of baksheesh to Brahmans. It is an interesting speculation whether credulity can go so far as to regard even such passages as an authentic part of the original Mahābhārata or Bhārata of Vyāsa, just because the passage is found in some Mahābhārata manuscripts.

The foot-notes contain a rare selection of passages that are either palpably absurd, sometimes contradicting the immediate context, or else have little connection with the context in which they lie embedded: quotations, glosses, fanciful additions of details, the jetsam and flotsam of Mahābhārata poesie.

These bewildering fluctuations in the text are quite unique, being peculiar to the Mahābhārata. They are not found in the manuscripts of the Vedic literature or in those of grammatical, philosophical, or rhetorical texts or of the works of the classical poets and dramatists. This only proves that the Mahābhārata was peculiarly liable to inflation and elaboration.

When I say that the Mahābhārata manuscripts contain quantities of spurious additions, I intend no disparagement or condemnation of the text or of the manuscripts. The process is normal, inevitable and in a wider sense wholly right. If the epic is to continue to be a vital force in the life of any progressive people, *it must be a slow-changing book!* The fact of expurga-

---

1 App. I, Nos. 35-36.
 tion and elaboration is only an outward indication of its being a book of inspiration and guidance in life, and not merely a book lying unused and forgotten on a dusty book-shelf. Those are probably just the touches that have saved the Mahābhārata from the fate of being consigned to the limbo of oblivion, which has befallen its sister epics like the Gilgamesh.

[102] To give only one illustration. The awkwardness of the sexual relations of some of those epic characters of bygone ages must have been indeed a puzzle and a source of constant tribulation to the reciter of the epics (Paurāṇika), who was called upon to narrate, explain and justify those old-world stories to his devout and impressionable audiences, in the course of his recitations, which were, in the post-epic period, nothing more than edifying popular sermons. It is then no wonder that the shrewd ones among these pastors of the people, these professional keepers of their morals, should have occasionally taken the bull by the horns, so to say, and boldly added or substituted, bona fide, details which harmonized better with their own conceptions of right and wrong or with those of their pious flock.

A PROBLEM IN "TEXTUAL DYNAMICS"

After what has been said above, it is needless to add that the constituted text is based on all versions of both recensions and prepared on eclectic principles. I have given in the text whatever in each case appeared to be supported by the balance of probabilities, but all important deviations in the manuscripts are noted in the critical apparatus, so that every reader has, at his disposal, the entire material for controlling and correcting the constituted text, where necessary. All important elements of the text—lines, phrases, significant words and even word-parts—that are less than certain, are indicated by a wavy line printed below them. Slight differences in the spellings of words, of proper names (e.g. निरूप; निरूप) and some minor details (such as the expletives or the prose formulae शून्य उपाय शौतिष्काच, चुत: etc.) are ignored for this purpose. This device is, by nature, hard to apply strictly, and there are bound to be many inconsistencies in its application. I have retained it all the same with the express object of obviating all false sense of security. This wavy line, running through the entire length of the text, is to my mind, the symbol and constant remembrancer of this essential fact in Mahābhārata textual criticism that the Mahābhārata is not and never was a fixed rigid text, but is fluctuating epic tradition, a thème avec variations, not unlike a popular Indian melody. Our objective should consequently not to be to arrive at an archetype (which practically never existed), but to represent, view and explain the epic tradition in all its variety, in all its fullness, in all its ramifications. Ours is a problem in textual dynamics, rather than in textual statics.

To put it in other words, the Mahābhārata is the whole of the epic tradition: the entire Critical Apparatus. Its separation into the constituted text and the critical notes is only a static representation of a constantly changing
epic text—a representation made for purpose of visualizing, studying and analyzing the panorama of the more grand and less grand thought-movements that have crystallized in the shape of the texts handed down to us in our Mahābhārata manuscripts.

"WHAT IS THE CONSTITUTED TEXT?"

To prevent misconception in the mind of the casual reader, it is best to state at first what the constituted text is not. The editor is firmly convinced that the text [103] presented in this edition is not anything like the autograph copy of the work of its mythical author, Mahārṣi Vyāsa. It is not, in any sense, a reconstruction of the Ur-Mahābhārata or of the Ur-Bhārata, that ideal but impossible desideratum. It is also not an exact replica of the poem recited by Vaiśampāyana before Janamejaya. It is further wholly uncertain how close it approaches the text of the poem said to be recited by the Śūta (or Sauti) before Saunaka and the other dwellers of the Naimiṣa forest.

It is but a modest attempt to present a version of the epic as old as the extant manuscript material will permit us to reach, with some semblance of confidence. It is, in all probability, not the best text of the Great Epic, possible or existing, nor necessarily even a good one. It only claims to be the most ancient one according to the direct line of transmission, purer than the others in so far as it is free from the obvious errors of copying and spurious additions. It may be regarded, if the editor has done his work properly, the ancestor of all extant manuscripts, or, to be precise, of the manuscripts examined and collated for this edition. The constituted text cannot be accurately dated, nor labelled as pertaining to any particular place or personality. Since our manuscripts are comparatively modern, our text cannot claim to be very old. It goes without saying that (precisely like every other edition) it is a mosaic of old and new matter. That is to say, in an average adhyāya of this edition (as of any other edition) we may read a stanza of the second century B.C. followed by one written in the second century A.D. Sometimes the gap will occur in the middle of a line, precisely as in every other edition. This unevenness and these inequalities are inevitable, conditioned as they are by the very nature of the text and the tradition.

The Vulgate text of the Mahābhārata is fairly readable and will appear in places, at first sight, to be even "better" than the critical text, because the

---

1 Thus Professor SASTRI (Southern Recension, Vol. I, Introduction, p. xiii) writes about this edition: "Whilst the Poona edition lays claim to constitute the text of the Mahābhārata as closely as [103] possible to Vyāsa's version of the same, the principle underlying this edition" etc. Even Professor Sylvain LÉVI, in a review of this edition (J.A. Oct.—Dec. 1929, p. 347), wrote: "Si j’osais me permettre une suggestion dans ce domaine, je conseillerais à l’éditeur de renoncer, par pitié pour nous, à la part même du travail qui lui tient le plus à cœur et qui apporte à son esprit le plus de satisfaction, la reconstruction de "Ur-Mahābhārata" comme il se plait à dire", etc. (Italics mine!). Both statements are false!
former has been purged by the continuous emendations of scholars for centuries. A whole army of anonymous scholars and poets must have worked at the text to make it smooth and easy of comprehension, and to increase its popularity and usefulness by adding to it interesting anecdotes, incorporating into it current and popular versions and explanations, bringing it in a line with the ethical, moral, religious and political ideas of essentially different ages.

The reader will find that the constituted text is by no means smooth. It contains fresh instances of loose and archaic linguistic forms and constructions, anacoluthons and lack of syntactical concord. There remain many contradictions and superfluities. There is evident lack of finish in the hidden parts. These blemishes—if they be blemishes in epic poetry, which is dynamic poetry, with no necessary pretensions to niceties of style, in the narrower sense of the term—must have been inherent in the old poem. Where they are met with in the critical text, they are not speculative fiction; they are documented by the manuscripts themselves or at least are inferable from them with a high degree of probability.

[104] For the shortcomings mentioned above, the constituted text has merits also. It cleanses the text of puerile modern accretions and obvious errors of repetition, which lengthen and weaken the text. It solves a certain number of textual riddles (bogus kūlas), which were the outcome of long standing corruptions and unskilful conflation. It rescues from undeserved oblivion many an authentic archaism, which had been gradually ousted in the course of transmission of the text.

Sooner than print up the text of one manuscript, however reliable it may be, declining to shoulder the responsibilities attaching to the work of an editor, I have ventured on the perilous path of text reconstruction, in the hope and belief that it will present a more faithful picture of the original than any extant manuscript could do. That to prepare such a text is a phenomenally difficult task, no one can realize better than the editor himself. It is as certain as inevitable that in preparing a text like this the editor will frequently make blunders, even gross blunders.

It is to be feared that there is no royal road in this incomparably difficult field. The only path left open to us by which we may return to the original Mahābhārata or Bhārata is the rough, narrow, scientific foot-path of repeated trial and error. More than one attempt will probably have to be made before the ideal is attained. It will, therefore, be prudent not to claim too much for the first critical edition, nor to expect too much from it.

OTHER EDITIONS

Of the old editions it must be said that they are creditable performances, but they lack the critical apparatus. We do not know on what manuscripts they are based, according to what principles the editors have prepared the
text, information essential on account of the wild fluctuations of the manuscripts. That is why they have been almost wholly ignored in the present edition.

The editio princeps (Calcutta 1836) remains the best edition of the Vulgate, after the lapse of nearly a century. The later text editions, as is unfortunately too often the case with our editions, add to the editio princeps only a fresh crop of spurious lines and misprints.

The well-known pūṭhī-form Bombay editions (published by Ganpat Krishnaji in Saka 1799, and Gopal Narayan in 1913, and others), which include Nilakantha’s scholium, are supposed to represent Nilakantha’s text; but they contain many readings and lines which are not to be found in the Nilakantha manuscripts, and are therefore not wholly reliable.

The Kumbhakonam edition, which is said to be “mainly based on the South Indian texts”, is a fine representative of the composite Telugu version; it has been of immense help to me in the study of what may be called “conflate” readings. In former years its chief value lay in that it gave the reader glimpses, however imperfect and confused, of the important Southern recension. It is now rendered obsolete and superfluous by P. P. S. Sastri’s new edition of the Mahābhārata, which will presently be described, and which is unquestionably a better representative of the Southern tradition.

[105] The Grantha edition (Sarfojirajapuram 1896) and the old Telugu edition (Madras 1855) were not examined: they are not likely to contain anything of high importance that is not found in the other editions or manuscripts collated for this edition.

The editions accompanied by vernacular translations, which form a very numerous class, are mostly bad reprints of one or the other of the earlier (printed) editions and may be completely ignored here; they are perfectly useless for critical purposes.

The new edition¹ of the Southern recension of the Mahābhārata by Professor P. P. Subrahmanya Sastri of Madras, now in the course of publication, which has been referred to several times already, is a laudable attempt to supply a long-felt want. He deserves the cordial thanks of all lovers of Sanskrit literature in general and of the Great Epic in particular, for his courageously undertaking such a stupendous and exacting task and pursuing it steadfastly, single-handed, during the scanty leisure permitted by his official duties as Professor of Sanskrit in the Presidency College of Madras, and Editor of the Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the extensive library of the Saraswathi Mahal at Tanjore. The edition is in no

¹ The Mahābhārata, Southern Recension, critically edited by P. P. S. Sastri, B.A. (Oxon.), M.A. Professor of Sanskrit, Presidency College, Madras, etc. V. Rama-swami Sastrulu & Sons, Madras, 1931 ff.
sense rendered superfluous by the Critical Edition, although most of the information it contains is or will be included, in some shape or other, in the present edition. The gulf between the Northern and the Southern recensions is so vast, that it is extremely difficult, if not practically impossible, to reconstruct the Southern text, completely and correctly, from the critical notes of this edition.

The principles on which the text of this edition of the Southern recension of the Mahabharata is prepared have been set forth and briefly discussed above. The editor, it was pointed out, fondly cherishes the unfounded belief that he is printing a Grantha manuscript as it is, but consciously and unconsciously he has introduced so many important innovations, that the text, as a whole, must be pronounced to be eclectic; as eclectic as any text—at least as far as the Adiparvan is concerned—published so far. For far less important deviations from the manuscripts have I condemned, above, the editions of the Vulgate. Judged as an eclectic edition, it must be pronounced to be inferior. The principle Sastri has laid down is a simple one to follow; in fact nothing could be simpler; he is to print the text of a selected manuscript as it is, only correcting clerical errors. And it is to be greatly regretted that he does not follow rigorously this principle. He constantly flouts it, in pursuit of some imaginary norm. Clear as his principle is, his actual procedure is somewhat paradoxical. He has left innumerable minor "inferior" readings in possession of the text (when he could have with perfect confidence, if not certainty, put into his text the correct readings), because he ostensibly wants to present the text as it is in one selected manuscript; on the other hand, he has light-heartedly, on utterly insufficient grounds, effected very substantial additions (in one instance extending to 140 lines), omissions and other unwarranted alterations (such as transpositions of adhyayas), in the utterly mistaken (though unquestionably bona fide) belief that he is correcting only the "scriptorial blunders" of his exemplar, when they are in reality (as is shown by the evidence of cognate versions) nothing of the kind.

[106] The sub-title "Southern Recension" is perhaps a trifle ambitious, at least as far as the Adi is concerned; because, firstly, he has utilized only six Southern manuscripts (1 Telugu and 5 Granthas), even less than the number (18) of the Southern manuscripts collated for our edition; and, secondly, he has completely ignored one whole Southern version, the important Malayalam version, in my opinion, the most important of Southern versions.

Further, it may be questioned whether the edition deserves to be called a critical edition at all, since, as was pointed out above, the editor is avowedly aiming only at reproducing the text of one manuscript, categorically renouncing the obligation of the textual critic to restore the text, as far as possible, to its original form.
The inclusion in Sastri's text of a certain number of stray lines and even a few lengthy passages which are peculiar to the Northern recension and absolutely foreign to the Southern,\(^1\) throws much light on the unconscious process of the growth of the epic and the irresistible influence which the Vulgate exerts on a text that is coming into being, in other words, on that subtle process of textual osmosis (if I may term it so) by which the epic texts have become conflated. Sastri's explanations in his Introduction as well as his procedure elucidate much of the psychology for the ancient scribes and reductors, who have in the past shaped our Mahābhārata texts for us. Unconsciously he seems to have worked on the identical principles on which the ancient scribes have worked. His edition is a true lineal descendant of the Mahābhārata manuscripts of South India.

In preparing Appendix I of this edition (in which there is a strong preponderance of the Southern element), I had to go rather carefully over Sastri's text of the Adi, when I came across far too many inaccuracies in the passages for which I checked his text and critical notes with the collations of the manuscripts common to our critical apparatus. The critical notes of the edition leave much to be desired. He has mostly shown correctly the additional passages in the manuscripts examined by him; but he fails, as a rule, to note the transpositions, omissions, and above all repetitions, which often are, critically, highly significant, probably again in the erroneous belief that they are negligible "scriptorial blunders." Some of them are undoubtedly so, but not all. Likewise he has not always shown correctly the additions and omissions of the colophons, and yet he is evidently most anxious to reach the number 218, given by the Parvasāṃgraha. All deviations, however trivial they may seem to him, he should have scrupulously noted, as a matter of principle, because he must realize that with his utterly negligible critical apparatus—comprising only five or six manuscripts out of a total of more than three hundred manuscripts of the Adi—it is wholly impossible for him to understand and explain the full significance of all the textual features and anomalies of the manuscripts examined by him. I will not take him to task for the numerous wrong readings which have inadvertently crept into his text, because I know, from personal experience, that it would be a physical impossibility to combine any high degree of accuracy with the pace at which he is compelled to bring out the volumes. But it is inevitable that the discovery of such inaccuracies should give rise to a sense of insecurity and suspicion in the mind of the reader in respect of those matters that he has to take from the editor on trust.

\[107\] The minor deficiencies pointed out here do not, however, detract materially from the many merits of the work, from the incalculable advantage we derive from having a Southern version of an entire parvan in Deva-
nāgarā transcript, printed in handy volumes, because the Southern manuscripts are really most inconvenient for the purposes of rapid consultation. I should be indeed very ungrateful if I did not frankly admit that Professor SASTRI’s edition has been of immense help to me, personally, for the study of the Southern recension, and I have no doubt that it will also help other workers in the field in future.

There remains for me the pleasant duty of recording all the encouragement and assistance I and my colleagues on the Mahābhārata Editorial Board have received from different quarters in the course of our labours in this connection.

To Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, B. A., Ruler of Aundh, whose liberality made it in the first instance possible for the Institute to undertake this ambitious project—the greatest philological enterprise undertaken in India within living memory—I have to tender on behalf of myself and other people like myself interested in the study and regeneration of our great National Epic, our most sincere and cordial thanks. For the numerous marks of personal kindness with which the Chief Saheb has favoured me, in this connection, on all occasions, I have to offer him the expression of my profound gratitude. His unflagging zeal and irrepressible optimism have helped me to carry on the work in the face of heavy odds. The Chief Saheb has been pleased to enliven the dry and scientific character of the work by contributing to this edition excellent paintings of scenes selected from the Great Epic, paintings especially prepared under his expert guidance and supervision, for the purposes of this edition.

I have next to record the gratitude of the promoters of this scheme to various distinguished donors: the Imperial Government of India; the Provincial Governments of Bombay, Madras and Burma; the Governments of H. E. H. the Nizam of Hyderabad, H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, H. H. the Gaekwad of Baroda; the Chief of Phaltan and other enlightened and patriotic Rulers and Chiefs of Indian States; the University of Bombay; and diverse other generous donors: who have all rendered valuable financial assistance to the scheme and contributed their share to that measure of success which has already been achieved. In this connection I must not forget to mention the kind offices of my old friend the Honourable Mr. Mukundarao R. JAYAKAR, M. A., Bar-at-law, Member of the Legislative Assembly, whose selfless interest in the success of this project has moved him to exert his influence for enlisting the sympathy and securing the help of some of the distinguished donors mentioned above.

I must next record my grateful thanks for help of various kinds I have received from my colleagues on the Mahābhārata Editorial Board, namely: Prof. S. K. BELVALKAR, M. A., Ph. D., I. E. S.; Prof. A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR, M. A., B. E. S.; Mr. P. V. KANE, M. A., LL. M.; Principal R. D. KARMAKAR, M. A.; Prof. V. G. PARANJPE, M. A., LL. B., D. Litt.; Prof. V. K. RAJAVADE, M. A.; the late Mr. N. B. UTTIKAR, M. A.; [108] Prof. P. L. VAIDYA, M. A., D. Litt.; Mr. V. P. VAIDYA, J. P., B. A., Bar-at-law; Prof. M. WINTERNITZ, Ph. D.; and the late Rev. Father R. ZIMMERMANN, S. I., Ph. D. No Board of which I have been a member has worked, ever since its inception, more smoothly and harmoniously.
But I desire to make a special mention of my indebtedness to Mr. V. P. Vaidya, Bar-at-law, of Bombay, and the late Rev. Father R. Zimmermann, S. J., whose advice and ready help accompanied my labours from the time I first undertook the responsibilities of the work. The interest of my late lamented fellow-student and friend Father Zimmermann in this project did not flag even as he lay, in 1931, in a Nursing Home at Faldkirch, waiting prepared to meet his Maker! Nothing encouraged me more in the early stages of this arduous and fascinating work than the active and unswerving interest with which these two friends followed it.

Nepal and Kashmir in the North and Tanjore and Travancore in the South are known to contain vast treasures of unpublished and valuable Sanskrit manuscripts; and the course of Indological studies of the last two or three decades may be said to have been dominated by discoveries of outstanding importance made during that period in the three last mentioned centres. On the other hand, in regard to the large and well-stocked public and private libraries which are known to have been in existence in the country, Nepal decidedly appears not have contributed its quota to the stock of fresh material which is now required for unravelling further the tangled skein of the history of Indian literature. Satis Chandra Vidyabhushana and Haraprasad Shastri among Indians, and Sylvain Lévi and Giuseppe Tucci among Europeans have undoubtedly done valuable pioneering work, but in view of the immense possibilities, what has been achieved thus far must be said to be tantalizingly little.

Under these circumstances, we cannot be sufficiently grateful to Rajaguru Hemaraj Pandit, C.I.E., Director of Public Instruction, Nepal, through whose good offices the doors of the rich store-house of the Nepali material were thrown open to us—material which is all but inaccessible to Indologists—and we have been placed in a position to publish, for the first time in the history of Mahabhārata studies, collations of valuable Nepali manuscripts. This supremely unselfish and profoundly learned patron of Sanskrit studies has really done more than merely supplying to the Institute, free of cost, collations of Nepali manuscripts available to him in local libraries. Realizing that there were valuable manuscripts to be had outside Kathmandu, the headquarters of the Rajaguru, he caused a search to be made, at his own expense, throughout that distant outpost of Hindu culture and civilization, for old Mahabhārata manuscripts, and the find of the valuable Ms. Np, the oldest of the dated manuscripts of our critical apparatus, is the unexpected and welcome fruit of the Rajaguru’s exertions in the cause of Mahabhārata research. Only those who know the difficulties in the way of obtaining any manuscript from Nepal will be in a position to appreciate fully the debt which the editor and the other members of the Mahabhārata Editorial Board, and beyond that the whole world of Indologists, owe to the Rajaguru. Sanskritists have much to hope for from the dispassionate efforts of this truly patriotic and cultured Rajaguru, who loses no opportunity of placing his immense learning and unbounded resources freely at the disposal of all serious workers in the field of Sanskrit research.

[109] In connection with other help that has been received from extra-mural collaborators, I must put on record our special obligation to Pandit Vidhushekhara Sastri Bhattacharya of the Visvabharati, and to M. R. Ry. Rao Sahib T. Sambamurthi Rao Avl., B. A., B. L., of the Saraswathi Mahal, Tanjore. These gentlemen have been good enough to supply the Institute, for many years past, with carefully procured collations of manuscripts which are in their charge or which were kindly procured by them, on loan, for the purpose, unselfishly supervising the work of their collation centre, at great sacrifice of their time and labour. To Professor
K. Rama Pisharoti, then Principal of the Sanskrit College at Trippunittura in Cochin State, I am indebted for the collations of Malayālam manuscripts for the first two adhyāyas of this parvan.

My special thanks are due to the Managing Committees and Trustees of the following libraries and institutions for supplying me with the manuscripts required by me and allowing me to retain them as long as necessary: the Adyar Library, the Baroda Oriental Institute, Benares Sanskrit College, Mysore Oriental Library, Shri Yadugiri Yatiraj Math (Melkote, Mysore) and the India Office (London). The latter deserves special mention as the only European library I know, which sends out freely its Indian manuscripts, on loan, back to India, for the use of Indian scholars. A few manuscripts were sent to me by my kind friends Professor Sushil Kumar De, Head of the Department of Sanskrit and Bengali, Dacca University, and Professor Bhagavaddatta of the Dayananda Anglo-Vedic College, Lahore, to whom I wish to thank for this kind help. I am obliged also to Sardar Kibe of Indore for the loan of a Nilakaṅṭha manuscript. The Chief of Idappalli, Mr. Anujan Achān, Mr. Kallenkara Pishāram, all of Cochin, as also the Proprietors of the following estates in Cochin, Poomulli Mana, Avanapparambu Mana, Narerī Mana, have put me under heavy obligation by sending me freely Malayālam manuscripts in their possession, for collation, at a time when it was rather difficult for me to secure any Malayālam manuscripts at all.

I desire further to express my gratefulness to various scholars who have followed the publication of the fascicules of this volume with keen interest, periodically publishing reviews of them in the Journals of different learned Societies, reviews expressive of their interest and appreciation; to wit, Professors Banerji, Sastri, Barnett, Belloni-Filippi, Charpentier, S. K. De, Edgerton, R. Fick, Jayaswal, Konow, Krishnaswami Ayangar, Lesny, Kalidas Nag, Weller, Winternitz and others. These kind reviewers have adopted uniformly a most courteous and sympathetic tone in their reviews. Their sympathy and courtesy have always reminded me of those classic lines of Bhartrhari:

परमपरमायूषितविद्वानोऽनि
निजाद्विभिन्नसन्तः सन्तः किष्ठतः

I must next record my thanks for the ungrudging assistance I have uniformly received from the members of the permanent staff of the Mahābhārata Department of the Institute. Mr. S. N. Tadpatrikar, M.A., Supervisor of Collations, was always by my side, helping me with useful suggestions, when I constituted the text of the Ādi. Mr. Tadpatrikar has been associated with the work, in various capacities, since 1919. He has assisted my predecessor, the late Mr. Utgikar, in preparing the Tentative Edition of the Viṇāparvan and seeing it through the press. The compiling of the critical notes (printed at the foot of the page) was entrusted by me to Messrs. B. G. Bhide and D. V. [110] Naravane. For the conscientious manner in which these two gentlemen have discharged their duty, I feel greatly obliged, since it is a most tedious and trying piece of work to collect the variant readings from the different collation sheets, and to arrange, in a prescribed form, according to stringent rules of sequence and enunciation, that ponderous mass of variants which is and will remain the unique feature and abiding achievement of this edition. The Śāradā codex was collated by the Head Shastri of the Mahābhārata Department, Shankar Shastri Bhilavadikar. The comparative paucity of printing mistakes in this volume is largely due to the vigilance and conscientiousness of the Collator and Reader, K. V. Krishnamurti Sharma, Sastri, of Erode (South India).
Photo taken on the occasion of an At Home given by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar on 4th August 1937, after completing 12 years of work as General Editor.

Standing: (left to right) Dr. S. M. Katre; Dr. H. D. Sharma; Prof. P. K. Gode; Dr. B. A. Saletore.

Sitting: (left to right) Dr. P. L. Vaidya and Dr. V. S. Sukthankar
These and other members of my staff have uniformly worked with exemplary zeal and untiring patience, to make a success of this edition, and I gladly take the opportunity of putting on record their loyal help and willing co-operation.

It is but right that I should also mention here that the Manager and the expert compositors of the renowned Niranaya Sagar Press have rendered ungrudgingly every assistance in carrying out the typographical arrangements which appeared to me best suited for the purpose of the work, meeting requirements that would have tried the patience and exhausted the resources of any other press in India.

Last but not least, I must express my profound gratitude to my revered Guru Geheimer Regierungsrat Professor Dr, Heinrich Lüders of the University of Berlin. What little merit there may be in the present work is due wholly to that excellent though somewhat rigorous and exacting training in philological methods which I had the benefit of receiving at his hands in the Indogermanisches Seminar, as a student in the University of Berlin. It is my firm conviction that there is no living scholar who has a deeper insight into the history of the Indian epic and the complications of its tradition than Geheimrat Lüders. It was, therefore, an unlucky day in the annals of Mahābhārata studies when, for lack of sympathetic co-operation and adequate financial support, he must have been compelled to abandon his epic studies, and our Great Epic lost the benefit of redaction at the hands of one of the greatest living philologists. His early Mahābhārata studies, Ueber die Grantharecension, Die Sage von Rāyaśrīga and the Druckprobe have been to me like beacon lights in the perilous navigation of the Mahābhārata Ocean. May this work be to him a small recompense for the great trouble he has taken to initiate me in the mysteries of textual criticism!

August, 1933.

V. S. Sukthankar
CONCORDANCE OF THE SCHEME OF ADHYAYAS

in the following three editions: the Critical Edition, the Bombay Edition (Ganpat Krishnaji, Saka 1799), and the Madras Edition (Southern Recension, 1931)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48-49. 1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58-59</td>
<td>49. 11-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68-69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 88, 47-94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>103-104</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>112-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 117

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>119-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-121</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123-124</td>
<td>125-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-128</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-131</td>
<td>132-133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-135</td>
<td>136-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139-140</td>
<td>141-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142-143</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144-145</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147-148</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149-150</td>
<td>150-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-152</td>
<td>152-153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153-154</td>
<td>154-155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155-156</td>
<td>156-157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157-158</td>
<td>158-159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159-160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 117
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>195-28-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>207-209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>210-212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>213-214-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182-183</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>214-18-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>215-216</td>
<td>223-225</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>200.1-7</td>
<td>193.1-19</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>200.8-20</td>
<td>195.1-27</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

THE CRITICAL APPARATUS

LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS FORMING THE CRITICAL APPARATUS

The manuscripts utilized for this edition of the Āraukyakaparvan are as follows:

I. N(orthern) Recension.

(a) North-western Group (v).

Sāradā (or Kaśmirī) Version (s).

S₁ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 159 of 1875-76. (The Sāradā Codex.)

Devanāgarī transcripts of the Sāradā (or Kaśmirī) Version (K).

K₁ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 471 of Viśrāmbāg I.

K₂ = Poona, BORI, Mbh. Collection, No. 15 (= Institute's Collection, No. 246). Dated V. Samh. 1528 and Saka 1693 (ca. a.d. 1772).

K₃ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 184 of 1891-95.

K₄ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 57 of 1882-83.

(b) Central Group (γ).

Bengali Version (B).

B₁ = Dacca, University Library, No. 495. Dated Saka 1393 (ca. a.d. 1471).


B₃ = Dacca, University Library, No. 601. Dated Saka 1678 (ca. a.d. 1756).

B₄ = Dacca, University Library, No. 728 B. Dated Saka 1739 (ca. a.d. 1817).

Devanāgarī Versions other than K (D).

Devanāgarī Version of Caturbhujamīśra (Dc).

Dc₁ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 32 of A 1879-80.

Dc₂ = London, India Office Library, No. 3170 (1908). Date a.d. 1765 (?).

Devanāgarī Version of Nīlakaṇṭha (Dn).

Dn₁ = Indore, Private Property of Sardar M. V. Kībe of Indore. Dated V. Samh. 1839 (ca. a.d. 1783).

Dn₂ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 236 of 1895-1902.

Dn₃ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 496 of Viśrāmbāg I.

Devanāgarī Composite Version.

D₁ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 269 of Viśrāmbāg II.

---

1 [to Āraukyakaparvan].

D$_3$ = Poona, Bombay Govt. Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 168 of 1887-91. Dated in year 1677, probably V. Sanhvat (then = A.D. 1620).

D$_4$ = Baroda, Oriental Institute Library, No. 767. Dated V. Sanh. 1655 (ca.

D$_5$ = Pudukottah, State Library MS. (without number). Dated V. Sanh. 1712 (ca. A.D. 1656).

D$_6$ = Madras, Adyar Library, No. 36 G. 15.

II. S(outhern) Recension.

Telugu Version (T).
T$_1$ = Lahore, D. A. V. College Library, No. 3908.
T$_2$ = Tanjore, Saraswati Mahal Library, No. 11809.

Grantha Version (G).
G$_1$ = Melkote, Yadugiri Yatiraj Math Library MS. (without number).
G$_2$ = Poona, BORI, Mkh. Collection, No. 53 (= Institute's Collection, No. 266).
G$_3$ = Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11839.
G$_4$ = Pudukottah State Library, No. 322.

Malayalam Version (M).
M$_1$ = MS. (without number) belonging to Ponnokkoṭṭu Mana Nambudiripad, Alwaye, Travancore.
M$_2$ = Malabar, Poomulli Mana Library, No. 299.

DETAILED ACCOUNT OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

S$_1$

(The Śāradā Codex.)

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 159 of 1875-76. Total number of folios, for this parvan, 192 (some frayed and patched at ends), with about 24 lines to a page. Size 12" × 19". Clear Śāradā characters. Birchbark (bhūrjapatra).

The codex, which is unfortunately incomplete and fragmentary, must have originally contained at least the first three parvans (Ādi, Sabhā, and Aranyaka or Aranyakā), written, as far as one can judge, by the same hand. The extant portion contains the Sabhā in its entirety, but only fragments of the other two parvans, the beginning of Ādi and the end of Aranyaka being lost. The text of Aranyaka begins on fol. 211a, line 1; and ends, or rather breaks off, at the end, of a folio marked 194b (sic). The numbering of the pages is most erratic. There are in all 192 folios pertaining to this parvan. The fragment breaks off in the middle of our 3, 253, 184, ending with the words : वरायवृूणिभिः. The margins are mostly clean, and corrections are few and far between. Erasures have been made in a few places with green pigment.

[3] In good many places (e.g., folios numbered 156a, 185b, 186a, 193b, 194a, etc.) the scribe has written dots to denote portions of the text which were either lost or illegible to him: sign of a conscientious copyist. On fol. 220a, some stanzas which had been omitted (? hapl.) in the text have been written on the margin (sec. m.), in a different and inferior ink. The top
parts of the four folios numbered 89-92 are broken off and lost, involving a loss of from 5 to 8 top lines on each page. The names of sub-parvans have been sporadically mentioned. The manuscript has been fully described at p. x of the Prolegomena to Adiparvan (q. v.)

\[K_x\]

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), Vîśrāmbīg I, No. 471, Folios 486 (numbered 55-540; first 54 folios missing), with about 10 lines to a page. Size 12\(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\times\) 5\(\frac{1}{2}\). Devanāgarī characters. Thin glazed superior Indian paper.

First 54 folios are lost; fol. 55 begins with 3. 32. 4. Number 237 is given to two consecutive folios, but the second folio thus marked is subsequently corrected (sec. m.) to 238. The missing portion of the text at the end of the first of the two folios marked as 237 is written out in small letters (? sec. m.) at the bottom of the page. Fol. 485 is written only on one side; and at the end of this folio is the remark: प्रमुखान्तर अक्षरों में विस्तार न ॥ विस्तार न ॥. The contents of this folio (485) have been copied out again sec. m. (on a separate sheet of modern paper with watermarks), including the final remark प्रमुखान्तर ... ॥ विस्तार न ॥, with the addition, श्रीरत्न । कपणालस्त्र ॥ श्रीकुणजी संव छे ॥ श्री ॥, which shows that the copyist of this sheet was some Gujarati scribe. The handwriting of the original, which is Kashmirian in style is not quite uniform: some folios show very thick, black, broad upright characters, while others are appreciably thinner and somewhat slanting. Frequently in the colophons, and the references to speakers, only alternate letters are written, blanks being left to be filled with red ink, which, however, has not been done. Mere folds, without vertical lines, mark the right and left margins of folios. The ink used is jet black and of a superior quality. The sub-parvan names are generally mentioned.

\[K_y\]

Poona, BORI, Mbh. Collection No. 15 (= Institute's Collection, No. 246). Folios 300, with about 14 lines to a page. Size 13\(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\times\) 6\(\frac{3}{4}\). Devanāgarī characters. Dated V. Sarvat 1828 and Saka 1693 (ca. A.D. 1772). Grey Indian paper.

This manuscript is described as D_2 at p. vii of the Introduction to the Udyogaparvan, for which parvan it was first used. The name of the scribe, which comes after the date (year) at the end of this parvan, appears as: उद्योगपारवन विनायक विनायक । श्री कश्मीरनंदनः. The day and month come last: सिद्धी आङ्ग्यप्रथम १५ पुष्ठ संवत्. In the Udyogaparvan, the scribe's name is given as का-श्मिरिया शादनंदा. Very incorrect, containing numerous little errors of spelling, such as writing स for स. Adhyāya colophons and margins are marked with red pigment, corrections with yellow pigment. Marginal (vertical) lines of pages are in black and red, separated by a thick yellow line. The manuscript is almost without any marks of punctuation. The dandas were probably to be marked with red ink, but the [4] revision was never actually carried
out. It may be noted that this is a parvan from an almost complete manuscript of the Mahābhārata written by one hand, and as such important.

**K₈**

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 184 of 1891-95. Folios 285, with about 17 lines to a page. Size 10½" × 5½". Devanāgarī characters. Indian paper.

Total number of folios is 294, of which fol. 270, 272-279 are missing. Fol. 152a has only six lines of writing, the greater part of the folio being left blank, and the writing continued on the reverse, without any loss of text. In the references to speaker the word तवत (resp. तवतुः) is generally omitted; the name of the speaker to be generally given in some abbreviated form like युद्धिः, बृहस्पतिः, माहीः. The manuscript seems to be fairly old. The edges, especially of the last folios, are brittle and worn. Characters are short and broad, representing an old style of writing in. Writing is incorrect on the whole. There are occasional corrections in margin (sec. m.). Adhyāya colophons and names of speakers are generally coloured with red pigment. The manuscript mentions sub-parvans as a rule. It does not distinguish between ष and ष; both are again often confused with च.

**K₄**

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 57 of 1882-83. Folios 370 (numbered 52-421), with about 10 lines to a page. Size 12½" × 5½". Devanāgarī characters. Old Indian paper.

First 51 folios are lost; fol. 52 begins with 3. 36. 1a. The hand-writing of the manuscript, though it seems to be of one scribe, is not uniform. For some portion we have large round letters with flourishes, while for others the characters are thin and upright. Prśhamātrās are almost invariably used. Marginal notes, especially variants, are written (sec. m.) with the clear remark that it is a pātha; there are explanatory notes also, written on the margins. Colophons, references to speakers, and śloka endings (the latter sporadically) are marked with red pigment.—The manuscript breaks off at the last folio (421), where it ends with the colophon of the last adhyāya of this parvan. There is no phalāsruti, nor the list of contents, which we often find at the end of Mahābhārata manuscripts.

**B₁**


The manuscript contains two correction slips, one between fol. 163 and 164, and another between fol. 247 and 248.—Collated at the Visvabharati.

**B₂**

INTRODUCTION

[5] The manuscript is written in one running hand, and has marginal corrections. It is described as "looking very old", and being extremely fragile. It was collated in 1931. With lapse of years its condition is said to have become steadily worse.—Collated at the Visvabharati.

B₂

Dacca, University Library, No. 601. Folios 326 (fol. 141 wrongly numbered as 142 and the mistake continued up to fol. 240; fol. 241 wrongly numbered as 231, and the mistake continued up to the end; fol. 227 duplicated). Bengali characters. Dated Saka 1678 (ca. A.D. 1756). Paper.—Collated at the Visvabharati.

B₄


Dc₁

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 32 of A 1879-80. Folios 506, with about 11-13 lines to a page. Size 13⅓" × 6". Devanāgari characters. Indian paper.

Text with commentary of Caturbhujamiśra entitled Vākyadīpikā. The handwriting is not uniform: it begins with a longish upright style, which gradually becomes slanting towards right, up to fol. 164; fol. 165 begins with a broad, short, round, broken style up to folio 265; from the next fol. (266), the style of writing again becomes long, slanting and thin; and towards the end the lettering becomes a little thick and bold. Right and left margins are marked by double lines in red, and stops in the text and the commentary, are also marked by double dāqādas in red. The lower borders of folios of this manuscript are a little soiled by damp.

Dc₂

London, India Office Library, No. 3170 (1908). Folios 502, with about 10-14 lines to a page. Size 15⅓" × 6⅔". Devanāgari characters. Date of writing A.D. 1765 (?). Indian paper.

Text with commentary of Caturbhujamiśra, entitled Vākyadīpikā. 1765 is the date given by EGGELING in the India Office Catalogue (1899), though the manuscript itself appears to be undated.

Dn₁

Manuscript belonging to Sardar M. V. Kibe of Indore, on loan at the Institute. Folios 523, with about 11 lines to a page. Size 16" × 6½". Devanāgari characters. Dated V. Sarhvat 1839 (ca. A.D. 1783). Thick Indian paper.


The date of writing this parvan is noted on the back-cover as: सं. १७३३

The first part of this manuscript is described as Dn₁, at p. xvi of the Prolegomena to the Ādiparvan, and the details of that description apply to this parvan also.
Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 236 of 1895-1902. Folios 768, with about 9 lines to a page. Size 15½" × 7". Devanāgari characters. Thick Indian paper.

Text with the commentary of Nilakaṇṭha, called the Bhāratabhāvadīpa. The manuscript is written in a uniformly neat upright handwriting. Right and left margins are marked by two double lines in red. Double daṇḍas in red are used on some folios to mark the stops in the text as well as in the commentary. Adhyāya colophons in both the text and the commentary are also in red ink. On some pages, continuations are written on the right side along the marginal red lines.

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), Viśrāmbāg I, No. 496. Folios 626, with about 12 lines to a page. Size 16" × 6½". Devanāgari characters. Indian paper.

Text with the commentary of Nilakaṇṭha, called the Bhāratabhāvadīpa. The manuscript has its right and left margins marked with close double lines in red as usual. The first three folios and the last folio have an illuminated border with floral designs. The writing, though incorrect, is bold and upright. Numerous corrections are made in the text by using yellow pigment. Fol. 401-439 are written with ink of a faint black colour. Subsequent portion is written in a shaky style, with short and round letters. There are also marginal corrections, entered sec. m., throughout the manuscript. Adhyāya colophons are marked with red pigment. The last colophon in the commentary is left incomplete, and the last but one fol. (625) breaks off with: श्रीगोविन्दसूरिपुरः. The first sloka of the Virāṭa too, is left incomplete, while the last folio is numbered 626 in one (right bottom) corner and 627 in the other (left top) corner. The usual table of contents is also wanting. All this suggests that the actual fol. 626 is lost.

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), Viśrāmbāg II, No 269. Folios 225, with about 16 lines to a page. Size 18" × 6½". Devanāgari characters. Old Indian un glazed paper.

A few folios of this manuscript are missing. This manuscript was written by the same scribe who wrote manuscript No. 266 of Viśrāmbāg II, which is described as D₄ at pp. xx of the Prolegomena to the Śrīdevaparvan. Most folios of this manuscript have a soiled appearance, while the last (225) reveals at its top left corner signs of burning by {7} fire; some folios are partly damaged. The manuscript is carefully written in a perfectly uniform style and the characters are short and round. The name श्रीलक्षिण is written at the lower right margin above the folio number. The corrections in the text are made by deleting the original incorrect reading with yellow pigment and
putting in the correct one in black ink. Adhyāya colophons and references to speakers are marked with red pigment.

D₂

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 229 of 1895-1902. Folios 234, with about 15 lines to a page. Size 14½" × 6½". Devānāgari characters. Dated V. Sarhvat 1795 (ca. A.D. 1739). Old Indian paper.

This manuscript, which contains the first three parvans, is the same as manuscript K₉ of the Ādīparvan, described at p. xi of the Prolegomena. The date of the manuscript is recorded at the end of the Aranyakaparvan. The manuscript is very corrupt and full of spelling mistakes. It frequently writes ढ for ढ and sometimes ण for ण; in other words, it confuses ढ and ढ. It likewise confuses औ and औ. The date is given as: संवं १६१५ वर्ष भारतवर्धम (read भारतवर्धम) विदि १३ ः (? ) गुरु।

D₃

Poona, Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the BORI), No. 168 of 1887-91. Folios 240, with about 11 lines to a page. Size 13½" × 5". Devānāgari characters. Dated in year 1677, probably V. Sarhvat (then = 1620 A.D.). Old Indian paper.

An old and valuable but fragmentary manuscript with many folios missing, some of which have been subsequently replaced, being written sec. m. Many of the folios are badly mutilated, carelessly copied and full of scribal mistakes. The last preserved folio but one is numbered 372 and breaks off with our 3-273, 10ab; while the last folio, which has its borders worn away and is pasted on to another sheet of paper, has the last three slokas of the parvan, and the final colophon but no contents or phalaśrutī. The date is given as: १६७७ शाम नाम आश्वत्स शुद्ध त्रि० कृशी १२ वर्ष गुरवर्ष. The specification of the era is lost on a missing portion of the folio, but it is probably the Vikrama era (Caitradi). In that case it would, correspond to Thursday, the 28th September 1620 A.D. The edges of some folios are coloured yellow; while for margins there are four close lines in black, on the right and left. Handwriting is uneven and there are many corrections. Single or double dandās are used to mark the stops. There are corrections entered sec. m. on the margins and at some places in the text also by using yellow pigment. Colophons and references to speakers are marked by red pigment in many places. The scribe writes ओ for ओ, and makes little distinction between औ and औ, as also between य and य.

D₄


[8] The characters are short and round, which later become thin and upright. Margins are marked by three close lines in red; some pages have
black lines; while double daṇḍas, which mark the stops in the text, as also adhyāya colophons and references to speakers are marked by red pigment. There are no marginal corrections, and blanks are left in the text where the scribe could not read the exemplar correctly or the exemplar was defective. The following statement containing the date and some other details comes after the last colophon:


Many of the folios are coloured yellow on both the sides; margins are marked to the right and left, by two black lines with one red line in the middle. Double daṇḍas in red ink are used to mark stops in the text. There are a few marginal corrections, added sec. m. Those in the body of the text are made by using yellow pigment. The characters are uniformly longish and upright. The date is given at the end as: || समाप्तेऽ आलोचना संवतः १७१२ ||. No name of the scribe or place of writing is mentioned.

Madras, Adyar Library, No. 36 G. 15. Folios 303 (including a śodhapatra bearing number 199), with about 12 lines to a page. Size 51/" × 131/". Devanāgarī characters. Old Indian paper.

Style of handwriting is upright and narrow. Double daṇḍas in red ink are used to indicate stops. Margins have, in places, additional stanzas, glosses etc. added sec. m. Many pages are coloured yellow; the right and left margins are marked by fine double lines in black, the intervening space being coloured red. The manuscript has a very old appearance, with worn and frayed folios.—A separate additional folio, numbered 199, written (sec. m.? ) on both sides is inserted as a śodhapatra after fol. 199 with the remark:

T1

Lahore, D. A. V. College Library, No. 3908. Folios 144, with about 13 lines to a page. Size 183/" × 113/". Telugu characters. Palm-leaf.

Incomplete, breaking off at 3. 297. 60ab.

T2

INTRODUCTION

[9] This manuscript contains the first five parvans and is the same as T_3 of the Adiparvan. It is written in small clear letters of good style. The manuscript bears no date, but it appears to be old.—**Collated at Tanjore.**

G_1

Melkote, Yadugiri Yatiraj Math Library Manuscript (without number). Folios 130 (numbered 165-294), with about 15-21 lines to a page. Size 18\(\frac{2}{3}\)" × 13\(\frac{1}{2}\". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.

The manuscript contains the first four parvans and a part of the fifth.

G_2

Poona, BORI, Mbh. Collection, No. 53 (== Institute’s Collection, No. 266). Folios 216 (two of which, namely 117 and 125, are missing), with about 12-14 lines to a page. Size 15\(\frac{1}{2}\" × 2\frac{1}{2}\". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.

The manuscript contains parvans three and four. It belongs to the Institute and was purchased a few years ago from a South-Indian manuscript collector, the late Mr. Rangaswamy Aiyangar of the Oriental Library, Mysore. It is in a very good state of preservation, only one folio (149) being broken. The manuscript is undated, but it does not appear to be very old. The margins are clean; but there are a few interlinear corrections.

G_3

Tanjore, Saraswathi Mahal Library, No. 11839. Folios 277 (numbered 75-351), with about 9 lines to a page. Size 21" × 1\(\frac{1}{2}\". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.

The manuscript, which contains parvans two and three, seems to be old. At fol. 75, the Sabhāparvan ends and the Āranyakaparvan begins thereafter immediately. After the end of the Āranyaka, about five ślokas from the Virāṭa are written on the last folio (351), which indicates that the manuscript originally contained some more parvans.—**Collated at Tanjore.**

G_4

Pudukottah, State Library, No. 322. Folios 168, with about 10-14 lines to a page. Size 19" × 2\(\frac{1}{2}\". Grantha characters. Palm-leaf.—The manuscript contains parvans Nos. 3 and 14-18.

M_1

Travancore, Alwaye. From the private Library of Ponnoottu Mana. Folios 300, with 8 or 9 lines to a page. Size 17\(\frac{1}{2}\" × 2". Malayālam characters. Palm-leaf.

The leaves have been cut regularly and are of uniform size. The manuscript is undated and is probably not very old. It is in a state of good preservation, having a fresh and clean appearance. The margins are clean. No corrections are noticeable.

M_2

Malabar, Poomulli Mana Library, No. 299. Folios 259, with about 9 lines to a page. Size 21\(\frac{1}{2}\" × 1\frac{1}{2}\". Malayālam characters. Palm-leaf.

[10] The numbering of the folios begins with the second folio, the first being marked sf and not counted. The manuscript has an oldish appearance. The leaves are uneven and discoloured in places. The edges are
considerably worn and uneven; the central holes are enlarged, apparently from constant use; one corner of the last folio (numbered 258) is broken off and part of text is lost. The margins are clean; corrections, which are interlinear, are few and far between.

MANUSCRIPTS NOT INCLUDED IN THE CRITICAL APPARATUS

Besides the twenty-eight manuscripts detailed above, the following two manuscripts were also examined by me, which deserve notice.


The dated Sāradā manuscript belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal is a very fragmentary and fragile manuscript, in an extremely delapidated condition. The custodians of the manuscript would not part with it for collation at the Institute, but allowed it to be collated and photographed on the premises of the Society. The difficulty in the way of collating—as of photographing—it, was that many of the folios were stuck together and could be separated only at the risk of damaging the writing. A partial study of the manuscript showed that the basic text is probably Kaśmīrī, but it is contaminated deeply from the Mid-Indian versions (Bengali-Devanāgarī). The manuscript is briefly described in Haraprasada Shastri's Descriptive Catalogue, Vol. 5, at p. 106. A facsimile of a page from this manuscript, containing the text from 3. 242. 20 to 243. 15, is given at the end of Volume 4 of this edition. Note the bits of commentary (सूची), wrongly incorporated, in lines 9-10, and in lines 12-13.

The other manuscript, which belongs to the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, is, on the other hand, an extremely valuable old manuscript, dated in V. Sārinvat 1573 (= A.D. 1516). It would have been fully collated and used for our edition, but for the circumstance that it is also very fragmentary, nearly one-third of the number of folios being, unfortunately, irrecoverably lost. The original manuscript was written at Yoginipura (modern Delhi) during the reign of "Sulitrān Sikandara", who appears to be the famous Sikandar Shah Lodi, Sultan of Delhi, for Bhānudāsa Chaudhari—a resident of Kacchauvā (a "water-fortress", jalādūrā). The manuscript was constantly [11] consulted by me in case of doubt to see what help it could give. I have cited its evidence occasionally, in the "Critical Notes" at the

1 This Kacchauvā may perhaps be identified with the modern "Kachola", a town in Udaipur State. The Imperial Gazetteer (1886) states that in former times the town, which stood on the western bank of a large lake, must have been a place of some importance; for all around, the ground is strewn with fragments of extremely fine sculpture, and half way up the hill the ruins of a temple are visible.
end of this Book, on important matters. I append here in full the somewhat lengthy post-colophon statement, which is not without interest. The copyist was probably a Jaina. Here follows the statement:

The manuscript is briefly described in H. D. Velankar’s Descriptive Catalogue of the Society’s manuscripts, Vol. 2, p. 292.

TESTIMONIA

The testimonia of the Āraṇyaka consist of ancient commentaries and epitomes, of which there are not very many in the case of this parvan.

Devabodha’s commentary on the Āraṇyaka has unfortunately been lost, or at least has not been recovered so far. The same is true of the Javanese version. This parvan thus unfortunately lacks two of the oldest—and the most important—of the testimonia of the Mahābhārata,—works which have rendered yeoman service in some of the parvans already edited.

As regards other works of that nature, there is, as far as I know, extant at least one complete manuscript of the commentary of Arjunamiśra on the Āraṇyaka. It belongs to the Government Sanskrit College Collection in Calcutta (No. 310); cf. Catalogue, Vol. 4, p. 190. There are also incomplete copies of the commentary in the Sanskrit College at Benares (MSS. No. 2279; and No. 34). I had the use of a rough copy of the Calcutta Sanskrit College manuscript mentioned above, which was kindly supplied to me, at my request, by the Principal of the College. The copy was however found to be full of clerical errors and was not exactly suitable for collation. It was therefore used by me merely for occasional consultation. The text used by Arjunamiśra is, as usual, of a superior type, and his commentary would repay careful study, if good manuscripts of the commentary could be obtained. A facsimile of the single extant page of a paper manuscript of what proved to be Arjunamiśra’s commentary on the Āraṇyakaparvan, written in Śāradā characters and included by chance in the Śāradā manuscript of this parvan belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, forms the frontpiece of the second part of the Āraṇyakaparvan (Vol. 4). The passage commented on is 3. 133. 20 to 134. 9. Note the consecutive numbering of the lines in the left margin.
Another useful testimonium of the Mahābhārata is the Bhāratamañjarī of Kṣemendra. Kṣemendra summarizes the Aranyaka in about 2000—to be precise 1964—stanzas, divided into the following 51 sections:

[12] (1) सूर्यसत्यं; (2) विदुरासम; (3) ख्रस्मुपावहन; (4) बैत्रेयस्वाम; (5) किन्द्रीरवच; (6) सान्तवच; (7) कैटात; (8) लोकालाखप्राप्ति; (9) इन्द्रलोकपत्य; (10) नायापावहन; (11) पुस्तवतीर्थयागा; (12) धौम्यतीर्थयागा; (13) बायास्व; (14) कृष्णद्रोहपावहन; (15) कार्तिक्योपावहन; (16) लोक्य; (17) मान्याराजपावहन; (18) जन्तुपावहन; (19) सप्तकमोतीय; (20) बायास्व; (21) यायकर; (22) इतमहाराजसम्बाय; (23) पुष्पारम; (24) ज्ञातारुच; (25) मणिवद; (26) वेद्ययाजसम्बाय; (27) निवातकचर्च; (28) उलसमतीर्थयागा; (29) अयास्व; (30) बायाराजस्व; (31) बैन्यो-पावहन; (32) सरस्वतीदासधेन्द्र; (33) दस्तोपावहन; (34) मार्केयसमस्ता (sic); (35) वतिजय; (36) मण्डूरोपावहन; (37) इन्द्रुद्योपावहन; (38) ख्रस्मुद्योपावहन; (39) पतिजीपावहन; (40) जालिएस; (41) त्रायस्व; (42) छोरायाग; (43) छुरायाग; (44) तातराजयाग; (45) ख्रस्मुद्यायाग; (46) मास्व; (47) छैत्य; (48) रामायाग; (49) ख्रस्मुपावहन; (50) ख्र्यायाग; (51) अयास्व.

From this list of contents, it can be seen that almost all the stories and episodes which we now find in our text of the Aranyaka were there already in Kṣemendra’s time (ca. 1050 A.D.). The parvan must therefore have had then the same general form and appearance as now. More significant is the fact that all important passages—without exception—that are lacking in our manuscripts of the Kaśmirī version are likewise missing in the Mañjarī. This fact alone cannot prove that these passages were lacking in the Kaśmirī version of the eleventh century. Some or even all of them could have been omitted by a poet who was making an epitome of an extensive work like the Aranyakaparvan: he would be within his rights in doing so. But the Mañjarī does not omit any important episode or passage which is not omitted at the same time in the Kaśmirī version of the Great Epic. Consequently, unless the version of the Aranyakaparvan used by Kṣemendra was nearly identical with our Kaśmirī version, the coincidence that our Kaśmirī manuscripts omit just those passages which Kṣemendra had considered not worth including in his epitome, and no other, would be extremely curious, if not miraculous. It seems accordingly most probable that the episodes which are not found in Kṣemendra’s Mañjarī were already lacking in the Kaśmirī version of the Mahābhārata in the eleventh century. I think, therefore, that with the help of this testimonium, we can establish for the omissions of the Kaśmirī version an antiquity much higher than that vouchsafed solely by the age of our manuscripts, which are later by some centuries than the period of the composition of Kṣemendra’s Bhāratamañjarī.

Noteworthy among such omissions of the Mañjarī are the following three

1 It is worth noting that our Sāradā Codex uniformly writes किन्द्रीर for our किम्मेर.
lengthy passages: (1) the Temptation of Arjuna by Urvāśi (App. I, No. 6); (2) Karna's Conquest of the World (App. I, No. 24); (3) the Visit of Durvāsas to Yudhiṣṭhira (App. I, No. 25). The first of these three interpolations has insinuated itself in the manuscripts of almost all versions and is now lacking only in some manuscripts of the Kaśmīrī version. The second among them is documented only by Devanāgarī manuscripts, excepting a few conflated manuscripts of other versions; consequently its claim to be recognized as an authentic passage is not very substantial. Finally, the last passage introducing Durvāsas into the story, a passage which is really restricted to the Nilakaṇṭha version, with the casual support of a few Devanāgarī and some conflated manuscripts, does not really come into question; because its spurious character is very evident and does not need an elobate proof.¹

The versions of the commentators Caturbhujā and Nilakaṇṭha are described below under the Devanāgarī version.

PEDIGREE OF THE ARANYAKAPARVAN VERSIONS

Vyāsa's Bhārata

Ur-Mahābhārata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>γ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sāradā (Ś) K Bengali (B) (Non-K) Devanāgarī (D) Telugu (T) Grantha (G) Malayālam (M)

¹ See below, p. 160.
² With this story disappears one of the very few episodes in the Mahābhārata in which Śrī Kṛṣṇa is represented as hearing from a distance, as it were by clairaudience or divine omniscience, the prayers of his distressed devotees and as either coming instantly to their help in person or providing invisibly the means of their rescue or safety. The other episode I had in mind, which has likewise proved to be an interpolation, is the well-known scene, in the Sabhāparvan of the disrobing of Draupadi (Draupadi-vastra-haraṇa), when, according to the Vulgate version, Draupadi prays to Śrī Kṛṣṇa, who hears her prayer and comes running to her rescue. (त्यः कन्या हरिणि पञ्चाः कुस्तः कुस्तायांः पञ्चाः। B. 2. 68. 45), and she is clothed again and again, miraculously, but presumably by the intervention and grace of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. They undoubtedly represent a later phase of Kṛṣṇa worship.
A CRITICAL SURVEY OF THE RECEPTIONS AND THEIR VERSIONS

GENERAL SURVEY

A description of the forest life of the Pândavas constitutes the topic of the Third Book, the Āraṇyaka—(Āraṇya—or Āraṇya—). parvan, commonly called (for short) the Vanaparvan, whose extent is between 11,000 and 12,000 ślokas (i.e. “granthas”). The actual incidents narrated, pertaining to the life-history of the heroes in this parvan, are indeed few and unimportant compared to the size of the book. The entire narrative has been condensed by Kśemendra in his Bhrāvalamanīṭa into less than 2,000 stanzas, without omitting any of the main incidents. The great extent of the parvan has been made up by the inclusion of episodes of the most diverse kind: stories of ancient kings, sages, and virtuous women; description of places of pilgrimage (tīrtha-yātra); discourses [14] on moral, ethical and philosophical topics, ancient gāthās and anuvāṃśa stanzas. It was a fashion for some time to obelize this episodic matter as late interpolation. But that is a misguided view, originating with a certain type of critics who have exhibited a uniform lack of understanding of the meaning of the Mahābhārata and of the basic plan and aim of the creators of our great epic. The episodical material in the Mahābhārata is, in general, not secondarily introduced; it belongs to the original plan and serves a distinct purpose. As Pisani has pointed out in his paper on the “Rise of the Mahābhārata”, the bulk of didactic and episodic matter has been used to fill up the great “temporal hiatuses” in the narrative, viz, in the first place, the twelve years of exile in forest (Āraṇyaka), and then the long interval between the end of the Bhrārta War and the last adventure of the Pândavas (Sānti and Anuśāsana). “This distribution”, remarks Pisani, “to fill up temporal hiatuses has not only the scope of not disturbing the course of narration, but also that of helping the reader to pass over irrelevant years without striking against too strong a contrast between periods minutely narrated and others rapidly surpassed. In a not different manner Homer introduces often dialogues and episodic stories when he must conceal the flowing of times without noteworthy events.”

The episodical material is largely Purānic in character. Many of the Purānic stories we find here narrated over again. Moreover, as, the references given in the foot-notes to the text and the critical notes at the end of this Book (pp. 1091-1109) will show, there is considerable verbal agreement between the epic and Purānic versions of the stories. The Purāṇas which show the closest contact and widest parallelism are the Skanda, Padma and Brahma. The entire story of Skanda (adhy. 213-221), together with the passage containing the 108 names of the Sun (our adhy. 3, stanzas 18-28), recurs

1 A Volume of Eastern and Indian Studies presented to Prof. F. W. Thomas, etc. (1939), p. 170.
almost verbatim in the Skanda Purāṇa. The story of the Bhārgava sage Cyavana and the princess Sukanyā, the prose story of the Frog-girl, and a considerable portion of the Rāmopākhyāṇa are also to be met with in the Skanda, worded almost identically with the Mahābhārata. The 108 names of the Sun recur besides in the Brahma Purāṇa, which, moreover, has a portion of the story of Mārkandeya in common with the Āraṇyakaparvan. Furthermore, sections of our tīrthayātrā are to be met with again in the Padma and Matsya. A Bengali manuscript 1 of the Padma Purāṇa contains besides a version of the Rāyaśṛṅga legend. In all these cases, the parallelism of verbal expression of the epic and the Purānic narratives is so complete and striking, that the possibility of their having originated independently of each other is at once ruled out. Many stray stanzas from our parvan are found in the Kūrma, Varāha, Vāyu, Viṣṇu, Viṣṇudharmottara, and in the Harivarṣa.

Our recensions of the Purāṇas are admittedly of a very late date, and it is not to be expected that the Mahābhārata would have borrowed any of its material from our Purāṇas. The claim that the the Mahābhārata owed certain geographical and cosmographical sections of the Bhīṣmaparvan to the Padma Purāṇa, preferred by Luise HILGENBERG, 2 [15] has been answered and liquidated by Rao Bahadur Professor Dr. S. K. BELVALKAR, who has shown that in reality the converse of this proposition is true. 3 This scholar has now shown from internal evidence that the Padma Purāṇa must have written up its geographical section from the information supplied by the Mahābhārata. Similarly, the question of relationship between our Pulastya Tīrthayātrā and a very similar episode in the Padma Purāṇa has been discussed by my assistant, Mr. M. V. VAIDYA, M.A., who has likewise shown from intrinsic evidence that the Mahābhārata passage is the source of the Padma Purāṇa version. 4

It must, however, be admitted that although in most cases the compilers of our Purāṇas appear to have drawn their material from the Mahābhārata, there may be—indeed there must be—a few cases in which both the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas may have drawn independently upon a third common source. We can also say this with regard to episodes like the Savitṛ episode, which likewise occurs in the Matsya Purāṇa, where it is narrated in an entirely different manner from that in the epic, and where all traces of

---

2 Die kosmographische Episode im Mahābhārata und Padmapurāṇa (= Bonner Orientalistische Studien, Heft 4), Bonn 1934.
4 M. V. VAIDYA, "Tīrthayātrā in the Āraṇyakaparvan and the Padmapurāṇa", A Volume of Studies in Indology presented to Prof. P. V. Kane etc. (1941), pp 530 ff.
mutual relationship are absent or obliterated, except for two or three common stanzas and stray pādās.

The reference in our parvan to Vāyu, वायुप्रेक्ष्मणुपश्चय (3, 189. 14), is worth considering in this connection. Nothing corresponding to the general contents of the passage where it occurs is to be found in the extant Vāyu Puraṇa, as is remarked by Hopkins,¹ or for the matter of that in any other Puraṇa proclaimed by Vāyu. There are, however, a few stanzas in the Vāyu describing the dissolution of the world where verbal similarity with some stanzas of this passage is pronounced, even though they are introduced in the Vāyu in a different context. The Mahābhārata, as mentioned in it (3. 189. 14), draws upon a Puraṇa of Vāyu—and indeed, the topic narrated belongs properly to a Puraṇa in its right, a Puraṇa which is older than the extant Puraṇas and which must be presumed to be now irretrievably lost. The evidence for establishing a relationship between the extant Vāyu and its old namesake to which the epic is indebted is lacking, barring these few stray stanzas.

Our parvan also contains an epitome of the legend of Rāma, son of Daśaratha, the hero of the Rāmāyaṇa, which is known as Rāmopākhyāṇa (adhy. 258-275); but in the Parvasamgraha this passage is called समायणसुपाल्याण (1. 2. 126). Does this name imply any connection with our “Rāmāyaṇa”? Jacobi has tried to show that the Rāmopākhyāna is indeed an epitome of the work commonly known as Śālumūk’s Rāmāyaṇa, a conclusion which has been confirmed by subsequent researchers.²

This book, as already observed, is particularly rich in legends of ancient India. Among them are three worthy of special mention, viz., the Tale of Nala, the Rṣyasrṇga Legend and the Story of Sāvirtrī which have been critically edited here for the first time. The first of these, the Tale of Nala, has by way of translations into English, French, German, Dutch, Italian and other European languages, passed into the great stream of world literature. The second, the Rṣyasrṇga Legend, though not so well known, has yet a long and interesting history and shows many modulations and ramifications, as has been convincingly shown by Professor Heinrich Lüders in his well-known monograph on the subject, “Die Sage von Rṣyasrṇga.”³ The story of Sāvirtrī portraying woman in the rôle of the saviour of man, which represents the high-water mark of epic poetry, is in a class by itself, and deserves to be more widely known. It is to be hoped that this first critical edition of the three of the most famous episodes of the Mahābhārata will evoke the interest of Indologists and encourage further study of them.

¹ The Great Epic of India, p. 48 f.
² Cf. V. S. Sukthankar, “Epic Studies VIII”, in A Volume of Studies in Indology presented to Prof. P. V. Kane etc. (1941), pp. 472 ff.
INTRODUCTION

THE TWO RECEPTIONS

The text of the Āraṇyakaparvan is, relatively speaking, remarkably smooth, offering no special difficulties for textual reconstruction. There are of course, as usual, discrepancies between the Northern and the Southern recensions, and between the various versions comprising these two main recensions. But it is noteworthy that in the whole of this big parvan, comprising between 11,000 and 12,000 "ślokas", there are not many transpositions of any consequence and there are also remarkably few "substitute passages". By the latter I mean parallel versions of fairly long passages in two or more conflicting recensions which agree in general sense but are worded differently in different groups of manuscripts, so that they cannot be co-ordinated line by line,—passages which we find in large numbers in some of the other parvans, notably in the Virāṭaparvan. These substitute passages are very clear evidences of textual corruption—or, shall we say, derangement?—and indeed very embarrassing to the textual critic. As for the transpositions, there is only one that is worth noting here, and that is of the last adhyāya of this parvan. The whole of this adhyāya is bodily transferred in the Southern recension to the next parvan and appears there incorporated in the first adhyāya of that parvan! It is not possible to say with certainty whether this chapter, which in all probability is itself an interpolation, belongs legitimately to our parvan or to the next; but it appears to be distinctly more appropriate in its Northern setting, as its intrusion in the Virāṭaparvan seems to lead to some obvious repetitions as well as disturbance of context.

There are naturally quite a number of large and small insertions in the various versions. But in this matter also the present parvan prepares a surprise for us. From the experience gained from our critical editions of the Ādi, Sabha, and Virāṭa parvans especially, we are inclined to regard the Southern recension as a highly inflated version of the text. Now, in this parvan—strange to say—the Vulgate version, which is based on the late Northern tradition, is actually considerably longer than the Southern, as may be seen from the extent of this parvan according to the existing printed editions of the Vulgate and the Southern recension: the Calcutta edition has 12,848 ślokas (corrected figure) as against 11,138 ślokas in SASTRI's Southern Recension.

[17] The large excess in the Calcutta-Bombay editions compared with SASTRI's is explained by the fact that the Vulgate text contains about a dozen adhyāyas which are lacking entirely in the Southern recension; whereas the Southern recension contains only two passages of any considerable length (App. I, Nos. 4 and 23), which are not found in representative manuscripts of the Northern recension, they being peculiar to the Southern,—with the result that the Calcutta edition has 1710 ślokas in excess of SASTRI's edition.

---

of the Aranyakaparvan. Thus we see that though, as a whole, the Southern recension is unquestionably inflated, yet the process of inflation, as is evident from this parvan, is not uniform throughout the epic,—which is a very important and significant fact.

Though the best version of the Northern recension—namely, the Śāradā-K version—and the Southern recension agree remarkably well as regards the general extent of the parvan, there are nevertheless numerous specific individual readings, characterizing the two recensions—Northern and Southern—and distinguishing them sharply from each other. Here is a selection of readings peculiar to the two main recensions, the references being to adhyāyas and ślokas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Recension</th>
<th>Southern Recension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 37 घोरे</td>
<td>संवार:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 41 छुड़िये</td>
<td>श्रीहूण्ड</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 13 विक्रमाद्य</td>
<td>विष्णु (text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 31 न लिप्ते</td>
<td>स्वप्नेय्य (text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 34 स्पूता</td>
<td>दुश्यन्त (text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 45 द्वारें</td>
<td>क्षरोप्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 50 ब्रह्मानु</td>
<td>विज्ञ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 74 वंदनावन</td>
<td>भोगाच</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 8 एवं कोषे यदि</td>
<td>एतच्छेयस्तव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 2 शब्दभेष राजा</td>
<td>मधुर बाक्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 16 न्येयमिळत लोचने</td>
<td>विपक्षगतमांकां</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 59 युक्त सभे ब्यक्तिर</td>
<td>भीमसेनापि महावर:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 13 क्षण(९) क्षण</td>
<td>क्रृष्णाजनोतरासङ्गः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 28 महिषी</td>
<td>क्रिमिणी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 50 श</td>
<td>तथा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 78 पुन: हुसान</td>
<td>ततः पुनर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 83 राजानं दशिनेन च</td>
<td>दलितेन युधिष्ठिरे</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. ४ सिंहविकासी</td>
<td>युधि विकासी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. ११ परमेश्वरमाहाश</td>
<td>स्मृतसाधना ब्रह्मण:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अस्तत्वस्याश्च ब्रह्म:</td>
<td>नाला ननुपपतितात:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be observed that all these additions in the Southern recension (with the exception of only one or two), numerous as they are, are uniformly short, each usually consisting of not more than a couple of lines.

As remarked already, the text of this parvan is remarkably smooth, not presenting any unusual difficulties in the way of restitution. When the Śarada-K version (which is the best Northern version) and the Southern recension are placed vis-à-vis, we can in general reconstruct the original with confidence, barring a certain number of minor verbal fluctuations in the shape of synonymous phrasings, which remain indeterminate without affecting the construction or obscuring the sense. The concord between the Śarada-K version and the Southern recension in point of general content is striking, and forms a sure basis for constituting a single text. Contamination between the Kasmiṁī and the Southern recension cannot be proved, but contamination between the Bengali-Devanāgarī version and the Southern recension is not impossible. The agreements between the Bengali-Devanāgarī and the Southern recension have nevertheless been as a rule utilized to arrive at a tentative stop-gap, based on the indications of documentary evidence. But it should be noted that the Kasmiṁī-Southern agreements have for greater documentary authority and probative value than the Bengali-cum-Devanāgarī and Southern agreements.

Let me put the matter in a slightly different way. The highest documentary probability we can demand and expect is when all manuscripts of our critical apparatus—which is the same as saying, all our different versions—agree on a reading or a feature. We must accept this as the original; at least we do not want to question it, at present. In the absence of such complete concord, the next best combination is the agreement between the Śarada version and the Southern recension (against Bengali-Devanāgarī). Third in importance is, in my opinion, the concord between the Southern recension and the Bengali-cum-Devanāgarī version (against the Śarada). Fourth in order stands the agreement between only Northern versions or only Southern versions inter se, which I consider, in general, as of equal value. With the proviso that a passage or a stanza or even a line, which is not necessary to the context, may be rejected, if it is actually omitted entirely in even one of the important versions, since—as experience has shown—the chances of conflation are always very much greater than those of accidental or intentional omission.
CHARACTER AND MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE VERSIONS AND THEIR MANUSCRIPTS

The Sāradā (or Kasmīri) Version.

We are fortunate in possessing for this parvan also, a genuine Kasmīrī manuscript written, in old Sāradā characters, on folios prepared from the Himalayan birch-bark (bhūrajapatra). The manuscript is no other than the now world-famous "Sāradā Codex", the unique birch-bark manuscript of the Mahābhārata belonging to the Bombay Government Collection, now deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, with identification No. 159 of 1875-76, which is the only extant genuine representative of the old [19] version of Kasmīr. Our manuscript is, in other words, the continuation of the Sāradā manuscript used for the Adi and Sabhā. The manuscript is fragmentary, breaking off in the middle of 3. 253. 184, thus lacking unfortunately the last 46 adhyāyas of our text. For this lacuna we have to depend upon the "K" version, some manuscripts of which have proved to be moderately good copies of the Sāradā version, especially K3, which is described below.

It is now recognized by the competent authorities on the subject that the Sāradā version is, in many respects, the most faithful representative of the original now extant; and the text of the Aranyakaparvan as preserved in our Sāradā Codex only confirms this view.

The Sāradā text of the Aranyakaka is of a piece with the texts of the Adi and the Sabhā. The stanzas comprising the text have not been actually counted—it would not be easy to compute its exact extent, as the text comprises ślokas, triṣṭubhs and two lengthy prose passages—but it is, in all probability, the shortest version of the parvan now extant, since it omits many passages which are found in other versions and manuscripts, while it does not contain new additions of any consequence. The text includes many archaic survivals in point of linguistic usage and shows what may fairly be regarded as "difficult readings" (lect. diff.), in comparison with those of other manuscripts.

The most striking omission of the Kasmīrī version is the story of Urvasī (adhy. 45-46 of the Vulgate—passage No. 6 of our App. I), which relates how Arjuna is tempted by Urvasī during his sojourn in Indra's heaven, and

1 The Kasmīrī character of the text of our Sāradā manuscript, which is suggested by the script (Sāradā) and the writing material (bhūrajapatra), is confirmed not only by the reading सरवस्य in the third pāda of the introductory mantra नारायण नमस्कृत्य etc.; but also by the regular omission of the word उवाच in such reference as वैद्यवाणि उवाच; and further by such Kasmīrī spellings of names like चाक्षेष्ठ (for चाक्षेष्ठ) in 3. 17. 22, corresponding to हुर्देश्य (for हुर्देश्य) in the Virāṭa; cf. RAGHU VIRA, Introduction to the Virāṭaparvan, p. xi. The Bhāratamañjari has जाठेश्य in 3. 189 and जुरेश्य in 4. 36, etc. That is a real Kasmīrī trait.
how he refuses her advances on the ground that she is an ancestress of his. Although this piquant story has permeated all versions of the epic except the Kaśmirī (S₁ and some K), there is no reason to doubt that it is a late addition. The highly erotic description of the voluptuous hetäre of the gods, Urvasī, with its pronounced sex appeal, is in my opinion totally incompatible with the epic setting, which lacks all “feminine” interest and eschews all erotic topics as such. The stanzas I refer to are (App. I, No. 6, lines 50-57 = Bombay ed. 3. 46.8-11 = Calcutta ed. 3. 1824-1827):

दिव्याकरणो हुमुक्तव दिव्यचन्दनस्थिति।
गलस्या सारविपनी नस्या तस्यां वचनहारः।
स्तनोदत्सप्तोभावस्यामानं पदें पदेः।
त्रिविक्षिपलिंचल्रेण मथेनातीव शोभिना।
अपोभूधविस्तोर्तीन्वितम्बोक्तपीवर्मू।
ममयायतनं चुंडः रसनादात्मणूपितम्।
कर्मर्णामपिदिग्यानं मनोवायागात्स्वनम्।
दुःखवस्वागरं रेजे जघने निरवशताः।

[20] The spurious character of this lengthy erotic interlude seems to me to be further revealed by two stanzas of phalasrūla with which the passage ends (App. I, No. 6, lines 157-162 = Bombay ed. 3. 46. 62-63 = Cal. ed. 3, 1877-1878):

य हृदं भयुपशिष्यं चुंचं पाप्पुचतत्त्वेः।
न तस्य कामं कामेण पापकेण प्रवतते।
इदमयंतिप्रम्पत्तयो घोरं
शुचिचं चरितं विनिद्रायण्यं फाल्युन्तस्ते।
व्यपमयंमद्वशरागद्वा-
खिदयामार्कर्मणि मानवेन्द्राः।

The object of the interpolations seems to be also clear. It is primarily intended to motivate Arjuna’s masquerading as the dancing master to Princess Utrāra in the harem at the court of Virāṭa, which is narrated in the next parvan. The devout see in it a trial, a test, to see if Arjuna’s mind was as pure as his body was strong. Arjuna withstands the test successfully. But the reward he gets for his patience and self-control is a curious one; he is cursed by the angry and disappointed nymph that he would live as a eunuch among women! This apparent curse is, however, looked upon as a blessing in disguise, for it was to take effect and serve its purpose in the thirteenth year of the exile through which Arjuna along with his brothers must remain unrecognized (ajñatavāsa).

This jejune invention creates, however, many complications not foreseen by the interpolator, as it is unfortunately contradicted by Arjuna himself in
the very next parvan, when he confesses to Uttara, that though he has been telling people that he is a eunuch (4. 10. 8-9), *he is in reality nothing of the kind*, and that he has only been practising strict continence, having taken the vow of rigid celibacy for one full year by order of his eldest brother, Yudhiṣthira (4. 40. 12-13):

\[
\text{नासिम ज्ञीयो महाबधो परिवर्त्यमुखतः।}
\text{समात्मत्वमुखतीयं विद्य मां त्य सुपातम।}
\]

If that be so, then we must assume that either Urvasī's curse had failed to materialize or—what is more plausible—that Arjuna was never under any curse such as the one implied in this interpolation. Such an interpolation could have been made only when it was considered necessary that Arjuna ought in reality to have been a eunuch to be admitted into the ladies' apartments at the Virāṭa court, or at least to justify his specific statement to the effect that he was a eunuch. But this appalling realism is as clumsy as it is unnecessary. The original conception was obviously quite different. At the end of the twelfth year of their exile Dharma tells Yudhiṣthira that they could go to Virāṭa's kingdom in any capacity or with any profession, and no one would recognize them under any circumstances. Their *samaṅkala*pa would be so strong that they would appear to others in any shape or form desired by themselves, without any external aid or make-up (3. 298. 17, 19):

\[
\text{यद्यपि स्वेता रुपेण चरित्रयथ महोमाम्।}
\text{न बो विज्ञायुस्ते कश्चित्तिथ योकेदु भास्त।}
\text{[21] यः संकल्पितं रुपं मनसा यतं याह्याम्।}
\text{ताह्यं ताह्यं स्वं छल्ते चाराविषयं।}
\]

In these circumstances I think there is not much doubt that the suspected episode is in fact a clumsy interpolation, and the circumstance that the Śāradā version lacks is only an additional proof of the superiority of this version.

I may add here that the whole story is likewise missing not only in the *Bhāratamāniṇī* but also in the fragmentary but excellent Devanāgarī manuscript of the Āraṇyaka parvan belonging to the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (No. 966, fol. 43b), which I have occasionally consulted in doubtful cases.\(^4\)

Further particulars of the Śāradā version will be found under the account of the "K" version, which follows next, and with which the Śāradā version is intimately connected.

---

\(^4\) See above p. 150f.
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A facsimile of a page of the “Śāradā Codex” (Ś₁) appears as the frontispiece of this volume. The text is 3. 45. 1-25.

The “K” Version.

This version, as is the case of the other parvans, is a specific Devanāgarī version; closely related to the Śāradā, and clearly differentiated from the so-called Devanāgarī version. The manuscripts comprising this version must in part be merely Devanāgarī copies of Śāradā originals and may in part represent the version of a province or a region adjoining the Śāradā zone, which it has not been possible to localize more precisely.

That the manuscripts of the K version are akin to and cognate with Ś₁, may be seen from the numerous readings common to Ś₁ and K (with or without some other Devanāgarī manuscripts). But it is demonstrated especially forcibly by their common omission of certain important and well-known passages found in all other manuscripts, or at least in all other manuscripts of the Northern recension. Of such passages, given in our App. I, the most important are numbered 16-18, 22, 27 and 31.

Of these passages No. 16, which forms a separate adhyāya of about 130 lines, and is a medley of legends—among them the story of Narakaśura and the legend of the rescue of the Earth by Viśṇu in the Boar incarnation,—is omitted in all five manuscripts of the group Ś₁ K, besides D₂-₃ of the Northern recension. It is, in other words, characteristic of the Mid-Indian group, Bengali and late Devanāgarī.—Passage No. 17 (42 lines), describing the return of the Pāṇḍavas to the hermitage at Badarī, has permeated more widely, and is now found not only in the entire Southern recension but also in all manuscripts of the Northern recension except Ś₁ K (with D₁-₂-₃). Here also we notice that the group Ś₁ K is clearly distinguished from the typical Central sub-recension B Dc Dn D₄-₅. —No. 18 is a short passage of 24 lines of exactly the same type; that is to say, it is omitted in Ś₁ K (with some other allied Devanāgarī manuscripts) in opposition to the typical Mid-Indian group B Dc Dn D₄-₅. K₃ secondarily incorporates in its text only the first four lines of the passage, which is as indication of the manner in which the additions of the Central sub-recension (B D) have contaminated the Śāradā-K version.—Another passage of that type is No. 22 (giving the names of Skanda); which is omitted in the whole group (Ś₁ K), with [22] the single exception of the conflated manuscript K₂.—The next passage of that kind is No. 27, a lengthy passage of 87 lines describing in detail how Jayadratha, after being released from captivity by Yudhiṣṭhira, seeks the help of the god Mahādeva in order to avenge himself; it is found in all Northern manuscripts except Ś₁ K D₁. —The last passage in our list is No. 31, a long spun out lament by Yudhiṣṭhira on seeing his brothers lying on the ground as if dead near the Enchanted Lake, a passage which is also found in all Northern manuscripts except Ś₁ K (with D₁-₂-₃).
The contrast between \( S_1 \), \( K \) and the Mid-Indian group is well brought out by two different single-line insertions, which are nothing but two different attempts to fill out a supposed lacuna after 3. 107. 18. After this stanza,

\[
\begin{align*}
S_1 & \quad K & \quad D_3 \text{ ins.:} & \quad & B & \quad Dc & \quad Dn & \quad D_{5-4, \, 6} \text{ ins.:} \\
531^* & \text{तावस्त्रम् न वस्त्यन्ति नम्म} & & & 532^* & \text{तावस्त्रम् गतिनिषिद्ध सागराण्यं} & \text{महान्द्रिद्} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Both of these, as shown by \( S \) (which our constituted text here follows), are superfluous, as will be clear from a perusal of the text (3. 107. 18-19):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{तेपामेथि विनंद्यानां स्वरूपं चासों न विच्यते} & \\
\text{तावस्त्रमि तारीमाणि त्वं जइनाभिनिषारि} & \text{महामायेऽथ महामायेऽथ महामायेऽथ} & \text{ब्राह्मण तेषा} & \text{ितामः} & \text{वे महान्द्रिद्} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Notwithstanding the fact that the manuscripts comprising the \( K \) version show many striking agreements which distinguish them from other groups, the \( K \) group itself cannot be said to be quite homogeneous. Of these \( K_2 \) is distinctly conflated and rather more deeply contaminated than the others. While preserving a large number of Kasmiri readings, it sides frequently (especially in the early adhyāyas) with the Bengali-Devanāgarī group; at times even showing readings peculiar to the late Nīlakaṇṭha tradition. \( K_4 \) is really a manuscript of the same type, though the degree of contamination is considerably less. \( K_3 \), on the other hand, shares with \( S_2 \) many unique readings, coming closest to it. Indeed I am inclined to regard the concordant readings of \( S_2 \) and \( K_3 \) as the specific Kasmiri readings. In \( K_4 \) the last manuscript of the \( K \) version, the contamination has gone yet further than in any other \( K \) manuscript, \( K_4 \) incorporating occasionally not merely Southern readings, but sporadically even what are characteristic Southern insertions.

I append here examples of readings showing special affinity between \( S_1 \) and \( K_3 \) (references are to adhyāyas and ślokas):

\[
\begin{array}{l|l}
\text{\( S_1 \), \( K_3 \)} & \text{Other MSS.} \\
7. 10 & \text{जगन्न संजयशः} \\
 & \text{वनास्ते विदुरो वने} \\
7. 15 & \text{स्नायुकामुक्तिनिधियिं} \\
 & \text{तन्त्रिकोग्य व पारिवर्तिषेऽर्थिष्टि} \\
7. 16 & \text{स्मिष्टे} \\
 & \text{सुर्यः संतर्पणं (text), स्तम्भ} \\
7. 18 & \text{अामंिति विदुरं नि:} \\
 & \text{तममिति महामायः (or महाराजः, तेजः, अश्रुः) } \\
9. 5 & \text{कः वदनमवेदी} \\
 & \text{महामाय: (text), महाया (or महाराजः, तेजः, अश्रुः) } \\
\end{array}
\]
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[23] Here follow examples showing the contamination of \( K_2 \) with \( B \ D \); and especially with the group \( B \ Dc \ Dn \ D_{4,6} \):

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
K_2 \text{ B } + \text{ some D} & \text{ Other MSS.} \\
2. 6 & \text{००} \text{००} \\
2. 9 & \text{००} \text{००} \\
2. 10 & \text{००} \text{००} \\
2. 32 & \text{००} \text{००} \\
13. 54 & \text{००} \text{००} \\
13. 98 & \text{००} \text{००} \\
17. 3 & \text{००} \text{००} \\
25. 15 & \text{००} \text{००} \\
34. 11 & \text{००} \text{००} \\
\end{array}
\]

Examples showing specially close contact between \( K_2 \) and \( Dn \) are as follows:

37. 9 \( K_2 \ Dn \) तं प्रति : rest सामार्थ (text) संप्रति etc.
37. 10 \( K_2 \ Dn \) संगरे : rest रक्षण
37. 26 \( K_2 \ Dn \) चन्दन: : rest चन्दन: (text), चुँचितः
37. 38 \( K_2 \ Dn \) विशारद: : rest विशारदः
38. 5 \( K_2 \ Dn \) चाँ (Dn दे) : rest च
38. 8 \( K_2 \ Dn \) ब्रजानवे नियोजकः : rest ब्रजानवे नियोजकः, etc.
44. 16 \( K_2 \ Dn \) देवेष्वर : rest देवेष्वर
52. 5 \( K_2 \ Dn \) घं : rest घं
54. 3 \( K_2 \ Dn \) transp. महाद्वार and नुपा:
61. 82 \( K_2 \ Dn \ D_5 \) रण्य: : rest पुण्य
61. 111 \( K_2 \ Dn \ D_5 \) जसु: : rest तसु:
81. 68 \( K_2 \ Dn \ D_5 \) कृत्यमान्य: : rest कृत्यमान्

Examples of insertions almost restricted to \( K_2 \ Dn \) are : 50*, 55*, (both very clear interpolations), 326* (with \( K_4 \) 390* (with \( D_{4,6} \)), 412* (with \( D_5 \)); and passage No. 12 of App. I (also found in \( D_6 \), but with a different point of insertion).

The contamination of \( K_2 \) from \( Dn \) is especially noticeable in the Nala Episode. Its Kaśmirī character, however, again comes to the surface in such wrong transcription from the Śāradā as तृताधय (for तृताधय) in 3. 97. 17.
Sporadic contamination of K₄ from S is seen in the insertion 159, and in passage No. 4 of App. I (cf. v. 1. 3. 38. 18).

Manuscripts D₁₋₈ of the Devanāgarī version show pronounced affinities with the K version, often supporting the specific readings and omissions of the latter, and they might have been classed under the K version.

**The Bengali Version.**

Our four Bengali manuscripts form on the whole a very homogeneous group, presenting generally a single common reading. The version has very close affinities with a particular type of Devanāgarī manuscripts represented by our Dn D₄₋₆ (with or without Dc). These two groups—B and Dc Dn D₄₋₆—show as a rule the same readings, and contain the same insertions. A notable exception is 939, which is a specific Bengali insertion lacking even in Dc D₄₋₆ and found only in Dn of the Devanāgarī manuscripts.

The affinity of B (Dc) Dn D₄₋₆ (often with the conflated manuscript K₃) is exemplified by the following readings:

11. 27 K₃ B Dn D₄₋₆ मस्तु = rest सुखृ
28. 32 K₃ B Dc Dn D₁₋₆ वै = rest ते
32. 13 B Dn D₄₋₆ अ = rest मम
34. 11 K₃ B Dc Dn D₄₋₆ दुबैला = rest अवीर or अवीर
t
91. 2 B Dn D₄₋₆ नरिण्य चैव = rest देवरिण्य च
t
93. 10 B Dn D₄₋₆ नगो = rest सरो
t
104. 9 B Dn D₄₋₆ तपते = rest (mostly) तताप.

Similarly B (Dc) Dn D₄₋₆, differing from most other manuscripts, have the following short additions: 446, 448, 455 (also in two Southern MSS.) 466, 467, 477, 498, 512, (with K₃), 532, (with D₅), 540, 541, 684, 806, (with K₃), 844, etc., etc.

**The Devanāgarī Versions (other than K).**

I have divided the Devanāgarī Versions into three groups: (1) the Version of Caturbhuja; (2) the Version of Nilakanṭha; and (3) the Composite Version. The first two are the versions respectively of the commentators Caturbhuja and Nilakanṭha, being accompanied by their glosses; the third is a group of Devanāgarī manuscripts not associated with any commentary.

**The Devanāgarī Version of Caturbhuja.**

The version of the commentator Caturbhuja has little to recommend for itself. It generally sides with the BD group, showing a slight preference for B; thus B and Dc have a common insertion 415*, not found in other manuscripts of our critical apparatus. But it is definitely superior to the version of Nilakanṭha, in so far that it lacks many of the very clearly spurious addi-
tions of the latter. The best known of such additions is a passage of 39 lines (App. I, No. 12) inserted in the Nala Episode after our 3. 62. 10, which is found only in K₂ Dn D₆ and is comparable to the passage substituted in K₄ D₄-3 for stanzas 1-17 of our adhy. 62 (cf. App. I, No. 10). Especially in the later adhyāyas of this parvan, Dc and D₂ go together, showing numerous agreements peculiar to themselves. Dc shows some unique additions, though their number is small; examples are 129* and 402*, both being one-line insertions.

Manuscripts of Caturbhuja’s commentary on different parvans are available; that on the Virāṭa has been published by the Gujarati Printing Press (Bombay 1915). It is not unlikely that Caturbhuja had written a commentary on the whole of the Mahābhārata, though it is doubtful whether complete manuscripts of the whole of his commentary are now extant. The manuscripts I have hitherto seen were invariably of individual parvans separately handed down.

[25] Very little is known about this scholiast. He bore the surname or title Miśra, like his fellow commentator Arjuna Miśra. It is therefore likely that he hails from Eastern India. It has not been possible to fix his chronology with precision even in relation to the five major Mahābhārata commentators, Devabodha, Vimalabodha, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa, Arjunamisra and Nilakanṭha. But it is most unlikely that he is a very early commentator.¹ In our manuscripts the commentary is called Vākyadīpikā (fol. 1):

श्रीचतुर्युज्ञमिद्भाषणारण्ये वाक्यदीपिका |

This name is analogous to the titles of the commentaries by Devabodha and Arjunamisra, Jñānadīpikā and Arthadīpikā respectively; compare also the title of Nilakanṭha’s commentary Bhārata-bhāvadīśa.

The Devanāgarī Version of Nilakanṭha: the Vulgate.

The version of Nilakanṭha has never inspired confidence, and in the case of the present parvan, it is singularly disappointing. It contains (along with some other manuscript groups) fourteen additional adhyāyas, some of which are palpably very late interpolations. Notable among the latter are adhy. 262-263 of the Vulgate (our App. I, No. 25), which relate how Duryodhana sends the Ṛṣi Durvāsas, with 10,000 disciples, to Yudhisṭhira at a moment when the latter would not be able to feed such an alarming crowd of hungry mendicants. In answer to Draupadi’s prayers, however, Ṛṣi Kṛṣṇa appears, all of a sudden, from Dvārakā, and so contrives it that the mendicant fraternity, without having eaten a morsel of food, inexplicably feels all of a sudden completely satiated and slinks away in fear and trepidation. They vanish without even making an effort to explain the situation and express

¹ Mr. P. K. Gose, the Curator of the Institute, tentatively assigns him to the period A.D. 1350-1550,
their apologies to Yudhiṣṭhira, who had managed in the meantime to cook food enough to feed that astonishing large troop of beggars. This naïve story, which is not without an element of humour, is found only in Dc, D, G, besides Dn, a very poor collection of manuscripts, and is therefore obviously a very late interpolation. Its omission from our text, I feel sure, will not be regretted.

The Vulgate contains many lines which are extremely weakly supported, at least by manuscripts of our critical apparatus. Thus, besides Dn, 5* is found only in D; 25* only in S, K; 30* only in K, D; 48* only in D; 50* and 55* only in K; 874* only in D; 1193* only in Dg; and passage No. 32 of App. I (a long interpolation of 72 lines) only in D, G.

Dn also shows a surprisingly large number of unique readings, not found in any other manuscript, a few of which are noted below as illustrations:

32. 31 Dn आन्तःति : rest अस्तःति
33. 13 Dn दुःक्षितः : rest दुःक्षिदेः
43. 28 Dn चर्मचारिणाः : rest भूमिचारिणाः
60. 14 Dn अभिवा : others सा तीर्थ (text), सारिन
82. 5 Dn पुष्या देवी : rest महापुष्या
82. 33 Dn च गच्छति : rest महौपते
84. 11 Dn अवज्ञनो : rest अज्ञनो
87. 1 Cn अस्तेत्युः : rest अवभित्तु
93. 4 Dn अद्देवा : rest पाण्डवः

[26]
100. 4 Dn भाषये : rest भाषम
145. 1 Dn मा चिरे : rest मातरं
146. 53 Dn तीर्थार्थः : rest तीर्थन्तर
167. 8 Dn ज्ञानः : others तथा (text), तथा, ततो
195. 14 Dn वाक्ययुः : rest वाक्यरः

Other specific readings of Dn, not supported by any other manuscript, will be found in: 3. 33. 35 (प्रभुमा), 36 (एवं), 46 (न मे), 52 (विवासं); 81. 21 (वर्षितः), 156 (गतः); 82. 46 (मालवः); 85. 1 (तथा), 10 (तथा), 16 (क [or ए] गलयपक्ती स्वम्); 86. 13 (द्रम); 178. 25 (सा ब्रह्म); 198. 15 (द्रम), 19 (पवं or परं); 200. 54 (विचारण मे); 229. 16 (सहस्रः); 230. 23 (पैठकः); 235. 3 (पूजासनः); 244. 13 (स्थानः); etc.; etc.

In his commentary on 3. 291. 70 (Bombay ed.), Nilakantha mentions Arjunamisra: अर्जुनमिष्र अर्जुनमिष्रिष्य, showing that Arjunamisra is prior to Nilakantha, as has been proved by me elsewhere on other grounds also.1

In commenting on 3. 33. 59 (Bombay ed.):

\[ \text{जिज्ञास दस्तावहं दि भूद्राणान् दुधाचेतससाम्} \]
\[ \text{निश्चया रामते राजयमाहारमिव शतर्क: II,} \]

Nilakantha notes certain commentators (अवाह:).

शतर्क: कावृत्त सूद्राणं महामलकाविशेषाणं जिज्ञास दस्तावहं बाहिन्दिनार्थे भक्तयति तदनन्त दश्तास्त रानुन् जस्तर्कं अवाह:।

Owing to the ambiguity of the word शतर्क: it is not possible to say for certain whether Nilakantha is here referring to eastern commentators or merely to old commentators, but he probably means the latter, as he calls easterners "Gaudas."

Nilakantha appears to have been an adept in the Kama-sastra also. In the course of his commentary on the chapter describing the general degeneracy of the Kali age, he discusses certain pornographic details with a frankness which is as astonishing as it is disconcerting. The stanza in question is 3. 186. 35 (= Bombay ed. 3: 188. 41):

\[ \text{बहुमजा इस्लीखद्वा दीलाकारविचविलंतिता।} \]
\[ \text{मुखेश्मगः यतियो राजनमधेविष्णुति दुधाचेतसः II,} \]

on which Nilakantha has the gloss: मुखेश्मगः यतियो बाहिन्दिन प्रतिष्ठाः। प्रथम मुखेष्मगं भवत्य स्त्रिया इस्लीखद्वा पुरस्त्र कामप्रदेश्वर्यः। तत्ततं रततात्त्वादः।

In the beginning of his commentary, Nilakantha mentions his guru Lakṣmanārāyaṇa, Nārāyaṇa-ṛthra and Dhīreśamīśra of Hamrāpurā:

\[ \text{प्रणम्य नारायणतीर्थयांन् धीरेशमामिःश्रां श्च हमिरपः हृदीपुर्वयोः।} \]

Nilakantha’s guru Nārāyaṇa-ṛthra—not to be confused with the Mahābhārata commentator Nārāyaṇa-Sarvajña or Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa—has been identified by Mr. P. K. Gode with the author of the Mīmāṃśā work Bhāṭṭabhāṣā-prakāśikā (c. A.D. 1650).

Variants cited by Nilakantha will be found in his commentary on the following stanzas (references to the adhyāya and śloka of the Bombay ed.):

2. 37; 3. 63; 4. 19; 6. 3 (अपपत्त:); 7. 5; 8. 11-12; 9. 15; 10. 24, 32, 37; 11. 4, 8 (अपपत्त:); 12. 23, 35, 36, [27] -80; 15. 7; 20. 10; 22. 4; 23. 8; 25. 1 29. 8, 22 (गौदपत्त:); 29; 30. 23, 41; 31. 8; 32. 13, 38, 59; 33. 8, 59 (प्राबः);

63, 68, 72; 35. 3 (अपपत्त:); 37. 34; 40. 4; 43. 6 (अपपत्त:); 71. 16 (वैति)

---

The Composite Devanāgarī Version.

The Devanāgarī has always been found to be a composite version. Our composite Devanāgarī manuscripts may be roughly divided into three groups. (1) The best group, from our view-point, is D₁₃ which frequently agrees with S, K (but especially K₄) in opposition to other D manuscripts and might have been classed under the K version. Of these D₂ agrees, however, frequently—especially in later adhyāyas—with Dc, the version of Caturbhujā. (2) Then there is the group D₄₀ which generally agrees with B Dc Dn. (3) The remaining manuscript D₅ is in a class by itself, presenting a text which is, for large parts, almost the same as that of the Nīlakanṭhā version, but which shows exceptionally some noteworthy discrepancies. Groups 2 and 3 are frequently seen in combination, and we accordingly very often get a wider group B Dc Dn D₄₀ (sometimes joined by K₃).

The affinity of the group D₁₃ is exemplified by the following concordant readings of these three manuscripts.

1. 3 D₁₃ बने बिज्जौँ: (Parasm.) पाल्लाह्ने: rest बने विज्जहि (Atm.) पायी:
   1. 5 D₁₃ पराशायिनां: other MSS. अरिपायिनां (text), अनिकायिनां
   1. 13 D₁₃ नार्थायाम: कुछ कुत: : other MSS. न धम्मी (or सा)धे: कुत: कुछ
   1. 14 D₁₃ नार्थायाम: : other MSS. नुभेष्टी (text), नुभेष्टी
   1. 15 D₁₃ गच्छाम: (Parasm.) सहित: rest साशु गच्छामहें (Atm.)
   1. 34 D₁₃ शेत्यवी: : rest पाल्लायावः
   2. 5 D₁₃ रा गच्छ: : rest रागिति (by transp.)
   0. 22 D₁₃ महिषायम्वि: rest कर्षिष्ठि
   48. 29 D₁₃ यथा: other MSS. भय (text), तथा
   167. 19 D₁₃ गच्छव्य: : other N MSS. माष्वन्त (text) etc., etc.

Examples of insertions, almost peculiar to D₁₃ and showing the close affinity between these three manuscripts, are: 182* (with K₄), 288*, 334* (with K₄), 1025*, 1186*, 1188*, 1190*, 1194* (latter four with K₄), etc., etc.

As remarked above, the group D₁₃, differing from other Devanāgarī manuscripts, frequently agrees with S, K. Examples of insertions common to S, K and D₁₃ (often with D₃) are: 640*, 707*, 711*, 715*, etc. etc.

Group D₁₃ is important for the reason that it lacks (like S, K) many of the interpolations of the B D group; e.g. 44*, 128*, 130*, 131*, 133*, 137*, 162*,
The Telugu Version.

Only two manuscripts of the Telugu version were collated, of which one (as is often the case with these manuscripts) is certainly contaminated, to a very high degree, from [28] Northern sources. In such conflated parts, T₂ is generally associated with G₃. Examples of such contamination will be found below, under the Grantha version.

T₂, differing from T₁ often sides with G₁ M₁ (with or without M₂), giving what appears to be the real Southern reading.

For examples of contamination of T₂ through the Northern recension, cf. 174*, 248*, 484*, 563*, 570*, 572*, 577*, 661*, 673*, 932*, (with M₁), 991*, etc., etc. Many of these are marginal insertions, added sec. m.

The Grantha Version.

Most of our Grantha manuscripts are unfortunately contaminated from the Northern recension. The contamination is particularly noticeable in the case of G₃, and it increases towards the end of the parvan; so much so that in the final chapters G₃ often omits the specific insertions of the Southern recension, absorbing at the same time the characteristic insertions of the Northern! Such manuscripts are valuable for a study of the fusion of recensions.


But the most striking instance of conflation is the inclusion in G₃ of our final adhyāyā (299), which is regularly transposed in all genuine Southern manuscripts to the beginning of the Virātaparvan. The evidence of G₃ is thus seen to be fully inconclusive and therefore untrustworthy for the constitution of the Grantha version and the Southern recension.

The Malayālam Version.

While forming an integral part of the Southern recension, the Malayālam version has its own peculiarities, which distinguish it clearly from the T G version, as regards both readings and insertions. Here is a list of T G
insertions, which are lacking in the Malayālam version: 183*, 218*, 232*,
856*, 859*, 867*, 868*, 869*, etc., etc.—On the other hand, M also shows a certain
number of specific insertions which are not known to the Telugu and Grantha
versions, such as 307*, 494*, 560*, 581*, 949*, 1028*, 1041*, 1083*, 1158*,
1262*, 1336*, etc., etc.—Nearly all of these insertions (of both types) are
single-line insertions; a few are of two lines.

But our M is not homogeneous, M₁ and M₂ exhibiting among themselves
numerous differences. M₂ shows clear signs of contamination from
Northern sources, and is by no means a good representative of the Malayālam
version. Examples of Northern accretions in M₂ are 96*, 99*, 465*,
516*, 796*, 955*, etc. etc. M₂ is again often excepted from the common
Southern reading, as in 3, 41, 24: S (except M₂) ऊष्णम् मनोज्ञः पर्यः
against N (with M₂) [29] ऊष्णम् मनोज्ञः पर्यः, where M₂ agrees with N. M₃ (like G₃)
also omits a few of the typical Southern insertions; e.g., 102*, 723*. M₁ is
not altogether free from contamination from some Northern source or sources
as is indicated by 629*, 677*, 932* (with T₂ marg. sec. m.), etc., etc.

A very good example of the contamination of M₂ from N is furnished by
the conflated reading of M₂ in 3, 22, 8. N reads विष्णुविद्याच्चकण \( \text{as opposed to S, which has } \) विष्णुविद्यांचिरे बुध; but M₂ reads विष्णुविद्याच्चकण, which is very evidently a result of the conflation of the Southern and Northern
readings: विष्णुविद्याः (S) \( \text{and } \) विष्णुविद्यांच्च (N). But the most convincing
proof is furnished by a palpable mistake in M₂. The manuscript inserts
line 1 of a Northern additional stanza (95*), after 3, 28, 16ab, but line 2 of
that stanza after 16cd. The two lines of the stanza, though superfluous, do
convey some meaning when read together; but arranged as in M₂, they serve
no useful purpose except to betray the conflated character of the manuscript
in question.

With regard to the status and merit of the Malayālam version in general,
I am glad to cite here an observation of Professor P. P. S. SASTRI, which I
am able to confirm from my own experience. In the course of his remarks
on the Southern recension in the Introduction to his edition of the Āraṇya-
kaparvan, Professor SASTRI writes: “Not having been subject to Nāyak influ-
ence in any manner whatsoever, the tradition handed down by the Malayālam
manuscripts preserved the Grantha text, in a purer and more unmixed form
than even some comparatively early Grantha manuscripts, as the Malayālam
Mss. do not at all seem to have come into contact with the Northern Reces-
sion till very recent times.”¹ This is in substantial agreement with what
I had stated in my Prolegomena to the Ādiparvan regarding the Malayālam

¹ The Mahābhārata (Southern Recension), Vol. IV (1883), Introduction,
13, iii f.
version, namely, that it is “the best Southern version.” I am happy to find that this cautious remark of mine has subsequently been confirmed by the editor of the Southern Recension himself in a clear and unambiguous manner.

THE PARVASAMGRAHA

The number of adhyāyas and ślokas of the Aranyaka, according to the Parvasamgrahaparvan, in our edition, and in the current editions, can be seen in the following table.

**COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE NUMBER OF ADHYĀYAS AND ŚLOKAS IN THE ARANYAKAPARVAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adhyāyas</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ślokas</td>
<td>11,664</td>
<td>? *</td>
<td>12,848</td>
<td>12,002</td>
<td>12,476</td>
<td>11,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[30] With regard to the above figures the following particulars may be noted. According to the count of the Calcutta edition the number of ślokas in this parvan is 17,478. But this calculation misses the correct figure by several thousands. The Calcutta Pandits responsible for the edition, who were apparently not very good mathematicians, have made repeated mistakes in the counting of the lines, being evidently baffled by the complicacies of calculation at the turn of the century! They have numbered the lines, by fives, without committing any mistake up to 3095. They make their first mistake by putting down the next figure (after 3095) as 4000, in place of 3100; and this is followed by several other lapses of that type! The correct total as computed by JACOBER is 12,848 as shown above.—The figure for the ślokas of the Bombay edition has been taken from the edition of text and Marathi translation by Kashinath alias Bhau Shastri LELE of Wai (Saka 1821), who has counted the stanzas in his edition, adhyāya by adhyāya; and, after correcting his own errors in three different places, gives the correct figure, according to him, at the end of the Vanaparvan volume (p. 1344) as 12,002.3—The figure for the stanzas of the Kumbhakonam edition has been taken from the Index Volume (p. 5) of that edition.—The extent of Professor
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1 *Prolegomena*, p. LXXIII.
2 *Das Mahabharata, Inhaltsangabe, Index, etc.*, p. 257.
3 According to another computation, that of the Chitrashala Edition (Poona 1930), the correct number is 11,859, as given in the footnote on p. 500 of its edition of the “Vanaparvan.”
P. P. S. Sastri's *Southern Recension* has been given by himself in the Introduction to the second part of his *Aranyakaparvan* (vol. 5, p. xiv).—The figure for the critical text has been intentionally left blank by me, since the parvan contains two prose adhyāyas, in addition to a large number of Trīṣṭubh stanzas, and it is difficult to compute their equivalent in ślokas. Indeed the figures given for the other editions are all defective for the same reason. In fact they are all *purely fictitious*, being obtained by the *addition of figures for the stanzas and prose sections*, but may be taken to represent a *very rough approximation of the extent*. It will thus be realized that it is futile to compare these figures with the Parvasaṁgraha figures, which are often themselves doubtful. It has been the general experience that ancient figures, when at all complicated, seldom come out quite right. And there is no reason to think that the Parvasaṁgraha figures for the number of stanzas are an exception to the rule.

We do not expect strict agreement between our figures and the Parvasaṁgraha figures in respect of the number of stanzas in such a voluminous work but we do expect some agreement as regards the number of adhyāyas. It is, therefore, surprising to find that almost all extant manuscripts contain about 30 adhyāyas at least more than the figure given by the Parvasaṁgraha! This discrepancy is the more striking, as the manuscripts of the Parvasaṁgraha, of all versions and recensions without exception, agree—for a change—in giving the same figure for the number of adhyāyas, namely, 269. As regards the manuscripts of the Āranyaka, the Kaśmirī (Śāradā) and the Southern manuscripts agree in having about 300 adhyāyas, while the Central Sub-recension (Bengali-Devanāgarī group) show in fact about 315 adhyāyas. The former may be taken as the more reliable figure. Professor P. P. S. Sastri's device of arriving at the Parvasaṁgraha figure (269), by omitting arbitrarily about 31 colophons actually contained in all of his manuscripts is hardly commendable.

[31] Due to these discrepancies between the data of the Parvasaṁgraha and the manuscripts, which are patent, two probabilities are presented to us: either, the compiler of the Parvasaṁgraha had made a mistake in counting the adhyāyas, or some thirty adhyāyas have been added to our parvan since the time of the Parvasaṁgraha count. No third explanation is possible, and both these are significant alternatives. If we admit that there has been an original error in the counting of adhyāyas, it is roughly a mistake of 30 in 300, that is 10 per cent., which is indeed a very high percentage of error. If we could prove even two or three such errors, the value of the figures in the Parvasaṁgraha will dwindle down to an insignificant quantity. If, on the other hand,—as is more likely—our critical text contains about 30 adhyāyas (equivalent to about 1500 stanzas) more than the text which was the basis of the Parvasaṁgraha calculation, then even in the matter of general contents
it is nowhere near the Parvasamgraha standard and must be very far removed from the hypothetical archetype of the Mahābhārata; for it is hardly credible that as many as thirty colophons could get displaced or lost in a mere aggregate of 300 colophons. There are moreover no means to excise these spurious accretions except by methods of higher criticism, which owing to the peculiar character of our work would be a very delicate operation indeed, and withal one of doubtful utility. We thus see how easy it would be to delude ourselves that just by collating a small fraction of the extant manuscripts, we could arrive at the archetype.

The passage in the Parvasamgraha giving the contents of this parvan exists in two versions (1. 2. 111-126): the longer version of the Vulgate being based on the Central Sub-recension (the Bengali-Devanāgarī), the shorter version on the Kaśmirī-Southern tradition. I have adopted the latter in this edition, relying mainly on the superiority of the agreement between what appear prima facie to be independent versions. But I think it is possible to fortify the argument in the present case from intrinsic considerations. It will be seen that in the shorter version, the sequence of the incidents mentioned in the list of contents does not tally with the actual sequence in the original text of the parvan, given uniformly by all extant manuscripts; the sequence of the longer version on the other hand tallies exactly with the present text. Moreover, the latter—namely, the longer version—is much fuller, containing as it does far more details. Is it now likely that the Kaśmirī and Southern traditions had independently—or in collusion with each other—discarded the original fuller and more correct version in favour of a shorter and defective version? It seems far more probable that the defects of the original short version, which has been preserved independently by the Kaśmirī and Southern traditions, had been noticed early, and that had led to its being modified and corrected by the revisers of the Central Sub-recension, which then adopted the revised version of the contents.

The Parvasamgraha mentions sixteen sub-parvans, which is also our number, but the Vulgate has twenty-two; that is six more. The latter number is obtained by adding to the list the names of certain episodes like the Nalopākhyāna, Rāmpākhyāna, Sāvityupākhyāna, which originally did not form separate sub-parvans at all, as will be seen from the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 अरण्यक (adhy. 1-11)</td>
<td>1 अरण्य (adhy. 1-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 किमीरवध (12)</td>
<td>2 किमीरवध (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ब्रह्मसत (13-42)</td>
<td>3 अरुणासिद्धान्त (12-37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 कैश्चार (38-41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The limits of these sub-parvans can be fixed, as a rule, with tolerable certainty with the aid of the colophons of our manuscripts, which give indications sufficient for purposes of approximate identification.

**OTHER EDITIONS**

Of the numerous printed editions of the Aranyakaparvan (almost uniformly passing under the name Vanaparvan), I have consulted the following:

1. The editio princeps of the Mahābhārata printed in Calcutta between 1834 and 1839. Its Vanaparvan comprises, according to its own data, 17478 ślokas in 314 adhyāyas. It gives in general the Nilakaṇṭha version, which we have called the Vulgate and which has been reproduced in many subsequent editions, sometimes accompanied by translation and commentary. The editio princeps still remains the best edition available of the Vulgate version of the Aranyakaparvan, though that is not saying very much.

2. The oblong pothī-form edition, published by Ganapat Krishnaji in Saka 1799 in Bombay (hence commonly known as the Bombay edition). It is accompanied by Nilakaṇṭha's commentary, Bhārata-bhāvadīpa, and should therefore represent the [33] Nilakaṇṭha tradition. But it contains as a matter of fact

---

1 The Parvasamgraha of the Vulgate cites Nos. 19 and 20 in reverse order, that is, the Patīvatāmāhātmya precedes the Rāmapākhyaṇa.
Quite a large number of lines and readings not countenanced by Nilakantha himself. The text is divided into 315 adhyayas, and contains (according to some editions which give the aggregate number of stanzas in the parvan) 12,002 stanzas.¹

(3) The Kumbhakonam edition published by T. R. Krishnacharya and T. R. Vyashacharya, and described on its title-page as "A New Edition, mainly based on the South Indian Texts". Its Vanaparvan comprises (according to the Index Volume) 12,476 slokas and 315 adhyayas, but contains like our misch-codices a good number of specific Northern passages unknown to the true Southern recension.²

(4) Professor P. P. S. Sastry's Southern Recension, Volumes 4-5, comprising (according to his own count) 11,136 slokas divided into 269 adhyayas.

As these old editions contain nothing of any serious importance which is not to be found in the different manuscripts already collated for this edition, they have been only sparingly used and cursorily studied by me. The following observations may be of use to those who may wish to consult these editions.

As remarked above, there are some grave mistakes in the numbering of the stanzas of the Calcutta edition. The first mistake occurs after stanza 3095, where the next number suddenly jumps up to 4000 (when it should be 3100). Similarly after 8895, the following number jumps up to 9900 (when it should be 8900). For the third time, after 10,095, the following number is given as 11,000 (instead of 10,100). For the fourth time, after 11,095, the next number jumps up to 12,000, when it should be 11,100. At the next step, however, the number equally suddenly jumps back to 10,200! Thus at one place three successive numbers (which are supposed to increase by five at each step) are 11095, 12,000, 10,200!! After adhy. 117, there appear to be no new mistakes, and from that point onwards the numbering may be taken to be continuous and correct. But the result of these earlier miscalculations is that the extent of the parvan appears to be 17,478, when it should in reality be (according to Jacobi's computation) 12,848, the Parvasarangraha figure being 11,664! Several numbers occur twice, and in giving reference to the Calcutta edition, it is advisable to cite the adhyaya number as well.

The Bombay edition, like the Calcutta, is based on the Nilakantha version but (like yet other editions of the Mahabharta prepared in the same fashion, e.g., the Chitrasala edition) does not represent the Nilakantha tradition very faithfully. In the footnotes to the text, and the critical notes at the end, I have frequently drawn attention to unwarranted departure from Nilakantha's original text. The vagaries are small and of no great consequence, but they are there nevertheless. They prove very clearly that with-

¹ According to the Chitrasala Edition the number is 11,859, though the text is precisely the same in both editions.
² It seems not to have been noticed that in the old printed editions though the name of this parvan is given on the title-page and in the captions as "Vanaparva" the colophons invariably give the name correctly as Aranya-or—Aranyakaparvan.
out any conscious effort at alteration or emendation—and perhaps, notwithstanding the half-hearted efforts to preserve intact the received text—discrepancies do arise in course of time, and the text does drift away from the norm, imperceptibly, within a relatively short period of time. Thus in 3. 9. 7 for our प्रतिपक्षां (which is documented [34] uniformly by almost all our manuscripts), the different editions printed in the Bombay province, and examined by me, all have the reading प्रतिपक्षां, a reading which has not been found in a single manuscript! In 3. 83. 30, the Bombay edition (with the Kumbhakonam and some other editions) reads ग्वां मेघम्, when the Nilakantha manuscripts themselves (along with a host of other manuscripts) have the correct reading ग्वां मेघम् (lect. diff.), which is the reading of the constituted text! Likewise in 3. 249. 8, out edition reads खुलतय ि which is the reading offered by all manuscripts collated for our edition, except one inferior Grantha manuscript (G₃), which reads खुलतय, and yet this latter reading (खुलतय) has been adopted in many of the Bombay editions.

Professor SASTRI’s edition is based chiefly on four manuscripts, of which one (ख) is in Telugu script, two (अ, घ) in Grantha, and one (क) in Malayalam. For adhyayas 67-130, that is, for about 64 adhyayas out of his total of 269 adhyayas, a fifth manuscript (ग) was partly utilized. According to the editor, manuscript अ (Grantha) “represents the Principal Text printed.” It bears a date corresponding to A.D. 1795, that is, it is less than 150 years old. As an edition of the Southern recension, Professor SASTRI’s edition is preferable and indeed much superior to the Kumbhakonam edition. But it seems to me that in its preparation the manuscript material has not been as fully and carefully utilized as it should have been. Judging by the Southern manuscripts collated for our edition and examined by me, which cannot be very different from his, it should seem that too often SASTRI’s edition agrees in its mislections and other short-comings with the Kumbhakonam edition to the exclusion of the genuine Southern tradition. I miss in his critical apparatus many of the readings which are given uniformly by all Southern manuscripts. Even if the editor, for some occult reasons, did not wish to adopt in his text these perfectly good and authenticated Southern readings, they should have appeared in the footnotes as discarded readings. Instances of Northern readings having contaminated his text will be found in the following stanzas (reference is to slokas and adhyayas of his text):

1. 27, 28; 2. 13, 22, 46, 71, 80; 4. 8, 8, 15; 5. 1, 6, 7, 22, 7, 2, 9, 23; 8. 17; 10. 49, 55, 66; 11. 60, 72; 12. 23, 41; 13. 1, 14. 6, 16, 17, 103, 11; 18. 5; etc. etc. These examples have been selected at random from the first 18 adhyayas only; but such lapses keep turning up on page after page up to the end of the book.

As his edition is based on four manuscripts only and even these manuscripts appear not to have been rigorously collated and fully utilized, I should
hesitate to accept his text as a true representative of the Southern recension, even ignoring the deficiencies of the critical apparatus.

In the division into adhyāyas, Professor SASTRI seems to have followed the Grantha edition of Sarabhojirajapuram (Tanjore District) printed in 1895. The reason given by Professor SASTRI for following the edition instead of the manuscripts is that the division of the Tanjore edition “accords exactly with the enumeration of the number of chapters” for the Vana Parvan (sic) in the Anukramaṇīkādhyāya of both the Northern and the Southern Recensions.”¹ This is a dangerously vicious circle! As the Tanjore edition does not pretend that it has followed any manuscript tradition, the adhyāya division of both these editions (Tanjore and SASTRI) remain unsupported by manuscript authority [35] and therefore perfectly arbitrary. Adopting the Parvasaṅgraha figure, SASTRI has divided the parvan into 269 adhyāyas, while the actual numbering of the adhyāyas in Southern manuscripts reaches the figure 300 approximately, the number according to our Southern manuscripts varying between 299 and 302.

While SASTRI by arbitrary elimination of colophons, has equated his adhyāya-number to that given by the Parvasaṅgraha, he could not make the figures for the ślokas tally! According to the Parvasaṅgraha the number of ślokas should be 11,664. “The total number of stanzas,” says Professor SASTRI, “printed in the Text of the Southern Recension comes to 11,136, which is short by 528”.”² As his text is short by over 500 stanzas, his equation of the number of adhyāyas with the Parvasaṅgraha figure, by arbitrary omission of about thirty colophons, which are found in all Southern manuscripts, has no significance, and remains a piece of useless and unmeaning manipulation.

It is exactly seventeen years since I took over charge of the Mahābhārata work, and reorganized, on somewhat different lines, this Department of the Institute, having profit by the experiments and experiences of my predecessor, the late lamented Mr. N. B. URGIKAR, M.A. During this interval the Mahābhārata Department of the Institute has prepared and published critical editions of four whole parvans (in this sequence) : the Ādi (1933), the Viśāṭa (1936), the Udyoga (1940), and now the Āranyakā (1942). These four parvans comprise, according to the data of the Parvasaṅgraha-parvan, about 28,400 “ślokas”. In addition to this : the Sabhāparvan, which is being edited by Professor Franklin EDGERTON of the Yale University (U.S.A.) and which has been ready for some time, has been taken up for printing, and its printing has made considerable progress; nearly the whole of the text, along with the critical apparatus pertaining to it, has been printed off, and the printed portion may even be issued, in the near future, as a separate fascicule. Furthermore, the press-copy of the Bhīṣmaparvan, which is being edited by Rao Bahadur Dr. S. K. BELVALKAR, I.E.S (Retd.), is almost ready and is now undergoing final revision at the hands of its editor. Funds permitting, it will be sent to the press in the not very distant future. Thus, during these seven-

¹ The Mahābhārata (Southern Recension), vol. 5, Introduction, p. xiii.
teen years the Institute has critically dealt with the first six parvans of the Great Epic: the Adi, Sabhā, Aranyaka, Virāta, Udyoga and Bhīṣma. These six parvans make up a total of about 36,800 “slokas”, out of the aggregate of about 82,150 “slokas” comprising the entire Mahābhārata, a portion which is approximately 45 per cent. of the aggregate, excluding of course the “Supplement”, Harīvaṇa, which, for the time being, we have placed aside. This is no mean achievement, we think. The part of the epic critically dealt with so far is, I imagine, in bulk, about four times as great as the Iliad and the Odyssey put together, and one and a half times as great as our Rāmāyaṇa.

That a work of this nature and these dimensions is not one man’s job is very evident. Many collaborators, sympathisers, friends, benefactors and patrons have contributed to such measure of success as has been achieved so far, and they include among them, princes and potentates, persons owning manuscripts, curators and librarians, printers and parvan-editors, not to speak of the General Editor and his modest staff in [36] the background. Surely the most potent among these multifarious contributory factors have been——

अर्थस्वर्ध्य पुरुषों दासों दासस्वादों न कस्वचित्त ।

—the generous patrons of learning, who out of regard for this venerable monument of Indian antiquity, this great and lustrous heritage of Bhāratavarṣa, have liberally supplied the Institute, all through these years, with funds to carry on this costly but very vital work.

First among these generous patrons stands in our estimation Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, B.A., RAJASAHEB of Aundh, whose princely liberality made it, in the first instance, possible for the Institute to think of undertaking this ambitious Project. The RAJASAHEB has already paid up a large part of the Foundation Grant of a lakh of rupees promised by him, and thus placed under his obligations not only the Institute but all those who love the Great Epic of India.

I have next to record the gratitude of the promoters of this scheme—which has now become nothing less than a great national undertaking—to a number of other distinguished and generous donors, scattered all over India, who have contributed liberally to our Mahābhārata Publication Fund, the chief among them being: The Imperial Government of India, the Provincial Governments of Bombay, Madras, Burma and United Provinces; the Gwalior, Hyderabad (Deccan), Baroda, Bhavnagar, Phaltan, Mysore, Porbandar, Kolhapur, Patiala, Sangli, Ichalkaranji, Ramdurg, and other Indian States. The Trustees of the Sir Dorab Tata Trust, the Savitribai Phule Trust, and the Tulsidas Charities also deserve a grateful mention here for their kind help to our finances. We must gratefully think also of those persons less gifted by Fortune, who have contributed smaller sums—with the one idea of helping on this great cause—each according to his ability.

The Institute is indebted, for subsidies to its Mahābhārata work, to the Trustees of the Mahābhārata Fund of Great Britain in London; and indebted also for a token grant, in appreciation of this work, to the British Academy of London.

And last, but not least, I must mention, in this connection, our Alma Mater—The University of Bombay—who has been exceptionally generous and appreciative of our endeavours in this field, supply us with funds, lending us manuscripts, and generally taking a very keen and active interest in the welfare and rapid progress of our project.

In connection with further assistance rendered by extra-mural collaborators and helpers, I must put on record our special obligations to Pandit Rajaguru HEMRAJ,
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C.I.E., of Nepal; as also to Professor Kshitmohan SEN, who has succeeded Professor Vidyushhekar BHATTACHARYA as Principal of the VIśvabharati; further to Mr. S. GOPALAN, B.A., B.L., who has succeeded the late Raosaheb Sambamurthi RAO, as Honorary Secretary of the Saraswathi Mahal Library of Tanjore. Both these latter gentlemen have been kind enough to carry on, in a purely honorary capacity, the onerous and responsible task of supervising the Mahābhārata collations done in their respective institutions.

The thanks of the Institute are also due to the Curators, Trustees, and Custodians of the following libraries and institutions for keeping us equipped with the manuscripts required for our Mahābhārata work, during almost two decades; the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, the Bangiya Sahitya Parishad, the Adyar Library, the Oriental Institute of Baroda, Madras Government [37] Library, Mysore Oriental Manuscripts Library, Sri Yadugiri Yatiraj Math (Melkote, Mysore), Cochin State Library, Pudukkottah State Library, and the India Office Library (London). The Institute has also received manuscripts or photo-copies or hand-made copies of manuscripts from the Bombay University, the VIśvabharati, Dacca University, Dayananda Anglo-Vedic College of Lahore (Research Department), Benares Sanskrit College, and Calcutta Sanskrit College—all of whom I wish to thank on behalf of the Institute very cordially for their kind help in the matter. The Institute is, moreover, obliged to Sardar M. V. KIBE, M.A. of Indore for the loan of a complete Nilakaṇṭha manuscript of the Mahābhārata. It is further indebted for the free loan of Southern manuscripts of the Mahābhārata to the Chief of Idapalli, Mr. Kallenkara PISHARAM, Mankavu Padinnare KOVILAKAM, Killimangalam NAMBUDIRIPAD, and to the proprietors of the following Malabar estates: Poomullimana, Avaṇapparambu Mana, Nareri Mana, Ponnakkottu Mana, Paliyam Estate, Channamangalam.

Once more I would fain express my gratitude for help of various kinds from my colleagues on the Mahābhārata Editorial Board, who have throughout reposed, very generously, full confidence in me, and helped and supported me invariably in the true spirit of camaraderie. It is sad to reflect that before we are even halfway through our work, several members of the old Editorial Board, formed in 1925, are no longer with us; from among whom I remember particularly my friends Father R. ZIMMERMANN, S.J., Professor M. WINTENITZ, and Mr. Vishvanath P. VAIDYA.

I have to record here my keen appreciation of the willing compliance and ungrudging assistance I have uniformly received from members of the Permanent Staff of the Mahābhārata Department of this Institute. Mr. S. N. TADPATRIKAR, M.A., Supervisor of Collations, who is in special charge of the collations, has been moreover, as usual, always by my side, helping me with useful suggestions, when I was engaged in constituting the text of this extensive parvan. The critical notes were compiled from the collation sheets by Mr. B. G. BHIDE SHASTRI, Mr. D. V. NARAVANE, and Mr. G. G. SOMAN. We shall miss, in future, the expert assistance of Mr. BHIDE in several fields, who having served the Institute in the Mahābhārata Department since 1921, has now owing to old age, retired from service. The Sāradā manuscripts have been invariably collated by our Sāradā expert, Shankar Shastri BHILAVADIKAR, Head Shastri of the Mahābhārata Department. The proof-reading has been done by the Collator and Reader Pandit K. V. Krishnamurti SHARMA SHASTRI, of Erode (South India), who is now helped in that work by Mr. M. V. VAIDYA, M. A., both of whom have worked with praiseworthy diligence, exemplary zeal, and signal devotion to their work. Collations of Southern manuscripts have been done at the Institute uniformly by the Pandits K. V. Anantana-
rayan Shastri of Erode, and K. S. Vishvanath Shastri of Kolengode (South India), both of whom also are very accurate and conscientious workers, exhibiting characteristically a single-minded devotion to duty.

The superior finish of the Aranyakaparvan Volumes, from the typographical viewpoint, is due solely to the care and thought personally bestowed on them by my indefatigable friend Professor Dr. Raghu Viraraghu of the International Academy of Indian Culture, who, as part of a programme of multifarious activities for the regeneration of our culture, has equipped at Lahore a small but efficient printing establishment—the Arya Bharati Press—which is solely devoted to the cause of the service of the ārya-bharati for endowing Sarasvatī with better vestments than she grudgingly receives in India at the hands of very mercenary printers and publishers. At great trouble and inconvenience to himself—and, I fear, even at the risk of pecuniary loss—he undertook and has carried out successfully the printing of these two big tomes, and thus led us safely out of the first big forest our little party of explorers had encountered on our way to the yet distant Utopia of a complete critical edition of the Mahābhārata.

If Maharsi Kṛṣṇa Dvaipayana Vyāsa tells us that he has cried himself hoarse, urging people to follow the Path of Duty:

उर्ध्वायुं विरोधपर्यथेऽपि न च कृष्णच्छल्पति मास् ||
धर्माविदाय कामद्व स किमयं न सेव्यते ||

his shouting with uplifted arms has not been entirely in vain. He has not failed in his mission. Across the reverberating corridors of Time, we his descendants can still hear dimly his clarion call to Duty. It is in response to that call and in a spirit of reverent homage to that sage of unfathomable wisdom—that embodied Voice of the Collective Unconscious of the Indian people—we offer this work, pledged to broadcast to mankind, in this hour of its need and its peril, the luminous message of the Mahārṣi:

न जातु कामात्म सयात्त लोकार्ध
धर्मस्य ज्ञेऽविद्यमाने हृदयोः ।
नियो धर्मस्य सुखद्वैतवत्ते
जीवो नियो हृदुर्मस्य त्वमित्यः ||

August 1942.

V. S. Sukthankar.
CONCORDANCE OF THE SCHEME OF ADHYAYAS

in the following three editions: the Critical Edition, the Bombay Edition
(Ganapat Krishnaji, Saka 1799), and the Madras Edition
(P. P. S. Sastri's Southern Recension, 1931).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1-14</td>
<td>3. 1-12, 32-35</td>
<td>3. 1-14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 35-70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35. 59-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3. 30-66</td>
<td>3. 15-26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45-46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45. 1-8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40. 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8. 1-12</td>
<td>45. 9-38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40. 9-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8. 13-35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12. 1-17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12. 18-41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46. 1-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13. 1-23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46. 23-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13. 24-56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15. 1-33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49. 1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15. 34-69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49. 10-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50. 1-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50. 26-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56. 1-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69. 1-23</td>
<td>56. 40-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69. 29-30</td>
<td>56. 69-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57. 1-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57. 29-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60. 1-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[40] 73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60, 32-60</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>76, 1-25</td>
<td>61, 1-24</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>76, 28-63</td>
<td>61, 28-61</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100, 1-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63, 1-32</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100, 20-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63, 23-64</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64, 1-30</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>102, 1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>81-82</td>
<td>64, 31-65, 130</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>102, 22-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>108-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>110, 1-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>110, 43-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74, 1-23</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>74, 24-47</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>78, 1-29</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>78, 30-33</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81, 1-25</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>81, 20-47</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>81, 48-74</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147-148</td>
<td>121-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>81, 73-98</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>83, 1-21</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>151-152</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>83, 22-84, 23</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>107, 1-29</td>
<td>84, 26-35</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>107, 30-70</td>
<td>84, 56-100</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>110, 1-21</td>
<td>87, 1-21</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>110, 22-58</td>
<td>87, 22-58</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>89, 1-18</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>89, 19-43</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>164-165</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>168, 1-61</td>
<td>140, 1-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>168, 52-86</td>
<td>140, 61-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>223-224</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>148. 1-22</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>148. 23-46</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>231. 1-27</td>
<td>188. 1-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>231. 28-113</td>
<td>188. 27-315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>183. 1-52</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>183. 53-95</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>189. 1-57</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>189. 58-190.97</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>[42] 235</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>198-198</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>249-250</td>
<td>205-207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>166. 1-52</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>166. 33-64</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>253-255</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>214-215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>262-263</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>212-213</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>178. 1-32</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>178. 33-60</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>179. 1-21</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>179. 22-29</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>179. 30-55</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>231-232</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Trans. to Virāṭa p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EPIC STUDIES
I. Some Aspects of the Mahabharata Canon.*

The problem of the Mahābhārata textual criticism is a problem sui generis. Here the principles of textual reconstruction must first be evolved from an intensive study of the manuscript material and the manuscript tradition. They can be finally considered as settled only after prolonged and considerable discussion and exchange of ideas and opinions.

The vulgate text of the Mbh. is fairly readable and appears, in places, to be even “better” than the critical text, because the former has been purged by the continuous emendations of scholars for centuries. The reader is consequently apt to prefer, at first sight, the readings of the vulgate text, but a thorough and sympathetic study of the author’s language and thought and a critical evaluation of the variants would show him that the constituted text is sound.

Of the many reviews of the first fascicule of the critical edition of the Mahābhārata that have appeared during the past year there are two that deserve my special attention: the review by Dr. Hermann WELLER in the Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik (vol. 6, pp. 166 ff.), and that by Professor EDGERTON in the Journal of the American Oriental Society (vol. 48, pp. 186-190). Both reviews are evidently products of a very close study of the text and the critical apparatus. Particularly valuable is the review by Prof. EDGERTON, who can appreciate the difficulties of the problem I have had to confront perhaps better than most scholars, since he has had to struggle with problems of a like nature in his valuable work on the Pañcatantra and the Vikramararita.

In the succeeding pages I have endeavoured to set forth my reasons for adopting in the text the readings that have commended \[158\] themselves to me, in those cases which have been discussed by WELLER and EDGERTON in the reviews mentioned above. They concern the readings of 1. 1. 19, 42, 49; 62, 201, and of the identification of the hundred sub-parvans of the Mbh. enumerated in the second adhyāya of the Adiparvan, that is, in the Parvasanāgrahaparvan.²

---
* [JBBRAS (NS) 4. 157-78].

1 Valuable hints are to be found especially in the writings of Prof. LÜBERS.

2 As most of the references in these studies will be to the Mahābhārata, all numbers without alphabetical prefix refer to the critical edition of the epic. When a reference is made to other editions of the epic, I have prefixed to the reference an indicative letter enclosed within parentheses: thus (C) denotes the Calcutta edition, (B.) the Bombay edition, and (K.) the Kumbhakonam edition.
WELLER suggests an emendation—in fact, two alternative emendations. He first proposes to read samitām for my samitām. The former variant is found only in one MS. which besides transposes the first two words of the pāda. His alternative suggestion is more radical. Seeing that the variant preferred by him yields a pāda metrically defective, he proposes to mend matters by recasting the pāda thus: caturbhīṣa samitām vedaiḥ. This pathyā he thinks, must have been the original reading of the pāda. The only reason WELLER has adduced for rejecting the text reading is the supposed intrinsic fitness of the alternate; it suits the context much better, he believes. K₅, the solitary MS. which contains the reading preferred by WELLER, stands sixth on my list of K MSS., whose relative value diminishes in the order there given; it is full of clerical mistakes, due probably to the difficulty experienced by the copyist (either of this MS. or of one of its ancestors) in deciphering the (?) Śāradā) exemplar. I consider it an inferior codex. With WELLER’S reading we get a prior pāda with the scansion —— / ——. HOPKINS’ statistical study of the relative frequency of the different forms of the pādas (Great Epic, p. 236) shows that this is a “rare” combination. Even WELLER realizes that the line does not read smoothly and calls therefore the length of the sixth syllable a “metrical archaism.” Now samitām (of the text, [159] without the anusvāra) recurs in a similar context, also at the end of a prior pāda, and apparently in the same sense in (B.) 1. 95.90: idam hi vedaiḥ samitām. It also occurs, in a different context, in Suśruta 2. 346. 3: anguṣṭhaparasamitām. If we read saṁhitām in the passage under discussion, we should have pari passu to read it in the two latter passages also, both of which then would be metrically defective; the scansion of the first would be nearly the same as that of the pāda in question, the second would end with three consecutive laments. Are these all instances of “metrical archaisms”? For that, it seems to me, the documental probability of the reading preferred by WELLER is not strong enough. The text reading, which is mentioned by Nilakaṇṭha as a variant, is supported indirectly by K₅ (samatām) and directly by K₀,ₐ,₄,₅ M₁,₃,₄. On the other hand, WELLER’S reading, as has already been remarked, is found only in one inferior MS. Worthy of note is Nilakaṇṭha’s gloss: samitām iti pāṭhe tulyāṁ ity arthaḥ. The initial mistake of WELLER lies in supposing that saṁmitām suits the context better than samitām, whereas, in point of fact, saṁmitām is nothing more than a doublet of the other word. WELLER does not realize that his attempt to substitute an “easier reading” has been anticipated by the scribe of K₅, who likewise finding the emended line (metrically) unreadable has transposed the words of the pāda, reaching a new combination: caturbhīṣa vedaiḥ saṁmitām, which according to HOPKINS (loc. cit.) is of “very rare, sporadic” occurrence. The word samita has been perfectly
correctly explained in PW. : \textit{samita} \((sa + mita) = sanimita, \) “gleiches Mass habend, gleich.” The relation between the two words is clearly revealed by the more familiar doublets \textit{satata} : \textit{sahitaka, sahita} : \textit{sahitita} and so on, \textit{sa}-and \textit{sam} being the unaccented and accented forms of one and the same prefix. When the accentual factor became inoperative, the choice was conditioned solely by metrical considerations. The identification in the case of \textit{samita} may have been helped by contamination with \textit{sam} + \textit{ita} \((= saṅgala), \) “conformable to, in harmony with” (a meaning not unsuitable even here), or by its supposed connection with \textit{sama}, “equal” (cf. WACKERNAGEL, Alting. Gramm. II, 1. § 30 bβ). The semantic values of the words in question being the same, the combined [160] force of documental probability and metrical preference decides the question of choice incontestably in favour of the adopted text.

The text reading really needs some further justification. WELLER’s misunderstanding of the text is, in my opinion, a direct confirmation of my remark in the Foreword (p. vi) that it is a \textit{lectio difficilior}. The word was, I suppose, early misunderstood. To judge by the character of the variants, it was commonly, though erroneously, interpreted as \textit{sam} + \textit{ita}, “united, combined with.” In this sense, in course of time, it must have been ousted by its easier synonyms \textit{saṅyukta} (substituted for it in V, B D) and \textit{sahita} (mainly in T and G). Both these readings are inadequate. Nilakantha’s explanation \textit{caturvedārthaśatam} is inadmissible; the phrase can at best mean \textit{caturvedasatam} (“possessing the four Vedas”), which is of course sheer nonsense. ROY’s “comprehended the sense of the four Vedas” and DUTT’s “contains the sense of the four Vedas” are equally inaccurate paraphrases (based upon the explanation furnished by the scholiast), because the passage in the vulgate cannot bear the meaning here forced upon it. On the other hand, the \textit{literal} meaning of \textit{saṅyukta} or \textit{sahita} is, as already remarked, wholly unsuitable. For what could the assembled sages mean by saying that they wished to hear the (Mahābhārata) \textit{Samhitā “combined with the four Vedas”?}

To return to the manuscript evidence. The K group is partly corrupt and indecisive though the majority has the text reading : \(K_{0, 3, 4, 6} \text{ as in text;} \ K_{1} \textit{saḥitām} ; K_{2} \textit{saṃtām} ; K_{3} \textit{saṃmitām}. \) All these stand resolutely against \textit{saṅyuktaṁ} of the vulgate; but, from the point of view of transcriptional probability, none of them is wholly incompatible with \textit{saṃtām} of the text. Three out of the four Malayālam MSS. have also preserved the true reading; the remaining Malayālam MS. has \textit{saḥitām}, the reading of the T G group. With this data I should explain the genesis of the variants thus. The text reading is a \textit{lectio difficilior}, preserved in the majority of K intact, and in the remaining MSS. of the K version in a corrupt condition. The K reading being partly supported by M, there is a partial agreement between two more or less independent versions, a condition almost wholly absent in the
case of the rejected variants. Being a difficult and unfamiliar word, it was [161] early misunderstood and finally dropped— independently in certain groups of the Southern and Northern recensions—in favour of such words as were thought to be its equivalents in sense but which do not fit the context and are wholly inadequate.

After what has been said above, it is hardly necessary to consider the alternative proposed by WELLER. But in passing it may be pointed out that it is methodologically wrong to expect to find the original reading by picking out a stray variant which appears to give a better meaning, and shuffling the words of the pāda until the pathyā form turns up. For one thing, it is by no means certain that the original must be a pathyā ; the MS. evidence, so far as I have examined it, is all in favour of the hypothesis that originally the vipulās were far more numerous than what one is led to suppose from the study of the vulgate text, which has modernized many of the archaic lines of the original and successfully covered up the traces of the metamorphosis.

* * *

1. 1. 42 :

daśajyotih satajyotih sahasrajyotih ātmavān (v. 1. eva ca.)

Here the situation is much clearer. According to WELLER the variant eva ca is not quite wrong (“abwegig”). Quite true. But about the text reading, I think we can say much more than that. In point of grammar, metre or even sense, there is not much to choose between the variants. But in point of documental probability, their values are totally different. eva ca is the variant offered by K₀, 2, 4, Da Dr D₁-₁₂; the text, on the other hand, is documented by a much stronger group, K₁₁,₅,₆ V₁ B Da₆ (marg.). D₁₄ S.

It is further-attested by another good MS. of a different category, I have since compared: a Nepāli MS. belonging to the Benares Sanskrit College Manuscripts Library. The text reading figures also in GÖLDSTÜCKER’s collations from European codices, of which I have photo copies. The position them, is this. On the [162] one hand the K version is indecisive, agreeing partly with D, which is the main witness for the rejected variant; on the other hand B S (probably together with the Nepāli Maithili version) form a solid group in favour of the text, further attested by three K MSS, including the important India Office codex K₁. It will be seen that the documental authority is almost wholly on the side of the text. For a contamination between Devanāgarī transcripts of Kāśmīrī MSS. and Devanāgarī MSS. must be postulated to be far more likely than a contamination between the entire Bangāli version and the entire Southern recension. The different Indian scripts being

---

3 The photographs were kindly presented to the Bhandarkar Institute by the University of Strassburg, through the kind offices of the late Prof. Emile SENART. I take this opportunity to thank the University publicly for this service.
all but unintelligible outside the provinces where they were developed, there is already a prima facie reason for assuming the independence of B and S. This principle was long ago recognized and enunciated by Prof. Lüders, than whom no scholar has a profounder acquaintance with and a clearer insight in the problem of Mahābhārata textual criticism. In Die Grantha-recension des Mahābhārata (Berlin 1901), Prof. Lüders has said: “Das beweist, dass die Grantha-handschriften nicht etwa auf Bengali-Handschriften zurückgehen, —etwa, was von vornherein nicht gerade wahrscheinlich ist,—sondern dass in den Fällen wo B und G zusammengehen, ihre Lesarten als alt zu sehen sind.” Now what is true of the consensus of B and G is a fortiori true of the consensus of B and S. This presumptive independence is wholly confirmed by my intensive study of the first 3,000 stanzas of the Ādiparvan from the extensive collations at my disposal, during which study I have not been able to detect the slightest trace of “secondary interrelationship” between the Bangālī version as a whole and the Southern recension as a whole. Equally fundamental in character is the agreement between K and S, the only difference between K and B being that K is comparatively purer and freer from interpolation than the other. The canon of Mbh. textual criticism, in its simplest form, may therefore be said to be the fundamental character of the consensus of K and S on the one hand, and of B and S on the other, provided of course the concordant reading is of such a nature that it could not be the result of a fortuitous coincidence.

Doubt can, and frequently, does arise when K B (then generally [163] with D; in other words the whole of N) stands against S. Here each case must be judged and decided on its own merits. It may sometimes be possible to adduce evidence of a decisive character on one side or the other. Such evidence may be intrinsic; one reading may be intrinsically better than the other. Or it may be extrinsic; when it is possible to supplement the evidence of MSS. from other ancient and independent sources. But as a rule, when there is a conflict between N and S, the evidence is so nicely balanced that no definite decision is possible.

To return to the instance under consideration. The agreement between B and S raises such a strong presumption in favour of the text reading that its evidence cannot be rebutted by the possibility conceived by WELLER that ātmavān might have crept into the text secondarily, under the influence of ātmavān and ātmajāțh in the following lines.

In this particular instance, I think, intrinsic probability is, to some extent, also on the side of the text. It is a feature of epic technique that out of three consecutive proper names occurring in the same hemistich, the last name is very frequently accompanied by a qualifying adjective. Scores of illustrations may be produced; here are thirteen selected at random.

1. 31. 14. Virajās ca Subāhuṣ ca Sālipindas ca vīryavān,
(K.) 1. 88. 9: Rceyur atha Kakṣeyuḥ Kṛkaneyuḥ ca viryavān
Staṇḍileyor Vāneyuḥ ca Jaleyuḥ ca mahāyasāḥ

(K.) 6.25.4-5: Yuuyudhāno Virāṭaḥ ca Drupadasaḥ ca mahārathahaḥ
Dhṛṣṭaketuḥ Cekitānah Kāsirājaḥ ca viryavān
Purujiit Kutibhojaḥ ca Saibyaḥ ca narapanhavah
Dhṛṣṭādyumnaḥ Virāṭaḥ ca Sātyakiṣ ca parājītaḥ

17: 

(K.) 8. 83. 9: Kṛpaḥ ca Kṛtavarmā ca Draunis caiva mahārathah
(K.) 9. 2. 17: Aśvatthāmā ca Bhojaḥ ca Māgadhaḥ ca mahābalaḥ
Brhadbaḷaḥ ca Kṛthaḥ ca Saḵuniś cāpi Saubalaḥ

(K.) 9. 3. 12: hate Bhīṣme ca Drōne ca Karṇe caiva mahārathe
(K.) 9. 5. 2: Saḷyaḥ ca Citrasenaḥ ca Saḵuniṣ ca mahārathaḥ

[164] The practice being the outcome of a natural desire to avoid the
tonoty of a bald enumeration of names, it is not surprising to find that
even the Homeric epics furnish ample illustrations of it; here is one with the
trick repeated in consecutive hemistiches (IIiad, 24.250-1) :

Πάμμονα τ’, Ἀντίφονόν τε, βοὴν σ’γαθόν τε Πολίτην,
Δηρίφοβον τε, καὶ Ἰππόθοον, καὶ Δίον σ’γαυον.

After having proved that the text reading is not only better documented
but in itself very plausible, we may proceed to consider whether any reason
can be suggested how the variant eva ca may have arisen. Two explana-
tions—both mere possibilities—occur to me. It is for one thing possible that
the original ạtmavān may have been deliberately suppressed in order to avoid
the monotonous reiteration of ạtma at the end of three consecutive verses.
A more likely reason for the suppression may have been the lack of a copula
in the original line, which had been crowded out by the succession of three un-
usually long names (two of four syllables each, and the third one of not less
than five), taking up by themselves 13 syllables out of an aggregate of 16 of
the sloka line.

* * * * *

1.1.49 :

vīṣṭīrṇatam mahāj jñānam ṛṣīḥ saṃkṣēpam abravit
(v. l. saṃkṣēpato 'bravīt).

The two rejected variants are: saṃkṣēpato 'bravīt K V, B,m D₄₄ and
saṃksīpya cābravīt B Da Dn Dr D₁₁₂ S (except G₁₂ M₃). Weller finds
saṃkṣēpato satisfactory ("befriedigend"). As a matter of fact, of the rejected
variants, the reading saṃksīpya cābravīt is far superior to the other. In it
the sense is clear; grammatically it is correct, metrically flawless. It is more-
over the reading indicated by the principle of agreement between independ-
ent versions. being supported by the Bangali and Devanagari versions on the
one hand and by one section of the Southern recension on the other. But
the compelling power of this agreement is weakened by the circumstance that
one Malayālam MS. and three (out of the seven) Grantha MSS. are outside
the group. Had the whole of B agreed with the whole of S, it would have
been difficult, if not impossible, for reasons explained in the previous section,
\[165\] to reject the concordant reading. The weak point of this variant lies
in the fact that it does not at all explain, as far as I can judge, how the other
readings may have arisen. There is the same flaw in the other rejected
variant, though not in the same degree. The text reading, though weakly
supported by MSS, serves admirably, in my opinion, to account for the
existence of the variants, especially if sanharepam is taken as an adverbial
gerund in-am (Pāṇini's yamul), as I think it should be; cf. WHITNEY, Sans-
krit Grammar, § 995. For there would then be an inherent tendency to substi-
tute for it simpler readings. sanhrshipya ca and sanharepatah would be very
neat paraphrases of the awkward adverbial gerund: the second (sanharepatah)
preserving nearly intact the original akṣaras, the first (sanhrshipya) involving
a more radical change from the view-point of form, but closely following the
original in sense. The latter may, moreover, have been directly suggested by
visītya in the first pāda which it nicely balances. I assume, of course, that
sanhrshipya was introduced independently in B D on the one hand and S on
the other. In other words, I think that the concordance between certain
sections of the Northern and the Southern recensions is purely accidental, and
it is unquestionable that it could be that. I must frankly admit, however,
that there is a strong element of subjectivity in this choice, which can in no
way be said to be compelling. I prefer the text reading, fully realizing that
others may prefer either of the other two readings; but that is precisely why
a wavy line has been printed in the text below sanharepam. I doubt very
much whether any compelling reason can be advanced to prove the absolute
superiority of any one of the variants over the others.

\* \* \* \* \* \*

1.1.62:

anukramaṇiṃ adhyāyam (v.l. anukramaṇikādhyāyam)

This again is a somewhat difficult and complicated case. The text read-
ing is perhaps less than certain, as has been indicated by the use of the wavy
line; but it can, I think, claim for itself greater certitude than the reading
in the preceding case. The apparatus contains five variants for this pāda.
They are:

\begin{align*}
K_0, \ 2-6 & \ V_1 \ B_3 \ Da \ Dn \ Dr \ D_1-4, \ 6-12-14 & \ D_4 & \text{anukramaṇikādhyāyam} \\
K_1 & & & \text{əkramaṃimādhyā}^o \\
\{166\} & \ T_1 \ G_5-7 & \ T_2 & \text{krāmiṃam adhyā}^o \\
& & & \text{krāmiṇa}^o
\end{align*}
Along with this passage, we must consider 1.1.199, where the pāda recurs and where again there are five variants, in part different from those of the passage under discussion. The second set of variants is:

\[
K_{2,4,6} \quad V_{1} \quad Dn \quad Dr \quad D_{1.2,4,6-12-14} \quad \text{anukramaṇikādhyāyam}
\]

\[
T \quad G_{1-2,4} \quad M_{1-2,4} \quad G_{1} \quad G_{2,7} \quad M_{3} \quad G_{2} \quad K_{1,5} \quad B \quad Da \quad D_{3,5}
\]

We have here very remarkable vacillation for a perfectly simple pāda. Every textual variation presupposes a cause. Therefore that reading is best which best explains how the various different readings may have arisen. The variant preferred by WELLER, which is also the reading of the vulgate text, though perfectly satisfactory in itself, fails wholly to explain why there are so many variants. What is wrong with anukramaṇikādhyāyam? Nothing apparently, if taken by itself. But let us have a closer look at the variants and try to understand the cause of the variation. We shall first consider the variants at 1.1.199, where the situation is slightly clearer. The text reading is supported by \( K_{1,6} \quad B \quad D_{a} \quad D_{3,3} \); that is, two of the K MSS. (including the important \( K_{4} \)) together with the whole of Bangāli and Arjunamiśra and two Devanāgarī MSS., a combination not to be despised. The rejected variants fall into two natural groups; on the one hand we have the majority of K and Devanāgarī (with the notable exception of Arjunamiśra MSS., which, as remarked in the Foreword, p. v, frequently side with Bangāli) having anukramaṇikādhyāyam; on the other hand we have the Southern MSS., which show anukramaṇam adhyāyam, with some unimportant variations. The case is somewhat similar at 1.1.62, the difference being that the manuscript support for the text reading is slightly weaker. The two sets of variants, it may be remarked, have this noteworthy feature \([167]\) in common that in both places there is partial agreement between K B on the one hand and S on the other, in so far that they both have as the first part of the pāda, a word uncompounded with adhyāyam. The explanation of this chaos is, I think, furnished by 1.2.34, where the name of the adhyāya (or rather of the parvan) is found to be anukramaṇi (and not anukramaṇikā): \(^2\)

\[
\text{parvānukramaṇī parvam.}
\]

Here the reading is certain, the variants (mainly in G) being negligible.

\(^2\) Accordingly I have called the parvan Anukramaṇi-parvan, differing from the Calcutta, Bombay and Kumbhakonam editions, in which it is called Anukramaṇi-kā-parvan.
All printed editions of the text without exception have the same reading, an indication that the large majority of all reliable MSS. hitherto examined read the name of the adhyāya as in text. The name in this form occurs at 1.1.200:

\[ \text{anukramavā yāvat syād ahnā rātrya ca saṁcitam,} \]

where again the variants though numerous, do not concern us since they are also mainly restricted to a single version, the Grantha.

As remarked already there is partial agreement between K B Da and S in so far that they break up the compound of the vulgate text into words, one standing in epithetical or appositional relation to the other. A little reflection will show that, used by a writer familiar with the older name of the adhyāya, the first word un-compounded with adhyāya could be no other than anukramaṇīṁ. With this word, however, we should get the awkward prior pāda \( \nabla - - \), which, according to Hopkins (op. cit. p. 236), is a “very rare, sporadic” combination. Now it is well known that, in the epic, grammatical accuracy is often sacrificed to the observance of preferred vipulā forms. The awkwardness of the pāda was removed by the (anomalous) shortening of the troublesome long \( \tilde{i} \) in the final syllable of the word. Examples of shortening metri causā, cited from the epics by Hopkins (op. cit. p. 246) are: svadhā ca svadhaḥbojjinam, Rām. 7. 23. 23 (again in the fifth syllable); apakramat, (B.) 9. 11. 62; sakhigavāryā, Nala 1. 24; na śīr jahati vai tanub, (B.) 11. 25. 5. The examples, as is well known, can be very easily multiplied.

[168] The assumption of an original anukramaṇīṁ adhyāyaṁ could, as far as I can judge, satisfactorily explain all the different variants of this pāda. It accounts for the neat bifurcation of the manuscript evidence into the vulgate text (with partial reflexes in the K version) and the Southern group. The vulgate text may be seen to have successfully overcome the difficulty of the anomalous shortening by substituting in the lame foot a form with a legitimate short vowel where required by the (later) stringent rule: pāṇicamam laghu sarvatra; it had to sacrifice the original appositional construction and substitute for it a compound. The Southern editors, on the other hand, adhered firmly to the appositional construction, and eked out a tolerable pāda with various synonyms having a short vowel in the fifth syllable such as: krāmiṇam, kramikam, krāmanam, krāmanīṁ.

It may be argued that even anukramaṇikaḥdyāyaṁ as the original reading might likewise furnish reasons for the growth of this singular crop of various readings, because the name anukramaṇikaḥ here given to the adhyāya was felt to be inappropriate, the correct name being anukramaṇī as given in 1. 2. 34. But such an interpretation would not be valid, because the original postulated here would at best serve to explain only one variant, namely, anukramaṇīṁ adhyāyaṁ; it fails wholly to account for the oscillations of the
entire Southern recension, since nothing would have been gained by substituting anukramaṇaṁ, kramaṁ and so forth, which all equally fail short of reproducing the original name of the adhyāya. So at least it seems to me must the variants be interpreted. I consider the text reading all but certain. A comparison of the extant manuscript material should show that, clerical errors and occasional anomalies apart, the Bangali MSS. uniformly, Arjuna-miśra (? together with Devabodha) MSS. frequently, and K. MSS. sporadically will have the text reading; MSS. of the vulgate text and other MSS. contaminated from this source will have the compound; while MSS. of the Southern recension will mostly have synonyms of anukramaṇaṁ such as kramaṁ kramaṁ and so on.

1. 1. 201:

[169] bhāratasya vapur hy etat satyam caṁtam (v.l. caṁtam) eva ca.

EDGERTON discusses at some length the variation amṛtam : anṛtam and decides emphatically in favour of anṛtam. EDGERTON’s arguments are briefly these: first and foremost, the text reading does not do justice to the emphatic particle eva in the same line, which is a “crucial word;” secondly, anṛtam is intrinsically far superior to the innocuous amṛtam, which has been substituted for the original lectio difficilior by ignorant copyists who, missing the “paradox” intended, “naturally gagged at attributing ‘falsehood’ to the epic.” In the first place I differ from EDGERTON radically as to the value and importance of the word eva in the sentence. It is unquestionably true that eva does emphasize the preceding word or words, but this is neither necessarily nor universally true. Very frequently, especially in the epics and the Purāṇas, the emphasis is so slight that it is almost negligible, and the word is nothing more than an expletive. My experience fully corroborates P. W., which has the following note s. v. eva : “Nicht selten, namlich nach einigen Partikeln, ist die Bedeutung von eva abgeschwacht, dass wir auch den Nachdruck aufgeben.” But the best answer to EDGERTON’s contention as to the value of eva is to show that it figures very frequently at the end of the pāda, in long enumerations of names and attributes where no emphasis could be intended whatsoever. Here are some examples chosen at random:

(K.) 1. 68. 95.: Durmersaṇo Durmukhaś ca Duskarṇaḥ Karṇa eva ca
(B.) 2. 100. 2 : Drouam Kṛpam niṁbāḥ cāṇyān Aśvatthāmānām eva ca
(B.) 13. 254. 17 : avayayoḥ puruṣaḥ sākṣi kṣetrajño ‘ksara eva ca 120 : yajñāntakṛṣṇ yajñahugyaṁ annam annāda eva ca
Brahma Pur. 182. 7 : tvam svāhā tvam svadhā vidyā sudhā tvam jyotir eva ca
Bhaviṣya Pur. 10. 8. 38 : jyotiś cakram jalam tejo nabhavān vidyud eva ca
It would be clearly preposterous to see in these eva ca “emphatic particles” or “crucial words” emphasizing paradoxes; [170] they are nothing more than copulative expletives. My impression is that the epic “poets” use the conjunctions ca, caiva or eva ca according as they require one, two or three syllables to fill their line! This, I hope, will suffice to dispose of the alleged necessity of looking for and finding any striking paradox in this line.

But I think Edgerton is making another and a graver mistake. His remark that “the panegyrist of the epic [italics mine] starts out to claim that it contains everything” makes me suspect that Edgerton has possibly misunderstood the hemistich in question. Here the subject matter of glorification is not the epic at all, but merely the first adhyāya thereof. The hemistich occurs in a passage at the end of the first adhyāya, and the passage is evidently of the nature of a phalaśruti. The hemistich says: “This is the body of the (Mahā-)Bhārata.” Here “this” refers not to the whole epic but merely to the Anukramaṇī chapter mentioned in the previous stanzas. The whole line is a subordinate (hi) clause depending upon the main clause contained in the immediately preceding stanza. “(200) He who repeats (in an undertone, even) a little of the Anukramaṇī at both twilights is freed immediately from as much sin as has been accumulated during the day and the night; (201) for, this is the body of the (Mahā-)Bhārata (that is) Truth and also Immortality!” It is owing to its partaking of the qualities of (or, as the panegyrist of the adhyāya will have it, owing to its being) Truth and Immortality that it is able to absolve the devout reciter of the adhyāya immediately from sin. The emphasis, if any, is on hi (“for”), not on eva. Objection may be taken to the neuter gender of etat, since it is made to refer the Anukramaṇī (f.) chapter as I do here. The gender may be explained either as a case of attraction by the gender of the predicate (vapus, n.) or as referring indiscriminately to anukramaṇī (f.) or adhyāya (m.). But if Edgerton does not like that, I have no great objection to his translating: “For this form of the (Mahā-)Bhārata is Truth and Immortality.” According to this interpretation, the variant anūtām is wholly inappropriate and inadmissible; and in fact on second thoughts I am inclined even to dispense with the wavy line under anūtām.

[171] The paradox conceived by Edgerton might apply fitly to the whole epic, which may be said to mirror all phases of life, “Truth,—yes, and Falsehood too!” but it is clearly unreasonable and even impossible to say that the Anukramaṇī chapter by itself could be “Truth,—yes and Falsehood too.” Furthermore, even if this wonderful chapter be the Truth as well as Falsehood, I fail to see how it should follow that such a chapter could on that account be able to give absolution to a sinner. If one bears in mind that the subject matter of the panegyr in is the Anukramaṇī chapter (and not
the epic), one cannot, I think, come to any other conclusion than that the true reading is anṛtam.

It may be added that Edgerton's mistake is quite natural and is caused primarily by the misleading division of the passage (stanzas 200-202) into distiches, which suggests that the subject matter of the praṣasti is the Mahābhārata. The first half of stanza 201 is logically and grammatically connected with the preceding stanza (200); on the other hand the second half is part and parcel of the following stanza (202). The first half clearly refers to the Anukramaṇi chapter, the second half equally clearly to the epic as a whole. Could I have foreseen the confusion it is apt to cause, I would certainly have joined the first half of stanza 201 to 200 and the second half to stanza 202, notwithstanding that this arrangement yields two consecutive three-line stanzas. In such cases I have mostly made three distiches, sometimes, I fear, as in this instance, clouding the sense.

There remains now only one point to be considered. By saying that anṛtam is a lectio difficilior, Edgerton implies that the change from anṛtam into anṛtam is ordinarily inconceivable, since any copyist would have fought shy of attributing falsehood to the epic. Such a view would, in my opinion, be entirely incorrect. The distinguishing feature of scribes' emendations is that it is superficial. The scribe does not stop to think very deeply about the consequences of the change. Here, I fancy, the variant has arisen merely because, in entirely different contexts, satyam and anṛtam are found frequently combined into a phrase, sometimes even combined into the compound satyāṇṛta (e.g. satyāṇṛte yo vivinakte loke, 1. 3. 152; satyāṇṛte avapaśyaḥ janānām RV. 7.49.3). I [172] therefore hold that the substitutions of anṛtam for anṛtam is wholly within the range of probability and even quite natural for an Indian scribe.

1.2.70:

etat parvaśatam pūṇam Vyāsenoktan mahorśinā.

Although it is perfectly true that all previous efforts to make the text of the Mbh. agree with the numerical data of its extent and size have ended in dismal failures, Edgerton is needlessly nervous about my attempt to reduce the number of the (sub-)parvans exactly to one hundred. Edgerton's view is that the traditional hundred should be regarded as an approximate or "round" number. This is the explanation given also by C. V. Vaidya in his Epic India (p. 189) when he is faced with the anomaly that his list of "hundred parvans" contains 107 titles. In support of the view, one might cite the use of the word śataka in titles of anthologies like the śṛngāraśatāka, which frequently, if not uniformly, contain more than 100 stanzas. The parallelism would, in my opinion, be not quite exact, because, I think, here the suffix ka (miscalled svārthe by Indian grammarians) probably suggests, if it does not
actually connote, the approximate character of the denomination. Less convincing still is the analogy (mentioned by C. V. Vaidya, loc. cit.) of the appellation śatasāhasri of the Mbh. This expression is admittedly not intended to mean exactly one hundred thousand, whatever else it may mean. But the latitude implicitly allowed in the use of the expression śatasahrasa in stating the number of stanzas which are approximately a lakh cannot, it seems to me, be claimed by a person giving the number of chapters which are approximately only one hundred. That question apart, when the old experts of the Great Epic (bhāratacintaka, 1. 2. 172) had calculated and stated the exact number of adhyāyas and ślokas, parvan by parvan for all the eighteen parvans, apparently correct to the last digit, would it not be exceedingly strange if the number of the chapter-groups alone, given in the very same adhyāya, in the same context, were to be only approximate? A few stanzas more or less in an aggregate of several thousand stanzas, or a few adhyāyas more or less [175] in an aggregate of several hundred adhyāyas would not have mattered very much one way or the other; but a few parvans more or less when the total was only in the neighbourhood of hundred! So careless I suppose even the careless custodians of the fifth Veda were not. Their calculations may have been wrong, but their intention is perfectly clear. They say and mean that the number was exactly one hundred: notice the pūnam in the first pāda of the hemistich. In fact, the amazing difference in the lengths and characters of these chapter-groups—there are some containing only 1 adhyāya and less than 70 stanzas, there are others which contain more than 70 adhyāyas and considerably more than 3,000 stanzas!—could, I think, only have been the result of an over-mastering desire on the part of some old editor or editors to reach, by hook or crook, some such predetermined "round" number.

Edgerton is perfectly right when he says that the attempt to reconstruct the original text of this passage presents some very serious textual difficulties. Whether my text will finally prove correct in every respect or not remains of course to be seen. I hope it will fit the constituted text of the whole epic; but I shall not be greatly shocked if it does not. The texts of the present editions, Calcutta, Bombay or Kumbhakonam, do not conform to the details given in the "Table of Contents." There are all kinds of discrepancies between them: the śloka numbers do not agree; the same is true of the adhyāya and the parvan number. These discrepancies cannot be helped—so long as we do not know who had done the counting and when it was done. As for the constituted text of the passage in question, I will only say that I have formed it rigidly on the principles of textual criticism worked out by me and followed elsewhere in the course of my work on the edition. These principles have been applied independently of the question of the past, present or future form and divisions of the epic. The constituted text is based mainly on documental and intrinsic probability. It is
more than likely that it contains some slight errors; the different versions are interwoven in such an intricate manner that to disentangle them with complete assurance or to one’s complete satisfaction is not yet possible, or perhaps is no longer possible. I honestly believe that the discrepancies between the constituted [174] text and the present “Table of Contents,” will be very considerably diminished. But about one thing I feel perfectly confident and that is that the number is intended to be exactly one hundred. **Edgerton** himself would probably have been less sceptical had he known that both Arjunamiśra and Nilakaṇṭa have left behind them in their scholia mnemonic stanzas, stating the exact number of (sub-)parvans in each of the eighteen (major) parvans. In both cases the total is exactly one hundred; besides that, the individual figures tally exactly in the two lists.

Here are the stanzas themselves.

Arjunamiśra² towards the end of the second adhyāya (Da₁ fol. 45)

\[
\text{ekonavimśati tu parvabhir Adiparva}
\]
\[
\text{khyaṭam, Sabhā navabhir, aṣṭabhir aṣṭayuktaḥ}
\]
\[
\text{Āraṇyakam, anu Viṛātakathā caturbhir,}
\]
\[
\text{ekādhikair daśabhir Udyamat āsanantī \| 1 \|}
\]
\[
\text{Bhaiṣmam ca pañcābhir, ato Guru aṣṭasārīkhyāair}
\]
\[
\text{ekena Kṛtaṃ, atha Madrakathā caturbhīh}
\]
\[
\text{Saṃptam tribhīs, tad anu pañcābhir Ānāgānānām}
\]
\[
\text{Sāriti caturbhir, Anuśāsanam ekakena \| 2 \|}
\]
\[
\text{dvābhyaṃ uṣanti Hayamedham, ato-Aśramākhyām}
\]
\[
\text{ahus tribhīr, Muśalaprava tathaikakena}
\]
\[
\text{ekaikaśo gamana-Nākaṭa, ubhābhyaṃ Vamsake Hārera, iti kṛtā śata parvasanīkhyā \| 3 \|}
\]

Nilakaṇṭha (ad 1. 2. 396) :

\[
\text{Adī-dhyāna-Sabhā-dhanaṃ Vana-cayam Vairāṭa-bhūdyoga-yuk,}
\]
\[
\text{Bhiṣma Drona-majam ca Kṛṇa-ku tathā Salye-bha Sāuṣuptāgam}
\]
\[
\text{Stī-saṁ Sānti-bha Dānadharmam-kū Hayeṣyā-ṛ-Āṣramāvāsa-gaṁ}
\]
\[
\text{kaṁ kaṁ Mausala-Yānayor Dyugati-kaṁ Vamṣe-kham etac chatam \|}
\]

[175] According to my list the various sub-parvans are distributed among the eighteen major parvans as under:

---

¹ The *a priori* attempt of Brockhaus (ZDMG 6. 528-532) to identify the hundred parvans from these stanzas of Arjunamiśra was premature and doomed to fail.
| I. Ādi (19) | I Anukramaṇī 1 | 2 Parvasāṃgraha. 3 Pauṣya. 4 Pauloma. 5 Āstika. 6 Ādivarta-sāvatraṇa. 7 Sarībhava. 8 Jatugṛhadāha. 9 Hādīmba. 10 Bakavadha. 11 Caitraratha. 12 Svayānvara. 13 Vaivāhika. 14 Vidurāgamana. 15 Rājyalambha. 16 Arjunavanavāsa. 17 Subhādā-haraṇa. 18 Haraṇahārika. 19 Khaṇḍavādāha. |
| II. Sabhā (9) | 20 Sabhā. 21 Mantra. 22 Jarasamdhiavadha. 23 Digvijaya. 24 Rājasūyika. 25 Arghabhaharaṇa. 26 Śiśupālavādh. 27 Dyūta. 28 Anudyūta. |
| III. Āraṇyaka 2 (16) | 29 Āraṇyaka. 30 Kirmāsavada. 31 Kairāta. 32 Indralokābhigamana. 33 Tirthayātra. 34 Jātāsuravadha. 35 Yakṣayuddha. 36 Ajagāra. 37 Märkaṇḍeyasamāyā. 38 Draupadī Satyabhāmasaṅvāda. 39 Ghoṣayātra. 40 Mrgasvapnabha. 41 Vṛihidraunjika. 42 Draupadiharaṇa. 43 Kūndalāharaṇa. 44 Āraṇeyā. |
| IV. Virāṭa (4) | 45 Vairāṭa. 46 Kīcakavadha. 47 Gograhāṇa. 48 Vaivāhika. |
| [176] V. Udyoga (11) | 49 Udyoga. 50 Saṅjayayāna. 51 Prajāgara. 52 Sanatsujāta. 53 Yānasaṃdhi. 54 Bhagavadyāna. 55 Viyāda. 56 Niryāna. 57 Rathātirathasarhkhya. 58 Ulūka-dūtāgman. 59 Ambopakhyaṇa. |
| VI. Bhīṣma (5) | 60 Bhīṣmabhīṣecana. 61 Jambukapadanirmāṇa. 62 Bhūmi. 63 Bhagavagītā. 64 Bhīṣmavādh. |

1 This is the correct name of the first (sub-)parvan, miscalled Anukramaṇīkā in modern editions. See above, the discussion on I. 1. 62.
2 This is the orthodox name of the third parvan, miscalled Vanaparvan in most Northern MSS., and modern editions. The Southern MSS. generally adhere consecutively to the older names.
My series differs from that of the mnemonic stanzas only as regards the two (consecutive) parvans Śānti and Anuśāsana. The aggregate number of the two parvans is the same in our lists; the discrepancy is only with regard to the division of the five sub-parvans between the two major parvans. My figures for these parvans are 3 and 2; those given by the scholiasts in their stanzas are 4 and 1 respectively, differing only by one each from mine. I am unable to account for this discrepancy at present.

These stanzas, it will have to be admitted, make the case for the exactitude of the figure 100 very much stronger. Is it conceivable that two different scholiasts would make up two different mnemonic stanzas, each giving a perfectly fictitious series of figures, with the total exactly hundred,

It will be noticed that 17 (out of the aggregate of 19) names of the (major) parvans, in this scheme, are identical with the names of the initial (sub-)parvan of each group. This is valuable because it suggests how the names of the 19 (major) parvans were obtained from the (older) list of the hundred (sub-)parvans.

VII. Droṇa (8) : 65 Droṇābhiṣeka. 66 Sarṇāsaptakavadha. 67 Abhimanyuvadha. 68 Pratijñā. 69 Jayadrathavadha. 70 Ghaṭotkacavadha. 71 Droṇavadha. 72 Nārāyaṇāśramokṣa.

VIII. Karna (1) : 73 Karna.

IX. Śalya (4) : 74 Śalya. 75 Hradapraveṣa. 76 Gadāyuddha. 77 Śārasvata.

X. Saupṭi (3) : 78 Saupṭi. 79 Aisika. 80 Jala-pradānika.

XI. Strī (5) : 81 Strī. 82 Śrāddha. 83 Abhiṣeca-nika. 84 Cārvākanigraha. 85 Gṛhapravibhāga.

XII. Śānti (3) : 86 Rājadharma. 87 Āpadharma. 88 Mokṣadharma.

XIII. Anuśāsana (2) : 89 Anuśāsanika. 90 Bhiṣmasvargāro-haṇa.

XIV. Aśvamedhika (2) : 91 Aśvamedhika. 92 Anugītā.

XV. Aśramavāṣa (3) : 93 Aśramavāsa. 94 Putradarśana. 95 Nāradāgamana.

XVI. Mausala (1) : 96 Mausala.

XVII. Mahāprasthānika (1) : 97 Mahāprasthānika.

[177] XVIII. Svargārohaṇa (1) : 98 Svargārohaṇa.

(Khila) Harivarmśa (2) : 99 Harivarmśa. 100 Bhaviṣyat.
for the number of chapter-groups in each of the eighteen books of the epic? These stanzas establish, in my opinion, irrefutably that as late as the time of Arjunamisra the total number of (sub-)parvans was believed to be exactly one hundred, and (what is much more important) the exact number of (sub-)parvan in each of the (major) parvans was also believed to be accurately known. Whether or not these figures tallied exactly with the actual divisions of the version of the text prepared by these commentators is an entirely different question, which I am not yet prepared to answer in the affirmative. These stanzas stand, in my opinion, for an effort to save from the limbo of oblivion some precious fragment of traditional knowledge regarding the epic. Like fossils these skeletons of the old Parvasamgrahaparva have survived, despite the frantic efforts of centuries of editors and critics to make the "Table of Contents" agree with the form of the text known to them.

Many of Edgerton's suggestions and queries relate to the uses of the wavy line: mostly cases where he has either less or {178} more confidence in the readings I have adopted. This device, as Edgerton himself admits, is "by its very nature hard to apply strictly and consistently." Moreover, most of the words cited by him are merely commonplace adverbs, conjunctions and other expletives like caiva, āhuḥ (v. 1. viduḥ), iha, vai, tv-atra, cāpi, kim-vā (v. 1. vā kim) and so on. I will therefore forbear from entering into a detailed discussion of the relative merits of the variants, especially as, in the majority of the cases, the manuscript evidence is so conflicting that absolute certainty is impossible.

I cannot conclude this paper without expressing both to Professor Edgerton and to Dr. Weller my cordial thanks for the very kind remarks they have to make regarding the work in general, and my keen appreciation of the uniformly courteous tone of their very sympathetic reviews.

II. Further Text-critical Notes.*

The organizers of the new Indian project of preparing a critical edition of the Mahābhārata are deeply indebted to both Geheimrat Lüders and Professor Winternitz not merely for their taking personally a keen interest in the scheme, but for their bringing the project formally to the notice of the savants assembled at the historic XVIIth International Congress of Orientalists held at Oxford in August 1928, and moving resolutions conveying messages of appreciation and congratulation.1 A singularly happy feature of this event was that this gesture of cordial sympathy and willing co-operation should have proceeded spontaneously from just those two

* [ABORI, II. 165-191].
1 The text of the resolution moved by Geheimrat Lüders and adopted unanimously by the Indian Section of the Congress has been published by Winternitz in Indologia Pragensia, 1, 63.
veteran scholars who not merely enjoy the greatest amount of respect and confidence in the world of Indologists but whose names are most intimately connected with the earlier scheme of the International Association of Academies of publishing a critical edition of our Great Epic. It is a matter of high gratification to the members of the Mahābhārata Editorial Board that their modest efforts in the cause of Mahābhārata studies are being so keenly appreciated by their fellow workers in Europe, just as it is a matter of relief to the responsible editors that the general method and principles underlying the preparation of this edition have won the warm approval of the two eminent European critics who have themselves made the closest study of the central textual problem and enriched the literature on the subject by the contribution of several valuable papers and monographs.

At the said session of the Congress of Orientalists, Winternitz read a paper entitled "The Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata", dealing with the history of the project from its early beginnings. Much of what Winternitz says in this [166] memorable address of his bears the unmistakable stamp of being personal reminiscences, because he was the first scholar who more than thirty years ago, at the XIth International Congress of Orientalists held in Paris (1897), emphasized the superlative importance of a critical edition of the Mahābhārata and proposed measures for its preparation.

After nearly thirty years of restless endeavour, he is again one of the small group of the first collaborators of the great and ambitious project. During 1922-3 he used his opportunities as a Guest Professor at the University of the poet philosopher Rabindranath Tagore to train some of his advanced pupils at the Viśvabharatī to do collation work, thus helping to establish there a centre for the collation of Bangali MSS. of the Mahābhārata, a centre which is still doing excellent work under the supervision of the Principal, Pandit Vidhushekha Bhattacharya. Finally, Winternitz has taken over some of the editorial burden on his own shoulders by kindly agreeing to edit for the Institute one Parvan, the Sabhāparvan. This is indeed a very happy augury for the continued success of our cherished project.

To the text of his Congress address, which he has published in the first issue of his Journal, Indologica Pragensia, Vol. 1 (1929), pp. 58-63, Winternitz has appended (pp. 64-68) some critical remarks on my edition of the Adiparvan. While expressing his whole-hearted agreement with the general principles underlying my reconstruction of the text, he has given a long list of passages in which he differs from me with respect to the readings of the constituted text. With unerring judgement he has picked out those

---

1 Cf. Winternitz, ABI. 5. 24, 30, and Ind. Prag. 1. 62, 67; Lüders, Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1929 (Heft 24), Sp. 1137-1146.
2 Cf. also ABI. 4. 145 ff.
passages in the first two adhyāyas that had given me most trouble, and he has criticized the readings of the constituted text, weighing the pros and cons with great acumen, and pointing out the errors and imperfections with much delicacy and courtesy. While tendering him my cordial thanks for the honour he has done me by making so close and penetrating a study of my critical work, I shall endeavour here briefly to answer his queries and criticism. I write these notes not so much to justify my selection and establish the readings of the critical edition as [167] to set forth the reasons that have guided me in the choice of the readings in question and that may not have occurred to my critic—remarks which will not fail to throw some fitful light on the obscure and complicated processes which go to make up Mahābhārata textual criticism.

* * *

MINOR QUESTIONS.

1. 1. 30: Winternitz observes that "in the notes the interesting remark of Arjunamiśra is given; paramesṭhy atha iti prāyaśaka pāthak, but the actual reading of the Da MSS. is not given". The reading of the Da MSS. not being specifically mentioned, it must, in conformity with a tacitly assumed Paribbāṣā, be taken to be the same as the text reading, namely, paramesṭhy atha. In that sense the reading of the Da MSS. (i.e. of Arjunamiśra) has been given, and my note is both complete and correct, because both the Da MSS. collated for the passage do, in point of fact, read paramesṭhy atha. Nevertheless, as I discovered on referring to the commentary once more, the note does not represent the facts fully and correctly, because the MSS. which are corrupt, being contaminated from the vulgate, had succeeded, for the time being, in completely misleading me.

That the true Arjunamiśra reading must, against the testimony of MSS., be assumed to be paramesīvarā (agreeing then with B₂, Dₐ,₈, C₉) follows, with certainty, from the commentary itself, a fact I had overlooked when I wrote the note. The commentary runs thus:

भन्त्र: प्रक्षिप्त:  क: वसिष्ठ:  तद्र्विवेकण परसेक्त्र: प्रजापतिवाद:  परमेश्वयथ इति प्रायसः

In the Foreword to Fascicule 1 (p. 1), I have already drawn attention to the fact that "the (epic) text in the Arjunamiśra codices is frequently contaminated from the "vulgate" and has to be corrected with the help of Arjunamiśra's commentary." The examples cited there are 1. 1. 17b and

1 A reference to Prof. Lüders' Druckprobe (p. 6) will show that the (Devānāgari) MSS. of Arjunamiśra's commentary collated by him for his Specimen edition read likewise paramesṭhy atha; only in one instance has the reading been corrected (by a later hand) to paramesīvarā. Accordingly Prof. Lüders has also taken paramesṭhy atha as the reading of the version of Arjunamiśra.
22b. In the former case, the Da MSS. read punyāṇī (like the vulgate, with which the constituted text here agrees; the true Arjunamiśra [168] reading is, however, punya-, as follows clearly from Arjunamiśra's own observation:

पुण्यम्यानि०। पुण्यम् श्रुतमावस्त्र श्रुतमावस्त्र । पुण्यम्यानि०।

In the latter case (1. 1. 22 b), likewise, the Da MSS. read śivam, agreeing with many K and D MSS.; but the commentary shows (as I have pointed out in the notes) that the true Arjunamiśra reading is sucitum, agreeing with the constituted text, śivam being only a variant mentioned by the scholiast:

अनर्र्व नित्यापमनवर्ता । अन्युपाधित विद्योपकारस्त्रावर्ता । अत एवं श्रुतिः । विविषयति पाठे सिवेकल्याण रहेन्नां ।

I must here add, therefore, a word of caution. In the critical notes published with the text, the readings as actually found in the (epic) text (in contradistinction to the commentary) of the Arjunamiśra codices have, as a rule, been taken to represent the readings of Arjunamiśra; the commentary was consulted by me only occasionally, in case of doubt or difficulty, or when a pāṭhāntara was noticed. It is, therefore, more than likely that, owing to the fact our Da MSS. are conflated by contamination with various types of MSS., in particular with the Nilakantha type, a few errors of the kind pointed out by WINTERNITZ may have inadvertently crept in. Such errors can be rectified only by working through the whole commentary, word for word, and comparing the lemmata with the (epic) text of the MSS.; even then one can of course be sure only of the words and passages actually cited and explained by the scholiast.

The version of Arjunamiśra, as I pointed out in the Foreword to Fascicule 1 (p. v), is closely allied to the Bangāli version. The reason for this affinity (as I have stated elsewhere) appears to be that Arjunamiśra was a native of Bengal.1 Following the example of my predecessors, I have utilized, for the critical edition of the Adiparvan, Devanāgarī MSS. of Arjunamiśra's commentary. The two MSS. I am using are extremely corrupt. In fact, all the MSS. of Arjunamiśra's commentary I have seen—and they are all Devanāgarī MSS.—have been remarkably corrupt. Not only that, the text they offer is, as already remarked, obviously contaminated from the [169] vulgate. This corruption of the Devanāgarī MSS. I could not account for at first; but it must be due, I cannot but think now, to their being copies of Bangāli or Maithili originals. It would, therefore, be expedient to procure and use, whenever possible, Bangāli2 or Maithili MSS. of Arjunamiśra.

---

1 See my note on Arjunamiśra in the Dr. Modi Memorial Volume, p. 565 ff.
2 The Asiatic Society of Bengal does contain some Bengali MSS. (Descrip-
misra’s commentary, treating his version as an offshoot of the Bangali (respectively Maithili) version.  

* * *

1. 1. 62: WINTERNITZ points out that the lengthy interpolation App. I, No. 1 = (B.) 1. 1. 55cd—93 is inserted in the R. A. S. Whish MS. No. 65 after 62ab, and not after 62, as in most of the Southern MSS. used by me. But two of my MSS. (T₁, G₇) also insert the passage in question after 62ab, like the Whish MS.; only between 62ab and the Appendix passage, my MSS. further interpolate 29*, 64 and 30*, as stated in the very note cited by WINTERNITZ. The point of insertion of this interpolation varied in the different MSS. Thus of the MSS. collated by Prof. LÜDERS for his Druckprobe, two G₂ [? read G₃] T₂ read it after 62ab, while two others (G₂ T₁) read it after 62; moreover, in T₂ (of the Druckprobe) the inserted passage is preceded by 29*, 64 and 65 (somewhat like T₁, G₇)²

* * *

1. 1. 131: The printer’s devil, I regret to say, is responsible for the erroneous spelling Samsaptaka—(with dental s) in this stanza; the correct spelling Samsaptaka—(with palatal š) is given at 1. 2. 56 and 160. Moreover, the various readings have been given only at 1. 2. 56, and, through some unfortunate oversight, omitted at 1. 1. 131 and 1. 2. 160. I make good the omission here. At 1. 1. 131 the various readings are as follows. K₀, a,—e, B₄ Da Da₁, n₃ Dr₁, r₃, r₄ D₁—e, 6, 7, 10, 14 T₁ Samsapta⁰; K₁ B₃ Dn₂ Dr₂ D₆, 8, 9, 11, 12 T₂ G (G₁. 2 om.) M Samsapta⁰; V₁ Šamsapta⁰; K₅ D₁₃ missing. At 1. 2. 160 they are: K₀, a,—e V₁ Da₂ Dn Dr₁, r₄ D₃—4, 7, 10—14 [170] T₁ G₇ Samsapta⁰; K₁ B Da₁ Dr₂, r₃ D₁, 5, 6, 9 T₂ G₁. 3—6 Samsapta⁰; G₂ Šamsapta⁰; K₅ missing; M om.

From the readings of the three passages in question, it should seem that, anomalies apart, K₅ (or the India Office Codex), Bangali and Southern MSS. read it correctly (that is, with the palatal š), while the rest of K agrees with the commentators in reading it with the dental s. The balance of probability inclines to the side of the palatal, I think, even if we restrict ourselves to the MS. evidence. C. V. VAIDYA (The Mahābhārata: A Criticism, p. 159) speaks of them as the “7 clans who came probably from the Afagan (sic) borders,” but it seems to me more likely that they got their nickname from the fact that they had bound themselves by an oath to kill Arjuna or die in the great Bhārata battle (Dropap. 17).

* * *

² That would also account for the frequent divergence of Da from the D class.

³ The passage is found inserted not only after 62ab and 62, but also after 26, 53ab, 59ab (according to the Druckprobe), and 60.
1. 2. 85: The spurious line (102*) kūtasya Dhārtarāṣṭreṇa preṣañām Pāṇḍavān prati stands in the MSS. not before 97* (as WINTERNITZ imagines and very naturally), but after 101*, as correctly stated in the critical notes. I have re-examined the MSS. concerned on the point and find that my note is perfectly correct. One cannot be dogmatic about the Mahābhārata MSS.; there is no knowing what they may or may not contain. The line was found only in six Nilakaṇṭha MSS. in Devanāgarī or Bangārī characters, collated for the first two adhyāyas. In all these six MSS. the line is found interpolated at the same place, the place mentioned in the critical apparatus (namely, after 101*), although all printed editions without exception place it elsewhere (namely, before 97*), which is no doubt the reason of WINTERNITZ'S remark. A note drawing attention to this patent discrepancy might have been usefully added in the critical notes. But I have found the printed editions so arbitrary and unreliable¹ that I have almost [171] completely ignored them in the foot-notes, which have necessarily to be rather brief and to the point. The meaning of this enigmatic line found in Nilakaṇṭha MSS. is as obscure to me as the cause of its transposition in the first printed edition. We need not inquire why the line occurs in the wrong place in the other editions as well, since the subsequent editors appear to have studiously and uniformly avoided consulting MSS. WINTERNITZ could easily convince himself of the correctness of my statement regarding the point of insertion of this line in the MSS. by referring to the superb complete copy of the Mahābhārata in śāradā characters, with Nilakaṇṭha's scholium, he purchased in Kaśmīr during his stay there.

1. 2. 102: Da Dn Dr do have magnām and Draupadīṁ, as found in the printed editions and as rightly surmised by WINTERNITZ. This group has, through oversight, completely dropped out of the long list of MSS. that read Draupadīṁ, and I am thankful to WINTERNITZ for drawing my attention to it. The correction will be duly notified in the list of Errata, which will be added at the end of the volume. In passing I may draw attention to the superiority of the K MSS., the only group which, as WINTERNITZ rightly remarks, gives the undoubtedly correct rendering of the whole stanza; all other MSS.—even such as do not contain the interpolated line 112*—are in utter confusion.

1. The Kumbhakonam edition contains a misleading colophon after its adhyāya 100, which is not found in any MS. and is, moreover, unnecessary.—All printed editions contain the line (B.1.28.4cd=K. 1.28. 5cd)

| gurur hi sarvahūtānāṁ brāhmaṇāḥ parikṣṛtāḥ |

which is not found even in Nilakaṇṭha MSS. The note on 1.74.12 mentions a line (B. 1. 79. 13 ef=K. 1. 73. 23 ab)

| māramāṁ śobhānāṁ tasya iti vidvajjanāū viduḥ |

which was not found in any of the 60 MSS. collated for that adhyāya!
This is indeed a difficult case, and I for my part doubt whether any definite decision can be reached as to how the stanza originally read. I must say, I cannot share the confidence with which Winternitz decides for the reading:

\[
yadā Vāyuḥ Śakra Śukrasūryau ca yuktau,
\]

which is mentioned as a pāṭha by Nilakaṇṭha and was adopted in the edilīo princeps. It is one of the eight rival readings and is found chiefly in the Bangālī version, and in MSS. and editions allied to or influenced by it. The combinations found [172] in the different MSS. may be arranged schematically as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vāyu</th>
<th>Śakra</th>
<th>Śūrya : Majority of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vāyu</td>
<td>Śukra</td>
<td>Śūrya : ( K_1 + \text{some } D )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāyu</td>
<td>Candra</td>
<td>Śūrya : ( D_n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) śrauṣam</td>
<td>Śukra</td>
<td>Śūrya : Text (T ( G_{1,6,8} ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) śrauṣam</td>
<td>Śakra</td>
<td>Śūrya : Majority of M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) śrauṣam</td>
<td>Vāyu</td>
<td>Śūrya : A few G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) śrauṣam</td>
<td>Vāyu</td>
<td>Śūrya : ( D_6 ) (inferior MS.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) śrauṣam</td>
<td>Śukra</td>
<td>Śūrya : ( M_1 ) (conflated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to WINTERNITZ, the stanza refers to (B.) 7. 7. 34 ff. "where the line vātoddhūtan ṛajas tvaram etc., also testifies to the reading vāyuḥ, while śakra (= Indra) 'probably refers to the rain of pieces of flesh, bones and blood.'" To start with I doubt whether Śakra could be held responsible for the "rain" of flesh, bones, and sundry other articles; but that is a minor point, immaterial to the present discussion. In believing, however, that our stanza refers to (B.) 7. 7. 34 ff., WINTERNITZ is partly mistaken, as will presently appear. The important point is that in the opinion of WINTERNITZ the stanza alludes to certain forces of Nature, certain elements, such as wind, rain and so on, which were favourable to the Pāṇḍavas and unfavourable to the Kauravas. The commentators Nilakaṇṭha, Arjunamīśra and Devabodha (with the readings which they had adopted or which were before them) have explained the stanza in a similar way. I hold a different view, however. When I selected the reading of the constituted text, I thought—and I still think—that in this stanza there is allusion not to the elements, but to some astrological factor or constellation—an allusion which was not understood by commentators and which I could not then fully explain. On reading the criticism of Prof. WINTERNITZ, I therefore made a reference to my
friend Prof. Jyotish Chandra GHATAK, M. A., of Calcutta University, who has made a special study of Indian Astrology and allied sciences and is rightly regarded as an authority on these topics; and I was not disappointed. Having already worked through the whole of the Mahābhārata in special search of references which have a bearing on Astrology, Augury and kindred subjects, he could at once lay his fingers on the right passage, the prototype of our stanza, which throws a flood of light on the question, without however fully solving the riddle of the stanza, so far as I can judge. The said stanza, (B.) 6. 20. 2, reads:

[173] [Dhṛtarāṣṭra to Sanjaya]

केषा जगन्नाथी सौमसूयः सवायू,
केषा सेना श्वावद्रा व्यावनतः।
केषा द्रुतां मुखवण्यं प्रसन्नः:
सर्वं बेलदव, बृहि तत्त्वं व्यावनतः।

While the connection between the two stanzas is patent and indeed unquestionable, the discovery of the prototype leaves, unfortunately, most of our real difficulties unsolved. The reading which agrees closest with that of the Bhīṣmaparvan stanza is that of the vulgate text and is found only in the MSS. of Nilakantha. These latter have Vāyu-Chandra-Surya (lacking Śakra or Śukra altogether) like Soma-Sūrya-Vāyu of the Bhīṣmaparvan. Is the Nilakantha reading then the original reading? As I have pointed out elsewhere, we are apt to prefer, at first sight, the readings of the vulgate, which appear to be better than those of the critical text; but that is only because the text of the vulgate has been arrived at by the purging of the original by the continuous emendations of scholars for centuries.¹ It seems to me that there is a long history behind the reading of the vulgate in the present case also. Nilakantha had evidently arrived at it by an emendation, by collation with the prototype, because there is no indication of there being any MSS. before him which could have contained that particular combination. This fact may, perhaps, supply us with a clue to the labyrinth of the readings recorded in the critical notes for the line in question. An important factor is that Śukra (or Śakra), which persistently occurs in all the various categories of our MSS. and which must, therefore, be regarded as an essential feature of our stanza, is entirely lacking in the later stanza. This proves irrefutably that the combination of the former was not identical, in every respect, with that of the latter originally. That is an important point to remember. WINTERNITZ is emphatic in asserting that yaddā Vāyuḥ of the original was changed in S into the usual yadāśrausam. This assumption does not seem to me to

¹ See my Epic Studies (I), JBBRAS. (NS.) 4 (1928). 157. A patent example of correction is grhaḥīva haranaṁ prāpte (in Devanāgarī MSS.) for haranaṁ ghṛya samprāpte (1. 2. 93).
be at all well founded, because the very next stanza (130) begins yadā Droṇo vividhān astramārgān, and here no attempt has been made in S (or anywhere else) to change the beginning into yadāśrauṣam. There are a few more stanzas (133, 140; 145) in [174] this series which do not begin with the oft-repeated formula. It seems to me much more likely, therefore, that Vāyu was introduced into our passage, secondarily, by some early Northern redactor who knew the prototype and had noticed the omission of one of the elements in the prior stanza; precisely as Nīlakaṇṭha, much later, appears to have further altered the line by changing the difficult Śakra (or Śukra) to Candra, thus equating the combination to that of the prototype. I therefore adhere to my original choice, explaining the genesis of the variants as follows. The stanza in question, which was suggested to the author of the yadāśrauṣam section by the Bṛhaspati-van stanza but was composed from a vague recollection of the original, began like the other stanzas of the series, and contained, moreover, an allusion to an astrological situation. Some Northern redactor (who had known the Bṛhaspati-van stanza and noticed that the first stanza did not contain Vāyu) then deleted (a)śrauṣam and substituted for it the missing Vāyu, retaining, however, the original feature Śukra. The corruption of Śukra into Śakra must be judged as easy and even natural (in juxtaposition with Sūrya), in view of the famous episode of the Mahābhārata which narrates how Indra, disguised as a mendicant Brahman, begs for the miraculous ear-rings and the armour which had been Karna’s from his birth and which had made him invincible. The emendatory activity of the early Northern redactor was continued by Nīlakaṇṭha, who expunged the Śakra (or Śukra) which he found in his MSS. (and perhaps did not fully understand) and substituted for it Candra, thus equating the two combinations.

I am confirmed in the supposition that the original line contained only two agencies instead of three by the fact that no MSS. hitherto collated show yuktāḥ (plu.) for yuktāu (dual) in the first line, as they certainly would have done, had there been three names in the original instead of two, as I have given.1

The question then arises whether Śukra and Sūrya, as gridhas, were at that time favourable to the Pāṇḍavas or, what comes to the same thing, adverse to the Kauravas. About [175] Sūrya I cannot say. But as far as Śukra is concerned, we may safely answer the question in the affirmative. My friend Prof. Ghatak has kindly drawn my attention to a stanza in Varāhamihira’s Brhat-samhitā which, if dyutājīvin may be taken to apply to the

---

1 It should be noted that even in the explanation of Winternitz, Śakra and Sūrya do not make any combined effort. If the three elements wind, rain and sun operate all together for the success of the Pāṇḍavas, then yuktāḥ is indeed the correct word. What is the point of the dual, when the plural form would be even metrically equally suitable?
Kauravas, would indicate that at the time of the Bhārata battle the planet Śukra, which was then in the Pūrvābhādrapadā (cf. 6. 3. 15), was in a position which augured disaster to the Kauravas and was therefore favourable (anuloma) to the Pāṇḍavas. The Brhatsamhitā reference (9. 34) supplied to me by my friend runs.

As Vāyu is missing in the whole of S except M₂ (which latter is a conflated MS.), it can never be established that Vāyu is an essential element of the original stanza; on the other hand, (a) śrausam, though of course no less doubtful because it is documented also by only half of the entire evidence, is rendered probable, if not required, by the context. But I am prepared to leave the line as "less than certain," as indicated by the wavy line below the words in question.

* * *

1. 1. 180: lava putrair mahattamāḥ.

WINTERNITZ complains that the sentence is "very awkward grammatically". To have called forth no less than nine attempts at emendation, the original must indeed have been most awkward. WINTERNITZ prefers to read lava putrair mahattarāḥ, pointing out that there is not much evidence for the text reading. It is quite true that the text is weakly supported; but so are almost all the readings except that of the vulgate, which certainly cannot be considered the original reading, as it is palpably an emendation. The text is based on K₄.₅ G₆.₆ only. But WINTERNITZ's reading is not much better supported; in its entirety it is found only in K₃ M; because, of the MSS. which do contain the questionable mahattarāḥ, K₀ begins the pāda with tvatputrair ye and K₄ with tvatseubhyo. I submit, therefore, that the reading preferred by WINTERNITZ is not better documented than mine. That is the first point. WINTERNITZ then seeks to explain the variation on the ground that the scribes must have found difficulties with the [176] instr. putraṅ. Now the so-called instr. comparationis is very common in both epics and, I submit, that alone would not account for this plethora of readings in the case of a simple line with a perfectly obvious meaning. I know instances in the Mahābhārata text where this instr. comparationis has called forth no variants at all in the MSS., no doubt because it was felt to be quite normal by the copyists, editors and readers alike. The cause of disturbance in this case must, therefore, be looked for elsewhere, and that was principally, I think, the use of the superlative joined to the instrumental.

In settling the original reading, the question is primarily one of fact, of the actual MS. evidence, not of grammar. The Shakespearean "This was
the most unkindest cut of all” cannot be judged and emended by modern standards of grammar. It sounds harsh to our ears; but there is, I suppose, sufficient documentary evidence to prove or make it probable that the line as I have quoted it was in point of fact written by the author of Julius Caesar (who knew his English quite as well as, if indeed not better than, we do), consciously or unconsciously using what our purists stigmatize as vulgarism. The argument that a dramatist like Shakespeare could not commit such a blunder (if blunder it be) would be without cogency, when the MS. evidence supports the questionable reading.

The Mahābhārata, I may point out here, has suffered from the great misfortune of being always edited by learned Pandits, who were concerned more about the purity of diction than with the determination and preservation of the words of the author or the authors of the epic. One of the very worst offenders in this way was Pandit BÖHTLINGK who, in the passages edited by him in his Sanskrit-Chrestomathie, has “corrected” away the few oddities of idiom and style of the original which had escaped the vigilence of mediaeval Indian scholiasts and editors and found their way stealthily into our printed editions!\(^1\)

[177] The nine variants mentioned in the critical notes may be classified as follows. Readings

(1) in which the comparison is emphasized  
   (a) by change of the superl. to the comp.:  
     लघुशीर्षेऽऽहँतः: 1 Kₐ  
     लघु पुनःहीतः: 1 K₉ D₁₄ M  
   (b) by a double change of superl. to comp. and of instr. to abl.  
      (the “correct” construction):  
     लघुद्वेष्यो महत्तः: 1 K₄ (inferior MS.) ;

(2) in which the awkward instr. is done away with  
   (a) by changing the instr. into abl.:  
     लघुद्वेष्यो महत्तः: 1 K₂  
     लघु द्वानन्दः: 1 V₁

\(^1\) In the Pausyaparvan (Adip. 3) especially, his editorial activities are very much in evidence. He has not only introduced, with scrupulous care, the correct Sandhi wherever it was at all possible, he has substituted the correct bhandhum for the (irregular) baddhum (1. 3. 21), found even in the printed editions and made many similar “corrections” independently of the MS. evidence. Most amusing, however, is his regular and systematic substitution of the correct form, as required by the Śūtra of Pāṇini, out of etad and enad, a rule probably unknown at any time to anybody outside a select coterie of Ācāryas of Vyākaraṇa.
(b) by using the adj. predicatively (mostly in G):

\[ T_2 \ G_{1-3} \ \text{m.7} \]

\[ G_4 \]

(3) in which the line has been recast (the vulgate):

\[ T_2 \ G \ \text{m.7} \]

and (4) corrupt:

\[ D_{10} \]

It is an admittedly sound principle of textual criticism to give preference to a reading which best suggests how the other readings may have arisen, and it would be hard, I think, to find another reading which could explain all these nine variants more satisfactorily. WINTERNITZ's choice, for instance, does not at all explain the origin of any of the readings which contain \textit{mahattamāh} (superl.) such as 2 (a) and (b) and the text reading; because there is in that case nothing to be gained by changing the (supposed) original comparative into superlative.¹

\textit{En passant} it may be pointed out that the so-called \textit{instr. comparationis} is not a distinct category of the comparative at all; it is only a special case of the (Prakritic) coalescence of the instr. and abl. pl. (\textit{metri causa}), an equivalence which comes out very clearly in such parallel phrases as:

\[ \text{सर: पापत्तमुच्यते} \quad 1.1.198 \]

[178] and

\[ \text{स्वप्नत: प्रमुलि} \quad 1.1.209 \text{ and } 494 \ast. \]

The latter does not mean "he is left by all sins" but "he is freed from all sins."

That the superlative is used in the epic in the sense of the comparative² may be seen from:

\[ \text{तेषां के योगविमुक्त:} \quad \text{Gītā 12.1} \]

\[ \text{न च तस्मानन्त्येषु कः किं न्यत्त्म:} \quad \text{ibid. 18.69} \]

"Of these which are more versed in Yoga?" "Nor among men shall there be any whose service is dearer to me than his."

The superlative is normally construed with the gen. or loc.; but that it is

¹ Unless it be a scribe's error perpetuated through centuries or repeated independently in different places and times.

² This \textit{pāda} recurs frequently in the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} also.

³ These derivative forms have probably a merely intensive value, and do not necessarily and invariably connote comparison. The Prakrits frequently confuse the \textit{tura} and the \textit{tama} endings. It is further worth noting that a separate formation of the comparative and superlative is unknown to the Modern Indian dialects. The epics also sporadically furnish instances of the use of the \textit{positive} in the sense of the comparative.
constrained sometimes also with the abl. may be seen not merely from the example last cited but also from:

अति चेतिति पापेयः सर्वेऽः पापकुलमः | ibid. 4. 36

"Though thou art of all sinners the most sinful."

Then the above-mentioned equivalence of the instr. and abl. pl. ushers in finally the construction of the superlative with the instr., which we find in the passage in question.

Formally the two constructions tava putrair mahattarāḥ and tava putrair mahattamāḥ are almost equivalent; but there may be just a slight difference of meaning between the two locutions. While tava putrair mahattarāḥ (comp.) evidently means only "greater than thy sons", the other clause (tava putrair mahattamāḥ) may have been intended to convey some such sense as "far, very much, greater than thy sons."

It may be finally observed that in dealing with the first two adhyāyas of the Adiparvan (as in fact with the whole of the earlier portion of this Parvan) the critic should never forget that he has before him what HOPKINS has justly called the "pseudo-epic" : the poetasters responsible for the compilation of these passages are capable of the worst blunders of every description.

* * *


As WINTERNITZ rightly observes, here the MS. evidence is almost evenly balanced. Moreover, graphically there is so little difference between the rival readings that we cannot expect much help from the side of the MSS., though it may be pointed out that their evidence inclines, if at all, just a trifle to the side of the text reading. WINTERNITZ (Ind. Ant. 27. 93) admits that the lines (69*) caturbhyāḥ etc. and tadā prabhṛti etc. are "quite superfluous." When these lines are expunged from the text, as has been done by me, the line mahaṭṭvā ca gurute ca of 208e) stands adjacent to mahaṭṭvād bhāra (of 209a). The idea of 208e is evidently reflected and repeated in 209a. Just as mahaṭṭvāt corresponds to mahaṭṭvā, so bhāra should correspond to gurute. This clearly shows, as far as I can judge, that the doubtful word (bhāra*), which should be a paraphrase of gurute, must be bhāravattvāt and not bhāratavāt. The latter seems to be an emendation made by some revisor who wanted to squeeze in somehow the significant word Bhārata into the context; and, it must truthfully be confessed, it is a very ingenious emendation indeed. But as to which is the orginal reading there cannot be much doubt. The importance that WINTERNITZ (like BÜHLER, Ind. Stud. 2. 9 f., before him) attaches to the circumstance that the verse is quoted in (our edition of) Kumārila's Tantravārttika with the reading bhāratavāt is wholly unjustifiable, and that for two reasons: firstly, because we have no critical edition of the Tantravārttika, and so we cannot be wholly sure of what the
MSS. actually read at that place; and secondly, because, even if Kumārila should, in point of fact, have quoted the verse with *bhāratatvāt*, it does not at all follow that this is *ipso facto* the original reading, notwithstanding that Kumārila’s work is far older than the extant Mahābhārata MSS; because Kumārila may have cited the stanza from one or the other of the versions which contained (and still contain) that reading. Or again he may have known both variants and preferred, for reasons similar to those adduced by Bühler and Winternitz, the variant rejected by me.

The situation is somewhat clearer and the facts better capable of demonstration in the case of the other great mediaeval commentator Śaṅkarācārya. In many cases when the readings of the Mahābhārata verses and stanzas cited by him [180] differ from those of the Bombay and Calcutta editions, I was able to identify Śaṅkarācārya’s readings in the Southern MSS. Being a Southerner, he had naturally studied and cited from the Southern recension of the Mahābhārata. It is quite clear that he was not going to work through all available MSS. and establish the original reading of the numerous Mahābhārata stanzas cited by him in the course of his voluminous commentaries. Therefore his citations, although of far greater antiquity than the oldest of our extant Mahābhārata MSS., do not necessarily give us in every case the “original” readings. Śaṅkara’s testimony applies to and affects mainly the version or the recension used or cited by him; and that was probably the Southern recension in its Malayālam version. Even in the time of the Acārya the Northern MSS. must have read differently in places, as they do now, because the divagation of the recensions must be assumed to be far older than the epoch of the great Vedantist.

I shall give only one example in order to clarify my meaning. 1. 1. 37 of the critical edition reads *yathartāv ṛtuṅgāni*, agreeing with other printed editions and with the majority of the MSS. of the Northern recension. Śaṅkarācārya in his Bhāṣya on the Brahmasūtra (1. 3. 30; Anandāśrama ed., p. 313) cites, however, the verse with the reading *yathartasu ṛtuṅgāni*. Now this reading is found only in Southern MSS. and in such of the Northern MSS. as can be shown to be contaminated from the Southern source, but not in any Kāśmīrī or Bangāḷī MSS. collated so far. Here it would be clearly wrong to cite the Bhāṣya as an authority older than our MSS. to establish the text reading as *yathartasu ṛtuṅgāni*. The Bhāṣya citation affects directly the Southern version only, documenting that the divergent reading of our Southern MSS. is as old as (or rather older than) the time of Śaṅkarācārya; and that is all. It does not take us beyond the Southern recension, much less beyond the two rival recensions to the archetype.

When Winternitz further observes that “from the etymologizer’s point of view” *bhāratatvāt* is a “better” etymology, since with the other reading

---

1 Only one of the Bhāṣya MSS. has our text reading.
the ta of the Bhārata remains unexplained, he is bringing into the discussion an element of finesse that is quite foreign to the view-point of [181] the Purānic writers, as will be evident from the following specimens of "etymologische Spielerei" culled from the earlier adhyāyas of the Adiparvan:

(B.) 1. 30. 7 = line 3 of 343* (Garuḍa):

In view of these bizarre specimens, it would be extremely strange should a Purānic "etymologizer" fight shy of sacrificing a ta, if he, for the moment, could not think of anything better.  

1, 2. 2 : suśrūṣā yadi vo viprā bṛuvatas ca kathāḥ śubhāḥ.  
I admit that my reconstruction of the line is not wholly satisfactory. The reading preferred by WINTERNITZ may also not appeal to other scholars, as it does not wholly appeal to me. I therefore cite here the 15 different readings found in the 48 MSS. collated for this passage, of which one (D₂₅), unluckily or luckily, omits the line altogether. The lines containing ca (to which WINTERNITZ takes exception in particular) have been underlined for the sake of ready identification.

1. श्रव्याचार्ये विष्णु ब्रह्मते से हुमा कथा:। K₄
2. श्रव्याचार्ये विष्णु ब्रह्मते से कथा: हुमा:। K₂₃
3. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु ब्रह्मते कथा: हुमा:। K₅
4. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु ब्रह्मते कथा: हुमा:। K₅ (corrupt)
5. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु ब्रह्मते कथा: हुमा:। K₅ V₂ D₅ D₁₅ a-11
6. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु ब्रह्मते कथा: हुमा:। B Da (Da₂₅ corrupt) D₁₃
7. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु ब्रह्मते कथा: हुमा:। Dr D₄
8. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु ब्रह्मते सत्कथा हुमा:। D₂
9. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु ब्रह्मते कथा: हुमा:। D₆
10. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु ब्रह्मते कथा: हुमा:। D₁₇ 12
11. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु ब्रह्मते कथा: हुमा:। T G₆
12. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु प्रवचन्ते निकिला कथा:। G₂ a, 7
13. श्रव्याचार्ये मन ते विष्णु ब्रह्मते से कथा: हुमा:। M₂, 4.
14. श्रुत्या यदि व निः मुखो यथा। मेव कथा। श्रुता। | \[182\] Text (K\textsubscript{0} D\textsubscript{14} G\textsubscript{1} 4.5 M\textsubscript{1}).

As for the doubtful ca, I may remark that, besides its normal use as a conjunction meaning “and”, ca is very frequently used in the Mahābhārata (and the Rāmāyaṇa) as an expletive, a pure and simple verse-filler (pādapūrana), without restriction of position, like ki and vai. It may occasionally have served as a particle of emphasis, stressing the previous word like eva. The second use is somewhat doubtful; but of the first, one can find scores of perfectly clear and certain instances in any portion of the epic, even in the printed editions. In the line in question, I consider, ca has been used in the first sense, as a mere verse-filler. Sporadically me, which improves this awkward line ever so slightly, appears to have been substituted for it, independently in both recensions. The first half of the line was so uncouth that it was recast in the vulgate. There are numerous instances of lines being recast in the vulgate, as a careful study of the critical apparatus will show.

\[1.2.29 : yat tu Saunakasatre te Bhūrāta-khyānañvistaram | \] \[\text{ākhyāyeye tatra Paulomam ākhyānaiś cādiṭaḥ param} \]

This is again a most difficult case, and, as Winternitz rightly remarks, “full of almost hopeless editorial cruxes”. The reconstruction would be, therefore, almost entirely a matter of speculation. Winternitz has rightly surmised that I regard the Parvasamgraha as an accretion later than this stanza, which, in my opinion, belongs to a much earlier stratum of the text of the Mahābhārata. That Saunakasatre in line 1 is a regular trap for the unwary. Misled by the printed editions, I had myself treated the words as separate at first, realizing only much later that in this adhyāya the Sūta is addressing not Saunaka but the Rṣis, among whom Saunaka is not yet present. Saunaka is not mentioned in the foregoing portion of the text except once, in connection with his twelve-year sacrifice in 1.1.1. In adhyāya 4, moreover, it is plainly stated that the Sūta first approaches the Rṣis assembled in the Naimiṣa forest and asks them what he should narrate. The Rṣis request him to await the arrival of Saunaka. The latter, as soon as he arrives, asks the Sūta to relate the history of the Bhārgavas (adhy. 5). If Saunaka was not among the audience in adhyāya 4, I do not see how he could have been there in adhyāya 2. Moreover, in the latter adhyāya the interlocutors are throughout stated as being the Rṣis, while it is only from adhyāya 5 onwards that Saunaka appears in this \[183\] rôle. It should, therefore, seem that the reading Saunaka satre is not easy to understand or explain by any means. Or does Winternitz mean that it should be adopted as the lectio difficillior? It would be admissible, in my opinion, only on the supposition (which is not as improbable as it may at first sight appear) that
the compiler of adhyāya 2, when he wrote stanza 29, had overlooked the fact that Saunaka was not then among the audience. I have preferred to give the "poet" the benefit of the doubt and assume that the remark is addressed to one of the Rṣis present.

Winternitz has misunderstood my reconstruction in some other particulars as well. yat, at the beginning of the stanza, is not a neuter pronoun but an adverb = yadā. The words ādītah param offer no difficulties at all for interpretation; ādītah does not mean "from the beginning," but "at the beginning" (=ādau); param = excellent." ākhyāsyu must of course be supplied in the first line; but that is not difficult as it is the very first word of the second line. Therefore I translate:

"But when, during Saunaka's (sacrificial) session, I (shall narrate) to thee the very extensive Bhārata Story, then shall I narrate, to begin with, the excellent Story of Pauloma."

Even a cursory examination of the variants given in the critical notes is sufficient to convince anybody that the stanza has been recast over and over again. With its history is bound up the history of the successive additions of the three episodes Astika, Pauloma and Pauṣya, which appear to have been appended successively to the main text in this order. The stanza in question seems to have been written at the time of or soon after the addition of the Pauloma, but before the addition of the Pauṣya. The purpose of the line was originally not—as Winternitz imagines—to state all the episodes with which the Mahābhārata begins, but to authenticate the latest interpolation then made, namely, the Pauloma, by making the Sūta declare beforehand his intention of narrating that ākhyāna at the beginning of the Mahābhārata. The Āstika must have formed at that time the recognized beginning of the epic (cf. Matvādi Bhārataṃ kecid Āstikādī tathā pare 1. 1. 50), and the Pauṣya had not yet been added. This is the state of things the constituted text envisages.

A study of the critical apparatus of this adhyāya shows that the adhyāya is best preserved in the Southern recension; [184] in the MSS. group on which the vulgate is mainly based (namely, BD) numerous additional stanzas are found which are missing in S and K₂, 1; but even the three latter MSS. occasionally include some of such additional stanzas, which also nevertheless, since they are missing in S, may safely be regarded as interpolations. Of this character is interpolation 74*, which is found in almost the whole of N and which must have been made with a view to documenting the fact—or rather the fiction—that the Mahābhārata as narrated by the Sūta to Saunaka was identical with that narrated by Vaiṣampāyana to Janamejaya (cf. Nilakanṭha ad loc.). K₂ agree with S on the reading of this stanza except for the inclusion of 74* in the one and the addition of the name of the Āstika to the
other. The text is formed by collating S with the inferable version of K before the addition in the latter of 74*. The subsequent steps leading towards the reading of the vulgate consisted in the addition of the name of the Astika episode (which intervenes between the Pauloma and the beginning proper of the Mahabharata), of a statement of the identity of the Suta-version and the Vaisampayana version, and finally of the name of the Pausya interlude, all these changes being made in our stanza with a view to setting the seal of authenticity on the three spurious additions. That adhyaya 3 must be an interpolation follows from the fact that it is wholly unconnected with the previous adhyaya and only loosely connected with what follows. Noteworthy is also the fact that adhyayas 1 and 4 have the same beginning: Lomaharshanaputra Ugrasravah sutaḥ pawāṇikor Naimisāraṇyaḥ dvādaśāvāndhi bhikkhe satre! And in the text itself there is no explanation why after the Sūta has finished his narration of the Pausya episode, it is necessary to reintroduce the Sūta in the same words as approaching the same Rṣis assembled at the same twelve-year sacrificial session of Saunaka in the Naimiṣa forest. There is clearly a new beginning made in one of the two adhyāyas.

Since many of the intermediate links are missing in the MS. evidence, it is not possible to reconstruct the history of this portion of the text fully and satisfactorily; but that it must be reconstructed on the lines sketched above, I have no doubt. Accordingly the successive stages in the development of the reading of the vulgate (which is the reading preferred by WINTERNITZ) I would arrange in a scheme like the following, in which the innovations have been printed in black type. [185] It will show among other things that the vistaram of the text and of the Southern recension is not "a remnant of vistarārtham" of the vulgate; on the contrary, in the latter the first line was filled up with uttamam when the original vistara was used in the interpolated stanza. The view of WINTERNITZ that at least Astikam must remain in the text is quite untenable; because if the stanza had Astikam there is no reason why it should not have Pauṣyam as well. On the other hand, if Pauṣyam is not indispensable, then Astikam could go with it as well.

Stage 1 (Constituted Text)

गृह शौकस्स्वे ते भारताश्वामविस्तरम् ।
आश्यास्ये तम चैत्योमाध्ययायां वायायां । भविष्यः परम् ॥

Northern recension.

Stage 2 (K₁) : by addition of 2 lines to the original.

गृह शौकस्स्वे ते भारताश्वामविस्तरम् ।
जनमेजयस्य तत्स्तथे व्यासोदिव्येण धीरतां ॥
काथं विस्तरायं व यथा धीर्या महाउद्दितां ॥
आश्यास्ये तम पाधोमाध्ययायां वायायां । भविष्यः परम् ॥
Stage 3 (Da D₃₋₄₁₃): by addition of आस्तीक to stage 2.

येष शौनकसे तु भारताद्यायनमुच्चमसि।
जनमेजयस्य तस्तसे भास्किण्यन्धीमत।
कथितं बिस्तराय च यदयो वीर्येश महाशिष्यतम।
आश्यानं तत्र गौमेश्वराशीकं चाहिः। स्वतम्।

Stage 4 (Dn Dr D₁₅₋₁₂): by addition of पौर्णे to stage 3.

येष शौनकसे ते भारताद्यायनमुच्चमसि।
जनमेजयस्य तस्तसे भास्किण्यन्धीमत।
कथितं बिस्तराय च यदयो वीर्येश महाशिष्यतम।
पौर्णे तत्र च गौमेश्वराशीकं चाहिः। स्वतम्।

Stage 5 (B): by addition of 1 line to stage 4.

येष शौनकसे तु भारताद्यायनमुच्चमसि।
जनमेजयस्य तस्तसे भास्किण्यन्धीमत।
आश्यानं कथितं इतस्त कथितं महाभारतमुच्चमसि।
कथितं बिस्तराय च यदयो वीर्येश महाशिष्यतम।
पौर्णे तत्र च गौमेश्वराशीकं चाहिः। स्वतम्।

Southern recension.

Stage 2 (S): by addition of आस्तीक to the original.

येष शौनकसे ते भारताद्यायनवित्तसि।
आश्यासि तनाम गौमेश्वराशीकं च तत: परस।

1. 2. 46: mrgasvapnabhayam tatah

Here again WINTERNITZ prefers the reading of the vulgate (mrgasvapnodbhavas). It is clearer but, I must say, I am very doubtful about its originality. The MS. support for this variant is only slightly stronger than that for the reading of the constituted text. It is worthy of note that B, which generally sides with the vulgate, has here a third and entirely different reading: mrgasvapno 'bhavat tatah! How would WINTERNITZ account for that? I explain the compound of the constituted text as an irregular compound with inverted sequence, common in Prakrit (PISCHER, Gramm. der Prakrit-Sprachen, § 603) and not unknown to the Low Sanskrit of the epics. HOPKINS, JAOS. 20 (1899), 223, has cited two instances from the Rāma-yāna: 7.22.36 dṛṣṭrā daṇḍoṣyatahi Yaman (for uḍādānaṇă) "like Yama with upraised staff"; and ibid. 7. 26. 2 tulyaparvatavarcasi (for parvata-tulyavarcasi) "glorious like the mountain (Kailāsa)." I accordingly take the compound in question as equivalent to svapna (dṛṣṭa) mrgabhayam "(Parvan) in which there is the fright of the deer (seen) in a dream" (cf. the compound Svapnavāsavadattam). Yudhishthira, in any case, was
not frightened; that is certain; but that the deer were, follows from (K.) 3. 259. 8, which WINTERNITZ himself cites:

The readings of the vulgate and the Bangālī version seem to represent different attempts at emendation of the irregular compound which stood originally in the Northern recension and which was perhaps misunderstood, if it was not totally unintelligible. The wavy line below the pāda was called for also by the variant reading of S, which has parva or tataḥ prāyopavesanam. This refers to an entirely different section of [187] the narrative, the name being derived from the vow of fasting taken by Duryodhana.

1. 2. 89: tathā rājyārdhāsāsanam.

The variants are śāsanam, āmabhānam, sarjanam (vulgate), māryam, ādānam, dāpanam! If rājyārdhāsarjanam corresponds better to one portion of the contents of Adip. 207, śāsanam may be said to correspond to a subsequent portion of the same adhyāya: sarjanam was followed by śāsanam. Intrinsically there is not much to choose between the two. The sub-parvan name is really something quite different: rājyalambha or labha, which has given rise to the reading of K3 rājyārdhākalambhanam. The reading preferred by WINTERNITZ is found only in the vulgate group supported by four Southern MSS. G4, 5 M1, 8. The text reading was adopted on the direct testimony of K9, 5 D2 G1, 6, but it has partial support of T3 and of two K MSS. (K4, 2), one of which is the important India Office codex (K1). These MSS. (K4, 2) read as a matter of fact rājyānuśāsanam, but the mu of these MSS. is obviously wrong (perhaps representing a mislection of the ligature rāha), being opposed by the remainder of the MS. material collated and conveying no satisfactory sense. There appears to be an agreement between independent versions on the reading sarjanam, but the concord, I believe, is only apparent, being due to the conflation of MSS. That G4, 5 are contaminated from some late Northern source, I think, I have established with tolerable certainty in the note on 1. 20. 1; the conclusion is corroborated by many less certain instances where these MSS. (along with G1, 2) agree with Northern MSS. against other Southern MSS., and the agreement cannot be regarded as one derived from their connection through the archetype.1 That further G7 and M1 are not reliable representatives of the Grantha and the Malayālam versions respectively, I have already pointed out in the Foreword to Fascicule 1 (p. v). There remains only one other MS. (M9), which represents a moderately pure (Malayālam) tradition and must

---

1 For instance, cf. v. 1. 1. 5. 26 (220*); 13. 34 (255*); 20. 15.
have acquired its "sarjanam, secondarily, through some complicated infiltration of the reading of the vulgate.

[188] In this instance, we have, moreover, a complex cross-agreement between the different versions.

\[ \text{sāsanam} : K_0, \text{D}_2 + T_2 \text{G}_{1, 6} \]
\[ \text{sarjanam} : \text{Vulgate (B D)} + G_{4, 5} \text{M}_{1, 3} \]

Graphically there is no connection between the conflicting readings. The reading of the vulgate is found in only one MS. of the K group (K), an inferior conflated MS. It will thus be seen that the MS. evidence is utterly confused. That being so, I have adopted the reading "sāsanam, giving preference to the side on which the majority of K stand, according to a principle enunciated in the Foreword to Fascicule 1 (p. vii).

* * *

1. 2. 96 : In the Editorial Note appended to Fascicule 3, I have given my reasons for selecting 7984 as the figure representing the number of ślokas in the Adiparvan. That is the figure given by the India Office MS. (K,) and corroborated by the Śrādā codex (S.). It may, therefore, be regarded as the extent of the Śrādā version at any rate. I consider, as I have frequently stated, the Śrādā (Kāśmirī) version the best version now preserved, and my edition of the Adiparvan is based mainly (though not wholly) on this version.

I fully agree with WINTERNITZ (op. cit. p. 61) that the Parvasaṅgraha argument is necessarily of secondary importance and should not be pressed too far. Be that as it may, it is extremely problematic whether we could make any use whatsoever of the Parvasaṅgraha enumeration in the case of the Adiparvan at least, because it will be difficult to compute the exact extent of this Parvan, and that for two reasons. Firstly, because this Parvan, as is well known, contains two lengthy prose adhyāyas (3 and 90); and it is difficult to say [189] now how the extent of the prose sections was computed by the compilers of the Parvasaṅgraha; our section-numbers certainly can give no indication of the extent in "ślokas." Secondly, this Parvan also contains

---

1 The exaggerated importance UTGİKAR attached to the data of the Parvasaṅgraha was, I believe, mainly due to his erroneous belief (induced probably by the misleading character of the text of the Kumbhakonam edition) that the Northern and Southern MSS. agreed completely with each other in all material particulars for this adhyāya. The Kumbhakonam edition, which claims to be an edition "mainly based on the South Indian texts", presents a text of this adhyāya which is almost identical with that of the Calcutta and Bombay editions, taking no notice of the Southern divergences, while in other sections of the epic it introduces numerous innovations which are based on the Southern tradition.

2 The lengths of the prose sections must have been computed on the basis of 32 aksaras to a śloka, but such a computation in the case of long prose sections can be only approximate.
a large number of Triṣṭubh-Jagati stanzas, which again introduce an element of uncertainty in the computation. Was each Triṣṭubh-Jagati stanza counted as one “Śloka” or did the Bhāratacintakas compute the exact equivalent of these long-metre stanzas in “Ślokas”? No definite answer is possible as yet. The difference in the reckoning will be, however, between 40 and 50 per cent of the total. As a very rough estimate, the Adiparvan may contain something like 500 long-metre stanzas. This factor alone would then introduce a difference of a little less than 250 “Ślokas” in the total!

We must, moreover, not lose sight of the fact that the reading of the number itself is never entirely free from doubt, since the MSS., as Winter-nitz remarks, differ sometimes quite essentially in the Parvasamgraha itself; the figures differ not by units or tens, but by hundreds, and even thousands in extreme cases. There can be no doubt, as I have pointed out elsewhere, that the text of the Parvasamgraha has been tampered with and designedly altered, in various ways, in order to make it harmonize with the inflated versions of a later epoch.

These are some of the difficulties in the way of making any practical use of the figures recorded in the Parvasamgrahaparvan for fixing the text of the Mahābhārata. The computations may have some value for a Parvan in which there is no prose at all, which is almost wholly in Anuṣṭubh metre, and for which finally the Parvasamgraha figure is tolerably certain.

It is quite within the range of probability, as far as I can judge now, that the extent of the critical text of a parvan may [190] fall appreciably below or rise appreciably above the figure recorded in the second adhyāya, as is actually the case with about half the number of Parvans in the Calcutta, Bombay and Kumbhakonam editions when checked up with the figures given in their respective Parvasamgrahas. Moreover, unless it can be made probable that the compilation of this “Table of Contents” is nearly synchronous with the final redaction of the Great Epic, this discrepancy will be without any cogency in questions relating to the constitution of the text. The value of a MS. or a version cannot be said to depend exclusively or even mainly upon its agreement with or discrepancy from the data of the Parvasamgraha. It must, in the first analysis, be regarded as depending upon some intrinsic criteria, upon the place it occupies in a logical and convincing scheme formu-

---

1 Thus for the Virāṭaparvan, the Northern figure is 2050, the Southern 3500; the difference therefore is 1450 ślokas.
2 Cf. the Editorial Note (2) appended to Fascicule 3 (p. iii).
3 The actual number of ślokas falls below the Parvasamgraha figure in the following 10 Parvans: Adi, Udyoga, Bhuṣma, Sauptika, Śānti, Anuśāsana, Aśvamedhika, Āśramavāsika, Mausala and Mahāprāśthānika; while it rises above the other figure in the following 8 Parvans: Sabhā, Aranyaka, Virāṭa, Droṇa, Karna, Śalya, Śri, and Svargārohaṇa.
lated to explain satisfactorily the evolution of the different extant versions and types of Mahābhārata MSS.

It should further be carefully borne in mind that even if there is an exact agreement as to extent between a constituted text and the Parvasaṅgraha, this fact alone is no guarantee of the originality and the absolute correctness of the entire text, line for line; because the same number of stanzas could be made up in innumerable different ways by accepting or rejecting, hesitatingly, stanzas of doubtful authenticity and uncertain documentation, of which there will always be a plentiful supply in every Parvan. The difficulty will finally not be solved even if we happen to light upon a unique MS. which agrees with the Parvasaṅgraha exactly and we should adopt its text verbatim; because there is every probability that while it satisfies the one criterion of extent given by the Parvasaṅgraha, it may not satisfy, in every respect, other and more exacting critical tests when compared, line by line and word by word, with other extant MSS.


WINTERNITZ is mistaken in thinking that the line is missing in the whole of K: it is missing in only two MSS. of the group, albeit the best MSS. These MSS. (K₀,₁) are, however, by no means infallible, as a careful study of the apparatus will show. Their evidence is, therefore, rebuttable and not conclusive. In this instance, not only does the line occur in the rest of N, but there is a corresponding line in S. I cannot think that the two lines:

Text: paurāṇugamanai caiva dharmaputrasya dhīmataḥ

S (except M₄): paurāṇukampā nirvedo dharmatarṣasya dhīmataḥ

could have arisen wholly independently of each other. Even though the purport of the lines is different, the construction is identical, which is a very important point in its favour. Either these lines are connected through the archetype, or else there is wholesale contamination between S and N except K₀,₁. The latter contingency being improbable in the extreme, we are led to conclude that there must have been a line of that description in the original; only its precise reading is doubtful; the doubtful words have accordingly been indicated in the usual manner.

* * *

The problem of the Mahābhārata textual criticism, as I have pointed out already, is a problem sui generis. Here the principles of textual reconstruction, which must first be evolved from a study of the MS. material and the MS. tradition, can be considered as finally settled only after considerable discussion and exchange of ideas on the subject. I would, therefore, earnestly request Prof. WINTERNITZ to continue his searching and exhaustive

1 See WINTERNITZ, ABI. 5. 25.
examination of the fascicules as they are issued and publish periodically the results of his scrutiny, a proceeding which cannot but throw much-needed light on at least some of the difficult problems the editors have to face, and thus advance the cause of Mahābhārata studies.

III. Dr. Ruben on the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata *

I am bound to form and express an opinion on the issues raised in the article “Schwierigkeiten der Textkritik des Mahābhārata” published in the current issue of the Acta Orientalia (vol. 8, pp. 240-256), in which the author, Dr. Walter RUBEN of the University of Bonn, has reviewed Fascicules 1-3 of my edition of the Ādiparvan, criticizing at considerable length and in great detail the principles underlying the preparation of the edition and the constitution of the text.

From his discursive remarks it is indeed hazardous to say what precise opinion RUBEN has formed of the critical edition. But it seems to me that his general verdict is anything but favourable.

It is not my intention to scrutinize every statement of the writer and answer all his queries and criticisms; nor is it incumbent on me to do so; nor even necessary, as will appear from the sequel. I shall confine my remarks to a few points of outstanding importance in RUBEN’s paper which might mislead the casual reader, creating an erroneous impression regarding the value of the results achieved by the critical edition.

* * *

The Bogey of Classical Philology

At the beginning of his paper (p. 241), the learned reviewer from Bonn formally recites the canon of the caturvarga of the Classical Philologist. The Classical Philology, we are explained, distinguishes: 1. Heuristics, i.e. assembling and arranging the entire material consisting of MSS. and testimonia in the form of a genealogical tree; 2. Recensio, i.e. restoration of the text of the archetype; 3. Emendatio, i.e. restoration of the text of the author; 4. “Higher Criticism,” i.e. separation of the sources utilized by the author.

[260] Tested on this touchstone of the classicist, the critical edition of the Mahābhārata is found wanting in no less than three items, namely, Nos. 1, 3 and 4. The third and the fourth items of the programme, R. points out, have been left wholly untouched; even the first has by a long way not been done full justice to by the hapless editor!1 But as one reads on, one finds that the dereliction is after all not as serious as one might be led to

* [ABORI 11. 259-283].
1 R. has inadvertently omitted the mention of the 23 Devanāgari MSS. in the description of my critical apparatus; cf. op. cit. p. 241, lines 3-6 from the bottom.
suppose at first. For, as regards No. 1 (Heuristics), R. himself admits that it is not yet possible to concentrate the entire material, and that in all likelihood it will be for ever impossible to prepare a genealogical tree of the Mahābhārata MSS.—As for No. 3 (Emendatio), I must plead guilty to having perpetrated so far, perhaps somewhat unnecessarily, minor emendations in 13 instances in about 3800 stanzas; that is, on an average 1 emendation in a little under 300 stanzas. R. has not taken any notice of my conjectural corrections; I take it that he approves of them. I feel greatly flattered, I must confess, by R.’s (implied) suggestion that I should have gone in more systematically and vigorously for emendation. Most scholars will, I fancy, be sincerely grateful that I have been so moderate and that I have declared it as my policy to give preference to interpretation over emendation.——In speaking at all of “Higher Criticism” (No. 4 on the programme) in this connection, R. seems to show a lamentable lack of understanding of the objective of the edition, having mistaken evidently the beginning for the end of the critical work on the Mahābhārata. Higher Criticism can begin only after Lower Criticism has done its work, and not until then. And our critical edition is just laying the foundation of the Lower Criticism of the Great Epic. But I imagine, R. does not want to say anything special at all, when he mentions his “Höhere Kritik”. In the 1833 ślokas of the constituted text (=2161 of the Bombay edition and 2208 of the Calcutta edition) so closely investigated by R. in the preparation of his erudite paper, he does not mention even a single passage where the “Höhere Kritik” could have [261] earnestly and usefully “functioned”. The item is probably introduced here merely pro forma, as the fourth and last stage of the ariya-magga.

But R. might have mercifully spared us this learned proemium on the aims and methods of the Classical Philology and their application to the problem of the Mahābhārata textual criticism. The same thing has been said by others before R., more simply but with ample clearness and emphasis. In the paper he read at the XVIIth International Congress of Orientalists (Oxford 1928), WINTERNITZ remarked: “The general principles followed in critical editions of classical texts, Greek or Latin or Sanskrit, can be applied to a critical edition of the Mahābhārata only with great limitations and modifications. It is simply impossible to trace a genealogical tree of all the MSS. of the Adiparvan, and only in some cases are we able to state how MSS. are related to one another. On the whole, we have to be satisfied with a classification of the MSS. according to script, and the provinces to which they belong. And we have more often to refer to classes of MSS., than to

---

1 In the first 86 adhyāyas, the following stanzas contain conjectural readings: 1.14.15;30.7;37.10;41.5;45.15;48.9;51.8;57.20;68.25;71.36;84.3,13;86.5.

2 Cf. Foreword to Fasc. 1, p. vi, column 2.

individual MSS." I had myself pointed out in the Foreword (p. ii) to Fascicule 1 that "it is impossible to apply to the Mahābhārata the special canons of textual criticism which are derived from a study of classical (Greek and Latin) texts and which depend ultimately upon there being a more or less complete concatenation of copies and exemplars reaching finally back to a single authentic (written) archetype.

And how would it be possible to apply to the Mahābhārata the canons of the Classical Philology in toto? Where has the Classical Philology, I should like to know, the necessary experience of dealing with a text with about a dozen recensions whose extreme types differ in extent by something like 13,000 stanzas (or 26,000 lines); a work which for centuries has been growing not only upwards and downwards but also laterally, like the Nyagrodha tree, growing on all sides; a codex which has been written in seven or eight different scripts, assiduously and lovingly copied through a long vista of centuries by a legion of devout—and perhaps mostly ignorant and inefficient—copyists speaking different tongues; a traditional book of inspiration which, in various shapes and sizes, has been the cherished heritage of one people continuously for several millennia and which to the present day is interwoven with the thoughts and beliefs and moral ideas of a nation numbering over two hundred million? No, the Classical Philology has no experience in dealing with a text of this description, a work of such colossal dimensions and complex character, with such a long and intricate history behind it. That is why I have elsewhere also said that the problem of the Mahābhārata textual criticism is a problem sui generis. The method of the Mahābhārata textual criticism must be evolved from a special study of the Mahābhārata manuscripts and of the Mahābhārata manuscript tradition. Its results and achievements can be judged only by a standard of its own.

**RUBEN'S Exaggerations and Generalizations**

In his endeavour to maintain consistently an attitude of dogmatic doubt, R. has been unconsciously led to make wild exaggerations and rash generalizations, which such a meticulous and captious critic as R. should have taken pains to avoid.

Thus in one place (p. 242), R. observes that the Śāradā MS., as a matter of fact, does not differ at all from other MSS. ! As a matter of fact, this statement of R. is demonstrably false. If a difference of something like 1000 stanzas (which is probably the difference between the Śāradā and the

---

1 See op. cit. p. 61.
2 The critical note on 1. 85. 20 mentions an instance whether the scribe (of $K_4$) has first copied the reverse of the folio of his exemplar and then the obverse!
3 See my "Epic Studies I" (JBBRAS. vol. 4), p. 157.
Grantha versions of the Adiparvan), not to speak of innumerable minor variants, is no difference, I should like to know what, in the opinion of R., would constitute a difference. Did R. expect that the Kāsmīrī Mahābhārata would be a poem of 8800 ślokas in Old Prakrit in which Kṛṣṇa was still a tribal hero?

On p. 253, R. remarks that every contextual criterion is problematic. This is a rash generalization. In the Editorial Note (3) appended to Fascicule 4, I have now pointed out (p. ii f.) three passages for which there is the strongest intrinsic probability, amounting to certainty, that they are interpolations in the recension in which they are found. All three are instances in which according to the Northern recension the parties to be married were united only by a shadowy and clandestine form of marriage known as the Gāndharva-vivāha, which is no marriage at all, while according to the Southern recension (respectively, in one case, the Grantha version only) the same parties were married, so to say, in church, in due form, with great pomp and ceremony. I maintain that at least in these three instances the criterion of the intrinsic probability is not at all problematic. I challenge R. to prove the contrary.

I shall mention only one other interesting instance of intrinsic probability. In the Paulomaparvan, Ruru, while praying for the life of his wife who has just died from the bite of a venomous serpent, says (1. 9. 4-5):

“If I have (practised) charity, (if I have) practised penance, if I have duly served (my) Gurus, then on account of that (merit of these virtuous acts) let my beloved be restored to life! As from (the moment of) my birth I have restrained myself and maintained my vows, so let the beautiful Pramadvarā even now arise!”

The fulfilment of Ruru’s fervent utterance is thought to be due merely to the efficacy of his pious acts in the past: they by themselves operate as a charm or spell to restore to life the dead Pramadvarā. This is a form of an “impersonal” prayer belonging to a comparatively older stratum of religious life and thought, which would never occur to an ordinary interpolator. At this place, G1, 2, 4, 5 have some additional lines including the following prayer (233*):

“If my faith in Kṛṣṇa, Viṣṇu, Hṛṣīkeśa, the Lord of the Worlds, the Foe of the Asuras, unshakable, then let this beloved of mine be restored to life!”

This belongs to a later stratum, the period of the Bhakti cult. This is just the thing that would be interpolated by a devout Vaiṣṇava, to whom the former prayer would be meaningless and unintelligible.

I maintain that here also the intrinsic probability as to what is original

---

2 Cf. also Ruben, op. cit. p. 244.
and what is interpolation is so strong as to be conclusive in favour of the text and against G. 1, 2, 4, 5. No [264] one with a modicum of the historical sense can doubt it. Can R. adduce even a shadow of a reason to show that the intrinsic evidence in this instance is in any degree problematic? Scores of illustrations of this character may be produced where the contextual evidence is not problematic at all, but quite definite and conclusive. 2

R. (p. 254) has magnanimously set the seal of his approval on “Die Sage von Rṣyasṛṅga” by Professor Lüders, 2 citing it approvingly as a piece of investigation that belongs to the coveted domain of *emendatio*. It is unquestionably that. Had R. now thought over the question a little more deeply than he appears to have done, he would have easily perceived that the whole thesis of “Die Sage von Rṣyasṛṅga” rests on the exploitation of intrinsic probability. There was, in fact, nothing else except the vulgate text before Prof. Lüders when he framed his brilliant hypothesis about the different strata and the cross-currents in the *Mahābhārata* version of that legend. If now every contextual criterion is so very problematic, then what is the value, may I ask, of Prof. Lüders’s monograph, which R. professes to admire so fervently? R. has been contradicting himself in one and the same paragraph (p. 253 f.).

Theoretically considered also, R.’s proposition is untenable. When a text has been tampered with on a large scale, however careful and however accomplished the interpolator may be, it is inconceivable that all the frills, patches and paddings added by the interpolator should remain for all time incapable of detection. It is inevitable that the interpolator should bungle something somewhere, produce a misfit, leave raw edges which do not meet. Therefore R.’s dictum (p. 253) “ebenso problematisch ist schliesslich jedes inhaltliche Kriterium” is, in the form in which he has put it, fundamentally wrong and is to be unhesitatingly rejected.

Here is another instance of R.’s misstatements. On p. 242 he observes that among the fifty MSS. collated for the Adiparvan [265] there are not even two that may be directly connected with each other. This is of course a wild exaggeration. The two Arjunamīra MSS. show inter se no more difference than any two (carelessly made) copies of an original would show; as a matter of fact—but this could not have been known to R.—they agree almost page for page. If they were not copied from the same original, their respective exemplars could not have differed from each other very consider-

---

2 For instance, it is on grounds of intrinsic probability that Prof. Lüders (DLZ. Heft 24, Sp. 1142 f.) decides for and defends the reading *amrtam* of the constituted text (1. 1. 201). Here the documentary evidence is inconclusive, but Prof. Lüders is on that account in no doubt as to which the true reading is.


Italics mine.
ably. The same is the case with the three Nilakantha MSS. The MSS. of the text as fixed by commentators (like Arjunamiśra and Nilakantha) are, in general, as like as two peas. The number of such replicas can be increased almost indefinitely. I have intentionally restricted their number to the minimum necessary for fixing the text of the respective versions, always giving preference to a divergent type. But even apart from such texts with commentaries, there is considerable similarity and kinship to be noticed among the different MSS. In the Editorial Note (2) appended to Fascicule 3 (p. ii), I have demonstrated the kinship between S₁ and K₁. I pointed out there that "the India Office codex must be a transcript not merely of a Sāradā codex, but, as a careful comparison with S₁ would show, of an exemplar very closely allied to our Sāradā codex". This conclusion is supported by numerous other agreements throughout the Ādiparvan. That the three new Malayālaim MSS. M₄, r, s again go back to the same original follows not merely from the numerous readings these MSS. have in common, but conspicuously from one particular mistake where they repeat inconsequentially, at the same point, a fragment of a stanza (1. 85. 25): पुजयन्त्रा लोके nāsābhavaḥ. Further the four Grantha MSS. G₄, 2, 4, 5, (which will come up for detailed discussion below) must go back to a not very distant common original. This group has not only numerous readings in common, but it contains quite a considerable number of interpolations peculiar to itself. Their close affinity is, however, placed beyond the pale of reasonable doubt by the fact that they all contain a stanza (294*) interpolated at a place where it is, as will presently be shown, so thoroughly irrelevant that with it the passage does not construe even!

It will thus be seen that these generalizations of R. are absolutely unwarranted. They appear to have been introduced [266] by R. merely for the satisfaction of having made some pointed and effective little statement.

The Four Types of Variants.

After pointing out that no pedigree of the Mahābhārata MSS. is possible, R. proceeds (p. 243) to consider the different types of characteristic combinations among the variants, whose consideration must take the place of the formation of the usual genealogical tree. He distinguishes four different types of constellations. They are as follows: 1. Complete Agreement, where the two recensions N and S register one concordant reading; 2. No Agreement, where N and S stand opposite to each other with two divergent readings; 3. Cross-Agreement, where a part of N agrees with a part of S against the rest of N, which latter agrees with the rest of S; 4. Partial Agreement, where a part of N stands against S and the rest of N (or vice versa).

---

2 See infra p. 273.
Diagrammatically the four types of constellations may be represented thus.

Type No. 1: *Complete Agreement*: 

\[ N = S \]

Type No. 2: *No Agreement*: 

\[ N \neq S \]

Type No. 3: *Cross-Agreement*: 

\[ N_1 \times N_2 \]

Type No. 4: *Partial Agreement*: 

\[ S \]

Type No. 1 (N=S). In this case I have assumed that the concordant reading of N and S must be postulated as having already belonged to the archetype. To my proposition R. adds the rider that there is a possibility that even such a concordant reading (or feature) might have been an innovation made in one recension and then borrowed in *toto* by the other recension. He cites (p. 244) Rāmāyana, Ayodhyā 6 (Bombay ed.), which (according to R.) is an interpolation in one recension, which had been borrowed *en bloc* by the other (independent) recension. R.’s proposition would be a contradiction in terms; only he takes care not to put forward the proposition in this form.

If the two recensions N and S of the Mahābhārata should have an interpolation in common, they would not be (truly) independent. But these recensions must be assumed to be independent, and R. would not be able to prove any “second-[267]ary interrelationship” between N as a whole and S as a whole, at least for the Ādiparvan. Should there be found a passage which stands in such an apparent disagreement with the context that it may (*a priori*) be regarded as an interpolation, it would be no more difficult—in fact it would be, in my opinion, far easier and much more natural—to assume that the contradiction was already present in the “archetype,” before the bifurcation of the recensions than to premise that one independent recension had borrowed it from another independent recension.

For example, adhyāyas 1 and 4 of the Ādiparvan begin with the identical sentence, depicting the identical situation, that the Sūta approaches the Rṣis assembled in the Naimiśa forest at the twelve-year sacrificial session of Saunaka. This implies that a new beginning is made at adhyāya 4, totally ignoring whatever has gone before it in the text as it now stands. Both passages occur with minimal variations in both recensions. It is evident that this double beginning (adhy. 1 and 4), as we find it in our version of the Mahābhārata, was not conceived and depicted by one and the same poet. But it does not at all follow therefore that the interpolation was first made in one recension of our text and was subsequently borrowed by the other from this recension. There are various possibilities.\(^1\) Perhaps both versions

\(^1\) Cf. Holtzmann, *Das Mahābhārata*, 2. 12.
of the beginning lay before the diaskeuasts of the last redaction of the Ma-
habhārata: one giving the very useful table of contents, the other containing
some interesting old tales of gods, Rṣis and serpents. They were not consistent
in juxtaposition, but each was too good to lose. The redactors put both in,
making but a poor compromise. This is one possibility. The other possi-
bility is that one of these sections was composed and tacked on to an existing
version of the beginning by the diaskeuasts of the last redaction themselves,
using the same opening device. That would only show—as R. himself con-
cedes in another connection (p. 254)—that though we might regard the or-
iginal epic as a more or less homogeneous [268] work, the archetype of our
MSS. already contained some inconsistencies and contradictions.

Type No. 2 (N≠S). I agree with R. that when there is a conflict between
N and S and they stand opposite to each other with two divergent readings,
no definite decision is, in general, possible as to which is the original; the
versions should a priori be placed on an equal footing and treated with im-
partiality. Accordingly, in such cases, I have adopted as stop-gap the
reading of N, placing a wavy line below it, to show that the reading is uncer-
tain. R. mentions an exception to this procedure of mine, but the exception is only apparent. R. has failed to understand my motives in
departing from my usual practice in the solitary instance of the benefic-
datory stanza with which the epic begins (Nārāyanaḥ namaskṛtṛya etc.). I
have printed it above the line not because it is found in K₀.₁ or in K or even
in N, but simply as a maṅgala. I am aware that the stanza is missing in S.
There is, therefore, every probability that it did not belong to the arch-
type. I am also fully aware that the stanza is a characteristic mark of the
works of the Bhāgavata sect and not peculiar to the Mahābhārata. There is,
however, the fact that all our MSS. of the Adiparvan begin with some ben-
dictory stanza. These stanzas have probably usurped now the place of some
simpler maṅgala with which the epic once began. No orthodox Hindu work
can begin without a maṅgala; and this edition of the Mahābhārata, critical
though it be, is and remains a Hindu work, which could not dispense with

1 For instance, the story of the birth of Bhīṣma contains a patent contradic-
tion. The reason why the Vasus were cursed by Vasiṣṭha as given in adhy. 91
(= 96 of the Bombay text) is quite different from and inconsistent with that
given in adhy. 93 (=99 of the Bombay text). Both versions occur, in substan-
tially identical form, in both recensions.— Cf. also the passage regarding the eight
forms of marriage (1. 67, 8-12) in the Sakuntalā episode. The passage is made
up of two different and mutually inconsistent systems of rules, taken from two
different sources. 11cd and 12ab have been borrowed from a context which men-
tions only five forms of marriages; cf. (K.) 13, 79, 9 and DAEHMANN, Das Ma-
hābhārata pp. 208 ff. The same passage, with some variation, but with the same
inconsistency, occurs in Manu (3. 21-26).

2 See my “Epic Studies 1” (JBBRAS Vol. 4), p. 163.

3 BÜHLER, Indian Studies, 2. 4 (footnote 2).
a māṅgala. My recognition of the unoriginal character of the stanza is, however clearly implied by the fact that I have omitted to give the 269 stanza a number, differing in this respect conspicuously from the earlier editions, which treat it as the first stanza of the epic and an integral part of the text.

The Position of \( G_{1,2,4,5} \).

One of the most perplexing forms of variation in the Mahābhārata text is Type No. 4, namely, Partial Agreement. The critical apparatus is a veritable labyrinth of complicated and intermingled versions, each with a long and intricate history of its own behind it. We have unfortunately no single thread to guide us out of the maze, but rather a multitude of strands intertwined and entangled and leading along divergent paths. How difficult it is to find one’s way in this maze may be realized from the fact that so painstaking and able a critic as R., despite his close and conscientious study of the critical apparatus, could totally lose his bearings the moment the network gets a little more complicated than usual.

The really perplexing part of the whole tangle is that while the agreements of \( S, K_1 \) with \( S \) are mostly authentic and fundamental, those of \( G_{1,2,4,5} \) with \( N \) are mostly secondary and spurious. Let us first consider the position of the group \( G_{1,2,4,5} \) which appears to have caused R. most trouble. I shall state the case as it has been put forward by R. himself (p. 249 f.).

Suparnaḍhyāya 19 contains a conversation of Garuḍa with his father Kaśyapa. Garuḍa introduces himself as \textit{pataliṁ varaṁtha} and makes some polite inquiries regarding his father (\textit{kaccid vas tata kuśalam gheṣu}) and his mother (\textit{kaccit...māṇa na śoçati}). The father replies that they are doing well at home (\textit{vedāham etat kuśalam gheṣu}) and then pronounces a blessing on Garuḍa (\textit{...tvā raḫṣat...7co yajñuṁśi; then svastyaṇanam}). This conversation assumes in the Mahābhārata (1. 25. 7-25) the following form. Garuḍa asks his father for some new and substantial food and the father recommends the mammoth elephant and tortoise (as in Suparna 13. 1 f. Garuḍa’s mother does) and proceeds to relate their history. In this scene the contents of the Suparna are to be found in the “interpolated” verses (here adapted to the new contents). In the beginning (324*: \( K_{0,3,4} \ N \ V, B \ D \ T_2 \)), the father asks Garuḍa if he is doing well “in respect of food” (\textit{kaccid vah kuśalam} 270 \textit{nityaṁ bhajane}); the three lines of this \( N \) interpolation (says R.) correspond to the equally long \( S \) interpolation (326*):

\[ \text{2 This is R.’s rendering (“fragt nach seinem Wohlergehen ‘in Bezug auf das Essen’”); but he has evidently misunderstood the line, which may be translated thus: “Have you (all) been doing well? (have you had) always plenty of food?”}. \]
G._2.4.5), in which Garuḍa introduces himself as patatāṁ śreṣṭha. In both these N and S groups there follows a common interpolation (327*) in which Garuḍa says that his mother is well (mātā me kuśalā), etc. At the end of the scene follows in these MSS. (N V._1 B D T._1 G._1 2.4.5; in K._2 4 only partly) the blessings of the father (335*...svastyaṇam...tco ya-

Garuḍa has stolen the Amṛta; Indra hurls at him his Vajra; Garuḍa shows his strength and drops just one feather (Mbh. 1. 29. 19 = Suparṇ. 27. 6). Mbh. 1, 29. 23 is similar to Suparṇ. 28. 2 (Indra then tries to make friends with Garuḍa); Suparṇ. 28. 3 is similar to Mbh. 1. 30. 4 ff. (Garuḍa boasts about his great strength).¹ In Suparṇ. 28. 1 it is narrated that out of Garuḍa’s feather, which had split in three parts (chīmam tridhā tat kuḷiṇaṇa patram), there sprang the peacock, the “two-mouthed serpent-lords” and the mongoose. The last three pādas of this stanza are interpolated at this place in K._0.4 (358*); the first finds an echo in 361*, an interpolation of T._2 G._1 3.4.5 (tridhā kṛtvā taddā vajram). K._0.4 has then further actually cited verbatim Suparṇ. 28. 3 in 365*.

R. admits that in the second scene K._0.4 unquestionably cite Suparṇ. Further 361*, according to R again, is to be judged similarly. That is an interpolation in the S MSS., the same stanza of the Suparṇ. (28. 1) having hovered before the eyes of the interpolators as in the case of those who interpolated 358* in K._0.4. After pointing out all this R. asks: “Should one now regard the first scene also as an interpolation made independently in N and S? Consider that G._1 2.4.5 agree quite frequently in this episode with N (1. 20. 15; 301*; 329*; 343*), that they alone have a remarkably large number of interpolations, and that 340* is found only G._1 2.4.5 M and corresponds to Suparṇ. 13. 4...Has the G group then [271] interpolated the passage under the influence of the Suparṇ. and in its turn influenced the N groups? Su[kthankar] gives in 1. 20. 1 the diametrically opposite answer with an assurance which is out of place in such difficult passages. It cannot even be strictly proved that these “interpolations”² in the first scene, which are common to N and S, are not an old remnant of the archetype.”

There are in the Adiparvan far more complicated passages than this; this is one of the simpler complications. I shudder at the thought of what

¹ It is by no means certain that (as R. says, p. 249) the stanzas which are common to the Mbh. and the Suparṇ. have been borrowed by the Suparṇ. from the Mbh. I believe, on the contrary, that the Suparṇ. has to be looked upon here as the source from which the stanza in question have been taken over by the epic. Four of the stanzas are nearly identical in the two works, because they occur as slokas in the Suparṇ., and could be utilized by the redactors of the epic version without change of metre and with some trifling change of language.

² R. means the passages which have been regarded as interpolations by me and excluded from the text.
R. would have done if he had to handle one of the really difficult cases of conflation.1 In the present case, it can, as it happens, be strictly proved that the doubtful passages of the first scene, which are common to certain N groups and S groups, are interpolations and no rest of the archetype. Also I may repeat here most emphatically what I have said in the note on 1. 20. 1 that the irrelevant insertion of 294* in G, 2. 4. 5 is irrefutable evidence of the contamination of these four Grantha MSS. from late Northern sources.

We shall consider the second point first. I imagine, R. has misunderstood or overlooked the little word “irrelevantly” in my note on 1. 20. 1. Otherwise he would have tried to visualize the passage, by reconstructing it carefully from the critical notes, and then he would have surely come to the same conclusion as I. All that is necessary in order to prove that 294* is an interpolation in the Grantha group is to cite the passage in extenso. Here is a transcript of the passage as it is found in G2, the better preserved of the two Grantha MSS. belonging to the Bombay Government collection, collated for the Adiparvan.

App. I, No. 132:  

राजालेखा सहित: हृदय कर्मानन्तित तदन:  
[272] विषेशतः विद्वेद्वन्तताः हाताधार्माविनोर:  
प्रत्यासा भोक्षेरकुलसाजज्ञापार्थ्या भाषिनी।  
हृद्ध पुच्छ करिष्यास्वरूपस्थलपति मंगलामन:  
तथेष्टि तथा ते तथ्य हृद्धवाल इत्य स्यथात: [5]  
एतस्मात्त्वेऽते तु पत्नी: तै पर्यते तद:  
294*: महाससर्वकहचेत: शासितव: थोलाविन्द:।  
कामस: कामम: 1 अस्मयो: किर्मित:।  

1. 20. 1: ते समुद्वविकषुः कृतिविनतात्सह।  
न्यायतुर्गाभांशे न चिरावित शीर्षात: [10]  
2: विषाणुग च बहुव्यात्कृतमुनुर्ध्मपाशितान:।  
विनताः विषाणवर्ताः कहृत्याः न्योजनत। 

Even a cursory reading of the passage will show that lines 7-8 of this passage (which constitute 294*) are thoroughly irrelevant here. The lines comprise merely a string of attributes of Garuḍa. There is no finite verb in

1 That would happen when the interpolation may have filled out a factitive lacuna or what looks like a lacuna in the archetype. Cf. the case discussed by BELLONI-FILIPPI in his paper in the next footnote.

2 In the stimulating article entitled “L’episodio di Kadrũ e d Vinatã nell’ edizione critica del Mahābhārata” (Traduzioni di epica indiana II) published in the Ascoli Memorial volume Sillēgo Linguistica (Torino 1930), F. BELLONI-FILIPPI justifies the excision of passage No. 13 of App. I (Bombay text 1. 22. 1-3), showing that the lacuna is only apparent and the textus simplicior is quite in order.
the sentence and there is no reference to Garuḍa in the foregoing or following lines. The only rational explanation of this state of things is that the lines were interpolated in an ancestor of G₁,₂₄,₅ by a clumsy copyist, who had missed the right place by four stanzas. Such mistakes occur frequently in Indian MSS. because the additional lines were, as a rule, first written in the narrow margin of the MS. and a small mark was made to indicate the point of insertion. Should the mark get obliterated, the lines would be inserted by the next copyist wherever he considered they belonged or fitted best. If those lines (294*) belonged to the archetype of our MSS. we should have to assume that they were accidentally mis-placed in a sub-group of the Grantha version, omitted (for an unknown reason) in another group of MSS. K₁,₃ D₂ T₃,₆ M and are found in their correct place only in K₀,₄ N V₁ B D (except D₃). Is this plausible? I can hardly think that R. would say so. I am inclined to believe that R. had failed to realize how the passage actually read in this particular sub-group of the Grantha version. Taking all things into consideration, it is difficult to escape from the conclusion that an ancestor of the Grantha sub-group had been compared with some MS. or MSS. of the Northern recension which contained the spurious passage 294*. This is the first important fact to remember with regard to this interesting sub-group of the Grantha version. It is quite in harmony with [273] the other fact that this group contains 25 interpolated passages in 52 adhyāyas (24-75) or about 2000 stanzas, which have not been found so far anywhere else. They are: 320*, 322*, 326*, 330*, 337*, 345*, 351* (third line!), 357*, 363*, 364*, 368*, 371*, 373*, 382*, 386*, 387*, 388*, 406*, 519*, 584*, 636*, 705*, 706*, 741*, 755*. This group moreover contains in the same section the following 10 passages which it shares only with two or three other MSS. (in some written only on the margin): 312*, 348*, 353*, 399*, 404*, 421*, 423*, 442*, 469* (phalāṣruti !), 831*. How these passages originate is somewhat of a mystery. But as no one would be so inane as to maintain that these are rests of the archetype preserved only in a sub-group of the Grantha version and lost without a trace elsewhere, not only in the remaining MSS. of the Grantha version but in all other versions of both recensions as well, we are inevitably led to the conclusion that this sub-group of the Grantha version must present a text exceptionally heavily padded with indiscriminate additions. This noteworthy fact renders its agreements with N immediately suspect. And a priori also it is more likely that, when there is agreement between a sub-group of one version and some entirely different version or versions, the sub-group is the borrower. It may further be pointed out that 294* is by a long way not the only passage which this sub-group of the Grantha version shares with the vulgate text, against the rest of the Grantha version together with the Śāradā-Kāśmīrī and the Malayālam versions. Here is a list of these passages (in adhyāyas 20-43), which must all be assumed to be interpolated in the sub-group in question.
under the influence of some MS. or MSS. on which the text of the vulgate is based, that is, of some late Northern sources: 294*, 301*, 307*, 327*, 329*, 335*, 341*, 343*, 355*, 385*, 392*, 393*, 396*, 402*, 411*, 419*, etc.

After this preamble we may proceed to consider the case of the Suparṇ. passage. Here the indebtedness of G₂. 2. 4. 5 to the Northern recension is equally clear and would have been manifest to R., had he but attempted to visualize the whole passage as it stands in the sub-group instead of contenting himself with merely counting the number of lines. R.’s initial mistake lies in thinking that 324* and 326* are equivalent passages, whereas the passages, although of the same length and inserted at the same point, are utterly different in contents and have an entirely different significance. The passage 324* contains a kuṣala-question and an inquiry as to whether Garuḍa gets enough to eat; 326*, on the other hand, contains a question as to where Garuḍa is going in such hurry! Remembering this and reading the various passages together, the relationship between the MSS. will be clear. It is again a case of irrelevant insertion in the conflated group. The passage in question reads in the different MS. groups as under.

\[
\begin{align*}
K_{0,3,4} & \cap V_1 B D T_1 \quad (7ab \text{ and } 324*) \\
G_{1,2,4,5} & \cap (7ab \text{ and } 326*) \\
K_{0,3,4} & \cap V_1 B D T_2 G_2. 4. 5 \quad (327*)
\end{align*}
\]

Placed in this way, the reader will see at a glance that while 327* is a proper rejoinder to the query in 324*, it is totally irrelevant after 326*; because in G₂. 4. 5, in reply to Kaśyapa’s question where Garuḍa is going, Garuḍa says “My mother is well, so is my brother, and so am I” etc. This clearly shows that in G₂. 4. 5, 327* is a secondary interpolation. Then the question arises whether 326* could be a rest of the archetype. The probability of this being so is reduced to nil not merely by the fact that the passage is found only in the highly inflated group G₁, 2. 4. 5, but also from the noteworthy circumstances (which I fear has escaped the vigilant R.) that in
G₁, 2, 4, 5, 7ab has been altered from ṗṛśaḥ cākhyaṭāvān pitnḥ to Kaśyapam diptalejasam in order to accommodate the additional lines. In any case these interpolations are not common to N and S, as erroneously believed by R.

The history of these interpolations must be something like the following. The question (which is missing in S except T₁) and the answer (which is found only in T₁ G₂, 4, 5 of the S MSS.) regarding Garuḍa’s gastronomic requirements (324* and 327*) were interpolated in a part of N (namely, the base of the vul-[275] gate), inspired by Suparṇ. 19. 2. Independently there was inserted in G₁, 2, 4, 5 a question by Kaśyapa (“Where are you going with such speed?”) in anticipation of the reply of Garuḍa in 1. 25, 7 cd, an interpolation which probably has nothing to do with the Suparṇ. Subsequently, after comparison with some MS. or MSS. of the N recension, the answer of Garuḍa 327* (which, as I have remarked above, fits only to the question in 324*) was irrelevantly added in an ancestor of G₁, 2, 4, 5 by an ignorant copyist after 326*, where it does not fit in the least! This second mistake of the copyist of an ancestor of G₁, 2, 4, 5 is another valuable piece of irrefutable evidence of the contamination of these four G MSS, from some late Northern source.

I have remarked above that the māṅgalya or svastyayana (335*) before 1. 25, 26 must also be regarded as an interpolation. This follows for one thing from the MS. evidence, and is corroborated by the fact that the words of the sūta : sa tāc chrutvā pitura vākyam refer clearly to Kaśyapa’s directions as to what Garuḍa should next do and ignore the intervening the long māṅgalya altogether. That is why the vulgate alters śrutvā to smṛtvā!

The reader need not be too sceptical about the possibilities of such indiscriminate conflation and addition. The critical apparatus, if closely scrutinized and properly understood, will reveal numerous instances of a similar character. Even a close study of the Kuṁbhakonam edition, prepared in our own times by two excellent Southern Pandits, will throw some light on the mentality of the old redactors of the Mahābhārata: parallel and even contradictory versions are placed quite unconcernedly side by side, regardless of the effect on the reader, regardless of the fact that sentences are left hanging in the air, that passages do not construe. Here one notices above all the anxiety that nothing that was by any chance found in a Mahābhārata MS. should be lost. Everything was carefully preserved, assembled in a picturesque disarray. The guiding principle was to make the Mahābhārata a “thesaurus of all excellences,” culled no matter from what source. At the beginning of his commentary on the Sanatsujātiya,¹ Nilakantha naively remarks:

[276] उद्वोगपरं च सनकुलातीये भाष्करार्यक्षणान्यनाथ समतुल्यात्मेण्यस्मिन् अर्थात् प्रतिपादनम्
कृष्णो शुमुपसंहरणायवै कुपक्ष्य व्याख्या वर्तते।

¹ Cf. Udyoga 42. See also Telang. Sacred Books of the East, vol. 8, p. 203 f.; and Winternitz, Ind. Ant., 27 (1898), 128.
That is why it is safe to assume that far more stanzas must have been added to the Great Epic than omitted from it. It follows from this as a corollary that the archetype must almost completely—if not quite completely—be contained in the extant MSS.¹

It will thus be seen that the assurance with which I have spoken (in the note on 1. 20. 1) of the contamination of G_x 2. 4. 5 from late Northern sources is amply justified; and that the passages common to this sub-group and the vulgate text (324*, 326*, 327*) mentioned by R. are in fact interpolations and no remnants of the archetype.

The Position of K.

If I understand R. (v. 248, lines 1-3) right—his remarks are somewhat confused—he questions the propriety of my treating the concordant readings of the Southern recension and the Kāśmīrī (Sāradā) version (against the rest of N) as original readings. But in the course of the same paragraph, he expresses his unqualified approval of the procedure of Prof. LübErs in accepting as original the consensus of G and B (against the rest of N). Now, as a matter of documentary probability, there is no difference whatsoever between the consensus of K and S against B D on the one hand and the consensus of B and G against D on the other; because the relationship between the different versions must be one of the following type:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Ur-Mahābhārata} \\
N \\
X \\
\text{*S (*K)} \\
\text{*N} \\
\text{*B} \\
\text{*D} \\
\text{*T} \\
\text{*G} \\
\text{*M}
\end{array}
\]

where X is the intermediate archetype of the vulgate, and *K, *B, etc. are the (uncontaminated) archetypes of K, B, etc.

¹ Cf. Ruben, op. cit. p. 245.
² Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1930; Heft. 24, Sp. 1141.

Prof. LÜDERS, in other words, unhesitatingly endorses my procedure. Herr Dr. RUBEN dissents! I am content to leave it at that.

The Extent of the Virātaparvan

When I adopted 2050 as the figure representing the extent of the Virātaparvan, I did not do so, as R. says (p. 251), [278] under the influence of UTGİKAR or anybody else. My chief reason for adopting the figure was that it represents the reading of the majority of K supported by the Maithili MS. (V3) and Nilakaṇṭha version (Dn). When Nilakaṇṭha adopts it, there is a certain amount of probability of its being well represented in the old Northern MSS. of his time. I cannot say whether R. knows that it is the reading of all printed editions as well; it looks as though he does not.

Now let us consider the claims of the other variants. S has an obviously inflated text. This inflated text appears to have been recounted in the South by the diaskeuasts and the Parvasamgraha figure altered accordingly to 3500. So the reading of S may be left out of consideration altogether. The other Northern variants are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>K,</th>
<th>V1m</th>
<th>B2, B6, B10, D7, D14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>श्रोका: पंचदशील हु</td>
<td>K3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>गीणु श्रोक्तातालि च</td>
<td>K1 V1m B2, B6</td>
<td>D7, D14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>पंच श्रोक्तातालि च</td>
<td>B4 D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Italic mine.
2 See my remarks in "Epic Studies II", pp. 188 ff. supra, on the value of the figures in the Parvasamgraha.
4 See Editorial Note (2) to Fasc. 3, p. iii.
Only one thing that is plain in the midst of the prevailing confusion is that the text has been counted and the figure adjusted more than once. The \( \text{pañcadaśa} \) of \( K_3 \), however, is obviously only a corruption of \( \text{pañcāsad eva} \) of the text.\(^1\) Thus the text reading represents the reading of \( K \) except \( K_0,1 \). There is no adequate reason for giving preference here to the readings of \( K_0 \) or \( K_1 \), because they not only disagree among themselves, but each finds only desultory support from other Northern MSS. What could the editor do under these circumstances but leave the reading of the vulgate (supported by the majority of \( K \) in possession and mark it as doubtful? The text figure appears, however, in a certain measure, to be supported and even made probable by the facts of the case; because there are in existence, as a matter of fact, a few MSS. of the textus simplicior (F A M)\(^2\)—and with the constantly operating [279] urge towards inflation their number will be necessarily small—\( \)which are approximately of that length.

The figure 2500, I must confess, I cannot adequately explain.\(^3\) But as regards 2500, which approximately represents the extent of the vulgate text and which is documented by \( B_2,3,4 \) among others, one may hazard the guess that it represents the measure of the text of that section of the Bangāli version in which the Kāli (or Durgā) hymn had been first interpolated along with some other accretions. All things considered, I think I was perfectly justified in adopting in the Parvasanigraha the reading which I did adopt.

What R. means\(^4\) by saying (p. 251) that the reading of the archetype might have been:

\[ \text{सहस्रे} \text{कोकाना सह} \text{कोकासतानि} \text{च} \]

is beyond my comprehension. Does he mean that I should have set this (imaginary) line in the constituted text in place of the one which I have, or does he only want to show that he can compose an Anuṣṭubh line? If it is the latter, I will readily admit that the line is metrically, grammatically and stylistically impeccable, and does him credit. As we do not, however, want to rewrite the Mahābhārata, such manufactured lines have no value for us. The only sound test of the correctness of a reading is the evidence

---

\(^1\) The only difference between \( K_3 \) and the text is that the former has "\( \text{cadasai} \)" for "\( \text{cāsade} \)" of the latter.

\(^2\) Utgikar did not realize it, but I surmise that his F A M are also MSS. of the K version, that is, Devanāgarī transcripts of Sāradā originals.

\(^3\) I surmise that it is the extent of some composite text (like that prepared by the scholiast Ratnarābha), comprising the vulgate text plus some interesting additions gleaned from the Southern recension.

\(^4\) A line made up by R. on the basis of Utgikar’s statement that there are 1729 stanzas common to N and S.
of MSS. In overriding this evidence, R. is unguardedly opening wide the door to a subjective "Höhere Kritik", which is the only thing that we must rigorously avoid doing at this stage of the Mahâbhârata studies and which R. would be the first to deprecate if any one else were to attempt it.

Ruben constitutes the Text

At the end of his paper R. has appended, as a specimen, the text of 3 stanzas (1. 26. 1-3), as it should be constituted. The reader who has waded through 15 pages of R.'s disquisition on the complicacies of the Mahâbhârata textual criticism will be amazed to discover that notwithstanding the overwhelming mass of variants and "additional" lines which stand at the [280] disposal of the exacting critic and despite the alarming theoretical doubts and scruples expressed by R. in the earlier part of his paper, his constituted text differs from mine principally in the readings of two akṣaras, and the addition of a line which he himself subsequently (p. 256) admits to be a probable interpolation! The difference between our readings is as follows. In line 1 he hesitatingly sets "mātre" for my "mātrā", and in line 3 bhaṅktvā for my bhagnām. R. (doubtfully) decides in favour of "mātre" on the ground that it is a lectio difficilior and according to R. himself—of course in another place (p. 253)—the criterion of the lect. diff. is problematic and proves nothing. Here is a neat little paradox: R. prefers the lect. diff. and sets it in the text, because the criterion of the lect. diff. is problematic and proves nothing!—As regards the second word, R. admits that though he prefers bhaṅktvā, the differentiation from (an original) bhagnām to bhaṅktvā may be an innovation (p. 256).

The other difference in the text as constituted by R. and by me lies in the underlining of the uncertain parts of the text. Let me at once admit that I have been rather remiss in showing the uncertain portions in this passage. The device is a practical makeshift and by its very nature hard to apply strictly and consistently. But the difficulty is not solved by R.'s marking below the text wavy and straight, single and double lines, in season and out of season, as soon as he espies a variant in the critical apparatus. An edition prepared on R's plan would be indeed not critical but hypercritical. Even a constituted text is after all a text, meant to be read like any other text, and not a chart of the aberrations of careless copyists of the last two millennia. While it would be foolish to underline bhagnām (line 2) merely on the

---

1 Even with his reading, R.'s translation is inaccurate. The translation should be: "Aber kaum hatte der übermächtige Garuda (den Baum) mit seinen Füssen berührt, als der Ast des Baumes abbrach", etc. and not "Nachdem (der Baum) von Garuda berührt war, brach von ihm ein Ast,“ etc. R.'s translation omits in, padhyām and baṅyasā and ignores the force of "mātra"—(ifc.)!—With R.'s reading "mātre", the word sō in line 1 (for which there is no variant even in TGM) remains unclaimed and has to be forcibly connected with sākhā in the middle of the following line. Altogether the reading adopted by R. is unsatisfactory.
ground that three (inferior) MSS. D₂,₆,₇ read for it lagnām, which is obviously a clerical error, it is fatuous to underline text-words merely because some MS. [281] or other has a divergent reading, as R. does in the case of baliyasā (K₁ mahatmanā), sa tad- (G₃ sarṣiṅ), teṣām evā* (N₃ teṣām caiva*), etc.

With regard to the short explanatory notes (p. 255 f.) added by R. below the specimen of the text, I have to make the following comments.

The participle smayamāna is not “episch”, but smayan (of the text) may be, since the root smi is commonly used with middle endings.—The line 340* being an interpolation (even R. admits, p. 256, the possibility of its being that), the adhomukhān of the text is opposed virtually only by the avānmukhān of the two Grantha MSS. G₃, ₆, because the remaining adverse MSS. (G₁, ₂, ₄, ₅ M), while trying to interpolate the Vaikhānasas (under the influence of Supāṁ. 13.4), have obviously altered the last foot of the line (2d) ; therefore the text reading adhomukhān is hundred per cent. certain and in need of no underlining, straight or wavry.—In view of the fact that 340* is missing even in T G₃,₆ and in regard to the general character of G₃, ₂, ₄, ₅ explained above, there cannot be the slightest doubt about the spuriousness of 340*; the line was probably first inserted in M and copied thence by the highly inflated group G₁, ₂, ₄, ₅.—The form jagṛhe is found only in five Devanāgarī and two Southern MSS. (one Malayālam and one Grantha). In old Devanāgarī MSS. (written with pṛṣṭhamātras), jagṛhe would be all but indistinguishable from jagṛāka of the text. So the reading of these Devanāgarī MSS. may be ignored in this case. The Bangāli and the Southern MSS., which would carefully distinguish between the two words, have jagṛāka, with two insignificant exceptions in the Southern recension. It is on that account that jagṛāka was adopted in the text, and it is not doubtful.—3ef is certainly a third line, but is in spite of that quite certain. The line is not missing in any MS., and as for its reading there is agreement on all material points between all versions of both recensions. Thus K and S agree completely with each other as far as e is concerned, which is a very significant fact in its favour and should not be lightly ignored. The variations concern mainly f. The difficult praviśātayat, a lect. diff., preserved only in K, was the cause of the remodelling of the pāḍa in S and the vulgate. Of [282] course all guesses as to how the variants have actually arisen must be more or less problematic. I would, however, hazard the conjecture that the way to the variant pravicālayan was virtually paved by the southern tendency to confuse the palatal sibilant (℅) and fricative (c): the successive steps in the corruption would be praviśātayat, corrupted to *cātayat and

---

1 G₁, ₂, ₄, ₅ have used their adhomukhān in 340*. They therefore substitute tapodhanān in its place in the original line. M has worked out another combination (tapodhanān-avānmukhān).
then "corrected" to * cālayan. The vināśayan of K₃ D₂ is perhaps an original gloss; or (more probably) a wrong correction of an original misstatement, the successive steps being viśālayan, *viśāṇayan (ta and na being written almost alike in old Devanāgarī MSS), and vināśayan. The difficulty with the word praviśālayan may be realized when it is remembered that the Dhātipātha knows no root like sat or śat; it cites only sad!

*  *  *

Ruben's long disquisition on the difficulties of the Mahābhārata textual criticism boils down to this: only that portion of the text which is documented by both recensions, in identical terms, is tolerably certain; the rest is doubtful in varying degrees, there being no criterion whatsoever which can enable us to discriminate with complete confidence between the variants; even the concordance between K and S (against B D)¹ is not conclusive evidence of the originality of the common reading. This is a more or less obvious standpoint, though partly erroneous and distinctly timid and conservative. It was hardly necessary for the "Referent" to write so much in order to say so little. His attitude of dogmatic doubt has caused him to make unwittingly some wild exaggerations and unwarranted generalizations as I have shown above. His perfunctory study of the manuscript evidence has led him occasionally to make gross blunders in the estimation of the relationship of the different manuscript groups and versions, some of which have been pointed out above. Many of the difficulties of the Mahābhārata textual criticism of which he speaks in his paper are [283] due to his failure to understand the modus operandi of the redactors and copyists of the epic and his lack of insight into the character of the different manuscripts—an insight which can be acquired only after a long familiarity with the manuscripts themselves and a close and patient study of their tendencies and idiosyncrasies. Ruben's paper is, in general, quite intelligent, but not at all important for the Mahābhārata textual criticism.

IV. More Text-Critical Notes.*

The Mahābhārata Textual Criticism is unquestionably making progress: slow but steady progress. There are many things in it still that are obscure, but some things have undoubtedly been cleared up. Thus there seems to be consensus of opinion among scholars now on the following points.

¹ R. seems to have somehow a lurking partiality for the consensus of B and S (or even B and G). If he only knew, the agreements between K and S are likely to prove much sounder than those between B and S; for, while there are indications that there may be sporadic contamination between B and G (and perhaps even between B and S), the (genuine) Kāśmīrī version (B) and S as a whole have certainly the appearance of being almost wholly independent of each other throughout the Adiparvan.

* [ABORI 16. 90-113].
The Mahābhārata textual tradition, as we know it, is far from being quite uniform. There are now two main streams of tradition, the Northern Recension and the Southern Recension. Each recension is further sub-divided into a number of provincial versions, which differ inter se in many particulars. But the text of the Mahābhārata must have been in a fluid state for a very long time, almost from the beginning. Clearly therefore a wholly satisfactory restoration of the text to its pristine form—even the late so-called satasāhasrī samhitā form—would be a task now beyond the powers of criticism. All that we can attempt now is to reconstruct the oldest form of the text that is possible to reach on the basis of the MS. material available. The peculiar conditions of the transmission of the epic necessitate an eclectic but cautious utilization of all MS. classes. The Kaśmīrī version (textus simpli
cior) has proved itself so far to be unquestionably the best Northern version; and the Malayālam, which in many respects is superior to the Grantha, is likewise the best Southern version (textus ornatior). The agreement between the Kaśmīrī version and the Southern recension (or sometimes even merely the Malayālam version) can be taken as an indication of originality. But contamination between the different versions was inevitable and must be admitted. The Telugu MSS. are generally and the Grantha MSS. frequently contaminated from Northern sources. Even the Malayālam version, which is on the whole free from Northern influence, may show some contamination, in unexpected places. [91] In fact, all versions, with the possible exception of the Kaśmīrī, are contaminated in various degrees. It is, therefore, often a very ticklish question to decide which agreements are original and which secondary. Notwithstanding these difficulties, experience has now shown, the case is not as desperate as it might at first appear. For one thing, there is a considerable bulk of text where the Northern and Southern versions are in full agreement, where there are no variants at all, or—more frequently—only unimportant variants: this part of the text is fortunately certain. There is then the question of the “additional” passages, that is, passages found in only one of the rival recensions. There is only one rational way of dealing with these “additional” passages: they must be carefully segregated from the rest of the text, and examined individually. The onus of proving the originality of these “additional” passages will naturally rest on him who alleges the originality: the documents speak naturally against them, but their evidence is not by any means conclusive.

These are some of the principal findings of the Prolegomena. It is assuring to find that these conclusions have been restated and endorsed emphatically by so cautious and judicious a critic as Prof. M. Winternitz in his recent review of the Ādiparvan volume, in the pages of these Annals (Vol. 15, pp. 159-175). The outlines of the reconstruction may, therefore, be taken to be correct, and the method of reconstruction sound. There is bound to be difference of opinion as regards details. When there are hundreds of thou-
ands of readings to be considered and weighed, it is natural that all the selections would not satisfy all readers; and there are bound to be small slips in so enormous and difficult a work as this. But the reader has the advantage of having the full critical apparatus before him, prepared with all possible care and presented in a convenient manner. The reader may easily substitute in the text any reading that appeals to him better. Prof. Winternitz has thus shown his preferences, in the article mentioned above, in a certain number of cases, where he differs from me as regards the choice of readings. They are passages, as he tells us, which he came across in reading parts of the Critical Edition with his pupils in the Indologisches Seminar at Prag. He has thus published these criticisms after much thought and discussion with [92] other scholars. I gladly take this opportunity, therefore, to present my view of the case, setting forth the reasons which have guided me in the choice of the readings adopted by me in the Critical Text.

1. 3. 60: girā vā śaṁśāmi.

I have indeed assumed that agreement between K (strictly speaking, between the original Kaśmīrī version, or at least the Śaradā MS. S,) and S is a sufficient though not a necessary proof of originality. But there is no agreement here between K and S. K₀, it is true, represents the version K in a comparatively pure form (Prolegomena, p. L.), but K₀ is not K; and K₁ is, on the whole, decidedly a better representative of the Kaśmīrī version than K₀ (Prolegomena, p. XLIX). Now here K₀ and K₁ have different readings: K₀ agrees with S, and K₁ with the rest of N! This fact has been ignored by Winternitz. As for the agreement of N₂ and S, I have pointed out in the Prolegomena (p. LIX), that “even the manuscripts of distant Nepal are not wholly free from contamination from some Southern source or sources (direct or indirect).” Thus the agreement between N₂ and S cannot be considered as compelling evidence, by any means. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that this agreement between K₀ N₂ and S concerns merely the omission of one syllable; and it is clear that this trifling omission could quite easily take place utterly independently in the respective groups. Therefore, even the documental probability in favour of the reading preferred by Winternitz is not at all strong. It is, in fact, considerably weakened by the following (intrinsic) consideration. N has vā and a dodeka (hypermetric) line; S omits vā and has the eleven-syllable (normal) line. This is a circumstance suspicious in itself. It is by no means certain or necessary that all the pādas of our Trīṣṭubhās should be of the eleven-syllable pattern. Some of these hypermetric pādas can indeed be made normal by the omission of one or more of the additional syllables, often merely of an expletive. But there are many lines which defy such athetization; for instance, the second pāda of the very next stanza (1. 3. 61; nāsātyadāsṛṣvunānasavaiḥjyontau). Such lines ought to [93] warn us against giving hasty preference to these normalizing readings. I have cited elsewhere (Prolegomena, p. xciii) clear
instances of efforts made by redactors to correct hypermetric pādas of Ślokas. Similar efforts are to be found among the variants of our Triśūbhs. But as the scheme of the Triśūbhb is more variable and arbitrary, or at least more complicated and obscure, it is difficult to prove the alterations made by the different scribes or editors. In this particular instance, however, it seems to me, there is no reason to assume that the original pāda was not hypermetric, because our pāda is a standard hypermeter—a type of which HOPKINS has cited numerous instances. Cf. No. 6 of the typical, oft-recurring varieties (mentioned by HOPKINS in The Great Epic, p. 275):

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\hline
\text{.} & \text{.} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

The scansion of our line is:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\hline
\text{.} & \text{.} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

which, it will be seen, is a pāda of the identical pattern.

From the examples given by HOPKINS, I will cite here only the following:

3. 13. 193 mamaiva (tatu) vāmyau parigrhayā rājan
5. 42. 9 tatrāna (te) yānti na taranta niśyum
5. 48. 77 vegera (iva) īśail abhihatya Jambhah
13. 94. 13 na (hy) uṣahe drasṣṭum ṭha jvalokam
Hari, 2. 72. 44 vi-ṣaṁjano jano ('tha) vidvān samagraḥ

Are we to omit the bracketed syllables—or some similar syllable—in each case, on the ground that they disturb the metre, if not the sense? We do not possess yet the collations of all these passages, but I am confident that there will always be some MSS. if not versions (or even a whole recension), which omit these extra syllables, for one reason or other. There is this other consideration. The ancients had as good an ear for the rhythm of their Triśūbhs as we have, if not better. Why and how was the offending syllable first inserted, and then tolerated by generations of editors? All N MSS. except D₃ contain the hypermeter. Is it not, under these circumstances, more probable that the original was a hypermetric line, which was emended by some redactors in conformity with the later ideas of the regular Upajātī metres? [94] This particular hypermeter is moreover antique, for we find (as HOPKINS has pointed out) already an example of it in Munda. Up. 3. 1. 6:

\[\text{yatra (tat) satyaśya paramam nīdānam,}\]

with the scansion \[\begin{array}{c|c}
\hline
\text{.} & \text{.} \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

which differs from our line as regards the quantity of the first two syllables only; ours has an iambic opening, the Munda line trochaic. Here, also, we can with impunity omit the bracketed syllable (tat), and get a line which is metrically a “better” line, but obviously not the original one. I am, therefore, fully persuaded that in all such cases we have original hypermeters. These old
stanzas were not built at all on the pattern of the later, more regular, classical metres, but followed some other finer rhythmic principle, which escapes our methods of rough analysis by syllable-counting.—Now as regards the sense. The exact explanation of the phrase girā vā śaṁśāmi is, I admit, difficult. Nilakaṇṭha offers the facile explanation: vāśabdās cārthe (i.e. vā = ca), which can hardly be considered satisfactory. Devabodha analyses the phrase into girāv+ā=śāṁśāmi (with girā, loc. of girī), but that hangs together with his interpretation of the Aśvins as the Sun and the Moon, which is not very convincing. It is possible to interpret the words as ‘girā vā’ śaṁśāmi (i.e. vai+āśaṁśāmi), as is done by some editors. On the other hand, it is also possible to emend vā to vāṁ (“ye two,” acc. dual), which would give a satisfactory sense. This reading, which is mentioned as a pāṭha by Arjunamirā, is found in only one of our inferior MSS. (D₂). It seemed to me such an obvious emendation that I did not like to adopt it on such slender MS. evidence, and I have hesitatingly (as shown by the wavy line) set in the text the old Northern reading vā, which is unquestionably a lectio difficilior. The whole hymn is, however, obscure and full of interpretative and other difficulties. It will have to be studied and dealt with more minutely before we can be sure of its text and meaning. But I am fully persuaded that vā (or some such word) did form part of the original line, and it would be a mistake to omit it.

1. 3. 145 Kurukṣetre nivasatām.

Why Winternitz should have any doubts about nivasatām, I fail to understand. It is merely an augmentless imperfect, and [95] augmentless imperfects are most common in the Mbh., especially in the case of verbs with prepositions, as in this case. Even Whitney (Sanskrit Grammar, § 587d) remarks: “Besides the augmentless aorist-forms with mā prohibitive, there are also found occasionally in the later language augmentless imperfect-forms (very rarely aorist-forms), which have the same value as if they were augmented, and are for the most part examples of metrical license. They are especially frequent in the epics1 (whence some scores of them are quotable).” To this, in 1884 (that is now more than fifty years ago), Holtzmann added the note:

“Beispiele von fehlendem Augmente des Imperfects sind ziemlich häufig, besonders in Compositum und hier wieder in solchen, die mit auf a auslautenden Präpositionen, ava, upa, apa, zusammengesetzt sind: aber nicht ganz vereinzelt ist der Mangel nur bei bhavan sie wurden 3, 110, 3 = 9970. 11, 27, 14 = 813. 16, 1, 9 = 9 u. a.”

He has given the following examples: prechat, patan, cintayan; man-yadhvam, buddhyetām; vyapagacchatām; adhyavasyan, avabudhyata, avatis-thata, aveksetām, avapadyanta, paryavasthāpayat; abhyupamanirayat, upa-

1 Italics mine.
tīṣṭhelām, uparyanta; abhiṣṭuvañ, abhidhaṃ, abhyarcayat; samuttis-
han, utthāpayan, uccārayan; paripālayan, nivartayetāṃ, nirayat; sam-
grhiṇāt; svikarot. [The Critical Ed. has, besides nivasaṭām, the following:
ṛāhyāta 1. 58. 8, avabudhyāta 120.11, avatīṣṭhat 189.11, avamanśthāk
(no. v. 1. !) 189. 21, samabhiṣṭravat 218. 28. There are many others, less
certain. A number of instances will be found in the Tentative Edition of
the Virātāparvan by Mr. Wintenitz; the Critical Edition of this parvan, I
may add, will again contain quite a few instances of this particular solecism.
How many examples are really needed before it is admitted that augment-
less imperfect forms occur regularly in the Mbh., and we cease to talk of
“correct” and “incorrect” forms? The augmentless forms are quite
as “correct” as the other as far as the Mbh. is concerned.
Wintenitz points out that the “correct” form “is given by the Kaśmi-
rian transcript K₄, by the Maithili and Bengali MSS., by Arjunamiśra, and
by some Southern MSS.,” and therefore he prefers it. It is a wonder that
[96] it is not given by more MSS.; because the tendency is always to change
an “incorrect” form into the “correct” one. We have here to look not to the
Mbh. which have the “correct” form, but to those which have not the “cor-
rect” form! Let us look at it in another way. If nivasaṭām be the original
reading, then there are two ways of improving the text: (i) keep vasatām
of the original and change the word to nyavasaṭām and thus make it “cor-
correct” (Central sub-recension and Malayālam, independently), or (ii) keep ni-
intact, and change the word to the present nivasaṭāḥ (“K” version);
both are represented here. If, on the other hand, nyavasaṭām were the origi-
nal reading, no one would think of changing it later to nivasaṭām; and
nivasaṭāḥ of K would also be quite unintelligible. The text reading niva-
saṭām thus explains, to a certain extent, how the other readings may have
arisen and has therefore been preferred. And I think there cannot be much
doubt about its correctness and originality.

1. 3. 183 prābrūhi vā kim kriyaṭāṃ dvijendra.

If Wintenitz prefers me kim, he must, at the same time, also prefer
karaṇīyam adya | yenāsi kāryaṇa etc., found in N (except K B₄ D₂ S); but
he did not realize it. The me kim of the Vulgate cannot be joined to kriya-
tāṃ dvijendra of K B₄ D₂ S. There is no MS. which reads prābrūhi me
kim kriyaṭāṃ dvijendra | suṣrūṣuḥ avsy adya vacas tvādiyam. The reading
of the line proposed by Wintenitz will be like an animal with the head
of a horse and tail of a donkey! The text reading of the entire line—nay, of
the entire stanza—occurs verbatim in K₁ a. 4. I think, the original Northern
reading was probably prābrūhi vā kim, as in text. If vā be useless after prā-
brūhi, it is more than useless after kim, where Wintenitz would have it.
It is conceivable that the (original) Northern reading (preserved in K₁ a. 4.
is corrupt, and we ought to give here preference to S. That is another mat-
ner. Not being convinced that vā kim of K₁ a. 4 was “secondary” or cor-
rupt from \textit{kim vā} of S, I have adopted, in the text, \textit{vā kim} underlining it to show that it is less than certain. But \textit{mām kim, mām yat, me kim, me tvam, vākyam} of the Northern MSS. are clearly all secondary, and need not be considered at all.

[97] 1. 55. 3 \textit{srotum pātram ca rājaṁs tvam.}

I have taken the Śāradā MS. only as the norm for my edition; I have not undertaken to reproduce its text \textit{verbatim}. The \textit{srotṛpātram ca rājaṁs tvāṁ} of S, K is opposed by all other MSS. And, moreover, as there is agreement between B D and S—more or less independent versions—on the reading \textit{srotum pātram ca rājaṁs tvam}, this reading is indicated as the original, and has been adopted, without wavy line; a procedure quite in accord with the principles of text reconstruction laid down in the Prolegomena (p. xci). WINTERNITZ finds \textit{srotṛpātram ca rājaṁs tvāṁ} of K “better Sanskrit,” but I must frankly confess that I could not make head or tail of it, and I cannot understand it even now. The text reading is the same as the reading of the Vulgate and of the Southern recension, and is besides quite clear, and, as far as I can judge, flawless Sanskrit. It may be translated: “And thou art, O King, a fit person to hear (Vṛṣāš’s Bhārati Kathā),” a sense which suits the context admirably. Furthermore, K has here an entirely different reading for the whole stanza. If we adopt the reading preferred by WINTERNITZ, then we must read the stanza as:

\begin{quote}
\textit{srotṛpātram ca rājaṁs tvāṁ prāpyeyam Bhārati śubhā |}
\textit{guror vahtrapatispandam mudā protsāhativa mām ||}
\end{quote}

which is appreciably different from the text. But the variants of the other versions do not at all suggest that this is the original reading. Our text represents the reading of the Southern recension, which has here, in my opinion, the greatest probability.

1. 56. 8: \textit{katham vyātikraman dyūte.}

It is natural that \textit{W.} should demand wavy lines for this verse. I admit the line is most puzzling, and I only lighted upon the solution of the puzzle by accident, after prolonged wrestling with it. An explanatory note was really called for, because the first line is absolutely unintelligible unless one knows the particular meaning of the root \textit{vyātikram} intended here, which is “to wrongly submit or surrender oneself to, wrongly take to (a thing or person, acc.).” It is a rare meaning, but not unknown. It is given in the dictionaries of MONIER WILLIAMS (ed. 1899, s. v. [98] \textit{vyātikram}), and MACDONELL (s. v. \textit{kram}). It appears not to be given in PW, but \textit{pw} has (s. v. \textit{kram}) : “verkehrter Weise sich einer Sache (Acc.) hingeben”. One example of the use is (B.) 12. 174. 36:

\begin{quote}
\texttt{atha ye buddhām aprāptā vyātikrāntās ca mādhatām}
\texttt{te 'tivelan prakṛṣyanti saṁtāpan upayānti ca} ||
\end{quote}
Here vyatikrāntāḥ ca mūḍhatām must mean "those who have surrendered themselves (wrongly) to folly"; no other meaning will fit, as far as I can judge. Our stanza is, therefore, to be translated thus:

"How (indeed) did the two sons of Pṛthā, as well as the two sons of Mādri, (tamely) surrender themselves to the tiger among men (Yudhiṣṭhira), who was being cheated at dice by those wicked men, and (how did they) follow him?"

This strange submission consists in their consenting, in the first instance, to be used as pledges or stakes in that dire game of dice, and acquiescing dumbly to everything that Yudhiṣṭhira did. The Southern recension is unanimous on the point that the doubtful word was some form of vyatikram; and the eight readings recorded in our crit. app. show that it must have been some word which was as unintelligible to the scribes and editors as it is to WINTERNITZ. WINTERNITZ is again mistaken in thinking that the S reading is vyatikramadyūte. This is the reading not of S but of only two MSS. (G₂₆) out of the thirteen Southern MSS. of our crit. app. I myself have followed S in reading vyatikraman dyūte, which is the reading of five of the Southern MSS. In fact, my text represents the reading of the majority of the Southern MSS., and is, therefore, in a sense, the true S reading. It is needless to add that vinirijitam of "K" and vyasaninam of the Central sub-recension, are emendations, made by those who could not make head or tail of the original. For it is clear that no one would change vinirijitam or vyasaninam to any of the Southern readings, while the reverse would be the most natural thing in the world. It is further worthy of note that while the Northern MSS. have the easier reading, there is no agreement between the Kaśmīrī and the Central sub-recension. They must therefore represent independent alterations of a third original.—Following certain other S MSS. P. P. S. SASTRI has adopted the reading [99] vyatikraman dyūte (without recording any v. 1.) ; but I am inclined to think that this is a wrong analysis of kramandyūte which in S MSS. stands for both kramān dyūte and kramān dyūte.—Now that I have explained how the awkward word is to be interpreted, I have no doubt that WINTERNITZ will agree with me that the text reading is correct.

1. 57. 20: kriyate *ucchrayo nṛpaḥ.

There has been extraordinary reluctance among scholars to face the fact that the Mbh. text once contained far more examples of hiatus than what one deems right or reasonable for such an ancient and venerable text. But there is hardly any excuse now for such hesitation. On p. xciii of the Prolegomena, I have given numerous instances of the surreptitious efforts of scribes and redactors to eliminate hiatus, which show that hiatus was an anathema to them. It is well known that the Sandhi is not rigidly observed in the Vedic Samhitās, the Brāhmaṇas, and the Upaniṣads, in Pali, and in Prakrit works.
Why must the Sandhi then be rigidly observed in the popular epic, a work which has its roots firmly embedded in the soil of the heroic poetry of the Śūtas, and which has throughout preserved vestiges of its humble origin? The only reference (so far as I know), in the poem itself, to the Mbh. being a Kāvya (kṛtāṁ mānedāṁ bhagavaṁ kāvyaṁ paramāpājitam) has now disappeared with the Brahmā-Gaṇeśa interpolation in the Ādi, and we are thus left only with a Purāṇa, Itiḥāsa or Ākhyaṇa. A specimen of this class of work may surely contain sporadic instances of hiatus, without our being scandalized. It is futile, I may add, to try to apply to this category of popular literature the rules of the dialect of the high-brow Śiṣṭas. We may expect every conceivable solecism in the language of the Mbh., and we find, in fact, an amazing variety of them; the hiatus, which was extremely common, is only one of such so-called irregularities. But for this strange modern antipathy towards hiatus, WINTERNITZ would have recognized that the emendation is quite legitimate and certain. WINTERNITZ considers the Northern readings but wholly ignores the Southern, which is fatal to his argument. S does not contain either ati (or abhi) which is found only in certain N MSS., and is besides superfluous. [100] TG have recast the line: kuruṇtvante dvaṣṭaṁ cchrayam, with kuruṇtī (note the active voice!), that is, a form of the root kṛ (like kriyate of N) at the head of the pāda. All these versions have the verb, it may be noted, in the beginning of the pāda. M contains the same three words as our kriyate, ucchrayaḥ and nṛpaṁ, but transposes kriyate and ucchrayaḥ, reading ucchrayaḥ kriyate nṛpaṁ. This is the key-reading, which gives a clue to the original. You can explain everything else, but you cannot explain the transposition in M (which normally ought to agree with TG), unless you start from the hypothetical kriyate *ucchrayo nṛpaṁ. If you argue, on the other hand, that the reading of M is an arbitrary variant, which is in no need of a special explanation by means of an emendation, then there is no need of a critical edition either; because all MSS. contain approximately the same text and the same story, and the few differences could be regarded as arbitrary variations which needed no explanation. With this reading, containing the opprobious hiatus, you can explain all the variations. N inserts a futile and innocuous abhi (corrupted in some MSS. to ati) to destroy the hiatus. M transposes the ucchrayo, which is the chief cause of the trouble; TG recast the original, and substitute a reading which fits badly in the context, with an active kuruṇti (having no proper subject), after kriyate in stanza 19. That is how I regard this little complex of readings, and hence the emendation, of whose correctness I myself have no doubt whatsoever.

1. 57. 21 : hāsyarūpaṇa sānkhurāḥ.

This reading is undoubtedly, as WINTERNITZ rightly observes, the lectio difficilior, but there is not the slightest doubt about its being the original reading, judging by documentary evidence, and therefore, there is absolutely
no need of underlining it. It is, in the first instance, the reading of the whole of M, which WINTERNITZ appears not to have realized. I have stated, as my opinion, that the Malayalam version is the best representative of the Southern recension (Prolegomena, p. LXXIII). I am glad to note that WINTERNITZ (Annals, Vol. 15, p. 170) agrees with me, and that even my learned friend Vidyāśāgara Prof. P. P. S. SASTRĪ now endorses it. In the introduction (p. iii) to Vol. IV of his edition [101] of the Southern Recension, SASTRĪ writes: “Not having been subject to Nāyak influence in any manner whatsoever, the tradition handed down by the Malayalam Manuscripts preserved the Grantha text, in a purer and more unmixed form than even some comparatively early Grantha manuscripts, as the Malayalam MSS. do not at all seem to have come into contact with the Northern Recension till very recent times.” Now this reading of the Malayalam version is supported by the reading of the Kaśmīrī version; for though $S_1$ is missing, yet $K_1$ (India Office 2137) has the corrupt hāmyahāmya” (for hāmsa” of the rest of N), and it is well known that in Nāgarī copies of sāradā MSS., s is frequently transcribed wrongly as m; so that we have to read hāsyahāsyā (dittoography). The reading is further borne out by Devabodha’s gloss (the MS. reads hāsa” for our hāsyā”): hāsarūpeṇa kṛṣṭavatārārūpeṇa (cf. p. 990 of the Crit. Ed. for the gloss), where hānsa, in any case, would not fit, for it is not clear how hānsarūpa would be kṛṣṭavatāraruṣa. Further, śaṅkarah is the reading of all MSS. except $B_5$ Dn, which have iśvaraḥ (an obvious emendation) and TG which has vāsavaḥ (which must likewise be an emendation), originally, perhaps, only a gloss. Here practically the whole of N is supported by M. śaṅkarah is here not a name of Indra, but only an epithet, an attribute meaning ‘auspicious, beneficent’. Thus in (B.) 3. 229. 6 śaṅkara is used with reference to Skanda: lokānām śaṅkaro bhava. In (B.) 3. 201. 29 the epithet maheśvara (“great lord”) is applied to Viṣṇu tvayi nītyaṁ maheśvara. Further in 1. 58. 43, the epithet iṣa (“lord”) and śaṁbhū (“auspicious”) are applied to god Brahmā: prabhavoḥ sarvaḥbhūtānām iṣaḥ śaṁbhukṣa praṇāpiṇiḥ. This shows that the words śaṅkara, Śaṁbhū, iṣa, maheśvara, and so on, which are now generally regarded as proper names of Mahādeva, were still not specialized, but were applied to other gods as well, as mere epithets, descriptive of their beneficence or omnipotence.

1. 57. 58: āavayor dṛṣyatvar ebhik.

Here it is not difficult to see on what authority the adopted reading rests. The footnotes give here the reading of N V, B, D [102] (except D) of the Northern, and of G of the Southern recension. The adopted reading (which is partly supported by the dṛṣyayor of $B_5$) is, therefore, the reading of the remaining MSS. K D, T, M (since $S_1$ is missing, as mentioned on p. 244, at the beginning of the adhy., or as may be seen from the table on

1. Italics mine.
The Vulgate lacks here the support of the Grantha version, which has an entirely different reading:

\[ \text{āvayoś ca katham brahman bhaviṣyati samāgamaḥ} \]

The Grantha version dispenses altogether with the troublesome \( dṛśyataḥ \) of the original (or the unsuitable v. I. \( dṛśyoh \) of the Vulgate), thus revealing its secondary character. The line was recast in the archetype “Sigma” (see the pedigree in the Prolegomena, p. xxx). The textual relations here are ideal, being clear as crystal. WINTERNITZ is right in regarding it as pass. part. prae. with active ending. Passive forms with active endings are quite common in the epic. I adduce a few examples to dispel the remaining doubts of sceptics: 1. 11. 15 isyati (v. I. isyeta, arhati etc.); 16. 15 ākṣipyataḥ (no. v. I. explanation); 34. 13 mokṣyanti (v. I. mokṣyante); 47. 9 sambhūryantu (v. I. ०bharanu, ०bhavantu); 48. 12 dahyatām (no. v. I. I!) 48. 13 pacyatām (v. I. jvalatām, dahyatām); 48. 22 diryati (v. I. śiryati); 53. 6 vidīyalā (no. v. I. I!); 71. 44 dṛṣyet (v. I. pasyeta); 124. 24 uhyantuk (v. I. uhyute); 147. 8 vyucchidyet (v. I. ucchindyata, chidyeta); 165. 24 hriyasi (v. I. ghyase, hriyase, prayāsi); 202. 19 adṛṣyadbhik (v. I. adṛṣyaś ca, adṛṣyau tau); 217. 13 mahyataḥ (v. I. manthane); 218. 49 paviṣyataḥ; 219, 5 adṛṣyan (v. I. adṛṣyā, nyapatan).

1. 92. 2 : Gaṅgā śrīr iva rūpinī.

The configuration of the MSS. as well as the intrinsic merit of the readings are different in the two lines. That is how \( S_1 K_2 \) appear to be of greater authority in the first line than in the second. The salilāt of the text is found in all MSS. except \( S_1 K_1 \) (S only transposing the word: Text salilāt tasmāl, S Gaṅgā salilāt), and is, therefore, for one thing, obviously far better documented than sāyanāt of \( S_1 K_1 \) only. In the second line, therefore, we have, practically, only two readings: sāyanāt of \( S_1 K_1 \), against salilāt of the rest; therefore the reading of \( S_1 K_1 \) has been rightly rejected. Such is not the case in the first line. Here we have three nearly independent readings (\( S_1 K_1 \) Gaṅgā śrīr iva rūpinī : Vulgate G. strīrūpadhāriṇī : S lobhanīyatalamākrtriḥ, which latter is our fourth pāda). Here, while the two Northern readings are somewhat allied to each other, the Southern reading is entirely different, having very little connection with the Northern. None of the readings can be mechanically derived from the other, and intrinsically they are all more or less of the same value. Such being the case, the Northern tradition was, as usual, followed. WINTERNITZ does not say why he thinks strīrūpadhāriṇī is better than the other. The reason why I chose śrīr iva rūpinī (“beautiful like Lākṣmī”) is that it is nearer in sense to lobhanīyatalamākrtriḥ (“with a most enticing form”) of S, than strīrūpadhāriṇī (“assuming the form of a woman”) of the Vulgate. I have here explained in detail the exact reasons which have weighed with me in making the difficult choice, but as a matter of fact, they are all three epic iterata and these iterata
keep alternating with each other indiscriminately. In such cases, it is impossible to decide, with certainty, which is original and which is secondary, and the matter is also of no great consequence. The uncertainty of the text tradition has been duly indicated by a wavy line.

1. 92. 7: rājan kanyāṁ varastrīyam.

I am glad WINTERNITZ has drawn my attention to a wrong reading which has crept in here, through oversight, and I gladly take this opportunity to publish a correction. The reading I had intended to adopt, or at least I should have adopted, is precisely the one advocated by WINTERNITZ: rājan kāmyāṁ vara, that of the Kaśmirī version (S₁ K₀-2,4). The fact is that just for first two words of the last pāda of this stanza, there is a confusing array of readings in Northern MSS., all meaning, more or less, the same thing: rājan kāmyāṁ (S₁ K₀-2,4), rājan divyāṁ (K₂), divyāṁ kanyāṁ (Vulgate), kāmyāṁ divyāṁ (B), divyāṁ kanyāṁ (N₁,4). Under these circumstances, clearly, the Kaśmirī reading should have been adopted, according to the principles enunciated in the Prolegomena, but through a clerical error kanyāṁ (of the Vulgate) [104] has crept in, in place of kāmyāṁ (of the Kaśmirī), which was intended.—I do not agree with WINTERNITZ however when he says that the epithet kanyā is “not very appropriate for Gaṅgā”. It would be quite appropriate, as far as I can see. It would imply that she was an unmarried virgin, which is the regular meaning of kanyā; compare:

1. 57. 63 uvāca matpriyam kṛtvā kanyāva tvam bhaviṣyasi
1. 104. 12 prādāc ca tasyāṁ kanyātvam punah sa paramaduryath
(B) 3. 307. 16 sā mayā saha samgamyam punah kanyā bhaviṣyasi

It would then answer Pratipa’s objection (1. 92. 6):

nāhaṁ parastrīyam kāmāt gaccheyah varavarnini.

But kanyāṁ is not supported by the MS. evidence, and kāmyāṁ is: that is the main point. The constituted text should therefore be corrected accordingly by changing kanyāṁ to kāmyāṁ.

1. 92. 45: na ca tāṁ kimcanovāca.

Here I do not agree with WINTERNITZ. I am fully persuaded that the text is quite in order. The first mistake WINTERNITZ makes is in thinking that sa is the reading of S₁ K; it is actually given in the crit. app. as the reading of S₁ K₀-2,4 D₃. WINTERNITZ has overlooked the fact that S₁ differs from K₁, which is in itself suspicious; and K₂ is also excluded from the group. If ca has to be translated by “but”, there is no help for it; for ca has frequently to be rendered in that way. For the Mbh., I may add, ca and tu are almost synonymous, tu having entirely lost the specific adversative force. It is quite clear that there must have been a period in the history of Sanskrit, as it was spoken, in which the two small particles ca
and \( tu \) were confused in the mouths of the common people, and were used indiscriminately. That is, in fact, the only explanation of the curious particle \( cu \) one comes across in certain Aśoka inscriptions, which is evidently a combination of \( ca \) and \( tu \). The Śāradā MS. undoubtedly offers a "better" reading, but, as a comparison of the different versions shows, it is a clear *innovation* or emendation. That the original had something like \( na ca \) (of the text) is proved by TG, which has \( na tu \), only in a slightly different combination: \( 105 \) \( uvāca kimcina tu tām. \) M differs from TG, and has a third combination, with a new word *vacanāḥ*, not found in the other versions: *novāca vacanāṁ kimcīt*, which has neither \( na ca \) nor \( na tu \), and which does not help to solve our difficulty. The *sa* of some of the Kāśmirī MSS. is not necessary for the context, as the subject *mahāpatiḥ* ("the king") occurs in the same line.

1. 92. 50: *aśṭe me Vasavo devāḥ.*

Practically all the MSS. except those of the D version begin with *aśṭau*, which makes it probable (if it does not directly prove) that the original must have begun with *aśṭau*; therefore *imeśṭau* (one of the readings preferred by WINTERNITZ) must be ruled out, as an emendation, probably of a *lectio difficilior*. The (final) *me* of *ś₁ K₁* and the initial *ime* of some Nāgarī MSS. suggest that the original was the conjectural *aśṭeme*, which combines the characteristics of these groups, and which is very close to the *aśta me* of *N₂*. It is also suggested, to a certain extent, by the Bengali *aśṭau ye*. The conjectural *aśṭeme*, is in fact, the hypothetical form to which the various readings *aśṭau me*, *aśta me*, *aśṭau ye*, *aśṭau hi*, and *imeśṭau* seem to converge. The convergence is not a matter of which a mathematical proof can be supplied. If WINTERNITZ does not see the convergence, he may substitute for the text reading any of the five readings found in the MSS. I did not know which to choose; hence the emendation. The change is not quite unmotivated. The motive appears to have been the seemingly irregular Sandhi (double crasis): *aśṭau + ime = aśṭā + ime = aśṭeme*. But as a matter of fact, there need not have been any irregularity at all in the Sandhi, for *aśṭeme* may simply be resolved into *aśṭā + ime*, or *aśta + ime*, since besides the heavier *aśṭau*, both the forms *aśṭā* and *aśta* were in use, of which the latter (*aśta*) particularly was used, I think, in all periods of the language (cf. WHITNEY, Sanskrit Grammar § 483). The translation of WINTERNITZ is not quite accurate; at least it is not literal. The stanza has no word for "obtained birth," which WINTERNITZ interpolates into it, in order to justify the reading *me*, "of me," which he has further to explain as "in my body". Translate: "Those gods, the Eight Vasus, had on account of Vasistha's curse become men (lit. attained the state of men)."

[106] 1. 93. 1: *mānuśīṁ tanum āgataḥ.*

The agreement between S and N V₁ Dn D₁ signifies absolutely nothing
for the original reading; it is purely the result of conflation. \( V_1 \) is, moreover, not a version; it is merely a single MS., written in Maithili script, and as such, capable of showing any reading at random. Again, the agreement of \( NV_1 \) with Dn and S against B Da is most unnatural and thoroughly suspicious. In other words, the MS. evidence here is extremely confused. Ordinarily I would have adopted the \( S_1 \), K reading \( mănusâvatvam \ upâgatâh \), which has occurred already in the previous adhy. (1. 92. 50), and occurs again in (B) 3. 83, 66; but owing to the \( mănusim \) of B, which recurs in \( S \), I have given here preference to the reading of the Bengali version. I may point out that it is the reading of the entire Bengali version, and not of a few unimportant MSS., as Winteritz imagines. The readings are these:

\[
\begin{align*}
&S_1 \quad K \quad mănusâvatvam \ upâgatâh \\
&B \quad mănusîm \ tanum \ âgatâh \\
&S \quad mănusîm \ yonîm \ âgatâh,
\end{align*}
\]

This being the constellation of the readings, \( mănusîm \) and \( âgatâh \) are as good as certain, as suggested by the agreement between B and S. Therefore the real variant is only \( tanum : yonîm \). It is likely that the original was \( yonîm \) which was corrupted, in N, to \( tanum \), and then the original pâda \( mănusîm \ tanum \ âgatâh \) (preserved in Bengali only) was replaced by the recurrent teg \( mănusâvatvam \ upâgatâh \); but it is most unlikely that the latter was the original which was changed in B to \( mănusîm \ tanum \ âg \), and in S to \( mănusîm \ yonîm \ âg \). In any case, the Kasrî reading must be rejected here as secondary (cf. Prolegomena, p. lxii), as shown by the evidence of B and S. Dn D2 appear to have got their \( yonîm \) from S (ibid. p. lxvii), and \( NV_1 \) possibly from Dn.

1. 93. 11 : devadevârśîsevitam.

Winteritz is mistaken in thinking that the hermitage in question was frequented by Rṣīs only, and not by gods as well. In fact, the talk is not about a hermitage at all, but about the [107] forest (\( vana \)) containing the hermitage. Moreover, it was not an ordinary hermitage, but the hermitage of Vasiṣṭha, situated on the slopes of the celestial mount Meru (1. 93. 15 f.) :

\[
\begin{align*}
Vasiṣṭha \ nāma \ iti \ sa \ khyāta \ āpava \ ity \ uta \ || \ 15 \\
tosyāśramapadaṁ \ punyoṁ \ mrgapakṣigaṇāvītam \ |
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
Meroḥ \ pārśve \ nagendrasya \ sarvatukumāvītam \ || \ 16 \\
\end{align*}
\]

The forest, therefore, in which Vasiṣṭha's hermitage was situated, was inhabited and frequented by divine rṣīs (like Vasiṣṭha) and by gods (like the Vasus). That is how, in fact, the Vasus found themselves in that hermitage on that fateful day. If the forest were not frequented by gods, the Vasus would not have come there at all. If we adopt the reading devâ devârśîsevitam (which is plausible) then the compound must be taken to
mean "frequented by gods and ṛṣis" (and not by divine ṛṣis, as Winter-
Nitz understands it). According to our text, the forest was frequented by
gods and divine ṛṣis. As will be seen, there is not much to choose be-
tween the readings, but I prefer the text, because only the divine ṛṣis like Vasiṣṭha
could reach those regions, not ordinary ṛṣis. Moreover, such adjectives
(forming the entire second half of the line) are extremely common in the
descriptions of sacred forests, hermitages, tirthas, with many variants, as
may be seen from the following examples from the Āraṇyaka' (Bom. Ed.) :

3. 82. 41 devaṛṣispiṭyesevita
   84. 46 siddhagandharvasevita
   87. 5 rājṛṣiṇaṇasevita
   89. 7 devagandharvasevita
   89. 8 devaṛṣiṇaṇasevita
   90. 21 brahmaṛṣiṇaṇasevita
   156. 10 siddhacārāṇapūjitita
   and 145. 41 devaṛṣiṇapūjitita,

which latter has our combination devadevarṣi, and in which deva cannot be
separated from devaṛṣi, for the stanza reads :

tatrāpaśyata dharmātmā devaṛṣiṇapūjitam |
Nara-Nārāyaṇaṣṭhānam Bhāgirathyoṣabḥitam ||

The adjective devadevarṣisvetam (or *pūjitam) is used with reference
to the most sacred and inaccessible regions like the [108] penance groves
on Meru or Gandhamadana, or on the Himalayan peaks. I do not wish
to suggest that the simple phrase devaṛṣisvetam would not have sufficed
here. I only want to show that there is nothing wrong with the text read-
ing, which is proved by the Kāśmirī version (Ś, K). From the graphical
point of view, the difference between the readings (devā and deva-) is so
slight that the documentary evidence actually counts here for very little. It
is just owing to this uncertainty that the reading has been underlined in the
critical text.

1. 214. 9 : Dharmarāje * atipṛtyā.

Here again we notice WinterNitz's prejudice against hiatus, to which
I had drawn attention in the discussion on 1, 57. 20, above. But here my
case is stronger still. As far as the Vedic tradition is concerned, e (like o)
remained unchanged before a which was generally elided in the written text,
but, according to the evidence of metre, must almost invariably in the
Rgveda and generally in the Yajurveda and Atharvaveda, be pronounced
whether written or not. According to the statistics prepared by Vedic
scholars, it must be pronounced in the Rgveda in 99 per cent of the cases,
in the Atharvaveda and the metrical portion of the Yajurveda, in about
80 per cent of its occurrences. This shows that in the older stages of the
language, at any rate, any Sandhi between final \( e \) (or \( o \)) and initial \( a \) was rare. The rule becomes more and more rigid as we advance, until with classical authors, ignorance or violation of the rule came to be regarded as a capital blunder. Now the Mbh., whatever its age be, stands unquestioningly midway between the Vedic and the classical epoch, and therefore partakes naturally of the linguistic characteristics of both. In the Vedic literature, where the scribes or editors did not dare to add even a single syllable to the received text, the later antipathy towards hiatus shows itself in the efforts to coalesce, in the written text, the adjoined vowels, according to rules of (Sanskrit) grammar, leaving a correct but unmetrical and unreadable line. The subterfuge is however so obvious that no one hesitates to dissolve the Sandhi automatically and restore the hiatus. Much reluctance is felt, on the other hand, by scholars in admitting that the epic text likewise contained originally many instances of hiatus, though of course they are not as frequent as in the Veda. The reluctance is due to two causes. Firstly the Mbh. text looks on the surface so like a classical text that scholars, who have so far studied the text mainly from printed editions, insist on applying rules of classical grammar to the text. The second reason is that the ancient redactors who had not the same compunction about making small alterations in the epic text (as is evident from our critical apparatus) as they had in the case of the Vedic texts, have not resorted to coalescence in order to remove the hiatus, but have boldly added little expletives like \( ca \), \( tu \), \( ki \) for saving their precious rules of grammar, a procedure which, as it leaves the line metrically intact, makes the detection of their nefarious interference difficult, if not impossible. Now though the Mbh. looks on the surface like a classical text, there are many peculiarities of Sandhi and grammar—even in the printed editions and the Vulgate—which distinguish it from a classical text. Coalescence unknown to classical usage is seen in \( amale 'itmānam \) (1. 68. 64), \( te 'jhayā \) (1. 70. 41), \( manyate 'tmānam \) (1. 198. 19). We have hiatus in a compound in \( Nārāyaṇa-urogataḥ \) (1. 16. 35); Pragrhyā Sandhi in \( samupe 'dbhute 'naghe \) (fem. du, 1. 14, 5), \( jāṇate 'stravi śāradau \) (1. 57. 88) etc. Double crasis in \( poma-gābhavon \) (1. 21. 6), \( Vasumanābravīt \) (1. 87, 18), \( jāyateti \) (1. 11. 13). Hiatus between pādas, caused by the change of \( as \) to \( o \) (1. 76. 35) : \( jagāma svapuranī hrīsto anujñāto mahātmanā. \) Frequently we come across Prakritic Absolutes like \( gṛhya \) (1. 2, 93; 9. 19; 39. 23, 30; 119. 16; 123. 12, 16, 50; 124. 20 etc.), \( toṣya \) (1. 1. 109), \( cintya \) (1. 9. 2), \( uṣya \) (1. 71. 58), etc. etc.; and the converse (\( tvā for ya \) in \( sam-pūjayitvā \) (1. 54. 15), \( ānayitvā \) (1. 66. 12), \( ni-śtanitvā \) (1. 85. 18), \( anu-śīṣṭpūnagatvā ca \) (1. 133. 24), \( prāpayitvā \) (1. 189. 25) etc., some of which may however, be explained as absolutes of verbs with separable prepositions. Such a separable preposition we have in 1. 65. 34:

\[ \text{prati śravayapurvāni naksatāni sasarja ha} \],
where *prati* is to be construed with *sasarja*, as *pratisasarja*: a line often misunderstood by editors, commentators and translators alike. These violations of (Sanskrit) grammar are not so rare that one has to hunt for them with a microscope. There is an endless list of [110] them. One meets with them at every step. If these and scores of other irregularities do occur as a matter of fact, why could there not be *hiatus* as well? Scholars are not yet familiar with this phenomenon, because they have been dealing, so far, with the clarified text, from which most of these irregularities have been carefully expunged, as is evident from our critical apparatus, by purists who have had the handling of the epic text during a long succession of centuries. I have noted that even BÖHTLINGK, who was otherwise a careful and conscious editor, has in editing *Mbh.* passages for his *Chrestomathie*, rigidly enforced *Sandhi* rules, even in prose passages, with a zeal which was worthy of a better cause, where there was not the slightest manuscript authority for doing so. My study of the *Mbh.* MSS during the last ten years has convinced me now that it is the grammatical and material irregularities of the original that are responsible for quite a large fraction of the mass of variations which we come across in the MSS. The correctness of my reconstructions can be proved only by adducing the entire evidence, which it is not possible to do here, but which may be undertaken later on, when a large part of the text has been dealt with in a like manner. I am fully persuaded that the Critical Edition, as it advances, will supply material for confirming most of my conclusions.—To return to the case under consideration, WINTERNITZ points out that *hi* is found in all N MSS., including *S₁*, but he ignores that *K₁* shows here *tu*, not *hi*? Now *K₁* is a clear transcript of a Šāradā MS., and agrees with our *S₁* to such an extent that I have expressed it as my opinion that it is a copy of a Šāradā original very similar to our Šāradā MS. It is, no doubt, a very small and insignificant variation, but how would WINTERNITZ explain it all the same? *kya* cannot be misread as *tva*, even in the Šāradā script. Why should just *K₁* show here *tva*? Is it not, perhaps, because a not very distant ancestor of our *S₁* and *K₁* had still the obnoxious hiatus, as in our text? The Kaśmīrī version does contain many original features and archaisms.

1. 215. 2: *ekām trptim prayacchatām,*

*prayacchatām* of the text, I may point out, is not entirely wrong; it may be construed with *bhavantau*, understood, a more [111] respectful form of address than the second person. In stanza 5, however, the reading *samprayacchatam* has been accepted, because the subject in the second person (*yuvām*) is expressed. We cannot argue that since in 5 we have *samprayacchatam*, therefore in 2 we must have also *prayacchatam*. Because in the *Mbh.*, which is not and never was polished literature, we do come across such strange yoke-fellows. Changes of subject and changes of construction are frequent. That is the view I had taken when I adopted the text reading.
But on second thoughts I decided that *prayacchatam* would nevertheless be a better reading, and the correction now proposed by WINTERNITZ had been already published by me, in the "Addenda et Corrigenda," at the end of the volume (p. 996).

1. 216. 10

\[
\text{sasarja yat svatapasā Bhauvano bhuvanaprabhuh} \\
\text{prajāpatir anirdeśyam yasya rūpani raver iva} \\
\]

The matter is not simple as WINTERNITZ imagines. Of course, with the reading *yam*, any one can see that the relative may be construed with *ratham* in 8. We then get two sentences: "Which (scil. chariot of Arjuna) was fashioned by Bhauvana...by (the power of) his austerities," and "whose beauty was like that of the sun." But the reading *yat* is actually found in S.K (except K₀) V₂ G (except G₁); i.e. in the Kšmiri version (except K₀), agreeing with the Grantha version (except G₁), plus the Maithil MS. How is it that so many MSS. give what WINTERNITZ considers, an "impossible" reading? The reading is, in fact, not impossible at all; only the construction is a little involved and difficult to understand. By reading *yat* we actually get better sense. Construe: *yasya, raver iva, yat anirdeśyam rūpani, (tat) Bhauvanaḥ...svatapasā sasarja, "whose indefinable (or incomparable) loveliness (or splendour), like that of the Sun, Bhauvana had fashioned by (the power of) his austerities." This construction avoids the two disjointed and halting sentences *yam anirdeśyam Bhauvanaḥ...svatapasā sasarja*, and *yasya rūpani raver iva* (or *yam Bhauvanaḥ...svatapasā sasarja*, and *yasya anirdeśyam rūpani raver iva*), which result from the wrong reading *yam* for [112] *yat*, *yat* is almost a perfect example of the lectio difficilior, and a regular trap for unwary editors.

1. 218. 14: jaladhārāmuco 'kulān.

WINTERNITZ is here again mistaken in thinking that *mucotulān* is the reading of S. It is the reading of only five of the thirteen Southern MSS. (T₁ G₁, 2 M₃,5) ; three others (T₂ G₈,₄) read *musonilān*, three more (M₆-8) read *mucośivān*, two (G₅,₇) read as in text (*mucokulān*). The question is, in fact, what was the original reading of S. That question I have not been able to answer definitely, and I have, therefore, put in, as a stop-gap, the reading of G₅,₇ which seemed to me not improbable, since initial अ is curiously enough, sporadically treated in the Mbh. text, like a. The reading *samākulān* is useless; it is obviously a substitute for some reading which was difficult to understand or explain.

I have underlined *muco* in the text, but I now think that it is as good as certain. It is documented not only by the whole of S, but also by K₉,5,8 N V₂ D₁. If *muco* be admitted, then samākulān of the Northern group becomes secondary, but with an important residue in the shape of the final *kulān*, agreeing with the final of *mucokulān* of G₅,₇, rhyming with *muco-
tulān of Kₗ,ₐT₂G₁,ₐMₘ,ₐ, and finally reflected faintly in muconilān T₃Gₑ,ₐ. The documentary evidence, therefore, points unmistakably to a reading jaladhārāmuco(x)lān. Query, what is the value of x? The adjective ākulān ("confused") qualifying meghān would be not inappropriate, referring to the condition of masses of clouds confusedly hurled about by a cyclonic wind; not so appropriate, to my mind, the atulān ("incomparable") preferred by WINTERNITZ, and adopted by P. P. S. SASTRI, against the evidence of his basic MS. Sr, which has our text reading. In SASTRI's adoption of atulān and his ignoring of variants, which must have appeared to him meaningless corruptions or clerical mistakes, we have an illuminating example of how the readings get indiscriminately distributed, disturbing the relationships established by the stemma codicum, and how the lectio difficilior is gradually effaced.

[113] 1. 218, 27: vyātiṣṭhanta mahaujaśah

The text reading vyātiṣṭhanta, it must be confessed, has not been adopted because it is the reading of S₁ K₁; it is a mere slip. I am thankful to WINTERNITZ for drawing my attention to it. The reading vyātiṣṭhanta should be adopted without doubt.

I may repeat here what I have stated elsewhere that the problem of the Mahābhārata Textual Criticism is a problem sui generis. Here the principles of textual reconstruction, which must be first evolved from a study of the MS. material and the MS. tradition, can be considered as finally settled only after considerable discussion and exchange of ideas on the subject. I would, therefore, repeat my request to Prof. WINTERNITZ, made some years ago, to continue his searching and exhaustive examination of the fascicles or volumes as they come out, and give us the benefit of his ripe experience and valuable opinions and findings. His publications on a subject which has engaged his attention, off and on, for the last forty years cannot but throw some much-needed light on the obscure question of the Mahābhārata Textual Criticism (which has unfortunately not received much attention so far from scholars), and thus advance the cause of Mahābhārata studies.

In conclusion, I must express my grateful thanks to Prof. WINTERNITZ for the very kind and encouraging remarks he has made regarding the work in general as also my keen appreciation of the uniformly courteous tone of his sympathetic and appreciative review.

V. Notes on Mahabharata Commentators *

§ 1. CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES.

A necessary complement to a critical study of the Mahābhārata is an intensive study of the commentaries of the Mahābhārata, of which there is

* [ABORI 17, 185-202].
quite a large number preserved still, mostly in manuscript form. Among the scholiasts who have written commentaries on the Mahābhārata—either on the whole, or only on selected parts of the Great Epic—are: (1) Anantabhaṭṭa, (2) Arjunamiśra, (3) Ānanda, (4) Caturbhujāmiśra, (5) Jagadīśacakravartin, (6) Devabodha, (7) Nilakanṭha, (8) Mahānandapūrṇa, (9) Yajña-Nārāyaṇa, (10) Ratnagarbha, (11) Ṛmakīrṇkara, (12) Rāmakṛṣṇa, (13) Rāmānuja, (14) Lakṣmana, (15) Varada, (16) Vādirāja, (17) Vidyāśāgara, (18) Vimalabodha, (19) Śāmkarācārya, (20) Śrīnivāsa, (21) Sarvajñā-Nārāyaṇa, and (22) Śrīstīdhara. Very little is at present known about these commentators: only very few of them have been, so far, published. The only collective study made of these commentaries is by HOLTZMANN in Das Mahābhārata, Vol. 3, p. 67 ff., and that was in 1897, that is, nearly forty years ago. The material at his disposal was very scanty, and so are his notes.

But the study of these commentaries must be now taken up more seriously, not so much for the sake of the explanations contained in the commentaries—though even the glosses of a commentator like Devabodha are extremely important—as for the readings and pāṭhāntaras recorded in them; because, most of [186] the commentaries are older—some very much older—than our manuscripts; and therefore the documentation of these readings by the commentators takes us back a stage further in our investigation of the history of the epic.

The usefulness of these commentaries is, however, considerably diminished by the fact that we know next to nothing about these commentators themselves. In particular, we lack information about their dates, which are not easy to fix in Indian literature. Even if the dates cannot be determined, it would be a great help if we could fix their relative chronology. An attempt is made in the following pages to fix, to start with, the relative chronology of some of the more important Mahābhārata commentators.

A fixed point in the exegetical literature centering round the Mbh. is furnished by Nilakanṭha, who until lately was considered, at least in India, as the most trustworthy guide for the exposition of the Great Epic, and about whose date there is not much doubt. The available personal data about him has been put together by Wilhelm PRINTZ in the biographical note on Nilakanṭha appended to his Berlin dissertation entitled Bhāṣāwörter in Nilakanṭha's Bhāratabhāvadīpa und in anderem Sanskritkommentaren.1 Nilakanṭha, according to his own statements, was a Mahārāṣṭra Brahmin of the Gautama Gotra, with the surname Caturdhara (modern Chaudhari), eldest son of Govinda Sūri and Phullāmbikā, residing at Kūrpargram (modern Kopargaon) on the Gudāvari. Nilakanṭha wrote his commentary

---

1 Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, Vol. 44, pp. 69-109; see particularly p. 70 ff.
on the Mbh. and on the Gaṇeśagītā (a section of the Gaṇeśapurāṇa) in Benares, in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, the latter (Gaṇeśagītā) being composed in A.D. 1694.\(^1\)

In the beginning of his commentary on the Mbh. Nilakaṇṭha tells us that before writing his commentary, the Bhāratabhāvadīpa, he had compared many (bahun) copies of the Mbh., collect-[187]-ed together from different parts of India (vibhinnadesyōn) in order to ascertain the correct reading (pātham agryam) and also consulted older commentaries.\(^2\) We accordingly find that he frequently mentions variant readings and “additional” passages found in the versions consulted by him, and he cites the explanations given by older scholiasts;\(^3\) information, scanty though it be, of immense interest and value for the history of the received text.

(i) Devabodha and Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa.

In marked contrast to Nilakaṇṭha stands Devabodha, whom I regard as probably the oldest and therefore the most important commentator of the Mbh. He is extremely reticent about himself and his predecessors, but is cited or mentioned by several commentators, who must therefore have lived after him. One of such successors of Devabodha was Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa. Sarvajña’s Bhāratabhāvatākāśa has fortunately been preserved, though it is not definitely known whether his commentary on all the eighteen parvans of the Mbh. is now available. His commentary on the Virāṭa and the Udyoga has already been published by Mahadeva Shastri Bakre.\(^4\) The Bombay Government MSS. Collection (No. 180 of 1891-95) contains a fragment of his commentary on the Ādi, comprising merely the first adhyāya with the beginning of the second; while the Madras Government Collection (No. 2169) contains another fragment which lacks the beginning. In the colophon of the latter MS., Sarvajña is styled paramahamsa-parivarjakācārya; he was therefore a saṃnyāsin.

Now Sarvajña explicitly refers to Devabodha in the beginning of his commentary on the Udyoga:

उयोगे देवबोधय वायुवाचवरीचयः।
पितानु: हानुद्वारस्वरासंज्ञात्माय।॥

\(^1\) He was apparently a protégé of Anūpasirhna, who was a contemporary of Shah Jahan.
\(^2\) The year of composition is given as Samvat 1750. The name of the commentary is Gaṇapatibhāvadīpikā. Cf. the name of his Mbh. commentary, Bhārata-bhāvadīpa; see next note.
\(^3\) ब्राह्मणमहामण्डितज्ञदेवस्यार्नाविकाशिक्षां च पाठमाणम्।
प्राच: रूपमान्तरोद्धारसर्वो नाथमाण्णवीः।॥
\(^4\) Cf. my Adiparvan (Poona 1933), Prolegomena, pp. LXV ff.
\(^5\) The Virāṭaparvan was published in 1915, and the Udyogaparvan in 1920, by the Gujarati Printing Press of Bombay.
\(^6\) Read रिवलव्यासः।
This stanza is curiously enough not found in the commentary of Sarvajña as printed in the Gujarati Press edition of the Udyoga, but occurs in both the MSS. of the work in the Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the Institute), bearing Nos. 33 of A 1879-80 and 168 of 1884-87 respectively. The priority of Devabodha is, however, independently established by another direct reference to Devabodha in the body of the published commentary itself, to which my attention was recently drawn by my friend and colleague Professor Sushil Kumar De of Dacca University, who is editing the Udyoga for the Institute. In Sarvajña’s comment on B. 5. 96. 41 (on p. 327 of the Gujarati Printing Press edition), we find:

\[188\] 

रेखोपाठसः।
कामकौशल्योभमोठी सदसनी तथैव च।
माल्ययांहृती चैव कमादेते उदाहरतः॥

इति। केन्त्रितुः काहुःके दुविष्टिर्... ।

This quotation can unfortunately not be verified; for in the very old Bengal Asiatic Society’s palm-leaf MS. (No. 3399) of the unpublished commentary on the Udyoga by Devabodha the corresponding folio is missing! But there is no reason to doubt its authenticity.

This establishes Devabodha’s priority to Sarvajña. We therefore get

**Series 1: Devabodha—Sarvajña**

Now this Sarvajña-नारायणa must be identical—as has indeed been assumed by JOLLY, BÜHLER, HOLTZMANN, and others—with the Sarvajña-नारायणa (also called नारायणa-सर्वज्ञa) the author of the *Manvarthāvatī* or *Manvarthanibandha*, a *189* well-known commentary on the Manusmṛti, published by V. N. MANDLIK. The assumed identity of the two commentators at present rests, it is true, merely on the identity of the names, but can scarcely be regarded on that account as doubtful. It is hardly conceivable that there were two different Sarvajña-नारायणas, both commentators of well-known works on Dharmaśāstra like the Mahābharata and the Manusmṛti.

The date of Sarvajña has been fixed on the basis of certain quotations.\(^7\)

---

1. This important passage was verified by me in a MS. of Sarvajña’s commentary deposited at the Institute, namely, Bombay Government Collection No. 33 of A 1879-80 (fol. 194v).
BÜHLER cautiously remarks that Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa “cannot have written later than in the last half of the fourteenth century,” but the recent researches of KANE tend to show that Sarvajña flourished between A.D. 1100 and 1300.

(ii) Arjunamīśra.

Both Devabodha and Sarvajña are mentioned and cited several times by the Bengali commentator Arjunamīśra, the manner in which Arjunamīśra refers to Devabodha suggesting that in his time Devabodha’s commentary possessed an established reputation. These references are as follows:

(a) In the foreword to his scholium (Bombay Govt. Coll. No. 30 of A 1879-80 = Da1 of the Critical Edition), Arjuna pays homage to his predecessors, citing by name several of them. Devabodha, he mentions with special reverence, whose commentary (among others) he had carefully studied before writing his own commentary on the Mbh.:

> वेदव्यासेनिधिपरंदेवविविनिरसवेजनारायणशिष्यभविष्यति|<br>श्रीदेवविविनिधिदिव्यतमारवेज़नारायणशिष्यभविष्यति॥

Worth noting is the fact that in the long series of names of Bhāratācāryas cited by Arjuna at the beginning of the above extract, the first four names Vyāsa and Vaiśampāyana, Devabodha [190] and Sarvajña have been recited in the correct order of precedence and chronology, a point to which we shall return in the sequel.

(b) Arjuna mentions the Ācāryas again in the list of his (immediate and remote) “Gurus”, placing this time Devabodha at the head of the list, which ends with the name of his father, who (as we know from other sources) was a well-known reciter (pāṭhaka) of the Mbh.

> श्रीदेवविविनिरसवेजनारायणशिष्यभविष्यति|<br>नारायणवर्मिन्दर्भविष्यति| पिता च गुरुः मनः॥

(c) In the short introduction which prefaces his commentary on the Virāṭa, Arjuna twice mentions Devabodha, once to give expression to the high esteem in which Arjuna holds him and again to record his gratefulness to his illustrious predecessor:

> वेदव्याससुप्रज्ञासर्बविष्याधिकार्यवास्तवः|<br>संभोज्यन्ते भुवन देवविविनि भवामहते॥

... ... ... ... ...

1. BÜHLER, op. cit. p. cxxix.
Finally, while commenting on 1. 143. 34 (a difficult stanza, giving a fanciful derivation of the name Ghaṭotkaca), Arjuna mentions two readings which had both won the approval of Devabodha:

These two readings are *in fact* mentioned by Devabodha: vide fol. 37° of the Baroda MS. of Devabodha’s commentary on the Ādi.

The above extracts taken together indisputably prove that Arjunamiśra was posterior to both Devabodha and Sarvajña-Nārāyana. Adding the name of Arjunamiśra to Series 1, we get

**Series 2: Devabodha—Sarvajña—Arjunamiśra.**

Some faint light on the question of the age of Arjunamiśra is thrown by a dated MS. of Arjuna’s commentary listed by the late M. M. Haraprasada Sāstri in his *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, Second [191] Series, Vol. I (Calcutta 1900), p. 298 (MS. No. 295). The late Mahamahopadhyaya reported that it was a carefully written palm-leaf MS. of Arjuna’s commentary on the Mokṣadharmā, called *Mokṣadharmārthadipikā* written in archaic Bengali characters and belonging, apparently, to Babu Saradaprasanna Ghose of Kelomal, Tamluk. The MS. gave the date of writing as Śaka 1456 (ca. A.D. 1534).²

I may here draw attention to some stanzas added by the copyist, which are to the effect that already at the time when the copy was made, correct MSS. of Arjuna’s commentary were a rarity even in Bengal, the home of the commentator, which can only be explained by assuming, as pointed out already by Mahadeva Shastri BAKRE that there was a considerable interval of time between the two. The stanzas I am referring to are:

```
पितु: सदुपेशेन विद्वेदात्मारोपतः ।
प्राहुनिन्यस्य संहृदोऽहता गतोऽक्षुना मया ॥
अत्याध्येक्तिन्यश्च गद्यं ब्रह्मणस्युपयुक्तः ।
विद्वां हृदया प्राच्यमयो नासमूपे प्रविष्टः ॥
```

The date Śaka 1456 (ca. A. D. 1534) is then the lower limit of the age of Arjuna, but the date of Arjuna, if we rely on the information vouchsafed by the copyist, must be long prior to A. D. 1534.

(iii) Nilakanṭha.

We return to Nilakanṭha, who is the next great Mahābhārata commentator, and who cites or mentions Devabodha, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa and Arjunamiśra, not

---

¹ Read ईवनोपहासदासा संततम्?
indeed in the introduction to his commentary on the Mbh., where he mentions a number of his "Gurus", but elsewhere in the course of his well-known scholium. Here are the references.

(a) While commenting on 1. 158. 14, a stanza with numerous variants, Nilakantha cites an old variant of the entire stanza, mentioning Devabodha in that connection.

न नेहसा: श्रुक्षणो भा न च देववाधरभ; ।
क्वेवर्षा यवहेण्यं किं मां सहुपसंवेष ॥

[192]इति प्राचीन: पाण्डे देववाधवाहिनियःविश्वात्तत्र ।

It is worthy of note that Nilakantha regards the variants as ancient, owing to its having been explained by "Devabodha and others". He must therefore consider Devabodha as an ancient authority.

What Nilakantha regards as ancient is of course a matter for speculation. Nevertheless I do not think that Nilakantha would have used the word praçña in connection with Devabodha unless the interval between them was at least three or four centuries.

In passing it may be mentioned that this reference to Devabodha by Nilakantha is yet another instance of the practice of mentioning names of Acāryas honoris causa (pujārtham), because the reading cited by Nilakantha is probably not that of Devabodha at all, who to judge by the lemmata in his commentary must have had before him a stanza differing from the corresponding stanza of the Critical Edition merely in reading schunāḥ for kunapāḥ of the Critical Edition (1. 158. 14). The third pada of the stanza as cited by Nilakantha is certainly the reading of the T G version, found otherwise only in three conflated N MSS., and in a fourth one written in the margin; while the last pada was found by me only in four MSS. (K, B, M, s.) of my critical apparatus, one of them (B) having as a matter of fact the reading of our text in the margin! It is therefore most improbable that Devabodha had commented on the particular variant version cited by Nilakantha, and it is really doubtful to me whether Nilakantha had at all Devabodha's commentary before him. Devabodha is referred to by Nilakantha merely as one of the ancient Acāryas.

(b) While commenting on B. 7. 82. 2, Nilakantha notices a variant interpretation of madhuparkika given by Devabodha:

मधुपर्किका: मधुपर्क्किकाये पद्ततिति देववध; ।

(c) Nilakantha's reference to Sarvajña will be found in his comment on B. 5. 40. 10 (Gujarati Printing Press ed., p. 131):

[193]विषं लोहितिति सवेभ; । स्वर्णम: शालाग्राम; । दुर्ग्रिषणात्सह: शक्ति इति नारायण; ।

---

1 This passage was already cited by me in the Critical Edition of the Adiparvan, p. 666.
and again in the same adhāya, a few stanzas further on (B. 5. 40. 26), we find:

परिशीतीयायमीने परिस्थतण्ये। एतेनामहत्तेऽपि उपायस्तवतीति नारायणे। परिस्थत्तत्त चित्तत्त। स्वे स्वेयाः आयामेत्तर्थे।

A reference to Sarvajña’s commentary printed in the same work (p. 131 f.) will show that all these explanations do as a matter of fact occur in the commentary of Sarvajña, while they are not met with in any of the three other commentaries printed there.

(d) For Nilaṅkaṇṭha’s mention of Arjunāmiśra, I may draw attention to Nilaṅkaṇṭha’s comment on B. 3. 291. 70, a stanza at the end of the Rāmopākyāna, where he mentions various explanations of the word jārūthya, among them the one given by Arjunāmiśra, whom he mentions by name:

आइणां निम्नतदिवणातिर्थिति अशुद्धमिश्र।

These various extracts establish the posteriority of Nilaṅkaṇṭha to Devabodha, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa and Arjunāmiśra. Adding Nilaṅkaṇṭha to Series 2, we get

Series 3: Devabodha—Sarvajña—
Arjunāmiśra—Nilaṅkaṇṭha.

It will be remembered that as each member of this series of four names clearly cites one or more of his predecessors, this is a chronological sequence whose correctness is absolutely incontrovertible.

(iv) Vimalabodha.

There is moreover a subsidiary series connected with a Mbh. commentator called Vimalabodha, to which we shall now turn our attention.

It will be recalled that in the excerpts given above from the commentary of Arjunāmiśra, the commentator twice mentions Vimalabodha in close proximity to Devabodha. Therefore it is evident that Arjunāmiśra is posterior to Vimalabodha, whose commentary (ṭīkā) variously known as Durghaṭārtha-prakāśinī [194] or Viṣamaśloki has fortunately been preserved. In the introduction to this unpublished commentary, a copy of which is to be found in the Bombay Government Collection (No. 84 of 1869-70), while speaking of his predecessors, Vimalabodha says (fol. 1):

निम्नतदिवणातिर्थिति विशेषत।
वैशालयानारीति देवस्यामातिर्थिति च।
वैस्त्रय व्याख्या बिकित्ततु दुस्रायथाप्रकाशिती।

Again while giving the etymologies of the name of the Sūta, Loma-(or Roma-)harṣaṇa, Vimalabodha observes (fol. 2):

पस्कतां सुनानो अज्ञविस्मयमुग्धितः तदित लोमहर्षेणनामामुद्धिति देववीरायाः।

1 See Holtzmann, op. cit. vol. 3, p. 72.
Undoubtedly the Devasvāmin mentioned in the first excerpt is the same as the Devabodha (who in the colophons of his commentary is styled paramahamsa-parivrājakācārya) in the second. Incidentally it may be pointed out that the etymology of Loma-(or Roma-)harṣaṇa mentioned by Vimalabodha is actually to be found in Devabodha's scholium. In the Baroda MS. (11372) of the unpublished commentary of Devabodha, we read (fol. 3 b, line 1 f.):

पृष्ठाः मुनीदानितिचित्रकार्ट, रोमाधामसिद्धवानिति जैमिन्दनामासमूहः।

which substantially agrees with the excerpt in the commentary of Vimalabodha.

Since Arjunamisra mentions Vimalabodha, and Vimalabodha cites Devabodha, we get a subsidiary series, namely,

Series 4: Devabodha—Vimalabodha—Arjunamisra.

Thus far we have been treading on solid ground and the correctness of Series 1-4 is, as far as I can judge, absolutely unimpeachable.

In trying to combine Series 3 and 4, however, there arises the difficulty that no cross reference has hitherto been found in the works of Vimalabodha on the one hand and Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa on the other. Their relative chronological position is, therefore, a matter for speculation. It is possible, however, to combine the two series tentatively, on the equivocal testimony of Arjunamisra, which we shall proceed to examine more closely.

[195] In one of the lists of the Acāryas cited by Arjunamisra, we have the sequence, Veda-Vyāsa, Vaiśampāyana, Devabodha, Vimalabodha, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa, Saṃdīlya Mādhava. Here the first two pairs, as was pointed out above, have been named in the correct chronological order, the earlier author being placed first, in conformity with the rule governing the sequence of the members of a Dvandva compound (P. 2.2.34 Vā. ). Devabodha is, as we have seen, prior to Vimalabodha as surely as Vyāsa, the reputed author of the Great Epic, is prior to Vaiśampāyana. Further in both lists the father of Arjunamisra is mentioned last. These facts suggest the surmise that the whole series is arranged in the strict chronological sequence. If this surmise be correct, then Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa would be posterior to Vimalabodha, and we get, tentatively, the sequence: Vimalabodha—Sarvajña.

It may, however, be noted that such names are often found arranged on the diametrically opposite principle of uttarottararagatiyasva, i.e., naming the more important persons later, which is however not admissible in the particular instance; or even arranged on no principle at all; or at least on some principle which it is difficult for us to comprehend. In fact a subsequent enumeration of these same Acāryas by the same Arjunamisra is in partial conflict with the earlier list! There the sequence (already given above) is
Devabodha, Vimalabodha, Śaṇḍilya Mādhava, Nārāyaṇa-Sarvajña. Here Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa has been placed after Śaṇḍilya Mādhava, while in the former list he is placed before them! This irregularity apart, the lists tally with each other.

It is not, however, impossible to resolve this contradiction and harmonize the data. There is a notable difference between the two lists. The first one is in prose, the second is an anuṣṭubh stanza. I am disposed to attach more importance to the sequence of the prose enumeration, and to regard the change of sequence in the other as due to the exigencies of metre. The first again is a formal expression of homage (namaskriya), where the principle of priority has been, it seems, rigidly observed; on the other hand, the second is merely a collective metrical list of the author's "Gurus," where the consideration of rank and precedence did [196] not perhaps prevail so much. I may also point out that the first list is in the form of a Dvandva compound, while in the second the persons have been all independently mentioned. If these considerations have any value, then we may postulate, at least tentatively, another series,

**Series 5: Devabodha—Vimalabodha—**

*Sarfajña—Arjuna—Nilakantha,*

where the relative position of Vimalabodha and Sarvajña alone is open to doubt.

Of these five commentators, as was mentioned above, Sarvajña could not have lived later than the latter half of the fourteenth century and flourished probably between A.D. 1100 and 1300; while Arjunamiśra lived some time prior to A.D. 1534.¹ Moreover, if the position assigned in Series 5 to Sarvajña be correct, then both Devabodha and Vimalabodha must have lived long prior to A.D. 1300.²

* * *

§ 2. **What was Devabodha’s Version of the Mahābhārata Like?**

The only commentary of the Mahābhārata completely printed so far is

---

¹ Since the above was written, two efforts have been made to fix the date of Arjunamiśra. Mr. Jagendra Chandra Ghosh (*Indian Culture*, Vol. I, p. 706 ff.), working on the data supplied by certain ancient pedigrees preserved in Bengal, arrives at the date ca. A.D. 1300 for Arjunamiśra; but it may be pointed out that the method of fixing precise dates on the basis of pedigrees alone never gives entirely reliable results. On the other hand, Mr. P. K. Gode of the Bhandarkar Institute (*Indian Culture*, Vol. 2, p. 141 ff.), relying on his identification of the Satya-Khāna, who was a patron of Arjunamiśra (see Sir J. F. Modi *Commemoration Volume*, p. 566), argues for a date between A.D. 1450 and A.D. 1500. There is thus a difference of about 200 years between the two computations. But the matter is still sub judice, and more light on the question may be expected from further investigation of the question which is being carried on by these two scholars.

² See further the Appendix at the end of this paper (below, p. 202).
the Bhāratabhāvadīpa by Nilakaṇṭha. The Gujarati Printing Press of Bombay has done, however, inestimable service to the cause of Mahābhārata studies by publishing other commentaries at least on the Virāṭa and Udyoga, edited by Mahadeva Shastri [197] BAKRE. The Virāṭaparvan Volume (published in 1915) contains, besides (1) the Bhāratabhāvadīpa, the commentaries of (2) Arjunamiśra, (3) Caturbhujā, (4) Vimalabodha, (5) Rāmakṛṣṇa, (6) Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa and (7) Vādirāja, as also a commentary called (8) the Viṣamapadāvivarāya of unknown authorship. The Udyogaparvan Volume (published in 1920) includes, on the other hand, besides (1) the Bhāratabhāvadīpa, the commentaries of (2) Arjunamiśra, (3) Vimalabodha, (4) Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa and (5) Vādirāja. A commentary more important than any of these and one more neglected still is the Jñānadīpika of Devabodha. Until recently nothing was in fact known about Devabodha or his commentary on the Mahābhārata save what is contained in perfunctory notices of Sanskrit MSS., which has been summarized in Holtzmann’s meritorious work Das Mahābhārata (Vol. 3, section 14, para 3, p. 70 f.). A selection of Devabodha’s readings and glosses was for the first time published by me in the critical notes of the Ādiparvan Volume.²

I have shown in the previous section that Devabodha is indubitably earlier than Nilakaṇṭha, Arjunamiśra, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa or even Vimalabodha, and is therefore in all probability the earliest commentator of the Mahābhārata hitherto known. It is therefore needless to add that the commentary is most valuable and its evidence, both positive and negative, of supreme importance for the constitution of the text.

The MS. of the commentary (which is unaccompanied by the epic text) utilized by me for the Ādi belongs to the Baroda Central Library (Sanskrit Section) and was kindly placed at my disposal by Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharya, Director of the Oriental Institute of Baroda, to whom my sincere thanks are due for the kind loan.³ This paper MS. which bears the identification No. 11372, contains the commentary on Ādi only and is written in [198] Devanāgarī characters of about the seventeenth century. The bulk of the MS. is in a fair state of preservation, though in many places the text is extremely corrupt. In our MS. the name of the commentary is given as Jñānadīpika; but, according to Holtzmann (op. cit. Vol. 3, p. 71), it is also known as Mahābhārata-tātparyaṣṭikā or tātparyadīpika. MSS. of this commentary are rare, and no complete copy has yet been found.

¹ Vādirāja’s commentary on the Sabhā has been published by Prof. P. P. Subrahmanya Sastri as an Appendix to his edition of the Sabhā according to the Southern recension (Madras 1932). For Vādirāja’s date see further below (pp. 203-210) the note on the subject by Mr. P. K. Gode.
² See also my Prolegomena, p. lxx.
³ There is another MS. of the commentary in the Asiatic Society of Bengal, which was also consulted by me.
In the colophon the author is described as *paramahamsa-parivrājaka*. He must therefore have belonged to an order of Sarinysāsins. The name of his Guru is given as Satyabodha. This is all the personal data we have at present about Devabodha.

The *jñānadīpikā* is a concise tīkā, that is, a running commentary paraphrasing the difficult words of the epic text and occasionally explaining the gist or purport (*tātparya*) of the original. The extent of the text of the commentary on the Ādi is given at the end of our MS. as 1,400 granthas.

The homage which Arjuna pays to Devabodha in the Introduction to his scholium is by no means a matter of mere form. Arjuna appears to have made a very close study indeed of the scholium of Devabodha, and based his own commentary, on the Ādi at least, largely on that of his predecessor. He has copied very large portions of Devabodha’s commentary, sometimes *verbatim*, sometimes in extracts. Moreover, even when the commentators differ, the influence of Devabodha is plainly discernible. In fact, Arjuna’s *Arthadīpikā* may be considered, as I have remarked elsewhere, as a revised and enlarged edition of Devabodha’s *jñānadīpikā*. Unlike the commentary of Nilakanṭha, that of Devabodha is unaccompanied by the epic text. The question, therefore, naturally arises what was Devabodha’s text like?

When we read the commentary along with any of the old printed editions of the Mahābhārata, like the Calcutta or the Bombay or the Kumbhakonam editions, we are at once struck by the singular disparity between the text and the commentary. Not only does Devabodha’s commentary contain many words or expressions which do not occur at all in the Vulgate, but it also cites, at times, verses or stanzas which read differently in the [199] Vulgate. One also comes across passages and even adhyāyas of the Vulgate on which one expects some comment but which are left wholly uncommented by Devabodha.

The Southern recension may be categorically ignored in our search for the prototype of Devabodha’s commentary, as this commentator does not know even a single one of the many passages peculiar to the Southern recension. He further does not show the typical Southern transposition of the Sakuntalā and Yayāti episodes, nor the characteristic position of the prose genealogical adhyāya (called *pūrvavamānukīrtana*), after the chapter containing the eulogy of the epic (*Bhārataprāṣaṁśa*).

The vulgate (with the Bengali) may likewise be excluded. It agrees with Devabodha’s text up to a certain point; but the divergences, which are numerous, remain inexplicable. There remain then only the Ādāradā and the “K” versions. And with them, the version of Devabodha does, as a matter of fact, show very close affinity.

It is worthy of note that Devabodha has no commentary on any of the

---

1 Adiparvan, Prolegomena, p. LXX.
six adhyāyas of the Vulgate which are completely missing in the Śāradā and the K MSS. and which have also been completely omitted in the Critical Edition of the Ādi. They are the following adhyāyas of the Vulgate: (i) adhy. 22 (duplicate description of the ocean); (ii) adhy. 24 (Aruṇa is appointed charioteer of the Sun, an evident digression and interpolation); (iii) adhy. 116 (birth of Duḥśalā: a fairy tale of questionable authenticity); (iv) adhy. 139 (an absurd chapter describing further exploits of the Pāṇḍavas and containing a reference to Yavana kings); (v) adhy. 140 (Kaṇikanīti); and finally, (vi) adhy. 149 (Pāṇḍavas' crossing the Ganges, a passage of doubtful value).

But on principle, we cannot attach very great importance to such omissions, as a commentator is apt to skip in the Mahābhārata any adhyāya which he thinks too simple to need any comment. This explanation will apply to most of the omissions mentioned above, but will not hold good in the case of the Kaṇikanīti an adhy. of 140 stanzas, which has evoked lengthy comments from both Arjunamiśra and Nilakaṇṭha; we expect some comment on this adhyāya by a commentator like Devabodha.

[200] Much more important from our point of view is an addition characteristic of the Kaśmiṇī version. This version adds at the very end of the Ādi a supplementary (and entirely superfluous) adhyāya, which contains merely a variant version of the well-known Puranic tale of Śvetaki's sacrifice, occurring earlier in the course of this very parvan, and which was known to Kṣemendra. Curiously enough the king who is called Śvetaki in the first version is here called Śvetaketu! That the version of Devabodha contained this interpolated (supplementary) adhyāya is proved by the concluding remark of Devabodha on this adhyāya (fol. 48):

शेतकिरिके शेतकिरिति नाम

This remark, as I have pointed out elsewhere, will not apply to any version which did not have the supplementary adhyāya containing the story of Śvetaketu, which in fact is peculiar to the Śāradā and the K versions. These facts demonstrate that the version of Devabodha agrees with the Śāradā and K versions with respect to both addition and omission of whole adhyāyas.

The conclusion regarding the affinity between the two versions is fortified by many minor agreements in point of shorter passages and even readings of individual stanzas.

For example, Devabodha has no comment on any portion of the Brahma-Gaṇeśa episode (40 stanzas in the Vulgate), which is missing in its entirety only in the Kaśmiṇī and the Bengali versions. Again, for 1. 105. 4-7 of the Critical Edition the Vulgate substitutes a lengthy passage of 56 lines, which is entirely ignored in the commentary of Devabodha, who on the other hand cites 7th (a line not known to the Vulgate), in exact agreement with the
Sāradā and K versions (besides the Southern recension), but in direct opposition to the Bengali and the Devanāgarī versions. In connection with the omission of adhyāya 139-140 of the Vulgate mentioned above, the Sāradā and K versions omit the first 19 stanzas of the following adhyāya (namely, adhyāya 141 of the Vulgate). In conformity with that, the first 19 stanzas of adhyāya 141 are ignored completely in the scholium of Devabodha. It may be noted that the omission of adhyāya 139-140 together with the first 19 stanzas of adhyāya 141 of the Vulgate makes an aggregate and continuous omission of 139 (= 27 + 93 + 19) stanzas of the Vulgate, a not inconsiderable portion of the text. Likewise there is no commentary on nearly 70 stanzas of adhyāya 128 and 129 of the Vulgate, which are omitted only in the Sāradā-K group and the Critical Edition.

This affinity is further borne out by agreements as regards minor readings too numerous to mention.

These considerations make it, in my opinion, perfectly clear that the version of Devabodha is closely allied to the Sāradā and K versions.

Though the Sāradā version and what I have called the "K" version run for the most part parallel to each other, there are in fact minor discrepancies between the MSS. of these versions, which indicate different sources. But as, on the one hand, we have for the Adi a solitary MS. (S.) of the genuine Sāradā (or Kaśmirī) version, and on the other hand we do not know the provenance of the Devanāgarī MSS. which I have denoted by the symbol "K" (on account of their affinity to the version of Kaśmirī), it is at this stage not easy to explain these discrepancies between Sāradā and K. It would be also premature to say whether Devabodha's version was more akin to Sāradā or the K version.

I may, however, draw attention to one instance which suggests to my mind and affinity with K rather than with the Sāradā version. In 1. 68. 72 the text reading is asatyavacanā nāryaḥ (nom. plu.), "women (are) perfidious," a general statement. Only K₁, B₁ (m as in text) have, on the other hand, asatyavacane nārye (voc. sing.), "O thou perfidious (and) dishonourable (woman)!" K₁, K₂ appear to have corrupt forms of the same. The vocative appears to be, therefore, peculiar to the K version, which differs here from the Sāradā, and which latter has the nom. plu. as in all other MSS. Now in agreement with K, Devabodha has anārye = vakre! One instance of an agreement like this is, I will readily admit, wholly inadequate to prove the point. It can only give an indication and may perchance give wrong indication. The question may, therefore, be left over for future investigation.
List of five major Mahābhārata commentators arranged according to the probable chronological sequence, with the names of their commentaries, approximate date, and sundry data about them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Commentator</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Devabodha</td>
<td>Jñānadīpikā, Mbh.—tātparya-tīka, Tātparyadīpikā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarīnyāsin: pupil of Satyabodha, mentioned or cited by Vimala, Arj., Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vimalabodha</td>
<td>Viśamaśloka-tīkā, Durghatārthaprakāśini, Durbodhapadabhaṭṭī</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions Vaiśampāyana's Tīkā and cites Devabodha (once as śvāmin).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sarvajña Narāyaṇa</td>
<td>Bhāratārthaprakāśa</td>
<td>Ante 1300</td>
<td>Mentions Dev. and is cited by Arj. and Nil., as also by a lexicographer Rāyamukuta. (A.D. 1431).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For Arjunamīśra's date, see also Mr. J. C. Ghosh's recent paper in Indian Culture, vol. 2 (1936), p. 585 ff.
*VI. The Bhṛgus and the Bharata: A Text-Historical Study*.

The Bhṛgus are unquestionably an interesting old clan. Tempted by the tantalizing affinity between the Sanskrit name Bhṛgu and the Greek φλέγω in the name of Φλέγως and of the Φλέγγα, A. Weber postulated a genetic connection between the Indian and the Greek names, and even ascribed Indo-germanic antiquity to a certain legend about Bhṛgu Vārṇuṇi preserved in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (11. 6. 1), a legend of which he thought he had discovered a parallel in Greek mythology. The facile phonetic equation put up by Weber has not, however, commended itself to other scholars, and we are not specially concerned with it either. But it cannot be gainsaid that the clan is very ancient and that some of their legends are of hoary antiquity. There are scattered notices about the Bhṛgus to be found from the Vedic Samhitās onwards through the Brāhmaṇa, Aranyaka and Upaniṣad literature up to the Epics and the Purāṇas, steadily growing in volume and importance.

[2] Not only is the clan ancient, its legends also are highly interesting. So suggestive in fact are the early myths of this clan that they had in former years engrossed the attention of many a student of Indian mythology, and called forth a variety of interpretations. Thus, A. Bergagne looked upon the Bhṛgu myth of the Rgveda as merely a more developed form of the early tradition about the descent of fire and identified Bhṛgu with Agni. A. Kuhn and A. Barth agreed in regarding the Bhṛgus as personifications of the lightning flash, and Kuhn tried to harmonize the Greek myth regarding the descent of fire with the Vedic. A. Weber, as already remarked, saw in a legend preserved in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa a relic of primitive Indo-germanic mythology. But even the later legends of these people are not without a
certain amount of grandiosity and ostentation. Just consider the figure of Paraśurāma: a matricide, annihilator of the Kṣatriyas and finally an avalāra of Viṣṇu (the "Preserver") all in one.

The popularity of the Paraśurāma legend in India is attested by the number of places, scattered all over India, which are associated with his name and his exploits and held sacred to his memory.\(^1\) Near the Kangra District\(^2\) of the Punjab there is a very ancient temple dedicated to Paraśurāma, (a name not yet applied to him in our epic), in which is deposited a copper-plate grant recording the gift of a village to a Brahmin studying the A. V. In the State of Udaipur\(^3\) there is a sacred pool called Markundeya where Rāma is said to have bathed and atoned for his sins; likewise in Cape Comorin. In the Bijapur District\(^4\) of the Bombay Presidency, an axe-shaped rock situated on a riverbank marks the spot where Rāma is represented as having washed his famous axe (parāsu), which has given him his nick-name Paraśurāma, Rāma-with-the-Axe; a stone boulder situated in the river bed has preserved Paraśurāma’s foot-prints. Even this irresistible axe of his has been deified, and there is in Mysore State\(^5\) a temple dedicated to it. Gokarn\(^6\) shows a sacred pool dedicated to Mahādeva, which is said to have been built by the son of Jamadagni. Even the Lakhimpur District\(^6\) of distant Assam has a pool to show to which, according to popular belief, Paraśurāma had surrendered his dreaded axe, and which attracts pilgrims from every part of India.

Notwithstanding the absorbing interest of the Bhārgava myths, it is primarily not their interpretation that is attempted here. \(^{[3]}\) That is a task fraught with difficulties and uncertainties, as also one which would call for a range of knowledge and a compose of mind to which the present writer can lay no claim. The modest aim of this paper is to collect and collate the Bhārgava references in the Mahābhārata, in other words, to give a succinct account of all that the Great Epic of India has to say about the Bhārgava. The choice of the source-book is, I think, abundantly justified, because the Mahābhārata, as I believe, is the richest mine for the exploration of the Bhārgava material, a veritable thesaurus of Bhārgava legends, containing as it does the largest number and the greatest variety of such legends. Even this material is naturally not entirely new, having already attracted the attention of scholars, but it seemed to me that it has not been studied with that degree of attention to details which it deserves. It is a trite observation but never-
Nevertheless true that even what appears on the face of it to be a most insignificant detail might yield a valuable clue if looked at from the correct angle, which is often difficult to get.

My intention is to pass under review here all the important myths and legends relating to the different Bhṛgus, which occur in the Mahābhārata, subjecting them to a critical analysis: to study the manner in which they are presented, to investigate their repetitions and even to examine their discrepancies. We shall find that there are many more Bhārgavas mentioned in our epic than commonly known and many more references to Bhārgavas than commonly suspected.

In essence, it must be admitted, this is merely a text-critical study, a subject which, having engaged my attention for a number of years, has acquired considerable fascination for me. But at the end of the paper it is shown that the investigation might at the same time yield results which are not without general value for a partial elucidation of the obscure history of this venerable old text.

The Bhārgava references could have been presented here in many different ways, but it appeared best to take them up for study in the sequence in which they appear in our epic, to examine the material book by book and chapter by chapter. The total number of passages of the Mahābhārata in which the Bhārgavas are mentioned is astonishingly large. Exigencies of space, however, compelled the writer to restrict himself to the discussion of only the more important of the references.

I add here a genealogical table which will enable the reader to follow the legends of the Bhṛgus and the discussions about them with greater ease. The table is made up from the data of the Mahābhārata itself, but it is undoubtedly incomplete; it appears to be very much abridged, lacking many details and intermediate links.

**GENEALOGICAL TREE OF THE BHṚGUS (ABRIDGED)**

Bhṛgu (m. Pulomā)

- Kavi
  - Šukra
    - Devayānī (m. Yayāti)
      - Yadu
      - Turvasu
      - Krishna

- Cyavana (m. Sukanyā & Áruṣī)
  - (by Áruṣī)
    - Aurva
      - Rṣika (m. Satyavatī)
      - Jamadagni (m. Rṣupalī)
    - Pramati (m. Ghṛtācī)
      - Ruru (m. Pramadvarā)
      - Śunaka

- Ramā Jāmadagnya
Strangely enough, already in the second chapter of the Adiparvan, the Parvasamgraha, which is in fact, for the greater part of it, something like a Table of Contents, we make our acquaintance with one of the Bhārgavas, the most famous of them, Rāma Jāmadagnya, a not yet a full-fledged avatāra, a character which in reality has no connection whatsoever with the action of the sublime tragedy which is going to be unfolded in the epic. That comes about in this way. The place where the Mahābhārata war was fought, as everybody knows who knows anything at all about the war, was called Kurukṣetra (Gītā 1. 1):

[5] dharmakṣetre Kurukṣetre samavelā yuyutsavah  
māmakāḥ Pāṇḍavaś caiva......

But the Sūta Ugraśravas, son of Lomaharṣaṇa, who recites the epic at the twelve-year sacrificial session held in the Naimiṣa Forest under the auspices of Saunaka, gives the name of the place as Samantapañcaka and is careful enough to add that he had visited that sacred spot (puruṣaṁ deśam) and was as a matter of fact just returning from it (1. 1. 11 f.)

Samantapañcakaṁ nāma puruṣaṁ dvijaṁśevisvam  
gatavān asmi taṁ deśam yuddhaṁ yatradhavat purā ||
Pāṇḍavānāṁ Kurūnāṁ ca sarvesāṁ ca mahākṣitām  
dīrksur āgatas tasmāt samippam bhavalām iha ||

That obviously needed a little explication. Accordingly we find in the beginning of the second chapter a query about this Samantapañcaka from the sages who formed the audience. They want to know all about this new place of pilgrimage (1. 2. 1):

Samantapañcakaṁ iti yad uktan sūtanandana  
etat sarvanā yathānyāyam śrotum icchāmaḥ vayam ||

And from the story narrated by the Sūta it proves to be a Bhārgava place of pilgrimage, situated probably somewhere in the neighbourhood of or within the limits of Kurukṣetra. It was in fact, as the Sūta proceeds to explain,

---

1 In the Adiparvan, the references are to the Critical Edition of that book published by this Institute (Poona 1933); elsewhere to the Vulgate, the edition used being the Chitrashala edition (Poona 1929-1933). References to the Vulgate are distinguished by prefixing “B.” to them.


3 Cf. Hopkins, Epic Mythology (Grundriss d. indo-ariosen Phil und Altertumskunde III. Bd., I. Heft B), p. 211.

4 In the Salyaparvan it is said that it is a holy place of pilgrimage situated on the Sarasvatī C. 9. 2136.
the sacred spot where the Bhārgava Rāma, the foremost of weapon-bearers (śastraḥbhṛtyām varāḥ 1. 2. 3), after extirpating the warrior race during the interval between the Tretā and the Dvāpara Ages, had made five pools of blood, probably forming a circle (hence obviously Samantapaṇḍakā), and standing in the middle of the pools the terrible man offered the uncanny oblation of congealed blood to his forefathers, until the shades of the departed ancestors appeared before him and pacified him, giving him the boon that those sanguinary pools of his would become holy places of pilgrimage (1. 2. 3 ff.):

Tretādvāparayoh saṁdham Rāmaḥ śastraḥbhṛtyām varāḥ
asaṅkṛ pārthivām kṣātrakāṇ jayhaṁmaṁśapoḍitaḥ  ||  (3)
sa saṁvān kṣātraṁ uśādyā suaviryaṇājalādyutiḥ
Samantapaṇḍakā paṇca cakāra rudhirakrādān  ||  (4)
sa teṣu rudhirāmbhaḥsu kṛdeṣu krodhaṁučchitaḥ
pitṛn samantarpayāṁśa rudhirṇeti nāḥ śrutām  ||  (5)

[6]. A few stanzas later we read that the Kuru-Pāṇḍava war was also fought at this Samantapaṇḍakā (1. 2. 9):

antare caiva saṁprāpte Kali-Dvāparayor abhūt
Samantapaṇḍakake yuddhaṁ Kuru-Pāṇḍavasenayoḥ  ||

Samantapaṇḍakā is thus made out to be only another name of Kurukṣetra: evidently a Bhārgava name.1 The people of India have forgotten this Bhārgava synonym: they remember only Kurukṣetra, a name which has struck deep root in the memory of the people. Even now at every solar eclipse there is held at Kurukṣetra, a mammoth fair, which attracts hundreds of thousands of devout pilgrims,2 hailing from the different corners of India, who reverently visit the spot hallowed by the blood of their beloved kings of yore, those shining examples of knighthood and chivalry, who counting their lives as straw fell fighting, waging a holy war (dharmayuddha), which has made the Kurukṣetra a dharmakṣetra.

In passing, it may be mentioned that this short account of the annihilation of the Kṣatriyas by the Brahmin Rāma Jāmadagnya—a very popular theme, as will be seen later on, with the redactors of our Mahābhārata—has been even amplified in later times by the interpolation of a short dialogue

---

1 Samantapaṇḍakā mentioned in Parvans 1, 3, 6, 7 and 9 only. That the war took place at Samantapaṇḍakā is also mentioned in:

B. 6. 1. 6 : SAMANTAPAṆḌAKĀT bāhyāṁ śibirāṇi sahasraśeṣaḥ
kārayāṁśa vidiḥvat Kuntiputro Yuddhiṣṭhirāṁ  ||

C. 7. 2725 : śvaḥ śṛṣṭyaṁ śiras tasya Saṁdhavasya raṇe hatam
SAMANTAPAṆḌAKĀT bāhyāṁ viśokā bhava mā rudāḥ  ||

C. 9. 3032 : etat Kurukṣetra-Samantapaṇḍakam
Prajāpater uttaravedir ucyate  ||

C. 9.3620-21 : Samantapaṇḍakāte punye triṣu lokeṣu viśrute
ahāṁ midhanam āśīḍya lokān prāpasyaṁ śāsvatān  ||

2 Imperial Gazetteer of India, (1886) vol. 8, p. 374 f,
(of eight lines) between Rāma Jāmadagnya and his Bhārgava ancestors (Adi 71 *; cf. B. 3. 83. 29 ff.) :

\[ Rāma Rāma mahābhāga pritāḥ sma tava Bhārgava | 
   anayā pūtābhaktāyā ca vikramena ca te vibho | 
   varāṁ vṛṣīva bhadram te kim ičchasi mahādyute | 

\[ Rāma uvāca | 
   yadi me pīlaraḥ pritā yady anugrāhyataḥ mayi | 
   yac ca roṣābhībhirtena kṣatram utsāditaiḥ mayū | etc.

This passage, which is an abridged version of a dialogue occurring in the Tīrthayātrāparvan, a sub-section of the Āraṇyakaparvan, is found at this point only in certain Devanāgarī MSS. (including those of the “K” Version), and is missing in the Bengali MSS. as well as in the entire Southern recension, and therefore certainly suspect. We shall have occasion to mention other similar enlargements of Bhārgava anecdotes.

[7] The next reference to the Bhārgava Rāma occurs in adhy, 58 of the Adi. and the theme is the same. The chapter, as a matter of fact, describes the circumstances which led to the incarnation of the gods and goddesses of the Purānic pantheon on this earth of ours. But the account begins with an allusion to the great exploit of the Bhārgava Rāma, his total extirpation of the bad old kings of yore (1. 58, 4) :

\[ triḥsāptakrtyavah prthivām kṛtva nihkṣatriyāṁ purā | 
   Jāmadagnyas tapas tepe Mahendre parvatoitame || (1)

The first line of this stanza is worthy of special note. It occurs, with slight variations, over and over again in our Mahābhārata, its exultant note ringing like a distant echo in the remotest corners and crevices of this huge epos, which was composed by Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana to spread in this world the fame of the high-souled Pāṇḍavas and of other puissant Kṣatriyas (1. 56. 25 f.) :

\[ Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyananedaṁ kṛtaṁ paṇyacakśunā || 
   kūrtīn prathayatā loke Pāṇḍavānāṁ mahātmanāṁ | 
   anyeśāṁ kṣatriyāṇāṁ ca bhūridraviṇaṭejasāṁ ||

When the Bhārgava Rāma, after making a clean sweep of the Kṣatriyas, retired to Mount Mahendra, on the eastern coast of India, to practise austerities, there remained of the warrior caste only the females, and the Kṣatriya race was in imminent danger of becoming totally extinct (Adi, 58). When the earth was thus bereft of Kṣatriya manhood, the Kṣatriya women, casting aside their pride, approached the Brahmins for offspring. With these Kṣatriya women cohabited the Brahmins of rigid vows of those times, in pity for their sad plight. They cohabited with the Kṣatriya women, not from passion, only in season, never out of season. Thus thousands of Kṣatriya women conceived from their intercourse with pious Brahmins. Their children were the virtuous Kṣatriyas, who ushered in again the Golden
Age. Thus sprang up a second Kṣatriya race from the surviving Kṣatriya women, owing to their intercourse with ascetic Brahmins. The new generation, blessed with long life, thrice in virtue. And there were again established the four castes, having Brahmins at their head (1. 58. 8. 10);

\[8\] \textit{evam tad brāhmaṇaṁ kṣaṭriyaṁ kṣaṭriyaṁ su tapasvibhiḥ} \\
\textit{jātam ādyata dharmena sudirgheṇāyusāvītam} \\
\textit{catvāro 'pi tadā vainā bahūvur brāhmaṇottarāḥ}||

\[\ldots\quad \ldots\quad \ldots\quad \ldots\]
\textit{tāḥ prajāḥ prthivipāla dharmavataparāyānāḥ} \\
\textit{ādhibhīr vyādhibhīś caiva vimuktāḥ sarvaśo narāḥ}||

Later the Asuras, defeated by the gods and expelled from heaven, in order to continue their fight for supremacy, took birth in royal families, among animals and elsewhere on this earth, and so again godless kings were born here on the earth. The goddess Earth, oppressed by this vicious and godless creation, lodged a complaint with Brahmā, who, with a view to freeing her from the tyranny of her oppressors, ordains that the various gods and goddesses, \textit{gandharvas} and \textit{apsarases} incarnate themselves, in different forms and shapes, to wage war with the Asuras, and annihilate them.

In this legend, which is here skillfully interwoven with the much lauded exploit of the Bhārgava Rāma, the Brahmin appears in the rôle of the \textit{de facto} Creator of the Later Kṣatriyas. But in a variant version of the same incident, which occurs in the Śānti (adhy. 48-49 of the Vulgate) and which will be discussed in due course, the narrator, Śū-Kṛṣṇa himself, while admitting that there was a general slaughter of the Kṣatriyas, allows that some Kṣatriyas had escaped death at the hands of the Bhārgava Rāma and, after his retirement to the forest, emerged from their places of concealment and resumed sovereignty. But in this prologue to the Ādiparvan, however, Vaiśampāyana, as we have seen is quite certain that the Kṣatriyas were \textit{totally} annihilated by Rāma and the race was \textit{entirely} regenerated by Brahmins.

Another little digression, adhy. 60, which explains the origin and genealogy of the different orders of beings, from the gods downwards, contains also a genealogy of the Bhārgavas, the only Brahmanic genealogy, besides that of the Āṅgirasas\(^1\) (a clan closely connected with the Bhṛgus) considered by the epic bards worthy of inclusion in this chapter.

This confused cosmogonic account (1. 60. 1 ff.) begins with the enumeration of the six mind-born (\textit{mānasa}) sons of Brahmā and the eleven sons of Śaṅku, namely, the eleven Rudras. The six mind-born sons of Brahmā are: Marīci, Āṅgiras, Atri, Pulastya, Pulāha and Kṛatu, which list does not include Bhṛgu.\(^2\) Dakṣa \([9]\) was born from the right thumb (\textit{aṅguśṭha})

\(^1\) Even the Āṅgirasas are shown scant courtesy. Only one generation of the family is mentioned: the sons of Āṅgirasas were Bṛhaspati, Utathya and Sāhvarta; they had a (nameless) sister.

\(^2\) These six “mind-born” sons are mentioned again in 1. 59. 10.
of Brahmā, and Dakṣa's wife from his left thumb. Dakṣa begat fifty daughters on his wife, of whom he gave away thirteen, in a lot, to Kaśyapa, son of Marīci. Kaśyapa's offspring were the gods and the titans. The list of gods and demi-gods closes with the progeny of Kaśyapa (1. 60. 39):

\[
\text{esa devagavyo rājan kirtiṣ te 'nupūrvaśaḥ} | \\
\text{yanyā kirtayītva manuṣaḥ sarvaprāpāh pramucyahe} |
\]

Immediately, after this list of celestials, come Bhṛgu and his descendants (1. 60. 40):

\[
\text{Brahmāya hādayāṁ bhittvā niḥśrto bhagavān Bhṛguḥ} |
\]

The close proximity to the gods is perhaps intended to be an indication of the high position of the Bhṛgus in the Precedence List. The genealogy given here is short and mentions only the well-known descendants of one branch of the Bhārgava clan, the branch made famous by Rāma Jāmadagnya. The pedigree begins with Bhṛgu, who also was a son of Brahmā, being born by piercing his heart (hādaya).

But this ancestry of Bhṛgu is in conflict with another account found in the epic (Anuśāsana 85 of the Vulgate), according to which Bhṛgu was born from the seed of Prajāpati which had fallen in the fire.

The latter account has partial Vedic support, for we read in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (3. 34) that the seed of Prajāpati became divided into three parts, from which were born Āditya, Bhṛgu and Aṅgiras. On the other hand, in the Pañcarāṇa Brāhmaṇa (18. 9. 1), the paternity of Bhṛgu with two others is attributed to Varuṇa. Further in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (11. 6. 1. 1), Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa (1. 42) Taittirīya Upaniṣad (1. 3. 1. 1), Taittirīya Aranyaka (9. 1) also, Bhṛgu is said to be the son of Varuṇa; from Varuṇa, it is said, he obtained the knowledge of Brahma.

There seems to be partial synthesis of some of these divergent versions in the confused Anuśāsana account cited above, according to which, while Mahādeva, in the form of Varuṇa, was performing a sacrifice, Brahmā was presiding and all the gods and the goddesses were present. Seeing that assemblage of celestial damsels of exceeding beauty, desire sprang up in the mind of Brahmā, and he had an emission. As soon as the seed came out, Brahmā took it up with the sacrificial ladle and poured it, like a libation of clarified butter, with the necessary mantras, on the burning fire. Thereupon [10] three beings emerged from the sacrificial fire. One arose from the flames (bhṛk) and hence he was called Bhṛgu; another came out of the burning charcoals (aṅgāra) and hence he passed by the name of Aṅgiras; the third originated from a heap of extinguished coals and was called Kavi. This tradition we find faintly reflected in a stanza (Ādi. 216*), interpolated

---

1 1. 60. 33: Kaśyapasya surāsuvrah.
in most MSS. of the Northern recension after 1. 5. 6:

Bṛṣgro mahārṣir bhagavān Brahmānā vai svayaṁbhuvā
Varunāśya kratā ājītaḥ pāvakād iti naḥ śrūtam

Here we see that the great seer, “Bhagavān” Bṛṣga is said to have been produced by the self-create Lord Brahmā during Varuna’s sacrifice from Fire.

However, to return to the pedigree of the Bṛṣgas given in Adi 60, we find the statement that Bṛṣga had two sons, Kavi (whose son was Śukra) and Cyavana. About both Śukra and Cyavana, we hear a great deal in our Mahābhārata. From Cyavana the short pedigree runs as follows: Cyavana-Aurva-Ṛcika-Jamadagni-Rāma. About Kavi and Ṛcika alone the epic has not very much to narrate, but it is full of the amazing powers and the wonderful exploits of the remaining Bṛḥgavas mentioned here, for whom our epic shows great predilection.

Thus we find, only a few chapters later, the epic relating at great length the well-known story of Yayāti (Yayātyupākhyāna, Adi. 71-80), in which Śukra, the Asura priest, and his haughty and ambitious daughter Devayāṇī play a prominent rôle, and which probably contains a solid substratum of historic truth. Between Yayāti and the Pāṇḍavas there intervene, according to the computation of Pargiter, nearly ninety generations. And thus although the connection of this episode with the main epic story is of most slender character, it possesses considerable Bṛḥgava interest, which is probably the main reason why it has been excerpted here from some Purānic source.1 The story of Yayāti is introduced in the epic in the following manner.

In adhy. 70, Vaiṣarṇpāyana briefly sketches the early history of the Lunar Dynasty, incidentally mentioning Yayāti and his five sons. Janamejaya is not satisfied with this sketchy account and requests Vaiṣarṇpāyana to relate in detail the story of Yayāti, a remote ancestor of the Pāṇḍavas, “tenth in descent from Prajāpati” (daśamo yāḥ Prajāpatieḥ 1. 71. 1). The story of Yayāti is as follows.

[11] Bṛhaspati, son of Aṅgiras, was the preceptor of the Devas, the Bṛḥgava Śukra (Kāvyā Uśanas) that of the Asuras. Śukra, a powerful sorcerer, like all the other Bṛḥgavas, had the knowledge of the secret of reviving the dead (sahjīvānī vidyā); not so Bṛhaspati. The Devas were therefore handicapped in their wars with the Asuras. So at the instance of the Devas Bṛhaspati’s son Kaca goes to Śukra, who was then the priest sorcerer of the Asura king Viṣaparvan and lives with him as his disciple in order to obtain from him a knowledge of the art of reviving the dead. Śukra’s beautiful daughter Devayāṇī falls headlong in love with Kaca, son of Bṛhaspati, and boldly proposes marriage, an honour which Kaca politely but firmly declines. Subsequently one day when Devayāṇī and Śarmiṣṭhā,  

1 It recurs almost verbatim in the Matsya Purāṇa (adhy. 25-42).
the daughter of the Asura Vyśaparvan, are having a bath in a neighbouring river. Indra tossed their clothes about, which had been left by the girls on the river bank, so that Sarmiśṭhā by mistake took up the dress of Devayānī. There ensues a hefty quarrel between the girls, and Sarmiśṭhā throws her rival into a dry well overgrown with grass. And there she remains until she is seen and pulled out of the well by the gallant king Yayāti, whom she promptly woos and who with the approval of her father, Sukra, marries her. Previously, as a recompense for her overbearing conduct towards Devayānī, Sarmiśṭhā, the Asura princess, had become Devayānī's slave. She now accompanies Devayānī to the capital of Yayāti and the three people live in happiness together for some time. Yayāti has been warned beforehand by the Asura priest Sukra that he must on no account call Sarmiśṭhā on to his bed: she was only a slave-girl belonging to Devayānī's entourage. But Sarmiśṭhā prevails upon the soft-hearted and indulgent Yayāti, by dint of importunity and feminine logic to act so that her menstrual period will not be wasted, "for the husband of one's friend is as good as one's own husband". Yayāti moved by her importunities admits the logic of Sarmiśṭhā's requisition and begets on her secretly three sons, while Devayānī has only two. Devayānī learns the truth of the whole affair one day by accident, and goes in a huff to her father, complaining bitterly of the perfidy of her husband. The enraged Asura priest Sukra curses Yayāti that he would instantly suffer the effects of premature decrepitude, and so it happens. Sukra relents, however, and adds that, as Yayāti had acted from pure motives he might transfer his premature old age at will to any one who is willing to take it on in his stead. Accordingly Yayāti exchanged his decrepitude for the youth of his youngest son, [12] Pūru son of the Asura princess Sarmiśṭhā, who was the only one of his five sons willing to take on his old age and to whom he subsequently handed over his vast kingdom as a reward for his filial affection.

In this version of the Yayāti legend, the Bhārgavi Devayānī has it all her own way and poor Sarmiśṭhā, the Asura princess has been thrust in the background except in the finale, which raises Sarmiśṭhā's youngest son to the throne and the tables are turned on Devayānī, the daughter of the Asura priest, Sukra. In spite of the Yayātyupākhyaṇa, Indian tradition honours Sarmiśṭhā as the pattern of a wife most honoured by her husband; for in Kālidāsa's famous drama, when Kāśyapa gives his parting blessing to his beloved daughter, Śakuntalā, he could think of no better boon than to wish that she might be like Sarmiśṭhā:

Yayātei iva Sarmiśṭhā bhartur bahumatā bhava|
“Be thou highly honoured of thy husband, as was Sarmiśṭhā of Yayāti!”

The extermination of the Kṣatriyas by the Bhārgava Rāma and the subsequent regeneration of the Kṣatriya race by pious Brahmins find a
mention already for the third time in adhy. 98 of the Ādi: this time in the course of a conversation between Bhīṣma and Satyavatī. The continuance of the royal family of Kūrus was sorely jeopardized by the untimely death of both the sons of Śāntanu, Citrāṅgada and Vicitrāvīrya. Satyavatī asks Bhīṣma to marry the young and beautiful widows of his half-brother Vicitrāvīrya and beget children on them for the continuation of the race of the Kūrus, a proposal which Bhīṣma firmly rejects as that would mean a deliberate breaking of his vow of celibacy. He proposes instead that a Brahmīn be called to officiate (niyoga) and do the job. He cites a precedent for this āpaddharma. It is no other than the story of the Bhārgava Rāma and its sequel. To avenge the death of his father, Bhīṣma relates, the Bhārgava Rāma slew Arjuna, the son of Kṛtavīrya, king of the Haihayas. Then he set out on his war chariot to conquer the world. And taking up his bow, he hurled his mighty magical missiles (astra) and exterminated the Kṣatriyas more than once. In days of yore this illustrious descendant of Bhṛgu annihilated the Kṣatriyas thrice seven times (1. 98. 3):

\[\text{trīhsaptātṛivah pṛthivā kṛtā nihkṣatriyā purā} \] (II)

Then from a high sense of duty, the virtuous Brahmīns of the [13] day, skilled in the Vedas, co-habited with the widows of the Kṣatriyas massacred by the Bhārgava Rāma and begat on them offsprings and thus revived the almost extinct race of the Kṣatriyas. Satyavatī should unhesitatingly follow this excellent precedent and arrange for the revival of the dying race of the Kūrus.

So far we have come across only legends of the past achievements of the Bhārgavas. The first reference to a direct contact between a Bhārgava and one of the epic characters occurs in adhy. 121 of the Ādi. In this pseudo-historical epic, the myth may not be properly regarded as concerned with events in time. Therefore the Bhārgava Rāma, who only a few chapters previously is said to have lived in the interval between the Tretā and the Dvāpara Ages is here represented as the teacher (guru) of Ācārya Drona, who lived in the interval between the Dvāpara and the Kali Ages. The pupilship is only symbolical, but the basis of the symbolism is significant. Ācārya Drona is the guru of the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍyas and of all the other valiant Kṣatriyas of the time, and he was also one of the greatest warriors on the side of the Kauravas in the Bhārata War. But Ācārya Drona must also have a guru. And who would be more suitable as guru than the Bhārgava Rāma, who is the foremost of all weapon-bearers (sarvaśastrabhṛtāṁ varāḥ)?

Once the symbol has been accepted, it is treated as real, and the myth is worked out in great detail. Thus we are told that when Drona had finished his studies and taken up the duties of a house-holder, he began to feel the pinch of poverty. He then happened to hear that the Bhārgava Rāma was bestowing wealth on Brahmīns. No inconsistency or anachronism is felt, be-
cause Rāma is assumed to be “ever-living” (citrayin). So Drona presented himself before the great Bhārgava, who was about to start for the forest, and asked for some wealth for himself. Rāma ruefully confessed to him that whatever wealth he at one time possessed he had freely presented to the Brahmans; he had even presented the earth to Kaśyapa, his sacrificing priest. And now he had nothing left except his mortal body and his weapons and magical missiles (astras). He asked Drona to choose what he wanted. Drona of course chose the famous missiles with which Rāma had conquered the whole earth. Rāma accordingly gave all his [14] weapons to Drona, instructing him at the same time fully in the science of arms.

This story of Drona and Rāma was apparently popular, for we find it repeated in an abridged form in adhy. 154, it being related there to the Pāṇḍavas by a Brahmin, who was urging them to proceed to the capital of Draupada to attend the svayamvara of Draupadi.

We learn another fragment of Bhārgava history from adhy. 169 to 172 of the Ādi, the Āurvopakhyāna, which is, as a matter of fact, a digression within a digression.

While the Pāṇḍava brothers were proceeding by slow stages to the capital of king Drupada to attend Draupadi’s svayamvara, they are opposed on the way by Citraratha Āṅgārapāma, king of the Gandharvas, whom Arjuna after a brief fight overcomes. Citraratha and Arjuna soon become close friends. This sudden friendship gives the necessary opportunity to the skilful raconteur to smuggle in some stories. Citraratha, as a matter of fact, relates to Arjuna a number of interesting but flimsily motivated anecdotes, which are a pure and unadulterated digression, among them the well-known story of Vasiṣṭha. It is related how Viśvāmitra, king of Kanyakubja, tried to seize Vasiṣṭha’s sacred cow (kāmadhenu) and, failing, turned ascetic and in the end became a Brahmin; how king Kalmāṣapāda Saudāsa was cursed by Vasiṣṭha’s son Śakti (or Śaktri) to become a cannibal and how he began his career as a cannibal by devouring Vasiṣṭha’s own sons including Śakti; how Vasiṣṭha subsequently freed the king from the effects of the curse. Then finally to dissuade his enraged grand son Parāśara, son of Śakti, from destroying the whole creation in his frenzy, Vasiṣṭha relates to him the story of the Bhārgava Āurv. It will thus be seen that the Bhārgava legend is emboxed within the Vasiṣṭha legend, which is itself an episode of the Caitraratha section. This story of Āurv is as follows.

Once upon a time there was a king by name Kṛtavīrya of the Haihyas, whose family priests were the Bhṛgus. On them he bestowed great wealth. After his death the princes of his family, for some reason or other, demanded it back. The Bhṛgus came out with some of it, but not all. It then happened that one of the Kṣatriyas, accidentally digging the ground in the settlement of the Bhṛgus, came upon a large store of wealth buried under [15] ground. Enraged at what they naturally considered deceitful conduct
on the part of the Bhrgus, the Ksatriyas used violence to the Bhrgus, and slew them all indiscriminately. The Ksatriyas even hunted down the women of the Bhrgus, and with a view to exterminating the race killed all those that were pregnant. Pursued by the Ksatriyas, some of the Bhrgu women took shelter in the inaccessible fastnesses of the Himalayas. One of these women, in order to perpetuate the race of the Bhrgavas, had concealed her embryo in her thigh. The Ksatriyas, when they came to know of it, pursued her with the intention of decimating her embryo; when, lo and behold, the child was born from his mother's thigh, blinding the Haihayas with his Lustre. Bereft of sight, they roamed about in the forest, and, meekly approaching the faultless Brahmin lady, prostrated themselves before her, begging that their eyesight might be restored. "My good sirs", said the Brahmin lady, "I have not robbed you of your eyesight, nor am I angry with you. But this scion of the Bhrgus seems certainly to be angry with you. Your eyesight has no doubt been destroyed by this high-souled Bhrgava, whose wrath has been kindled by the massacre of his kinsmen. When you took to destroying even the embryos of the Bhrgu race, the child was held by me concealed in my thigh for one hundred years. That he may do good to the Bhrgu race, the entire Veda with its six anigs revealed itself to him when he was still in the womb. Being enraged at the slaughter of his kinsmen, he desires to kill you. It is by his divine effulgence that your eyesight has been destroyed, Pray therefore, my good sirs, to this excellent son of mine, born of my thigh (āru) ; and pacified by your humbly prostrating yourself before him, he may restore your eyesight". Thereupon all those Ksatriyas on their bended knees said to that high-born child, "Forgive us", and the high-born child forgave them. But that descendant of the Bhrgava race did not forget that outrage and resolved in his mind upon destroying this wicked world. With that object in view he started performing the most severe austerities. By the intensity of his austerities he afflicted all the worlds. On learning what Aurva was doing to avenge the wrong done to them by the Ksatriyas, the shades of his ancestors came to him and addressed his as follows: [16] "O Aurva, O child, the prowess of thy fierce austerities has been seen by us. Control thy anger and forgive the people." . They explain to him that the Ksatriyas were really not to blame for the slaughter of the Bhrgus! How could those puny Ksatriyas ever hope to kill the Bhrgavas? That contretemps was a little contrivance of the Bhrgavas themselves. The fact was that the Bhrgavas were tired of their lives and longed to die, but death dared not touch them, those sinless effulgent specimens of humanity, and suicide was a cowardly act and a sin. They had therefore staged that little quarrel with those foolish and arrogant Ksatriyas, so that the Ksatriyas might get en-

1 According to C. 1.2610 her name was Āruṣī :

Āruṣī tu Manoh kanyā tasya patni maniṣīnah ||
Aurvās tasyaṁ samabhavād Urum bhīttvā mahāyaśaḥ ||
raged and kill them, as they did. Of what use could wealth be to those emancipated souls, whose sole desire was to obtain heaven? Aurva replies that they may be all true, but he had made a vow to destroy the world in order to calm his own anger and he must destroy it, or else he would be destroyed himself by the fire of his uncontrollable wrath. And so the world was in imminent danger of being totally destroyed! But the ancestors of Aurva show him a way out of the dilemma. They wisely advise him to fling the fire of his wrath in the waters, which are the primeval source and support of the world, and Aurva does so. And now, in the shape of horse’s head (hayaśiras), his wrath dwells in the ocean, consuming its waters, which are the world (lokā hy āpomayāḥ smṛtāḥ. 1. 171. 19).

In the above legend we may notice some of the repeated motives of Bhārgava stories. There is first of all the feud with the Kṣatriyas, which finally develops into the creation of the figure of the Bhārgava Rāma, “the foremost of all weapon-bearers,” who single-handed, with the aid of his magical weapons, the astras, conquers the whole earth, annihilating the Kṣatriyas thrice seven times. Then there is the motif of the opportune birth of a miraculous child, whose effulgent lustre either blinds the oppressor (as here) or consumes him (as in the case of Cyavana). There is, lastly, the appearance of the shades of the ancestors, who step in to stop the carnage either contemplated (as here) or actually perpetrated (as in the case of Rāma), to avenge some private wrong done with reference to the family.

[17] Sabhāparvan

The short Sabhā, which is a compact little book with 81 chapters and about 2700 stanzas (in the Vulgate), begins with the Erection of the Darbar Hall and ends with the Second Gambling Match. Here the story marches forward by rapid strides, consisting as it does mainly of spirited dialogue and dramatic action. The digressions are few and far between, and of upākhyānas as such there are none. The real important digressions, which occur early in the beginning, are two: firstly, the somewhat lengthy and imaginative descriptions (ākhyānas) by Nārada of the halls of the celestials Indra, Yama, Varuṇa, Kubera, and Brahmā, preceded by a short Niti tractate (adhy. 5-12); and, secondly, the previous history of Jarāsārandha, narrated by Kṛṣṇa (adhy. 17-19). Consequently, in this parvan, the Bhārgava material is extremely scanty.

The Bhārgavas are nevertheless briefly mentioned several times. Thus, naturally, many of the Bhārgavas, to wit, Bhrigu, Mārkaṇḍeya, Rāma, Jāmadagnya, are several times mentioned as being present, along with other famous sages and seers of the past, in the halls of the celestials mentioned above, as also as a matter of course in the newly erected hall of Yudhiṣṭhira. In adhy. 8, Rāma has been placed by mistake among the royal sages (ṛājārṣis). They are likewise present at the coronation of Yudhiṣṭhira. These
static figures are like mural decorations, and of no special interest to us. We shall therefore ignore them.

Rāma's extermination of the Kṣatriyas, which is really never quite forgotten by our bards, is mentioned in adhy. 14. Kṛṣṇa prefaced his long reply to Yudhīṣṭhira regarding the prerequisites of the Rājasūya sacrifice by pointing out, quite irrelevantly, that the contemporary Kṣatriyas were far inferior to that old race of Kṣatriyas that was exterminated by the Bhārgava Rāma (B. 2. 14. 2):

Jāmadagnyena Rāmeṇa kṣatraṁ yat avaśesitam |
tasmād avarājanīḥ loke yad idam kṣatrasaṃjñānīṁ ||

It was mentioned above that the high esteem in which our epic bards held Rāma Jāmadagnya had led to his being represented as the teacher of Ācārya Drona in the science of arms. The same ideology is responsible for the sedulously fostered belief that Rāma was the teacher of Bhīṣma also, an idea which is taken hold of [18] and further developed in that late addition to the Udyoga, the Ambā episode (Ambopākhyāna). Rāma is represented as standing in the same relation to Karna, the protégé and ally of Duryodhana. So, in his denunciation of Kṛṣṇa, Śisupāla mentions Karna's pupilship under Rāma as one of Karna's qualifications entitling him to receive the argha (B. 2, 37. 15 f.):

ayam ca sarvarājñān vai balāśāgha mahābalaḥ |
Jāmadagnyasya devitāṁ sīṣya viprasya Bhārala ||
Yenaṁ mañcata aśritya rājāno yuddhi nirjītāḥ |
tam ca Kārmam atikramya katham Kṛṣṇas tuvāyārcitah ||

ĀranyakaParvan

This book is a veritable thesaurus of ancient Brahmanic myths and legends. We accordingly find that a fair amount of Bhārgava material has been incorporated in it. We further find that one Bhārgava takes a considerable share in the story-telling that is done here.

The first important deference to the Bhṛgus is in the Tīrthayātṛā section. The list of tīrthas given in adhy. 82 ff (of the Vulgate) is said to have been first communicated by the sage Pulastya to Bhīṣma and then repeated by Nārada to Yudhīṣṭhira. It is in reality a material compendium of tīrthas, which gives, in the space of a stanza or two, the necessary details about the particular tīrtha: the name of the tīrtha, the ritual acts to be done there, and finally the merit (puṣya) accruing from these acts. Thus, for example, we read (B. 3, 83. 13 ff.):

“O king, going to Sālākinī and bathing in the Daśāśvamedha, the pilgrim obtains the merit of performing 10 aśvamedha sacrifices.—Then going to Sarpadevi, that excellent tīrtha of the Nāgas, one obtains the merit of performing 1 agnistoma sacrifice and goes to the world of the Nāgas.—One should then proceed, O virtuous man, to (the shrine of) Tarantuka, the gatekeeper. Staying there only for one night, one obtains the merit of giving
away 1000 kine.—Then going to the Pañcanada, with regulated diet and subdued soul, and bathing in the Koṭiṭhā, one obtains the merit of performing 1 aśvamedha sacrifice. Going to the tīrtha of the Aśvins, a man is born handsome (in a future birth, of course).—One should then go, O virtuous man, to the excellent [19] tīrtha called Vārāha, where Viṣṇu in times of yore appeared in the form of a boar. Bathing there, O foremost of men, one obtains the merit of performing 1 aṅgirāṣṭoma sacrifice.—O king of kings, one should then visit Somaṇātha, situated in Jayanti. Bathing in it, one obtains the merit of performing 1 rājasūya sacrifice.—Bathing in Ekaharīsa, one obtains the merit of giving away 1000 kine.—O ruler of men, going to the Kṛtaauca, the pilgrim becomes purified, and obtains the merit of performing 1 pūndarīka sacrifice.—Then going to Muṇjavata, the place sacred to Sthānu, and fasting for one night, one acquires the position of gāṇapatiya".—And so on and so forth.

Only very rarely is this dreary enumeration interrupted by a brief account of some myth or legend connected with the place of pilgrimage in question. Now we find embedded in this list the legend connected with the Rāmahradas (B. 3. 83. 26 ff.), which appears to have considerably roused the interest of the compiler and to which he has devoted not less than 32 lines. The story is of course no other than that of the extirpation of the Kṣatriya race by the Bhārgava Rāma, of which this is already the fourth repetition in some form or other. The story is as follows.

The greatly effulgent and heroic Rāma, after exterminating the Kṣatriyas with great valour, formed five lakes filled with the blood of the slaughtered warriors. And he offered that blood as oblation to his forefathers, who were most gratified by this supreme act of filial piety. The shades of these ancestors appeared before him and addressed him as follows: "O Rāma, O Rāma, O fortunate one! We are pleased, O Bhārgava, with thy filial piety and with thy great valour. Ask for a boon, O greatly effulgent one. What dost thou wish to have?" Having been thus addressed by his ancestors, Rāma, that foremost of smitters (Rāmāḥ praharatāṁ varāḥ B. 3. 83, 31), thus spoke with joined hands to his ancestors: "If you are pleased with me and if I have deserved your favour then by your grace I desire that I may again derive pleasure in asceticism. By your power, may I be freed from the sin I have incurred by killing these Kṣatriyas in a fit of wrath. Also may these sanguinary lakes become holy places of pilgrimage celebrated throughout the world." Hearing these righteous words of Rāma, his ancestors were highly pleased, [20] and filled with joy they thus replied to Rāma: "Let thy austerities prosper, especially by virtue of thy filial piety. Forsooth thou hast exterminated the Kṣatriyas in a fit of wrath, but thou art already freed from that sin, for they have fallen owing to their own misdeeds. These lakes of thine shall without doubt become places of pilgrimage. He who will bathe in these lakes and offer here oblations to his ancestors will
please his manes and they will gratify all his heart’s desire, and lead him to the eternal celestial regions”. Having granted these boons to Rāma and affectionately taken leave of him, the shades became invisible. It was thus that the bloody lakes of that illustrious descendant of Bṛghu become sacred places of pilgrimage.—Leading the life of a student of the sacred lore and observing sacred vows, if a person bathes in the Lakes of Rāma (Rāmahrada) and worships Rāma, he will obtain much gold.

The reader will easily recognize this as the story which was briefly related already in connection with Samantapañcaka. In fact Rāmahrada appears to be only another name of Samantapañcaka, one of the tīrthas explicitly mentioned as having been visited by the Sūta (that is, the putative narrator of the Mahābhārata), before he came to Saunaka’s sacrifice. It will be recalled that some information was asked then about Samantapañcaka in adhy. 2 of the Ādi, and in that connection this story was briefly narrated by the Sūta to the sages of the Naimiṣa Forest. There the story was originally summarized in four stanzas, but some subsequent reviser, apparently not satisfied with such a cursory allusion to this epoch-making feat of Rāma, had interpolated at that place the dialogue between Rāma and his ancestors (compressed into eight lines) made up mostly of bits and pieces of verses borrowed from the present context, and like all interpolations proving itself to be somewhat of a bad fit.

A few chapters later, we have a strange story of a conflict between two different avatāras of the same god, Viṣṇu, between the Jāmadagnya Rāma and the Dāsarathi Rāma, told in connection with Bṛghutīrtha, “celebrated in the three worlds, which Yudhiṣṭhira and his party are said to have visited (B. 3. 99. 34 ff). Once upon a time, the story goes, Rāma Jāmadagnya went to Ayodhya to meet Rāma Dāsarathi and to test his strength. [21] Rāma D. was sent by his father to the boundary of his kingdom to receive Rāma J. hospitably, but was flagrantly insulted by the latter. Rāma D. nevertheless bends the bow given to him by Rāma J. to test his strength and shoots an arrow which convulses the whole world, astounding Rāma J. Rāma D. further confounds Rāma J. completely by showing him his cosmic form (viśvarūpa), made popular by the Gītā (adhy. 11), and rebukes him for his overweening conduct. Abashed, Rāma J. returns to Mount Mahendra, having lost his lustre (tejas), which he regains later at some tīrtha or other. Yudhiṣṭhira is asked to bathe in the same tīrtha that he might regain the lustre he had lost in his conflict with Duryodhana.

This grotesque story, composed probably with the object of glorifying the Kṣatriya Rāma at the cost of the Brahmin Rāma, must be quite a modern interpolation, in the Mahābhārata. Contextually it is an obvious misfit, being incongruously wedged in between two halves of the Agastya legend, with which it has absolutely no connection. Not only is this bizarre story contextually a misfit, it is a very poor piece of composition, and it strikes
moreover a discordant note, involving disrespect towards the Bhārgava Rāma, who in our epic is otherwise throughout held up for our admirations as the foremost of weapon-bearers and fighters. Fortunately we are not left to deduce the spuriousness of this passage merely from intrinsic arguments, which are apt to be discredited; for, the passage is missing entirely in the Southern recension, an omission supported by the Kaśmīrī version and even by some ancient Devanāgarī MSS. The story, which is narrated at some length in the Rāmāyaṇa, is not even alluded to in the Rāmopākhyaṇa of our epic and belongs evidently to a different complex of legends, quite inharmonious with the Mahābhārata context. It appears to have been smuggled into the capacious folds of the Āranyakaparvan in quite recent times by some well-meaning but ignorant Northern interpolater anxious to vindicate the claim of the epic to be a complete encyclopaedia of the Hindu legendary lore.  

But the next chapter (100) again contains a Bhārgava story, the legend of Dadhīca. Lomaṇa relates how the Kālakeyas under the leadership of Vṛtra persecuted the celestials, who betook them-[22]-selves to Brahmā asking for his protection. The latter advises them to go to the (Bhārgava) Dadhīca and ask for his bones. The sage magnanimously gives up his body for the good of the three worlds. The celestials took the bones of Dadhīca to Viśvakarman, the architect of the gods, who fashioned out of his bones the thunderbolt, with which Indra vanquished the enemies of the gods. The story is repeated in the account of the pilgrimage of Baladeva (Śalya 51 in the Vulgate), where it is said of Dadhīca that he was the strongest of all creatures, tall as the Himalayas and that Indra was always mightily afraid of him on account of his lustre.

Yet again, a few chapters later, the arrival of Yudhiṣṭhira and his party at Mount Mahendra, the headquarters of Rāma, now a saṁnyāsin, affords a welcome opportunity to the bard for the presentation of a full-length portrait of the hero of the Bhārgavas, Rāma, son of Jamadagni (Āranyaka 115-117 in the Vulgate).

The Pāṇḍavas bathe at the mouth of the Ganges and proceed to the river Vaitaraṇī in Kaliṅga, where the altar of Kaśyapa is. They rest on Mount Mahendra and hear there from Akṛtavrata, a disciple of the Bhārgava Rāma, the well-known story of Rāma, which may be summarized as follows.

Gādhi, king of Kanyakubja, had retired to the forest to practise religious austerities. There a most beautiful daughter was born to him, Satyavatī, whom the Bhārgava Reśika wooed. Gādhi perhaps did not relish his suit and tried to evade it by demanding a present of a thousand peculiarly coloured horses, but Reśika supplied them and gained her. Then a Bhṛgu (perhaps Auruva is meant), who was a great sorcerer, visits the newly married couple and gives his young

1 *Yad ihāsti tad anyatra yam nehāsti na tat kvacit.*
daughter-in-law the boon that she would give birth to a gifted son, and so would her mother. To fortify the boon, he prescribes that she should embrace an udumbara tree, her mother an āswattha, and both should partake of different dishes of some special cara prepared by him with powerful incantations and endowed with magical potency. These good ladies go and exchange the trees as well as the dishes of cara which were apportioned to them by the great sage, with the result that the daughter was about to give birth to a Brahmin son with Kṣatriya qualities and the mother a Kṣatriya son with [23] Brahmanic qualities. But the Bhrigu, who comes to know of this interchange by occult means, comes rushing to the hermitage and tells his daughter-in-law what was going to happen. Moved by her entreaties, he gives a further boon to the young woman who had really been deceived by her mother, postponing the action of the potent charm. Thus her son Jamadagni was saved from the taint of Kṣatriyahood, which ultimately fell upon her grandson Rāma, who turned out to be, as prophesied, a revengeful and bloodthirsty warrior, perpetrator of cruel and sanguinary deeds. Jamadagni, though a peaceful Brahmin who excelled in the study of the Vedas, as desired by his mother, was not without martial equipment, for “the entire science of arms with the four kinds of magical missiles spontaneously came to him, who rivalled the sun in lustre, without any instruction from anybody” (B. 3, 115. 45). Jamadagni married Rṣākā, daughter of king Prasena-jit. She gave birth to five sons: Rūmanat, Susēna, Vasu, Viśvāvasu, and last but not least Rāma. The family lived happily for some time. Then one day when Rṣākā of rigid vows happened to see Citraratha, the handsome king of Mārtittelavata, sporting in water with his numerous wives, her fortitude forsook her and she felt the pangs of desire. When she returned to the hermitage, Jamadagni noticed her pollution and guessed her secret. In a fit of rage he called in turn upon each of his sons to kill their unchaste mother. Four of them refused to do the atrocious deed and were cursed by the angry and disappointed father for their disobedience. Then came the last of all that “slayer of hostile heroes,” Rāma Jāmadagnya. A military type, accustomed to receive and obey orders, Rāma, when sternly commanded by his father to slay his mother, took his axe and without hesitation chopped off his mother’s head! Jamadagni, mightily pleased with the instant obedience of his son, granted Rāma several boons, among them the boon that the mother whom Rāma had decapitated might be restored to life. And the family lived again happily for some time. Then one day Arjuna Kārtavirya Sahasrabhū came to the hermitage and was hospitably received by the Bhrārgavas. The ungrateful king, intoxicated with the pride of power, not heeding the hospitality, seized and carried off by force from the hermitage the calf of the sacred cow of the sage (a variant of the kāmadhenu motif of the Vasiṣṭha-[24]-Viśvāmitra legend), and spitefully broke the big tree in the hermitage grounds. This was the beginning of a terrible feud. Rāma
first slew the arrogant Arjuna Kārtavīrya, and Arjuna’s sons then slew the unresisting Jamadagni. Then Rāma slaughtered the sons of Arjuna K. and finally destroyed all Kṣatriyas off the earth thrice seven times and made five pools of blood in Samantapañcaka (B. 3. 117. 9):

\[ trihapsiktatvāḥ prthivīṁ kṛtvā nihkṣatriyāṁ prabhuh | \\
Samantapañcaka pañca cakāra rudhirahradāṁ || (III) \\
\]

Standing in the middle of these pools of blood—as has already been narrated several times above—Rāma offered oblations to the manes until at last his ancestor Rīc̄ka appeared and stopped him. Rāma then performed a great sacrifice to gratify Indra, in which he bestowed the earth upon Kaśyapa, his priest. Then this annihilator of the Kṣatriya race was at last satisfied and retired to Mount Mahendra, engaging himself in austerities of a rather severe type. “Thus did hostility arise between Rāma and Kṣatriyas of this earth, and the entire earth was conquered by Rāma of immeasurable lustre” (B. 3. 117. 15). It is then narrated that the Bhārgava Rāma appeared there in person on Mount Mahendra to meet the Pāṇḍavas. He was duly received and honoured by Yudhiṣṭhira and his party, and he honoured them in turn.

This account has been amplified in later times—like several other Bhārgava episodes—by the addition of a passage of 23 lines (B. 3. 115. 9-19), which is prefixed to it and which is chiefly of interest on account of the vague suggestion it contains to the effect that Bhārgava Rāma was an avatāra of Viṣṇu. This interpolation begins with the previous history of Arjuna Kārtavīrya, king of Haihayas. He is represented here as a worshipper of Dattātreya, by whose favour he had obtained a golden vimāna and a wonderful chariot. Intoxicated with the pride of power, Arjuna Kārtavīrya insulted Indra, trampled upon the sages and even upon the celestials, and persecuted all creatures. Thereupon the celestials and the sages met together and went in a body to Viṣṇu to ask for his protection. Then the exalted god (Viṣṇu) held a consultation with Indra. The god of gods (Indra) told Viṣṇu what had to be done. Thereupon the exalted god, promising to do the needful, went to Badarī, his [25] favourite retreat.—Here the introduction suddenly breaks off, and the story narrated about Gādhi and Rīc̄ka begins (B. 3. 115-20). The suggestion probably is that at the consultation between Indra and Viṣṇu it was decided that Viṣṇu should incarnate himself on the earth as the son of Jamadagni, as Rāma Jamadagnya, who should, in the fullness of time, slay Arjuna Kārtavīrya, but that is left unsaid. The passage is missing in the entire Southern recension and in some Northern manuscripts including those of the Kaśmirī version. There can therefore be no doubt about its being a comparatively recent interpolation.

As already remarked above, Rāma Jamadagnya and the other Bhārgavas such as Cyavana, Rīc̄ka and so on are generally used as static figures, along with other ancient sages like Nārada, in the description of largely attended
and important meetings and state functions, and such treatment of these characters is quite intelligible, if not natural. But the Bhārgavas—and especially the Bhārgava Rāma—are accorded a somewhat different treatment; they are represented as taking part in the action more definitely and more frequently. We have seen that the Bhārgava Rāma is said to have given all his astras to Droṇa. He is also said to have taught Bhīṣma and Karna. Here he is represented as having shown himself to the Pāṇḍavas, as a special favour. In another context Rāma is said to have fought with Bhīṣma, a fight which lasted for twenty-three days but was absolutely barren of any consequence. Elsewhere also we shall find Rāma and some of other Bhārgavas represented as taking some innocuous part in the action, which in no way affects the course of events but which serves to establish and maintain contact between the Bhārgavas and the epic characters.

The above story of Rāma, which is miscalled the Kārtavīryopākhyāna, ends at adhy. 117 of the Vulgate. At adhy. 122, we have another Bhārgava story, which covers adhy. 122-124 and about half of adhy. 125: the story of the great wizard Cyavana, son of Bhṛgu.

The Pāṇḍavas reach the Payoṇā and the Narmadā rivers and hear from Lomaśa the story (upākhyāna) of Cyavana: how he demanded in marriage a young princess, by name Sukanyā, who [26] had innocently and unwittingly blinded him; how he recovered his sight by the grace of the Aśvins and how he gave them on that account that Soma libation, paralyzing the arm of Indra, who would have prevented it. The story runs thus.

Cyavana, son of Bhṛgu, practised austerities in a forest so long that an ant-hill was formed round him. There came one day to that place king Sāryāti, accompanied by his daughter Sukanyā, with beautiful eyebrows and tapering thighs. The sage imprisoned within the ant-hill gazed longingly at the youthful princess, clad in a single garment and adorned with costly ornaments, and addressed some words to her which she did not hear. Sukanyā saw, however, the gleaming eyes of the sage, engaged in self-mortification in the ant-hill, and mistaking them for a species of glow-worm, in youthful heedlessness, pierced the eyes of the sage with a thorn. Little did she think of the dire consequences of her childish act. For through the anger of the offended sage, smarting with the pain thoughtlessly inflicted on him by the heedless princess, the king’s entire army suffered suddenly from a complete stoppage of urine and excreta. The bewildered king inquired about the cause of this strange mishap, but none of his soldiers and companions could enlighten him. The occurrence remained a mystery until the guilty princess confessed her misdemeanour. Sāryāti forthwith set out to pacify the irate sage. The sage would relent only if the mischievous but fascinating princess is given to him in marriage. Without reflecting, the king agreed to bestow his beautiful daughter on the high-souled Cyavana and returned to his own city. Some time later the Aśvins saw the faultless Sukanyā bathing in the
lake adjoining the hermitage of the sage. They also were smitten by her ravishing beauty and asked her to accept one of them for her husband instead of the blind old sage. As she would not consent, they propose that they would rejuvenate Cyavana, and then she should choose. With the permission of her husband she consents to the second proposal. Cyavana had to dip into the waters of the lake, into the primordial element, the womb of all creation, along with the Aśvins (Fountain of Youth motif). The three of [27] them came out of the water, all looking exactly alike. Here is a dilemma (Naladamayantī motif). By virtue of her unswerving loyalty to her husband, Sukanyā is however able to choose the right man. In gratefulness for the gift of youth and beauty, Cyavana promises the Aśvins a draught of the Soma juice during a regular sacrifice. Soon afterwards, Śaryāti comes to visit his son-in-law Cyavana and the latter arranges a great sacrifice for Śaryāti, at which he offers the first draught of Soma to the Aśvins, who used to be altogether excluded on these festive occasions on account of their being medicine-men. Indra tries to stop the sacrilegious act; but as Cyavana will not heed, Indra then attempts to hurl the thunderbolt at him. But Cyavana was too quick for him. Instantly Cyavana paralyzed Indra's arm and brought him to his knees. At the same time the great sorcerer created by his magic a terrible demon (kṛtyā) called Mada (Intoxication). When Mada rushes towards Indra to slay him, Indra grants the wish of Cyavana, who triumphantly continues the sacrifice and gives the Aśvins, the promised libation of Soma. Since that time the Aśvins participate regularly in the sacrificial offerings on a basis of equality with the other gods. Indra at the same time apologizes and explains that he had opposed Cyavana merely to spread the fame of Cyavana and his father-in-law Śaryāti throughout the world: a significant and prophetic utterance.

Bhrigu, the father of Cyavana, had only cursed Agni, a minor god, in fact, merely the “mouth” of the gods, to be sarvabhaksā, devourer of all things, good and bad (1. 6. 13). Cyavana did even better. He thoroughly humbled Indra, the king of gods, who had to submit to the will of Cyavana.

In the next chapter again we have a passing allusion to a Bhārgava, who remains unnamed. The background is a Bhārgava hermitage, though the main actors are not Bhrigus. The pious Yuvanāśva Saudyumni is practising austerities for the sake of progeny. One night he became very thirsty. Searching for water, he enters the hermitage of the Bhārgava who was engaged in performing some magical rites in order to make Yuvanāśva's queen give birth to a son. This sorcerer had actually prepared a potion, endowed with magical efficacy, for administering it to the queen and kept the jar containing the dose in a corner of the [28] hermitage. The thirsty king found it, and, not knowing that the water was charmed and intended in fact

---

1 An alluring explanation of the idea underlying this intriguing motif has been given by H. ZIMMER in his Maya, Der indische Mythos (Stuttgart 1936), pp. 42 ff.
for the queen, drained the potion to the dregs. Here was a mess. But the potion prepared by a Bhṛgu is infallible in its effect. Whoever drinks it must give birth to a son. Consequently the king became himself pregnant, and a son, Māndhārty, was born to him, ripping open his left side, but owing to some propitiatory rites performed by the Bhṛgu, Yuvanāśva himself escaped unhurt.

It is interesting to compare this version of the story of Māndhārty with the one which occurs in the Droṇaparvan (adhy. 62 of the Vulgate). There we are told that once upon a time king Yuvanāśva, when out hunting, became thirsty, and his steed was exhausted. Seeing at a distance a curl of smoke, the monarch guided by it reached a sacrificial enclosure and found there some sacrificial butter (ājyā), which he greedily swallowed. Thereupon the king became pregnant and was delivered of a son (Māndhārty) by the Āśvins. The rest of the story is nearly the same.

In this version, king Yuvanāśva was not practising austerities for securing the birth of a son, but had gone out hunting. Nor did he partake of the magical preparation at night in the dark, but presumably in full daylight, when the smoke from the sacred hearth could yet be seen by him. The second version moreover makes no mention of any Bhṛgu, playing the rôle of the officiating priest and saviour of Yuvanāśva, like the first, which is an important discrepancy. The second story is sketchy and lacking in definition, and appears to be the older version. In the first the details are filled out, by adding a Bhṛgu as an officiating priest and generally making the picture more vivid and realistic.

The next Bhārgava of importance we meet with in the Āraṇyaka is the sage Mārkaṇḍeya, whose discourses on the most divers topics extend over 51 chapters (182-232) in the Vulgate, containing about 2200 stanzas (Mārkaṇḍeya-samāsyā), which he delivers for the delectation and edification of the Pāṇḍavas. This is not his first visit to the Pāṇḍavas by any means. For early in the beginning of their exile, when the Pāṇḍavas had settled in the Dvārakavana Forest, Mārkaṇḍeya had paid a flying visit [29] to them (adhy. 25). He turns up again, as a matter of fact, also towards the end of their exile, without notice or warning, to console Yudhiṣṭhira and relates to him the Rāmopākhyāna, the popular story of Rāma and Sītā, as well as the Sāvitrupākhyāna, that immortal story of a wife’s splendid devotion. These two upākhyānas, narrated by Mārkaṇḍeya, together comprise about 1060 stanzas. Thus the Mārkaṇḍeya-samāsyā together with the two latter upākhyānas comprise 3260 stanzas, which is nearly one fourth of the entire extent of this extensive parvan.

Mārkaṇḍeya was one of the cirajvinś: eternally youthful though many thousand years old. How he was exactly connected with the two well-known Bhṛgu families of our Mahābhārata (Bhṛgu-Cyavana-Rāma and Bhṛgu-Cyavana-Sūnaka) is not exactly known; but that he was a Bhārgava is beyond doubt. He is referred to as Bhārgava in B. 3. 183. 60; 189. 97;
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will create all beings: gods, asuras and human beings, the mobile and the immobile creation."

This story, which appears to belong to a different complex of myths and does not at all fit well in the Mahābhārata cycle, is, as has been surmised, probably of Semitic origin. If Manu creates all beings, Brahmā is thrown

out of employment. The Purānic theory of creation is that there is a deluge; nothing remains of the universe except Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa, reclining on the coils of the Eternal Serpent (Śeṣa-Ananta) floating on the waters. Then out of Nārāyaṇa’s navel emerges Brahmā, seated on a lotus, the creative aspect of the deity. From Brahmā are born his mind-born sons (mānasapu-trās). Then other beings, male and female, emerge from his heart, breast, thumbs and so on. These are the Prajāpatis. They propagate this world of ours. The process is repeated at each dissolution; it is an eternal recurrence. In this complex there is clearly no room for the Semitic legend, which would imply a parallel creation by Manu, a state of things which is not at all what is intended by the legend. Since a [31] variant version of this legend is found even in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (1. 8. 1), it should seem that the Semitic legend was introduced into India at a fairly early date but has remained unassimilated. Its exotic character, however, appears to me to be clearly betrayed by the phalasruti at the end of the chapter, an addition which accompanies all late accretions to the Great Epic (B. 3. 187. 58 emended):

ya idam śṛṇuyān nityāṁ Manoś caritam āditah |
śa sukhā sarvasiddhārthah svargalokam iyān narah ||

The Indian Noah is a man of a very different character. He requires neither boat nor horned fish to save him; nor does he keep a store of seeds with himself. The man who could live through the dissolution of the world can only be a perfect Yogi; and a perfect Yogi is deathless. “There is none equal to you in years save Brahmā Paramешthin,” says Yudhisṭhira to the Bhārgava Mārkaṇḍeya. But he requires neither food nor drink to live. He can walk on water as easily as on land. So when the world was overwhelmed with floods and the creation was gradually submerged, Mārkaṇḍeya found himself alone, walking on the waters of the ocean. After some time Mārkaṇḍeya, being human after all, begins to feel a little tired and lonely, tramping about all by himself on the surface of the endless ocean. He also felt inexpressibly sad at that awful destruction. Then all of a sudden he noticed a little child resting on the extended branch of a huge banyan tree (nyagrodha). Mārkaṇḍeya could not at all imagine how that little helpless child could have survived all that cataclysmal devastation, and he kept pondering over that matter, standing near the child. Seeing his confusion, the child softly told him to go into his body and rest there, and the child opened its little mouth and drew him gently inside. And, lo and behold, inside the child he found the world whose destruction he had seen with his own eyes. The sun, the moon and the stars, all the oceans, seas and rivers of the world, all the men, women and children whom he had known, all animals, gods and demons,—they were all there, inside the little stomach of that wonderful little child. He wandered about inside for hundreds of years and still he could not find the end of it all, when he suddenly found [32] himself outside the child,
blown out by his gentle exhalation. Then the child spoke to the sage, and then it suddenly dawned on Mārkandeya who the Child was. He sees and recognizes God.²

As this Brahmin Noah had no need for the ark, he had no need for any seeds. The seeds are there permanently. There had been in fact no destruction at all: that destruction was an illusion. There was only an involution: the world had been only withdrawn into the interior of God. Creation, moreover, was not Mārkandeya’s concern: it was the business of Brahmā. Like the seed which has been well planted, the universe will grow of itself, putting forth in due time blossoms and fruits and other seeds. Mārkandeya, the Yogi, is interested only in knowing and understanding things. He had seen God, but that is not sufficient for him. He wants to know God, know about His nature and character, His Māyā, that Māyā which had not been understood even by the gods themselves (B. 3. 188. 135):

\[ \text{Jñatum icchāmi deva tvāṁ māyāṁ caitāṁ tadvattamāṁ} \]

The divine Child declares itself to be Nārāyaṇa, the indestructible source of the world, and reveals to Mārkandeya His real nature and character.

The Bhārgava Mārkandeya is, according to this account, the only man who had survived the last deluge, witnessed the act of dissolution and creation in progress, stood in his own person face to face with Nārāyaṇa in the utter solitude of total annihilation, but it is nowhere made clear why Mārkandeya was singled out for this unique honour: it is an unmotivated theme. It is left to us to infer that the Bhārgava Mārkandeya is the only perfect Yogi that ever lived.

A little later, as already mentioned, Mārkandeya relates to the Pāṇḍavas the famous Rāmopākhyāna (Āranyaka 273-292 in the Vulgate), an abridgement of the Rāma story in about 750 stanzas. The occasion for relating the story arises in the following way.

Jayadratha, a near relative of the Kurus and the Pāṇḍavas tries to carry off Draupadī, but is defeated and captured, and ultimately pardoned and released. Yudhiṣṭhira mourns his fate [33] and asks Mārkandeya, who seems to be rather abruptly introduced for the purpose of the story, if there is any mortal more unfortunate than himself. Thereupon Mārkandeya relates the story of the Dāśarathī Rāma. Now the entire story of the attempted rape of Draupadī by Jayadratha is so ill conceived and unconvincing that it appears to have been invented solely for the purpose of introducing a summary of the Rāmāyaṇa. Who could be now a better narrator of the story of Rāma than the Bhārgava Mārkandeya, age-old and yet eternally young, the only man who had witnessed the happenings in this world in all the different ages, witnessed even the dissolution and creation of the world?

² An illuminating commentary on a different version of this same myth is given by H. Zimmer, Maya, Der indische Mythos, pp. 52 ff.
After hearing the story of Rāma, Yudhiṣṭhira, the "dummy" of the bard, says that he did not grieve so much on his own or his brothers' account as he did on account of the daughter of Drupada; and then asks Mārkaṇḍeya if he had ever seen or heard of a woman as devoted to her husband as Draupadī. To console Yudhiṣṭhira, Mārkaṇḍeya then relates the well-known story (upākhyāna) of Sāvitrī, who rescues her husband from death by the insistent importunity of her pleading, by her deep feminine intuition and by her unflinching devotion to her husband (Āranyaka 293-299 in the Vulgate). And that is the last episode of the Āranyaka narrated by the Bhārgava Mārkaṇḍeya and in fact the last episode of this parvan in which a Bhārgava is concerned.

VIRĀṬAPARVAN

In the short Virāṭaparvan, as is in the Sabhā, the narrative is plain and straightforward, unembellished by any episodic enlargement, and the story marches rapidly forward. This book contains consequently no upākhyānas and there is no room for any Bhārgava digression. The references to the Bhārgavas are few and far between, and they are incidental allusions to the greatness or heroism of the Bhārgavas. One of these may be adduced for the purpose of illustration. Addressing Duryodhana, Bhiṣma asks: "Who is superior to Droṇa except Rāma, the son of Jamadagni?" (B. 4. 51. 10).

[34] UDYOGAPARVAN

The Udyogaparvan furnishes its quota of references to the Bhārgavas, at least to the Bhārgava Rāma. Here again Rāma Jāmadagnya emerges from the obscurity of myth and legend, and we find him coming into direct contact—and in one case, actual conflict—with some of the epic characters.

In adhy. 72 ff. of the Vulgate version of the Udyoga, we have an account of a council held by the Pāṇḍavas, where Kṛṣṇa is commissioned to go and treat with Dhrṛtarāṣṭra, which is followed in adhy. 83 ff. by a description of Kṛṣṇa's journey to Hāstinapura. On the way he meets a company of ancient sages, whom he duly honours. On his asking them whither they were bound, the Bhārgava Rāma, who is apparently their spokesman, explains that they were on their way to attend the council meeting which was going to be held at Hāstinapura in order to witness the proceedings and listen to the discussion. The sages then take leave of him and proceed on their way. Led by Rāma Jāmadagnya, they arrive in due course at the capital of the Kurus and present themselves in the darbar hall, where they are received with due honours by Bhiṣma (adhy. 94). The proceedings begin with a long peroration by Kṛṣṇa, in which he announces that the Pāṇḍavas were ready to obey implicitly the commands of Dhrṛtarāṣṭra, provided

1. But this is 852* of our edition, and it was found only in Dn D₄.₁₂; that is, it was added perhaps within 3 or 4 centuries!
they were assured that they would be treated with fairness and given what is theirs by right (adhy. 95). The Bhārgava Rāma, taking advantage of the spell of silence which followed Kṛṣṇa's diplomatic speech, gets up and, advising peace, relates, unasked, the story of Dambhodbhava (adhy. 96). The foolish king Dambhodbhava, who wants to be acknowledged the unconquered and unconquerable hero, challenges in his cupidity the sages Nara and Nārāyaṇa (who were then practising penance at Badari) to fight with him. The ascetics meekly decline, but Dambhodbhava is importunate. So in the end Nara takes up a handful of grass and, charging the blades in his hand with mystic potency, flings them at the enemy. They change into deadly missiles, overpowering the soldiers of Dambhodbhava, and compel him to surrender and acknowledge his defeat. Nara reads Dambhodbhava a sermon on self-control, on kindness to all creatures and humility towards Brahmīns. The Bhārgava Rāma appearing here in the rôle of a [35] peace-maker concludes by advising conciliation and pointing out that Nara is Arjuna, while Nārāyaṇa is Kṛṣṇa. The story is an unnecessary digression, with the very obvious object of reiterating and emphasizing the identity between Nara-Nārāyaṇa and Arjuna-Kṛṣṇa.

The Udyogaparvan closes with a story (Ambopālkhyaṇa), in which the Bhārgava Rāma plays a very active and prominent part (adhy. 173-196 of the Vulgate). Bhīṣma explains to Duryodhana that, because of a vow he had taken, he would not fight with Śikhaṇḍin, who at birth had been a girl, and then relates the whole life history of Śikhaṇḍin, who in a previous birth was Ambā, the daughter of the king of Kāśi. Bhīṣma narrates how Ambā, having been disappointed of marriage through Bhīṣma's action, vowed to compass his death and how the Bhārgava Rāma, having promised to help her, fought with Bhīṣma at Kurukṣetra for twenty-three days, a fight which ends in a stalemate. The story is developed in this way.

When Ambā was repulsed by Śālva, to whom she was engaged and who subsequently refused to marry her on account of her abduction by Bhīṣma, she left him and wandered about alone in a neighbouring forest, nursing her grief and vowing vengeance. There she meets a company of ascetics, who sympathize with her and devise means to help her. While the ascetics are cogitating as to how they should help her, there comes along by chance Ambā's grandfather, the royal sage Hotravāhana, who advises her to seek the help of his friend Rāma Jāmadagnya. While these deliberations are proceeding, Rāma's disciple and faithful follower Akṛṭavrāṇa appears on the scene. Hotravāhana tells him the previous history of Ambā and also her future plans. Akṛṭavrāṇa decides that Bhīṣma is certainly responsible for Ambā's misfortunes, and is the party deserving punishment. By a fortunate accident Rāma—on the war-path, armed with a bow and a sword and his famous axe (paraśu)—comes there the following morning. Ambā again relates the whole story of her unfortunate life to the Bhārgava Rāma and be-
seeches him to slay the offending Bhīṣma. But since Rāma has taken the vow that he would on no account take up arms except at the bidding of the twice-born, he has to be persuaded by the sages to espouse Ambā's cause. [36] He then proceeds with Ambā and all the assembled sages to the banks of the Sarasvatī and from there sends a message to Bhīṣma, who meets him at the boundary of the Kuru kingdom. Rāma orders Bhīṣma to take back Ambā or failing that fight a duel with him. Since Bhīṣma cannot do the former, he decides to fight, goes back to the city and returns, furnished with all arms and accoutrements, in a chariot made of silver, drawn by white horses. Bhīṣma's mother Gaṅgādevī (identified with the river Ganges) tries to stop the impending fight but without success. The fight lasts for several days, when at last Rāma wounded by an arrow of Bhīṣma falls down in a swoon. Bhīṣma stops fighting: it is a gentlemanly duel, following minutely all the strict rules of chivalry, and unlike the deadly combats of the Bhārata war. The fight is continued on the following days, with varying luck. Even after many days of constant fighting, in which millions and billions of arrows are showered by each combatant and cut up by the opponent, various magical missiles are flung by which alternately the combatants get wounded, fall down, recover and resume the fight, the grim contest continues indecisively. Then one night Bhīṣma, who was one of the Vasus, saw in a dream a group of eight Brahmins (the Eight Vasus), who had supported him and encouraged him that same day while he was lying wounded and unconscious on the battlefield. They remind him of a magical missile of his, by discharging which he could put the Bhārgava Rāma to sleep on the field of battle. Next day the fight began again and the combatants hurled at each other simultaneously the terrific Brahma missile, which is capable shattering the earth. The two missiles clash in the middle and neutralize each other. During the commotion caused by these weapons, Bhīṣma thinks of the sleep missile. As he is about to discharge that missile, the gods intervene. With Bhīṣma's mother, Gaṅgā, the gods go from one to the other of the combatants, trying to pacify them. Seeing that neither of them is prepared to yield and be the first to retire from the field of battle, the gods stand between the combatants and make the fight impossible. Still the combatants are not pacified and will not leave the field. Finally the shades of his ancestors persuade Rāma to lay aside his weapons, which he then reluctantly does. That is sufficient for Bhīṣma. He puts down his bow and arrow, goes to Rāma, his guru, and prostrates [37] himself at his feet. They soon forget their quarrel and become friends again. Thus this titanic conflict between Bhīṣma and the Bhārgava Rāma, which is said to have lasted for three and twenty days, is utterly barren of any result beyond adding a few hundred lines to the text!

One peculiar thing we notice about this story is the sudden change of heart on the part of the Bhārgava Rāma. While in all other accounts of
him he is represented as the inveterate foe of the Kṣatriyas and the epic bards are never weary of telling us that he had exterminated the Kṣatriyas thrice seven times, here we find him befriending the royal sage Hotravāhana and championing the lost cause of an unhappy Kṣatriya damsel! The episode shows another inconsistency in the behaviour of Rāma; for, here we are surprised with the statement that in Bhīśma Rāma had taken a Kṣatriya pupil and had apparently taught him so well that the pupil knew not only as much as the guru but perhaps even more. This does not prevent him subsequently from cursing Karna, who had learnt the secrets of the science of arms from Rāma in the guise of a Brahmin but later had to confess that he was a Kṣatriya. There Rāma is reported to have said to Karna that the Brahman weapon can never be learnt by one who is not a Brahmin (B. 12. 3. 31), though Bhīśma had used the Brahman missile successfully against Rāma in the combat mentioned above.

BHĪŚMAPARVAN

With the Bhīśmaparvan begin what may be called the "battle books," which in some shape or other must have formed the kernel of the Mahābhārata, which kernel has served as a nucleus for the growth of a vast amount of secondary material, cohering together so as to form a more or less harmonious whole. A rough sketch of the original plan of the epic is preserved in a stanza occurring in one of the chapters of the first book (1. 55. 43):

\[
evat purāvritāṁ teśāṁ aklīśakarmayāṁ  \\
bdheda rājayavīnaśaṁ ca jayaś ca jayatāṁ vara\]

The Bhārata, according to this statement, was a trilogy consisting of the story of the dissension, loss of the kingdom, and victory, among some descendants of Bharata.

[38] The Bhīśmaparvan, according to the Vulgate, is divided into four sections (upaparvans). Of these the first two are mainly geographical tracts: Jambūkhaṇḍa-nirmāṇa-parvan and Bhūmi-parvan. The third is the famous philosophical discourse, the Bhagavadgītā, which is, so to say, the keystone of the whole new superstructure of the remodelled Bhārata and which has passed into world literature. The fourth and last section of this book is a lengthy account in eighty chapters (or about 4300 stanzas) of the fight of the first ten days of the Great War, up to the fall of Bhīśma. After the Bhagavadgītā, the account of the fight runs on smoothly and is not allowed to be interrupted by any digressions. Consequently this sub-section also contains no Bhārgava episode or for that matter any other episodic narrative at all. But passing allusions to the Bhārgavas are not by any means wanting even in this final section of the Bhīśmaparvan. They are, however, for the most part trivial and confined to the glorification of Rāma Jāmađagnya, playing on the theme of his encounter with Bhīśma. The Bhārgava
Rāma is subly praised by saying that Bhīṣma was a hero whom even Rāma could not defeat.

But the Bhagavadgītā itself contains an interesting allusion to the Bhṛgus and that is in the tenth chapter, in the enumeration of the so-called vibhūtis of Śrī-Kṛṣṇa. The vibhūtis are said to be infinite (nāsty anto viṣtarasyan me, Gitā 10. 19 in the Vulgate version), but about sixty of them have been specifically enumerated and they are worthy of close study. Some of these vibhūtis are pure and simple gods, such as Indra, Viṣṇu, Śiva and so on. Some are yet other supernatural beings, such as Kubera, Citraratha and others. Some are celestial luminaries such as the Sun, and the Moon. Some are merely terrestrial features such as mountains, rivers, the ocean and so on. Some are even animals such as the serpent (Śeṣa), elephant (Airāvata), eagle (Garuḍa) and so on. There are mentioned among these vibhūtis only nine human—or at least semi-human, that is, semi-divine—beings, whom we may regard as historical or semi-historical personalities. Three of them, Vāsudeva, Arjuna and Vyāsa, are well-known and important epic characters, and as such their inclusion in this list is expected and may be said [39] to be quite natural. They may therefore be ignored. Then, further, of divine sages (devārsīs), Śrī-Kṛṣṇa declares himself to be Nārada, the official messenger between the gods and the men. Of perfected beings (Siddhas), Śrī-Kṛṣṇa says, he is Kapila, a celebrated sage, probably the codifier of the Sāṁkhya, the system most popular with the epic bards. Of household priests, Śrī-Kṛṣṇa identifies himself, quite naturally again, with Bṛhaspati, the priest of the gods, one of the Aṅgirases, a clan closely connected with the Bhṛgus from very ancient times. There remain three; of these all—or at least two—are clearly Bhārgavas. Of Kavis, Śrī-Kṛṣṇa says, he is Śukra, the Bhārgava priest of the Asuras, the asuric counterpart of Bṛhaspati. Of weapon-bearers (sastra-bhṛt), Śrī-Kṛṣṇa declares himself to be Rāma, who is identified by some authorities as Rāma son of Daśaratha, but who in my opinion is meant to be no other than the much lauded hero of the Mahābhārata poets, Rāma son of Jamadagni, the Bhārgava Rāma. Lastly, of great sages (mahārṣis), Śrī-Kṛṣṇa says he is Bhṛgu (mahārṣiqāṁ Bhṛgur aham, Gitā 10, 25). All other vibhūtis are more or less intelligible; for each vibhūti is or may be regarded, more or less, as the foremost or the first of a class; but why Bhṛgu should be considered as the greatest of the great sages (Mahārṣis) is somewhat enigmatic. He is not reckoned among the Seven Sages (saptarṣis). He is no doubt said to be a son of Brahmā, but Brahmā had nearly a dozen sons of that kind, who all became Prajāpatis and founders of gotras. And about Bhṛgu's greatness even the Mahābhārata has nothing to narrate beyond the

---

1 C. V, VAIĐYA, Proc. & trans : 1st Or. Conf. (1922), p. 39 ("Gotra and Pravara" p.p. 34-45) explains it differently. He is of opinion that of all Rṣis Bhṛgu was actually considered as the foremost.
fact that his wife Pulomā was abducted by a cannibal called Puloman (Adi) or Darśa (Śānti), and that he had cursed various people.

**DRONAPARVAN**

The Dronaparvan supplies what is for our purpose one of the most interesting of Bhārgava references in the Mahābhārata.

On the thirteenth day of the Great War during Arjuna’s temporary absence, Abhimanyu with a small following pierces the Kaurava ring-formation (cakra-vyūha), but Jayadratha intercepts his followers and isolates him, and Abhimanyu is slain after a brave fight; one of the most tragic episodes of the Great Epic. [40] To console Yudhiṣṭhira for the untimely death of Abhimanyu, Vṛṣṇi tells him many stories illustrating the transitoriness of human life. At that time he relates how Nārada comforted Spṛjaya in a time of bereavement by telling him of the sixteen kings of great merit, who nevertheless all died when their time came (adhy. 55-71 of the Vulgate). These kings were, as a matter of fact, all cakravartins, sovereigns who had conquered surrounding kingdoms or brought them under their sway and established a paramount position on more or less extensive regions around their own kingdoms. The episode, which is known as the Śoḍaśarājātīya, recounts the heroic deeds and the meritorious actions of sixteen of such famous kings of antiquity. The sixteen kings are these: (1) Māruṭa, son of Avikṣit; (2) Suhotra Ātithina; (3) Paurava (Bṛhadṛatha, king of Aṅga); (4) Śibi, son of Uṣṇara; (5) Rāma, son of Daśaratha; (6) Bhagiratha, son of Dīlīpa; (7) Dīlīpa Aīlavīla; (8) Māndhatrī, son of Yuvanāśva; (9) Yayāti, son of Nāhuṣa; (10) Ambaraśa, son of Nābhāga; (11) Śaśabindhu, son of Citraratha; (12) Gaya, son of Amūrtarayasa; (13) Rantideva, son of Sāmīrti; (14) Bharata, son of Dūlsaṭa; (15) Prithu, son of Veṇa; and, last but not least, (16) the Bhārgava Rāma, son of Jamadagni.

Accordingly we have here a vivid and colourful description of that great feat of the Bhārgava Rāma, the extirpation of Kṣatriyas, an account which courts mistrust by its appalling exaggeration and staggering figures (adhy. 70 of the Vulgate). We are told how Rāma took a vow to relieve the Earth of her burden of Kṣatriyas. Thereafter he first slew Kārtavīrya, who was never before defeated in battle. Then of Kṣatriyas he slaughtered 64,000, cutting off their ears and noses and breaking their teeth, besides stifling in smoke 7000 Haihayas (the clan to which Arjuna Kārtavīrya belonged) and torturing them, and butchering 10,000 with his own axe... Then the puissant son of Jamadagni, marching against the Kaśmīras, the Daradas, the Kuntis, the Kṣudrakas and Mālavas, the Aṅgas, Vṛṅgas and Kaśīgas, the Videhas, the Tāmraliptakas, the Rakṣovāhas, the Vīthotras, the Trigartas, the Mārtkīvatas, the Śibis and other warrior races, thousands in number, slew them all with arrows of exceeding sharpness. Going from country to country, he slew [41] thousands and hundreds of thousands of Kṣatriyas, creat-
ing a veritable deluge of blood and filling many lakes with it... Then bringing under his sway all the eighteen divisions of the earth, that descendant of Bhrgu celebrated a hundred sacrifices, like a second Indra, when he gave away costly gifts (daksinā) to Brahmins. The sacrificial altar, full eight nalaś high and made entirely of gold, embellished with hundreds of gems and adorned with thousands of banners, as also this earth abounding in domestic and wild animals, was accepted by Kaśyapa from the Bhārgava Rāma as his sacrificial fee for performing the sacrifice. Rāma also gave him many thousands of huge elephants adorned with golden ornaments. Freeing the earth of robbers that infested her, making her full of righteous and amiable people, Rāma gave the earth to Kaśyapa at his great horse sacrifice. Then comes the Bhārgava slogan (B. 7. 70. 20):

trikṣaptakrtvah prthivim krtvā nīkṣatrimāṃ prabhuḥ | (IV)

Having cleared the earth of Kṣatriyas thrice seven times, having celebrated a hundred sacrifices, Rāma gave the earth to the Brahmins. When the earth with her seven grand divisions was bestowed by him upon Kaśyapa, then the latter said to Rāma, “Go thou out of this earth at my command!” Hearing these words of Kaśyapa, that foremost of weapon-bearers, obedient to the command of a Brahmin, caused the ocean to roll back and to give him a new strip of land to live in, and Rāma took up his abode on Mount Mahendra.

It is instructive to compare this Story of Sixteen Kings with a variant version of it in the Śānti (adhy. 29 of the Vulgate), as related to the same Yudhiṣṭhira by Śrī-Kṛṣṇa. After the battle the month of mourning is spent outside the capital on the banks of the Ganges. Yudhiṣṭhira, very dejected, proposes to renounce the kingdom and retire to the forest. At Arjuna’s request, Kṛṣṇa tries to console him and so relates to him the Story of Sixteen Kings, which Nārada had once related to king Śrījaya. The stories are naturally almost the same as those related to Yudhiṣṭhira by Vyāsa after the death of Abhimanyu. There is, however, one very striking difference. Fifteen of the kings in the list are the same; the sixteenth “king” of the Droṇa list, namely, the Bhārgava Rāma, is conspicuous by his absence in the Śānti [42] list! He is replaced by a real king. Sagara’s son of Ikṣvāku, who was indeed a very famous king, fully deserving to be included in this list of the celebrated sixteen kings of antiquity, whereas the Bhārgava Rāma was no king at all and does not properly fall into this enumeration. His “extermination” of the Kṣatriyas was merely an act of vendetta. And although he is said to have conquered the whole earth, he never was crowned a king. Therefore the propriety of including his exploits in the Śoḍaśaṣṭājākīya is more than questionable. In fact it would never strike anybody except an unscrupulous Brahmin redactor—with strong Bhārgava leanings—to perpetrate such a tendentious perversion and father it upon Vyāsa.
Karṇa is represented in our epic as a pupil of the Bhargava Rāma, like Bhīṣma and Droṇa. So there are several casual references—in his capacity as the guru of Karṇa—to Rāma Jāmadagnya in the course of this parvan.

In adhy. 31 (of the Vulgate), we have a reference to the bow (Vijaya) which Karṇa had received from the Bhargava Rāma, who in his turn had obtained it from Indrā himself. Indra had used it in his fight with the Daityas: Rāma had used it in his campaign against the Kṣatriyas of the earth, which he had conquered thrice seven times (B. S. 31. 46):

\[ trihsaptakṣtvadhṛṭhividhanuṣāyena nirjita \] (V)

On the seventeenth day of the war, Duryodhana persuaded Śalya to be Karṇa’s charioteer and to encourage him tells the story how Karṇa had become possessed even of celestial weapons through the Bhargava Rāma.

To emphasize further the great importance of Karṇa, Duryodhana then narrates a story which shows the greatness of Karṇa’s guru, Rāma Jāmadagnya (adhy. 34 of the Vulgate). Rāma is generally represented in the Mahābhārata as a man—or rather a Superman—who had fought his battles on this earth with other human beings like himself. Here we are told that he had fought with and vanquished even the Daityas. The story is this. To obtain celestial weapons from Mahādeva, Rāma (like the Pāṇḍava Arjuna later) was practising terrible austerities. At that time [43] the Asuras had become so powerful that even all the gods together could not subdue them, and so Mahādeva asks the Bhargava Rāma to fight with them (as Arjuna later fought with the Nīvātakavacas and other demons). Rāma went up to the Asuras and said to them, “Most invincible in battle as you are, O Daityas, give me battle”. Then the Daityas began to fight with Rāma. Then that delighter of the Bhargava clan slaughtered those Daityas, on the battle-field by strokes that were like the strokes from Indra’s thunderbolt. After Rāma had vanquished the invincible Asuras without the use of any special weapons, then Mahādeva gave him those celestial missiles for which Rāma was practising the terrible austerities. Perhaps feeling that the story might be disbelieved, Duryodhana hastens to add that he had heard it himself from the lips of a pious and truthful Brahmin while the latter was relating it to king Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Duryodhana’s father.

Then in adhy. 42 (of the Vulgate), Karṇa relates that under the guise of a Brahmin he had been a disciple of the Bhargava Rāma in order to learn from him the secret of certain magical missiles known to Rāma alone. One day while Rāma was sleeping with his head resting in the lap of Karṇa, the thigh of the latter was bored through by Indra (Arjuna’s de facto father) in the form of a ferocious centipede, and Karṇa was weltering in blood but did not move a muscle, for fear of disturbing the sleep of his guru and thus incurring his displeasure. When Rāma woke up and saw this state of things,
he concluded that his disciple was no Brahmin, as only a Kṣatriya could suffer such agony and keep still. Then Karna confesses his guilt and begs Rama’s pardon. Rama pronounces a curse on Karna, saying that at the critical moment the magical missiles of which he had obtained knowledge from Rama by such a dastardly trick—even the great Yogi could not see through it—would fail him. Brahma could never reside firmly in one who is not a Brahmin: \textit{abhrāhmene brahma na hi dhruvam syāt} (B. 8. 42. 9.) And so it happened, needless to say.

In a variant version of this tale (Śānti 3 in the Vulgate) the worm which had bored through Karna’s thigh is said to have been not Indra in disguise, but a demon suffering the effects of a curse pronounced on him by Bhṛgu!

[44] ŚALYAPARVAN

In the Śalyaparvan there are only stray references to the Bhārgavas, especially in the account of Balarāma’s pilgrimage—another very obvious digression—during which Balarāma visits of course all the places sacred to the Bhārgavas such as Rāmatīrtha, Samantapañcaka and so on, which lay on his way.

At Rāmatīrtha we have a repetition of the story that Kaśyapa officiated at the sacrifice celebrated by Rāma Bhārgava after conquering the whole earth and annihilating the Kṣatriyas (B. 9. 49. 7 f.) :

\begin{verbatim}
yatra Rama mahābhāgo Bhārgavaḥ sumahālapāh ||
asakṛt prthivim jituḥ hataksatīrampungavām ||
upādhyāyaṁ puraskṛtya Kaśyapaṁ munisātamam ||
ayajad vājepeyena so 'svamedhaśatena ca ||
pradadau daksināṁ caiva prthiviṁ vai sasāgarām ||
\end{verbatim}

SAUPTIKAPARVAN

The Sautika is one of the few books of the Mahābhārata which are entirely, or almost entirely, free from reference to the Bhārgavas. The book is short, consisting of 18 chapters and about 800 stanzas in the Vulgate version, and comprises only two sub-parvans: the Sautika and the Aśīka. The first sub-parvan describes the slaughter of the sleepers in the camp of the Pāṇḍavas, while the second gives an account of the use of the world-destroying dart Aśīka by Aśvatthāman.

STRĪPARVAN

In the next book, the Strīparvan, which like the former is short, consisting of 27 chapters and about 800 stanzas in the Vulgate version, there are only three incidental references to the Bhārgavas. The parvan consists almost wholly of the description of the obsequial ceremonies of the warriors killed in the war and lamentations of women over their dead kinsfolk, which is fortunately held free from digressions and interpolations. The tragedy also does
not permit the development of any other sentiment. The absence of reference to the Bhārgavas, who, as already remarked, had strictly speaking no connection whatsoever with the Kuru-Pāṇḍāla heroes, is not only thoroughly [45] appropriate, but is an omission for which we may be truly grateful to the redactors of our Mahābhārata.

ŠĀNTIPARVAN

The Śānti, which is in essence a manual of instruction in king-craft (rājadharma), conduct in time of calamity (āpaddharma) and emancipation (mokṣadharma) compiled in the peculiar pedagogic technique developed by the redactors of the Great Epic for the edification of the people combined with their entertainment, supplies its quota of Bhārgava material, making up in some measures for the deficiency of the last three books.

Already in adhy. 2 i. (of the Vulgate) we hear of the Bhārgava Rāma. The month of mourning is spent by the Pāṇḍavas outside the capital on the banks of the Ganges. There Nārada relates to Yudhiṣṭhira the story of the early career of Kāmā, which is here said to be a secret of the gods (devaguhya). In the course of the narrative Nārada repeats with more details the story we have already noticed as to how Kāmā had easily deceived the Bhārgava Rāma and obtained from him the carefully guarded secret of the famous Brahma missile (brahmāstra) under the false pretence of being a Bramin, and a Bhṛgu too. An interesting point of difference between this version of the story and that given in the Kāmpaparvan is, as mentioned already, that the worm which bites Kāmā and bores a hole through his leg is not Indra but a demon called Daṁśa, who had tried to carry off Bhṛgu’s wife. If this wife be Pulomā, then her ravisher’s name was given as Puloman in adhy. 4 of the Ādi, where, however, there is no mention of Bhṛgu’s curse; but we are told on the other hand that the ravisher of Pulomā was reduced to ashes by Bhṛgu’s son Cyavana. But perhaps this demon Daṁśa is some other ravisher of Bhṛgu’s wife.

In any event the happy result of this discourse of the sage was that Yudhiṣṭhira, casting off grief, enters the capital in state, is installed on the throne and performs the obsequial ceremonies of his departed kinsmen. Later Kṛṣṇa in an ecstatic trance communes with the distant Bhīṣma, who remains lying on the battlefield on a bed of arrows and who in a long hymn of adoration invokes Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa then sets out with the Pāṇḍava brothers and his followers [46] to visit Bhīṣma on his death-bed. The arrival of the party at the battle-field, which it will be remembered has been identified by the redactors of the epic with the Bhārgava varṇa Samantapaṇcaka, affords an easy opportunity for another repetition of the legend of Rāma’s heroic exploit. That was the very spot where the Bhārgava Rāma had established those five lakes of blood. Śrī-Kṛṣṇa in passing points to those lakes and says (B. 12. 48. 9) :
trihṣaptakṛtvā vasudhāṁ kṛtvā niḥkṣatryāṁ prabhūḥ ।
śvedānihīnāṁ tato Rāmaḥ karṇayō virarāma ha || (VI)

Yudhiṣṭhira, the “dummy” of the rhapsode, has an insatiable longing to hear all about the extermination of the Kṣatriyas by the Bṛgava Rāma though he had heard it all before from other story-tellers, and he has besides some doubts which he forthwith refers to Kṛṣṇa (B. 12. 48. 10):

trihṣaptakṛtvāḥ prthivī kṛtā niḥkṣatryāḥ purā ।
Rāmeṣṭi tathātthā tvam atra me saṁśayo mahāṁ || (VII)

To solve this doubt of Yudhiṣṭhira Kṛṣṇa gratuitously volunteers to repeat the whole story of Rāma from the very beginning, a full-size account of the birth of the Bṛgava Rāma, of the extirpation of the Kṣatriyas and of the subsequent regeneration of the race. Here we have now an attestation of the entire story by Śri-Kṛṣṇa, a variant of the story told by Akṛtavrāna, a disciple of Rāma, to Yudhiṣṭhira himself in the Aranyakā. There are naturally several discrepancies between the two versions, two of which are noteworthy. In the first version it was Satyavatī’s father-in-law who prepares the magical corus, which were subsequently exchanged by the good ladies who were to partake of them; here it is Satyavatī’s husband himself, Rṣiika, who prepares them. The other is a somewhat more serious discrepancy. In the Aranyakā version, Jamadagni was robbed of his calf by Arjuna Kṛtvirya himself, who is represented there as a perfect fiend. In the story as told by Śri-Kṛṣṇa, Arjuna is a perfect angel of a man, always devoted to peace, ever obedient to Brahmins and ready to protect all classes; he had given away the earth to Brahmins in a horse sacrifice which he had performed. His sons on the other hand were “proud and cruel”, and it was they who brought away the calf of Jamadagni’s sacrificial {47] cow. As it is difficult, at this distance of time, in the absence of independent evidence, to say whether Akṛtavrāna or Śri-Kṛṣṇa was more truthful, it must remain a moot point whether the guilty party is Arjuna Kṛtvirya or his sons. Then Śri-Kṛṣṇa goes on to tell Yudhiṣṭhira that the Kṣatriyas were annihilated by the Bṛgava Rāma thrice seven times, speaking exactly like a Bṛgava (B. 12. 49. 64):

trihṣaptakṛtvāḥ prthivim kṛtvā niḥkṣatryāṁ prabhūḥ ।
dakṣināṁ aśvamedhānte Kaśyapāyādātha tathāḥ || (VIII)

The matter being now attested by Śri-Kṛṣṇa himself, it cannot be described by revilers of Brahmins as a fabrication made by the Brahmins themselves.

It must always have been something of a puzzle to all thoughtful persons where Kṣatriyas like the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas and even Śri-Kṛṣṇa himself came from after the Kṣatriya race had been wiped out thrice seven times by the Bṛgava Rāma, and that was in fact Yudhiṣṭhira’s doubt, which he had expressed to Śri-Kṛṣṇa. Various explanations of the mystery have been propounded. In the earlier chapters of the epic, as we have seen
several times, it was the pious Brahmins who procreated children on the widows of the Kṣatriyas slain by Rāma and they became Kṣatriyas by the Vedic rule pāvigrāhasya tanaśya (1. 98. 5): the child belongs to him who has gone through the form of marriage with the mother. That was however not the view of Śrī-Kṛṣṇa. His explanation was that the Earth had concealed some Kṣatriyas. She had concealed some Haihayas among women, some Pauravas among the bears of Mount Rkṣavant. Some other Kṣatriyas were brought up in the forest among the kine, some in the cowpens among the calves. Some were protected by the Ocean, some by the wolves on Mount Čīdrakūṭa. These had all escaped destruction at the hands of the formidable Bhārgava. And the old Kṣatriya dynasties were resuscitated by Kaśyapa, who first ordered Rāma to clear out from the earth which he had given to Kaśyapa as a part of the sacrificial fee and restored by and by those scions of the old Kṣatriya families to their rightful heritage. Śrī-Kṛṣṇa evidently did not know anything about the procreation of Kṣatriyas by pious Brahmins on the widows of the Kṣatriyas slaughtered by the bloodthirsty Bhārgava. He con-cludes by remarking that the present Kṣatriyas are the legitimate offsprings of those ancient Kṣatriyas (B. 12. 49. 88 f.):

tatāḥ pṛthivyā nirdeśaṁ tāṁ samānya Kaśyapaḥ |
abhyaśiṣcanaṁ mahāpālāṁ kṣatriyāṁ vīryasaṁmatāṁ ||
teśāṁ putrāś ca paśtroś ca yesūṁ vaṁśaḥ pratīsthitaḥ |

At the beginning of the third great sub-division of the Śānti, the Mokṣadharma, we have a lengthy discourse attributed to Bhṛgu, called the Bhṛgu-Bhāradvāja-saṁvāda (adhy. 182-192 of the Vulgate), which summarizes in the form of questions and answers almost the entire Brahmanic teaching on the subject of (1) the elements, (2) life and death, (3) caste distinctions, (4) good and evil, (5) the four stages of life, and finally, (6) the other world. It will be seen that it is a complete tractate on Hindu Ontology, Sociology, Eschatology and Ethics that is here attributed to Bhṛgu, the eponymous ancestor of the Bhārgavas.

The oft-cited stanza B. 12. 339. 103 f.:

Hamsāḥ Kūrmaś ca Matsyaś ca prādurbhāvād dvijottama |
Varāho Narasihhaś ca Vāmano Rāma eva ca |
Rāmo Daśrathis caiva Sāvataḥ Kalkir eva ca |

from the Mokṣadharma is important as containing one of the two actual references in our Mahābhārata to the Bhārgava Rāma as an avatāra of Viṣṇu, one of his ten avatāras; but the passage is suspect, as it is missing in some Grantha MSS. and some old Devanāgarī MSS. which have been

---

1 The relevant passage is cited and translated by J. C. Ghosh, in an article which has appeared in the Annals (Vol. 12, pp. 168 ff.) entitled "Some additional notes on 'Foreign elements in the Hindu Population'."

2 Monkeys? [MON. WILL.]
collated by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute for a critical edition of that book. The other reference is in the same chapter, a few stanzas earlier (B. 12. 339. 84):

\[ \text{Tretāyuge bhaviṣyāmi Rāmo Bhṛgukulodvahāḥ} \\
\text{Kṣatram cotsādayiṣyāmi semaddhabalavāhanam} \]

This stanza cannot be impugned on the score of documentary evidence, which is unanimous in its favour. But both references occur in the Nārāyanīya section of the Mokṣadharma, which is notoriously a late addition to our Mahābhārata. This shows that the theory of avatāras is still developing in the epic and their number is not yet fixed, nor are the avatāras fully canonized. It should thus seem that the Mahābhārata does not \([49]\) necessarily presuppose the Bhārgava Rāma to be an avatāra of Viṣṇu.

ANUSĀSANAPARVAN

The Anuśāsana, for some reason that is not yet quite clear, is the richest in Bhārgava material.

Early in the beginning of this book (adhy. 4), we have the third repetition of the legend of the birth of Jamadagni. The previous chapter (3) relates the mighty deeds of the Kṣatriya Viśvāmitra, which led to his attaining the coveted status of a Brahmin. In adhy. 4, Bhṛṣma explains how it came about that Viśvāmitra who was of mingled Brahmin and Kṣatriya parentage was born in the Kṣatriya caste with Brahmanic qualities, while his nephew Jamadagni, under similar conditions, was born in the Brahmin caste with Kṣatriyan qualities. We have here a repetition of the old story how Rcīka married Gādhi's daughter Satyavatī, who obtained some boons for herself and her mother. The mother and the daughter exchange the trees they had to embrace and carus of which they had to partake. The wise Rcīka had purposely made the prescriptions differently. He had in fact put the entire accumulated energy of Brahmanism in the caru of his wife, while he had put the entire accumulated energy of Kṣatriyahood in the caru intended for her mother. The consequence of the exchange slyly effected by the mother was that the son of Gādhi's wife turned out to be a man with Brahmanic propensities, while the son of Rcīka's wife would have been a model Kṣatriya; but, owing to the pleadings of Satyavatī, the great sage graciously gives his consent to the postponement of the doom to Satyavatī's grand-son.

This story we have had at Āraṇyaka 115 and Ṣānti 49 of the Vulgate. In passing it may be mentioned that the present version agrees with the Sāntiparvan version in making Rcīka the giver of the boons, whereas in the Āraṇyaka version this person is some ancestor of Rcīka, either Rcīka's father or perhaps Bhṛgu himself.

The mere mention of Bhārgava Rāma in B. 13. 14. 273 at once calls forth the reaction:
In adhy. 30 (of the Vulgate) we are told how a Kṣatriya Vitahavya was made a Brahmin by the mere word of a Bhṛgu. The story is as follows.

Vatsa, a descendant of Śaryāti had two sons, Haihaya and Tālajaṅgha. The hundred sons of Haihaya attacked and killed Haryaśva, king of Kāśī, whose son Sudeva succeeded him on the throne. Sudeva was likewise defeated and killed by the Haihayas. Sudeva was succeeded by Divodāsa, who built Vārāṇasī, on the northern bank of Ganges and the southern bank of the Gomati. Likewise defeated by the Haihayas, he fled to his priest Bharadvāja, who obtained for him, through sacrifice, a son Pratardana. The son of Divodāsa defeated in turn all the Haihayas, when Vitahavya pursued by Pratardana, fled to the hermitage of Bhṛgu. When Pratardana demanded from Bhṛgu the surrender of Vitahavya, who was hiding in Bhṛgu’s hermitage, Bhṛgu in order to save the life of Vitahavya said that there were only Brahmīns in the hermitage. Through that declaration of Bhṛgu, who could not tell a lie, Vitahavya actually became a Brahmin. His descendants are set out for fifteen generations. His son was Ğṛtsamada, whose eleventh descendant was Pramati; his son was Ruru; his son was Śunaka, from whom came the Śaunakas.

In adhy. 40, Bhiṣma expatiates on the fascination and frailty of women, the root of all evil, and to support his statement he relates the story of Vipula, another Bhārgava, an interesting story in which mesmerism or hypnotism plays some part (Vipulopākhyāna, adhy. 40-43 in the Vulgate).

The sage Devaśarman, the story goes, had a beautiful wife Ruci (Beauty) by name, who had attracted the attention of the gay king of the gods, Indra. Once upon a time it so happened that Devaśarman had to go away from his hermitage on some sacrificial business. Not feeling quite sure about his little Ruci, the old sage taking into his confidence his disciple, the Bhārgava Vipula, told him to protect his slender-waisted wife, especially against the amorous advances of Indra, who was an adept at assuming different forms at will. Devaśarman pathetically en-[51]-joined his disciple to take every care and see that the lascivious king of the celestials did not defile that frivolous wife of his, like a wretched dog licking the havis placed near the sacrificial altar. To protect the virtue of Ruci, who was peerless on earth in beauty, Vipula decided to enter into her by his yogic power and live in her without her being conscious of it, until the critical moment was passed. Indra comes as expected and makes overtures to the beautiful Ruci, who had captivated his mind. Ruci, though anxious to reciprocate, remains externally indifferent to the blandishments of Indra, through the influence of Vipula, who was living within her and guiding her actions. Indra, puzzled by the behaviour of Ruci, reflects and realizes how matters stand. At that moment Vipula leaves the body of Ruci and re-enters his own body. Then Vipula faces the
philanderer and soundly rebukes him, and Indra slinks away abashed. Only one man had been able to protect a woman and that was the Bhārgava Vipula (B. 13. 43. 27):

tenaikena tu rakṣā vai Vipulena kṛtā striyāḥ |

nānyah ṇaktaś triloke 'smin rakṣitum nyatya yośitam ||

This story was told by the Bhārgava Märkaṇḍeya to Bhīṣma (B. 13. 43. 18) and repeated by the latter to Yudhiṣṭhira.

A few chapters later we have again a Bhārgava story, the Cyavanopākhyāna in seven chapters (50-56), which is divided into two parts: the first two chapters (50-51) illustrate the sanctity of cows, the last five deal really with that topic of perennial interest, the mingled Brahmin and Kṣatriya parentage of the Bhārgava Rāma.

The first story, in which a cow was found to be the only equivalent possible for the ransom of the sage Cyavana, may be passed over.

In the second story (adhy. 52-56), we come back to the anecdote of Rāma Jāmadagnya, and we have here practically a repetition of the explanation given above (in adhy. 4 of this very parvan) of the circumstances under which Viśvāmitra, who was of mixed Brahmin and Kṣatriya parentage was born in the Kṣatriya caste with Brahmanic qualities, while Rāma under similar conditions was born in the Brahmin caste with the oppo-[52]-site qualities. The repetition comes about in this way. Yudhiṣṭhira, whose curiosity about the Bhārgava Rāma is, as already remarked, never satisfied, says to Bhīṣma (B. 13. 52. 1 ff.) : “I have a great curiosity, O Lord, about Jāmadagni’s son Rāma, that foremost of all righteous persons. You should satisfy that curiosity. How was Rāma born, that truly valorous hero? He belonged by birth to a family of Brahmin sages. How did he become a follower of Kṣatriya practices? Relate to me in detail the circumstances of Rāma’s birth. Also how did a man born in the family of the Kuśikas, who was a Kṣatriya, become a Brahmin? Great indeed was the power of the high-souled Rāma as also that of Viśvāmitra!”

The answer is given by Bhīṣma by relating the prophecy which had been made by Cyavana, an ancestor of the Bhārgava Rāma. Cyavana wants to prevent the harm that will come to his clan by Rāma’s adopting the practices of the Kṣatriyas, a danger of which he has prophetic knowledge. He repairs to Kuśika, through whose descendant the harm was to happen, in order to vex him, and, if he finds a favourable opportunity to pronounce a malediction on Kuśika, damning him and his descendants to eternal perdition. When the sage presents himself before the king and says that he wants to observe a certain vow while living in the palace with the king, he is warmly welcomed with unfeigned joy, and also served with meticulous care and obsequiousness by the king and the queen. The sage has a meal and he then sleeps for twenty-one days, during which the king and the queen wait upon him without food or drink, gently massaging his legs. Suddenly the sage wakes
up and goes out, followed with trepidation by the king and the queen, and as suddenly vanishes! The king looks for in vain, and, returning in a depressed mood to the room set apart for the sage, finds him again, stretched as before on his luxurious bed! The sage practises many tricks of this type, calculated to try the patience of the unfortunate couple, and ultimately yokes them to a heavily laden war-chariot. During the drive through the city, the sage gives the royal couple vicious digs with a heavy iron goad, distributing all the while in charity the entire wealth of the king. Still the sage finds no change in their behaviour. So in the end he has to {53} express himself as satisfied with their treatment of him and he goes back to the forest, asking the royal couple to come there on the following day. The king and queen take a little rest for the first time after forty-two days of trial and spend the night happily in each other's company. The next morning the king and the queen go to the forest to pay their respects to the sage and see there a magnificent palace standing in a big park, a fair imitation of Indra's paradise. After a short while, the magical palace and the park vanish, and there sits in the solitude of the forest the sage who had yoked them to the chariot and ill-treated them in other ways. Then the king feels that Brahmic power was the sumnum bonum of life. When he approaches Cyavana, the sage gives him a boon. Kuśika wants to know why Cyavana had come to live with him and what all those incidents implied. Cyavana tells him frankly what his intention was and also prophesies that Kuśika's wish would be fulfilled in so far that a descendant of Kuśika's (Viśvāmitra) would become a Brahmin. Through the lustre of the Bhṛgus, Kuśika's grandson (Viśvāmitra) would be an ascetic endowed with the splendour of fire (B. 13. 55. 32):

\[ Bhṛgūnām eva tejasā paurus te bhavitā vipras tapasvi pāvakadānih \]

Then follows in the final chapter Cyavana's prophecy about the persecution of the Bhṛgus, about Īrva (or Aurva), about Rṣika, and Jamadagni, who will marry Gādhi's daughter, that is, Kuśika's grand-daughter. Of the boons that will be given to the two ladies by Bhṛgu, the exchange of the trees and the carus by the mother and the daughter, about Viśvāmitra, and so on and so forth. Incidentally it may be mentioned that this is the fourth occurrence of this interesting story of the birth of the Bhārgava Rāma, it having occurred already at adhy. 4 of this very parvan, and before that in the Śānti (adhy. 48) and the Aranyaka (adhy. 115-117).

Some chapters later we again meet with the Bhārgava Rāma when Bhīṣma tells Yudhiṣṭhīra about the merit of the gift of gold. The shades of his ancestors had appeared to Bhīṣma and told him that the gift of gold purifies the giver. Now it happens that the same advice had been given to the Bhārgava Rāma by Vasiṣṭha and other sages. In this connection we have again an {54} allusion to the extirpation of the Kṣatriyas and the con-
quest of the earth by Rāma (B. 13. 84, 31):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{trihsaptakrītvaḥ prthivī kṛtā nihksatriyā purā} \\
tato jītvā mahīm kṛṣṇāṁ Rāmo rājivalocanāḥ
\end{align*}
\]

e tc. (X)

The next chapter (85), a long rambling chapter with 168 stanzas, deals with the mystery, already alluded to above, of the birth of Bhṛgu, Aṅgiras and Kavi. They are said to be praśīpatiś and progenitors of many tribes and clans, in fact of the entire mankind.

It will be a surprise to many that our sandals and umbrellas we also owe to a Bhṛgu. Chapter 95 relates how the practice arose of giving umbrellas and sandals to Brahmans at śrāddhas and other religious rites. Once upon a time Jamadagni was amusing himself by shooting arrows at a distant target, and his wife Rṣekā was fetching the arrows shot by him. Sorely afflicted by the scorching heat of the midday sun, she rested just for a moment under the shade of an umbrageous tree. Being kept waiting, the irascible Bhṛgu scolded his wife for her tardiness, but on learning the real cause of the delay, wanted to shoot down the offending sun from his high position in the heavens. The frightened luminary comes to him in the guise of a poor Brahmin, who tries to dissuade him from carrying out his terrible threat, but is recognized by the Bhṛgu and reprimanded. In the end Jamadagni is pacified and receives from the sun the first umbrella and the first pair of leather sandals. To make a gift of them to Brahmans is highly meritorious. This account of the origin of shoes and sandals is, I believe, not found outside the Mahābhārata.

In adhy. 98 (of the Vulgate) we have a report by Bhīṣma of a discussion between the Bhṛgava Śukra and Bali about flowers, lamps, aromatics, appropriate to be offered to gods on diverse occasions and the merit accruing from the presentation.

Above, while discussing the Drona-parvan version of the Sūdaśarājakīya, I had referred to palpable evidence of the “bhṛguization” of a legend. We have another illuminating instance of the process in the next story (adhy. 99-100 of the [55] Vulgate) told by Bhīṣma to Yudhīśthira. It is another version of the well-known legend of Nahuṣa's fall from heaven.

Nahuṣa, when king of the gods, neglected the daily offerings to the gods including the bali, losing thereby some of his spiritual power. Subsequently, having oppressed the sages, he was hurled down from heaven and turned into a boa by the curse of a Brahmin sage, Bhṛgu.

A similar version of this legend occurs in the Udyoga (adhy. 11-17) and is again alluded to in the Śānti (adhy. 342). There it is related that Nahuṣa became extremely arrogant and caused the sages to carry his palanquin. While being carried about in this way, his foot touched the head of Agastya, who by his curse turned him into a boa. The defect in the construction of this naïve story is very obvious and must have been early noticed by the diakseuasts themselves. Nahuṣa, by the terms of the boon which
Brahmā and the gods had foolishly given him, could absorb the power of any being on whom he set his eyes. Under these circumstances, even the resourceful Agastya could not effectively curse Nahuṣa, because Agastya, when kicked by the tyrant, being in full view of the other, was ipso facto deprived of all his spiritual power, like all the gods and sages who had been oppressed by Nahuṣa and were utterly powerless before him.

The revised version of the legend in the Anuśāsana stages beforehand a confabulation between Bhṛgu and Agastya. Agastya wants to damn Nahuṣa but does not know how to. Bhṛgu befriends him and gives him the assurance that he (Bhṛgu) would somehow bring about the downfall of the tyrant. Bhṛgu, who knows beforehand, by spiritual prevision, that Nahuṣa was going to kick Agastya, proposes to Agastya, in anticipation of it, that on a certain day he would sit hidden inside the matted locks of the sage and from that position he would curse Nahuṣa. So when the opportune moment came, Bhṛgu, possessed of great lustre, addressed Agastya as follows: “Do you shut your eyes, Agastya, while I enter into the matted hair of your head”. Having said this, Bhṛgu of unfading glory and great energy entered into the locks of Agastya, who stood still like a wooden post. Soon after, Nahuṣa saw Agastya approached for being yoked to his chariot. Bhṛgu, who was sitting in the matted locks of Agastya, took [56] care not to look at Nahuṣa. Fully acquainted with the power which the illustrious Nahuṣa had acquired on account of the boon which Brahmā had given him, Bhṛgu had acted thus. Agastya though thus treated by Nahuṣa did not yield to anger. Then Nahuṣa urged Agastya with his goad. The pious sage Agastya still did not yield to anger. The lord of celestials, himself enraged at this pusillanimity, then struck Agastya on the head with his left foot. When the sage was thus struck on the head, then Bhṛgu, who was sitting within the matted locks of Agastya, became incensed and cursed the sinful Nahuṣa saying, “Thou hast kicked the head of the great sage, fall down therefore on the earth, changed into a boa!” Thus imprecated by Bhṛgu, who had not been seen, Nahuṣa forthwith became transformed into a boa and in that form dropped down on the earth.

Yudhiṣthira, who had heard a different version of the story from Śalya, as narrated in the Udyoga, maintains naturally a discreet silence about these discrepancies and proceeds to question Bhūṣma about some other matters on which he wanted information.

Next, in the course of a long passage devoted to the praise of Brahmins, showing that the Brahmins are mightier than even the gods, the story of Cyavavana is repeated (adhy. 156).

Cyavavana, who had been rejuvenated and cured of blindness by the Āśvins, had, as we have seen, promised them that they should drink Soma with Indra and the other gods. The gods were wavering in their mind, but Indra was adamant. He refused to accept the Soma libation in Cyavana’s sacrifice,
if those low-caste Aśvins were invited at the same time. When Cyavana was going to put his magic in operation, Indra rushes on him with a mountain and thunderbolt, but is instantly paralyzed by Cyavana and brought to submission. Then Cyavana creates a fearsome monster, Mada, who is about to gobble up all the gods. Beseeched by the gods, who were frightened to death by this terrible apparition, Indra apologizes to Cyavana; and the Aśvins, patronized by the great wizard, are allowed to share the Soma libation with the other gods. This story was already narrated to Yudhiṣṭhira by the sage Lomaśa in the Ṙaṇyaka (adhy. 123 of the Vulgate).

[57] Aśvamedhāparvan

An echo of the above story we find early in the course of the Aśvamedhāparvan. In adhy. 9 we find Agni taunting Indra about the humiliation of the latter at the hands of Cyavana, which has been just described (B. 14. 9. 31):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{yatra Śaryatiḥ Cyavano yājāyisyan} \\
\text{sahāśvibhyāṁ somam agraṇād ekah |} \\
\text{tam tvan kruddhaḥ pratyasedhīḥ purastāc} \\
\text{Charyātiyajñam smara tam Mahendra ||}
\end{align*}\]

Agni might have added the story of his own humiliation at the hands of another wizard of the same clan, Bhṛgu, when he was indiscreet enough to divulge some secret to Puloman, the seducer of Bhṛgu’s wife Pulomā, but for obvious reasons he does not do so.

In another digression, the Anugītāparvan, we have an allusion to the annihilation of Kṣatriyas by the Bhārgava Rāma, used this time for a different purpose (adhy. 29-30 of the Vulgate). It is here made the basis of a homily on the vanity of life. After the murder of Arjuna Kārtavīrya and the extermination of the Kṣatriyas, the Bhārgava Rāma was taught by the shades of his ancestors that greater than any victory over kings was the conquest of one’s own self: the ascetic ideal. This conquest is made by self-mortification. Thus admonished by his departed ancestors, the Bhārgava Rāma practised the most austere penances, and as a consequence of this exercise of self-control, that highly blessed one acquired that supreme felicity which it is so difficult to obtain.

The last Bhārgava story of the Mahābhārata is the Uttāṇkopākhyāna of this parvan (adhy. 53-58 of the Vulgate), which we shall next consider.

After the death of Bhṛṣma, Kṛṣṇa returns to Dvārakā. On his way he meets in a desert the sage Uttāṇka, who is ready to pronounce a malediction on Kṛṣṇa when he learns that the latter had not brought about peace between the contending Kauravas and Pāṇḍavas. Isrī-Kṛṣṇa pacifies Uttāṇka by enlightening him about his divine nature and divine mission, complaining that the Kurus, intoxicated as they were by the pride of pomp and power, had not listened to the wholesome advice he had given [58] them for their
welfare. At Uttanaka's request, Sri-Krsna shows him his cosmic form (rupam aisuaram), made popular by the Gita, giving him rare boons.

This story impels the intelligent Janamejaya to ask Vaisarnpayana what penances the great Uttanaka had practised so that he had the temerity to threaten even Vishtu (Sri-Krsna). Vaisarnpayana replies that it was his supreme devotion to his guru that had endowed him with this great spiritual power, and he proceeds to relate the story of Uttanaka. He relates how Uttanaka had escaped being eaten by the cannibal king Saudasa and obtained the ear-jewels of Saudasa's queen Madayantī as fee for his guru Gautama, how on the way the ear-jewels were stolen by a snake (nāga), and how Uttanaka recovered them from the subterranean world of the Nāgas.

It will be noticed that this Uttanakopākhyaṇa is but a variant (metrical) version of Pausyaparvan, a (prose) sub-section of the Adi (adhy. 3), but with some significant differences in the details. The dramatis personas are in part different. The preceptor is not Veda, as in the Adi, but Gotama, the husband of Ahalyā; likewise the king from whom Uttanaka gets the ear-jewels is here not Pauśya but Saudāsa (Kalmāsapāda), who had become a cannibal by the curse of some great sage, whom the arrogant king had laboured with a hunter. Moreover, in the first version, the name of the snake is given as Takṣaka, the snake which had bitten king Parīkṣit and been the cause of his premature death; in the second he remains nameless. The only reason for citing the story of Uttanaka here, in this paper, is that in the Aśvamedha version of the story Uttanaka is several times called a Bhārgava, a fact which does not appear from the Adiparvan version. We have thus here a documentation for a Bhārgava, who by the power of his austerities—devotion to one's guru is a kind of tapas—was in a position to curse an aṣṭalāra of Vishtu himself for his apparent fault in not conciliating the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas and preventing the fratricidal war, and who had to be gently pacified by the great god by showing him his cosmic form to support his assertions.

If we now go back to the Adi, we shall find that this figure of Uttanaka has been further deftly woven into the fabric of [59] the epic and not allowed to remain merely as a loose appendage. For, in the short metrical tail of the (prose) Pausyaparvan, it is narrated that, after his adventure in the world of the Nāgas Uttanaka betakes himself straight to the Pāṇḍava Janamejaya in Hāstina-pura and prevails upon the king to punish Takṣaka for causing the death of Parīkṣit. At Uttanaka's instance Janamejaya instituted the snake sacrifice; and at this sacrifice Vaisarnpayana first recited the Mahābhārata. Now the Mahābhārata that we now possess is said to have been recited by the Sūta Ugraśravas before Śaunaka exactly as he had heard it during the recitation of the poem by Vyāsa's own pupil Vaisarnpayana at the famous snake sacrifice which was instituted by king Janamejaya at the instigation of Uttanaka. Our debt to this Bhārgava is therefore very obvious.
This Uttâkopâkhyâna contains the last important reference in the Mahâbhârata to the Bhârgavas, linking up with that in adhy. 3 of the Ādi.

There are still a few more Bhârgava stories in the Mahâbhârata, the consideration of which I had intentionally postponed and to which we shall now turn.

We run into a nest of Bhârgava legends, as a matter of fact, already in the fourth sub-section of the Ādi, the Paulomaparvan, which have not been discussed above.

The Mahâbhârata, as is well known, has two variant openings. In the first (Ādi. 1), when the Sûta (or, according to some editions, Sauti) Ugrasûravas, who is to recite the Mahâbhârata, presents himself at the hermitage of Kulapati Saunaka, during the twelve-year sacrificial session inaugurated by the sage in the sacred Naimiša Forest and offers to recite stories for the edification and entertainment of the guests, the sages assembled there express their desire to hear the celebrated Mahâbhârata (1. 1. 18 f.) :

Janamejayasya yâṁ râjña Vaiśampâyana uktavâṁ |
yathâvaṁ sa ṛṣis tuṣṭyâ saatre Dvâpâyânâjñayâ ||
vedais caturbhiḥ samitâṁ Vyâsasyabhutakarmanâk ||
samhitâṁ śrotum icchâmo dharmyâṁ pâpabhayâpaḥ ||
The Sûta accordingly commences with some machine stanzas (1. 1. 20):

[60] adyaṁ puruṣam īśanam puruḥitaṁ puruṣitulam |
ṛṇam ekâksaram brahma vyaktâvyaktan sanātanam || etc.,
which are followed by a sort of prologue, which latter languishes and breaks off somewhere.

In adhy. 4 of the Ādi, we come upon another opening, which totally ignores the first! The Sûta is re-introduced. The scene is the same, but the programme is changed. Here the assembled sages do not themselves order the entertainment, but ask the Sûta to wait until the Kulapati Saunaka comes. When in the next chapter (5), the Kulapati joins the company, after having duly performed his round of daily duties, he instead of asking the Sûta to narrate the Mahâbhârata, as the sages in the first instance had done, tells him, strange to say, to relate first the history of the Bhârgavas (1. 5. 3).

tatra vamśam ahau pûrvaṁ śrotum icchâmi Bhârgavam |
kathayaśva kathâṁ etâṁ kalyâṁ sma śrauṣṇe tava ||

The Sûta obediently proceeds to relate the history of that “most illustrious family of the Bhrgus, which is honoured even by the celestials with Indra, Agni and the Maruts” (1. 5. 5). Here the Bhârgava interest is very clear and unmistakable. Accordingly eight chapters (5-12), which form the Paulomaparvan, are entirely consecrated to an account of the wonderful deeds of some of the Bhârgavas, an account which is not even remotely connected in actual fact with the incidents or characters of our epic. It is a digression pure and simple, introduced with the very obvious object of glorifying the Bhârgavas and giving a permanent form to some of the Bhârgava myths and
legends. These chapters are a short history of one special branch of the Bhārgava clan, represented by: Bhrigu, Cyavana, Pramati, Ruru and Śunaka. The significance of this branch and its connection with our version of the Mahābhārata will become apparent presently.

Bhrigu, a sage of almost mythical character, the eponymous ancestor of the family, is here said to have been created from Brahmā from the sacrificial fire during Varuṇa’s sacrifice (216*):

*Bhrugur mahaśir bhagavān Brahmanā vai svayambhuvā |
Varuṇasya kṣatru jātaḥ pāvakād iti nāḥ śrutam ||

[61] This interpolated stanza (found only in N) contradicts the statement in the main body of the text (documented jointly by N and S) to the effect that Bhrigu was born by piercing the heart of Brahmā (1. 60. 40):

Brahmāno hṛdayah bhittvā niḥṛto bhagavān Bhruguk |

While Bhrigu’s wife Pulomā was pregnant, the story continues (adhy. 5-6), there came to Bhrigu’s hermitage, during his absence, a demon (rākṣasa), Puloman, who became enamoured of her and wanted to carry her off. To make sure of his facts, however, the demon asked Agni whether she was really Bhrigu’s wife. The fact was that this Pulomā was first betrothed to Puloman and afterwards given by her father to Bhrigu, and Puloman wanted to have his Pulomā back. On getting from Agni an answer in the affirmative, the demon, assuming the form of a boar, carried her off. On the way Cyavana is born. His lustre instantly reduces to ashes the demonic ravisher of his mother and saves her from a very awkward predicament. Pulomā returns home safely with the baby. Bhrigu only learns of this incident after his return to the hermitage. Incensed at the outrage, he curses the god Agni, whom he regards as the prime cause of the disaster, saying that Agni would be an eater of all things, good and bad (sava-bhākṣa).

There follows in adhy. 8 the story of Ruru, son of Pramati. Menakā an apsaras, abandons her beautiful daughter near the hermitage of the sage Śthūlakesa. She is called Pramadvarā. Pramati arranges her marriage with his son Ruru, who has fallen in love with her. Shortly before the celebration of their marriage Pramadvarā is bitten by a venomous snake and dies, leaving Ruru disconsolate. By the miraculous powers of his austere penance, this Bhārgava gives up half of his life to Pramadvarā and revives her, and ultimately marries her. Ruru takes a vow to destroy all the snakes in the world, like Janamejaya before him, whose father Parikṣit had died as the result of a snake-bite. One day Ruru comes across a harmless old snake of the variety known as dundubha (adhy. 9). The snake begs to be spared and so Ruru does not kill it. The serpent body only concealed the metamorphosed soul of a sage, who was suffering the effects of a curse pronounced on him in a previous birth (adhy. 10). The [62] sage declares ahiṁsā to be the highest duty of a Brahmīn. Janamejaya had once tried to destroy the race of snakes by performing a snake sacrifice; they were saved by the Brahm-
min Astika (adhy. 11). Ruru subsequently hears the story of Janamejaya's snake sacrifice from his father Pramati (adhy. 12). This story of the snake sacrifice as told by Pramati to his son Ruru was repeated verbatim by the Sūta to Saunaka and forms in our version of the Mahābhārata the Astikarpavan, the fifth sub-section of the Adi. (adhy. 13-53).

It will be noticed that from adhy. 4 to adhy. 12 of the Adi, a section which, as already mentioned, is entirely concerned with the history of a branch of the Bhārgava clan, there is no mention of the Mahābhārata at all. Nor is there, as a matter of fact, any mention of the epic in the immediate sequel up to adhy. 53 of the Adi! Only in adhy. 53, after having heard first the Bhārgava legends and then the story of the snake sacrifice (which had been previously related by the Bhārgava Pramati to his son Ruru), Saunaka at last expresses the desire to hear the Mahābhārata of Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana, which was narrated to king Janamejaya by Vaiśampāyana in the intervals of that snake sacrifice (1. 53, 32 f.):

Mahābhāratam ākyāhānam Pāṇḍavānāṁ yaśaskaram ||
Janamejyena yat prṣṭah Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyanas ladā ||
śrāvayāmāsa vidhīvat tadā karmāntareṣu saḥ ||
tāṁ aham vidhīvat puṣyāṁ srotum icchāmi vai kathām ||

This completes our survey of the Bhārgava material in the Mahābhārata. But even this analysis does not give an adequate idea of the total number of Bhārgava references in the Great [63] Epic. The Bhārgavas regularly occur as static figures, along with other ancient sages, in the descriptions of martial combats, festive gatherings, state functions, council meetings and all important assemblies. Outstanding incidents of their history are frequently alluded to, briefly, even in the course of other narratives. The names of their heroes are habitually introduced in similes and metaphors: they are the standards of comparison (upamāna), to which everybody else is compared, especially the epic heroes. Thus a man is praised by saying that his intelligence is like that of Śukra. A warrior is eulogized by saying that in heroism he was the equal of the Bhārgava Rāma. Bhīṣma is once praised by saying that he could not be defeated even by Rāma. In other places the valour and effulgence of Cyavana and Aurva are utilized for the sake of a passing comparison. The devotion of Śukanyā to her husband

---

The following sages should probably further be included among the Bhūrgus:
(1) Āśīrśīva, a sage, mentioned several times in the Aranyaka; a legend is told about him in the Baladeva-tīrthayātrā (Salyaparvan); (2) Gṛtsamada, mentioned briefly in the Anuśāsana; (3) Veda, who was the teacher of Uttaṅka and chaplain of Janamejaya and Pausya; (4) Pāda, one of the pupils of Vyāsa; and (5) Māyādva, who curses Dharma in the celebrated story (upākhyāna) of Anīmāndavva in the Adi. The part they play in our epic is small, and therefore they have been ignored in this paper. Moreover, none of them, except Gṛtsamada, is actually called a Bhārgava in our epic, Śrī-Kṛṣṇa himself was distantly connected with the Bhārgavas, being a descendant of Yadu, the son of Yayāti by the Bhārgava Devayānī.
Cyavana has been made proverbial by constant citation. These details could not be considered in the present paper for want of space.1

RETROSPECT

From the legends preserved in our epic it should seem that the Bhārgavas were a Brahmin clan, perhaps more intimately associated with the ancient Kṣatriyas than most of the other Brahmin clans, being largely connected with them by matrimonial ties. Thus Cyavana is said to have married Sukanyā, the daughter of king Śaryāti. Rṣikā had married Satyavatī, the daughter of king Gāḍhī of Kānyakubja and sister of the famous Viśvāmitra. Jamadagni's wife Reukā is likewise said to have been a princess by birth, being a daughter of king Prasenajit of Ayodhyā. The Bhārgavi Devayāni was moreover married to king Yayāti: one of the very few pratiloma marriages on record in Brahmanical literature.2 King Vitahavya had been adopted and made a Brahmin by a Bhṛgu, and his descendants became Bhārgavas. On the other hand some of the ancient Bhārgavas seem to have come seriously into conflict with the Kṣatriyas. The relations of Rāma Jamadagnya with the Kṣatriyas are so well known and have been repeated above so often that it is [64] unnecessary to dilate upon them here. But even in the case of Aurva and Jamadagni, the epic has to relate conflicts with the Kṣatriyas, which have been alluded to above.

In these conflicts the Bhārgavas are represented in our epic as irascible sages, domineering, arrogant, unbending and revengeful. To our epic bards they are at the same time omniscient and omnipotent. Superman, who had become so chiefly by virtue of their rigid austerities and the magical or spiritual powers acquired by them. Owing to these occult powers, the Bhārgavas were like gods walking on earth, or rather greater than mere gods. Thus Bhṛgu pronounces a curse on Agni—a god fervently lauded and worshipped by the simple Aryans—for no faults of his. He also cursed (according to one version) Nahuṣa, who had been elected king of gods and who had become arrogant and irreligious owing to this sudden elevation to power. The wizard Cyavana paralysed the arm of the recalcitrant Indra, a high god of the Vedic Aryans. Jamadagni would shoot down the Sun, another Aryan god. The Bhārgava Uttanka, when about to curse Śrī-Kṛṣṇa, the supreme god of the Bhāgavatas or Vaishnavas, was gently pacified by the avālāra. The kings of the earth are of course like vermin before these Bhārgavas. The mighty Haihayas tremble before the infant Aurva, who blinds them by his effulgence, and they have to beg for mercy on their bended knees. King Kusīka grovels at the feet of Cyavana and meekly submits to all varieties of indignities for fear that the great sage might curse him.

1 Even these may be considered later, if a suitable opportunity presents itself.
2 Two others: Apnavāna's with Nahuṣa's daughter Ruci, and Prabhākara's mentioned by Pargiter, Anc. Ind. Hist. Trad., 304 f.
3 Devāpi, brother of Santanu, becomes Arṣiṣena, a sub-class of the Bhṛgus.
Bhrigu, the eponymous ancestor of the Bhārgavas, was one of the pra-jāpatis. While the other pra-jāpatis like Dakṣa are said to have issued from different limbs of Brahmadeva, Bhrigu is represented as having sprung from Brahmadeva’s heart, the noblest of the internal organs of man of god. In another context in our epic, it is implied that Bhrigu was the greatest of the mahārṣis, though his name is not included even in the list of the famous Seven Sages.

But the Bhārgava most popular with our bards is surely Rāma Jámadagnya. The bards love to dwell on his martial exploits, repeating them whenever the slightest opportunity for it presents itself. The shadow of this colossus overspreads the entire epic, excepting the short tale at the end of the poem. In our epic he is not yet a full-fledged avatāra, but on the high way to be ele-[65]-vated to that rank, surreptitious efforts being made to make the epic document his divinity. He conquers the whole world, alone and unaided; such is the prowess of his fierce austerities. He frees the earth of the burden of Kṣatriyas thrice seven times and makes the gift of the earth to Kaśyapa, his priest, who divides it among Brahmins. Rāma fights even the enemies of the gods, with the same assurance and success, enemies whom the gods themselves could not subdue. As the Bhārgava Rāma is the perfect warrior (sarvaśastrabhṛtāṁ varaḥ a phrase the bards love to apply to him), three of the leading warriors of the Kaurava army— Bhīma, Drona and Karna—are said to have been initiated into the science of arms by Rāma Jámadagnya, though the latter according to the epic itself, lived at the end of the Tretā Age and the Kuru Pāṇḍava war took place at the end of the Dvāpara.

The epic contains a number of episodes (upākhyānas) relating to the Bhārgavas, such as, the Auvropākhyāna (Ādi), Kārtavīryopākhyāna (Āranyaka), Ambopākhyāna (Udyoga), Vipulopākhyāna (Sānti), and Uttarakopākhyāna (Āsvamedha), and so on. The entire Pauloma and a large section of the Pausya two independent sub-parvans of the epic, are also devoted to the legends of the Bhārgavas. Besides these there are important discussions and discourses attributed to some of the celebrated Bhārgavas, such as the Bhrigu-Bhāradvāja-saṁvāda, the Cyavana-Kuṣika-saṁvāda and the Mārkanḍeya-saṁsāyā,

Another striking feature of these Bhārgava legends in our Mahābhārata is the frequent repetition of these legends on different occasions in the course of the epic. Thus the legend of Uttānika, the myth of the altercation between Cyāvana and Indra, the story of Droṇa’s obtaining weapons from the Bhārgava Rāma, and the account of Karna’s pupilship under him, is each told twice, in different contexts. The legend of the birth of Jámadagni and Rāma is related in all four times. That the Bhārgava Rāma exterminated the Kṣatriyas thrice seven times is mentioned ten times, in nearly
identical form (triśaptaktyvah prthivī kṛtā niḥkṣatriyā purā, which appears to have been a slogan of the bards); but the humiliation of the pride of the Kṣatriyas by the Bhārgava Rāma is mentioned about a score of times.

It is to be noted that the Bhārgavas spring into this prominence all of a sudden in the Mahābhārata. We look in vain for any reflection of their phenomenal power and glory in the Vedic literature.1 There the Bhārgavas are frequently alluded to as devoted to the fire-cult and they appear in the rôle of a group of ancient fire priests. They are said to have procured fire for mankind. In the Battle of Ten Kings, the Bhārgavas are mentioned with the Druhyus. In many passages they are associated with the Aṅgirases. The Atharvaveda is also known as Bṛgvanagrī, and it seems certain that both the Bṛgus and the Aṅgirases dabbled a great deal in the black art and were feared on that account. That they probably came into conflict with other clans and especially perhaps the Kṣatriyas is indicated by the fact that in the last-named Veda the name of Bṛgus is chosen to exemplify the dangers incurred by those who oppress Brahmins. The Śṛjaya Vaiyāhavyas succumb as the result of an attack on Bṛgus. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa shows Bṛgus in a similar light.

Thus we see that the Vedic references give no ground for explaining the eminence of the ancient Bhārgavas implied by the epic account. These references supply nevertheless rudimentary clues of ideas and sentiments which were probably magnified in the imagination of the remote descendants of a powerful ancient clan, influenced strongly by the cult of ancestor worship. Thus, for example, the close connection of the Bṛgus with the fire cult may perhaps serve to explain the part that Agni plays in many of the Bhārgava legends in the Mahābhārata. The Cyavana-Aśvins legend of the epic finds some support in the statement of the Rgveda to the effect that the Aśvins rejuvenated Cyavana, making him "acceptable to his wife and a husband of maidens." The Brāhmaṇaśas amplify this account. The connection of the Bṛgus with the Atharvaveda explains the element of witchcraft in the Bhārgava legends of our epic, such as, for example, the revival of the dead by the Bhārgava Śukra, or the paralyzing of the arm of Indra by Cyavana and of the creation of the monster called Mada, mentioned above. That the Bṛgus had in some way championed the cause of Brahmins against other clans is, as [67] already mentioned, supported by a reference in the Atharvaveda. Their intimate association with the Aṅgirases implied in the Vedic literature is reflected faithfully in many of the stories and genealogies of our epic.

Taking a collective view of these Bhārgava references in the Great Epic, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the Bhārgava heroes occupy a surprisingly large portion of the canvas—which is said to depict the Bhārata War—filling up as they do much of the available space of the background.

And it is more than probable that if the epic is examined yet more minutely, still further evidence of Bhārgava material, hitherto undiscovered, will be brought to light. Their myths and legends are uniformly distributed over the entire extent of the Great Epic with the exception of some short and unimportant paśvas (10 and 15-18) at the end (comprising in all not more than 2500 stanzas, a negligible fraction of the epic), books on which the average reader of the poem bestows but scant attention. The figures of the Bhārgavas have also been magnified to colossal proportions, painted with a thick brush and in vivid colours. In short, the Bhārgavas are represented in our epic—the Mahābhārata, the epic of the Bharata’s or the epic of the Bhārata War—throughout as the people. How does that come about?—“Cui bono?”, as the Roman lawyer would have asked.

To imagine that all this fulsome eulogy liberally showered upon the heroes of the Bhārgavas, and the interminable repetition of their stories and legends are entirely unconscious—at least unintentional—and without any ulterior motive, being just ordinary features of epic treatment, would be indeed naïve. In the first place, we have very clear and definite evidence of the fact that our epic has been consciously and deliberately expanded at least in one instance: the surreptitious addition of a bunch of Bhārgava legends to the Kuru-Pāṇḍava epic in the shape of the so called Paulomparpan in the Ādi which is entirely made up of Bhārgava legends and has not even the remotest intrinsic connection with the story of the epic. Then we have equally clear and definite evidence of the tendentious “Bṛguization” of older legends, which occur in the epic itself in two forms, one with and the other without some important Bhārgava element, to wit, the Stories of Sixteen Kings (Ṣoḍāsarājikīya) and the Nahuṣa-[68] Agastya legend. We have also noticed that our Mahābhārata contains two variant openings, one of which is clearly inspired by a Bhārgava, both for-

1. There is only one explanation of the childish exaggeration and this repeated mention on the annihilation of the Kṣatriyas by the Bhārgava Rāma. A deep analysis of the motives underlying this (phenomenon) would suggest that these fabrications are only a form of ‘over-compensation’, and endeavour to make the Bṛgus feel important and ‘worth while’, after the disastrous blow to their ego-ideals. It is the psychological revenge of the Bṛgus who were all but exterminated by the Kṣatriyas. The slaughter of the Bṛgus admitted by the Bṛgus themselves in the Auvra legend deserves all the credence which unfavourable evidence by a witness against one’s own self ordinarily does; what the Bṛgus in turn did to the Kṣatriyas—namely, the annihilating the Kṣatriyas by Bhārgava Rāma 3×7 is known to us only from the account of the event from Brahmin sources. This myth—the dream of the Bṛgus—is the sublimation of that intolerable inferiority feeling which had been repressed, but which was clamouring for expression.

2. This was noticed by Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata, vol. 2 (1893), p. 12. "Es liegt hier die Einleitung des Mahābhārata der Bhārgava vor, gerade wie im Gesetzbuche des Manu die Fassung der Bhārgava sich eingedrängt hat." He did not follow, however, this fruitful idea any further, being misled by the immediate
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Blighs to the Rama. A chief analyst of the motives underlying
the (phenomenal) word suggests that the fabrication are
only "false-compensation", an inducement to make the Blighs
feel important and to work while, after the denouncement they
were all but dissipated by the Krishna. The "Shakuntla"
the Blighs strongly admitted by the Dr. themselves, and observed
all the wordadium which was favourable to their agents.
and thus précieux, was, in his turn, discredited by the
Blighs in her deed to the Krishna - namely, the unthinkably
1624, by Bligh-Rama, as it is known only by
for the moment its event from Dr. Reini's sources. This
night - the dramatis personae in the embodiment of that
untellable suffering part, which had been exalted, but
collected, clarionity for its passion.
Not only is the clan ancient, its legends also are highly interesting. So suggestive in fact are the early myths of this clan that they had in former years engaged the attention of many a student of Indian mythology, and called forth a variety of interpretations. Thus Bergaaina looked upon the Bhrgus as merely a more developed form of the early tradition about the descent of fire and identified Bhrgus with Agni. A. Kuhn and A. Barth agreed in regarding the Bhrgus as personifications of the lightning flash, and Kuhn tried to harmonize the Greek myth regarding the descent of fire with the Veda. A. Weber, as already remarked, saw in a legend preserved in the Satapatha Brahmana a relic of primitive Indo-Germanic mythology. But even the later legends of these people are not without a certain amount of grandiosity. Just consider the figure of Parashurama: a matricide, annihilator of the Ksatryias and finally an ascetic of Visvesvanath. All in one.

The popularity of the Parashurama legend in India is attested by the number of places scattered all over India, which are associated with his name and his exploits and held sacred to his memory. Near the Kangra District of the Punjab there is a very ancient temple dedicated to Parashurama a name not yet applied to him in our epic. In the State of Udaipur there is a sacred pool where Rama is said to have bathed and atoned for his sins. In the Bijapur District of the Bombay Presidency, an axe-shaped rock marks the spot where Rama is represented as having washed his famous axe (pirata), which has given him his nick-name Parsurama, Rama-with-the-Axe. Even this irresistible axe of his has been deified, and there is in Mysore State a temple dedicated to it. Golconda shows an old tank dedicated to Mahadeva, which is said to have been built by the son of Jamadagni. Even the Lakhimpur District of distant Assam has a pool to show to which, according to popular belief, Parashurama had surrendered his dreaded axe, and which attracts pilgrims from every part of India.

Notwithstanding the absorbing interest of the Bhargava myths, it is primarily not their interpretation that is attempted here.

1. Cf. Amijan Achan, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1934, p. 145. The paper was read at the Eighth Session of the All-India Oriental Conference (Mysore, 1958) and has since been published separately with the special sanction of the Government of Cochin.
fortunately preserved by the conservative instinct of the re- 
dactors, helped by a 
rocess of conflation peculiar to the Mahābhārata, which tolerates a close 
juxtaposition of discrepant versions. We have further indirect testimony of 
the effort made to connect some Bhārgava or other with the propagation of 
the epic. We are thus told that it was the Bhārgava Uttāka who instigated 
Janamejaya to undertake the snake sacrifice at which the Mahābhārata was 
first publicly recited. Our Āstīka is that tale which was narrated to the 
Bhārgava Ruru by his father Pramati. And last but not least, we must take 
account of the very important fact that the Kulapati Śaunaka himself, 
before whom the Mahābhārata is said to have been recited by the Śūta Ugrārā 
vas, was also a Bhārgava! So when Śaunaka says that he wants to hear 
the history of the Bhārgavas before anything else (1.5.3): 

\[ tatra vaṁśam aham pūrvam śrotum icchāmi Bhārgavam, \]

the reason for this peculiar predilection of the host of the Śūta is very evi-
dent.

But it might be contended that we are unnecessarily emphasizing the 
Bhārgava element; that the Mahābhārata was or has come to be an encyclo-
paedica of Brahmanic tradition and it therefore contains also all the Bhārgava 
legends—in a slightly exaggerated form perhaps. The epic itself says (1. 
56.33):

\[ yad ihāsti tad anyatra yan nehāsti na tat kvacit \]

That is undoubtedly true, to a certain extent. One can, however, easily con-
vince oneself that the diaskeuasts who boldly conceived the colossal idea of 
converting the popular Epic of the Bhāratas into the Encyclopædia Brah-
manica, though generally catholic in their selection of Brahmanic legends and 
doctrines, and eclectic as regards their religious and philosophical outlook, 
yet they [69] were probably not entirely without their preferences and pre-
judices, and that they do not apportion anything like the same amount of 
space and breadth of treatment to the myths and legends of other Brahmanic 
families such as the Agastyas, Átreyas, Kāṇvas, Kāśyapas, Gautamas, Vā-
śiṃhas, and so on. The legends of these other families or clans are by no 
means entirely ignored in our Mahābhārata, but they are comparatively few 
in number and hardly ever repeated. They appear like negligible details 
on the vast canvas of the epic and are easily lost sight of in this colossal 
accumulation of apparently most heterogeneous elements, which are all the 
same carefully balanced so as to produce a more or less homogeneous impre-
sion. Very differently treated are the Bhārgava legends in our Mahābhārata. 
To make any impression by the side of the titanic figures of the old epic like 
Bhīṣma and Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna, the Bhārgavas had to be magnified a 
great deal and their legends, which were probably not so well known then 

\[ \text{"Unser Mahābhārata," he remarks, "kehrt aber sofort wieder zur andere-} \n\text{nen Fassung zurück. In Folgenden erzählt nicht Pramati den Ruru, sondern, wie} \n\text{früher, Ugraśravas dem Saunaka."} \]
as now had to be repeated. And we accordingly find that the legends have been repeated, so often that the redactors themselves must have in time come to believe in them; and the figures have been magnified, so liberally that they appear almost to eclipse the heroes of the Great Epic itself.

Just for the sake of contrast, we might compare the other great epic of India, the Rāmāyaṇa, for Bhārgava references. That epic also is a Brahmanic epic, containing a host of Brahmanic legends and stories. The result of his quest for Bhārgava references will astonish the reader. The references are remarkably few and extremely meagre. About our Bṛghu, a vibhūti of Śrī-Kṛṣṇa, the only thing recorded in the Rāmāyaṇa is that his wife was decapitated by Viṣṇu! Cyavana has been introduced in Vālmiki's epic only to narrate some stories. The solitary reference to our Rāma Jāmadagnya (sarvasastrabhṛtyān varah) has been noticed above; it is the one in which he challenges Rāma Dasarathi and is worsted in the encounter! We learn nothing more about Jāmadagni from the Rāmāyaṇa than the bald fact that he was slain by Arjuna Kārtavirya. Aurov, who as an infant had blinded the Haihayas by his effulgence, is not mentioned at all, so far as I know. Comment is superfluous.

[70] Now there can be no question that all this Bhārgava material in our present Mahābhārata is entirely foreign to the plan of the original saga of the Bhāratas, occurring as it does almost wholly in the episodic portion of the epic. There should be, therefore, in my opinion no hesitation in concluding that in our version of the Mahābhārata there is a conscious—nay deliberate—weaving together or rather stitching together of the Bhārata legends with the Bhārgava myths.

The question how precisely this Bhārgava element, which we find concentrated mostly in the upākhyānas, came into the cycle of the Bhārata legends is intriguing, but unfortunately the answer is largely a matter of speculation. Even according to the traditional view, it was not the work of Vyāsa, the reputed author of the Mahābhārata, because the diaskeuasts have been fortunately frank enough to admit that his work, the Bhārata, which originally consisted merely of 24,000 stanzas, had no episode to speak of (1. 1. 61):

\[
\text{caturvīṁśatisāhasriṁ ca cre Bhārataśanhitām |}
\text{upākhyānair vinā āvad Bhārataṁ procyate budhaiḥ.}||
\]

It could again hardly have been the work of Vaiśārīpāyana, the direct pupil of Vyāsa, according to tradition, who is said to have recited the Bhārata of Vyāsa, in the presence of Vyāsa himself, as he had been taught by his guru, during the intervals of the short snake sacrifice celebrated by king Janamejaya.

The case was different with the next recorded recitation of the Mahābhārata: it was by the Sūta Ugraśravas in the presence of the Bhārgava Saunaka during the twelve-year sacrifice instituted by the latter (1. 1. 1 ff.; 4. 1 ff.). Even before the recitation commences, Saunaka explicitly asks the
Sūta who had come there to recite his Mahābhārata, to narrate first of all the history of the Bhārgavas and, as directed by his host, the Sūta obediently does so. There is a very clear shifting of the centre of gravity. Here we have a different milieu and a different interest. The scene changes from the bustling and scintillating pageantry of the Kaurava Court to the reflective calm and leisure of the sylvan retreat of the Bhrigu.

Few scholars, I imagine, would now be inclined to deny that our epic text has undergone momentous alterations in the course of its long and eventful history. It is now generally recognized that the Bhārata, like the popular lays, ballads and early epics of all countries and all people, has always been a fluid text, adjusted to the varying needs of the occasion and the differing tastes of the audience. No disparagement or condemnation of the text is thereby implied. The process is quite normal, inevitable and in a wider sense wholly right. To continue to be a vital force in the life of a progressive people, the epic must be a slow-changing book. The fact of expurgation and elaboration is only an outward indication of its being a book of inspiration and guidance in life, and not merely a book lying unused and forgotten on a dusty book-shelf. And this is no drawback in the case of our text. Therein lies on the contrary its capital interest and importance for us. It is a rapid motion picture reel of many ages of Indian culture—not necessarily factitive history—arranged in a naïve fashion; something like the sculptured panels on the gateways and the railings of the Buddhist Stūpa at Sanchi or the mural frescoes of Ajanta, with scenes telescoped all in one plane, without much regard to perspective or perhaps with its own peculiar technique of perspective.

As already remarked, it seems probable that in the formative period of the epic a powerful Bhārgava influence—direct or indirect—has been at work, so to say behind the scenes, in shaping our epic for us. This element had obviously obtruded itself upon the original nucleus, certainly after the time of the original author Vyāsa and probably after that of Vaiśampāyana. The next traditional link, however, in the transmission of the epic is the Sūta. Is the Sūta then responsible for the conversion of the Bhārata into the Mahābhārata? Now I do not doubt that some of the Sūtas probably were gifted versifiers, able to compose ex tempore short bardic poems and to improvise lays to suit them to the varying tastes and requirements of the audience. But if we consider these Sūtas capable of composing on the spur of the moment such masses of narrative episodes and didactic discourses as we find in our Mahābhārata, we shall be crediting these minstrels with an accomplishment far beyond their natural capacity. Nobody is, however, so credulous nowadays as to imagine the Sūta as the author of those extensive innovation that must have been necessary in order to convert a heroic poem of about 24,000 stanzas (taking the traditional figure as a rough guide for our speculations) into an encyclopaedia, of the present dimensions.
We are not in any case, as far as I can see, constrained to accept every single statement of the epic in its exact literal sense. And when I say that, I mean no disparagement either of the text; far from it. Our epic does not pretend to be a dry, prosaic, matter-of-fact chronicle, nor a statistical history in the modern sense, based upon a laboriously compiled critical apparatus. If it were that, it would surely not have lived for 2500 years. We have on the shelves of our libraries hundreds of ponderous tomes and compendiums of national and world history, prepared along approved lines by laborious professors of history. But hardly anybody reads these works twice, and they are mostly forgotten, in a generation or two, by an understanding and ungrateful posterity. The Mahābhārata never was a scientific chronicle of that type and it would be egregious folly to regard it as such. It is above all an inspired poem. It was actually regarded by later generations as a kāvya:

\[ \text{kṛtamb mayedam bhagavan kāvyam paramāpūjitam} \]

the highest type of Indian poetry, like its sister epic, the Rāmāyaṇa. It was before everything else a work of art, creative art, idealistic in conception, informed with deep religious feeling, permeated by a conscious didactic purpose, focussed more on ideas and ideals than on facts and figures, in which people were not interested then so much as now; a work in which a moral was conveyed by a parable, an elusive truth by a tangible facile myth. And to the inspired creators of a traditional book of that type we must at least allow poetic licence and common imagination.

The entire story that the Sūta had heard the epic at its first recitation by Vaiśampāyana and reproduced it verbatim at Saunaka's bidding, having committed it to memory after a single hearing, is so obviously unnatural and improbable that it seems clearly more appropriate to regard it merely as a poetic fiction, a "frame-story," the most popular of Indian devices of literary composition. But there is no symbolism without a basis, however difficult it may [73] be for us to reach the elusive subconscious or unconscious. To my mind, the frame-story of our Mahābhārata is directly an unconscious admission of the fact that the Bhārata had at a critical stage of its evolution passed into the sphere of influence of the Bhṛgus, through the medium of the wandering minstrel. The Bhārgava influence is implied in the person of the Kulapati Saunaka. The Sūta, who used to recite the poem in the Heroic Age, is kept on, with due regard to traditional usage, to give the new recension a setting appropriate to it and indicating the source at the same time.

The influence of the Bhārgavas in the narrative portion of the Great Epic is very evident and can hardly be disputed. But their influence in an entirely different sphere, though less tangible and therefore more difficult to demonstrate, is to my mind nevertheless probable: I mean the incorporation into the epic of large masses of didactic material, concentrated chiefly in the śānti and Anuśāsana, especially so far as it concerns the Dharma and Niti elements. Though the philosophy of the Mahābhārata is often times rather
shaky, being in places abstruse and confused, and though the religious beliefs which find expression there are perplexingly eclectic, oscillating between Vaiśṇavism and Śaivism, between Henotheism and Pantheism, there can be no two opinions about the fact that the Mahābhārata offers a very sound and complete exposition of Dharma and Nīti according to Indian theorists, a feature which has given this venerable old monument of Indian antiquity its rank as Smṛti and its abiding value and interest to the Hindus, nay to all true children of Mother India.

Now it happens that Dharma and Nīti are just the two topics in which the Bṛgus had specialized and with which their names are prominently associated. The connection of the Bhārgava Śukra with Nīti, which is proverbial in the Mahābhārata, is so patent that it does not need to be especially pointed out. The connection of the Bṛgus with the Dharmaśāstra is perhaps not so well known, but is nevertheless equally certain. One has only to recall that, according to a tradition preserved in the work itself, our Manusmṛti, the most famous and popular of ancient Indian works bearing on the Dharmaśāstra, is the ancient Code [74] of Manu in the form in which it was communicated to mankind by Bṛgu and is therefore even commonly known as the Bṛgusamhitā, an explanation which I see not the slightest reason to question or doubt. It is also recognized that there is intimate connection between the Mahābhārata and the Manusmṛti. The Manusmṛti, it may be pointed out, has an introduction not unlike in conception to the first chapter of our epic; a few stanzas agree to some extent even in their wording. The opinions of Manu have been frequently cited in our Mahābhārata (itv evam Manu abravit). According to BüHLER's computation, there are about 260 stanzas of the Manusmṛti, that is nearly 10 per cent. of the total, which are again found verbatim (or with only slight variations) in parvans 3, 12 and 13 alone of the Great Epic.1 Then on the side of the Mahābhārata, Dharma is the foundation on which the whole stately edifice of the Great Epic has been reared, and to a great extent also the material of which it is composed. Our Mahābhārata is itself a dharma-grantha. The putative hero of the epic, Yudhiṣṭhira is called Dharmanāja, himself a son of Dharma; he is Dharma incarnate. The Bhārata was a dharma-yuddha: yato dharmaś tato jayāḥ. The field of battle was a dharma-kṣetra. Nārāyaṇa incarnated himself as Śri-Kṣiṇa to restore the fallen Dharma. The essence of the book (Bhārata-sāvitrī), embodying the moral of the story, is given as (B. 18. 5. 62 f.):

```
urdhvaśahur virāmy eṣa na ca kaścit chṛṇoti me |
dharmād arthaś ca kāmaś ca sa kimarthām na sevyate ||
na jātu kāmān na bhayān na lobhād
dharmān tvaijey jīvitsyāpi hetoh |
nityo dharmāh sukhaadhukhe tv anitye
jivo nityo hetur asya tv anityah ||
```
336 EPIC STUDIES

The infiltration of masses of Bhārgava material in the shape of Bhārgava myths and legends, the manner of its treatment, and even that strange admixture of the Epic with the Dharma and Niti elements, which latter especially has so long puzzled many inquirers into the genesis of the Mahābhārata, thus appear to find a simple and straightforward explanation in the assumption of an important unitary diaskeuasis of the epic under very strong and direct Bhārgava influence. But this does not at all [75] imply that the text has remained untouched after this first diaskeuasis; far from it. Like all traditional works, it was a slow-changing book; and additions and alterations, as already remarked, must have been made in it continuously throughout its long history of about 2500 years.¹

These further additions were in the main probably made in the first instance by the Bhārgavas themselves in the centuries that immediately followed the first important diaskeuasis under Bhārgava supervision, since it is most likely that just as the different collections of Vedic hymns, the various Brāhmaṇas and the ritualistic manuals were all, for some time, the closely guarded property of diverse Vedic schools and families of sages, which had respectively cultivated and developed them, so also our remodelled Bhārata, now elevated to the rank of the Fifth Veda, must have remained for some time in the exclusive possession of the Bhārgavas as their close literary preserve. That would, in my opinion, account for the apparent homogeneous character of this heterogeneous mass: it all came from different hands, but out of the same mould.

If the above considerations have any validity, they might help us to lift up a corner of the thick veil enveloping our Great Epic and allow us to have a covert peep into its history. Such a peep would show that there existed in India, in very ancient times an epic poem of about 24,000 stanzas, attributed to Vyāsa (the "Expander"), which described in great detail the Bhārata War and sang the glory of the Pāṇḍavas. This heroic poem, the Bhārata, which used to be recited by the Śatás mostly at royal courts and had in course of time become very popular, was at a critical stage of its history appropriated by the Bhṛgus (who had certainly specialized in the Dharma and Nītiśāstra and probably also developed leanings towards Viṣṇuisms), with the idea of developing the epic into a vehicle of popular instruction and edification combined with entertainment. These anchorites, full of age-old wisdom

¹ The most conspicuous instances of such latter additions (not found in all mss. even):
Virāṣa: Durgāstotra.
Bhiṣma: Durgāstotra.
and wonderful masters of the art of myth-weaving, took from the Sūtas the Bhārata and gave back to the world the Mahābhārata, the same book yet different. In the process of the redaction by the Bhṛgus, the work, naturally and to an extent unconsciously, received that characteristic and indelible stamp [76] which was predetermined by the eventful history, the natural proclivities, the special endowments, and the peculiar “Weltanschauung” of the Bhṛgus. It was this little episode in its history that necessarily gave our poem the anomalous character of an Epos and “Rechtsbuch” combined. It may be surmised that this remodelled Bhārata remained for some considerable time in the hands of the Bhārgavas, who had developed it and so to say re-created it, as their exclusive literary property, and they exploited it thereafter and propagated it in their own way. The colossal success of the Bhārgava recension of the ancient Epic of the Bhāratas, a success which in one sense was richly deserved, was the indirect cause of the neglect and subsequent disappearance of the original heroic poem, which probably still existed at the time of the composition of the Āśvalāyana Grhya Sūtra (3. 4. 4). Like other branches of the hieratic literature, when the epic at last passed out of the hands of the Bhṛgus and became the common property of the literati of India, it still remained a fluid text, not entirely closed to minor alteration and expansion, but retained its character as a traditional work, revered and cherished by the people as the work of Māraṣī Vāsa and serving still as a vehicle of popular education, inspiration and edification as intended by the Bhṛgus. The further we pursue the study of the traces of Bhārgava influence on the Epic of the Bhāratas, the clearer, it seems to me, will become the history of our Mahābhārata, the Great Epic of Bhāratavarsa.

VII. The Oldest Extant MS. of the Adiparvan.*

Introductory:

A discovery of capital importance for Mahābhārata studies is the accidental but singularly lucky find by Mānyavara Gurju Hemraj Panditjiu, C.I.E., D.P.I., the well-known savant of Nepal, of a new Nepāli MS. of the Adiparvan, which according to the Panditjiu is between seven hundred and eight hundred years old, and therefore easily the oldest extant MS. of the Mahābhārata. It was only a few years ago that I had remarked in the “Prolegomena” to the Adiparvan: “Only those who know the difficulties in the way of obtaining any MS. from Nepal will be in a position to appreciate fully the debt which the editor and the other members of the Mahābhārata Editorial Board, and beyond that the whole world of Indologists, owe to the Rajaguru. [202]

---


* [ABORI 19.201-262].
Sankritists have much to hope for from the dispassionate efforts of this truly patriotic and cultured Rajaguru, who loses no opportunity of placing his immense learning and unbounded resources freely at the disposal of all serious workers in the field of Sanskrit research”. How prophetic those words have proved and how the Rajaguru has more than justified our expectations, is manifested in the recovery of this singular old Nepālī MS.

The MS., of which complete collations and specimen photos (reproduced here in facsimile1) were kindly sent to me for my use by Rajaguru HEMARAJ Panditjiu, was recently acquired by him and is in his possession. The material is palm-leaf and the writing, which is throughout uniform, is in old faded ink. It contains only the first parvan of the Mahābhārata, but is complete in itself, there being no folios missing. The average folio measures 21″×24″ and each folio contains uniformly 7 lines of writing, except the last folio, which has only 43 lines. The MS. is not dated but the high antiquity claimed for it is authenticated, apart from its antique look,2 by convincing internal evidence. The best proof is that it is almost entirely free from those modern accretions which are given in Appendix I of the Ādiparvan Volume, as also in great part from those other smaller insertions which are listed in the foot-notes. More astonishing still is the fact that out of the textual *emendations* hazarded by the editor, fifty per cent. are actually documented by this MS. It is therefore no exaggeration to say that this remarkable MS. opportunely affords welcome support to the Critical Edition in most crucial matters. Moreover many of the variant readings of the new MS. are difficult and obscure, marking out its text as distinctly archaic. And, finally, in many of its readings it agrees fairly closely with a certain other MS. from Nepal, which is symbolized as N₈ in the critical apparatus of the Ādi, and which is again the oldest *dated* MS. of the the Ādiparvan. The tradition is therefore fairly complete and well attested.

[203] The greatest value of this MS. lies, as hinted already, in its corroboration of the constituted text of the Critical Edition. Indirectly it attests and justifies, as an independent witness, the principles according to which the reconstruction of the epic text is achieved, thus placing the constituted text on still surer foundations.

*Long Insertions of the Vulgate.*

Hitherto, it may be observed, the data of the Sāradā and the “K” versions had mainly to vouchsafe for the purification of the epic text attempted

---

1 The photographs are of the written surface of the first and last folios and two intermediate folios (one of which latter is the penultimate folio of the MS.).

2 I have compared the script with the specimens reproduced in BÜHLER’S *Paleographische Tafeln*. It comes closest to the script of Tafel VI, No. XI (Cambridge MS. No, 1691, 2 of A.D. 1179).
in the Critical Edition. Now, the omissions of the constituted text are supported from a new source and from an entirely different version, the Nepali. Our MS. is in fact surprisingly free from most of the matter pronounced to be spurious on the evidence of the then available MSS. of different versions. The longer insertions given in Appendix I are conspicuous by their absence in this MS. Here is a list of the long passages which are missing in the new MS.

No. 1: The Brahmā-Ganeśa complex; inserted at different points in K₄₋₆ Dn Dr D₂₋₁₂,₁₄ S, i.e., om. in its totality only in K₀₋₃ D₁.

No. 13: A passage of six lines ins. in K (except K₁) V₁ (marg.) Da Dn D₁₋₇ G₁₋₂,₄,₆.

No. 14: The Purānic story of Aruṇa, who is made to act as the charioteer of the Sun; ins. in K₄ (marg.) N V₁ B D (except D₂, D₃ on suppl. fol.) T₁ G₁₋₂,₄,₆.

No. 41: Names of the hundred sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra; ins. in K₃₋₄ N₂,₃ V₁ B D (except D₅).

No. 42: Story of the birth of Abhimanyu; ins. in K₃₋₄ N V₁ B D (except D₅).

No. 43: Story of the birth of Kama; Ins. in K₄ N V₁ B D (except D₅).

No. 61: Details of the marriage of Pāṇḍu and Mādri, subst. for 1. 105. 4-7, in K₂ N B D.

No. 62: Story of the birth of Duḥśalā; ins. in all MSS. except Ś₁ K₀₋₃.

No. 71-72: Details of the picnic (jalakriḍā); ins. in K₄ N B D.

No. 75: Story of pīṭkodaka given to Droṇa's son; ins. in all MSS. except Ś₁ K₀₋₃.

[204] No. 76: Arjuna's pre-eminence among the pupils of Droṇa; ins. in K₄ N B D T₂ G₁₋₂,₄,₆.

No. 78: Description of the conquest and annexation of Drupada's kingdom by the Pāṇḍavas exacted by Acārya Droṇa as gurudaksinā; ins. in K₄ Da, Dn D₂ (suppl. fol. sec m.)₄₋₅, S.

No. 80: Installation of Yudhishṭhira as heir-apparent; ins. in all MSS. except Ś₁ K₀₋₃.

No. 81: Kanikanī: ins. in all MSS. except Ś₁ K₀₋₃.

No. 85: Story of the boat sent by Vidura for the use of the Pāṇḍavas; ins. in all MSS. except Ś₁ K₀₋₃.

No. 118: Śvetakī-episode; ins. in all N MSS. Cf. also passage No. 120 ins. in T₂ G₃₋₄, and No. 121 ins. in Ś₁ K₀₋₁,₄.

Short Insertions of the Vulgate.

Like these long insertions our MS. omits most of the short insertions given in the foot-notes to the constituted text. There are more than two

These, it may be noted, are some of the many passages (extending from three to twenty lines) which are found in all N MSS. (except śK K)—with or without some S MSS.—but which are omitted by our MS. The following omissions from among these deserve special notice:

128*: This is a passage of 72 lines, consisting of the longer version of the contents of the Aranyaka-parvan, found in certain MSS. of the Northern Recension. It may be noted in passing that in its Parvasāṅgraha chapter, the new MS. gives throughout the shorter version, which has been adopted in the Critical Edition and which agrees with the version of this adhyāya in P. P. S. Sastri’s edition of the Southern Recension.

560*: By omitting this, our MS. omits the reference to Pāṇḍu, found in all N MSS, except those of the Kaśmirī Version.

[205] 693*: This is a passage of sixteen lines and contains the famous couplet na jātu kāmāḥ kāmānām etc., recurring in many places.

892*: This passage, occurring after 1. 89. 51, is found in all N MSS.

In the place where it is inserted there appears to have been a lacuna in the original, filled up by the two recensions in different ways. In the constituted text the place is marked by asterisks.

1036*: Details of Brhaspati’s cohabitation with Mamātā, wife of Uthrya and the godharma mentioned in that context, inserted in all N MSS. except śK Kc2 Nc3.

1341*: A passage of ten lines found in all MSS. except śK Kc2 Nc3. It describes the approach of Droṇa to Rāma Jāmadagnya for the astravidyā.

1793*: A passage of seven lines found in all MSS. except Tc2 Gc2,c6 M.

These significant omissions, major and minor, prove that the text of our MS. is shorter than that of all other MSS. hitherto known. Accordingly we find that in the Parvasāṅgraha chapter of this MS. the figure of the stanzas for the Ādi is given as 7784, which brings down the figure of the Vulgate by eleven hundred and the figure even of the Śāradā MS. by two hundred stanzas! It is however, curious that it apparently has the same number of adhyāyas as the Critical Edition viz. 225, while the Parvasāṅgraha figure for the same is 218 both in this MS. and the Critical Edition. In other words in differing from its own Parvasāṅgraha figure, our MS. exactly agrees with the critical text! The number of adhyāyas in the Vulgate, it may be noted, is 234, while that of the Southern Recension can be computed to ex-
tend to about 250 adhyāyas. On the other hand, the number of adhyāyas in the Kumbakonam edition reaches the astonishing figure 260!

**Small Infiltrations.**

Even though our MS. is appreciably shorter than any other MS. of the Adi so far known, we cannot indeed suppose it to have been absolutely free from inflation and contamination. This MS. has in fact just a few insertions not countenanced by the Critical Edition. For instance:

[206] App. I, No. 12: *The first three lines of this passage (of sixteen lines) are substituted* in our MS. in place of 1. 19. 1-2. This substitution is common to N5 also! The passage is characteristic of all N MSS. except those of the Kaśmīrī Version.

App. I, No. 33: This passage is found in all N MSS., the Kaśmīrī Version showing variation only in sequence. The passage is inserted after 1. 56. 31, and is a continuation of the eulogy of the Mahābhārata, serving as an introduction to that redaction of the epic which begins with the episode of Uparicara. Here our MS. agrees with N1 in omitting lines 3-11.

App. I, No. 58: This passage also is a common heritage of all N MSS. It describes how Sūrya, when invoked by Kuntī, presses her to have sexual intercourse with him.


All these insertions are uniformly met with in all N MSS., or at least in the majority of N MSS., and not a single one of them is sporadic.

An insertion of a single stanza from the *yādāśrausam* section (adhy. 1) is the only *unique insertion* in this MS.

**Conflation of Mahābhārata texts.**

Here we may note, in passing, the light this MS. sheds in an indirect way on how the text gradually gets inflated. At several places we find additions made *marginally* by another and a later hand. For instance, after 1. 5. 26, we find a marginal insertion of two lines सेनपितानवयक्खणि etc., which is taken from a passage [207] of eight lines found in all N MSS. (except K6, D6). Again, after 1. 19. 15 we have a marginal addition of two lines
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ardanabhâsîmî: etc., of which the first line is merely a variant of a line included in our text, but the second is an "additional" line found chiefly in late Northern MSS. of the Central Group. It is clear that the copyist of such a MS. as this, without further investigation—which of course is not his business!—cannot determine whether the lines added in the margin belonged to its original exemplar, or whether they were taken from some other source. It is not the custom of the copyist to be very squeamish about such things. He copies whatever he finds before him, provided it makes sense and has something to do with the epic. It is thus that the corpus has got gradually inflated to its maximum capacity. Cf. the example of K, cited in the Aîparvan Volume (Prolegomena, p. xii).

Minor Readings.

Let us now consider the individual readings of our MS. Here also the agreement of this MS. with the constituted text is quite remarkable. That it cannot and must not be expected to have complete agreement with the constituted text is only obvious; like all other Mahâbhârata MSS., it also represents a particular version of the epic, and nothing more.

Our MS. shows in point of readings the greatest agreement with MSS. of the Nepâli group: quite naturally, as it is written in the same script and belongs to the same provincial version. In particular, its agreements with Ns, the best and the oldest MS. of the Nepâli version belonging to our apparatus, are unique and striking. The total number of variant readings in our MS. amounts approximately to a little more than 2500. Out of these, its unique agreements with Ns (or in a few places along with one or two other MSS.) against all other MSS. count over 500. This shows that our MS. definitely belonged to the Nepâli version, and is not a copy of a MS. of the Sâradâ or "K" version—a very important point—though it has marked affinities in many a place with the latter groups. Here are appended about sixty instances, chosen at random, as specimens of the unique agreements of our MS. with Ns.

[208] 14.17b Kâmaâbhisûkya (for Kâma- 
parêtaya)
16.26b sâkhyâ vipasa (for râsanaa pâsas)
16.31c âavisate (for sâkhyê)
17.6â śâsvan (for châkeça)
17.24a gâhâmâtya: pratyâ (for gannâma- 
mabhâtya)
19.4c sâtruryâ (for sâtreyâ)
21.3b udyâyâ (for abhâpita)
27.23b sâtruyâ (for sâtriya)
30.15d sattama (for phalama)
32.8â prâkâro (for prâlako)
33.21d sambhut (for sambhût:)
38.22d akshamahânana: (for raja mahâtapa:)
44.14d jágyama tadâ (for pratyagjuna)
45.2a râjâ (for mahan)
48.1b pañâhâpanâ: (for pâmarpañâ:)
48.10d vâjê (for sâkhyê)
52.4d mahâbhâvanâ (for viharâjanânâ)
53.34d kâhe (for suhaja)
55.23f abhisûkya: (for abhâpita:)
56.19c madyâ châpi jâyâkâloka
57.55a gâthavâti (for sâthavâti)
60.5a prâjñâyâ (for sâtreyâ)
61.2a cedânâ (for tâvân)
64.34b kramânâpi (for aparâdikê)


Here it is necessary to emphasise the curious circumstance that while the new MS. is almost on a par with \( N_3 \) in respect of individual readings, it is far superior to \( N_3 \) in so far that it lacks about ninety per cent. of the insertions which \( N_3 \) has in common with the Vulgate, that is to say, the Bengali-Devanāgarī group. It thus gives its welcome support to the Śāradā-K group and our Critical Edition as regards that large mass of passages in which [209] these texts are lacking. It may be incidentally remarked that \( N_3 \) is relatively purer than the other two Nepāl MSS. and occasionally has definite leanings towards the Śāradā or Kāsmīrī version. These additional passages in MSS. like \( N_3 \), we may reasonably infer, were gradually added by the epic artists, who worked out the details and filled in the lacunae of this colossal composition. There must have been a free give-and-take of these passages in the extensive comparisons of different manuscripts of the epic text at holy places and centres of pilgrimage and seats of ancient learning. Beginning in the lowly way of marginalia and śodhapatrās, these additions must have got embedded in the text, through their transmission from copyist to copyist, undergoing in this process a strange variation of details.

In a small percentage of cases, our MS. shows, it must be admitted, readings documented mostly by Southern MSS.—with or without support of a few other N MSS. It is naturally the most difficult thing in the world to decide in these cases whether this sporadic agreement is due to late contamination or to primitive connection through the lost archetype. In the light of such variants, some readings of the Critical Edition will have to be recon-

| 71.26\(^{a} \) शक्तीक्षम (for तिष्कः तृष्यम) | 111.26\(^{a} \) जाते हे (for नित्य) |
| 76.26\(^{a} \) शक्त्वम तस्मान (for वहस्त्व पिवा माः) | 111.28\(^{d} \) सभिन्यः (for जैत्वियाः) |
| 79.16\(^{c} \) देवा सं प्रतिपत्त्वाभि | 115.6\(^{a} \) नाही (for सात्मा) |
| 84.3\(^{c} \) यध्व (for सन्न्यास) | 116.7\(^{a} \) एको गता (for आसाभमाः) |
| 89.33\(^{c} \) संवरणम्.सं (for स एवं समरे) | 122.28\(^{d} \) सम्यक (for ाशमन) |
| 90.32\(^{b} \) महाशक्तिः (for वयस्वरणान) | 123.71\(^{b} \) समाधि: (for निर्दिशि: ) |
| 90.42 \ अभावा (for अभावानु: ) | 134.10\(^{d} \) धुरत: पैरीः (for पुराणसहुः) |
| 92.15\(^{c} \) सृजिते: (for हुः) | 134.24\(^{d} \) स्वरूपः (for प्रकाश: ) |
| 93.14\(^{c} \) त्रिक्षिप्ति (for दिव्ये वै) | 136.12\(^{d} \) विभविः: (for सन्नियाः ) |
| 93.33\(^{a} \) अयोब: वसुमालाश्वमिः (for राजन्यसुवही तरोडः) | 141.2\(^{d} \) राजसानाः शशीः |
| 94.55\(^{b} \) वरायः: (for विशेषः) | 143.20\(^{d} \) मणिमोहनितेपुः (for पशोःपधुः पुरुः) |
| 94.84\(^{a} \) न तदाव्य (for नान्यथा ततः ) | 149.7\(^{a} \) फलो ग्राभ्यः (for परः पायः ) |
| 96.17\(^{b} \) महाशक्तियन्ति: (for ते श्नाशाशक्तिः) | 149.7\(^{d} \) कृत्वकालवती (for शेषो आशध्वोः) |
| 99.6\(^{b} \) आशीर्वेत्र: (for आशीर्वेत्री) | 149.11\(^{b} \) न च कति (for न तुक्तसः) |
| 100.1\(^{b} \) सा उप: (for वनन्तः) | 154.16\(^{d} \) नकास (for नारः) |
| 103.17\(^{a} \) वैष्णवान (for वैष्मेनाद्या) | 157.4\(^{b} \) स्वच्छ (for शाश्वेण) |
| 111.12\(^{b} \) तत्त मानवः (for मनुष्य सुवि) | 111.26\(^{a} \) जाते हे (for नित्य) |
sidered, and it may, in sporadic cases, be found necessary even to alter slightly the readings of the Adiparvan in the Critical Edition. That work must however be left over now for further research by a future generation of scholars.

Unique Readings.

Like all MSS. modern or ancient, our MS. has quite a large number of unique readings, that is to say, readings which have not been found in any MS. so far collated for the Critical Edition. They consist of variants of proper names, consciously or unconsciously manipulated; synonyms or paraphrases; and sometimes of mere transpositions of words and phrases; or even insignificant variants of expletives and verse-filling particles. In a few instances the variants are obscure and archaic, but generally weak and inconsequential as compared to the readings of the Critical Edition. The Mahābhārata problem is made a problem of problems and a problem sui generis by the amazing diversity of MSS. in all imaginable details; and our MS. is not [210] behindhand in liberally contributing to this diversity. Here I specify a few samples of unique readings of the new MS.:

1.181 b विनयः (for विक्रमः)
1.194 b परायणम् (for सनातनम्)
2.77 b गर्भवस्त्र (for गद्भवस्त्र)।
2.28 b सस्वंक्षातात्त्विन् (for तथा नव नः)
2.104 d श्रीका प्रथमसहे तु
2.136 d महामुहू (for विनोधया)
2.139 c सपन (for सचिवं)
2.214 d प्रातः अतन्यपुर्वते यथा (for वीरान्य-पथः) नामानां
7.11 d छुट (कुछुटे)
13.15 e एकत्रमुखः (for एकनमाचितः)
13.44 c प्रातास्त्रयः (for सुमोहता)
20.12 a व्रतात (क्षतुः)
43.25 b भावः (क्षत्रियः)
57.12 d घराव (क्षत्रियः)
59.41 d तथास् (क्षत्रियः)
67.30 d हेतुभो (क्षत्रियः)
68.66 c बालः (कर्त्तराः)
71.58 b पञ्च (कर्तराः)
79.21 d रतनायण (कहायणे)
84.17 d अभास्त्रम् (कर्त्तराः)
88.25 d हरदेशस्त्रिकाताम्
102.16 b वराध्यवस्त्रमेति
108.1 d कैलापायनः (कर्त्तरायस्ये)
112.27 b कुलात्तमालावानी
114.38 d सुमहारः (कर्त्तराः)
118.19 b श्रुण्यो (कर्त्तराः)
132.3 d कार्यास्तध (कर्त्तरायः)
134.22 a अद्वितिया श्रध्वंसः
147.18 d सुडुःनिता (कर्त्तरायिता)
158.18 d विनाृपरिः (कर्त्तरायः)
158.50 श्रव्णे वस्त्रस्य भावने
178.5 d नन्दाः (कर्त्तराः)
179.19 d वैकीर्षिनि (कर्त्तराः)
180.9 d सुखानि (कर्त्तराः)
186.7 c विचारणी (कर्त्तराः)
190.8 a अध्याजनोपपश (कर्त्तराः)
191.6 d अधिकः (कर्त्तराः)
194.2 d तेवेद शक्तिजा: म्योि
195.5 d संज्ञे (कर्त्तराः)
199.32 c श्रसी त (तलैः)
201.18 a शहदेव (कर्त्तराः)
207.18 b श्रव्ण सन्तार: प्रेणुः
207.23 d श्रीगुण सन्तारः (कर्त्तराः)
211.24 d हर्षा संतारः
214.30 b गृहश्यालक्ष्यामाः
218.18 a श्वास्तिकाचः
218.22 c हर्षा भैक्षुः (कर्त्तराः)
223.9 d अभास्त्रविचारः (कर्त्तराः)
Our Emendations.

Now we may turn to what is perhaps the most surprising feature of our MS. That is the support our MS, affords to the constituted text of the Critical Edition, with regard to the emendations attempted therein. It is remarkable to find that this single MS., which is certainly older than any of the MSS. we had before, supports and confirms, as already remarked, fifty per cent of these emendations. Out of the total of thirty-six emendations \[211\] made in the Critical Edition the following eighteen are corroborated by our MS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.7 ग्रंमणांसवारिता ॰ ॰ ॰ (hyper-meter !)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.10 हिवः सवःवे सिद् विनिसितः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.8 अम१ हि: स्वयम्भास्वागमः (hiatus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.20 कियः उक्त्वर्यो लोः (hiatus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.13 ततो दोऽक्षरः *अर्धाः वै (hiatus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.50 अनासे च वस्त्रव देत्वा (double sandhi.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.8 अन्तर्ज्ञः *आ अमो (hiatus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.5 श्रष्टे यावदी कन्या *अनुरुपा (hiatus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

224.5 संतति माणः *अभिधो (hiatus) |
224.9 तथाःिः से (प्रीतसा)

Now, even though these emendations were put forward more as a hypothesis than as a dogma (Prolegomena p. xciv), they have evoked severe criticism from certain scholars. It will therefore be advisable to consider here some of these criticisms in the light of the readings of our new MS.

Professor A. B. Keith, in his review\(^2\) of the Adiparvan, admits that, "the editor has quite justly relied often on the maxim that the more difficult reading is to be preferred to the simpler, since it is easy to explain the latter as correction of what was poorly understood by careless scribes", but continues, "we need not, therefore, accept as a necessarily correct theory the view that we are to restore hiatuses, whenever we find variants in the MSS, which might be explained by assuming that they are the different efforts made by scribes, who were not accustomed to hiatus to remedy the irregularity". Whether the said view represents a correct theory of Mbh. text-reconstruction or not may be best judged from the circumstance that out of the eighteen emendations which are actually documented and attested by this new MS., not less than thirteen were made just on the ground of \[212\] hiatus! A glance at the above list will convince the reader of the truth of this contention.

\(^1\) One stanza 1. 71. 36 in which there is an emendation is unfortunately omitted in the new MS.
In all these thirteen instances there are violent fluctuations in the MS. readings. These uncommon fluctuations pointed towards the possibility, which this MS. has turned into a certainty, that they represent more or less independent attempts at correcting some solecism to which the scribes, editors or commentators would naturally take violent objection. It is natural to infer that this solecism is the hiatus to which a steadily increasing antipathy is noticeable as we pass from the earlier to the later Sanskrit literature. It is well-known that Vedic texts frequently contain hiatus which does not cause any serious offence to the susceptibilities of the modern reader, but the same hiatus in the work of a poet of the classical period would be rated as a capital blunder. The view of Hopkins (which Prof. Keith endorses) to the effect that there is nothing peculiarly epic in hiatus, and that it is found in precedent and subsequent poetry, is quite non-committal, and, if anything, favours our position. The point at issue is the legitimacy of the hiatus in the subsequent literature and not merely its occurrence. It is quite legitimate in the earlier literature, but comes to be progressively regarded as a solecism and therefore is an anthema to scribes bred and brought up in the classical tradition. It is no doubt carelessness only, as Prof. Keith observes, in the later stages of the growth of Sanskrit literature, but not necessarily so throughout its history. Prof. Keith himself has not much faith in his own scepticism and consequently much of his criticism loses point, as he concedes, though reluctantly, the validity of certain restorations of hiatuses.

Prof. Keith has altogether missed the significance of the variation of MSS. between particles like, hi, ca, tu, vā, in these instances of emendations. It is true that these particles show great variation from MS. to MS., as is only natural in the corpus of a fluid text. But the scribes did not go out of their way to vary the text and to replace deliberately one particle by another. Often enough these small particles are very instructive in determining the complex relationship of MSS. Our present MS., for instance, agrees with N8 scores of times in the choice of just [213] these particles against all other MSS. But we need not press the point too far. It is sufficient to note that the variation is not as arbitrary as it might at first sight appear. Moreover, it is easy to understand that these small particles do come in very handy whenever the question of avoiding a hiatus arises and can be sandwiched between the vowels without disturbing the metre. This is clearly the simplest and most natural mode of avoiding the hiatus and explains the violent fluctuations of the text. That it is not the only mode of avoiding the seeming blunder may be seen from 1. 57. 20 kriyate *ucchrayo nrīpah, where T G have entirely recast the pāda, changing it to: kuruantu ete dhvajocchrayam.

---

1. Cf. Hopkins, The Great Epic, p. 199 f. : "In both metres, to avoid hiatus, irrational particles are often inserted. A good example is: purā kṛtyayuge tāta hy āsid rājā h.y Akampanaḥ, vii, 2,029, where B, 52, 26, omits the first hi."
So the proof of an original hiatus does not always rest upon a mere variation of particles, as Prof. KEITH thinks.

Prof. KEITH starts from the conviction (which is quite a priori), that if at all a hiatus occurs, it must occur either between the pādas where the absence of sandhi is natural; or else before a vocative, where it is easy to feel a natural pause. He does not grudge the restoration of hiatus in 1. 99. 15; 103. 5; 110. 20; 119. 11 etc. on these grounds. In 1. 57. 20 kriyate uchrayo nṛpāyaḥ and 1. 100. 2 niśtho āgamisyati, he haltingly admits the validity of the restoration of hiatus and tries desperately to defend it on grounds of metrical facility. He is adamant, however, when it comes to—what he styles—"unmotived" hiatus. He has exemplified his scepticism in the following instances.

In 1. 147. 2 he considers roravīthas tv anādhavat as more legitimate.

Proceeding further, Prof. KEITH says that it is very difficult to believe in 1. 207. 17 kule asmin babhūva haḥ: since such a hiatus as this is "unmotived". He can, however, easily persuade himself to believe that "the sambabhūva of a large body of MSS. was erroneously curtailed to babhūva with the result that kule 'asmin had to be extended'!

In 1. 119. 11 tathāt ukte Ambikayā, the position according to Prof. KEITH is "uncertain"; tv may be right before Ambikayā.

[214] In 1. 98. 8, antarvatni aham Bhrātā may be explained, in the opinion of Prof. KEITH, "by emphasis"; but it is quite probable, he adds, that "tv is original, ty would be a blunder for it and ḥy a correction".

1. 224. 5, sāntapyaṁanā abhito is quite "needless", according to Prof. KEITH. The MSS. suggest, according to him, sāntapyaṁanā as "clearly correct". "Misunderstanding of the accusative", we are told, "as following on the previous line has led to the mere corrections saṁtaṇyaṁanā bahudhā or purato".

In 1. 157. 13, pāṇcakṛtvas tvayā uktaḥ "seems unmotived and the variants of the MSS. hardly justify it".

Prof. KEITH calls 1. 110. 28, yadi āvāṁ mahāprājña, "very dubious", and in 1. 51. 8, ato Indraḥ svayam evajagāma according to him is "not at all certain".

1. 214. 9 is an interesting case. The pāda in dispute reads Dharmarāje *atipṛtyaḥ, which is an emendation. It was first criticized by the late Prof. WINTERNITZ as being "really unnecessary". A reply was given to his criticisms in these Annals by me and I have devoted three pages of the journal (vol. 16. pp. 108-110) to explain the circumstances which, in my opinion, necessitated the emendation. Prof. KEITH was left unconvinced by these arguments. Rejecting this explanation, he dogmatically lays down: "in 1. 214. 9, Dharmarāje hy atipṛtyaḥ should be read; the variant tv is normal, and the hiatus is unmotived".

Now that most of these unmotived, needless, dubious, illegitimate, un-
necessary hiatuses are actually documented and are no longer merely my conjectures, I am intrigued to know what hidden motives Prof. KEITH will discover in them in order to explain their occurrence in an authentic MS. in the possession of the Rajaguru of Nepal.

It is sad that Professor WINTERNITZ should not have lived to see some of his doubts about the readings of the constituted text finally dispelled by the evidence of this MS. The discovery of this valuable MS., so consequential for the text-criticism of the Adiparvan, would certainly have delighted the heart of this veteran scholar, who took a passionate and life-long interest in epic studies. The text of the Critical Edition objected to in the following places by the late lamented Professor WINTERNITZ is supported by our MS.

I append below the collations of the new Nepāli MS. exactly as they were received from Panditjiu HEMARAJ, omitting only a few corrupt readings which are obvious mislections by copyists.

### Collations of the Nepāli MS. of the Adiparvan of the Mahābhārata Belonging to Gurujiu Hemaraj Punditjiu c.i.e. of Nepal

Corrupt readings have been mostly ignored in this list. The readings in parenthesis ( ) are those of the Critical Edition. [U] after a reading shows that it is unique to this MS., and not found in any other MS. collated for the Critical Edition. The MS. symbols after a reading show that the reading is elsewhere found in those MSS. only.

#### Adhy. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>ठू (for ठे) [U]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>यथालवःपरिश्रुत्राया</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>अशरः (for अशरम्)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>अक्षरम् (for अक्षरम्) [U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>तद्भ (for आयो)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>समास: (for तथा) [U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>विवर्धनो (for विवर्धनो)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>स (for च)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 48 | ईतिहास्यार्थ वैयालित्य [U] |
| 48 | ठू (for ठे ) [U] |
| 49 | महासां (for महासां) |
| 50 | समासार्थवणरातरस |
| 51 | बिनाशपति (for बिनाशपति) [V.] |
| 54 | तदा (for पुरा) [U] |
| 57 | यदूरूणा (for यदूरूणा) [U] |
| 60 | विष (for वर्ष) |
| 63 | अविनयस्य (for अविनय) |
| 67 | जन्मस्य एव सजनो न्ययनुग्रहारतिः: [U] |
| 70 | समवेठु (for समवेठु) [U] |
[216] 71 a) यदि (for च)
73 b) श्रवण (for जूतव)
77 b) पुरोसेवि (for आसम्ब 0) [V₁]
79 b) तेन्वाय वेदान्तिलाम
95 b) श्रावण्या (for ग्वावण) [U]
97 b) कुशायकु (for कुशायकु)
98 b) अचेतासम्ब (for अचेतासम्ब)
99 b) पाण्डवायसमितिदिन [M]
100 a) व्यवस्ताः कार्यम् (for तिथिमश्र 0)
101 b) श्रवण (read श्रवण) निन्द (for श्रावण)
102 Om.
104 b) महाम (for च)
109 b) यदि (for तद्) [U]
112 a) मीलित (for मीलित)
118 Om.
122 Om.
125 a) न चैत (for नैत)
122 a) यदि वायु: शक्रष्टो (for यदि वायु: शक्रष्टो)
133 a) आर (for आर)
834 a) तथा यैवायनेन (for यैवायनेन चारुः)
138 b) नाग्नपत्र (for क्षेत्र)
140-141 Om.
142 After 142, ins.:
यादायम् महात्मजुनौगुंधकं
किंग सेना समरे वायुमिनिताम्.
मादुरं संपूर्णो सीतामानं
तदा नालोऽविशेषाय स्वयम् II [U]
143 a) शा आचार्य (for द्विमात्तुचार्) [Corrupt]
150 b) समस्य (for साह्य)
154 a) तेन (for तेन)
155 a) तुकः (for तुकः)
156 a) वैपायनं वेशाय (for न: न: ओको)
a) वैपायन (for शादाप)
166 a) गुकीवर्त्त तमसैवितम्
167 b) महास्मित मुखु [M₁]
169 a) विलुः (for वैयकु)
173 a) हस्त (for नैत) [K₄]
174 a) वेस्त: (for वैस्त:)
175 a) निष्ठेन नदः: (for नैष्ठेन नदः)
178 a) वृत्तायाः (for वृत्तायाः)
181 b) विनय (for विनय) [U]
184 a) शास्त्र (read शास्त्र) कृता (for शास्त्रायाः)
186 a) [१] निवितिन्तु (for निवितिन्तु) [U]
187 a) निवितिन्तु (for निवितिन्तु)
188 a) संविधि (for संविधि) [U]
194 b) पराजयम्भ (for तनात्मम्) [U]
195 a) अस्व (for अस्व)
196 a) तद्द (for तद्द) [U]
197 a) यतं यत्वं श्रवण [U]
198 a) विन्यथे व (for शुरुः)
199 a) श्रवणा (for श्रवणा) [M₁]
200 a) विनितम् (for स्वितम्) [K₄]
202 Om.
204 a) महायाचिन्यायति
205 a) चेत (for चेत) [U]
208 Om.
209 a) भारतवाच (for भारतवाच)

Adhy. 2

2 a) भस्क (for बन्धि)
3 b) शर्मम् (for शर्मम्)
7 a) प्रतिविद्ये (for भक्तितम्)
8 b) इमिता: श्रावेत तु भवि [U]
9 a) तेजेव (for तेजेव) [U]
12 b) ग्राहमथम: (for शुनि)
16 b) अभिपरिषिति: (for अभिपरिषिति)

[217] 31 b) Transp. आमोज and चैतेन: तमेन [U]

32 b) निमिता: (for निमिता) [U]
37 b) राजोपास: (for राजोपास:)
38 a) तेजः त्रयमारिका
42-43 Transp. 42ends and 43ab
46 a) मुखसम्बन्ध (for शृंखला)
50 c) Transp. प्राप्सावे and तदः [U]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>शैलि (for शैलि)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Om. तत्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>After स ति ins. मात्रे [N, D6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>उपदुःखात्म (for उपदुःखात्म)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>नावपालि (for नावपालि)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ग्रान्तः (for ग्रान्तः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Om. सत्वा (after सत्तुंके पीतवशः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>प्रेमायमास (for प्रेमायमास) [U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Om. उपयम्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>अयोदयः (for अयोदयः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>भवता (for भवता)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>आद्वानदेवः (for आद्वानदेवः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>रेतुं (for रेतुं)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>भवतः (for भवतः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Om. भागित (for भागित)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Before भोज्विनः, ins. से</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>पीवालिमपथतः (for पीवालिमपथतः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>वाच्यवाच्यवाच्य (for वाच्यवाच्यवाच्य)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Om. अधिः (after कान्तः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>नामधृतसः (for नामधृतसः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Before भोजि, ins. पुत्र च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Om. स (before गृहः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Om. को (before उपसन्यो)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>पूर्णः (for पूर्णः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>नाववावसुदागासासेन (for नाववावसुदागासासेन)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>अब्यादारस तदादारसं (for अब्यादारस तदादारसं)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>किंचितकारः (for किंचितकारः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>गुरुहुम्ब (for गुरुहुम्ब)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>परिहर्ष्यतः (for परिहर्ष्यतः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[219]</td>
<td>87 अहित्य (for अहित्य)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>उच्चः स ज्ञातुः (for उच्चः स ज्ञातुः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Om. स (before वसनः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>वसतः (for वसतः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>ते क्षमुकात (for ते क्षमुकात)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>After आद्वानदेवः, ins. मा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Om. गुहेः (before गुहेः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>वार्तजाः (for वार्तजाः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>After समाहृ, ins. से</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Transp. उच्छः and आशीःमृ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Om. स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Om. मः पीला</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Transp. तेन तत्स्या and सम्बन्धविन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>प्रथमस्यकार अत्थत (for प्रथमस्यकार अत्थत)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>प्रकर्णः (for प्रकर्णः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>उपाहतः (for उपाहतः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>श्रेष्ठायामास्तः (for श्रेष्ठायामास्तः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Om. लोकः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>आद्वानसुधाधावः (for आद्वानसुधाधावः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>निनिलतः (for निनिलतः)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>After शापः, ins. न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>After अभिसुतः, ins. अभि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>वुवुस वहुसासखः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>अनुरोहः (for तथा)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
143) ये बेचदुपक्षीयति
145) हृदस्ताता (for निवो) [Ny.1 M.1-5.]
146) इह सस्त्रित्र (for महादुपक्षी) [U]
147) Transp. एवं and स्तवायूं
148) अभिक्षु (for अभिरोधय)
154) Transp. सा and पूर्ण
155) उपेशु (for इंगु)
156) आचारसञ्ज (for ध्यासञ्ज)
157) आचार (for अभ)
158) उपायमित्ति (for भूपिति)
159) इन्द्रे ते (for पूर्णे)
160) जमाह (for ज्ञात
161) ततु (for एतस)
162) एवज्ञातमु (for श्रणादेव)
166) After तदुकें, ins. मे
167) तस्ते (for तन्त्रे)
177) Om. अविरोध्य परिपत
181) अद्व देव (for अद्वदेव) [U]
182) विविधस्वरूपप्रस्वरूप
183) परिपरिपालयाम (for परिपरिपालयाम) [U]
184) तल्कितयावम (for तल्कितयावम) [U]
185) काम काराः (for कामकाराः) [U]
193) उद्दक्षाक्ष्मन्यमित्रविष्ये [U]

Adhy. 4

1) Om. वैशाशिकी
2) Om. द्रास्तवाचिकि
3) कुटातिधिः (for कुटातिधिः) [U]
4) Om. वाचु
5) कर्तवयि (for हुवाणि) [U]
6) प्रश्नायः (for प्रश्नायः)
7) भोवाण (for भोवाण)
8) वेश चालसुःकामः [K9.253]
9) गृहपितः (for गृहपितः)
10) सुतंतुपुष्प: स्वतः

[220] 3) हिंद्र: (for तत्र:)

Adhy. 5

2) शुद्धवेत्वे (for शुद्धवेत्ता: पूर्ण)
5) भागवत्हि जिज्ञासात् [U]

Adhy. 6

5) Om. (? hapl.) 5\textsuperscript{sef}
6) सूतं (for शूतं)
8) Transp. सा and एवम् [K0.1]
12) हृ (for ब)
13) अतिक्रुयु (for अभिक्रुयु)

Adhy. 7

9) सर्वसा (for परशु) [D9.7]
11) हुज्जि (for हुज्जि) [U]
16) देवसुत्व (for देवसुत्व)
21) Transp. सर्वे and हुज्जि [U]
23) व्यापि (for व्यापि) [U]
24) तत्र (for सत्ता:) [U]

Adhy. 8

2) शुनक्षत्व यत्तोभवत्व [U]
7) Transp. सा and सर्व [U]
10) संवेदं रूपसूत्राग्नित (Corrupt)
13) विवेदनेति (for भवेदः) [U]
16) स दुस्सूकः (for दुश्सूकः)

Adhy. 9

3) शेवसे (for शेवे: सा)
5) यदवां (for यदवा)
7) त्याजासू (for त्याजावत)
12) उपाभिधु वयाविनी [K.]
6) हुज्जि (for हुज्जि)
8) उपमत्सर्सः (for उपमत्सर्सः) [U]
9) करिवेच्यें (for °वेचं तं)
11) Before उत्तिष्ठतु, ins. च
12) तवमा (for तत्ते) [U]
17) एवं (for इति)
18) तात्सोप प्रतसुद्रय
19) वचेशसाम

Adhy. 10
2) तुजायं देवेष हन्यो [U]
5) हुण्डमस्य (for सुण्डस्य)
6) अहनाव (for अप्पीतः)

Adhy. 11
1) ग्राता (for तातः) [U]
2) ह्रव (for अंखः)
3) त्रांस्क. हुण्डवा च and स [U]
6) हस्तोत्तरः ते (for °तेवे ते) [Corrupt]
8) c निवाप्तम् (for विनि:°)
9) तवथे (for बा करः) [B]
5) में संविधिता (for तमे तुत°)
6) हस्ते (for हुक्ति ते) [U]
12) वर (for स्तुतः)

Adhy. 12
3) वक्त (for वर्णसु)
4) त्वथ (for वच्यि)

Adhy. 13
1) पुरा (for राजा)
3) ववीहित तस्म (for वेदम स्म)
5) तपस्यनः (for यत्पालिमः)
6) ब्लदिष्टु
8) त्रांस्क. आन्तर्देप असम्यान
11) अवाभालक (for अपोधय°)
12) वे ब्लदिष्टु (for ब्लदिष्टी)
15) संतति विचीिकः (for संततिविचीिको)
5) शुनि: (for शुनिः)

Adhy. 14
3) आयुस्वर्णम स्यान (for आयुष्य निषुः)
9) इदॅसां (for इदॅस्वीत) [N, T]
13) निधिपालिनः (for निधिपालिनः)
15) देश्यत (for देश्यत°)
16) देश्यत: (for देश्यत°)
17) कोम्भभिन्नस्तुस्य (for कोम्भभिन्नस्तु)
21) तधा (for दवा)
23) वशुक्षित: (for °शुक्षितः)

Adhy. 15
8) सुम्भोहस्य (for °हः)
9) बहुवस्त्र मिन्वय [N]
10) वहिं (for वहिं)
11) तदा नियमस्तुंगता:
12) अचिन्त्यज्ञुवेदवाच्यमानविविधाय सावधा [N]

Adhy. 16
3) अभ्यत (for अभो) [U]
8) अमृताए (for अमृतायें)
9) मिः (for अमृतायें)
10) तस्मु (for उक्तव) [U]
11) स हैलस्त (for स हैलस्त)
12) ततो (for तषा)
14) अण्डियस्त (for अण्डियस्त)
19) विनिः (for विनिः)
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20 b) विनाशकज्ञ (for वापसत्)
21 a) महावश: महावीया:

Adhy. 29
1 b) मरीचिकनकोभ्यक्त: [N₃ T₂]
2 a) द्वारायस्म (for द्रवयास्म) [N₃]
3 a) जस्तकारर्म (for जस्तकारर्म) [N₃ B₄]
4 c) चारणितायस्मय (for चारणितायस्म) [N₃]
5 b) पर्यावर (for पर्यावर) [U]
6 a) महारोधी (for महारोधी) [U]
7 d) दर्श (for दर्श) [D₄ T₂]
8 b) प्रायवाद: (for प्रायवाद) [N₃]

Adhy. 30
1 a) गुण्य उद्व (for गुण्य उद्व) [U]
2 a) सन्तोषकुरस्तवम (for सन्तोषकुरस्तवम) [N₃]
3 a) राधी (for राधी) [N₃]
4 a) नीलानक (for नीलानक) [N₃]
5 a) विद्युतीको (for विद्युतीको) [U]
6 a) मुद्रालिपिक: (for मुद्रालिपिक) [N₃]
18 b) अरुणाम (for अरुणाम) [N₃ G₄ a₅]

Adhy. 31
4 a) प्रव (for प्रव) [U]
7 a) नीलानाटि (for नीलानाटि) [N₃]
9 a) निद्रारिक: (for निद्रारिक) [U]
16 b) मुद्रालिपिक: (for मुद्रालिपिक) [N₃]
18 b) अरुणाम (for अरुणाम) [N₃ G₄ a₅]

Adhy. 32
1 a) लचिविधाय (for लचिविधाय) [N₂ G₁]
2 a) आस्था (for आस्था) [N₂ G₁]
3 a) तपोकाम (for तपोकाम) [K₁ N₃]
4 a) नियतेन्द्रिय: (for नियतेन्द्रिय) [K₁ N₃]
5 a) मुद्रालिपिक (for मुद्रालिपिक) [N₃ G₃]
6 a) जनमुद्रालिपिक (for जनमुद्रालिपिक) [N₃]
8 b) [S] लिख (for लिख) [N₃ M₄ a₅]
9 a) ग्रामवाद (for ग्रामवाद) [N₃]
13 a) अवि: (for अवि:) [S₁ K₁ N₃]
19 b) ग्रामवादशक्त (for ग्रामवादशक्त) [U]
21 a) अविर (for अविर) [U]
22 b) ग्रामवादशक्त (for ग्रामवादशक्त) [N₃]

Adhy. 33
3 a) यथार्थ (for यथार्थ) [N₃]
12 a) त्रांस्पे ताम: (for त्रांस्पे ताम:) [N₃]
16 b) त्रांस्पे 16rd and 19rd [U]
19 b) भवयोग्य: भवयोग्य [N₃]
21 a) समन्वत: (for समन्वत:) [N₃]
[225] 21 a) समन्वत: (for समन्वत:) [N₃]
27 a) शृंखलक (for शृंखलक)

Adhy. 34
9 a) विशेषज्ञताव (for विशेषज्ञताव) [U]
Here and in 10° [U]
12 a) वार्षिकितवान (for वार्षिकितवान) [U]
12 a) वार्षिकितवान (for वार्षिकितवान) [U]

Adhy. 35
4 a) सांत्वासिक (for सांत्वासिक) [U]
4 a) अवि: (for अवि:) [U]
7 a) कन्या (for कन्या) [N₃]
10 a) धृत (for धृत) [U]

Adhy. 36
7 a) शिल्पोपश: (for शिल्पोपश) [S₁ K₁ N₃]
8 a) अवि: (for अवि:) [S₁ K₁ N₃]
9 a) स्वादशक्त: [U]
13 a) परिक्रितो नरेन्द्रण [S₁ K₁ N₃]
16 a) संहिता (for संहिता) [U]
22 f) ग्रामवादशक्त (for ग्रामवादशक्त) [N₃]

Adhy. 37
1 b) चेतनसम्बन्धित (for चेतनसम्बन्धित) [U]
4 a) बाण (for बाण) [U]
5 a) ग्रामवादशक्त (for ग्रामवादशक्त) [U]
8 a) ग्रामवादशक्त (for ग्रामवादशक्त) [N₃ G₄]
9 a) तेजस (for अधाराः) [ Corrupt ]
10 a) शव (for अवश्य)
25 a) विसो (for तथा)
26 a) प्रव (for अन्व)

Adhy. 38
3 b) तात (for दुरु)
5 b) सनीयिद्धम (for महाभादाति)
7 b) अतररत (for भाषन)
9 b) पत्विन्यितकान्
11 b) तावकर्णयांसः तात
13 b) महामाया: (for महात्माः)
[ K_1 G_{1,4,5} ]
22 b) भावामहामाया: (for राजा महात्मा:)
[ N_5 ]
27 b) स (for बै) [ N_5 ]
37 b) घरित: (for घरिते)

Adhy. 39
1 a) दश्म (for दश्म) [ K_{0,5} N_5 ]
3 a) वम (for वम) [ N_5 ]
12 a) ताहि स्वाम्या: (for ताहि स्वाम्या)
[ N_5 ]
14 a) यतात्तम (for यत्तात्तम)
[ N_5 G_3 ]
15 a) इह (for इह)
16 a) युवालिवा (for युवालिवा)
17 a) निवेश हिजात्सम [ N_5 ]
25 a) वत (for वत)
32 a) लं लिनेश्वर (for लं लिनेश्वर) [ U ]
33 a) अनज्ञेयेङ्को (for अज्ञेयेको) [ D_4 ]

Adhy. 40
6 a) दस्माणेष्ठत (for दस्माणेष्ठत)
7 a) अमरः: (for आमरः:)
[ Corrupt ]
10 a) नगेशु (for नगेशु)
11 a) Ōm. वै [ U ]

Adhy. 41
5 a) बाहुत मा (for बाहुत मा)
8 a) वाय (for अभिमुख)
9 a) तत्स (for तत्स)
13 a) Transp. तत् and तत्स:
17 a) तत्स (for अवस्थि) [ U ]
[226] 23 a) चाव लं (for चाव ब्रह्म)
25 a) तमोरसे (for तमोरसे)
27 a) सहायवेच: (for सहायवेच:)
29 a) त (for त)
17 a) वायुधरण (for वायुधरण) [ N_5 ]

Adhy. 42
6 a) सनामान (for सनामान)
11 a) जगामानिः स्फोरनि छ च
15 a) सनामा (for सनामा)
18 a) च स (for च स)
20 a) वासुकं (for वासुकं)

Adhy. 43
2 a) कन्याः (for कन्याः) [ N_{1,6} ]
20 a) पब्धि: (for पब्धि:)
25 a) भाषी (for भाषी) [ U ]
30 a) विन्यासकम्लिता
32 a) Transp. विन्यास and विन्यास [ N_5 ]

Adhy. 44
2 a) दीनतायया (for दीनतायया) [ N_5 ]
11 a) तथा (for तथा) [ N_5 ]
12 a) से (for से)
13 a) तमोरसा (for तमोरसा)
14 a) जर्गुदे तदा (for जर्गुदे तदा) [ N_5 ]
19 a) श्रींवत (for श्रींवत)
21 a) समन्नातः (for समन्नातः)

Adhy. 45
1 a) क्त: (for क्तः)
2 a) राजा (for राजा) [ N_5 ]
6 a) सूते (for सूते) [ N_5 ]
3 a) वाजानिः हि भवानिः [ Corrupt ]
11 a) दशसान (for दशसान)
13 a) जस्विजनस (for जस्विजनस)
15 a) संपाद्यमिनिविनितम [ U ]
16 a) पुष्कवत्व (for पुष्कवत्व)
17 a) सर्वभूमिलुप्त: (for सर्वभूमिलुप्त)
18 a) आचार्य (for आचार्य)
22 a) तवादुपक्ष: [ K_1 N_{1,5} ]
3 a) Transp. सुख and तिति [ U ]
Adhy. 46
2 a) सहातपः (for घसहः)
3 a) स यज्ञ (for अजुरालो)
7 a) रक्षुनुः (for रक्षुनानां)
11 a) स्त्र (for स्त्र) [न न]
14 a) Here and in the sequel कल्पः
   (for कल्पः)
17 a) तथा विपलः (for महायतिपलः) [U]
18 a) कं ते (for कं ते)
25 a) पश (for पशु)
26-32 Omn.
34 a) तेन्यो: भाप तं (for नेत्रायणं प्रततं) [न न]
36 b) शादोतने (for श्रृदुलस्ये) [S1 न न]
38 a) प्रज्ञावेगः (for प्रज्ञावेगः)

Adhy. 47
1 a) जै (for ङर) [निन न]
3 a) नो (for से) [S1 क न न]
4 a) प्रायस्ये (for सारकः भृत्व) [न न]
6 a) परिपक्वः (for कण्ठः चुपः)
7 a) जनाधिपः (for नरः)
8 a) ह्वः (for ह्वः)
10 a) Transp. देवः and तं
11 b) ह्रिजनायुतस्तः (for ह्रिजनायुतस्तः)
    प्रधानार्थयथः

[227] 15.7) संस्थायां (for संस्थायां)
22 a) रावचः (for रावचः)
24 a) तुर्गः: (for तुर्गः)

Adhy. 48
1 a) पुरुषस्मा: (for पुरुषस्मा:) [न न]
2 b) तत्र लोकः (for सपर्स्ये)
3 a) महामः (for महामः)
4 a) वर्धितासि (for कथः) [न न]
6 b) कौलेवार्जितः (for कौले) [न]
   a) चोथितः (for जगोः)
7 a) कामसः (for कामः)
8 a) कुमारः (for कुमारः)
9 a) बलःवासरःवेशःवानः
   काहलः (for काहलः)

Adhy. 49
4 a) त्रसंस्चारः (for त्रोभरः)
10 a) युद्धः (for से) [न न]
12 a) तेरः मेदीवः (for वसामः)
    [निन न]
18 a) तथा (for तथा)
26 b) वृत्तसंसारः (for ङर)
    [Corrupt]

Adhy. 50
1 a) भारताः (for भारताः) Here et.
    seq. in this adhy.
2 b) तथापरः (for परः)
8 a) सुमयसमुच्चारः (for सूपहः)
7 a) अन्तः (for अन्तः)
6 a) क्राचिल (for क्राचिल)
9 a) महो (for महो)
4 a) क्षेत्र (for क्षेत्र)
10 a) विकम्बः (for अकुकः) [न न]
    a) प्रज्ञायः (for प्रज्ञायः)
    12 a) तथा बे (for तथा) [निन न]
    13 a) कदुकः
15 a) व्यतायाः (for क्तुतायः) [निन न]

Adhy. 51
2 a) सम्यः (for सम्यः)
3 a) वाकः (for वाकः) [K3 M2-4]
7 a) प्रसहवितः (for प्रसहवितः) [U]
8 a) प्रस्नः: प्रस्नः (for च वचः स ङर)
    [न न]
9 b) परितः स्तुतवः: (for परितस्तु)
    a) श्रवणीयः (for श्रवणीयः)
9 a) After विचारः, ins. च [B1]
12-15 Transp. 12-13 and 14-15
12  नदो (for कदो)
15 राजदेह (for जनसेवय उवाच)
  a) कुशापियाय (for "सिरवस्य"
   [N₃]
  b) वाजतुरुपस (for "वयाप"
  c) हाविज्ञ (for "हावि सिरि"
16  जातवेससम (for "झस"
18 a) विखं (for कड़दु) [N₁] [N₃]
20  च (for न:)
22  अन्यत्र (for अन्ये) [N₁, G₁,]

Adhy. 52
4 a) महाकाल (for विशेषणान) [N₃]
[228] 5 b) सद: पालो (for सह: पैलो)
7 a) विषारङ्ग (for विभेदय)
8 a) अच्छा: द्रुस्तर (for अच्छे: द्रुस्तर)
   [N₃]
 b) बलितालकोणी (for "कोणी")
10  मेहः (for मोहः)
11  बामो: सहादाकऽ: [N₃]
12  पतिता (for प्रजीता)
12  अहिलकऽ: (for अहिलकऽ: [N₁] [N₃]
 b) वेयुस्मान: (for वेयुमृ)
 b) बुधकेशः (for बुधकेशः)
15  आामकऽ: (for आामकऽ:)
 b) हवञ्जी (for मानी)
   [N₃]
 b) सम्भवदाहः (for "साभार"
16  नामः (for नामः)
17  खुचिरः (for "कुचिर"
 b) पराशकः (for पार"
   [G₀]
 b) कोषिकः (for मणि"
   [N₃]
21  देशा(र्थुतलस्तारा [N₁] [N₃]
22  कामवहा (for कामामा)

Adhy. 53
1  a) छन्नामानी (for "मानी")
4 b) महामानाय (for सम्मीयाय)
 b) य च संवित्तभावमस्य थि थेनाहो न पापात
   स: [N₃]
5 a) अमुपीर्यत (for अमुपीयत)
6 a) विन्याय (for विन्याय) [K₀, N₃]
 b) गङ्गकेस्यान्तरा (for गङ्गकेस्यान्तरा)
   [K₀ N₁, N₃]
7 b) अभिवोदितः (for चोलितो "सुसम"
   [U]
18 a) च (for "वै"
22  Om. [U]
24  हु (for स)
27  कसऽत (for कसऽत)
 b) अलो (for तेन) [U]
28  न्यश्रस्मिरः च (for न्यश्रस्मिरः चैव)
 b) विचारः (for प्रज्ञ"
29  तथा कऽ (for महाकाल"
30  तचऽ विचारः न: (for लः चैे
   विचारः
34  कसऽरे (for सुहः) [N₃]
35  तेहः श्रस्मिरः (for ते क्षुश्रस्मिरः)

Adhy. 54
1  a) अष्टाच्छ ः (for अष्टाच्छ)
5 a) चन्हः (for चन्हः) [N₁, N₃]
 b) सयः: खुचिरः (for सल्लवत: कुचिर"
13  हथी (for अया) [K₀, M]
15  प्रख्यातः (for यणेन) [N₃]
20  यथाशूर हिषोऽतम
24  Trasp. तसः and रासे

Adhy. 55
3  a) ओऽनुपाबः (for ओऽनुपाबः)
 b) प्रज्ञोऽं भारती सुभाष [K₀, N₃]
17-21 For 17—21 (both incl.),
   subst. 476* (for v. l. see below)
476* [(L₅) Transp. सहिता and नामात
   (L₄) सीत्र (for मन्त्री)
   (L₅) त्व (for "तै")
   (L₁₉) न्यावस्तू महामानी (for न्यावस्तू महामानी)
   L₁₅ मात्रा सह परस्त्वाः (for धार्मिक राष्ट्रावधिताः)
   (L₁₉) पाणीलठः (for पाणीलठ)]
23 f) अभिरोचितः (for अभिरोधित"
 [N₃]
26 a) तंत्र यत्र तंत्रा ते [N₃]
30  bमो (for आद्यो) [N₃]
31 After 31°, ins. 478*, reading in 31°, सर्वसाधिन (for वे योगमयम्).
After 31, ins. 479*.

[229] Adhy. 56

6 a) नाचारतपनो (for नाचारतपनो) [U]
8 Om. [K₁₂ N₁]
10 a) परेक्ष्य (for परेक्ष्य) [U]
12 In place of 12, ins. 485* [N₁]
19 a) मही (चयः) जयेकुलो [N₃]
24 Om. [N₁]
26 After 26, ins. 494* & 495* [U]
27 Om.
28 a) इन्मा (for हि) [U]
 8 बाय नाकोक्ष शास्त्रदृष्टिः
29 a) आचर्यः (for आचर्यः) [U]
 8 च (for शास्त्रदृष्टिः)
 8 उपाधिग्रंथिनी
31 a) समुच्छयते (for समुच्छयते) [U]
31 After 31, ins. (with v. 1.)

Adhy. 57

1 b) सदा किञ्च (for स कर्जिन) [U]
3 b) सत्वचनम् (for सत्वचनम्)
 8 वेधः शकुनुरोगात्रे राजनयुरपत्थिरे
5 वेधः (for हि उवच)
 8 पाठयते (for भारते)
8 a) च (for सीतश्र) [Corrupt]
9 a) मृत्युमित्र [?] (for विदिम) [Corrupt]
12 b) अर्कलिस्याः (for लक्ष्यते) [U]
 8 सत्तम (for वनवेद) [U]
14 b) श्रवण्युधु (for श्रवण्युधु) [N₃]
16 a) होकान्तात च (for होकान्तात्व च) [U]
17 a) शेषभेडः (for शेषभेडः)
 8 सृष्टि (for सृष्टि) [U]
20 b) वस्त्रः (for चास्याः)
24 a) सत्यः (for तथा)
26 b) जनस (for नरः)
4) नरः वुजाधिकामः: (for वरदामः)
 8 [N₃ B₃ m]

27 f) च स: (for वचः)
29 a) मन्वः (for मन्वः) [K₂, B₁, D₁]
31 f) परिशुद्धम् (for परिशुद्धम्) [N₃]
34 b) परिशुद्धम् (for परिशुद्धम्) [T₁ G₁, B₃]
41 a) तेजसः (for रेतसः)
42 b) च (for सः)
47 a) आजुः (for अजुः)[U]
45 a) अशिपाकाश्यः (for अशिपाकाश्यः) [N₃]
49 f) कृष्णासायसः मातुरशी [N₃]
52 f) जनाधिविल्यकत्वं कृष्णासायसः दुः
 8 भामिनी [N₃]
53 a) अतः (for ततः) [D₃]
 8 दे (for तच्च) [U]
54 a) सत्त्वसमायुक्तः [K₂, N₃ M₃]
55 a) गन्धवती (for गन्धवती) [N₃]
58 b) पारावर्धम् (for पारावर्धनः)
59 a) लदा स (for तरीकः) [N₃]
60 a) बिशिष्टागमनिव (for ता चाप्रस्थित)
 8 [Corrupt]
62 a) युहं गन्धः युद्धः (for गन्धः युहं युद्धः)
68 a) अतः (for ततः)
 8 प्रतिष्ठितम् (for परिशुद्धम्) [U]
73 a) अनुपुष्पकाश्यः (for काश्यः)
77 a) आणिपण्डत्वम् (for भणीः)
81 a) अकलिक्ष्यः (for अलिक्ष्यः) [U]
84 a) कली हति गंगामयः [N₃]
86 a) विशः (for निवः)
87 a) सव्वतीकौसिमध: [N₃ G₃, B₃]
 8 धर्मसत्यपरानायां
88 a) अर्थवदार्शनः (for अर्थबाधिताशी)

[230] 89 ab) Transp. स्त्रस्ते and श्रोया [N₃]
91 a) पञ्चायतः (for पञ्चायतः)
 8 [Corrupt]
93 a) रेतवकोपनी (for रेतवकोपनी) [U]
101 a) सब्ज़सा विख्यातः
103 a) ततो (for वने) [U]
106 b) सत्तुः (for सत्तः)
f) ततः (for ततः) [N₃ G₁, B₃]
Adhy. 58

1  a) शातुम् (for श्रोतुम्)
2  b) महाज्ञात् (for सहस्राय: ) [नि]
10  f) शासी (for सवेशी)
11  a) सब्तमपथाताः
13  a) कामकी चतवात् (for कोतीवाताः) [नि]
  b) अतापिता (for नर)
21  a) अवुर्द्धरेटः (for पक्षतः) [उ]
22  a) वधभूतिः (for वधकमः)
27  b) पुनः पुनः (for मनस्वि: ) [नि]
28  b) संयोगमूलेषु (for हृदमूलेषु) [नि]
29  a) तत्त्र (for आसाना) [नि द्व ग्]
30  b) बलवन्द्विताः (for बलसमति: ) [नि बस द्व]
  a) देवकोटानिः (for तस्मादभुकाः)
32  b) गुप्तदणु (for अन्यपिकणु)
33  a) सवेश (for सवेशत) [नि]
34  a) बलसदेन (for संवदेन)
41  a) तत्त्वाय मस्तार्थाय तदा [नि]
42  a) सवेशाः (for लोकानाः) [नि गृ]
45  a) ततो वादाः (for तदा सर्वीत) [उ]
46  a) ततो (for चाक्षीत) [नि]

Adhy. 59

7  a) देवानां दानवानां च
  a) [अ] हैं (for कै)
11  b) देवाना दानाना व [उ]
12  b) देवानु: (for अनानु:)
16  a) जननय (read श्यो) या: (for जन्यण:)
25  a) इत्यादा (for इत्यासा)
  a) विरुध्दाकराहुमी [नि]
  a) क्रूणताः कवात्ताः [नि]
27  a) देवाना दानाना राजाः [नि]
29  a) अन्झेवत् (for न्धेवत) [नि]
30  a) सिह्व (for दिन्हिं) [नि]
31  b) प्रयोगदत्त (for प्रयोगम्) [नि]
38  a) स् (स) भक्तिमहिमी (for सन्त्राकः) [Corrupt]
  a) कबिविलक्ति नवपितानम्
  a) देवाना दानाना शुरुणाः
  a) कबिविलक्ति नवपितानम्
  a) देवाना दानाना शुरुणाः

Adhy. 60

1  a) लप्तेनास: (for लानास: ) [उ]
3  a) चाहनोऽक्रमः (for चहनोऽक्रमः)
[231] 4  a) मरोदितायादपायसिः
  a) दुधा (for संवर्वेश) [नि]
6  a) अथे: दुधा दवः
12  a) दुधा [नि]
13  b) नियोजत (for ने से) [उ]
  a) दुधा [नि]
15  a) अनुवस्य: (for लोगः)
  a) स्मुखः (for स्मृत: ) [नि द्व]
17  b) दुधा [नि]
21  a) दुधा [नि]
31  a) देवरायाः (for देवाशिष्ठ: ) [नि द्व]
40  a) कालः (for कविविलक्ति)
  a) श्रुतिरूप (for काल) [नि]
42  b) दुधास्त (for चावत) [नि]
43  b) अनुवस्य: (for लोकम्)
51  a) दुधासुशुलीनिम्
53  a) अधिकाश: (for अधिकार: ) [नि द्व]
54  b) दुधास्थिराकोष्ठ (for दुधा तथा)
55  a) नवाशिष्ठ (for नवाशिष्ठ) [नि]
56  a) [अ] (for अ) [क]
57  a) दुधास्तवाचकाः [नि]
EPIC STUDIES

58 ¹) बादगारी (for बादगारी)
59 ¹) कृष्णकास (for कृष्णकास)
60 ¹) उद्धवत (for उद्धवत)
61 ¹) पुरुष (for पुरुष)
62 ¹) संजय (for संजय)

[232] 69 ¹) संवरण:
70 ¹) दोषालय (for दोषालय)
71 ¹) वर् (for वर्)
72 ¹) से (for से)
73 ¹) महादेव (for महादेव)
74 ¹) संजय (for संजय)
75 ¹) पुरुष (for पुरुष)
76 ¹) श्रीमान्यक (for श्रीमान्यक)
77 ¹) अंबात (for अंबात)
78 ¹) नातिबीर्य (for नातिबीर्य)

Adhy. 61

10 ¹) रसवत (for रसवत)
11 ¹) सन्तविकसार (for सन्तविकसार)

Adhy. 62

18 ¹) पुरुष (for पुरुष)
19 ¹) नातिबीर्य (for नातिबीर्य)
20 ¹) संजय (for संजय)
21 ¹) पुरुष (for पुरुष)
22 ¹) श्रीमान्यक (for श्रीमान्यक)
23 ¹) समेध्य (for समेध्य)

Adhy. 63

20 ¹) महादेवक (for महादेवक)
21 ¹) महादेवन (for महादेवन)
22 ¹) महादेव (for महादेव)
23 ¹) पुरुष (for पुरुष)
24 ¹) पुरुष (for पुरुष)
25 ¹) श्रीमान्यक (for श्रीमान्यक)
26 ¹) संजय (for संजय)
27 ¹) संघ (for संघ)
28 ¹) संघ (for संघ)

Adhy. 64

20-22 Stanzas 20-22 are ins. on the margin.
21) फेनुपुष्पवान्दिरीरतं
23) अनुम् ins. च [U]
25) तत्त्र (for द्वारा) [T₁ G₁]
36) से (for तथा) [N₃]

Adhy. 65
1) After नाप्रवत, ins. च
4) शतिपुष्पनुनुन (for शूष्क च)
5) ह (for हि)
6) तथा (for तदा)
9) इरासिस (for इरासिस)
12) का स्वस्त कथा (for कास्ति कास्ति)
13) भी (for देव) [N₃]

21) मा (for मां)
36) आयुष्य सा (for आयुष्य) [U]
37) निम्नत्रियत्तमति युद्धोष [K₄ N₃]
41) राजन (for देव) [N₃]
4) भो (for देव) [N₃]

Adhy. 66
1) तत्त्र (for तदा)
4) अभावसहिरीरतं (for अविस्मरती)

After 4, ins. 601*

[233] 5) छुट्टा यथा सत्यसंक्षम
6) रूपपुष्पनुनुन (for रूपपुष्पनुनुन)
10) गुरुक्कटां (for गुरुक्कटां)
12) शुद्धे (for [S]शुद्धे) [N₃]
13) घरेमसराभो (for ग्नरेमसराभो)
14) [हं] (for च) [K₄]
16) मनुवेक्ष (for मनुवेक्ष) [N₃]

Adhy. 67
2) सुरवीभान्ति (for सुरवीभान्ति)
4) में (for माता) [N₃]
8) तत्त्र (for पहिरि)

21) वामोष (for रमोष) [U]
22) देव (for रमोष) [U]
23) तत्त्र (for देव) [N₃]
25) तत्त्र (for अव्र) [N₃]
26) से (for सत्य) [U]
29) वातासिस (for वातासिस)
31) अविद्विति (for अविद्विति)
32) अथवा (for अत्यस्म) [N₃]
37) सुद्धय (for देव) [U]
38) सुवेश (for सुवेश)
40) मृत्तिष्टिन्द्र: (for सिंह मरि)
50) स्वा रामा (for रामाणाः) [N₆]
51) हि (for च)
52) रामा संस्ते (for रामाद्रे) [S₁ K₁]
53) र्म्म प्रास (for अभुमार्) [U]
54) विधातः (for विधाति) [S₁ K₁ B₃m. 4₃₅]
55) सत्यविधा (for तथा सुखः)
57) सुविधा (for कोः) [N₆]
60) वाहुना स्वाधि (for भुक्तानाय) [N₆]
61) जातकेम्स (for भणिणि) [S₁ K₅ N₆ D₆]
62) शरदृ (for शरदः)
66) बाला (for रजनृ) [U]
67) विज्ञापितः (for पर्वेषिपितः)
68) पुतासं (for पुतासं मा) [N₆]
75) Transp. च (ते and चिता)
77) प्रभावसि (for [अ] भिवास्यसि)
78) स्व (स्वदे)
79) ब्रज मेनका (for मेनकाय) [U]

Adhy. 69
2) वितराङ्कः (for वितराङ्छेप)
6) अपि (for अपि) [N₆]
6) हुष्यतामाय (for भुष्यतामाय)
14) चतुः (for चतः)
16) हुज्जनाम (for हुज्जनाम)
18) विज्ञापितः (for विज्ञापितः) [U]
19) विज्ञापितः (for पर्वेषिपितः) [U]
20) लवानहुइः (for बांहुइः लविः) [U]
28) पुतासं हु (for पुतासं हु)
29) भर्ती माता पिता (for मा माता पितुः)
30) रेतेश (for रेतेशः)
30) अपि (for अस्ति)
31) आहततोऽ लघ गम्बर्मामायमेवः
35) अपि (for अस्ति)
35) चार्य्येश्वराय (for अय्येश्वरायः)
35) आभ्यन्त (for आभ्यन्तः)
[Ś₁ K₁ D₆]

37) After 37, ins. 678a
38) विवेदनैः (for विवेदन) [U]
40) में (for में) [D₆]
41) सत्यविधा हि (for सत्यवते चैव)
       [K₀₁ D₆]
42) Transp. शान्ति and ते [D₆]
45) स्वित (for अतिं) [N₆]
46) आपि (for आपि)
48) गोविन्दर्य (for गोविन्दर्यः) [K₀₂ D₆]
49) हृ (for हृ) [U]
51) व्यासुद्धार्य (for भुक्ताय)
      भारवाय (for भाराय) [N₆]

Adhy. 70
2) वृत्तवाणोऽ (for पौरोऽ)
3) ग्राश्चासः (for प्र्येचः)
5) संज्ञित: सुताय (for संज्ञितवाय) [U]
7) पुष्करकः (for पुष्करिक) [S₁ K₀₁]
8) सत्याविद्वितम (for सत्याविद्वितम)
9) सतोऽदे (for सतश्रः) [U]
11) यद: (for तदः) [N₆]
12) ब्रह्मान्यायेव वस्ताय [U]
13) सङ्खेस्व (for सङ्खेस्व)
14) नामानागद्विदमामाय [K₀]
20) सङ्केतोऽ: सङ्केतोऽ: (for महार्मिकः
    कुःकुः)
22) शतासुः (for वनसुः)
23) रजतः [U₆]
25) पाश्चिमः (for पाश्चिमः)
36) स [सता] ह (for कार्यः)
40) त तत: न (for न ते ततः) [N₆]
41) तवादत्थ (for समास्याय)
       [K₀₁ N₆ D₆]
46) ह (for ह) [K₀ D₆]

Adhy. 71
2) लघा हिन्त (for हितीच्युत) [N₆]
3) राशो वर्षकराय (for पुरोवाचः)
5) पैशोहित्याय (for पैशीनेचः)
8 1 Transp. च और ताल्त
10 2 ते [श] (for ते छ)
12 3 त (for इ)
5) Transp. न और द [वा, गा]  
13 7 युक्ति (for कवियता) [वा, गा, ऊ]
[235] 16 8 वाचनमार्ग (for वाचन-  
मार्ग ह) [वा, गा, ऊ]
17 9 कथा (for कथा)
20 1 काम (for काम)
21 1 वे [राहितावा] (for प्रस्थान)  
[वा, गा, ऊ]
24 2 नियोजनवाचनमार्ग
26 2 शाकनिग्रहम (for निग्रह: ब्रह्म)  
[वा, गा, ऊ]
28 1 चैत (for चैत) [वा, गा]
30 1 ब्रह्म (for ब्रह्म)
31 1 तत्सा (for तत्सा)
31 1 शुक्ला [? read क्षमा] (for  
शुक्ला)
32 1 कवि (for कवि)
34 1 Transp. चार्य और दिप्तमधू  
36 1 पर्व (for पर्व) [वा, गा]
   After 36**, ins. 708* (with  
v. 1.)
7) सुदृढिक्षिप्त (for सुदृढिक्षिप्त)
4) उपस्थित सिद्धतिम मध्यालय  
   After 36, ins. 709* (with  
v. 1.)
37 1 तांत्यकम: पिता (for पिता तांत्यकम:)
38 After 38, ins. 710*  
39 1 लिखित नागराजवृत्ति (for नागराज  
लिखित सूत्रविन्यास) [वा, गा, ऊ]
40 Om.
43 1 आचारी तथा मार्ग (for आचारी  
चैत मार्ग)
48 1 अविद्यालय (for समीक्षया) [वा, गा, ऊ]
52 1 चैतवण शोभायों (for चैत तथा-  
विद्याय) [वा, गा, ऊ]
56 1 वैदिकसूत्रिकमार्ग (for वैदिकमार्ग)  
[वा, गा, ऊ]  

58 1 पाद (for दान) [वा, गा, ऊ]
7) स्त्रियालाभक्षण (for स्त्रियालाभक्षण)
   [वा, गा, ऊ]

Adhy. 72
1 1 निजरेकुण्डा तथा [वा, गा, ऊ]
3 1 Transp. मूलो और साधन
5 1 चैत शतमार्ग (for चैत शतमार्ग)
   [वा, गा, ऊ]
8 1 निरोध (for निरोध)
9 1 मे [त्रूमो] (for त्रूमो बै) [वा, गा, ऊ]
10 1 अत्यन्त (for अत्यन्त)
12 1 उभारवर्म (for उभारवर्म)
14 1 लय लक (for लय लक)
11 1 सौरभ-दारुसेना (for दारुसेना)
   [वा, गा, ऊ]

Adhy. 73
8 1 वच्च क्वं (for वच्च क्वं)
18 1 विष (for विष)
3 1 संस्कृत (for तत्सा)
19 1 Transp. जन और न [वा, गा, ऊ]
21 1 संवाद (for संवाद)
25 1 प्रतिविद्या (for प्रतिविद्या)
26 1 महाशाक्त (for शाक्त)
30 1 वास्तव तथा माला (for मेस्तुत तथा  
माला)
36 1 इत्यादि (for इत्यादि) [वा, गा, ऊ]
   After 36, ins. 750* (with  
v. 1.)

[237] Adhy. 74
3 1 निर्यश्चति (for निर्यश्चति)
   [वा, गा, ऊ]
8 1 चात्मकाल्यकक्ष (for चात्मकाल्यकक्ष)
11 1 अभित्वान्तित (for अभित्वान्तित)
   After 11, ins. 750* (with  
v. 1. as in K)
Adhy. 75

| 6) | Transp. धर्मश्र and स्तव्य च | [N₂ B₃ G₃] |
| 7) | अवहाय (for अपहाय) |
| 8) | After अवहाय, ins n: [K₆] |
| 10) | क (for वा) |
| 11) | वदरि kचिक्षुदुविच [N₃] |
| 13) | यवाच (for दार्शयति) |
| 14) | Transp. सा तथा यं |

| 20) | ज्ञातुपयास्यामि (for लों तत्र या) | [N₃] |

Adhy. 76

| 12) | को नाम (for किनासा) |
| 13) | Transp. कृत्वा: and से बेद: | [N₂ D₆] |
| 15) | सामु (for तन्म) | [N₃] |
| 18) | After दार्शय, ins. अधि |
| 19) | एक्नान्तवाच (for एक्ने हेतुवच) | [N₃] |
| 25) | विदर्शासि (for विदर्शासि) | [K₁, M₅ C₆ A r j. (comm.)] |
| 26) | मनवस्त मस्तान्म (for वहस्त विष्णु) | [N₃] |
| 28) | पिता (for लों हि) |
| 29) | Transp. नाम्यं and होके |
| 32) | वर्ज्यो वसम (for वर्ज्यो वसम) |
| 33) | तथासि (for तथासि) |
| 34) | समाशुधु (for वापस्यसि) |

Adhy. 77

| 16) | अनुजः (for अवजः) |
| 17) | वर्ज्यो वसम (for वर्ज्यो वसम) | [M] |
| 18) | वक्तुम (for कक्तुम) |
| 25) | स (for च) |

Adhy. 78

| 1) | सा (for हु) | [N₃] |
| 3) | अन्यायायर्धश्र (for अन्यायायर्धश्र) |
| 4) | वेदवेदार्य (for धर्मायसा वेदव्य) | [N₃] |
| 5) | श्रेष्ठम (for श्रेष्ठम) | [N₃ D₆] |

| 6) | Transp. रूपिष्ठ च प्रवा |
| 7) | तीष्ठासि (for तीष्ठासि) | [N₃] |
| 8) | सेवाय (for हेतु) |
| 11) | ज्ञातु (for ज्ञातु) |
| 14) | अभिन्त (for अभिन्त) |
| 15) | तामु (for तामु) | [U] |
| 18) | त्रे (for त्रे) |
| 20) | भांति (for भांति) |
| 23) | त्वरिता (for त्वरिता) |
| 25) | च (for हु) |
| 28) | सत्व (for सत्व) | [K₆ N₃] |
| 30) | व्यवस्त्र (for व्यवस्त्र) |
| 32) | यो (for हु) | [K₉, N₂ D₆] |
| 35) | मवदवदव (for मवदवदव) |
| 37) | न (for न) |

Adhy. 79

| 4) | कलिकच्यासि (for वर्षच्यासि) |
| 6) | स्वयम्ब (for स्वयम्ब) | [D₄ G₆] |
| 237) | तात्त (for बैक्त) | [N₃] |
| 7) | तात्रां न काम्ये | [N₃] |
| 9) | त्रे (for हु) | [K₁ N₃] |
| 10) | तात्रां न काम्ये तत्त्रां | [U] |
| 16) | त्रे (for हु) | [S₁ N₃] |
| 17) | ज्ञातुः (for ज्ञातुः) |
| 19) | नोच्याच्यासस्यकरो | [S₁ K₉,₁] |
| 21) | तत्त्रां न काम्ये | [U] |
| 22) | त्वरिता (for त्वरिता) | [U] |
| 24) | व्यवस्त्र (for व्यवस्त्र) | [N₃] |
| 30) | दुर्ण (for दुर्ण) |
| 37) | द्वाशः (for द्वाशः) | [N₃] |

Adhy. 80

| 1) | ऋषिक्षा (for ऋषिक्षा) | [N₃] |
9-10 The ten names ending with यु are spelt with यु. After 10th, ins. 875b

10 )) तातस्व ( for तात )
11 )) राजसुतास्वभावः

15 )) अयु युफ्ते ( for यु भीमो च )
16 )) प्रभूतिस्वरा: [ N3 ]
17 )) सुताय ( for सुत )

18 )) बुद्राभु ( for बुजुर्ण )

Adhy. 88

1 )) पट्टे ( for पट्टामि )
2 )) ददानि ( for ददामि )
6 )) ओम. दद [ K न3 द3 ]
7 )) हदायन चापि ( for अदायनाय विद्रन्म् )
8 )) अबह्य ( for अबम्यः )
11 )) यदैहेद तद्धृत्वः
12 )) संप्रदयते ( for प्रदत् ) [ N3 ]
13 )) नात्वायथा: नरा बाहानादिवानवानत्वः शास्तानान्
14 )) विवाहस्म ( for विवस्ता )
15 )) अत वादाया ( for अदुपा )
16 )) यथा ( for यदा )
17 )) विवजनान ( for विजजना: )
18 )) देशस्यमान ( for देशमानः )
19 )) नुआथे नुपात ( for नुपातमा: )
20 )) अहस्य ( for पूवस्य ) [ U ]
21 )) नापते ( for नुपाते ) [ N3 G4-6 ]
23 )) मालेशु ( for मालेशु ) [ N3 G1 ]

After 24th, ins. 868* ( with v. 1. as in K1 )

संवरण सच ( for स पुण्य समरे ) [ N3 ]

Adhy. 89

1 )) चंसारस्र ( for चंसारस्र )
2 )) चीरास्री ( for चीरास्री ) [ N3 ]
5 )) वेंशास्र ( for वेंशास्र ) [ N1,3 ]
7 )) अत 7, ins. 873b.
8 )) महोसाया ( for महोसाया ) [ N3 ]

35 )) नगरिस्थापनन्ते
37 )) अस्ता: ( for अस्ताः )
38 )) समाविश्वासित ( for समाभिव दुहे ) [ N3 ]

42 )) दुवप ( for दुवः ) [ K3 N3 ]
43 )) तुहुतास्तम ( for तुहुतास्तम् )
44 )) वाचस्य ( for वचस्य )
45 )) अनिष्ट ( for अनिष्टः )
46 )) अनिष्ट ( for अनिष्टः )
47 )) सत ( for सा )
51 )) वाचक ( for वाचक ) [ N3 ]
52 )) हस्तो विवक ( for हस्तो विवकः )
Adhy. 90

1 (for मे)
2 (for मामति)
3 (for वधाम [N3])
4 (for अहस्त [N3])
5 (for पुर [K3 N3])
6 (for मग [N3])

11 After पूरोः, ins. तु
12 परेतस्य प्राचीनानाम (for प्राचीनानाम) [U]
14 अहंपातिः (for अहंपाति)
15 इतक ज्ञान हुितम (for ज्ञान हुितम) [U]
17-18 सुभाषित (for अर) [N13]
19 अवानानायिः (for अवानानायिः)
23 अनवानायिः (for अनवानायिः)
25 After सर्वत्रायं (ins. गुणसंबंध्यतं)
[240] आहारं (for आहार)...
26 समासे (for निम्बुः) Before तस्या, ins. स
31 (for माता and भ्रजा)
32 (for राष्ट्रवाद [N3])
35 (for ज्ञान तस्य (for तस्यानाम) [U]
40-41 From तस्यानाम up to संप्रिया

36 अविविन्तवत कथं न (for विन्तवत [N3])
37 उपेक्षे व्रजेत (for उपेक्षे व्रजेत)
61 Om. तम
63 After कृती, ins पुरा
66 After विशेषहृत, ins. तथा
68 Om. श्वे
70 Om. तो
71 Om. स

77 After 77 ins. 903 (with v. 1)
78 शक्तिः विद्युतसमाप्तिः (for शक्तिः विद्युतसमाप्तिः)
81 अविन्तवत (for अविन्तवत)
83 योधे (for योधे)
84 वद्यदान (for वद्यदान)
85 महाभाषिणी (for the first नाम)

87 After उपनयेः, ins. महाराणो
88 नाम राशिः घटनकवः (for राशिः घटनकवः)

94 भवोपि (for भवोपि)
After पूजः, ins. ज्ञाते
95 शासनीन्द्रमापि वेदेऽयः पुन्त उक्तकोशः

96 (for तु)
97) Om.

After 96b, ins. the following passage followed by 909*
Adhy. 91

1 a) संविशेष्वरता: (for सत्यविशेषता)
2 a) राजारेिन (for राजस्विन)
3 a) व्यासः (for आस्ति)
6 a) सोपाध्यात्मक (for अपण)
9 a) कामसाहिनिकृतेश्वर [Corrupt]

[241] 13 l) न तम्ख्यं न केशेः [न] 6
17 l) चिकित्सी (for करीस्या)

Adhy. 92

2 b) ब्रह्मचर्यानि (for श्रीरिच सुनिधि)
4 b) व्यासकोष (for सण)
7 b) भाविकर (for कलवानि)
7 l) दिशया कार्यो (for रजसाकर्यः)
15 l) सूक्ष्मे (for पुजः) [न] 6
21 l) बालका (for बालके)
22 b) संस्कार (for सामग्र्या सा)
30 l) त्रिवर्त (for त्रिवर्ती त्रि)
32 l) [अ] आचार्यिनि (?) न न्यायु (for अन्यायाः)
39 b) च (for सा)
44 b) विद्वानिः (for पुत्राः) [स, न] 6
46 b) अहसासी (for अहसासवत)
50 l) खुल्ल (for खुल्ल मु) [उ]
47 b) संदर (for इति) [न] 6
49 b) चै (for अहो)
50 b) जाता (for जैवा) [न] 6
53 b) अस्मति (for अस्मति) [न] 6
54 b) तथासेव (for इति) [न] 6
7 l) वासापूर्व (for अस्वृ पूर्व) [स, न] 6

Adhy. 93

1 a) योगिनिः (for तपस्वी)
3 b) प्रपल्लल (for उपवधत) [न] 6
4 l) संस्कृतिसाधनशास्त्र
8 l) श्लोकान्तिः (for अव्यक्तिः)
13 l) अय अन्नातां (for तु भायं दै)
14 l) श्रीश्चारिः (for श्रीश्चारिः) [न] 6

Adhy. 94

1 b) पुरुषः (for पुरुषः) [न] 6
4 After 4 a, ins. 962:
5 a) अय (for आस्ति) [न] 6
8 l) सप्तितस्मातः (for अविद्विश्चरः)
11 a) विधानवाचः [न] 6
12 a) सूक्ष्म्यादिः [S] आदिः (for सूक्ष्म्यादिः)
13 l) श्रीमले (for श्रीमले)
18 a) अय (for अश्मी) [न] 6
20 l) च (for सा)
29 l) त्रिविन्द्र (for त्रिविन्द्र)
30 l) अर्जुनपरस्तुः (for त्रिज्ञानपरस्तुः) [स, क] 6
3 तृतीय (for तृतीय)
31 a) अखिन्द्यः (for अखिन्द्यः)
33 l) पौरेषीर्दुः (for पौरेषीर्दुः)
42 l) वनं ततः (for समस्तं) [न] 6
46 a) Om.
48 l) सतः (for ततः) [न] 6
55 l) वश्याः (for विद्याः) [न] 6
64 l) इव (for इव)
56 l) वज्तमातः (for वध्यमातः) [न] 6
58 l) शौरिपिः (for शौरिपिः)
59 l) अविनिवालुः (for अविनिवालुः) [न] 6
60 a) त्रीम विद्या (for त्रीम विद्या)
b) सन्तानमाति (सन्तानमाति)
60 a–61 a Om. [न] 6, 8
61 l) देवानां (for उत्साहान)
64 l) राजा (for राजा)
b) जाला निवेद (for जाला निवेद)
[242] 74 l) पुरुषपम (for भरतपम) [न] 6
84 a) न तुस्त्री (for तुस्त्री तु)
88 a) इति (for इति) [न] 6
92) अत्यन्तिक्ष (for संस्कृते) [K₃ N₃]

Adhy. 95

4) पुरुषभेद (for सर्वभौम) [N₃]
9) विपुल (for दरुक) [N₃]
14) वनस्पति (for अलोक) [N₃]
4) शुभालय (for अलोक) [N₃]

Adhy. 96

1) चेव (for भोजी) [N₃]
6) नासिनि (for नामसिनि) [N₃]
10) For 10⁴, subst. 999
17) प्राकृतिक (for ते द्राक्षाराज्यः) [N₃]

Adhy. 98

1) राजा परंतुता पुरबः
4) Om. [N₁-3]
3) वर्षा (for वर्षिते) [U]
4) तत्ततः (for समन्ताः)
5) Om. [N₁-3]
6) तथा (for अधः)
7) साम्यपशु (for साम्यपशु) [N₁-3]
12) तत्ततः (for तत्ततः)
13) श्रवण (for तांत्र) [N₁-3]
15) संवृत्तिहेतुसे
17) महान (for तत्त)
20) तत्त (for तत्त)
28) संवृत्ति (read तांत्र) (for तांत्र)
29) द्वार (for तत्त)
33) Transp. सात: and कुरु [N₃]

Adhy. 99

5) After व्यत्रिः, ins. हि

[243] 5) तथा महात (for परं तत्त)
6) आद्वीरो (for आद्वीरो) [N₃]
12) उत्सुक्तत्ता (for उत्सुक्तत्ता)
39) After 39, ins. 1013
41) After 41, ins. 1017
43) वाताः (for अ] रूपः) [N₁-3 D₂]
44) सुवा (for सुवा) [N]
44) For 44, subst. 1018 [N₁-3]
46) धरती (for धरती) [N B₁]
50) तत्त (for तत्त)
51) ध्वजक्रं (for ध्वजक्रं)
54) वेद (for वेद)
55) प्रतिपद (for लोकस्तै) [U]
59) हुः (for हुः)

Adhy. 97

1) After 1, ins. 1022 (with v. 1.)
2) भानि (read भानि) नी (for मा
तिरी)
5) वा (for च) [N₁-3]
6) चे (for केवः; in both places) [N₇ D₁]

Adhy. 100

1) सा पुनः (for श्रमकः) [N₇]
2) After निमीते, ins. हि
3) हुः (for तत्त)
Adhy. 101

4 4) वर्णित (for विहित)
10 4) सद्यां (for बैठा)
14 4) कक्षमध्ययाच (for सुनुपोः)
15 4) भारत (for सहस्तः)

Adhy. 102

6 4) पार्वत्क्षंगियाचारीया:
8 4) श्रमिक्षंगियाचारीया: [नृ]
11 4) तत्त्वमाय: (for प्रजास्तद्) [नृ]
7 4) [श]न्यानन्दत (for ०वर्षतः)
8 4) च (for घी) [सिक्रि कोः नृ]

Adhy. 103

1 4) स्त्रयु (for स्त्रयस्)
Adhy. 105

1) सबूतपूणणोपेता
2) भालस्वन्तर्क (for गन)°
3) वृषभान्तर्क (for कत्र°)
4) परिक्रिय (for २प्रकट) [S₁ K₁₋₃]
5) ततः (for तदा)
6) महास्वन्तर्क (for गज)° [G₁]
7) वृषभान्तर्क (for कत्र°)
8) त्रांस्प. पाण्डु और द्रध्या

10) वद्वनामागतानं करते
11) जेरेण सर्ववक्षस्तिवास [N₃ T₁ G₃]
12) मण्डलराजस्त (for ४राजस्त) [N₅]

12) दीर्घा च तन्त्रस्त

14) कुञ्जसंघ (for कर°)
18) कथ्याजितवापायनां राज्यवस्तुसरणाः च
20) आद्यः (for आद्यः) [U]

23) त्रांस्प. गोकुण्डो और द्रध्या
24) बालदेव° [N₅]
25) यानेरस्यनीचरित [N₅]
26) च (for हु) [U]
27) सर्वभूतानि (for सर्वभूतानि)

Adhy. 106

7) [आ] अरणानि (for शरणानि) [N₁₋₃ B₅ D₄]

Adhy. 107

5) श्य (? read त) स्य महायजनः (for देव महायजनः)
8) अरुभीत्र (for अरुभीत्र) [Corrupt]
12) हिर्बॉसिहरीत (for ५संस्तुताः)
17) कुटीअन्त (for कुटीअत्यन्त) [S₁ K₁₋₃ N₃]
19) लक्षिणा (for *लक्षिणा)
21) बसुवण शरण (for *अवश्चणः)
24) दु:ना (for ततः)
25) After 24, ins. 1141*, followed by line 1 of 1142*
27) तथ्यं (for हर्षे)
[245] 29 After 29, ins. 1146* (with v. 1.)

Adhy. 108

1) एसां (for तेसाः) [K₅₋₄]
2) वेमान्याय (for आनुयप्याय) [U]
2) त्रांस्प. समः और अहः
3) कुञ्जश्रय (for दुःश्रय) [N₅]
5) विकटाासं (for विकट: समः) [N₅]

6) ओम.
9) अभेदंतु (for अभेदंसेनः)
10) कुञ्जश्रयी (for पण्डतको)
11) माण्डलितायायचिति
12) कुञ्जकुञ्जश्रय (for लिङ्गी पश्चि च)
14) कुञ्जश्रयो धतुः
16) श्वेत लघूक्रियाः [N₅]

15) इति पुनःस्वांतकोः
16) शापार्था (for ६पर्यः)
18) जप्य समाय (for समाये राजा)
12) धाराशी महापितः
4) विपिन भत्तपेन

Adhy. 109

1) महावाणिन्द्र (for ६र्वनस)
9) कुञ्जश्रय विपिनायायत्व [N₅]
13) वा (for च)
15) कश्चात् (for कपि) [K₀ N₅ B₃]
16) हि (for देवे) [N₅ B₆₋₅]
16) समुन्नितं (for वि°) [U]
Adhy. 114

1) संबस्तरक्षिते (for श्रामिक) [Nā]
2) संबस्तर (for संभाषण)
3) हितत्वा (for वर्षा)
4) मानवतिति विचिन्तयूः
5) राजस (for रजस)
6) क्रमा (for क्रमा) [Nā]
7) मित्राण (for मित्राण) [Nā]

[247] After 23ab, ins. 1212* (with v. 1.)
24) तरसिन्धवार (for वानस्पति)
    After 28, ins. 1219* (om. line 1)
29) कैन्तित (for कैम्नि) (here and elsewhere)
31) लोके (for केम्नि)
34) शिविर [Nā]
38) देवशिवां (for देवशिवां)
40) मुनीदार (for मुनीदार) [U]
41) उत्ति (for [S] उत्ति) [Nā]
43) दिव्यांकार
    After 43cd, ins. 1224*
44) गोविष्क (for गोविष्क) [Ko.1]
48) प्रविष्कार (for विश्वास) [Ko.2 Nā]
50) कामी (for कामी) [Nā]
51) मनोहरी (for मनोहरी) [U]
52) [चर्च] (for चर्च)
53) स्मृतकथा [Nā]
61) तवसा (for तवसा)
62) महाबिष्क (for अनुभव)
   [Ko Nā Dā]
63) After 62, ins. 1230*
56) वासिनियाँ (for वासिनियाँ)
57) Transp. प्रेयमे and विनयकी
58) सां (for सां)

Adhy. 115

2) विविधां (for विविधां)
6) नानी (for स्नानी) [Nā]
8) सइ (for सजाव)
9) Transp. कुरु and शिम्मस [Nā]

[248] Adhy. 119

1) Transp. राजस च and शिप्स [Ko. Mā]
26) सत्यक (for आर्यकुञ्ज) [क,]  
28) में सवा सदा (for समसास्वदा मं)  
32) समसास्वदा (for दुर्सास्वदा)  
35) मां वृद्धि (for आया मां ले)  

Adhy. 123

2) समास्वदा (for तदा)  
7) हददु (for खेतु)  
9) हददु (for अददु)  
8) कौष्ठिण (for पाण्डवस्)  
14) Transp. परया and अन्त्या  
[क,] [क,] [क]  
18) ते (for स) [क,] [क]  
23) अन्त्यानत् (for अन्त्या)  
25) देने (for च दे)  
26) समास्वदा (for समास्वदा)  
33) दृष्टान्तमृत (for समसास्वदा)  
35) तदाप (for तदाप) [क]  
4) इति (for दम)  
36) चदा (for चदा)  
40) गदाधरस्व (for गदाधरस्व)  
41) दृष्टिकेन (for दृष्टि केन) [क]  
43) लोचने चापि (for दृष्टि च)  
44) पालय (for दृष्टि)  

[249] 47) सत्यका (for सत्यका)  
50) महामहान् (for महामहम्) [क]  
54) हददु (for छद्दु) [क]  
58) निधानयतम्य (for निधानयतम्य)  
60) भासं (for बासं)  
62) दृष्टि (for दृष्टि)  
66) धृष्टे नितेन सदा: [क]  
67) फल्युन (for फल्युन) here and  

in the sequel  
71) इदानिः (for इदानिः) [क]  
74) वीर (for नाम)  
78) छाद (for दुमाद) [क]  

Adhy. 124

6) समास्वदा (for पाराकांतादार)  
16) Om. [सि, क केवल केकि]  
29) व्रोम (for व्रोम)  
32) हृदरूप (for हृदरूप)  

Adhy. 125

2) हृ (in both places for हा)
Adhy. 126

2) क्रुड्डोज्जव्वक्षयम् [Ni₂]
6) सतः तत्वां (for सत्वां) [Ni₃]
8) अय (for हृ) [K₀₋₁ D₃]
14) After 14°, ins. 1430°
15) अदिनक्षेत्रः (for अदिनक्षेत्रः)
19) अद्ग्ने (for अद्ग्ने)

Adhy. 127

1) जन्तुशक्तिः (for हृशक्तिः) [Ni₃]
2) सदमवन्दनं (for सदमवन्दनं)
4) अवित्वः (for अवित्व)
8) प्रकृतिरिततः (for प्रकृतिरिततः)
14) After 14°, ins. 1430°
15) अदिनक्षेत्रः (for अदिनक्षेत्रः)
19) अद्ग्ने (for अद्ग्ने)

Adhy. 128

2) लिङ्गम (for लिङ्गम) [U]
10) तपसीक्षिताः (for तपसीक्षिताः) [K₀ N₀ V₁]

Adhy. 129

2) तथा (for तथा) [S₁ K₀₋₁]
4) प्रतिच्छेदेण्यागमः
11) परिप्रेक्ष्य (for परिप्रेक्ष्य) [Ni₃ Dₙ₋₁]
18) यद्य हि ल्यं पुराराज्ये [Ni₃ Gₙ₋₂ M]

Adhy. 130

5) शास्त्रिकम् (for शास्त्रिकम्) [U]
7) सिद्धपुरोगालान (for सिद्धपुरोगालान) [U]
[250] 7) कौम (for कौम)
8) विद्वः (for विद्वः)
11) ततः (for ततः) [Ni₃]
13) नास्तिध्वाम (for नास्तिध्वाम) [Ni M]
14) विदेशान: (for विदेशानः) [S₁ K₀₋₁ N₀ Dₙ]
18) धान्यपञ्जय (for धान्यपञ्जय)

Adhy. 131

15) वन्दितार (for वन्दितार) [Ni₂]
16) अंग्नवृत्ति (for अंग्नवृत्ति)
18) राज्यवर्त्तमाय (for राज्यवर्त्तमाय)

Adhy. 132

8) कार्यं सातु (for कार्यं सातु) [U]

Adhy. 133

4) समाध्वेत (for समाध्वेत) [Ni₃]
13) तथ्यवृत्ति (for तथ्यवृत्ति)
17) विद्वः (for विद्वः)
18) पाप्पेन जेदेन (for पाप्पेन जेदेन)
19) आङ्ग्न (for आङ्ग्न)
28) पाप्पेन (for पाप्पेन)
29) पाप्पेन (for पाप्पेन)

Adhy. 134

8) भरतसेष (for भरतसेष)
10) पुराणं धृरेः (for पुराणं धृरेः) [Ni₃]
13) सौन्य (for सौन्य)
14°-15° Om.

Adhy. 135

After 15, ins. 1463°
21) सुप्रोहसेषी (for सुप्रोहसेषी)
22) अहिन्ना दाहव्येषी [U]

After 22°, ins. 1470°
(with v. 1.)
Adhy. 135
6 4) आश्वासकारणम् (for बिघासा⁰)

Adhy. 136
1 4) संभेष्य (for संहेष्य)
4 4) वधानह (for सिधि⁰) [K₀₂-4 \(\text{Nil}_3\)]
10 4) ततः (for तदः) [K \(\text{Nil}_1\) D₀]
11 4) तद् (for तद्)
12 4) हा हा (for अहो) [\(\text{Nil}_3\)]
4) वाहिनि: (for मनन्याणा) [\(\text{Nil}_5\)]

Adhy. 137
5 4) धीमानु (for धीमो) [\(\text{Nil}_3\) M₀₃]
16 4) कुशः (for कौशः)
5 4) बोक्कमतिविनः (for परास्त्रः) [U]
18 4) निदानैैै (for बिधाय)
21 4) वचन् (for भयात्) [\(\text{Nil}_1\) M]

Adhy. 138
2 4) यात्रिक्यमालं (for सरः) [K₀₂-4]
6 4) अपमासः चोङ्गसम् [\(\text{Nil}_3\) M]
13 4) नरोसम् (for तदः नुी)
14 4) ग्रह्योत्सम्बङ्गायम् [K₀ \(\text{Nil}_5\)]
18 4) अनामंमस्त्रोत्सम् [S₁ K \(\text{Nil}_1\)]
9) इमः (for इह) [K₁-4 \(\text{Nil}_1\) M]

Adhy. 139
1 4) Transp. तः and तेषु [\(\text{Nil}_5\)]
[251] 2 4) अपस्यस (for इभयत) [K₀ \(\text{Nil}_1\) D₀]
5 4) स्मृह्वः (for स्रोवाव) [\(\text{Nil}_5\)]
11 4) भरत्यसम् (for भृत्यसम) [S₁ K₀₂-3 \(\text{Nil}_5\)]
12 4) ज्ञात्श्च (for ज्ञातः छ्) [K₀-2-3 D₀₁ G₀]
15 4) हृदेयाविस्वम् (for साधित्वम्) [\(\text{Nil}_5\)]
4) हि बचवानु (for [S]तिस्थलवान)
11 7) पलित (for सद्द) [Corrupt]
4) नर्तुभा (for श्रेयसः)

12 7) प्रवश्यापि (for वाहिन्यापि)
8) अम्बिकासार (for अस्यसः)
[S₁ K₁, B₁, D₁]

20 7) पुष्पेश्वर (for पुष्पेश्वर)
[S₁ Ko₁, N₁, N₃]

22 7) मणिसामलित (for पशोकिल्युष्टे)
[S₃]

23 7) वैद्यविज्ञातेतु (for वातायो)

25 7) रूपेश्वर (for पुष्पेश्वर) [N₃, G₅, M]
7) देवातिकावनैचव [N₃]

27 7) महामवल (for बलम्)
[252] 28 7) महाश्रेष्ठ (for बलम्)
[N₃, T₂, G]

36 7) तो (for सं) [K (except K₁)]
[N₁, N₃]

Adhy. 144

13 7) चम्मनिथ्यो (for पुष्पो)

14 7) [अ]सवयाम (for अशोः)

15 7) महावल (for रथः)
7) सता (for तदः)

16c-18 7) Inserted marg.

sec. m.

Adhy. 145

3 7) [अ]व (for च)

5 7) कौन्त्या भैश्यः (for भैश्य कुम्भः)

7 7) राजः (for राजसः) [N₃]

8 7) पुष्पेश्वरः (for भरतः)

13 7) यः कुम्भविष्टं (for कुम्भविष्टं)

15 7) सद्दर (for सुधरं) [S₁ K₁ N₃]

19 7) विगमणसम (for विकुतः)
[N₁, N₃, B₁]

22 7) प्रस्मसततसम (for संगं सतम) [N₁, N₃]

29 7) शोककर (for दुःखः) [K₁ N₃]

31 7) रतिम (for गतिम)

34 7) सुत (for सुतः)

7) बालम् (for बालम्)

36 7) नेति (for नेति)

40 7) कुम्भ (for कुम्भ)

Adhy. 146

9 7) सब्जकामवनेकाः [S₁ Ko₁, N₃]

16 7) वेदस्वतीनिः (for वेदस्वतः यथा) [N₃]

18 7) अन्तर्विवारस (for अन्तर्विवारस) [U]

20 7) तव (for मसः) [K₁]

22 7) गन्तुः बह्यः (for गन्तुः बह्यः)

31 7) महानु (for मसः)

7) नीविताः (for [अ]नीविताः)
[S₁ K₁ N]

Adhy. 147

1 7) निषाम्य (दृश्यम) [N₁, N₃]

5 7) तारावन (for तारावन) [N₃]

6 7) भव (for [अ]भ)

9 7) अन्तर्विवार (for अन्तर्विवार) [N₃, D₂]

16 7) रेड्स 16d, after 1623* (cf. 18)

18 7) सुहृदिता (for सुहृदिता) [U]

After 18, ins. 1623* (cf. 16)

21 7) फिता रत्न (for रत्नश्रिवात)

7) त्रांस्प. सहीं and तनम्

7) स्पंदित्य (for संपंदित्य) [K₁]

Adhy. 148

1 7) बायण्वें (for बायण्वें) [Ko N₃, D₃, M₃]

10 7) ते (for ते) [N₃]

12 7) नियमवर्तम (for नियमवर्तम)

13 7) क्षण (for मस्त) [N₃]

7) अस्याम्भव: समुपादित्व: [N₃]

16 7) शुक्रविन (for दुःखः) [N₃]

7) अतो (for ततो) [U]

7) उपमुस्थति (for उपमुस्थति)

Adhy. 149

7 7) महं प्राप्य (for परं पापं) [N₃]

7) कुतस्वामववी (for कुतस्वामववी) [N₃]

8 7) नन्त्य (for न नन्त्य)

[253] 11 7) शुद्धावर्त (for शुद्धावर्त)

7) न च कथा (for न च कथा) [N₃]

12 7) कुदाचन (for कुदाचन)

20 7) तद (for तद) [M]

7) तथा (for तथा) [U]
Adhy. 150
15) सत्तेन (for महत्तेन) [N\textsubscript{3}]
16) बुकोदवङ्गे (for ोबलो) [K (except K\textsubscript{1}) N\textsubscript{3} D\textsubscript{3}]

After 5r ft

20) [आ] चरित्रो (for चरित्रो) [K\textsubscript{4} N\textsubscript{3}]
21) सत्तेन (for युक्तम्) [U]
25) मा (for ह)
26) After 26, ins. 1644* 

Adhy. 151
9) प्रेष्मणी (for नेशः)
11) च (for सः) [U]
14) प्रायो (for सिसं)
[Ś\textsubscript{1} K\textsubscript{0-1a} D\textsubscript{3}]
19) कुदेन (for आमेण)

Adhy. 152
6) After 6, ins. 1665* 
7) तत्त (for तः) [N\textsubscript{3}]
8) कल्य एव तम (for काल्यंह ्तु) 
15) परिध्वङ्ग (for ोधच्छय)
4) विचारस्य (for आधारस्य)

Adhy. 153
4) विच्छे (for विधान)
6) सतितस्या (for विबधाति च)
9) महुर्जयम्या (for ुऽच्छषप) [N\textsubscript{3}]

Adhy. 154
9) हियोतस्य (for हिजेन्यस्)
13) दोणो (for बापि)
9) महाभाष (for महाभाष) [N\textsubscript{3}]
16) सकारां (for नगरं) [N\textsubscript{3}]

Adhy. 155
1) तृप्तितमहमणि तृप्ति: [S\textsubscript{1} N\textsubscript{3}]
2) स (for बै) [Ś\textsubscript{1} K N\textsubscript{1-3} D\textsubscript{3} M\textsubscript{3}]
8) उपासनायोगास्त (for वास्तम्)
10) यथाकामस्त (for ोन्यायस्त) [N\textsubscript{3}]
18) सुस्तेत सम (for सुस्ते बापि) 
[cf. N\textsubscript{3}]
20) तु (for [ह]ब) 
21) मा (for ह)

Adhy. 156
5) द्रुप हि (for हदाति)

Adhy. 157
4) सत्येन (for शाक्येन) [N\textsubscript{3}]
13) युक्त (for युक्त) [K N\textsubscript{1-3}]
14) जले (for जाला)

Adhy. 158
2) सोमवाहुहस्त (for ोवायान) .
3) महास्य (for ोयासा)
7) प्रायी (for घोरः) [N\textsubscript{3} M\textsubscript{3-a}]
8) कन्नीचारु (for कान्नीचारसह) 
[254] 10) पारस्ते पुरास्वत्वारु [N\textsubscript{1-3}]
4) युक्तस्वात्व (for युक्तस्वात) [N\textsubscript{3}]
13) वास्त (for वाकां)
 [N\textsubscript{1-3} B\textsubscript{3} m D\textsubscript{1}]
14) कौवण: (for कुवणा:)
15) च (for च)
16) रणे कृत्य (for कृषण कृत्य)
18) विषुपादी (for चैकपादी) [U]
8) बालुकाकाराण (for बालुकाकारः) [Corrupt]
4) [अ] ज्ञक्षा (for ोन्द्यायन) [K\textsubscript{0-2-4} N\textsubscript{1-3} B\textsubscript{1}]
22) अनाय (for बानाय)
5) अमरवत (for मुमोत) [Corrupt]
24) विभिन्नको दे (for ोविक्षेप)
8) प्रमोक्ष्यत: (for प्रमुख्येत) [N\textsubscript{3}]
25) कामये (for दृष्ये) [N\textsubscript{3}]
31) परितापम (for पति)
32) महामाय (for राज) [U]
34) गन्धविं (for गन्धव) [U]
37) शान्तिना (for अशा) [U]
40) सम (for मः)
41 a) यथा ( for मया ) [Ś₁ K₁,₂]
  b) लघु विषय ( for प्रतिनि )
      [ K ( except K₁ ) N₈ ]
50 a) क्षणां वशस्य भाजन [ U ]

Adhy. 159

4 a) Om. [Ś₁ K N₁,₃ ]

10 b) अभिसार ( for आभिषक )
      [Ś₁ K ( except K₄ ) B₆ G₁ ]
14 b) कदिक ( for परंतप ) [ N₁,₅ B
      ( except B₅ ) D₉ ]
15-16 Transp. 15ᵃᵇ and 16ᵃᵇ [ U ]
19 a) किम् ( for किम् )
21 b) वा ( for व )

Adhy. 160

3 a) हु ( for स ) [ N₁,₅ T₁ G₉ ]
12 a) वत्त ( for सद ) [ U ]
13 a) मालयोपासंगम [ K₀,₄ N₅ ]
21 b) नदिश्वरुस्त्र ( for गदा गुलि )
30 a) सत्या ( for असत्या )
32 a) ताहितिः [ K₀,₆,₄ N₁,₃ ]

Adhy. 161

8 a) कालपालसे ( for गमगसे )
17 a) मृत्यु ( for लोकेष्व ) [ U ]
19 a) हे ( for से ) [ U ]

Adhy. 162

4ᵃᵇ) Om. [ N₁,₃ ]
7 a) दुरिंदुरसासांसाळ ं [ N₅ ]
  b) महीने ( for गतवते ) [ N₁,₃ G₁ ]
18 a) वरेश्वेश्वर ( for क्षेत्र )
      [ B₁,₃,₆ D₄ ]

Adhy. 163

17 a) स्नितस्म ( for राजस्तत्तम )

Adhy. 165

10 a) अस्मितिः ( for गर्भे )
13 a) दशुप्रकाशात्तनस्
19 a) धर्मक्रियो ( for समेक्षिताम् )
20 a) चापि ( for चापि )
22 a) अजूकुता
  a) स्मायायणां ( for हम्म )
35 a) अश्रवत ( for श्रवतः )
36 a) द्रष्टान्नूल्ल ( for द्रष्टान्नूल्ल )

Adhy. 166

20 a) नन्द ( for नुस् )
34 a) रक्षोपेतिनिः

Adhy. 167

10 After 10, ins. 1786 *
11 a) अनुमम्यः ( for अनुमम्यः ) [ N₁,₃ ]
  b) मालयोपासंगमम्
21 a) रक्षानन्दी ( for रक्षानन्दी )
      [ N₃ M₄,₉ ]

Adhy. 168

4 a) तत्साध्यः ( for धोतात् ) [ N₅ ]
  b) रक्षसी ( for रक्षसात् )
6 a) विपासु ( for वपसु )
      [Ś₁ N₅ G₃ ]
8 a) महानाम ( for गमान ) [ N₅ ]
10 a) अस्मितिः ( for अस्मितिः ) [ U ]
14 b) रह से व ( for विहितानन्द )
  b) व्याति उपवते ( for व्याति उपवते )
19 a) पातकालसासात्तुम
25 a) नुपति ( for जनपिः ) [ N₅ ]
  a) पोदन ( for पोदन ) [ U ]

Adhy. 169

7 a) ह्रति न गे ( for ताहति ) [ K₁
      N₁,₃ M₃ ]
  b) वात एष महानाम:
8 a) वात ( for तत्त्व ) [ N₅ ]
9 a) महात्माः ( for महाम )
15 a) ददो ( for भ्रानो ) [ cf. N₅ ]
18 a) महीपाला ( for महोत्साहः ) [ N₁,₃ ]
19 a) उस्मानान्ते ( for उच्छिष्ठ )
20 a) [अ] व्याति ( for गतम त )
      [Ś₁ K₁ N₅ ]
  b) दधशायं ( for दधशाय ) [ K₁ N₅ ]
22 a) क्रत्रियायः प्रनु: ( for क्रत्रियपः )
23 a) गतादिक ( for शम्ता ) [ N₅ ]

Adhy. 170

12 a) रुपाम [ N₅ ]
17 After 17, ins. 1789 *
      ( with v. 1 )
EPIC STUDIES

19) झोके (for ताल) [N9]
   21) न न (for तरप) [U]

Adhy. 171
2 2) भविष्य (for जो भविष्य)
7 8) संपूर्णकामना हुए से
8) पारमेयमु (for साधारणमु) [Corrupt]
17) तेज़ (for वेष्ठित) [N9]
23) लोकार (for तर्कार)

Adhy. 172
2 2) सर्वरमसमुत्त (for ओपेडवित) [N9]
6 8) शतित: (for वुचित:)
8 9) उनरामसमु (for समुपा) [U]
9 9) ततः (for तथा)
२) तत्ताजयरुपमिनां

Adhy. 173
2 8) पुरा तेन महारिणा [?!]
14 9) सुप्रसंस्वादृ (for ओदु)
9) पुष्यम (for ग्रामम)
[SK, N1s, D3]
16 8) ोकरताः
[256] 23 8) काममोहित: (for शापो) [U]
 8) संब्राह्वी (for स तस्या)

Adhy. 175
2 8) सहानाश (for समाशान)
3 8) ले (for ताल)
5 8) भमभारिण: (for ब्रह्मो)
8 9) व्यासवनी (for समान)
12 9) महावता: (for यतः)
14 9) वेयाय (for वायाय) [N9]
17 8) प्रतिज्ञा (for ओगुर्ध) [U]
18 8) पतिम (for कर्म)
19 8) भवेत (for ब्रह्म) [N1s]

Adhy. 176
6 8) निवास (for निवेश)
9) [अ] नामस्य (for ओकर्णो)
10) लक्ष्यरण समिति (for यन्त्रण सहित) [U]
14) तत्तारित (for तेस्मः)
After 14, ins. 1812x
15) विजुमारिकरार (for ओपर)
16) भुविमेवेस (for ओसारे) [N9, M6]
18) पराश्वारासूखितः
21) ोपूपिते:
24) महाविल्लारकानार
27) श्रीपुरो [Corrupt]

Adhy. 177
5 8) [अ] कर्ष्य (for कर्ष्य)
9 8) सुचित: (for सुचित)
11 8) विसेचित: (for वक्रो)
12) अर्धां (for सुन्दरां)
18) महात्म (for ताय)
19) पीवः (for कोषक)
After 15, ins. 1815x
16) Om.
17 8) महामाति: (for ओकल)
18) After 15, ins. 1818x
(with v. l.)
 8) सारसेकर: (for सारो)
 8) जाली (for जीली)

Adhy. 178
3 8) [अ] श (for [अ] वि) [U]
5 8) तनमी (for हद्मः) [U]
6 8) तथा (for ओहा) [U]
7 8) सुप्रामाण्ड (for सुप्राणी) [U]
9 8) क्रुणा: (for पापानु)
12) कन्यायामाता (for ओ सायासिता)
16) अनिधियामाणा (for अनिधियां)
[KS, M4, M6, 8]
8) दयानि ह तम प्रविष्ठाविताः [N1]
18) च (for स)

Adhy. 179
11 8) विषु (for कमो)
19) श्रीविष: (for सुविषः) [U]
20) [अ] कन्यायामाणा (for [अ] रिति\%)

22 ॥ वर्तमानार्थ (for वर्तमानार्थ) ।
   [ cf Ōṣṇ. ]
23 ॥ [अ]किस्य राजः (for [अ]किस्य कारकम्) [K]
   Adhy. 180
2 ॥ After 2, ins. 1885* (with कर्नका for कालिका)
   [Ś, K, Ōṣṇ.]
3 ॥ ते हन्सने (for निः) [Ś, K, G6]
4 ॥ हुरामान (for खचारे) [Ōṣṇ. B3, S3]
[257] ॥ ५) नागुदगावः (for नेवः [U]
9 ॥ चुड़ानि (for चुड़िनि) [U]
10 ॥ चेव (for चेतन) [U]
13 ॥ सहलामी (for शेरौ) [U]
16 ॥ श्रीम (for पाठे) [U]
18 ॥ शिंस्यभमतामी (for सत्तभमत्य- ।
   Ōṣṇ.]
   Adhy. 181
4 ॥ आयस्य (for आदय) [Ōṣṇ. B6]
5 ॥ महाकाल: (for महुषः) [U]
9 ॥ लिती: (for लिनिः)
31 ॥ After 31ahl, ins. 1882* (with स्त्रमारापि सर्वं का as posterior
   पादा)
   ४) भोक्ताम द्वारम् (for महे वयी)
   After 31, ins. 1883*
   Adhy. 182
2 ॥ ह्यानं (for कल्यान) [U]
4 ॥ च (for हि)
7 ॥ श्योचित्यत (for लोपः) [U]
8 ॥ अधमुसेवं (for प्रेमभाजः) [U]
14 ॥ सस्मार भार्तर्थम
   Adhy. 183
1 ॥ Om. [U]
5 ॥ मुखवारी (for युद्धः) [U]
8 ॥ दुर्गा संवेच पावकवालस्य युध्या
   Adhy. 184
3 ॥ निमेच्छामायु (for निमेयाच्छकः)
   [D4 M5]
5 ॥ चक्षुः (for चतुर्ण) [U]
6 ॥ ददस्य (for ददाहि) [Ś, K, D5]
   ॥ शिंस्यभमतामी (for महुषः) [U]
7 ॥ [S] ज्ञुपजाः (for [S] ग्यवः)
   [Ōṣṇ. V1]
9 ॥ सा दुः (for पति:)
18 ॥ पात्रा: (for दुः) [K2 G5]
   Adhy. 185
8 ॥ स्थितं (for स्थितो) [U]
11 ॥ दिति (for दिति [U]
12 ॥ [Ś] शिष्ठान (for शीतार) [U]
16 ॥ बद्धे वराणी (for मुरो सुभाहो)
20 ॥ तस्मिन्य (for समसिन्य)
   [V1 M5]
21 ॥ तवेत्त (for तां थेत) [U]
23 ॥ आ (for न) [U]
25 ॥ दुःसा (for नेवः)
   Adhy. 186
5 ॥ चानानि (for चानाणि) [Ōṣṇ.]
7 ॥ कम्पेण (कम्पनि) (for श्रावक्षमाणि)
   [Ś, Dn, D1]
9 ॥ [अ] दोनस्याम (for शेता)
   Adhy. 187
13 ॥ वाचा (for राजा)
26 ॥ कथंचन (for कथः) [U]
   Adhy. 188
1 ॥ [अ] अंवािमः (for पुजयत्)
2 ॥ प्रतिभः (for भन्त्) [U]
3 ॥ [अ] हिश्चिमः (for [अ] भिन त्वादा)
   [D3]
4 ॥ च्येवरे (for विदा पतिः)
   [Ōṣṇ. B D3]
   Adhy. 189
4 ॥ हेम (for प्रः) [Ś, K1, K2]
10 ॥ बच देवी गंधा सततं मनसा
18 ॥ दुर्बलत्वा (for दुर्बला) [U]
19 ॥ निजेंयत (for निजेंयते)
22 ॥ माथपाताच्छन्न मन्तवोत्सिकताः
[258] ॥ २४ ) लोक (for लोकस्य)
27 ॥ [अ] हस्तः (for [अ] स्तान,
29 ²) इद्ध (for इद्ध) [U]
31 After 31*, ins. 1919*
   After 31, ins. 1920*
38 After 38*, ins. 1921*
39 ²) [अ]बेश्य (for [अ]वाप्श)  
   ³) [अ]तिशुद्धायु (for इव रुपणि च)  
   After 39ab, ins. 1922*
48 ²) उपाय (for तंत्र) [K₃]

Adhy. 190
1 ²) वर्जन (for कर्यनेत्र)  
   ³) उपाय (for उपाव) [U]
8 ³) [अ]न्यजनोपयथ (for [अ]सिं जनयोगितं) [U]
   ³) विकृणीपुष्पलिः  
   ²) प्रमुखगनि [U]
12 ²) परिवयासां (for समान्यायासां)

Adhy. 191
6 ²) कड़िया: (for भट्र) [U]
7 ³) गुणानुर्भवी  
12 ³) क्रृष्णवाससां (for घंट्रुवावसां)  
13 ³) श्रावणी भाजनानि च (= 15a)  
14-16 Transp. 14ab and 18ab, and  
   om. 15  
17 Transp. 17ab and 19ab.
18 ³) तथा (for तथा) [Ś₂ K₃-₄ N₁ V₁]

Adhy. 192
1 ²) समुपवीते (for सुपुपनीत)  
3 ³) न्यमपीद (for [अ]न्यमपीद) [U]  
3 ²) अभामासां (for अभामायापिः) [U]  
   ³) नूवरता (for नूवरता) [U]
5 ³) द्वार (for द्वारा) [N₁-₃]  
   ²) राजस्मि-सुधातान्त्र तान् [U]
6 ³) एवातात्त्व स्तम्भास  
20 ³) तथा (for तथा)  
21 After 21, ins. 1951*
22 After 22, ins. 1953*
26 ³) शब्दम् (for शब्दम्)  
   ³) ववः (for ववः)  
   ³) शुद्धपरमस्मिनेत्रावभ  

Adhy. 193
3 ³) [अ]शि (for शि) [N₁]

Adhy. 194
2 ³) तथा (for तथा)  
4 ³) नैवेद्य शाक्तिः: प्रभो [U]
6 ³) विचार (for विचार) [V₁ D₅]  
8 ³) वचन (for वचन) [U]
9 ³) संहार: (for वहरे:)  
   [Ś₁ K₁, 1-4]
12 ³) विचारण (for विचारण) [U]
13 ³) विचारण स मुखवानि वचनस्वति ददानि  
   च [U]
15 ³) पदायसदनं प्रभि  
19 ³) भाव (for प्रभा) [U]
20 ³) समानवधानेन (for साध्न न)  
   [U]
   ³) [अ]शि (for शि) [Ś₁ K₃  
   except K₃] N₁]
23 ³) महायानेन (for महायानेन) [U]
   [259] Adhy. 195
5 ³) निजे (for निजे) [U]
8 ³) न (for )  
9 ³) वास (for वास) [K₀-₃ V₁ G₁]  
   ³) भक्तित (for भक्तित) [U]
13 ³) पार्थ (for पार्था)  
19 ³) राज्य तेषां (for राज्यतेषां) [M₃-¢-₃]

Adhy. 196
1 ³) तथा (for सुप)  
25 ³) भाषात्म (for भाषात्म) [U]
28 ³) वाचि (for वाचि)  

Adhy. 197
13 ³) सेव (for सेव)  
16 ³) सधुसम्ब (for श्वस) [U]
19 ³) पाण्डे क्वेश्चि (for पाण्डववेश्चि)  
23 ³) दुर्विकु (for दुर्विकु) [U]  
   After 23, ins. 1975*
29 a) न भविष्यति (for विनविष्यति) [U]
   Adhy. 198

24 a) पत्थरेन सर्व सम
   Adhy. 199

6 a) तथा (for तथस्तो) [U]
9 a) पाण्डुपति (for पाण्डवोः) [U]
24 a) गदादी (for गदाहानि) [U]
25abcd Om.
32 a) श्री: (for तपते:) [U]
37 a) सत्वभाषायविदित्र (for ०भाषायविद्व) [U]
   Adhy. 200

3 a) सत्वाय्य (for महाभाषा) [U]
5 a) स्वाय्य इत्य (for स्वाय्याय इत्य) [U]
8 a) ल (for ल) [B3 G2]
9ab Om.
22 a) कम्य (for कम्यन्) [U]
   Adhy. 201

4 a) द्विवेद्यों (सूत्रकल्ता) [U]
14 a) गाहिति (for गाहिति) [U]
15 a) नोषायास्व (for ०यास्व) [U]
18 a) महादेव (कक्षुं देव) [U]
24c-26d Om.
29 a) लिप्य: प्रसुधितः सबः:
   Adhy. 203

5c-6b Om.
12 a) स विशेष्यत् (for विशेष्यतः) [U]
   Adhy. 204

5 a) सहोधास्व (for वनी) [K1, D6, D7]
   Adhy. 205

8 a) [अ] सिसत्यते (for ०सत्यति) [U]
17 After 17th ins. 2016a
30 Om. with colophon
   Adhy. 206

2 a) मृत्यु (for वृत्यु) [T3 G4]
7 a) प्रहरी (for प्रहरी) [S1 K (except K2)]
18 a) राजस्व (for पार्वते)
19 a) [अ] सिसूधितिं (for [अ]सिसूधिति) [U]
   Adhy. 207

3 a) वधालोधियों सत्त्रिवायाः [260] 5 a) पुत्रायास्व (for भरतः) [U]
6ab Om.
13 a) मण्डुरु (for मण्डुरु) here and in the sequel
18 a) भाव शरणं प्रसु (for भाव शरणं प्रसु) [U]
19 a) एके प्रत्यावेश (for एके प्रत्यावेश) [U]
20 a) एका तु मनं कलयं [U]
4) उत्साही (for उत्साही) [S1]
23 a) तीव्रै वष्णायस्व (for तीव्रिमण: समा:) [U]
   Adhy. 208

20 a) पुत्रायायाय तत्क्षेत (for तत्क्षेत) [U]
   Adhy. 209

24 a) चेत (for चेत) [U]
   Adhy. 210

5 a) दोभी (for दोभी) [K4, N1, V1]
11 a) सत्यायत्त (for सत्यायत्ति) [U]
12 a) द्वीनम (for द्वीनत) [U]
19 a) वापरी (for वापरी) [U]
   Adhy. 211

10 a) वधुर (for वधुर) [U]
13 a) महाकुले (for ०कुले) [U]
24 a) द्वीनत (for द्वीनत) [U]
   Adhy. 212

8 a) काकासम्भव (for एकासम्भव) [U]
12 a) समस्ततः (for समस्ततः) [U]
19 a) हासुः (for हासुः) [U]
31 a) अर्थात परायजः [U]
   Adhy. 213

6 a) इत्यं (for इत्यं) [U]
12 a) प्रधा (for प्रधा) [U]
13 आगत: (for आविष्कारः)
14 Om.
15 Om. [Ś 1 K 1]
17 रक्षाकृपेयवासिनी
19 अभिवाद्य (for अभिवाद्य) [U]
26 महामान: (for ोयशा:)
28 जाँदी (for जिज्ञी)
32-33 Om.
38 कुट्टीचुंद्र (for गर्भारोत्स्वः)
42 उपायूङ्विद्युतानां [Corrupt]
45 स्वरस्वताः (for सुद्रोस्वताः)
49 पाणिग्रहणिक (for पाणिग्रहणोः)
51 महाहान: (for ोन्दः)
57 सुभाषी स सहायताः: After 57, ins. 2097*
68 व्याख्यानमाहानाः [B 1.5]

Adhy. 214
3 सर्वकामार्थिन (for धमोः) [U]
8 पाणी (for बिमाः) [U]
20 तथा (for छुसेः) [D 12]
30 वाणिज्यनिधिक: [U]
31 बीमारासि (for कुशः)
32 तुर्जनः वे (for जाजामानं) [U]

Adhy. 215
3 श्रस्त्रवधिः (for [श्]जलय) [U]
9 सेवेनिमित्वमः [सि] प्रवृत्ति [K 9.4 N 1 D 12]
12 उक्तेनविभूः (for उक्तेन प्रभुवच) [G 9.4]
15 शरी: समयोः (for शरीः सेनसोः) [U]

[261] Adhy. 216
5 सर्वकामवधवि (for ोमसाधि)
12 शक्तिपुष्कस्मातः [N B 9 D 4]
13 सिद्धार्थारुकस्मातः:  
16 तथा (for राघः)
17 जयः: (for [Ś]पुंजः)
28 कुर्षीत (for जीविता) Adhy. 217

6 आनूप (for माहुः)
9 वसेसु (for सचेपनः)

Adhy. 218
6 स निरंतर (for विनमः)
10 लक्षान्तरसरस्मः
14 विन्यये (for विन्यये) [K 9.4]
15 [ड़]स्नमु (for [ड़]स्नमु)
18 संमतीपः [U]
22 श्लोकाशिसु (चिराल) [K 9.4]
24 विवर्त्ति (for वर्ति) [U]
27 बहुसङ्गः (for महीनः)
[Ś 1 K 1]
31 विचकः (for विचकः) [U]
38 महाते (for महेवे)
4 भूषोपातान्य (for ोद्वारः)

Adhy. 219
4 [ड़]सङ्केवः (for जनाघनः)
17 धूपः (for ोन्दः)

Adhy. 220
4 विषा पते (for विषायते) [V 1]
22 सर्वहोकाः (for ोद्वानः)
31 विवेचनः (for विवेचनः)

Adhy. 221
3 सर्वपीलः (for सर्वपीलः) [U]
14 संधः (for पूंजः) [U]
19 घरोत (for घिनेषः)

Adhy. 223
9 [ड़]स्मातलोकविधि (for हि न: परिकिनः) [U]
10 शाणेनिमित्वमः (for ोविनः) [Ś 1 K 1]
11 तिष्ठे (for तसा) [K 9]
14 तसः (for तसिः) [U]

Adhy. 224
1 दीक्षाः (for [ड]दीक्षः) [N 1]
10 च (for छः)
17 सर्वस्वाकः वकः वे न स्वस्तः (for तत्वज्ञः)
13 यस्मायेः (for यस्मावः)
VIII. The Rāma Episode (Rāmopākhyāna) and the Rāmāyana*

Sluszkievicz’s elaborate dissertation on the recensions of the Rāmāyana has revived the interest in the question of the relationship between the Rāmāyana and the Rāma Episode of the Mahābhārata, a question which appears to have been first mooted by Weber. Weber had contented himself with formulating the four logical alternatives: (1) the Rāmopākhyāna is the source of the Rāmāyana; (2) the Rāmopākhyāna constitutes an epitome of the Rāmāyana, but of a Rāmāyana more primitive than the epic in its present form; (3) the Rāmopākhyāna represents an epitome of the Rāmāyana, but an epitome modified somewhat by the compiler of the Episode himself; and lastly; (4) the two poems are derived independently from a lost common source. The alternatives worked out by Weber may be admitted; but then logical possibilities, unfortunately, do not carry us very far in historical investigations.

Jacobi, who has dealt with the question at great length in Das Rāmāyana, Geschichte und Inhalt (Bonn 1893), held firmly to the opinion that the Rāmopākhyāna was based on the Rāmāyana, on our Rāmāyana, on the Rāma Epic as we have it,—the episode forming a rather careless abridgment

---

* [A Volume of Studies in Indology presented to Prof. P. V. Kane, 472-87].
1 Eugeniusz Sluszkievicz, Przyczynki do badań nad dziejami Redakcji Rāmāyany (Contributions à l'histoire des recensions du Rāmāyana) = Polska Akademia Umiejętności Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej Nr. 30 (Kraków 1938), pp. 1-86.
2 “Uebew das Rāmāyana”, Abhandlungen der Berliner Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1870, 1-88 (see especially, p. 36 ff). Referred to by Jacobi, Das Rāmāyana, Geschichte und Inhalt, p. 71 ff.—Cf. also E. W. Hopkins, The Great Epic of India (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1920), pp. 58 ff,
of Vālmiki's epic (op. cit., p. 70). In discussing the question he has drawn attention to certain passages in the Rāmopākhyāṇa which presuppose a knowledge of the Rāmāyaṇa, and which would be indeed unintelligible if the reader did not know certain facts and circumstances which were detailed in the Epic but omitted in the Episode. This argument [473] seems to be not quite as sound as it appears at first sight; because, for the allusions in question, the compiler of the Episode might have been indebted to any other source or sources which likewise contained those explanatory allusions which happen to be omitted in the Episode. The allusions do not point unequivocally to any one single definite source.

But JACOBI did not of course base his case on this fact alone. He strengthened it from another side. He pointed out (op. cit. pp. 72 ff.) about a dozen passages which the Episode had in common with the Epic. These parallelisms carry naturally far greater weight than the allusions mentioned above. Exact verbal agreement between the works of two poets, even though they may be working on the same theme, are always suspicious. The human mind is not easily duplicated. Similar ideas may arise independently; but the words in which they become clothed are still something personal and characteristic, varying with each individual.

JACOBI attached special importance to one particular stanza in the Episode,—a veritable doggerel which, (according to JACOBI) was evidently a copy of the perfect Rāmāyaṇa stanza—once heard never forgotten:

 sxārœ  cāmvaragāyamnrbh śaṅgoropāsma  
 rāmāyaṇavāyayaṃ śaṃsāvāyatāta 

The Mbh. caricature of this stanza, according to JACOBI, was:

dvākarrājaratunyāstāya yuddhasānyāha 
ānunāyaṃpannapratyāt tathābhavāt

JACOBI was of opinion that this stanza of inferior form proves borrowing because it is inferior. This unquestionably proved also, JACOBI argued, that the Episode is merely an epitome of our Rāmāyaṇa. The argument is again not quite conclusive, and the point has been contested by HOPKINS. "A great poet," says HOPKINS, "is more apt to take a weak verse and make it strong than is a copyist to ruin a verse already excellent" (Great Epic, p. 63). Whatever the merits of this latter contention, JACOBI’s conclusion appears to be correct in the main, though his argument is certainly fallacious. JACOBI should have stopped short with the stanza. The Mahā-

bhārata stanza appears to be—and very probably is—a weak [474] imitation of the Rāmāyaṇa stanza. The fallacy lies in the extension that the Rāmopākhyāna is therefore a weak imitation of the Rāmāyaṇa. The relation between the two stanzas does not necessarily prove anything about the relationship between the Rāmāyaṇa and the Rāmopākhyāna as wholes.

Winternitz\(^1\) has already warned us that each stanza of the Mbh, must be judged on its own merits,—it may be added, when we want to use the stanza for historical and comparative purposes. We could not find a better example of this dictum than the stanza on which Jacobi has relied for establishing the posteriority of the Rāmopākhyāna. The stanza has an intricate history. Though found in all our old printed editions, the MS. support for it is surprisingly meagre. Of the two lines comprising the stanza, the second was found only in Bengali MSS. in addition to some stray Nāgarī MSS.; but the first line is itself known in two variant versions! The form known to and cited by Jacobi, namely,

\[\text{दसक्रन्यराजसूर्विसत्या युद्धसृस्तम्महत्} \]

alternates with another:

\[\text{ततः प्रवहते युद्ध रामराजयाःसंहत्} \]

which appears to be an attempt at remedying the awkwardness of the former, which was the subject of Jacobi’s strictures.\(^2\) Both lines are however completely missing in Kāśmīrī and Southern MSS. (besides many old Nāgarī MSS.)! This fact leaves no room now for doubting that the stanza in question is but a very late addition to the Great Epic. It can therefore naturally prove nothing whatsoever about the age or the character of the original Episode to which it has been secondarily appended by a recent interpolator. All disquisitions based on this stanza from the Rāmopākhyāna have consequently become futile. We must look for other criteria.

This only shows how very precarious are the conclusions that are based on the Vulgate text of the Mbh. And it is very remarkable that many of those very passages that have been used in the past for literary-historical purposes have turned out to be unhappily but also unquestionably spurious.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) History of Indian Literature (Calcutta 1927), p. 469: “the date of each section, nay sometimes of each single verse, must be determined separately, . . .”


\(^3\) For instance, in the fragmentary Devanāgāri MS. of the Aranyakaparvan belonging to the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bhau Daji Collection, No. 245.

\(^4\) I cannot give a better instance than that of a passage which was cited by H. Oldenberg to illustrate his Akhyāna theory. It is well known that Oldenberg always maintained that the oldest form of epic poetry in India was a mixture of prose and verse, the speeches being in verses, while the events were narrated in prose. In this connection he drew attention to the story of Sibi in the Vanaparvan (adhy. 199 of the Bombay ed.). This adhyāya which Oldenberg (Das Maha-
However the fact that one particular stanza cited by Jacobi has turned out to be unauthentic does not affect his general conclusion about the relationship between the Rāmopākhyāna and the Rāmāyana which, in my opinion, is quite well-founded and can be supported on other grounds.

As far as I can judge, the minute differences in the details of the story, which have been pointed out and exaggerated by some critics of Jacobi's theory, tell us nothing whatsoever about the matter which is the subject of discussion. The verbal agreements have, on the other hand, an unusually great probative force. To strengthen the case of Jacobi, we need therefore a large number of agreements. I had this fact in mind when I was studying the Rāmopākhyāna for my edition of Vanaparvan or—to give it its correct name—Aranyakaparvan.

Jacobi had found just twelve concordances. They are obviously too few. But their actual number should be very much greater, even if we exclude the epic iterata and standing phrases, which are the common heritage of the epic bards and which have been listed separately by Hopkins in an Appendix to his Great Epic. It would be premature, it seems to me, to discuss the question which of the existing versions of the Rāmāyana our Episode stands closest to. That question can be taken up only when we have a really critical edition of the Rāmāyana, which is promised by my friend and colleague Professor Raghunath Viras of Lahore from his International Academy of Indian Culture. In the meantime, I shall just register the concordances which I have been able to find, irrespective of the versions of the Rāmāyana to which they may belong. A scholar who knows his Rāmāyana better than I do would naturally be able to handle the question with more competence and find more concordances. But in the absence of such an exhaustive study by a savant who has mastered both the poems, the following table which I have prepared may be found useful. I have consulted only the Bombay edition (published in 1888 by the Nirmaya Sagar Press) and Gorrètis's edition (1843-1867). Of the latter edition, moreover, the last volume (Uttarakāndha) was not available to me and therefore could not be utilized.

*bharata, p. 23* regarded as a survival from the oldest form of our great epic can now on manuscript authority be proved to be one of the latest interpolations in the epic. We are not concerned with the date of this passage. The passage may be of hoary antiquity—though I doubt it personally—but it certainly never formed a part of the oldest strata of the Mahābhārata: that much we can now say with confidence. One sees how even a scholar like Oldenberg can make abysmal blunders in the estimation of the age and character of passages of the Mahābhārata.

I must acknowledge here the help I have received from Mr. M. V. Vaidya, M.A., and Pandit Krishnamurti Sastri, two of my assistants in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, in tracing out and identifying the parallel passages listed below,
Concordance of Parallel Passages in the Mbh. (Ramopākhyāna) and the Rāmāyaṇa.¹

Mbh. Aranyakaparvan (Rāmopākhyāna), Crit. Ed. (B. = Bombay Ed.)

1. 258. 2<sup>d</sup>
   (B. 274. 2<sup>d</sup>)
   हल्वा गुर्धे जदानुपस्म

2. 258. 4<sup>b</sup>
   (B. 274. 4<sup>b</sup>)
   किरीचे: किररक्राम:

3. 258. 5<sup>d</sup>
   (B. 274. 5<sup>d</sup>)
   रामस्याभिमानः:

4. 258. 9<sup>d</sup>
   (B. 274. 9<sup>d</sup>)
   रामस्य महिष्ठा भ्रायमः

5. 259. 13<sup>ab</sup>
   (B. 275. 13<sup>ab</sup>)
   सचं वेदविदं: शुराः:
   सचं सुचरसिन्द्राः:

6. 259. 30
   (B. 275. 30)

Rāmāyaṇa, Bombay Ed. (=B.)
(G. = GORRESIO’S Ed.)

B. 1. 1. 53<sup>b</sup>
   (G. 1. 1. 58<sup>d</sup>)
   गुर्धे हल्वा जदानुपस्म
   (G, like Mbh., हल्वा गुर्धे जः.)

B. 3. 34. 2<sup>b</sup>
   (G. 3. 38. 2<sup>b</sup>)
   किर्रपं किर्रतात्रामः:
   (G, like Mbh., किरीचे: किर्राम:

B. 5. 42. 34<sup>b</sup>: 43. 9<sup>b</sup>;
   6. 41. 77<sup>b</sup>; etc.
   (G. 5. 38. 31<sup>b</sup>; 6. 16.
   79<sup>b</sup>; etc., etc.)

B. 3. 50. 26<sup>d</sup>
   (G. 4. 49. 24<sup>d</sup>)

B. 1. 18. 25<sup>cd</sup>

B. 7. 10. 30<sup>cd</sup>: 31<sup>ab</sup>
   (G. 7. 10. 30)

¹ Stanzas identified by Jacobi have been marked in the list with "J"; thus [J]. A few of the other passages have been noted by Sluszkiewicz also, and have been marked with "S" in the list. Sluszkiewicz’s arrangement seemed to me rather complicated and confusing. From his various lists it is difficult to estimate the actual range and extent of the similarities.
(7) 259. 31
(B. 275. 31)

वस्मादाक्षाक्षोऽनि ते

जात्तस्मात्मुखकाणि

ना चरणं सते वृक्षः-

स्रस्त्रं द्वामिः ते [S]
(B धीयते for सते and द्वामिनि

for द्वामिः.)

(8) 259. 36ab
(B. 275. 36ab)

विभीषणस्तु धर्माम्स्त

सतां धर्मस्तुसुरमव्

( B माग्मस्तु for धर्मस्तुः.)

(9) 260. 7d
(B. 276. 7d)

कामस्यकान्वितानू

(10) 261. 6b
(B. 277. 6b)

सर्मालास हि प्रजा: [S]

(11) 261. 9b
(B. 277. 9b)

सर्मालास्यािमानस

(12) 261. 15c
(B. 277. 15c)

संभावः संभियेन्त्वि मे

(13) 261. 17cd
(B. 277. 17cd)

बाह्यविचारस्य संक्षु

षणोऽवशिषि दुःखेि [S]
(B दुःख for दुःखि.)

[478] (14) 261. 18ab
(B. 277. 18ab)

मुभगा खल्दु कौशल्या

वस्त्य: पुजोस्मियेक्षते

B. 7. 10. 34cd-35ab
(G. 7. 10. 34)

वस्मादाक्षाक्षोऽनि ते

जात्तस्मात्मुखनाशनि

ना चरणं जायते बुक्षः-

स्रस्त्रं द्वामिः ते [S]
(G, like Mbh., "कर्षित for नाशन,

and वातं for जायते.)

B. 7. 10. 6c

विभीषणस्तु धर्माम्स्त

नियम धर्मापि: खृि: इ

G. 1. 20. 14b

कामस्य बनावितातः

G. 1. 19. 28b

सत्यांस्त हि प्रजा:

B. 2. 3. 28b
(G. 2. 2. 13d)

सत्यांस्यािमानसर

B. 1. 8. 14e [cf. 1. 8. 11e; 12. 3e]
(G. 1. 11. 15e)

संभावः संभियेन्त्वि मे

( G च for से. )

G. 2. 7. 3ab

अतिविचारस्य दशानु

संभियामािमानसर

B. 2. 8. 9cd
(G. 2. 7. 4cd)

सुभगा किथ कौशल्या

वस्त्य: पुजोस्मियेक्षते [S]
(G कौशल्यां सुभगां सम्बे and

विच्येते for बेखळि.)
(15) 261. 22<sup>ed</sup>
(B. 277. 22<sup>ed</sup>)
अवध्यो वच्यतां कोंव
वच्यः कोंव विसुन्यवादः। [JS]

(16) 1245* (line 1)
(B. 277. 24<sup>st</sup>)
पुष्यत्यां राजसाजोधस्ति [S]

(17) 261. 25<sup>ab</sup>
(B. 277. 26<sup>ab</sup>)
आभिप्रेयचिन्ति यति
राम्येवयुपक्षिपति। [S]

(18) 261. 25<sup>d</sup>
(B. 277. 27<sup>d</sup>)
वनं गच्छति राजवः।

(19) 261. 33<sup>ab</sup>
(B. 277. 34<sup>ab</sup>)
अवधः पात्यवा के
सुभिः वं दुधपालने। [S]

(20) 261. 39<sup>d</sup>
(B. 277. 40<sup>d</sup>)
शरभुकुस्तम् प्रति

(21) 261. 40<sup>c</sup>
(B. 277. 41<sup>c</sup>)
नदीं गोदवरीं स्याम्ये

(22) 261. 42<sup>cd</sup>
(B. 277. 43<sup>cd</sup>)
चउद्धक सहस्वाणि
जवान शुचि स्काम्याः।
(B. राजसान्त for राजः।)

[479] (23) 262. 3<sup>b</sup>
(B. 278. 3<sup>b</sup>)
ककशिक्षेमं पुरे तव [JS]

(24) 262. 12<sup>c</sup>
(B. 278. 13<sup>c</sup>)
अपकार्ये च काशुः

B. 2. 10. 33<sup>ab</sup>
(G. 2. 9. 11<sup>ed</sup>)
अवध्यो वच्यतां कोंव
वच्यः कोंव विसुन्यवादः।
(G अवध्यो वच्यतां कोंव and वच्यः
for वच्यः)

G. 2. 9. 13<sup>g</sup>
पुष्यत्यां राजसाजोधस्ति

G. 2. 12. 3<sup>cd</sup>
आभिप्रेयचिन्ति त्रेयं
राम्येवयुपक्षिपति।
B. 5. 33. 21<sup>d</sup>
(G. 5. 31. 15<sup>d</sup>)
वनं गच्छति राजवः।

G. 2. 76. 7<sup>od</sup>
सम चाप्यसौ मुक्ति
पालितं हुध्यवा व्ययः।
B. 3. 5. 20<sup>d</sup>
(G. 3. 9. 15<sup>d</sup>)
शरभुकुस्तमं प्रति
B. 3. 64. 3<sup>u</sup>
(G. 3. 68. 30<sup>u</sup>)
नदीं गोदवारीं स्यां
B. 5. 37. 16<sup>ab</sup>
(G. 5. 35. 17<sup>ab</sup>)
चउद्धक सहस्वाणि
राजसान्तो जवान वः।
B. 3. 35. 41<sup>ab</sup>
ककशिक्षेमं पुरे तव राजसाजोधस्ति
B. 3. 40. 20<sup>g</sup>, 22<sup>g</sup>
(G. 3. 44. 18<sup>g</sup>)
अपकार्ये च काशुः
(25) 262. 22\textsuperscript{od}
(B. 278. 23\textsuperscript{ab})
हा सीते कहता ज्ञाने वेचेत
ज्ञानस्वभावान्वेष राजाः [JS]

(26) 262. 27\textsuperscript{d}
(B. 278. 28\textsuperscript{b})
विशेष च गुरुपालनां

(27) 262. 30\textsuperscript{e}
(B. 278. 32\textsuperscript{r})
अभच्यो भव्यपेण [JS]

(28) 262. 33\textsuperscript{nd}
(B. 278. 35\textsuperscript{rd})
सम छन्दा पुरी नाईः

(29) 263. 8\textsuperscript{b}
(B. 279. 9\textsuperscript{ab})
सा वद्वर्ण गौरिनाथे
पद्म वानसपुञ्जवानां

(30) 263. 11\textsuperscript{b}
(B. 279. 14\textsuperscript{b})
वने राजस्वेषिते

(31) 263. 22\textsuperscript{b}
(B. 279. 25\textsuperscript{b})
व्यवहित्रुवशींस्तम्बः
(B. 80 वस्ति.)

[480] (32) 263. 39\textsuperscript{a}
(B. 279. 43\textsuperscript{a})
रावणेन हुता सीता

(33) 263. 40\textsuperscript{b}
(B. 279. 44\textsuperscript{b})
हंसतारियवायुता

B. 3. 44. 24\textsuperscript{ab}
(G. 3. 50. 22\textsuperscript{od})
हा सीते कहता ज्ञाने
माकुलो तु महास्वानम्

(G. हा कहता ज्ञाने चारीति महाकुलो तु महास्वाने।)

G. 3. 51. 41\textsuperscript{b}
प्रविष्टे दुरवासनम्
B. 3. 46. 9\textsuperscript{o}
(G. 3. 52. 14\textsuperscript{a})
अभच्यो भव्यपेण
(G. २५ स्त्रोता तां for रुपेण।)
B. 3. 47. 29\textsuperscript{ab}; 48. 10\textsuperscript{ab}
(G. 3. 53. 35\textsuperscript{ab}; 54. 14\textsuperscript{ab})
छन्दा नाम सयुद्धस्य
(B and G both second time)
मम पारे सयुद्धस्य।

(32) 263. 39\textsuperscript{a}
(B. 279. 43\textsuperscript{a})
वने राजस्वेषिते

(31) 263. 22\textsuperscript{b}
(B. 279. 25\textsuperscript{b})
व्यवहित्रुवशींस्तम्बः
(B. 80 वस्ति.)

[480] (32) 263. 39\textsuperscript{a}
(B. 279. 43\textsuperscript{a})
रावणेन हुता सीता

(33) 263. 40\textsuperscript{b}
(B. 279. 44\textsuperscript{b})
हंसतारियवायुता

B. 3. 54. 1\textsuperscript{od}
(G. 3. 60. 5\textsuperscript{od})
ददर्शे गिरिवृक्षस्थाने
पद्म वानसपुञ्जवानाः

B. 3. 57. 16\textsuperscript{b}
(G. 3. 64. 18\textsuperscript{d}; 66. 2\textsuperscript{d})
वने राजस्वेषिते
B. 3. 60. 7\textsuperscript{b}
व्यवहित्रुवशींस्तम्बः

B. 3. 71. 21\textsuperscript{e}
(G. 3. 75. 37\textsuperscript{a})
रावणेन हुता भायो
(G, like Mbh., सीता for भायों।)

G. 3. 79. 40\textsuperscript{a}
हंसतारियवायुताः
(34) 263. 41<sup>b</sup>
(B. 279. 45<sup>b</sup>)
संवसत्वम् कुमीवः
श्रुतिः सचिवः सह।
(B वस्तन्ते तत्र for संवसत्वम्.)

(35) 264. 2<sup>d</sup>
(B. 280. 2<sup>d</sup>)
जगाम मनसा विप्राया

(36) 264. 23<sup>b</sup>
(B. 280. 23<sup>b</sup>)
मेन्द्र द्विविद्वेशव
हनुमातानांहिलामा।
(B द्विविद्वेशपि.)

(37) 264. 27<sup>d</sup>
(B. 280. 27<sup>d</sup>)
का लरा सर्थे पुनः [S]

(38) 264. 32<sup>d</sup>
(B. 280. 32<sup>d</sup>)
शुपिनाविविन दुर्गकी

(39) 264. 34<sup>b</sup>
(B. 280. 34<sup>b</sup>)
स माहया तथा बीरः
शुपुभे कपनसमा।

(40) 264. 37<sup>b</sup>
(B. 280. 37<sup>b</sup>)
वक्षाप्पोकितमुद्रमन्

[481] (41) 264. 42<sup>b</sup>
(B. 280. 42<sup>b</sup>)
वापसीवेशधारणिः

(42) 264. 55<sup>b</sup>
(B. 280. 56<sup>b</sup>)
अविनयो नाम संधावी
झुको रासलयुगः। [S]
(43) 264. 64<sup>a</sup>-65<sup>a</sup>, 65<sup>d</sup>  
(B. 280. 65<sup>a</sup>-66<sup>e</sup>, 66<sup>d</sup>)

अत्यावश्यकत्रु के तु 
रथे मुर्यहिं सियत:।

कुम्भकर्षणियय: 
रक्षमायानुबंध: [S]

(44) 264. 66<sup>ed</sup>  
(B. 280. 67<sup>ed</sup>)

केतापपवतमारूप 
एक पय विशेषण:। [S]

(45) 265. 4<sup>d</sup>-5<sup>d</sup>  
(B. 281. 4<sup>d</sup>-5<sup>d</sup>)

वसता इत्व मूर्तिमाला 
स कल्पकश्लबो 
वजनाधिप विजुरित:।

समालोक्यस्तुमम-
शृष्टिःस्तिप मन्त्यर:। [S]

(46) 265. 8<sup>ab</sup>  
(B. 281. 8<sup>ab</sup>)

हीते पराहेमेववत- 
इति भवुधृतमह:।

[482] (47) 265. 17<sup>ed</sup>  
(B. 281. 17<sup>ed</sup>)

शामस्त: इत्वा 
वधुवाच मिशामस्त। [JS]

(48) 265. 21<sup>a</sup>  
(B. 281. 21<sup>e</sup>)

न वैचित्र्यप्यथ भवान्य 

(49) 266. 1<sup>e</sup>  
(B. 282. 1<sup>e</sup>)

वस्मायायत: पृष्ठे

B. 5. 27. 21<sup>ed</sup>, 33<sup>e</sup>  
(G. 5. 27. 16<sup>ab</sup>, 22<sup>a</sup>)

रथे वस्मावने 

रक्षमायानुबंध:।

कुम्भकर्षणियय: 

G. 5. 27. 23<sup>ab</sup>

केतापपवतमारूप 
एक पय विशेषण:।

B. 5. 22. 29  
(G. 5. 20. 24<sup>ed</sup>)

स कल्पकश्लामी 
वसता इत्व मूर्तिमाला।

क्षामाचेयपश्चिमो 
शृष्टिःस्तिप अभयंकर:।

(G which has only the latter half "इधरम् for "प्रत्यय, like Mbh.)

B. 5. 24. 21<sup>ab</sup>  
(G. 5. 25. 20<sup>ed</sup>)

हीते पराहेमेववत- 
भातुः केध्व: प्रद्धितच।।

(G भवुधृतमेववतमारूप for the posterior half.)

B. 3. 56. 1<sup>ed</sup>: 5. 21. 3<sup>ab</sup>  
(G. 3. 62. 1<sup>ed</sup>)

शामस्त: इत्वा 
वधुवाच मिशामस्त।

(B second time श्रविधितचा.

G वाक्यमानमीत, for "श्रव."

B. 5. 21. 6<sup>e</sup>  
(G. 5. 23. 4<sup>e</sup>)

नामीपर्यथिकी भवान्य 

B. 4. 28. 1<sup>e</sup>  
(G. 4. 27. 1<sup>e</sup>)

वस्मायायत: पृष्ठे
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 266</th>
<th>Page 267</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(50) 266.49&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>B. 4. 58. 7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B. 282. 51&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(G. 4. 58. 8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निद्रापण पतियो</td>
<td>निद्रापण पतियो</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G, like Mbh., 8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; पक्ष : for पक्ष )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51) 266.58&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>B. 5. 65. 11&lt;sup&gt;cd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B. 282. 60&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(G. 5. 66. 10&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तन सीता मया द्वारा</td>
<td>तन सीता मया द्वारा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रावणान्तः पुरे सती</td>
<td>रावणान्तः पुरे सती</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52) 266.67&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>B. 5. 40. 4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B. 282. 70&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(G. 5. 37. 4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विशामिद्रा काक्ष्य &lt;S&gt; [S]</td>
<td>विशामिद्रा काक्ष्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B काक्ष फल काक्ष्य )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53) 266.67&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>G. 1. 4. 35&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B. 282. 70&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>- विशामिद्रा महागिरी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विषुष्ट्रे महागिरी</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54) 267. 2&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>B. 4. 39. 19&lt;sup&gt;cd&lt;/sup&gt; ; 40. 18&lt;sup&gt;cd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B. 283. 2&lt;sup&gt;ac&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(G. 4. 39. 27&lt;sup&gt;cd&lt;/sup&gt; ; 40. 17&lt;sup&gt;cd&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भुत : कटिसहल्क्रेण</td>
<td>भुत : कटिसहल्क्रेण</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वानराणां तरस्तिनाम्</td>
<td>वानराणामद्वस्यतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B second time शहस्त्रल्क्रेण for कटि&lt;sup&gt;२&lt;/sup&gt;,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and तरस्तिनामू for अहस्यत्व. G, first time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कटित&lt;sup&gt;२&lt;/sup&gt;, and गोलडुर्गूङ्गैर for वानराणाम; G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second time कटित&lt;sup&gt;२&lt;/sup&gt; and लिक मब.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तरस्तिनामू for अहस्यत्व. )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[483] (55) 267. 4&lt;sup&gt;cd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>B. 4. 39. 19&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt; ; 6. 42. 28&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B. 283. 4&lt;sup&gt;cd&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(G. 4. 39. 27&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt; ; 6. 17. 20&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गोलडुर्गूङ्गमहाराजः</td>
<td>गोलडुर्गूङ्गमहाराजः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गवाश्च भीमदर्शीन् : ।</td>
<td>गवाश्च भीमदर्शीन् : G first time गोलडुर्गूङ्ग,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B second time गोलडुर्गूङ्ग महाकायो</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गवाश्च भीमदर्शीन् : G first time गोलडुर्गूङ्ग,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and नाम नामत् : for भीम&lt;sup&gt;२&lt;/sup&gt;; G second time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गोलडुर्गूङ्ग महाराजः गवाश्च भीमदर्शीन् : )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(56) 267. 44ª
(B. 283. 44ª)

B. 6. 22. 72ª
(G. 5. 95. 12ª)

शतयोजनविस्तीर्ण
शतयोजनमायतम्
(G, like Mbh., आयं शतयोजन्ने
for शह°.)

(B. 6. 16. 17ª; 17. 7ª
(G. 5. 88. 14ª; 89. 3ª)

B. 6. 19. 26ª
(G. 5. 92. 3ª)

अभ्यस्वभाविष्करणम्

(B. 6. 25. 9ª, 26ª
(G. 6. 1. 12ª, 36ª)

B. 6. 41. 78ª
(G. 6. 16. 80ª)

( G first time सति: सह [ like
Mbh.], and second time सति:
सह for सह रा°.)

(B. 5. 21. 11
(G. 5. 23. 9)

अभ्यस्वभावि
रायजनमन्ये रतम्।
सगुह्यविनिविश्विशो
राजानि नगराणि च ||

(G भतास्म for राजानम; and हुसद्युभा
विनिविश्विति राजाश्च नगर°.)

(B. 6. 41. 79ª
(G. 6. 16. 81ª)

( G भहं हुता सहा°.)

[(57) 267. 46ª
(B. 283. 46ª)

चतुर्भू: सचिव: सह]

(58) 267. 49ª
(B. 283. 49ª)

[ अ ] न्यायविनिभीषणम्

(59) 267. 52ª
(B. 283. 52ª)

राक्षसैः कुक्षसारणी
(B. मन्त्रिणी for राक्षसीः.)

(60) 268. 10ª
(B. 284. 10ª)

आह तां रायवो राजन्

(61) 268. 11
(B. 284. 11.)

अकुलामानमालाव
राजामनवे रतम्।
विनिविश्वविनिविशा
देशाश्च नगराणि च ||

[B महामालेश्वर]

[484]} (62) 268. 15ª
(B. 284. 15ª)

इन्सिम्बि वां सहमाल्यं
(B. सहमालेश्वर)}
(63) 268. 16\textsuperscript{ab}
  (B. 284. 16\textsuperscript{cd})

अराध्यसम्म होके
कर्तारसिं निलिते: शङ्के। [JS]

(64) 268. 17\textsuperscript{a}
  (B. 284. 17\textsuperscript{a})

रावण: कोथनीक्षितः
(65) 268. 18\textsuperscript{b}
  (B. 284. 18\textsuperscript{b})

चलारो रजनीचरा:

(66) 268. 36\textsuperscript{c}
  (B. 284. 37\textsuperscript{c})

नर्गेद्येश वीराण्य

(67) 270. 13\textsuperscript{d}
  (B. 286. 13\textsuperscript{d})

सस्कृतविद्येशः

(68) 270. 14\textsuperscript{d}
  (B. 286. 14\textsuperscript{d})

हनुमाननासनलाभः

(69) 270. 17\textsuperscript{b}
  (B. 286. 17\textsuperscript{b})

हनकोषा विलाचरा:

(70) 271. 4\textsuperscript{b}
  (B. 287. 5\textsuperscript{d})

भक्ष्यामात्र वाराण्

(71) 271. 21\textsuperscript{ab}
  (B. 287. 23\textsuperscript{ab})

ततः शुक्लसदृष्टि- ततः शुक्लसदृष्टि- महिमार्थमहिमार्णस्।

B. 6. 41. 67\textsuperscript{ab}
  (G. 6. 16. 68\textsuperscript{cd})

अक्षरालिम पुरोके
कर्तारसिं निलिते: शङ्के। (G करोरि for कर्तारसिं)

(64) 268. 17\textsuperscript{a}
  (B. 284. 17\textsuperscript{a})

रावण: कोथनीक्षितः

(65) 268. 18\textsuperscript{b}
  (B. 284. 18\textsuperscript{b})

चलारो रजनीचरा:

(66) 268. 36\textsuperscript{c}
  (B. 284. 37\textsuperscript{c})

नर्गेद्येश वीराण्य

(67) 270. 13\textsuperscript{d}
  (B. 286. 13\textsuperscript{d})

सस्कृतविद्येशः

(68) 270. 14\textsuperscript{d}
  (B. 286. 14\textsuperscript{d})

हनुमाननासनलाभः

(69) 270. 17\textsuperscript{b}
  (B. 286. 17\textsuperscript{b})

हनकोषा विलाचरा:

(70) 271. 4\textsuperscript{b}
  (B. 287. 5\textsuperscript{d})

भक्ष्यामात्र वाराण्

(71) 271. 21\textsuperscript{ab}
  (B. 287. 23\textsuperscript{ab})

ततः शुक्लसदृष्टि- ततः शुक्लसदृष्टि- महिमार्थमहिमार्णस्।

B. 6. 41. 67\textsuperscript{ab}
  (G. 6. 16. 68\textsuperscript{cd})

अक्षरालिम पुरोके
कर्तारसिं निलिते: शङ्के। (G करोरि for कर्तारसिं)

B. 6. 26. 6\textsuperscript{b}
  (G. 5. 47. 36\textsuperscript{d})

रावण: कोथनीक्षितः

B. 6. 41. 84\textsuperscript{d}
  (G. 6. 16. 86\textsuperscript{d})

चलारो रजनीचरा:

G. 6. 65. 22\textsuperscript{e}

नर्गेद्येश वीराण्य

B. 6. 52. 30\textsuperscript{d}
  (G. 6. 28. 32\textsuperscript{d})

सस्कृतविद्येशः

B. 6. 52. 30\textsuperscript{d}, 32\textsuperscript{b}
  (G. 6. 28. 32\textsuperscript{b}, 34\textsuperscript{b})

हनुमाननासनलाभः

B. 6. 52. 37\textsuperscript{d}
  (G. 6. 28. 40\textsuperscript{b})

हनकोषा विलाचरा:

B. 6. 67. 96\textsuperscript{d}
  (G. 6. 46. 79\textsuperscript{d})

भक्ष्यामात्र वाराण्

B. 3. 25. 34\textsuperscript{cd}
  (G. 3. 31. 44\textsuperscript{cd}; 6. 18. 23\textsuperscript{ab})

वज्रबाहुर्वं दुःखं

गुरुम्भ रोमहर्षणं।

(G first time लोम° G second time
tमात्रीबाहुमुखं दुःखं लोमं 
  G first time लोम° G second time
tमात्रीबाहुमुखं दुःखं लोमं )

B. 6. 65. 6\textsuperscript{b}
  (G. 6. 47. 2\textsuperscript{ab})

शुक्ला विनिहारं सक्ष्ये
कर्मन्यं महाभासम्।

(G for शुक्ला विनिहारं)

( स शुक्ला निः for शुक्ला भिनि°)
(73) 272. 26\(^a\)  
(B. 288. 26\(^a\))

हातरे रामकृत्तमणि

(74) 273. 5\(^b\)  
(B. 289. 5\(^b\))

कृतकम्री विभीषणः:

(75) 273. 20\(^b\)  
(B. 289. 20\(^b\))

श्रवणः: कोषमचित्तः

(76) 273. 20\(^d\)  
(B. 289. 20\(^d\))

शरातासीविपय्यमानुः

(77) 274. 5\(^d\)  
(B. 290. 5\(^d\))

शरणो राक्षसेश्वरः:  
(B राक्षसाथिप: )

(78) 274. 12\(^d\)  
(B. 290. 12\(^d\))

मातिधः: शक्तिसारिः

(79) 1298\(^*\), 1299\(^*\)  
(B. 290. 19\(^b\)-20\(^b\))

क्षणन्यस्वरस्य-  
स्थया युद्धसुन्महरः ।  
अवाह्योपपसमपन्त  
तथोरित तथासमवः ।  
(MSS. v. I. for the first line  
ततः: प्रवहुदेव युद्द्द रामरावणयोऽवहः ।)

(80) 274. 21\(^d\)  
(B. 290. 23\(^b\))

शश्राणिः विविधानिः च  
[486] (81) 275. 25\(^d\)  
(B. 291. 26\(^d\))

वातश्रणां महाभाष्यम्

B. 6. 44. 36\(^a\); 45. 13\(^b\); 46. 1\(^d\) etc.  
(G. 6. 19. 54\(^b\); 20. 13\(^b\); 20. 1\(^d\),  
29\(^b\) etc.)

हातरे रामकृत्तमणि

G. 6. 24. 42\(^d\)

कृतकम्री विभीषणः:

G. 6. 70. 19\(^b\)

श्रवणः: कोषमचित्तः:

B. 6. 88. 41\(^b\)  
(G. 6. 68. 5\(^b\))

शरातासीविपय्यमानुः

B. 6. 95. 32\(^d\); 97. 2\(^d\); 100. 10\(^b\);  
102. 2\(^d\), 27\(^b\); etc. (G. 6. 80. 10\(^b\))

शरणो राक्षसेश्वरः:  
(B राक्षसाथिप: in 97. 2\(^d\) and ff.)

B. 6. 112. 5\(^d\)  
(G. 6. 97. 6\(^b\))

मातिधः: शक्तिसारिः:

B. 6. 107. 51\(^c\)-52\(^b\)

सागरं चाचव्यमवल्य-  
मस्वरं सागरोपसमस् ।  
रामरावणनांहुः 
रामरावणवाचिं

B. 6. 103. 29\(^b\)  
(G. 6. 88. 35\(^b\))

शश्राणिः विविधानिः च  
G. 1. 4. 72\(^b\)

वातश्रणां महाभाष्यां
This cannot be considered as an exhaustive list. In fact I must frankly confess that my study of the Rāmāyāna has been rather perfunctory, and moreover it is difficult to identify passages in a work like the Rāmāyāna in the absence of a verse-index. A closer study of the Epic and Episode, I am confident, would result in the tracing of many more parallelisms in diction and phraseology. I must here add that I have intentionally ex-
cluded such passages as show merely parallelisms in ideas, and I have strictly confined myself to exact verbal similarities. The greater the number of such verbal similarities the weaker becomes the case for Hopkins. He, relying on the many minor differences in detail, argues that the fact that the subject-matter of the Epic and the Episode is treated differently in several particulars “points to different workings-over of older matter rather than to copying or condensing” (Hopkins, op. cit. p. 63). Hopkins loses sight of the fact that differences like those pointed out by him do not prove anything in such cases. Differences are natural and may be expected; nay, they could scarcely be avoided—as far as I can judge—when one is condensing a work of about 25,000 stanzas. But agreements in the bulk can never be casual or accidental; they show invariably identity of source. And the source, as already pointed out by Jacobi, was not a manuscript of the Rāmāyāna, but a memorized version of it, current in the time of the adapter and in his locality. Then, I expect, the compilers of such works could hardly avoid the influence from oral tradition which existed then. In this restricted sense we must understand the statement that the Rāmopākhyāna is an epitome of our Rāmāyāna, a fact which we may regard as established on account of the numerous verbal agreements which have been shown to exist between the two poems.

1 Ob. cit. p. 72.
ARJUNAMIŚRA*

A commentator of the Mahābhārata who has suffered undeserved neglect at the hands of scholars and publishers alike is Arjunamiśra. Not only is Arjuna's commentary better than that of Nīlakaṇṭha, his text also is superior, in many respects, to that used or fixed by the Western commentator. And yet Arjuna's Dipihā has never been published in its entirety¹ and, being difficult of access, is seldom consulted by scholars. HOLTZMANN has devoted a paragraph to him in his compendious work Das Mahābhārata, Vol. 3, pp. 67 ff., but WINTERNITZ does not mention him even once in the 130 pages he devotes to the Mahābhārata in his Geschichte. He is referred to en passant by BROCKHAUS, ZDMG, 6. 528; by TELANG, Bhāgavadgītā Translation; by Rajendralal MITRA, Notices, Vols. 5 and 6; and in some other manuscripts catalogues.

The version of Arjunamiśra, as I pointed out in the Foreword (p. v) to the first fascicule of the critical edition of the Mahābhārata (1927), is closely allied to the Bengali version. The simple reason for this affinity, not known to me then, is apparently that Arjunamiśra was a native of Bengal, to judge from the extracts from the colophons of his commentary recently published by Mahamahopadhyaya Haraprasada SHASTRI in the Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. 5 (1928).

The few facts about Arjunamiśra and his commentary that I have been able to glean from the various available sources may be briefly summarized thus. The name of his commentary is variously given as (Mahā-)bhāratārtha- [566] (pra)đīpīka and Bhāratasamgrahadiśīpīka. The commentaries on the different Parvans have been handed down singly or in groups of a few Parvans at a time. Complete manuscripts of the commentary exist in Bengal, but even there they are not common. The manuscripts, which are written in Bengali and Devanāgari characters, bear various dates in the seventeenth or later centuries: the earliest hitherto reported date is Sarhvat 1676 (ca. A.D. 1620).

Arjunamiśra, who styles himself Bhāratacārya in the colophons of the manuscripts of his commentary, was the son of Iśāna, who was a "reciter" (pāṭhaka or pāṭhakarāja) of the Mahābhārata and who appears to have, like his son, borne the title Bhāratacārya. Arjuna is cited by name, by

---

* [Dr. Modi Memorial Volume, pp. 565-568.]

¹ The commentary on the Virāṭaparvan and the Udyogaparvan has been published by the Gujarati Printing Press, Bombay.
Nilakaṇṭha once in his commentary on the Mahābhārata (ad 3. 291. 70) and is, therefore, certainly anterior to Nilakaṇṭha, who belongs to the third quarter of the seventeenth century.  He in turn turns among his predecessors the commentators Devabodha, Vimalabodha, Saṃdilya, Sarvajñā- Nārāyaṇa, and he appears to have based his scholium closely on that of Devabodha. He wrote also a commentary on the well-known Vedic hymn Puruṣasūkta, to which he himself refers in the Dīpīkā on Mbh. 14. 25. 26. Telang (op. cit. p. 204) surmises that he is posterior to Saṃkara, and Holtzmann assigns him to the thirteenth or fourteenth century: both without adducing any cogent reasons for their assumptions. Arjuna regarded and has treated the Harivaṃśa as an integral part of the Great Epic, elaborately defending this position: his commentary, therefore, embraces the supplement Harivaṃśa also.

Arjunamīśra lived in North India, in a town or village on the banks of the Ganges and, according to his own statement, compiled the great commentary on the Mahābhārata under the patronage of one Satyakhāna. [567] Relying on one Bengal Asiatic Society’s manuscript examined by him, Haraprasada Shastri asserts that Arjuna was a Vārendra Brahman of North Bengal. The Mahamahopadhyaya may indeed be right in this, but I am not wholly convinced. I find it a suspicious circumstance that this word Vārendra occurs only in one place in one manuscript (No. 3422), while it is conspicuous by its absence in the others which contain a similar colophon. There is, however, another word which is often repeated in these colophons but not discussed by the Mahamahopadhyaya and which I think also contains a place-name. The word is spelt in the colophons variously as Campāheṭṭi(y)a, Campāheṭṭi, Campiheṭṭika. It is used there as an attribute of Kula. I take the reference to mean that Arjunamīśra’s family (kula) belonged to a town or village, called Campāheṭṭi(y)i. Could this place be identified with certainty, we should have a very definite clue as to Arjunamīśra’s provenance. I am tempted to identify it with Campahāti mentioned in the Imperial Gazetteer of India (1885) as a “small village...15 miles south-west of Calcutta, in the district of the Twenty-four Parganas, Bengal”; but owing partly to the erratic manner in which proper names are spelt in the Imperial Gazetteer and partly to the lack of sufficient data as to the situation of the place in question, the identification proposed above is necessarily uncertain.

Following the example of my predecessors, I have utilized Devanāgari manuscripts of the commentary of Arjunamīśra and treated his version as a sub-division of the Devanāgari version. The two Devanāgari manuscripts I am using for my edition of the Adiparvan are extremely corrupt. In fact all the manuscripts I have consulted—and they are all Nāgari manuscripts—have been surprisingly corrupt. Not only that, the text they contain is

---

2 Printz, KZ, 44, 70 ff.
obviously contaminated from the vulgate text, as evidenced [568] by the glaring discrepancies that exist between the readings of the text and the lemmata in the commentary. This corruption of the Devanāgarī manuscripts I could not understand at first, but is, I cannot but think now, due to their being copies of Bengali originals. It would, therefore, be expedient to secure and use, whenever possible, good old Bengali manuscripts of Arjunamiśra’s commentary, treating his version as an offshoot of the Bengali version. Arjunamiśra certainly seems to belong to the Eastern school of Mahābhārata commentators.
THE NALA EPISODE AND THE RĀMĀYĀNA *

There must be indeed very few Sanskritists who have read the justly popular Nala-Damayantī episode of the Mahābhārata and not felt disposed to echo the sentiments of A. W. V. SCHLELGEN that the poem "can hardly be surpassed in pathos and ethos, in the enthralling force and tenderness of the sentiments." ¹ It is without doubt one of the most beautiful love stories of the world, striking on account of the simplicity of its style and the beauty of its imagery. Owing to its innate attractiveness and transparent lucidity, it has been the custom, since a long time, at almost all Western Universities, to begin the study of Sanskrit with the reading of this romantic little poem, for which purpose it is no doubt excellently suited. Its popularity may be judged from the fact that it has been translated not only into English, French and German, but also into Italian, Swedish, Czech, Polish, Russian, Greek and Hungarian among the European languages.² Every province of India can of course boast of its own version of this superb little epopee.

Regarded as an integral part of the Mahābhārata,³ the episode is a palpable "interpolation", impending annoyingly the march of the epic story, and is forced upon the reader of the Epic in the most barefaced manner. During the exile of the Pāṇḍavas they receive a casual visit from a peripatetic sage called Bṛhadāśva. Yudhiṣṭhira—as is usual with him—complains to him of the misfortune which has overtaken him and his family, and asks the sage whether there has ever been a more unfortunate king than himself. Thereupon Bṛhadāśva forthwith relates the Nala story, in 27 adhyāyas, comprising something like 1100 stanzas or 2200 lines. There could be no clearer instance of deliberate interpolation, introduced with a coolness difficult to match. Yet we are really intensely grateful at heart in this case, as in the case of the Sāvitrī episode,—the two immortal stories that are known and loved throughout the length and breadth of India—that some meddlesome interpolator had the courage to interrupt deliberately the smooth flow of the epic narrative with these beautiful digressions and thus saved them [295] from falling a prey to the ravages of Time. And so with a number of other

² WINTERNITZ, op. cit., p. 238 n.
³ Aranyakaparvan, adhy. 53-79 (Bombay edition). In the Critical Edition these adhyāyas have been tentatively numbered 50-78. The abbreviation "B." in the references means the Bombay ed. of the Mahābhārata.
interpolations in the Great Epic. Many of them richly deserved to be “interpolated” in this Golden Treasury of the Myths and Legends of India.

Not only has the Nala-Damayantī poem what may be called a lively story-interest, but it is also clothed in a most attractive garb. The charmingly simple diction of this exquisite little poem is marked by a rigorous economy of words and “ornaments”; the construction of the story is also on the whole remarkably faultless: qualities which have endeared it to connoisseurs all the world over. The narrative, like a sylvan brook, runs its meandering course naturally and smoothly to its destined conclusion. And in spite of a few inevitable scenes of divine intervention and a little exaggeration necessary for artistic effect, we carry away the impression that the story rests on a foundation of fact, and we feel that it may all have happened, in those wonderful bygone times, exactly as it is narrated here.

In the whole length of this carefully and artistically constructed poem there is just one passage which is apt slightly to perplex a careful reader. It is the soliloquy of the Brahmin Sudeva in chapter 16 of the poem (B. 3. 68. 8 ff.). On reading this passage a discerning reader would notice for one thing a sudden change to a rather florid style, marked by a plethora of epithets and a rich embroidery of similes.

The situation is this. King Nala, having deserted Damayantī where she lay asleep, strode through the forest aimlessly until he met the snake-king Karkoṭaka, who, in return for a good turn done to him, transformed the handsome Nala into an ugly hunchback and advised him to go to Ayodhya and seek service as a charioteer with king Rūparṇa. Nala does so and remains at the court of Rūparṇa in the service of the king. His whereabouts and identity are not known to any living soul besides himself: which is a very important point in the narrative. Damayantī, in the meanwhile, after a number of perilous adventures, reaches, by a fortunate coincidence, the palace of the queen of the Cedis, who is no other than Damayantī’s own aunt (as is revealed later), who takes compassion on her and gives her shelter. In course of time the evil tidings of the fateful game of dice and the subsequent exile of Nala and Damayantī reached king Bhūma, Damayantī’s father. Thereupon he called to him some Brahmans and enjoined them, with promise of rich gifts, that they should search for Nala and Damayantī and bring them back to him. One of these Brahmans, the fortunate Sudeva, comes to the country of the Cedis and there, in the palace hall, he sees Damayantī and recognizes her forthwith. On seeing the wan, unkempt and forlorn appearance of the beautiful princess of Vidarbha, he indulges in a soliloquy before addressing her directly. This passage, as already remarked, seems marked out from the rest of the poem by attempts at higher flights of imagination, approaching the requirements of what is known as the Kāyya style. Damayantī is here successively compared by Sudeva to Śrī (or Lakṣmī), to the full
moon, to Rati (Cupid's consort), to the splendour of the full moon, to a lotus stalk, to a full-moon night, to a river, to [296] a lotus pool, again to a lotus stalk, and finally to the crescent of the moon (B. 3. 68. 10-17). That, however, is a minor matter.

The really perplexing part of the soliloquy is the way in which Sudeva refers to Nala in the following stanza (B. 3. 68. 20):

\[ \text{duśkaraiṁ kurute 'tyartham hino yad anayā Nalaḥ} | \\
\text{dhārayaty ātmano dehaṁ na śokenāvasidati |} \]

"Extremely difficult is the trial of Nala who, deprived of her (scil. Damayantī), supports his body and does not pine away in sorrow!"

This can be properly said by a person who knows that Nala is heroically bearing the cruel blow of fate which had temporarily separated him from his beloved, and above all that Nala is alive. But for all Sudeva knew, Nala might have been dead. Here is a slight incongruity to start with. It might be argued that as it was not definitely known that Nala was dead, Sudeva was to a certain extent justified in assuming that Nala was alive, and so this outburst was after all not so very incongruous. But, even if he were alive, how was Sudeva to know whether Nala wanted to recover Damayantī; in fact, to know at all what feelings Nala entertained then about Damayantī: they might conceivably have been even hostile, for all Sudeva could say. Such minute analysis of hidden motives and distant possibilities might, however, be regarded as captious criticism, when considering such an old-world love poem as this.

The disturbing thought however recurs when a few lines later we read (B. 3. 68. 23 ab):

\[ \text{asyā nūnam punarābhāṁ Naiśadhaṁ pritīṁ esyatī |} \\
\text{"Through her recovery Nala will become happy indeed",} \]

words which again definitely presuppose that Nala is alive and anxious to rediscover his lost Damayantī, neither of which facts could have been known to Sudeva, and whose assumption by him is quite gratuitous and most puzzling to the reader. Inappropriate to a certain extent are in the same context the adjectives aprameyasya and vīryasattvāyataḥ (stanza 25) applied to Nala. Was it not through Nala's own insane infatuation for dice that Damayantī was reduced to this condition, and all that great disaster was brought upon the two families? A discordant note is likewise struck by the words Naiśadho 'ṛhati Vaidarbhīṁ (stanza 24), which under these circumstances seem peculiarly inappropriate. One rather feels at this stage that poor Damayantī had definitely made the wrong choice at the svayaṁvara: she would have been much happier had she chosen, in preference to the profligate Nala, one of the four gods who were wooing her.

Another very curious thing we notice about this passage is that while Sudeva waxes eloquent about Nala and his sufferings, he has no thought at
the moment for king Bhīma, who is Sudeva's patron and who has dispatched him on this errand. Sudeva has not a word to say in this long soliloquy as to how glad the fond parents would be on seeing their beloved Damayantī and how happy Damayantī would be on being reunited to her kinsfolk. From [297] his present words we could never guess that he had been sent by king Bhīma or that he had any connection with the House of Vidarbha.

Our first thought is that the whole passage is one of those modern interpolations which have unintentionally disfigured many a fine old poem. The manuscripts do not however countenance such an idea. The passage is documented uniformly by all manuscripts alike. It is therefore not in any case a recent interpolation. Moreover the idea itself of the soliloquy is not by any means inherently inappropriate; only the precise wording and some of the sentiments expressed seem a little incongruous.

We are therefore led to conclude that the poet's own knowledge of the real state of things, that Nala was not dead and that, repenting his hasty abandonment of Damayantī, he was then making reproaches to himself and was in fact longing to meet his lost Damayantī, had betrayed the poet into putting those words in the mouth of Sudeva, anticipating what was actually going to happen: a mistake common in the works of careless and inexperienced writers.

That this also is not the correct explanation of the anomaly follows, however, from the fact that almost all the lines forming this soliloquy of Sudeva recur almost verbatim in the long soliloquy of Hanumat in the Sundarakāṇḍa (adhy. 18 ff., ed. Gorresio) of the Rāmāyaṇa at the time when he first sees Sītā in the Aśoka grove of Rāvana's Lāṅkā,—a soliloquy which, as will be made clear, is the source of the passage under discussion from the Nala episode.

The two situations, it will be recalled, have a superficial similarity. The heroine is lost, and messengers have been sent, by persons interested in her recovery, to find out her whereabouts. One of these messengers, more fortunate than the rest, suddenly and unexpectedly lights upon her, whereupon he just stands gazing at her and giving vent to his mixed feelings of joy and sorrow in the form of a soliloquy.

The one important difference between the two situations—a difference obviously overlooked by the adapter—is that in one case—the Rāmāyaṇa—the messenger, Hanumat, has been sent by Rāma himself, and the messenger therefore knows exactly the state of the mind of the husband of the missing princess; whereas in the other case, the Nala episode, the messenger, sent by king Bhīma, has not only no knowledge of Nala's feelings towards Damayantī, but he does not even know whether Nala, who is missing, is alive or dead. And that makes a deal of difference. The words of the Rāmāyaṇa soliloquy are wholly appropriate in the mouth of the Monkey Chieftain;
but the same words, in spite of a few necessary verbal alterations made by the adapter, prove on close scrutiny, as shown above, just a trifle incongruous in the soliloquy of Sudeva.

The extent of the similarity between the two passages will be clear from the following table in which the related lines are given in parallel columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahābhārata (Bom. ed.) 3. 68. 8 ff. [Emended]</th>
<th>Rāmāyaṇa (ed. Gorresio) Sundarakanda2 (Adhy. 18, 19, 21, 29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 mandapakshyāyamānena rūpenāpratimena tām</td>
<td>18 4 mandana prakhyāyamānena rūpenāpratimena tām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pinaddhām dhūmajālena prabhām iva vibhāvasoḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 tāṁ samīkṣya viśālākṣīṁ adhikāṁ malināṁ kṛśāṁ</td>
<td>18 22 tāṁ samīkṣya viśālākṣīṁ adhikāṁ malināṁ kṛśāṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tarkayāmāsa Bhainīti kāraṇair upapādayan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 yatheyam me pura dṛṣṭā tathārūpeyam aṅgaṇa</td>
<td>18 23cd yathā purā vai dṛṣṭā me tathārūpeyam aṅgaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kṛtārtho 'smy adya dṛṣṭyemāṁ lokakāntāṁ iva Śriyam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 pūrṇacandrānanāṁ śyāmāṁ cāruvṛttapayodharāṁ</td>
<td>18 24 pūrṇacandrānanāṁ śyāmā cāruvṛttapayodharā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kurvantīṁ prabhayā devīṁ sarvā vitimirā disāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 cārupādmapalāśākṣīṁ</td>
<td>18 26 padmapattraviśālākṣīṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manmathasya Rātīṁ iva</td>
<td>Manmathasya Rātīṁ iva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>istāṁ sarvasya jagataḥ pūrṇacandraprabhām iva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>istāṁ sarvasya jagataḥ pūrṇacandranibhām iva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The readings adopted here are readings of the “Vulgate,” emended in the light of collations prepared for the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata and available at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

2 The text given here is that of Gorresio. The Bombay editions have a slightly discrepant version, but most of the stanzas cited here do occur in the Bombay editions also which were compared by me.
13 Vidarbhasarasas tasmād
daivadoṣaḥ ivodhṛtām |
malapāṇkānuśāśṭhāpāṇi
mṛṇālim iva tāṁ bhrśam ||

14 paurnamāsīṃ iva niśāṁ
Rāhugraṣṭaniśākarāṁ |
patiśokākulaṁ dināṁ
śūkasrotāṁ nadīm iva ||

[299] 15 vidhvastapāṃpakamaṇāṁ
vitrāṣiṭavihaṅgamāṁ |
hasthastaparikliṣṭāṁ
vyākulāṁ iva padmināṁ ||

16 sukumārāṁ sujātāṅgāṁ
ratnagarbhaṁghoṣitāṁ |
dahyamānāṁ ivosphena
mṛṇālim aciroddhṛtāṁ ||

18 kāṃabhogaśī prīyair hīnāṁ
hīnāṁ bandhujanena ca |
dehāṁ dhārayatiṁ dināṁ
bhartrdarśanakāṅkṣayā
g

19 bhartā nāma paramāṁ nārāyāṁ
bhūṣaṇāṁ bhūṣaṇāṁ vīnā |
esā virāhitā tena
śobhanāpi na śobhate ||

20 duṣkaraṁ kurute tyarthaṁ
hīna yad anayā Nalāḥ |
dhārayaty ātmano dehaṁ
na sokenavasīdāti ||

21 imām asitakeśāntāṁ
ṣatapatṛayatesaṇāṇāṁ |
sukhārāṁ duḥkhitaṁ dṛṣṭvā
mamāpi vyathate manaḥ ||

22 kādā nu khalu duḥkhāsya
pāram yāṣyati vai subhā |
bhartūḥ samāgamaṁ eśāḥvi
Rohīṇī śasāno yathā ||

19 15cd Ikṣyākusarasas tasmād
Rāvanenodhṛtā balāt |
18 16cd malapāṇkadharaṁ dināṁ
māṇḍanāṛḥām anamāṇītām |

21 14ab paurnamāsīṃ iva niśāṁ
Rāhugraṣṭaniśākarāṁ |
21 15cd patiśokākulaṁ dināṁ
śūkasrotonadīm iva |

21 14cd vidhvastapattakamaṇāṁ
vitrāṣiṭavihaṅgamāṁ |
21 15ab hasthastaparikliṣṭāṁ
ākulāṁ padmināṁ iva ||

21 16cd sukumārāṁ sujātāṅgāṁ
ratnagarbhaghoṣitāṁ |
21 17ab tapyamānāṁ ivosphena
mṛṇālim aciroddhṛtāṁ ||

19 23cd kāṃbhogaviḥiṁeyāṁ
hīna bandhujanena ca |
19 24ab dhārayaty ātmano dehaṁ
tatSanāgamakāṅkṣayā ||

19 25cd bhartā nāma paramāṁ nārāyāṁ
bhūṣaṇāṁ bhūṣaṇāṁ vīnā |
19 26ab esā tasyānurāgena
śobhate 'py analarṇākṛtā ||

19 26cd duṣkaraṁ kurute Rāmo
hīna yad anayā vibhūḥ |
19 27ab dhārayaty ātmano dehaṁ
na sokenavasīdāti ||

19 27cd imām asitakeśāntāṁ
ṣatapatṛanibhānāṇāṁ |
19 28ab sukhārāṁ duḥkhitaṁ dṛṣṭvā
mamāpi vyathitam manaḥ ||

19 28cd kādā tu khalu duḥkhāsya
pāram yāṣyati Maithili |
19 29ab Rāghavasyaprameyāsya
Lakṣmaṇāsya ca jīvataḥ ||
The question which of the two passages is the original one, need not detain us long. It is a priori not very likely that Vālmīki who is credited with having composed an epic of the size and rank of the Rāmāyaṇa would need to borrow the idea or the phraseology of such a commonplace soliloquy from a poem like the Nalopakhyāna. The redactor of the Nala story is, therefore, clearly indicated as the poet who would be under obligation for his inspiration to the Ādi-kavi. This a priori conclusion is happily confirmed in the present instance by the fortuitous circumstance that the passage turns out to be somewhat of a misfit in our poem. The anomaly, as has been suggested above, can be explained only on the supposition that the Nalopakhyāna lines were borrowed en bloc from a slightly different context. The exact phrasing of the speech of the messenger was originally conceived for a somewhat different set of circumstances as pictured in the Rāmāyaṇa, in which the soliloquy fits perfectly. The borrowed plumes, as is very often the case, do not fit the new incumbent as well as the adapter had imagined or at least hoped. We have, therefore, here an indubitable proof of the direct borrowing of some Rāmāyaṇa material by one of the Mahābhārata poets.

The corresponding line has been omitted by Gorresio, but is correctly given in the Bombay (Nimaya Sagar Press) ed. (1888), 5, 30, 7ab (cf. p. 83), and in the Gujarati Printing Press ed. (1916), 5, 30, 7ab (cf. p. 1856), both editions reading "aham" for our "ayam." Both Tilaka and Govindarājīya mention (the pratīka) āśvāsayaṃ, showing that they knew the stanza.
not necessarily of course Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa, but one of the "Epigoni", the Vyāsāids, who carried on the good work commenced by Vyāsa.

*   *   *

The conclusion that the idea of this soliloquy of Sudeva in the Nālopākhyaṇa of the Mahābhārata must necessarily have been borrowed by one of the redactors of the Great Epic from the Rāmāyaṇa is perhaps not without some significance for an understanding of the general interrelation of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata to which we may here advert in passing.¹

The soliloquy discussed above is, as is well known, not by any means the only passage in which the Mahābhārata, shows contact with its sister epic,² and the question arises each time in the mind of the textual critic whether [301] the Mahābhārata or the Rāmāyaṇa is the source of the passage common to the two epics, a question to which, owing to the peculiar character and development of the Indian epics, no general answer is possible, though a partial solution of the problem may be attempted.

As remarked already, the Nala passage is not the only passage for which a parallel exists in the Rāmāyaṇa. In the Ādiparvan, for instance, in a cosmogonic chapter, I had occasion to draw attention to the fact that a passage of some 30 lines (1. 60, 54-67 of the Critical Edition) recurs almost verbatim in the Rāmāyaṇa (3. 14. 17-32, ed. Nirnaya Sagar Press). No definite evidence was available in that particular instance to show whether the passage was original to the Mahābhārata and had been borrowed by the Rāmāyaṇa, or vice versa, or again whether it had been borrowed by both epics independently from a third source. There seemed to me, however, to be some slight abruptness in the manner in which the stanzas were introduced in the Mahābhārata, which would suggest borrowing from the Rāmāyaṇa where the context is smoother; but, as the contents of the passage were of a very general nature, the third possibility mentioned above, namely that both epics owed the idea to a common (Purānic) source, could not be entirely eliminated.

The Sabhāparvan again supplies the well known kaccit chapter (adhy. 5), which has its counterpart in the Rāmāyaṇa.³ Here also the contents are of a very general character, having no direct bearing on the context of either the Rāmāyaṇa or the Mahābhārata, and the whole passage could well have been adapted by both epics independently from an older Niti tractate.

On the other hand, in the Āranyakaparvan, commonly known as the

¹ The question has been discussed at some length by Hopkins, The Great Epic of India, chapter 2 ("Interrelation of the two Epics") ; and by Winternitz, op. cit., pp. 501-517. See now also Eugeniusz Słuszkiewicz, Przyczynki do badan nad dziejami redakcji Rāmāyany. (Contributions à l'histoire des recensions du Rāmāyaṇa). Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej Nr 30. Kraków 1938.

² Several such passages are mentioned by Hopkins, op. cit., p. 73 ff.

Vanaparvan, the Rāmopākhyāna closely follows in general our Rāmāyaṇa, notwithstanding some isolated though striking discrepancies between the two accounts. There are also not wanting in the Rāmopākhyāna a few of our genuine Rāmāyaṇa stanzas which have been reproduced either verbatim or with but slight verbal alteration. To suggest that the Rāmopākhyāna was the original source which had inspired the revered Ādi-kavi to compose his Rāmāyaṇa would be again a reductio ad absurdum. The inevitable conclusion is that the diaksekasts of the Rāmopākhyāna knew and summarised an extensive older Rāma epic. The only doubt is whether the redactors of the Mahābhārata had utilized our version of the Rāmāyaṇa or some other older version unknown to us, to which the discrepant traits of our episode might be traced. After an intensive study and a close comparison of the two texts, the late Prof. Jacobi had definitely expressed himself in favour of the former alternative, namely, that the Rāmopākhyāna was a passably accurate summary of our Rāmāyaṇa, the discrepancies between the accounts being due either to casual misconception or else to natural and unavoidable failure of memory, of which instances are common in summaries and abstracts. [302] Jacobi's view, it seems to me, now finds further confirmation from the instance discussed above of direct borrowing from our Rāmāyaṇa text in a case where there is no intrinsic reason whatsoever for any reference to the Rāmāyaṇa at all. Evidence seems to be, therefore, gathering to show that our Rāmāyaṇa text—or the bulk of it, at any rate—was used as a "source" by the diaksekasts of the Mahābhārata. We can even go further and admit with Jacobi that the Rāmāyaṇa must already have been "generally familiar as an ancient work before the Mahābhārata reached its final form." On the other hand it will have to be admitted that the Mahābhārata makes in various ways a distinctly more archaic impression, a fact which has led some scholars to regard it as even a much older work than the other epic. We thus arrive at the apparent paradox that the Rāmāyaṇa is older than the Mahābhārata and the Mahābhārata is older than the Rāmāyaṇa. The only way we can resolve this paradox is by supposing—as has already been suggested by Winternitz and other writers on the subject—that the period of composition of the Rāmāyaṇa, which is a work with a distinctly more unitary character, falls within the much longer period of the evolution of the Mahābhārata, which latter compared to the other is a very complex and complicated work indeed.

1 Jacobi, Das Rāmāyaṇa, pp. 71 ff.
2 Jacobi, loc. cit. Contra Hopkins, op. cit., p. 63: "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".
3 Jacobi, op. cit., p. 71.
This statement of the relationship between the two epics will appear perfectly valid and even natural when we remember that the evolution of the Great Epic of India falls into two distinct and separate phases, namely, the Bhārata and the Mahābhārata, the caturviniśatisahasrī (1. 1. 61 Crit. Ed.) and the satasahasrī, a fact which is documented in very clear terms by the work itself—and there is no reason to disbelieve it—but which for some unintelligible reason is not taken very seriously by people. Assuming, however, this to be a fact—which it undoubtedly is—we may hazard what seems to me to be a perfectly legitimate conjecture that the Rāmāyana was composed in the interval which separated the Bhārata from the Mahābhārata. Thus, though we may admit that the Rāmāyana was, as Jacoby says, a well-known work before the Mahābhārata reached its ultimate form, we must reckon with the possibility that when the Rāmāyana itself (minus perhaps Books 1 and 7) was composed by the poet Vālmiki, the heroic poem Bhārata—the nucleus of our Mahābhārata—was already long in existence, current perhaps in some distant part of the country and in a different milieu. The Bhārata and the Rāmāyana may have been indeed more or less independent products, different in origin and treatment. But when the Bhṛgava redactors¹ set to work and converted the [303] Bhārata into the Mahābhārata, conceived on a much larger scale and with a much more ambitious programme, they had already the archetype of our Rāmāyana text before them and they made full use of it, absorbing in their own encyclopaedic work all that they possibly could, and they were perhaps also influenced by it in no small degree. In fact the very impetus to the conversion of the Bhārata and the compilation of the Mahābhārata may well have been given by the contact with the sister epic, which appears to have had a more elevated ethical standard, a more serious didactic purpose, a much higher idealistic view of life, and a wider popular appeal.

A priori, then, whenever our Mahābhārata shows close verbal agreement with the older books of the Rāmāyana, the presumption would be that we have to look upon the Rāmāyana as the source, assuming of course that the common element is not of such a character that it could have been borrowed by both epics independently from a third source. It is naturally not excluded that the Rāmāyana in its turn might have been influenced to a certain extent, at a still later epoch, in its further development, by the Mahābhārata, the new encyclopaedic Dharma Saṁhitā. In fact there is every indication that the interrelation between the two epics will reduce itself to a very complicated system of mutual actions and reactions, and it would be interesting to investigate the question more fully by collation of all possible parallelisms in ideas and expression between the two great epics of India.

¹ For the part played by the Bhṛgus in the development of the Mahābhārata, see my "Epic Studies (VI): The Bhṛgus and the Bhārata: A text-historical study," Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. 18, pp. 1-76 (particularly pp. 63-76).
EPIC QUESTIONS

No. 1: Does Indra assume the form of a swan?*

Mbh. (Crit. Ed.) 1. 57.21: hāsyarūpaṇa śaṅkarah.

This is the second pāda of a stanza occurring in the Ādiparvan which reads:

bhagavān pūjyate cātra hāsyarūpaṇa śaṅkarah |
svayam eva grhitena Vasōk prītyā mahātmanah ||

The Vulgate (1. 63. 21cd—22ab) differs from this only in so far that it reads the second quarter of the stanza as hamsarūpaṇa cēsvaṇah.

I have discussed the text-reading briefly in the Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (vol. 16, p. 100 f.) and justified it, in my reply to the late Professor WINTERNITZ, who in the course of a lengthy review¹ of the Ādiparvan had drawn attention to it, observing that as the reading was a lection difficilior and was “far from certain” it requires a “wavy line”. While admitting that the reading adopted in the Critical Edition was a lection difficilior I contended that since the documentary evidence in its favour was complete, therefore it need not be regarded as uncertain and there was no need of a “wavy line.” There would have been no reason for me now to revert to it but for two facts. On the one hand, it has been again, incidentally, criticized² by the late lamented Professor J. J. MEYER in his last publication, Trilogie altindischer Mächte u. Feste d. Vegetation³ (Zürich-Leipzig 1937),—a thick opus with extremely rich and varied contents, enlivened as usual by the author’s spicy wit and trenchant style. On the other hand, the reading receives some confirmation from a new and unexpected source.

MEYER argues for the reading of the Vulgate, characterizing the hāsyarūpṇa of the Critical Edition as an astonishing (“verwunderliche”) reading, and dismissing hāsyā- as the stupid mistake of some scribe (“ein dümmer Schreibfehler”).

The context in which the Mbh. stanza occurs is as follows. The righteous king Uparicara Vasu, having laid down his arms, retired to the forest and

---

* [Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute 1. 1-7.]
1 ABORI, vol. 15, pp. 159 ff; cf. p. 166.
2 Apparently, in complete ignorance of the previous discussion on the point in the Annals.
3 In the last part of the Trilogie, dealing with Indra. The reading in question is discussed on p. 5 ff. The references are to the pagination of this part of the Trilogie.
began practising penance. Indra and the [2] other gods, apprehending trouble, appeared before him, and, dissuading him from continuing his fierce austerities, induced him to return to his royal duties. He should rule the kingdom of Cedi as Indra's special friend. As a mark of his favour, Indra presented Vasu with various uncommon gifts, among them a crystalline aerial car (śphāṭikaḥ vimānam) and a garland of unfading lotuses (known as Indāramālā) which would protect the king against the missiles of his enemies and bring him wealth and victory (vaśeyantim). But he gave him also a bamboo staff (vaśavīṃ yaśtim), which would protect the good (śiśṭānam pratipālinim) and of course chastise the wicked. King Vasu brought home these precious gifts, according the wonderful staff full divine worship. That was how, we are told, the custom began of bringing from the forest, at a certain specified season, the staff, pole or tree, which was then set up, decorated with flowers, wreaths, flags, and with pilakas—whatever these latter are—and worshipped in due form. Here we find the stanza cited above, which says in effect that on this occasion Indra is worshipped, according to ancient rites, in a certain form assumed by the god of his own accord, out of love for Vasu Uparicara.

What was this form? Was it the form of a swan, as the Vulgate has it and as Meyer argues? That is the question.

Before we try to answer this question, it would be well to examine the MS. evidence a little more closely than Meyer appears to have done. The important MS. reading (ignoring that of Dn), as given in the Critical Edition, may be put in the following synoptical form:

\[ \begin{align*}
N \text{ (except } K_1) & : \text{hanśarūpena} \\
K_1 \text{ M } (= \text{Text}) & : \text{hāṣyarūpena}^1 \\
T. G. & : \text{Yaśṭīrūpena} & \text{Vāsavaḥ.}
\end{align*} \]

To this we may now add the important, newly discovered eight hundred years old Nepāli MS. of the Ādi (of which I have given full collations in ABORI, vol. 19, pp. 201 ff.), which agrees exactly with K1 M and therefore supports the critical text in an unambiguous manner.

Now let us see what Meyer has to say about these readings. According to him (p. 5), the original cēśvarah (found in the Vulgate) was misunderstood as referring to god Śiva; and, with a view to clarifying its meaning, it was deliberately changed by some scribe into śankarah, which latter is a well-known epithet of Śiva. And further hāṣyarūpena of the Critical

---

1 The actual reading of K1 is ōṃmyahāmyarūpena, which is clearly corrupt. The original s has been wrongly transcribed as m: a common mistake in Devanāgari transcripts of Sāradā MSS.; there is moreover dittography. The portion of the text under discussion is missing in the Sāradā codex.
Edition is, according to Meyer, as already [3] remarked, nothing more than the stupid blunder of some copyist for the original hamsaripena.

It may be made perfectly clear once for all that at least as far as the Mahābhārata text is concerned, the time when one could juggle with readings of MSS and lay down the law ex cathedra as to what is the original, what is an emendation and what is a scribe's mistake, is long past. It has now become a very much more serious and complicated matter, since the publication of the Critical Edition. To entitle anyone to a hearing, he must first of all show that he understands the critical apparatus and that he has studied the stemma codicum published by me on p. xxx of the Prolegomena of my edition of the Adiparvan.

Let us now go back to the MSS. There we find that sankarah (of the Critical Edition) is documented by the whole of the Northern Recension (including the new Nepāli MS.) and the Malayālam version, while cesvarah (championed by Meyer) is merely the reading of B₅ Dn! Now one would like to know why what Meyer considers the original reading (cesvarah) is found only in the most recent version represented by Nilakantha (end of the 17th century) with the sporadic support of one aberrant Bengali MS. (B₅), while what he considers a recent emendation (sankarah) is found in still older versions represented by MSS. scattered all over India from Kashmir to Malabar and from Gujarāt to Bengal, including the distant Nepal and excepting (in addition to the Vulgate) only the Tamil-Telugu zone, which latter has moreover a third and divergent reading (Vasavah). How is it that only the Nilakantha version has preserved the correct reading, while all other—much older—versions of North India together with the entire Malayālam version from the South contain what Meyer regards as a corruption? If sankarah of all N and M MSS. be a corrupt reading, as Meyer maintains, then Nilakantha could have got his cesvarah only by emendation, because I do not think that Nilakantha had access to any really old Mahābhārata MSS., containing very original readings. In thousands of cases his text shows what can be proved, with absolute certainty, to be secondary, inferior, or corrupt readings.

This inability on the part of Meyer to recognize in a patently simple case what is original and what is secondary shows that he had only very vague notions of the relationship between the different recensions, versions and manuscripts. And the ignorance of this relationship is absolutely fatal to any attempt to discriminate between original readings and emendations and scribes' mistakes. You can never find out an original reading by selecting one which suits your purpose, or satisfies your aesthetic sense, or appeals to you in some other way, and then looking about for reasons in support of your a priori choice; because almost always "good" reasons can be found for nearly every reading. It is not a question of dialectic, but [4] of documenta-
tion. And no amount of tendentious arguing will refute the objective evidence of MSS.

MSS. in this case clearly prove that the process of alteration has been the reverse of what is imagined by MEYER. Here, it is evident, cesvarah has not been changed into samkarah for the sake of clarity, as MEYER maintains; but, on the other hand, samkarah has been very clearly changed into cesvarah—already rendered suspect by the expletive ca—perhaps, to avoid confusion, samkarah being here not the nomen proprium of Siva, but an epithet meaning “beneficent, promoting welfare”.1

We can now turn to the other word of the pāda, the more difficult of the two: was it hāsyarūpena, hamsarūpena or yaṣṭirūpena? MEYER (p. 5) rightly rejects the last. It is correct as far as the sense goes; but it can hardly be the original reading. Were it so, no scribe would think of deliberately changing it into the obscure and almost unintelligible hāsyarūpena or hamsarūpena, both of which are, moreover, graphically unrelated with the former. From what we know of scribes’ emendations they tend generally to simplify the text, not to complicate it. If that be so, then either hāsyarūpena or hamsarūpena is the correct reading. Moreover yaṣṭirūpena is confined (like Vaśsavah), to T G, and does not receive any support even from M, which in innumerable cases has preserved—in contradiction to the T G version—the original reading, which has been emended or simplified in T G.2

There remains, therefore, only the two alternatives—hāsyarūpena given by K, M with the new Nepali MS, and hamsarūpena supported by N (except K). By the test of the agreement between independent versions,3 hāsyarūpena is clearly indicated as the original reading, since we have here an agreement between the independent versions of the extreme North and the extreme South, it being preferable to hamsarūpena, supported only by the central sub-recension. It is, moreover, undoubtedly the lectio difficilior (as was rightly observed by WINTERNITZ in the course of the review mentioned above), which accounts for its being surreptitiously ousted by the other. Both documentary and intrinsic probability are thus unquestionably in favour of the reading hāsyarūpena adopted in the Critical Edition.

What indeed are we to understand by the hamsarūpena of the Vulgate? The word hamsa has a number of meanings. MONIER WILLIAMS gives the following:

[5] a goose, gander, swan, flamingo (or other aquatic bird); the soul or spirit (sometimes ‘the Universal Soul or Supreme Spirit’, identified with Virāj, Narāyaṇa,

1 This point has been discussed by me in the paper mentioned above, ABORI, vol. 16, p. 101.
2 For this point also cf. ABORI, vol. 16, p. 101.
3 Cf. Prolegomena to Ādi, p. xcii.
Visu, Siva, Kama, and the Sun); one of the vital airs (Lex); a kind of ascetic; a man of supernatural qualities born under a particular constellation; an ambitious monarch (Lex); a horse (Naigh); an excellent draught-ox (according to some, 'a buffalo'); a mountain (Lex); a temple of a particular form; a kind of Mantra or mystical text; silver (Lex); envy, malice (Lex); name of two metres; (Music) a kind of measure; a mystical name of the letter h; a spiritual preceptor; name of a Deva-gandharva; of a Danava; of a son of Brahman; of a son of Vasudeva; of a son of Arjuna; of a son of Brahmadatta and general of Jarashandha; of various authors; of one of the Moon's horses; of a mountain.

Meyer (p. 6) has cited copious examples for the meanings of hanisa as the sun, the sun-god, as Visu and as Krsna (son of Dharma).

Unfortunately none of these fit in the case of Indra. Meyer (p. 6) found, however, a loophole in the meaning of hanisa as "sungod", and he surmised that perhaps the idea of this hanisarupa of Indra was to be dated back to the period when Indra was still recognized as a sun-god!

Nilakaṇṭha, who has commented on this stanza, had naturally some difficulty in explaining this hanisarupa. According to him Indra was: hanisarupa yukto hanisarupi | tasya buddhisthasya rupasya visesaevam svayam eva etc. To Nilakaṇṭha the hanisa-form is present only in the mind (buddhistha) of the worshipper. To Meyer, on the other hand, who was a realist with a vengeance, this explanation naturally did not satisfy. According to him (p. 4 f.), Indra, who is ordinarily invisible to mortals, takes on the concrete form of a swan, so as to be visible to Vasu and his subjects. Meyer further found (p. 5) the aquatic bird admirably suited to the mirth and gaiety and the sporting games that accompany the ceremonial.

Now which is the original and which is the emendation of these two readings? The characteristic of a scribe's emendation, as has been well said, is that it has all the appearance of improvement without its reality. Ours is a case in point. hanisarupena is a phrase under which you can think all sorts of things, all equally vague; but on closer inspection they prove to be uniformly inadequate.

For why should Indra appear before Vasu, or the kings who followed in his footsteps, in the form of a swan of all things in the world, whether in a concrete shape before the eyes of his worshippers or in an abstract form in their minds? He had assumed one form already: that of the yasti, the staff. Meyer (p. 101) has himself established—absolutely incontrovably—that the tree or the pole or the staff which figures so prominently in the Indramaha ceremony, was worshipped, if not by Vasu, at least by the people whom the writer of the Mahabharata account had in mind, as a symbol, [6] an image, or an incarnation of Indra himself, and not merely as a remembrance of a present from Indra to Vasu. As Meyer has pointed out, the Puranic writers, when speaking of the pole, refer to it unhesitatingly as "Indra" (or its synonyms "Sakra", etc.) in such expressions as Sakrasthana or Indra-
sthāna, Indra (or Śakra) pāda, Indraprayāṇa, Śakrothāpana, Śakrocchraya, Indraṁ utthāpayanti, Puranādāram utthāpya, uttiṣṭhate (or niṣīdai) vaiprapāṇīḥ, etc. Viṣṇu-dharmottara 2. 157. 3cd, and (agreeing with it) Agnipurāṇa 268, 6cd say in so many words that here is the god Indra himself, come to earth (bhūmiṣṭha).

And what a funny form to assume for the thousand-eyed god of gods, who had performed a hundred sacrifices, the wielder of the thunder-bolt, the destroyer of enemies' forts, the killer of Vala (or Bala) and Vṛtra, and the hero of a thousand other wonderful exploits: the form of a bamboo staff, with wreaths and bells, flags and buntings hanging from it and with those curiously shaped pitakas, some of which at any rate, according to Meyer (p. 96), were shaped like penies! It was indeed a laughable form (hāsyarūpa), calculated to provoke mirth and laughter. And this form, it must be borne in mind, was not given to Indra by any man; such a thing would have been very likely resented by him. The great god, wishing to do good (sāṅkṣara) to Vasu, had assumed it himself (svayam eva grahitena) out of his great love for the high soul Uparicara Vasu (Vasoh prityā mahātmanaḥ). The jocular form—krīḍāvatārārūpa, as Devabodha1 puts it—assumed by the mighty god on this occasion caused great merriment; and the feast was accordingly celebrated with much laughter and gaiety, as described in the Brhat-samhitā, the Viṣṇudharmottara and other texts (Meyer, p. 103 f.).

Thus both documentary probability and intrinsic considerations support the reading hāsyarūpeṇa Sāṅkṣaraḥ. This reading is therefore not so astonishing as Meyer seems to have thought; but it is astonishing that Meyer who had with praiseworthy diligence extracted and translated very lengthy passages from about a dozen original sources describing the ceremony in great detail, and not found anywhere (except in the Vulgate) the remotest reference to Indra's assuming the form of a swan or to his being represented as a swan, should have been so enamoured of the Vulgate reading, a reading which I am fully persuaded is nothing more than a scribe's emendation in the archetype of the Central group. But perhaps even Meyer's mistake is not so very astonishing: it is only an example of wishful thinking. Does it not connect Indra with the sun (hānsa) [7] or at least with the sun-god? And Meyer's whole thesis (pp. 134-144) is that Indra was originally just not a rain-god or a thunder-god, but a sun-god, the vernal sun, the "genius" of fertility and vegetation, in fact, a phallic deity!

The redactors of the T G version were, perhaps, after all wise, in dis-

1 Devabodha has the gloss: hāsa (sic) rūpeṇa krīḍāvatārārūpeṇa. Here hānṣa-rūpeṇa would certainly not fit, as it is not clear how hānṣarūpa would be krīḍāvatārārūpa.—Devabodha is the oldest known commentator of the Mahābhārata, and, in my opinion, the best,
carding a reading which has caused so much confusion and misunderstanding, and adopted the plain and simple *yaṣṭirūpena Vāsavaḥ*, which is a correct paraphrase of the original and has the additional advantage of being absolutely fool-proof.

I am convinced that this *hamsa*-incarnation of Indra is nothing more than a *canard*.

II. The Parvasamgraha Figures.*

The Parvasamgrahaparvan (Adi, adhy. 2) is a document of considerable importance. But its value has been unduly exaggerated by some scholars, a circumstance which has led to some highly misleading results and some curious conclusions. It is thus supposed that Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa had himself counted and noted down the number of ślokas he had composed, and that our Parvasamgraha was composed by Vyāsa himself. No doubt it is sometimes stated in the Parvasamgraha chapter that that sage had stated the extent of each of the eighteen parvans. But this attribution to Vyāsa is naturally only pūjärthe (*honoris causa*). It is nowhere suggested in the work itself that the first two adhyāyas of our epic were composed by Vyāsa. They could not be, because they are obviously only a report of the conversation which took place between the Sūta (Ugrārasvā, son of Lomaharṣana) and the sages assembled at Saunaka's twelve-year sacrifice in the Naimiṣa Forest. The erroneous supposition regarding the authorship of this adhyāya has led to the naïve attempt on the part of some scholars to produce a text—a so-called critical text—of the Mahābhārata containing the same number of adhyāyas and ślokas as that given in the Parvasamgraha. Such an attempt is already negatived by our manuscripts and testimonia, which contain many variants of the figures in the Parvasamgraha. Thus the figures for the Adiparvan itself vary, according to different sources, between 7984 (Kāsmīrī Version and the Critical Edition) and 9984 (Āndhra-Bhāratamu). That is sufficient to discourage any attempt at too close a reliance on the data of this adhyāya of the Adiparvan. It has been common experience that figures in ancient works, if at all complicated, seldom come out right, and the figures of the Parvasamgraha are probably no exception to this rule.

[550] The figures given in the Parvasamgraha could have been obtained

---

* [Silver Jubilee Number, *ABORI* 23. 549-58].

1 Cf. my Prolegomena to the Adiparvan, pp. xcvii ff.; "Epic studies (III)" *ABORI*, vol. 11, pp. 277 ff.

2 Cf. P. P. S. SASTRI in the Introduction to vol. 15 of his Mahābhārata (Southern Recension), p. xxii: "Vyāsa's description of his Mahābhārata that he composed it in 18 parvas of 2,000 chapters and 100,000 stanzas is not a fanciful account but an accurate statement. And I have tried to substantiate this in this edition of the Principal Text of the Southern Recension,"
in one of many different ways. The most probable suggestion has been that they were arrived at, not by actual counting of the stanzas, as we should ordinarily do now, but by computing the extent in some other way. Even now we speak of a story of 5000 words or a broadcast talk of 1500 words, and so on. The individual words are never counted in such computations; the figures are only approximations. The figures given in our Parvasaṁgraha chapter must be approximations of that type. They are not "ślokas" or stanzas as we ordinarily understand them; but are, properly speaking, what are technically known as, "granthas," a grantha being a unit of measurement of written matter equal to 32 aksaras.

Assuming this to be the case, the first difficulty is that the figures given in the lists appear not as round numbers, as we should expect them to be, but are apparently correct to the last digit; for instance, the extent is given not as 8000 ślokas, but as 7987. We actually come across such figures as these: 6698, 7998, 8909, 14525, where true approximations would be 6700, 8000, 8900, 14,500, and so on. The approximation seems to me to have been reached by some such process as this. First, an average was obtained by counting carefully all letters in a certain number of lines. This average was then multiplied by the number of lines in a page and the total number of complete pages. The number of "granthas" of the last page, which was rarely fully written out, seems to have been computed separately, and added to the previous total. The grand total of letters (aksaras) was then divided by 32 to give the number of "ślokas" or "granthas," fractions being omitted. That is how figures like those mentioned above must have been obtained. They are careful approximations, but approximations all the same. Moreover, as has been pointed out by me elsewhere, it would be impossible to count the exact number of stanzas in a composite text made up of ślokas, triṣṭubhs, "fancy metres" and prose passages, which we actually find in many of the parvans of the Mahābhārata, as for instance in the Ādi, Āraṇyaka and Anuśāsana.

The figures we find in the Parvasaṁgraha chapter are fairly old; we cannot say now exactly how old. They are certainly prior to 1000 A. D., when the Javanese Bhārata and the Āndhra Bhāratamu were composed; because both these works contain similar lists, which agree in many particulars with our list.

Here are the figures given in three different sources.

---

2 Prolegomena, p. xcix.
### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhyāyas</th>
<th>Parvan</th>
<th>Ślokas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C B A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 818 218</td>
<td>I. ĀDI</td>
<td>7984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 72 72</td>
<td>II. SABHA</td>
<td>2511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269 272 269</td>
<td>III. ĀRANYAKA</td>
<td>11,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 67 67</td>
<td>IV. VIRĀṬA</td>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186 186 186</td>
<td>V. UDYOGA</td>
<td>6698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 117 117</td>
<td>VI. BHIṢMA</td>
<td>5884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 170 170</td>
<td>VII. DRONA</td>
<td>8909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 69 69</td>
<td>VIII. KARNA</td>
<td>4900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 121 59</td>
<td>IX. ŚALYA</td>
<td>3220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 18 18</td>
<td>X. SAAUTIKA</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 70 27</td>
<td>XI. STRI</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339 333 339</td>
<td>XII. ŚANTI</td>
<td>14,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 146</td>
<td>XIII. ANUSĀSAŅA</td>
<td>6700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 133 133</td>
<td>XIV. ĀSVAMEDHIKA</td>
<td>3320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 92 42</td>
<td>XV. ĀŚRAMAVĀSIKA</td>
<td>1506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 8 8</td>
<td>XVI. MAUSALA</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>XVII. MAHĀPRASTHĀNIKA</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>XVIII. SVARGAROḤAṆA</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total     | 82,136 | 95,586 |

(The average number of "ślokas" per adhyāya is about 45.)
The above is a conspectus of the figures for the adhyāyas and ślokas of the eighteen parvans of the Mahābhārata according to (1) the Critical Edition, (2) the Javanese Version,1 and (3) the Southern Recension by Professor P. P. S. SASTRI.

Observations on the Figures of the Above Table.

I. Adī: The first figure (8) of the Javanese number for the adhyāyas of the Adī (818) is obviously wrong; the other digits agree in the three texts. So we may take as correct the figures 218,2 which is given us by the Critical Edition and Southern Recension, the Vulgate reading (227) being certainly a mistake.—The number of ślokas is no doubt a problem. I have adopted the figures given by theŚāradā MS. and one "K" MS. (K₁),3 which is confirmed by the Rajaguru MS. from Nepal,4 and I am still inclined to suppose that that was the original figure. The Javanese and Southern figures 8884 and 9884 respectively differ by 1000 exactly, the Javanese figure being the same as that of the Mid-Indian group (Bengali-Devānāgari).

II. Sabhā: The numbers are here absolutely certain. As regards the adhyāyas, there is perfect agreement between the three sources, all of them giving 72, which is also the exact number of adhyāyas of our Critical Edition of the Sabhā now passing through the press. The Vulgate figure (78) for the śloka is therefore unquestionably wrong.—The śloka number is also certainly 2511, as the Southern Recension, in which the first figure has been increased to 4, is demonstrably inflated to make it conform with the interpolated text, and the additional stanzas of the Southern Recension do approximately amount to 2000. The correct figures for Sabhā are therefore 72 and 2511.

III. Aranyakā (commonly known as Vana): As regards the adhyāyas, the Javanese records 272 against the concordant figure 269 of all Indian versions. The latter may be taken to be the right figure, the discrepancy of the Javanese, which is negligible, remaining unexplained.—The same is true of the figure for the ślokas, the concordant figure (11,664) of all Indian versions being the original Parvasarāngraḥa figure.

IV. Virāja: The Javanese figure for the adhyāyas is unfortunately missing. But as our Critical Edition of the Virātāparva has successfully

---

1 The figures for the Javanese Version have been taken from JUYNBOLL’S Adīparva, Oudjavaansch prosageschrifti, Gravenhage, 1906. pp. 5-6. The passage is reproduced in a note by H. Kern, “Inhoudsopgave van’t Mahābhārata in ‘T Kawi” in Bijdragen, ser III, Vol. IV, pp. 92-95, Kern has given in this paper a comparative table of the Indian and the Javanese figures.
2 Kern, op. cit., p. 95 also remarks that the Javanese figure 818 is incorrect, and that it should be 218.
3 See the Critical Edition of the Adīparvan, p. 878.
identified the adhyāyas on the basis of the colophons given in MSS., there is no reason to doubt that the correct figure is 67, as given by the Sanskrit Parvasaṅgraha.—The three sources give three different figures for the ślokas. The Southern Recension is obviously inflated, and may therefore be ignored, its figure having been revised—as in Sabhā—to accord with its interpolated text. It is likely that the Javanese translator has confused the Sanskrit words for 50 and 15 (paṇcāśat and paṇcadaśa). The first two digits of the figures given in the Critical Edition and the Javanese Version do agree. We may therefore reasonably assume the original figure to be 2050, which is given by the Critical Edition of the Parvasaṅgraha, though the two last digits naturally remain somewhat uncertain.¹

V. Udyoga: The three sources agreeing exactly as regards the number of adhyāyas of the Udyoga, the figure 186 may be taken as certain.—The figures for the ślokas, on the other hand, are in a chaotic condition, the three texts giving three different figures 6698, 6928, 7998; which agree only in respect of the last digit! The figures for the ślokas remain, therefore, doubtful.

VI. Bhāṣma: The number of adhyāyas in the Bhāṣma is given by the Critical Edition and the Javanese Version as 117, but the Southern Recension gives their number as 118. In any case, the difference is not very significant, and the number may be assumed to be 117 or 118—There is no such doubt regarding the number of ślokas, which is unanimously given as 5884.

VII. Droṇa: There is likewise considerable agreement as regards the adhyāyas and ślokas of the Droṇa. The adhyāya number [554] is 170.—As regards the number of ślokas, the first two digits (89) are certain. And since both the Critical Edition and the Southern Recension agree on the figure 8909, that is indicated as the correct figure. The probability in favour of this figure is strengthened owing to the circumstance that the last two figures of the Javanese Version (84) are in all probability due to contamination with the previous śloka-figure 5884, which ends in 84. We may therefore adopt with confidence the concordant figure of the Indian versions 8909, the difference between the Javanese and the Indian numbers being 75; the error is in any event not more than 1 per cent.

VIII. Kaṃśa: The figures for Kaṃśa are exactly of the same type. The three sources agree in giving 69 as the number of adhyāyas.—The Javanese MSS. give the number of ślokas as 970, which is obviously wrong, it being almost certain that the word for 4000 has been omitted by the scribe by oversight;² so we get the original Javanese figure as [4]970. We may

¹ See Raghu Vira, Virūṭaparvan, Introduction, p. xxiv; and Sukthankar “Epic studies (III),” ABORI vol. 11, pp. 277 ff.
² Kern, loc. cit., also recognizes that the first figure has been omitted by mistake in the Javanese text.
tentatively adopt the figure 4900, on the concordant evidence of Indian versions. The difference between the Indian and Javanese figures being only 70, the discrepancy is only about 1.4 per cent.

IX. Salya: In this parvan there is fortunately no doubt about the sloka number, which is unanimously given as 3220.—And again, fortunately, as regards the adhyāya number, the discrepancy between the Indian (59) and Javanese (121) figures is so great that the Javanese may be ruled out as hopelessly corrupt. There is another test we may apply, the Javanese figure1 (121) for adhyāyas gives the average of about 27 slokas to an adhyāya, while the Indian average is 54. Now the total number of adhyāyas in the Mahābhārata is supposed to be 2000, and the number of stanzas 100,000 (sahasraioi), which gives the average of slokas to an adhyāya as 50 and that is much nearer the average for the Indian figure for the adhyāya number of the Salyaparvan than the Javanese figure.

X. Sauptika: The figures for the Sauptika call for no remarks. They are uniformly given in all the three sources as 18 and 870 respectively.

[555] XI. Strī: The sources do not agree as regards the number of adhyāyas, but the Javanese figure (70) which is nearly two and half times as large as the Indian (27) is extremely improbable.2 We may therefore tentatively take the concordant Indian figure (27) as correct.—The difference between the Javanese and Indian figures for the slokas is only five. It would seem that the last digit was lost in the Javanese tradition; if that be so, the correct number is 775, as given unanimously by the Indian MSS.

XII. Sānti: The sloka figure for Sānti (14,525) is given unanimously by all the three of our sources, which is a fortunate coincidence and also a remarkable proof of the reliability of our tradition. The Vulgate figure (14,725) for the slokas is positively wrong.—There is a difference of only six between the Javanese and Indian figures for adhyāyas; the Indian tradition giving the figure as 339, the Javanese as 333. The agreement between the different Indian versions is a weighty point in favour of 339, which we may tentatively assume to be the correct figure.

XIII. Anuśāsana: The evidence of the Javanese Version is unfortunately missing, the version ignoring this parvan altogether, for some reason which it is hard to guess. It cannot be argued that it is included in the Sānti, since there is no appreciable increase in the number of adhyāyas or

1 Kern, loc. cit., likewise considers the Javanese figure (121) as very suspicious.
2 See the Critical Edition of the Adiparvan, additional passage No. 486*, given on page 241.
3 As in the case of the Salyaparvan, Kern (loc. cit.) regards the Javanese figure is very doubtful,
ślokas of the Javanese Version of the Śānti, as there would surely have been, had the two parvans been amalgamated as is done sometimes. There being also no agreement between the various Indian versions, the figures for both adhyāyas and ślokas of the Anuśāsana remain uncertain.

XIV. Āśvamedhika: The number of adhyāyas is unanimously given as 133, which may therefore be accepted as the correct figure.—There is a discrepancy as regards the number of ślokas: the Critical Edition gives the figure as 3320, while the Javanese and the [556] Southern Recension agree in giving the figure as 4420, this being one of the rare instances in which the Javanese and the Southern Recension agree against the Northern Recension. The Southern Recension contains here an additional sub-parvan, comprising 23 adhyāyas and about 1700 ślokas, known as the Vaiṣṇavadharmaparvan. There is no mention of any such parvan in the list of 100 pavans, given in the Pañcavāṁśagraha, though some Southern MSS. do insert, in another place, a line which mentions the Vaiṣṇavadharmaparvan among the contents of the Āśvamedhika. In this Section, Yudhīṣṭhira is instructed by Śrī-Kṛṣṇa in the Dharma of the Vaiṣṇavas, which seems hardly necessary, after the instruction he had received from Bhūṣma in more than 21,000 stanzas on general Dharma (Śānti and Anuśāsana). The higher Southern number must therefore be regarded as due to this inflation, and can in any case not be accepted. Nevertheless the peculiar agreement between the Javanese and the Southern is a disturbing factor. The number therefore may be regarded as doubtful.

XV. Āṣramavāsika: There is not much doubt about the adhyāyas of this parvan, though the Javanese Version has a high figure (92); against the unanimous Indian figure 42, which may be assumed to be the correct figure.₁ —As regards the number of ślokas, there is a slight discrepancy of 2 between the Critical Edition and the Javanese Version, the former being 1506, the latter 1508. But the last digit in this number is not in doubt; it must be six. The Southern Recension gives the figure 1906, which must be regarded as extremely doubtful, since even Professor SASTRI, who has edited the Southern Recension, could not find more than 1108½ stanzas for this parvan.² There has been clearly a mistake in the counting of the stanzas of this parvan.

1 It is perhaps worth noticing that so late a commentator as Vādirāja (cf. P. K. Gooe, ABORI, vol. 17, pp. 203-210, who assigns him to the seventeenth century), treats the Śānti and Anuśāsana as one parvan and has colophons like:

४१ श्रीभगवाने शतसदिक्यां शतसहित्यां वैमालिन्यां शास्तिप्रवाणि आरोग्यासनिके भाषास्वाभिर्मण

नाम पृथ्विदिविश्वविश्वास्याम्: ॥ तत्र शास्तिरां समानः ॥

—which is quoted by Professor P. P. S. SASTRI in the Introduction to vol. 17, (Anuśāsana Parvan, part 2) p. xxiv.

2 Kern (loc. cit.) likewise suggests reading 42 for 92 of the Javanese.

3 It is interesting to note, as pointed out by Professor SASTRI, Nannaya's Andhra-Bhāratam gives 1106 as the figure of ślokas in the Āṣramavāsika parvan. That probably is due to a fresh count.
van, and the Southern figure being palpably incorrect, we may utilize the approximate agreement between the Critical Edition and the Javanese Version and adopt 1506 as the probable original Parvasamgraha figure for the Āśramavāsīka.

XVI. Mausala: All sources agree in giving the number of adhyāyas as 8 and the number of ślokas as 300, which may accordingly be taken as the correct figures. The text also seems to contain actually 300 stanzas. Consequently the vulgate reading 320, in the Parvasamgraha chapter, is clearly faulty and has been properly rejected.

XVII. Mahāprasthānīka: The Javanese figure for the number of adhyāyas is missing; but the Indian sources, including the MSS., uniformly divide this short parvan into three adhyāyas; and the unanimous Indian reading cannot be called into question.—The number of ślokas may also be regarded as correctly given in the Critical Edition, which is supported by the Southern Recension, though the Javanese Version adds, erroneously, three to the number, giving the figure as 123. I surmise that this addition of three to the śloka number is a wrong transposition from the adhyāya number, which is missing in the Javanese Version. The Vulgate figure (320) for the ślokas is absurd and unquestionably incorrect.

XVIII. Svargarohaṇa: As in the previous case the adhyāya number is lost in the Javanese Version; but there cannot be any doubt that the correct figure is 5, which is given by all editions and MSS. of the Mahābhārata. —The śloka number is unanimously given, by our three sources, as 200, which is a sufficiently correct approximation of the actual extent of this last parvan of the Great Epic; and the Vulgate figure (209) may be unhesitatingly rejected.

The table on the following page gives the figures for the adhyāyas and ślokas, book by book, arrived at by a collation of the various extant versions of the Parvasamgraha chapter of the Ādiparvan.
Table giving the authentic figures for the Adhyāyas and Ślokas of the eighteen Parvans of the Mahābhārata, based upon a collation of the MSS. of the Sanskrit Parvasamgrahaparvan and of the Javanese Version (ca. 1000 A.D.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parvan</th>
<th>Adhyāya</th>
<th>Śloka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. ĀDI</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. SABHĀ</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. ARANṆYAKA</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>11,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. VIRAṬA</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. UDYOGA</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. BHIŚMA</td>
<td>117 (or 118)</td>
<td>5884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. DRONĀ</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>8909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. KARṆA</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. SALYA</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. SAUPTIKA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. STRI</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. SANTI</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>14,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. ANUŚĀSANĀ</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. ĀŚVAMEDHIKĀ</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. ĀŚRAMAVĀSIKĀ</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. MAUSALA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. MAHĀPRASTHĀNIKĀ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII. SVARGAROḤAṆA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A STATEMENT REGARDING THE PROGRESS OF THE CRITICAL EDITION OF THE MAHĀBHĀRATA

Read by the General Editor, Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, on the occasion of the publication of the Udyogaparvan and the presentation of it to the Rajasaheb of Aundh, on 6th July, 1940

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

On this happy and auspicious day, which is the twenty-third anniversary of the foundation of this Institute, I am glad to announce the publication of the edition of the Udyogaparvan by Professor Dr. S. K. De of the Dacca University, which is volume six of our Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata. This is, as you are no doubt aware, the third parvan to be completed by us. The Adiparvan, edited by myself, was completed in 1933. It was followed three years later by the Virāṭaparvan edited by Professor Dr. Raghu Vira of the Sanatan Dharma College, Lahore. And now we have the Udyogaparvan, which, I hope, will testify to our industry and perseverance.

The amount of matter published during the last 21 years, since the commencement of the work in 1919, may appear to you small. And it is a fact that some editions of the Mahābhārata which were begun long after we had started have already been long completed. But you must not confuse those editions with ours. Those other editions implied only work for compositors and proof-readers. Their procedure, which is very simple, is this. Older editions of the Mahābhārata are put in the hands of compositors, who proceed to manufacture a new edition, faithfully copying, in every detail, all the old mistakes and adding some of their own making, in the bargain.

When this Institute undertook to bring out a Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata, it was not meant to bring out a new edition in this time-honoured way, which has made the term “Indian edition” a synonym of a “bad edition.” In Indian editions of the past, the paper was bad, the type was bad, the ink was bad, and the text also was generally bad. I do not wish to say that we have produced an ideal edition of the Mahābhārata, but I do maintain that we have taken a distinct step forward in that direction, and that our work has marked an appreciable advance in the technique of the editing of Sanskrit texts. And when I say that I am giving you not my own opinion but the considered opinion of savants, published repeatedly in the course of lengthy and elaborate reviews of our edition, in high-class and authoritative Journals throughout the world. The edition has been before the world of scholars for nearly fifteen years, and there has been a steady
chorus of enthusiastic approbation greeting the appearance of every successive fascicule, whose publication is eagerly awaited by Indologists in all parts of the world.

When we say we are bringing out an edition of the Mahābhārata, we are really considerably underrating our own work. It is not merely a text-edition that we are preparing. What we have undertaken is a research into the Mahābhārata manuscript tradition, which, you will realize, is a very different thing and which—let me emphasize—has now been undertaken for the first time in the long history of our Great Epic.

Let us glance for a moment at the history of the project. Since 1897 there has been a steady and persistent demand for a critical edition of the Mahābhārata, which was wanted, as the late Professor Winternitz put it, "as the only sound basis for all Mahābhārata studies, nay, for all studies connected with the epic literature of India." In 1904, as a result of the agitation which was kept up in Europe by certain Indologists, the International Association of the Academies of Europe and America undertook the work. And for that purpose, even some money was collected by the Sanskritists in England, through the Secretary of State for India, from certain sources in India, and the amount was placed in the hands of Trustees in England, which is still lying there, in the name of the Trustees, in some English bank. The last great European War put an end to this project of a European edition of the Mahābhārata, which ended as a matter of fact without achieving anything beyond some preliminary work. After that war, this Institute undertook the work, making a fresh start. The difficulty was of course the money. What really made it possible for the Institute to launch, some twenty years ago, this gigantic and ambitious scheme was the promise made by Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, Raja Saheb of Aundh,—our worthy guest of this evening—to contribute a lakh of rupees to the Mahābhārata Publication Fund. Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar, the then senior-most Acārya of Indology in Western India, was naturally consulted. He is reported to have said that the project was certainly worth undertaking, but it would cost ten lakhs of rupees; and if was no use undertaking the work unless there were prospects of raising that sum. When he was assured that that amount would be found, he agreed to sponsor the undertaking, and as a matter of fact himself inaugurated it here, in this hall, in April 1919, by writing down the mantra of the Great Epic, nārāyaṇam namaskṛtya etc. The Institute, it may be observed, undertook then to prepare an edition in which all the different versions of the epic have been turned to account and which will meet with the highest requirements of critical scholarship.

With that our work has been chalked out for us. It divides itself naturally into five stages: (1) search for old and reliable MSS.; (2) collation of the MSS.; (3) constitution of the text with the help of the collations;
(4) preparation of the critical apparatus, to be printed along with the constituted text; and, finally, (5) seeing the matter through the press.

From the published volumes you will see that on every page from a half to two-thirds of the space is taken up by the critical notes, which give a very detailed account of the MSS. examined and collated and which form the bulk of our evidence for the text. It is this which necessitates laborious work and demands endless patience; and its completion for the parvans so far published is, I consider, the abiding achievement of our edition. Our edition thus gives you not only a text, a critical text, but also a digest of the MSS. tradition of the Mahābhārata extending over nearly 2000 years. I may observe that in the case of every text, when the manuscript tradition fluctuates to any extent, it is only a careful study of the collations of the MSS., and nothing else, that can give you an authentic text; just as when there is a dispute between two or more litigants an impartial judge trying the case would decide it only after examining the depositions and hearing the evidence of all the parties and their witnesses.

I am glad to say that the method which has been worked out by the Institute for dealing with the Mahābhārata textual problem has commended itself to all scholars who are competent to pass an opinion on the merits of the question. Professor Walter Ruben, of the University of Ankara, who has made a close study of Rāmāyaṇa MSS., has declared that the same method may be applied, mutatis mutandis, to the Rāmāyaṇa also. Appreciative reviews of our edition, as I remarked already, have been published during the last thirteen years not only in Indian, but also in English, French, German, Italian, Czecho-Slovakian, Polish and American Journals. The scheme has been commended by the International Oriental Congress, by the All-India Oriental Conference and by many of the learned bodies specializing in Oriental studies. There have been heard a few dissentient voices, but they are mostly of persons who do not know the ABC of textual criticism and who have never even seen a Mahābhārata MS. in their whole life. Such uninformed criticism of self-styled scholars we may safely ignore.

But we need not rest on the judgment of other scholars alone, for a justification of our method. The correctness of the method adopted by us has been vindicated now by independent and objective evidence. The now famous Rajaguru MS., discovered in Nepal by the Rajaguru Pandit Hemaraj, which is nearly 800 years old and is therefore the oldest extant MS. of the Adiparvan, confirms not only many of the disputed readings of the critical text but justifies even some of the emendations made by me, which is—it will be admitted—unimpeachable evidence of the correctness of the method we have been following.

We have completed now in this fashion, as I said, three whole books of the Mahābhārata: the Adiparvan, the Virataparvan and the Udyogaparvan.
As for the other parvans, you are no doubt aware that the Sabhāparvan has been assigned to Professor Frankling Edgerton of Yale University, who came over to Poona in 1938 in order to examine for himself the MSS. of the Sabhā which had been collated by the Institute for him, and also to give the finishing touches to his edition in consultation with me. His work has been lying with him ready for publication and would have been sent to the press long ago, but for this war, which is hampering inter-communication and delaying the publication of the parvan.

The next parvan we took in hand is the Vanaparvan (or rather the Aranyakaparvan, to give it its correct name), which is being edited by myself. It is passing through the press as rapidly as we can take it through. It will comprise about 1100 pages of our edition, of which nearly 700 pages have already been printed off. I hope to finish it—if nothing untoward happens to hinder its progress—by the end of this year.

As regards the Bhīṣmaparvan, which has been assigned to Rao Bahadur Dr. Belvālkar, I am glad to report that considerable advance has been made by the editor in the preparation of the press-copy. Not only has Dr. Belvālkar completed his draft of the constituted text, but the compilation of the critical notes has been taken in hand and is proceeding apace.

When the Bhīṣmaparvan is completed, which we hope to do in a little over a year from now, we shall have completed nearly 45 per cent. of this gigantic work. You will realize the amount of work that will be accomplished when I tell you that we shall have critically dealt with a little under 40,000 slokas and printed about 4500 pages of our edition.

The collation work has made considerable advance and is a long way ahead of the publication. We possess now nearly complete collations of all the parvans up to the Anuśāsana, which means that we have nearly finished that part of our task; because there remains now only the short tail, consisting of some easy and unimportant parvans, which I am confident, will offer no great difficulties either to the collator or to the editor.

I have given you, gentlemen, a very brief outline of the main work done under the name of the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata. Our work has, moreover, given rise to many other subsidiary undertakings, which are being carried out by different scholars, in different places, to some extent independently of our work here.

Noteworthy among these works are the following four. Our edition has given to a student of the Dacca University a subject for a Ph.D. thesis entitled "Studies in Epic Grammatical Forms," which is an essay towards the compilation of epic grammar and which is based entirely on our edition of the Ādiparvan. Our Mahābhārata researches have further inspired another student of the epic to submit to the Bombay University a Ph.D. thesis on
the Bhṛgyaṃgirasa element in the Mahābhārata. There is a third Ph.D. dissertation for which a subject has been furnished by our edition. The subject is the phenomenon of case-variation in the epic dialect, which is being investigated by a student of Dr. S. M. Katrē at the Deccani College Research Institute. A Spanish professor, Dr. Jose Canedo, I understand, has planned an elaborate grammatical work on Epic Syntax, which has made considerable advance and which would have been published by now but for this war, which, as you know, is paralyzing all literary and scholarly activity in Europe.

I shall pass on to some minor studies which have arisen out of our Mahābhārata work. Arising out of his study of the Sabhāparvan, Professor Edgerton has recently published three important papers. One of them is about the mention of the city of Rome in the Digvijaya section of the Sabhāparvan, which is the first time that a clear reference has been found in Indian literature to the name of the capital of ancient Italy, Roma. Another paper by him deals with the question of “Epic Tristūbh and its Hypermetric Varieties.” A third paper by him concerns the reading and interpretation of a Sabhāparvan stanza, an old crux, which has become famous as the parable of the “Goat and the Knife” (“ajakapāṇiya”).

In connection with his study of the Bhāṣmaparvan, which is being edited by him, Dr. Belvalkar has published several valuable papers, among them the “Miscarriage of the attempted stratification of the Bhagavadgītā,” the “Kashmiri Version of the Bhagavadgītā,” and the “Cosmographical Episode in the Mahābhārata and the Padmapurāṇa.” He has other papers in preparation.

You will thus see, gentlemen, that the time and the money spent during the last twenty years of silent and arduous work of the Mahābhārata Department of the Institute have not been spent in vain. The Institute has not only brought out critical editions of three of the parvans of the Mahābhārata, but it has built up an independent school of textual criticism and perfected the technique of the editing of Sanskrit texts. It has opened out new vistas of work with immense possibilities, which will occupy Indologists, I imagine, for at least half a century, if not more. It has stimulated vivid interest in Mahābhārata studies, which were languishing for want of a critical edition of the text. They are carried out now on a sound basis and in a scientific spirit, differing conspicuously from the somewhat gassy ebullitions of previous writers on the subject of the Mahābhārata.

The Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata is thus a comprehensive and many-sided literary activity, with ramifications in many directions. It is this aspect of our Mahābhārata work, I imagine, which impressed the British Academy in London and which induced that august body to vote a grant to our Mahābhārata Publication Fund in order to show its appreciation of the
work which is being done by the Institute and which is not merely of national but international interest and importance.

It is gratifying to note that we have all along been staunchly supported in our enterprise financially by the Governments, the Princes and the People of India,—and at least by one University, the University of Bombay. During the last twenty years they have contributed in the aggregate some Rs. 3,50,000. That is a considerable sum, you will admit. But much more will be needed to complete the work. As we progress and inspire confidence among the people, who will begin to realize the great literary and scientific importance of this project, more help will, I am confident, be coming forth. Indeed there are indications that these are no false hopes. As the Secretary of the Institute, Dr. DandeKar, has just told you, the Sir Dorabjee Tata Charities have only recently, despite the prevailing financial stringency, sanctioned a grant of Rs. 5,000 for the Mahābhārata work, which has been a welcome addition to our attenuated resources, and for which we are extremely grateful to the Trustees of that Fund. Some of our annual subsidies, which had been granted for a fixed period of years, have expired. We have been endeavouring to get them renewed, and the response has been very encouraging, notwithstanding the chaos into which the war has thrown our national economy. Of the patrons whom we have thus approached, the first one to respond was the Chief Saheb of Ichalkaranji, who, as the Secretary has just announced, has kindly promised to continue his patronage. This is a great encouragement to us and we are most grateful to the Chief Saheb, who is a staunch patron of learning and a great friend of all earnest students. On behalf of the Mahābhārata Editorial Board I must also express our most grateful thanks to Shrimant Raja Saheb of Phaltan, who in response to our urgent appeal, as announced by the Secretary, been pleased to continue his annual grant of Rs. 500 for the Mahābhārata work for a further period of five years. If the work is not finished by then, we shall again have to approach the kind Raja Saheb, who, I am sure, will again be pleased to renew the grant. Small though these donations be which we have now secured, there is no need to lose courage. They are indicative of good-will and confidence, which are worth a great deal. When the war clouds have passed away, better days will surely dawn for us; when the thoughts of men will again turn to the preservation and growth of cultural values. We shall then have again, I am confident, the same share of bounty from our patrons of learning which we have hitherto enjoyed and which will help us to carry to completion one of the most important of our national projects.

July 6, 1940.
A STATEMENT REGARDING THE PROGRESS OF THE CRITICAL EDITION OF THE MAHĀBHĀRATA

[Read by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, on the occasion of the presentation of the Āranyakaparvan to Shrimant Rajasaheb of Aundh on 5th January 1943.]

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

It is now more than seventeen years since I took over charge of the Mahābhārata work and reorganized, on somewhat different lines, this Department of the Institute, having profited by the experiences and experiments of my predecessor, the late lamented Mr. Utgikar. During this interval the Institute has published Critical Editions of four complete Books of the Mahābhārata; Ādiparvan (1933), Virāṭaparvan (1936), the Udyogaparvan (1940), and now the Āranyakaparvan (1942). These four parvans comprise, according to the Parvasaṁgrahaparvan, about 28,400 ślokas. In addition to this a fascicule of the Sabhāparvan edited by Prof. Franklin Edgerton of Yale University (U. S. A.), which has been ready for some time and which could be taken up for printing only owing to the very generous special grant of Rs. 10,000 recently made by the Government of Bombay, is being published today. Furthermore, the press-copy of the Bhīṣmaparvan, which is being edited by Rao Bahadur Dr. S. K. Belvālkar, is almost ready and is now undergoing final revision at the hands of its editor. It will be ready for being sent to the press very shortly. In fact the work is advanced as far that it can be got ready for the press within three months. But can we send it to the press? Not unless we can find a generous donor prepared to pay for the cost of the printing of the new volume, in these days when the cost of printing has almost doubled. The present financial situation of the Department is such that we can just manage to get the press-copies ready; but the large world of scholars outside the walls of this Institute, eagerly awaiting the appearance of our now-famous yellow-covered fascicles, must unfortunately be kept waiting until more funds are available.

Any way, during the past 17 years the Institute has critically dealt with the first 6 parvans of the Great Epic: the Ādi, Sabhā, Āranyaka, Virāṭa, Udyoga and Bhīṣma. The six parvans make up a total of about 36,800 ślokas, out of an aggregate of 82,150 ślokas, a portion which is approximately 45% of the entire Mahābhārata, excluding, of course, the Harivarma, which I have kept out of my calculation in order not to frighten you too much. Even this is no mean achievement, I think. The part of the epic
critically dealt with so far is, I imagine, in bulk about four times as great as the Greek epics, Iliad and Odyssey put together and one and a half times as our Rāmāyaṇa.

That a work of this nature and these dimensions is not one man's job is very very evident. Many friends, collaborators, sympathisers and patrons have contributed to such measure of success as has been achieved so far, and they include among them princes and potentates, curators and librarians, printers and parvan-editors, not to speak of the General Editor and his modest staff of collators in the background. Surely, the most potent among these multifarious contributory factors have been our generous patrons, who, out of regard for this venerable monument of Indian antiquity, this great and lustrous heritage of Bhāratavarṣa, have in the past liberally supplied the Institute, through all these years, with funds to carry on this costly but vital work.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I must tell you frankly this is a costly work. All good work costs money now-a-days! Good manuscripts cost money. Good printing costs money. Good editors cost money.

The British nation once paid out one million pounds for one rare Ms. of the Bible. Would India pay a similar amount for any book? Why not? Are the British people greater lovers of books, greater lovers of literature, greater lovers of religion, greater lovers of knowledge than we Indians? Certainly not. Great Britain is a small nation, a young nation, compared to India. And our love of knowledge, love of literature, love of scriptures, is greater. We are the inheritors of the great book, this "book of books" composed at a time when Great Britain was not yet entered on the map of civilized nations. And the entire cost of making this Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata is only one million rupees—and not pounds—which is only 1/15th of the cost of the Bible. We have collected and spent already 5 lakhs of rupees. We want now only 5 lakhs more. And we are not pessimistic about it. We have no reason to be that. When the war clouds have passed away, better days will surely dawn for us; then the thoughts of men will again turn to the preservation and growth of cultural values. We shall then, I am confident, enjoy the same generous support from patrons of learning as we have hitherto enjoyed and that will help us to carry to completion one of the most important of our national projects.

If you want me to point out to you just one man who is responsible for originating and furthering the project, he is sitting in front of you, I mean, Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, the RAJA OF AUNDH.

The question may occur to you. Is it worth all this expenditure? Whether we realize it or not, we still stand under the spell of the Mahābhārata. Amid the deepest strands that are woven in the thread of our
civilization, there is more than one that is drawn originally from Bhārata-
varṣa and from Sanskrit literature. And well in the centre of this vast mass
of literature, there stands this deathless, traditional book of divine inspiration,
unapproachable and far removed from possibilities of human competition.

There is a danger that in our pseudo-scientific mood, we may be
tempted to discard this great book, thinking that we have outgrown it. That
would be a capital blunder! That would in fact mean nothing but an
indication of our will to commit suicide, national suicide, the signal of our
national extinction. For never was truer word spoken than when the late
German Indologist Hermann Oldenberg said that “in the Mahābhārata
breathe the united soul of India, and the individual souls of her people.”
And why is that? Because the Mahābhārata is the national saga of India.
It is, in other words, the content of our collective unconscious. And just
for that reason it refuses to be discarded. We must therefore grasp this
great book with both hands and face it squarely. Then we shall recognize
that it is our past which has prolonged itself into the present. We are it:
I mean the real WE! Shall we be guilty of strangling our own soul?
NEVER!
TABULA GRATULATORIA
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