

Another rhetorical trick, which appears not to have been noticed in the epic, is the occurrence of distinct attempts at "pathetic repetition." A comical example is given above. I have noted cases but rarely, and only from late parts of the great epic, but I cannot say they are not found elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> The first is from viii, 75, 6-7 a:

ratham sasūtam sahayam ca kañcit  
kañcid rathī mṛtyuvaçam nināya  
nināya cā 'py ekagajena kañcid  
rathān bahūn mṛtyuvaçe tathā 'çvān  
rathān sasūtān sahayān gajāñç ca  
sarvān atīn mṛtyuvaçam çarāughāih

Another is found, H. 3, 118, 9 = 15,776:

adrākṣam adrākṣam<sup>2</sup> aham sunirvṛtaḥ  
piban pibañs tasya vapuḥ punaḥ punaḥ,  
(B. has purātanam)

and in the next stanza:

sañsmṛtya sañsmṛtya tam eva nirvṛtaḥ.

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

### Cadence in Çloka and Triṣṭubh.

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

hāyi hāyi huvā hoyi huvā hoyi tathā 'sakṛt

is interesting as showing the epic's recognition of this form of interjectional piety (gāyanti tvām suraçreṣṭha sāmaga brahmavādinah);<sup>3</sup> but I introduce it here as illustrating the

<sup>1</sup> Without the attempted pathos, mere repetition is an ancient trait exhibited as early as the Rīg Veda, as pointed out, e. g., by Weber, *Vedische Beiträge*, 1900, p. 7, on RV. ii, 11. Repetition of the same words in succeeding stanzas is perhaps best illustrated by R. ii. 28, where duḥkham ato vanam is the pathetic refrain.

<sup>2</sup> Compare RV. i, 25, 18, dāçam . . . dāçam.

<sup>3</sup> Compare the stobha ib. 105: hūñ hūñ hūñkārāpārāya, etc.

common occurrence of the repetition of the final foot of the prior at the beginning of the posterior pāda. This extreme example duplicates even the syllables, but in the pathyā form of the *ṣloka* the duplication of the whole foot, while not reproducing the syllables, may extend backward as well as forward, thus giving three identical feet, as in R. vii, 28, 6,

na bhietavyam na gantavyam nivartadhvam raṇe  
surāḥ

Such a verse, however, is often modified as in iii, 168, 80:

nibodhata mahābhāgāḥ *Ṣivam* cā 'cāsta me 'naghāḥ,

or, if the first two are maintained, by making the third foot — — — or — — —. The different possibilities concern us here only as they affect the cadence, for the monotony of the pāda is varied quite as much by the rhetorical cadence as by the foot. Even the stereotyped diiambic close of the posterior pāda is constantly broken by a choice of words which, far from lending themselves to iambic rhythm, impede it. So instead of the posterior  $\cup$  — —  $\cup$ ,  $\cup$  —  $\cup$  — the pāda must often be read as  $\cup$  —, —  $\cup$   $\cup$  —,  $\cup$  —; while in the prior pāda  $\cup$   $\cup$  —  $\cup$ ,  $\cup$  — —  $\cup$  is frequently to be read as  $\cup$   $\cup$ , —  $\cup$   $\cup$  —, —  $\cup$ . Pronounced cretics and dactyls often claim recognition, as at R. vi, 17, 12,

Rāvaṇo, nāma, durvṛtto, rākṣaso, rākṣaseṣvaraḥ,<sup>1</sup>

or ib. 17, 67, vidyate tasya saṁgrahaḥ; ib. 18, 7, iti ho 'vāca Kākutstho vākyam, satyaparākramaḥ. Hence even in the more rigid posterior pāda the *ṣloka* presents great variety. The effect, for example, of the diiambic ending is quite lost in the following typical examples:

balād ādāya, viryavān  
nava, pañca ca, sapta ca  
sandhim Rāmeṇa, Rāvana

To read such pādas mechanically, as if they had a pause before the diiamb (as Occidental scholars almost always read

<sup>1</sup> A stock phrase, the parallel to Rāvaṇo lokarāvaṇaḥ, R. vi, 20, 21, etc.

them), is vicious. The *çloka*, more than any other metre, must be read by sense rather than by scheme. The latter method is bad enough in all metres, but peculiarly so in the short *çloka*, where, unless the stress jibes with the words, the result is a peculiarly painful tum-tum, which in no way gives the rhythm; for in reality the *çloka* is a metre of great subtlety and force, in which neither iambic nor trochaic cadence has ever held sway, but both interchange with pleasing variety even in *pathyās*,<sup>1</sup> often uniting in a dactylic or choriambic measure, as in iii, 56, 24,

kim abravīc ca naḥ sarvān,  
vada, bhūmipate, 'nagha

or R. vi, 65, 11,

gaccha çatruvadhāya tvaṁ,  
Kumbhakarnaḥajayāya ca

or ib. 59, 47,

tam abravīn mahātejā  
Rāmaḥ, satyaparākramaḥ,  
gaccha, yatnaparaç cā 'pi  
bhava, Lakṣmaṇa, saṁyuge

With the same freedom at the outset, the *triṣṭubh*, instead of embracing all forms, as it might have done, continued on a more and more restricted path. It kept the iambic cadence much more closely than did the *çloka* and contracted its middle to an almost unvarying shape. It thus grew more and more monotonous, and not having even the advantage of hemistich-unity it became a mere collocation of hendekasyllabic verses, each *pāda* having the same unvarying quantity:

— — — — —

<sup>1</sup> Still greater variety is given by the melodious *vipulās*, of which I shall speak below. But seven-eighths of epic verse are in *pathyā* form, that is, half the syllables in the verse are unalterably fixed as — — — and — — —, so that it is of interest to see how with this self-imposed restriction the Hindu poet still manages to make verses so melodious, energetic, and varied, when read properly.

(called upajāti), as in Horace's

trahuntque siccas machinae carinas.<sup>1</sup>

The only way to save from dead uniformity a rhythm so stereotyped was to shift the cæsura frequently.<sup>2</sup> In the Rāmāyaṇa, where upajātis are the rule (the Mahābhārata triṣṭubh did not reach the same level of monotony), there is often a constant play from fourth to fifth or a remoter syllable, as the place of rest. With the usual pause at the fifth, the dactylic middle foot is converted into an anapaestic iambic slide, as in the following examples from R. iv, 43, 62; 44, 16; v, 32, 10, the last two examples showing also the lighter cæsura not of sense-pause but of breathing:

- (a) tataḥ kṛtārthāḥ  
sahitāḥ sabāndhavā  
mayā 'reitāḥ  
sarvagunāir manoramāiḥ  
cariṣyatho 'rvīm  
pratiṣāntaṣātravaḥ  
sahapriyā  
bhūtadharāḥ plavaṅgamāḥ
- (b) sa tat prakarṣan  
harinām mahad balaṁ  
babbhūva viraḥ  
pavanātmajaḥ kapiḥ  
gatāmbude  
vyomni viṣuddhamaṇḍalāḥ  
çaṇī 'va nakṣatraganopaṣobhitāḥ
- (c) svapno hi nā 'yam  
na hi me 'sti nidrā

<sup>1</sup> Brown's Sanskrit Prosody, p. 9. On the other hand the jagatī corresponds in outer form to the iambic trimeter with twelve syllables. I treat the jagatī throughout as a triṣṭubh with one syllable added (the final syllable anacrusis of the former becoming fixed as brevis), ∪ — ∪ — ; not assuming this as a genetic fact but as a convenience, the same body appearing in both and the pādas being interchangeable except in the akṣaracchandas.

<sup>2</sup> On the derivation of types fixed in respect of the initial syllable (the upendra and indravajrī being derived from the upajāti and not vice versa), see below, the section on the Stanza.



çokena duḥkhena ca  
 pīḍitāyāḥ  
 sukhāṁ hi me  
 nā 'sti yato vihinā  
 tene 'ndupūrṇapratimānanena

But this tendency ran to extremes also, and as the syllabic arrangement became fixed, so the cæsura became stereotyped, till stanzas showed an almost unvarying cæsura of the painful type of R. v, 47, 30,

iti pravegaṁ tu  
 parasya tarkayan  
 svakarmayogaṁ 'ca  
 vidhāya vīryavān  
 cakāra vegāṁ tu  
 mahābalas tadā  
 matiṁ ca cakre 'sya  
 vadhe tadānīm

or of R. vi, 126, 55,

tataḥ sa vākyāir  
 madhurāir Hanūmato  
 niçamya hr̥ṣṭo  
 Bharataḥ kṛtāñjaliḥ  
 uvāca vānīm  
 manasaḥ praharṣiṇīm  
 cirasya pūrṇaḥ  
 khalu me manorathaḥ

Even if Vālmīki did not write these stanzas, which may be doubted, a greater poet than he is guilty of the same sleepy iteration of cadences, as may be seen in Raghuvāṇça iii, 30; v, 18; vii, 19 (cæsura after the fifth in all pādas); vii, 16 (after the fourth in all pādas).

### Tags.

Alternation of triṣṭubh and jagatī pādas in the same stanza helped somewhat to mitigate the weary effect of this metre; but it gradually yielded before the çloka or passed into other

forms. One of its decadent uses was to furnish new tags for the end of chapters of *çlokas*. This was an old use, but it is extended in the later epic. The different texts show no uniformity in the insertion of these tag-triṣṭubhs, one text having several, where another has one or none, just as in the case of other tag-metres, for example, a *puspitāgrā*, G. iii, 39, 42; two *rucirās* between G. iii, 56 and 57, but none in R. Plainly a late insertion, for instance, is the imitation-stanza which serves as a tag to G. iii, 43, 42 (not in R.),

*kālasya kālaç ca bhavet sa Rāmah  
saṁkṣipyā lokāṇç ca sṛjed athā 'nyān,*

Manu, ix, 315; Mbh. ix, 36, 40,

*sa hi kruddhaç sṛjed anyān devān api mahātapaḥ*  
xiii, 152, 16,

*adāivam dāivatam kuryur, dāivatam cā 'py adāivatam  
lokān anyān sṛjeyus te*

Such tags may, in fact, be made of adjacent *çlokas*. An instance is given below where a *rucirā* has thus been created. As regards triṣṭubhs, G. iii, 62 ends with a tag made out of a *çloka* omitted in this text but kept in the other, na *çarma labhate bhīruḥ* and na *vindate tatra tu çarma Māithilī*. A good example is found in R. vii, 75, 18 ff., where a triṣṭubh tag is added in almost the same words with those wherewith the following chapter begins, showing that with the division into two chapters a tag was simply manufactured out of the next stanza; as is still more clearly indicated by the fact that 76, 2 answers the question of 75, 18, *vāṇçyas tṛtīyo varṇo vā çūdro vā ('si)? çūdrayonyām prajāto 'smi*. Evidently only one verse intervened, the *çloka*: *tasya tad vacanam çrutvā avākçirāḥ . . . uvāca ha*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The same thing occurs in R. iv, 50, where the chapter closes with the *çloka*: *papraccha Hanumāns tatra kē 'si tvam kasya vā bilam*. Then follows the tag: *tato Hanumān girisainnikāçāḥ kṛtāñjaliḥ tām abhivādya vṛddhām, papraccha kē tvam bhavanam bilam ca ratnāni ce 'māni vadasva kasya*, simply repeating the last *çloka* in triṣṭubh form. G. very properly drops the *çloka*; but it is clear that originally the *çloka* closed the question.

The tag-function of the *triṣṭubh* is also known in the *Mahābhārata*, notably in the one *triṣṭubh* found in the *Nala*, iii, 76, 58, which has been regarded as spurious on account of its isolation. But the following sections, after the *Nala* episode, show just the same conditions, the end of chapters 83 and 100. So, too, at the end of ix, 24 and 28. *Hariv.* 2, 66, and 69 end with one *jagatī* each; 2, 68, with three.

The present text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* shows many cases of *triṣṭubhs* and *jagatīs* interpolated into the middle of a *śloka* section. Some of these at least are clearly the finale of former chapters. Thus *R.* vi, 69, 15 looks like an inserted *jagatī*, but its function is to close the chapter in *G.* 48, 13. So *R.* vi, 69, 88-96 appear as a group of interpolated *triṣṭubhs*; but in *G.* the same group is a tag to chapter 49. Probably the break in *R.* vi, 69, 44, *G.* 49, 31, is the original *finis* of a chapter. Occasionally, when one edition breaks a chapter, only the new division is found to have *triṣṭubh* or *jagatī*, as an accepted sign of conclusion, as in *R.* iii, 11, after 70; *G.* 16, 41.

A special function of the later *triṣṭubh* is to produce pathetic effect.<sup>1</sup> In this guise it wins new life and makes whole chapters, as in *R.* v, 28, where the burden of the chapter is expressed by *hā Rāma hā Lakṣmaṇa hā Sumitre*, etc.; or in *R.* iv, 24 (not in *G.*), a lament, the dolorous style of which may be illustrated by the reminiscent verses, 13-14:

prāpto 'smi pāpmānam idaṁ vayasya  
bhrātur vadhāt Tvāṣṭravadhād ive 'ndrah  
pāpmānam Indrasya mahī jalāṁ ca  
vrkṣāḥ ca kāmāṁ jagṛhuḥ striyaḥ ca, etc.

Closely allied is the employment of the *triṣṭubh* to describe not mental conditions but operations of nature. The Vedic *pra vātā vānti patayanti vidyutah*, *RV.*, v, 88, 4, appears in

<sup>1</sup> This begins in the *Mahābhārata* as an extension of the tag-function. Compare the illustrations given in *A. J. Phil.*, vol. xix, p. 18 ff. A good example of the sentimental effect, intensification of horrors, etc., deputed to the *triṣṭubh* by predilection, is found in *R.*, v, 54, 30 ff. The action is in *śloka*. The moral effect is given by the following *triṣṭubhs*.

R. iv, 28, 45 as varṣapravegā vipulāḥ patanti pra vānti vātāḥ samudīrṇavegāḥ, in a long section wholly descriptive. Another example is found in R. iv, 80, 28-57.

Çlokas and triṣṭubhs are not often commingled, save in a few late passages of the great epic, i, 232, 10 ff.; Hariv. 3, 82, 8 ff.; and in R. v, 41; G. 37 (chiefly upendras), throughout a section. In R. a few long passages occur in the sixth book, 59-61, 67, but apart from these books the exchange of the two metres is avoided.<sup>1</sup> In the Sanatsujātiya, v, 46, there is, indeed, a regular çloka refrain besides other çlokas intermingled with triṣṭubhs, but this is because the author is reducing Upanishad stanzas, and at the same time adding some of his own. The practice belongs to those scriptures, and is not generally kept up in the epic, though occasionally a çloka or two appears among triṣṭubhs, as in ii, 64, 9-10. In xii, 350, 49 ff., two triṣṭubhs (the second having three hemistichs) are inserted between çlokas (after a çloka of three verses).

### Common Forms of Çloka and Triṣṭubh.

From a mechanical point of view, the prior pāda of the çloka and the triṣṭubh are identical, except for the fact that to the eight syllables of the çloka pāda the triṣṭubh appends a scolus or amphibrach. The natural division of the eight syllables in each case is into groups of four or five, followed respectively by four or three. For convenience the group of four, which is found oftenest, is usually called a foot, and to have a name I shall so designate it. Now in epic (Mahābhārata) poetry, every foot of the çloka pāda is found in the triṣṭubh, and, vice versa (as will be seen from the following table), every prior foot and every last foot of the triṣṭubh's eight syllables is also a corresponding çloka foot:

<sup>1</sup> G. ii, 110, 3 ff. is not in R., and appears to be an interpolation. The parallels to G. v, 89 are also lacking in R. Verse 7 in G. vi, 34, is prakṛipta (the passage is not in R., but compare R. iv, 33, 53).

PRIOR FOOT OF ÇLOKA  
AND TRIṢṬUBH.

- 1, √ — √ —
- 2, √ — — —
- 3, √ √ — —
- 4, √ — — √
- 5, √ √ — √
- 6, √ — √ √
- 7, √ √ √ —
- 8, √ √ √ √

LAST FOOT OF ÇLOKA  
AND TRIṢṬUBH.

- 1, √ — — —
- 2, √ √ √ —
- 3, — √ √ —
- 4, — — — —
- 5, — √ — —
- 6, √ √ — —
- 7, — — — √
- 8, √ — — √

But, curious as is this purely mechanical identity, it is subject to three limitations, which prevent the effect one might think would be caused by it. First, the triṣṭubh's eighth syllable is long, while in the çloka, since the pāda ends here, the same syllable is aneeps. Second, the scoliis of the triṣṭubh is usually closely united with the second foot, while in the case of upajātis and some other triṣṭubhs the cæsura occurs in a majority of cases after the fifth syllable, so that the feet are not in reality what they are in the measured division given above; but the pāda appears, for example, as √ — √ — —, √ √ — √ — √, whereas in the çloka the usual cæsura is after the fourth, and only in certain cases falls after the fifth syllable. But the third difference, that of the general effect given by the çloka cadence and that of the corresponding syllables in the triṣṭubh, is produced by the interrelation of the first and second foot. Here there is a wide divergence, and it is the preference for one combination over another that makes the greatest difference between the form of the çloka as a whole and the triṣṭubh as a whole. Although it is true, as has been remarked by Professor Jacobi, that the essential difference in metres lies not in the opening but in the close of the pāda, yet in this case the interrelation just referred to is almost as important. Thus, to take a striking example, while √ — — — is a second foot both in çloka and triṣṭubh, in the former it is pathyā, "regular," in all combinations, the commonest of all, while in triṣṭubh it is a rarity in any combination. So √ √ — — occurs after four or five forms of the first foot in çloka, yet is never a favorite, in triṣṭubhs after six forms, and is here everywhere common.

It is, however, interesting to see in how many cases a permissible form of both metres is used, so that one cannot tell which metre one is reading till the pāda is nearly complete. Ordinarily the general rhythm determines the anticipation and the expected metre is duly met; but not infrequently is the justified anticipation deceived, and the metre, still keeping on the lines of the preceding form, suddenly changes. A penultimate verse, for example, in R. ii, 38, 14, begins mayā vihinām varada prapannam, but we no sooner learn that this is a ṣloka verse, not a triṣṭubh tag (as we might expect from its form and position), than in 15 we read imām mahendropa-majātagardhinīm, the real tag of the section.

The form just cited is the usual one in which the ṣloka coincides with the body of the triṣṭubh. Sometimes, as in set phrases, the same words are used; thus in G. ii, 18, 33, and 55,

prasādaye tvām ṣirasā kariṣye vacanam pituḥ  
prasādaye tvām ṣirasā yatavrate (triṣṭubh)

or in R. vi, 106, 4 and 59, 36,

tam āpatantam sahasā svanavantam mahādhvajam  
tam āpatantam sahasā samikṣya (triṣṭubh)

With the prevalent upajāti cæsura and almost after a system of upajātis (one ṣloka intervening), appears in R. vi, 69, 130, sa vāyusūnuḥ kupitaḥ cikṣepa cikḥaram gireḥ, a perfect upendravajrā pāda in a ṣloka verse. Such alien pādas are not very common in the midst of a ṣloka system,<sup>1</sup> but are common in close conjunction with triṣṭubhs, as if the poet either wished to trick or could not himself get the last metre out of his ear. Another instance like the one above is found in R. v, 54, 48 ff., where only a ṣloka hemistich intervenes between a triṣṭubh system and the triṣṭubh-like cadence of the ṣloka: vyarājatā 'ditya ivā 'rcimālī; Laṅkāṁ samastām sampīḍya lāṅgūlāgnim mahākapiḥ, nirvāpayām āsa tadā samudre (haripuṅgavaḥ). Cases where a whole ṣloka is interposed

<sup>1</sup> But compare R. v, 2, 31, anena rūpeṇa mayā na cakyā rakṣasām purī; R. vi, 43, 17, cārīrasaṁghāṭavahāḥ prasasarūḥ cōṇitāpagāḥ; Nala, 3, 1, tebhyaḥ pratijñāya Nalaḥ kariṣya iti, Bhārata; and ib. 12, but no more cases till 6, 8.

are not at all rare. In R. vi, 67, 99–101, 99 ends in a *triṣṭubh*, 100 is a *çloka pathyā*, 101 begins *sa Kumbhakarnasya çarān çarīre* (*sapta, vīryavān*). Less striking is the case where only one *pāda* of a *çloka* of *choriambic* form (second *vipulā*) corresponds to the *triṣṭubh* it follows, for here the former's cadence is not kept up. Such a *pāda* needs no intervening *pathyā*, but may follow directly on the *triṣṭubh*, as in R. vi, 67, 21–22,

pradudruvuh saṁyati Kumbhakarnāt  
tatas tu Nīlo balavān (paryavasthāpayan balam)

When an unimportant word or a superfluous adornment, an unnecessary adverb or epithet, is added, it arouses a suspicion that some of the *çlokas* may be reduced from an older form. Thus *vidyunmālī* appears to stop a *jagatī* in R. vi, 43, 41 a,

çilāprahārā 'bhihato (vidyunmālī) niçācarah

So in R. vi, 69, 138 a,

khaḍgaprahārā 'bhihato Hanūmān (mārutātmaḥ)

So, too in the verse cited above, *haripuṅgavaḥ* fills out the verse where *mahākapiḥ* precedes, a sufficient subject. In G. iv, 60, 2, *nivedayāmāsa tadā maharṣim* (*samhatāñjaliḥ*); in the other example above, *sapta, vīryavān*; and in the following example both terminals (even the accusative) are unnecessary, R. vi, 71, 37,

tato 'tikāyo balavān praviçya (harivāhinīm)  
visphārayāmāsa dhanur nanāda ca (punaḥ punaḥ)

And very likely, since an inspection of epic phraseology shows that there were many stereotyped turns of expression, there were phrases used first in the *triṣṭubh* which were preserved in a crystallized form in the general *çloka* solution in which the epic was immersed. But to say, except in the case of such stereotyped phrases, whether this happened in any one instance, would be at best rather an idle expression of opinion.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In *sādhv* *sādhv itī* (te) *neduḥ* (ca) *dr̥ṣtvā* *çatrum* (or *rakṣaḥ*) *parājitam*, R. vi, 44, 81, G. 19, 37, a stock phrase in either form, an old *triṣṭubh*, — — —, might be preserved, but a varied reading is more likely.

Certain verbal forms lend themselves best to one cadence and it is not surprising, for instance, that one turn should go to make both *çloka* and *triṣṭubh* (R. v, 47, 10; vi, 106, 14), or that the exact form here is elsewhere, G. vi, 89, 25 (R. has *hayān*), used as part of another *triṣṭubh*, so that we find:

pracodayāmāsa ratham sa sārathih  
 pracodayāmāsa ratham surasārathir uttamah  
 pracodayāmāsa çitāih çarais tribhih  
 pracodayāmāsa çitāih çarair hemavibhūṣitāih

On this point I have only to add that a complete *jagatī* *pāda*, as well as a *triṣṭubh* *pāda*, may thus appear in a *çloka*, as in the example above and in R. v, 57, 15 b,

sa pūrayāmāsa kapir diço daça (samantatah)

and that, next to the choriambic form, the old *triṣṭubhs* in  $\times \cup \_ \_ \cup \cup \cup \_ \cup \_ \cup$ , and  $\times \_ \cup \_ \cup \cup \cup \_ \cup \_ \cup$  are most often incorporate in *çlokas*, as in Nala, 4, 28, *varṇyamāneṣu ca mayā bhavatsu*; 9, 4, *vyadīryate 'va hrdayam na cāi 'nam*; and 12, 39, *patatribhir bahuvidhāih samantād*, etc., etc. Professor Jacobi has suggested that the *çloka* has borrowed such forms from the *triṣṭubh*. This seems to be a reasonable suggestion, yet it should be said that the argument advanced in favor of it is scarcely valid. Professor Jacobi bases the derivation of the second *vipulā* from the *triṣṭubh* on the assumed fact that in this form of the *pāda* " $\_ \cup \cup \cup$  almost never takes the place of  $\_ \cup \cup \_$ ," IS. vol xvii, p. 450. This statement, however, is based on a rather restricted area of examples. In the *Bhārata çlokas*,  $\_ \cup \cup \cup$  is not uncommon except in late passages, and even there two or three cases out of twenty-five to thirty are not very unusual. All that we can say is that final *brevis* is much less frequent than in the first *vipulā*.



### The Epic Āloka.

#### THE PRIOR PĀDA OF THE ĀLOKA.

##### *The Pathyā.*

The pathyā, or ordinary form of the first pāda, should exclude sporadic cases, but including them for convenience we may say that the pathyā foot  $\cup - - \cup$  is preceded by five kinds of feet, sporadic choriambus or proceleusmaticus; iambic,  $\cup - \cup -$ ; pyrrhic,  $\cup - \cup \cup$ ; trochaic,  $\cup - - \cup$  and  $\cup \cup - \cup$ ; spondaic,  $\cup - - -$  and  $\cup \cup - -$ . The frequency of these feet advances in the order here given! With the exception of a sporadic choriambus or other wild irregularity, all these forms occur passim, even that with precedent iambus. This last is sure to be found so many times in a given number of ālokas and it must therefore be marked as occurring passim rather than as common; but it is far less frequent than the other forms, often less than half as frequent as the pyrrhic, as this is often only half as common as the precedent trochee. The relation between the trochee and spondee is from one-half to two-thirds. A curious fact in regard to the avoided iambus (before the iambus of the pathyā, as in the posterior pāda) is that when used it is sometimes preferred in its double form. Thus in xii, 312 ff., for about two hundred hemistichs, the precedent spondees, trochees, pyrrhics, and iambs are (respectively) 82, 54, 29, 11; but of the 11 iambs, 10 are double  $\cup - \cup -$  (against  $- - \cup -$ ). On the other hand, in xiv, 59 ff., these precedents are 73, 38, 31, 20; and of the 20 iambs, only 8 are double; while the opening stanzas of the Gītā (introduction, ch. 13) show 96, 62, 27, 14; but only 6 double iambs out of the 14. The precedent double iambus is characteristic also of Pāli verse. It does not seem to me that any great weight is to be laid on this or that ratio in the use of these feet, since all are used by epic writers everywhere, and the only striking distinction as regards their employment is that spondees naturally (it is a matter of nice ear to a great extent) occur oftenest before an iamb, and iambs least often; while

trochees and pyrrhics lie between. But very often a double trochee (— ∪ — ∪) is preferred to a spondee (— ∪ — —).<sup>1</sup> As regards minor differences, as for example whether ∪ ∪ — ∪ or ∪ — — ∪ is used more frequently, I have not thought it worth while to gather the statistics. Only the curious preference in later writers for three successive iambs seemed worth noticing, as it leads to the hemistich of eight iambs sometimes affected by doggerel epic poets.<sup>2</sup> Such a combination regularly occurs only at the beginning of a prior pāda, being tabooed in the posterior pāda, though occasionally found there. The general (not inviolate) rule for the pathyā is that any foot may stand before ∪ — — ∪ which does not make tribrach or anapæst after the initial syllaba anceps of the pāda. The final syllable of the pathyā is long in about two-thirds of the cases.

More important are the facts in regard to the preference for certain forms combined with the vipulās, although these make but a small proportion of prior pādas.

### *The Vipulās.*

The vipulās (syllables five to eight) are four in number: (1) ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪, (2) — ∪ ∪ ∪, (3) —, — — ∪, (4) — ∪ — ∪. Only the third (as indicated) has an almost invariable cæsura. In respect of the general rules for these vipulās, from an examination of a considerable mass of material, I would state first that the epic śloka generally conforms, as far as I can formulate them, to the following conditions:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The preference for — ∪ — ∪ instead of — ∪ — — is illustrated below. Cases of double iambus before the pathyā seem to me rather characteristic of the popular and late scholastic style than an archaic survival (the late scholastic often coincides with the popular through a common carelessness or ignorance). To be compared are Simons, *Der Śloka im Pāli*, ZDMG., vol. xlv, p. 84 ff., and Oldenberg, *ib.* liv, p. 194. The latter seems inclined to see (with due caution) evidence of antiquity in the precedent iambus. I regard this combination rather as a sign that the writer is more careless.

<sup>2</sup> See below for an example.

<sup>3</sup> Besides the articles above, see Colebrooke; Gildemeister, ZKM. v, 280; Weber, IS., vol. viii; Oldenberg, *Bemerkungen zur Theorie des Śloka*, ZDMG. xxxv, p. 187; and Jacobi, IS., vol. xvii, p. 443; *Das Rāmāyana*; and Gurupū-jākāmudī. Professor Jacobi's rules given first as "valid for the older epics"

1. The first *vipulā*,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup$  usually follows  $\cup - \cup -$ ,  $\cup - - -$ , or  $\cup \cup - -$ , though it is sufficient to have the preceding syllable long (even this restriction is not always observed). The later style has fewer cases of the first of these combinations. The *cæsura* is after the (*pāda*'s) fourth or fifth syllable, sometimes after the sixth. The last syllable of the *vipulā* is prevailingly long but not infrequently short, especially apt to be short after the diiambic opening. When the *cæsura* is after the fifth syllable of the *pāda* the last syllable of the *vipulā* as a rule is long (which would indicate that this *cæsura* is later than the one after the fourth).

2. The second *vipulā*,  $- \cup \cup \cup$ , usually follows  $\cup - \cup -$ , though a preceding  $\cup - - -$  or even  $\cup \cup - -$  is not a great rarity. Any other precedent foot is sporadic only. The *cæsura* is after the fourth or fifth syllable of the *pāda*, inclining to the latter place (at times twice as frequent). The last syllable of the *vipulā* is sometimes short, most often when the *cæsura* is after the fourth syllable of the *pāda*, but is prevailingly long, especially in the later epic, where a short final is often rather rare (rarer than in the first *vipulā*).<sup>1</sup>

3. The third *vipulā*,  $- - - \cup$  usually follows  $\cup - \cup -$ . The *cæsura* is very rarely after any other syllable than the fifth, and is seldom neglected. The last syllable is indifferently short or long. This is the most rigid form, both in

were modified in the later articles cited (1884, 1893, 1896). Professor Oldenberg's observations give an excellent comparison of Manu's practice with that of an epic passage. The statements in Colebrooke's and Weber's works mentioned above, based on the rules of native metricists, often conform, through no fault save that of the metricists, neither to epic nor to classical usage and historically considered are useless as regards the extant epic *çloka*. Professor Jacobi's rules, as modified by him, though not exhaustive, are generally quite unimpeachable and give the best (as did Gildemeister's in his day) presentation of epic conditions. I follow his order in numbering the four *vipulās*, and his rules, with some revision.

<sup>1</sup> The age of the piece affects the quantity of the final syllable. For example, of the two *lotus-theft* versions, the prior (as is often the case) is the more modern (xiii, 93). Here there is no case of  $- \cup \cup \cup$ , but fourteen cases of  $- \cup \cup -$  (one hundred forty-nine *çlokas*). But in 94, in the compass of forty *çlokas*,  $- \cup \cup \cup$  occurs six times (against  $- \cup \cup -$ , four times).

respect of cæsura and of precedent foot, so that the pāda is almost always  $\cup - \cup - -$ ,  $- - \cup$ .

4. The fourth vipulā,  $\cup - \cup$ , usually follows  $\cup - \cup -$ , but in some sections is found quite as often after  $\cup - - -$  and  $\cup \cup - -$ . The cæsura rarely changes from the fourth syllable. The last syllable of the vipulā is generally long.

5. The Mahābhārata has what may be called a fifth vipulā,  $\cup \cup - -$ . It occurs sporadically in all parts of the epic and is not very uncommon, though not so current as in the Upanishads. This form crops up occasionally in the Purāṇas, but is ignored by Vālmīki and later Kavis.

These epic conditions may be condensed into one short rule of general usage: All vipulās are found after  $\cup - \cup -$ , but with occasional exceptions<sup>1</sup> only the first vipulā after  $\cup - - -$  and  $\cup \cup - -$ , and no other precedent feet are admitted before vipulās. The cæsura is free (usually after the fourth or fifth syllable) in the first and second vipulā; after the fifth in the third; after the fourth in the fourth vipulā.

The chief difference between the normal type of the epic pāda and that of classical writers lies in the circumstance that, as contrasted with the facts stated above, in classical works there is

- 1) almost complete absence of the fourth vipulā,
- 2) greater rarity of the first vipulā after diiambus,
- 3) greater strictness in the cæsura of the third vipulā,
- 4) very rare exceptions in the employment of other precedent feet (e. g., the third vipulā after  $\cup - - -$ , Ragh. xii, 71),
- 5) almost exclusive use of long finals in first and second vipulās.<sup>2</sup>

Thus it will be seen that there is still an appreciable advance

<sup>1</sup> The commonest exception is found in the case of the fourth vipulā. On an average half-a-dozen exceptions occur in the course of a thousand hemistichs, but excluding the fourth vipulā only one or two exceptions, generally in the form  $\cup - - -$ ,  $- - \cup \cup$ .

<sup>2</sup> On the rarity of the fourth vipulā in classical writers, see Jacobi, IS., vol. xvii, pp. 443. The rule for the long finals is cited by Weber, IS., vol. viii, p. 245: sarvāṣāṁ vipulāṁ caturtho varṇah prāyeṣa gurur bhavati.

to be noticed in the classical style as compared not only with the style of older parts of the epic but also with the normal epic. Fewer vipulās (especially fewer second vipulās) in general, avoidance of the fourth vipulā, and greater strictness in the use of vipulās mark in some passages an advance even on the normal epic.

There is no "epic usage" in respect of the proportion of vipulās to pathyās. The fact that there is considerable variety proves little in regard to difference of authors, since many conditions affect the ratio. Not only is there apt to be a larger number of vipulās in scenes of excitement, as Professor Jacobi, I think, has somewhere observed, but also a monotonous list develops vipulās, partly because it is apt to be composed of names which, as they are harder to manage, always receive a certain latitude of treatment, partly because the dulness of the subject requires the livelier effect of the skipping vipulā. The vipulā (in excess of the normal) may then be due to a) personal style; b) intensity; c) formality; d) avoidance of dulness; to which must be added imitation or actual citation of older material. For this reason there is, in mere ratio of vipulās to pathyās, no especial significance, as may be further shown by the fact that on an average this ratio is about the same in the Rāmāyaṇa and Bhārata, though each poem shows great variations within itself. Thus in the first thousand verses (hemistichs) of the Rāmāyaṇa's third and fourth books respectively the vipulās are 125 and 118, or one-eighth. But twenty thousand hemistichs, which I have examined from all parts of the Bhārata, give twenty-six hundred vipulās, or a trifle over the same ratio. I do not then lay much stress on the presence or absence of vipulās in an epic section unless it shows remarkable extremes. Thus if we compare the 1098 śloka verses of the Raghuvāṇṇa and the 1070 which make the first half of Nala, we find that in Nala the ratio of vipulās is one-sixth, while in the Raghuvāṇṇa it is one-fourteenth (184 in Nala, 76 in Raghuvāṇṇa). But this paucity of vipulās, though common to most classical writers, is not found in Māgha (according

to Professor Jacobi because he was a Westerner, loc. cit. p. 444), so that in itself it is no criterion of lateness.

The number of vipulās gives the general average (of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent) already noticed.<sup>1</sup> But this ratio is sometimes almost halved and sometimes nearly doubled, small sections of two hundred verses (hemistichs) not infrequently showing from fourteen to forty-six non-pathyā forms; while in special cases even greater disproportion may be observed, some of which when taken into consideration along with other elements may still be worth noting. Thus as between the old tale, Upā-khyāna, of Namuci, as told in ix, 43, 33 ff., and the following account, hanta te kathayisyāmi, of Skanda, in 44, 5 ff., the weight of probable seniority lies with the Vedic tale. Here there are vipulās enough to make the ratio  $33\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, instead of the average  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent; whereas in the Skanda tale there are only half as many. But again, the list of Skanda's followers, ib. 45, 86 ff., shows fourteen vipulās in fifteen ślokas, as the list of Mothers in 46 shows forty-six in one hundred ślokas, and the list of nations in xii, 101, 3 ff., has thirteen vipulās in twenty ślokas, all of these, however, being names and therefore exceptional. There are, on the other hand, good reasons, apart from vipulās, for considering that the conversation of Sulabhā and Janaka is not an ancient part of the epic (bad grammar is one item), and here in nearly four hundred cases there are but eight vipulās, or less than 3 per cent; instead of the average  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

Not the number of vipulās per se, but the use of vipulās may be a determining factor. The refined classical style differs, however, not from the epic alone but from the Purāṇas, where obtains even greater freedom than in the epic, especially in the nice test of the fourth vipulā. Thus, fifteen fourth vipulās is not a high number in a thousand Puranic verses, e. g., exactly this number is found in Vāyu

<sup>1</sup> In simple narrative, with no disturbing factors, the compass ranges from fourteen to thirty vipulās in one hundred ślokas (two hundred cases), three times more often above twenty than below it, and seldom exceeding thirty, for instance, only once in the first 4,000 cases of the ninth book.

Purāṇa, ch. 4-9, five hundred ślokas; and in the epic section of Cānti from the end of the prose in 243 to the end of 351 (13,224-13,740). The Agni Purāṇa has as many as fifty-seven fourth vipulās in the same number of verses, the first twenty chapters, five hundred and five ślokas. But if we compare the use of the vipulās we see at once a striking difference in these passages. The epic selection has fifty second vipulās and thirty-two third vipulās; the Vāyu selection, thirty-three second and fifty-one third; the Agni selection, twenty-six second and fifty third; withal, despite the carelessness in the last, which gives four cases of the second after  $\cup \cup \_ \_$  and three of the third after  $\cup \_ \_ \_$ . That is to say, even the late and careless Puranic style still inclines to the third instead of second vipulā, which is the classical preference. If, however, we revert to an older selection of the epic, we find, for instance, in the heart of the Bhagavad Gītā (830-1,382), that the second vipulā (in the same number of verses, hemistichs, namely one thousand, which in all the examples now to be given is the number to be assumed) has twenty-nine cases and the third but eleven; that is, the proportion is not only reversed but is in very striking contrast both to the norm of the Rāmāyaṇa and Raghuvaṇṇa on the one hand and the Purāṇas on the other. Coincident with this is the further fact that, whereas Vālmīki and Kālidāsa have proportionally few first vipulās after diiambus, both epic selections above have more first vipulās after diiambus than after any other combination; while the Puranic specimens are quite classical in this regard, the Vāyu having only one-fourth, the Agni only one-third of all the first vipulās after diiambus. An extract from the Anuṣāsana Parvan of the epic, cl. 3,732-4,240, shows also an approach to the classical model (ten first vipulās after diiambus, twenty-three after  $\cup \_ \_ \_$  and  $\cup \cup \_ \_$  each). The last case has thirty-six second vipulās against fifty-four third vipulās and only seven fourth vipulās (whereas the Gītā extract has twenty-two fourth vipulās).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The five texts, Gītā, Nala, Anuṣ. P.; Rāmāyaṇa iv. 1-11, and Raghuvaṇṇa show as fourth vipulās (in 1000 verses) 22, 10, 7, 2, 0, respectively

A curious fact is, further, that, while this extract of the *Anuṣāsana*, which is a medley on the gifts of cows, origin of gold, and other late stuff, has but seven fourth *vipulās* in five hundred *śloka*s, the following chapter on *Grāddhas*, the basis of which is old (rules expanded from Manu's list of guests), has four in sixty *śloka*s. Another interesting fact is that the thousand verses which lead up to and follow after the extract from the *Gītā* given above, 495-830, 1,382-1,582 do not keep the ratio between the second and third *vipulās*, but approach the later norm, having an equal number of each *vipulā*. The *Anugītā* itself contains only one-half as many "irregular" forms as does the *Gītā* in the same amount of matter;<sup>1</sup> but following this the epic narrative is expanded in modern form, and here, where the subjects are the mountain festival, recapitulation of the *Bhārata* war (xv, 61, 1), digging for buried treasure, *Parikṣit*'s birth, demise, and restoration to life, losing the white horse, and *Arjuna*'s renewed battles, the metre becomes almost classical, with scarcely a single violation of *vipulā* rules and with only five cases of the fourth *vipulā* to the thousand verses. Compare for instance the *vipulās* in *Raghuvaiṇya*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* (iv, 1-11), and *Āṇvamedhika*<sup>2</sup> Parv. 59-77, according to *vipulās*:

	i	ii	iii	iv
Ragh.,	33	17	26	0
Rām.,	62	20	34	2
Āṇv.,	74	27	34	5

The *vipulās* of the first thousand verses (hemistichs) of *Nala* are, in their order, 91, 33, 50, 10. Though modernized, the irregularities in *Nala* are antique: 8, 13, *iva prabhām*; 12, 105, *Nalam nāmā rimardanam* (changed to *damanam*); 16, 37, *katham ca bhraṣṭā* (?) *jñātibhyah*; 20, 13, *tvam iva yantā* (now *eva*); in 12, 55, and 91, *vilapatim* must be read (grammar is of no importance here, as will be shown below).

<sup>1</sup> They are three cases of the second *vipulā* after  $\cup \_ \_ \_$  and  $\cup \cup \_ \_$  respectively; five and one each of the fourth *vipulā* after the same feet respectively.

<sup>2</sup> The strictness here may be measured by the fact that there is only one case of final *brevis* in the second *vipulā* and only three in the first; no case of second or third *vipulā* after any precedent foot save  $\cup \_ \_ \_$  (and only one of the fourth *vipulā*). Further, only one-third of the first *vipulās* follow a *dilambā*.



Also in the first thousand hemistichs of Ācrama there are only four cases of the fourth vipulā. Like Māgha of the West, the Māusala, on the other hand, which treats of Dvāraka and was probably a clan-tale of the West, comes much nearer to the antique standard, having ten fourth vipulās in five hundred hemistichs, three of them irregular, besides one further vipulā irregularity (stz. 47, 132, 211, 253).<sup>1</sup> It should be added too that, though (as just stated) there are four fourth vipulās in the first thousand hemistichs of the fifteenth book, yet they are all found in the first seventy-seven verses, and from this point on there is not another case of fourth vipulā for one thousand hemistichs, which is as classical as Vālmīki. This last selection is, in fact, almost precisely on the classical model, and differs from it anyway only in having two second vipulās after ∪ — — —. This would imply an acquaintance with the classical norm, which can perhaps scarcely be doubted in the case of the writers who finally completed the poem.

A very interesting example of how the antique will make the poet hark back to an older norm is given by the Sāuptika. It will be remembered that this is almost pure narrative, but that at one point Īiva is addressed with a hymn and his demons are briefly described. This occurs just at the middle of a selection like those above of one thousand hemistichs. Now up to this point there is no fourth vipulā at all, but with the hymn and names come five fourth vipulās within thirty-five ślokas. Then the narrative is resumed, and till the end of the thousand hemistichs appear only three more. Some smaller points here also deserve attention. The num-

<sup>1</sup> In the next Parvan, there are four fourth vipulās in two hundred verses, but three are at the beginning and in three successive hemistichs, and of these, two are forced by proper names. That proper names are quite important may be shown by the catalogue at the beginning of the Harivaṅṣa, where the names force up the fourth vipulā to twelve (seven of these being in nom. prop.), and a third vipulā occurs after ∪ — — — (in a name); as contrasted with the next thousand verses, where there are only four fourth vipulās. Bhaviṣya, partly owing to imitation of Gītā and Smṛti, partly to names, has nine in its first thousand verses.

ber of first and second vipulās with cæsure after the fifth is double that of those with cæsure after the fourth, and there is only one first vipulā, and no second vipulā, with final brevis. Finally, there are only fourteen cases of first vipulā after  $\simeq - \cup -$  out of fifty-four in all. Thus from every point of view the same result is obtained. The little Parvan is comparatively refined in style (number of vipulās, 54, 30, 35, 8).

No doubt this parisamkhyā philosophy is tiresome reading, but as it is even more tiresome to obtain the facts than to glance at them, I shall beg the reader to have patience while I give the results of a few more reckonings, since I believe they are not without a certain value. What I want to show is that the treatment of the fourth vipulā goes hand-in-hand with that of other factors involving a more or less refined style, but not necessarily with all of them. I will take as my first illustration the tent-scene from Droṇa 72-84, and ib. 51-71, a group of apparently old stories on the "sixteen kings that died" and allied tales. In the former there are four, in the latter twenty-one fourth vipulās to the thousand hemistichs; in the former there is but one slight irregularity ( $\simeq \cup - -$ ,  $- \cup \cup -$ ); in the latter there are six. But in the former there is one more second vipulā than there is third; in the latter these stand thirty to forty-seven; while after diiambus in the former there are nine out of forty in all, and in the latter sixteen out of fifty-five in all. In other words, in the last test there is scarcely any difference, but in that of second and third vipulās such evidence of antiquity as is furnished at all by this test is in favor of the former, whereas in the other tests it is in favor of the latter specimen. I have not selected these specimens, however, to show that all these tests are useless. On the contrary, I believe they may be applied, but all together and with constant reference to all other factors. The modifying factor here, for example, is that though the tales of the "kings that died" are undoubtedly old, yet they are told (or retold) in such modern careless Sanskrit that final i is here kept short not only before br but even before

vy. It is not enough then to say that a story in Droṇa or Anuṣāṣana is "undoubtedly old," because perhaps it smacks of antiquity or even is found in a Buddhist record. It is not the age of the story but the age of the form in which it is couched that marks the age of the literature. This specimen, for example, enumerates earth's islands as eighteen in number, a sure mark of lateness, but here supported by other data. Another extract from Droṇa, an ordinary battle-scene, adhy. 92-100, has, to be sure, thirteen fourth vipulās, but the vipulās, in their order, run 44, 14, 37, 13, with not a single irregularity of any sort, while only ten of the forty-four are after diiambus; in other words, as clean a scheme as might be met in Vālmīki, except for the fourth vipulā, and even here eight of the thirteen are in proper names. Less classic in appearance, but still far removed from the free epic type, is the passage dealing with the deaths of Bhūriṣravas and Jayadratha (vii, 141-146, not quite a thousand verses), important because of its mention of Vālmīki, 143, 67. Here the vipulās run 43, 33, 18, 11 (four of these in nom. prop.), with three irregular forms of the second vipulā.<sup>1</sup> A fourth of the first vipulās follow iambus. On the other hand, in the death of Droṇa and the following scene, vii, 190-198 = 8,695-9,195, only one-sixth of the first vipulās follow iambus and there are no certain exceptions. The scheme of vipulās is here 30, 28, 43, 9 (two in nom. prop.), that is, a more modern preponderance of third vipulās. Several other features show modern touches. Thus in 192, 7, Rudrasye 'va hi kruddhasya is either a very careless vipulā or contains an example of the Puranic licence (taken from Prākṛit) of short vowel before kr; while in the same passage, çl. 13, eṣo or eṣa hi pārṣato vīraḥ, we have to choose between careless sandhi or careless metre. In 190, 33, the antiquity of ∪ ∪ — — is in an inherited name, Jamadagniḥ, where, as in similar cases, the old licence persists even into Puranic writings.<sup>2</sup> In 195, 44, kadamhī-

<sup>1</sup> In 146, 7, occurs the rare combination ∪ — — ∪, ∪ ∪ ∪ —. The reading of C. 6,245 = 146, 92 is vicious, and is corrected in B.

<sup>2</sup> Names, formulae, and numerals often retain this licence, e. g., rāyaç ca,

*kr̥tya* is a late phrase, and in 191, 37, the stereotyped manœuvres are twenty-one in number (the earlier epic having fourteen). Here, then, the *vipulās* (110 in number, slightly below the average) do not badly represent the period of the selection, which is a worked-over piece, intended to save the heroes from blame, and is often incongruous with the rest of the epic; as in the humbug of the war-car "not touching the ground hitherto." When Yudhiṣṭhira tells a lie his car drops to the earth for the first time! But "hitherto" there has been no mention of this conscientious chariot, which here is represented as having floated just above the earth.

In *Kaṇva* we may compare the thousand verses of 18-29, where there is late battle-action (*guṇa* for *ṛjā* for example), with the five hundred fifty verses of old tales in 33-34. Each has seven fourth *vipulās*, though one is only half the length of the other. In *Sabhā* the interest centres on the gambling-scene, certainly the kernel of the old tale. Here, ii, 50 ff., for a thousand verses, there is the greatest number of fourth *vipulās* (thirty-six, nine of which are in proper names) and the most irregular forms; three cases of a third *vipulā* after a spondee, one case of a prior *pāda* ending in iambus, two cases of the "fifth" *vipulā*,  $\cup \cup - \cup$ , one case of first *vipulā* after a brevis, besides six cases of ordinary exceptions (second *vipulā* not after  $\cup - \cup -$ ), all of which remove the piece far from the almost classical norm found in some of the cases given above. It is in fact Puranic.<sup>1</sup> Of course the scene is intense and exciting; but I opine that no poet who had once learned to walk the straight and narrow way of the later stylists would ever get so excited as to use thirty-six fourth

xii, 349, 78; *daṣa devāḥ*, Ag. P. xvii, 6. The same cause induces the fourth *vipulā* in many cases of the *Rāmāyana*. For example, the only fourth *vipulā* in the first thousand verses of R. iii, *vāikhānasāḥ vāikhilyāḥ*, 8. 2.

<sup>1</sup> Compare for instance the 505 *śloka*s or 1010 verses in the first twenty chapters of the *Agni Purāṇa*, where the *vipulās* in their order are 41, 28, 50, 57, with six irregular second *vipulās* (not after iambus); five third *vipulās* not after iambus; and only nineteen of the fifty-seven fourth *vipulās* after iambus. The first *vipulā* in the gambling-scene is run up by the repetition of one phrase. They are in order, 60 (odd), 34, 51, 36.

vipulās in a thousand verses! Besides, there are other passages almost as dramatic. If we compare the Jaṭugṛha and four hundred verses of the Hiḍimbā stories, which together make about a thousand verses, we find eleven fourth vipulās, half of which are in proper names, only one case of a third vipulā not after  $\cup - \cup -$ , and three ordinary exceptions in the case of the second vipulā. The Kīcaka in Virāṭa is also a lively scene, which with a slight addition of circumjacent verses contains a thousand verses (325-825), and here the vipulās are in order, 42, 24, 52, 6, with no unusual exceptions and only three ordinary exceptions in the second vipulā;<sup>1</sup> while five of the six fourth vipulās are in proper names and in the title rājaputrī.

But since it may be objected that the subject matter is after all the essential factor, I will compare a philosophical section where the matter is that of the Bhagavad Gītā, for example Çānti, adhy. 811 and following for one thousand verses. Here the vipulās in their order are:

Gītā,	38	29	11	22
Çānti,	50	31	29	3
Compare R. iii, 1-16, 60		33	31	1

It will be seen that the extract from Çānti is almost on a metrical par with the ordinary narrative of the Rāmāyaṇa (1010 verses). But further, of the three cases of fourth vipulā in Çānti, one is in a proper name and there are no anomalous forms of unusual character, and only two ordinary exceptions (second vipulā), while the Gītā has a dozen irregularities of all kinds (including "fifth vipulās"). I may add to these specimens the instructive opening of Udyoga, where for nearly two hundred ślokas there is epic narrative followed by the old tale of Nahuṣa and Indra. The vipulās, for one thousand hemistichs, are here 55, 25, 46, 10, respectively, but nine of the ten are in the old tale, adhy. 9 ff., śl. 227, the other one being in a proper name. In the old-style didactic

<sup>1</sup> By ordinary exceptions I mean cases where the second vipulā does not follow an iambus.

verses, v, 35, 60 ff., on the other hand, there are six fourth vipulās in only five ślokas.

Whether we are entitled to draw from these data conclusions in regard to the time when the several selections were written may be doubted in all cases when the percentage of fourth vipulās is not sustained by other factors. But it seems to me, as I have said, that it is not unreasonable to assume a more modern authorship in the case of a sustained refinement of style. Even in cases where the data are not of an extreme character I think it is legitimate to question whether a comparative refinement is not of significance. Take for example the thousand verses of Udyoga, 119-133 (4,000-4,500). Here the subject-matter of the selection is the Bhagavadgītā. Nothing in the account seems antique; on the contrary, the whole story appears on the surface to be a late addition. Now, going beneath the surface, we find that the vipulās are in order 48, 23, 39, 13, but that eight of the last are in proper names. The collateral evidence agrees with the two factors here shown (preponderance of third vipulā over second, comparative scarcity of fourth vipulā); for of the forty-eight only twelve are after iambus; of the twenty-three, nineteen are after iambus; while of the four ordinary exceptions (after — — —) two are in the same phrase, yathā Bhīṣmaḥ Śāntanavaḥ; the third vipulā is perfectly regular or has at most one exception, mānena bhraṣṭaḥ svargas te (though, as a matter of fact, there cannot be much doubt that we have here the late light syllable before bhr); the five fourth vipulās not in proper names are all after iambus except one, contained in an hereditary phrase, eṣa dharmāḥ kṣatriyāṇām. Here then, though there is not the striking classical smoothness found in parts of the pseudo-epic, the few fourth vipulās agree with the other data in marking the piece as rather refined, perhaps modern, when compared with the oldest epic style.

When, however, the data are contradictory, as often happens, we may imagine a rehandling, as in the suspected<sup>1</sup> Nārāyaṇa exploitation in Śānti, from the end of the prose in

<sup>1</sup> Compare Bühler in *Indian Studies*, No. ii, p. 52.

343 to the end of 351, about a thousand verses, 13,224–13,740, where the scheme of vipulās is in order 80, 50, 32, 15; thirty-one of the eighty being after iambus; with five cases of irregular second vipulā and perfectly regular third vipulā (save for a slightly neglected cæsura, dharmapratisthāhetuḥ ca). The fourth vipulā here owes its large number solely to names, numbers, and an old phrase. Thus we find, not after iambus, tasmin yājñe vartamāne (like the regular phrase tasmin yuddhe vartamāne); Vāsudevam (second foot); Sāṅkhyam Yogam Pañcarātram; Sāṅkhyayogam (second foot); Pañcarātram (second foot); Vāikhāṇasāḥ phenapebhyaḥ; Sarva-kṛcchram (name of vrata); aṣṭadaṇṣṭrāu; leaving two cases, durvijñeyo duṣkaraḥ ca and jāyamānam (as second foot) after ∪ — — —; with five more after iambus.

Rather a striking example of the mixture of styles is given by ix, 48, where Indra and the jujube-girl are concerned. This is plainly interpolated with a Īva parody. Compare, for instance, prīto 'smi te ṣubhe bhaktyā tapasā niyamena ca, in the Indra dialogue, with çl. 45 (in the interpolation), prīto 'smi tava dharmajñe tapasā niyamena ca. Now the original Indra tale has fifteen vipulās in the first thirty odd verses; but the same number of çlokas in the following Īva parody shows only five vipulās.

Again it must be remembered that some rather modern selections are interspersed with old material. In the six hundred odd verses of the Çakuntalā episode, for instance, the style is modern to a certain extent, the first vipulā being less common after iambus than after spondee, and only one ordinary exception occurring in the second vipulā, while there are no unusual anomalies. But the passage has thirteen fourth vipulās, which is not a refined ratio and may be explained only partly by the presence of Dharmaçāstra material, hr̥di sthitaḥ karmasākṣī, bhāryām patiḥ sampraviçya (Manu, ix, 8). In my opinion the episode is old, but, like many ancient tales in the epic, it has been rewritten and in its present shape is not so old as the vaṇça and Yayāti episodes following, where there are as many fourth vipulās and more

anomalies. This episode has recently been made the subject of an interesting study by Dr. Winternitz,<sup>1</sup> who believes that it is of very doubtful antiquity, because it is lacking in the Southern manuscript examined by him and because the knot is untied by a "divine voice," instead of by a ring. One point not noticed by Dr. Winternitz must be remembered, however, namely that the Harivaṅṣa recognizes the episode and cites from it, apropos of the "divine voice,"<sup>2</sup> so that it existed in the present version, if not in its exact form, before the Harivaṅṣa was added to the poem; though I should not deny on that account that it was of doubtful antiquity.

I think I have now shown sufficiently that the different parts of the epic cannot revert to one period, still less to one poet, and will leave this minute analysis with a repetition of the statement that, whereas the parts already cited clearly reveal more styles than we may attribute to one age or man, occasional freedom of style in respect of vipulās does not in itself indicate antiquity; but when all the elements agree in refinement, this sustained refinement certainly points to a different environment and may imply that some parts of the epic are later than others. There is a refined style and there is a careless style, but the latter is late Puranic as well as antique, and mere carelessness proves nothing beyond the fact that the poet either did not know or did not regard classical rules. On the other hand, even the careless Puranic writers generally show a greater number of first vipulās after spondee than after iambus and more third than second vipulās. When, therefore, even these rules are not upheld and we find besides other irregularities, such as the three cases of the fifth vipulā in the Gītā, we may rest assured that the writer was rehandling material more antique than that of other passages. I say rehandling, because the Gītā has clearly been rewritten by a modernizing hand, as is shown not only by the circumstance already noticed that the heart of the poem differs in style from its beginning and ending, but also, for example, by the

<sup>1</sup> *Indian Antiquary*, 1898, pp. 67 and 136 ff.

<sup>2</sup> I, 74, 111 = H. I, 39, 12.



fact that in *Gītā*, 12, 15 we read *yasmān no 'dvijate lokah*, a metrically bettered form of *yadā cā 'yam na bibheti*, a phrase found intact in other parts of the epic.<sup>1</sup>

The usual epic *çloka*, apart from occasional variations, differs, as I have said, from the classical model most conspicuously in *vipulā* licence; as will clearly be seen at a glance on comparing the normal epic forms with the classical in the following tables, where is given first the average epic usage:

First Foot	Second Foot			
	U U U U	— U U U	— — — U	— U — U
U — U —	passim	passim	passim	passim
U — — —	passim	common	rare	common
U U — —	passim	common	sporadic	common

and then the forms permitted and almost never exceeded in *Kālidāsa* ("common" here means not unusual yet not *passim*):

First Foot	Second Foot			
	U U U —	— U U —	— — — U	— U — U
U — U —	common	passim	passim	
U — — —	passim			
U U — —	passim			

<sup>1</sup> Per contra, in the *Sanatsujāta Parvan*, v, 46, 26, *yatho 'dapāne mahati* is a metrical improvement on *Gītā*, 2, 46, *yāvān artha udapāne*. Other later features in the *Gītā* are the long sentences already referred to; the sporadic intrusion of the *Māyā* doctrine (discussed above in Chapter Three), and perhaps also the recognition of the *Vedānta Sūtra*.

The usual Rāmāyana ṣloka agrees with this later scheme, except in admitting sporadic cases of the fourth vipulā after an iambus.<sup>1</sup>

But, to get a comprehensive notion of the epic ṣloka, in its rarer forms as well as in its normal or average appearance, one must contrast these tables with the next, which gives, I believe, about all the Bhārata combinations for the prior pāda:

First Foot	Second Foot of Prior Pāda of Ṣloka in the Mahābhārata							
	υ _ _ _ υ	υ υ υ υ	υ _ υ υ	υ _ _ _ υ	υ _ υ υ	υ υ _ υ	υ _ υ υ	υ _ υ υ
υ _ υ _	p 1	p 9	p 14	p 21	p 28	s 34	r 39	s 43
υ _ _ _	p 2	p 10	c 15	r 22	c 29	s 35	s 40	s 44
υ υ _ _	p 3	p 11	c 16	s 23	c 30	s 36	? 41	s 45
υ _ υ υ	p 4	s 12	s 17	? 24	s 31	s 37	s 42	
υ υ _ υ	p 5		s 18	s 25	s 32	s 38		? 46
υ _ υ υ	p 6		s 19	s 26	? 33	.		
υ υ _ _	s 7	s 13	s 20	s 27				
υ υ υ _	s 8							
	Pathyā	First Vipulā	Second Vipulā	Third Vipulā	Fourth Vipulā	Minor Ionic	Major Ionic	Diambus

Abbreviations: p, passim; c, quite common; r, rare; s, very rare, sporadic. The interrogation marks indicate doubtful cases, for which the illustrations (as numbered in the table) must be consulted in Appendix B. For the corresponding table of triṣṭubh forms, see below.

<sup>1</sup> For the few exceptions to these much more restricted forms of the Rāmāyana, see Jacobi's Rāmāyana. There is to this uniformity not a single exception, for example, in the two thousand hemistichs found in B. iii, 1-16; iv, 1-11. Final brevis is rare in the second, but not in the first, B. vipulā.

[illegible]

Yet if, as I think, the *çloka* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* shows that it is in its present form not only more refined (which is conceded) but also later than parts of the *Mahābhārata*, the latter no less is later than the *Rāmāyaṇa* in other parts. There are five sorts (perhaps stages) of *çloka* reflected in epic and pre-

<sup>1</sup> Gurupūjākāumudī, p. 53.

epic literature (besides its parent Vedic anuṣṭubh). The first is the free ṣloka of the Upanishads. The second is the less free, but still unrefined, ṣloka of certain parts of the Mahābhārata. The third is the current Bhārata ṣloka. The fourth is the ṣloka found in parts of the pseudo-epic, a ṣloka which stands on a par with the ṣloka of the Rāmāyaṇa. The fifth is the continuous iambic ṣloka, which is found only in the Mahābhārata and is certainly later than other epic forms of ṣloka. Nearly forty stanzas of this type, consisting of iambs only (allowing final anceps), that is, over six hundred successive iambs — evidently a late tour de force — occur in xii, 322, 83-71, written by a poetaster who presents old ideas in a new style,<sup>1</sup> as in this specimen:

purā vrkā bhayaṃkarā manuṣyadehagocarāḥ  
 abhidravanti sarvato yataḥ ca puṇyaḥilane  
 purā hiraṇmayān nagān<sup>2</sup> nirīkṣase 'drimūrdhani  
 na mātrputrabāndhavā na saṃstutaḥ priyo janāḥ  
 anuvrajanti saṃkate vrajantam ekapātinam  
 yad eva karma kevalaṃ purākṛtaṃ cūbhācūbham  
 tad eva putra sārthikam bhavaty amutra gacchataḥ  
 ihā 'gnisūryavāyavaḥ ṇarīram ācṛitās trayāḥ  
 ta eva tasya sāksīṇo bhavanti dharmadarṇiṇaḥ

So far as I have observed, although the prior pāda may end either in ◡◡◡— or in ◡—◡◡, the union of both in one ṣloka is unknown to the epic. This is a combination of one freedom with another. The forms, therefore, were felt as liberties and consequently were not multiplied in narrow compass. Such ṣlokas, however, are found in the early style, and even the Mahābhāṣya gives us a sample, apparently from some defunct epic source, where one prior pāda is aharahar nayamāno and the following is Vāivasvato na tṛpyati.<sup>3</sup> This

<sup>1</sup> Found, for example, in the Vedāntasāra of Sadānanda: satattvato 'nyathāprathā vikāra ity udrītaḥ, 162, etc. For the single pāda, diiambic prior, see vii, 55, 49, cited below under Dīambua. A single pāda of this sort is both Vedic and Puranic.

<sup>2</sup> See Proverbs and Tales in the Sanskrit Epics, A. J. Phil., vol. xx, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Cited by Weber, Indische Studien, vol. xiii, p. 483.

may indicate that our epic has been metrically refined; otherwise we should perhaps find in it the same freedom. Noticeable also, I may say in view of the paragraph below on the posterior pāda, is the absence of any certain case of a hemistich ending like the prior pāda in  $\cup \_ \_ \_$ . This Gāthā form is found in the examples from the Bhāṣya (compare, for instance, *rātrīm rātrīm smarīṣyānto rātrīm rātrīm ajānantah*<sup>1</sup>); but the utmost freedom of the epic is  $\_ \_ \cup \_$  at the end of a hemistich, except in the semi-prose example given below (on the Dīāmbus); a circumstance that makes it impossible to believe that the epic in its present form is older than the second century B. C.

### THE POSTERIOR PĀDA OF THE ŚLOKA.

Owing to the prevailing diiambic close of the hemistich there is little variety in the posterior pāda. The first foot may have (sporadically) any one of seven forms, that is, with the exception of the unique opening of the prior pāda in proceleusmaticus, the first foot of the posterior pāda may be identical with any of those of the prior pāda. The second foot is a diiambus, or sporadically  $\_ \_ \cup \_$ , and  $\cup \_ \_ \_$  (doubtful).

FIRST FOOT.	SECOND FOOT.
1. $\cup \_ \cup \_$	regular
2. $\cup \_ \_ \_$	
3. $\cup \cup \_ \_$	
4. $\cup \_ \_ \cup$	sporadic
5. $\cup \cup \_ \cup$	
6. $\cup \_ \_ \cup \cup$	[ $\cup \_ \_ \_$ ]
7. $\cup \cup \cup \_$	

Of these forms, the first three and the fifth occur also as prior pādas (with diiambic close). The seventh form is avoided because it is the jagatī measure; but in general three final iambs are avoided. The first form is an oddity. Illustrations of all the forms of prior and posterior pādas will be found in Appendix B. The rules for this pāda are given below.

<sup>1</sup> Weber, loc. cit., p. 485.

Of the forms of the first foot (third of the hemistich), all except Nos. 1 and 7 are found *passim* in both epics; of the forms of the second (fourth) foot, with rare exceptions only the diiambus is found. The commonest forms are Nos. 2 and 3 (ending in spondees). After the first *vipulā* both of these are equally common and each is about twice as frequent as No. 4, and from two to four times as common as No. 5 (final trochees). No. 6, ending in a pyrrhic, is sometimes surprisingly frequent after this *vipulā*; but at other times is lacking for whole test-sections of a thousand verses. After the second *vipulā*, which usually ends in an iambus, as after the first *vipulā* (also iambic), Nos. 2 and 3 are favorites; No. 3 being perhaps a little more frequent. Here Nos. 4, 5, 6, are much less common; No. 6, however, is rarest of all. After the third *vipulā*, No. 2 sometimes yields in frequency to No. 3; but in other sections this foot still holds its own, and as in the former examples is even twice as common as other combinations, though it practically repeats the *vipulā*, —, — — —, ∪ — — —. Here Nos. 4 and 5 are about on a par, sometimes only a third as common as No. 2, sometimes more frequent, with No. 6 half as common as Nos. 4 and 5.<sup>1</sup> After the fourth *vipulā*, however, No. 6 is as common as any other, sometimes slightly in excess, with the others about on a par; No. 4 being perhaps the rarest.

Such varying ratios are not worth tabulating. They show that while the posterior *pāda* is not absolutely uninfluenced by the form of the prior, yet the determining factor is rather the inevitable presence of the former's diiambus, since the only marked choice is for spondees before it, as in the first *pāda* before an iambus (*pathyā*). The other cases reveal merely a shifting predilection for one of several forms, all of which are used pretty freely, the strongest influence of the preceding *vipulās* being simply that the usual prefer-

<sup>1</sup> For example in one text case of a thousand verses, there were twelve cases of No. 2; four each of Nos. 4 and 5; and two of No. 6. In another, nine of No. 2; eleven each of Nos. 4 and 5; four of No. 6.

ence for a spondee before the final diiambus is changed into a natural aversion after a spondaic vipulā, —, — — — or — ∪ —, but this is what might have been predicated in advance. After pathyās one foot is as permissible as another. Occasional variations here are of even less significance than in the case of precedent vipulās.

As all the forms of the prior and posterior pādas may have syllaba anceps, both initial and final, each pāda may appear in four forms.<sup>1</sup> Not to speak of the important modifications introduced by a varying cæsura, the syllabic combinations resulting from joining any one of the four kinds of each form of the posterior pāda with any one of the four kinds of each form of the prior pāda results in a large number of possible verse (hemistich) forms; while, since any form of the first hemistich may be united with any form of the second hemistich — to take only the commonest eighteen forms of prior pāda<sup>2</sup> and the five current forms of posterior pāda — the resultant variations in the form of the verse (hemistich) are 1440; in the case of the whole stanza (çloka), 2,073,600; so that one could write twenty Mahābhāratas in çlokas (the present one in the Calcutta edition contains 95,739 çlokas) and never repeat the same metrical stanza. Despite this latitude, however, the poets are not at all shy of repeating the same syllabic hemistich in juxtaposition, showing that they were indifferent to the vast possibilities before them and cared for cæsura more than for syllables. Thus Nala v, 45 b-46 a:

Damayantya saha Nalo vijahārā 'maropamaḥ  
janayāmāsa ca Nalo Damayantya mahāmanaḥ

<sup>1</sup> In explanation of the number of examples in Appendix B, I would say that, for the sake of showing the truth of this anceps theory, I have given the four forms, syllaba anceps at both ends of the pāda.

<sup>2</sup> That is, the first six pathyās, the first four forms of the first and second vipulās respectively, the first form of the third vipulā, and the first three forms of the fourth vipulā. These, by the way, are the forms "approved" by modern native scholars, according to Brown, Prosody, p. 6.

### The Diiambus

The rule of diiambic cadence appears to be violated in the epic. Far from regarding this as an archaism on the part of epic poets, one should recognize in such cases only a Puranic licence or adaptation of the Gāthā freedom conspicuous in all popular and therefore loose composition. Not only is that rule for Sanskrit which allows a syllable to remain light before kr, pr, br, hr, valid for the later epic, but the extended Prākṛit licence is also found, whereby almost any conjunct<sup>1</sup> may be treated for metrical purposes like a single consonant. Examples are found both in the Mahābhārata and the later Rāmāyaṇa. For the latter epic, Jacobi, *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 25 ff., should be consulted, where are given examples in br, pr, mr, ml, tr, hr, kl, and ṣr, e. g., *kiṁ tu Rāmasya prītyartham*, R. v, 58, 13; *vināṣayati trāilokyam*, ib. 1, 65, 13. From the Mahābhārata (in the appended illustrations of epic śloka forms) I have drawn several examples which are doubtful, because they may be regarded either as irregular (unusual) forms without this licence or regular forms with it. Such are *daṣa pañca ca prāptāni* (No. 25); *hate Bhīṣme ca Droṇe ca* (No. 22); *sarvaṣaṅgeṣu Brāhmaṇa* (No. 23); *abhiṣmāmi brāhmaṇam* (No. 41); *mānena bhraṣṭaḥ svargas te* (No. 22); *Rudrasye 'va hi kruddhasya* (No. 24). But further, in a few cases, ṣr also seem to leave the syllable light behind them, as in R.; e. g., *adyaprabhṛti ṣrīvatsaḥ* (Nos. 15, 26, 39). Nor are we aided as much as we should like to be, when, turning from these doubtful priors, we examine the posterior pādas. For though at first it seems decisive that such a pāda appears as *putram ipsanti brāhmaṇāḥ*, vii, 55, 21; *toṣayiṣyāmi bhrātaram*, viii, 74, 80; yet it is not quite settled whether we have here a syllable to be read light because, as in Greek, mute and liquid really make insufficient position, or whether the syllable is heavy but is allowed to stand for a light. For there are other cases where mute and liquid are not the

<sup>1</sup> Colebrooke, *Essays*, vol. II, p. 65, note ("any conjunct" in Prākṛit).



components of the conjunct. First we have double semi-vowels, which ordinarily make position, but fail to do so, for example, in vii, 55, 50, abhi Āvāitye 'tī vyāharan, which appears after a śloka with a diiambic prior pāda (sa cen mamāra Śrījaya). So the syllable remains light before cch and kṣ and dv, or the metrical rule is violated. In the Rāmāyaṇa and in the Mahābhārata, cases of liquid and kṣ are found more rarely in triṣṭubhs, but often enough to show that they are occasionally allowed. Thus in R. iii, 63, 6 b, °etya kleṣam (triṣṭubh).<sup>1</sup> In M.:

- viii, 37, 24 d, tyaktvā prāṇāṇ anuyāsyāmī Droṇam  
 xii, 73, 7 a-b, yadā hi<sup>2</sup> brahma prajāhātī kṣatram  
 kṣatram yadā vā prajāhātī brahma  
 xii, 319, 89 b, sarve nityam vyāharante cā brahma

In sum, the cases where this licence may be assumed for the later epic style<sup>3</sup> are before dr, br, bhr, mr, kr, pr, kl, tr, ṣr, lr, ty, vy, ṣy, dv, cch, kṣ. For dv, compare striyaṣ ca kanyaṣ ca dvijāṣ ca suvratāḥ, iv, 37, 33; āvartanāni catvāri tathā padmānī dvādaṣa, xiii, 107, 26; for cch, yugeṣv iṣāsū chatreṣu, vii, 159, 36, where the texts avoid the third vipulā by writing ch for cch. But whenever a short syllable is needed before cch it is got by dropping c (sometimes in one text, sometimes in another). For kṣ, ca kṣīyate, xii, 343, 87; raṇabhītāḥ cā kṣatriyāḥ, vii, 73, 39 (apparently an interpolated passage); exactly as we find the same licence in Vāyu Purāṇa, viii, 155, where the śloka ends °śā kṣatriyān, or as ib. v, 28, we find the common licence before br, lokān sṛjati brahmatve. For ṣy, see below on the triṣṭubh scoliis; mr, ml, ty, tr, I have not found in the Mahābhārata. They seem to belong to the latest parts of the Rāmāyaṇa.

<sup>1</sup> Jacobi, Rām. p. 27, gives cases from the later R. In G. v, 28, 5, na tyajet (B. correct v. l.); G. ii, 27, 24, tvayā sāham (B. correct v. l.).

<sup>2</sup> This section is free; but in xii, 202, 22 b, there is an upajāti group where we find tad evā pratyādadate svadehe (∪ — ∪ — being demanded).

<sup>3</sup> Examples of regular (heavy) position before mute and liquid are found everywhere, e. g., ix, 17, 41, 43, 44, 47, 51, 52; xii, 63, 8, 27; 64, 16, 18, etc. This is the rule; failure to make position or neglect of quantity is the exception and is characteristic rather of the later epic, as shown by the examples above.

We may, I think, assume that the liberty in respect of liquid and consonant was first introduced into epic Sanskrit, and that then in the later epic this was extended, with Gāthā freedom, to cases where the precedent syllable cannot be light, but is reckoned so. Therefore, while the early epic has only diiambic close, the later epic (like the Purāṇas) admits — — ◡ — as an equivalent; not of course generally, but sporadically, where the writer is late and careless, as is indicated by the character of the sections where such illegitimate freedom is found. So in the triṣṭubh scolius, there are a few cases of careless writing where a heavy syllable stands in the place of a light one. To say that this heavy syllable is light because it ought to be, is misleading. The weight may be ignored, as in Prākṛit (though there mutilation explains much that appears of this nature), but it must exist. Even the Greek poets occasionally pretended that a heavy syllable was light. In fine, — — ◡ — must be admitted as an occasional fourth foot of the hemistich, though it is avoided whenever possible.<sup>1</sup> For the foot ◡ — — —, I have only the hemistich *etac chrutvā tu Kāuravyaḥ Āibim pradakṣiṇaṁ kṛtvā*, iii, 194, 7, but this is apparently an accidental verse in a prose narration.

### Poetic Licence.

In general, however, while the epic poets are here and there rough and uncouth in their versification, the normal epic style sacrifices a good deal to what is regarded as good metrical form. Such a sacrifice, which culminates in the classical rule that one may use *bēn* for *bean* (*maṣa* for *māṣa*) if one only follows the metrical norm, is found most clearly exemplified in this very case of the diiambic close; a proof that the diiambus was regarded in general as obligatory.<sup>2</sup> But it is also to be noticed in the observance of preferred *vipulā* forms at the sac-

<sup>1</sup> Its restitution in Praṇa ii, 6, *ro yajūṅṣi sāmāni, yajñāḥ kṣatram* [ca] *brahma ca*, is at least probable.

<sup>2</sup> Compare even in the Rig Veda the regular irregularity of *yaviṣṭham*, for *yaviṣṭham*, for the sake of the diiambus; and see now an article by Professor Bloomfield on this very point, JAOS. xxi, p. 50 ff.

rifice of (Sanskrit) grammatical accuracy. There are, indeed, cases where word-structure appears to be needlessly sacrificed; but the vast majority of cases in which Sanskrit grammar is violated have to do with metrical necessity or predilection.

As already stated, the most frequent cause of such violation is the well-nigh obligatory diiambus at the close of a verse, as in *phullam Gomatī-tīrajam*, iv, 17, 12. The diiambic rule, as ordinarily stated, is included in this presentment of *çloka* restrictions: "The second, third, and fourth syllables of a posterior *pāda* should not form a tribrach, anapæst, or amphimacer, and the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth syllables should make a diiambus or second pæon, while the tribrach and anapæst rule apply also to the prior *pāda*." Obviously, in the posterior *pāda*, the tribrach rule, forbidding

⏏ ⏏ ⏏ ⏏ — ⏏ ⏏

is to avoid a succession of four or five short syllables; while the anapæst and amphimacer rule, forbidding

⏏ ⏏ ⏏ — ⏏ — ⏏ ⏏

is to avoid the (*jagatī*) close of three final iambs. The rule then for the even *pāda* is simply: Posterior *pādas* must end with diiambus, but must not end with triiambus, and must not contain a *proceleusmaticus*.

The following examples illustrate how secondary is Sanskrit grammar to this metrical rule: *yaç ca çūnyam upāsate* (for *upāste*),<sup>1</sup> v, 33, 39; *na sma paçyāma lāghavāt*, vii, 146, 5 (necessarily present); *bhāryāyāi gacchatī vanam*, R. ii, 32, 8; *setihāse cā chandasi*, xiii, 111, 42; *kathākhyāyikākārikāḥ*, ii, 11, 36, and *svadhā ca svadhābhojinām*, R. vii, 23, 23; *yathā hi kurute rājā prajāḥ tam anuvartate*,<sup>2</sup> R. vii, 43, 19; *madhūni droṇamātrāṇi bāhubhiḥ parigrhyate*, R. v, 62, 9 (not in G.); *apākṛāmat*, ix, 11, 62.

<sup>1</sup> So we find at the end of a *triṣṭubh* *pāda*, *upāsate yaḥ*, iii, 5, 19 b. Less common is the second person, *mokṣadharmam upāsase*, xii, 315, 15.

<sup>2</sup> This is simply a case of sacrifice to metre by a pedant who imitates *Manu* viii, 175, where *prajāḥ tam anuvartante* is the close of a *prior pāda*. Another form of this proverb, by the way, is shown in R. ii, 109, 9: *yadvṛttāḥ santi rājāṇas tadvṛttāḥ santi hi prajāḥ* (Spr. 1,643, 1,652, 5,768).

\* These examples comprise different classes, where, metri causa, are changed (a) the conjugation or mode; (b) the temporal termination; (c) the feminine participle; (d) the euphonic rule; (e) the gender; (f) the syntactical combination;<sup>1</sup> (g) length of root-vowel and other sporadic cases.

Of these, by far the commonest are irregularities in the temporal termination, and in the ending of the feminine participle. Of these two, the usual changes are the substitution of preterite for present endings and *atī* for *antī*; less often, present for preterite and *antī* for *atī*. The participial change is the commonest of all, and what is most important is that scarcely any of the irregular participial stems are irregular from any other cause than that of metrical preference, and the greater number are fashioned simply to give diiambus at the end of the hemistich. I lay especial stress on this because in the lists of such changes occasionally published either no weight at all has been laid on the motive of the change, or the motive has been only incidentally acknowledged, or thirdly the lists have been made with reference to the class of the participle, as if the conjugation were especially important.<sup>2</sup> The only thing of importance, however, is the metre. What has been lost sight of, or not seen, is that not only the obvious diiambic rule but also the vipulā preferences come strongly in play, especially in the Rāmāyaṇa. A few examples will illustrate this.

First for the diiambus: *cā 'nyām gatiṃ apaçyatī*, R. vi, 47, 10; *kurarīm iva vāçatīm*, Nala, 11, 20; so elsewhere in Mbh., *abhilapsatī*, *cikīrṣatī*, *nādayatī*, *avekṣatī*, *anveṣatī*; and in Rām., *parigarjatī*, *yācatī*, *anudhāvātī*, *janayatī mama*, etc. Likewise in the verbal ending: *adho gacchāmā medinīm*, i, 13, 18; *duḥkham prāpsyāmā dāruṇam*, ix, 59, 30; *yuddhe kiṃ kur mā te priyam*, ix, 32, 62; *kathā drakṣyāmā tām purīm*,

<sup>1</sup> See below, on dialectic Sanskrit.

<sup>2</sup> At the same time I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to the following lists as collections of material: For four books of the Rāmāyaṇa, Böhtlingk, *Berichte d. philol. histor. Classe d. Königl. Sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* 1837, p. 213; Holtmann, *Grammatisches aus dem Mahābhārata*.

R. ii, 47, 11; na ca paçyāmā Māithilīm, R. iv, 50, 15; 56, 13. Compare also the striking example in R. ii, 91, 59: nāi 'vā 'yodhyām gamiṣyāmo na gamiṣyāmā Daṇḍakān. These ordinary irregularities might be exemplified with hundreds.<sup>1</sup> Other cases are less frequent; but to the same cause is due the close of hemistichs in tāv akurvātām, i, 176, 9; the frequent change of voice, as in svargam ihantī nityaçaḥ, vii, 71, 14; the change of vowel-length in upākramat, apākramat, parākramet, vii, 54, 58; ix, 11, 47; 11, 62; xii, 140, 25; so 'pi niṣkrāman, R. iv, 50, 9; Lakṣmīvardhanaḥ (passim) and the frequent loss of augment.<sup>2</sup> One of the most striking verbal changes is in na bibhyati for na bibheṭi in i, 75, 53; na bibhyase, R. iii, 46, 30.

The other half of the rule for the posterior pāda is kept by avoiding three iambs and a succession of four breves, with a sacrifice of the normal quantity, in prācetaso daça (so explained in PW. s. v.); sakhīgaṇāvṛtā, Nala, i, 24; na çrīr jahāti vāi tanūḥ, xi, 25, 5 (jahanti for jahati, below); upāsante mahāujasaḥ, R. vii, 37, 19 (upāsate in 20) and 21; āyatīhitam ucyate, G. iii, 44, 11; and instead of adhārayam (mahāvratam), samadhāram, R. vii, 13, 25. Compare also na svapāmi niças tadā, Nala, 13, 61, patois for svapimi; and the middle drakṣyase vigatajvaram, ib. 12, 93, with drakṣyasi in 92 and 95; drakṣyase surasattamam, v, 14, 5.<sup>3</sup>

In the prior pāda, to avoid the anapæst the same form is used, drakṣyase devarājānam, v, 11, 24; the sandhi of eṣo hi

<sup>1</sup> One of the commonest cases is the substitution of sma for smaḥ. This is found oftenest in the prior pāda but also in the posterior, e. g., R. iv, 65, 11, anuprāptāḥ sma sāmpratam.

<sup>2</sup> Compare also the endings patnīṣu, prakṛtījanaḥ, R. i, 37, 6; 42, 1; gṛhagṛdhnūnām, R. vi, 75, 14, manyūnām, ib. 15 (dīrghābhāva āṛṣaḥ says the scholiast); kopenā 'bhiparivṛtaḥ, R. vii, 58, 22 (below); anūdaram, xiv, 46, 47.

<sup>3</sup> Here too belongs the use of the future imperative in ix, 25, 44, drakṣyadhvam yadi jīvati, followed by yudhyadhvam sahītāḥ sarve. Böhtlingk, loc. cit., denies to the epic a future imperative. The case I have cited, however, is not in Holtzmann's list (loc. cit. § 938), on which B. draws for his material, and it seems to me conclusive in favor of such a form (and meaning). Were it not for the breves the poet would have used paçyata (not drakṣyatha), as is shown by yudhyadhvam and the general situation.

pārṣato virah, vii, 192, 13; the long vowels in Pūṣānam abhyadravata, vii, 202, 59; ṣrutāvati nāma vibho, ix, 48, 2; and the change of conjugation in dadanti vasudhām sphitām, xiii, 62, 46. To avoid diiambus at the close of the prior pāda we find, for the genitive, dadarṣa dvāiratham tābhyām, vii, 98, 26; the participial exchange noted above, kusumāny apacinvantī, R. iii, 42, 32; jānantī, R. ii, 10, 35 and Mbh. i, 78, 6; and various sporadic irregularities in the latter poem: pradakṣiṇam akurvanta, viii, 72, 12; puṣṇāmy āuśadhayaḥ sarvāḥ, i, 78, 40; Duryodhanam upāsante, viii, 84, 12; ṣayānam samupāsanti, vii, 72, 40 (so G. vii, 41, 2); vālūkām, pattībhiḥ, etc., R. iii, 73, 12; iv, 25, 23; ṣaktībhiḥ, R. vi, 71, 14. For a like reason, but to avoid a final minor Ionic, we find paṣyate rājā, R. vii, 32, 25; drakṣyase tatra, ib. 34, 10, etc.

Less generally have been recognized irregularities due to vipulās. But here too Sanskrit grammar yields to the decided tendency to have an iambus or diiambus precede in three of the four forms and also to less marked tendencies. Even the pathyā shows similar cases, though in this foot more latitude is allowed. But there often is, for example, in the pathyā a decided preference for the opening  $\cup - \cup - \cup$  rather than  $\cup \cup - -$ , and in accordance with this we find arditāḥ sma bhr̥ṣaṁ Rāma, in R. iii, 10, 11, and āgatāḥ sma, ib. 15, 2; where sma must be for smaḥ (in some cases this is doubtful).<sup>1</sup> Of the vipulās, the third is naturally chiefly affected. In the last passage, for example, ṣl. 19, we read iha vatsyāma Sāumitre, which is changed as certainly for metrical reasons as are the similar cases in the diiambic ending. So in R. ii, 17, 10; 40, 22, etc. So, too, loss of augment in sa praviṣya ca paṣyad vāi; the participle in -ant, tathā rudantīm Kausalyām, R. ii, 40, 44; duḥkhāny asahatī devī, R. ii, 12, 89; kācic cintayatī tatra, R. vii, 24, 11 (as opposed to sā cintayantī buddhyā 'tha, Nala, 5, 12); and shortening of a long vowel, sapatnīyṛddhāu yā me tvam, R. ii, 8, 26; pitur iṅgudīpanyā-

<sup>1</sup> In upāsanta mahārājam, iv, 18, 16, the form is chosen not from any aversion to  $\cup - \cup \cup$ , but for variety, because this foot precedes in the same ṣloka. In R. i, 4, 4, agrhītām ("Vedic") is merely an error.

kam, R. ii, 104, 8; so 'marāvatīsamkācam, R. vii, 33, 4. The commonest form here is the sma just referred to: pitṛmatyaḥ sma bhadraṁ te; kṛtapuṇyāḥ sma bhadraṁ te, R. i, 33, 3; ii, 55, 12. So, adharmam vidma Kākutstha aśmin, R. vii, 63, 2. Offensive is the heavy third vipulā preceded by a succession of heavy syllables, and so we find: aho tṛptāḥ sma bhadraṁ te, R. i, 14, 17; nūnam prāptāḥ sma sambhedam, R. ii, 54, 6; vyaktam prāptāḥ sma taṁ deçam, ib. 93, 7.<sup>1</sup>

The Mahābhārata is not so strict in its vipulā regulation, but even here we find the same condition of things, though in less careful observance. Thus, tvayy adhināḥ sma rājendra, v, 8, 22; tvadadhīnāḥ sma rājendra, xv, 3, 54; upaḥikṣāma te vṛttam, xii, 16, 2; <sup>2</sup> ihāi 'va vasatī bhadre, Nala, 13, 66. Both texts, merely in accordance with the vipulā rule or predilection, have kim mām vilapatīm ekām in Nala, 12, 55, and 91, which modern editors, sure of grammar but ignorant of metre, change to vilapaṇīm (compare R. iv, 20, 22, kim mām evam pralapatīm); evaṁ vilapatīm dīnām, vii, 78, 36. Other examples are tato rudantīm tām dṛṣtvā, Nala, 16, 33 (as in R. vii, 80, 18, arajā 'pi rudantī sā, to avoid the Ionic; but visamjñakalpām rudatīm, vii, 78, 39, etc.); mām anusmaratī çete, viii, 44, 17; paitim anveṣatīm ekām, Nala, 12, 34. Most participial changes of this sort not due to the diiambus (avoided or sought) are due here as in the Rāmāyaṇa to the natural disinclination to heap up long syllables and the grad-

<sup>1</sup> About half the cases of sma for smaḥ are due to metre. This word before sonants on account of its monosyllable would lose its character, and for this reason most of the cases not due to metre are before sonants to avoid smo. Of all the cases in Böhtlingk's list only two are before surds. At the pāda-end, where length is indifferent, sma stands only before sonants. With the exception of sma, in the first four books of the Rāmāyaṇa (according to Böhtlingk's list) the only examples of ma for maḥ which appear to be independent of metre are vidma pūrvam and praveṣyāma at the beginning of posterior pādas. The first is not in G.; the second appears in G. as *veṣyāmi*. I may add of sma, as indicative of the pseudo-epic, that the thirteenth book has three forms of this word, smaḥ, sma (perhaps dialectic), and smahe. The last, a modern form, is found not only in xiii, 1, 13, but in 93, 41, na smahe mandavijñāṇē na smahe mandabuddhayaḥ . . . pratibuddhā sma jāgṛma.

<sup>2</sup> Holtzmann, at § 548; but I should not entertain the notion that any of these forms (as here suggested) was other than indicative.

ual creation of the iambic rule for the third vipulā.<sup>1</sup> The change to *antī*, illustrated by *muṣṇantī* and *kurvantī* in Nala, 5, 8, and 16, 11, respectively, and *āyāntī*, R. vii, 26, 47; 96, 11, etc., is in part explained by preferred combinations and in part by analogy, the great mass of verbs making the form *antī*. The best case of change for metre is furnished, however, by the *triṣṭubh* in ii, 67, 53 (— — — — — begins a *triṣṭubh* only before — — — — —):

tathā bruvantīm karuṇām rudantīm <sup>2</sup>

The first vipulā is responsible for the form *upāsanta* in ix, 38, 53, *tvām upāsanta varadam*; the second, for *aho mūḍhāḥ sma suciram*, xiii, 16, 27; the third, for *vicariṣyāma loke 'smin*, viii, 33, 12. For the fourth I have no sure case.

In regard to the augment, it is omitted so freely that only in pronounced cases are we sure that it is dropped for metre, especially as the endings *ta* and *tha* are interchanged (as they are in the later Upanishads). Thus in R. iv, 53, 8 *kiṁ na budhyata* may be present, or, as the commentator says, stand for *nābudhyata* (*dīambus*); but again there appears to be no reason for *samantāt paridhāvata* in R. vii, 28, 17, for the augmented form would serve as well. But in this category, besides the influence of patois, we have a more than usual source of pseudo-archaisms. For in many other cases we can but assume that copyists have tampered with the text, correcting after their wont, sometimes for grammar and sometimes for metre, according to their individual taste; a process that explains in our printed texts the frequent divergences that depend on these points.<sup>3</sup> But with the augment it is especially easy to give an archaic effect, since, while Sanskrit

<sup>1</sup> In Holtzmann's list, for example, the only case of *atī* for *antī* that does not come under these rules is *caratī* in Nala, 12, 10; which may be attracted by *anveṣatī* in the same verse (the latter caused by the *dīambic* rule).

<sup>2</sup> Holtzmann registers *rudantī* for 1, 3, 5, where B. has *rudatī*; and for Nala, 17, 12, but B. has *rudatyāu*.

<sup>3</sup> For this reason I have elsewhere called them "unguarded texts," meaning of course that they were not protected, as were the poems of sacred character, by artificial methods of transmission.



kept the augment, most of the other forms dealt with are current side-forms as well as antique. So we find, for example, in R. vii, 28, 26, *nānāvadyāni vādyanta*, but in G. 36, 26, *ny avādyanta*, and here, as in parallel cases, it is quite impossible to say whether we have a grammatically emended text or a mere imitation of the antique on the part of a copyist.

Instances of alteration in triṣṭubh verse are of the same sort as those just mentioned and need not be specifically detailed. Here too we find the same imitation of the antique. One example will illustrate both cases. In xiii, 102, 55 a – b, occurs, *budhyāmi tvām Vṛtrahaṇam ṣatakṛatam, vyatikrāmantam bhuvanāni viçvā*.<sup>1</sup> Compare also *na cū 'pi jānīmā tave 'ha nātham*, iii, 265, 4 d; *nā 'bhūtikāleṣu phalaṁ dadanti*, xii, 25, 7 a; and the following examples:

*na tām vaded uṣatīm pāpalokyām*, xii, 300, 8 d  
*prayāma sarve ṣaraṇam bhavantam*, i, 197, 4 d  
*Karṇam bibhēduḥ sahitāḥ pṛṣatkāiḥ*, viii, 82, 16 c  
*jahāra pāpas taruṇīm viceṣṭatīm*, R. iii, 53, 26 c  
*apaṇyati Rāghava-Lakṣmaṇāv ubhāu*, R. iii, 52, 44 c  
*hataḥ sma sarvāḥ saha mantribhiḥ ca*, R. ii, 61, 26 b

Here, as will be seen from the structure of the triṣṭubh, the cases of grammatical irregularity are of the same type and character as those in ṣloka. The prevailing type, namely, is the patois substitution of *ma* for *mas* as verbal ending, and the alternate participial form. The change here also, as in ṣloka, induces a preferred or "regular" form against a more unusual, more disliked, or more irregular form. The last example above, for example, gives a cadence common to both epics; but to have *smaḥ* for *sma* would be a cadence of the *Mahābhārata*, not of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

To sum up for the ṣloka: In the occasional modification of accepted Sanskrit forms purely for the sake of metre and in the lack of a thorough observance of metrical laws, which have

<sup>1</sup> This form occurs also in i, 3, 57 *bhuvanāni viçvā*; and vii, 201, 77, *bhuvanāni 'ha viçvā*, in the same formula. Generally *sapta* takes its place.

yet obviously affected certain parts of the epic, we can see the rules themselves in process of making. For the greater part of the Bhārata there is no fixed rule, but the foundation of the rule is there in popular liking and dislike. Thus cases do exist, and they are not infrequent, of  $\simeq \cup \_ \_$  before a second vipulā, but there is a decided tendency against such a combination, and as a result we find bhakṣayiṣyāva sahītāu, i, 152, 18; to explain which we need only say that the first vipulā favors, while the second does not favor, this precedent foot; just as ib. 154, 35, cīghraṁ gacchāma bhādraṁ te is merely a present indicative with a preterite (patois) ending, substituted because the Sanskrit ending would oppose a metrical combination to which there is a growing though not yet thoroughgoing aversion.

Finally, as already abundantly illustrated, the statement that "the laws of the ṣloka are the same in the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the classical poets"<sup>1</sup> is certainly much too strong. What is quite fixed in the last is not so rigid in the first, and is much looser in the Bhārata than in either of the other two.<sup>2</sup>

### The Hypermetric Ṣloka.<sup>3</sup>

A ninth syllable is often attached to the octosyllabic prior ṣloka pāda, regularly prefixed, sporadically incorporated; the hypermetric syllable in the former case being, with the next also, a brevis, while the third is long before an iambus, the whole foot preceding a pathyā or any vipulā, thus: —

<sup>1</sup> Das Rāmāyaṇa, 1893, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> It is indeed enough if the vipulā be preceded by a heavy syllable or long vowel, as has justly been remarked by Jacobi, in his article Ueber den Ṣloka im Mahābhārata, but this rule does not mark the distinction between precedent iambs and spondees. The rule is to have a precedent iamb, and a spondee is always exceptional; but in R. it is a very rare exception; in Mbh. a very common exception.

<sup>3</sup> Analogous to the freedom in triṣṭubh we might expect to find also cases of catalectic, or more properly abridged, ṣloka-pādas, such as, e. g., puraṣ cakre dvipadaḥ, BAU. ii, 5, 18 (cakṛa ?); but I have not noticed any such epic pādas.

pathyā:

anubhūyatām ayaṁ vīrāḥ, Nala, 2, 9

first vipulā:

prakṛtir guṇān vikurute, xii, 314, 15

second vipulā:

katham Ārṣṭiṣeṇo bhagavān, ix, 40, 1

third vipulā:

navanītapāṅkāḥ kṣīrodāḥ, xiii, 80, 6

fourth vipulā:

çaraṇāgatām na tyajeyam, v, 12, 16

The regular hypermeter thus coincides in its opening with the irregular and unusual octosyllabic pāda, ∪ ∪ — ∪ — — —. For instance, akṛtavraṇaḥ çubhāir vākyaīḥ, v, 184, 14, is hypermetric, while apakāriṇam mām viddhi, xiii, 96, 7, is an acatalectic pāda; for which reason, probably, the latter is so rare.

Such hypermeters are not unusual in the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa, though more frequent in the former, not only on account of the mass, but in the same amount of matter. They seem to be at times rather affected by the later epic poets; perhaps to give an appearance of antiquity, whereby, as often, the effect is overdone. I know at least of no passage in either epic where, as in Harivaṇṣa, 1, 3, 54, and 87, and 91, and 108, four hypermeters can be found in the space of fifty odd çlokas. They are common too in the Purāṇas.

Certain phrases are apt to appear in this form. The commonest is abhivādayanti or some similar derivative, which often introduces hypermeters in çlokas (as also in triṣṭubhs). Thus, for example:

abhivādayanti bhavatīm, v, 90, 98

abhivādayanti vṛddhāṅ ca, v, 47, 16

abhivādaye tvām rājendra, iii, 291, 37

abhivādaye tvām bhagavan, iii, 207, 13 and R. iii,

11, 72

abhivāditaḥ kaṇṭyobhiḥ, iii, 257, 8

abhivādya cāi 'nam vidhivat, v, 179, 13

abhivādayitvā çirasā, v, 176, 28

abhivādayīta vṛddhāṇḍ ca, xiii, 104, 65

abhivādayiṣye hr̥ṣṭe 'ti, xiv, 68, 19

abhivādayāmas tvām sarvāh, R. vii, 49, 15

Although avamanyase mām nr̥pate, v, 189, 22, might suggest the possibility of pronouncing omanyase, and abhivā-denti in the examples above, yet this explanation is almost excluded by the fact that parallel examples, in overwhelming majority, admit of no such solution. Many of the cases have been collected by Gildermeister in his excellent article in the fifth volume of the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, p. 269.<sup>1</sup> It is easy to add many parallel examples. Thus abhiṣektukāmas taṁ rājā, G. ii, 74, 55, is a parallel to abhiṣektukāmaṁ nr̥patim, Mbh. i, 85, 19, and çaraṇāgatam is an opening used repeatedly, e. g., v, 178, 9; viii, 90, 112; xiii, 82, 2 and 34 (but in 38 b, çaraṇāgatasakṣaṇam).<sup>2</sup> Some difference of texts is to be noticed. Thus in xiii, 93, 119, çaraṇāgatam hantu sa vāi, C. omits vāi, an impossible pāda. On the other hand, in xiii, 94, 27, anṛtāu vratī jaṭī cāi 'va, of C. 4,573 is converted into anṛtāu ca vratī cāi 'va. So in G. v, 63, 2, abhayaṁ dadāmi te vīra; but in B., abhayaṁ te pradāsyāmi. The commonest words thus employed, owing perhaps merely to opportunity, are abhivādayanti, or an equivalent, çaraṇāgata°, and Janamejaya. Those mentioned by Benfey, in the notes to his *Chrestomathie*, are chiefly of the same character, but he also adduces long initials, of which I shall speak presently. Although, as shown above, any form of vipulā or a pathyā may contain the hypermetric pāda, and the fourth vipulā is very common, yet the pathyā is the usual place for it, so that the last may be regarded as itself the pathyā or regular form of this irregularity.

Besides the cases noticed by others, to which references will be found loc. cit., Janamejaya, abhiṣaryamāṇam, aditir

<sup>1</sup> Compare also Jacobi, *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 24 and in the *Gurupūjākāsumudī*.

<sup>2</sup> In v, 12, 15, and 16 (cited above), çaraṇāgatā 'ami te brahman, and çaraṇā-gatam na tyajeyam, respectively. But in v, 15, 38, çaraṇam tvām prapanno 'mi.

ditih, balavat sapat-, upajīvanam, vṛṣalīpatih, puruṣam tv idānīm, aruṇodaye, tam ahaṁ smayann iva raṇe (one of the repeated phrases, v, 179, 22, etc.), atithivratī (also repeated, iii, 260, 4, etc.), akṛtavraṇaprabhṛtayaḥ (repeated opening, v, 180, 17, etc.),<sup>1</sup> and a few more hitherto cited, I add with references:

aparājito jyotikaḥ ca, i, 35, 13; upagīyamānā nārībhiḥ, etc., ii, 58, 36 (iii, 158, 83; vii, 82, 28); kapilāvaṭam, iii, 84, 31; (kapilasya goḥ, xii, 269, 5); bhagavān anekaḥ, iii, 99, 39; 188, 9; viyunajmi dehāt, iii, 142, 26; paricārakeṣu, iii, 200, 9; amitāujase, v, 4, 12; Sumanomukho Dadhimukhaḥ, v, 103, 12 (in i, 35, 8, as Sumanākhyo Dadhimukhaḥ); kṛtakilbiṣāḥ, v, 165, 22; puruṣaḥ sanātanamayāḥ, vi, 21, 14 = 773, v. l.;<sup>2</sup> madanugrahāya paramam, vi, 35, 1; avamanyamāno yān yāti, vii, 73, 30; aruṇām Sarasvatīm prāpya, ix, 5, 51; Garudānanāḥ kaṅkamukhāḥ, ix, 45, 83; madadhiṣṭhitatvāt samare, ix, 62, 18; Çakune vayanṁ sma devā vāi, xii, 300, 4; avyaktarūpo bhagavān çatadhā ca sahasradhā, çatadhā sahasradhā cāi 'va tathā çatasahasradhā, xii, 315, 2; tadanantaram ca Rudrasya, xii, 319, 62; araṇī mamantha brahmarsih, xii, 325, 9; Uçanā Bṛhaspatiḥ cāi 'va, xii, 336, 45; ayajad dharim surapatim, xii, 338, 30; paramāṇubhūtā bhūtvā tu, xii, 345, 15; sahasā jaghatur vedān, xii, 348, 29; tridaças trikāladrk karma, xiii, 17, 62; animantrito na gaccheta, xiii, 104, 143; Vidurādayaḥ ca, xv, 3, 76; aṭavibalam, xv, 7, 7; Upadānavi sutaṇi lebhe, H. i, 32, 8; asatīm Vapnṣṭamām etām, H. 3, 5, 21; dhvajinaḥ patākinaḥ cāi 'va, R. v, 4, 20; Amarāvatiṁ samāsādyā, R. vii, 5, 26; Yamalārjunāu, R. vii, 6, 35; Kṛtavān Pracetasas putrah, R. vii, 111, 11.

It will be observed that Yamalārjunāu and Amarāvatiṁ (these Rāmāyaṇa passages have already been cited by Jacobi) are exactly of the same type as are dhvajinaḥ patākinaḥ, abhivādaye, and abhiṣektukāmaḥ, though the first two occur together in a late addition to the epic and the other three examples are in the body of the work. As the type per se

<sup>1</sup> These are complementary references.

<sup>2</sup> Enda, yataḥ Kṛṣṇas tato jayaḥ, variant on the older phrase, just preceding, yato dharmaḥ tato jayaḥ.

is old (Upanishads),<sup>1</sup> the occurrence of hypermeters denotes rather lack of refinement than lack of antiquity, so that the phenomena as a class stand parallel to the care or carelessness in the making of vipulās.

When on two short syllables a third short follows, the phrase is rudely adapted to metrical needs. Hence also manyata for ahar amanyata in R. iv, 35, 7.<sup>2</sup> Some exceptions occur to mar the uniformity of the phenomena, but for the most part they are in words or phrases which are forced upon the poets and which they have to handle as best they can. So we find a variant on the daṣa proverbs<sup>3</sup> in the form daṣaṣṭriyasamo rājā ity eva Manu abravīt, i, 41, 31, where there are two departures from the norm and the verse is a hypermetric form of the pathyā ∪ — ∪ ∪, ∪ — — ∪.<sup>4</sup> A similar case occurs in R. iii, 35, 9, where we find daṣagrīvo viṇṣatibhujāḥ. Here I can scarcely agree with Professor Jacobi in regarding daṣa as monosyllabic (Rām., p. 24). So in the case of Daṣakandhara-rājasunvoh, cited by the same author (in Gurupūj, p. 52) from iii, 290, 19, which is like pratibodhaviditam matam, simply hypermetric but answering to the type ∪ — ∪ ∪, — ∪ — — (not to be read as Daṣakandharā, as Jacobi suggests). Either this or the explanation offered below of suppressed *a* seems to me most probable.

Hypermeters with long initial syllable are sometimes found. They are of two sorts and should be carefully distinguished. The first is where the pādā corresponds exactly to those just discussed save that a long syllable takes the place of the first brevis. So far as I know, this occurs only in the later epic portions (also Puranic). It is a clumsy or careless form which, induced generally by proper names, regards only the mechanically counted syllables and entirely disregards the

<sup>1</sup> For example, pratibodhaviditam matam, Kena, ii, 4; abhayaṁ titirṣatām pāram Kaṭha, iii, 2. Gildermeister, loc. cit., p. 275.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Böhtlingk, loc. cit., p. 214 ad fin. So puno pi, Gāthā and Pāli.

<sup>3</sup> Compare xii, 108, 16, daṣāi 'va tu sadā 'cāryaḥ ṣṭriyān atiricyate; xiii, 105, 14, daṣā 'cāryān upādhyāyāḥ.

<sup>4</sup> The partial parallel, uttarāyaṇam from Manu vi, 10, cited by Gildermeister, loc. cit., p. 272, is a later text for turāyaṇam (see Jolly's text).

essence of the hypermetric light dissyllable. This consists in a mora measurement of two breves, or light syllables, as a substitute for one long vowel or heavy syllable, which is impossible in pādas that have such initials as

Ekata-Dvita-Tritāḥ co 'cuḥ, xii, 337, 20

Āṇvamedhikam samāsādyā, xviii, 278, corrected in

B. 6, 69 to āsādyā.<sup>1</sup>

Nāimīṣāranye kulapatih, H. 1, 1, 4 (C. 11)

dakṣiṇāyanam smṛtā rātriḥ, H. 1, 8, 9 e<sup>2</sup>

Where a short vowel follows (as in other parallel cases mentioned hereafter) it is practically suppressed. So asthīny antarato dārūṇi, BAU. iii, 9, 28 (asthīny antar 'to')<sup>3</sup> and in the epic:

pakṣivānararutajñāiḥ ca, i, 70, 45 (vān 'ra),

or the two breves must be read as a mora-equivalent. It is a mark of the popular style, as in Agni Purāṇa, iii, 11, bibhrata kamaṇḍalam pūrṇam; ib. x, 28, brahmaṇā Daṣarathena tvam. Prefixed extra metrum is āum in xii, 348, 38, āum, namas te brahmahṛdaya, and elsewhere.

The cases of long initial cited from the older epic are of quite different character from the form with initial long. The supposed parallel from Manu vi, 10, adduced by Gildemeister, and cited above, being removed in the revised text, there remain only a few pādas of entirely different formation. Instead of having a long syllable prefixed they follow a distinct type of triṣṭubh. The pāda does not begin with a long syllable and then continue with a short, but begins with two long vowels or heavy syllables, or a short followed by a long:

(a) retodhāḥ putra unnayati, i, 74, 111; H. 1, 32, 12

(b) Bhīṣmo vasūnām anyatamaḥ, v, 185, 18

(c) ṇṛāddham pitṛbhyo na dadāti,<sup>4</sup> v, 33, 35

<sup>1</sup> Compare Amarāvatiṁ samāsādyā, v. l. āsādyā, R. vii, 5, 26.

<sup>2</sup> In Manu i, 67, rātriḥ syād dakṣiṇāyanam. Compare the similar "Puranic" verse, dakṣiṇenā 'ryamnah panthānam, cited above, p. 6, note 2.

<sup>3</sup> Compare the subsequent pādas: retasa iti mā vocata: dhānāruha iva vāi vṛkṣaḥ, though here we may read a(h) + i = e, as also occasionally in epic verse.

<sup>4</sup> Cited by Gildemeister, loc. cit., p. 273.

One case (cited like these by Jacobi) is found in the later Rāmāyaṇa, vii, 21, 14,

santāryamāṇān Vāitarāṇīm

with the first syllable short and second long, e. g., v, 43, 11,

(d) katham samṛddham asamṛddham

It will be noticed that the cæsura is after the fifth syllable. The forms in the corresponding (a, b, c, d) triṣṭubh pādas, where the initial length is indifferent, may be illustrated by :

- (a) na cen mām Jiṣṇur | āhvayitā sabhāyām
- (b) āmantraye tvām | brūhi jayam raṇe me
- (c) yasyā 'vibhaktaṁ | vasu rājan sahāyāih
- (d) samānam mūrdhni | rathayānam viyanti

Many cases of these forms will be shown in the next section on triṣṭubhs. The two formations are evidently identical; but what occurs passim in the triṣṭubh is sporadic in the ṣloka. The pāda in each case consists of a complex of two metrical groups,  $\cup - \cup - \cup$  and  $- \cup \cup -$  or  $\cup \cup - -$ .<sup>1</sup>

An extra syllable in the posterior pāda is indicative merely of late carelessness under the power exerted by names and titles which are hard to coerce into normal metrical form; as in the spurious verse cited by Professor Jacobi from R. vi, 105, 10, Hiranyaretā divākarah. Such cases as Pulastyovāca rājānam or Lakṣmaṇas tu tatovāca indicate not a precedent hypermeter but the looseness of epic sandhi. They are very common.

There is, however, a more regular interior hypermeter which is old. Thus in Kāṭha Upanishad, vi, 8 and vi, 11, respectively, we find

avyaktāt tu paraḥ puruṣaḥ  
apramattas tadā bhavati

<sup>1</sup> The references for the triṣṭubh pādas will be given below. The pāda cited from the Mahābhārata, IS. vol. xiii, p. 459, avidvāṇasaḥ pratyabhivāde is without parallel, I believe, in the epic. The same rule appears in Manu ii, 123 with abhivāda, which may have stood here originally, unless abhi was monosyllabic.



It was suggested by Gildemeister, loc. cit. p. 274, that in such instances in the epic, bhavati might be read as two syllables, but he seems inclined to reject the notion. Professor Jacobi, on the other hand, favors this reading, and says of such cases, "All is in order if one pronounces bhavati as bhoti" (Gurupūj., p. 52). But he is forced to add immediately, "It is more difficult to decide how one could have managed with kimsvit suptam na nimīṣati and katham samrddham asamrddham."

The explanation lies, I think, in the fact that mora-measurement was at work in syllabic verse. This is very clear in triṣṭubh; in fact, it is the only possible explanation for a mass of forms which from a syllabic point of view are wildly irregular but with this admission of mora-measurement are easily understood. The ḡloka cases are generally found at the end of pādas, where cæsura aids the reading of two breves as equivalent to one long. In the case of bhavati itself and a few similar forms, where we know that bhoti or hoti is a dialectic equivalent, there is, to be sure, no great objection to reading bhavati as bhoti, but the general explanation of the phenomena as a class is not that ∪ ∪ is *contracted*, for some of the intervening consonants would make this impossible, but measured as the metrical equivalent of one long. In the examples above bhavati and puruṣaḥ and nimīṣati are thus parallel cases. In Kaṭha iii, 5-6, both pādas are hypermetric:

yas tv avijñānavān bhavaty  
ayuktena manasā sadā  
yas tu vijñānavān bhavati  
yuktena manasā sadā

I see no reason to separate these cases from their epic analogues.<sup>1</sup> Here we have the oft-cited examples of prior pādas ending in -triyo bhavati, priyo bhavati, nivartayitum, unnayati, iii, 818, 45-48.<sup>2</sup> In the cases cited above from this passage,

<sup>1</sup> For more examples from the Upanishads, compare Gildemeister, loc. cit., p. 275, ff.

<sup>2</sup> The irregular use of *svit* in this passage probably explains the impossible pāda, kena [svit] dvitīyavān bhavati, ib. 47. In the following question, *svit*

313, 61, and from v, 43, 11, the same principle is extended, exactly as we shall see it in triṣṭubh verse, where the second foot after the first dipody,  $\underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} -$ , may be resolved from  $\underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} -$  into  $\cup \cup \underline{\cup}$ . So here, *kiṃ svit suptaṃ na nimiṣati* may be on the triṣṭubh model,  $- - - - \cup, \cup \cup \cup$ , which passes into and appears as  $- - - -$ ,  $\cup \cup \cup$ , as in the triṣṭubh, v, 16, 5, *prāpte kāle pacasi punaḥ samiddhaḥ, tvam evā 'gne bhavasi punaḥ pratiṣṭhā*. So we shall find *labhate* in a triṣṭubh, where it must be equal to  $\underline{\cup} -$ , just as in the ṣloka of the Dhammapada, No. 131, we find *pecca so na labhate sukham*, where the two breves must be measured as one long (so the MSS., but changed in the new text), but is not contracted (compare in prior, *prajāpatiḥ carasi garbhe, Praçna ii, 7; çrīç ca prajñāṃ ca vidhehi naḥ, ib. 13*).

A very interesting phase of this question is the relation of the Sanskrit to the Pāli. We have a proverb in R. ii, 103, 30,

*yadannaḥ puruṣo bhavati tadannās tasya devatāḥ,*

which Professor Lanman at the Meeting of the Oriental Society in 1899 argued was from the Pāli form because there *hoti* actually occurs in the same proverb.<sup>1</sup> But against the certainty (though not the probability) of this conclusion stand the facts that the form of the verb is undetermined in Pāli and the hypermeter of this sort is just as common there as in Sanskrit. It is clear, for example, that in such verses as *na tena bhikkhū hoti*, Dhammapada 266, must be read (as the text now stands) *bhavati* (compare *tatrāyam ādi bhavati*, sic, in 375, and in other verses of the same collection); while on the other hand, in 387, *sannaddho khattiyo tapati* (= *tap'ti*) stands parallel to similar uncontractile forms in Sanskrit ṣloka

is omitted, as it should be here. The other cases are all parallel to *kena svic chrotiyo bhavati, çrutena çrotiyo bhavati*, 47-48.

<sup>1</sup> Since publishing an article on the Parallel Proverbs of the two epics in A. J. Phil., vol. xx, p. 22, ff., I have found a parallel to this *yadannaḥ* proverb in the *Mahābhārata*, viz. *yadannā hi narā rājans tadannās tasya devatāḥ*, where *tasya* is still preserved though the plural noun precedes! It is (of course) from the careless pseudo-epic, xiii, 66, 61.

and triṣṭubh forms. There is then no real necessity for changing the latter to khatyo (a possible form.)

Nevertheless, in the case of bhavati itself, which like bhoṣ may have been current as bhoṣi in Sanskrit as well as in dialectic form, the latter may have been used, and a dual pronunciation may be accepted and given as a probable reason for its frequent recurrence in apparent hypermeters.<sup>1</sup> In other words, pādas with this word *may possibly* not be true hypermeters, as *must* be other forms which are not thus contracted or contractile. That a hoti in Pāli may stand for an original bhavati, may be seen by comparing Dhammap. 260 with Mbh. iii, 133, 11:

na tena thero hoti [bhavati] yen' assa phaliṭaṃ siro  
na tena sthaviro bhavati yenā 'sya palitaṃ ṇiraḥ

Compare Manu ii, 156, na tena vṛddho bhavati (v. l. sthaviro in some of the commentators). Another of these numerous bhavati proverbs is found in Dhammap. 268, na monena munī hoti, Mbh. v, 43, 60, māunān na sa munir bhavati.<sup>2</sup>

### Dialectic Sanskrit.

Accepting bhoṣi (= hoti) as a possible dialectic Sanskrit form, I have next to show that the maṣa for māṣa principle, as illustrated in the paragraph above, is subject to an important restriction. It would be quite wrong to suppose that the mass of grammatical irregularities are of a form entirely arbitrary, or that, in general, a grammatical modification that is found repeatedly in one category may be utilized for metrical purposes in any other of the same outer appearance. I say in general, because I admit that here and there in the epic occur grammatical monstrosities and forms not subject to metre, though irregular, but what is of moment is that *most of the grammatical irregularities in the epic are merely dialectic*

<sup>1</sup> Thus xii, 233, 12, ṇariraṃ ṇarāṇā bhavati, mūrtimat ṇoḍaṇmakam, and often.

<sup>2</sup> On the variant to the yadannāḥ proverb contained in the words yaccittas tanmayo bhavati, see p. 42.

*variations.* For this reason in the paragraph above, headed Poetic Licence, I have been careful to state that the modifications were those of Sanskrit forms, not that they were absolute alterations of received forms, independent of any grammatical basis. I believe the latter cases to be excessively rare, while on the contrary there is some sort of grammatical authority for most of the changes so abundantly introduced. Metre surpasses Sanskrit grammar but not grammar altogether. What then? Where Sanskrit grammar fails, the poets had recourse to patois.<sup>1</sup>

As I have already shown, a large majority of the cases under consideration are comprised under the head of feminine participles and first plurals of verbs, with a smaller number of various forms.<sup>2</sup>

Some of these, like *brūmi*, are at once dialectic and yet accepted as Sanskrit. There is no reason why we should not regard *kurmi*, *Gāthā kurumi*, in *tathā kurmi* and *kiṃ kurmi* 'ti *kṛtāñjaliḥ*, iii, 142, 44; H. 3, 14, 12, as on a par with *brūmi*. The latter occurs not only in R. vi, 9, 20 (where G. reads *bravāmi*, v, 80, 22), but also in R. ii, 19, 4; iii, 13, 17; iv, 7, 14. So R. ii, 12, 36, *añjaliṃ kurmi*; vii, 78, 20, *āhāraṃ garhitam kurmi*. So too *vedmi* and *dadmi*, e. g., R. ii, 53, 21; vi, 124, 17, *aham apy atra te dadmi*, which in the later *Bhārata* is more and more frequent. Others appear to be gross violations of grammar, like *°nāti* and *viduṣaḥ*, nominative, as in parallel forms, *tasthuṣam puruṣam*, xii, 317, 17, etc.,<sup>3</sup> but they may be not only Vedic but dialectic, as Pāli *°āti* and *vidū* (= *vidvān*) may imply. Doubtless some are pure archaisms,

<sup>1</sup> So far as I know, this important subject has only been touched upon in a note by Kielhorn, JRAS., 1898, p. 18, who says: "In the so-called epic Sanskrit there are not a few forms and constructions which seem to me to be Pāli rather than Sanskrit."

<sup>2</sup> Lengthening of a vowel *metri gratia* is called *āṣṣam* almost invariably by the commentators. Some of the cases are really archaic; others are clearly a sacrifice of form to metre, generally for the *dilambus*, as in R. v, 36, 21, *sukhānām ucito nityam asukhānām anūcitah*.

<sup>3</sup> To Prof. Holtzmann's list I add (the reduplicated forms, § 603) *tasthuṣaḥ*, x, 3, 70, and *veduṣam* (*apsaraśam*), ix, 57, 68.

as in *viçvā*, lack of augment, *vā* for *iva*, and varying final vowel length (*athā parī*, *nā*, etc.); but when we consider that the participle is indifferently *bhavatī* and *bhavantī*, and that the first plural verb ends regularly in *ma* in all forms,<sup>1</sup> that, for instance, *asma* is regular, we shall hesitate to speak of any general grammar-sacrifice save that of Sanskrit. Thus *krāmati* (for *krām*) is Prākṛit.<sup>2</sup> In the older epic, arbitrary changes were not introduced at will, but dialectic forms were borrowed. Even *upāsante* for *upāsate* (compare the older *hiṁsate* for *hiṁste*, R. iv, 53, 16) is merely a dialectic change of conjugation, just as is the case with the forms *dadanti*, *jahanti* (compare *Dhammap.*, *hiṁsati* and *dadanti*, *okaṁ okaṁ jahanti te*, etc.). These forms, it is important to observe, cannot be explained on the assumption that epic Sanskrit precedes the differentiation of correct (Sanskrit) and vulgar (Prākṛit) forms, because, were that the case, they would appear *passim*; whereas they appear usually, as in *svapāmi* for *svapimi* and *grhya* for *grhītṵvā* (cited above, pp. 205, 247), only when the metre requires them. Take, for instance, the clear case of *patois*, *geha* for *grha*. It occurs in iii, 69 (*Nala* 17), 15-16 to prevent a *diambus* at the end of a prior *pāda* (though *grha* is used in the preceding verse); again at v, 36, 34, to prevent the minor *Ionic*; in ii, 68, 1, to prevent a third *vipulā* from following a *brevis*, *bhavanti gehe bandhakyah*; in iii, 303, 13, to prevent an *anapæst*, *mama gehe mayā cā 'sya* (for the same reason in R. vii, 68, 20); in xii, 336, 25, to avoid *triambus* in an even *pāda*. Dialectic are further, in all probability, the exchange of weak and strong perfect forms

<sup>1</sup> The change is not really grammatical but phonetic, as Dr. Thorp has shown, since the preterite is not used for the present but the primary ending is reduced from *mas* to *ma* (and may be contracted, as in *na jānime 'ty athā 'bruvan*, v, 120, 21).

<sup>2</sup> *Fischel, Grammatik der Prākṛit Sprachen*, § 481. For *svapāmi*, compare *ib.*, § 497; for *asiyā* as *na syāt*, § 464; for neuter instead of *masc.*, § 357. Professor Fischel's mine of wealth came to hand only after this book had gone to press, or I could have given a more systematic as well as fuller treatment of a comparison based chiefly on Sanskrit and Pāli, and such few dialectic forms as chance furnished. But I think the more the epic is studied the more Prākṛit will be found.

and perfects without reduplication, when needed for metre, ākarṣatuḥ, i, 153, 44; bibheduḥ, viii, 82, 16 (to avoid a brevis before a second vipulā); the exchange of nominative and accusative, auṣadhayāḥ (acc.),<sup>1</sup> though this is also Vedic.

But the epic took long in making, and while the earlier poets drew on dialectic forms (thereby creating a sort of Gāthā dialect, though not so gross as the genuine article), the later poets did exactly what the later Greek hexameter poets did, viz., copied their predecessors instead of borrowing from the life. Consequently they made blunders. The early poets, for example, used, metri causā, optative for indicative, viii, 89, 22, and often (as in late Upanishads, e. g., Āvet. v, 5) a vulgar confusion; and ma for mas and dadanti for dadati; because they knew that these were spoken forms, if not the polite forms (which they used by preference when convenient); but the later poetaster knew only that the old epic poets had mixed up ma and mas and anti and ati, and so he used the un-Sanskrit forms not only more frequently but more incorrectly. Thus he said apaçyāmas, ix, 1, 20, and did not hesitate to use bhavati for bhavanti, of course only in the later epic, as in iii, 211, 9 (a late chapter, above, p. 34), anyonyam nā 'tivistante samyak ca bhavati, dvija. Compare the wisdom to be learned at Mithilā, in the preceding copy of Vālmiki's proverb, striyo hy avadhyāḥ sarveṣāṃ ye dharmam abhivindate, iii, 206, 46 (na hantavya striya iti, vii, 143, 67). So in xiii, 145, 20 (alpabuddhayāḥ), bubhūṣate (for diiambus); and, in the later Rāmāyaṇa, prajāḥ tam anuvartate, R. vii, 43, 19 (v. 62, 9, interpolated? above, p. 245).

<sup>1</sup> Both in Mhb., puṣpāmy auṣadhayāḥ sarvāḥ, i, 78, 40; and R. drakṣyasy oṣadhayo dīptāḥ, vi, 74, 32. Compare sarvāḥ prakṛtayaḥ ṇanāḥ . . . sam-jahāra (Jaṭugṛha Parvan) and ib. 145, 4; with R. vi, 112, 19, sātṛvayitvā prakṛtayaḥ. Carelessness in the length of vowels in declension is also a mark of patois (epic examples above). The Rāmāyaṇa has some genders which may be dialectic. They certainly are not Sanskrit: parikhān (!) pūrayantaḥ ca, R. vi, 42, 16; cikṣipur vividhāṇ castrān (!), R. vi, 53, 20 (both lacking as such in pw.), etc. As remarked above, some of this may be scribe's work. Thus padā vedaçrutir naṣṭā, xii, 340, 105; vedaçrutim yathā, G. iv, 5, 4; but in R. 6, 5, naṣṭāṃ devaçrutim ("āṛṣa") iva. But merely for metre is doṣam for doṣaḥ, R. v, 28, 5; G. vi, 33, 30.

In the careless writing of the pseudo-epic, Sanskrit grammar is flung to the winds. I do not mean that irregular forms are not found outside of it. Substitution of the a-conjugation is found in *adadāt*, iii, 173, 8; 275, 40; ix, 51, 10; though the last is an evident interpolation, and as the forms are not required metrically in the other cases it is still open to question whether they do not contain just such copy-slips as are found, e. g., in the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, where viii, 163 has *vyadadhāt prabhuh*, while 165 has *adadat prabhuh*. The cases in the older epic are, however, not frequent (in xi, 25, 5, *jahāti* is 3d sg.), but in the late epic they flourish like reeds (compare *jahanti* in i, 172, 8; *dadanti* in xii, 25, 7; 341, 16; xiii, 62, 46, etc.), and it is just here that new irregularities are found. Thus *viṣvedevān āpnoti*, xii, 318, 5; *viṣvedevebhyaḥ*, xiii, 97, 14. Even such a syntactical monstrosity as the *Gāthāism iti vā menire vayam* (with similar cases there) is not shunned, xii, 337, 38, to say nothing of the syntactical confusion in *aṣvibhyām pataye cāi 'va marutām pataye tathā*, xii, 341, 103. In the thirteenth book, besides *kurvāṇas*, xiii, 17, 131, we find *smahe*, xiii, 1, 13; 93, 41; *stām* for *astām*, ib. 98, 7; the first instance of a finite negative verb,<sup>1</sup> another *Gāthāism* (compare *ajānehi* for *mā janaya*), afterwards somewhat affected: *dr̥ṣyate 'dr̥ṣyate cā 'pi*, xiii, 14, 160. Here also, another *Gāthāism*, the popularized change of the *ṛ*-declension, *apaharta* and *harta* (together with *Atharva*, which, however, is in late *Upa-nishads*, *Muṇḍ. i, 1*, epic *atharvāya namaḥ*), *sraṣṭārāya namaḥ*, ib. 309–310 and 313–314. So *etān* for *etāni*, xiii, 62, 55. Such neologisms go far beyond the current interchange in *npāsante* and *vilāsinyaḥ* (acc.),<sup>2</sup> also found here, xiii, 104, 19;

<sup>1</sup> With the infinitive, e. g., xv, 11, 15, *nā 'dātum*. The negative finite verb (given here in C., and required by the sense) is not recognized in the grammars as occurring before the classical period.

<sup>2</sup> In *Gitā* 10, 16 and 19, *ātmanibhūṭayaḥ* may be nominative. The form as acc. can scarcely be a Vedic reversion. The *Gitā* still uses *no = na u*, and so in iii, 34, 11: but in xiii, 51, 10, *yad etad api no mūlyam*, *no* is simply late and careless for *na*. Editors or copyists have tried to change *bhavati* and acc., the text in C. xv, 376 (= 11, 21), but they cannot in xiii, 62, 30, and in *bhūmir bhavati bhūmidam*, it still governs the accusative.

107, 39, and bring us into the field of slovenly adaptation from any source, which characterizes the slipshod Sanskrit of later epic and Purāṇas alike.

### Prose-Poetry Tales.

In the *Verhandlungen der Philologenversammlung in Gera*, 1878, attention was called by Professor Windisch to a "pre-epic phase of poetry," consisting of prose narration interspersed with gāthās or verses of popular form which helped on the story. One epic tale, which has gone over into later verse-form, has been shown by Professor Oldenberg, in his article on the old-Indic Ākhyāna,<sup>1</sup> to exist in a prototype of this kind. Such mingling of prose and verse, as remarked by the latter writer, is found in the epic itself, in i, 3. There is also, though not of epic content, a kind of rhythmic prose which is half metrical, as in xii, 190, 5 ff.: tatra yat satyaṁ sa dharmo, yo dharmah sa prakāṇo, yaḥ prakāṇas tat sukham iti . . . yat tamas tad duḥkham iti, atro 'cyate (three ṇokas); tat khalu dvididham sukham ucyate (. . . to 13): susukhaḥ pavanaḥ svarge, gandhaḥ ca surabhiḥ tathā, etc. Here the epic Upanishad glides in and out of metre, the last verse before the resumption of ṇoka being again metrical, in a form of triṣṭubh found elsewhere in the epic: na cāi 'te doṣāḥ svarge prādur bhavanti.

The next chapters to this have alternate prose and ṇokas, the latter appearing either, as at the end of 191, without warning, or introduced with the words "there's a stanza about that," bhavati cā 'tra ṇokaḥ. In 192, one unannounced ṇoka follows the introductory prose, then more prose, and with the words bhavanti cā 'tra ṇokāḥ follow one ṇoka and two triṣṭubhs,<sup>2</sup> after which ṇokas are again resumed.

It happens that a late poet runs on in triṣṭubhs till he

<sup>1</sup> ZDMG., vol. xxxvii, p. 54 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The ṇoka here, xii, 7006, is another form of a proverb given elsewhere in the epic, abhayaṁ sarvabhūtebhyo dattvā, and may be added to Sprüche, 495, 496. ṇokāḥ here scarcely connotes triṣṭubhs (as in the Brāhmaṇas), but includes them with the ṇoka.



stumbles and ends in prose, xii, 336, 10, after several triṣṭubhs: çvetāḥ pumāṁso gatasarvapāpāç cakṣurmuṣaḥ pāpakṛtām narānām, vajrāsthikāyāḥ samamānonmānā divyā(n) -vaya(va)rūpāḥ çubhasāropetāḥ, etc., in pure prose. There is, further, a good deal of plain prose narration in the first, third, and twelfth books and in a hymn in H. 3, 68 (praise by titles).

But a tale of the prose-verse variety exists complete in the story of the Frog-girl, iii, 192. In this apparent prose there are not only metrical and half-metrical pādas and hemistichs, such as ramaṇīyaṁ saro dṛṣṭvā, but even regular epic pādas, such as mudā paramayā yutaḥ, the latter being indeed a stereotyped epic phrase, as in iii, 256, 20; 295, 16. The verses here, as was to be expected, are freer than in the regular epic style.<sup>1</sup>

The tale begins:

2. athā 'caṣṭa Mārkaṇḍeyaḥ (apūrvam idaṁ çrūyatām)

The opening line of C., 13,143, is not in B. From the openings in the following tales, parv. 196 and 198, the phrase athā 'caṣṭa Mārkaṇḍeyaḥ was stereotyped and united with the preceding, thus:

bhūya eva mahābhāgyaṁ kathyatām iti abravīt  
athā 'caṣṭa Mārkaṇḍeyaḥ

In the present tale the former appears as: bhūya eva brāhmaṇamahābhāgyaṁ vaktum arhaṣī 'ti abravīt.

In the following mixture of prose and metre it is sometimes difficult to say whether the rougher metrical parts ought to be touched. For instance, at the beginning, Ikṣvākukulodvahaḥ pārthivaḥ Parikṣin nāma mṛgayām agamat may have been prosed out of Ikṣvākukulavardhanaḥ Parikṣin nāma pārthivaḥ mṛgayām gataṁ nṛpaḥ, or some such turn. So in the next sentence, tam ekāçvena mṛgam anusarantam, from tam açvenā 'nucarantam; while for the ninth stanza or paragraph it would be a sin of omission not to note how easy it is to read: atha

<sup>1</sup> In another case, iii, 194, the section begins and ends in prose, but has plokas between, the last hemistich of which, before the narration closes in prose, has the free measure cited above, p. 244, — — — —, √ — — —, √ — — — —, — — — —, etac chrutvā tu Kāuravyaḥ Çibim pradakṣiṇaṁ kṛtvā.

kanyām gāyantīm ca puspāṇi cā 'vacinvatīm ; apaçyaḍ, atha sã rãjñah samīpataḥ paryakrãmat; all with freedom not unknown to the epic çloka. But any change would in the first place be pure guesswork, and besides why should çloka have become prose? Again, these tales are built with prose bricks and metrical mortar and it is not strange that the mortar occasionally runs over the brick.<sup>1</sup> I therefore abstain except in two or three cases (in some, as will be seen, where the length of prose invites verse) from the temptation to make çloka pãdas out of clauses more or less metrical, and write the story as it stands (with prose omissions as indicated below):

1-4, Ayodhyāyām Ikṣvākukulodvahaḥ pãrthivaḥ Parīkṣin nãma mrgayām agamat, tam ekãçvena mrgam anusarantam  
mrgo dūram apāharat (5, prose)

6, ramaṇiyam saro drṣṭvã  
sãçva eva vyagãhata

7, madhuraṁ gītam açr̥ṇot

8, sa çrutvã 'cintayan ne 'ha  
manuṣyagatim paçyãmi

kasya khalv ayam gītaçabda iti.<sup>2</sup> 9, athã 'paçyat kanyām paramarūpadarçanīyām puspāṇy avacinvatīm gāyantīm ca, atha sã rãjñah samīpe paryakrãmat. 10, tãm abravīd rãjã

kasyã 'si bhadre kã vã tvam (iti) <sup>3</sup>  
ṣã pratyuvãca kanyã 'smi (iti)

<sup>1</sup> That is to say, as in the case given in the last note, a more or less regular verse may incidentally and accidentally be shaped in prose narration without its being intended as regular verse, though the poetic style of the environment may have induced such prose-poetry subconsciously. As for the metaphor above, except as illustrating my meaning very roughly, I cannot defend it. "On the contrary, as the verse-element in tales was fixed and used in many buildings, while the prose was crumbled up and renewed in each new edifice built of the same brick, it would not be quite unhistorical to invert it and speak of poetic bricks and prose mortar.

<sup>2</sup> Was this: kasya khalu ayam çabdaḥ ?

<sup>3</sup> This or kã 'si kasya kutaç ca tvam is an ordinary epic (verse) formula. With the preceding, compare (Sītã) kusumãny apacinvatī (prior pãda), and kusumãni vicinvati, R. iii, 42, 32; 43, 1.

tām rājo 'vāca arthi tvayā 'ham iti.<sup>1</sup> 11, atho 'vāca kanyā

samayena aham çakyā  
tvayā labdhum na anyathā

iti, rājā tām samayam apr̥chat, kanyo 'vāca

no 'dakam me darçayitavyam (darçetavyam ?)

iti, 12, sa rājā tām bādham ity uktvā tām upayeme,<sup>2</sup> kṛtodvāhaç  
ca rājā Parikṣit kṛidamāno

mudā paramayā yutaḥ<sup>3</sup>

tuṣṇīm saṁgamyā tayā saḥā 'ste. 13, tatas tatrāi 'vā 'sīne  
rājani senā 'nvagacchat(a). 14, sā seno 'paviṣṭam rājānam pari-  
vāryā 'tiṣṭhat, paryāçvastaç ca rājā tayāi 'va saha çibikayā prāyād  
avaghotitayā sva(m) nagaram anuprāpya rahasi tayā saḥā 'ste.<sup>4</sup>  
15, tatra 'bhyāçastho 'pi kaçcin nā 'paçyad atha pradhānāmātyo  
'bhyāçacarās tasya striyo pr̥chat.<sup>5</sup> 16, kim atra prayojanam  
vartate (vartata) ity, athā 'bruvanṣ tāḥ striyaḥ.<sup>6</sup>

17, apūrvam idam paçyāma  
udakam nā 'tra nīyata(e)

ity, athā 'mātyo 'nudakam vanam kārayitvo 'dāravṛkṣam, etc.

18, vanam idam udārakam<sup>7</sup>  
sādhv atra ramyatām iti

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps samarthi tvayā bhadre 'ham (compare 33).

<sup>2</sup> More natural would be: sa rājā bādham ity uktvā tām kanyām upayeme  
ha.

<sup>3</sup> A regular epic phrase in various forms, mudā, çriyā, prītyā, etc., with  
yutaḥ or yuktaḥ, according to the pāda. Compare the references above and  
ii, 53, 23; Nala, 20, 40; ix, 27, 6; 36, 42; prītyā paramayā yuktaḥ, ix, 55, 4; R.  
i, 52, 11, etc.

<sup>4</sup> The texts give 'nvagacchat and 'nvagacchata, svanagaram and svam  
nagaram. This may point to a corruption. Leaving out the fine palanquin:  
tatas tatrāi 'vā 'sīne (tu ?) rājāni senā 'nvagacchata sā (tn) seno 'paviṣṭam (ha)  
parivārya atiṣṭhata, paryāçvastaç ca (sa) rājā anuprāpya svanagaram rahasy  
āste tayā saha. The long stretch of prose favors this. Compare uvāca ca  
tayā saha, an epic phrase, e. g., i, 73, 20.

<sup>5</sup> There is no object to the first verb. Was it not: tatrā 'bhyāçastho 'pi  
kaçcin rājānam na apaçyata, atha pradhānāmātyas tu tasya striyaḥ apr̥chata ?

<sup>6</sup> The more probable form is vartate kim prayojanam; kim prayojanam is  
a regular epic close of a hemistich. Compare for example, xiii, 93, 81, kasyā  
'rthe, kim prayojanam.

<sup>7</sup> Sic, B.; C., udāram anudakam.

After this, prose to 23-25,

kruddho ajñāpayāmāsa (sa rājā) . . .  
yathā vṛttam nyavedayan

. . . 27, iti, çlokāu cā 'tra bhavataḥ (28-29). Compare v, 64, 5, where, although the whole text is in çlokas, one stanza is especially mentioned, çlokenā 'nena, Kāuravya, papraccha sa munis tadā.

30, tam evaṁ vādinam iṣṭajanaçokaparitātmā rājā 'tho 'vāca

31, na hi kṣamyate tan mayā

haniṣyāmy etān etāir durātmabhiḥ, etc. ; prose to

32, sa tad vākyam upalabhya

etc., prose to 33.

In the following I omit references to the intervening prose and give the metrical pādas in their order:

33, tam abravīd rājā tayā  
samarthi,<sup>1</sup> sā me diyatām

34, athāi 'nām rājñe pitā 'dad<sup>2</sup>  
abravīc ca enām enām  
rājānam çuçrūṣasve 'ti<sup>3</sup>

35, evam uktvā duhitaram

36, harsena bāṣpakalayā  
vācā<sup>4</sup> prapatyā 'bhipūjya  
maṇḍūkarājam abravīd  
anugṛhīto 'smi iti (sc. te, omit iti)

37, yathāgatam agacchat(a)

<sup>1</sup> In C., asmy aham arthi.

<sup>2</sup> In C., dadāu. Perhaps sa dadāu.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps : abravīc ca duhitaram enām rājānam çuçrūṣa, iti.

<sup>4</sup> A stereotyped phrase, either straddling the pādas of a verse, Nala, 9, 25; or in a pāda (after one syllable), as in sū, iv, 20, 23; R. ii, 82, 10. Perhaps here : sa bāṣpakalayā vācā prapatyā 'bhipūjya ca.

- 38, atha kasyacit kālasya <sup>1</sup>  
 tasyām kumārās (te) trayas  
 tasya rājñāḥ sambabhūvuh  
 Čalo Dalo Balaç ce 'ti  
 tatas teṣām jyeṣṭham Čalam

samaye pitā rājye 'bhiṣicya <sup>2</sup> tapasi dhṛtātmā vanam jagāma,  
 prose through 39. In the following Tale of Čala:

- 40, sūtam co 'vāca, çighram mām  
 vahasva [iti], sa tathā uktaḥ <sup>3</sup>  
 sūto rājānam abravīt

- 41, na kriyatām anubandho  
 nāi 'sa çakyas tvayā mṛgo  
 'yam grahitum, yady api te  
 rathe yuktāu vāmyāu syātām (iti)  
 tato 'bravīd rājā sūtam

- 42, athāi 'nam evam bruvānam  
 [abravīd rājā]  
 Vāmadevāçramam yāhi (iti) <sup>4</sup>

- 43, bhagavan, mṛgo [me viddhaḥ] palāyate  
 sāmabhāvayitum arhasi  
 [vāmyāu dātum, iti, tam abravīd ṛṣir  
 dadāni te vāmyāu]

kṛtakāryeṇa bhavatā  
 mamāi 'va <sup>5</sup> vāmyāu niryātyāu  
 [kṣipram iti]  
 . . . antahpure asthāpayat

- 44, atha 'ṛṣiç cintayāmāsa  
 taruṇo rājaputro ('sti)  
 kalyānam pattram āsādyā

<sup>1</sup> An epic phrase with variations, kasyacit tv atha kālasya, H. 8, 5, 11, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Possibly: pitā rājye 'bhyāçecayat tataḥ tapasi dhṛtātmā vanam jagāma (sa rājā); or: pitā rājye 'bhiṣicya ca. Both are formulas, as in i, 74, 126 and 75, 55.

<sup>3</sup> The text has: vahasveti sa tatho 'ktaḥ, perhaps as much of a verse as is the form above. As in 36, the iti pādas are, I admit, particularly bad.

<sup>4</sup> B. prayāhi.

<sup>5</sup> So B.

ramate na (me) pratiniryātayaty, aho kaṣṭam iti (prose to 48, ff. triṣṭubhs).

Though far from epic verse, this is not exactly prose,<sup>1</sup> which, though often rhythmical, is not metrical to such an extent as this. Further, the actual presence of epic pādas in the narrative shows beyond question that it is meant to be couched more or less in metrical form. Of what sort then is this metrical prose? It is, I think, an early form of popular verse, older than the present epic śloka, which, as I have remarked above, is probably more refined than it was when first written and is less free even than the Mahābhāṣya epic śloka. It is not, however, necessarily antique, nor necessarily modern. It is, in short, the instrument of the perpetual story-teller, a naïve form, running in and out of prose like rhymes in fairy tales.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Benfey, Panchatantra (translation), vol. i, p. 259, says that with the exception of the two ślokas (28-29), "the rest of the narrative is in prose."

<sup>2</sup> The same tendency to the creation of pāda verse (not arranged in śloka form) may be seen in the prose tale of i, 3, where, besides the regular verses in the prose narration, are found such metrical combinations as :

Janamejaya evam ukto  
devaṇyā Saramayā . . .  
etasminn antare kaṣcid  
ṛṣir Dhāumyo nāmā 'podas . . .  
sa ekam ṣiṣyam Ārunim  
Pāñcālyam preṣayāmāsa . . .  
sa upadhyāyena saṁdiṣṭa Āruniḥ,

the last being a respectable triṣṭubh pāda. If, however, this and the tale of Suçobhanā be regarded (as Benfey says) as pure prose, what difference is there between the other parts which will not give any rhythmical cadence and such a rhythmical complex as, e. g., ramaṇiyam saro dṛṣṭvā, sāçva eva vyagāhata, kruddho ājñāpayām āsa, and yathā vṛttam nyavedayan? And how does it happen that kasyā 'si 'bhadre kā vā tvam, and mudā paramayā yutaḥ and . . . bāṣpakalayā | vācā are actual verses found in the epic? There is a literary product which is neither prose nor poetry, but a middle genre, a sort of dog-trot between walking and running, into which a narrator may drop without the conscious campū alternation of padya and gadya (poetry and prose) found in more precise literature. It is perhaps not extravagant to say that beneath the cultured verse of the literati this kind of style may have existed for centuries and even have been the foundation of the earliest literary

### The Epic Triṣṭubh

#### i. THE REGULAR TRIṢṬUBH IN THE MAHABHĀRATA

The rarest forms of the epic triṣṭubhs are those that in the corresponding syllables answer to the commonest forms of the ṣloka, namely the pathyā and first and third vipulās. The commonest forms of triṣṭubh are those that answer to the second and fourth vipulās (decadent in the more refined ṣloka) and to the minor Ionic, a form of ṣloka almost extinct in the later epic style. Both metres have besides the diambic and major Ionic forms, but in both they are exceptional.

Measured by their precedent combinations, the triṣṭubh forms thus corresponding to the ṣlokas in second and fourth vipulās and minor Ionic, outclass the others as decidedly as they do in the number of their occurrences; for whereas before the triṣṭubh feet corresponding to the pathyā and first vipulā forms stand only  $\cup - \cup -$  and  $\cup - -$ , before the second and fourth vipulā forms stand five, and before the minor Ionic form stand seven combinations, respectively.

In thus grouping the triṣṭubhs ṣloka-wise I have wished merely to contrast the general structure of this metre with that of the ṣloka,<sup>1</sup> and have included only the hendekasyllabic triṣṭubh. For the sake of convenience, I shall call regular all forms of the eleven-syllable triṣṭubh (pāda), however unusual, in distinction from other forms, and will now give a scheme of these regular triṣṭubh forms (omitting the scolus or terminal amphibrach).<sup>2</sup>

product. That any of it has been preserved is a mere accident, not antecedently to be expected.

<sup>1</sup> Of course, as previously explained, the syllaba anceps of the eighth syllable must be given up; but the initial syllable is anceps, as it is in the ṣloka, in the usual forms.

<sup>2</sup> The jagatī occurs in the same forms as the triṣṭubh and needs no special table (though separately discussed below). Mechanically, it is merely a triṣṭubh with an extra syllable added, making the close with diambus instead of amphibrach.

## COMBINATIONS OF THE REGULAR EPIC TRIŠṬUBH IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA.

First Foot	Second Foot of Trišṭubh							
	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —
— — —	p <sub>1</sub>	p <sub>6</sub>	p <sub>12</sub>	c <sub>19</sub>	s <sub>21</sub>	s <sub>23</sub>	s <sub>24</sub>	s <sub>26</sub>
— — —	p <sub>2</sub>	p <sub>7</sub>	p <sub>13</sub>	r <sub>20</sub>	s <sub>22</sub>		r <sub>25</sub>	s <sub>27</sub> ?
— — —	c <sub>3</sub>	c <sub>8</sub>	c <sub>14</sub>					
— — —	s <sub>4</sub>	s <sub>9</sub>	c <sub>15</sub>			23b	s <sub>25b</sub> ?	
— — —		? <sub>9b</sub>	s <sub>16</sub>					
— — —		s <sub>10</sub>	s <sub>17</sub>					
— — —	s <sub>5</sub>	? <sub>11</sub>	s <sub>18</sub>					
— — —		? <sub>11</sub>						

For the abbreviations, compare the table above, p. 236. For — — — — as a second foot in a hypermetric pāda, see the paragraph in the list of illustrations in Appendix C, under No. 11. For — — — — as second foot, see under No. 15. The hypermetric forms indicated in Appendix C, when references are not given, will be found illustrated in the following paragraphs. Trišṭubhs of catalectic and hypermetric form are not included in this table.

The Illustrations in Appendix C give a full discussion of the occurrences of these forms as they appear in combination with the cæsura, now after the fourth now after the fifth syllable. Here I will point out that, as is shown by the table, all cases of pyrrhic and most cases of trochee in the syllables immediately preceding the fourth syllable are merely sporadic, whatever be the cæsura; but that the trochee before the vāstomic middle, — — — —, is not uncommon; and add that the cæsura is here after the fourth syllable (No. 15). The prevailing types of the great epic are (as is also shown by the table) an iambic or spondaic opening, — — — —, followed by



— 0 0 —, — 0 — —, 0 0 — —, all three of which are found in the same stanzas. They are always commingled in the older parts of the epic and even in later parts, but, on the other hand, the first, or choriambic middle, is the stanza-form often exclusively employed in late sections, as is shown below in the paragraphs on the Stanza.

### Bird's-eye View of Tristubh Pādas.

The regular Mahābhārata triṣṭubh, which is of the hendeka variety (i), appears then in three (four) principal phases (all others being rare or sporadic), thus:

- i. { (a)  $\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \\ \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \\ \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \end{array}$ , passim, but restricted as in (b).  
 (b)  $\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \\ \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \\ \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \end{array}$   
 (c)  $\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \\ \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \\ \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \end{array}$   
 (d)  $\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \\ \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \\ \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \end{array}$  } common

Besides these, as will be shown below, there are other Bhārata types, thus:

- [illegible]

Jagatī forms of these pādas will be discussed below.

The epic triṣṭubh, then, is not (as has been affirmed by a distinguished scholar) of one uniform type. On an average, about one-fifth of the Bhārata triṣṭubhs of the regular mixed type have twelve-syllable pādas, which, however, are not jagatīś, since they have the triṣṭubh finale. A noticeable point is the common (not passim) occurrence of the trochaic opening, — ◡ — —, in some sections of triṣṭubhs, and also in such sections the comparative rarity of the choriambic triṣṭubh as compared with the triṣṭubhs which have forms of ṣālinī, — ◡ — —, or vātermī, ◡ ◡ — —, character (though not strictly ṣālinī or vātermī pādas). Thus in the hundred odd pādas

that complete in triṣṭubh form the story of the Frog-girl given above, there are only a dozen of choriambic form; while only one stanza out of the twenty-five is of upajāti (— — — — —) form throughout, though two others have two consecutive choriambic pādas.

### The Rāmāyaṇa Triṣṭubh.

Very different is the scheme presented by the Rāmāyaṇa. Here the upajāti is almost exclusively the form of triṣṭubh employed, and all the variegated pādas of the Bhārata are practically reduced to one type. In fact, the exceptions, given under Nos. 7, 13, 19, 23, of the Illustrations, Appendix C, are so few as scarcely to modify the statement that the Rāmāyaṇa employs only one kind of triṣṭubh,<sup>1</sup> which is — — — — —, with variable cæsura, as in

R. vi, 128, 122:

āyusyam ārogyakaram yaçasyam  
sāubhrātrkam buddhikaram çubham ca  
çrotavyam etan niyamena sadbhir  
ākhyānam oṣaskaram ṛddhikāmāḥ

R. ii, 82, 32:

tataḥ samutthāya kule kule te  
rājanyavāiqyā vṛṣalāç ca viprāḥ  
ayūyujann uṣṭrarathān kharāṇç ca  
nāgān hayāṇç cāi 'va kulaprasūtān

<sup>1</sup> I pass over some obvious errors, noticing their place: typographical, G. iv, 43, 69, vicetum; R. vi, 59, 12, patākā; G. vii, 7, 48 (açani in R.). These affect the fourth syllable. R. iv, 28, 66, affects the eighth, nigṛhe for nigrahe. Other palpable errors affecting the metre are: G. ii, 80, 24, kṣudhā ca tandryā (ca ?) vipannatām gatāḥ, not in R.; G. iii, 63, 28, jahāu tadā trtsamuddbhavam klamam (in R., kṣudhā duhkha°); ib. 29, pāda ends eças tadā (compare end of R. iii, 63, 6 b, etya kleçam, where, however, kl probably does not make position); G. v, 14, 66, priyām avikṣamāṇo Raghunandasaya, corrected by R., priyām apaçyan Raghunandanasaya tām; ib. 19, 34, evam sa tām hetubhir anuvikṣya, for anvavekṣya (the form, though with v. l., in R.); naçati for āçyati in v, 80, 24, is noticed under No. 19; G. vii, 20, 44, tam arcayitvā niçācaro jagāu (not in R.) has apparently lost a ca (cf. d); G. vii, 40, 19, Hanūmataḥ kaḥ sthāsyati purastāt, for sthāsyati kaḥ (R. 36, 46). In R. vi, 59, 12, nānāpatākā dhvajachatrajuṣṭam (çastra in G. 35, 6), cch becomes ch as in Mbh. i, 3, 658, prchāmi tvām. Contrast sāçvadhvajacchatramahāpatākam, R. ib. 135.

R. iv, 11, 93:

yathā hi tejahsu <sup>1</sup> varah sadā ravir  
 yathā hi çāilo Himavān mahādriṣu  
 yathā catuspatsu ca kesarī varas  
 tathā narāṇām asi vikrame varah

This uniformity of metre, resulting in an almost classical triṣṭubh, places the Rāmāyaṇa on the same plane, when compared with the Bhārata, as we saw it occupied from the point of view of the çloka. The more antique forms of regular triṣṭubhs are found in the Bhārata.<sup>2</sup>

Yet if this is the case in the regular triṣṭubh, still more striking is the difference between the two epics in respect of the catalectic, hypermetric, and other irregular triṣṭubhs, which are antique and found in the Bhārata, but are unknown to the Rāmāyaṇa. But before taking up these three classes as they appear in the great epic, I have a few words to say in regard to the final amphibrach or scolius.

### The Scolius.

The many examples given in Appendix C sufficiently illustrate the fact that after the long eighth syllable (very rarely short)<sup>3</sup> the ninth syllable of the triṣṭubh is regularly

<sup>1</sup> In G. 11, 11, yathā hi tejasvitaro divākaro, etc., followed by a stanza not in R., with na sarvayakṣeçadhaneçvaro vibhuḥ, the other pādas having cæsura after fourth or fifth.

<sup>2</sup> One cannot, however, claim as evidence of antiquity the antique çālīnī and vārtmī type of pāda, either pure or in parti-form, ∪ — ∪ — — ∪ — — and ∪ — — ∪ — ∪ — —, without noting that these are also Purāṇic, though rare here, and chiefly loans. Thus in a pure single (separate) upendra stanza at Vāyu P. v, 19, stands pravartate codyamānaḥ samantāt. So ib. ix, 113, where a, b, d, have çālīnī form, and c has : diçaḥ çrotre caraṇāu cā 'sya bhūmih. Most of this is epic, e. g., ib. xvii, 7 d, na jāyate mriyate vā ka-dācit (Gitā, 2, 20). Still rarer (as in Gitā, 8, 9) is the form in the same Purāṇa, xiv, 7 c, kavim purāṇam anuçāsitāram. I take this opportunity of stating that I shall hereafter use upendra and vaṇçastha as shorter forms of upendravajrā and vaṇçasthabila, though I believe only the latter has authority.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix C, under No. 15, ekaḥ sāma yaçur ekām ṛç ekā, xii, 60, 47 c.

short, the tenth is long, and the eleventh is anceps. This rule is seldom violated, but in the *Çibicarita*, iii, 197, 8, we find:—

gadāmi vedān vicinomi cchandaḥ  
sarve vedā akṣaraso me adhitāḥ  
na sādhu dānam çotriyasya pradānam  
mā pradāḥ çyenāya na kapoto 'smi

Here we find, in pāda a, the phenomenon discussed, above, in relation to the close of the çloka. Before cchandaḥ the vowel should weigh heavy, but it is doubtless reckoned light. In b, me 'dhitāḥ is more probable than the (hypermetric) pāda, as it appears in both texts (above); but since this is a possible form, the pāda cannot be cited for a long ninth. Pāda c is regular. In d, the pāda may be corrupt, the necessary mā (= mām) apparently being lost after the prohibitive mā, though a long ninth cannot be avoided in any circumstances with the rest of the text as it is. I suspect that çyenāya has taken the place of a vocative, and that the verse read originally: mā mā pradā nā 'smi rājan kapotaḥ; but it may be a specimen of the group of six before cæsura, like yatra devī Gaṅgā | satatam prasūtā, and the other cases of the sort cited below, if the hiatus may be assumed to leave a short vowel, mā pradāḥ, çyenāya na kapotō asmi (hypermetric), as in xiv, 9, 9 a, just below. The tale, however, is a popular story, doubtless handed down in rough verse, and since the long ninth is actually found in such verse, it is not necessary to assume that the pāda must be correct. In the following stanzas, in the same way, we find the vowel apparently reckoned as still short (light) before çy. The cases are:

iii, 197, 15 c, yasmin deçe ramase 'tiva, çyena  
ib. 18 b, sāmmyo hy ayaṁ, kim na jānāsi, çyena  
ib. 24 b, prcchāmi te,<sup>1</sup> çakune, ko nu çyenaḥ<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps accusative. I refer to C. only when the reading differs.

<sup>2</sup> On çyena as çiena in 19 c, see the paragraph on Defective Triṣṭubhs below. Above I have cited cases where the vowel is short (light syllable) before mute and liquid in çlokas and also given examples in triṣṭubh, where cā brahma, 'ti kṣatram, and 'ni Droṇam make the scollus. The latter is, as it were, strengthened to make position in vii, 179, 47 b, antarmānāḥ kuruṣu prādravatsu (C. 8, 181, prā).

In v, 44, 24 d the long ninth is admitted into an old pāda: nā 'nyaḥ panthā ayanāya vidyate, in VS. 81, 18; Çvet. Up. 3, 8: vidyate (a)yanāya (perhaps in the epic for: na anyāḥ panthā ayanāya vidyate).

Another apparent example is found in the stanza<sup>1</sup> xii, 270, 23:

caturdvāram puruṣam caturmukham  
caturdhā cāi 'nam upayāti vācā  
bāhubhyām vāca udarād upasthāt  
teṣām dvāram dvārapālo bubhūset

But here the first pāda is perhaps a jagatī, either with ca lost before puruṣam or (but this is unlikely) with resolution of the semivowel: caturduāram puruṣam caturmukham (as in RV. iv, 51, 2, vi ū vrajasya tamaso duārā); though as it stands it is a metrical duplicate of nā 'nyaḥ panthā (above).

Two metrical irregularities appear in xiv, 9, 4 c:

samvarto yājayati 'ti me çrutam

This pāda also is of the same form as the two last, with the irregular ∪ ∪ — ∪ as second foot and — ∪ ∪ as the scolus; yet to read *çrutam me* corrects them both. But in iv, 8, 8 a, çr certainly fail to make position, though not before a scolus. The first section has another example, xiv, 9, 9 a, aham gacchāmi maghavan dūto 'dya, where hiatus, as in the first example above, may perhaps be assumed with a short vowel: aham gacchāmi | maghavan dūtō adya, unless an inversion has taken place, adya dūtaḥ, with maghavo (or bhagavo, C.) before it. Below, ib. 31 b, sahā 'çvibhyām somam agrhṇād ekaḥ, B. saves the metre and C. 249 saves the grammar.

In the Harivaṅṣa is found one case at 7,593 c, which is corrected in B.:

prāhur viprās tvām guṇinam tattvajñāḥ

Though of the same class with the Anuṣāsana pāda (cited below) ending in prāyacchat, yet, while the latter may be easily emended, tattvajñāḥ is intractable, and the hypermeter

<sup>1</sup> For the meaning, compare ib. 28; v. 1. in 300, 28: catvāri yasya dvārāṇi, suguptāny amarottamāḥ, upastham udaram hastāu vāk caturthī sa dharmavit.

of B. 2, 74, 32, is probably correct : prāhur viprās tvām | guṇi-  
nam tattvavijñāḥ. Another apparent case in H. 14, 732 d,  
where yadā ve 'çvaraḥ ends a triṣṭubh, is a mere misprint for  
yādaveçvaraḥ, 8, 82, 13. But xii, 292, 22 d, antye madhye vā  
vanam āçritya stheyam, has a clear case of — — ◡ for ◡ — ◡.

A secondary cæsura is more likely not to be found before  
the scolius than to be found there. Examples of both cases  
are given (incidentally) in the examples of the different sorts  
of triṣṭubh. Calling the scolius an addition is, then, merely a  
mechanical device, to show the pāda forms free of their uni-  
form close. In reality, the scolius, because it is always the  
same, is the most important part of the pāda, since it seals the  
triṣṭubh. To show how the second cæsura does not divide off  
the scolius as a sort of tail tied on to the pāda proper, may be  
taken vii, 179, 13 a-b:

āsthāya taṁ kāñcanaratnacitraṁ  
rathottamaṁ sinhavat saṁnanāda

The form ◡ — ◡ is then the only form of the epic scolius,  
except for a few cases of seeming carelessness, as in prāyacchat  
and vidyate, where special reasons may have induced the ex-  
tant form, or, as in cases before kṣ, cch, etc., where advantage  
appears to have been taken of a Gāthā freedom in reckoning  
a heavy syllable as light in certain cases. Of the scolius type  
— ◡ — ◡, which Fausböll (previously) set up for the Dhamma-  
pada, the epic has parallel examples, but I doubt whether  
the single example to be found in the Dhamma, vs. 306 :

yo vā 'pi ka- | tvā na karo- | mī 'ti cā 'ha

will be found on second thought really to support this inter-  
pretation. For in this case, as in all similar epic examples, the  
division is not, as Fausböll assumed, — ◡ — | — ◡ — | — ◡ — ◡,  
but (as a hypermeter) — ◡ — — | ◡ ◡ — — | ◡ — ◡, exactly as  
in the common hypermeters of the epic, e. g., sa vāi rājan nā |  
'bhyadhikāḥ kathyate ca, where the only difference between  
the scansion and that of the more usual hypermeter, e. g.,  
yasyā 'vibhaktaṁ | vasu rājan sahāyāḥ, is that in the latter

case the cæsura is normal, while in the former it is neglected.<sup>1</sup> On such cases, see the section just below, on Hypermeters.

The epic, then, as a whole, has passed far beyond the Vedic stage, where the final syllables of a triṣṭubh are (◡) ◡ ◡ ◡; nor is it likely that the few cases above are to be explained as archaisms rather than as further examples of such slovenliness as has been met before in the examples already given. For even the Rig Veda poets are already tending to a stricter form, ◡ — ◡, as is shown, for example, by the substitution of māsiya for maṁsiya, RV. x, 53, 4, merely to win an amphibrach.

### Catalectic and Hypermetric Triṣṭubhs.

A short form of triṣṭubh is where a syllable is omitted, but in such a way as to preserve the characteristic final cadence, giving the pentad form familiar to the Rig Veda; as in Mbh. iii, 195, 3, taṁ tvām prechāmi | katham tu rājan, like RV. i, 67, 8, ya im ciketa | guhā bhavantam. Although catalectic is a name more properly applied to a pāda cut off at the end, I shall yet call the double pentad a catalectic triṣṭubh.

In a jagatī, by the addition of a syllable, the final trochee or spondee of the triṣṭubh's amphibrach is converted into a di-iambus; in a hypermetric triṣṭubh, the final cadence is preserved intact, the triṣṭubh's nature is not lost, but a syllable is prefixed or inserted elsewhere. It may be said that any dodeka is a jagatī pāda. I shall not quarrel with this (native) definition, but the difference here is one of metrical character, and must be strongly marked in name. Admitting then that it is somewhat arbitrary, I shall designate as a jagatī only the diiambically closed pāda; the other, as a hypermetric triṣṭubh.

<sup>1</sup> This interpretation, anyway, seems to be merely a slight oversight on the part of the learned editor. In No. 329, *eko care mātaṅg' araṅṅe va nāgo*, the first foot is correctly given as — — ◡ — —. The choriamb doubtless caused the different interpretation; but the middle foot — ◡ — — is parallel to ◡ ◡ — —, as shown in the examples cited below. [The new text in 306 omits *iti*: but I keep the remark above, written prior to the new text's appearance, as the old text has authority and need not be changed *metri causa*.]

Besides the prefixed or inserted syllable, which gives two varieties of the hypermetric triṣṭubh, a triṣṭubh pāda may have both the prefixed and inserted syllables. The triṣṭubh, then, as shown in the bird's-eye view on p. 275, may consist of ten, eleven, twelve, or thirteen syllables, without losing its characteristic cadence. Unique, however, and not typical (I may add) is a fourteen-syllable triṣṭubh. Apart from all these forms lies the mātṛā-triṣṭubh, of thirteen syllables, but with two breves reckoned as equivalent to one long syllable. Postponing the examination of these forms, I take up now, reckoning the regular triṣṭubh (above) as i, the catalectic and simple or dodeka hypermetric triṣṭubh, ii-vi.

### ii-iii. The Catalectic Triṣṭubh.

ii. In this form the cæsura falls after the fifth syllable. The pāda is one of a triṣṭubh stanza. Examples are iii, 113, 23 :

Arundhati vā subhagā Vasiṣṭham  
 Lopāmudrā vā yathā hy Agastyam  
 Nalasya vai Damayanti yathā 'bhūd  
 yathā Ṣaci Vajradharasya cāi 'va

Here b can be scanned only as Lopāmudrā vā | yathā hy Agastyam. Another case, referred to above, is found in the stanzas at iii, 195, 3-4 :

- 3, vidveṣaṇam paramaṁ jīvaloke  
 kuryān naraḥ pārthiva yācyamānaḥ  
 taṁ tvāṁ prcchāmi katham tu rājan  
 dadyād bhavān dayitam ca me 'dya  
 4, na cā 'nukirtayed <sup>1</sup> adya dattvā  
 ayācyam artham na ca saṁcṛṇomi  
 prāpyam artham ca saṁcṛutya  
 taṁ cā 'pi dattvā susukhī bhavāmi

In 3 d and 4 a, the cæsura is shifted, and the pādas can be read as

dadyād bhavān da- | yitam ca me 'dya  
 na cā 'nukirta- | yed adya dattvā

<sup>1</sup> This seems better than anukirtaye (he) dadya (N.).



In 4 c, there is a *çloka pāda*; unless d be reft of its opening, to leave another pentad: *prāpyam arthaṁ ca saṁçrutya taṁ ca*, which would leave d as: *api dattvā su- | sukhī bhavāmi*.

The dekasyllabic *pāda* is particularly striking when united with the hypermetric *pāda* (10 + 12.) An example occurs in the same story, iii, 197, 26, c-d :

etad vo lakṣma | çivam karomi  
hiranyavarṇam | ruciram punyagandham

The ten-syllable *pāda* ib. 17 b, has, perhaps, lost a syllable, (taṁ) te paçyantu :

(a) uksānam vehatam anūnam nayantu  
(b) te paçyantu puruṣā namāi 'va  
bhayāhitasya dāyam mamā 'ntikāt tvām  
pratyāmnāyantu tvām hy enam mā hiṁsiḥ

(a) — — — — ∪, ∪ ∪ — — ∪ — ∪ (No. 13, hypermetric)  
(b) (—) — — — — ∪ ∪ ∪ — — ∪ — ∪ (No. 20)

For c and d, see No. 23 and No. 7, in the Illustrations of Appendix C. It is possible, however, that b belongs under another head (below). Giving a patois pronunciation, *pasi-antu*, would make the verse quite smooth. In the subsequent stanza, 19 c, there appears to be a case of resolved semi-vowel (*çiena* for *çyena*), a regular *pāda*:

yathā çiena priyam eva kuryām,

though it may be read as catalectic.<sup>1</sup>

A case in C. viii, 4,545 d, is corrected in B. 89, 22:

C.: vāyavyāstrenā, tataḥ sa Karnāt  
B.: vāyavyāstrenā 'patataḥ sa Karnāt

In xii, 322, 72 = 12,115, where C. has *kim te dhanena bandhubhis te*, B. has the dekasyllabic *pāda*:

kim te dhanena, kim bandhubhis te,

the other *pādas* being hendekas. A combination of hyper-

<sup>1</sup> For the verse in the same stanza, *yathā mām (hi) vāi sādhuṇāḍāḥ prasaṇṇaḥ*, see below, The Hypermetric Triṣṭubh.

metric, catalectic, and hyper-hypermetric pāda occurs in H. 7,448:

yasmād bhūtānām | bhūtir anto 'tha madhyam  
*dhrtir vibhūtiḥ | ṣrutīḥ ca Rudrah*  
 grahā (sic) 'bhībūtasya puruṣasye 'ṣvarasya

Compare<sup>1</sup> H. 8,899:

taṁ kūrda mānam madhusūdanāḥ sa  
 dr̥ṣṭvā mahātmā | harṣānvitās tāḥ  
 cukūrda satyā sahito mahātmā  
 balasya dhīmān | harṣāgamārtham

iii. This pāda is what may be called cæsurally catalectic. Like the last, it is antique, in Veda and Upanishads, and the epic has but few examples. The pause follows the fourth syllable, which is usually heavy. Here the cæsura, so to speak, costs a syllable and, unless read with sufficient time allowance, the triṣṭubh appears to be crippled. Of this sort are:

i, 3, 61 d, māyā 'ṣvināu samanakti carṣaṇī (so 66 c)  
 i, 92, 14 a, pr̥chāmi tvām, spr̥haṇīyarūpa

In the latter example there may be corruption. Compare i, 88, 10 c, tat tvām pr̥chāmi spr̥haṇīyarūpa, but the opening phrase, pr̥chāmi tvām is stereotyped, i, 93, 21 a; v, 48, 1 a, etc. We may compare RV. i, 120, 4, vi pr̥chāmi pākīā na devān.<sup>2</sup> The next case is

iii, 197, 27 b, surarṣiṇām atha sammato bhṛṣam

Although this pāda has eleven syllables, it is not a triṣṭubh, but a catalectic jagatī, analogous to the triṣṭubhs of the same nature. The whole stanza consists of syllables 13 + 11 + 12 + 11, but a is doubly hypermetric (explained below), so that there is no alternate symmetry but chiasitic symmetry, thus:

13 (= 11) + 12 + 12 + 11

<sup>1</sup> In the Bombay edition, 2, 72, 59: dhrtir bhūtir yaç ca guhā ṣrutīḥ ca guhā 'bhi°, etc. (on this, see below). The following 8,899 = 2, 89, 17, also avoids the same cadence by reading: dr̥ṣṭvā mahātmā ca mudānvito 'bhūt ... harṣāgamārtham ca balasya dhīmān.

<sup>2</sup> C. in 8,664 has pr̥chāmi (sic) tvām.

It is, however, possible, perhaps, to resolve the -ām.

v, 42, 5 a, pramādād vai asurāḥ parābhavan (jagati)  
v, 42, 21 a, ya etad vā bhagavān sa nityo

In this case, although there is no possible objection to reading the pāda as it stands, it is possible that a bhāti has been lost after etad. The sense is yaj jagad iva bhāti sa nityo 'vikārī bhagavān (N.). Compare 43, 7, jagad bhāti.

v, 46, 3 c, atandritaḥ Savitur vivasvān

The same criticism. Before Savitur, sa may have been dropped, as in C. viii, 3,343 c, çete pāpaḥ suvibhinnagātraḥ, where B. restores the metre with çete sa pāpaḥ. So C. omits su in the aparavaktra, xii, 9,035 b, but corrects it in repeating the verse at 10,530. Nevertheless, I prefer the text as it stands, especially as any correction would have to be extended into the next stanza, where we find :

ib. 4 b, diçāḥ çukro bhuvanam bibharti

Here it is easy to suggest sambibharti, but emendation is otiose.

v, 48, 37 c, Matsyāiḥ sārddham anṛçaṇçarūpāiḥ

The next stanza has jyeṣṭham Mātsyam anṛçaṇsāryarūpam, which makes it rather doubtful whether this form may not have stood in 37 c.

v, 67, 6 c, ānayasva pitaram mahāvratam (jagati)  
viii, 68, 7 a, apy āçiṣma vayam Arjuna tvayi

C. 3,386 has athā 'çiṣma. Possibly āçiṣāma should be read but it is not necessary. The brevis is noticeable (compare above, in § ii, iii, 197, 17 b).

xiii, 76, 7 a (after the injunction in the half-çloka, vs. 6) :

6, praviçya ca gavām madhye imām çrutim udāharet  
7 a, gaur me mātā viṣabhaḥ pitā me  
divaṁ çarma jagati me pratiṣṭhā, etc.

xiii, 102, 55 d:

budhyāmi tvām Vṛtrahanam çatakratum  
vyatikramantam bhuvanāni viçvā  
kaccin na vācā vṛjinam kadācid  
*akārṣam te manaso 'bhiṣaṅgāt*

#### iv-ix. The Hypermetric Triṣṭubh.

##### iv-vi. SIMPLE HYPERMETERS.

The first form, iv, is the initial hypermeter; a light syllable appears to be prefixed to an iambic opening. The same effect is produced, in some cases with the same words, as that already described in the account of the çloka. The pāda starts with an anapæstic slide. The difference is one of frequency, since in the case of the triṣṭubh the initial hypermeter is not very common. Most of the cases have a brevis and in fact, to my ear, the long (heavy) initial belongs in another category (vi); but I admit that in yatra devī Gaṅgā satatam prasūtā and the few similar cases it is doubtful how we should regard the extra syllable. I have noticed with short initial the following cases (iv):

- i, 3, 147 b, vayatas tantūn satatam vartayantyāu (No. 13)  
i, 76, 55 a, asurāḥ surāyām bhavato 'smi dattaḥ (No. 1)

Here the preceding pāda ends in i, but it is scarcely possible that the two triṣṭubhs should have been read as a unit. The same thing occurs occasionally in the examples of hypermetric çlokas.

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| i, 92, 6 c,        | kuta āyātaḥ katarasyām diçi tvam (No. 13)                         |
| iii, 5, 10 a,      | tata utthāya Viduram Pāṇḍaveyāḥ (No. 15)                          |
| v, 42, 6 c,        | pitṛloke rājyam anuçāsti devaḥ (No. 20)                           |
| v, 44, 18 b,       | dhanam ācāryāya tad anuprayacchet (No. 20)                        |
| xii, 63, 4 c,      | vṛsalipatiḥ piçuno nartanaç ca (No. 12)                           |
| xiii, 76, 14 d,    | pratigṛhṇan vāi gopradāne vidhijñāḥ (No. 7)                       |
| xiii, 102, 19 a,   | atithivratāḥ suvratā ye janā vāi (No. 6)                          |
| ib. 35 c, (jagat), | Varunasya rājñāḥ sadane mahātmanāḥ                                |
| xiii, 126, 38 a,   | bahule samaṅge hy akutobhaye ca (No. 1)                           |
| H. 2, 72, 33 b,    | kṛtinam vīram (C, 7, 422 dhīram) dāna-<br>vānam ca bādham (No. 7) |

All these cases have an anapæstic opening; all but one have the fifth syllable heavy.<sup>1</sup> Some have been given under the examples referred to above.

v, a. Much more frequent is the inserted fifth. I do not mean, of course, that a regular triṣṭubh is first made and a syllable is then inserted, but that the cadence does not have the rhythm of iv, to wit,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , but (with the cæsura regularly after the fifth syllable)  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , so that the effect is that of a syllable inserted at the place of cæsura. This measure produces rather a pleasing alteration and is frequently found in regular triṣṭubh stanzas, scanned exactly like the other pādas with the modification thus indicated. The form is Vedic, and is found also in the Upanishads and in the Buddhistic texts. Examples are:

i, 71, 40 d, yathā tvadartham | rakṣitā 'ham careyam<sup>2</sup>

v, 48, 101 d, samyudhyamānā | Dhārtarāṣṭrā na santi

The effect of this measure I have endeavored to reproduce from the following extract, v, 48, 75-76:

ayaṁ Gāndhārās tarasā sampramathya  
jitvā putrān Nagnajitaḥ samagrān  
baddham mumoca vinadantam prasahya  
Sudarṣanam vāi devatānām lalāmam  
ayaṁ Kapāte<sup>3</sup> nijaghāna Pāṇḍyam  
tathā Kaliṅgān Dantakūre mamarda  
anena dagdhā varṣapūgān vināthā  
Vārānaśī nagarī sambabhūva

And yon Gāndhārās, at a blow Krishna vanquished,  
And conquered all Nagnajita's descendants,  
Their plaining victim, as he lay bound, releasing  
(Of gods the jewel, "Beautiful" called, a fair man);

<sup>1</sup> On this case (tata utthāya), see below, p. 290.

<sup>2</sup> Compare with this example, Rig Veda, i, 120, 3, tā no vidvāṁsā | manma vocetam adya, and for other Vedic parallels, Oldenberg, Hymnen des Rig Veda, vol. i, p. 66 ff. (ZDMG. vol. xxvii, p. 75).

<sup>3</sup> v. l., kapāteṇa jaghāna. Below, the scholiast explains dantakūre as in battle rather than as a proper name. Perhaps Dantakrūrām jaghāna (ā before kr), as in vii, 70, 5.

He at Kapât slew in a war the Pândya,  
 He smote Kalingas, Dantakûr's men a-fighting,  
 He too, that hero, burned and enslaved a long time  
 Benares town, city sans help unaided.

It will be observed that the first part of this measure is that of the regular triṣṭubh with the cæsura after the fifth, as in Yamo 'bravîn<sup>1</sup> mām: na mrto 'si sāumya, xiii, 71, 18 a, which form may have led to the establishment of the hypermeter on the one hand and the cæsurally catalectic pāda on the other.

The texts sometimes show variations, like those found in the simple triṣṭubh forms.<sup>2</sup> Thus in vii, 179, 45 d, where C. has the hypermeter, B. omits the extra syllable: sampac-yanto (vāi) vijayam rākṣasasya.

Of the different hypermetric forms, the commonest are those in which the fifth syllable is followed by — ∪ — — or ∪ ∪ — —; less often by — ∪ ∪ —. All three occur at i, 76, 50 ff.:

50, kacasya mārgam prātipatsye na bhōksye  
 53, guror hi bhīto vidyayā co 'pahūtaḥ  
 54, smarāmi sarvaṁ yac ca yathā ca vṛttam

The extra syllable, like the initial, may be heavy or light; but except when followed by ∪ ∪ — — the latter is rare. The second and fourth syllables are rarely light. I give below examples of the different forms. First of the common varieties (but ∪ ∪ ∪ — as second foot is the rarest of these):

— ∪ — —

yaço na naçyej, jñātibhedaç ca na syāt, iii, 4, 8 a  
 vadhāya rājan, Karpasūtasya saṁkhye, viii, 85, 36 b  
 mā vāi dvītiyam mā tṛtiyam ca vañce(t), iii, 297, 25 c

<sup>1</sup> On page 186, note 1, I have referred to Yama's world as portrayed in *Sabbhā* in contrast to "elsewhere." The remark is correct, but elsewhere is not everywhere else; e. g., this account of *Nācīketas* represents it as blissful. Usually, of course, it is a hell.

<sup>2</sup> These changes I have discussed in *A. J. Phil.*, xx, p. 18 ff. as affecting vii, 168. In vii, 179, 24 a, B. has — ∪ — — for ∪ ∪ — — in C., with several similar changes close by; strikingly in 32 d = 8,146, where B has no *babhūvaḥ* (C., na).

So in v, 44, 24 c; vii, 2, 33 b; viii, 42, 17 c; xii 278 (7), 6 a, etc.

A case of fifth brevis and also fourth brevis is found in i, 1, 217 c, dvyūnā viṅcatir āhatā 'kṣāuhipīnām; and fourth brevis in iii, 197, 12d, na trāṇam labhet trāṇam icchan sa kāle; where, however, C. has labhate (labh'te) which may be correct.<sup>1</sup> All five syllables are heavy in ii, 77, 10 b; kanyām Pāñcālīm Pāṇḍāvebhyaḥ pradāya. Unique (I think) are breves in the third and fourth syllables: datvā 'naḍuham sūryalokaṁ vrajanti,<sup>2</sup> iii, 186, 8 b (No. 10).

— — — — —

Preceded by brevis (fifth syllable):

samānam mūrdhni rathayānam viyanti, i, 3, 64 b  
tathā titikṣur atitikṣor viṣṭaḥ, i, 87, 6 b = xii, 300, 15 b  
yas tv evam brahma tapasā 'nveti vidvān, iii, 192, 56 c  
dharmaṁ purāṇam upajivanti santaḥ, viii, 45, 16 c  
taṁ vāi manyeta pitaraṁ mātaraṁ ca, xii, 108, 22 c  
garbho 'mṛtasya jagato 'sya.pratiṣṭhā, xiii, 76, 10 b

So i, 1, 212 c; 1, 213 c; 89, 6 c; 232, 16 c; iii, 4, 13 a; viii, 42, 16 b; etc.

Preceded by a heavy syllable:

hataṁ saṁgrāme Sahadevena pāpam, i, 1, 208 c  
idaṁ ca rājan hitam uktaṁ na cet tvam, iii, 4, 12 c  
tathā ṣaktir apy adhamam ghorarūpāḥ, v, 181, 9 d  
tathā vāyavagnī pramimāṇam jagac ca, vii, 201, 67 b  
yasyā 'vibhaktaṁ vasu rājan sahāyāḥ, iii, 5, 20 a  
tān āha sarvān ṛṣimukhyān Agastyāḥ, xiii, 94, 9 a

So iii, 5, 18 b; 113, 6 b; v, 42, 15 a; 48, 46 c; vii, 179, 42 a; viii, 37, 30 b; 42, 9 d, etc.

Cases of fourth brevis are ii, 56, 15 c, paṇcāt tapsyase tad upākramya vākyam; and i, 1, 216 b, tathā bandhubhiḥ pitṛbhir bhrātṛbhiḥ ca.

<sup>1</sup> Compare also iii, 13, 291 a, yathā mām hi vāi sādhuṣādāḥ prasannāḥ; where, however, B. 197, 19, omits hi, which makes, when retained, a bhujaṁ-gaprayāta pāda; q. v. below, under the head of Akṣaracchandas.

<sup>2</sup> Compare RV. viii, 59, 7, indrāvaruṇā | sāumanasam adṛptam, cited by Oldenberg, loc. cit., p. 68.

For v, 516, prayacchā mahyaṃ bhavatsaḥyaṃ kariṣye, B. 16, 32-d, has tava sāhyam. In vii, 200, 82 a, B. has tasyā 'syatas tān niṣitān pītadhāraṇ, where C. 9,339 has suniṣitān. All five syllables are heavy in ii, 77, 7 a; citrān samnāhān avamufic-  
antu cāi 'śām.

Preceded by brevis: — 0 0 —

na cen mām Jisṇur āhvayitā sabhāyām, ii, 58, 16 b  
tāns te dadāni mā prapata prapātam, i, 92, 11 a = 93, 3

Preceded by a heavy syllable:

gomāyur uccāir vyāharad agnihotre, ii, 71, 22 b  
amanyamānaḥ kṣatriya kiṃcid anyat, v, 42, 15 c  
āmantraye tvām brūhi jayaṃ raṇe me, viii, 67, 22 c  
anarthakam me darṣitavān asi tvam, viii, 68, 8 c  
prayacchā 'nyasmāi Gāṇḍivam etad adya, viii, 68, 28 a<sup>1</sup>  
nāi 'ko bahubhyo Gāutamī rakṣitavyaḥ, xiii, 1, 30 b

There is, I believe, only one other case of this form in the thirteenth book, 103, 42 c. It is rare as a triṣṭubh hypermeter, but it occurs also (see below) as a jagatī.

Besides these forms are found: 0 0 0 —, of which I have but sporadic examples: sa yatre 'cchasi, Vidura, tatra gaccha, ii, 64, 11 c (note to No. 20); ahaṃ karte 'ti, Vidura, mā ca maṇsthāḥ, and na tvām prechāmi, Vidura, yad dhitam me, ii, 64, 7 a and c (C. has mā 'vamaṇsthāḥ); prātas trivargā ghr̥tavahā vipāpmā, xiii, 26, 88 c (No. 19, ad fin.).

Between divisions iv and v stand a couple of cases in which the initial syllable is heavy but the second is light. They belong neither to iv with its anapaestic opening, nor to v with its iambic or spondaic opening: aṣvināv indum | amṛtaṃ vṛttabhūyāu, i, 3, 63 a; atra Kāunteya | sahito bhrātr̥bhis tvam, iii, 134, 41 a. Compare above p. 286, tatā utthāyā viduraṃ Pāṇḍaveyāḥ (No. 15).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This pāda is followed by tvatto yo 'strāir abhyadhiko vā harendrah, with the caesura ignored. Pāda a is virtually repeated in viii, 69, 72 c-d, anyasmāi tvam Gāṇḍivam dehi Pārtha, tvatto 'strāir vā vīryato vā vīṣṭaḥ.

<sup>2</sup> Such Vedic cases as this last are grouped by Oldenberg, loc. cit., with those just mentioned, e. g., abhi kṛṣṇena rajasā dyām aṇoti, RV. i, 35, 9.



Quite exceptional, though corresponding to recognized (but unusual) forms of the regular triṣṭubh, are further:

dadarçā 'sinaṁ dharmātmānaṁ vivikte, iii, 5, 6 c  
(No. 27)

kiṁ vidviṣā vāi mām evaṁ vyāhareyuḥ, ii, 71, 7 c  
(No. 26)

dhṛtāyudhaḥ su-kṛtīnāṁ uttamāujah (v. l. sukṛtīnām),  
H. 7,442 c (No. 24; v. l. in ii, 72, 53).

Compare also a case of No. 23, below, p. 294.

The hypermeter beginning with an anapæst, iv, is found also in popular Buddhistic poetry, where also a long syllable rarely takes the place of the initial brevis. There are, for example, in the Dhammapada, half a dozen cases with anapæst, but none with long initial (vs. 40 has naga-, in the new text).

Examples of jagatīs like the triṣṭubh hypermeters given above<sup>1</sup> are:

athāi 'va çyeno vajrahastah çacīpatih, iii, 197, 25 b  
bhītaṁ prapannaṁ yo hi dadāti çatrave, iii, 197, 12 c  
svādhyāyaçilā guruçuçrūṣaṇe ratāḥ, xiii, 102, 33 a  
satye sthitānāṁ vedavidāṁ mahātmanāṁ, xiii, 102, 34 c  
balena tulyo yasya pumān na vidyate, ii, 65, 25 a  
(a has 13 syllables; b, 12; c-d, 11 each)

Occasionally a triṣṭubh and jagatī occur in the same stanza in hypermetric form, as in iii, 134, 39:

tato 'ṣṭāvakraṁ mātur athā 'ntike pitā  
nadīm samaṅgām çighraṁ imām viçasva  
(provāca cāi 'naṁ sa tathā viveça)

The unique triṣṭubh-pāda of fourteen syllables, of which I spoke above, runs, ii, 64, 1 d:

bālān ivā 'smān avamanyase nityam eva

perhaps better so than with the initial hypermeter, as the latter, except for this example, is characterized by a heavy fifth, as stated above.

<sup>1</sup> Also Vedic, e. g., viçvāsu dhūrṣu vājakṛtyeṣu satpate, R.V. x, 50, 2 (included under triṣṭubh in Oldenberg's list, loc. cit.).

The scholiast, who rarely touches on purely metrical phenomena,<sup>1</sup> explains this as "redundant and archaic," recognizing the pāda as it stands. But it is impossible to suppress the suspicion that avamanyase stands for an original manyase, a regular hypermeter (—, — ∪ —), "thou regardest us as children," strengthened by some one to "thou despisest us." Another, but doubtful, example is given below.

The distribution of these hypermetric forms, *va*, is somewhat uneven. The examples run in groups, showing clearly the effect of different styles. A baker's dozen of hypermeters, for example, are found in the seventh book, which has three hundred and twenty triṣṭubhs; but half of the dozen are in the fifty-seven triṣṭubhs of adhy. 179. On the other hand, the fourth book, which has two hundred triṣṭubhs, has no example.<sup>2</sup> The second book, which has only one hundred and fifty-five triṣṭubhs, has thirty examples.<sup>3</sup> In the thirteenth book the older parts have most examples. Thus in the few triṣṭubhs that tell of the seers' oath, adhy. 94, there are twelve hypermeters in thirteen triṣṭubhs, a much greater proportion, as the tale is much more ancient, than is found in any other part of equal length in this book.<sup>4</sup>

As an illustration of the epic free triṣṭubh with hypermeters may be taken the following stanzas from the continuation of the story of the Frog-girl in iii, 192, 48 ff.:

[Vāmadeva uvāca]

prayaccha vānyāu mama pārthiva tvaṁ  
kṛtaṁ hi te kāryam ābhyān açakyam

<sup>1</sup> He seldom comments on unusual rhythms, although often remarking on archaisms real or fancied, as for example on *prasthe dattvā vipinam brāhmaṇebhyaḥ*, at i, 98, 23 b, explaining *prasthe* as for *pratasthe* "with Vedic loss of reduplication."

<sup>2</sup> The fourth book is writ like the Rāmāyaṇa, in the refined style, and has scarcely a dozen pādas of the free triṣṭubh type, almost all its triṣṭubhs being *apajātis*.

<sup>3</sup> Two such hypermeters in one stanza are not unusual in old tales, e. g., iii, 192, 63 a-b, *jānāmi putraṁ ḍaḍavaraṣaṁ tavaḥ haṁ jātaṁ mahiṣyāṁ Qyena-jitam narendra*.

<sup>4</sup> Compare what was said above, in the note on p. 221, regarding the *çloka*s in this section.

mā tvā 'vadhīd Varuno ghorapāçair  
brahmakṣatrasya 'ntare vartamānam

[rājo 'vāca]

anaḍvāhāu suvratāu sādhudāntāv (— ∪ — —)  
etad viprāṇām | vāhanām Vāmadeva (—, — ∪ — —)  
tābhyām yāhi tvam | yatra kāmo maharṣe (—, — ∪ — —)  
cchandānsi vāi tvādr̥çam saṁvahanti (— ∪ — —)

[Vāmadevaḥ]

chandānsi vāi mādṛçam saṁvahanti  
loke 'muṣmin pārthiva yāni santi  
asmins tu loke mama yānam etad  
asmadvidhānām | apareṣām ca rājan (—, ∪ ∪ — —)

[rājā]

catvāras tvām vā | gardabhāḥ saṁvahantu (—, — ∪ — —)  
çreṣṭhāçvataryo | harayo vātarānhāḥ (—, ∪ ∪ — —)  
tāis tvām yāhi kṣatriyasyāi 'ṣa vāho (— ∪ — —)  
mamāi 'va vāmyāu | na tavāi 'tau hi viddhi (—, ∪ ∪ — —)

[Vāmadevaḥ]

ghoraṁ vratam brāhmaṇasyāi 'tad āhur  
etad rājan yad ihā 'jivamānaḥ  
ayasmayā ghorarūpā mahāntaḥ  
catvāro vā yātudhānāḥ surāudrāḥ  
mayā prayuktās | tvadvadham ipsamānā (—, — ∪ ∪ — —)  
vahantu tvām çitaçulāç caturdhā

And so on (the last stanza has six pādas, as not infrequently happens).<sup>1</sup>

As seen in some of these stanzas, there is sometimes accord between the hypermeter and its environment. This is not rare. Thus in ii, 58, 9, three pādas have the form ∪ — ∪ — ∪ ∪ — — ∪ — ∪, and these are followed by pāda d as a hypermeter of the same sort; ity āgato 'haṁ nr̥pa te taj ju-  
ṣasva. The hypermetric cadence to close a passage is not unusual. Thus to close a stanza, xiii, 159, 11: sa eva pūr-  
vaṁ nijaghāna dāityān, sa pūrvadevaç ca babhūva samrāt,  
sa bhūtānām bhāvano bhūtabhavyaḥ, sa viçvasyā 'sya jagataç

<sup>1</sup> That is, it is a strophe of two three-pāda triṣṭubhs (above, p. 194).

cā 'bhigoptā. Again, in i, 90, 5 d: bhūyaç ce 'dānīm vada kim te vadāmi; then Aṣṭaka uvāca. As hypermeters I should explain the difficult pādas, 1, 3, 123 c-d, the latter having (affectation of the antique?) choriambic opening before ∪ ∪ — — (No. 18 has ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — — ∪ — ∪):

vān navanītaṃ | hṛdayaṃ tikṣṇadhāraṃ (iti).

The preceding pāda is, I think, to be read as:

\* tad viparītaṃ | ubhayaṃ kṣatriyasya,

instead of tad ubhayaṃ etad viparītaṃ. Then all the pādas are metrical, after a fashion.

There is a regular triṣṭubh with the movement ∪ — ∪ —, — — ∪ —, and hypermetric in bhayāhitasya dāyaṃ mamā 'ntikāt tvām (cited under No. 23). Like this, but with a different hypermetric opening, is the apparent pāda found in 1, 3, 63 c: hitvā | girim açvi- | nāu gā mudā carantāu, — — ∪ — ∪ — — ∪ —, with neglected cæsura.

This brings me to the comparatively few cases of different cæsura in this form of \*hypermeter. As shown in the examples given above, the cæsural pause comes after the fifth syllable. \*When this is neglected (but the practice is observed in a large majority of the cases), we have an approach to the shifting cæsura of the former division, iv, and, as I have said already, it may seem simpler to regard such cases as initial hypermeters with long instead of short initial. But the difference of cadence between the opening ∪ ∪ — ∪ —, and ∪ — ∪ — ∪ —, seems, as in the case of the glosa, to mark an important though not a radical distinction, between these groups. While the ictus of the former, as in vṛṣalipatiḥ, is ∪ ∪ 1 ∪ 1, that of the latter, as in hataṃ saṃgrāme is ∪ 1, — 1 —. Nor does the shift of cæsura in asurāḥ surāyāṃ bhavato 'smi dattaḥ, etc., change this. But when the second class shifts the cæsura to the sixth syllable, as in yatra devī Gaṅgā satatam prasūtā, then, instead of coinciding with the ictus of iv, we still have necessarily the same opening with that of v, but still differentiated in the following. For in

the whole triṣṭubh, we certainly cannot read *hataṁ saṁgrāme Sahadevena pāpam* as  $\cup \text{ — } \text{ — } \cup$ , etc., whereas in the other case the only way, as it seems to me, to read the *pāda* is *yatrā devī Gaṇ | gā | satatām prasūtā*. I prefer, therefore, not to call these cases long initial hypermeters, but to class them separately, as vi. There are, as I have shown, cases which bridge the distinction and connect these classes in their extreme varieties, so that some may choose rather to consider them as radically identical openings; but it is certainly convenient to distinguish these forms. Of vi I have the following examples, the type being antique, as in *Mund. Up.*, iii, 1, 6, *yatra tat satyasya paramaṁ nidhānam*, as distinguished from *ib.* ii, 2, 10, *na tatra sūryo bhāti na candratārakaṁ, ne 'mā vidyuto bhānti kuto 'yam agniḥ*, etc. I unite with them the sporadic cases where the *cæsura*, instead of coming after the sixth, where it is usually found, is neglected or falls after the fourth syllable, except where, in the latter case, two light syllables follow:<sup>1</sup>

- i, 89, 3 b,      *sa vāi rājan nā 'bhyadhikaḥ kathyate ca* (No. 13)  
i, 197, 10 d,      *yatra devī Gaṅgā satatam prasūtā* (No. 3)  
ii, 64, 11 b,      *viṣeṣataḥ kṣattarahitam manuṣyam* (No. 19)  
iii, 134, 7 a,      *evam Aṣṭāvakraḥ samitāu hi garjan* (No. 3)  
ib, 27 c,      *bāleṣu putreṣu kṛpanaṁ vadatsu* (No. 19)  
iii, 13, 193 a (B. 192, 54) *mamāi 'va tāu vānyāu 'parigṛhya*  
   *rājan*

B. omits *eva*, but both texts immediately after have —

- iii, 192, 55 b,      *na tvā 'nuçāsmi adya prabhṛti hy asatyam* (No. 1)  
v, 42, 9 b,      *tatrā 'nu te yānti nā taranti mṛtyam*<sup>2</sup> (No. 19)  
v (42, 17), 1, 592 d, *etad vidvān 'pāiti katham nu karma* (No. 2)

B. has *no 'pāiti* —

- v, 44, 10 a,      *guruṁ ṣiṣyo nityam abhivādayita* (No. 20)  
v, 44, 28 c,      *rathamtare bārhadrathe vā 'pi rājan* (No. 6)  
v, 48, 77 c,      *vegenāi 'va çāilam , abhihatya jambhaḥ* (No. 20, note)

<sup>1</sup> For these cases see below.

<sup>2</sup> C. 1,584 has *te tatrā 'nuyānti*.

vii, 2, 1 b, bhinnām nāvam ivā 'tyagādhe Kurūpām (No. 9)<sup>1</sup>

vii, 179, 26 b, çaktyrṣṭiprāsamusalāny āyudhāni (No. 13)<sup>2</sup>

But C. 8, 140, has çaktyaḥ prāsā (regular) —

viii, 4, 546 b, prāduç cakre vajrapratimaprabhāvam (No. 2)

Here B. 89, 23 has vajram atiprabhāvam, but C.'s form (words) is a stereotyped triṣṭubh ending, as in viii, 89, 61 d; ix, 17, 19 d; 85, 37 c; xii, 112, 21 b, etc.; e. g., in the last case, purā mahendra pratimaprabhāva.

[xii, 108, 33 a, etat sarvam anirdeçenāi 'vam uktam<sup>3</sup>]

xiii, 94, 13 d, na hy utsahe draṣṭum iha jivalokam (No. 19)

xiv, 9, 34 c, sahasraim dantānām çatayojanānām (No. 2)

H. 2, 72, 31 c, virūpākṣam sudarçanam puṇyayonim (No. 7)

ib. 32 d, somapāuām marīcipānām varīṣṭhaḥ (No. 8)

ib. 44 a, vi-añjano jano 'tha vidvān samagrah

(Note to No. 9 in Appendix, with the pāda tri-ambakam puṣṭidam, etc., another case of resolution.)

Compare also the pāda cited above p. 278, mā pradāḥ çyenāya, etc.

In the explanation of the pādas given above, I have partially accepted<sup>4</sup> the analysis of Kühnau, who in his book, *Die Trishtubh-Jagatī Familie*, has divided yatrā tat sátyasyā | paramām nidhānām; but I cannot carry this out in tāns te dadāni, mā prāpata prapātam, and therefore separate the classes, reading the latter as tāns té dadāni | má prapatá prapātam. The pāda with cæsura after the sixth syllable,

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps vā for iva (as below).

<sup>2</sup> On this pāda also, see below.

<sup>3</sup> This extraordinary verse, though anirdeçena is vouched for by the commentator, seems by metre and meaning to have been originally a sample of No. 27 (with nirdeçena in its usual sense), ∪ — — —, — — — — ∪ — ∪. As it stands it must have fourth brevis (hypermeter), — — — ∪ ∪ — — — — ∪ — ∪.

<sup>4</sup> Kühnau's schemes (loc. cit., pp. 104, 159) find a place even for the pāda: yadā 'çrāuṣam Droṇaḥ Kṛtavarmā Kṛpaç ca, which does indeed stand in C. 196 a, but is corrected in B. i, 1, 108, 'çrāuṣam having been taken over from the circumjacent pādas, but being properly omitted (as in C. 201, yadā Droṇe), leaving a regular triṣṭubh. See, however, viii, below.

examples above, may, however, be grouped for mechanical clearness with the regular triṣṭubhs, the numbers of which I have added to the various specimens.

As in the case of triṣṭubh versus çloka pāda, one cannot always say just which measure one has in hand when regular and hypermetric triṣṭubhs run together. Thus in xiii, 80, 11 a-b:

dhenum savatsām,  
kapilām bhūriçṅgīm  
kānsyopadohām,  
vasanottariyām ;

or in iii, 34, 21 c-d:

mitrāṇi cāi 'nam | acirād bhajante  
devā ive 'ndram | upajivanti cāi 'nam,

like a vāitāliya.

The hypermetric syllable may be only apparent (elision) in some cases. In the older epic I have noticed only *a* elided thus, as in v, 44, 10 d:

eṣa prath 'mo brahmacaryasya pādaḥ

In the later epic, such elision takes place as well in the case of u and i, unless we assume a freer use of hypermetric syllables; as in:

i, 55, 11 d,                      tvam vā Varuṇo dharmarājā Yamo vā  
vii, 201, 65 b,                paraçvadhinaṁ gadinam cā 'yatāsim  
ib. c,                              çubhram jaṭilam musalinam candramāulim  
vii, 9,455 d (= ib. d),      vyāghrājinam paridadhānam daṇḍapāṇim

But here B. has pariḡhinam.

xiv, 10, 2 a, Dhṛtarāṣṭra ! prahito gaccha Maruttam <sup>1</sup>

H., 2, 79, 9 c, where the whole stanza reads:

a, āpo devya | ṛṣiṇām (hi<sup>2</sup>) viçvadhātṛyo  
b, divyā madantyo yāḥ | çamkarā dharmadhātṛyaḥ  
c, hiranyavarṇāḥ | pāvakāḥ çivatamena  
d, rasena çreyaso mām juṣantu

<sup>1</sup> Read gacch' (a common type, No. 14).

<sup>2</sup> C., 7,794, omits hi, and in b reads dharmarāṣṭṛyaḥ.

If yāḥ followed rasena it would improve both pādas; but on this see the next paragraph. In c, hypermetric, çivatamena must be read as çiv'tamena. In the next stanza (after apām eṣa smṛto mantrah, intervening), C., d, has (sc. mā)

bhartur bhaveyaṁ ruṣatī syām ca vaçagā

but here B., 11, has syām vaçāṁgā, which smacks of B.'s usual improving process.

### vii-ix. Double Hypermeters or Triṣṭubhs of Thirteen Syllables.

vii. Sporadically appears an "inserted fifth" in addition to the initial hypermeter:

xiii, 94, 3 a, ṛṣayaḥ sametāḥ | paçime vāi prabhāse

xiii, 102, 39 a, çatavarṣajīvi | yaç ca çūro manuṣyaḥ

If the reading is right, this is found, but with different opening, in

iii, 197, 27 a, etāsām prajānām | pālayitā yaçasvī.

viii. But in the last case (though tāsām may be suggested for etāsām) a combination seems to be at work which is like that wrought by the cæsura after the fifth, in cases where the triṣṭubh then builds up its second half independently. Thus pālayitā yaçasvī would be a regular second half and etāsām prajānām would be a rough metrical equivalent of the type yatra devī Gaṅgā. The cases are:

- (1) ii, 67, 4 c, sā tvam prapadyasva | Dhṛtarāṣṭrasya veçma<sup>1</sup>
- (2) iii, 5, 20 c, sahāyānām eṣa | saṁgrahaṇe 'bhyupāyaḥ
- (3) v, 46, 27 c, ajaç caro divā- | rātram atandritaç ca<sup>2</sup>
- (4) viii, 76, 18 a, prāsaç ca mudgarāḥ | çaktayaç tomarāç ca
- (5) xiii, 159, 26 a, sa eva pārthāya | çvetam açvam prāyacchat  
(read prāyacchat ?)
- (6) xiv, 9, 10 b, balāni sarvāni | vīrudhaç cā 'py amṛdnan

<sup>1</sup> Possibly, however, prapadya has been altered here by a grammarian.

<sup>2</sup> In 30, ajaç caro divārātram atandrito 'ham, where C., 1,790, has ajaç cā 'horātram. The stanza is Upanishadic: aṅguṣṭhamātrah puruṣo mahātmā na droçyate 'sau hr̥di samniviṣṭah, ajaç (etc.), sa tam matvā kavir āste prasaṁnah (as in Kātha vi, 17, etc.).



- (7) H. 2, 72, 32 a, bhuñkte ya eko (pronounce yāiko) vibhur |  
jagato viçvam agryam  
(8) ib. 47 d, abhi triviṣṭapam | çaraṇam yāmi Rudram  
(9) ib. C. 7448 c, guhā 'bhibhūtasya | puruṣasye 'çvarasya<sup>1</sup>

And so, perhaps, in the case cited above from H., 2, 79, 9 b, divyā madantyo yāḥ | çamkarā dharmadhātṛyaḥ (when, after rasena in d, tāḥ may be supplied).

The number of cases (all I have found) is considerably reduced by reading in the etāsām verse above,

	tāsām prājāṇām
in (1)	sā tvam prapadya
in (4)	prāsāç ca mudg'raḥ
in (5)	sāiva pārthāya
in (6)	balāni sarvā (analogous to viçvā)
in (8)	triviṣṭapam (omitting abhi)

But the type seems to be established by bhuñkte yāiko vibhur in (7), and guhā 'bhibhūtasya in (9); so it may seem better to stick to the text than to adopt an explanation which would demand still further changes, such as omitting eṣa in (2), and vibhur in (7); or rejecting the form of (9). Other examples of thirteen-syllable triṣṭubhs exist, but they seem to belong to another category, as shown below, where, however, chandovidas te | ya uta nā 'dhītavedāḥ differs from adyāi'va punyā 'ham | uta vaḥ Pāṇḍaveyāḥ only by cæsura, the latter (from i, 198, 5 b) belonging here.

### Defective Triṣṭubhs.

Considering the extent of the epic, the number of defective (impossible) triṣṭubh pādas is small. Some of these I have already noticed incidentally, and need not take up again. The others I group in their order:

- i, 197, 23 d, adyā 'çeṣasya bhuvanasya tvam bhavā 'dyāḥ  
Omīt Bhava, Çiva (No. 13, hypermetric).

<sup>1</sup> Here B. (59) has puruṣeçvarasya.

- v, 42, 15 d,     nā 'dhīyīta nirṇudann ivā 'sya cā 'yuh  
                              Read vā for iva.<sup>1</sup>
- v, 44, 3 c,         anārabhyām vasati 'ha kāryakāle  
                              Omit iha (= ātmany eva).
- v, 44, 25 a,       ābhāti çuklam iva lohitaṃ ivā 'tho  
                              kṛṣṇam athā 'ñjanam kādravaṃ vā (v. l. in 26 a,  
                              kṛṣṇam āyasam arkavarṇam).

Read vā for ivā 'tho and atho kṛṣṇam añjanam. In 26 a, a like change. So v, 48, 86 d, ākāçe cā 'psu ca te kramaḥ syāt, for ca apsu.

- v, 44, 28 a-c,     nāi 'varkṣu tan na yajuḥṣu nā 'py atharvasu  
                              na dṛçyate vāi vimaleṣu sāmasy  
                              rathamtare bārhadrathe vā 'pi rājan

For c, see the list above, p. 295. In a, read nāivarkṣu tan nā 'pi yajuḥṣv atharvasu, or as hypermetric with yajūṣu?

- viii, 3,338 c,     ditsuh Karṇaḥ samare hastiṣatkaṃ yaḥ  
                              B. 66, 30, has hastiṣaḍgavam and omits yaḥ

- xii, 60, 46 c-d,     adhara vitānaḥ samsrṣṭo vāicyo brāhmaṇas triṣu  
                              varṇesu yajñasrṣṭaḥ

The preceding pādas make metre and sense. These make neither.

- xii, 226, 18,     na tat sadaḥ satpariṣat sabhā ca sā  
                              prāpya yām na kurute sadā bhayam  
                              dharmatattvam avagāhya buddhimān  
                              yo 'bhyupāiti sa dhuramdharaḥ pumān (v. l. naraḥ)

Read (?)

na tat sadaḥ satpariṣat sabhā ca sā  
                              samprāpya yām na kurute sadā bhayam  
                              tad dharmatattvam avagāhya buddhimān  
                              yas tv abhyupāiti sa dhuramdharaḥ naraḥ

The sā has caused the loss of the following sam, a copy-error. Just so, bhavātmakam parivartamānam has lost sam before the

<sup>1</sup> The form vā for iva is found everywhere, e. g., xiii, 90, 42 c, sa vāi muktaḥ, pippalam bandhanād vā (cyavate). So R. vii, 84, 15; 36, 42.

last word, xii, 10,544 a = 287, 13. The parallel proverb, v. 35, 58, has na sã sabhã yatra na santi vṛddhāḥ (Manu, xii, 114).

xii, 285, 26 d, mām adhvare çamsitāraḥ stuvanti  
 ratham̐taram̐ sãmagāç co 'pagānti  
 mām brāhmaṇā brahmavido yajante  
 (d) mamā 'dhvaryavaḥ kalpayante ca bhāgam

Varied readings in xiii, 159, 16, where d appears as tasmāi havir adhvaryavaḥ kalpayanti, but tasmāi here is offensive. Read *me* 'dhvaryavaḥ.

H. 2, 74, 27 b, çaçvac chreyaḥ kãkṣibhir varadāmeyavīrya(h)<sup>1</sup>  
 (sc. pūjyase)

v, b and ix. **Mora-Tristubhs.**

v, b. In the form of the hypermetric tristubh shown above in tathā titikṣur atitikṣor viçīṣṭaḥ or na tvām pṛcchāmi, Vidura, yad dhitam me, the scheme is

— — — — —, — — — — —

Now, as soon as the cæsura in such a combination of syllables shifts back to the fourth syllable, — — — — —, — — — — —, as in

teṣām kramān kathaya tato 'pi cã 'nyat, v, 42, 26 c,

it is evident that, although such a pāda may be mechanically equated with No. 19 (as a hypermeter), it is on the other hand nothing but a mora-equivalent of the form (No. 1) — — — — —, — — — — —. Again, in the case of neglected cæsura (above), where two light syllables follow the "extra" syllable, we may as well take çaktyṛstiprāsamusalāny āyudhāni as an equivalent of — — — — —, — — — — —, like the regular pāda with — — — — — in the second foot (No. 6); or, to give an example where the cæsura is clearly marked, sa mām jihmaṁ, Vidura, sarvam bravīṣi, iii, 4, 21 a, may be scanned as — — — — —, — — — — —. Such pādas stand parallel to the regular forms, as in the Gītā, 2, 29, imitation of Kāṭha Up. ii, 7 :

<sup>1</sup> The commentator asserts that this is really a "fourteen-syllable pāda," but, as nityadã precedes, çaçvat may be omitted, leaving a dodeka hypermeter.

ācaryavat paçyati kaçcid enam  
 ācaryavad vadati tathāi 'va cā 'nyaḥ  
 ācaryavac cāi 'nam anyaḥ çṛṇoti.

As resolution may take place in several places, we get quite a variety of rucirā-like pādas. The common alternation of the — ◡ — — and ◡ ◡ — — pādas is thus represented :

xiv, 10, 19 a-b, ayam indro haribhir āyāti rājan  
 devāiḥ sarvāis tvaritāiḥ stūyamānaḥ

ib. 10, 23 c-d, ayam yajñam kurute me surendra  
 Bṛhaspater avarajo vipramukhyaḥ

But the choriambus-equivalent is more common, as in

iii, 134, 28 c, hasti 'va tvam, Janaka, vinudyamānaḥ  
 xiv, 26, 1 ff. (refrain), yo hr̥cchayas, tam aham anubravīmi

Two or three of these pādas together are not unusual :

iii, 132, 9 d-10 a, bhāryām ca vāi duhitaram svām sujātām  
 tasyā garbhaḥ samabhavad agnikalpah<sup>1</sup>

viii, 68, 7 d and 8 a-b, phalārthinām viphalā ivā 'tipuṣpaḥ  
 pracchāditam baḍiçam ivā 'miçena  
 samchāditam garalam ivā 'çanena

So in the jagatī-pāda iii, 133, 10 d, kasmād bālāḥ sthavira iva prabhāṣase. Here it needs only the iambic opening to make a true rucirā, ◡ — ◡ — ◡ ◡ ◡ — ◡ — ◡ —, and this pāda is found repeatedly, not in complete rucirā-stanzas alone, but in jagatī stanzas. For example, iii, 8, 31 is a vañçasthabila stanza, where three pādas are regular, but b has :

prakīrtayec chucisumanāḥ samāhitah

On the other hand, in i, 34, 26, the first pāda alone is of vañçastha type, while three rucirā pādas follow, e. g., pāda d :

mabātmanāḥ patagapateḥ prakīrtanāt

These are both tag-stanzas, embellishing the close of a chapter

<sup>1</sup> The naïve pādas 10,606 b-7 a, following this stanza, are omitted in B. The embryo here says: vedān sūgān sarvaçāstrāir upetān adhitavān ami tava prasādāt, etc.!

and of benedictive content.<sup>1</sup> A similar case occurs in iii, 3, 75 a, where, after praise, is said:

imam stavam prayatamanāḥ samādhinā  
paṭhed ihā 'nyo 'pi varam samarthayan, etc.

But this arrangement is found also apart from such employment. So in viii, 66, 47, a, b, d are of this rucirā type; c is of upendra form, thus c-d:

hato mayā so 'dya sametya Karna  
iti bruvan praçamayase (v. l. me) 'dya Phālguna

Here eleven syllables do not equate twelve (thirteen), but d equals  $\sim \cup \cup \_$ . In viii, 84, 20 a, B. has sphāṭikacitra, where C. 4,281 has (tato dhvajam) sphāṭikavicitrakāñcukam, probably the original, as B. is apt in varied readings to have the more uniform (improved) types.

As upendra and vañçastha pādas alternate, so rucirā pādas alternate with vañçasthas. Thus in xii, 244, 29, a and c are of rucirā form; b and d, of vañçastha form. In a stanza of mixed upajātis, xii, 341, 119 b has

mahātmanah puruṣavarasya kīrtitam<sup>2</sup>

The seventh book has a number of these combinations of rucirā pādas and stanzas and upajāti pādas and stanzas, usually as pāda tags at the end of chapters, for example, adhy. 26, 29, 30, 32; but it has also incorporated complete rucirās as parts of an upajāti system, as in 2, 15 and 16.

I give now — reverting to the triṣṭubh — a few more examples:

ii, 58, 16 a, na cā 'kāmaḥ Çakuninā devitā 'ham  
iii, 4, 17 a, tvayā prṣṭaḥ kim aham anyad vaḍeyam  
iii, 4, 18 a, etad vākyam Vidura yat te sabhāyām

<sup>1</sup> In xii, 219, 52, two or three pādas in a benedictive stanza are of this type. The first pāda in C. begins imam yaḥ paṭhati vimokṣaṇiçayam, for B.'s imam hi yaḥ paṭhati (vi?) mokṣaṇiçayam. In xii, 114, 21, a benedictive stanza, rucirā pādas appear in a and d, e. g., the latter: na vāñmayam sa labhati kinçid apriyam. xiii, 77, 32 has a whole rucirā in benediction.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Gītā, 8, 10, sa tam param puruṣam upāṣiti divyam, etc.

In this example, ii, 71, 17, the much affected pāda symmetry is shown, b and d having ॐ ॐ — —, a and c having ॐ ॐ — —:

atidyūtāṃ kṛtāṃ idāṃ Dhārtarāṣṭrā  
yasmāt striyaṃ vivadadhvaṃ sabhāyāṃ  
yogakṣemāu naçyato vaḥ samagrāu  
pāpān mantrān Kuravo mantrayanti

Similar is ib. 8, only the first pāda is jagatī. But the second foot corresponds to that of the third pāda; and so the fourth pāda has ॐ ॐ — — corresponding to ॐ ॐ ॐ — in the second pāda:

anyaṃ vṛṇīṣva patim āçubhāvinī  
yasmād dāsyāṃ na labhasi devanena  
avācyā vāi paṭiṣu kāmavṛttir  
nityāṃ dāsyē viditāṃ tat tavā 'stu

Contrast this, for example, with the following pādas, 20 a, 24 a, 26 c, of the same section:

Bhīmasya vākye tadvad evā 'rjunasya  
tato Gāndhārī Viduraç cā 'pi vidvān  
Kṛṣṇām Pāñcālīm abravīt sāntvapūrvam

The last is a pure vāiçvadevī pāda, as above nityāṃ dāsyē viditāṃ tat tavā 'stu is a pure vātormī pāda, and yogakṣemāu naçyato vaḥ samagrāu is a pure çālinī pāda.

In pādas of the rucirā or rucirā-like type, the same word appears in the triṣṭubh, which has caused a discussion in the śloka:

iii, 192, 56 d, tena çreṣṭho bhavati hi jīvamānaḥ

v, 44, 18 c-d: sa tāṃ vṛttim bahugunāṃ evam eti  
guroḥ putre bhavati ca vṛttir eṣā

xii, 300, 27 d, moghaḥ çramo bhavati hi krodhanasya

Here bhavati need not be pronounced bhoti, as it is a perfect parallel to bahu gu- in this stanza and to pacasi (bhavasi) in the following:

i, 232, 14, sṛṣṭvā lokāns trīn imān havyavāha  
kāle prāpte pacasi punaḥ samiddhaḥ  
tvam sarvasya bhuvanasya prasūtis  
tvam evā 'gne bhavasi punaḥ pratiṣṭhā

A monosyllabic pronunciation cannot be claimed for all these cases, though it might be maintained for special words:

i, 197, 42 a, tān cāi 'vā 'gryām striyam atirūpayuktām<sup>1</sup>  
iii, 4, 1 c, dharmāt.mānam Viduram agādhabuddhim  
iii, 4, 3 a, evam gate Vidura yad adya kāryam  
iii, 26, 11 d, labdhvā dvijam nudati nṛpaḥ sapatnān  
iii, 34, 9 b, yathākāmaṁ viditam Ajātaśatro  
iii, 34, 20 c, mahāguṇam harati hi pāuruṣeṇa  
iii, 111, 10 d, vratam brahmaṇḥ carasi hi devavat tvam  
xii, 302, 114 b, mahārṇavam vimalam udārakāntam  
xiii, 71, 16 a, dṛṣṭvāi 'va mām abhimukham āpatantam  
xiii, 93, 136 a, adhvaryave duhitarām vā dadātu<sup>2</sup>  
xiii, 102, 36 b, tatthe 'ṣṭīnām daśaśatam prāpnuvanti  
xiii, 103, 35 b, tathāi 'vā 'nyān anaḍuho lokanātha  
H. 2, 72, 33 a, Atharvānam suçirasam bhūṭayoniṁ  
H. 2, 74; 23 b, khyāto devaḥ paçupatiḥ sarvakarmā

But the great objection to a monosyllabic pronunciation is that the rucirā pāda interchanges up to three pādas with the ordinary triṣṭubh pāda, and must therefore be identical in structure with the same pāda when four times repeated, in a perfect rucirā stanza. But in the rucirā stanza, no one can maintain for a moment that ○○○○ — is to be read with crasis. Why then when a stanza has three pādas of the same type or even one?

It may be said, however, that the mora triṣṭubh pāda differs in no respect from the "inserted fifth," when the latter is a light syllable. For example in this stanza:

iii, 4, 21, sa mām jihmam, Vidura, sarvam bravīṣi  
mānam ca te 'ham adhikam dhārayāmi  
yathe 'cchakam gaccha vā tiṣṭhā vā tvam  
susantvyamānā 'py asatī strī jahāti

<sup>1</sup> All the other pādas here are of strict çālinī type, — — — —, — ○ — —

<sup>2</sup> ib, 94, 44, idem, but vā fails.

Here it is clear that *susantvyamānā* 'py is a complete foot of the inserted fifth variety; but *pāda* *b* is indifferently an inserted fifth or a mora *pāda*, the *cæsura* pointing but lightly to the latter explanation. One reason, however, against such an identification is that the mora explanation in almost all cases is indicated, as in most of the examples given, by a plain *cæsura* before the fifth. Another is that this explanation brings the various *pādas* of a stanza into symmetry, as in iii, 192, where — ∪ — — is employed with predilection throughout, and we find in

iii, 192, 69, *yathā yuktā | vāmadevā 'ham enam*  
*dine dine | samdiçantī nṛçaṁsam*  
*brāhmaṇebhyo | mṛgayatī sūṇṭāni*  
*tathā brāhmaṇa | puṇyalokaṁ labheyam*

Here *mṛgayatī sū* —, as ∪ ∪ ∪ — —, accords with the structure of the other *pādas*. So in *jagatī*, e. g.,

vii, 26, 65–66, *sa nāgarājaḥ pravaraṅkṣāhataḥ*  
*purā sapakṣo 'drivaro yathā nṛpa*  
*bhayaṁ tadā ripuṣu samādadhāt bhr̥çam*  
*vaṇigjanānām kṣubhito yathā 'rṇavaḥ*  
*tato dhvanir dviradarathāçvapārthivāih, etc.*

vii, 50, 14a–b, *tathā tadā yodhanam ugradarçanam*  
*niçāmukhe pitṛpatirāṣṭravardhanam*<sup>1</sup>

vii, 109, 37 c–d *niçamya tam pratyanadaṁ tu Pāṇḍavās*  
*tato dhvanir bhuvanapathā 'spṛçad bhr̥çam*

Compare the close of vii, 155, four stanzas of *rucirās* and of *vaṇçasthas*, with the same mora-*pādas*.

A third point to be noticed is that the "inserted fifth" as *brevis*, and with its *cæsura* there, is always a rarity (as indicated in the lists above) unless followed by two (or three) other *breves*, so that we have finally two chief classes to explain, one with *cæsura* after the fifth heavy syllable, and the other with *cæsura* after the fourth, followed by *breves* equiva-

<sup>1</sup> Variant on the old stereotyped *yamarāṣṭravardhana*, of battle, hero, etc. as in vii, 145, 97 d; ib. 98 d.



lent in moræ to the rucirā pāda. There are a few cases bridging these classes and showing that the metrical equation was not always in harmony with the cæsura, but this is no more than was to be expected. We are not to imagine that the poets set themselves to compose pādas by categories; but we can hardly escape the conclusion that a pāda identical with a rucirā pāda was felt to be the same with it, though the characteristic pause of the rucirā may be absent; for in the regular rucirā the sense-pause and rhythmical pause are not always identical. Hence, when we find samānam mūrdhni rathayānam viyanti in one stanza, and yuvām varṇān vikurutho viṣvarūpān in the next, i, 3, 65 a, we may explain them as belonging to two categories cæsurally distinct, or put them into one category, remarking that usually the cæsura is after the fourth in such syllabic combinations; for even with two breves following (the commonest case with the cæsura after the fifth) the examples are rare in comparison with the rucirā-like or true rucirā pāda,  $\cup - \cup - \cup$ ;  $\cup \cup - - \cup - \cup$ ;  $\cup - \cup -$ ,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup - \cup - \cup$  (rucirā-like);  $\cup - \cup -$ ,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup - \cup - \cup$  (rucirā). It is perhaps in each case merely a question of how the pāda is naturally to be read. Some will scan only one way, e. g., mārge bhagnam ṣakaṭam ivā 'calākṣam in iii, 133, 23 d, irrespective of the stanza; while others may be read either way, as in the stanza ib. 19:

so 'ham ṣrutvā brāhmaṇānām sakāṣe  
brahmādvāitam kathayitum āgato 'smi  
kvā 'sau bandī yāvad enam sametya  
nakṣatrāṇi 'va savitā nāṣayāmi

or when united with the five-syllable foot, as in i, 89, 20:

tatra sthitam mām devasukheṣu saktam  
kāle 'tite mahati tato 'timātram  
dūto devānām abravīd ugrarūpo  
dhvanse 'ty uccāis trihplutena svareṇa

ix. The mātṛā or ati-triṣṭubh pāda may even be combined with the pāda having inserted fifth, where the breves following the cæsura seem to be only rucirā-like resolution. It is a triśkaideka measure:

i, 89, 23 b, samikṣya ce 'mām | tvaritam upāgato 'smi  
 (i, 198, 5 b, adyāi 'va puṇyā 'ham | uta vaḥ Pāṇḍaveyāḥ<sup>1</sup>)  
 v, 43, 50 c, chandovidas te | ya uta nā 'dhītavedāḥ  
 xvii, 3, 13 b, yad dattam iṣṭam | vivṛtam atho hutam ca

In xiii, 1, 32 d, kṣipram sarpaṁ jahi, mā bhūt te viṣaṅkā, as compared with caktyā rakṣo jahi Karṇā 'dya tūrṇam, vii, 179, 48 c; tapantam enaṁ jahi pāpaṁ niṣṭhe, ib. 49 b, *te* may be thought to be an intrusion, but it has a sort of parallel in iii, 4, 22 d, nē 'dam astī 'ty atha Viduro bhāṣamāṇaḥ (where C. has *atho*!).

The mora rhythm in general is early, being found not only in the epic but in the Upanishad and Buddhistic verse. But it is found also in imitative parts of the Purāṇas, as in Vāyu P., xiv, 7, in a section where upendra pādas interchange with the ṣalīnī-like pāda (— — — —, — — — —). Here in 7 b-d: mahātmānam paramamatiṁ vareṇyam, kavim purāṇam anuṣṭi-  
 āram, where, as often in the epic, — — — — stands with — — — — and — — — — (e. g., 9 a) as the equivalent, — — — —, of the latter. On the last verse above, see the note on p. 277. The measure appears in triṣṭubhs as an ati-triṣṭubh of twelve; in jagatīs, as an ati-jagatī of thirteen syllables.

In the Rāmāyaṇa I know of only one case where this resolved form is found, and that is peculiar. In R. vii, 81, 22, an extraordinary ṣloka closes the section, and in G. 88 a tag-triṣṭubh of the form above is made out of it. The extraordinary ṣloka is: sa tāir brāhmaṇam abhyastam sahitāir brahmavittamāih, ravir astam gato Rāma gaccho 'dakam upa-  
 sprṣa, "the sun has set (after accepting as a laudation) the secret worship by the assembled Veda-versed (seers)," according to the commentator. The parallel in G. indicates a brāhmaṇair abhiṣṭutaḥ instead of brāhmaṇa = upaniṣad or pūjā. The tag-end in G. vii, 88, 22 seems to be from a phrase just preceding (found in G. and R.), saṁdhyām upāsi-  
 tum vīra (Rāma). The whole tag reads:

<sup>1</sup> As remarked above, p. 290, this, though inserted here on account of its likeness to the next example, belongs rather to the group of Double Hyper-meters.

abhiṣṭutaḥ suravarāḥ siddhasaṅgāir  
 gato ravir suruciram astaçāilam  
 tvam apy ato Rāghuvara gaccha saṁdhyām  
 upāsitum prayatamanā narendra

This may be called a rucirā-triṣṭubh. On the rucirā stanza, see the section on akṣaracchandas below.

### The Triṣṭubh Stanza.

UPAJĀTIS. UPENDRAVAJRĀS AND INDRAVAJRĀS.

As stanzas, the forms that begin with a diiamb and continue with a choriamb are not particularly common. They are generally modified as upajātis, by combination with the *indra* varieties, which begin with a spondee, indravajrā and indravaṅçā. Sometimes the perfect form appears as a mere later addition. Thus in iii, 23, only one stanza, 14, is upendra in sixteen upajātis (pāda a has final brevis). So iii, 111, 17-18 = 10,044; while in iii, 295, 9 and 10 are two perfect vaṅçasthas, interpolated among çlokas. In iii, 232, 14, an almost perfect<sup>1</sup> upendra is ensconced in a stuti of Skanda, where the environment is upajāti. Again, in iii, 236, in an upajāti system of thirty-one stanzas, one, 15, is pure upendra, except that pāda a ends in a brevis; and 19, 25, 27 are also pure upendras,<sup>2</sup> except that in 27, pāda a ends in brevis. In xii, 201, out of twenty-seven triṣṭubhs, two, 6 and 23, are pure upendras. A pair of pādas occurs in viii, 89, 47, tato mahīm sāgaramekhalām tvam sapattanām grānavatīm samprdhām. But two pādas together is a large number except in late passages, like iii, 176 and 177, where they are not uncommon (176, 7, 15, 16; 177, 11, 21, 22); vaṅçasthas in vii, 109, 36-37, with a rucirā pāda, etc.

As the vaṅçastha(bila) is merely an upendra with a sylla-

<sup>1</sup> The third pāda, however, ends in a brevis. On this point is to be noticed that such a brevis is not uncommon in the Bhārata, but in the Rāmāyaṇa is rare enough to deserve a special notice of R. vi, 74, 54, where every pāda ends in brevis. Here the stanza itself is upendra, but the system is upajāti.

<sup>2</sup> Here only eight pādas are not of upajāti form, but — — — — —, — — — — —.

ble added,<sup>1</sup> so the jagatī corresponds to the different forms of the triṣṭubh. Thus in i, 197, 25, it takes the place of a vāṭormī, tatra hy ekam bhavitāro na sañçayo, yoniṁ sarve mānuṣim āviçadhvam, tatra yūyam karma kṛtvā 'viṣahyam, bahūn anyān nidhanam prāpayitvā; and just below, 53 b, pañcānām ekā svakṛtene 'ha karmanā, where it is hyper-metric. Here a and d have eleven, c, 12, and b, 13 syllables. A near approach to a perfect vañçastha is found in i, 198, 8, where all four pādas are normal, except that in b, — — ∪ — takes the place of the opening diamb. In ii, 64, 5, all pādas are perfectly regular. The interchange of an occasional vañçastha pāda with the other pādas of an upajāti triṣṭubh is too common to call for further remark. Two instances will be found in i, 193, 20 and 22. In the former, the stanza would be a perfect upendra, but pāda c is of vañçastha form; in the latter, which is an upajāti triṣṭubh, pāda c again is of pure vañçastha form. So in i, 197, 11, an indravañçā pāda heads and closes a triṣṭubh stanza. The cæsura is after the fifth or fourth, passim; or after the sixth, as in i, 197, 17 a, yadā tu paryāptam ihā 'sya<sup>2</sup> kṛdayā; or a second occurs, as in iii, 5, 19 c, saṁvardhayan stokam ivā 'gnim ātmavān. The sixth place is often half as common as the fifth.

The cæsura in the pādas of the upajāti system is found most frequently after the fourth or fifth. The former, perhaps, in isolated pādas, as in xii, 64, 18 d, tatas te 'ham dadmi varān yatheṣṭam, and i, 92, 9 a and 11 d; but the forms in the Bhārata, though inclining largely to the fifth place, vary constantly, as they do in the Rāmāyaṇa. Examples from the latter have been given above in the introductory paragraph. I add some specimens from the other epic:

tad vāi nṛṇaṁsaṁ tad asatyam āhur  
 yaḥ sevate dharmam anarthabuddhiḥ  
 artho 'py anīçasya tathāi 'va rājan, i, 92, 5 a-c  
 nilotpalābhā suradevate 'va  
 Kṛṣṇā sthitā mūrtimati 'va Lakṣmī, iv, 71, 17 c-d,

<sup>1</sup> That is for ∪ — ∪, ∪ — ∪ —, mechanically considered.

<sup>2</sup> On the light syllable before mute and liquid, see above, p. 242.

where a-b have cæsura after the fifth and fourth respectively. Not infrequently where the triṣṭubhs pause after the fifth, the jagatī, in the same stanza, pauses after the fourth, as in iii, 268, 19:

saçaṅkhaghosaḥ satalatraghoṣo  
gāṇḍivadhanvā muhur udvahaṇḥ ca  
yadā çarān arpayitā tavo'rasi  
tadā manas te kim ivā 'bhaviṣyat

But in pure vaṅçasthas, the cæsura is apt to vary almost with the pāda, as in xii, 103, 40:

na sāmadaṇḍopaniṣat<sup>1</sup> praçasyate  
na mārdayam çatruṣu yātrikaṁ sadā  
na sasyaghāto na ca saṁkarakriyā  
na cā 'pi bhūyaḥ prakṛter vicāraṇā

So in viii, 18, 12, the cæsura of two pādas falls after the fourth and fifth respectively, and then comes the pāda: atīva cukṣo-bhayiṣur janārdanam; while the fourth pāda is cut after the fourth syllable. Alternation is common, as ib. 14-15 (◡—◡— and ◡—◡— alternately). Sometimes there is no cæsura:

vāditraçaṅkhasvanasinhanādāih  
çarasiçaktyrṣṭinipāḍaduḥsaham, viii, 88, 3-4

or it is irregular:

alam virodhena ! dhig astu vigraham, ib. 21 b.

kṛtyām atharvāṅgirasim ivo 'grām, viii, 91, 48 = ix, 17, 44.

Upajātis are sometimes used to close systems, as are also upendras and vaṅçasthas. Pure vaṅçasthas may end a system of upajāti triṣṭubhs, as in viii, 76 and 79, xii, 167, 49-51, just as upajātis close a scene composed in old triṣṭubhs. The analogy with the tag-measures (discussed below) is here complete; the scene is set off with something better than the ordinary. As an example of the way in which upajātis are thus used may serve the end of iii, 154; or in i, 197 and 198,

<sup>1</sup> Upaniṣad is here secrecy. So perhaps in xii, 271, 30, (apetatiṣṭhānām, etc.) caturthopaniṣaddharmah sādharāṇa iti smṛtiḥ.

where the first part of the wedding scene at Drupada's is in irregular old triṣṭubhs, but regular upajātis conclude the scene; the latter beginning just where the actual wedding is described, and taking in the statement that the heroine was first married to Yudhiṣṭhira, then to the other brothers; that she preserved her virginity day by day; and that Drupada in conclusion gave most extravagant gifts. The smoothness of the statement babhūva kanyāi 'va gate gate 'hani, etc., 198, 14, stands with its surrounding verses in at least metrical contrast to the part that goes before, where triṣṭubhs of vātermī and ṇalīnī pādas and every sort of irregular combination is the rule. Whether the uniform upajātis conform to the uniforming of the poem is certainly a proper question to raise, though no signed and sealed statement to that effect is extant.

Another interesting example will be found at the end of the gambling scene, where from ii, 67, 24, almost regular upajātis continue to the end. This happens to be the passage where the heroine puts the legal question to which Bhīṣma is unable to reply, and where Karna joins in the laugh. The question is implied in what follows (68-70), but the passage in its present form is certainly open to the suspicion of having been rewritten by a more modern hand.

The first chapter of the R̥ṣyaçr̥ṅga episode is in old triṣṭubhs. With the beginning of the sensuous description in the second chapter begin the upajātis, iii, 111, 112.

In the systems of the older epic, — — — —, — — — —, — — — —, and — — — —, are used as interchangeable second feet. So universal are — — — — and — — — — that they must be considered as the chief triṣṭubh measure of the older epic, greatly in excess of — — — —. But in the fourth book and most later parts, these recede before the upajāti forms. Jagatī pādas are inserted occasionally in all the free triṣṭubh sections.<sup>1</sup> It is perhaps worthy of remark that, for example, in the Dyūta Parvan, the diiambic opening, or even, it might be said, the

<sup>1</sup> The process elsewhere of making a jagatī pāda is sometimes patent, as in viii, 90, 72 d : bhīndhi tvam enam Namuciṁ yathā Hariḥ (for yath 'endrah); here in an upajāti system of jagatī.

whole upendra form, is found par excellence in the final pāda(s), though found also in a, b, c, especially as the section gradually passes (towards its end) into regular upajātis, 67, 26 ff. For example, at the beginning of the scene, 56, 12-16:

- 12, ∪ — ∪ — —, — ∪ — — ∪ — ∪; — — ∪ —, ∪ ∪ — — ∪ — ∪;  
 — — ∪ — —, ∪ ∪ — ∪ —; ∪ — ∪ —, ∪ ∪ — — ∪ — ∪;  
 13, — — ∪ —, ∪ ∪ — — ∪ —; — — ∪ —, — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪;  
 — — ∪ —, ∪ ∪ — — ∪ —; ∪ — — —, ∪ ∪ — — ∪ — ∪;  
 14, — — — —, — ∪ — — ∪ — —; — — ∪ —, — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪;  
 ∪ — — —, — ∪ — — ∪ — ∪; ∪ — ∪ —, — ∪ — — ∪ — ∪;  
 15, — — ∪ —, — ∪ — — ∪ — —; — — ∪ —, — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪;  
 — — — —, ∪ ∪ — — ∪ — —; ∪ — ∪ —, — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪;  
 16, — — — —, ∪ ∪ — — ∪ — —; ∪ — ∪ —, — ∪ — — ∪ — ∪;  
 ∪ — — ∪, ∪ ∪ — — ∪ — —; ∪ — ∪ —, — ∪ — — ∪ — ∪

I have remarked in the list of examples given above that some of the older forms of the triṣṭubh are practically confined to the early parts of the epic. The fourth and seventh books are considered to be late, or, what amounts to the same thing, modern expanded forms of older material. The middle foot ∪, ∪ ∪ — occurs not infrequently in the older epic, but in the whole fourth book it occurs but once, and in the seventh only twice in 1280 pādas. Upajāti systems, except, as just observed, as a sort of tag, are not frequent in the older epic, where the systems are of the type — ∪ — — and ∪ ∪ — — with interspersed choriambes. The latter part of the third book, however, and all of the fourth book prefer the upajāti system (the cæsura being after the fourth in only one-third of the cases in the latter), and blocks of upajātis appear in the much-expanded battle-books. As a system, the upajāti marks late passages, such as the song of Ǫrī in the eleventh section of the thirteenth book, and the praise of gifts in the fifty-seventh section of the same book, where only two pādas are not upajāti. This book is also marked by the large number of its ǧālinī stanzas (not single pādas), which keep up an old measure in a new fixed form. Old as is the choriambic pāda, the stanza form of the choriambic triṣṭubh employed in great groups to the exclusion of other forms of triṣṭubh appears to be an innovation. A form once given persists, and so we have late passages with

\* — — as the second foot, just as this and — — are still met here and there in the *Purāṇas*,<sup>1</sup> but when the choriamb is employed continuously in a long system<sup>2</sup> the passage may be set down as late, or, if one prefers the expression, as more refined, as in the whole *Rāmāyaṇa* and in the later books of the *Mahābhārata*.

Another mark of lateness appears to lie in the absence of an indiscriminate mixture of *triṣṭubh* and *jagatī* forms. Later passages are rather apt to show uniformity in this regard; earlier passages show none, though an harmonious commingling in alternate or chiasitic form (12 + 11 + 12 + 11 or 11 + 12 + 12 + 11) is at all times somewhat affected, and late passages sometimes show no uniformity; but the tendency is in the other direction.

### The Syllaba Anceps.

In respect of the *pāda* syllaba anceps, the epic permits this not only in free *triṣṭubhs*, but also in *upajātis*, and even in isolated pure choriambic stanzas. But even the classical poets share this freedom. That is to say, as Professor Capeller has shown, although the rule is that pure *upendras* and *indravajrās* or the corresponding *jagatīs* shall have final anceps only at the end of the hemistich, yet if these stanzas, though complete

<sup>1</sup> Solitary *çālinī* stanzas also occur in the *Purāṇas*. For example, *Vāyu P.* vi, 71, repeated in ix, 113, where occurs the stanza: *vaktrād yasya brāhmaṇā samprasūtāḥ, yad [tad] vakṣataḥ kṣatriyāḥ pūrvabhāge, vāiçyāç co 'rvor yasya padbhyām ca çūdrāḥ sarve varṇā gātrataḥ samprasūtāḥ*, a pure *çālinī*.

<sup>2</sup> A choriambic verse or stanza is a different matter. This may be as old, or older, than a corresponding stanza of other form. For example, the prose proverb of *Gāut.* xxiii, 29, appears in the form *pañcā 'ṇṭāny āhur apātakāni* first in *Vas.* xvi, 35, as an *upajāti* stanza. The oldest version in the epic is in i, 82, 16, where there is no exception in the case of a teacher, as in *Gāutama* (for an untruth here is a mortal sin, not venial), nor is the priest included, as in *Vas.*; but the five venial lies are in case of wounds, about women, in case of marriage, death, and robbery, couched in *upajāti*. A second form occurs, however, in xii, 165, 80, where the teacher is mentioned in the same way as is the priest. The other difference between the epic versions is that the latter begins *na narṇayuktam anṛtaṁ hinasti*; the former, *vacanaṁ hinasti*, as choriamb. Spruch 3,321 has only one of these forms (ascribed to a *Purāṇa*). *Manu*, viii, 112, is in *çloka*.



in themselves, form part of a general system of upajātis, the freer form is permitted. Thus in Raghuvāṇṇa vii, 9, a pure indravajrā occurs with the third pāda ending in brevis, but it is in an upajāti chapter. Examples from epic poetry are:

ii, 56, 21 a (a triṣṭubh stanza), tato vidvān Viduram man-  
trimukhyām

ii, 63, 10 a (ditto), jānīmahe devitam Sāubalasyā

So in these pure choriambic stanzas, found in a general upajāti system:

iii, 176, 7, tava pratijñām Kururāja satyām  
cikīrṣamānās tad anupriyam ca  
tato na gacchāma vanāny apāsyā  
Suyodhanam sānucaram nihantum

and ib. 15,

tavā 'rthasiddhyartham api pravṛttāu  
Suparṇaketuḥ ca Çineḥ ca naptā  
tathāi 'va Kṛṣṇaḥ pratimo balenā  
tathāi 'va cā 'ham naradeva varya

iv, 11, 9, c, Bṛhannalām mām naradeva viddhi

ib. 54, 17 a, cacāra samkhye vidiḥo diḥaḥ cā

This is very rare in Virāṭa. In jagatī:

iii, 268, 19 c, yadā çarān arpayitā tavo'rasi

xiii, 70, 9 c-d, tvayā purā dattam iti 'ha çuçrumā  
nrpa dviḥebhyaḥ kva nu tad gatam tavā

Examples in the Harivaṇṇa may be found at 2, 95, 1 ff. (= 8781 ff.); ib. 6 a; ib. 10 and 11 c; ib. 14 a and c; ib. 24 c; ib. 29 c (na vetsi); 2, 124, 53 a (= 10,625), etc.

Epic usage, however, keeps the final syllable long in the prior pādas. Exceptions like those just given are not uncommon, but are distinctly exceptions. I have no statistics, but perhaps the general condition may be stated well enough in saying that one has to hunt for final breves in prior pādas of pure upendra and indravajrā stanzas and does not have to hunt for final longs; while in upajātis the final breves are not so uncommon as in the pure stanzas of uniform type.

In this regard I see no special difference between the two epics. Perhaps the Rāmāyaṇa poet is a little more shy of the brevis but it occurs there also, not only in pure upendras standing in an upajāti environment, but even in isolated tag-stanzas where the upendra stands alone. Thus where G. ii, 33, 27 has a varied reading which converts the stanza to an upajāti, the Bombay text of R. ii, 33, 29, presents (in an upajāti environment) a pure upendra stanza, with the first pāda ending in brevis, pratikṣamāṇo 'bhijanaṁ tadā 'rtaṁ. Another example will be found in vi, 69, 92 = G. 49, 77. In upajātis it will be enough to refer to R. ii, 15, 44 a; 21, 52 c; 37, 34 a; 36 a; v, 28, 4 ff., etc. In the case of isolated tag-upendras, examples may be found in R. vi, 61, 39, where c ends in a brevis, although the isolated stanza is pure upendra, and in R. ii, 115, 24 (not in G.), where both a and c end in breves:

tadā hi yat kāryam upāiti kimēd  
upāyanaṁ co 'pahṛtaṁ mahārham  
sa pādukābhyāṁ prathamam nivedyā  
cakāra paçcād Bharato yathāvat

One fact seems certain from the treatment of upajātis versus upendras and indravajrās or vaṅcsthābhilas and indra-vaṅcās, namely, that the native metricists in calling the upajāti a mixture of upendra and indravajrā or of vaṅcsthā and indravaṅcā, and treating it as a derived form are historically incorrect. Of course, the upajāti stanza is a stanza in which some pādas are of one type and some are of another; but it is not a mixed development from pure stanzas of either type. On the contrary, the upajāti is the prius, and the pure upendra and pure indravajrā stanza is a refinement on the mixed type. Historically the choriambic triṣṭubh begins with syllaba anceps like the ṣloka,<sup>1</sup> and upendras and indravajrās are differentia-

<sup>1</sup> For this reason, in the Illustrations, though giving examples of each, I do not separate (as is usually done) the types of opening, e. g., ∪ — ∪ — and — — ∪ —. Only in complete forms of stanzas, like the cālīnī, vāṭormī, and rucirā, is the first syllable fixed. In the free triṣṭubh and upajāti stanzas the initial syllable is quite indifferent. Then comes the upendra stanza,

tions of the earlier mixed types. They had the same development as had the *çālinī*, which began, as in the epic, with  $\underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} -$ , and settled at last into  $- - - -$  as a first foot.

The *upajāti* stanza in its turn is derived (as a more refined form) from the mixed *triṣṭubh* of the early epic type, which unites into one stanza not only *pādas* of the *choriambic* type and of the types  $\underline{\cup} - -$ ,  $\underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} -$ ,  $\underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} -$ , but also of the type of the *rucirā* or *mora-pāda*; of which, together with the special stanzas of fixed form derived from these measures, I shall speak hereafter. It is to be observed that this mixture of *vātermī*, *çālinī*, *choriambic*, and resolved-syllable *pādas* in one stanza is Vedic and *Bhārataic*, non-classical and non-*Rāmāyanan*,<sup>1</sup> but also, in a very limited degree, *Puranic*. That is to say, the *Bhārata*, the oldest extant *Purāṇa*, on the one hand preserves the old Vedic type, which is still kept up in a measure in the later *Puranic* diction, while on the other it has the clear-cut *upajāti* system favored by *Vālmiki*, the former both in early and late parts; the latter only in late parts, according as the different poets preserved the old style, or, like *Vālmiki*, cut loose from it and wrote only in *upajāti* form.

### Emergent Stanzas.

Of peculiar interest is the growth of the completed stanza of other *triṣṭubh* forms. In the great epic, we can, as it were, see the gradual emergence of the complete *çālinī*, *vātermī*, and *vaiçvadevī* stanzas (of four identical *pādas*) from the single, double, and triple *pāda* of this form in *triṣṭubh* stanzas, till at last a few complete *çālinī* stanzas are found and one perfect *vaiçvadevī*.

The occasional *pāda* is indefinitely antique. It is the four-fold-combination that is emerging; just as *upajātis* emerge from mixed *triṣṭubhs*, and *upendras* from *upajātis*. In the completed refined *pāda* the opening is *spondaic*; in the emer-

$\underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} -$ , as distinguished from the *indravajrā*,  $- - \underline{\cup} -$ , both secondary, not as *pādas*, but as stanzas, to the *upajāti*.

<sup>1</sup> The Vedic usage is illustrated in Kühnau, *Die Triṣṭubh-Jagati Familie*, p. 52.

gent type it is indifferently iambic or spondaic like other triṣṭubh forms. This sporadic appearance calls for no special remark here, as examples may be found in the list of examples of triṣṭubh pādas. The first stage beyond this is where two pādas appear of half-çālinī form but with iambic opening. This is either "regular" or hypermetric,<sup>1</sup> as in

iii, 5, 16 c-d: yathā ca parṇe puṣkarasyā 'vasikṭam  
jalām na tiṣṭhet pathyam uktaṁ tathā 'smin

The hypermetric çālinī pāda of this sort (vāigvadevī) is common, as in i, 55, 12 b, trātā loke 'sminś tvaṁ tathe 'ha prajānām (so ii, 77, 10 b, etc.), as shown below.

Again, in mixed triṣṭubhs, where we have half a stanza of almost pure çālinī form, as in vi, 3, 65 c-d; or even an almost complete stanza, as in

i, 58, 19: etac chrutvā priyamānāḥ sametā  
ye tatrā 'san pannagā vītamohāḥ  
Āstike vāi pritimanto babhūvur  
ūcus cāi 'nam varam iṣṭam vṛṇiṣva

Here the çālinī is complete save for the last pāda. So in iii, 4, 4, there is a perfect çālinī save for the first syllable of a. In iii, 5, 13, the stanza is nearly vātermī, but three pādas begin with a short syllable and the first has the çālinī trochee. In v, 40, 29, three pādas are pure çālinī and one is vātermī. These forms are often symmetrically united. Thus in i, 58, 20, the pādas run çālinī + vātermī + çālinī + vātermī, save that in b and c the third syllable of the first foot is brevis. Sometimes the arrangement is chiasitic, as in i, 197, 30, where the pādas are vātermī — çālinī, çālinī — vātermī, etc. These forms are again mixed freely with upajāti pādas, as in i, 187, 6, this combination being too common to need further illustration. The vātermī or çālinī pāda often closes the stanza in such a combination. Thus in i, 76, 47, a is upajāti, b is jagati, c is çālinī, d is vātermī; ib. 64, d is çālinī, the others

<sup>1</sup> This form is sometimes effaced by varied readings. Thus in vii, 64, 48, pāpenā 'tmānam majjayiṣyaty asantam, of C. 2116, appears as pāpe 'tmānam.

are upajāti pādas. Alternation of upajātis, ṣālinī-pāda tri-ṣṭubhs, and ṣlokas is found in the dramatic Čārṅgopākhyāna, i, 232, 8 ff.

A goodly number of specimens of stanzas showing a close approach to the ṣālinī is found in vii, 2, where finally, in 26, appears one whole ṣālinī stanza :

aṣvān agryān pāṇdurābhraprakāṣān  
puṣṭān snātān mantrapūtābhir adbhiḥ  
taptāir bhāṇḍāiḥ kāñcanāir abhyupetān  
ṣiḡhrān ṣiḡhram sūtaputrā 'nayasva

So in vii, 54, 40 ff., there is a number of almost complete and quite complete ṣālinīs.

A complete ṣālinī occurs in i, 58, 21; another in v, 33, 115 (toward the end of adhy. 40 there are ṣālinī pādas). The usual order in the epic, however, is a mixture of single pādas. The pseudo-epic, on the other hand, heaps up complete ṣālinī stanzas. Thus in a little system of ten stanzas at xii, 24, 25 ff., ṣālinī, vātermī, and upajāti pādas are all mixed up together but lead up to perfect ṣālinī stanzas in 29, 30, 32. In Anuṣāsana, complete stanzas are common, e. g., xiii, 73, 39; 77, 31 and 33 (with a rucirā between), on giving cows to priests. In Čānti may be compared also xii, 63, 9-10 (two complete ṣālinī stanzas); 259, 39-42; 319, 86 ff. (five out of seven stanzas). The prior pāda of the hemistich may end in brevis, as in some of the last examples, e. g. in 319, 89, where the stanza from a Brahmanic point of view is as late as the sentiment :

sarve varṇā brāhmaṇā brahmajāḡ ca  
sarve nityam vyāharante cā brahma  
tattvam ṣāstram brahmabuddhyā bravīmi  
sarvaṁ viḡvam brahma cāi 'tat samastam

The vātermī stanza, if I am not mistaken, is not yet complete in the epic; but its pādas come near to making a complete stanza, as in vii, 201, 78:

astāuṣaṁ tvāṁ tava sammānam icchan  
 vicinvan vāi sadṛṣaṁ devavarya  
 sudurlabhān dehi varān mame 'ṣṭān  
 abhiṣṭutaḥ pravikāṣiḥ ca māyām

still closer in ii, 58, 12 :

ke tatrā 'nye kitavā dīvyamānā  
 vinā rājño Dhṛtarāṣṭrasya putrāiḥ  
 prechāmi tvāṁ Vidura brūhi nas tān  
 yāir dīvyāmaḥ gataḥ saṁnipatya

The hypermeter is not so common as that of the ṇalini. A case occurs in iii, 134, 14 b: sapta cchandāṁsi kratum ekaṁ vahanti; and another, ib. 12 b: yajñāḥ pañcāi 'vā 'py atha pañcendriyāṇi. So in ii, 77, 7 a; v, 35, 42 a. The last case reads:

nāi 'naṁ chandāṁsi vṛjināt tārayanti  
 (in 43, 5, as : na cchandāṁsi vṛjināt tārayanti)

As said above, the isolated vaiṣvadevī pāda is not unusual. Such pādas are reckoned as triṣṭubh pādas, as in i, 1, 205 c; 216 a; and so very often elsewhere. For example, xii, 319, 91 d :

ajñānataḥ karmayonim bhajante  
 tām tām rājaṁ te yathā yānti abhāvam  
 tathā varṇā jñānahināḥ patante  
 ghorād ajñānāt prakṛtaṁ yonijālam

In i, 1, 212 b, there is a pāda identical with this save that it has initial brevis, hatān Pañcālān Drāupadeyāṅ ca suptān, followed in 217 d by a pure pāda, tasmin saṁgrāme bhāirave kṣatriyāṇām. In i, 89, 12 b, — — — — —, — — — — —, the vaiṣvadevī appears as an irregular hypermetric ṇalini. This stanza is almost a vaiṣvadevī :

anityatām sukhaduḥkhasya buddhvā  
 kasmāt saṁtāpam Aṣṭakā 'hām bhajeyam  
 kim kuryām vāi kim ca kṛtvā na tapye  
 tasmāt saṁtāpam varjayāmy apramattaḥ

Half a complete stanza appears in xii, 292, 22 (a tag) :

rajñā jetavyāḥ çatravaç co 'nnatāç ca  
samyak kartavyam pālanam ca prajānām  
agniç ceyo bahubhiç cā 'pi yajñāir  
antye madhye vā vanam āçritya stheyam

(where the scolus is — — ∪, above, p. 280)

A vāiçvadevī pāda appears also in a benedictive verse in viii, C. 5,045 d, çūdrā ārogyam prāpnuvantī 'ha sarve, but B. 96, 63 has çūdrā 'rogyam. The complete stanza occurs but once in the great epic and twice in the Rāmayaṇa, as will be shown in the next section.

### The Fixed Syllabic Metres.

The title akṣaracchandās or its equivalent, varṇavṛtta, "syllabic verse" covers, properly speaking, all metres fixed by syllabic measurement, but it is used only of such stanzas as have a fixed number of syllables arranged in a fixed order in each pāda, all four pādas being alike. The çloka, therefore, is not included, nor the free triṣṭubh of the Mahābhārata. On the other hand, the triṣṭubh in several of its fixed forms, when these are used throughout the stanza, is an akṣaracchandās. Such are the upajāti forms, the çālinī, vātormī, vāiçvadevī, and rucirā. In the scheme of classical metres, there are from twenty to thirty each of such hendekas and dodekas, called triṣṭubhs and jagatīs because of the number of syllables in them.

Of this large number, about a dozen are found in epic poetry. They include those just named, in regard to which it will be necessary to speak further only of two, the vāiçvadevī and rucirā. Besides these, the additional epic rhythms of this class will now be reviewed, arranged, according to their syllabic value, as triṣṭubh, jagatī, atijagatī, çakvarī, atīçakvarī, and atidhṛtī, that is in stanzas of four pādas, each pāda having eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, and (in the epic case) nineteen syllables, respectively. They are distributed<sup>1</sup> between the two epics as follows:

<sup>1</sup> On their numerical distribution in the Mahābhārata, see below.

In Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa	{	(upajātis and their components)
		vaiṣṇadevī
		bhujāṅgaprayāta
		rucirā
		praharṣiṇī
In Mahābhārata alone	{	vasantatilalakā
		mālinī
		(çālinī)
In Rāmāyaṇa alone	{	rathoddhatā
		drutavilambita
		çārdūlavikrīḍita
	{	mrgendramukha
		asambādhā

The upajātis, including their four components, as also the çālinī and vātormī, have already been sufficiently discussed. The vātormī does not reach stanza form, but its pāda is frequently found alone, duplicated, or trebly; the last case, which is rare, giving three-fourths of a complete vātormī. The çālinī is found not only often in pāda form but occasionally as a complete stanza, sometimes grouped in small numbers in the later books of the great epic. The jagatī pramitākṣarā pādas, isolated in the Çānti Parvan, will be spoken of below, under the head of mātṛāchandas; where will be discussed also the free praharaṇakalitā found in the same part of the pseudo-epic.

### Rathoddhatā.

Having eleven syllables to the pāda, this metre is called a triṣṭubh. Its scheme is — ◡ —, ◡ ◡ ◡ —, ◡ — ◡ —; for example, tasya taj janayati 'ha sarvataḥ. It may be regarded, therefore, as a jagatī without the initial syllable, its final diiambus giving the true jagatī cadence. Compare under No. 19: (ku-)lambharān anaḍuḥaḥ ṣaṭam ṣaṭān. There are three and one half stanzas of this rhythm, though the actual occurrences are more numerous; but the same stanza appears repeated. Thus xii, 250, 13-14 is a repetition of xii, 194, 61-63.



Here there are two and one half stanzas, arranged in B. in groups of four, two, and four pādas; in C., as four, four, and two; as if the hemistich were a whole in itself. In xii, 286, 46, one of these stanzas is repeated again with slight changes. In the first instance, the group forms a tag with an *apara-vaktra*, as it does also in the second instance; while in the third it appears in the same way after a *puṣpitāgrā*. The third separate stanza of this sort is found as a tag after *çloka*s in xii, 247, 23. All these cases are regular; only the hemistich ends in *brevis*. The metre is found only in *Çānti Mokṣa* and not in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The last case may serve as an example:

yac ca te manasi vartate param  
yatra cā 'sti tava saṁçayaḥ kvacit  
çrūyatām, ayam aham tavā 'grataḥ  
putra kim hi kathayāmi te punaḥ

The (meaningless) diiambic name may at least be a reminder of the *rathoddhata*'s presumably original opening, and its diiambic close.

### **Bhujāṅgaprayāta.**

This twelve-syllabled rhythm is called a *jagatī*, but it has the final *triṣṭubh* cadence. The latter part of the *pāda* is in fact identical with that common *triṣṭubh* form which has the middle and end — ◡ — ◡ — ◡; but before this<sup>2</sup> are five syllables, the fourth being a *brevis* ◡ — — ◡ —. Such a form as this, however, is actually found in one text as the *pāda* of a *hypermetric triṣṭubh*, as already pointed out (p. 289), and is nearly equalled (long initial) in the corresponding *pāda*,

na trāṇam labhet trāṇam icchan sa kāle,

But the specimens in the epic show that the *cæsura* is not that of the *pāda* just cited, but rather that of a series of *bacchii*:

sa ādih | sa madhyaḥ | sa cā 'ntaḥ | prajānām  
anādyo hy amadhyas tathā cā 'py anantaḥ

This metre appears once as a tag in a *Tīrtha* story, ix, 41, 40, and twice in the twelfth book in an identical hymn in the

middle of two chapters, xii, 341, 100 and 343, 90, the first and third pādas of each version being those just cited, one being a repetition of the other with variations.

There is only one case in the Rāmāyaṇa, vi, 77, 24. In R. this is part of a tag after a puṣpitāgrā, which appears in both texts, while the bhujaṅgaprayāta itself is lacking in G. Here also the cadence is distinctly bacchiic: cacāle 'va co 'rvī | papāte 'va sā dyāur | balam rākṣasānām | bhayaṁ cā 'viveṣa.<sup>1</sup> In both epics, the hemistich alone has final brevis (anceps), as above, and in ix, 41, 40 d, dhṛtātmā jītātmā samabhyājagāmā. This metre is expressed by its name bhujaṅga-prayātam, 'the snake-slide,' ∪ — — ∪ — ∪, which, in the stanza, is repeated (as a whole) eight times.

#### Dr̥ṇṭavilambita.

This measure, having twelve syllables to the pāda, is called a jagatī. But although it ends as well in a diiambus, it is yet far from the cadences already examined under the name of jagatī. The rhythm is in fact dactylic, so that the trisyllabic measurement suits it; but the first foot has a tribrach as a substitute for a dactyl, and the final syllable is long: ∪ ∪ ∪, — ∪ ∪, — ∪ ∪, — ∪ —. Only two of these stanzas are found in the great epic, and none in the Rāmāyaṇa. The two are together in vii, 184, 47-48; the latter, for example, as follows:

haravṛṣottama-gātrasamadyutiḥ  
smaraṇārāsana-pūrnasamaprabhaḥ  
navavadhūsmīta-cārumanoharaḥ  
praviṣṭaḥ kumudākarabāndhavaḥ

These are not exactly tags, but they are close to the end of the chapter. The prevailing cæsura<sup>2</sup> may indicate that the metre is a catalectic form of triṣṭubh with resolved opening;

<sup>1</sup> A rough English equivalent would be (of the hymn): "Beginning and midst he, and end of creation;" (of the description): "and terror then entered the huge host of demons." The trisyllabic native measurement is here the most accurate.

<sup>2</sup> The last pāda above may of course be read as anapestic with anacrusis; the preceding, more naturally, with dactylic cadence.

but this genesis is by no means so certain as in the case of other triṣṭubh derivatives. To judge from the epic, it is a later metre, and may be either an experiment in resolution (of No. 2), or a new independent invention. It is not necessary, I conceive, to derive every metre from some other, and I incline to the latter view. All the pādas in the two epic specimens end in heavy syllables. The sound drutavilambitām, ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪, may serve to remind of the opening cadence; but the other form of the name (in °tām) really agrees with the meaning, "rapid and dilatory," indicating the beginning and end of the pāda.

### Vāiṣvadevi.

Rare in both epics, this metre occurs but once in stanza form in the Mahābhārata, a tag followed by a supplementary triṣṭubh. The first hemistich end in brevis. Sporadic pādas of the vāiṣvadevī type, — — — — —, — ∪ — — ∪ — ∪, are not infrequent. The twelve syllables do not make a jagatī, though the metre is so called, but a hypermetric triṣṭubh of the type described above (see No. 7). The native method of measuring by trisyllables in all cases is well shown in this metre to be absurd. For example, in the pāda cited above, Kṛṣṇām Pāñcālīm abravīt sântvapūrvam, the cæsura and natural division is in groups of five and seven syllables respectively. So in the one stanza of the great epic, xii, 291, 25 = 10,721 (Mokṣa):

bhīrū rājanyo, brāhmaṇaḥ sarvabhakṣyaḥ  
vāiṣyo 'nīhāvān, hīnavarṇo 'lasaḥ ca  
vidvāṅg ca 'ḡlo, vṛttahīnaḥ kulīnaḥ  
satyād vibhraṣṭo brāhmaṇastri ca tuṣṭā<sup>1</sup>

(26, rāgi yuktāḥ pacamāno 'tmahetor  
mūrkho vaktā nṛpaḥīnaḥ ca rāṣṭram  
ete sarve cocyatām yānti rājan  
yaḥ cā 'yuktāḥ snehahīnaḥ prajāsu)

<sup>1</sup> This is the reading of B. In C., brāhmaṇaḥ stri ca tuṣṭā.

In the Rāmāyaṇa, a single pāda is found in R. (above), and one whole stanza also (lacking in G.), v, 65, 28 (both hemistichs ending in brevis). There is, further, a half stanza in v, 63, 33, united with a hypermetric triṣṭubh hemistich, not in G. but following a tag-triṣṭubh common to both texts; an interesting example of the equivalence of the vāiṣṭadevī and free triṣṭubh pādas:

prītiṣphītākṣāu samprahr̥ṣṭāu kumārāu  
 dr̥ṣṭvā siddhārthāu vānarānām ca rājā  
 āṅgāiḥ prahr̥ṣṭāiḥ kāryasiddhim viditvā  
 bāhvor āsannām ātimātram nananda

For the two pādas of the second hemistich, see Nos. 6 and 13 in the Illustrations of triṣṭubhs. The only difference between them and the vāiṣṭadevī lies in the syllables marked short. For another form of vāiṣṭadevī, see the mālīnī below.

### Atijagatis.

#### Rucirā.

Of the fifty-one stanzas of rucirās in the Mahābhārata, almost all are regular. One or two slight irregularities occur in the thirteen cases found in the Rāmāyaṇa. Independent pādas of this type scattered among ordinary triṣṭubh pādas are not uncommon in the former epic. They have been discussed above as mora-jagatis and triṣṭubhs. The type of the pure rucirā, — — — —, — — — — — — — —, has long been held<sup>1</sup> to be merely a jagatī with resolution, and, as was said above, this seems to be the only possible explanation of the pāda, whether it happens to occur four or three times, twice, or only once in a stanza.

Less common than the substitution of a rucirā pāda for a triṣṭubh or jagatī pāda, yet still not infrequent, is the harmonious alternation of pādas. The converse of the former case is found in the occasional substitution of a vaṅgasthabila pāda in regular rucirā stanzas, as in the group of ten tag-

<sup>1</sup> Geldermeistra, in Lassen's *Anthologia Sanscrita*, 2d ed., p. 124; Jacobi, *ZDMG.*, vol. xxxviii, p. 697.

rucirās at i, 19, 22–31 (hemistichs end in brevis; so in xii, 52, 34). Here the stanzas are all regular rucirās, four pādas each of the type given above (final anceps only at the end of the hemistich), with the exception of stanzas 27 and 30, in which the second pādas are vaṇṇasthabila-pādas; thus, 29–30:

tato mahīm lavaṇajalam ca sāgaram  
 mahāsurāḥ praviviṣur arditāḥ surāiḥ  
 viyadgataṁ jvalitahutāṇanaprabham  
 sudarṇanam parikupitaṁ niṣamyate  
 tataḥ surāir vijayam avāpya Mandarāḥ  
 svam eva *deṇam gamitāḥ* supūjitaḥ  
 vināḍya kham divam aṇi cāi 'va sarvaṇas  
 tato gatāḥ saliladharā yathāgatam

In i, 23, 21–26, there are six tag rucirās, as stuti, but in stanza 23 only one pāda is of rucirā form, the others being upajātis; while in i, 34, 26, one vaṇṇastha pāda is followed by three rucirā pādas.

It is very unusual to find this stanza except as a tag, as in the examples just given.<sup>1</sup> In i, 56, 1, however, is found a stanza consisting of one rucirā pāda and three triṣṭubh pādas, the first being peculiar in opening with a spondee: bālo 'py ayaṁ sthavira ivā 'vabhāṣate, nā 'yam bālāḥ sthaviro 'yam mato me, etc. Such a pāda in such a stanza confirms the view that the whole rucirā is merely a resolved jagatī.

The alternate arrangement, referred to on the last page, may be seen in the tag at vii, 29, 51:

nihatya taṁ narapatim indravikramam  
 sakhāyam indrasya tad āndrir āhave  
 tato parāṇs tava jayakāṅkṣiṇo narān  
 babhaṇja vāyur balavān drumān iva

<sup>1</sup> At ili, 25, 5, a rucirā stanza appears among the group of triṣṭubhs with which the chapter begins. Its first pāda is an echo of the one cited above, *taṁ āgataṁ jvalitahutāṇanaprabham*. In vii, 2, 15–16, two rucirās appear in the same way among vaṇṇasthas. At the end of vii, 148, the tag-effect is done away with by the addition in C. 6,443 ff. of five ślokaś (not found in B.) after the two vaṇṇasthas, which in B. complete the tag begun by the rucirā, 56.

The same arrangement has already (p. 303) been noticed in xii, 244, 29. Another stanza in this book, xii, 52, 34, forms the finale of a short system of pure (tag) *vaṇçasthabilas*. One fifth of all the *rucirā* stanzas in the epic are in the *Hari-vaṇça*, inserted as tags, and they are all perfectly regular, with the substitution of one *vaṇçastha pāda* each in 2, 123, 35 c and 3, 34, 48 d, respectively. In addition to these, there is half a *rucirā* at C. 10,274 (after *vaṇçasthas* and before *çloka*s), the prior *pāda* of which ends in *brevis*: *namo 'stu te mahiṣamahāsurārdinī*, *namo 'stu te bhayakari vidviṣāṃ sadā*. Here B. 2, 120, 43, inverts the *pādas*, permitting the *brevis* at the end; but it also has a varied reading, *bandhana-mokṣakārini*, which leaves only one *rucirā pāda*.<sup>1</sup> The other cases call for no special remark. The *cæsura* is after the fourth syllable.

In the *Rāmāyaṇa* there are but four *rucirās* common to the two texts, R. and G., two of which are in the seventh book; but there are four in G. not found in R., and five in R. not found in G. As in the *Mahābhārata*, the *cæsura* is regularly after the *diambus*, the *gaṇa* division  $\cup - \cup, - \cup \cup, \cup \cup - , \cup - \cup, -$  not corresponding to any text. Here the position of the *rucirā* is always that of a tag, usually after *upajātis*. The second hemistich occasionally ends in *brevis*, e. g., G. ii, 68, 56; vii, 68, 25; R. vi, 62, 22; but, as in the *Mahābhārata*, even this liberty is seldom taken. In R. v, 7, 15-17 (not in G.), of the twelve *pādas*, all are regular save the first, which has an extra syllable: *itī 'va tad grāham abhigamya çobhamānam*.<sup>2</sup> In G. vi, 39, 33, *pāda* b has *yaçaskaram priyakaram bāndhavapriyam*, where R. 62, 22, is regular, *yathā priyam priyaraṇa bāndhavapriya*. R. omits the tag of G. vii, 68, 25 (continuing with *çloka*s). The case is interesting, because it is evidently an instance of breaking a chapter by means of a tag (perhaps as an aid in recitation), and because the *rucirā*

<sup>1</sup> P.W. s. v. *mahisa* 2 c, gives a var. lec. I give the readings of the Calcutta and Bombay, 1895, *Hari-vaṇça*.

<sup>2</sup> It is easy to suggest *çobhitam*; but this half-*rucirā* half-*praharṣiṇī pāda* really needs no emendation. See just below.

tag thus employed is highly irregular (pāda b: haniṣyasi, Raghuvara, nā 'tra saṁçayah) in making the cæsura answer for a long syllable; thus showing that there is a late (careless) freedom as well as the freedom of early (undeveloped) forms. With one exception, no such substituted pādas as equate upajātis in the other epic occur in the Rāmāyaṇa.<sup>1</sup>

### Praharṣiṇī.

Having thirteen syllables to the pāda this metre is called an atijagatī, though its finale is that of a triṣṭubh, ◡ — ◡. As to the relation of the measure, it is clearly of the puṣpitāgrā class, in closing in ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — —, as will be seen below; and as clearly of rucirā nature, both in its middle and even in its opening; for it begins with a mora-equivalent, — — —, of the rucirā's diiambus, ◡ — ◡ —, and continues with the rucirā's resolved triṣṭubh form. In fact, as we have seen that a rucirā pāda may appear with the extra syllable of the praharṣiṇī, we can supply all the links from triṣṭubh to puṣpitāgrā with actually extant measures (see also below, under mātrāchandas, p. 337):

triṣṭubh-jagatī,	◡ — ◡ —,	— ◡ ◡ —	◡ — ◡ —
rucirā type,	◡ — ◡ —,	◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ —	◡ — ◡ —
rucirā freak,	◡ — ◡ —,	◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ —	◡ — ◡ — —
praharṣiṇī,	— — —,	◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ —	◡ — ◡ — —
puṣpitāgrā,	◡ ◡ [◡ ◡],	◡ ◡ ◡ —	◡ — ◡ — —

The secondary cæsura sometimes makes the pāda coincide very closely with the rucirā, for example in R. ii, 79, 17 a-b:

ūcūs te | vacanam idaṁ | niçamyā hr̥ṣṭāḥ  
sāmātyāḥ | sapariṣado | viyātaçokāḥ,

but in other cases this cæsura causes a trochaic cadence to be struck with the beginning of a new word after the proceleusmaticus, as is clearly shown in R. ii, 107, 17 c-d:

gaccha tvam | puravaram | adya samprahr̥ṣṭāḥ  
samhr̥ṣṭas | tv aham api | Daṇḍakān praveksye

<sup>1</sup> For this exception in the Rāmāyaṇa, see above, p. 309.

Do thou now | to the city | fare with heart rejoicing  
while meantime | merrily I | will to Dandakās go

It is rather striking that in both these examples the name of the metre seems to be implied in it, *hr̥ṣṭāḥ* and *saṁhr̥ṣṭas* like *praharṣiṇī* (or *-aṇī*) "rejoicing," but I do not know that this is more than an accident.<sup>1</sup> There is a parallel in the *rucirā*-like *pāda* cited above from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, G. vii, 88, 22:

*gato ravir suruciram astaçāilam*

The *Rāmāyaṇa* has one more case of this metre, G. vi, 25, 41, *sa krodhād vipulayaçā mahānubhāvo*, etc. The only short finals are at the end of the whole stanza.

In the *Mahābhārata* there are twelve cases, all regular (but the first hemistich as well as the second may end in *brevis*), with the same norm and varying *cæsura*, — — —, ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡, — ◡ — ◡ — —, or — — —, ◡ ◡ ◡, ◡ ◡ — ◡ — —. They are not all tags. For example, that at vii, 143, 48 and the group of four in xii, 322, 24-27; but that at i, 2, 396, is the tag of a tag, apparently merely a scholiastic addition:

*ākhyānam tad idam anuttamam mahārtham*, etc.,

as are those in i, 21, 18; 22, 12; 25, 17 (tag to a *rucirā* tag, b ends in *brevis*), *vedāṅgāny abhigamayanti sarvayatnāiḥ*, etc. The first two of these just mentioned are akin: in 21 c, *vistīrṇaṁ dadṛçatur ambaraprakāçam*; in 22 b, *gambhīraṁ vikasitam ambaraprakāçam*. In the specimen at xiii, 7, 28, the *praharṣiṇī* is by one *çloka stanza*<sup>2</sup> removed from the end of the section, and is a moral excrescence added to the tale:

<sup>1</sup> I may add that in the first example there is not only *hr̥ṣṭāḥ* in R. ii, 79, 17, but in the *vaṅçastha* which precedes this tag we find: *praharṣajās tam prati bāspabindavo*, etc. See a case like this from the other epic cited in the next note.

<sup>2</sup> This final *çloka* says: "I have repeated what the seer proclaimed in regard to the getting of good and evil fruit. Now what do you want to hear?" The *çloka* before the *praharṣiṇī* is: *Bhīṣmayāi 'tad vacaḥ çrutvā viçmitāḥ Kurupūṅgavāḥ, āsan praharṣamanasaḥ pritiṁanto 'bhavans tadā*. See the last note.



yan mantre bhavati vṛtho 'payujyamāne  
yat some bhavati vṛthā 'bhiṣṭyamāne  
yac cā 'gnāu bhavati vṛthā 'bhihūyamāne  
tat sarvam bhavati vṛthā 'bhidhiyamāne

The tendency to restrict the final syllaba anceps to the close of the stanza is observable in several of these cases. For instance, in the group cited from the twelfth book, the only final breves are at the end of whole stanzas, not at the end of the first hemistich. In i, 2, the first hemistich ends in a short vowel, but before two consonants (d ends in ā); in i, 21 and 22, no final is short. The only exception is the one noticed above, i, 25, 17 b. The two cases in H., C., 6248 and B., 8, 7, 25 are tags, and have no final brevis. The former has hiatus in pāda d (avoided in B., 2, 53, 57, manujendra cā 'tmaniṣṭham):

yad yuktaṁ, kuru manujendra, ātmanēṣṭam

The latter, instead of C.'s amṛtam, 11,303, has

yad satyam yad anṛtam ādimakṣaraṁ vāi,

where (ādimā and kṣara are kārāṇa and kārya)<sup>1</sup> ādimā is a late adjective.

On the verse goptā samikṣya sukr̥tinām dadāti lokān, see below under mātrāchandas.

### Mrgendramukha.

Another atijagatī, not found in the Mahābhārata, but in one text of the Rāmāyaṇa, is the mrgendramukha of R. vi, 101, 55, which takes the place of a puṣpitāgrā tag in G. 85, 13. The posterior pādas of the latter metre have regularly the form illustrated by G. at this place, muditamanāḥ samud-ikṣitum tvarāmi, ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ∪. This form is simply quadrupled in order to make the mrgendramukha; the cadence of which is often made trochaic through the cæsure, as in this epic example, a and d:

<sup>1</sup> In the next pāda, B. has yad bhutam bhavati mithaḥ ca yad bhaviṣyam, where C. has yad bhūtam bhavad amitam ca.

yadi vadham iṣhasi | Rāvaṇasya saṁkhye  
 yadi ca kṛtām hi tave 'oḥasi pratijñam  
 yadi tava rājasutābhilāṣa, ārya,  
 kuru ca vaco mama | cighram adya vīra<sup>1</sup>

The native division of the pāda of course is ॐ ॐ ॐ, ॐ — ॐ, ॐ — ॐ, — ॐ —, —, which fits pāda b. The brevis at the end of either pāda, as in this case, is probably due to the fact that the metre is a stereotyped posterior pāda in repeated form.

### Asambādhā.

The remaining akṣara tags are longer metres, the cakvarī, of syllables 4 × 14; the atīcakvarī, of 4 × 15; and the atidhṛti, of 4 × 19. Of the first, there are two varieties, of which one is the asambādhā, found only in the Bombay R. ii, 116, 25, with the norm (according to the example, — — — ॐ ॐ ॐ, ॐ ॐ ॐ, — — —) violated as follows (prior hemistich):

Rāmaḥ saṁsādhya ṛṣigaṇam anugamanād  
 deçāt tasmāt kulapatim abhivādya ṛṣim  
 samyak prītāis tair anumata upadiṣṭārthaḥ  
 puṇyam vāsāya svaṇilayam upasampede

To this is added a supplementary tag, a peculiar stanza (where G. iii, 1, 35, has a vaṇçastha tag), in which the last pāda differs from the three preceding; a, b, c, being alike in having each the fourteen moræ of the even vāitāliya pāda (explained below), and eleven syllables, but not in a fixed order; against seventeen moræ and twelve syllables in d. Pāda b is aparavaktra, but I do not know what to call the whole (R. ii, 116, 26):

āçramam ṛṣivirahitam prabhuḥ  
 kṣaṇam api na jahāu sa Rāghavaḥ  
 Rāghavam hi satatam anugatās  
 tāpasāç cā 'ṛṣacarite dhṛtaguṇāḥ

<sup>1</sup> The stress, but not the quantity, is Saturnian: kuru ca vaco mama | vīrum mhi Cāsmena | cighram adya vīra | insecf versutum. The name mrgendra-mukha comes from the mnemonic verse: ksudhitamrgendramukham mrgā apetya (Brown).

**Vasantatilakā.**

The second *çakvarī* called *vasantatilakā* (or °kam) is found twice in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, but only in the last and latest book, vii, 8, 28, where it is followed by a *jagatī* *upajāti* as a final tag, and vii, 96, 23, also a tag. In the latter case, all *pādas* have heavy final syllables. In the former, *pāda c* has final *brevis*, but this liberty is taken in the case of the *vasantatilakā* even by the classical writers.<sup>1</sup> The metre is clearly hypermetric *triṣṭubh*: — — — —, — — — —, — — — — or — — — —, — — — —, — — — —. In the first example, three *pādas* have *cæsura* after the fifth, like other hypermetric *triṣṭubhs*:

esā mayā tava narādhipa rākṣasānām  
 utpattir adya | kathitā sakalā, yathāvat  
 bhūyo nibodha | Rāghusattama, Rāvaṇasyā  
 janma prabhāvam | atulaṁ sasutasya sarvam

The *Mahābhārata* has twelve occurrences of *vasantatilakās*, but only eight separate stanzas, the others being vain repetitions of old material. The first three are in the tag-group at the end of i, 2, 391 ff., which ends in a *praharṣiṇī*. The second of this group has short finals in *b* and *d*; the third (which follows immediately after two *çlokas*) has final *brevis* in *a*. The stanzas are benedictive and are partially repeated at the end of xviii, 5, 67–68, where *B.* has the third of this group (omitted here in *C.*), and this again is found at the beginning of the *Harivaṇça*. In all these occurrences of the same stanza, *dadātī* is left at the end of *pāda a*; but in *c* the reading varies between *satataṁ çṛṇotī* in xviii and *çṛṇuyāc ca nityaṁ* or *tadvat* in i, 2, 395 and *Harivaṇça*, i, 1, 4. In xiii, 151, 80, the same stanza has *kathayec ca nityaṁ*. I give it in full on account of its universal interest:

<sup>1</sup> Compare the note to *Vāmana's Stilregeln* by Professor Cappeller, p. 23. The final *brevis* in prior *pādas* is found also in inscriptional poetry. Compare e. g., the third and tenth stanzas in *Vatsabhaṭṭi's* poem, fifth century, given in *Bühler's* essay on Indian inscriptions, p. 91, where *pādas a* and *c* respectively close in *brevis*; or the fifth and twenty-fifth, where, in each, both the prior *pādas* end in *brevis*. In fact, the tendency here is to close the hemistich in heavy syllables and the prior *pādas* in light syllables (25, 27, 31, 33, 40).

yo goçatam kanakaçr̥ṅgamayaṁ dadāti  
viprāya vedaviduṣe subahuçrutāya<sup>1</sup>  
puṇyām ca bhāratakathām satatam çṛṇoti  
tulyam phalam bhavati tasya ca tasya cāi 'va

In the thirteenth book (as in the case of the Rāmāyaṇa, this metre is found only in pseudo-epic or late books), there are two new cases of vasantatilakā. The first, 14, 189, is unique in not being a tag (only d has final brevis); the other (with a çārdūlavikr̥ḍita) being a tag, as usual. The latter is united with the benedictive stanza above, and like it has final brevis in the first pāda, 151, 80-81 (80 being the stanza quoted above).

The Harivaṅṣa has a tag-group (followed by one çloka) of three more vasantatilakā stanzas at 3, 114, 39-41, the last of which also has final brevis in c:

41, c, jyotis trilokajanakam tridaçāikavandyam  
d, akṣṇor mamā 'stu satatam hr̥daye 'cyutākhyam

### Mālinī.

This is an atīçakvarī, 4 × 15 syllables, having syllaba anceps regularly only at the close of the hemistich, but in one instance at the end of a prior pāda, a freedom found among classical works only in the Mṛcchakaṭikam, according to Professor Cappeller.<sup>2</sup> The metre is found in both epics; but the Rāmāyaṇa has only one case common to R. and G., and that is in the last book, vii, 59, 23 = G. 61, 21, the stanza only ending in brevis. It is a tag. In R. vi, 40, 29-30, there are two cases, not in G., both regular, a tag couplet (in the former case both hemistichs end in brevis). G. ii, 106, 29-30, has two stanzas, not in R., a tag (final brevis only at the end of the first stanza). The natural division is often ∪ ∪ ∪, ∪ ∪ ∪, — —, — ∪ —, — ∪ — —, with cæsura after the spondee. The Mahābhārata has eleven cases,

<sup>1</sup> v. l. bahuvīçrutāya in the Bombay H. Also ca for su, and other variants in Anuçāsana.

<sup>2</sup> Loc. cit.

and (like the one case in both texts of the *Rāmāyaṇa*) they are all in the later epic: vii, 73, 48; viii, 85, 1-4; 90, 24; xiii, 6, 45-47; H. 2, 105, 84; and 3, 132, 100. The one in *Droṇa* unites with a *puṣpitāgrā*, but, although both are almost at the end of a chapter, they are rather a tag to a speech than to the chapter itself. Those in *Kaṇva* are at the beginning and in the middle of their respective chapters. Those in *Anuśāsana* are a tag, except that two *śloka*s follow. In the group of viii, 85, all the *pāda*s end long except the posterior *pāda*s of the third stanza, both of which have final *brevis*. The two cases in *Hariv.* are tags (one *śloka* following in the latter) with *brevis* only at the close of the stanza. An irregularity appears in xiii, 6, 46 c-d:

bahutarasusamṛddhyā mānuṣāṇāṃ gr̥hāṇī  
pitṛyanabhavanābhaṃ dr̥gyate cā 'marāṇāṃ

In 47, the hemistichs end in *brevis*; in 45, only the first hemistich. The plural *gr̥hāṇī* is remarked upon as Vedic by the scholiast, who thus supports it; but *gr̥haṃ* (*vāi*?) is probably right.

A very common cadence, whereby the end of the *pāda* assumes the fall — ◡ — —, ◡ — —, rather than — ◡ —, — ◡ — —, is illustrated by H. 3, 132, 100 a-b (cited above):

ajaram amaram ekam dhyeyam ādyantaṣṭūnyam  
saguṇam aguṇam ādyam sthūlam atyantasūkṣmam

Another kind of *mālinī*, not found in the epics, begins with — ◡, ◡ ◡ ◡ — —, showing that the epic form is a further resolution of an original *triṣṭubh*, which may be represented by ◡ ◡ ◡ — —, — ◡ — — ◡ — —. This is, of course, the *vāiṣṭva-devī* form of the hypermetric *triṣṭubh*,<sup>1</sup> the close relation of which with the *puṣpitāgrā* is well shown in vii, 73, 48-49:

48 a-b: asurasuramanuṣyāḥ pakṣiṇo vo 'rago vā  
pitṛrajanicarā vā brahmadevarṣayo vā  
49 a-b: yadi viṣati rasātalanī tad agryam  
viyad api devapuram Diteḥ puram vā

<sup>1</sup> Compare Professor Jacobi's learned essay, *Entwicklung der indischen Metrik in nachvedischer Zeit*, ZDMG. vol. xxxviii, p. 609.

The content of this mālinī appears a little further on, 77, 26, in the form of a puṣpitāgrā:

yadi ca manuṣṭhānagāḥ piṣācā  
rajanicarāḥ patagāḥ surāsurāḥ ca

and in viii, 37, 36, in aparavaktra: asurasuramahoragān narān.

### Çārdūlavikrīḍita.

The only remaining akṣaracchandās in the epic is the ati-dhṛti (4 × 19) çārdūlavikrīḍita, which occurs in the eighth and thirteenth books of the Mahābhārata. The chapter of the former book graced with a mālinī is also enlivened with the "tiger's play," viii, 90, 42 (two lines in C., 4668-9). It is not a tag and is perfectly regular, four times — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —. There are also one and a half stanzas at xiii, 14, 229, and a whole stanza ib. 234; neither of which is a tag. This position of a fancy-metre in a chapter instead of at its end always shows a late section (affected in the Harivaṅṣa). In xiii, 151, 79, the çārdūlavikrīḍita joins with vasantatilakās to make a tag. All the specimens are regular. The metre may be a late development from the triṣṭubh. The intermediate phases, however, are not very clear, though the genesis may tentatively be assumed as; — —, — —, — —, — — (as in the vāitāliya, below), — —, — —, — —, or two stanzas to the strophe, as in the classical grouping of śloka, with shift of cæsura. This metre is not found in the Rāmāyaṇa.

### Ardhasamavṛtta (Mātrāchandas).

#### (A) PUṢPITĀGRĀ AND APARAVAKTRA.

These metres, as is indicated by their name "semi-equal," are uneven in their pādas. They are not quite mora-metres, since the number and position of their syllables, heavy or light, are regularly fixed; but on the other hand they are not like akṣara metres, for their pādas are not identical. In the epic, however, the rule of fixed syllables is not strictly preserved. The cadence of the hemistich, with its unequal

pādas, has either wholly trochaic close or alternate trochaic and iambic. The first is illustrated by R. vi, 33, 36 c-b :

tam iha çaranam  
abhyupāhi devī  
haya iva maṇḍalam  
āṇu yah karoti

Rapid as a charger is,  
Hasten, hurry quickly.

As already remarked, the second pāda of this puṣpitāgrā, when quadrupled, makes the mṛgendramukha (above, p. 331), which also has trochaic fall. The aparavaktra, which has one syllable (usually two moræ) less than the puṣpitāgrā, shows more clearly the derivation from the triṣṭubh, R. ii, 39, 41 :

murajapaṇava-meghaghosaṇḍa  
Daçaratha-veçma babhūva yat pūrā

or, again, in M. viii, 37, 42 :

bhavatu bhavatu, kiṁ vikatthase,  
nanu mama tasya hi yuddham udyatam

There is one form of triṣṭubh which actually corresponds to the second verse of the puṣpitāgrā, when its breves are equated with heavy syllables, thus :

triṣṭubh {	mānam na kuryān nā 'dadhita roṣam
	— — — — —
puṣpitāgrā b {	— — — — —
	— — — — —

svaparamatāir gahanam pratarkayadbhiḥ

Professor Jacobi also sees in the jagatī or triṣṭubh the origin of the puṣpitāgrā, though he is inclined to adopt a more complicated development (from a Vedic verse of 12 + 8 syllables).<sup>1</sup>

The puṣpitāgrā and aparavaktra are used only as tag-metres; sometimes, as in R. v, 16, 80 (not in G.) inserted

<sup>1</sup> ZDMG. vol. xxxviii, p. 591 ff. Professor Jacobi, p. 595, regards the puṣpitāgrā as a development from a pure mātrāchandas, which in turn he refers to the satobhṛatī (4 × 12 + 8). Compare also the same author, IS. vol. xvii, p. 449.

among upajāti tags common to both texts; sometimes, as in G. iii, 54, 28 (not in R.) after a common triṣṭubh-tag; or in other similar situations.<sup>1</sup>

The puṣpitaḡrā occurs much more frequently as a tag-metre than does the aparavaktra. For example, in the Rāmāyaṇa, the puṣpitaḡrā is found four times as often. There are, however, only thirteen cases common to the two texts, R. and G. Besides these, G. has fourteen, and R. has twenty-one cases not found in the alternate text.

The mark of the posterior pāda, as distinguished from the prior, is the apparent insertion of a heavy syllable (in terms of mātrā metre, two moræ), at a point which is usually fixed as after the initial four breves. This, however, is not always the case. Thus in G. v, 31, 62 b, corresponding to d, which latter, vacanam idam mama Māithili pratihi, is regular, appears as posterior pāda of a puṣpitaḡrā:

lavaṇajalanidhir goṣpadīkṛto me,

where the heavy syllable is put after all the breves, perhaps merely on account of the awkward phrase (in ṣloka, ib. 33, 23, goṣpadīkṛtaḥ). Later rule especially forbids this arrangement for all mātrāchandas: "In the opening of prior pādas, ∪ — ∪, and of posterior pādas, ∪ — — — ∪ and — ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ and ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ —, are forbidden."<sup>2</sup>

Further,\*for the prior pāda may be substituted a different cadence, almost that of the vāitāliya, ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ ∪ —, ∪ —. This occurs in G. vi, 62, 44 a (where R. 83, 44, has the normal ∪ ∪, ∪ ∪ ∪, — ∪ — ∪ —) thus:

G., ayam adya vibho tava ca priyārtham

R., ayam anagha tavo 'ditaḥ priyārtham

Compare G. vi, 92, 83 b: svabalā 'bhivṛto raṇe vyarājatā,

<sup>1</sup> In G. vi, 39, 32, where R. has only a rucirā, there is a puṣpitaḡrā inserted before the rucirā. These two names, by the way, appear together as ordinary adjectives "bleaming and shining" (trees), supuṣpitaḡrāṇ rucirāṇ (vṛkṣāṇ), R. v, 14, 41.

<sup>2</sup> Weber, IS. vol. viii, p. 309.



where R. 108, 34, has svajanabalā 'bhivṛto raṇe babhūvā.<sup>1</sup>

The prior pāda may be hypermetric. Thus R. vi, 107, 68 a-b:

Daṣarathasutarākṣasendrayos tayor  
jayam anavekṣya raṇe sa Rāghavasya

A parallel case or two occurs in the other epic (see below).

Occasionally there is a quasi inversion, ∪ — ∪ — ∪ —, of the ending — ∪ — ∪ —. This occurs twice in R., but only in *Adi* and *Uttara*. The first case presents varied readings. In G. i, 22, 20, there is simply the not unusual equivalence of a and c *puṣpitāgrā* and b and d (*aparavaktra*) catalectic. But in R. the same stanza, i, 19, 22, has, besides, the irregular pāda a:

∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ —  
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — | = b

that is, instead of *iti hrdayavidāraṇam tadānīm* in G. a, R. has *iti sahrdayamanovidāraṇam*. This can scarcely be a mere lapsus, as the finale occurs again in the *Mahābhārata* and in R. vii, 29, 38 c-d:

yad ayam atulabalas tvayā 'dya vāi  
tridaṣapatis tridaṣa ca nirjitāḥ

In the latter passage, 37 a has ∪ ∪ — ∪ — as close:

atha saraṇavigatam uttamāujāḥ<sup>2</sup>

While posterior pādas have syllaba anceps, as in G. vi, 92, 83 b, cited above, a prior pāda has this only in R. vi, 33, 36,

<sup>1</sup> Another case of variation, R. vi, 84, 22 d = G. 63, 22, where G. has *asuravaro 'nmathanāya yathā mahendraḥ* may be corrupt (for *asuravaro 'nmathanē yathā mahendraḥ*?). B. has *divijaripumathane yathā mahendraḥ* (for *ripur*?).

<sup>2</sup> In b, compare G. v, 36, 77 b, *Janakanṛpātmajādhr̥tam*; but R. 38, 70, has *Janakanṛpātmajayādhr̥tam prabhāvāt*, which is correct. In R. vii, 29, 37 and 38 are *puṣpitāgrās*; 39 and 40 are *aparavaktras*. In G. the only irregularity here is in (37) 38 c, *svasutasya vacanam atipriyam tat*. Here in 40 = R. 39, a is *aparavaktra* and b is *puṣpitāgrā*, though the latter may have added the unnecessary *tvam* that makes the change. The same is true of R. 38 a. I have noticed besides only the following *puṣpitāgrā* irregularities, which seem to me more grammatical than metrical, or mere errors: G. ii, 29, 29 b, ∪ ∪ — — for — ∪ — —, read *apratimarūpa*? G. iv, 34, 35 c, read *anṛtamadhura*? Neither stanza is found in R.

devī (cited above), where, however, G. has Sīte (here, 9, 39, abhayaṁkaram is to be read). In posterior pādas, final syllaba anceps is found about a dozen times in the forty-odd puspitāgrās of the Rāmāyaṇa text.

The aparavaktra is a puspitāgrā shortened by one long syllable, two moræ, in each pāda; or in other words, its pāda is a catalectic puspitāgrā pāda. To native prosodians, as to European scholars, the shorter is the type, and the puspitāgrā is an expanded aparavaktra; a view that appears to me erroneous. The aparavaktra occurs in the Rāmāyaṇa, as said above, not quite one-fourth so often as the puspitāgrā.<sup>1</sup> Like the latter, it is used alone, or with other metres to make tags. The final syllables are always long. Irregularities are rare; a substitute like that in the puspitāgrā occurs in G. ii, 82, 15 a:

○○○○,○○○—○○—  
 ○○○○,—○○—,○○—  
 ○○○○,○○—○○—,○○— (ca satī omit ca?)  
 ○○○○,—○○—,○○—

Here R. has a regular aparavaktra, ii, 81, 16. In G. iv, 62, 25, the second pāda is plavagapuṅgavāḥ paripūrṇamānasāḥ, for R.'s (63, 15) plavagavarāḥ pratilabdhapāuruṣāḥ; and in G. 63, 29, plavaṅgamāḥ paripūrṇamānasāḥ.

There is only one passage in the Uttara, vii, 29, 37-40, where puspitāgrā and aparavaktra are found. Otherwise these metres are distributed pretty evenly over the Rāmāyaṇa, except that the first book has no aparavaktra,<sup>2</sup> and only one puspitāgrā common to both texts, but R. here has four not in G. The reason is that the later epic prefers pure mātṛachandas.

Interchange of aparavaktra and puspitāgrā pādas occurs occasionally, as in G. ii, 15, 36 (R. has upendra here), where a

<sup>1</sup> There are only six cases common to both texts; besides, two in R. not in G.; three in G. not in R.; twelve in all, as G. at iv, 62, 25 and 63, 29 has the one at R. 63, 15. In the last case, the first pāda is the same in the three stanzas; in R. all the other pādas are normal, but in G. 62, 25 d is a puspitāgrā pāda, as is e of 63, 29. The missing stanza in the alternate text is due merely to the latter having a puspitāgrā in G. iii, 7, 36; R. vi, 68, 24.

<sup>2</sup> The fifth book has no aparavaktra, but it has half a dozen puspitāgrās. The sixth book has the greatest number of puspitāgrās.

and c are *puṣpītāgrā* pādas and b and d are *aparavaktra* pādas in regular interchange; or as in G. v, 36, 77, where only the last pāda of the stanza is catalectic (of *aparavaktra* form).

It is clear that the *puṣpītāgrā*, a form of *triṣṭubh*, and the *aparavaktra*, a catalectic *puṣpītāgrā*, are not regarded as separate but as interchangeable in pāda formation. As complete stanzas, the latter compared with the former, are rare. The pāda type is not absolutely fixed.

Before comparing the usage in the *Mahābhārata*, I shall complete this description of the phenomena in the *Rāmāyaṇa* with an account of the

### (B) ĀUPACCHANDASIKA AND VĀITĀLIYA.

In the later part of the *Rāmāyaṇa* — if one may dare suggest that any epic poem in India was not all written at the same moment — the place of the *puṣpītāgrā* and *aparavaktra*, as tag-metres, is taken by pure *mātrāchandasas*, namely, the *āupacchandasika* and *vāitāliya*, which bear to each other the same relation as that held by the former pair; that is to say, the *vāitāliya* pāda is a catalectic *āupacchandasika* pāda. These two pairs are essentially identical, as may be seen by comparing the posterior pādas, which in each are increased by a long syllable. The posterior pāda of the *āupacchandasika* is

— — — — —, — — — — —, — — — — —,

which, when catalectic, should have final syllaba anceps; but this never happens at the end of the first hemistich, only at the end of the stanza, an indication that the *vāitāliya* is the derived form. Again, the *āupacchandasika* is really the epic stanza metre. The *vāitāliya* is used but once as a stanza, all the other cases being merely catalectic pādas of an *āupacchandasika* stanza. The prior pāda in *āupacchandasika* may also end in brevis, and, as the spondee is usually resolved into an anapæst in both pādas, we get the norm (16 and 18 moræ):

- (a) ∪ ∪, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — ∪  
 (b) ∪ ∪ —, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — ∪  
 or (b) — —, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — ∪

This is evidently a variety of the *puṣpitāgrā*.<sup>1</sup> That is, it reverts to a *triṣṭubh* origin.

R. vii, 57, 21 = G. 59, 22, may be taken as the typical form:

∪ ∪, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — (—)  
 ∪ ∪ —, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — ∪  
 ∪ ∪, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — —  
 ∪ ∪ —, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — ∪

G. adds *te* to R.'s *pāda* a, *iti sarvam aṣeṣato mayā (te)*. The final syllable of the stanza in vii, 61, 24 = G., 66, 24, *vāitāliya*, is short in R., long in G. Prior *pādas* do not usually end in *brevis*, but they do occasionally, as in G. vii, 87, 18 (not in R.), where in b the spondaic type of opening is illustrated:

*iti karma sudāruṇaṁ sa kṛtvā*  
*Dando dandam avāptavān ugram*  
*ṛṇu sarvam aṣeṣatas tad adya*  
*kathayisye tava rājasinhavṛtta*

The close of b, however, shows an unusual phase of the type of the equivalent variant with spondee; but it is not necessary to suppose that a *brevis* is lost before *ugram*. Both posterior *pādas* may begin with a spondee (but end in — ∪ — ∪ —), as in R. vii, 55, 21 = G. 57, 22 (all *pādas* end long), e. g., *tulyavyādhigatāu mahāprabhāvāu*, apparently an older form than the usual resolved type.

As in the case of the *puṣpitāgrā* and *aparavaktra*, the catalectic (*vāitāliya*) *pāda* may take the place of the full measure. Thus in R. vii, 95, 17 (not in G.), the spondee type (b) is used as a catalectic *pāda*:

*iti sampravacārya rājasinhah*  
*ṣvobhūte ṣapathasya niṣcayam*  
*visasarja munin nrpāṇḍ ca sarvān*  
*sa mahātmā mahato mahānubhāvah*

<sup>1</sup> Compare the form cited above, ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ ∪, as a variant of *puṣpitāgrā* (b).

In R. vii, 86, 21 (G. 93, 21), a-b show a new form of this combination:

iti Lakṣmaṇavākyaṃ uttamam  
nṛpatir ativamanoharam mahātmā

that is, a vāitāliya prior and puṣpitāgrā posterior pāda. Compare the only case not in the Uttarakāṇḍa, where in G. ii, 81, 33 (not in R.), a lame aparavaktra hemistich is followed by a lame mātrā hemistich (fifteen morae):

○○○○,○○,—○○—  
○○○○,—○○—,——  
○○○○,—○○—  
○○—,—○○—,○○—

The patois metres show that the mātrā-form was used early, but how much earlier than the third century B.C. it is impossible to say. The vāitāliya itself is a common metre of the Dhammapada.<sup>1</sup>

### Mātrāchandas in the Mahābhārata.

The many "semi-equals" in the great epic form a fair parallel to the state of things in the little epic. But there are no regular vāitāliya or āupacchandāsika stanzas at all. In a late passage of Vana and in Ānti there is a sporadic approach to vāitāliya form. On the other hand, there are over ninety-one puṣpitāgrās and aparavaktras. They are found chiefly in the later part of the epic and appear more in groups than they do in the Rāmāyaṇa. The interchange of puṣpitāgrā and aparavaktra pādas, of which I have spoken above, is met with in the very first example at the end of i, 30:

anupamabalavīryatejaso  
dhṛtamanasaḥ parirakṣaṇe 'mṛtasya  
asurapuravidāraṇāḥ surā  
jvalanasamidhavadhuprakāṇināḥ

<sup>1</sup> The type here has in the posterior pāda either anapaest, spondee or amphimacer as an opening; but both here and in the choriambic much greater freedom is allowed than in the epic, where, despite the occasional irregularities noticed above, the form is much more systematized than in Pāli.

iti samaravaram surāḥ sthitās te  
 parighasahasraçatāiḥ samākulam  
 viçalitam iva cā 'mbarāntaram  
 tapanamarīcivikāçitam babhāṣe

In the first stanza the pādas are aparav., puṣpit., aparav., aparav.; in the second, puṣpit., aparav., aparav., puṣpit. Almost the same as the latter is the arrangement in a tag to a dānakathana (followed by three triṣṭubhs), at the end of iii, 200, 126, where a puṣpit. pāda is followed by an aparav. pāda in the first couplet; but the second begins with the *posterior* puṣpitāgrā pāda, and is followed by the posterior pāda of an aparavaktra:

c-d: bhavati sahasraguṇam dinasya rāhor  
 viṣuvati cā 'kṣayam aṇute phalam

as if the posterior pāda were used originally in either position as the norm; which would agree with the identification with the triṣṭubh ventured above.

Of the eight puṣpitāgrās in the seventh book, six (all tags) are perfectly regular ( $2 \times 16 + 18$ ) and require no notice (for C. 2731, rajani°, read rajani°, as in B. 77, 26). Here only hemistichs end in brevis. Two cases deserve notice. In vii, 1622 = 37, 37 b, C. has pitṛsuracāraṇa-siddhasaṅghāiḥ, in B., siddhayakṣasaṅghāiḥ. But B. is often less better than bettered, and here the net result of three corrections is to make a perfect puṣpitāgrā out of C.'s scheme, which is

○○○ ○○○ — ○ — ○ — —, ○○○ ○ — ○ — ○ — —, 16 + 15  
 ○○○ ○○○ ○ — ○ — —, ○○○ — ○ — ○ — ○ — —, 17 + 17

but this is attained by adding yakṣa in b; changing avanitalavigatāiḥ ca to avanitalagatāiḥ ca in c; and inventing the word ativibabhāu for abhibabhāu in d (B, ativibabhāu hutabhug yathā 'jyasiktaḥ). Mates to pāda c were shown above from the Rāmāyaṇa. Irregular too as is d, it is not lightly to be rejected, since it has its perfect parallel in the eighth book (below), as also in Hariv. C. 11, 269 d (3, 6, 4 d)

(iti sa nṛpatir ātmavāns tadā 'sau)  
 tad ānu(vi)çintya babhūva vītamanyuh

where, for C.'s *anucintya*, *anuvicintya* of B. may be a corrected reading, as above it is easy to propose *abhivibabhāu* and refer to the *Rig Veda* for the form.

The case at vii, 182, 27 = 8273, shows a better reading in B., where *hi* is required (accidentally omitted in C.). The *pādas* here are regular, the stanza's end having *brevis* (in 77, 26, the first hemistich ends in *brevis*). The chief peculiarity here is that the passage stands in the middle of the chapter, the other cases in *Droṇa* being taghs.

Once  $\cup \cup \cup - \cup$  takes the place of  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , producing in *pāda* a the *choriambus* equivalent to that in b and d. This happens in one of the two great groups of late *aparavaktras* in the eighth book, viii, 30, 3 (almost at the beginning of the chapter)<sup>1</sup>:

$\cup \cup \cup, - \cup \cup -, \cup - \cup -$   
 $\cup \cup \cup \cup, - \cup \cup -, \cup - \cup -$   
 $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup -, \cup - \cup -$   
 $\cup \cup \cup \cup, - \cup \cup -, \cup - \cup -$

The rest of the twenty-five "semi-equals" in the eighth book are all grouped together in 37, 31 ff., where, after one *puṣpitāgrā pāda*, follow, as in the last group after a stanza, *aparavaktras* only. In this group of twelve stanzas, *breves* occur but rarely at the end of the hemistich, in (31), 40, and 42 at the stanza's end, in 35 alone at the end of b. Only two of these stanzas require a word. In 37 c-d, where the first of the two *pādas* has seventeen *moræ* (for fourteen),

*dinakarasadṛṣāḥ ṣarottamāir yudhā*

*Kuruṣu bahūn vinihatya tān arin,*

it seems simple to drop the hypermetric and unnecessary *yudhā*; but it is in both texts (*Nīlakaṇṭha* says that this particular stanza is *viṣamaṁ chandas*) and has a parallel in *Hariv.* 11,269, where (C. only) a *puṣpitāgrā* begins:

<sup>1</sup> The first stanza of the chapter is a *śloka*; the first stanza of the group is a *puṣpitāgrā*; then follow *aparavaktras* to 9, where the first half is *catalectic* (*aparavaktra*) and the second half is *puṣpitāgrā* (as in 18, b ends in *brevis*); 10 is a regular *aparavaktra*; 12-14, regular *aparavaktras*; 11 is regular in B. a, but irregular in C. (*cinivṛsabhaṣarapīḍitās* for *ṣarāḥ nipīḍitam*). Here d ends in *brevis*.

vidhivihitam aṣakyam anyathā hi kartum<sup>1</sup>

A similar case has been shown above in the Rāmāyaṇa.

The other stanza deserving notice is the first of the group, viii, 37, 31 = 1737. Both texts have a puṣpitāgrā pāda in a; an aparavaktra pāda in b; and in c-d

jugupīṣava ihā 'dya Pāṇḍavaṁ  
kim bahunā | saha tāir jayāmi tam

that is, — ∪ ∪ for ∪ ∪ — of the resolution in vāitāliya (but the cæsura in d is after the choriambus: "Though the gods may wish to guard the Pandu here to-day, what then? I shall conquer him, gods and all").

In Čānti, the puṣpitāgrās are generally too regular to be interesting. A big bunch of them in Mokṣa makes a tag at the end of adhy. 179, thirteen in all. They have an unusual number of final breves, but only because vratam idam ājagaram guciṣ carāmi is the final refrain of ten of them (only twice has b brevis). Of the twenty-one stanzas of this class in Čānti (Mokṣa), sixteen are puṣpitāgrās; five, aparavaktras. About the same proportion obtains in Harivaṇṣa, where there are twenty-two stanzas of ardhasamas, of which only three are aparavaktras. All those in Čānti are tags, either following triṣṭubhs or followed by another supplementary tag (as in the case of a rathoddhatā mentioned above). In xii, 250, 12 b = 9035 (yad aviduṣām) mahadbhayam (paratra) in C. appears to be a lapsus; in B. as sumahadbhayam, and in 10,530, yad aviduṣām sumahadbhayam bhavet; but compare the parallel below in H. The following is a parallel to the case above in the Rāmāyaṇa in its late form (∪ — ∪ — ∪ —): xii, 819, 112 = 11,836 (the order of moræ is 17 + 18 + 16 or 17 + 16); where B. has:

yad upaniṣadam upākarot tathā 'sāu  
Janakanṛpasya purā hi Yājñavalkyaḥ

<sup>1</sup> This is in the stanza referred to above. In this case, H. 3, 6, 4 a has only vidhivihitam aṣakyam anyathā, to which C. adds kartum. The fact that the same superfluity of syllables is found in the Rāmāyaṇa must at least make doubtful an instant acceptance of the more usual form given in what is so often a clearly improved text.



yad upagaṇitaçāḡvatāvyaṃ tac  
chubham amṛtatvam açokam arohati

(here C. in c has °gaṇitam). Both texts have thus in a :

○○○ ○○○, ○—○— ○—

and C. has in c :

○○○ ○○○, —○— ○—

The last stanza in the book, 366, 9 = 13,943, has, as an aparavaktra tag, moræ 14 + 18 + 14 + 18, alternate calalectic verses, of which I have spoken above.

The remaining mātṛāchandasas in Çānti are discussed below. The thirteenth book has no aparavaktras but nine puṣpitāgrās, all of which are perfectly regular (the hemistich ends in brevis, e. g., 76, 31). All except those in the extraordinary (late) section, 14, 180, and 190, are tags, though 26, 101-2 are followed by four çlokas.<sup>1</sup>

Apart from the pādas already noticed, the Harivaṅṣa has little of interest. Interchange of the two forms (a, catalectic) occurs in 3, 6, 3. In the puṣpitāgrās at 12,705-6, the latter has in b, ○○○ ○—, ○—○—○—, as in the lapsus above. Here sa has been dropped, (3, 42, 21) dititanayaṃ (sa) mṛgādhipo dadarça. As usual in the later books, several of the stanzas are not tags: 2, 123, 32 is followed by çlokas and rucirās, but is near the end of the section; at the beginning are the three of 3, 6, 2 ff.; in the middle of the section are 3, 49, 31 = 12,960, and 3, 50, 12 = 12,989; as are the four in 3, 51, vss. 18, 29, 42, 49 = 13,024-35-51-58. Many of the final stanzas are benedictive, as in 3, 6, 10, where puṣpitāgrās are interwoven in an upajāti kāvyastuṭi:

vijayati vasudhām ca rājavṛttir  
dhanam atulaṃ labhate dviṣajjayaṃ ca  
vipulam api dhanam labhec ca vāigyaḥ  
sugatim iyāc chravaṇāc ca çūdrajātiḥ  
purāṇam etac caritam mahātmanām  
adhītya buddhiṃ labhate ca naiṣṭikīm, etc.

<sup>1</sup> Here C., 1860 b, has the meaningless words: çilataraye tripathagānuyogārūpān, for °rataye . . . pathānuyoga° in B.

It will be convenient here to put together the forms of ardhāsamavṛttas thus far exhibited in the two epics. In the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa the general types of aparavaktra and puspitāgrā are:

(a<sup>1</sup>) ○○○○○○, —○—○— (—), 14 (16) moræ

(b<sup>1</sup>) ○○○○—○○, —○—○— (—), 16 (18) moræ

These may be called *the* types, because the following variations are proportionally insignificant. But, though few in number, they are important as showing that there was no absolute line between the fixed mātrāchandas and the free mātrāchandas, for these variations may just as well be regarded as, e. g., vāitāliya pādas as variants of aparavaktra pādas. But it must be remembered that they do not represent pādas of, e. g., vāitāliya stanzas; only equivalent pādas of, e. g., aparavaktra stanzas, which I call variants on account of their position:

In M. and R. both are found the following variants of (a<sup>1</sup>):

(a<sup>2</sup>) ○○○ ○○○ ○—○—○— (—)

In both texts of both epics, two cases in M.; three in R. In M. both cases are in pāda c; in R., only in aparavaktra.

(a<sup>3</sup>) ○○○ ○○○ —○—○—○— (hypermeter)

In M., in both texts and also in Harivaṇṣa; in R., one case. In M. alone:

(a<sup>4</sup>) ○○○—○○—○—○—

In R. alone:

(a<sup>5</sup>) ○○○ ○○○, ○○—○— (B., vii)

(a<sup>6</sup>) ○○—○○—○○—○— (G., 17 moræ)

(a<sup>7</sup>) ○○○ ○○○ —○—○○— (doubtful, pāda c, 15 moræ)

(a<sup>8</sup>) ○○○ ○○ —○—○— (only in G., pāda c, 15 moræ)

In M. and R. both is found the following variant of (b<sup>1</sup>):

(b<sup>2</sup>) ○○○○—○○—○— (only in C. and G., 15 moræ)

In M alone:

(b<sup>3</sup>) ○○○ —○○—○—○— (only in C. and Harivaṇṣa, pādas b and d, 17 moræ)

(b<sup>4</sup>) ○○○○, —○—○—○— (sic, bis in C.)

(b<sup>5</sup>) —○○—○○—○—

In R alone :

(b<sup>6</sup>) ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ —, — ∪ — ∪ — (only in G., forbidden by rule)

(b<sup>7</sup>) ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ —, ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — (only in G.)

(b<sup>8</sup>) ∪ — ∪ — ∪ ∪, — ∪ — ∪ — (only in G.)

(b<sup>9</sup>) ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ ∪ (only in G., a prior āupacchandasika)

The complete vāitāliya and āupacchandasika stanzas, of perfect mora form, found only in the later Rāmāyaṇa, have the scheme :

(a) ∪ ∪, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — (∪)

(b<sup>1</sup>) — —, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — (∪)

(b<sup>2</sup>) ∪ ∪ —, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — (∪)

(b<sup>3</sup>) — —, — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — —

Before taking up the odd cases remaining, I cannot refrain from departing somewhat from a purely metrical point of view, to express admiration for the art with which these metres are handled. The poets of the later epic play with them skilfully. They are not apprentices but master workmen. I give two illustrations. In one, the metre is employed to give a list of fighters and weapons, the names of which are cleverly moulded together to form half a perfect stanza. In the other the poet is indulging in satire at the expense of the philosophers:

viii, 30, 5,    parighamusalāçaktitomarāir  
                  nakharabhuṇḍigadāçatāir hatāḥ  
                  dviradanarahayāḥ sahasraço  
                  rudhiranadipravahās tadā 'bhavan

xii, 179, 35, bahukathitam idam hi buddhimadbhiḥ  
                  kavibhir abhiprathayadbhir ātmakīrtim  
                  idam idam iti tatra tatra tat tat<sup>1</sup>  
                  avaparamatāir gahanam pratarkayadbhiḥ

I have now given seriatim all the mātrāchandas cases in the great epic, with the exception of one case in Vana, to be

<sup>1</sup> v. l. hanta.

mentioned immediately, and two or three peculiar groups in Čānti, also to be discussed below. It will have been noticed that in the later books great heaps of stanzas of this metre are piled together. Thus all the twenty-five in Karṇa (a late book in its present shape) are in two sections, thirteen stanzas in one, twelve in another; while in Čānti another group of thirteen is found. This stupid massing of adornments — for these tag-metres were used originally only as fringe-work — the still later thirteenth book exceeds by uniting together in one heap, first, a puṣpitāgrā, xiii, 14, 180, then four āryās, ib. 181-4, then two ḡlokas, ib. 185-6, then an āryā, ib. 187, then an upajāti, ib. 188, then a vasantatilakā, ib. 189, then a puṣpitāgrā, ib. 190, then an āryā, ib. 191.

Despite this profusion of puṣpitāgrās and aparavaktras, the Mahābhārata has no such regular vāitālīyas and āupac-chandasikas as has the later Rāmāyaṇa. But the following interesting verses occur in the popular story of Yudhiṣṭhira and the dæmon, who required him to answer certain questions. They are not tags, iii, 313, 112-113; they are late; and they are an approach to vāitālīyas:

priyavacanavādī kiṃ labhate  
vimṛṣitakāryakaraḥ kiṃ labhate  
bahumitrakaraḥ kiṃ labhate  
dharme rataḥ kiṃ labhate kathaya

○○,○○○ — —, —○○ —, 15  
○○○○, —○○ —, —○○ —, 16  
○○, —○○ —, —○○ —, 14  
—○○ —, —○○ —, ○○○, 16

priyavacanavādī priyo bhavati  
vimṛṣitakāryakaro 'dhikaṃ jayati  
bahumitrakaraḥ sukhaṃ vasate  
yaç ca dharmarataḥ sa gatiṃ labhate

○○,○○○ — —, ○ —○○○, 15  
○○○○, —○○ —, ○ —○○○, 16  
○○, —○○ —, ○ —○○ —, 15  
—○, —○○ —, ○○ —○○ —, 17

In C., 17,397-98, the same text. This is the kind of story which, because it appears Buddhistic, is often labelled as a matter of course 'certainly old.' But the tale, on general principles, is just as likely to be late as early; perhaps more so, when one considers that kings interviewed by spirits who ask conundrums are merely stalking-horses, and must first be famous as kings before such stories are fastened upon them. This particular tale bears all the marks of a late inset.<sup>1</sup>

Although the great epic lacks the regular vāitāliya of the Rāmāyaṇa's Uttarakāṇḍa, yet Ṣānti offers a type of metres which shows forms ending in the close of this measure. For besides the usual ending — ∪ — ∪ — of the mātrā form, the close may also be — ∪ ∪ — — (called āpātālikā). Also the beginning of the verses given below is of mātrā-formation, but the mātrās are not regular. The group xii, 322, 28-32 = 12,071-75, follows a group of praharṣiṇīs (4 × 13 syllables):

28, rājā sadā dharmaparaḥ ṣubhāṣubhasya  
goptā samikṣya sukr̥tinām dadhāti lokān  
bahuvidham api carati praviṣṭi  
sukham anupagataṁ niravadyam

— — ∪ —, — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪ — ∪  
— — ∪ — ∪, ∪ ∪ ∪, — ∪ — ∪ — —  
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪, ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪  
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪, — ∪ ∪ — —

Moræ 20 + 21 + 14 + 14, the first hemistich bridging the preceding praharṣiṇīs, — — —, ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪, — ∪ — ∪ — —, and the āpātālikā (c-d scheme also in 30, below).

29, ṣvāno bhīṣanākāyā ayomukhāni  
vayāṁsi balagr̥dhra[kula] pakṣiṇām ca saṅghāh  
narakadane rudhirapā guruvaca —  
nanudam uparataṁ viṣanty asantah

— —, — ∪ ∪ —, — ∪ — ∪ — ∪  
∪ — ∪, ∪ ∪ — ∪ [∪ ∪], — ∪ — ∪ — —  
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ —, ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪  
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪, — ∪ ∪ — —

19 + 19 + 15 + 16

<sup>1</sup> Compare Holtzmann, who rightly says that the story is a late addition to the third book to connect it with the fourth, Neunzehn Bücher, p. 95.

30, maryaḍāniyatā svayambhuvā ya ihe 'māḥ  
 prabhinatti daṣaḡunā manonugatvāt  
 nivasati bhr̥ṣam asukham pitṛviṣa —  
 ya-vipinam avagāhya sa pāpāḥ

— —, — u u —, u — u, — u u — —  
 u u — u u u —, — u — u — —  
 u u u u u u, u u — u u u u (= 28 c)  
 u u u u u u, — u u — — (= 28 d)

22 + 18 + 14 + 14

31, yo lubdhah subhr̥ṣam priyānṛtaḡ ca manuṣyah  
 satatanikṛtivan̥canā<sup>1</sup>-bhiratiḥ syāt  
 upanidhibhir asukhakṛt sa paramānirayago  
 bhr̥ṣam asukham anubhavati duskr̥takarmā

a, — —, — u u —, u — u — u u — — (= 32 a)  
 b, " u u u u u u — u, — u u — —  
 c, u u u u, u u u u —, u, u u u u u u —  
 d, u u u u u u u u u u, — u u — —

22 + 17 + 19 + 18. Here c has the resolved equivalent of the u u u u — close of a, b, d. The choriamb of a is all resolved in d, u u, u u u u, — u u — —; in c only the first syllable, u u u u — (as if sa were interpolated).

32, uṣṇām Vāitaran̥īm mahānadīm<sup>2</sup> avagāḍho  
 'sipatravanabhinnagātrah  
 paraḡvunaḡayo nipatito vasati (ca)  
 ca mahāniraye bhr̥ṣartah

— —, — u u —, (u —) u — u u — — (= 31 a)  
 u — u u u — u — —  
 u u, u u u u —, u u u — u u u (u)  
 u u, — u u —, u — —

22 (19) + 13 + 16 + 13

<sup>1</sup> C. vacana, but N. vañcanā cāryādi.

<sup>2</sup> C. omits mahā.

**Mātrāsamakās.**

In xii, 336, 11-12 = 12706-7 occur two lines, as printed in C., which seem to be rather rhythmical prose than poetry; but in 347, 18-22 = 13444 there are five *mātrā* stanzas, of which I give the scheme alone (they are not arranged in the same way in both texts):

18, ○○○○ —, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○  
       ○○○ — (16 × 2)  
       ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ ○○○,  
       ○○○ ○○○ — (16 + 17)

B. adds ○○○○○ —, which C. gives to the next stanza.

19, ○○○ ○○○, ○○○ —, ○○○ —, ○○○ — (16 + 14)

C. adds ○ — ○ —, which B. gives to the next hemistich.

      ○○ —, ○ —, ○ —, ○ —, ○ — (16 × 2)  
 20, ○ —, ○ —, ○ —, ○ —, ○ — (16 × 2)  
       ○○ —, ○ —, ○ —, ○ —, ○ — (16 + 17)  
 21, — —, — —, — —, — —, — — (16 + 22 or 17)  
       — —, — —, — —, — —, — — (15 + 16)

Perhaps *purāṇam* in 21 is to be omitted. The text is:

taṁ lokasākṣiṇam aṇam puruṣam purāṇam ravivar-  
       ṇam iṣṭam gatiṁ bahuṇaḥ  
 praṇamadhvam ekamanaso yataḥ salilodbhavo 'pi  
       taṁ ṛṣiṁ praṇataḥ

22, ○ —, ○ —, ○ —, ○ — (16 + 17)  
       — —, — —, — —, — — (16 + 18)

The *āryā* form is clear in stanzas 18 and 20. On the other hand, the first stanza is an almost pure *praharanakalitā pāda*, ○○○○○ —, while the *pramitākṣarā pāda*, ○ —, ○ —, ○ —, ○ —, prevails in the following stanzas; not, however, as pure *ṣakvārī* or *jagatī* stanzas, but with *mātrā* resolution. The stanzas, if they are treated as one group, may perhaps be considered as rather rough *mātrāsamakās* (four *pādas* of six-

teen moræ each), partly of the *viçloka* type;<sup>1</sup> or as *āryāgīti* (but with four moræ in the sixth foot), mixed with *mātrāsamakas*. Nothing of this sort is found in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

### Gaṇacchandās.

The statement that the *āryā* metre occurs in Buddhistic writings (and earliest inscriptions) but not in epic poetry, was made so long ago that the learned author of *Das Rāmāyaṇa* can scarcely at this date be held responsible for the slight oversight.<sup>2</sup> Nor is the main argument, to which this statement served as a support, especially affected by the fact that the *Mahābhārata*, besides the stanzas of *āryāgīti* mentioned in the last paragraph, has eight *āryā* stanzas; since these are in parts of the epic so late that their presence, as affecting epic poetry in general, may be discounted; at least for any one who takes a reasonably historical view of the growth of the great epic.

Six occur in xiii, 14, 181-84, 187, 191 = 772-75, 778, 782:

- 181, — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 182, — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 183, — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 184, — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 187, — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 191, — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —,  
 — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —, — —.

The last two stanzas are *upagīti*, that is, they have the

<sup>1</sup> Colebrooke, *Essays*, vol. ii, pp. 78, 142 ff.; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, vol. viii, pp. 314-318. I am indebted to a query note in Professor Cappeller's manuscript for the suggestion that these may be imperfect *akṣaracchandāsas* of the types named. The pure *mātrāsamaka* has *brevis* in the *pāda*'s ninth syllable.

<sup>2</sup> ZDMG., vol. xxxviii, p. 600; *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 93.

<sup>3</sup> B., *bhavati hi*; C. omits *hi*.

<sup>4</sup> Text: *yeṣāṃ na kṣaṇam api rucito haracarāṣmaranaviechedaḥ*; *Āryāgīti* and neglected *cæsura*; but if *api* (an easy intrusion) were extruded, the neglected *cæsura* would be in its usual place, — —, — —, — —; — —, — —, — —, — —, with the *Āryā* final foot of two moræ.



short verse in each hemistich. The full eighth foot, *āryāgīti*, is found only in 183 b (if left uncorrected). There are no irregularities in the use of the amphibrach. Brevis may stand at the end of the first hemistich.<sup>1</sup>

Two cases occur in *Harivaṅṣa*. I give the text:

1, 1, 3, jayati Parācarasūnuḥ satyavatīrḍḍayanandano Vyāsah  
yasyā 'syakamalagalitaṁ vāṇmayam amṛtaṁ jagat  
pibati

1, 1, 7, yo Harivaṅṣaṁ lekḥayati yathā vidhinā mahātapāḥ  
sapadi

(in C.) sa yāti Hareḥ padakamala[m] kamalaṁ yathā madh-  
upo lubdhah

(in B.) sa jayati Haripadakamalam madhupo hi yathā rasena  
samlubdhah

The first stanza is regular. The second neglects the usual cæsura after the third foot in the first hemistich in both texts; while C.'s text is impossible in the second, though the metre may be set right by omitting the antecedent and reading (without sa):

— ∪ ∪, — ∪ ∪, ∪ ∪ —; ∪ ∪ —, ∪ — ∪, ∪, — —, —

The text of B. is regular, with ∪ — ∪ as sixth foot, where (in the second hemistich) stands ∪ in the cases above.

On page 164, I cited in full a stanza beginning: āhuḥ ṣaṣṭim buddhiguṇān vāi (the sixty Sāṃkhya guṇas); the scheme (unique in the epic) for the whole stanza being (xii, 256, 12):

— — — — — ∪ ∪ — —, — ∪ ∪ — — — ∪ ∪ — —  
— ∪ ∪ — — — ∪ ∪ — —, — ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ — —

Although this lacks the marked characteristics of the *āryā*, both in its early and in its later forms, it is yet a *gaṇa* metre which may be reckoned either as *āryāgīti*, or as *mātrāsamaka*, but not pure.

As to the origin of the *gaṇacchandas*, the metre seems to me to be rather a species than a genus. As seen in the speci-

<sup>1</sup> There is here no case of four breves in the sixth foot of the second hemistich, which occurs in classic writers and inscriptional *āryās*, e. g., *Vaṭsa-bhaṭṭi*, loc. cit., vs. 30.

mens above under *mātrāsamakās*, they are interchangeable with the latter, of which they are only a more special type, with  $\cup\cup\cup\cup$ ,  $\cup\cup\cup$ ,  $\cup\cup\cup\cup$ ,  $\cup\cup\cup\cup$  as the last four feet of the hemistich (compare 183 a, only this is not in the *āryāgītī* form, but has the alternative one heavy syllable for two, or two moræ for four). The *mātrāsamakās* in turn are the equivalent in moræ of the *çloka* strophe (that is, a unit composed of two *çlokas*, such as the classical writers affect), the thirty-two syllables of the half strophe answering to the thirty-two moræ of the hemistich in the *mātrāsamaka* and *āryāgītī* (the one mora of the sixth foot and two moræ of the eighth foot being special modifications).<sup>1</sup>

### The Distribution of Fancy-Metres in the Great Epic.

The relation of *çloka* and *triṣṭubh*,<sup>2</sup> which in the whole *Mahābhārata* stand numerically in the rough proportion of 95,000 to 5000 (out of 101,900 stanzas or prose equivalents, the sum of the whole), varies enormously from book to book, one *triṣṭubh* to three hundred and ten *çlokas* in the eighteenth book, almost nine hundred *triṣṭubhs* to four thousand *çlokas* in the eighth book, the extremes in absolute number of *triṣṭubhs* as well as in their proportion to *çlokas*.

From reasons quite apart from metre, I have elsewhere maintained that the first part of book i, and book xiii, with the *Harivaṇṣa* were late, as compared with books vii, viii, xii, but that these in their turn contain very late additions to

<sup>1</sup> One may, indeed, take the *çloka* hemistich in the form  $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ ,  $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$  and reckon it in moræ, 15 + 14, as a hemistich of a *mātrāsamaka*, which is as nearly correct, that is as near to a real *samaka*, as are the cases above, where the *pāda* may have 15, 16, or 17 moræ. But I prefer to rest with the fact that the *mātrāsamaka* is a parallel in terms of moræ to the *çloka*-strophe in terms of syllables, without attempting a derivation. For particular studies of the *ganacchandās*, see Professor Cappeller's *Die Ganacchandās*, and Professor Jacobi, *ZDMG.* vol. xxxviii, p. 595 ff. The latter scholar believes the *āryā* to have been a musical adaptation, and to have come into Sanskrit from *Prākṛt* poetry. The metre can be traced back to the time of *Açoka*.

<sup>2</sup> That is *triṣṭubh* and *jagati*. There are just about the same number of *triṣṭubh-jagati* stanzas in the *Mahābhārata* as in the *Rig Veda*.

the original epic, often palpable intrusions.<sup>1</sup> The use of the fancy-metres seems to illustrate the general correctness of my former analysis. Thus the *rucirā* occurs in i, iii, vii, xii, xiii, Hariv.; the *vasantatilakā* only in i, xiii, xviii, Hariv.; the *mālinī* only in vii, viii, xiii, Hariv.; the *āryā* only in xiii, Hariv. The tag-metres of *Ādi* are confined to the first quarter (two thousand) of the eight thousand in the whole book. They cease after *Sarpasattra* (almost after the beginning of *Āstika*), or, in other words, they occur almost entirely in the most modern part of the book. Books ii, v, and vi have no fancy metres at all; book ix has but one, a *bhujāṅgaprayāta*. On the other hand, books iv, x, xi, xiv, xv, xvi, and xvii have none also, which however, need not surprise us much, as most of them are short supplementary books, and the fourteenth is mainly an imitation of the *Gītā*. That the fourth book is not adorned with these metres indicates perhaps that it was written between the time of the early epic and the whole pseudo-epic. The much interpolated eighth book would be comparatively free from these adornments were it not for its massed heaps of *ardhasamavṛttas*, twenty-five in all (otherwise it has only one *ṣāṇḍilavikrīḍita* and five *mālinīs*). The seventh book, on the other hand, has two *drutavilambitas*, nine *rucirās*, one *praharṣiṇī*, one *mālinī*, and eight *ardhasamavṛttas*, — twenty-one in all. The first book, that is, its first quarter, has thirty-one, of which twenty-two are *rucirās*; four, *praharṣiṇīs*; three, *vasantatilakās*; two, *ardhasamavṛttas*. The pseudo-epic shows the greatest variety, as well as of course the greatest number, the books represented (with the exception of one *vasantatilakā* in the eighteenth) being the twelfth, thirteenth, and *Harivaṅṣa*, with 48½, 28½, and 43, respectively.

<sup>1</sup> Compare the paper on the *Bhārata* and Great *Bhārata*, *AJP.*, vol. xix, p. 10 ff. That there are antique parts in books generally late, no one I believe, has ever denied. Nor has any competent critic ever denied that in books generally old late passages are found. *Ādi*, *Vana*, and *Anuṣṣaṇa*, and in a less degree *Karna*, are a hodge-podge of old and new, and the only question of moment is whether in each instance old or new prevails or is subsidiary.

The number of occurrences of each metre, according to the books in which they are found, is given in the following table:

		Cases occurring in books.									
		i	ii	vii	viii	ix	xii	xiii	xviii	Hariv.	Total.
Akṣara	Rathoddhatā . . .	..	..	..	..	..	6½	..	..	..	6½
	Bhujāṅgaprayāta . . .	..	..	..	..	1	2	..	..	..	3
	Drutavilambita . . .	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
	Vāṇivadevī . . . . .	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
	Rucirā . . . . .	22	3	9	..	..	4	3	..	10	51
	Praharsinī . . . . .	4	..	1	..	..	4	1	..	2	12
	Vasantatilakā . . .	3	..	..	..	..	..	3	1	5	12
	Mālinī . . . . .	..	..	1	5	..	..	3	..	2	11
Mātrā	Ārdūlavikrīḍita . . .	..	..	..	1	..	..	3½	..	..	4½
	Puspitāgrā	2	6	8	25	..	31	9	..	22	103
	Aparavaktra										
	Mātrāsamaka										
Gaṇa	Āryā . . . . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	6	..	2	8
Total . . . . .		31	9	21	31	1	48½	28½	1	43	213

How are we to account for these fancy-metres? Let us imagine for a moment—to indulge in rather a harmless fancy—that the whole epic was written by one individual, not of course by Vyāsa the arranger, but by Kṛit the maker, even as the pseudo-epic says; though the latter sets reasonable bounds to the human imagination and very properly adds that the maker of such a poem must have been divine.

This superhuman being, Kṛit (Bhāratakr̥t or better, Mahābhāratakr̥t) must have had from the beginning a well-developed ear for fancy-metres. When he writes them he writes them very carefully, seldom opposing the rules that later

writers, say of 500 A. D. and later, impose upon themselves, except in the case of the *ardhasamavṛttas*. These at one time he writes correctly and another loosely, as if he occasionally failed to grasp the distinction between this class of metres and that of the strict *mātrāchandas*; which is rather peculiar, when one considers how correctly he writes at other times. But, passing this point, how are we to account for the distribution of these metres? Evidently there is only one way. Having started out with the statement that the poem was to glitter with various fancy-metres, the poet first gave an exhibition of what he could do, reserving, however, the more complicated styles for the end of the poem. Then, settling down into the story, he got so absorbed in it that he forgot all about the fancy-metres, till after several thousand stanzas he suddenly remembered them and turned off three *rucirās* and six *ardhasamavṛttas*, e. g., as tags, lauding Īiva's gift and Arjuna's glorious trip to heaven; but then, becoming interested again, again dropped them, while he wrote to the end of the sixth book. With the seventh book, feeling that an interminable series of similar and repeated battle-scenes was getting a little dull, he sprinkled five different kinds of fancy metres over his last production, and in the eighth emptied a box of them in a heap, which lasted till the first part of the poem was complete. On resuming his labors (we are expressly told that he rested before taking up the latter half of the poem) he decided that, as all interest in the story itself was over, the only way to liven up a philosophic encyclopedia would be to adorn it with a good many more fancy-metres, and toward the end he brought out the *āryās*, which he had had concealed all the time, but kept as a final attraction. In this last part also he emptied whole boxes of metres together, just as he had done so desperately in the eighth book.

This seems to me an entirely satisfactory explanation, granting the premiss. But in case one is dissatisfied with the (native) assumption of a homogeneous Homer, one might consider whether it were not equally probable that the present

poem was a gradual accumulation and that fancy-metres were first used as tags<sup>1</sup> to chapters in the later part of the work, as an artistic improvement on the old-fashioned triṣṭubh tag (to śloka sections); and so find the reason why the masses of fancy-metres are placed in the middle of sections in a later exaggeration, a vicious inclination to adorn the whole body with gewgaws, whereas at an earlier date it was deemed a sufficient beauty to tag them on to the end of a section. The only difficulty in this assumption is that it recognizes as valid the delirament of believing in the historical growth of the epic.

As regards the āryā, it makes no difference whether it was a Prākṛit style known before the epic was begun or not. Just as in the case of the Rig Veda, the point is not whether such and such a form existed, but only whether (and if so, in how far) the poets admitted the form into hymns;<sup>2</sup> so here, the question is simply as to when Sanskrit writers utilized Prākṛit melodies. It is somewhat as if one should properly try to define the decade in which a piece of X's music was composed by considering that it was in rag-time. One might object that rag-time melodies have been used for unnumbered decades by the negroes. The reply would be: True; but it is only in the last decade of the nineteenth century that rag-time has been utilized by composers; ergo, X must have published his composition in that decade or later.

When then did the vulgar āryā (i. e., melody used as a

<sup>1</sup> The expression tag-metres answers exactly to the function of the fancy-metres in the Rāmāyaṇa, and pretty closely to their function in the Bhārata. I have indicated above the few cases where in the latter poem they have been inserted in other positions. There can be no serious doubt that such medial position simply shows how late is the passage where are found such stanzas thus located. The bhujangaprayāta appears in medial position in Čānti; the drutavilambita, in Droṇa; where also the rucirā (usually only tag); the praharṣiṇī (medial), only in Droṇa and Čānti; the vasantatilakā, generally a tag, medial only in Anuśāsana; the mālīnī, medial in Karna; the gārdūlavikṛīḍita, medial in both these last.

<sup>2</sup> The all-sufficient answer to the unsatisfactory contention that, because certain Vedic forms are pre-Vedic, therefore their employment by Vedic poets cannot be used in evidence of the age of certain hymns.

frame for literature) appear in Sanskrit poetry? The author of the Rāmāyaṇa, using freely the akṣaracchandās and ardhasamavṛttas as tag-poetry, either knew it not or ignored it. The later poets of the Mahābhārata, doing the same, ignored it also. Only the poets of the latest tracts, the fourteenth section of Anuṣāṣana and benedictions in Harivaṇṣa, used it, whether inventing or utilizing is a subsidiary question. The employment of this metre, if borrowed from the vulgar, stands parallel, therefore, to the adoption of Prākṛit licence in prosody.<sup>1</sup>

Further, the sometime intrusion into the middle of a chapter of metres used originally only as tags, shows that parts of the Mahābhārata reflect a later phase than that of the Rāmāyaṇa, which still confines them to their earlier function. In fact, the Mahābhārata is here on a level with the poems of inscriptions where all metres are flung together,<sup>2</sup> and, like these poems, its later parts show a predilection for long compounds and for long sentences extending over many verses.

The total result of a comparison of the various metres in the two epics shows in outline:

In the Mahābhārata	In the Rāmāyaṇa
(a) early (Vedic) ṣloka early (Vedic) triṣṭubh	
(b) almost classical ṣloka classical triṣṭubh	(b) almost classical ṣloka classical triṣṭubh
(c) late ṣloka stanzas (pure iamb)	(c) early use of fancy metres
late triṣṭubh stanzas (cā- linī)	
late use of fancy metres	

A review of the results obtained in regard to the chief metre of the epic makes it clear that the presence in the

<sup>1</sup> Only xiii, 14 is really affected. The benedictive Harivaṇṣa verses are an addition too late to affect dates. Even the native (Bombay) edition omits them from the text proper.

<sup>2</sup> See on this point, Bühler's essay, *Das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie*, with examples at the end.

Mahābhārata of *çloka*s of an older and also later type than are found in the Rāmāyaṇa indicates not only that the style of the Mahābhārata is more antique in one part than in another, but also that this difference is not due to conscious metrical variations on the part of one poet; or, in other words, that the epic was not made all at once. For the general shape of *çloka*s might voluntarily be shifted, though even here it is not probable that a poet who wrote in the refined style common to the Rāmāyaṇa and to parts of the pseudo-epic Mahābhārata would shift back to diambic close of the prior *pāda* or a free use of the fourth *vipulā*. But even granting this, there remain the subtle differences which are perceptible only with careful and patient study, elements of style not patent to the rough-and-ready critique which scorns analysis. The poet who had trained himself to eschew first *vipulās* after diambics and renounce a syllaba anceps would not write first in this particular style and then in the careless old-fashioned manner. The very presence of the more refined art precludes the presumption that the same poet in the same poem on the same subject would have lapsed back into barbarism. For the distinction is not one that separates moral discourses from the epic story. Except in the case of a few obvious imitations or parodies of *Çruti* texts, topics of the same sort are treated with a difference of style attributable only to different authors and in all reasonable probability to different ages.



The epic in its present form is swollen with many additions, but they are all cast into the shade by the enormous mass added bodily to the epic as didactic books, containing more than twenty thousand stanzas. I have elsewhere fully explained<sup>1</sup> the machinery by which this great appendix was added to the original work through suspending the death of the narrator, and shown that there are many indications left in the epic pointing to the fact that the narrator in the original version was actually killed before he uttered a word of the appendix. As this one fact disposes of the chief feature of that theory of the epic which holds that the work was originally what it is to-day, and as no sufficient answer has been given to the facts adduced, there can be no further question in regard to the correctness of the term pseudo-epic as applied to these parts of the present poem.<sup>2</sup> There has been, so far as I know, no voice heard in favor of the so-called synthetic theory in regard to the nature of these late books, except certain utterances based apparently on a misconception. Thus it has been said, I think, by Professor Oldenburg, that the discovery of the lotus-stalk tale among the early Buddhistic legends tends to show that the epic book where it occurs is antique.<sup>3</sup> On this point this is to be said: No one has ever denied that there are early legends found in the late parts of the epic; but the fact that this or that legend repeated in the pseudo-epic is found in other literature, no matter how old, does nothing toward proving either the antiquity of the book as a whole, which is just what the "synthetic" method contends for, or the antiquity of the epic form of the legend. The story of the Deluge, for example, is older than any Buddhistic monument; but this does not prove that the epic version in the third book is old. The same is true of the

<sup>1</sup> Am. Journ. Phil., xix, p. 7 ff.

<sup>2</sup> In this view I am glad to see that Professor Jacobi, in the review cited above, fully agrees. So also M. Barth, *Journal des Savants*, 1897, p. 448.

<sup>3</sup> I am not sure that I have here cited the well-known Russian savant correctly, as I have seen only a notice of his paper; but I believe the essential point is as given above. The Lotus-Theft, however, perhaps the same story, is alluded to as early as *Alt. Br.* v. 80.

first book, where the pāurāṇī kathā of Khāṇḍava, for example, is a justifiable and instructive title, set as it is in a late book. A special "ancient tale" is just what it is; intruded awkwardly into the continuous later narration, 228, 14-16, but still bearing traces of its heterogeneous character, as I have shown elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> Knowing, as we do, the loose and careless way in which epic texts have been handed down (compare the way in which appear the same passages given in different editions of the same epic or in both epics), and the freedom with which additions were made to the text, we are in such cases historically justified in saying only that certain matter of the epic stands parallel to certain Bhāṣya matter or Buddhistic matter. A tale is found in the epic. Its content is pictured on a stone or found in different form in a Jātaka. What possible guarantee have we that the epic form of the tale is as old as the Jātaka, still less that it is as old as the stone, least of all that the book in which the epic tale appears must as a whole be antique? Only paucity of solid data could make eminent scholars build structures on such a morass.

Having already given an example or two of late features in the pseudo-epic, I would now point to some of the characteristic marks of the later poem in other regards. Mid-way in the development of the epic stands the intrusion of the fourth book, where to fill out an extra year, not recognized in the early epic, the heroes live at court in various disguises. Here the worship of Durgā is prominent, who is known by her Puranic title, mahiṣāsuraṇāṣiṇī, iv, 6, 15, whose "grace gives victory," ib. 30 (though after the intrusion of the hymn nothing further is heard of her). The Durgā here depicted bears a khetaka (as she does when the same hymn is repeated in vi, 23, 7), iv, 6, 4. This word for shield amid innumerable passages describing arms, is unknown in the epic except in connection with Durgā, but it is found in post-epical literature. It stands in the same historical position as does the epithet just mentioned. In these cases we have

<sup>1</sup> *Bhāṣya and Ceylon Bhāṣya*, p. 15.

general evidence of the lateness of the book as well as of the hymn to Durgā. Matter and metre go hand in hand.

A very striking example is given further in the show of arms which are described in this book. Although Arjuna is still a young man, yet, when the exhibitor comes to show his bow, Gāṇḍīva, he says "And this is the world-renowned bow of the son of Pṛthā, which he carried for five-and-sixty years" iv, 43, 1-6. Nothing could be plainer than this passage. The exhibition of arms was composed when the later poet had in mind the actual number of years the hero carried the bow according to the epic story. He forgot that he was composing a scene which was to fit into the hero's young manhood and not into the end of his life. In iv, 71, 15 Arjuna is recognized as still a "dark-featured youth,"<sup>1</sup> and some time after this scene it is expressly stated that it was even then only thirty-three years since the time when Arjuna got the bow, v, 52, 10 (referring to the Khāṇḍava episode, i, 225).<sup>2</sup>

While it is obvious to one who is willing to examine the

<sup>1</sup> Here there is another inconsistency. In iv, 44, 20, instead of being a *gyāmo yuvā* as in 71, 15, he is called Arjuna because of his white steeds and complexion, "which is rare on earth," where the "white" complexion matches steeds and deeds, "pure (white)." In v, 59, 10, Arjuna is also dark.

<sup>2</sup> According to v, 82, 40, and 90, 47 and 70, respectively, the time from the exile to the battle is thirteen years past ("this is the fourteenth"). Ignoring the discrepancy between twelve and thirteen years of exile, we must allow at least twenty-nine years for Arjuna to live before the Khāṇḍava incident, which, added to thirty-three, makes sixty-four, which would be Arjuna's age when "a youth," before the war begins! If, however, we overlook the statement of v, 52, 10, and add the years of exile to twenty-nine, we still get forty-odd years as his life-limit when he has carried the bow sixty-five years. It must be remembered that Arjuna was twenty-four years in exile, twelve years before the dicing and twelve or thirteen after it, and that Abhimanyu was sixteen when the war broke out (forty-four years for Arjuna if he won Drāupadī when he was sixteen, and he could not have been twenty years older at that time). The synthesist may say "How narrow! Poets do not regard such discrepancies," but even poets are generally aware that a hero less than fifty cannot have carried a bow for more than sixty years, especially when he got it at the age of forty or thereabouts! Krishna dies in the thirty-sixth year after the war (xi, 25, 44), which should make Arjuna about thirty at the beginning of the war. This throws a side-light on the intrusion of the twelve-years exile as a brahmachārin, spoken of above."

epic with careful analysis that the Gītā and the thirteenth book, for example, are purely priestly products, and that one of them is on the whole as early as the other on the whole is late,<sup>1</sup> it is not easy to decide what is the relation between these great groups of verses and the heroic epic, with which neither has any inner connection. Nevertheless, although there can be as a result of the inquiry only the historical probability usual in answering the problems of ancient literature, and not such a mathematical quod erat demonstrandum as the synthesist demands, we are not wholly at a loss to reply to this question. In the first place we have a very instructive analogy in the intrusion into both epic texts of an incongruous didactic chapter found both in the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, which bears on its face evidence of its gradual expansion. But even without this evidence it will, I think, be clear even to the synthesist that the same chapter cannot have arisen independently in both epics; so that in this instance we have a plain case of the dynamic intrusion into an epic text of foreign didactic material.<sup>2</sup>

Again, the presence of a huge volume of extraneous additions, containing both legends and didactic stuff, now tagged on to the epic as its nineteenth book and recognized in the last part of the epic itself, is an object-lesson in dynamic expansion which in itself shows how the pseudo-epic may with perfect regard to historic probability be supposed to have been added to the epic proper. The Rāmāyaṇa too is instructive, as it shows that whole chapters have been interpolated, as admitted by its commentator. The great epic itself admits that there is a difference between the main epic and the episodes, in saying that the former is only one-fourth of the whole, and relegating seventy-six of its hundred thousand stanzas to the domain of the episodic epic.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare the chapter on metres.

<sup>2</sup> This chapter is the Kaccit section ii, 5 and R. ii, 100, previously referred to, discussed in detail in AJP. xix, 147 ff.

<sup>3</sup> As an interesting example of the growth of Sanskrit popular poems, Mr. Grierson informs me that there is extant a *vyākhyāna* or *brhad* Vishnu Purāṇa, which contains large additions to the received text.

That the priests developed the epic for their own interests, goes without saying; hence the long chapters of priestly origin on the duty of charity — to priests. That they added legends has already been shown, and the metre still attests the approximate age of a Nala or a Śulabhā episode. But besides didactic and legendary masses, it was necessary, in order to popularize the poem, to keep some sort of proportion between the tale and its tumors. Hence the fighting episodes were increased, enlarged, rewritten, and inserted doubly, the same scene and description occurring in two different places. For this reason, while there is an appreciable difference in the metre of the different episodes which were inserted whole, the fighting scenes are chiefly of one cloka-type, — a type later than that of some of the episodes, but on a par with that of the later didactic and narrative insertions.

Whether the original tale was occupied with the Pandus or not, the oldest heroes are not of this family, and the old Vedic tradition, while it recognizes Bhāratas and Kurus, knows nothing about Pandus. The Kuru form of epic may perhaps be preserved in the verse (restored) of one of the oldest Upanishads, Chānd. Up. iv, 17, 6.

yato yata āvartate tad tad gacchati mānavah  
Kurūn aṇvā 'bhirakṣati,

a gāthā restored by omitting an evident interpolation.<sup>1</sup> The style is like the usual epic turn, e. g., R. vi, 106, 22,

yena yena ratho yāti tena tena pradhāvati.

Nevertheless, a Pandu epic of some sort existed as early as the third century B. C., as is shown by the testimony of Pāṇini and the Jātakas (which may indeed give testimony for an era even later than the third century), though in the latter literature the epic story is not presented as it is in our epic. This takes us from the form to the date of the Mahābhārata.

<sup>1</sup> Compare Müller, SBE. i, p. 71. See also the Sūtra verse on the Kurus' defeat, cited by Professor Ludwig, Abh. Böhm. Ges. 1884, p. 5.

## CHAPTER SIX.

### DATE OF THE EPIC.

FIRST, to define the epic. If we mean by this word the beginnings of epic story, as they may be imagined in the "circling narration," in the original Bhāratī Kathā, or in the early mention of tales of heroes who are also epic characters, the time of this epic poetry may lie as far back as 700 B. C. or 1700 B. C., for aught we know. There are no further data to go upon than the facts that a Bhārata is mentioned in the later Sūtra, that the later part of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa mentions the "circling narration," and that ākhyāna, stories, some in regard to epic personages, told in prose and verse, go back to the early Vedic period.<sup>1</sup> We must be content with Weber's conservative summary: "The Mahābhārata-saga (not the epic) in its fundamental parts extends to the Brāhmaṇa period."<sup>2</sup>

✓ If, on the other hand, we mean the epic as we now have it, a truly synthetical view must determine the date, and we shall fix the time of the present Mahābhārata as one when the sixty-four kalās were known, when continuous iambic pādas were written, when the latest systems of philosophy were recognized, when the trimūrti was acknowledged, when there were one hundred and one Yajur Veda schools, when the sun was called Mihira, when Greek words had become familiar,

<sup>1</sup> On the early prose-poetic ākhyāna of the Vedic and Brahmanic age, compare the essays by von Bradke, *Journal of the German Oriental Society*, xxxvi, p. 474 ff.; and Oldenberg, *ib.* xxxvii, p. 54 ff., and xxxix, p. 52 ff. Ballad recitations, akkhāna, are mentioned in early Buddhistic works, which we may doubtfully assign, as Professor Rhys Davids does undoubtedly, to the fifth century B. C.

<sup>2</sup> *Episches im Vedischen Ritual*, p. 8: Die Mbhārata-Sage reicht somit ihrer Grundlage nach in die Brāhmaṇa Periode hinein.

and the Greeks were known as wise men, when the eighteen islands and eighteen Purāṇas were known, when was known the whole literature down to grammars, commentaries, Dharma-çāstrās, granthas, pustakas, *written* Vedas, and complete MSS. of the Mahābhārata including the Harivaṅṣa. But this is a little too much, and even the inconsistent synthesist, who draws on a large vituperative thesaurus whenever another hints at intrusions into the epic, may well be pardoned for momentarily ceasing to be synthetic and exclaiming with reason *Da liegt doch die Interpolation vor Augen!*<sup>1</sup>

That the complete Mahābhārata, for the most part as we have it to-day, cannot be later than the fourth or fifth century of our era, follows from the fact, brought out first by Professor Bhandārkār and then by Professor Bühler, that it is referred to as a Śāṣṭi in inscriptions dated not much later than this, while by the fifth century at least it was about as long as it is now.<sup>2</sup> But we may go further back and say with comparative certainty that, with the exception of the parts latest added, the introduction to the first book and the last book, even the pseudo-epic was completed as early as 200 A.D. For the Roman denarius is known to the Harivaṅṣa and the Harivaṅṣa is known to the first part of the first book and to the last book (implied also in the twelfth book); hence such parts of these books as recognize the Harivaṅṣa must be later than the introduction of Roman coins into the country (100-200 A.D.); but though coins are mentioned over and over,<sup>3</sup> nowhere, even in the twelfth and thirteenth books, is the denarius alluded to.

<sup>1</sup> Genesis des Mahābhārata, p. 129.

<sup>2</sup> Quite important, on the other hand, is the fact recently emphasized by Dr. Cartellieri, WZ. xiii, p. 69, 1899: "Für Subandhu und Bāṇa war das Mahābhārata . . . kein dharmāçāstra, sondern ein Kāvya," which the poem itself proclaims itself to be, i, 1, 61.

<sup>3</sup> The money recognized is gold and silver "made and unmade" and *niṣkas*, though chests of precious metal are mentioned and a great deal of money is found when excavating for treasure (perhaps near Taxila). When the realm is prosperous the soldier's pay is "not copper." For references to money, coins, etc., see ii, 61, 2, 8, 20-30; iii, 15, 22; 255, 17; iv, 18, 18; 22, 10; 38, 43; xii, 323, 46 (threefold test of gold); xiv, 65, 20 (amount of treasure). On the

Another interesting item is contributed by the further negative evidence afforded in the matter of copper-plate grants. Gifts to priests are especially urged in the Anuṣāsana, and the gift of land above all is praised in the most extravagant terms. We know that by the second century of our era, and perhaps earlier, such gifts to priests were safeguarded by copper-plate grants, bearing the technical name of paṭṭa (paṭa) or tāmrapaṭṭa, and elaborate instructions for their making are given in the law-book of Nārada and Vishnu, while they are mentioned in the code of Yājñavalkya, but not before; for Manu, though he mentions the boundary-line being "recorded," nibaddha, has no suggestion of plate-grants. The epic, however, at least the pseudo-epic, speaks of writing down even the Vedas, and recognizes rock-inscriptions, but in the matter of recorded grants to priests says nothing at all; much less does it recognize such a thing as a tāmrapaṭṭa. The only terms used are parigraha and agraḥāra, but the latter, which is very rare, is never used in the sense of a land-grant, though grāmāgraḥāra occurs once in the later epic, xv, 14, 14. Even the general ṣāsana is never so employed.<sup>1</sup> It is true that this negative evidence does not prove the epic to have been completed before the tāmrapaṭṭa was known; but on the other hand, it is unlikely, were the tāmrapaṭṭa the usual means of clinching a bhūmidāna when the Anuṣāsana was composed, that this mode would have passed unnoticed,

conquest of Takṣaṣilā, see i, 3, 20. According to ii, 61, 20, the soldier's pay is "a thousand a month," here presumably copper.

<sup>1</sup> Legal documents appear first in Vas. Dh. S., xvi, 10, 15, under the name lekḥita. Probably the first deeds were written on cloth or boards, phalaka, as a board-copy precedes the rock-inscription, ASWI, iv, p. 102. The epic has picture-pata, as in xv, 32, 20, dadṛṣe citraṃ paṭagatam yathā (āṇḍarya-bhūtam) and often. Rock-inscriptions are mentioned only in xiii, 139, 43, citraṃ tiṣṭhati medinyām cāle lekhyam ivā 'rpitam. Written Vedas are alluded to only ib. 23, 72. Seals are used as passports, iii, 15, 19. Compare also ii, 55, 10, na lekhyam na ca mātṛkā; v, 148, 23, citrakāra ivā 'lekhyam kṛtvā; ib. 189, 1, "lekhya and other arts;" vii, 99, 7, nāmāṅkitāḥ (compare above, p. 205), of arrows. The conjunct gaṇakālekḥakāḥ occurs only in xv, 14, 8, and in the verse of the Kaccit section, ii, 5, 72, which is a subsequent addition even to this late chapter; AJP., xix, p. 149.



and we may conclude that the gift-sections of this book were at least as old as the oldest copper-plate grants to priests.<sup>1</sup>

The time of the whole Mahābhārata generally speaking may then be from 200-400 A. D. This, however, takes into account neither subsequent additions, such as we know to have been made in later times, nor the various recastings in verbal form, which may safely be assumed to have occurred at the hands of successive copyists.

For the terminus a quo, the external<sup>2</sup> evidence in regard to the Pandu epic, Mahābhārata, though scanty, is valuable. It shows us first that the Mahābhārata is not recognized in any Sanskrit literary work till after the end of the Brāhmaṇa period, and only in the latest Sūtras, where it is an evident intrusion into the text. For the Grhya Sūtras belong to the close of the Sūtra period, and here the words Bhārata and Mahābhārata occur in a list of authors and works as substitutes for the earlier mention of Itihāsa and Purāṇa in the same

<sup>1</sup> The verse xii, 56, 52, which the author of Das Mahābhārata als Epos und Rechtsbuch, p. 187, adduces to prove that written deeds were known, is given by him without the context. When this is examined it is found that the verse refers not to land but to a king's realm. Neither does the text nor the commentator necessarily (as asserted, loc. cit.) make it refer to land-grants. The word used is *viśaya*, a king's realm or country (as in xiv, 32, 8) and the poet says that ministers who are given too much liberty "rend the king's realm by counterfeits" (or falsifications). The situation and the analogy of 59, 49, and 69, 22, and 100, 6, where general deceit and dissension are the means employed to destroy a realm, make it most probable that the word *pratirūpaka* is used here to distinguish the forged laws and edicts of the usurping ministers from the true laws which the helpless king would enact. Such suppression of the king and substitution of false edicts are thoroughly Oriental, and may easily be illustrated by the use of this very word, *pratirūpaka*, in the Lotus of True Law, where *pratirūpaka* means just such "false laws" substituted for the real king's true laws (iii, 22; SBE., xxi, p. 68, note, with Iranian parallel). The commentator says "corrupt the country by false edict-documents," that is, he gives a general application to the words, which may be interpreted as referring to land-grants, but this is not necessary. Possible would be the later law-meaning of frauds of any kind, perhaps counterfeit money. Certain it is that the passage is not "a direct proof for forged documents," still less for "false documents by means of which any one gets land."

<sup>2</sup> Cis-indic evidence is negative and without weight. Megasthenes, c. 300 B. C., has left no fragment on Hindu epics, and the source of Dio Chrysostomos (100 A. D.), who mentions a Hindu Homer, is unknown.

place, so recent a substitution in fact that some even of the latest of these Sūtras still retain Itihāsa and Purāṇa. But when the words do actually occur they are plainly additions to the earlier list. Thus in Çāṅkhāyana iv, 10, 13, the list is Sumantu, Jāimini, Vāiṣampāyana, Pāila, the Sūtras, the Bhāṣya, Gārgya, etc., with no mention of the epic. But the Aṣvalāyana text, iii, 4, 4, inserts the epic thus: Sumantu, Jāimini, Vāiṣampāyana, Pāila, the Sūtras, the Bhāṣya, *the Bhārata, the Mahābhārata, dharmācāryas, Jānanti, Bāhavi, Gārgya, etc.* The next step is taken by the Çāmbavya text, which does not notice the Bhārata and recognizes only the Mahābhārata (whereas some texts make even the Aṣvalāyana Sūtra omit Mahābhārata altogether, reading Bhārata-dharmācāryāḥ). When it is remembered that these and other lists of literature are not uncommon in the Sūtras, and that nowhere do we find any other reference to the Mahābhārata, it becomes evident that we have important negative testimony for the lateness of the epic in such omission, which is strengthened by the evidently interpolated mention of the poem, withal in one of the latest Sūtras.<sup>1</sup>

Patañjali, it may be admitted, recognizes a Pandu epic in the verse, asidvītyo 'nusasāra Pāṇḍavam, and in his account of the dramatic representation of the sacred legend, indissolubly connected with the tale.<sup>2</sup> This takes us at farthest back to the second century; but this date (p. 56) is doubtful.

(Pāṇini knows the names of the epic heroes, and recognizes the Arjuna-Krishna cult in giving a derivative meaning "worshipper of Arjuna" (Krishna). He also, which is more important, recognizes the name Mahābhārata.) It cannot reasonably be claimed, I think, that this name does not refer to the epic. It stands, indeed, beside mahā-Jātāla, and might (as masculine) be supposed from this circumstance to mean "the

<sup>1</sup> That these lists, anyway, are not of cogent historical value, has lately been emphasized by Dr. Winternitz in his last review of Dahlmann. They certainly cannot help in dating the epic before the fourth century. The intrusion of the genus itihāsa-purāṇa into such lists is illustrated even in the Upanishads. Compare Mānd. Up. i, 8, with the note at SBE., xv, p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Weber, IS., i, pp. 147-149; xiii, pp. 356-357.

great descendant of Bharata," yet not only do other words in the list show that this is not necessary, but further, there is no instance, either in the epic itself or in outside literature, where Mahābhārata means a man, or where it does not mean the epic. In this particular, therefore, as it gives me pleasure to state, I believe that the Rev. Mr. Dahlmann is right, and that Pāṇini knew an epic called the Mahābhārata. That he knew it as a Pandu epic may reasonably be inferred from his mentioning, e. g., Yudhiṣṭhira, the chief hero of the epic.<sup>1</sup>

But no evidence has yet been brought forward to show conclusively that Pāṇini lived before the third century B. C.

Again, it is one thing to say that Pāṇini knew a Pandu Mahābhārata, but quite another to say that his epic was our present epic. The Pandu epic as we have it represents a period subsequent not only to Buddhism 500 B. C., but to the Greek invasion 300 B. C. Buddhistic supremacy already decadent is implied by the passages (no synthesist may logically disregard them) which allude contemptuously to the eḍukas or Buddhistic monuments as having ousted the temples of the gods. Thus in iii, 190, 65, "They will revere eḍukas, they will neglect the gods;" ib. 67, "the earth shall be piled with eḍukas,<sup>2</sup> not adorned with god-houses." With such expressions may be compared the thoroughly Buddhistic epithet, cāturmahārājika, in xii, 339, 40, and Buddhistic philosophy as expounded in the same book. More important than this evidence, however, which from the places where it is found may all belong to the recasting of the epic, is the architecture,<sup>3</sup> which is of stone and metal and

<sup>1</sup> He mentions him not as a Pandu but only as a name, like Gaviṣṭhira; to distinguish the name from the expression (e. g. R. vi, 41, 65) yudhi sthiraḥ, I presume.

<sup>2</sup> Lassen, loc. cit., p. 400. So, iii, 188, 56, vihāra; 49, pāṣāṇḍa; 67, seven suns; all found in one place (p. 88). See final notes.

<sup>3</sup> Buddhistic buildings with wooden fences and walls of brick and stone are alluded to in Cull. vi, 8, 8. In connection with this subject it must be remembered that even the late Gṛhya Sūtras in giving directions for house-building know only wooden thatched houses. The Greek account states that the Hindus used only mud, wood, and brick. This makes it improbable that wood architecture had almost disappeared in the third century.

is attributed in all the more important building operations to the demon Asura or Dānava Maya, who, by his magic power,<sup>1</sup> builds such huge buildings as are described, immense moated palaces with arches and a roof supported by a thousand pillars. There is in India no real architecture that goes back of the Buddhistic period, and of both Buddhistic and Jain architecture the remains are distinctly influenced by Greek models.<sup>2</sup>

The Greeks are described as a western people (northwestern, with Kāmbojas), famous as fighters, wearing especially fine metal armor, and their overthrow is alluded to. The allies engaged in the epic battles are not only native princes but also Greek kings and Persians, who come out of the West to the war. In one passage the Greeks are described as "all-knowing," though I think this to be a late interpolated chapter.<sup>3</sup> But *rāṣi*, iii, 190, 90, surely implies the zodiac.

But even if the passage mentioning all-knowing Greeks be an interpolation, the fact that the "Greeks," who must here be the real Greeks, bear the name Yavanas, shows that the

<sup>1</sup> So the great walls and palaces of Patna, which are especially mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya, are attributed by tradition to demoniac power (Fa-Hien), and the great architecture of Mathurā is also ascribed to superhuman power. On Maya's māyā, to which is attributed the most extensive building, compare ii, 1; v, 100, 1-2; viii, 33, 17 (Asura cities); R. iv, 51, 10. It is possible that the Benares ghāts are referred to in vii, 60, 1 (Gaṅgā) cayanāḥ kāñcanāḥ citā. "Golden" buildings may be only gilded wood (as they are to-day). Plated stone is mentioned in ii, 3, 32. Old Patna's noble "walls and palaces" are now unfortunately under the Ganges, in all probability.

<sup>2</sup> The cāitya and stūpa mounds (only R. has a cāityaprasāda, v, 43, 3), like the caves, are not to be compared with roofed palaces of stone and marble. A statue of iron is mentioned, āyaso Bhīmah, xi, 12, 15; iron bells in temples, xii, 141, 32. In ii, 4, 21-22, the Greeks are compared to Kālakeya Asuras. Here, along with the king of Kāmboja, is mentioned one king, (the) Kampana, "who was the only man that ever frightened, kamp, the Yavanas, (men) strong, heroic, and skilled in weapons. Like as Indra frightened the Kālakeya Asuras, so" (K. frightened the Greeks). Compare also Kālayavana who had the Garga-glory (p. 15) in xii, 340, 95, Weber, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup> Compare ii, 14, 14; iii, 254, 18; xii, 101, 1 ff.; Ruling Caste, p. 305; viii, 45, 36, sarvajñā Yavanāḥ, in the expansion of the preceding vituperative section, where from hanta bhūyo bravīmi te, in 45, 1, Karna bursts out again in new virulence, which looks almost too much like a later adornment.

Yavanas elsewhere mentioned<sup>1</sup> are also Greeks and not some other people exclusively. It is a desperate resort to imagine that, in all these cases, well-known names refer to other peoples, as the synthesist must assume in the case of the Greeks, Bactrians, Persians, Huns, and other foreigners mentioned frequently throughout the poem. A further well-known indication of Greek influence is given by the fact that the Kṣudrakas and Mālavas were united into one nation for the first time by the invasion of Alexander,<sup>2</sup> and that they appear thus united under the combined name kṣudrakamālavās in the epic, ii, 52, 15. The Romans, Romakas, are mentioned but once, in a formal list of all possible peoples, ii, 51, 17 (cannibals, Chinese, Greeks, Persians, Scythians, and other barbarians), and stand thus in marked contrast to the Greeks and Persians, Pahlavas, who are mentioned very often; though in the account of Krishna killing the Yavana whose name was Kaserumat, iii, 12, 32, it has been suggested by Weber that the name was really of Latin origin. It is clear from this that, while the Greeks were familiar, the Romans were as yet but a name. Further, the distinct prophecy that "Scythians, Greeks, and Bactrians will rule unrighteously in the evil age to come" (kali-age), which occurs in iii, 188, 35, is too clear a statement to be ignored or explained away. When this was written the peoples mentioned had already ruled Hindustan. If this were the only place where the names occurred, the Mārkaṇḍeya episode, it might be regarded as part of an interpolation in mass. But the people here described as foreign oppressors are all mentioned repeatedly as barbarians and warriors, associated generally, as in the passage just mentioned, with other peoples of the West, such as Abhīras and Kāmbojas. Thus in iii, 51, 23, "Singhalese, Barbaras and barbarians,"<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Yavanas or Yāunas (xii, 207, 42-3), i. e., Ionians. So Jacobi, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup> Lassen, Ind. Alt. ii, pp. 169-171; Weber, Ind. Stud. xiii, p. 375.

<sup>3</sup> That is both the Hindu and native name for Ceylon, and the Greek and Hindu name for barbarian! Siṅhalān Barbarān Mlecchān ye ca Laṅkānivāsinaḥ. The word barbarās (= αἱ βάρβαροι) occurs in both epics but not in literature of an earlier date. Weber, Ind. Lit., p. 237, note, calls attention

and the inhabitants of *Laṅkā*” are grouped together, in contrast to the “Western realms, those of the Persians, Greeks, and Scythians” (with the folk of Kashmeer, Daradas, *Kirātas*, Huns, Chinese, *Tuṣāras*, Indus-dwellers, etc.). So in xii, 207, 43, opposed to sinners of the South, are the Northern sinners, Greeks (*Yāunas*), *Kāmbojans*, Kandahar-people (*Gāndhāras*), *Kirātas* and Barbaras, who are here said to be wandering over this earth from the time of the *Tretā* age, having customs like those of wild animals or of the lowest castes.

Such allusions as these can mean only this: the *Pandu-Epic*, in its present form, was composed after the Greek invasion.<sup>1</sup> I have suggested above that the form of the name *Bactrian* does not compel us to accept Professor Weber’s conclusions in regard to the date of passages now containing this form. If this seems inconclusive, there is nothing for it but to refer the epic in its present form to a post-Christian era. But even otherwise, the presence of the Greeks and *Bactrians* as warriors and rulers in India cannot be explained out of the poem by a loose reference to the fact that India had heard of *Yavanas* before Alexander.

This brings us to another point of view. A stanza following the one last cited proclaims that “even *Nārada* recognizes *Krishna*’s supremacy,” an utterance<sup>2</sup> which points clearly to a comparatively recent belief in *Krishna* as *All-god*, a point long recognized. On the basis of the *Arjuna* cult implied by *Pāṇini*, the synthesist urges that the whole epic, in its present *Smṛti* form and with its belief in the all-godhead of the *Krishna-Arjuna* pair, is as old as the fifth century B. C. But even if an *Arjuna* cult were traced back to this date, to this constant union of Greek with other Western peoples in other literature as well. The name was extended to Indo-Scythians and later even to Persians and Arabians. Weber, loc. cit.

<sup>1</sup> As has long ago been suggested, of the Greeks mentioned in the epic among the allied forces, *Bhagadatta* may be *Apollodotus* the founder of the Græco-Indian kingdom (180 B. C.). Weber, *Ind. Lit.*, p. 204 ff. This Greek is especially mentioned not only as “ruler of the *Yavanas*,” but as the friend of the epic hero’s father, that is, as known to an older generation, ii, 14, 15; von Schroeder, *Lit. und Cultur*, p. 468 (with other references).

\* *Narado* ‘py *atha Kṛṇasya param mene . . . cāvatattvam*, xii, 207, 48.

there would still be no evidence in regard to the cult of the twain as All-god. And this is the claim of the present epic, except where, as in the case just cited, incredulity is involuntarily manifested or plainly stated (as in the reviling scene in *Sabhā*). The *Gītā* itself admits that those who worship Krishna as the All-god, or recognize him, are few in number: *vāsudevaḥ*<sup>1</sup> *sarvam iti sa mahātmā sudurlabhaḥ*, 7, 19; "Me (as All-god) in human form, not recognizing my godhead, fools despise," 9, 11. The *Mahābhāṣya* does not recognize Krishna as All-god, but as hero and demigod. The cult is growing even in the epic itself. So, too, no *Smṛti*<sup>2</sup> can be implied by Pāṇini's words.<sup>3</sup>

I come now to the testimony of Buddhistic literature. As said above, the oldest literature knows only ballad tales. It may be assumed that the *Jātakas* are older than *Aṣṭvaghosa*, who knows epic tales, but not always in epic form, and does not refer to the epic either by name or by implication, his general *āgama* being, as I have shown, a term used of any traditional literature, sacred or profane.<sup>4</sup> The *Jātakas* may

<sup>1</sup> Mathurā in the whole epic is the birthplace of Vāsudeva, who seems to herd his cattle there; while in the *Mahābhāṣya* it is *bahu-Kurucarā Mathurā* and the chief city of the *Pañcālas*, clearly the older view. See ii, 14, 34, 45 ff.; xii, 340, 90; i, 221, 46 (*cows, māthuradeṣyāḥ*); IS. xiii, p. 379 ff.; on Krishna as *not* Vishnu in the *Bhāṣya*, ib., pp. 349, 353. In ii, 14, Krishna (as All-god?) "could not injure his foe even in three hundred years," 36 and 67.

<sup>2</sup> The state of mind that in the face of the "evidence" of Pāṇini can lead one to say *Pāṇini was acquainted with a Pandu-Mahābhārata peculiarly didactic* (Das *Mbh.* als *Rechtsbuch*, p. 155) is inconceivable. The whole "evidence" at its most evincing is that Pāṇini knew a *Mahābhārata* in which the heroes were objects of such worship as is accorded to most Hindu heroes after death.

<sup>3</sup> So the later *Itāmāyaṇa* is turning into just such a moral and didactic work as the other epic. I have already instanced the intrusion of the *Kaccit* section. So *Rāma*, in vii, 55, 3, sets himself to telling homilies, with a familiar sound, *kathām paramadharmīṣṭhām vyāhartum upacakrame* (just as in xv, 29, 14, *kathā divyā dharmīṣṭhāḥ cā bhavan, nṛpa*); and R. ib. 37, 24, *kathāḥ kathayante dharmaśamyuktāḥ purāṇajñāir mahātmabhiḥ*. In the same way, the late (gradual) identification of *Rāma* with Vishnu stands parallel to the change of the demigod Krishna to the All-god Vishnu, for Krishna is never mortal — there is no such antithesis — but he nevertheless is often not supreme god but only demigod in the epic.

<sup>4</sup> Use of law-rules in epic language, e. g., *ṣiṣṭāḥ ṣāstreṣv anāgatam vyavahāryam rājānaṁ dharmam*, R. iii, 50, 9 (G. has *nayaṣāstreṣu*).

go back to the third or fourth century, or they may not, so far as their present form is concerned. At any rate, they show no knowledge of the epic as such. What they show (the material has been sufficiently collected by the Rev. Mr. Dahlmann) is that the epic characters were familiar and the story of the Pandus was known, although the characters do not occupy the position they do in the epic.<sup>1</sup> But no date of an epic, still less of our epic, can be established on casual references to the heroes of the epic found in literature the date of which is entirely uncertain. Perhaps it is negatively quite as significant that the Jātakas do not refer to the epic at all, but only to people mentioned in it.

The present epic, if it records anything historical, records the growth of a great power in Hindustan, a power that could not have arisen before Buddhistic supremacy without leaving a trace of the mighty name of Pandu in the early literature. There is no such trace. Moreover, even the idea of such a power as our epic depicts was unknown before the great empire that arose under Buddhism. For this reason it is impossible to explain the Pandu realm described in the epic as an allegory of the fifth century, for we cannot have an allegory in unknown terms. The Pandus, be it remembered, rule all India, and the limits of their empire, as geographically defined in the epic, far surpass the pre-Açoka imagination, as it is reflected in the literature. Even Manu has no idea of an empire. His king is a petty rāj.<sup>2</sup>

Before the Mahābhārata there were tales of Kurus and Bharats known to antiquity. Incongruous as the name appears to be, Bhārata yet designates the Pandu epic. How

<sup>1</sup> The latter point proves nothing, for even in Sanskrit literature, as I pointed out long ago, the heroes of the two epics are mixed up confusedly, and we cannot suppose a Buddhist would be more careful than a Brahman in verifying references to Brahmanic literature.

<sup>2</sup> "Great kings" and "emperors" are indeed known even in pre-Buddhist times, but what was the "empire" of any king before Açoka? Certainly not that of the Pandus. It is significant, in view of the great importance laid by some scholars on the cakravartin idea, that this word does not occur before the later Upanishads, although "great kings" are mentioned; nor is it an early epic phrase.



the Pandus succeeded in attaching themselves to the tales which told of the old national heroes is unknown. All theories and hypotheses of development are pure guesswork. What we know is that the tales which told of Kurus and Bhāratas became the depository of the Pandus, who appear to have substituted themselves for Bhāratas<sup>1</sup> and may in fact have been a branch of the tribe, which from a second-rate position raised itself to leadership. There is a theory that the epic story has been inverted, in favor of the Pandus; there is another that it is what it pretends to be, the strife of Pandus, calling themselves Bhāratas, with the scions of the old Kurus. With the former, that so persuasively advanced by Professor Holtzmann, I have never been able to agree; but my own theory I have from the beginning put forward merely as one of probable epic growth.<sup>2</sup>

While, however, it is necessary to recognize the doubtful character of speculation in regard to the exact course of epic development, it is not desirable to blink the truths that are made clear in view of the facts we actually possess, the evidence of remaking, the base of the poem resting on old Kurus and Bhāratas, the present structure of Pandu material; the age of the Pandu poem as a whole (synthetically considered), evinced inter alia by its recognition of late philosophical writers such as Pāṇinī (c. 100 A.D.), by a growing modernness of metre, by acquaintance with Greeks and Greek art, etc.

Putting these facts together with those gleaned from other works than the epic itself, we may tentatively assume as approximate dates of the whole work in its different stages: Bhārata (Kuru) lays, perhaps combined into one, but with no evidence of an epic before 400 B. C. A Mahābhārata tale

<sup>1</sup> The Bhārati Kathā (never "Pandu-tale"), as the received name of the epic, certainly favors this view.

<sup>2</sup> This I was careful to point out at its first presentation in my *Ruling Caste* (now nearly fifteen years ago) with *mays* and *mights* and *seems*, and other useful words. As a theory I still consider this the best yet offered, but I have never held it to be demonstrable, only more or less probable, in outline and detail respectively.

with Pandu heroes, lays and legends combined by the Puranic diaskeuasts, Krishna as a demigod (no evidence of didactic form or of Krishna's divine supremacy), 400-200 B. C. Re-making of the epic with Krishna as all-god, intrusion of masses of didactic matter, addition of Puranic material old and new; multiplication of exploits, 200 B. C. to 100-200 A. D. The last books added with the introduction to the first book, the swollen Anuṣāsana separated from Cānti and recognized as a separate book, 200 to 400 A. D.; and finally 400 A. D. + : occasional amplifications, the existence of which no one acquainted with Hindu literature would be disposed antecedently to doubt, such as the well known addition mentioned by Professor Weber, *Lectures on Literature*, p. 205; and perhaps the episode omitted by Kṣemendra,<sup>1</sup> *Indian Studies*, No. ii, p. 52.

In the case of these more precise dates there is only reasonable probability. They are and must be provisional till we know more than we know now. But certain are these four facts:

1, That the Pandu epic as we have it, or even without the masses of didactic material, was composed or compiled after the Greek invasion; 2, That this epic only secondarily developed its present masses of didactic material; 3, That it did not become a specially religious propaganda of Krishnaism (in the accepted sense of that sect of Vaiṣṇavas) till the first century B. C.; 4, That the epic was practically completed by 200 A. D.; 5, That there is no "date of the epic" which will cover all its parts (though handbook makers may safely assign it in general to the second century B. C.).

The question whether the epic is in any degree historical

<sup>1</sup> We cannot, however, be too cautious in accepting the negative evidence of one mañjarī, or précis, as proof that the original work lacked a certain passage. I dissent altogether from the sweeping statement, made loc. cit., p. 27: "The importance of the condensations lies in the fact that by means of them we are enabled to determine the state of these works (epics, etc.) in his (Kṣemendra's) time." Two or three compendia agreeing on one point of omission might "determine," but one résumé alone can only create a possibility, as in this case (p. 53 note).

seems to me answerable, though not without doubt, and I cannot refrain from expressing an opinion on a point so important. As I have remarked above, there is no reflex of {Pandu glory in Brahmanic literature before the third or fourth century.† It is, further, impossible to suppose that during the triumph of Buddhism such a poem could have been composed for the general public for which it was intended.) The metre of the poem shows that its present form is later than the epic form of Patañjali's epic verses, but this indicates simply re-casting; so that a Pandu Mahābhārata may have existed previously, as implied by Pāṇini. But while a Buddhist emperor was alive no such Brahmanic emperor as that of the epic could have existed, no such attacks on Buddhism as are in the epic could have been made, and the epic of to-day could not have existed before the Greeks were personally familiar. In other words, granted a history, that history must have been composed at least as late as the history was possible. {Pāṇini's allusions and those of Buddhist writers show that the Pandus were known as heroes.) It is, further, most improbable that the compilers, who made the poem represent Pandu virtues and victories, would have chosen them for this position had they been mythical. In their reassertion of Brahmanism they would have chosen rather the well-known ancient Brahmanic heroes of the older tale, Bhārati Kathā; yet to appeal to the people something real and near was necessary. But while before the second century the conditions were lacking which could have produced the poem, with the second century they became possible;<sup>1</sup> and there was already the Pandu tribe

<sup>1</sup> As this book goes to press I receive Kirste's essay *Zur Mahābhārata-frage*, who says, p. 224, "It is incredible that the work could have been undertaken so long as a royal family favoring that sect (of Buddhists) reigned. This (state of affairs) suddenly changed when the Maurya dynasty (of Brāhadratha) was overthrown by Puṣyamitra in 178 B. C., for the new ruler opposed the Buddhists." Professor Kirste thinks, indeed, that the polyandry of the heroes is not an historical trait, and gives a very ingenious explanation of it as a myth of divided divinity, which, however, scarcely seems to me probable. But I am glad to find my own suggestion, of the improbability of the anti-Buddhist epic being cast in its present shape before the second century B. C., supported by this independent reference to actual historical data.

with its perhaps justified claim to be considered a branch of the Bhāratas, its own later heroes, its cult of anti-Buddhistic type. (In so far, then, as we may discern a historical germ in the midst of poetic extravagance, it would seem that the poem represents an actual legend of a real tribe, and in so far as that legend persists in its adherence to polyandry as an essential part of the legend, a tribe which, like so many others in India, had been brahmanized and perhaps become allied by marriage to the old Bhārata tribe, whose legends were thus united with its own).

Finally, I would speak shortly of the poem as a literary product of India. In what shape has epic poetry come down to us? A text that is no text, enlarged and altered in every recension, chapter after chapter recognized even by native commentaries as *prakṣipta*, in a land without historical sense or care for the preservation of popular monuments, where no check was put on any reciter or copyist who might add what beauties or polish what parts he would, where it was a merit to add a glory to the pet god, where every popular poem was handled freely and is so to this day. Let us think ourselves back into the time when the reciter recited publicly and dramatically; let us look at the battle scenes, where the same thing is repeated over and over, the same event recorded in different parts of the poem in slightly varying language. The Oriental, in his half-contemptuous admission of epic poetry into the realm of literature, knows no such thing as a definitive epic text. The Vedas and the classics are his only real care. A Bhāratavid in India is even now more scorned than honored.

If the epic as a whole belongs to no one era, and this remains an incontrovertible fact, it is then in the highest degree probable also that no one part of the whole can be assigned to a certain period. I mean, not only must we admit that old books contain more recent insets, as for example chapters five and eleven of book ii, and that late books contain old passages, as for example the rape of Subhadrā and the burning of Khāṇḍava in book i, or the lotus-theft in book

xiii, but we must admit further that the smaller divisions, these special scenes themselves, have in all probability not remained untouched, but that the tale, the language, and the verse of the epic have been subjected to an evening process irregularly applied since first the poem was put together as a *Mahābhārata*; great liberty being taken with the poem both by reciters and copyists, the establishment of the text by commentaries (noticed as early as the introductory chapter of the poem itself) proving no bar to occasional alterations and additions. Such changes were not introduced of set purpose (or the metre would have been made more uniform), but incidentally and illogically. The same tale was told not in identical language but with slight variations; intrusions were not shunned; grammatical and metrical forms were handled freely, but with no thorough revision of form or sustained attempt at harmonizing incongruities of statement. It is for this reason that there is not a still sharper metrical line between old and new in the epic itself, and it is for this reason that the epic verses of the *Mahābhāṣya* are freer than those of the *Mahābhārata*. The former were fixed by their function as examples in a grammar; the latter were exposed to constant though sporadic modification, and appear to-day as they survive after having endured the fret and friction of innumerable reciters and pedantic purists. One by one, and here and there, the transmitters, working neither in concert nor continuously, but at haphazard and at pleasure, have trimmed this mighty pile into a shape more uniform, though they have not altogether hid its growth, except from eyes that, seeing the whole as a thing of power and beauty, are perhaps less apt to mark the signs of varying age.

But if this be so, it may be asked, and I think it will be asked, perhaps triumphantly, by those lacking in sobriety of judgment, what becomes of the results of the analysis of metres, of the discovery of late elements in this or that section? What do they signify?

They signify and proclaim that the Great Epic was completed in just the way the synthesist proclaims it was not

completed. Pitched together and patched together, by the diaskeuasts and priests respectively, the older parts, though not free from rehandling, bear a general stamp of antiquity lacking in later parts. For this reason, the *Gītā* and Gambling scene are, as wholes, metrically and stylistically more antique than are the *Anugītā* and the extravaganzas in the battle-books; and for this reason, the pseudo-epic comes nearest in syntax and forms to the hybrid language that is preserved in literary monuments immediately preceding and following the Christian era. But it is true that no one can prove the relative antiquity of the *Gītā* and Gambling scene so absolutely as to prevent one devoid of historical sense from clinging to the notion that these parts of the epic are in origin synchronous with the pseudo-epic. Fortunately, however, the judgment of scholars is in general sane, and the determination of values may safely be left in their care.

## APPENDIX A.

### PARALLEL PHRASES IN THE TWO EPICS.

[M. is prefixed to Mbh. references only where confusion with R. is possible.]

- 1, acireṇāi 'va kālena, ix, 2, 58; R. v, 26, 23; vi, 61, 20; acireṇa tu, R. ii, 80, 11.  
atitāyām, No. 94.
- 2, atha dīrghasya kālasya, iii, 70, 1; v, 160, 20; R. iv, 9, 17; vii, 99, 14; atha dīrghena kālena, G. vi, 24, 3; R. vii, 24, 5, 72; tato dīrghena kālena, M. ix, 1, 50; sa tu dīrghena k., ib. 48; 36, 10; atha kālena mahatā, G. i, 40, 16 = R. 38, 19, v. l., atha dīrghena kālena; atha k. m., also G. i, 40, 22 = R., 38, 23, tataḥ kālena mahatā. See above, p. 271.  
atha rātryām, No. 94.  
athā 'nyad dhanur, No. 56, and No. 80.
- 3, anayad Yamasādanam, vi, 54, 81; vii, 19, 15; G. iii, 34, 31; 75, 28. See No. 225.
- 4, anastamgata āditye, vii, 145, 19; acc., G. v, 3, 41 (in R. iv, 67, 15, anastamitam).  
anyat kārmukam, No. 80.  
anyonyavadha°, No. 157.
- 5, abhidudrāva vegena, vi, 100, 49; 104, 34-35, etc.; R. vi. 69, 99; 76, 46. See No. 97.
- 6, abhivādaye tvā(m) bhagavan, iii, 207, 13; R. iii, 11, 72.
- 7, amṣyamāṇas taṁ ghoṣam (tat karma), etc., H. iii, 60, 3; R. vi, 67, 142; 69, 141, etc.
- 8, alātacakrapratimā(m), iv, 61, 9; R. iv, 46, 13; vi, 93, 28.  
The first and last refer to weapons, R. iv, 46, 13 to earth, pṛthivī, alātacakrapratimā dr̥ṣṭā goṣpadavat kṛtā.
- 9, alātacakravat sāinyam tadā 'bhramata, viii, 81, 40; alātacakravac cakram bhramato 'rinirvāhaṇam (sic!) G. iv, 5, 25.  
Compare, of persons, vi, 59, 22; vii, 7, 53; xiv, 77, 30.

- 10, *avaplutya rathāt tūrṇam*, vi, 94, 22; 96, 39; G. vi, 18, 47; *avatīrya*, G. vi, 36, 87; *rathād avaplutya tataḥ*, M. vi, 59, 99, etc. For other forms, see AJP. xix., p. 143.
- 11, *avasīdanti*, me *prāṇāḥ*, iv, 61, 12; *pariśīdanti* me *prāṇāḥ*, G. vi, 82, 6 = R. 101, 6, *avasīdanti gātrāṇi*.
- 11 b, *açokaḥ çokanāçauaḥ*, iii, 64, 107; *açokaḥ çokavardhanaḥ*, R., iv, 1, 59.  
*açvānām khura°* No. 247.
- 12, *astrāṇi vividhāni ca*, vii, 7, 1; *çastrāṇi*, R. vi, 103, 29. The terminal is fixed, *vasūni*, *vastrāṇi*, *bhāṇḍāni*, etc., preceding, e. g., ix, 47, 24;  
*asmin hate*, No. 328.  
*ākarna*, No. 170.
- 13, *ākriḍa(m) iva Rudrasya ghnataḥ kālātyaye paçūn*, vii, 19, 35; *ākriḍa iva Rudrasya kruddhasya nighnataḥ paçūn*, G. vi, 73, 38; *ākriḍabhūmiḥ kruddhasya Rudrasye 'va mahātmanah*, R. vi, 93, 35. Compare ix, 14, 18, *Rudrasya 'kriḍanam yathā*.
- 14, *ākhyātum upacakrame*, xviii, 5, 7; R. iii, 11, 10; iv, 8, 46; 52, 3; G. v, 66, 2, where R. 65, 2 has *pravaktum upacakrame*. Compare *vaktum samupacakrame*, xiii, 87, 2. The phrase is common in R.; rarer in M., owing to the use in the latter of the dramatic *uvāca*, extra metrum. Both epics have also the similar phrase *vyāhartum upacakrame*, e. g., xii, 350, 15; R. vi, 115, 1; vii, 51, 1. See No. 57.
- 15, *ājaghāno 'rasi kruddhaḥ*, vi, 61, 36; R. vi, 69, 152; 76, 29; *passim* in M. See l. c., No. 10, p. 142, and note to No. 35.
- 16, *āditya iva tejasā*, iii, 53, 2; R. vi, 55, 9; *āditya iva tejasvī*, R. v, 34, 28, metrical. See No. 176.
- 17, *alikhantam ivā 'kāçam*, iv, 38, 3; R. vi, 99, 12.
- 18, *āvarta iva samjajñe balasya mahato mahān*, H. iii, 60, 4; G. vi, 32, 21; *āvarta iva gāṅgasya toyasya*, G. v, 50, 16; *āsīd gāṅga ivā 'vartaḥ*, M. vii, 36, 13.
- 19, *aviṣṭā iva yudhyante*, vi, 46, 3; *aviṣṭā iva kruddhās te (cakrus tumulam uttamam)*, G. vi, 54, 64.
- 20, *açivīṣa iva kruddhaḥ*, vii, 10, 31; R. v, 67, 7.  
*āsīt kila°*, *āsīc caṭacaṭa*, etc., No. 334.
- 21, *āsīd rājā Nalo nāma*, iii, 53, 1; *āsīd rājā Nimir nāma*, R. vii, 55, 4. With *Virasena-suto* *balī* at the end of the first



verse, compare Dyumatsenasuto balī, M. iii, 294, 18; suto balī, R. iii, 12, 2; Ayodhyāyām purā rājā Yuvanāśvasuto balī, R. vii, 67, 5; Prajāpatisuto balī, R. vii, 90, 23 (in G., 'bhavat).

22, iti me niṣcitā matiḥ, iii, 78, 6; G. v, 8, 25 (R. v. l.); 68, 36 (R. v. l.).

23, ity āsit tumulaḥ ṣabdaḥ, vi, 119, 19; ity evam t. ṣ., G. vi, 19, 4 (R., evam sutumulaḥ ṣabdaḥ). Compare babhūva t. ṣ., M. vi, 56, 22, etc.; R. vi, 58, 17, etc.; samjajñe t. ṣ., M. vi, 46, 17, and l. c. No. 10, p. 144, ff. Compare Nos. 82-84.

24, idam vacanam abravīt, iii, 69, 17, etc.; R. i, 26, 33; iv, 8, 1, etc. Sometimes tato for idam, ix, 3, 51 (= C. 176, idam). About forty times in Rām., unnumbered in Mbh. See No. 237.

25, Indradhvaja ivo 'cehritaḥ (tato nipatito bhūmāu), ix, 17, 53 and often; Indraketur ivo 'cehritam, ix, 4, 16; Çakra-dhvaja ivo 'cehritaḥ, R. v, i, 59. Compare utthāpyamānaḥ Çakrasya yantradhvaja ivo 'cehritaḥ, R. ii, 77, 9; mahāmerum ivo 'cehritam, ix, 37, 20; ubhāv Indradhvajāv iva (petatuḥ), ix, 12, 24; dhvajāv iva mahendrasya (nipetatuḥ), R. vi, 45, 17-18; jagāma vasudhām kṣipraṁ Çakrasye 'va mahādhvajāḥ, G. iii, 34, 25; apatad devarājasya muktaraçmir iva dhvajāḥ, R. iv, 17, 2; Indradhvaja ivo 'tsrṣṭo yantranirmuktabandhavaḥ (papāta), M. vii, 93, 70; yantramukta iva dhvajāḥ (papāta), M. vii, 92, 72; yantracyuta iva dhvajāḥ (papāta), G. ii, 84, 8.

Indrāṇi, No. 275.

25b, ihāi 'va prāyam āsiṣye, x, 11, 15; R. iv, 53, 19.

26, uttiṣṭha rājan kim ṇeṣe, xi, 2, 2; G. vi, 95, 37; rājann uttiṣṭha kim ṇeṣe, G. ii, 81, 10; uttiṣṭho 'ttiṣṭha, Gāndhāri, xi, 26, 1; uttiṣṭho 'ttiṣṭha, kim ṇeṣe, R. vi, 111, 81 (preceded by No. 45); uttiṣṭho 'ttiṣṭha, bhadraṁ te, M. i, 172, 4; R. i, 35, 2; preceded in Mbh. by uvāca madhuraṁ vākyaṁ, with which compare ix, 36, 50, uvāca paruṣaṁ vākyaṁ; ūcuḥ sumadhurāṁ vāṇim, R. vii, 70, 1; bhadraṁ te being current ad nauseam in both epics.

uvāca . . . vākyaṁ, No. 26.

27, ekāntabhāvopagataḥ, xii, 337, 28; ekāntabhāvānugataḥ, R. vii, 38, 5. In both, of the men in Çvetadvīpa, preceded

in M. by tatra Nārāyaṇaparā mānavāḥ candravarcaṣaḥ; in R., by ananyamanaso nityam Nārāyaṇaparāyaṇaḥ tadā rā-dhanasaktāḥ ca taccittāḥ tatparāyaṇaḥ (ananyamanasaḥ is a Gītā phrase, 9, 13, bhajanty ananyamanasaḥ; 8, 14, ananyacetāḥ satatam).

- 28, etac chrutvā tu vacanam, vi, 48, 98; G. iv, 56, 19, and passim.  
 29, etat te kathitam sarvam and (in prior pāda) etat te sarvam ākhyātam; ix, 46, 108; G. vi, 82, 167. In M. preceded by yan mām tvam paripreçasi, as in xii, 334, 40; xiii, 14, 139, etc.

- 30, etasminn antare vīraḥ, vi, 48, 96, and often; R. iii, 30, 37; vi, 50, 7; vii, 28, 19; G. vi, 36, 99. The phrase here is etasminn antare, which is filled out with various words, as Rāmaḥ, R. vi, 111, 91; tatra or tasya (v. l.), R. vi, 92, 58; kruddhaḥ, R. vi, 100, 13; krodhāt, 102, 47. Compare also etasminn antare çūnye, M. vii, 17, 7; xii, 330, 1; cāi 'va, vii, 19, 38; çūraḥ, ix, 28, 17; G. vi, 32, 15, etc. A combination of this and the next (No. 31) is found in etasminn antare kāle, "in the meantime," R. vi, 20, 33.

- 31, etasminn eva kāle tu, like the last, a standing phrase, e. g., i, 149, 1; iii, 54, 13; 168, 13; 298, 1; v, 121, 9; vi, 74, 36; ix, 51, 25; xii, 328, 3, etc.; R. i, 9, 7; 33, 11; G. 21, 1, etc.

- 32, evam uktaḥ pratyuvāca, or tathe 'ty uktvā, vi, 59, 47; vii, 202 70; ix, 35, 68; G. vi, 36, 102. Compare evam astv iti (with pratyuvāca), ix, 48, 52; G. vi, 109, 18 (co 'vāca); (kṛtvā sa), ib. 82, 56.

- 33, kakṣam agnir iva jvalan, ix, 24, 62; kakṣeṣv agnir iva jvalan 4, 36 (C., kakṣe 'gnir iva samjvalan); vanāny agnis ivo 'tthitaḥ, R. vi, 66, 12; kakṣam agnir ivo 'tthitaḥ, G. v, 85, 24; kakṣeṣv iva hutācanam, G. ii, 106, 25. Compare also (dahantam) kruddham agnim yathā vanam, M. vii, 21, 30; vanam agniri vāi 'dhitaḥ, R. ii, 63, 44, where G. 65, 39, has çuṣkam kāṣṭham ivā 'nalaḥ, like R. v, 41, 11, çuṣkam vanam ivā 'nalaḥ. The ivā 'nalaḥ ending is common to both epics, e. g., dahan kakṣam ivā 'nalaḥ, M. vii, 14, 1 (followed in 2 by sāksād agnim ivo 'tthitam, C. vṛkṣam); tan me dahati gātrāṇi çuṣkavṛkṣam ivā 'nalaḥ, M. vi, 95, 7, etc. See also Nos. 75, 99, 117, 196, 226, 256, 291.

- 34, kaṅkapatrāir ajihmagāiḥ, vi, 103, 11 and often; R. vi, 52, 4.

Frequently close together with svarṇa, rukma, or hema puṅkhāir ajihmagāḥ, vi, 114, 11; vii, 18, 18, hema; G. vi, 19, 68. In G. vi, 20, 26, rukma° ajihmagrāḥ, metrical (v. l. in R.). The common terminal çarāir ajihmagāḥ is sometimes inverted in jagatīs, as in G. iv, 30, 22, though the regular çloka order is also found in this jagatī metre, ib. 34, 34. See No. 234.

- 35, Kandarpa iva rūpeṇa, mūrtimān, iii, 53, 15; rūpavān . . . kandarpa iva mūrtimān, R. v, 34, 30. This with āditya iva tejasvī, is a description of Rāma, 28, as the two phrases, and also satyavādī (R. 29), here describe Nala.

- 36, kampayann iva medinīm, ii, 29, 7; viii, 34, 58; ix, 18, 26, etc.; kampayaṇç cā 'pi, ix, 30, 60; sa kampayann iva mahīm, iii, 78, 3; kampayann iva medinīm, G. vi, 37, 101; R. vi, 56, 13; 67, 115; kampayanti 'va, G. iii, 62, 31; kampayanti 'va parvatān, M. vii, 181, 11; cālayann iva medinīm, R. iii, 67, 13; dārayann iva, R. iv, 15, 5 (G. kampayann); dārayann iva parvatān, M. iv, 46, 21; nādayann iva medinīm, G. vi, 46, 91. pūrayann iva medinīm, M. iii, 73, 8 (pūrayanto diço daça, ix, 46, 77), etc., etc. For diço daça, see No. 114.

karam kareṇa, No. 163.

karṇāyata, No. 170.

- 37, karmanā manasā vācā, iii, 65, 32, 41; ix, 50, 2; xii, 327, 34; manasā karmanā vācā caksusā ca, R. vii, 59, 1, 24. Compare Sprüche, 1,559 ff., 2,222; Dhammap. 391.

kalām nā 'rhati, No. 196.

kalpyatām me rathaḥ, No. 230.

- 38, kaṣāyikṛtalocanāḥ, °am, i, 102, 23; 131, 3; G. vi, 33, 17; 37, 68. In M., sakrodhāmarṣajihmabhrūḥ precedes in each instance. Compare Nos. 50, 51.

kasyā 'si. See above, p. 268.

- 39, kāñcanoṣṇiṣinas tatra vetrajharjharapāṇayaḥ, vi, 97, 33; kañcukoṣṇiṣinas tatra vetrajharjharapāṇayaḥ, R. vi, 114, 21. Compare G. vi, 33, 10 and 13, vetrajharjharapāṇibhiḥ.

- 40, kāmabānaprapīḍitaḥ, i, 220, 7; G. iii, 61, 2 (R. 55, 2, bāṇāḥ); kāmabāṇābhisaṁtaptaḥ, iii, 280, 3; kāmabāṇavaçaṁgataḥ, R. vii, 88, 12.

- 41, Kālacakram ivo 'dyatam, vii, 7, 31; iva 'param, G. vi, 73, 33 (R., 93, 30, iva prajāḥ); kāladaṇḍam iva 'param (R., iva

- 'ntakah); G. vi, 51, 89 = R. 71, 85. For the var. lec., compare s. daṇḍahasta, No. 104, and kālarātrim ivā 'ntakah, R. vi, 69, 134. Compare kālarātrim ivo 'dyatām, ix, 11, 50; °sūryam, xiii, 14, 270.
- Kāladandopama and Kālapāṣopama, No. 220.
- Kālānanam, No. 272.
- Kālarātrim, No. 41.
- 42, Kālāntakayamopamaḥ, iii, 22, 31; 27, 25; iv, 33, 25; vi, 54, 47; G. iii, 32, 5; vi, 49, 36; R. vi, 57, 32; 60, 94; 82, 7; 95, 41. See No. 220; and for Kālāntakopama, see Nos. 104, 105.
- 43, Kālo hi duratikramaḥ. While not generally including in this list the proverbs common to the two epics, I enter this particular proverb because of the similar environment in imām avasthām prāpto 'smi, Kālo hi duratikramaḥ, ix, 64, 9 (C. vāi); so 'yam adya hataḥ çete, Kālo hi duratikramaḥ, R. iii, 68, 21. For the rest, compare Am. Journ. Phil., vol. xx, p. 26, and add (besides the above) Kālo hi duratikramaḥ in M. ii, 46, 16; also H. iii, 2, 30, and 5, 36; dāivam hi duratikramam, R. vii, 50, 18; dāivam tu, ix, 65, 31; and the later version, lekhā hi kālalikhitāḥ sarvathā duratikramā, H. iii, 2, 27.
- 44, kiṅkiṇjālasamivṛta, ix, 23, 13, °āiḥ rathāiḥ; R. vii, 23, 1, 2, °am nagaram. Ordinarily in M., kiṅkiṇjālamālinam, etc., i, 221, 45; ii, 24, 18; viii, 86, 4; in R., kiṅkiṇjātabhūṣita, vi, 102, 9; but I cannot say whether or not mālin appears in R. in this combination. See No. 113.
- 45, kim mām na pratibhāsase, part of a lament (see uttiṣṭha, above, No. 26), iii, 63, 9; 64, 19 ff.; xi, 20, 13-14; R. iii, 60, 26; vi, 111, 80 (doubled in G. 95, 36, and v.l. 37). In R. vi, 115, 15 (= G. 98, 12) kim ca mām nā 'bhibhāsase, v.l. as in G. 95, 37.
- 46, kuçalam paryapṛcchata, ix, 34, 17; R. i, 52, 4.
- 47, kṛtakāutukamaṅgalāḥ, i, 129, 24; viii, 1, 11; R. i, 73, 9. kṛtapūrvāhnikakriyah, No. 49.
- 48, kṛtvā karma suduṣkaram, vi, 14, 14; vii, 8, 32; R. ii, 101, 5; vi, 76, 70; G. vi, 21, 11; 30, 37; 55, 36. Variations are naturally many, e.g., karma kurvāṇam duṣkaram, vi, 105, 6; kṛtaṁ karma suduṣkaram, R. vi, 67, 55; 127, 47; G. vi, 88, 17; karma kurvanti duṣkaram, R. vi, 65, 4; tat

- kṛtvā duṣkaraṁ karma, R. vi, 126, 14; kariṣyan karma duṣkaram, G. iv, 15, 20. Similar in R. are mahat karma kṛtaṁ tvayā and kṛtaṁ tvayā karma mahat suduṣkaram, G. vi, 112, 100 and G. vi, 36, 118, respectively; aho mahat karma kṛtaṁ nirartham, R. v, 48, 50; sādhu, Lakṣmaṇa, tuṣṭo 'smi, karṇa te sukr̥taṁ kṛtam, G. vi, 70, 80; suduṣkaraṁ tu tat karma, G. iv, 11, 7. Somewhere in M. ix (verse lost) occur together the two phrases, kṛtvā na duṣkaraṁ karma, gato Vāivasvataksayam (No. 55).
- 49, kṛtvā pāurvāhnikīḥ kriyāḥ, iii, 168, 2; 296, 10; °kam karma, R. iii, 17, 2; °kīm kriyām, R. vii, 59, 1, 1; kṛtapūrvāhnikakriyāḥ, viii, 1, 13; R. i, 35, 3 (with the phrase, tac chrutvā vacanaṁ tasya).
- 50, krodhasamraktanayanāḥ, i, 78, 35; vii, 1, 19; R. i, 62, 15; G. v, 89, 1; vi, 76, 11. In M. v, 9, 45, united with idam vacanam abravīt. See note to No. 51.
- 51, krodhasamraktalocanāḥ, v, 178, 40; vi, 100, 52; ix, 42, 13; R. v, 44, 19; vi, 95, 3; krodhāt sam°, R. iv, 9, 22; vi, 98, 1. Both forms, No. 50, No. 51, are common in both epics. They are the same phrase differentiated according to metrical requirements, and interchange with the similar kopa- and roṣa-forms, which it is unnecessary to give in detail. Variants are common, e. g., krodhaparyākulekṣanāḥ, v, 178, 94; G. iv, 15, 17; often united with another iterate, e. g., roṣasamraktanayana idam vacanam abravīt, G. iii, 57, 15; samraktanayanāḥ krodhād (G. kopād) idam vacanam abravīt, R. vi, 59, 56 = G. 36, 33. Compare taṁ krodharaktanayanam kurvantaṁ bhrūkuṭīmukham, G. iv, 33, 40; sa kṛtvā bhrūkuṭīm vaktre roṣasamraktalocanāḥ, G. vi, 86, 46, where R. 102, 38, has sa kṛtvā bhrūkuṭīm kruddhaḥ kiṁcit samraktalocanāḥ. See Nos. 106, 123, 190, 198, and s. v. PW., where they are illustrated sufficiently.
- 52, kroṇṭīm kurarīm iva, i, 6, 12; G. ii, 68, 43; R. iv, 19, 29; yathā, vi, 32, 3; plural, xi, 12, 10; 16, 18; variants, G. ii, 67, 16; iv, 19, 4; v, 18, 12; R. vi, 49, 9, etc; kurarīm iva vāṇatīm, M. iii, 63, 20. That in G. ii, 67, 16, the unusual form kuraryas trāsītā iva follows the exclamation hā nātha hā mṛto 'si 'ti in 12, just as hā nātha in N. 11, 23 follows kurarīm iva vāṇatīm in 20 (above), is perhaps worth

- noticing, especially as this chapter of R. G. is not in the Bombay text and may be supposed to be late. The correspondence is not remarkable enough to prove copying, though it may be due to the influence of the Nala passage, as this episode is well known to the later Rāmāyaṇa.
- 53, kṣitikampe yathā cāilah, vii, 174, 23; yathā 'calah, vii, 36, 29; kṣitikampe yathā nagāḥ, G. vi, 30, 30, where R. has kṣitikampa iva drumāḥ, 56, 31. See No. 248.
- khuranemisvanena ca, No. 247.
- 54, gatapratyāgatāni ca, term. tech., vii, 19, 6; R. vi, 107, 32. See maṇḍalāni, No. 201.
- 55, gato Vāivasvataksayam, or ninye, vii, 26, 53, and s. kṛtvā karma, No. 48, above; R. vi, 82, 183.
- 56, gadām adaya vīryavān, ix, 11, 49; 32, 37; 55, 24; 56, 27, etc.; R. vi, 69, 33. In G. vi, 49, 18, vipulām. See l. c. No. 10, p. 142, and No. 80, for parallel variants.
- 57, gamanāyo 'pacakrame, i, 151, 14; R. vii, 25, 51; gamanāyā 'bhicakrāma, R. i, 77, 18 (G. 79, 4, upa°). See No. 14.
- 58, Garudaḥ pannagam yathā, viii, 87, 96; R. vi, 69, 6, °gān iva, where G. 48, 6, has °gam yathā; G. vi, 46, 3 has °gān iva. Many var. lec., e. g., Garutmān iva.
- 59, garjantāu iva toyadāu, ix, 55, 38; °tam, G. vi, 3, 19; garjanti na vrthā cūrā nirjalā iva toyadāḥ, R. vi, 65, 3. See Nos. 77, 217.
- 60, giriḥ prasravaṇāir iva, iii, 279, 5, with cakāra rudhīram bhuvi preceding; R. vi, 67, 89, with rarāja cōṇitotsiktaḥ preceding. G. vi, 46, 75 has giripra, an error. Compare G. ib. 109, giriḥ prasravaṇam yathā; R. vi, 67, 121, giriḥ praśravaṇāir iva. In R. vi, 58, 55, gireḥ prasravaṇo yathā, where G. 32, 43 has jalām prasravaṇād iva, as in R. vi, 45, 21, jalām prasravaṇāv iva, and R. vi, 88, 61.
- gāirikam, No. 318.
- 61, cakāra kadamam mahat, vii, 21, 37; R. vi, 86, 24; 95, 50; G. vi, 46, 108; karomi, M. iv, 21, 2; kurvāṇaḥ, ix, 61, 30; akāri, G. vi, 49, 43; kṛtvā ca, G. vi, 110, 50; akarot, M. vii, 32, 41; ix, 44, 3; cakāra kadanam ghoram (metre), R. vi, 58, 24; H. iii, 60, 3; kadanam sumahat cakruḥ, R. vi, 55, 32.
- 62, caksurviṣayam āgataḥ: In vii, 17, 14, sa no diṣṭyā 'strasampannaḥ caksurviṣayam āgataḥ; R. vi, 103, 19, diṣṭyā 'si

mama mandātmaṇḥ cakṣurviṣayam āgataḥ (G. 88, 24, mama durbuddhe).

- 63, candrasūryāv ivo 'ditāu, ix, 55, 22; G. v, 53, 25 = 69, 23; sūryacandramasāv iva, M. iii, 288, 26. See Nos. 33, 189. cayāṭṭālaka, No. 186.

caled dhi Himavān sthānāt, ii, 77, 35; çāilah, v, 82, 48; caled api ca Mandaraḥ, G. v. 58, 9 (R. 59, 14, Mandaraḥ pracaled api). See No. 153.

- 65, cāmikaravibhūṣitām, gadām, x, 9, 11; cāpam, R. iii, 20, 6.

- 66, cittapramāthini (bālā devānām api) *sundarī*, iii, 53, 14; trāilokya-*sundarī* (kāntā, sarva-) cittapramāthini, R. vii, 37, 1, 29 (compare R. ii, 10, 30, mama cittapramāthini). As said above, the Uttara recognizes the Nala, and this (praksipta) may be imitation. At any rate it may support pramāthini against the Mbh. Bomb. and Calc. reading here, cittaprasādani, which, however, is found in xii, 133, 13, janacittaprasādinī; compare naracittapramāthibhiḥ, R. i, 10, 4.

- 67, citraṁ laghu ca suṣṭhu ca, vii, 145, 77; laghu citraṁ ca suṣṭhu ca, R. vi, 88, 65.

- 68, cintā me vardhate 'tīva mumūrṣā cā 'pi jāyate, Karpasya nidhanam'crutvā, viii, 9, 6; cintā me vartate tivrā mumūrṣā 'pi ca jāyate, bhrātaram nihataṁ drṣṭvā, R. vi, 101, 7. See No. 213.

- 69, cintāḥokaparāyaṇaḥ, vii, 1, 6; xv, 16, 18; G. iii, 52, 17; variants, viii, 96, 58; xv, 21, 7. See Nos. 27, 116, 161, 293.

- 70, chāye 'vā 'nugatā pathi, iii, 65, 57; chāye 'vā 'nugatā Rāmam, R. vii, 37, 3, 24, after rupeṇā 'pratimā loke (No. 236), also a Nala phrase. Compare No. 66.

chinnamūla iva drumah, No. 248.

- 71, chinne 'va kadali vane, xi, 17, 1, nyapatad bhūmāu; G. vi, 8, 6, papāta bhūmāu (both of grief-stunned woman) = R. vi, 32, 6, but here jagāma jagatīm bālā chinna tu kadali yathā. See Nos. 135, 136, 180, 248.

jarjarīkṛta, Nos. 184, 235.

- 72, jalam sūrya ivā 'ṇubhiḥ, vi, 109, 33; megham sūrya, G. vi, 18, 40 (R. 43, 29, karāir megham ivā 'ṇumān); tamah sūrya ivā 'ṇubhiḥ, M. vii, 18, 24.

jalam prasravaṇād iva, No. 60.

jājvalyamāna, No. 176.

jātarūpapariṣkṛta, No. 335.

- 73, jīmūta iva bhāskaram, vi, 64, 44; °tam iva °aḥ, G. vi, 21, 43; nīhāram, R. i, 55, 25; toyadād iva bhāskarāḥ, G. iv, 12, 24 (papāta). See No. 326.
- 74, jīrṇām tvacam ivo 'ragāḥ, xiii, 62, 69; R. iii, 5, 37; sarpo jīrṇām iva tvacam, xii, 265, 15; G. vi, 21, 40; tvacam sarpa ivā 'mucya, M. v, 40, 2. See Nos. 106, 139; Praç. v, 5. jvalantam iva tejasā, No. 176.
- 75, jvalantam iva pāvakam, jvalantā iva pāvakāḥ (and jvalitā iva), vi, 16, 12; 18, 6; xi, 25, 16, etc.; R. iii, 32, 5; vi, 50, 36; 70, 19; 95, 33; G. 68, 36. Compare prajvalitām ivo 'lkām, M. v, 181, 5; prajvalantam ivā 'nalam, G. iii, 18, 23; jvalantam iva pannagam, M. vi, 82, 36; ix, 13, 21; G. iii, 18, 39, pannagāiḥ (but R. 12, 34, pāvakāiḥ): also parvatam, M. vii, 80, 37, apaçyata (on fire as it were). See Nos. 111, 176, 226, 255. For ivā 'nalaḥ, see Nos. 33, 99, 196, 291.
- 76, jhillikāgaṇanāditam, iii, 64, i; R. iii, 2, 3. The two descriptions (of a fearful forest) are similar also in the adjacent verses, e. g., nānāpakṣigaṇākīrṇam, in M.; nānāmṛgagaṇākīrṇam, in R. I have not entered others.
- 77, ta enam çaradhārābhir, dhārābhir iva toyadāḥ, vii, 26, 54; athāi 'nam çaradhārābhir, dhārābhir iva toyadaḥ, R. vi, 71, 92 (in M., siṣicuḥ; in R. abhyavarṣata); abhyavarṣat tadā Rāmam dhārābhir iva toyadaḥ, R. vi, 100, 59; vavarṣa çavarṣeṇa dh. i. t., M. vi, 58, 26. Compare mahendra iva dhārābhiḥ çarāir abhivavarṣa ha, R. vi, 56, 11. See Nos. 59, 158, 217, 244. tataḥ kilakilā, No. 334.
- 78, tataḥ prajavitāçvena rathena rathinām varāḥ. This hemistich H. 3, 59, 5 and also G. vi, 30, 6 (= R. 56, 6, but here pracalitāçvena). The prior pāda in M. vii, 116, 30; G. iii, 33, 27; R. vi, 95, 42 (with rathena). See No. 287.
- 79, tataḥ prabhāte vimale, viii, 1, 9; xiv, 64, 16; R. vii, 59, 1, 1, with kṛtvā pāurvāhnikīm kriyām (No. 49); 68, 2. Compare prabhāte vimale sūrye, R. ii, 86, 24. The first phrase is in triṣṭubh as well as in çloka, loc. cit.
- 80, tato 'nyad dhanur ādāya, vi, 48, 67; G. iii, 34, 16, and 22. In the former of G., followed by pradīpta iva manyunā (as in M. iii, 63, 13, pradīpta 'va ca manyunā). The usual phrase in M. begins with athā 'nyad, e. g., vi, 45, 33; 77, 68; 114, 28; vii, 21, 17; ix, 10, 34; 15, 21. Compare anyat karmu-



kam ādāya, and so 'nyat karmukam ādāya, vi, 45, 29; 110, 40; ix, 10, 45, etc.; R. as cited loc. cit., No. 56.

tato muhūrtam, No. 214.

81, tato halahalāṣabdaḥ prītidāḥ samajāyata, i, 58, 9; tato halahalāṣabdas tumulaḥ samajāyata, R. ii, 16, 33; the prior pāda, M. vii, 21, 2; xiv, 74, 26; R. ii, 81, 14; vii, 21, 24; 32, 33; 96, 12; G. iii, 31, 41 followed by the late trait, punaḥ *kolā-halo* mahān (not thus in M. or R.); G. ii, 82, 13, followed by sumahān samajāyata. Compare No. 334.

82, tatrā 'sīt sumahad yuddham tumulaḥ lomaharṣaṇam, vi, 58, 13; R. vi, 43, 16. For other forms, see l. c. No. 10, p. 144 ff. In R., roma for loma, but according to Winternitz, loc. cit., these forms interchange also in MSS. of M. See Nos. 23, 83, 84.

83, tad adbhutam ivā 'bhavat, iii, 167, 17 and 31; v, 131, 25; vi, 47, 28; 54, 82; vii, 7, 53 (with alātacakravād rājan); 14, 27 and 38; 21, 14; ix, 12, 13; xii, 334, 2 and 4 and 11, etc., etc. G. i, 75, 28. Compare G. iii, 33, 22, tad abhūd adbhutam yuddham tumulaḥ lomaharṣaṇam; R. iii, 51, 3, tad babhūvā 'dbhutam yuddham; R. vi, 102, 18, tad babhāu cā 'dbhutam yuddham . . . romaharṣaṇam; M. xi, 16, 4, raṇājiram nrvīraṇām adbhutam lomaharṣaṇam; ix, 15, 28, tatrā 'dbhutam apaṇyāma, and 15, 41, tatrā 'dbhutam param cakre. In M. iii, 76, 41, tad adbhutatamaḥ dr̥stvā; R. vii, 79, 1, tad adbhutatamaḥ vākyam ṣrutvā. See also Nos. 82, 84, 110.

84, tad yuddham abhavad ghoram, vii, 16, 12 (sumahal lomaharṣaṇam); G. vi, 58, 34 (in R., 79, 23, tatra for ghoram). M. adds devānām iva dānavāiḥ, wherewith compare R. vi, 79, 2, tataḥ pravṛttaḥ sumahat tad yuddham lomaharṣaṇam . . . devānām dānavāir iva. See Nos. 82 and 83.

tapantam, No. 175.

85, taptakāñcanabhūṣaṇāḥ, xii, 326, 34; R. iv, 17, 2; G. v, 24, 24 (hāṭaka, R. iv, 3, 18); preceded in M. by sūkṣmaraktāmbaradharāḥ, in G., by raktāmbaradharāḥ ṣrīmāns. See No. 280.

86, tam antakam iva kruddham, vii, 8, 11 (āpatantam); R. vi, 56, 24 (sadrutam). See Nos. 104-105.

tamaḥ sūrya ivā 'ñubhiḥ, No. 72.

87, tam āpatantam sahasā, vi, 116, 49 and 50; R. vi, 59, 36; 106,

4. Further examples, l. c. No. 10, p. 141. *vegena* in prior *pāda*, R. vi, 76, 36, etc.
- 88, *tam dīptam ivā kālāgnim*, vii, 15, 5; *sa dīpta*, R. v, 67, 12. Compare *kālāgnir ivā mūrtimān*, R. vi, 95, 3.
- 89, *tam mumocayiṣur vajrī*, i, 227, 9; *tam mumocayiṣum vīrah*, G. vi, 80, 26.
- 90, *taruṇādityasadrçāiḥ çaṇagāurāiç ca vānarāiḥ*, iii, 284, 28; *taruṇādityavarṇāiç ca çaçigāurāiç ca vānarāiḥ*, R. iv, 39, 13. *talaṁ talena*, No. 163.
- 91, *tasthāu girir ivā 'calaḥ*, vi, 94, 22; vii, 15, 7; *sthitam çāilam ivā 'calam*, G. vi, 79, 49; *sthitam çāilam ivā 'suram* and v. l. *sthitam çāilam ivā 'param*, R. iv, 48, 17 = G. 48, 18. In M. another standing phrase is *tasthāu Merur ivā 'calaḥ*, vi, 48, 34; 63, 8. Another *ivā 'calaḥ* phrase is *çigbro vāyur ivā 'calam* (*nā 'kampayata*), M. vii, 14, 36; *vāyuvēgāir ivā 'calāḥ* (*na prakampante*), R. iii, 67, 8. See Nos. 218, 240.
- tasthāu mṛtyur ivā*, Nos. 104–105.
- tasmin jite and hate*, No. 328.
- 92, *tasmin vimarde tumule*, i, 101, 9; *vimarde tumule tasmin*, R. vi, 43, 46; *tasmin pravṛtte tumule vimarde*, R. vi, 69, 66.
- 93, *tasya tad vacanam çrutvā*, ix, 33, 56; 56, 42; 65, 21, etc.; R. iii, 69, 46, etc.; G. vi, 37, 21, etc.; rarer is *tasya tad bhāṣitam çrutvā*, M. vii, 19, 22; G. iv, 38, 17. The first and *tac çhrutvā vacanam tasya* are found *passim* in both epics (*tasya, tasyāḥ, teṣām, tayos*, etc.; l. c. No. 10, p. 144).
- 94 and 95, (a) *tasyām rātryām vyatītāyām*, iii, 150, 1; 175, 1; 299, 1, etc.; R. iv, 64, 11; G. ii, 82, 1; *atha rātryām*, G. ii, 67, 3; v, 1, 12; *atha rātryām pravṛttāyām*, R. vii, 67, 1; *atītāyām ca çarvaryām udite sūryamaṇḍale*, M. v, 35, 12; *vyatītāyām tu çarvaryām ādityasyo 'daye tataḥ*, R. ii, 67, 2; *vyatītāyām rajanyām tu*, M. ix, 8, 1; *rajanyām tu prabhātāyām*, R. vii, 99, 1 (G. 106, 1, *sa rajanyām prabhātāyām*); (b) *prabhātāyām tu çarvaryām*, M. iii, 2, 1; R. ii, 52, 1; 54, 36; *vyuṣṭāyām cāi 'va çarvaryām*, xv, 10, 53; *tato raj. vyuṣṭ.*, 11, 1; similar is G. i, 30, 1.
- 96, *tārājālam ivā 'mbare*, viii, 27, 35; G. vi, 68, 19; in M. of decapitation; in R. of breastplates!
- 97, *tiṣṭha tiṣṭhe 'ti cā 'bravīt*, vi, 111, 41 and 45 and often (l. c. No. 10, p. 142); R. vi, 79, 37; *cā 'vadat*, M. iv, 33, 24; *cā*

- 'bruvan, G. i, 43, 25; cukroṇa, ib. ii, 39, 46. United with the phrase (No. 5) abhidudrāva vegeua, in M. vi, 101, 9.
- 98, tuṣārāvṛtamaṇḍalam, ix, 65, 7 (pūrṇacandram iva vyomni); tuṣārenāvṛtām sābhrām pūrṇacandraprabhām iva, G. i, 50, 16 (R. 49, 15, satuṣārāvṛtām. Compare pūrṇacandram ivo 'ditam, R. iv, 10, 3. Compare No. 169.
- 99, tūlārāḍim ivā 'nalaḥ, vi, 75, 32 (vyadhamat); vii, 21, 24 (vyadhamat); R. vi, 88, 7 (vidhamiṣyanti); tṛṇārāḍim ivā 'nalaḥ, G. vi, 64, 26 (vidhamiṣyanti); tṛṇa, ib., 67, 8 (vidhamiṣyanti) = R. 88, 7, tūlā° (above). In the former passage, R. has the verb but not the simile. See Nos. 33, 75, 196, 291.
- 100, tṛṇam antarataḥ kṛtvā, iii, 281, 17; R. iii, 56, 1; v, 21, 3. Compare tṛṇikṛtya ca tad rakṣaḥ, R. vi, 40, 9; saṃgatān, M. i, 189, 2; matvā tṛṇena tāṃs tulyān, M. vi, 113, 36; tṛṇavat tān apaṇyata, G. iv, 48, 19. tṛṇārāḍim, No. 99.
- 101, tṛṇāḥ kūpā ivā 'vṛtāḥ, iii, 207, 59; kūpa iva, R. iii, 46, 10; G. iv, 16, 17. In M., adharmā dharma-rūpeṇa; in R. (abhavyo bhavyarūpeṇa) sa pāpas tena rūpeṇa, and dharmavāitaṃsikaḥ (the same, R. iv, 17, 22, with the bracketed words also in 28), also Mbh. phrase (PW.).
- 101 b, te vāi nirayagāmināḥ, xiii, 23, 60 ff.; R. sarve n., iv, 17, 36 (similar list).
- 102, totṛā 'rdita iva dvipaḥ, vi, 54, 69; vii, 146, 55; ix, 21, 16; 25, 21; G. ii, 39, 43 (v. l. in R., totṛāir nunnāḥ). See Nos. 149, 215.
- 103, totṛāir iva mahādvipam, vi, 101, 13; ix, 13, 29; R. iii, 28, 10; totṛāir iva mahāgajam, M. vi, 111, 7. triṣu lokeṣu, No. 252.
- 104-105, (a): daṇḍahasta ivā 'ntakaḥ (and acc.), vi, 102, 36; vii, 15, 5; viii, 29, 30; ix, 3, 26, etc.; G. vi, 65, 25; iii, 32, 17; 34, 11 (where R. 28, 11, has pāḍahastam); daṇḍapāṇir ivā 'ntakaḥ, M. iv, 22, 66; vi, 48, 90; 62, 55; dhanurdandam ivā 'ntakaḥ, G., iv, 31, 11 (R., dhanuḥ kālāntakopamaḥ). Similar and in part interchangeable are the phrases (b): pāḍahasta ivā 'ntakaḥ, vi, 109, 11; vii, 36, 32; ix, 12, 2; R. iii, 39, 15; vi, 53, 25; G. vi, 39, 30; vii, 28, 21. In G. vi, 46, 36, pāḍahasto yathā Yamāḥ, where R. 67, 38, has pāḍahasta ivā 'ntakaḥ.

- The epithet is used of Varuṇa, R. iii, 12, 19; iv, 42, 45, = G., 43, 58 (nilayaḥ pāṇahastasya Varuṇasya). Compare M. vi, 112, 41, dahati vāi mahācamūm yuddheṣu sadṛṇas tāta Yamasya Varuṇasya ca. Compare also sākṣāt kalāntakopamaḥ, M. iii, 157, 50; sthitaḥ kalāntakopamaḥ, R. vi, 88, 2; ṇarāiḥ kalāntako°, G. vi, 45, 19; sākṣāt kāla ivā 'ntakaḥ, G. iv, 14, 25; tasthāu mṛtyur ivā 'ntakaḥ, M. vii, 16, 38. For kaladaṇḍam ivā 'ntakaḥ, see No. 41. See also Nos. 42, 86, 220, 250, 272.
- 106, daṇḍāhata ivo 'ragaḥ, ix, 14, 40; R. vi, 54, 33. The ḡloka in M. is worth noticing in its entirety: cukopa samare Drāuṇir | daṇḍāhata ivo 'ragaḥ | triḡikhām bhrukutīm kṛtvā | sṛkkinī parisamlihan, where c = ix, 32, 46 a; and sṛkkinī, etc., is a frequent phrase, No. 320; that is, the whole ḡloka consists of iterata except for the first words. See No. 150, ad finem.
- 107, dadarṇa Dvārakām vīro mṛtanāthām iva striyam, xvi, 5, 4; dadṛṇus te tadā Lankām . . . narīm iva mumṛṣatīm, G. vi, 15, 27.
- 108, darṇayan pāṇilāghavam, vi, 48, 66; 54, 73; 59, 22; 62, 28 (C. 2, 743, hastalāghavam); vii, 145, 70; ix, 26, 30; R. vi, 99, 20; G. 36, 55. Compare darṇayan vīryam ātmanah, M. vii, 14, 57; d, svaparākramam, vi, 100, 34, etc.
- 109, darṇayā 'tmānam ātmanā, iii, 64, 57; smara cā 'tmānam ātmanā, R. vii, 37, 5, 47. Better parallels might, I think, be shown, but I have at hand only Gītā, 6, 5.
- 110, Daṇagrīvasya paṇyataḥ, iii, 290, 4; R. vi, 41, 89. This type, especially in M., is common. Compare vii, 17, 7, Drṣṭadyumnasya; ix, 11, 13, Dharmarājasya; ix, 16, 40, Bhīmasenasya; xi, 14, 19, Vāsudevasya; R. vi, 38, 12, tasya Rāmasya paṇyataḥ. But the M. type sarvalokasya paṇyataḥ, which occurs repeatedly, e. g., vi, 48, 69; 58, 44; ix, 5, 7, and sarvasāinyasya paṇyataḥ, e. g., vii, 18, 28; sarvaḡṣatrasya paṇyataḥ, ix, 7, 24; 14, 37, is found in R., if at all, only as a rarity. I have noted G. vi, 93, 5, (Rāmam) lokasya paṇyataḥ; G. vi, 25, 35, paṇyatām sarvarakṣasām; vi, 121, 16, sarveṣām eva ḡṇvatām. In M. these correspond rather to paṇyatām sarvasāinyānām, vii, 144, 20; 195, 9; paṇyatām sarvayodhānām, vii, 145, 70 (with darṇ. pāṇiv., No. 108); sarvalokasya ḡṇvataḥ,

- ix, 31, 27; paçyatām sarvasāinyānām (tad adbhutam ivā 'bhavat, No. 83), ix, 10, 50.
- 111, didhakṣann iva pāvakaḥ vi, 94, 7 (krodhenā 'bhīprajajvāla, also phrase of M.); didhakṣur iva pāvakaḥ, xi, 12, 13; acc., G. iv, 38, 15 (with jājvalyamānaṁ kopena, phrase, No. 176). See also Nos. 75, 226, 255.
- 112, divi 'vā 'bhrāṇi mārutaḥ (vyadhamat), vii, 30, 35; mahābhrāṇi 'va mārutaḥ (vidhaman), R. vi, 96, 4; the same with karṣan, G. vi, 49, 58.
- 113, divyābharāṇa (and sarvābharāṇa) bhūṣitā(h); lajjamāne 'va lalanā divyābharāṇabhūṣitā, i, 152, 22; divyaratnāmbaradharo divyābharāṇabhūṣitā, ii, 9, 6; divyamālyāmbaradharo divyābharāṇabhūṣitā, v, 122, 2; the prior also vi, 35, 11, and here also divyagandhānulepanaḥ, with which compare divyasraganulepana, in the same stanza with the titular pāda, R. vi, 50, 44 (also G. vi, 112, 8); divyamālyavibhūṣitām divyāmbara-dharām devīm, iv, 6, 4; kṛṣṇaraktāmbaradharā . . . divyakunḍalasampannā divyābharāṇabhūṣitā, xii, 258, 16; divyarūpasamāyuktā divyābharāṇabhūṣitāḥ divyamālyāmbaradharāḥ, xv, 33, 23; sarvābharāṇabhūṣitā, iii, 53, 12; 277, 19; in G. iii, 15, 14–15, divyābharāṇabhūṣitāḥ . . . lalanāḥ (as in M. above); divyā°, G. iii, 23, 42; R. i, 16, 13; v. 24, 25; vi, 50, 44; divyāṅgarāgām Vaidēhīm divyābharāṇabhūṣitām, 114, 7; sarva° R. i, 73, 9, where G. 75, 9 has mahārḥāmbara-bhūṣanāiḥ; R. iii, 47, 31; G. iii, 25, 15; R. vi, 47, 9; 50, 44, without similar neighboring pādas. Compare also nānābharāṇabhūṣite, M. vi, 23, 6; sarvābharāṇanaddhāṅgaḥ, v. l. sarvābharāṇasarvāṅgaḥ, R. vi, 65, 31, where G. 44, 24 has °citrāṅgaḥ; sarva °sam-yukta and °sampaṇna, M. i. 153, 14; G. iv, 44, 108, respectively. The form with divyā°, Raghuv. x, 11. R. is generally content with the pāda, M. often adds, as above, similar pādas. See No. 44.
- divyamālyāmbara, No. 113.
- 114, diṇḍa ca (pra and) vidīṇḍa cāi 'va: ii, 38, 26; H. 2, 127, 127; G. vi, 90, 28 (where R. 106, 30 has pradiṇḍa sarvāḥ); vidīṇḍa tathā, G. iii, 28, 41 (where R. 22, 23 has diṇḍa sapradiṇḍa tathā); G. vi, 58, 38 (where R.

- 79, 28 has *diçaç ca pradiças tathā*). The shorter terminal *diço daça*, vii, 20, 52 (etc., often); R. vi, 75, 38; G. v, 55, 13; G. vi, 77, 30 (G. 93, 1; R. 115, 18 = G. 100, 18, not terminal; the last, *daça diço*). In C. to ix, 15, 17, the same v. l. as above in R., namely, *vidiçaç cāi 'va* in BM.; *pradiçaç cāi 'va* in C. 769. See also under No. 36.
- 115, *diṣṭyā diṣṭye 'ti cā 'bruvan*, i, 129, 31; *abravīt*, G. iv, 10, 23.
- 116, *dīnāç cintāparāç cāi 'va*, ii, 49, 4; *tataç cintāparā dīnā*, iii, 54, 2; *dīnāç cintāparāyanāḥ*, G. vi, 74, 6 (= R. 94, 4, °*pariplutāḥ*); *iti cintāparo 'bhavat*, R. vii, 79, 12. See Nos. 69, 161, 293.
- 117, *dīptām agniçikhām iva*, iii, 63, 36; vii, 14, 78; R. i, 49, 14; vi, 118, 17; vii, 30, 29; G. vi, 80, 20, where R. 100, 19 has *pradiptām açaṇīm iva*; *dīptāv iva hutāçanāu*, R. vi, 97, 25. See No. 33.
- 118, *dīptāsyān uragān iva*, v, 151, 25; 180, 7; G. iii, 69, 24 (instr.). See Nos. 74, 106, 141, 150.
- 119, *dīrgham uṣṇāṁ ca niḥçvasya*, ix, 4, 51; 32, 8; x, 1, 4; G. vi, 34, 1; 99, 5, where R. 114, 6 has *sa dīrgham abhiniḥçvasya*. This phrase appears in a variety of forms, very likely in more than I have noted. The prevailing type is the titular one above. Compare the variant in C. 238 to ix, 4, 51 (above), *dīrgham uṣṇāṁ ca niçvāsāṁ mumoca ca mumoha ca* (B. *çuçoca ca mumoha ca*); a form not unknown in R., *dīrgham uṣṇāṁ ca niçvāsāṁ vimuñcantam muhur muhuḥ*, G. iv, 33, 41. This is followed (the next verse!) in M. by ix, 5, 1, *niḥçvasya dīrgham uṣṇāṁ ca tūṣṇīm āsit*; *sa* for *ca* in ix, 2, 55 (but C. 109, ca); like the form above in R., M. iii, 313, 3, *sa dīrgham uṣṇāṁ niḥçvasya, çokabāṣpapariplutaḥ* (phrase, see Nos. 120, 190); R. v, 34, 13, *abraviḍ dīrgham ucchvasya*, where G. 31, 33 has *dīrgh. uṣ. ca niḥçvasya*; R. vi, 95, 2, *sa tu dīrgham viniḥçvasya*, where G. 75, 3, as before, followed by *muhūrtam dhyānam āsthitaḥ* (phrase, compare No. 214). The likeness, when given, is to snake or elephant. Thus G. iv, 33, 41 (cited above) continues: *kupitām saptaçirasāṁ jvālāruddham ivo 'ragam*; ib. 33, 31-32, *niḥçvasya dīrgham uṣṇāṁ ca kopād raktāntalocanaḥ babhūva naraçārdūlo vidhūma iva pāvakaḥ* (phrase, see

- No. 255) tam dīptam iva kālāgnim nāgendram iva kopi-  
tam; 35, mahendram iva durjayam (a fine mixture!).  
The turn dīrgham uṣṇam ca niḥṣvasan is so common that  
in G. ii, 15, 7 it stands for the accusative! niḥṣvasantam  
yathā nāgam, dīrgham uṣṇam ca niḥṣvasan (rectified with  
v. l. in R.). For other corresponding phrases, see below,  
Nos. 133, 141–143, 205.
- 120, duḥkhamohapariplutaḥ (v. l. çokamoha, duḥkhaçoka, çoka-  
bāṣpa, bāṣpaçoka), R. ii, 99, 29; G. 108, 26; 16, 33; C.  
vii, 96, etc.; tasthāu çokapariplutaḥ, M. iii, 76, 46; duḥ-  
khaçokasamanvitaḥ, M. iii, 70, 22; xiv, 77, 17; xv, 21, 1;  
xviii, 2, 31; R. vii, 74, 1; °parāyanah, xv, 10, 18. The  
ending occurs in all sorts of phrases, e. g., çonitāugha-  
pariplutaḥ, vi, 103, 10. B.'s v. l. for C. (above) is, vii,  
3, 8, bāṣpavyākulitākṣaram. See Nos. 137, 190.
- 121, duṣṭahastī 'va hastipān, viii, 53, 17; R. vi, 67, 131.
- 122, devā iva çatakratum, iii, 78, 33; devāir iva çatakratuḥ, G.  
vi, 92, 80. The situation is the same, king restored to  
people; omitted in R. (Bombay).  
devānām (iva) dānavāih (iva), No. 84.  
dāivam . . . duratikramam, No. 43.
- 123, dviguṇīkṛtavikramah, vii, 19, 9; G. vi, 82, 179. There  
follows baddhvā ca bhrukuṭim vaktre (M. 10); sa  
baddhvā bhrukuṭim vaktre (G. 180). On these phrases  
see Nos. 51, 198. Compare R. vi, 100, 26, vimukhīkṛ-  
tavikramah.
- 124, dvitīya iva (sāgarah, etc.), ix, 30, 55, etc.; R. vi, 4, 104; 26,  
41; pāvakah, ix, 46, 54; xiii, 14, 278.  
dhanurdandam, Nos. 104–105.
- 125, dhanurvede ca vede ca, i, 109, 19, etc.; G. v, 32, 9, etc.  
dhārābhir iva toyadaḥ, No. 77.
- 126, na kālasya priyaḥ kaçcin na dvesyaḥ, Kurusattama, xi, 2,  
23; na kālasya priyaḥ kaçcin na dvesyo 'sti, Kapīçvara,  
G. iv, 18, 28. Compare Gītā, 9, 29, na me dvesyo 'sti, na  
priyaḥ, Nos. 43 and 131.
- 127, na ca tāu yuddhavāimukhyaṁ çramam vāpy upajagmatuḥ;  
copied H. 1, 54, 49 from R. vi, 88, 77 = G. 68, 37; almost  
the same in H. 2, 36, 25.
- 128, na tvaṁ çocitum arhasi, vi, 26, 27, etc.; R. iv, 7, 14; G. iii,  
71, 10 (v. l. in R., vyathitum), etc.; many occurrences

- and many v. l., e. g., G. iii, 71, 11, *çocitum nārhasa deva* (= *Rāma*), where RB. has *vīra*. See No. 147.
- 129, *nanu nāma mahārāja*, iii, 63, 4; *mahābāho*, R. vi, 111, 3. Compare M. iii, 64, 19, *nanu nāmā 'ham iṣṭā tava*, and G. iv, 24, 37, *tave 'ṣṭā nanu nāmāi 'tāḥ* (R. has *nanu cāi 'va*). Namuci, No. 250.
- 130, *na hi çakṣyāmi jīvitum*, iii, 249, 20; *nāi 'va çakyāmi jīvitum*, G. ii, 17, 32; *na hi çaknomi*, G. v. 26, 23. See No. 134.
- 131, *nā 'kāle vihitō mṛtyuḥ*, *nā 'prāptakālo mriyate*, iii, 63, 7; 65, 39; *akāle durlabho mṛtyuḥ*, R. v, 25, 12; *nā 'kāla-mṛtyur bhavati*, G. v, 28, 3. Compare ix, 64, 10 and xi, 2, 5, *kālam prāpya mahābāho* (*mahārāja*) *na kaçcid ati-vartate*. See Nos. 43 and 126. The (new) references here given to M. are to be added to those in Journ. Phil., vol. xx, pp. 25–26, where will be found other parallels.
- 132, *nāgāḥ . . . siddhāç cakracarās tathā*, iii, 85, 72; *nāgāḥ . . . cakracarāç ca siddhāḥ*, R. v, 48, 23 ("the sun and other heavenly bodies" are the blessed cyclists).
- 133, *nāgendra iva niḥçvasan*, ix, 32, 38; *bhujamga iva*, R. v, 22, 30. See Nos. 119, 141–143, 205.
- 134, *nā 'ham jīvitum utsahe*. This is a commoner form than that above in No. 130. It occurs repeatedly, e. g. iv, 19, 13; vii, 24, 11; x, 4, 26; xvi, 8, 23; R. v, 26, 4 (= G. v, 26, 33, v. l.); vi, 116, 18; G. ii, 80, 9; vi, 24, 18; with many variations, e. g., *katham jīvitum utsahe*, G. vi, 34, 8, and above in No. 130.
- 135, *nikṛttā iva kiṃçukāḥ*, xiii, 30, 43; R. vi, 67, 29; *pādapāḥ*, R. iv, 17, 1; G. ii, 45, 5; G. iii, 31, 48; etc. See Nos. 71, 136, 168.
- 136, *nikṛttā kadālī yathā*, iii, 291, 14; G. ii, 17, 22 (= R. 20, 23, *patitām kadālīm iva*). See Nos. 71, 135, 180.  
*nityam dharmaparākramah*, No. 293.  
*nipapāta*, No. 148.
- 137, *nimagnāḥ çokasāgare*, vii, 1, 11; 193, 34; R. iv, 20, 9 (compare 10, 34); G. ii, 37, 22 (R. *prapannā*). Compare *duḥkhasāgarasampluta*, G. vi, 9, 7; *patitā çokasāgare*, R. vi, 111, 31; G. vi, 95, 20, and 34. See Nos. 120, 190.
- 138, *nimeṣāntaramātreṇa*, iv, 64, 28; v, 15, 31; xii, 334, 21, etc.; R. iv, 39, 11; v, 62, 36; vi, 44, 19; 45, 16; G. vi, 13, 9.



- 139, *nirmuktāv iva pannagāu*, vii, 136, 29; inst. pl., ix, 15, 40; fem. sg., G. vi, 34, 23; *nirmuktāu bhujagāv iva*, G. (ref. lost). See Nos. 74, 140, 150, 243.
- 140, *nirmokam iva pannagāḥ*, vii, 168, 5; R. vi, 33, 33; G. v, 3, 45; *pannago yathā*, G. ii, 91, 12. See Nos. 74, 139.
- 141, *niḥṇvasann urago yathā*, vi, 121, 10; ix, 64, 5; R. vi, 51, 18; *jihmaga iva*, ix, 1, 49 (C. *pannaga*); *iva pannagaḥ* M. ii, 65, 42; *yadvat fer yathā* (metre), vii, 193, 70; *papāta bhuvi saṅkruddho niḥṇ. iva pannagaḥ*, R. ii, 74, 35. See Nos. 118, 119, 133, 139, 142, 143, 150.
- niṣpiṣya*, No. 163.
- 142, *niḥṇvasantam punaḥ punaḥ*, vii, 15, 30; G. vi, 55, 77 (dual, *gajāv iva*); R. vi, 76, 81 (v. l. of last, *gajāv iva*) *niḥṇvasantāu muhur muhuḥ*; as in G. ii, 110, 14 (sg.), while here R. ii, 101, 15 has *punaḥ punaḥ*. See Nos. 141, 143.
- 143, *niḥṇvasantam yathā nāgam*, vi, 106, 71; xii, 224, 1; R. vi, 49, 1, dual; G. ii, 15, 7 (R. 18, 5, *mahārājan*); G. vi, 21, 5. The usual R. form is *ṇvasantam iva pannagam*, vi, 108, 10; with v. l., *niḥṇvasantam ivo 'ragam*, G. ii, 19, 1; °*tāu ivo 'ragāu*, M. vii, 77, 1. C. vi, 3478, *ṇvas.*; B., *jval*. See Nos. 119, 133, 141, 142, 205.
- 144, *nilakuñcitamūrdhajaḥ*, iii, 277, 9; 280, 50; G. vi, 37, 61, with another phrase, *mattamātaṅgagāminam* (No. 203); *nilakuñcitakeṇi*, M. ii, 65, 33.
- 145, *nilāñjanacayaprakhyāḥ*, vii, 20, 18; °*prabhuḥ*, G. vi, 24, 43 = R. 49, 32, but here °*cayopamaḥ*, as in G. vi, 94, 7 = R. 110, 6.
- 146, *nilotpalamayīm mālām*, vii, 139, 8 (*dhārayan*); *mālām nilotpalamayīm iva*, G. vi, 79, 62 (*dhārayan*), v. l. in R.; in both cases of a wreath of arrows.
- 147, *no 'tkanṭhām kartum arhasi*, iii, 216, 10; xii, 170, 11, etc.; G. v, 36, 76 (not in R.), but in R. ii, 46, 2, *na co 'tkanṭhitum arhasi* (*tvaṁ no 't°* in G. 44, 2); and R. ii, 53, 2, *tām no 'tkanṭhitum arhasi* (*nāi 'vo 't°* in G. 53, 3). R. here has the classical turn. See No. 128.
- 148, *nyapatanta mahītale*, ix, 56, 11; *sa papāta*, R. vi, 59, 88 = *nipapāta*, G. 36, 67; G. vii, 111, 47 (not in R.); *petatus tāu*, R. vi, 97, 24, 26. The usual variant is *papāta dharaṇītale*, ix, 27, 46; R. iii, 52, 26; 66, 18; G. iv, 19, 3; *passim* in both epics. See also No. 167, 240, 309.

- 149, pañke magnā iva dvipāḥ, vi, 100, 9; pañkamagna iva dvipāḥ, G. iv, 15, 30; v, 87, 26. R. iii, 61, 13 extends the phrase, pañkam āsādyā vipulam sīdantam iva kuñjaram (= G. 68, 2, sīdann iva mahādvipāḥ); a new turn in ix, 58, 33 gives anyonyam jaghuatur virāu pañkasthāu mahiṣāv iva. See Nos. 102, 215.
- 150, pañcaçīrṣā ivo 'ragāḥ, iii, 57, 6; iv, 22, 56; R. v, 10, 18; vi, 99, 40 (of arrows, çvasantaḥ). Compare pañcāsyāḥ pannagāḥ çhinnair Garuḍene 'va, vii, 36, 27; pañcāsyāv iva pannagāu, G. iii, 74, 22. This variety of snakes is recognized together with those having four and seven heads in Hariv. 3, 46, 38. The seven-headed variety, together with those having three and ten heads respectively, is recognized in i, 27, 51, while the saptaçīrṣa (çīrṣan) sort, pannago mahān, is taken as the form of the divine weapon, xiii, 14, 257. G. iv, 33, 41, saptaçīras, has been cited above under No. 119. For the ending ivo 'ragāḥ. See also Nos. 74, 106, 118, 141.
- 151, pataṁgā iva pāvakam, v, 130, 21; vi, 117, 35; pataṁgān iva pāvakaḥ, ib. 37; R. iii, 28, 14; vi, 44, 23; 97, 6; 102, 62; G. v, 38, 36; G. vi, 54, 53; pataṁgā jvalanam yathā, C. ix, 152 (where M. ix. 3, 27 has pataṁgā iva pāvakam); R. vi, 66, 26; 96, 2; interchanges with çalabhān iva pāvakam (q. v. No. 283), R. vi, 65, 43 = G. 44, 38; pataṁga iva cā 'gnāu te, xvi, 3, 42 (prior pāda); triṣṭubh, yathā pradiptam jvalanam pataṁgā viçanti, M. vi, 35, 29. See also Nos. 181, 258, 283.
- 152, patākadvajamālīnī (°nam), iii, 77, 6 (açobhayac ca nagram); G. ii, 42, 12; G. iv, 25, 38; G. vi, 14, 20. The corresponding verses in R. are sūcchritadvajamālīnī, ii, 43, 10; patākadvajaçobhitā, iv, 26, 41; and a complete v. l., vi, 38, 11 (G. v, 9, 17 also has patākadvajaçobhitā). But R. has the titular phrase at vi, 47, 14 = G. 22, 21 (both °mālīnī); and at vi, 57, 3, where G. 31, 4 has bahudhvajapatākinīm.
- patidarçanalālasā, No. 165.
- 153, pated dyaūr himavān çīryet, iii, 12, 130; idem but prthivī, G. ii, 15, 29. In M. follows prthivī çakalī bhavet çuṣyet toyanidhiḥ; in G., çoṣam jalanidhir vrajet. In v, 82, 48, dyaūḥ patec ca sanakṣatrā; in iii, 278, 38, and vii, 13, 10,

- prapated dyāuḥ sanakṣatrā pṛthivī cakali bhavet; in iii, 249, 31-32, vidīryet sakalā bhūmir dyāuḥ cā 'pi cakali bhavet . . himavāṇḥ ca parivrajat ṣuṣyet toyaiḥ samudreṣu (with other like expressions). See Nos. 64, 327.
- 153 b, papāta ca mamāra ca, passim. See Nos. 148, 167.  
param (-am) vismayam, No. 264.
- 154, param kāutūhalaṁ hi me, iii, 296, 26; ix, 35, 39; 40, 2; xiii, 75, 7; R. i, 1, 5, etc., etc.; bhūyaḥ k. h. m., ix, 47, 3.
- 155, parasparajayāiṣiṇāu, vii, 14, 46; R. iv, 11, 42; vi, 89, 1; G. 76, 32; G. 79, 33. Interchanges with °jighāṁsavaḥ and °vadhāiṣiṇaḥ, q. v. below.
- 156, parasparajighāṁsavaḥ, vi, 46, 5, 15; G. vi, 29, 16, where R. 55, 17 has jighāṁsayā, which is found also in G. vi, 49, 42, but here R. 69, 54 has jayāiṣiṇaḥ (No. 155). So G. i, 77, 19 has jighiṣayā, where R. has jayāiṣiṇāu; G. vi, 77, 27, jighāṁsinam, where R. 97, 27 has jaghnatuḥ ca parasparam. See Nos. 155, 157.
- 157, parasparavadhāiṣiṇāu, vii, 7, 32; ix, 12, 38; 55, 23 (with the phrase kruddhāv iva mahādvipāu); and passim; G. vi, 69, 1, where R. 89, 1 has jayāiṣiṇāu (No. 155); G. vi, 67, 31; 79, 33. Compare anyonyavadhakāṅkṣiṇāu, R. vi, 99, 31. I have noticed vadhāiṣin only in G., but cannot say that it is lacking in the Bombay edition. Nos. 155-157 might perhaps all be put under one head as simple variants of one phrase. See l. c. No. 10, p. 143.
- 158, Parjanya iva vṛṣṭimān, vi, 63, 25; vii, 89, 4; ix, 12, 59; 17, 2; xii, 67, 32; 69, 32, etc.; vṛṣṭibhiḥ, R. iii, 28, 7; G. vi, 54, 34; iva jīmūtāiḥ (metre), R. vi, 27, 8; Parjanyam iva karṣakāḥ (yeṣāṁ dārāḥ pratikṣante), xiii, 60, 15; tvām eva hi pratikṣante Parj. i. k., R. ii, 112, 12, where G. 122, 12 has tvām eva pratikāṅkṣante Parj. i. k. See No. 217.
- 159, parvaṇi 'va mahodadhiḥ, ix, 26, 28; jalāçayaḥ, G. ii, 87, 5, where R. 80, 4, has sāgarasye 'va parvaṇi.
- 160, parvatān iva nīradāḥ, vii, 89, 4; G. vi, 66, 28, where R. 87, 25 has toyadāḥ.
- 161, palāyanaparāyaṇaḥ, vii, 22, 15; 103, 32; 192, 83, etc.; G. v, 33, 31. See l. c. No. 10, p. 143, and Nos. 69, 116, 293.  
palāçair iva, No. 168.
- 162, paçum raçanayā yathā, iv, 22, 74, etc.; R. vii, 23, 1, 40.  
paçyatām sarvasāinyānām, No. 110.

- 163, pāṇim pāṇāu viniṣpiṣya, vii, 73, 19 (with dantān kaṭaka-tāyya ca); R. ii, 35, 1; vii, 69, 2 (pāṇau pāṇim sa niṣpiṣya). Compare niṣpiṣya pāṇinā pāṇim, iv, 22, 81; pāṇāu pāṇim nipīḍya ca (v. l. ha), ix, 65, 33; karaṁ kareṇa niṣpiṣya, i, 151, 42; karaṁ kareṇā 'bhinipīḍya vīraḥ, iii, 236, 19; talaṁ talena niṣpiṣya, vii, 193, 70.
- 164, pāṇḍureṇā 'tapatreṇa dhriyamāṇena mūrdhani, v, 178, 77; xiii, 14, 175; xiv, 64, 3; 75, 7; xv, 23, 8; R. iv, 38, 13 (G. pāṇḍareṇa); chatreṇa dhriyamāṇena pāṇḍureṇa virā-jatā, ix, 9, 2. Four references are here added to those cited, l. c. No. 10, p. 138.
- pāṇahasta ivā 'ntakaḥ, Nos. 41, 104-105.
- 165, putradarṣanalālasā, i, 122, 29; G. i, 9, 56; bhartṛdarṣana-lālasā, iii, 64, 124; 282, 60; G. ii, 26, 5; Rāmadarṣana-lālasā, iii, 289, 27; R. v, 14, 42; lālasā as terminal, ṣoka°, i, 2, 229; G. iv, 18, 19; pati°, M. iii, 65, 1; patidarṣana-lālasā, G. v, 29, 6, where R. 30, 6 has °kāṅkṣiṇī; yuddha-lālasāḥ, G. vi, 27, 25, where R. 51, 25 has nardanto jaladā yathā. See also PW. s. v.
- 166, punarjātam ivā 'tmānam (mene), viii, 96, 47; R. vi, 39, 15; R. vi, 65, 15, and G. 44, 12. In R. vi, 69, 8, manyate kālacoditaḥ, where G. 48, 8 keeps mene; in R. vi, 74, 25, manyate plavagottamaḥ, where G. 53, 30 keeps mene.
- 167, puṣpavṛṣṭiḥ papāta ha, iii, 76, 40; papāta puṣpavṛṣṭiḥ ca, R. vii, 110, 6. See also No. 148.
- 168, puṣpitāv iva kiṁṣukāu, iii, 280, 32; vi, 45, 14; ix, 12, 15; 57, 4; dadṛḡāte Himavati p. i. k., ix, 58, 34; plural, vii, 19, 14; ix, 9, 24; R. vi, 45, 9; 80, 34; 90, 37; G. vi, 32, 33, where R. 58, 46 has prabhinnāv iva kuṇḍjarāu, a phrase, No. 178; extended in M. vi, 101, 17, saṁstīrṇa iva parvataḥ; kiṁṣukaḥ puṣpavān iva, ib. 110, 36; puṣpitāv iva niṣpatrāu, yathā cālmalikiṁṣukāu, G. vi, 68, 31; kiṁṣukāv iva puṣpitāu, viii, 29, 18; palāṣair iva puṣpitāiḥ, R. vi, 58, 28, where G. 32, 25 has puṣpitāir iva kiṁṣukāiḥ as in R. vi, 75, 27, and G. 54, 24. See Nos. 177, 178.
- pūrayann iva, No. 36.
- 169, pūrṇacandranibhānaṁ, iii, 68, 26; R. vii, 33, 14. See also No. 98, for a similar phrase.
- 170, pūrṇāyatavisṛṣṭena ṣareṇā 'nataparvaṇā, vi, 95, 72; R. vi,

71, 72 (G. 51, 75, *karnāyata*<sup>o</sup>). The hemistich consists of two *iterata*, the last *pāda* being often used independently, vi, 64, 52; 88, 29; ix, 16, 39; G. iv, 17, 23; v, 31, 30. Compare *ṣarāiḥ samnataparvabhīḥ*, M. vii, 14, 30; *ākarna-pūrṇam āyamyā*, R. iv, 11, 91.

171, *prthivi sasyamālīnī*, vi, 3, 19; R. iii, 16, 5 (*sasyaṣālīnī*, in the other texts, C. vi, 86; G. iii, 22, 5); *tristubh, mahīm iva prāvṛṣi sasyaṣālīnīm*, G. v, 80, 31 (not in R.).

172, *prthivyām caturantāyām*, iv, 44, 20; R. v, 31, 4. *prakīrṇa*, No. 251.

173, *pragrhya saṣaram dhanuḥ*, iii, 282, 34; 288, 10; G. v, 93, 14.

174, *prajākāmāḥ sa cā 'prajāḥ*, iii, 53, 5; R. i, 38, 2; G. i, 14, 28. *prajvalam*, No. 176.

175, *pratapantam ivā 'dityam*, vi, 59, 66; vii, 40, 24; G. ii, 117, 16; *pratapantam ivā 'dityam madhyāhne diptatejasam*, R. vi, 128, 9; *madhyaṅgatam ivā 'dityam pratapantam svatejasā*, M. vi, 106, 80. Compare *tapantam iva bhāskaram*, R. iv, 11, 86.

*pradīpta iva manyunā*, No. 80.

176, *pradīptam iva tejasā*, R. iv, 35, 1; G. iv, 33, 3; G. v, 80, 5 (*°tā*); vi, 46, 87. Compare *prajvalann iva tejasā*, xii, 325, 11; *jvalantam iva tejasā*, R. vi, 71, 70; G. v, 89, 44; G. vi, 46, 130; *pradīptam iva pāvakam*, xiv, 73, 4 and 6; G. iv, 44, 53; *pradīptam iva sarvaṣaḥ*, G. iii, 78, 30; *vapuṣā . . . jvalantam iva tejasā*, R. vii, 37, 2, 8; *jājvalyamānam vapuṣā*, M. i, 97, 27; iii, 100, 19; R. vi, 108, 7; G. vi, 19, 49; *jājvalyamānam tejobhīḥ (pāvakārkasamaprabham)*, M. iii, 188, 108; *jājvalyamānam kopena*, M. iv, 22, 42; G. iv, 38, 15. See Nos. 16, 75, 80, 111, 177.

177, *praphulla iva kiṃṣukāḥ*, v, 179, 31; G. vi, 68, 20; *pradīptān iva kiṃṣukān*, G. ii, 56, 7; iii, 79, 33. See Nos. 168, 176. *prabhātāyām*, No. 94; *prabhāte*, No. 79.

178, *prabhinna iva kuṇḍjarāḥ*, vi, 92, 4; vii, 21, 52; 22, 4; 39, 29; ix, 57, 62, etc.; R. vi, 28, 8; G. ii, 116, 42; dual as v. l. in R. vi, 58, 46 for *puṣpītāv iva kiṃṣukāu*, No. 168; *prabhinnāv iva mātāṅgāu*, M. vii, 10, 8; R. vi, 89, 1; *prabhinnam iva mātāṅgam parikīrṇam karenubhīḥ*, M. iv, 19, 29; *karenubhir mahāranye parikīrṇo yathā dvipah*, G. v, 14, 28.

179, *prabhūtakamalotpala*, iii, 280, 1; R. iv, 26, 16.

- 180, pravāte kadali yathā, v, 13, 3, prāvepata; R. ii, 117, 18, pravepita; R. iii, 2, 15; G. v, 26, 1. See Nos. 71, 136.
- 181, praviveṇa mahāsenām makaraḥ sāgaram yathā, i, 138, 30; viii, 77, 10; ix, 18, 10, etc.; G. vi, 77, 6 (v. l. ripoḥ sāinyam); (sāinyam) mahārṇavam mīna ivā 'viveṇa, R. vi, 69, 67. In R. vi, 97, 6, patamga iva pāvakam (No. 151) takes the place of makaraḥ sāgaram yathā in G. 77, 6.
- 182, prasannasalilām ṇubhām (nadīm), iii, 64, 112; prasanna-salilām saraḥ, R. vii, 38, 21.
- 182 b, prasādam kartum arhasi, ix, 35, 72; R. iv, 8, 19; G. ii, 110, 7.
- 183, prahasann iva, Bhārata, vi, 45, 23; (uvāca) prahasann iva, (pratyuvāca) hasann iva, M. passim; R. iv, 5, 25, etc.; G. i, 41, 3; 53, 12; 74, 19; 33, 36; G. v, 1, 52, 62, etc.
- 184, prahārāir jarjarikṛtaḥ, vii, 94, 60; viii, 56, 28; R. iv, 12, 22. See No. 235.
- 185, prahr̥ṣṇāntarātmanā, iii, 57, 30; 72, 42; G. vi, 112, 21 (R. 128, 18, prahr̥ṣṭā putravatsalā); R. vii, 11, 19.
- 186, prākāratoraṇā, terminal, dṛḍha°, iii, 284, 2; xv, 5, 16; xvi, 6, 23; sāṭṭha°, G. v, 35, 35. Compare cayāṭṭālakaparyantam, G. i, 72, 3; cayāṭṭālakaḇbhīnā, M. iii, 160, 39. On these terms, see my Ruling Caste, p. 174, note.
- 187, prāṇāḥ saṁtvarayanti mām, G. ii, 66, 57 = G. iv, 21, 24 (neither in R.); in xii, 52, 8 ca for mām, but the latter is implied, as balam me prajāhātī 'va precedes. In M. i, 172, 8, prāṇā hi prajāhanti (sic!) mām.  
prāvṛṣi 'va, No. 217.  
phulāḇoka, No. 228.
- 188, baddhagodhāṅgulitrāṇau, and plural, iii, 283, 17; iv, 5, 1; R. i, 22, 9; ii, 23, 36; baddhagodhāṅgulitravān, x, 7, 52; khadgagodhāṅgulitravān, iii, 278, 19.  
baddhvā ca bhrukūṭim, Nos. 51, 123.  
babhūva tumulaḥ ṇabdaḥ, No. 23.
- 189, babhāu sūrya ivo 'tthitaḥ, vii, 18, 18; bhāti candra ivo 'ditaḥ, R. vi, 127, 29; kālasūrya ivo 'ditaḥ, M. vii, 16, 15; divākara ivo 'ditaḥ, R. vi, 60, 58; jvalan sūrya ivo 'ditaḥ, G. iii, 69, 1; bālasūrya ivo 'ditaḥ, G. v. 41, 36; bālacandra ivo 'ditaḥ, G. iii, 38, 15. See ivo 'tthitaḥ, ivo 'ditaḥ, as terminals also under No. 63; babhāu, No. 228.

189b, bahutālasamutsedhāḥ, iii, 158, 91 (waterfalls); R. vi, 26, 5 (a palace).

bāṣpa, all under Nos. 51, 119, 120, 190; bāṣpagadgada, No. 331.

190-193, bāṣpavyākulalocanaḥ, vii, 1, 3 (also C. 97); ix, 65, 31; xv, 16, 9; R. vi, 46, 6; G. ii, 68, 51; vi, 46, 27, where R. 46, 30 has krodhavyākulalocanaḥ; G. vi, 83, 57, etc.; R. vi, 117, 1 = G. 102, 1; G. vi, 103, 1. This (a) is the usual parallel among these lachrymose pādas. Another (b) is ṣokavyākulalocanāḥ, M. vii, 78, 14; G. ii, 83, 31; and ṣokabāṣpapariplutaḥ, M. iii, 313, 3; G. v, 66, 20. In R. the commonest form is bāṣpaparyākulekṣana, G. iii, 7, 32; R. vi, 114, 3 (G. 99, 3, with 4, ṣadbāṣpapariplutaḥ); R. vi, 101, 46 (v. l. to G. 83, 57, above); G. vi, 26, 27, where R. 50, 45 has harṣa° (No. 331). Varieties are bāṣpaṣokapariplutaḥ, G. iv, 26, 9; R. iii, 2, 22; ṣoka-vegapariplutaḥ, G. v, 75, 18; ṣokabāṣpasamākulaḥ, M. vii, 52, 7; bāṣpaṣokasamanvitah, ix, 65, 32; bāṣpasamīg-dhayā vācā (see No. 331), xv, 8, 23. A third (c) case of identity is found in tataḥ sā bāṣpakalayā vācā and sā bāṣpakalayā vācā, M. iii, 61, 25; iv, 20, 28; R. ii, 82, 10. Perhaps others will be found, of which I have given one side above, and finally in these: ṣokaviplutalocanāḥ, G. v, 39, 5; bāṣpopahatacetana, R. iv, 27, 32; ṣokenāviṣṭa-cetanā, G. vi, 9, 3; bāṣpaviplutalocanaḥ, G. ii, 96, 2; bāṣpadūṣitalocanaḥ, R. iv, 8, 29; bāṣpavyākulitekṣanaḥ, R. vii, 98, 2; bāṣpapūrṇamukhāḥ sarve, R. ii, 40, 21. See Nos. 51, 119, 120, 290, and especially the same compounds with *harṣa*, No. 331, where too are put the bāṣpagadgada compounds.

bijam uptam, No. 219.

194-195, Brahmā lokapitāmahaḥ, ix, 2524 (= 45, 22, sarva°, as in 47, 15 and in R. i, 63, 17; vi, 61, 21); R. i. 57, 4, etc.; sarvabhūta°, M. i, 64, 39.

bhayagadgada, No. 331.

bhartṛdarṣanalālasā, No. 165.

196, bhasmacchanna ivā 'nalaḥ, iii, 278, 32; R. iv, 11, 81; 27, 40; G. iv, 16, 17; bhasmacchanno va pāvako, Dh. Pada, 71. For the terminal ivā 'nalaḥ, see Nos. 33, 75, 99, 291. A pāda in the śloka preceding this in Dh. P., as Prof.

- Hardy has reminded me, is also an epic phrase, *kalām nā 'gghati soḷasim*, Dh. P. 70, *kalām nā 'rhanti soḍaḍim*, M. i, 100, 68; ii, 41, 27; iii, 257, 4 (*kalām arhati*); vii, 197, 17, *yah kalām soḍaḍim pūrṇām Dhanamjaya na te 'rhati*; xii, 174, 46, and 277, 6, (ete) *nā 'rhataḥ soḍaḍim kalām*; so Manu ii, 86.
- 197, *bhīmo bhīmaparākramah*, ii, 30, 30; iii, 53, 5; 73, 19; iv, 22, 85; ix, 57, 47, and 61; R. vi, 58, 5; G. v, 35, 30; 38, 44; G. vi, 64, 23; 82, 181; *bhīmam bhīmapratīsvanam*, R. vi, 107, 19. *Bhīmam bhīmaparākramam*, M. vi, 14, 17. See No. 206.
- bhujāṅga iva*, No. 133.
- bhūyah kātūhalam*, No. 154.
- 198, *bhrūkutikuṭilānanah*, iii, 150, 5; G. vi, 65, 33. See Nos. 51, 106, 123.
- makarah sāgarām yathā*, No. 181.
- 199, *Maghavān iva Čambaram* (*jahi raṇe Čalyam*), ix, 7, 35; *Čambaram Maghavān iva* (*Bālinam jahi*), G. iv, 12, 8. Compare *Mahendreṇe 'va Čambarah* (*tena vikramya*), G. v, 18, 29.
- 200, *maṅgalyam maṅgalām Viṣṇum*, i, 1, 24; *maṅgalyam maṅgalām sarvam*, R. vi, 112, 21 (G. 97, 20, *maṅgalyam*).
- 201, *maṇḍalāni vicitrāṇi*, iii, 19, 7; ix, 57, 17, etc.; R. vi, 40, 23. Here also *gatapratyāgatāni ca*, as in both cases in M. and elsewhere and in R. vi, 107, 32 (above, No. 54). The whole passage ix, 57, 17 ff. is the same with R. vi, 40, 23 ff. (not in G.), with slight changes. See JAOS., vol. xx, p. 222, and my Ruling Caste, p. 253, note (the *gomutraka* there mentioned is found R. loc. cit.).
- 202, *maṇḍalikṛtakārmukah*, i, 133, 3; R. iii, 25, 16.
- 203, *mattamātāṅgagāminam*, iii, 80, 14; 277, 9; R. ii, 3, 28; G. vi, 37, 61. Compare *mattanāgendravikramah*, M. i, 188, 10, and *mattamātāṅgavikramah*, R. vi, 3, 43. See No. 314.
- 204, *mano vihvalatī 'va me*, i, 1, 218; iv, 61, 4; xi, 14, 14; G. ii, 71, 21.
- martukāma*, No. 213.
- 205, *mahānāga iva cvasan*, ix, 32, 35; 57, 59; G. ii, 92, 26; *ma-hāsarpa*, R. iv, 16, 13; *krudhaḥ sarpa*, R. vi, 88, 38; *ruddho nāga*, R. iii, 2, 22. See Nos. 119, 133, 141-143.



maḥāpāpaprāṇāṇī, No. 301.

- 206, mahābalaparākramah, vii, 10, 72; ix, 45, 49, etc.; G. v, 1, 49; G. vi, 70, 6; 75, 49; 110, 40. Tērmināl, Nos. 273, 293.
- 207, maholkā patatī yathā, vii, 15, 20; maholke iva petatuḥ, G. vi, 70, 18; maholke 'va nabhasstalāt (apatat), M. vi, 48, 85; divyolke 'va nabhaçcyutā, G. iv, 19, 31; nyapatad dharanipr̥sthe maholke 'va mahāprabhā, M. vi, 104, 32; sã jvalantī maholke 'va . . . nipapāta, M. vii, 92, 67.
- 208, mānsaçoṇitakardamā(m), vi, 54, 103; vii, 20, 53; 21, 43; ix, 14, 18; xi, 16, 56; xviii, 2, 17; R. vi, 42, 47; 69, 70; 125, 4; G. vi, 19, 16; °phenilām, R. vi, 69, 148 (compare usñisavaraphenilā, M. vii, 14, 11; mānsaçoṇitakardamām . . . patākavastraphenilām, vii, 187, 16-17).
- 209, mādharmañ ninaçaḥ pathaḥ, iii, 52, 15; G. i, 24, 9.
- 210, mānuṣam vigraham kṛtvā, i, 98, 8; R. iv, 66, 10.  
muktaraçmir iva, No. 25.
- 211, mudā parañayā yuktaḥ, ii, 53, 23, etc.; R. i, 52, 11. This is a phrase of various forms, yuktaḥ or yutaḥ, according to position; mudā, çriyā, prityā, according to sense. Other examples are given above, pp. 267, 269.
- 212, munayaḥ sañcitavratāḥ, xiii, 6, 41; R. iv, 13, 18. In G. iv, 13, 24, r̥śināñ sañcītātmanām = mahar̥śin sañcītavratān, M. i, 1, 3.
- 213, mumūrsur (-sor) iva bheṣajam, vi, 121, 57; ix, 5, 5 (na mām prīnāti tat sarvam); G. iii, 45, 19; āusadham iva, M. ii, 62, 2; martukāma ivāu 'sadham, R. iii, 40, 1; G. v, 89, 57, where R. vi, 17, 15 has viparīta ivāu 'sadham. Compare mumūrsur naṣtacetanaḥ, M. v, 53, 12; and na prīnayati mām bhuktam apathyam iva bhojanam, G. v, 76, 6 (paretakalpā hi gatāyuṣo narā hitam na gr̥hṇanti, R. iii, 41, 20). See No. 68.
- 214, muhūrtam iva ca dhyātvā, iii, 282, 66; sa muhūrtam iva dhyātvā, R. vi, 101, 38; sa muhūrtam iva dhyātvā bāspa-paryākulekṣaṇaḥ, two pāda phrases (Nos. 190-193, compare also s. No. 119), G. v, 19, 2; tato muhūrtaṁ sa dhyātvā, ix, 5, 2.  
mūle hate, No. 328.
- 215, mrgā vyādhair ivā 'rditaḥ, xii, 332, 31; mrgāḥ kokair ivā 'rditaḥ, G. vi, 28, 19. In M. usually mrgāḥ sinhārdita

- iva, vii, 37, 36; ix, 3, 7; 19, 3, etc.; *sinhārdita* iva *dvi-paḥ*, G. v, 37, 19. See Nos. 271, 316.
- 216, *mekalāprabhavaḥ cāi 'va Ḥoṇo maṇinibhodhakāḥ*, H. 3, 46, 44, perhaps from G. iv, 40, 20 (*°am Ḥoṇam nadam maṇi°*), the passage entire.
- megham sūrya*, No. 72.
- yathā devāsura yuddhe*, No. 227.
- 217, *yathā prāvṛṣi toyadāḥ*, vi, 81, 39; R. iii, 18, 23; *prāvṛṣi 'va balāhakāḥ*, R. v, 1, 180; *prāvṛṣi 'va mahāmeghaḥ*, R. iv, 11, 25 (compare 8, 43); *prāvṛṣi 'va ca Parjanyaḥ*, xiii, 68, 71. See Nos. 59, 77, 158.
- 218, *yathā bhūmicale 'calāu*, C. ix, 614 (vicious); *'calaḥ*, R. vi, 59, 61; 77, 13. In M. corresponding to 614, *raṇabhūmitale calāu*. Both R. passages have *samuddhūto* preceding. See Nos. 91, 240.
- 219, *yatho 'sare bijam uptam (na rohet)*, xiii, 90, 44; *sunīṣphalam bijam ivo 'ptam ūsare*, R. ii, 20, 52; *bijam nptam ivo 'sare*, R. iii, 40, 3. Compare Manu, ii, 112, *ḥubham bijam ivo 'sare*.
- yantramukta (cyuta) iva dhvajāḥ*, No. 25.
- 220, *Yamaḍaṇḍopamām raṇe*, vi, 116, 49; *Yamaḍaṇḍopamām gurvīm Indrāṇim ivo 'dyatām*, ix, 57, 12; *Yamaḍaṇḍapratīkāḥ Kālārātrim ivo 'dyatām . . . dehāntakaraṇīm ati*, ix, 11, 50 (*gadām*); *Kālaḍaṇḍopamām gadām*, R. vii, 14, 14; 27, 48; G. iii, 35, 43; *Yamaḍaṇḍopamām bhīmam*, R. vi, 77, 3; *Kālapāḥopamām raṇe*, G. iii, 31, 16; *Kālaḍaṇḍopamām raṇe*, M. vi, 45, 8; *vajrasparḥopamā raṇe*, ix, 63, 21. See Nos. 42, 104–105.
- 221, *yasya nā 'sti samo loke*, xi, 23, 14 (*ḥāurye vīrye ca*); *yasya nā 'sti samo yudhi*, G. vi, 33, 24; *yeṣām nā 'sti samo vīrye*, ib. 49.
- 222, *yasya prasādam kurute sa vāi tam draṣṭum arhati*, M. xii, 337, 20; R. vii, 37, 3, 14 (copied). This is in the *Ḥvetadvīpa* interpolation of R.
- 223, *yāvat sthāsyanti girayo*, v, 141, 55; R. i, 2, 36; adding *yāvat sthāsyanti sāgarāḥ*, xii, 334, 37; G. vi, 108, 15–16 (*sāgarāḥ*); in *Ḥānti*, correlated with *tāvat tava 'kṣayā kīrtiḥ*, . . . *bhaviṣyati*; in G. with *kīrtir eṣā bhaviṣyati*. Compare No. 224.
- 224, *yāvad bhūmir dhariṣyati*, iii, 291, 50; viii, 86, 20; ix, 53.

- 21; R. vi, 100, 57; G. vi, 92, 76; 112, 102; yāval lokā dharīṣyanti, R. i, 60, 29; vii, 84, 13; yāvad bhūmir girayaḥ ca tiṣṭheyuḥ, xii, 343, 51; yāvat prāṇā dharīṣyanti, ix, 24, 40; yāvac ca me dharīṣyanti (prāṇā dehe), M. iii, 57 (N. 5), 32. See No. 223.
- 225, yiyāsura Yamasādanam, i, 163, 10; G. vi, 57, 23. See No. 3, and l. c. No. 10, p. 143 ff.
- 226, yugāntāgnir ivā 'jvalan, i, 138, 37; R. iii, 24, 34; v, 21, 25; G. vi, 80, 40, where R. 101, 38 has yugānta iva pāvakaḥ (bhāskaraha in R. iv, 11, 2). Compare yugāntāgnir iva prajāḥ, R. v. 58, 158; G. vi, 50, 50, where R. 69, 150 has iva jvalan. See Nos. 33, 75, 111, 176.
- 227, yuddham devāsuropamam, vii, 15, 2; yuddhe devāsuropamāḥ, G. vi, 4, 3; yathā devāsura yuddhe, M. vi, 116, 36; vii, 14, 48; purā devāsura yathā, iii, 285, 11. yuddhe yuddhaviṣāradāḥ, No. 307.
- 228, raktāḥoka ivā 'babhāu, vi, 103, 10; phullāḥoka ivā 'babhāu, R. vi, 102, 69. Compare babhāu Rāmo 'ḥoka iva rakta-stabakamaṇḍitaḥ, M. v, 179, 31. See No. 189. rajanyām, Nos. 94-95. rathanemisvanena ca, No. 247.
- 229, rathenā 'dityavarcasā, iii, 290, 12; 291, 51; R. vi, 71, 16.
- 229 b, rathopastha upāviṣat, vi, 94, 19, etc.; R. vi, 59, 114.
- 230, ratho me kalpyatām iti, iii, 289, 33; kalpyatām me rathāḥ ḥighram and ratho me yujyatām iti, R. vi, 95, 21; ii, 115, 7. Rāmadarṣanalālasā, No. 165.
- 231, Rāma-Rāvaṇayor iva, R. vi, 107, 53; Rāma-Rāvaṇayoḥ cāi 'va, Vāli-Sugrīvayos tathā, ix, 55, 31; Rāma-Rāvaṇayor mṛdhe (yādṛṣam hi purā vṛttam), M. vii, 96, 28. Compare Nos. 267, 274.
- 232, Rāmo rājīvalocanaḥ, R. iii, 61, 29, etc., and passim; M. iii, 148, 10; xiii, 84, 31 (Jāmadagnyaḥ !).
- 233, Rāvaṇaḥ krodhamūrechitaḥ, iii, 277, 47; 284, 17; R. vi, 26, 6; 90, 57; G. i, 1, 51; vi, 75, 10; 88, 1; rakṣasi duḥkhamūrechitā, M. iii, 277, 46. The terminal is found often in both epics, e. g. in M. iii, 46, 48, Urvaḥ krodhamūrechitā.
- 234, rukmapuṅkhais tīladhātūḥ, ix, 24, 60 (karmāraparimāṛ-jitaiḥ); G. vi, 34, 24; svarṇapuṅkhaiḥ ḥiladhātūḥ, ix, 15, 14. See Nos. 34, 337.

- 235, rudhireṇa samukṣitāḥ, iii, 287, 14; iv, 22, 92; ix, 65, 4, etc.; G. vi, 75, 54; ṣoṇitena samukṣitāḥ, M. iii, 12, 62; jarjarīkṛtasarvāṅgāu rudhireṇā 'bhisamplutāu, ix, 58, 34; compare R. iv, 12, 22, klānto rudhiraśiktāṅgaḥ prahārāir jarjarīkṛtaḥ (phrase of No. 184).
- 236, rūpeṇā 'pratimā bhuvī, i, 152, 17; iii, 62, 25; ix, 35, 47; 48, 2; xiii, 82, 4; G. i, 40, 4; R. i, 32, 14; iii, 34, 20, Sītā; 35, 13; 72, 5, vii, 58, 7 (last three, neuter with kanyā- or bhāryā- dvayam); vii, 80, 4; 87, 26; with loka for metre, xvii, 2, 14; R. v, 12, 20; Sītā cā 'pratimā bhuvī, R. vi, 110, 22; rūpeṇā 'sadṛṣī bhuvī, Hariv. 1, 12, 7; with bala, balenā 'pratimā bhuvī, iii, 275, 7. The prevailing form in both epics is rūpeṇā 'pratimā bhuvī, as above and in R. iv, 66, 9, here after the pāda, vikhyātā triṣu lokeṣu, with which compare M. iii, 53, 15, where Nala is lokeṣv apratimo bhuvī, but with rūpeṇa following, which in turn takes the place of mūrtimān (No. 35) in another R. phrase. In R. vii, 37, 3, 24, the phrase is united with chāye 'vā 'nugatā, No. 70, and sarvalakṣaṇalakṣita, No. 303. It is slightly modified on occasion, jānanty apratimā bhuvī, ix, 42, 20; rūpeṇā 'pratimā rājan, M. v. 35, 6.
- laghu citraṁ ca, No. 67.
- 237, vacanaṁ ce 'dam abravīt, v, 178, 27; G. v, 23, 24; interchanges with vākyam ce 'dam uvāca ha, R. i, 35, 3 = G. 37, 3. Loc. cit., No. 10, p. 144. See No. 24.
- 238, vajraṇiṣpeṣagāuravam, iii, 11, 40; G. vi, 76, 27; °niḥṣavanam, G. vi, 36, 105 (°niṣṭhuraṁ, R. 59, 126). vajrasparṣopamā raṇe, No. 220.
- 239, vajrahasta ivā 'surān, viii, 9, 5 (mohayitvā raṇe); °tam i. °āḥ, vi, 108, 35; vajrapāṇer ivā 'surāḥ (saṁtrasiṣyanti), vii, 3, 15; asurān iva vāsavaḥ, G. vi, 14, 8; vajreṇa 'ndra ivā 'surān, G. v, 50, 19; vajrahasto yathā Ṣakraḥ, R. vi, 67, 38; vajravān vajraṁ dānaveṣv iva vāsavaḥ (krodham mokṣye), R. vi, 25, 25; surānām iva vāsavaḥ, ib. 26, 37; nibudhān iva vāsavaḥ (pātu), M. vii, 6, 4; tridaṇḍā iva vāsavam, M. vi, 97, 24; vāsavo vāsavān yathā (v. l. iva), R. iv, 26, 36, etc.; marutām (marudbhīr) iva vāsavaḥ, G. v, 31, 57; R. ii, 106, 27; sahasrākṣam ivā 'marāḥ, R. iv, 26, 23. See No. 250.

vajrāṇi, No. 275.

240, vajrāhata ivā 'calah, vii, 26, 16; R. vi, 69, 162 (ib. 95, yathā 'calo vajranipātabhagnaḥ); papāta sahasā bhūmāu, v. i. acalah, R. vii, 69, 36 (No. 148); G. iv, 48, 22 (R. 48, 21, v. l., paryasta iva parvataḥ); vajrakṛttā ivā 'calah, R. vi, 69, 73. See Nos. 91, 218.

241, vajrāir iva girir hataḥ, vii, 15, 26; vajreṇ 'va mähāgiriḥ, R. iv, 16, 23 (nihataḥ.)

vanam agnir, No. 33.

242, vane vanyena jīvataḥ, xii, 13, 10; xv, 11, 23; R. ii, 37, 2; 63, 27, and G. 80, 11; G. iv, 20, 7. Compare vane vanyena vartayan, Raghuv. xii, 20.

243, valmika(m) iva pannagāḥ, vi, 117, 43; vii, 139, 7; R. iii, 20, 21; 29, 11. See Nos. 74, 139 ff., 150.

244, vavarṣa ṣaravarṣāṇi (°ena), vi, 47, 20 and 67; ix, 16, 33-34; etc.; R. vi, 58, 40, etc. Compare ṣaravarṣam vavarṣa saḥ (or ca), common in M.; R. vi, 93, 18; ṣaravārṣāir avākīrat, M. vii, 18, 19; G. vi, 30, 11; R. vi, 100, 25; 103, 23. See No. 77.

vasavo, No. 239.

245, vākyajño vākyakovidah, iii, 278, 2; G. v, 7, 40; R. vi, 111, 97.

246, vākyam vākyaviçāradaḥ, ii, 15, 10; v, 13, 10; R. v, 52, 4; 63, 15; vii, 87, 1; G. i, 60, 17; G. vi, 82, 46. Compare vākyam vākyavidam çreṣṭhaḥ, R. i, 70, 16; vi, 3, 6; vākyajño and vākyavid vākyakuçalāḥ, R. iv, 3, 24; vi, 17, 30; G. v, 81, 2 (G. 81, 46, çāstravid vākyakuçalāḥ); sarve vākyaviçāradaḥ, G. vi, 27, 11 (v. l. vākyakovidah). Compare No. 307.

247, vājinām khuraçabdena rathanemisvanena ca, ix, 9, 14; G. vi, 111, 17, but with aqvānām for vājinām, where R. 127, 20 has khuraçabdaç ca. In G. ii, 111, 46 (the second pāda only) khuranemisvanena ca, where R. 103, 40 has rathanemisamāhatā; rathanemisvanena ca is common in M., vii, 38, 12, etc.

248-249, (a) vātarugṇa iva drumah, iii, 286, 4; C. xi, 611 = 21, 9, where is found °bhagna, as in vi, 13, 13; 14, 16; vji, 16, 4, but °rugṇa occurs again in vii, 79, 25 (C. bhugna). Other forms in M. are vātahata, vāyurugṇa, viii, 9, 5; agnidagdha (all with iva drumah), iii, 63, 39; vāteritah

çāla ivā 'driçrṅgāt, viii, 85, 38; iii, 16, 20, vātarugṇa iva kṣuṇṇo jirṇamūlo vanaspatih (vegavān nyapatad bhuvi). (b) Besides these, chinnamūla, iv, 16, 12; viii, 96, 54 (like chinne 'va kadali, No. 71). In R. the last (b) is the favorite form, though in iii, 20, 21, bhinnamūla iva drumāḥ stands for G. 26, 24 chinnamūlā; papāta sahaṣā bhūmāu chinnamūla i. d., G. ii, 74, 19; R. vi, 58, 54 = G. 32, 42; in R. iii, 29, 7, çirṇamūla (= G. 35, 8, chinna), etc. Compare also vātanunna, M. vii, 190, 27 (vātanunna ivā 'mbudāḥ, viii, 24, 27); chinna tarur ivā 'raṇye, G. vi, 82, 115; drumā bhagnaçikḥā iva, M. vi, 62, 44; vajrarugṇa ivā 'calāḥ, xiv, 76, 18. Other forms in R. are mūlabhraṣṭa, bhūmikampa, vātoddhūta, vajrāhata (all with iva drumāḥ); bhagnā iva mahādrumāḥ. I enter only two as identical, but there may be more. Compare Nos. 53, 71, 136, 240. I add here another like interchange of ptc.: bhagnadaṇṣṭra ivo 'ragaḥ, R. i, 55, 9; çirṇa°, ix, 3, 7 (cf. 19, 3).

250, vāsavō Namuciṃ yathā, ix, 7, 38 (jahi cai 'nam); G. vi, 51, 102 (jahī 'mam); Çakreṇa Namucir yathā, G. vi, 18, 16 (compare 30, 17); Namucir vāsavaṃ yathā, G. iii, 31, 36 (= R. 25, 31, kruddhaṃ kruddha ivā 'ntakaḥ, Nos. 104-105); Namucir yathā Hariṃ! (samabhyadhāvat), G. iii, 32, 36; sa vṛtra iva vajreṇa phenena Namucir yathā Balo ve 'ndrāçanihataḥ, R. iii, 30, 28 (vā for iva, as often); dvandvayuddhaṃ sa dātum te [samarthaḥ] Namucer ivā vāsavaḥ, R. iv, 11, 22. See No. 239.

251, vikīrṇā iva parvatāḥ (and instr. pl.), vi, 116, 39; iii, 172, 18; vii, 20, 50; G. iii, 56, 39; G. vi, 37, 30; 52, 37; interchanges with viçīrṇa, viii, 27, 38; G. iv, 7, 23, viçīrṇa = R. iv, 8, 24, vikīrṇa; so viçīrṇa in G. v, 87, 4; also prakīrṇa, R. iv, 5, 29; G. vi, 76, 13. Compare nirdhūta iva, G. v, 8, 4; patita, G. vi, 32, 24. See Nos. 75, 111.

252, vikhyātā triṣu lokeṣu (above, No. 236); triṣu lokeṣu viçruta, iii, 84, 83; 85, 74; ix, 38, 38, etc.

253, vidyut sāudāmanī yathā, iii, 53, 12; 96, 22; R. iii, 52, 14, where G. 38, 19 has vyomni, as in G. vi, 80, 24, where the v. l. is dīptāçanisamaprabhā; also R. iii, 74, 34 (not in G.); R. vii, 32, 56 = G. 21, 57.

- 254, vidhidr̥ṣṭena karmanā, iii, 166, 8; ix, 47, 10; R. i, 49, 19;  
Compare r̥sidr̥ṣṭena vidhinā, ix, 50, 12.
- 255, vidhūma iva pāvakah, vi, 109, 35; 117, 48; xii, 251, 7; 325,  
12; R. iv, 67, 7; vi, 77, 7; 88, 20. See Nos. 75, 111, 226,  
283.
- 256, vidhūmo 'gnir iva jvalan, i, 102, 38; ix, 14, 20; xii, 334, 3;  
R. iii, 28, 19. See Nos. 33, 226.
- 257, vinadya jalado yathā, vi, 49, 35; nādayan jalado yathā, R.  
iii, 70, 10; vineduḥ . . . jaladā iva, G. vi, 21, 22 (v. l.  
jaladopamāḥ); G. vi, 50, 36; jaladā iva cā 'neduḥ, R. vi,  
60, 35.
- 258, vinirdagdham patamgam iva vahninā, ii, 42, 19; vinirdag-  
dhaḥ ṣalabho vahninā yathā, G. vii, 23, 48. For another  
case of interchange between patamga and ṣalabha in the  
same phrase, see No. 151.  
vimarde tumule, No. 92.  
vimukhikṛtavikrama, No. 123.
- 259, vivatsām iva dhenavaḥ (dhenukām), vii, 78, 18; R. ii, 41, 7.  
Compare gāur vivatse 'va vatsalā, G. ii, 66, 28.
- 259 b, vivarnavadanā kṛṣā, iii, 54, 2; R. ii, 75, 7.
- 260, vivyādha niṣitāiḥ ṣarāiḥ, vi, 45, 77; and passim; R. v, 44,  
6; G. vi, 19, 55; and passim. See l. c. No. 10, p. 141, for  
variants.
- 261, viṣalyakaraṇīm ṣubhām, vi, 81, 10: G. vi, 82, 39; 83,  
9, etc. The passage in M. should be compared as a  
whole with G. vi, 71, 23. In M.: evaṃ uktvā dadāv  
asmāi viṣalyakaraṇīm ṣubhām oṣadhiṃ vīryasampannām  
viṣalyaḥ cā 'bhavat tadā; in G.: evaṃ uktas tu . . .  
viṣalyakaraṇīm nāma . . . ṣubhām dadāu nasyam sa tasya  
gandham āghrāya viṣalyaḥ samapadyata (all explained  
again in G. 82, 39).
- 262, viṣapīta iva skhalan, Hariv. C. 4,840 = ṣvasan in 2, 32, 1; G.  
ii, 84, 1. Compare madakṣiba iva skhalan, G. ii, 84, 5. &
- 262 b, viṣam agniṃ jalam rajjum āsthāsyē tava kāraṇāt, iii, 56, 4  
(Nala, 4, 4), where the situation is the same as in R. ii,  
29, 21 (not in G.); viṣam agniṃ jalam vā 'ham āsthāsyē  
mr̥tyukāraṇāt.  
visphārya ca, No. 308.
- 263, visphūrjitam ivā 'ṣaneḥ, iii, 51, 13, and often; G. iv, 5, 24;  
G. v, 23, 19 (R. 21, 24, nirghoṣam aṣaner iva).

- 264, vismayam paramam gataḥ, ix, 54, 11; R. iv, 12, 5; R. v, 32, 3; gatvā, xiii, 14, 368; yayāu, M. iii, 71, 24, etc.; prāpa, G. vi, 16, 95; jagmuḥ, M. v, 131, 22; ix, 38, 10, 57, 9, etc.; R. vi, 107, 3; G. 99, 45; param vismayam āgatāḥ, M. iv, 22, 93 (sarve); R. i, 69, 16; R. vi, 107, 3 (sarve); G. vi, 4, 44; paramam vismayam gataḥ, G. iii, 30, 38; sarve vismayam āgatāḥ, G. vi, 86, 11; ṣrutvā tu vismayam jagmuḥ, R. vi, 130, 40.
- 265, vismayotphullanayanāḥ, i, 134, 28; R. iii, 42, 34; G. v, 9, 60; °locanāḥ, M. i, 136, 1; xiii, 14, 386; Hariv. 3, 10, 45; R. vii, 37, 3, 29; G. iv, 63, 10; G. vi, 105, 21, where R. has kim tv etad iti vismitāḥ; vismayākulacetasaḥ, G. iv, 50, 14. See No. 332.
- 266, vīro raṇaviṣāradāḥ, vi, 57, 16; G. vi, 60, 4.
- 267, vṛtravāsavayor iva, vi, 100, 51 (tayoh samabhavad yuddham); R. vi, 99, 31 (tayor abhūn mahāyuddham). Compare Nos. 231, 274.
- 268, vedavedāṅgapāragāḥ, iii, 64, 81; xiii, 14, 62; G. ii, 70, 16; °tattvajñāḥ, metrical, M. vi, 14, 44, etc.
- 269, velām iva mahodadhiḥ, vii, 197, 6; R. vi, 76, 63; 118, 16; G. ii, 30, 30; velām iva samāsādyā, M. i, 227, 28; velām ivā 'sādyā yathā samudraḥ, R. vi, 109, 21; velām iva mahārṇavaḥ, M. iv, 19, 22; ix, 3, 18; vele 'va makarālayam, iv, 52, 19; vi, 108, 60, etc.
- vyatitāyām, No. 94.
- 270, vyāghrakesariṇāv iva, vii, 14, 68; G. vi, 67, 32.
- 271, vyāghraḥ kṣudramrgam yathā, iii, 10, 25 (jaghāna); vyāghrāt kṣudramrgā iva (trastāḥ), G. iii, 33, 21. Compare (trāsayan) sinhaḥ kṣudramrgān yathā, M. iii, 288, 10; (drṣtvā no 'dviḥ), R. iii, 28, 13; sinham kṣudramrgā yathā (samtrastāḥ), M. vi, 19, 10; vyādhibhiḥ ca vimathyante vyādhāḥ kṣudramrgā iva, xii, 332, 29. See also Nos. 215, 316.
- 272, vyāttānam ivā 'ntakam, vi, 63, 26; 107, 99; R. iii, 32, 6; and G. iii, 7, 8, where R. iii, 2, 6 has vyāditāsyam; which phrase occurs also in M. vi, 114, 39. Compare viii, 91, 42, Kālānam vyāttam ivā 'tighoram. For ivā 'ntaka see No. 104.
- vyāhartum upacakrame, No. 14.
- vyuṣṭāyām, Nos. 94-95.



- vyomni sūdāmanī, No. 253.
- 273, Çakratulyaparākramaḥ. The common terminal is parākramaḥ, to which is prefixed Yama, Vāyu, Çakra, etc., as in ix, 15, 10, Yama; G. vi, 83, 39, Vāyu; G. vi, 75, 2, Çakra. The last is naturally the most frequent, Çakratulyaparākramaḥ, viii, 27, 27, etc.; G. iii, 42, 19; R. iv, 11, 43; 32, 11; vi, 69, 10 and 82; 71, 1; Çakratulyabalo 'pi san, G. iii, 47, 2. See Nos. 206, 293.
- Çakradhvaja, No. 25.
- 274, Çakraçambarayor iva, R. vi, 76, 77; (yathā yuddhe) Çakraçambarayoḥ purā, M. vi, 100, 54. See Nos. 231, 267.
- 275, Çakrāçanīsamaspārçān (çarān), vi, 108, 35; G. vi, 68, 6, where R. 88, 42 has sarpān iva viṣolbanān; Indrāçani°, ix, 24, 57, etc.; R. vi, 98, 21; vajrāçani°, R. vi, 43, 32. So Çakra, Indra, and vajra, in Çakrāçanīsamāsvanam, Indrā°, vajrā°, M. vi, 44, 11; 62, 61; G. i, 42, 5 (mahā°, 33, 12); vajrā° also R. vi, 100, 32; G. iii, 26, 20; Çakrāçanīsamāprabhā, R. vi, 54, 2. Compare çarāir açaṇīsam-spārçāḥ, M. vi, 117, 22 with Çakrā° vajrāçanīsamāḥ çarāḥ, R. vi, 88, 46 = G. 68, 10; also vajrasamspārçasamān çarān, G. vi, 70, 15 (= 90, 44, vajrasparçasamān); Çakrāçanīsvanam, ib. 61, 1, etc.
- 276, çāṅkhaḍundubhinīhsvanāḥ, i, 69, 6; °nirghoṣaḥ, R. vi, 42, 39.
- 277, çataço 'tha sahasraçāḥ, M. iii, 288, 24; vi, 35, 5; 57, 23; 59, 10; vii, 16, 5, etc.; R. ii, 57, 9; G. i, 56, 6; G. iii, 34, 14; G. iv, 50, 18; G. v, 73, 23; 95, 24; G. vi, 99, 14. Common is the terminal çatasahasraçāḥ, M. i, 134, 28; G. ii, 57, 9, etc.
- çaravarṣam vavarṣa ca, etc., No. 244.
- 278, çaravarṣāṇi srjantam (two pādas), vi, 59, 66; 106, 53; srjantam çaravarṣāṇi, G. vi, 18, 36.
- 279, çaraç cāpād iva cyutaḥ, R. iv, 11, 14; çaraç cāpaguṇacyutāḥ, G. iii, 33, 16, where R. 27, 13 has guṇāc cyutān. M. has cāpacyutāḥ çarāḥ, vi, 48, 79; 116, 51, etc., but not I think cāpaguṇacyutāḥ, guṇa for jyā being rare in M., though it occurs a few times, e. g., viii, 25, 39; 26, 30; iii, 282, 12.
- çarenā 'nataparvanā, No. 170.
- 280, çarāḥ kanakabhūṣanāḥ (or °aḥ), vi, 64, 15; ix, 13, 43; R. vi, 71, 40; G. vi, 18, 45, where R. kāñcana (as in G. vi, 86, 30); G. vi, 55, 28; çarā hemavibhūṣitāḥ, R. iv, 8, 22;

- united with phrase No. 87 in ix, 28, 41. See Nos. 85, 336.
- 281, *çarāir aqīviṣopamāḥ* (or °āḥ), vii, 37, 12; ix, 16, 11; R. vi, 88, 42; G. vi, 76, 25; *jvalitāqīviṣopamān*, M. vi, 100, 5. For other references, see l. c. No. 10, p. 146.
- 282, *çarāḥ sarpaviṣopamāḥ* (or °āḥ), vi, 117, 22; R. vi, 88, 18.
- 283, *çalabhā iva pāvakam*, vii, 36, 21; viii, 24, 61; 27, 7; xi, 25, 14; G. vi, 44, 38, where R. 65, 43 has *patamgān*; *çalabhān iva mārutaḥ* (vyadhamat), M. vii, 145, 70. Compare also the close resemblance in *çalabhānām iva vrajāḥ* or *vrajā iva*, M. ix, 11, 25; 13, 42, where C. 697 has *çakunānām* (in the former, one of a group of similes of arrows, *bhramarānām iva vrātāḥ çalabhānām iva vrajāḥ hrāḍinya iva meghebhyaḥ*, scil. *nyapatan çarāḥ*), and in R. vi, 41, 49, *çalabhānām ivo 'dgamaḥ*; ix, 13, 41, *ivā 'yatim* (with *vrajā iva* above), perhaps for 'valim? Compare *hansāvali*, R. vi, 69, 37. Another favorite simile is the lamp, on which, however, I have at hand, besides the *iva pāvakam* phrases above, only *çalabhā iva te dīptam agnim prāpya yayuḥ kṣayam*, M. vii, 146, 14; *te pāvakam ivā 'sadya çalabhā jīvitaksaye jagmur vināçam sarve vāi*, G. v. 39, 12; *çalabhā yathā dipam (pīdayeyuḥ) mumūrṣavaḥ (sūryam abhṛagaṇā iva)*, M. vii, 22, 26. See Nos. 151, 181, 258.
- 284, *çārdūla iva kuñjaram*, vii, 14, 67; also in G., but ref. lost. Terminal, No. 297.
- 285, *çiro bhrājiṣṇukunḍalam*, iii, 289, 23; *çiro jvalitakunḍalam*, R. vi, 100, 15; 103, 20. See No. 317.
- 286, *çighragām ūrmimālinīm*, R. ii, 55, 22, of *Yamunā* (cf. 113, 21); *Vitastām* (for *çighragām*), xiii, 25, 7; *ūrmimālinam akṣobhyaṁ kṣubhyantam iva sāgaram*, R. ii, 18, 6; which adds *upaplutam ivā 'dityam*, a phrase found also in xiv, 11, 2, in the same situation.
- 287, *çighram prajavitāir hayāḥ*, M. vii, 98, 10; G. ii, 70, 3, and 6, where R. 68, 6 has *çighram çighrajavāir hayāḥ*. See No. 78.
- 288, *çubhaṁ vā yadi vā pāpam*, v, 34, 4; R. iv, 30, 72. This phrase introduces in these passages two different proverbs. The same occurs xvii, 3, 31, etc.; R. ii, 18, 25, in a general relation. The first *vā* is often omitted in such turns, as in G. v, 64, 6 = *Manu xi, 233, ajñānād yadi vā*

jñānāt (followed in G. by na kaṣcin nā 'parādhyati = R. vi, 113, 43, where G. 98, 34 has na kaṣcid apa°).

guṣkaṁ vanam, No. 33.

- 289, gr̥ṅgābhyāṁ vṛṣabhāv iva, ix, 14, 25 (tataksatus tadā 'nyon-yam); govṛṣo yathā, G. iii, 32, 4. In the latter case the warrior thus receives arrows! The reading is nimilita iva 'rṣabhah, R. iii, 26, 4. Compare gr̥ṅgināu govṛṣāv iva, v. l. vṛṣabhāv, ix, 57, 2.
- çokabāṣpaparipluta and some other çoka-forms, Nos. 137, 190.
- 290, çokopahatacetanāḥ, iii, 59, 14; R. iv, 1, 124; °cetasam, M. vii, 191, 1; ix, 41, 25. These to add to No. 190.
- çvasantam iva, No. 143.
- 291, saṁvartako ivā 'nalah, vi, 95, 54; G. iii, 70, 1; G. v, 8, 7; G. vi, 83, 16. See Nos. 33, 75, 196.
- 292, sakhe satyena te çape, i, 131, 46; G. iv, 13, 34. Compare, among other variants, vīra satyena te çape, G. ii, 48, 4, where R. 51, 4 has satyenāi 'va ca te çape; satyenāi 'va çapāmy aham, R. iv, 7, 22; satyena vāi çape devi, G. v, 34, 7. See No. 294.
- 293, satyadharmaparāyaṇah, iii, 64, 83; vii, 12, 26; xii, 278, 39; 337, 63; R. vii, 74, 19 (where G. has puraskṛtya); G. i, 59, 7; G. ii, 74, 26; G. ii, 19, 6, where R. 22, 9 has nityam satyaparākramah; wherewith compare nityam dharmaparāyaṇah, G. iv, 38, 43. Compare satyavrataparāyaṇah, M. i, 109, 6; xiii, 107, 122; G. ii, 21, 3. Compare also satyaparākramah, terminal after dhimān, M. iii, 73, 23; after Rāmah, G. iii, 33, 10; G. v. 66, 21; after satyam, R. vi, 119, 12. For the terminals parāyaṇa, parākrama, see Nos. 69, 116, 163, 206, 273.
- 294, satyam etad bravīmi te, i, 73, 17; iii, 56, 14; 57, 32; xiii, 14, 178, etc.; G. ii, 15, 19; G. v, 6, 13; 36, 70; G. vi, 98, 15; etad satyam, G. vi, 23, 32; tattvam etad, often in R.; satyenā 'ham, R. v, 38, 65; satyam pratiçṛṇomi te, R. v, 1, 148; vi, 100, 48; satyam etan nibodha me, G. iv, 61, 4; satyam etan nibodhadhvam, M. iii, 298, 13; satyam etad vaco mama, ix, 35, 75. See No. 292.
- 295, saṁdaçya daçanāir oṣṭham, vi, 91, 31; R. vi, 95, 3 (in M. with the phrase sr̥kkinī parisamlīhan; in R., with kro-dhasamraktalocanah); R. vi. 69, 88, where G. 49, 76 has

- sampīdya daṇḍāir oṣṭhāu; ix, 11, 49, saṁdaṣya daṇḍa-  
echadam (C. 577, saṁdaṣṭa°).
- 296, sapakṣāv iva parvatāu, vii, 14, 71; R. ii, 89, 19. Compare  
saṅgāṅāv iva parvatāu, M. vii, 14, 25; ix, 12, 22; 55, 40;  
Kāilāsam iva ṅṛṅiṇam, vi, 62, 33; 94, 23. See Nos. 75,  
111, 251.
- saptaçirṣan, No. 150.
- 297, samadāv iva kuñjarāu, i, 134, 33 and 34; R. vi, 66, 9  
(plural); samadā iva hastinaḥ, G. v, 81, 35.
- 298, samantād akutobhayāḥ, xii, 68, 30; G. iii, 11, 17; both  
after yathākāmam, but with different application; that  
of M. being found elsewhere, R. ii, 67, 18 (A. J. Phil.  
vol. xx, p. 33).
- 299, samudraṁ saritām patim, ix, 50, 15; R. iv, 11, 8.
- 300, sarvakāmasamṛddhinī, ii, 21, 25; ix, 38, 7, °inā, etc.; R.  
iii, 47, 4, etc.
- 301, sarvapāpaprāṇāṇam (parva) i, 2, 79, etc.; R. vii, 83, 4  
(dharmapravacanam); mahāpāpaprāṇāṇī (kathā), R.  
vii, 37, 4, 7.
- 302, sarvabhūta (bhayaṁkara and) bhayāvaha (the former, ix,  
36, 26; the latter), G. vi, 60, 49, where R. 69, 149 has  
sārvabhūma; xiii, 14, 259. Also Manu viii, 347, sar-  
vabhūtabhayāvahān. See also No. 304.
- 303, sarvalakṣaṇalakṣitā(h), xii, 337, 35; R. vii, 37, 3, 24;  
°sampannam, ix, 6, 13, etc. In R. with phrase No. 236.  
sarvalokapitāmahaḥ, No. 194.
- 304, sarvalokabhayaṁkaram, iii, 65, 20; R. iv, 8, 19; G. vi, 91,  
1, where R. 107, 1, has sarvalokabhayāvaham; R. vi,  
108, 30; °bhayāvaham also in xii, 68, 38; R. i, 9, 9;  
vii, 22, 6; trāilokasya bhayāvahaḥ, ix, 49, 14. See No.  
302.
- 305, sarvalokavigarhitam, i, 118, 22; R. vi, 94, 9; G. ii, 76, 5  
and 13; G. iii, 75, 15, etc.
- sarvalokasya paçyataḥ, No. 110.
- 306, sarvaçāstraviçāradah, ii, 5, 8; ii, 73, 15; vi, 14, 51; xiii,  
32, 1; R. ii, 43, 19; iii, 5, 32; iv, 54, 5; G. vi, 51, 26  
(where R. vi, 71, 28 has sarvaçāstraviduṣāṁ varah); Manu,  
vii, 63. Compare G. v, 2, 2, sarvaçāstrārthakovidam,  
where R. iv, 66, 2 has sarvaçāstraviduṣāṁ varah. Com-  
pare No. 266.

- sarvābharanabhūṣita, No. 113.
- 307, sarve yuddhaviçāradāḥ, iii, 276, 13; vii, 23, 18; G. vi, 29, 2. Compare yuddham (or yuddhe) yuddhaviçāradāḥ, R. vi, 65, 10; G. vi, 31, 7; 42, 11; 76, 31; yudhi y°, ib. 77, 26. Compare No. 246.
- 308, sa visphārya mahac cāpam, vi, 49, 26; G. vi, 51, 5; 79, 9 (ib. 43, visphārya ca). In R. vi, 71, 5 (= G. 51, 5) tadā cāpam, where as often, the fact may be remarked that G., mahac cāpam, is more stereotyped than R.
- 309, savisphuliṅgā nirbhīdya nipapāta mahitale, vii, 92, 67; savisphuliṅgaṁ sajvālam nipapāta mahitale, R. vi, 67, 23. In M., sā jvalantī mahoḁke 'va precedes. See No. 148.
- 310, sahasraraçmir ādityaḥ, iii, 3, 62; G. iii, 62, 13; old Up. adj. sāksāt kālāntakopama, Nos. 104-105. sāṭṭa°, No. 186.
- 311, sāgarā makarālayāḥ, vii, 77, 5; sg., ix, 47, 7; G. iv, 9, 38.
- 312, sādhuṇvādo mahān abhūt, vii, 100, 3; R. vii, 96, 11; jajñe, ix, 13, 3; sādhu sādhu iti cukruçuḥ, M. vii, 14, 84; cā 'bravīt, R. iv. 8, 25; vi, 19, 27; G. v, 56, 35; sādhu sādhu iti Rāmasya tat karma samapūjayan, R. vi, 93, 36; sādhu sādhu iti te neduḥ, ib. 44, 31; iti saṁhr̥ṣṭāḥ, G. ii, 88, 22 (with vicukruçuḥ); sādhu sādhu ite te sarve pūjayāṁ cakrire tadā, M. v, 160, 36; sādhu iti vādinaḥ, R. vii, 32, 65.
- 313, sāyakāir marmabhedibhiḥ, vii, 21, 10; G. iv, 15, 9; iṣu-bhir, G. vi, 75, 65; nārācāir, M. vii, 16, 7.
- 314, siṁhakhelagatiḥ (çrīmān), i, 188, 10; siṁhakhelagatiṁ (vā-kyam), G. i, 79, 10. Compare in triṣṭubh, gajakhela-gāmin, xv, 25, 7, with mattagajendragāmin in 6. See No. 203.
- 315, siṁhanādāṅ ca kurvantaḥ, vi, 64, 84; kurvatām, R. vi, 75, 41; G. vi, 32, 13, where R. 58, 17 has nardatām; siṁhanādāṁ nanāda ca, ix, 13, 27; athā 'karot, ix, 3, 3; pracakrire, ix, 8, 19, etc.
- siṁhaḥ kṣudramṛgān yathā and siṁhārdita, Nos. 215, 271.
- 316, siṁhene 've 'tare mṛgāḥ, vii, 7, 53; siṁhasye 've 'taro mṛgaḥ, R. vi, 79, 13; siṁhasye 'va mṛgā rājan, M. vi, 109, 14. Compare also the pair; siṁhene 'va mahāgajaḥ, xi, 18, 27; R. vi, 101, 53; siṁhāir iva mahādvipāḥ, R. vi, 31, 33. See Nos. 215, 271.

- 317, *sumr̥ṣṭamanikundalaḥ*, i, 78, 17; iv, 18, 19; G. vi, 37, 56; *pra°*, M. iii, 57, 4; *sumr̥ṣṭamanitoranam*, G. v, 16, 39. See No. 285.
- 318, *susrāva rudhiram gātrāir gāirikam parvato yathā*, ix, 13, 14; *susruvū rudhiram bhūri nagā gāirikadhātuvat*, G. vi, 59, 13. With the first *pādā* of G. here, compare *cakāra rudhiram bhūri* M. iii, 279, 5; and compare also G. v, 83, 12, *rudhirasravaṇaiḥ santu gāirikānām ivā 'kārāḥ*.
- 319, *sūtamāgadhabandinām*, vii, 7, 8; G. ii, 26, 14, nom., where R. 26, 12 has *bandināḥ* . . . *sūtamāgadhaḥ*.
- 320, *sr̥kkinī parisamlihan*, iii, 157, 50; iv, 21, 51; vi, 91, 31; 111, 11; vii, 146, 120; ix, 14, 40, etc., v. l., *parilelihan*, C. vi, 4,094 = 91, 31; *samlihan rājan*, ix, 55, 24; in iii, 124, 24, *lelihan jihvayā vaktram* (*vyāttānāno ghoradr̥ṣṭir grasann iva jagad balāt sa bhakṣayiṣyan*) *saṁkrud-dhaḥ*, as in R. vi, 8, 22 = G. v, 79, 12, *kruddhaḥ parilihan sr̥kkām* (G. *vaktram*) *jihvayā*. In R. vi, 67, 140, *jihvayā parilihyantām sr̥kkinī* *ṣṇiteksite*, where G. 46, 86 has *lelihanam asrg vaktrāj jihvayā ṣṇitokṣitam*. Compare, also in R., *oṣṭhāu parilihan ṣuṣkāu* (*netrāir animiṣāir iva mṛtabhūta ivā 'rtas tu*). In M. vi, 64, 31, *sr̥kkinī*, where C. 2,840 has *sr̥kkinīm*; in other cases, *sr̥kkinī* is the Bombay reading, as observed PW. s. v. where *sr̥kv°* is preferred. The type is not yet stereotyped in R., as it is in M.'s titular phrase. See Nos. 106, 295.
- 321, *se 'ndrāir api surāsurāiḥ*, vii, 12, 28, etc.; R. vi, 48, 30. In M. preceded by *na hi ṣakyo Yudhiṣṭhiraḥ grabhitum samare rājan*; in R. by *ne 'māu ṣakyāu rane jetum*. The phrase is not infrequent.
- sthitām cāilam*, No. 91.
- 322, *sphurate nayanam savyam bāhuḥ ca hṛdayam ca me*, R. iii, 59, 4; *sphurate nayanam cā 'sya savyam bhayanivedanam bāhuḥ prakampate savyaḥ*, H. 2, 110, 25.
- 323, *smitapūrvābhībhaṣiṇī*, iii, 55, 19; xii, 326, 35; H. 2, 88, 35; R. vi, 34, 2; G. iii, 49, 5; °*bhaṣitā*, M. i, 140, 55; *nityam suṁmitabhāṣiṇī*, R. v, 16, 21 (G. *sa°*); *smitapūrvam abhāṣata*, G. v, 92, 12; *smitapūrvābhībhaṣiṇam*, *Raghuv.* xvii, 31.

- 324, svabāhubalam ācṛitaḥ, iii, 285, 10; G. iii, 63, 13; G. vi, 84, 20; ācṛitya, M. i, 140, 38; v, 133, 45. Compare Manu ix, 255, rāṣṭraṁ bāhubalācṛitam.
- 325, svabāhubalavīryeṇa, vii, 4, 5; G. vi, 25, 35. svarṇapūṅkhāiḥ, Nos. 34, 234.
- 326, svarbhānura iva bhāskaram, iii, 11, 52, paryadhāvata; G. iii, 30, 44, abhyadhāvata. See No. 73.
- 327, svāireṣv api kutaḥ çapan (nā 'ham mṛṣā bravīmy evam), i, 42, 2; svāireṣv api na tu brūyām anṛtaṁ kaccid apy aham (after pated dyāuḥ No. 153), G. ii, 15, 29; nā 'ham mithyā vaco brūyām svāireṣv api kuto 'nyathā, xiii, 51, 17.
- 328, hate tasmin hataṁ sarvaṁ, R. vi, 65, 45; tasmin hate hataṁ sarvaṁ, ix, 7, 37; mūle hate, etc., G. vi, 79, 6; tasmin jite jitaṁ sarvaṁ, R. vii, 20, 17; in triṣṭubh, R. vi, 67, 71, asmin hate sarvaṁ idaṁ hataṁ syāt (G. 46, 57, vipannam).
- 329, hanta te kathayiṣyāmi, i, 94, 4; iii, 201, 9; vii, 12, 1; ix, 44, 5; xii, 341, 18; H. 1, 4, 31, etc.; R. i, 48, 14, etc. Compare hanta te 'ham pravakṣyāmi, M. vi, 101, 5; hanta te kīrtayiṣyāmi; hanta te sampravakṣyāmi, G. vi, 3, 1. In Kāth. Up. v, 6, hanta ta idaṁ (te 'dam) pravakṣyāmi guhyam brahma sanātanam; kath., Gītā, 10, 19.
- 330, harīṇāṁ vātaranhasāṁ, iii, 42, 7 (daça vājisahasrāṇi); 284, 23; sahasraṁ api cā 'çvānāṁ deçyānāṁ vātaranhasāṁ, G. ii, 72, 23.
- 331, harṣagadgadayā vācā, iii, 167, 2; xiii, 14, 342; R. vii, 33, 9; G. vi, 98, 13, 109. There are many harṣa° compounds like those in bāṣpa above, Nos. 190-193; harṣavyākulalocaṇaḥ, R. iv, 5, 21; harṣabāṣpākulekṣaṇa, G. vi, 112, 100; harṣaparyākulekṣaṇa, R. vi, 50, 45; harṣagadgadama uvāca or vacanam, M. iii, 138, 12; G. iii, 3, 13. The common phrase of G. bāṣpagadgadayā vācā or girā is frequently unrepresented in the other text: G. i, 79, 24; ii, 35, 30; bāṣpagadgadabhāṣiṇī, G. iv, 19, 29 (but this occurs R. vi, 116, 17); G. v, 33, 2; G. vi, 101, 19; also R. v, 67, 33, where G. has saṁdigdhayā girā (noticed above in Nos. 190-193); but R. has bāṣpagadgadayā girā in v, 25, 2; 39, 7; 40, 21; vi, 113, 16; with a new turn (compare iv, 8, 16, harṣavyākulitākṣaram) in v, 38, 11,

- bāṣapragrathitākṣaram, where G. 36, 10 has bāṣpagad-gadabhāṣiṇī; both have roṣagadgadayā vācā, R. vi, 29, 6, = G. 5, 4. M. has haṁsagadgadabhāṣiṇī, iv, 9, 10; xi, 18, 14, etc., as also abravīd bāṣpagadgadā, iii, 259, 12; bāṣpasamdigdhayā girā and vācā, iii, 64, 101; 74, 24, etc. G.'s bāṣpagadgadayā tataḥ, after vācā, ii, 58, 13, is in R. sabāṣpaparibaddhayā. Compare R. iv, 7, 1 (vākyam) sabāṣpaṁ bāṣpagadgadaḥ. In R. vii, 6, 3, bhayagadgadabhāṣiṇaḥ. In R. iv, 8, 29, etāvad uktvā vacanam bāṣpadūṣitalocanaḥ bāṣpadūṣitayā vācā no 'ccāiḥ ṣaknoti bhāṣitum. See Nos. 190-193.
- 332, harṣenotphullanayanah, vii, 39, 9; G. ii, 74, 3; harṣād ut°, ix, 60, 42. See No. 265.
- 333, hāhākāraṁ pramuñcantah, iii, 65, 11; vimuñcatām, G. vi, 54, 11. A common form is hāhākāro mahān āsīt, vi, 48, 84; 49, 38; ix, 44, 42, etc.; tadā 'bhavat, ix, 16, 44; hāhākāro mahān abhūt, R. vii, 69, 13. Compare also hāhābhūtaṁ ca tat sarvam (āsīt nagaram), xiii, 53, 41; hāhābhūtā tadā sarvā Laṅkā, G. vi, 93, 4. The Hāhāhūhū pair of G. vi, 82, 50 are found xii, 325, 16, hāhāhūhū ca gandharvāu tuṣṭuvuḥ.
- 334, hāhā-kilakilaḥabdah, vi, 112, 35; atah k°, G. v, 65, 12; tataḥ, viii, 28, 11; hrṣṭah, ix, 18, 30, etc.; āsīt, M. i, 69, 8; āśic caṭacatāḥabdah, C. ix, 1,249 = B. 23, 70, kaṭakaṭā. Compare No. 81.
- 335, hemajālapariṣkṛtaṁ, iii, 312, 44; R. vi, 102, 11; jātārūpa°, ix, 32, 39.
- 336, hemapattavibhūsitam, ix, 14, 30; G. vi, 106, 23 (padma in R. for patṭa); hemapattanibaddhayā, ix, 32, 68; °pariṣkṛtā, viii, 29, 35; usually of club or car. The ending hemapariṣkṛtaṁ is found passim, ix, 16, 39; 21, 22; 57, 46; G. iv, 11, 4, when R. 12, 4 has svarṇa°; G. vii, 14, 7; 18, 8. See No. 280.
- 337, hemapuṅkhāiḥ ṣilāṣitaiḥ, vii, 29, 4; rukmapuṅkhāiḥ ṣilāṣitaiḥ, G. iii, 8, 7; cf. ix, 25, 7; 28, 5, etc. For svarṇapuṅkhāiḥ, see No. 234.

In presenting this list, I must again call attention to what has been said on p. 72. The phrases have been collected at haphazard and cannot be used to determine the relation of one



text of one epic, but only to show the general base of epic phraseology. A more complete list would be needed for special critical purposes. Under No. 196, I have acknowledged a contribution from Professor Hardy. Eighteen parallels were also kindly sent me by Professor Jacobi, two of which, Nos. 153 b and 229 b, I had not previously enrolled. The parallels were slowly collected by memory, chance, and often, as I wish particularly to acknowledge, from the ample store of citations in the Petersburg Lexicon, which has given me many a trail to follow. But even in correcting the proofs I find more cases. Thus the simile of No. 149 is the same as that of Dhammapada 327, and the stanza on repentance, *na tat kuryām punar iti*, iii, 207, 51, is comparable in wording with Dh. P. 306. But on this field specialists can doubtless find many more cases. A long (omitted) parallel is that of M. xvi, 2, 6, *cīcīkūcī 'ti vāçanti sārīkā Vṛṣṇi-veçmasu*, and R. vi, 35, 32, *cīcīkūcī 'ti vāçantaḥ çārīkā* (sic) *veçmasu sthitāḥ*, with the circumjacent stanzas. For one beginning *upaplutam* (not in place), see under No. 286.

## APPENDIX B.

### ILLUSTRATIONS OF EPIC ÇLOKA FORMS.

#### Prior Pāda of Epic Çloka.<sup>1</sup>

The pathyā, ◡ — ◡. Cæsura may be anywhere, but is usually after the fourth or fifth syllable. With the exception of Nos. 7 and 8 all these pathyā forms are found often in both epics, though Nos. 1 and 6 are less frequent than the other regular forms, of which Nos. 2 and 3 are most common, though No. 5 is often preferred to No. 3. See pp. 219, 248.

- 1, ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡, sāha tṛayā gamiṣyāmī; āvighnam astu Sāvitrīyāḥ; dyūte sa nirjitaḥ cāi 'vā; puṇyāhavācane rājñāḥ. For cæsura, further: çarāḥ kadambakīkṛtya, vii, 146, 124; ādād bubhuksito māṇsam, R. vi, 60, 63. This measure is found passim but is less frequent than No. 6, q. v.
- 2, ◡ — — — ◡ — — ◡, kārīṣyāmy etad evaṁ cā; kāthāyoge kathāyoge; āsīd rājā Nimir nāmā; ūcus tān vāi munīn sarvān. To avoid third vipulā after spondee, yugeṣv iṣāsu chatreṣu (sic, vii, 159, 36 = 7,077). For cæsura: madhūni droṇamātrāṇī; nā 'taḥ pāpiyasi kācid.
- 3, ◡ ◡ — — ◡ — — ◡, ābhigamyo 'pasamgrīhyā; bāhudeyāḥ ca rājānaḥ; nā 'rjunaḥ khedam āyātī; tatra gacchanti rājānaḥ. For cæsura: rākṣasāḥ stūyamānaḥ san; tam ajaṁ kāraṇātmānaḥ.
- 4, ◡ — — ◡ ◡ — — ◡, nā çastreṇa na çāstreṇā; tātas tṛpta iti jñātvā; bhūtāḥ cāi 'va bhaviṣyāḥ cā; vedasyo 'paniṣat satyam. For cæsura: samgrāme samupodhe ca (R. ii, 75, 39, cf. Āçv. G. S. iii, 12, 1); rudantau rudatī duḥkhāt;

<sup>1</sup> Some of the examples, especially in the case of rare forms, have already been given by Jacobi in his Rāmāyaṇa, and in the Gurupūjākāumudī. For the following lists I have sometimes drawn also on examples furnished by Gildemeister, Böhtlingk, and Benfey. References for usual cases are not necessary, and have not been given. Sporadic and rare forms, or those of special interest, are referred to their place.

udāsīnavad āsīno; teṣām āpatatām çabdah; mantrabrāhma-  
nakartārah. This foot is sometimes duplicated, as it is both  
metrically and verbally in viniçvasya viniçvasya, and  
may be repeated a third time, not only with initial syllaba  
anceps, as in viii, 45, 19, dharmam Pāñcanadam dṛṣtvā dhig  
ity āha pitāmahah, but even syllable for syllable, as in vii,  
201, 62, āṇiyānsām āṇubhyaç cā bṛhadbhyaç cā. Not in-  
frequently, however, this measure seems to be avoided in  
favor of No. 6, as in vasāma (sic) susukham putra, i, 157, 12.

- 5,  $\underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - - \underline{\cup}$ , tvāyi tiṣṭhati deveçā; vīditam bhavatām  
sarvam; sākrđ āha dadāni 'ti (iii, 294, 26 = Manu ix, 47);  
kā 'si devi kuto vā tvam. For çesura: kuru me vaca-  
nam tāta; jagatī 'ndrajid ity eva; dhruvam ātmajayam  
matvā; kṣatajokṣitasarvāṅgāḥ; mṛṣṭakāñcanakoṇānām;  
lāṅgalaglapitagrivāḥ. This arrangement is popular, often  
appearing in groups, as in dakṣiṇena ca mārgeṇa . . . gaja-  
vājisamākīrṇām . . . vāhayasva mahābhāga, R. ii, 92, 13-14,  
etc. Contrasted trochaic and iambic opening is somewhat  
affected (Nos. 5 and 3), as in: yo balād anuçāstī 'ha . . .  
mitratām anuvṛttam tū . . . pradīpya yaḥ pradīptāgnim,  
ii, 64, 9-10. The pyrrhic opening is generally preferred;  
the amphimacer, although not shunned (mā çuco, nara-  
çārdulā, ix, 63, 53, etc.) is often avoided when in one word,  
as in Nala, 5, 8, muṣṇantī (sic) prabhayā rājñām; so  
kurvantīm, ib. 16, 11, etc. This may be due, however, to  
grammatical unifying (p. 250). Many examples give an  
anapæstic fall according to the natural division of the  
words, as in vii, 54, 57, asinā gadayā çaktyā dhanuṣā ca  
mahārathah. On na bibheti yadā cā 'yam, see below the  
note to No. 35.

- 6,  $\underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - - \underline{\cup}$ , ānekaçatabhāumāni; vānam kusumitam  
draṣṭum; brūyāsta janasaṃsatsū; yat tac çrṇu mahā-  
bāho. For çesura: dole 'va muhur āyāti; kim ābharāṇa-  
kṛtyena; antaḥpuracarān sarvān; mā bhāir iti tam āhe  
'ndrah. This also is a favorite combination, though less  
frequent than Nos. 4 and 5. It appears in groups, as in  
ix, 12, 14, where three successive pādas begin  $- - \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup}$   
( $\underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} -$ ); or R. ii, 94, 4-5, 7, where three neighboring  
hemistichs begin thus (the last, nānāmṛgagaṇair dvīpitara-  
kṣvṛkṣagaṇair vṛtaḥ). See No. 4, ad finem.

- 7,  $\underline{\cup} \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , çuktimatīm anaṅgām cā, vi, 9, 35; raçmi-  
vatām ivā 'dityaḥ, v, 156, 12; eṣa hi pārṣato vīro, C. vii,  
8,821, eṣo in B. Compare No. 33, note.
- 8,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , Paçusakhasahāyās tu, xiii, 93, 79; phalaka-  
paridhānaç ca, xii, 304, 14 (parallel to çinhacarmaparidhā-  
naḥ, etc.; metrically bettered<sup>1</sup> in C., phalakam).

First vipulā,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup$ . Cæsura usually after the fourth or  
fifth. Final brevis not unusual even in R.; and common  
in Mbh. All forms are found in both epics, except No. 12,  
which is sporadic in both, and No. 13, unique. See p.  
221.

- 9,  $\underline{\cup} \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , ātho 'tthiteṣu bahuṣṭi; yāthā yathā hi  
nṛpatih; na tvadvaco gaṇayati; gatvā, Sudeva, nagarīm.  
For cæsura: sa kampayann iva mahīm; anekavaktrana-  
yanām; daṇṣṭrākarālavadanām; satvaṁ rajas tama iti;  
tvayā hi me bahu kṛtaṁ yad anyāḥ (triṣṭubh, Nala, 18, 20).  
This combination, common in the older and freer style,  
declines in Rāmāyaṇa and classical poetry. As an example  
of the refinement of G., it is interesting in view of this  
fact to notice that No. 9 is often admitted even in the  
later R., when omitted (or altered) in G. For example,  
both āpitavarṇavadanām, R. ii, 76, 4 (not in G.); sukhō-  
ṣitāḥ sma bhagavān, R. iii, 8, 5 (smo in G.); mahodaraç  
ca çayitaḥ, R. v, 48, 8 c (not in G.); Vibhīṣaṇena sahito, R.  
vi, 85, 35 (not in G.); avaçyam eva labhate, R. vi, 111, 25  
(not in G.); and also ahaṁ Yamaç ca Varuṇaḥ, R. vii,  
6, 6 (otherwise G.); mātuḥ kulam pitṛkulam, R. vii, 9,  
11 (otherwise G.); nihatya tāṁs tu samare, R. vii, 11,  
17 (otherwise G.); sanakramīnamakarāsamudrasya, R. vii,  
32, 35 (otherwise G.); tasmāt purā duhitaram, R. vii, 12,  
10 (otherwise G.). But in the (interpolated?) passage,  
G. vii, 23, 45 and 46, the form occurs twice.

- 10,  $\underline{\cup} \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , nā hantavyāḥ striya iti, vii, 143, 67; na  
çakyā sā jarayitūm, R. iv, 6, 7; bhāveyur vedaviduṣaḥ;  
yogī yuñjita satatām; yaḥ pūjyaḥ pūjayasi mām. For  
cæsura: tataḥ sā bāṣpakalayā; nā 'yam loko 'sti na paro;  
putrāç ca me vinihatāḥ; hāhā rājann iti muhūr; mṛgīv-

<sup>1</sup> In R. iv, 43, 15 vicinvata (°tha in 12) mahābhāgam may be for vicinuta;  
but more probably the verb was ab initio modernized to the a-conjugation,  
like inv, jinṇ, pinṇ. The usual epic form is middle vicinudhvam.

otphullanayanā; chāyāsamsaktasalilo; kim kāryam brūhi bhagavan. To avoid second vipulā after spondee, vayan paçyāma (sic) tapasā. See p. 248.

- 11,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , ūṣitāḥ smo ha vasatīm; Dāmayantyaḥ saha Nalāḥ; yatra tad brahma paramām; yena doṣo na bhavitā. For cæsura: candralekhām iva navām; annasamskāram api cā; kuñjaradvipamahisā-; brāhmaṇakṣatriyaviçām; āgrato vāyucapalāḥ; Sarayūṃ puṇyasalilām. When ending in brevis often followed by another or two: salilasthas tava suta, idam, ix, 31, 37; sa tatho 'ktvā munijanam, arāj-; ūṣitāḥ smo ha vasatim anujānātu, R. ii, 54, 37. Nos. 10 and 11 prevail over No. 9 in the later style. There is no general preference for either of the former two in the Mbh., but in R. No. 11 is more common than No. 10, as it often is in parts of Mbh.<sup>1</sup>

- 12,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , pradiptāç ca çikhimukhaḥ, vii, 146, 7; viddhi tvam tu naram ṛṣim, xv, 31, 11; tan no jyotir abhi-hatam, ii, 72, 7; tadā vartmasu calitāḥ, R. vii, 16, 30 (v. l. in G.). The last example is peculiar in not having the cæsura after the fourth syllable, where, as Professor Jacobi has shown, irregular forms are usually (but, it may be added, not by any means invariably) cut.

- 13,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , jalacarāḥ sthalacarāḥ, G. i, 13, 29.

Second vipulā,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup$ . Cæsura usually after fourth or fifth syllable; final prevailingly long (brevis quite rare in R.). No. 14 is the only form usually found in R. but Nos. 15 and 16 are common enough in Mbh.; all the other forms except a sporadic No. 18 being absent in R. and sporadic only in Mbh. See p. 221. I give here several examples of final brevis and therewith variant cæsuras. The cases I take chiefly from R., because they are anomalous there and not so easily found as in M.

- 14,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , sūrām surāpāḥ pibatā, R. ii, 91, 52; ānāhitāgnir çatagūr; yāto yato niçcaratī; ānor aniyān su-manāḥ, v, 46, 31 (also a tristubh opening); āvidhyad ācaryasuto; jāgati cāi 'va svapitī; rājādhirājo bhavatī; dīno yayāu nāgapurām; tvām eva sarvaṃ viçati; vīro

<sup>1</sup> So far as I have noticed, this form of vipulā least often has final brevis in R., as in iii, 16, 22, nā 'vagāhanti salilām, out of twenty-nine with long final (in a thousand verses).

jananyā maṃa cā, R. v, 39, 2; hā Karṇa hā Karṇa itī; somena sārddham ca tavā; vāsāṃsi yāvanti labhe; Rāmāyaṇam vedasamaṃ, E. vii, 111, 4; dāvāgnidīptāni yathā; sā cintayāmāsa tadā; udvejite me hṛdayam.

- 15,  $\surd - - - - \surd \surd \surd$ , bhāvān dharmo dharma itī; Ghṛtācīm nāmā 'psarasām; dūrāvāram durvisamam, R. vi, 90, 66; tato vāyuh prādur abhūt; <sup>1</sup> tātaḥ kruddho vāyusutaḥ, R. vi, 59, 112; pāriṣrāntam pathy abhavat, R. ii, 72, 9; <sup>2</sup> pāṇavah kim vyāharase; sāhasravayamā nrpate; yavad bhūmer āyur ihā; ko mām nāmā kīrtayati; jñātvā rakṣo bhīmabalām R. vi, 60, 15; praty ādityam praty analam; dr̥ṣṭve 'mam Vṛṣṇipravaram; vedādhyāyī dharma-parah; Viçvāmitro Dīrghatamāḥ, R. vii, 96, 2.
- 16,  $\surd \surd - - - \surd \surd \surd$ , āpaviddhāiç cā 'pi rathāiḥ, R. vi, 43, 43; iti loka nirvacanam; ātmayāji so 'tmarati; sāi 'va pāpam plāvayati; ṣrāntayugyaḥ ṣrāntahayo; vāyuvego vāyubalo; ūrdhva-dr̥ṣṭir dhyānaparā; hemaçr̥ṅgā rūpyakhurāḥ; nitya-mulā nityaphalāḥ, R. vi, 128, 102; ekasāle sthānumatīm, R. ii, 71, 16; tāryamāṇān Vāitarāṇīm, G., vii, 25, 11; krūraçastrāḥ krūrakṛtaḥ. This combination is found in Manu, v, 152. Compare Oldenberg, ZDMG., xxxv, 183; and Jacobi, Rāmāyana, p. 25; Gurupūj., p. 50. It occurs oftenest in the older texts, e. g., four times in Dyūta, with cæsura always after the fourth, as far as I have observed. But it is not necessarily old (e. g., R. ii, 71, 16, is "interpolated"). I happen to have on hand no example of two breves (initial and final).
- 17,  $\surd - - - \surd \surd \surd \surd$ , gṛhasthas tvam āçramiṇām, xiii, 14, 319; yāthā vartayan puruṣaḥ, xiii, 104, 5; brahmā 'dityam unnayati, iii, 313, 46; agrāhyo 'mr̥to bhavati, xiv, 51, 34.<sup>3</sup>
- 18,  $\surd \surd - - - \surd \surd \surd$ , nā hinasti nā 'rabhate, xii, 269, 31; āpākṛtya buddhimataḥ, v, 38, 8; sātato nivāritavān, vi, 96, 3; Kūrupāṇḍavapravarāḥ, vii, 137, 16; viçamacchadāi racitāiḥ, iii, 146, 22; dvīpinā sa sinha ivā, R. vii, 23, 5, 14 (unique in R.). This irregular combination also is found in

<sup>1</sup> So, tato varṣam prādur abhūt; tato vyomni prādur abhūt, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Jacobi regards this as "irregular" and proposes to scan it as pāriṣrāntam, but in view of the other examples this seems unnecessary, though çr do not always make position. Compare Nos. 26 and 39. R. has the same measure in ii, 30, 23; v, 4, 19.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps originally agrāhyo amr̥to bhavati.

Manu. See Oldenberg, l. c. Jacobi has most of the examples.

- 19, — — — — — — — — — —, saṁskṛtya ca bhojayatī, iii, 96, 8. Also in Manu v, 47 (cited by Oldenberg, loc. cit.) and i, 88, adhyāpanam adhyayanam (cited by Oldenberg, through an oversight, as a first vipulā). Not in R.
- 20, — — — — — — — — — —, ājagavam nāmadhanuḥ, iii, 126, 34; dvādaçapūgām saritaṁ, v, 46, 7. Compare Jacobi, Gurupūj., p. 51. The type is old; compare nā 'virato duçcaritāt, Kāṭha Up. ii, 23. Not in R.

Third vipulā, — — — — —. Cæsura usually, and in R. almost invariably, after the fifth syllable. The only general form is No. 21, but in Mbh., while not common, No. 22 is found more frequently than are the last four cases. Final syllable long or short. Except Nos. 25, 27, all irregularities are found sporadically in R.

- 21, — — — — — — — — — —, tāto 'bravīn mām yācantām; çloṇcha-vṛttir dharmātmā; pālāyamāno vadhyetā, R. ii, 75, 39; saptarṣayo mām vakṣyanti; na sthānakālo gacchāmaḥ; jāne ca Rāmanī dharmajñānī, R. ii, 90, 22. For cæsura: bhaveyur, aṇvādhyakṣo 'si, Nala, 15, 6; bhavanti vīrasyā 'kṣayyāḥ, iv, 43, 13; tasmāt tu Māndhātē 'ty evaṁ, vii, 62, 71; gr̥hasthadharmanā 'nena, xiii, 2, 87; tathāi 'va viçvedevebhyāḥ, xiii, 97, 14; sa vardhamānadvāreṇa, xv, 16, 3. This form of third vipulā is more common than the second vipulā in later texts. It is sometimes grouped, as in ix, 11, 28–29, where occur three successive hemistichs with this opening. In Nala 18, 21, the reading is sa evam ukto 'thā 'ṇvāçya, for which evam ukto 'thā 'ṇvāçya tām is read by some, an improbable change.
- 22, — — — — — — — — — —. In several of the examples (see p. 242 ff.) it is questionable whether position is made by the lingual, that is whether the pāda is not pathyā; hāte Bhīṣme ca, Droṇe ca, ix, 4, 11; sthīrā buddhir hi Droṇasyā, vii, 190, 43; tāthā Bhīṣmeṇa Droṇenā, ii, 58, 23; kīm artham Vālī cāi 'tenā, R. vii, 35, 11 (v. l. Vālighātena); kṣāyam nā 'bhyeti brahmarṣe, R. vii, 78, 21 (v. l. in G.); bhakṣyam bhojyam ca brahmarṣe, ib. 24 (also G., 85, 28).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare Jacobi, Rāmāyaṇa, p. 25, who gives also mā bhāṣī Rambhe bhadraṁ te, and tam auvārohat Sugrīvāḥ, R. i, 64, 5 and vi, 38, 8 (with v. l.).

so 'yam matto 'kṣadyūtenā, ii, 62, 6; dāivam hi prajñam muṣṇāti, ii, 58, 18; jñānam vāi nāma pratyakṣam, v, 43, 48; nityodyogāḥ ca kṛṣṇadbbhiḥ; prsthacchinnān pārçvacchinnān, x, 8, 116; tasyā 'ṣu kṣiptān bhallān hi, vii, 92, 9 (short before kṣ?);<sup>1</sup> brahman kim kurmaḥ kim kāryām, R. vii, 33, 12 (kurmahe in G.).<sup>2</sup> In vi, 16, 22 = 629, B. has çvetosñiṣam çvetahayam, where C. has çvetosñiṣam çvetacchatram. As regards the licence, in ix, 4, 31, appears (after — — ∪ —) ca te bhrāta instead of the ca bhrātā te of C. Compare v, 121, 7, where bhr may fail to make position, mānena bhraṣṭaḥ svargas te. In Nala 16, 37, both B. and C. have katham ca naṣṭā jñātibhyah (for bhraṣṭā). The type is antique, withal with cæsura after the fourth syllable, as in some of the examples above, and in Manu ii, 120 = Mbh. v, 38, 1 = xiii, 104, 64, ūrdhvaṁ prāṇa hy utkrānti (v. l. vyutkrānti in Mahābhāṣya, IS. xiii, p. 405).

23, ∪ — — — ∪ — — — ∪. The same question arises here in regard to the length of the first syllable of the second foot. Other examples are extremely rare: preṣayāmāsū rājānam, i, 141, 14; bhagavān devarṣinām tvaṁ, iii, 273, 4; sarvaçauçeṣṇ brāhmena, xiii, 104, 112; kim tu Rāmasya prītyartham, R. v, 53, 13; yam prāvarteyaṁ saṁgrāmam, G. vii, 38, 12.<sup>3</sup> This combination also is found in Manu, iv, 98, ata ūrdhvaṁ tu cchandānsi. In vii, 6, 245, C. has prapalāyāntaḥ saṁtrastāḥ, where B. 146, 92, has prāpalāyanta. This form occurs also R. ii, 36, 28 (with v. l.).

24, ∪ — — — ∪ — — — ∪, na ced vāñchasi tvaṁ dyūtaṁ, Nala, 26, 8; Rudrasye 'va hi kruddhasyā, vii, 192, 7. The form given by Oldenberg, loc. cit., from Manu is due to an oversight. Once in R. v, 23, 17, with v. l. To avoid this form and wrong cæsura, Nala 16, 18 has deham dhāraya(n)tiṁ dīnam. In hi (kruddhasya), hi is probably to be read as a light syllable.

<sup>1</sup> This licence is Puranic and may be assumed here.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps kurma should be read here for kurmaḥ, as in ix, 32, 62, kim kurma te priyam. In Mbh. vii, 52, 45 = 2,048, B. has kim kurma and C. has kim kurmaḥ kāmam kāmārha.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps for pravarteya, the middle, as in R. vii, 36, 30, evamvidhāni karmāṇi pravartata mahābalah.



- 25,  $\cup \cup - \cup - - - \cup$ , dāṇa pañca ca prāptāni, xii, 319, 21; āpa-kāriṇaṁ māṁ viddhi, xiii, 96, 7; yajusaṁ ṛcāṁ sāmnaṁ cā, iii, 26, 3; narakapratisthās te syuḥ, v, 45, 8.<sup>1</sup>
- 26,  $- - \cup \cup - , - - -$ , adyaprabhṛti çrivatsaḥ, xii, 343, 132 (perhaps pathyā).<sup>2</sup> The only case cited by Jacobi from R. is i, 65, 13, also of the same form, vināçayati trāilokyam. Both are in late additions.
- 27,  $\cup \cup \cup - - - - \cup$ , tvam iva yantā nā 'nyo 'sti, Nala 20, 18; saptadage 'mān rājendrā, v, 37, 1. The texts have eva for iva in Nala, which is impossible. Odd as are these forms they are not without Manavic authority and it is far more likely that iva was changed to eva than that eva was written for iva. Oldenberg, loc. cit., xxxv, p. 184, gives examples from Manu (iii, 214; iv, 154). Not in R. Fourth vipulā,  $- \cup - \cup$ . No. 28 is the usual form, though Nos. 29-32 are not uncommon in Mbh. and are found occasionally in R. On the cæsura, usually after the fourth syllable, see Jacobi, Gurupūj., p. 51.<sup>3</sup>
- 28,  $\cup - \cup - - \cup - \cup$ , Bṛhaspatiḥ co 'ṇanā cā; mūhur muhur muhyamānaḥ; ānantaraṁ rājadārāḥ, R. ii, 89, 14; vāy-asyatām pūjayan me, R. iv, 7, 14; so 'vastratām ātmanaḥ cā; akṣapriyaḥ satyavādī; Viṣṇoḥ padam prekṣamānāḥ, R. ii, 68, 19. Vāikhānasā vālakhilyāḥ, R. iii, 6, 2. Cæsura: tadāi 'va gantā 'smi tirthāny, iii, 92, 17; Yudhiṣṭhīrenāi 'vam ukto, iii, 201, 8; Yudhiṣṭhīrasya 'nuyātrām, iii, 233, 50; Dhanañjayasyai 'ṣa kāmāḥ, v, 77, 19; rajas tamaḥ cā 'bhibhūya, vi, 38, 10.
- 29,  $\cup - - - - \cup - \cup$ , pāriṣvaktā cā 'rjunenā; ānāditvān nirgunatvāt; āpreche tvāṁ svasti te 'stū; ekāḥ panthā

<sup>1</sup> The first example may be pathyā and the three last are so good hyper-meters that the change may be at least suspected, yajusaṁ ṛcāṁ (ca); āpa-kāriṇaṁ (tu); narakapratisthās te tu syuḥ.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the second note to No. 15, and p. 242 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Jacobi, Rāmāyaṇa, p. 25, states that in R. ii-vi there are only thirty-eight cases of fourth vipulā, and of these all but seven follow  $\cup - \cup -$ . In the Mahābhārata the same vipulā occurs on an average as many times as this in a compass equivalent to only half the sixth book of the Rāmāyaṇa. This statement therefore must restrict the somewhat Rāmāyaneque utterance of Oldenberg, who in ZDMG. vol. xxxv, p. 184, Bemerkungen zur Theorie des Çloka, says that this metre in general is common in Manu, but "much more restricted in epic poetry," a statement which is true of the Rāmāyaṇa and of parts of the Mahābhārata. Compare above, pp. 224 ff.

brāhmaṇānām; ete nāgāḥ kādraveyāḥ, R. vi, 50, 49; Vidyutkeṣād garbham āpa, R. vii, 4, 18, and 23. The measure is grouped in v, 35, 60-62, pāpam kurvan pāpakīrtiḥ . . . puṇyam kurvan puṇyakīrtiḥ . . . naṣṭaprajñāḥ pāpam evā, etc.

- 30,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , nā samāno brāhmaṇasyā; jātārūpam droṇameyām; atra gāthā kīrtayanti; atra gāthā bhūmigītāḥ; rājaputra pratyavekṣa; kāma eṣa krodha eṣa; Dhṛṣṭake-  
tuḥ Cekitānaḥ Kācīrājaḥ, vi, 25, 5; evam ukte Nāiśadhena; evam uktā Rāvaṇena, R. vii, 23, 5, 34; ekavarṇān eka-  
veśān ekarūpān, ib. 40; prapnuyāmo brahmalokaṁ, R. vi, 66, 24. The measure occurs oftenest in such repetitions as ūrdhvaretā ūrdhvaliṅgaḥ, lokavṛttād rājavṛttam, etc.; proper names (as above); and in some set phrases, of which the commonest is an instrumental after evam uktaḥ or uktvā (which also is a common triṣṭubh opening, evam ukte Vāmadevena, etc.) or the stereotyped evam uktaḥ pratyuvāca, e. g., i, 145, 27; viii, 24, 5; 34, 144, etc.
- 31,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , kameit kālam uśyatām vāi, iii, 216, 12; mumocāi 'va pārthive 'ndraḥ, R. vii, 33, 17 (v. l. in G.).
- 32,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , ṣaḍabhāstram aḥmavarṣam, iii, 167, 33; avicālyam etad uktam, iii, 294, 31; kiṁ nimittam icchayā me, R. vii, 16, 5; pakṣiṇaḥ catuspado vā, R. vii, 30, 10 (v. l. in G.), cited by Jacobi for abhorrent caśura.<sup>1</sup>
- 33,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ , yajurmaya ṛṇmayaḥ ca, C. xii, 10,400, corrected in B. 285, 126, to yajurmayo<sup>2</sup>; tathā 'gramavāsike tu, C. xv, 1,105. This latter is in a benedictive stanza at the end of Ācrama Parvan. It is not in B.

Minor Ionic,  $\cup \cup \cup \cup$ . These forms are all separately sporadic. They are found both in the earlier, Upanishad, and the later, Purāṇa, śloka.<sup>3</sup> I have called the measure the fifth vipulā merely to indicate that, while each special

<sup>1</sup> A Puranic measure; compare jitadevayaññabhāgaḥ, Ag. P. iv, 4, etc.

<sup>2</sup> A clear case of sacrifice of grammar, sandhi, to metre, as above in No. 7.

<sup>3</sup> For example, Agni P. x, 23, where the pāda ends daṣa devāḥ. Here too is found the major Ionic, e. g., ib. xiv, 1, a pāda ending in Dāuryodhanī (so Vāyu P. vii, 27); also the diiambus, e. g., Ag. P. iv. 11. The older of these Purāṇas has three cases of minor Ionic in the compass of two short sections, Vāyu, v, 34, paraḥ ca tu prakṛtatvāt; vi, 16, sa vedavādy upadañṣṭraḥ; and again, ib., 17. In Vāyu lxi, 108, ṛgyajuṣṣāmātharva (-rūpiṇe brahmaṇe namaḥ), we must read sāmā-atharva, as minor Ionic.

combination is sporadic, the ending itself is not a great rarity in Mbh., though not found in R. (except as shown in No. 36).

- 34,  $\underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup}$ , Bhāgīratham yajamānām, vii, 60, 8; tato 'rjuno çaravaṣaṁ, iii, 39, 36; 46, 52; hayān dvipāṁs tvarayanto, ix, 9, 47; satyavrataḥ purumitraḥ, vi, 18, 11 repeated from v, 58, 7; yan māmakāiḥ pratipannām, C. vii, 8, 133 (emended in B. 179, 20); tapasvino dhṛtimantaḥ, xii, 269, 10.

Jacobi, Gurupūj., p. 51, gives other examples of this and of No. 35, from the Mahābhārata.

- 35,  $\underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup}$ , yādā cā 'yam na bibheti, i, 75, 53; xii, 26, 14; 252, 5; 263, 15<sup>1</sup>; gātaçrikān hṭarājyān, iii, 267, 17; kāmān devā ṛṣayaç cā, xii, 349, 78; svayaṁ yajñāir yajamānāḥ, xii, 341, 60; etaṁ dharmān kṛtavantaḥ, xii, 245, 18; mānrvighoṣastanayitnuḥ, vi, 14, 27; çakṛnmūtre nivasatvam, xiii, 82, 24; Viçvāmitro Jamadagniḥ, vii, 190, 33; xiii, 93, 21; Jārāsandhir Bhagadattaḥ, xv, 32, 10. Here belongs the mutilated pāda of Nala 24, 13, sāksād devān apahāya, which now appears in both texts as apāhāya (but apahāya tu ko gacchet, in çl. 11). A similar case will be found under No. 36. The measure has suffered the same fate in Manu ix, 101, where abhicāro has been changed to abhīcāro (though  $\underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup}$  occurs in Manu ii, 85). The same change may be suspected in xii, 300, 44, asādhutvaṁ parivādaḥ; 297, 25, atrā teṣām adhīkāraḥ. See No. 36.

- 36,  $\underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup}$ , parivittīḥ parivettā (Manu iii, 172), xii, 34, 4; 165, 68; uṣṭravāmīs triçataṁ ca, ii, 51, 4; pāṇçurā-ṣṭrād vasudāno, 52, 27; Kurukartā Kuruvāsī, xiii, 17, 107. Perhaps also amaratvam apahāya, texts apāhāya as above in No. 35, iii, 167, 48;<sup>2</sup> and the pāda cited above, in No. 35, atra teṣām adhīkāraḥ. It is to be observed, however,

<sup>1</sup> This is an old formula incorporated into the epic, which has it also in the pathyā form, na bibheti yādā cā 'yam, xii, 21, 4 (No. 5). Another form of this pathyā is found in xii, 327, 33, na bibheti paro yasmān (na bibheti parāc ca yaḥ). Compare vi, 36, 15, yasmān no 'dvijate loko lokān no 'dvijate ca yaḥ, with v. l. in xii, 263, 24.

<sup>2</sup> So H. 1, 9, 26 = 570, se 'yam asmān apāhāya. The Dhammap. has kaṇham dhannam vippahāya. Jacobi gives another example, v. 90, 44, putralokāt patilokam.

that the analogous pratikāraḥ and parivāraḥ occur both in Mbh., R., and Raghuv. (xv, 16; xvii, 55) as pathyā forms, and all these cases may be such (but in abhicāraḥ the older MSS. have this form). In vii, 81, 13, B. has aprameyam praṇamato, where C. 2,898 has praṇamantāu. G. ii, 5, 24 has yatprasādād abhiṣikṭam for yatprasādenā (Jacobi, Rām., p. 25); and G. vi, 70, 15, vajrasaṁsparṇasamāns trīn (v. l. in R.).

- 37, — — — — —, drāṣṭā 'sy adya vadato 'smān, iii, 133, 14; adhastāc caturaṅgītīr, vi, 6, 11; yāvān artha udapāne, vi, 26, 46 (compare v, 46, 26, yatho 'dapāne mahati).

- 38, — — — — —, bhūcarāya bhuvanāya, xiii, 14, 305.

Major Ionic, — — — — —. Cæsura after fourth or fifth. Sporadic and only in Mbh.

- 39, — — — — —, Ūmāsahāyo vyāladhṛk, iii, 167, 44; āha-carō naktamcarāḥ, xiii, 17, 47; atrāi 'va tiṣṭhan kṣatriyā, v, 45, 21; tām prekṣyamāno 'pi vyathām, x, 7, 51; etān ajitvā ṣaḍ rathān, vii, 75, 29. In R. vi, 111, 93, vimṛṣya buddhyā praṅgitaṁ, prā is light; v. l. with third vipulā, dharmajñāḥ.<sup>1</sup> In C. ii, 2,107, tadarthakāmaḥ Pāṇḍavān mā druhaḥ Kurusattama, where B. 62, 14 has tadarthakāmas tadvat tvam mā druhaḥ Pāṇḍavān nrpa, apparently changed for the metre. Similarly, in vii, 2,513, C. has aṇṇvatas tasya svanaṁ, changed in B. 72, 37, to svanaṁ tasya.

- 40, — — — — —, gāyanti tvā(m) gāyatrīṇaḥ, xii, 285, 78 (Rig Veda, i, 10, 1).

[— — — — —, — — — — —, evam ukto 'thā 'ṇvāṇya tām (?), see No. 21 (ad finem)]

- 41, — — — — —, abhijānāmi brāhmanam, v, 43, 56, but perhaps to be read with diiambic close (No. 46).

- 42, — — — — —, adṛṣyanta saptarṣayaḥ, iii, 187, 46.

Diiambus, — — — — —. A few sporadic cases (identical with posterior pādas). One case, No. 45, in R.

- 43, — — — — —, sa cen mamāra Sṛjīyā, vii, 55, 49; 67, 20; āviṣṭhalam, vṛkasthalam v, 72, 15; 82, 7; tasmāt Samantapañcakām, ix, 55, 9; anvālabhe hiraṇmayam, v, 35, 14. Compare also the long extract, described above on p. 238, from xii, 322.

<sup>1</sup> Probably (Jacobi, loc. cit., pp. 25-26) gr fail to make position here. So perhaps tr and vy in M. ? Compare note to No. 15 and No. 26.

- 44,  $\underline{\cup} - - - \cup - \cup \underline{\cup}$ , Nalam nāma 'rimardanam (B. and C. have damanam), Nala, 12, 105; tad vāi devā upāsate, v, 46, 1 (but in viii, 84, 12, Duryodhanam upāsante, as elsewhere); brahmānam tvā çatakratum, xii, 285, 78 (as in No. 40).
- 45,  $\underline{\cup} \cup - - \cup - \cup \underline{\cup}$ , yatra gatvā na çocatī, iii, 180, 22; (sam or) āksipantīm iva prabhām, Nala, 3, 13. With the first (antique) example compare in the tristubh specimens below: yatra gatvā nā 'nuçocanti dhīrāḥ. The case in Nala has been unnecessarily emended. It may belong here, or pr may fail to make position. No. 41 may belong here.
- 46,  $- \cup - \cup \cup - \cup -$ , yā ca vāi bahuyājīnām, vii, 73, 43 (but in a passage wanting in C.).

Professor Jacobi's list of "metrically false" pādas in Gurupūj., p. 53, includes praha (sic) vaco bṛhattaram, which would give another form; but it has been taken up through an oversight, as the words form part not of a çloka but of a jagatī, Yudhiṣṭhirah prāha vaco bṛhattaram, viii, 71, 39. So from vi, 23, 8 is cited a "metrically false" pāda, but it is a perfectly regular *posterior* pāda.

### Posterior Pāda of Epic Çloka.

- 1,  $\underline{\cup} - \cup - \cup - \cup \underline{\cup}$ , manuṣyadehagocarāḥ, etc. (above, p. 238). Also in Manu, ix, 48, as posterior pāda,  $\cup - \cup - \cup - \cup \cup$ .
- 2,  $\underline{\cup} - - - \cup - \cup \underline{\cup}$ , krātūnām dakṣiṇāvatām; ekāhaṁ jāgariṣyatī; samyak cāi 'va praçāsītā; sarve çṛṇvantu dāivatāḥ (sic!), R. ii, 11, 16 (devatāḥ in G.); mähāprasthānikam (sic) vidhim, R. vii, 109, 3.
- 3,  $\underline{\cup} \cup - - \cup - \cup \underline{\cup}$ , nṛpate dharmavatsalā; çvāçuro me narotamah; toṣayiṣyāmi bhrātārām, viii, 74, 30; kārayāmāsatur nṛpāu. Between this and No. 5 there is sometimes only a difference of editing, as in yad akurvanta tac çṛṇu, xviii, 3, where B. has the grammatically correct form.
- 4,  $\underline{\cup} - - \cup \cup - \cup \underline{\cup}$ , tvāyā çṛṅgaçatāir nṛpaḥ; bhavadbhir paatibodhitāḥ; Puṇyaçloka iti çrutāḥ; bhidyante bahavaḥ (sic) çilāḥ, R. vi, 66, 11.

- 5,  $\cup \cup - \cup \cup - \cup \cup$ , yūgapat samahanyatā; kālūṣīkṛtalocanaḥ; Virasena iti sma hā; <sup>1</sup> na svapāmi niṣās tadā (Nala, 13, 61, grammar sacrificed); mṛgayām upacakrame (common terminal). Cæsura: surasārathir uttamaḥ; Viṣṇunā prabha-  
viṣṇunā, R. vii, 11, 17. Apparently avoided in mṛdnantī (sic) kuçakantakān, R. ii, 27, 7; bruvantīm mantharām tataḥ, R. ii, 8, 13; 12, 57; tapasā sma for smaḥ, R. i, 65, 19, etc.
- 6,  $\cup - \cup \cup \cup - \cup \cup$ , nikṛntata nikṛntatā; ākampayata medi-  
nīm; yaḥ paçyati sa paçyati; sañjīva çaradaḥ çatam; Viṣṇutvam upajagmivān. Cæsura: tam vāi naravarotta-  
mam; samāçvasiḥ mā çucaḥ; jagāma diçam uttarām; kṛdāpayati yoṣitaḥ, R. vii, 32, 18. In R. vii, 22, 2, ratho me (sic) upanīyatām, the metre seems as unnecessarily avoided as sought in the preceding example.
- 7,  $\cup \cup \cup - \cup - \cup -$ , madhumatīm trivartmagām, xiii, 26, 84; caturaçītir ucchritaḥ, vi, 6, 11 (v. l. in C.); Kāuçiki pīta-  
vāsini, vi, 23, 8. In R. the pāda pāitṛpitāmahāiṛ dhruvāiḥ has a v. l. that destroys its value.<sup>2</sup>

For  $- - \cup -$  (and  $\cup - - -$ ) as last foot of the hemi-  
stich, see above, p. 242 ff.

<sup>1</sup> N. 1, 1, suto balī, is a stereotyped ending.

<sup>2</sup> These cases (except the first) are cited by Jacobi, Rāmāyaṇa, p. 25, etc.

## APPENDIX C.

### ILLUSTRATIONS OF EPIC TRIṢṬUBH FORMS.

- — — — —
- 1, — — — — —, passim, cæsura after the fourth or fifth syllable, inclining to the latter place, often irregular or neglected: <sup>1</sup> himātyaye kakṣagato yathā 'gnih, tathā daheyam saganān prasahya, viii, 74, 56-57; na Pāṇḍavān creṣṭhatarān nihanti, i, 1, 188 c; çamena dharmena nayena yuktā, ii, 75, 10 a; prabrūhi me kiṁ karaṇīyam adya, i, 3, 176 c; Bhīṣmāya gacchāmi hato dviṣadbhiḥ, vii, 2, 30 d; yo veda vedān na sa veda vedyam, v, 43, 52 c; Madrādhipāya pravaraḥ Kurūnām, ix, 17, 41 d; sa çāntim āpnoti na kāmakāmi, vi, 26, 70 d. Cæsura after second, in na cen, nigrhṇīṣva sutam sukhāya, iii, 4, 13 d; after fourth, in refrain of vii, 118, 11 d; 140, 15 d; or elsewhere in: yaç cittam anveti parasya rājan, vīraḥ kavīḥ svām avamanya drṣṭim, ii, 63, 4 a-b; artho 'py anīçasya tathāi 'va rājan, i, 92, 5 c; vāsāsi divyāni ca bhānumanti, ii, 77, 7 b; evaṁ kariṣyāmi yathā bravīṣi, iii, 5, 22 a; gadāsibāhudravinaṁ ca te 'sti, viii, 76, 17 d; ye cā 'çvamedhāvabhṛthe plutān-gāḥ, xiii, 102, 41 c. In jagatī: Kaṇādanānānam ajam maheçvāram; H. 3, 85, 16 b; tam dharmarājo vimanā ivā 'bravīt, iii, 25, 7 a. The only triṣṭubh in Nala has this form, iii, 76, 53. Also hypermetric.

In the Rāmāyaṇa this is the typical pāda.

- — — — —
- 2, — — — — —, passim, cæsura after fourth or fifth: yadā çṛauṣaṁ Vaiçravaṇena sārddham, i, 1, 166 a; vimucyā 'raṇye svaçarīradhātūn, i, 91, 7 d; bhittvā 'nikam lakṣyavaram, dharāyām, i, 187, 22 b; kāuçyām br̥syām āsṣva yatho 'pa-joṣam, iii, 111, 10 a; mamāi 'tāu vāmyāu parigr̥hya rājan, iii, 192, 54 a; na mitradhruṇ nāikṛtikah kṛtaghnaḥ, xiii,

<sup>1</sup> On the cæsura here, see above on the upajāti stanza.

73, 15 a. In jagatī: ayam jeta Madra-Kaliṅga-Kekayān, viii, 68, 11. Also hypermetric. Much rarer than No. 1.

— — — — —

- 3, — — — — —, common, cæsura after the fourth: yadi lokāḥ Pārthiva santi me 'tra, i, 92, 9 b; na pṛthivyām tiṣṭhati nā 'ntarikṣe, v, 44, 26 e; tam asahyam Viṣṇum anantavīryam, v, 48, 88 a; maghavā 'ham lokapatham prajānām, xiii, 102, 56 a; tam jahi tvam madvacanāt prapunnah, iii, 192, 63 c; nā 'sya varṣam varṣati varṣakāle, nā 'sya bijam rohati kāla uptam, iii, 197, 12 a-b; hrīṇiṣevo Bhārata rājaputrah, viii, 7, 18 a; dyāuḥ pṛthivyām dhāsyati bhūri vāri, xiii, 159, 41 d. Change of cæsura in jagatī. eka evā 'gnir bahudhā samiddhyate, iii, 134, 8 a. Also hypermetric.

— — — — —

- 4, — — — — —, antique and sporadic, cæsura after the fourth (with long initial, as far as I have observed): sarvām rātrim adhyayanam karoṣi, iii, 132, 10 c; ācāryeṇa ātmakṛtam vijānan, so to be read, v, 44, 14 a; yam man-yeta tam pratihṛṣṭabuddhiḥ, C. v, 1,697 c (B. 44, 14 c, manyate); ākāṣe ca apsu ca te kramah syāt, so to be read, v, 48, 86, d.

— — — — —

- 5, — — — — —, antique,<sup>1</sup> and I think unique: antavataḥ kṣatriya te jayanti (lokān janāḥ karmanā nirmalena), v, 44, 24 a. See No. 11.

Between Nos. 4 and 5, in the order of the schedule, should be found the triṣṭubh pāda — — — — — but I am unable to give any example from the Bhārata, and the only case known to me in the Rāmāyaṇa, G. vii, 89, 19, vimānavaram bahuratnamanditam, is added to a late book (not in RB.). It is, however, not unknown in Buddhistic verse, e. g., Dh. P. 144, pahassatha dukkham idam anappakam, with the cæsura to be expected for such a form. [The new ed. (not MSS.) has pahassathā.]

— — — — —

- 6, — — — — —, passim, often mixed with upajātis, cæsura after the fourth: parasparam spardhayā prekṣamāṇāḥ, i,

<sup>1</sup> E. g., BAU. iv, 3, 13, jakṣad ute 'vā 'pi bhayāni paçyan.



187, 3 a; tato 'bravid Vāsudevo 'bhigamya, i, 191, 20 a; devarṣayo guhyakāḥ cāraṇāḥ ca, i, 187, 7 b; prajñā ca te Bhārgavasye 'va cūddhā, iii, 4, 2 a; ṣatruḥ ṣadeḥ ṣāster vā cyater vā, viii, 42, 32 c; Karnas tvaran mām upāyāt pramāthī, viii, 67, 12 d; yat tat Pṛtham vāg uvācā 'ntar-ikṣe, viii, 68, 10 a, etc. In jagatī, xiii, 102, 44 c, etc. Also in hypermetric form, atithivratāḥ suvratā ye janā vāi, ib. 19 a; sadā kumāro, yatra sa plaksarājaḥ, ix, 43, 49 d,<sup>1</sup> etc. If pr make position, divyena rūpeṇa ca prajñāyā ca, iii, 186, 25 c (but cæsura indicates that cā is to be read, No. 1).

7,  $\underline{\cup} - - - - \cup - -$ , passim, especially in upajātis, cæsura after the fourth or fifth when the initial is short (light); after the fourth when the initial is long (heavy) as a çālinī verse (pāda), which is even more common than the vātorṃī pāda, both in its full form and in its party shape  $\underline{\cup} - \cup - - \cup - -$ . In hypermetric form this pāda with a heavy initial is a vāiçvadevī pāda (common as such and found also as a complete vāiçvadevī stanza): raṇe çūraṃ dharmarājena sūta, i, 1, 207 b; nihanmī 'maṃ vipram adya pramathya, iii, 192, 65 b; Nalo hy akṣair nirjitaḥ Puṣkareṇa, viii, 91, 13 b; satām vṛttaṃ cā 'daditā 'rya-vṛttaḥ, i, 87, 10 d; hatam pārthenā 'haveṣy apradhr̥ṣyam, i, 1, 205 b; no 'tsrakṣye 'haṃ Vāmadevasya vāmyāu, iii, 192, 58 c; mitram minder nandateḥ priyater vā, viii, 42, 31 c; with an unusual word-division, muniçreṣṭhā r̥gbhir ānarcuṣ īçam, xvi, 4, 28 b. As vāiçvadevī also, pratyāmn-āyantu tvaṃ hi enam mā hiṃsiḥ, iii, 197, 17 d, where hiatus must be read (C. has prāpayantu); rājā Gāndhār-yāḥ skandhadeçe 'vasajjya, xv, 15, 9 c, etc. In C. xiii, 4, 863 c, ye 'dhīyante se 'tiḥāsam purāṇam, the grammar is corrected in B. 102, 21 (No. 6). See also the note following No. 11, where  $- \cup - \cup$  appears as the second foot of the hypermetric pāda. With initial hypermeter, kṛtinam vīraṃ (v. l. dhiraṃ) dānavānām ca bādham, H. 2, 72, 33 b.

<sup>1</sup> One pada, c, of the half-vāṇīśvadevī in R. v, 63, 33, is of this form, aṅgār prahrstāh kārṇasiddhīm viditvā. See above, p. 326.

In the Rāmāyaṇa, saṃsiddhārthāḥ sarva evo 'gravīryāḥ, B. vi, 11, 30 b (with a case of No. 13), not in G.; also in a proverb, R. (B.) vii, 59, 3, 33 d (prakṣipta): na tat satyaṃ yac chalenā 'nuviddham, where G. vii, 64, 33, has satyaṃ na tad yac chalam abhyupāiti. Mbh. v, 35, 58 d, has na tat satyaṃ yac chalenā 'bhyupetam.

— — — — —

- 8, — — — — —, rather common, cæsura after the fourth, used chiefly in phrases and proper names, but often without constraint: pratikūlaṃ karmanām pāpaṃ āhuḥ, i, 89, 4 a; bahuvittān Pāṇḍavāṇi cej jayas tvam, ii, 63, 9 c; paribhūte pāuruse Dhārtarāstre, C. vii, 72 b (B. 2, 21, parābhūte);<sup>1</sup> avasāṃ vāi brāhmaṇacchadmanā 'ham, viii, 42, 4 a, etc.; but the long (heavy) initial is more common: yatra gatvā nā 'nuḥcanti dhīrāḥ, i, 93, 8 d; tatra yūyaṃ karma kṛtvā 'viśahyam, i, 197, 25 c; evam ete Pāṇḍavāḥ sambabhūvuḥ, ib. 35 a; durvibhāsam bhāṣitaṃ tvāḍṛṣena, ii, 66, 2 a; ko hi divyed bhāryayā rājanputra, ib. 67, 5 b; tasya duḥkhe 'py aṇḍabhājah sahāyāḥ, iii, 5, 20 b; nā 'nuyogā brāhmaṇānām bhavanti, iii, 192, 56 a; evam ukte Vāmadevena rājan, ib. 57, a; so ib. 62, c; 64, a; v, 48, 96 b; 71, 2 a; vi, 20, 1 c; vii, 2, 31 c; viii, 37, 22 c, etc.; irayantam bhāratim bhāratīnām, v, 71, 2 a; brāhmaṇānām hastibhir nā 'sti kṛtyam, xiii, 102, 13 a; duṣkṛtām vā kasya hetor na kuryāt, xii, 73, 22 d. In jagatī, sa mahendraḥ stūyate vāi mahādhvare, xiii, 159, 28 c. Also in hypermetric form.

This measure is often divided by the words (as in some of the examples above, or in iii, 134, 36 a, mahad āukthyam giyate, sāma cā 'gryam) in such a way as to make a second cæsura after the seventh syllable, with the last three (5-7) syllables included in one word. It is an antique measure of the Upanishads and Buddhistic writings<sup>2</sup> and is clearly decadent in the epic, being far less common than the two preceding combinations, Nos. 6 and 7.

<sup>1</sup> The case in vii, 0,468 a, daṇḍa cā 'nye ye puram dhārayanti, is also uncer-  
tain, as B. 201, 76 c, has daṇḍa 'py anye.

<sup>2</sup> It is the only form found with trochaic opening in the Dhammapada; vs.  
354, sabbadānaṃ dhammadānaṃ jināti.

- 9,  $\underline{\cup} - - \cup - \cup - -$ , sporadic, but also found in hypermetric form; caesura after the fourth: yadā 'ṣrāuṣam Arjunam devadevam, i, 1, 162 a (165 a); na hi jñānam alpakālena çakyam, iii, 133, 10 c; vānaspatyam āyasam pārthivam vā, iii, 186, 25 b; in vii, 179, 24 c, B. has apaçyāma lo. hitābhraprakāçam, where C. 8,138, has tām paçyāmaḥ. The corresponding measure with the vātorṃī cadence, No. 15, is more frequent.
- (9 b), Note: Between Nos. 9 and 10 should stand examples of  $\underline{\cup} \cup \cup - \cup - -$ , but I have only Hariv. 2, 72, 44 a, vyañjano jano 'tha vidvān samagraḥ, and in this case it is clear that we may have a resolved semi-vowel and hypermeter: vi-añjano ja-no 'tha vidvān samagraḥ. Similar hypermeters are given in the discussion above, p. 288. Compare the resolution ib. 45 a, tri-ambakam puṣṭidam vo bruvānam (texts, also 7,434, tryambakam).

- 10,  $- - \cup \cup - \cup - -$ , sporadic, caesura after the fourth: yene 'cehasi tena kāmam vrajasva, iii, 133, 2 b; nā 'nīçvara idṛçam jātu kuryāt, iii, 197, 24 c. Not rare in Vedic rhythms. Sporadic also as hypermeter, p. 289.

- 11,  $- \cup \cup \underline{\cup} - \cup - -$ , questionable. The text of v, 44, 25 b has kṛṣṇam athā 'ñjanam kādravam vā, which can be read only with hiatus. I suspect that originally atho or athā stood in the verse. Compare p. 300, and the choriambic opening which precedes this passage, cited above as No. 5. Possibly the prose in xii, 343, 20 may have once been verse. It begins with vedapurāṇetihāsapramāṇyāt.

Note: To these cases of partly-formed çālinī pādas must be added the hypermetric analogue of the çloka's fourth vipulā with final brevis, which from its first foot belongs more particularly under No. 7, to wit, yas tvam devānam mantravitsu purodhāḥ, xiv, 9, 5 b.

- 12,  $\underline{\cup} - \cup - \cup \cup - -$ , passim, caesura after fourth, common in upajātis: sa cā 'pi tad vyadadhāt sarvam eva, i, 197, 32 a;

na hi tvayā sadr̥ṣī kācid asti, iii, 186, 23 a; vāci k̥suro niṣitas tīkṣṇadhāraḥ, i, 3, 123 b; paścād ayaṁ Sahadevas tarasvī, i, 191, 9 b; yasmāt striyaṁ vivadadhvaṁ sabhāyām, ii, 71, 17 b; satye rato guruṇuṣayā ca, xiii, 73, 26 b. In jagatī, kaccit sukhaṁ svapiṣi tvam Bṛhaspate, xiv, 9, 1 a. To this category belongs perhaps iii, 192, 58 a; but see No. 24. Not rare (e.g. iii, 197, 11 c; 16 d; v, 42, 6 c; 44, 14 d, etc.) are the hypermetric forms  $\underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup}$ ,  $\underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup}$ , as shown above (initial and inserted), pp. 286, 289.<sup>1</sup>

$\underline{\cup} - - - \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - - \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup}$

- 13,  $\underline{\cup} - - - \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - -$ , passim, cæsura after fourth, common in upajātis: idaṁ çreyaḥ paramam manyamānāḥ, also sām-khyā yogāḥ paramam yaṁ vadanti, iii, 186, 26 a and e; svarge loke çvavatām nā 'sti dhiṣṇyam, xvii, 3, 10 a. Other examples under the vātermī stanza (also hypermetric).

In the Rāmāyaṇa, vi, 11, 30 (with a case of No. 7): bhartuḥ sarve dadṛṇuḥ cā 'nanam te, not in G.; hypermetric, ib. v, 63, 33 d.

$\underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - - \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - - \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup}$

- 14,  $\underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - - \underline{\cup} \underline{\cup} - -$ , common, cæsura after the fourth: nava-nitaṁ hr̥dayam brāhmaṇasya, i, 3, 123 a; tata eṣāṁ bhavitāi 'vā 'ntakālaḥ, i, 197, 7 d; yadi cāi 'vaṁ vihitāḥ Çamkarena, i, 198, 4 a; upasargād bahudhā sūdateç ca, viii, 42, 33 a; yadi daṇḍaḥ spr̥çate 'puṇyapāpam, xii, 73, 22 a; so in xiii, 159, 27, and 42 (initial  $\underline{\cup}$  and  $-$ ); santi lokā bahavas te narendra, i, 92, 15 a; eṣa dharmāḥ paramo yat svakena, iii, 4, 7 c; agnihoṭrād aham abhyāgatā 'smi, iii, 186, 22 a; tasya mūlāt saritaḥ prasravanti, ib. 28 c; nāi 'va çakyam vihitasyā 'payānam, C. i, 7, 329 c (but B. 198, 1, na vāi); kasya hetoḥ sukṛtaṁ nāma kuryāt, xii, 73, 22 c; samprahārṣiç Cyavanasyā 'tighoram, xiv, 9, 32 b; 10, 22 a and 30 b. Also hypermetric.

<sup>1</sup> I think that this is the way such early stanzas must be read as appear, e.g. in Praçna iv (10), 11, c, where b-c read: (b) prāṇā bhūtāni | sampra-tigḥanti yatra; (c) tad akṣaram ve- | dayate yas tu somya. The alternative is a choriambus with the scolius  $- \underline{\cup} - \underline{\cup}$ ; but on this see the remarks above, p. 281.

— — — — —

- 15, — — — — —, common,<sup>1</sup> cæsura after the fourth: tato divyam ajaram prāpya lokam, i, 89, 17 a; purodhāya su-kṛtaṁ duṣkṛtaṁ vā, i, 90, 18 b; tad eve 'dam upapannaṁ vidhānam, i, 198, 1 d; tad evāi 'tad avaṣasyā 'bhyupāiti, ii, 56, 16 c; prañetāram ṛṣabhaṁ Yādavānām and draṣṭāro hi Kuravas taṁ sametāḥ, v, 71, 3 b and 4 a; tad icchāmi na sa taṁ yājayeta, xiv, 9, 4 d; so iii, 5, 22 b; v, 48, 57 c; vii, 145, 94 a, etc.; with long or heavy initial, tat tat prāpya na vihanayeta dhīraḥ, i, 89, 7 e; prāptaṁ rājyam asa-patnam punas tāiḥ, i, 1, 216 d; taṁ sarvasya bhuvanasya prasūtiḥ, i, 232, 14 c; tatra dyūtam abhavan no jaghan-yam, iii, 34, 13 a; tam manyeta pitaram mātaram ca, v, 44, 9 c; hiṁsāvegam udaropasthavegam and nindā cā 'sya hṛdayaṁ no 'pahanyāt, xii, 279, 17 b and d; durgam janma nidhanaṁ cā 'pi rājan, xii, 319, 110 a; in C. i, 3,662 d, kuryād eva, where B. 92, 18 d, has evam. Other cases in iii, 4, 22 b; 197, 9 a and 16 b; vii, 2, 21 c; xii, 73, 26 c; 206, 27 c and 29 d; xiii, 71, 18 d; 94, 43 b; 159, 19 d, etc., all with cæsura after the fourth syllable. Rarely hypermetric.

In xii, 60, 47 c, the second foot ends in brevis! It is, however, forced by the meaning: ekam sāma | yajur ekam | ṛg ekā. In regard to nā 'nyaḥ panthā ayanāya vidyate, see the paragraph on the scolius, p. 279, where also is cited caturdvāram puruṣaṁ caturmukham. and another similar pāda.

— — — — —

- 16, — — — — —, ṣuklam ekam aparaṁ cā 'pi kṛṣṇam, i, 197, 32 d. I have no other examples of this opening.

— — — — —

- 17, — — — — —, antique and sporadic, cæsura after the fourth: ṣamārthinaṁ upayātaṁ Kurūṇām, i, 1, 175 b; ṛjur mṛdur anṛṣaṁsaḥ kṣamāvān, xii, 63, 8 c; ye tad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti, v, 44, 31 d; 45, 18 d. BAU. iv, 4, 14, etc. (ya etad).

<sup>1</sup> This is the only case where the fourth syllable is a brevis in a common combination.

- 
- 18, ○○○—○○—, antique and unique, virajaso vitamaskā viçokāḥ, xiii, 102, 32 b. The same repeated below has, in 35, supuṇyagandhā virajā viçokāḥ (hypermetric in 42, supuṇyagandhā virajā vītaçokāḥ). Compare ib. 38. Imitation of Chānd. viii, 1, 5; Māitri, vi, 25, etc. With choriambic opening in a sporadic hypermeter, p. 294.

- 
- 19, —○○—○○—, common, cæsura after fourth or fifth: yuvam diço janayatho daçāgre, i, 3, 64 a; ajo hi çastram agilat kilāi 'kah, ii, 66, 8 a; (after iyam Gaṅge 'ti niyatam pratiṣṭhā, xiii, 26, 88 a, No. 20), ib. c, in hypermetric form, prātas trivargā ghṛtavahā vipāpmā (the same without cæsura, ib. 94, 13 d, below); te bhānavo 'py anusṛtāç caranti, i, 3, 65 c; te mām yathā vyabhicaranti nityam, i, 76, 52 b; rājā 'ham āsam iha sarvabhāumah, i, 89, 15 a; jānīmahe Vidura yatprias tvam, ii, 64, 1 c; iço 'bhaviṣyad aparā-jitātmā, ii, 71, 18 d; brahmadviṣaghnām amṛtasya yonim, vii, 201, 67 d; Vāivasvatasya sadane mahātman, xiii, 102, 14 c; also i, 90, 6 c; ii, 63, 6 c; iii, 4, 12, a; 186, 8 d; 186, 25 d; xiii, 90, 48 a, etc. In jagatī: evam bruvāṇam ajināir vivāsitam, ii, 77, 19 a; parājiteṣu bharateṣu durmanāḥ, vii, 2, 8 c; kulambharān anaḍuhaḥ çatam çatān, xiii, 93, 32 a. In i, 90, 24 c-d = v, 35, 45 this measure is combined with that of the next number: mānāgnihotram uta mānamāunam (etc., see No. 20). The tendency is to give up this measure for the choriamb, and so grammar suffers, as in ix, 59, 10 b: ye cā 'py akurvanta sadasyavastrām. This old metre, which is Vedic and is found in the Upanishads, is already passing away in the epic, though it can scarcely be called rare. In some parts it is rarer than in others, and it still survives in the Purāṇas. In the seventh book's three hundred odd triṣṭubhs, for example, it occurs only in the two places cited above; the fourth book in its two hundred has only one case (in jagatī form), iv, 14, 51 d; the thirteenth, with three hundred odd triṣṭubhs, has eight cases; the second, in one hundred and fifty-odd, has five. Other jagatī cases are in i, 197, 20 a; iii, 134, 10 c; xiv, 9, 30 c (all with cæsura



examples. In the former there is none at all; in the latter, vii, 200, 83 a, āsannasya svaratham tivratajāḥ stands for C.'s reading, 9,340, svaratham ugratejāḥ, but it may be one of B.'s frequent improvements.

I have not noticed any epic pāda with the form — ◡ — ◡, ◡ ◡ — ◡ — ◡, such as is found in the earlier versification, e. g. cūkram ādāya punar eti sthānam, BAU. iv, 3, 11; nor with fourth brevis, except as hypermeters, p. 290, when three breves follow (c̣loka, Nos. 11, 12).

Sporadic, or at most rare, are all the remaining forms.

◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡

- 21, ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ —, sporadic, cæsura after fourth or fifth: purā jagāu maharṣisaṅgha eṣaḥ,<sup>1</sup> v, 43, 50 b; Sanatsujāta yām imām parām tvam (brāhmīm vācam vadase viçvarūpām), v, 44, 1. In iii, 197, 13 a, and 13,285 (this has a *vāi* which is omitted in B., apparently because *sadā* in B. is regarded as belonging to b) there is a parallel jagatī, which I read:

(a) jātā hrasvā prajā pramiyate sadā

(b) na vāi vāsam pitaro (a)sya kurvata

The version of B. abandons a as too unmetrical, and omits vai, to make of b the pāda: sadā na vāsam pitaro 'sya kurvata; while C. abandons b, and also refuses to recognize the hiatus, but keeps vāi, which, however, with hiatus makes of the hemistich two pādas, as given above. Compare the corresponding form in c̣loka measure. There is a parallel in the Mahābhāṣya:

no Khaṇḍikāu jagāma no Kālīṅgān,  
but Weber, IS. vol. xiii, p. 368, reads jagāma, perhaps a warranted emendation (compare jagrāha, ib. c).

— — — — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡

- 22, — — — — ◡ — ◡ —, sporadic or unique: svasti 'ty uktvā maharṣisiddhasaṅghāḥ. I have lost the reference.

These diiambic middles appear to be almost as rare in other popular verse. Only one case is found in the

<sup>1</sup> The whole stanza runs: chandānei nāma kṣatriya tāny Atharvā purā jagāu maharṣisaṅgha eṣaḥ, chandovidas te ya uta nā 'dhītavedē na vedavedyasya vidur hi tattvam. Pāda c is explained under hypermeters. Both of the passages from which the two first extracts are taken are antique.



Dhammapada and that is rather doubtful (vs. 281):  
kāyena ca | akūsalam na kayirā, with kayirā for kayrā.<sup>1</sup>

- 23,  $\underline{\cup} - \cup - - - \cup -$ , antique and sporadic, variable cæsura:  
tadvr̥ṣṭimahṇā prasthitāu balasya, i, 3, 63 d; vedān adh-  
iyitā 'nahamkr̥taḥ syāt, i, 89, 7 b; mānam na kuryān nā  
'dadhita roṣam, v, 44, 10 c; in hypermetric form, bhayā-  
hitasya dāyam mamā 'ntikāt tvām, iii, 197, 17 c.

In the Rāmāyaṇa G. iii, 75, 74, Sumeruṣṛṅgāgre gatām  
aninditām, where B. has ṣṛṅgāgragatām; G. v, 11, 10,  
mattapramattānām samākulāni, where B. has mattapra-  
mattāni; G. vi, 46, 74, sa bhūtale nyastah kapipravīrah,  
where B. has bhīmabalā 'bhipiṣṭah; G. vi, 51, 108, jagh-  
āna ṣaktibhir vināṣacetāḥ, where B. has ṣaktyr̥ṣṭigadā-  
kuṭhārāḥ. I have noticed no example in RB.

In the Dhammapada this measure is also rare, though  
sometimes employed, as in No. 143 b: asso yathā bhadro  
kasāniviṭṭho ātāpino samvegino bhavātha.

[23 b, See the note to No. 25.]

- 24,  $\underline{\cup} - \cup - \cup - - - \cup -$ , sporadic or unique; ubhāu ca te jarā-  
mr̥tyū vyatītāu, xiv, 9, 5 c; Ikṣvākavo yadi brahman Dalo  
vā, iii, 192, 58 a (or with I before br, No. 12.) Perhaps  
hypermetric in Hariv. C. 7,442 c, dhṛtāyudhaḥ sukr̥tinām  
uttamāujāḥ, but B. 2, 72, 53, has sukr̥tinām.

- 25,  $\underline{\cup} - - - \cup - - -$ , rare, cæsura after the fourth: tadā  
devīm rudantīm tām uvāca, i, 7,292 b in C., but rudatīm  
in B. 197, 17; na cā 'bhakṣye kvacit kurvanti buddhim,  
xii, 141, 78 b; so 'ham nāi 'vā 'kr̥tam pūrvam careyam,  
i, 3,657 c in C., but  $\cup \cup - -$  in B. 92, 13; nā 'cāryasyā  
'napākṛtya pravāsam, v, 44, 15 a; tasmād etām darām  
āviṣya ṣeṣva, i, 197, 24 d (but in C. 7,299, āviṣā 'trāi 'va  
ṣeṣva); vimueyo 'ccāir mahānādam hi sādho, xv, 15, 6 c.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> More probably: kāyena ca akūsalam na kayirā,  $\cup \cup \cup - \cup - -$ . [So the new ed., but with cā akūsalam suggested.]

<sup>2</sup> For  $\underline{\cup} - - - \cup - - - \cup - \underline{\cup}$ , I have only H., loc. cit., p.297,  
āpo devya r̥ṣinām viṣvadhātṛyo (No. 25<sup>b</sup>), where B. inserts hi after r̥ṣinām,  
or a form with  $- - - \cup -$  after  $- - - \cup ( )$ , that is, hypermetric opening.

- 26,  $\frac{\vee}{\vee} - \vee - - - -$ , sporadic:  
 samāhvayat samrambhāc cāi 'va kāvyah, i, 76, 51 b; mahac  
 ca rūpaṁ tad vāi parvatebhyah, v, 44, 29 d. Also  
 hypermetric, p. 291.

- 27,  $\frac{\vee}{\vee} - - - - -$ , sporadic and questionable: maheṣvā-  
 sāh Kāikeyāç cā 'pi sarve, C., iii, 15,654 b, but B. 268,  
 16, has Kekāyāç; rajo dhvastam Gāṇḍīvena pravṛttam,  
 C. v, 1,869, but B. 48, 61, has Gāṇḍīvena. At the cost  
 of grammatical nicety, xii, 24, 27, avoids the cadence by  
 having caturah for catvārah: cāturhotram caturo vāji-  
 mukhyāh. For the hypermeter, see p. 291.

[Note: etat sarvam anirdeṣenāi 'vam uktam, xii, 108, 33 a, would  
 be hypermeter of  $- - - \vee (\vee) - - - - \vee - \vee$ , but see  
 the note on p. 296.]

## FINAL NOTES.

To pp. 44-45: On the Māitri Upanishad. Compare also mātṛā, "matter," in Māitri vi, 6; the later Gītā, 2, 14; and possibly xii, 271, 12. The image of spirit as a "smokeless flame" is found in Kaṭha Up., iv, 13, jyotir ivā 'dhūmakāḥ; Māitri (i, 2 and) vi, 17; and the epic, xii, 251, 7 (307, 20; 325, 12): sarvātmānam mahātmānam vidhūmam iva pāvakaḥ; as is also the phrase tām āhuḥ paramāṁ gatim, Kaṭha, vi, 10; Māitri, vi, 30; Gītā, 8, 21. On a closer resemblance to Māitri vi, 15, see the note on p. 167. The tree of desire is in this passage called the hṛdi kāmadrumaḥ citro mohasaṁcayasambhavaḥ, the image, like that of the following "town of the senses," being very fully expanded, xii, 255, 1 ff. The "wheel of transmigration" is found in other passages also: yathā kāṣṭham ca kāṣṭham ca (R. ii, 105, 26) sameyātām mahodadhāu . . . saṁsāre cakravatgatāu; sukhaduḥkhe manuṣyānām cakravat parivartataḥ, xii, 28, 36-41 (= 174, 15 ff.); 174, 19.

To p. 117: On Kapila's ādya. Compare ādyā prakṛtiḥ, xii, 299, 34.

To p. 118: The reference to the negative definition (omitted from the first paragraph) is xii, 201, 27.

To p. 159: Cf. xii, 28, 46: na mṛtyum ativartante velām iva mahodadhīḥ.

To p. 183: On God as the Divine Word. Compare xii, 47, 46: yam āhur akṣaram divyaṁ tasmāi vāgātmane namaḥ. See p. 14.

To p. 186: On Yama's abode. The first note is restated, more carefully, on p. 288.

To p. 191: On the help derived from Professor Cappeller's MS. By "in the epic" is of course to be understood in the Mahābhārata. It should perhaps have been stated that all cases have been re-examined, and that the MS. contained nothing in regard to śloka and no discussion of the various other metres. Without qualifying my indebtedness, I should not wish to make Professor Cappeller responsible for the further analysis.

To p. 213: On the scapegoats. According to xii, 343, 53, Indra's sin was distributed over women, fire, trees, and cows.

The distribution of this sin is parallel to that of Nahuṣa (here said to be cow-killing), which was divided into one hundred and one parts (generally, but not always, an inauspicious number), as diseases among men, xii, 263, 49.

To p. 217: On the conversion of *çlokas* and *triṣṭubhs*. I ought here to have referred to the attempt at wholesale excision of *triṣṭubhs* in the work published in 1883 by Sørensen, *Om Mahābhārata's Stilling i den indiske Literatur*, pp. 211 ff. The theory, despite the ingenuity of the author, never seemed to me convincing. The early forms of *triṣṭubh* found in the epic, and the fact that Patañjali cites epic *triṣṭubhs*, seem to me decisive evidence that the latter measure was a primitive form of epic expression.

To p. 238: On Patañjali's epic verses. M. Barth, in his review of Dahlmann's first book, *Journal des Savants*, 1897, very properly questions whether Professor Ludwig is correct in claiming that "all citations in Bhāṣya verses referring to the epic are in other metre than that of the epic" (p. 8 of the study entitled *Ueber das Verhältniss des mythischen Elementes zu d. hist. Grundlage d. Mbh., Abh. d. Böhm. Ak., 1884*). Neither scholar gives illustrations in support of his statement. The examples given above, on p. 239, sufficiently illustrate the partial correctness of Professor Ludwig's observation. At the same time, the half-*çloka* cited above, on p. 6, is found in both Bhāṣya and Bhārata, and Patañjali's *triṣṭubh pāda*, *asidvitiyo 'nusasāra Pāṇḍavam*, is in regular Bhārata metre. The truth seems to be that Patañjali's epic verse is not wholly different; but it is on occasion freer than that of the Bhārata.

To p. 263: On the Prākṛit original of the epic. It is possible that the epic tales may have been composed first in patois; but it is not probable that the philosophical sections, for example, the *Gītā* and parts of *Çānti*, have suffered such a transformation.

To p. 264: On pseudo-epic atrocities. An early epic writer would have said (in prose) *jīvān ahaṁ dr̥ṣṭavān*. The poet of the pseudo-epic, just after using the word *jīva* (masc.), employs, in xii, 280, 20, not only *jīvāni* but *adr̥ṣṭavān*:

*evam saṁsaramāṇāni jīvāny ahaṁ adr̥ṣṭavān*

From the context it is evident that, as Nīlakanṭha says, the real meaning is "I have seen" (*ahaṁ vedmi*), though the commentator derives the sense through the idea of not-seeing being

equivalent to knowing not by sight but by insight. The form, however, is simply an irregularly augmented verbal, and the sentence means literally, "thus in course of transmigration have I seen spirits." The form stands on a par with the augmented imperative of R. iv, 3, 27, where some late pedant, to avoid the metrical irregularity of an anapæst after the first syllable, has handed down tam abhyabhāṣa, "speak to him," as the opening words of a verse (just before na kiñcid apaçabditam!). The difference between such freedom as this and that found (for the same reason) in R. v, 13, 41, where occurs samyag āpaḥ pravek-  
syāmi, is that, whereas the later metricist employs an unheard-of liberty, the second poet simply harks back to the legitimate interchange of āpaḥ and apaḥ, which, to avoid another irregularity, are exchanged in the already stiffening verse of the Rig Veda; for here also we find in RV. x, 121, 8 (to avoid in a triṣṭubh an opening choriambus): yaçcid āpo mahinā paryapaçyat. Similarly, in syntax, we find in the pseudo-epic the genitive after a comparative, as in xiii, 14, 5 (cited by Holtzmann), and xii, 218, 28; nā 'nyo jivāḥ çarīrasya; exactly as we find it in the later Rāmāyana; for G. vi, 24, 28 merely indicates that the text is late (since the alternate text, R. vi, 49, 20, has the ablative here); but the genitive occurs at R. i, 47, 22, nā 'sti dhanyataro mama. That the Rāmāyana was also influenced by Prākṛit forms, may be shown by R. iv, 17, 49: (mām yadi tvam acodayaḥ) Māithilīm aham ekāhnā tava cā 'nitavān bhaveḥ. Here bhaveḥ must be for the dialectic optative bhave (as the commentator says, "bhaveyam"). Whether çādhi, in yatra na çādhi (= çikṣayasi), is due to dialectic form, I must leave to experts to decide, R. ii, 105, 10:

eṣo 'pamā mahābāho tadartham vettum arhasi  
yatra tvam asmān vṛṣabho bhartā bhrtyān na çādhi hi

In R. ii, 111, 25, occurs anuçāsāmi, sic, and it is difficult to see why çāsasi is not found here.

To p. 265: Note on *bhavati* with the accusative of specification. The only case of this construction in respectable Sanskrit known to me is in Māitri Up. vi, 10: athe 'ndriyārthān pañca svāduni bhavānti, "the five (senses) become (operative, as regards) the objects of sense, in tasting." The preceding phrase has svāduni bhavanti without object, and the scholiast supplies prati with indriyārthān. In no circumstances, however, could the sixth

chapter of Māitri prove an early use for a construction otherwise unknown in good Sanskrit. Probably the Petersburg Lexicon is quite right in questioning the reading altogether.

To p. 358: The table is (revised) from Professor Cappeller's MS.

To p. 373: On sāuvīra. For the Bālhikas' (Vahlīkas') sāuvīra, see IS. xiii, p. 369. Both Bhārata and Bhāṣya recognize Çākala, the chief town of the Madras.

To p. 374: On the Puñjāb. Compare the grouping of Kashmeer and Puñjāb as places of pilgrimage: Kāçmīramaṇḍale nadyo yāḥ patanti mahānadām, tā nadiḥ sindhum āsādyā çilavān svargam āpnuyāt, xiii, 25, 8 (with Candrabhāgā and Vitastā in 7).

To p. 378: On human sacrifices. The inferred antithesis is, of course, the horror elsewhere felt at the very sacrifice here ordered. So in ii, 22, 11, it is said that "human sacrifice has never been recognized" (seen). But Çiva is here worshipped with human sacrifices, as has always been the case with this God and his consort. On the "blamable vice" of hunting, compare also ii, 68, 20; xii, 28, 31.

To p. 387: On the denarius. In a passage published some years ago (AJP. vol. xix, p. 24) I called attention to the fact that, though the Roman denarius is not directly mentioned in the epic itself, yet it is mentioned in a later addition to the epic, and this addition is in turn recognized (so late are some parts of the epic itself) in two (I might have said three) books of the epic; whence followed the conclusion that those parts of the epic itself which recognize the addition that in turn recognizes the denarius must naturally be later than the introduction of the denarius into the country, and this implies for these parts of the epic a date later by half a thousand years than the date assumed by the synthetic method for the whole epic in its present condition. When in *Die Genesis des Mahābhārata*, p. 45, the author comes to discuss this awkward point, he simply says, without referring to the source of his information or to the actual state of the case: "This poem contains no such evidence of late origin" (as is implied in the recognition of the Roman coin), words of especial significance when one considers that the author everywhere insists on regarding "this poem" as a complete whole, and that they are put immediately after the remark: "No book in which it (the denarius) occurs can belong

to a remote antiquity." The passage as a whole is thus liable to give readers unacquainted with synthetic methods the erroneous impression that the historical facts, instead of disproving the contention of the author, favor the conclusion drawn by him. Compare i, 213, 34: *na vyājena cared dharmam*.

To p. 391, note: On Buddhistic traits. The Pāṣaṇḍas in this passage are set next to those who *ācrameṣu vṛthācārāḥ . . . iha lāukikam ihante māṇsaṇitavardhanam*, iii, 188, 48-49. The last verse, *bahupāṣaṇḍasaṁkirṇāḥ parānnagunavādinaḥ ācramāḥ . . . bhaviṣyanti*, is the converse of the one cited above on p. 87 from iii, 191, 10. In the former passage, Professor L. de la Vallée-Poussin has just called my attention to the significance of the world-destroying "seven suns" as a term "well-known in Pāli and Nepalese books." I had space only to note the item, as his card came while I was correcting page-proof. The particular importance of this observation lies not in the fact that "seven suns" are Buddhistic (for they are also Brahmanistic), but in these two facts combined, first that (in distinction from seven rays) seven suns are rare in Brahmanism and common in Buddhism, and second that they are here associated with Pāṣaṇḍas, whom the epic scholiast regards as "unbelievers, particularly Buddhists," and with vihāras, another term somewhat more closely associated with Buddhists than with Brahmins. I have pointed out above, p. 49, that the duplicate form of this section is probably later than the Vāyu Purāṇa. In this section, the parent-children are a little older than in the parallel verse at 190, 49 = 188, 60, the age of the girls being that of the boys as cited above. The former is the zodiac section (p. 392).

To p. 392: On some later traits in the epic. The passage (in note 3) from Vana gives the rare adjectival form *Yāvana nṛpāḥ*, "Ionic kings out of the West." The same section, iii, 254, has a verse, 7 a (not in C.) on the kings of Nepal, *Nepāla-viṣaya*, a name unknown in early literature and presumably interpolated here. The Mongolians, mentioned in vii, 11, 16, also seem to belong to a late period, a fact M. Barth has emphasized. The Huns, too, while common in the Bhārata, are strange to the Rāmāyaṇa (probably unknown altogether). I really do not know how the synthesist explains such cases, whether as dating from 500 B. C. or as interpolations. The theory is so elastic, with its extrusion of unwelcome data and illogical recourse to

interpolations whenever convenient, that it is perhaps otiose to try to refute it on historical grounds. Again, in regard to late words, merely as words, any one may say that any word may have any age; but there is still a reasonable suspicion that a number of words found in unique combination or only in certain parts of the epic and in later literature may indicate a somewhat close connection between these parts and that literature: *anva-vāya*, family, i, 209, 2; vii, 144, 6; *atyatikrāmat* (*rathavarān*), vii, 146, 40; *kāṇḍīkākāḥ* (*prādravan*), ix, 3, 9; x, 8, 102; *nā'yam* *klībayitum* *kālāḥ*, ix, 5, 27 and v. l. to vi, 96, 12 = 4,334; *aṣṭāpada*, gold, xii, 299, 40, etc. Compare also in mythology, only three world-protectors, xiii, 159, 31 (effect of trinity?); Varuṇa's wife, Siddhi, xii, 301, 59; Citragupta (p. 184).

To p. 396: On the date of the Jātakas. In respect of the importance to be attached to the circumstance that epic tales are recognized in the Jātakas, it must not be forgotten that for the form of the Jātakas, as we have them, there is no evidence whatever of a very ancient date, and since the oldest sculptured tale does not antedate the third century B. C., even the matter they offer can only doubtfully be referred to so early a century. It is of course quite possible, and some may think it probable, that at least the content, if not the form, of the extant Jātakas, is still earlier; but in using the tales for literary and historical comparison it is obviously unsafe to base much upon a double uncertainty, of date and of form. The fact that Buddha always appears in these stories as a Bodhisattva makes it possible indeed that the Jātakas may be much later than the third century. M. Barth, in the review referred to above, has with his usual clearheadedness called attention to the fact that the custom, generally recognized in these stories, of sending young men to Taxila to complete their education, is anything but an antique trait.

CORRECTION.—On pages 55 and 57, *prekkhā* (*prekṣā*) is a lapsus for *pekkhā*.



## ENGLISH INDEX.

- ABSORPTION**, 182 ff., 185.  
**Accents**, 5.  
**Accusative with bhavati**, 265, 473.  
**Ages**, 3.  
**Allahâbâd**, 83.  
**Alliteration**, 202 ff.  
**Annihilation**, 89.  
**Arabians**, 394.  
**Archery**, 11, 12.  
**Architecture**, 11, 391 ff.  
**Art**, 349; arts and sciences, v. *Upaveda*.  
**Assonance**, 200.  
**Astronomy**, 14, 15, 392.  
**Atheism**, 104, 189.  
**Augment**, 248, 251.  
**Authority**, 90 ff.  
  
**BACTRIANS**, 373, 394.  
**Banyan**, 83.  
**Bards**, 365 ff.  
**Barth**, vii, 381, 472, 475 ff.  
**Benfey**, 254, 272, 446.  
**Blood**, circulation of, 11.  
**Bloomfield**, 3, 244.  
**Body** (growth of, etc.), 153, 173 ff., 177.  
**Böhtlingk**, 246, 247, 249, 256, 446.  
 (von) **Bradke**, 386.  
**Breaths**, five, seven, or ten, 36, 171 ff.  
**Brown**, 193, 210, 241, 332.  
**Buddhists**, 87 ff., 123, 147, 176, 391 ff.  
**Buddhist works**, 386, 395; verses, v. *Dhammapada*; 79, 204, 237, 291, 308, 343, 379; traits in epic, 351, 379, 391, 475.  
**Bühler**, 21, 25, 27, 232, 333, 361, 376.  
  
**CADENCE**, 207 ff., 210 ff.  
**Cæstura**, 198, 210 ff., 216, 310. See also under each metre.  
**Callimachus**, 26.  
**Cappeller**, 191, 333, 334, 354, 356, 471.  
**Cartellieri**, 387.  
**Ceylon**, 80, 393.  
  
**Chinese**, 393.  
**Çiva**, 88, 97 ff., 113 ff., 143, 165, 183, 189, 474.  
**Coins**, 387.  
**Colebrooke**, 220, 242, 354.  
**Collitz**, 56.  
**Colors**, 172; of soul, 179.  
**Creations**, 130, 142, 182.  
**Cunningham**, 83.  
**Custom**, 90.  
  
**DAHLMANN** (v. *Synthesis*), *Preface*, 391, 396.  
**Dauids**, Rhys, 55, 87, 367, 386.  
**Death**, 184.  
**Denarius**, 387, 474.  
**Destructible**, 182.  
**Dialectic forms**, 69, 247, 251, 261 ff.  
**Didactic epic**, 381.  
**Dilambus**, 242, 248.  
**Dio Chrysostomos**, 389.  
**Documents**, 388.  
**Drama**, 54 ff., 62.  
**Drinking**, 377.  
**Dualism**, 85.  
  
**Echo**, origin of, 26.  
**Egg** (cosmic), 187.  
**Eighteen** — *vidyās*, 17; *Purāṇas*, 48, 49; (fold), 143; books, islands, armies, etc., 371.  
**Eighty thousand**, 6.  
**Elements**, five, 33, 149; *tanmātra*, 34, 44, 46, 129, 156 ff., 172, 173 ff.  
**Emergent stanzas**, 317.  
**Everett**, 85.  
  
**FA-HIEN**, 392.  
**Fate**, 183.  
**Faults**, 181.  
**Fausböll**, 280.  
**Fick**, 55, 380.  
**Free-will**, 103.  
**Frog-girl** (tale), 267 ff.

- GANGULI**, 95.  
**Garbē**, 174, 178.  
**Geography**, 81, 371, 373 ff., 393 ff.  
**Ghāts**, 392.  
**Gildermeister**, 220, 254, 256 ff., 326, 446.  
**Gods** (v. s. nom.), 4, 183, 379.  
**Grace of God**, 188.  
**Grammar**, v. *Vedāṅga*.  
**Grammatical forms** (v. Sanskrit, Prākṛit, dialectic forms), of later epic, 264 ff.; 472 ff.  
**Greeks**, 87, 387, 397; words, 372, 391 ff., 399.  
**Grierson**, 384.  
  
**HARDY**, 428, 445.  
**Heaven and hell**, 184.  
**Hemistich**, 196.  
**Heretics**, 86 ff.  
**Hiatus**, 197, 199.  
**Holtzmann**, Preface, 3, 4, 15, 22, 24 ff., 26, 27, 46, 47 ff., 56, 62, 65, 77, 97, 183, 186, 246-249, 262, 365, 368, 397.  
**Homer**, Hindu, 379, 389.  
**Horace**, 193, 210.  
**Huns**, 393, 475.  
**Hunting**, 378.  
**Hwen Thsang**, 83.  
**Hypermetrics**, 252 ff., 275 ff.  
  
**IMPERATIVE** future, 196, 247.  
**Inscriptions**, metre of, 333, 355, 361; on rock, 388.  
**Inspiration**, plenary, 92.  
**Islands**, number of, 229, 371.  
  
**JACOB**, 45, 174.  
**Jacobi**, 15, 60, 62 ff., 78, 79 ff., 84, 215, 220, 222 ff., 236 ff., 242 ff., 252, 254 ff., 256, 258 ff., 326, 335, 337, 354, 356, 369, 374, 381, 445, 446, 449 ff., 453 ff., 456 ff.  
**Jains**, 87 ff.  
  
**KAMBOJAS**, 392 ff.  
**Kashmere**, 72, 116, 394, 474.  
**Kern**, 10.  
**Kirste**, 399.  
**Kjellhorn**, 262.  
**Knowledge and soul**, 40.  
**Kühnan**, 296, 317.  
  
**LAMP**, 42.  
**Land grants**, 388.  
**Lanman**, 206, 260.  
**Lassen**, 326, 365, 393.  
**Letters**, sixty-three, 364.  
**Lévi**, 367.  
**Literature**, 1 ff.  
**Logic**, 7, 11.  
**Lord-spirit** (v. yoga), 134.  
**Lotus**, 37 ff., 121; lotus-theft, 221, 381.  
**Lotus of True Law**, 389.  
**Lüders**, 50, 60, 77.  
**Ludwig**, 376, 385, 472.  
  
**MAGIC**, 380.  
**Manuscripts of epic**, 364, 387.  
**Meat-eating**, 377.  
**Medicine**, 11, 12, 14, 35.  
**Megasthenes**, 389.  
**Metaphors**, 205 ff.  
**Metre**, affects grammar, 246 ff.  
**Metres**, 191 ff.; tables of, 193, 353.  
**Mind**, 33 ff.; sixth sense, 112, 166.  
**Mongolians**, 475.  
**Mora-verse**, 259, 343.  
**Morals**, 376 ff.  
**Muir**, 46, 84, 368.  
**Müller**, 5, 44, 385.  
**Music**, 11, 13, 172, 365.  
**Mute and liquid rule**, 242.  
  
**NAME** and form, 178, 183.  
**Nepal**, 475.  
**Numbers**, 206.  
  
**OCEAN**, allusions to, 80 ff.  
**Oldenberg**, 220, 267, 289 ff., 386, 450 ff., 452 ff.  
**Oldenburg**, 381.  
**Organs**, 34 ff., 129, 149 ff., 155 ff., 166.  
  
**PĀLI**, 260, 262 ff.  
**Pantomime**, 55.  
**Pathetic repetition**, 205, 207.  
**Patna**, 392.  
**Persian**, 392; word, 371.  
**Philosophy**, 85 ff.  
**Physician**, 54.  
**Pictures**, 388.  
**Pischel**, 57, 263.  
**Plants**, 171.  
**Poetic licence**, 244 ff., 251, 261 ff.

Polyandry, 376, 399.  
 Prākṛit, 69, 83 ; metre, 242, 244, 263,  
 366, 360, 472, 473.  
 Principles, twenty-fifth and twenty-  
 sixth, 113 ff., 125 ff., 133 ff., 189.  
 Prose-poetry, 266 ff.  
 Proverbs, 75, 83, 245, 260, 261, 266.  
 Pseudo-epic, 260, etc., 381, 472.  
 Pun, 204.  
 Punjab, 78, 374, 474.  
  
 RHAPSODE, 5, 54, 56, 365.  
 Rhyme, 200 ff.  
 Romans, 393.  
  
 SACRIFICES, plants, beasts, human,  
 377 ff., 474.  
 Sanskrit, 69, 83 ; grammar, 245 ff.  
 Sānchi, 367.  
 Saturnian verse, 332.  
 Scapegoats, 213, 471.  
 (von) Schroeder, 394.  
 Scythians, 394.  
 Self-existent, 4, 18.  
 Senses (v. mind), 35, 40, 42, 129, 132,  
 149 ff., 155 ff., 166, 172.  
 Seven, creators, 142 ; breaths, 171 ;  
 suns, 391, 475.  
 Seventeen, group, 30, 33, 165 ff.  
 Ships, 82.  
 Shiva, v. Īiva.  
 Silkworm, 36, 151.  
 Similes, 205 ff.  
 Sixteen (groups), 168.  
 Sixty, v. guṇas.  
 Sixty-four arts, 16.  
 Sørensen, 472.

Soul (v. Puruṣa), 42.  
 Sound, 172 ; eternal, ghoṣa, 183.  
 Stadia, 183.  
 Statues, 392.  
 Suttee, 81.  
 Syllaba anceps, 194 ff., 314.  
 Synthesis, method, Preface ; illustra-  
 tions of, 106, 124, 184, 377, 381, 389,  
 395, 475.  
  
 TAGS, 211 ff., 360.  
 Taxila, 387 ff., 475.  
 Telang, 27, 93.  
 Terminals, 67.  
 Theocritus, 380.  
 Thorp, 263.  
 Time, 41, 45, 103, 182 ff.  
 Tūṣāras, 394.  
 Trinitarian doctrine, 46, 184.  
  
 VALLÉE-POUSSIN, 475.  
 Vedic forms, 360.  
 Vishnu, 62, 64, 97, 183.  
 Vowel-changes, 248.  
  
 WEBER, 3, 5, 14, 26, 56, 62, 84, 207, 220,  
 222, 238 ff., 354, 365 ff., 368, 373, 380,  
 386, 390, 394, 398.  
 Whites (white men), 72, 116, 144.  
 Widows, v. Suttee.  
 Windisch, 79.  
 Winternitz, ix, 60, 115, 234, 391.  
 Wirtz, 60.  
 Writing, 205, 388.  
  
 ZODIAC, 392.

## SANSKRIT INDEX.

AKKHĀNA, 386.  
 akṣaracchandās, 192, 193, 321.  
 agrahāra, 388.  
 atijagatī, 193, 326.  
 atidhṛti, 193.  
 atiṣakvarī, 193.  
 Atri, Kṛṣṇātreya, 11, 35.  
 Atharvan (v. Vedas), 51.  
 Atharvaçiras, 9, 46.  
 adhyātma (scheme), 132.  
 Aniruddha, 143.  
 anuprāsa, 203.  
 anumāna, 51, 92, 93, 145.  
 anuvañça, 54, 364.  
 Anuṣāsana, 364, 398.  
 aparavaktra, 193, 336, 340 ff., 358.  
 apavarga, 107.  
 Apāntaratamas, 3, 97.  
 abhinaya, 55.  
 ariṣṭāni tattvāni, 100.  
 Arthaçāstra, 16, 86, 111.  
 ardhasamavṛtta, 193, 336; epic variations, 348.  
 avidyā, 136, 148.  
 avyakta (v. Prakṛti), 34, 134 ff.  
 Açoka, 356, 396.  
 Açvaghōṣa, 395.  
 açvasamjñāpana, 25.  
 Asamañjas, 77.  
 asambādhā, 193, 322.  
 Asita Devala, 98, 155 ff.  
 ĀKHYĀNA, Bhārata-, 9, 386; dharma-, satya-, 5, 43, 50.  
 āgama (v. kṛt°), 4, 11, 43, 145, 305; of sects, 115.  
 ācāra, v. custom.  
 ātman (v. soul), 130, etc.  
 āpātālikā, 351.  
 āmnāya, 92.  
 Āyurveda (v. Medicine), 53.  
 Āraṇyaka, 7, 9 ("sung"), 52.  
 āryā, 193, 353, 354 ff., 356, 358, 360.

āryāgiti, 193, 354 ff.  
 Āçvalāyana, 47.  
 Āsuri, 98, 99, 144.  
 ITIVṚTTA, 51.  
 Itihāsa, 4, 7, 10, 47 ff., 50, 64 (great), 111, 368.  
 Indra, 213, 471.  
 indravañça, 192, 309.  
 indravajrā, 192, 210, 309.  
 indriya (from Indra), 35.  
 Īçvara (v. Lord-spirit), 105, 139, 187, 189.  
 UTTARA (mīmāṃsā), 7.  
 upagīti, 193, 354.  
 upajāti, 192, 210, 216, 303, 309, 316.  
 Upanishads (v. Vedānta), 9 ff., 13, 25, 27, 79; 145 ff.; secret, 311; metre, 237; Atharvaçiras, 46; Kaṭha, 29, 31, 46, 90, 471; Chānd., 42, 385; Tāitt., 49; Praçna, 6, 27; BA., 26, 45, 46; cited, p. 149, etc.; Brahmanindu, 45; Mahā, 10, 48; Mahānār., 27; Māitri, 27, 30, 33 ff., 45, 90, 167, 471; Muṇḍ, 90, 390; Yogatattva, 31; Çvet., 28, 167.  
 upaniṣā, 10.  
 upamā, 205 ff.  
 upamāna, 93.  
 Upaveda, 7, 10, 11, 13.  
 upasarga, 181.  
 upākhyāna, 50.  
 upādhyāya, 380.  
 Upāñga, 7, 10, 13.  
 upendravajrā, 192, 210, 309, 316.  
 Uçanas (v. Brhaspati).  
 ūṣman, 156, 171.  
 EKĀNTIN, 143.  
 eḍūka, 49, 391.  
 ĀTITHYA, 43, 51, 145.

OJHA, 380.

ĀUPACCHANDASIKA, 193, 341, 349 ff.

KACCIT chapter, 12, 16, 75, 384.

Kaṇāda, 96, 98.

kathaka, 54 ff., 364 ff.

kathā, 50 ff.

kathaka, 54 ff.

Kapila, 96, 97 ff., 117, 369.

kapha, 12, 35, 122.

Karma, 103, 149.

karmendriyas, 130.

kalājñāna, 15, 16, 168; sixty-four, 17, 386; thirty-one elements, 152.

kāñci, 82.

Kāpila, 99.

Kāmaçāstra, 16.

Kāla, v. Time.

kālajñāna, 14, 15.

Kālayāvana, 15, 48, 392.

Kālidāsa, 56, 80, 225.

Kāvya, 53, 79, 80.

kīrtana, 51.

Kurus, 61, 376.

kuçilava, 65, 366.

kṛtāgama, 4.

kṛtānta, 99, 145.

kṛṣṇa (age), 3.

Kṛṣṇa, 4 (religion of), 9, 14, 53, 143, 175, 184, 189; as Dvāipāyana, 4, 54, 97; nature of, 374 ff., 394 ff.

Kṛṣṇātreyā, 11.

kevala, kevalatra, 44, 102, 108.

koṇa v. tri°.

koṣakāra, 36, 151, 161.

Kosala and Videha, 78.

Kāulika-çāstra, 380.

Kāuçika, 14, 116.

krama, 5, 14.

kṣetrajña (v. jīva), 160.

Kṣemendra, 398.

KHETAKA, 382.

GAṆACCHANDAS, 192, 354 ff.

gadya, 8, 272.

Gayā, 83.

Garga, 15 ff.

Gāṇeças, 115.

gāthā, 52, 305 ff.; epic, 385; verse, 239, 244, 264.

gāthin, 366.

Gāndharva (Veda, v. Music), çāstra, 17. gāyana, 366.

Gārgya, 11, 14.

Gālava, 5.

gīti, 5.

guna for jyā, 230, 437 (No. 279).

guṇas, (three) 34, (seven of Yogin) 39, 119 ff., 150 ff., 152 ff., 158 ff., (sixty) 163, 164, 173 ff., 355.

geha for grha, 263.

Gāuḍas, 202.

Gāutama, 95, 97.

Gāuraçiras, 18.

grantha, 16.

granthika, 366.

GHOSA, 183.

CAKRAVARTIN, 396.

caturmūrti, 184.

campū, 272.

carapa, 6.

Carapaavyūha, 5.

citta, 161.

Citragupta, 184, 476.

cetanā, 150.

cāitanyā, 45.

cāitya, 392.

CHANDAS, 191 ff.

chāyopasevana, 380.

JAGATĪ, 192, 193.

Jātakas, 55, 380, 382, 385, 396, 475.

jīva, 97, 137, 146 ff., 152, 175.

jīva and videha mukti, 111.

Jāimini, 97.

jyeṣṭha sāman, 368.

TATTVA, v. Principles.

tatrabhavant, 68.

tatstha, 44.

tanmātrās, v. Elements.

tapas, 188.

tarkaçāstra, 90, 146.

tāmrapaṭṭa, 388.

tiṣya (age), 3.

Tirthas, 8, 20, 49, (gāthā) 52.

triṇa, τριῶνος, 372.

triṣṭubh, 192, 209 ff., 214 ff., 273 ff.;

bird's-eye view, 275; of Rāmāyana, 276; scoliis, 277; catalectic, 282; hypermetric, 286, 296; defective,

299; mora-triṣṭubhs, 301 ff.; stanza, 309; number of, 356.  
tvaṃkāra, 26.

DAKṢA, 115.  
Daṇḍin, 202 ff.  
Damayantī, 72, 78.  
digvāsas, 88.  
Durgā, 382.  
deva as paramātman, 37.  
drutavilambita, 193, 324, 358.

DHANURVEDA, 11 ff.  
dhamanyas, 35.  
Dhammapada, 35, 39, 42, 68, 69, 87, 147, 181; forms of, 290 ff., 263; metre of, 280, 291, 343, 455, 460, 462, 467, 469; parallels with, 379, 407 (No. 37), 427 (No. 196), 445.  
Dharma-works (v. Manu), 6, 8; Āp., 6, 9; Gānt., 9; Bāndh., 25; Yāj. 6, 9; Vās., 9; Vishnu, 8, 9; Sūtras, 15; Dharmasāstras, 17 ff.; epic, 53, (authorship) 91.  
dhātavas, 34.  
dhāraka, 367.  
dhāraṇā, 109, 181.

NAṬA, 55, (sūtra) 13, 56.  
nartaka, 54.  
Nala, 72.  
Nahusa, 471.  
Nāciketas, 288.  
nāṭaka, 55 ff.  
nāṇdivādya, 306.  
Nārada, 10, 11, 57, 100, 367; system of, 133 ff.; law book, 388.  
nāstika, 86.  
nirātman, 41.  
Nirukta, 14.  
niryāṇa, 62.  
nirvāṇa, 88, 145.  
nirveda, 145.  
Nītiśāstra, 11, 12, 17.  
Nāighaṇṭuka, 14.  
Nyāya, 93, 94, 95 ff., 119.  
Nyāyatantras, 11, 17, 19, 117.

PAÑCAKĀLAŚA, 140.  
pañcamahākāla, 115, 144.  
Pañcaçikha, 98, 99; system of 142, 149 ff., 154; date of, 397.

Patañjali, philosopher, 97, 147, 180 ff.; grammarian, 390, 399; metre, 239, 472.

pathyā, 219 ff., 440.  
padakrama, 5.  
padya, 272.  
Pāñcarātra, 96, 97, 143, 144 ff.  
pāṭhaka, 364.  
Pāṇini, 13, 16, 390, 395.  
pāṇisvanika, 366 ff.  
Pāṇḍavas, 376 ff., 385, 397.  
pāriplava, 365.  
Pācupata, 96, 97, 114 ff., 118.  
pāda, 191, 193.  
Pāṣaṇḍa, 89, 391, 475.  
pitta, 12, 35, 122.  
Purāṇa, 4, 7, 10, 17, 47 ff., 80, 111, 368; Vāyu, 6, 48 ff., 63; Bhaviṣyat, Garuda, Vārāha, 48; Vishnu, 384; metre of, 224 ff., 229, 234, 256 ff., 314.  
purāvṛtta, 51.  
Purusha, 36, 44, 106, 113 ff., 118; plurality of, 122; eternal, 134, 182.  
Purohita, 380.  
puṣpitāgrā, 193, 330, 340 ff., 358.  
pustaka, 364, 387.  
Puṣyamitra, 399.  
Pūrvaçāstra, 87.  
pāurāṇika, v. Sūta.  
Prakṛti, 44, 106, 112 ff., 117 ff., 121; ādya, 471; eight, 129; eternal, 134, 170, 182; seven, 146, 170; colors of, 28, 180.  
pratibhā, 107, 181.  
pratirūpaka, 380.  
pratyakṣa, 51, 92, 105, 145.  
pratyāhāra, 182.  
prabhaviṣṇutva, 108.  
pramāṇa, 51, 90.  
pramitākṣarā, 322, 353.  
prayojana, 95.  
pravacana, 8.  
prasava, 128.  
prasāda, 42, 188.  
praharaṇakalitā, 322, 353.  
praharṣiṇī, 193, 329, 358.  
Prākṛt, v. English index.  
prāṇa, v. Breaths.  
prekṣā (and pekkhā), 55, 57, 476.

BANDIN, 366.  
bala, sixth organ, 150 ff.

bahvṛca, 5.  
 Bādarāyaṇa, 97, 124.  
 Bālīkka, 373, 474.  
 buddha and budhyamāna, 132, 134 ff.  
 buddhi (v. Sāṃkhya), 158; has sixty  
 guṇas, 163.  
 buddhindriyas, 130.  
 Brhaspati (with Uṇanas), 11, 18, 87.  
 Brahmajāla sūtra, 55, 57.  
 Brāhman, 11, 90, 104 ff.  
 Brahman, 4, 183, 187.  
 brahmasūtra (thread), 364 (v. Sūtra).  
 Brāhmaṇa, 7; Āit., 26; Śatapatha, 6,  
 7, 26, 368; Tāndya, Kātha, Kāṇva,  
 Tāittiri, 8; Kālāpa and Kaṭha, 14.

BHAGAVADGĪTĀ, 53, 205; metre of, 219,  
 225, 234 ff., 384, 402.

Bharata, 11, 57.

Bharadvāja, 11, 18.

bhavati with acc., 265, 473.

bhave(h) for bhavayam, 473.

Bhāgavatas, 91, 115, 117.

Bhārati kathā, 54, 64, 386 ff.

bhujāṅgaprayāta, 193, 289, 323, 357,  
 358.

bhūtātman, 39, 40.

bhoti, 259.

MATHURĀ, 395.

Manu, 8, 9, 18 ff., 22, 25, 57, 69, 144,  
 388.

manovahā, 35, 181.

mantra, 4, 11.

Maya, 392.

mahātman, 39.

Mahābhārata, 4, 54; -kṛt, 358, 389 ff.;  
 date of, 397 ff.

Mahābhāgya, 3, 5, 6, 8, 56; verse, 238,  
 258, 390, 401, 468, 472.

mahābhūta, 34, 130 ff., 175.

māgadhas, 366.

Māgha, 223, 227.

mātrāchandas, 192, 336, 343.

mātrāsamaka, 193, 351, 353 ff., 355 ff.

māyā, 80, 101, 116, 138, 151, 235.

māriṣa, 68, 204.

mālini, 193, 334, 357, 358.

Mihira, 371.

mīṃṣāṇsā, 87.

mṛgendramukha, 193, 331, 337.

mokṣadharma, 51.

mokṣaśāstra, 16.

mleccha, 49, 393.

YAMA, 186, 288.

yamakās, 205.

Yavanas, v. Greeks.

Yāska, 14.

yuktiśāstra, 17.

Yudhiṣṭhira and yudhi sthira, 391.

yoga, (eightfold) 44, 86 ff., 111, 136,  
 159, 188.

yoga-śāstras, 110, 179.

yogin, seven guṇas, 39; practice, 107;  
 body of eight guṇas, 108; faults,  
 181; discipline, 107, 181, 189.

RATHAMTARA, 368.

rathoddhatā, 193, 322, 358.

rahasya, 9, 10, 13.

Rāma, 64, 78, 79, 395.

Rāmāyaṇa, 19, 27, 52, 55, 56, 58-84,  
 188; metre of, 226, 231, 236 ff., 242,  
 247 ff., 264, 316, 317, 349 ff., 354, 361,  
 384, 395; also the Appendices, pas-  
 sim, and 473.

rucirā, 193, 302 ff., 326, 358; in R., 309.

Rudra-Śiva, 115, 184.

rudras, 108.

rūpaka, 205 ff.

Romaharṣa(ṇa), 47.

rāudrarasa, 204.

LOKĀYATA, 87, 111.

VAṆĀSTHABILA, 192, 309.

Vatsabhaṭṭi, 333, 355.

varṇavṛtta, 192, 321.

vasantatilakā, 193, 333, 357, 358.

vasso, 364.

vācaka, 363.

vāṇi, 172.

vāta, 12, 35, 122.

vātormi, 192, 304, 317 ff.

Vāmana, 333.

Vālmiki, thief, 57; poet and saint,  
 58 ff., 61 ff.; copied, 204, 225, 229,  
 264; yajurvedin, 368.

Vāsudeva, v. Krishna.

vāstuvidyā, v. Architecture.

Vāhika, 373.

vikāras, eleven, 37, 44; sixteen, 128 ff.,  
 168 ff.

Vidarbhas, 203.

- vidūsaka, 55 ff.  
 vidyā, 136, 183.  
 vipulā, rules, 220 ff., 248; examples, 448 ff.  
 viṣeṣas, 44, 129, 187.  
 viṣvā(ni), 251.  
 Vishnu, law-book, 388 (v. Krishna).  
 vihāra, 88, 391.  
 viṇā, 172, 365.  
 Veda, 2 ff., 101; made, 3; vedakartar, 4; lost, 3, 4; size and branches, 5; Sāmhitā, 7, 53; other names, 2, not including Āraṇyaka, 9; Atharva, 2, 3, 5, 12, 26, 380; Brahma and Brāhma, 9, 12, 13; Rk, 2, 5, 23 ff., 124, 207, 356; Yajus, 2, 5, 25, 368; Sāman, 2, 3, 5, 369; fourfold, divided, etc., 3; Çākalaka, 6; fifth, or Vyāsa's Veda, 7, 10, 53.  
 Vedāṅgas, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14.  
 Vedānta, 9, 43, 53, 93 ff., 111, 143, 150; Secret of, 157.  
 Vedāntasāra, 34, 238.  
 Vedāraṇyaka, 96.  
 vāitālika, 366.  
 vāitāliya, 193, 341, 349 ff.  
 vāiṣeṣika, 96.  
 vāiṣvadevī, 193, 304, 317 ff., 325, 358.  
 Vāiṣnavas, 115.  
 vyākhyā, 53.  
 Vyāsa, 58, 71, 123, 124, 157.  
 ÇAKVARĪ, 193.  
 Çatapatha, v. Brāhmaṇa.  
 Çatarudriya, 24, 368.  
 çabdaçāstra, 17.  
 Çambūka, 72.  
 Çāktas, 115.  
 çākhā, v. Veda.  
 Çāṇḍilya, 14, 97.  
 çārdūlavikrīḍita, 193, 336, 357 ff.  
 çālinī, 192, 304, 314, 318.  
 Çālihotra, 12, 99.  
 çāstra, 9, 12, 13, 17.  
 çikṣā, 4 (saçāikṣyam), 7, 14.  
 çukra, 153.  
 Çūdra (in later epic), 379.  
 Çāivas, 115.  
 çlesman, 12.  
 çloka, 192, 194, 214 ff., 219 ff.; scheme of metre, 235, 236; prior pāda, 219 ff.; iambic çloka, 238; posterior pāda, 239; hypermetric, 252 ff.; compared with mātrā, 356.  
 Çvetadvīpa, v. White men.  
 ŚAṢṬIBHĀGA, of Çiva, 113, 165.  
 SAMĀJA, 57.  
 samādhāna, 109.  
 saṁkhyāna, 126.  
 samprasāda, 41, 42.  
 Sāmkyha, 86 ff., 93, 110, 111, 124, 127 ff.; scheme, 129, 189; sixty guṇas, 164 and 355.  
 Sāmkyayoga, 90, 99, 101; difference, 111, 124, etc.  
 sāman (v. Veda), 16.  
 siddhānta, 117.  
 siddhārtha, 14.  
 Siddhi, wife of Varuṇa, 475.  
 suruṅgā, 372.  
 Sūta, 56, 364 ff.  
 Sūtra, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17; epic verse in, 385; mention of epic, 390; Veda-sūtra and Brahmasūtra, 15, 16.  
 sūtradhāra, 56.  
 sāmkyhaçāyika, 366.  
 Sāuras, 115.  
 sāuvīra, 373, 474.  
 stutiçāstra, 48.  
 stūpa, 392.  
 stobhas, 207.  
 Sthāpatyaveda, v. Architecture.  
 sma and smahe, 249.  
 Smṛti, 395.  
 HARIGĪTĀS, 53.  
 Harivaṇṇa, known in Çānti, 9.  
 Hiranyagarbha, 96, 113.

