



FILE

Name: BuK892__Buehler_Kirste_ContribHist_Mahabharata_IndianStudies-II_SKAW_127-XII.pdf
PURL: http://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl/?gr_elib-228
Type: Searchable PDF/A (text under image); index/bookmarks
Encoding: Unicode (â î û ı ... ś ... ð)
Date: 24.10.2012

BRIEF RECORD

Author: Bühler, Georg; Kirste, Johann
Title: *Indian Studies, II: Contributions to the History of the Mahâbhârata.*
Publ.: Wien : F. Tempsky 1892
Description: 58 p.
Series: Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 127, XII.

FULL RECORD

www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindolo/gr_elib.htm

NOTICE

This file may be copied on the condition that its entire contents, including this data sheet, remain intact.

SITZUNGSBERICHTE

DER

PHILOSOPHISCH-HISTORISCHEN CLASSE

DER KAISERLICHEN

AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN.

HUNDERTSIEBENUNDZWANZIGSTER BAND.

(MIT ZWEI TAFELN.)

WIEN, 1892.

IN COMMISSION BEI F. TEMPSKY

BUCHHÄNDLER DER KAIS. AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN.

XII.

Indian Studies.

No. II.

Contributions to the History of the Mahâbhârata.

By

G. Bühler and J. Kirste.¹

The present paper is the first instalment of certain researches regarding the history of the Mahâbhârata, on which I have been engaged for some time with two of my pupils, Professor J. Kirste and Dr. Cartellieri. The task, which we have undertaken, is to compare some of the older abstracts of the Mahâbhârata with the published text as well as to collect, and to examine the value of, the references to, and the quotations from that work which occur in great number in some of the more ancient Sanskrit compositions with exactly or approximately ascertainable dates.

The importance of a careful scrutiny of the external evidence, bearing on the condition of the great Epic during the long period which precedes the time of its earliest commentator whose notes have been preserved at least partially,² is obvious and has been long recognised. Professor A. Weber

¹ Professor Kirste's share of this paper consists of pp. 27, l. 27—57, with the exception of the bracketed passage on p. 28—29.

² This is Sarvajña Nârâyana, who as I have shown in the Introduction to my Translation of Manu, S. B. E. vol. XXV, p. CXXIX, cannot have written later than in the second half of the fourteenth century, but may be somewhat older. Large fragments of his notes have been preserved in MSS. of the Berlin, Oxford and Deccan College collections. He had, of course, predecessors, among whom, to judge from Arjunamîśra's remarks, A. Weber, Berlin Catalogue of 1858, p. 104, Devabodha was the oldest.

has repeatedly¹ pointed out that the existence of the Mahâbhârata and of its subdivisions, as well as that of the Harivaṁśa, is guaranteed for the beginning of the seventh century A. D. by various passages in the romances of Bâṇa and of his predecessor Subandhu. Professor Kern² has given some account and a specimen of the text of a Javanese translation, which dates from the eleventh century, and Dr. R. G. Bhânḍârkar has collected and discussed a large number of data from literary works and inscriptions, which bear on the antiquity of the Mahâbhârata, in an able article³ directed against a curious theory of Colonel Ellis, who assigned the composition of the poem to a period later than A. D. 1521. In the latter paper, which unfortunately has not attracted the attention it merits, the author has gone a long way beyond generalities and has brought to light many interesting and important details. Thus, in discussing the references found in Bâṇa's and Subandhu's works, he comes to the conclusion that "the Mahâbhârata existed in a form complete, so far as the story concerning the principal characters goes, in Bâṇa's time, i. e. in the first half of the seventh century." Moreover, he shows that the work used to be read in the temples for the edification of the worshippers, just as is done in our days, and quotes a passage from the Kâdambarî,⁴ which asserts that queen Vilâsavatî of Ujjain went on the fourteenth day of the halfmonth to the temple of Mahâkâla and 'heard during a recital of the Mahâbhârata that there are indeed no joys in heaven for those destitute of a son, and that a son is called *puttra* because he saves his father from the hell named Put.' Later Mr. K. T. Telang has shown in the introduction to his Translation of the Bhagavadgîtâ⁵

¹ See e. g. Indische Streifen, vol. I, pp. 358, 386.

² Over de oud-Javansche Vertaling vant Mahâbhârata.

³ Jour. Bo. Br. Roy. As. Soc., vol. X, pp. 81—92.

⁴ Kâdambarî p. 61, l. 15 f. (Peterson), अथ च चतुर्दशीति भगवन्तं महाकालमर्चितुमितो गतया महाभारते वाच्यमाने श्रुतमपुत्राणां किल न सन्ति लोकाः शुभाः । पुत्राम्नो नरकात्त्रायत इति पुत्र इति ॥ The last phrase perhaps refers to Mah. I, 74. 39, or I, 229. 14, where the above etymology of *puttra* is given.

⁵ Sacred Books of the East, vol. VIII, p. 28.

that Bâṇa's Mahâbhârata included also the Bhagavadgîtâ. The Anantagîtâ, with which according to Bâṇa the Mahâbhârata gladdens the auditory faculties of men, can only be, as Mr. Telang says, the Thespesion Melos. For, Ananta is a very common name of Bhagavat or Vishṇu-Kṛishṇa, and the substitution of Ananta for Bhagavat is necessary in order to make the compound *ananta-gîtânanditanarām* applicable to a royal palace which resounds with the songs of countless dancing girls and singers. Valuable as all this is, the recent publication of various formerly inaccessible Sanskrit texts and of numerous inscriptions permits us at present to ascertain the condition and the character of the Mahâbhârata in the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries of our era with very much greater accuracy, and the indisputable results, obtainable by a careful examination of the materials, enable us to put forward not unfounded conjectures regarding the state of the work during the immediately preceding times. Under these circumstances it is only proper that the scrutiny of the most promising documents, belonging to the period named, should be undertaken first, and this will be done partly by myself and partly by Dr. Cartellieri. The latter scholar has already finished a complete analysis of the references occurring in Subandhu's and Bâṇa's works, to be published very shortly, which shows beyond a doubt that these two authors had studied and did use legends from almost every one of the eighteen Parvans for the embellishment of their poems. I myself shall prove in this paper that during the three centuries mentioned, the Mahâbhârata had the same character which it still has, viz., that it was regarded as a great Smṛiti, composed by Vyâsa or Kṛishṇa Dvaipâyana in order to teach the whole duty of man, and that it was practically used as such. Incidentally I shall show that there are valid reasons for assuming that the work did not differ much in size from the published text.

At the same time this paper offers a specimen of the results of Professor Kirste's exploration of the oldest known abstract of the Mahâbhârata, the Mahâbhârata or Bhârata Mañjarî of the Kaśmîrian poet Kshemendra, who dates¹ two of his compositions

¹ Kaśmîr Report, p. 46 and Samayamâtrikâ (Kâvyamâlâ 10) p. 57.

in Saptarshi Samvat [41]25 and [41]41 i. e. A. D. 1049/50 and 1065/66. Though the period, from which the abstracts date, is comparatively speaking recent, it yet precedes that of the commentaries by several centuries, and hence their examination possesses a considerable interest for critical purposes. The present paper offers only an analysis of a small portion of the work. Kshemendra's Âdiparvan alone has been compared in detail with the printed text and some notes on Parvans XII and XIII as well as on Kshemendra's divisions of the Mahâbhârata have been added. Still, even this fragment gives a very fair idea of the general state of things. Continuations of the analysis will be published, as soon as Paṇḍit Durgâprasâda has completed his edition of the Mañjarî, which he has undertaken for the Nirṇayasâgara Press.

The Mahâbhârata, a Smṛiti during the earlier
centuries of our era.

It is a well known fact that the Mahâbhârata, as known to us, claims to be not only a heroic poem and a Kâvya, but a composition, which teaches in accordance with the primary revelation, the eternal Vedas, how the fourfold end of human existence, spiritual merit, wealth, pleasure and final liberation may be gained. Though it calls itself the Kârshṇa Veda,¹ the Veda proclaimed by Kṛishṇa Dvaipâyana, a difference between it and the real Śruti is admitted, since it confesses to be the product of a human author, the Ṛishi Kṛishṇa Dvaipâyana, *alias* Vyâsa. It thus belongs, according to its own statement, to the second class of the sacred writings of the Hindus, the Smṛiti or the sacred Tradition, which is supposed to contain the individual recollections of those divinely favoured men, who received the revelations of the Śruti. And numerous particulars, like the title Kârshṇa Veda, the occurrence of the famous Mantra or invocation to Nârâyaṇa, Nara and Sarasvatî at the beginning of each of its larger sections² and the prevalence of

¹ Mahâbhârata I, 1. 268.

² The Mantra नारायणं नमस्कृत्येत्वादि is found also in the beginning of Kshemendra's abstract. It is a characteristic mark of the works of

Vishṇuitic doctrines, prove it to a Smṛiti of the ancient Bhāgavatas.

It is equally well known that the medieval and modern Sanskrit authors from the eleventh century of our era down to the present time, one and all regard the Mahābhārata as a Smṛiti and that they quote its words as authoritative in their countless compilations on the sacred law and on Moksha, allotting to it the same rank which Manu's Sainhitā and other lawbooks hold in their estimation. If we go backwards from the year A. D. 1,000, we find that the great Vedāntist Śaṅkarāchārya, who according to the perfectly credible tradition wrote his Śārīraka Bhāshya in A. D. 804,¹ frequently quotes the Mahābhārata in his works and often introduces the quotations by the words स्मृतिरपि 'the Smṛiti also says' स्मर्यते च 'and it is recorded in the Smṛiti' and similar phrases.² Moreover, in his commentary on Brahma Sūtra I, 3. 38 Śaṅkara states in connexion with a verse from the twelfth Parvan, which will be discussed below p. 10, that the Mahābhārata is intended for the religious instruction of those classes, which by their position are debarred from studying the Vedas and the Vedānta.

The great Epic, therefore, was regarded in the beginning of the ninth century, exactly in the same light as in the middle ages and in our days.

Further back and closer to the period, with which we are immediately concerned, we are lead by Kumārila's Tantravārttika,

the ancient Bhāgavata sect, where it is invariably found, frequently with the variant देवीं सरस्वतीं व्यासं instead of चैव.

¹ See Mr. K. B. Pāthak's paper in the Indian Antiquary, vol. XI, p. 174 f., and Professor Deussen, Vedānta, p. 37, Note 23. The seeming absurdity of the tradition regarding Śaṅkara's short career disappears with a very simple and perfectly admissible interpretation of the Sanskrit passages, found and communicated to me by Dr. R. G. Bhāṇḍārkar. I trust that he will publish it soon.

² The quotations from the Mahābhārata in Śaṅkara's Śārīraka Bhāshya have been collected by Professor Deussen in his Vedānta, p. 35 f. and the passages have been carefully identified by the same scholar in his German translation of the Bhāshya. See also Śaṅkara's introduction to the Bhagavadgītā (p. 3 of the Bombay edition by Gaṅgāviṣṇu Kṛishṇadāsa, Jagadīśvara Press, 1879), where the Bhagavadgītā is clearly characterised as a Smṛiti.

which belongs approximatively to the beginning of the eighth century. Though the tradition, which makes Kumârila an older contemporary of Śaṅkarâchârya, deserves no credit, it is yet certain that the works of the latter contain 'allusions to Kumârila, if no direct mention of him',¹ and, as Professor Max Müller says,² Kumârila cannot be placed later than A. D. 700. A small portion of his huge explanation of the Sûtras of the Pûrvâ Mîmâṁsâ, the exposition of I. 2. 1 — III. 4. 13, has been printed of late in the Benares Sanskrit Series, and this fragment contains numerous references to, and some quotations from, the Mahâbhârata as well as a discussion of the character of the work, which is fully sufficient for our purpose. The most important passage, which bears on the second point, occurs in the discussion of Sûtra I. 2. 7, which gives the Sidhânta regarding the value of Arthavâdas or explanatory statements. After showing, how the Vedic Arthavâdas must be treated, Kumârila continues:³

एवं भारतादिवाक्यानि व्याख्येयानि । तेषामपि हि आवयेच्चतुरो
वर्णानित्वेवमादिविध्यनुसारेण पुरुषार्थत्वान्वेषणादक्षरादि व्यतिक्रम्य
धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाधर्मानर्थदुःखसंसारसाध्यसाधनप्रतिपत्तिरूपादानपरि-
त्यागाङ्गभूता फलम् । तत्रापि तु दानराजमोक्षधर्मादिषु केचित्साक्षा-
द्विध्यः केचित्पुनः परकृतिपुराकल्परूपेणार्थवादाः । सर्वापाख्यानेषु च
तात्पर्ये सति आवयेदिति विधेरानर्थक्यात्कथंचिद्गम्यमानस्तुतिनिन्दा-
परिग्रहः । तत्परत्वाच्च नातीवोपाख्यानेषु तत्त्वाभिनिवेशः कार्यः ।
वेदप्रस्थानाभ्यासेन हि वाल्मीकिद्वैपायनप्रभृतिभिस्तथैव स्ववाक्यानि

¹ See Professor Cowell's note 4, to his edition of Colebrooke's Essays, vol. II, p. 323.

² India: — What can it teach us? p. 308. The beginning of the eighth century is the latest date, assigned to Kumârila. Several able Sanskrit scholars, among whom I may mention Mr. K. T. Telang have tried to prove that he is much older. Their arguments do not appear convincing to me, and I prefer to base my arguments on that date, which is the lowest possible. Should they eventually succeed in proving an earlier date for Kumârila, my views regarding the Mahâbhârata will, of course, not be invalidated. See also below the Additions.

³ Tantravârttika p. 16, l. 14 ff. The Benares edition has the following misprints, which I have corrected conjecturally: मोक्षा धर्म०; साध्य-साधनं प्रति०; श्रूयमाणगन्धमादना०.

प्रणीतानि । प्रतिपाद्यानां च विचित्रबुद्धित्वाद्युक्तमेवैतत् । इह केचि-
द्विधिमात्रेण प्रतिपद्यन्ते । अपरे सार्थवादेन । अपरेत्येनार्थवादेनापरे
महता । सर्वेषां च चित्तं ग्रहीतव्यमित्येवमारम्भः । तत्र तु केचिद्विधि-
प्रतिषेधाः श्रुतिमूलाः केचिदर्थसुखादिषु लोकमूलास्तथार्थवादाः केचि-
द्वैदिका एव केचिल्लौकिका एव केचित्तु स्वयमेव काव्यन्यायेन रचिताः ।
सर्वे च स्तुत्यर्थेन प्रमाणम् । ये तु वाक्यशेषत्वं न प्रतिपद्यन्ते तेपि केचि-
त्स्वयमेव श्रूयमाणा गन्धमादनादिवर्णकप्रभृतयः प्रीतिं जनयन्ति । ये तु
युद्धवर्णकास्ते सर्वेषां शूराणां भीरूणां चोत्साहकराः पार्थिवानामुप-
युज्यन्ते । यत्र तु न किञ्चिद्दृष्टमुपलभ्यते तत्र विशिष्टदेवतादिस्तुतिद्वारमद्दृष्टं
कल्पनीयमित्येषा दिक् ॥

“The sentences of the Bhârata and similar works must be explained in like manner. For, if one goes beyond their literal sense, because one inquires into their connexion with the highest aims of man, according to such rules as that, (given Mahâbhârata XII. 328. 49): ‘Let him teach the four castes’ etc., they too (yield as) reward the knowledge of the accomplishment of that which is to be accomplished with respect to merit, wealth, pleasure and liberation as well as with respect to demerit, misfortune, pain and the circle of births, which (knowledge) conduces to the acquisition (of the former) and to the avoidance (of the latter). But even there (in the Mahâbharata) some direct rules are found in the *Dânadharma*, the *Râjadharma* and the *Mokshadharmâ* and other (sections), while there are some explanatory statements in the shape of legends narrating the deeds of others in ancient times. And as the rule ‘Let him teach the four castes,’ refers to all the episodes (of the Mahâbhârata), one must take them to contain praise or blame, which may be understood in some way or other, because (else the above rule would be) meaningless. And as the episodes refer chiefly to this, one must not be too eager to find in them fundamental truths. For, Vâlmîki, Dvâipâyana (Vyâsa) and the other (sages) composed their sentences, after studying the method followed in Vedas, in exactly the same manner. And this is suitable, because the intellectual power of those who are to be instructed is of very different degrees. In this world some men learn through rules alone, others through (rules) accompanied by explanatory statements,

others through short explanatory statements, and again others through circumstantial ones. And the action (of the sages pursues) this (object), that they may captivate the hearts of all. But in the (works mentioned) some rules and prohibitions are based on the revealed texts, some, (which refer) to wealth, pleasure and the like on worldly (wisdom); likewise the explanatory statements are partly Vedic, partly worldly and some have been composed by (the sages) themselves after the manner usual in artificial poetry. And all are authoritative, because they refer to praise. But some passages like the description of the mountain Gandhamâdana,¹ which do not indicate that something unsaid must be understood, by themselves produce pleasure, when one hears them. But the descriptions of battles rouse the energy of all (hearers), both of heroes and of timorous men, and are (thus) useful to kings. But, in those passages, where no visible (worldly aim) is perceived, one must assume that an unseen (transcendental one exists), i. e. the praise of some particular deity and the like. These are the general directions (for the interpretation)".

This passage leaves no doubt on the following points: —

(1) Kumârila had before him a Mahâbhârata, attributed to Vyâsa, which was not merely a narrative of the war between the Pânḍavas and the Kauravas, but a Smṛiti, or work belonging to the sacred tradition, composed according to the same method as the Vedas, teaching chiefly the whole duty of man and intended for the religious instruction of all Hindus, containing also numerous episodes and traces of the learned poet's art. That is just what the Mahâbhârata, known to us, is and pretends to be. In the Anukramaṇikâparvan, in the Parvasaṅgraha and in the Bhârataprasâmsâ (Mah. I, chapters 1, 2, 62) all these statements are made over and over again. Thus we read in the last mentioned chapter, vs. 23:² —

धर्मशास्त्रमिदं पुण्यमर्घशास्त्रमिदं परम् ।
मोक्षशास्त्रमिदं प्रोक्तं व्यासेनामितबुद्धिना ॥

¹ Mahâbhârata III. 158. 38 ff.

² Compare also I. 1. 48—49, 62—69, I. 2. 383. I. 62. 62.

“Immeasurably wise Vyâsa proclaimed this work, the holy institutes of the sacred law, the best manual of polity and a guide to salvation”; again *ibidem* vs. 35: —

ब्राह्मणानां गवां चैव माहात्म्यं यत्र कीर्त्यते ।
सर्वश्रुतिसमूहोयं श्रोतव्यो धर्मबुद्धिभिः ॥

“This collection of all sacred texts, in which the greatness of cows and Brahmans is exalted, must be listened to by virtuously minded men”; and chapter 1, vs. 73:¹

अस्य काव्यस्य कवयो न समर्था विशेषणे ।
विशेषणे गृहस्थस्य शेषास्त्रय इवाश्रमाः ॥

“Poets are unable to excel this poem, just as the other three orders cannot surpass the householder.”

It would not be unreasonable to assume that the Mahâbhârata, known to Kumârila, contained the utterances quoted, or at least some of them. And there is another very good reason for asserting Kumârila's acquaintance with the Anukramaṇikâ. For, when discussing the importance of the *nirukta* or science of etymology in connexion with Sûtra I. 3. 9. he says, Tantra-vârttika p. 160—161: —

यथा महाभारतनिर्वचनान्वाख्याने द्वैपायनेनोक्तम् ।
महत्त्वाद्भारतत्वाच्च महाभारतमुच्यते ।
निरुक्तमस्य यो वेद सर्वपापैः प्रमुच्यते ॥

“Thus Dvaipâyana says in the successive enumeration of the etymological meaning of the (parts of the word) Mahâbhârata; “On account of its greatness and on account of the true state of its weight (*bhâva-tattva*) and on account its treating of the Bharatas (*bhârata-tva*) it is called Mahâbhârata. He who knows the etymology of its (name), is freed from all sins.”

The verse, quoted here, stands in our editions last but one in the Anukramaṇikâparvan (I. 1. 274), but offers a variant *bhâravattvât* ‘on account of its being possessed of weight’. In the preceding verse it is narrated that the Mahâ-

¹ Compare also I. 1. 61, 72, where the work is emphatically a Kâvya, and I. 2. 388—390, which last verse is a repetition of that quoted above.

bhârata was weighed by the gods against the four Vedas and was found to be of greater weight. Hence it is evident that a play on *bhâra* is intended. With Kumâri's reading¹ this comes out very neatly, because *bhâratatva* may be taken in accordance with the spelling usual in MSS. and inscriptions, as equivalent to *bhâra-tattva* and to *bhârata-tva*, and we have in reality a double etymology for the second part of the compound, the latter of which agrees with the hints given in the Bhârataprasaṁsâ, I. 62. 26 and 39—40. The reading of the printed texts looks like a correction.

(2) Kumâri's remarks on Mîm. Sû. I. 2. 7 make it perfectly plain that in his time the Mahâbhârata included the twelfth and thirteenth Parvans,² which so frequently have been declared to be 'late additions'. For, the Râjadharma and Mokshadharmâ which are explicitly mentioned are two of the sections of the Śânti Parvan and the Dânadharma belongs to the Anuśâsana Parvan. The word *âdi*, 'and others', which stands after the compound *dânarâjamokshadharmâ* indicates that there were more sections giving explicit rules and can be referred only to the Âpaddharma of the twelfth book and to the Upavâsavidhi of the thirteenth. Very interesting, too, is the quotation from the latter portion of the Mokshadharmâ, where the verse 'Let him teach the four castes' stands in the Śukotpatti-section, as well as the fact, that the by no means very clear words are considered to refer exclusively to recitals of the great Epic.³ In another passage, which explains Mîmâṁsâ Sûtra I. 3. 4, (Tantravârttika p. 113) Kumâri quotes another verse of the twelfth Parvan:

¹ I consider Kumâri's reading to be unimpeachable, because Professor Goldstücker gives it likewise in his Sanskrit Dictionary sub voce *anvâkhyâna*.

² Though I speak here and in the sequel always of the twelfth and thirteenth Parvans, I do not wish to prejudice the question whether their contents originally formed one book or two (see below p. 53). All I mean to say is that the several subdivisions included in these two Parvans were in existence.

³ The same view is expressed by Śaṅkarâchârya on Śârîraka Sûtra I. 3. 38.

द्वैपायनादयश्चाहुः ।

परिनिष्ठितकार्यस्तु स्वाध्यायेनैव हि द्विजः ।

कुर्यादन्यन्न वा कुर्यान्नैत्रो ब्राह्मण उच्यते ॥

“Dvaipâyana and others say, ‘But a twice-born man fulfils (all) his duties by the private recitation of the Veda alone; he who befriends (all creatures) is a (true) Brâhmana, whether he performs other (religious acts) or does not perform them.’”¹ This quotation is found in the Râjadharma, Mahâbhârata XII. 60. 12, where the printed texts offer an unimportant various reading, *brâhmanah* instead of *hi vai dvijah*. Kumârila’s addition ‘and others’ after Vyâsa’s name refers to Manu II. 87, Vishṇu LV. 21, Vasishṭha XXVI. 11, where a verse, identical in the second half and similar in the first, occurs.

Other references to and quotations from the Mahâbhârata are not unfrequent in the published portion of the Tantravârttika. I give them, as much as possible in the order of the Parvans and chapters of the Mahâbhârata, where they are found.

(1) P. 416, l. 14, Kumârila mentions the Sauparṇopâkhyâna explicitly and refers in particular to Mahâbhârata I. 28. 2.² He says there: **अमृतः सोममाहरेति सौपर्णाख्याने विनतया गरुडान-
मृतार्थं प्रेषितः ।** “In the Sauparṇa episode Vinatâ sends Garuḍa to fetch the nectar, saying, ‘Bring the Soma from the other world.’” The quotation is, however, not literal.

(2) P. 452, l. 12, he gives the name of the Pañchendropâkhyâna: **तथा च पञ्चेन्द्रोपाख्याने वृद्धकुमारीवरप्रार्थने पतिं मे देहीति पञ्चकृत्वोभ्यासः श्रूयते ॥**

“And thus we hear in the Pañchendropâkhyâna that in the old virgin’s request for a bridegroom, the words, ‘Give me a husband,’ were repeated five times.”

The verse, particularly referred to is Mah. I. 197. 49, where Śiva says to the petitioner, who remonstrates against the promise of five husbands,

पञ्चकृत्वस्त्वयोक्तोहं पतिं देहीति वै पुनः ।

¹ I translate the second line in accordance with the remarks of Kullûka and Râghava on Manu II. 87. It may, of course, be taken differently.

² This passage, as well as a great number of the following ones, has been first identified by Dr. Cartellieri in the Calcutta edition of the Mahâ-

“Five times, indeed, thou spokest to me, ‘Give me a husband.”

The fact that the god practised a deception on the Brahman’s old daughter by granting her five husbands instead of the one, for whom she asked, is stated in the further remarks, appended to the quotation.

(3) P. 135, l. 15, occurs a passage of the older metrical *Ṭikâ*¹ or *Saṅgraha*, from which Kumârila gives so many extracts, which refers in all probability to *Mahâbhârata* I. 197, 52 and I. 67. 57. The verses try to solve the knotty question, how Draupadî could be married to five husbands without a violation of the sacred law, and state that Dvaipâyana himself has solved the difficulty by declaring that she arose in the full bloom of youth from the middle of the altar and that she was an incarnation of Śrî. The text runs as follows:

या चोक्ता पाण्डुपुत्राणामेकपत्नीविरुद्धता ।
सापि द्वैपायनेनैव व्युत्पाद्य प्रतिपादिता ॥
यौवनश्लैव कृष्णा हि वेदिमध्यात्समुत्थिता ।
सा च श्रीः श्रीश्च भूयोभिर्भुज्यमाना न दुष्यति ॥

It is evident that the author had in his mind the description of the birth of Draupadî, *Mah.* I. 67, 57. f. f.,

द्रौपदी त्वथ संजज्ञे शचीभागादनिन्दिता ।
द्रुपदस्य कुले कन्या वेदिमध्यादनिन्दिता ॥ ५७ ॥
नातिह्रस्वा न महती नीलोत्पलसुगन्धिनी । etc.

and that he considered Śachî to be another name of Śrî in accordance with *Mahâbhârata* I. 197. 52,

स्वर्गश्रीः पाण्डुवार्थं तु समुत्पन्ना महामखे ।

bhârata. I herewith acknowledge his valuable assistance, and specially point out that he has most ingeniously discovered the identity of the *Âscharya Parvan* with the *Sudaršana Parvan* of the printed editions (see No. 11).

¹ I do not believe that the *Ślokas* in the *Tantravârttika* belong to Kumârila, because he very frequently paraphrases the meaning of the verses. Colebrooke, *Essays*, vol. I, p. 335 (ed. Cowell) is doubtful on the point.

and with other passages of the Âdiparvan, where Draupadî is identified with the goddess of Fortune.

(4) In his remarks on the above two verses, loc. cit., l. 19, Kumânila adduces, in order to prove the divine nature of the wife of the Pânḍavas, Mahâbhârata I. 198. 14,

इदं च तत्राङ्गतरूपमुत्तमं जगद विप्रर्षिरतीतमानुषम् ।¹
महानुभावा किल सा सुमध्यमा बभूव कन्यैव गते गतेहनि ॥

The agreement with the more correct Bombay text is complete, except in the one word *viprarshih*, for which both editions offer *devarshih*. The discrepancy may be due to Kumânila's quoting from memory, as the Paṇḍits invariably do.

On pp. 127—128 and 134, 135, 137 occur discussions of several other legends from the Âdiparvan, which narrate seemingly immoral or unlawful acts of various heroes and sages, the first mentioned pages of the Tantravârttika giving brief statements of the cases and the latter ones the final solutions of the difficulties. Among these the following may be mentioned specially: —

(5, a) P. 128, l. 1 तथा वसिष्ठस्य पुत्रशोकार्तस्य जलप्रवेशात्प्रत्यागसाहसम् । “Vasishṭha, tormented by grief on account of his sons made the criminal attempt to commit suicide by drowning himself.” This note refers to Mahâbhârata I. 176. 48—49, and 177. 1—4, where it is narrated, how Vasishṭha first threw himself into the ocean with a stone tied to his neck, and afterwards into a river, tying his arms with ropes to his sides.

(b) P. 128, l. 3 and p. 134, l. 18 कृष्णद्वैपायनस्य गृहीतनैष्ठिकब्रह्मचर्यस्य विचित्रवीर्यदारिष्यपत्न्योत्पादनप्रसङ्गः ॥ “Kṛishṇa Dvaipâyana, though vowed to perpetual celibacy, became a father through the widows of Vichitravîrya”, see Mahâbhârata I. 105. 1. ff.

(c) P. 128, l. 5 and p. 135, l. 1 f., “Bhîshma lived a kind of life, opposed to all the rules regarding the Âśramas or or-

¹ The Benares edition has अतीतमानुषः. But Kumânila's further remarks, loc. cit., l. 24, न हि मानुषीधैवमुपपद्यते । तेनातीतमानुषमित्युक्तम् । show that he read the text, as I have given it.

ders, and, though¹ he was unmarried, like Râma, offered a Vedic sacrifice." The first remark refers to Mahâbhârata I. 100. 94 ff., where Bhîshma promises to remain unmarried and to allow the son of Satyavati to take the kingdom which by right would have been his. The sequel of the story shows that he, nevertheless, continued to live in the world and did not become a perpetual student, hermit, or ascetic. Thus, his position was not justifiable by any of the rules of the Dharmaśâstra. The second point, his having offered a sacrifice or sacrifices, though he had no wife, is alluded to in Mahâbhârata I. 109. 13,

भीष्मेण धर्मतो राजन्सर्वतः परिरक्षिते ।²

बभूव रमणीयञ्च चैत्ययूपशताङ्कितः ॥ १३ ॥

स देशः -----

"Protected on all sides by Bhîshma in accordance with the sacred law, that country, oh king, became lovely and was adorned with hundreds of Chaityas³ and sacrificial posts."

(d) P. 128, l. 6 तथान्यस्य धृतराष्ट्रस्येज्या पाण्डुर्जितैर्धनैरित्यन-
धिकृतक्रिया ॥ The charge is also alluded to in a verse from the metrical Tikâ, p. 135, l. 6—7. "Dhṛitarâshṭra, though blind, offered a sacrifice with the wealth acquired by Pându, and thus performed an act, which he had no right to perform." The fact that Dhṛitarâshṭra 'offered hundreds of horse-sacrifices after his brother had subdued and plundered many hostile kings', is stated Mahâbhârata I. 114. 5.

(e) P. 128, l. 7 युधिष्ठिरस्य कनीयोजितभ्रातृजायापरिणयनम्
"Yudhisṭhira married the wife whom his younger brother had gained," see Mahâbhârata I. 188. 21 and 195. 23 ff.

(f) P. 128, l. 9 वासुदेवार्जुनयोः प्रतिषिद्धमातुलदुहितृस्त्रिणी-
सुभद्रापरिणयनम् "Vâsudeva and Arjuna married against the

1 भीष्मस्य च सर्वाश्रमव्यतिरेकेणावस्थानम् ।

अपत्नीकस्य च रामवत्कृतप्रयोगः ॥

² Though both editions read परिरक्षिते, it seems very probable, that परिरक्षितः must be read.

³ As the Chaityas are mentioned here together with the sacrificial posts, it is evident that they denote monuments worshipped by the Brahminical sects, see my remarks on the subject Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vol. IV. p. 329.

law the daughters of their maternal uncles, the former Rukmiṇī and the latter Subhadrâ.” The solution of this difficulty is stated on p. 137, l. 17—24, to be as follows:

यत्तु मातुलदुहितृपरिणयनं तयोस्तन्मातृस्वस्त्रीयादिसंबन्धव्यवधानेपि भ्रात्रादिव्यवहारादविरुद्धम् । यद्यपि वासुदेवस्वसेति सुभद्रा ख्याता तथाप्युत्पत्तौ बलदेववासुदेवयोरेकानंशयाश्च निजत्वान्वाख्यानान्मातृस्वस्त्रीया वा सुभद्रा तस्य मातृपितृस्वस्त्रीया दुहिता वेति परिणयनाभ्यनुज्ञानाद्विज्ञायते ॥

वासुदेवाङ्गजाता च कौन्तेयस्य विरुध्यते ।
न तु व्यवेतसंबन्धप्रभवे तद्विरुद्धता ॥¹

“But, as regards their (i. e. Kṛishṇa’s and Arjuna’s) marrying the daughters of their maternal uncles, that is not opposed (to the sacred law) because (the terms) brother and the like are also used to designate remoter degrees of relationship, (viz.) a son of the mother’s sister and the like. Though Subhadrâ is called the sister of Vâsudeva, it is understood that Subhadrâ is the daughter of his mother’s sister, or the daughter of his mother’s father’s sister, because, in the account of the birth, the blood-relationship of Baladeva and Vâsudeva with Ekânamśâ is distinctly stated² (and) because the consent (to Arjuna’s) marriage was given (by Vâsudeva).”

“The daughter of Vâsudeva cannot lawfully (become the wife) of the son of Kuntî. But the illegality with respect to her does not exist, if she sprang from a remote connexion.”

Here we have undoubtedly an allusion to Mahâbhârata I. 219. 21—220. 2. For, though the marriage of Arjuna with Subhadrâ is repeatedly mentioned, the above passage from the Subhadrâharâṇa alone notices the consent of Vâsudeva to Subhadrâ’s abduction. And in the last mentioned verse, 220. 2,

वासुदेवाभ्यनुज्ञातः कथयित्वेति कृत्यताम् ।
कृष्णस्य मतमादाय प्रययौ भरतर्षभः ॥

¹ The end of the discussion is quoted below under Nr. 9.

² This clause, it seems to me, is intended to furnish a proof for the assertion that the terms ‘brother and so forth’ are frequently used loosely.

we have the very expression *abhyanujñâ*, which Kumârila employs when speaking of the 'consent' or 'permission' given by Vâsudeva.

Further the statement that Ekânaiṣâ, the miraculous maiden (*yogakanyâ*) or incarnation of Durgâ, who was born of Yaśodâ and exchanged with Kṛishṇa, is declared to be a blood-relation i. e. the sister of Baladeva and Vâsudeva, occurs in the Harivaṁśa, Vishṇuparvan, 101. 16—18.

तां च तत्रोपसंगम्य प्रियामिव सखीं स्वसाम् ।¹
 दक्षिणेन कराग्रेण परिजग्राह माधवः ॥ १६ ॥
 तथैव रामोतिबलः संपरिषृज्य भाविनीम् ।
 मूर्ध्नुपघ्नाय सव्येन प्रतिजग्राह पाणिना ॥ १७ ॥
 ददृशुस्ताः स्त्रियो मध्ये भगिनीं रामकृष्णयोः ।
 हृक्पद्मव्ययकरां श्रियं पद्मालयामिव ॥ १८ ॥

“And Mâdhava, approaching that sister like a dear friend, took hold of her with his right hand. Most powerful Râma likewise embraced that noble lady, touched her head with his lips and took hold of her with his left hand. Those wives (of the Daśârhas)² saw the sister standing between Râma and Kṛishṇa,³ resembling the goddess of Fortune, whose dwelling is the lotus and whose hands play with a gold - coloured water-lily.”

Durgâ is also called 'the younger sister of Gopendra or Vâsudeva (*gopendrasyânurje*) and the issue of the family of the cowherd Nanda' (*nandagopakulodbhave*) in the hymn Mahâbhârata VI. 23. 7. Though the name Ekânaiṣâ does not occur in this latter passage, it is evident that the same legend is alluded to. But, as Kumârila gives the name Ekânaiṣâ which

¹ The Calcutta edition reads **सखा**, which is obviously a correction in order to remove the grammatically objectionable form **स्वसाम्**. The language of the Epics and of the Purâṇas offers, however, various instances of words in *ri* being treated like *â*-stems.

² See verse 7 of same chapter.

³ This is the position in which Ekânaiṣâ was represented since ancient times in the temples, see the passage of the Brihat-Saṁhitâ quoted in the larger Petersburg Dictionary, sub voce *ekânaiṣâ*.

does not occur in the Mahâbhârata, he presumably thought of the passage of the Harivaṁśa.

(6) An allusion to a passage of the Sabhâ Parvan occurs T. V. p. 136 l. 7, where it is stated that Draupadî by the advice of Yudhishṭhira put on the dress of a *rajasvalâ* in order to put Dhṛitarâshṭra and his sons to shame. This occurred, according to the Mahâbhârata, after Yudhishṭhira's defeat by Śakuni at the great gambling match, when Draupadî by the law of the game had become the property of the Kauravas, and is narrated Mahâbhârata II. 67. 19—20 and 32.

(7) From the Vana Parvan there is one quotation in the long discussion on the nature of the individual soul, T. V. p. 380, l. 14 f.:

यदपि द्वैपायनेनोक्तम् ।

अङ्गुष्ठमात्रं पुरुषं निश्चकर्ष बलाद्यमः ।

इति तदपि काव्यशोभार्थं विस्फष्टमृत्युव्यवहारप्रशंसनार्थं¹ च पति-
व्रताप्रशंसापरे वाक्ये प्रजापतिवपोत्खेदनादिवद्द्रष्टव्यम् । तथा हि तेनैव
गीतादिषूनेकप्रकारं सर्वगतत्वं वर्णितम् ॥

“But what Dvaipâyana says, ‘Forcibly Yama drew forth the soul, which had the measure of a thumb (from Satyavat’s body)’, that (statement which occurs) in a speech devoted to the praise of a faithful wife, must be understood to be a poetical embellishment and a clear description of the act of dying, similar to (the Vedic passages) like that declaring Prajâpati to have extracted his own omentum.² For, the same (author) repeatedly describes (the individual soul) as all-pervading in the Gîtâ (i. e. the Bhagavadgîtâ) and elsewhere.” The verse, quoted by Kumârila, is found Mahâbhârata III. 297. 17 in the Sâvitryupâkhyâna, which position Kumârila’s remark ‘in the speech devoted to the praise of a faithful wife’ unmistakably indicates.³ The editions read *yamo balât* instead

¹ The Benares edition has a misprint ०मृत्यु० for ०मृत्यु०.

² The passage प्रजापतिर्वपामुदखिददात्मनः is quoted by Kumârila T. V. p. 176. l. 2, and apparently taken from Taittirîya Saṁhitâ II. 1. 1. 4.

³ The ‘speech’ is that of Mârkaṇḍeya, which contains the word *pativratâ* ‘faithful’, verse 20. The quotation occurs also in Śaṅkara’s commentary on Śârîraka Sûtra I. 3. 24.

of *balâd yamaḥ*. This very slight and unimportant difference may be due to inexactness on Kumârila's part. With respect to the reference to the Gîtâ, it may be noted that two quotations from the famous episode will be adduced below under No. 9.

(8) From the Udyoga Parvan we have two quotations.

(a) In the list of improper acts T. V. p. 128, l. 9, it is stated regarding Vâsudeva and Arjuna that both drank spirituous liquor, and the words उभौ मध्वासवचीबौ are quoted in confirmation of this statement. The Pâda occurs in the speech of Sañjaya, who says to Duryodhana, Mahâbhârata V. 59. 1.

शृणु राजन्वथा दृष्टौ मया कृष्णधनंजयौ ।

'Listen, oh king, in what state I saw Kṛishṇa and Dhananjaya (Arjuna)' and begins his description in verse 5,

उभौ मध्वासवचीबावुभौ चन्दनरूषितौ ।

'Both drunk with mead, both smeared with sandal', etc.

(b) In the discussion, which is to prove the divine character of Draupadî, Kumârila says, T. V, p. 136, l. 1 ff.:

अत एव वासुदेवेन कर्ण उक्तः ।

षष्ठे च त्वामहनि द्रौपदी पर्युपस्थास्यतीति ।

इतरथा हि कथं प्रमाणभूतः सन्नेवं वदेत् ॥

"It is for this reason (because Draupadî is an incarnation of Śrî) that Vâsudeva says to Karṇa: 'And on the sixth day Draupadî will serve thee.' For how could else a person, whose word is authoritative, speak thus?" The verse is an older version of the second half of Mahâbhârata V. 140. 15,

षष्ठे त्वां च तथा काले द्रौपद्यभुगमिष्यति ।

"And at the sixth meal-time Draupadî will come to thee." The line, quoted by Kumârila, is metrically irregular, and the irregularity is of a kind which occurs frequently in the Mahâbhârata. It seems probable that the smoother and more correct version is the later one.

(9) Nor is a quotation from the Bhîshma Parvan wanting, and it is taken from the Bhagavadgîtâ, which in the passage,

discussed under No. 7, is referred to as the Gîtâ. In repelling the accusation, that Kṛishṇa-Vāsudeva improperly permitted Arjuna to marry his maternal uncle's daughter (see above No. 5 f.) Kumârila says, p. 138, ll. 1—6:

येन ह्यन्यत्रैवमुक्तम् ।

मम वर्त्मानुवर्तेरन्मनुष्याः पार्थ सर्वशः ॥

यद्यदा चरति श्रेष्ठस्तत्तदेवेतरो जनः ।

स यत्प्रमाणं कुरुते लोकस्तदनुवर्तते ॥ इति ॥

स कथं सर्वलोकादर्शभूतः सन्विरुद्धाचारं प्रवर्तयिष्यति ॥

“For how will he, who is the mirror of the whole world, instigate to unlawful conduct? — he, who says elsewhere, ‘Let men, oh Pârtha, follow my path in every respect.’ ‘Whatever conduct the best follows, even that the men of different degree observe; that rule, which he settles, the world obeys’.”

The first line attributed to Kṛishṇa is the second half of Ma-hâbhârata VI. 27. 23, (Bhagavadgîtâ, III. 23) and the next two are from verse 21 of the same chapter. The agreement is complete. The change in the order of the lines has probably to be explained by Kumârila's desire to prove in the first instance that Kṛishṇa claims to be the spiritual guide of all men.

(10) Among the immoral acts, laid to the charge of Yudhishṭhira, Kumârila mentions, T. V. p. 128, l. 8 आचार्यब्राह्मण-वधार्थमनृतभाषणम् ‘his having uttered an untruth in order to bring about the death of his teacher, a Brâhmaṇa.’ In discussing the case, p. 136, l. 14 f, he adds: तथा च द्रोणवधाङ्ग-भूतानृतवादप्रायश्चित्तं कामकृतेष्येक इत्येवमन्तेष्यश्चमेधः प्रायश्चित्तत्वेन कृत एवेति न तस्य सदाचारत्वाभ्युपगमः ॥ “Further, a penance (was performed) for the untruth, which was spoken in connexion with the slaying of Droṇa, in accordance with the maxim, ‘Some (prescribe a penance) even (for an offence) intentionally committed.’¹ Thus, in the end a horse-sacrifice was even performed (by Yudhishṭhira) as a penance. Hence it is admitted that that (act, the untruth) was not consonant with the rule of virtuous conduct.”

¹ See Manu XI. 45.

Here Kumârila alludes first to Mahâbhârata VII. 190. 55—58 (8750 C.), where it is narrated that Yudhishthîra, though aware of the untruth of his statement, informed Droṇa that his son had been slain, and secondly to Mahâbhârata XIV. 2. 9 ff. where Vyâsa recommends to Yudhishthîra the performance of a horse-sacrifice in expiation of his sins,¹ which advice the king finally accepts.

(11) In the remarks on the charge, brought against Dhṛitarâshṭra (see above, (5) d., p. 14) who though blind offered a sacrifice, Kumârila says, T. V. p. 135, ll. 8—11: —

धृतराष्ट्रोपि व्यासानुग्रहादाश्चर्यपर्वणि पुत्रदर्शनवत्क्रतुकालेपि दृष्ट-
वानिव । शापानुग्रहसमर्था महर्षयः श्रूयन्ते । तद्यथैव तद्वचनादसावन्धो
जातो विज्ञायते तथा यज्ञानुष्ठानवचनात्तावति काले दृष्टवानित्वर्था-
पत्या सुज्ञानम् ॥

“But Dhṛitarâshṭra certainly saw also at time of the sacrifice, just as he saw his sons through the favour of Vyâsa, (as is narrated) in the Âścharya Parvan. It is stated in the Veda that the great sages have power to curse and to bless. Hence it is easy to understand by inference from the circumstances that, just as the (king) is known to have been born blind in consequence of the word of that (sage),² he must have recovered his sight, because it is stated that he offered a sacrifice, for so long a period.”

Here we have, besides an allusion to a circumstance narrated in the Âdi Parvan, a direct mention of a subdivision of the epic, called Âścharya Parvan. Now our editions do not contain a section which bears such a name. Nevertheless the passage, which contains the statement that Dhṛitarâshṭra saw his sons by the favour of Vyâsa, can be easily identified. It is found Mahâbhârata XV. chapter 32, where in verse 7 ff. the heroes are enumerated, whom Vyâsa caused to come forth from the Gaṅgâ, and verse 29 asserts that Dhṛitarâshṭra seeing them all rejoiced exceedingly³ the section now bears the name Pu-

¹ Compare also Mah. XII. 33. 38. ff.

² See Mahâbhârata I. 106. 10.

³

ततस्ते पार्थिवाः सर्वे भीष्मद्रोणपुरोगमाः ।

ससैन्याः सलिलात्तस्मात्समुत्तस्थुः सहस्रशः ॥ ७ ॥

tradarśana Parvan. But, it is not difficult to show, that this Parvan could also be called 'the section of the miracle'. In its third verse, Mah. XV. 29. 3, Janamejaya asks Vaiśaṃpāyana, as usual, certain questions and says: —

यत्तदाश्चर्यमिति वै करिष्यामीत्युवाच ह ।
व्यासः परमतेजस्वी महर्षिस्तद्वदस्व मे ॥

"Tell me what that miracle (âścharya) was, which the most glorious great sage Vyâsa promised to perform."

The text has here the very word, after which Kumârila names the section. If we now compare the Parvasaṅgraha, Mah. I. 2. 351, we find there the following statement: —

एतदाश्रमवासाख्यं पर्वोक्तं महदद्भुतम् ।¹

"This section, named Âśramavâsa, is called (also) the great miracle."

Though it is possible to render the words *uktam mahad-adbhutam* by 'is stated to be a great miracle', it is not doubtful, that an author may with all propriety give to the Putradarśana Parvan or even to the whole Âśrama Parvan the name Adbhuta Parvan or Âścharya Parvan.

The results of the preceding discussion may be briefly summed up as follows: —

"In Kumârila's times or about A. D. 700., the Mahâbhârata was regarded not as an epic poem, but as the great Smṛiti proclaimed by Vyâsa or Kṛiṣṇa Dvaipâyana, based on the Veda and intended for the instruction of all the four Varnas. The narrative of the great war, which no doubt in a remote past was its chief portion, had long become an accessory. The descriptions of the battles were, however, used, in order to rouse the martial instincts of the Kshatriyas, and apparently read at their banquets, as was done also in much later times. The Bhârata, moreover, contained many passages such as de-

धृतराष्ट्रस्तु तान्सर्वान्पञ्चद्व्येन चक्षुषा ।
मुमुदे भरतश्रेष्ठ प्रसादात्तस्य वै मुनेः ॥ २१ ॥

¹ The Calcutta edition I. 617 reads सुमहाद्भुतम् ।

scriptions of scenery, which showed the art of the Kavi. All these characteristics are those of the Mahâbhârata, known to us."

"If we descend to the details, it is not doubtful that Kumârila's Mahâbhârata included the Âdiparvan and that this section in his times very closely resembled the text known to us. For, first he quotes (see p. 9) a verse from the Anukramanikâ, chapter 1, and his remarks on the character of the work make it probable that he had before him the Parvasaṅgraha and the Bhârataprasaṅsâ. To his acquaintance with the Parvasaṅgraha points also the fact that he gives to the second section of the Âśramavâsa Parvan, the name Âścharya instead of Putradarśana in accordance with a hint contained in chapter 2 verse 351. Secondly he names (No. 1) the Sauparṇâkhyâna, chapters 20—34, and clearly refers, though there is no literal quotation, to chapter 28, verse 2. Thirdly, there is (No. 3) a distinct reference to the last chapter, 67, of the Amśâvatarâṇa. Fourthly, no less than four passages (Nos. 5b, 5c, 5d, 11) prove Kumârila's acquaintance with chapters 100, 105, 106, 109 and 114, which all belong to the Saṁbhava section of the first book. Fifthly, we have (No. 5a) in the story of Vasishṭha's attempts to drown himself references to chapters 176 and 177 of the Chaitraratha section."

"Sixthly, there is (No. 5c) a reference to chapters 188 and 195."

"Seventhly, there are two references (Nos. 2, 3) to verses from chapter 197, as well as an explicit mention of its separate title, Pañchendropâkhyâna, and a quotation (No. 4) from chapter 198, both of which chapters form part of the Vaivâhika section. Finally, we have a very clear allusion (No. 5f) to chapters 219—220, which form part of the Subhadrâharâṇa section."

"There is only a single reference to the Sabhâ Parvan. But it is plain enough to allow of the identification of the passage and it alludes to a very peculiar minor detail in the narrative. The existence of the Vana Parvan is attested (No. 7) by a reference to the description of the Gandhamâdana mountains, which is inserted in chapter 158 and by a quotation from the Sâvitryupâkhyâna (chapter 297), which shows only an unimportant change in the position of two words. An incidental

remark proves that the verse then, as now, formed part of Mārkaṇḍeya's speech in praise of the faithful wife. Two quotations (No. 8) have been taken from the Udyoga Parvan, chapters 59 and 140, and the second has, it would seem, a more archaic form than the text of the printed editions. One verse and a half from the Bhagavadgītā (No. 9) belongs to the Bhīshma Parvan. The fact that the Gītā belonged to the Mahābhārata is mentioned in the remarks on the quotation from the Sāvitrīyupākhyāna (No. 7). Only one point from the next book, the Droṇa Parvan, is mentioned (No. 10), and this is the fact that Yudhishṭhira uttered an untruth, as narrated in chapter 190, in order to encompass the death of Droṇa."

"The next book, the existence of which is attested by Kumārila, is the twelfth, the Śānti Parvan. The names of its two chief component parts, the Rājadharmā and Mokshadharmā, are mentioned explicitly (p. 7), and there is a quotation from each of them, which exactly agrees with our text. The existence of the middle section, the Âpaddharmā, is at least hinted at. The title of the main portion of the thirteenth book, the Anuśāsana Parvan, is again given in full (p. 7), but there is no quotation. To the Aśvamedha Parvan, chapter 2, Kumārila refers (No. 10) by stating that Yudhishṭhira offered a horse sacrifice as an expiation of his misdeeds. The second section of the fifteenth book, the Âśramavāsika Parvan, is distinctly referred to (No. 11) and it receives the title Âscharya Parvan, which it certainly may be given in accordance with its contents, and which it probably also bore in accordance with a statement of the Parvasaṅgraha. Finally, the existence of the Harivaṁśa it proved by an allusion to Ekānaṁśā and her relationship to Balarāma and Kṛishṇa (p. 16). As this allusion is inserted without any special remark regarding its source in a discussion, which refers to the Mahābhārata, it would appear that Kumārila considered the Harivaṁśa to be a part of the former work. Thus in the small published portion of the Tantravârttika, no less than ten of the eighteen main divisions of the Mahābhārata are named, quoted or referred to, and among them in particular more than one, which again and again have been declared to be 'of late origin'. Nay, it appears that such pieces, as the Anukramaṇikā and the Parvasaṅgraha, existed

in Kumârila's times, and it is not improbable that the version, known to him, had the double beginning which we find in the modern MSS. and editions. Kumârila's testimony regarding the character of the Mahâbhârata is, of course, not only valid for his own time, but for a considerably earlier period. His treatment of the work is such that it shows at least his belief in its great antiquity and in its having been from the beginning a great Smṛiti, proclaimed for the benefit of mankind, not an epic account of the war between the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas. And this belief makes it necessary to assume that centuries had passed since the time when the description of the great war was its only or even main contents. In connexion with this point it must also be noticed that some of the discussions of stories from the Epic occur also in the older metrical *Ṭikâ* or *Samgraha*, the fragments of which are embodied in Kumârila's work, as well as, that the enquiry into the various supposed or real immoral and unlawful actions, laid to the charge of the heroes of the Mahâbhârata, looks like a defence against attacks, directed by unbelievers against the authoritativeness of the work. Both these circumstances confirm the inference that the Mahâbhârata was considered and used as a Smṛiti long before Kumârila's times. There is also further independent evidence proving the correctness of this view.

The first witness is the passage from Bâṇa's *Kâdambarî* quoted above p. 3, to which Dr. Bhâṇḍârkar has first called attention and which states that the Mahâbhârata was being publicly recited in the temple of Mahâkâla at Ujjain. Public and private recitations of the Epics and of the Purâṇas are common enough also in modern India, and they are always instituted for one and the same purpose, viz. the edification and religious instruction of temple-worshippers or of the domestic circle. Mostly the Sanscrit texts are not only read, but also explained in the vernacular for the benefit of the women and of the males of the classes unacquainted with the idiom of the Brahmanical schools. It is only reasonable to assume that in Bâṇa's times these public readings pursued the same aim, as indeed is made evident by the character of the information which queen Vilâsavatî is said to have received in the temple

of Mahākāla. If then in the beginning of the seventh century the Mahābhārata served for the instruction of the four castes, it follows that it cannot have been a mere heroic poem, but that it must have contained if not all, at least many of edifying episodes and didactic pieces with which the present text abounds, or, in one word, that it must been a Smṛiti.

Secondly, an inscription from the remote Indian colony of Kamboja,¹ which belongs exactly to the same time as the Kādambārī, fully confirms Bāṇa's assertion that the Mahābhārata was used for public readings. It states that copies of the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyana and of an unnamed Purāṇa were presented to the temple of Veal Kantel and that the donor made arrangements in order to insure their daily recitation in perpetuity. This is most valuable evidence, as it proves that the *Mahābhāratapāṭhana* was a custom, prevailing about 600 A. D. not only in some parts of India, but in all countries where the Hindu religion had penetrated. Its spread over so wide an area clearly indicates that in A. D. 600 it was not of recent origin, but must have existed at least during several centuries before that date. And it also follows that the Mahābhārata must have been during this earlier period a Smṛiti, teaching the whole duty of man.

The last proposition is also clearly established by some other facts, to which Dr. Bhāṇḍārkar has already called attention, viz. by the frequent appeals to the Mahābhārata in the landgrants, where almost invariably imprecatory verses against the resumption of gifts of land are quoted, which are attributed 'to divine Vyāsa, the Vyāsa of the Vedas', or stated to have been taken 'from the Mahābhārata'. The most ancient dated inscriptions, in which these quotations occur, belong to the middle and the second half of the fifth century A. D., and among them may be mentioned the early Gurjara inscriptions of Mahārājādhirāja Dadda II. of Śakasamvat 400, 415 and 417,² the grant of the Traikūṭaka king Dahrasena,³ who gave

¹ A. Barth, Inscriptions du Cambodge, p. 30—31.

² See Indian Antiquary, vol. VII, p. 6, vol. XIII, p. 135, vol. XVII, p. 183.

³ Jour. Bo. Br. Roy. As. Soc. vol. XVI, p. 346 ff.

away a village in southern Gujarat in (Chedi-) Saṃvat 207, the grants of the Parivrājaka kings¹ of Central India,¹ Gupta-Saṃvat 156—209, and those of the kings of Uchchakalpa² from the same districts, (Chedi-)Saṃvat 174—214. It is evident that those, who quoted the Mahābhārata as an authority teaching the rewards of pious donors and the punishments for impious despoilers of the donees, must have considered it as a Smṛiti or Dharmasāstra, proceeding from a Ṛishi. And, as the quotations occur in grants from various parts of India, it is not less evident that the Mahābhārata cannot have been endowed with this sacred character, merely just about A. D. 450, but that it must have held the same position for at least a century earlier.

Moreover, one of the landgrants mentioned, that issued by king Śarvanātha of Uchchakalpa in A. D. 532/33 proves also with absolute certainty the correctness of the otherwise probable assumption, that the Mahābhārata had in these early times about the same bulk as at present. The grant says,³ "And it has been declared in the Mahābhārata, *the compilation containing 100,000 verses (śatasāhasrī saṃhitā)* by the highest sage, Vyāsa, the Vyāsa of the Vedas, the son of Parāśara". The number of the verses is exactly the same as that which the work, known to us, ought to contain according to the Anukramaṇikā, Mah. I. 1. 101 and 109. Though the figure, no doubt, has and is intended to be taken as approximative, it yet distinctly proves that the Mahābhārata of the sixth century included the long twelfth and thirteenth Parvans and the extensive Harivaṃśa, without which any approach to the Lakh of Ślokas is impossible.

The results of the preceding enquiry are sufficient to warrant the assertion that the Mahābhārata certainly was a Smṛiti or Dharmasāstra from A. D. 300, and that about A. D. 500 it certainly did not differ essentially in size and in character from the present text. Further researches, I must add, will in all probability enable us to push back the lower limits,

¹ Fleet, Corp. Inscr. Ind., vol. III, p. 93 ff.

² Fleet, op. cit., p. 117 ff.; Ind. Ant., vol. XIX, p. 227.

³ Fleet, op. cit., p. 137,

which have been thus established provisionally, by four to five centuries and perhaps even further. But a portion of the requisite materials, among which the sacred works of the Northern Buddhists and their dated Chinese translations are not the least important, is for the present difficult of access and difficult to use. Hence, I stop for the present at this point. But I must point out that the evidence, already brought forward, is more than sufficient to prove how untenable those theories are, which assert that the Mahâbhârata has changed its character and become a Dharmasâstra within the last thousand or eleven hundred years. Quite recently Professor A. Holtzmann has published the final results¹ of his laborious researches regarding the great Epic, which he has pursued during many years with remarkable devotedness and not without profit for Hindu mythology. According to him (*op. cit.* p. 177 f.) the Mahâbhârata was 'forcibly turned into a legal work or Dharmasâstra on the second revision of the poem' [by the Brahmans], which he places somewhat vaguely in the period A. D. 900—1100 (*op. cit.* p. 194). The inscriptions and the literary works, quoted above, furnish the clearest proof that this estimate is very much out. The testimony of the same documents is equally fatal to various conjectures, which Professor Holtzmann puts forward (*op. cit.* p. 188 ff.) regarding the gradual development of the Mahâbhârata, such as the assertion that the Âśvamedhika and Âśramavâsika Parvans were added during the same late period, when the whole work became a Smṛiti.

II. Kshemendra's Bhâratamañjarî and the text of the Mahâbhârata.

The importance of the three condensations, entitled Mañjarîs, which Kshemendra made from the Mahâbhârata, Râmâyana and Brihatkathâ, lies in the fact that by means of them we are enabled to determine the state of these works in his time. For the first two poems we can compare the current texts with the extracts made by the Kashmirian poet, which is not the case with the third (compare S. Lévi's treatise. *Journ. Asiat.* 1885, VI and 1886, VII).

¹ Zur Kritik und Geschichte des Mahâbhârata, Kiel 1892.

For the Bhāratamañjarī I could avail myself of two MSS. The first, No. 154 of the Deccan College Collection of 1875/77, is written in Śāradā characters, on 477 folios, numbered 1—224 and 1—253, eighteen lines to the page. Besides the résumé of the eighteen books of the Epic proper it contains a short version of the Harivaṁśa. It is dated in [Saptarshi] Saṁvat 72, Phā[lguna], va ti aṣṭamyāṁ parataḥ corresponding to the year 96—97 of some century of the Christian era. It ends:—

समाप्तेयं महाभारतमञ्जरी (॥) कृति×कवेर्यासदासापरनाम्प्रका-
शेन्द्रसूनोः क्षेमेन्द्रस्य ॥

अहो कविसरस्वत्या विचित्रेयं प्रसन्नता ।

सद्यो मलिनतां[ता] वक्त्रे खलानां जायते यथा ॥ [१ ॥]

मद्वचोदर्पणतले महाभारतदिग्द्वपः ।

समस्तावयवोषेष मुष्टिमेय इवेच्यते ॥ [२ ॥]

रत्नोदारचतुस्समुद्ररशनां भुङ्क्ता [भुक्ता] भुवं कौरवो ।

भयोरूपतितस्स निष्परिजनो जीवन्वृकैर्भक्षितः ॥ [३ ॥]

गोपैर्विश्वजयी जितस्स विजय×कक्षैः क्षता वृष्णयः ।

तस्मात्सर्वमिदं विचार्य सुचिरं शान्त्यै मनो दीयताम् ॥ [४ ॥]

फुल्लेन्दीवरसुन्दरद्युतिमुषशीरेशरीरत्विष ॥

पायासुर्निजनाभिपङ्कजरजोलुब्धालिमालोपमाः ।

या × कुर्वन्ति शशाङ्कबिम्बविष[श]दे लक्ष्मीमुखाञ्जे मुहुः

कस्तूरीरसपत्रभङ्गसुभगा[गं] लक्ष्मीप्रभाविभ्रमम् ॥ [५ ॥]

एष विष्णुकथातीर्थपुण्यवत्सलिलोक्षितः ।

प्राप्तस्सामान्यजल्पोपि क्षेमेन्द्रोद्य कवीन्द्रताम् ॥ शुभम् ॥¹ [६ ॥]

[“Here ends the Mahābhāratamañjarī, the composition of the poet Kshemendra *alias* Vyāsadāsa, son of Prakāśendra.”²

1. “Ah, marvellous is that brightness of the speech of poets, which forthwith blackens the faces of the wicked!”³

2. “This Mahābhārata, huge like one of the elephants guarding the quarters of the horizon, looks in the mirror of

¹ The first halfverse of the last śloka stands in the margin, and the second is repeated there. For the whole compare Bühler's Report from Kaśmīr (Bombay 1877) p. LXV.

² See Bühler, Kaśmīr Report, p. 46.

³ I. e. of the poets' enemies, the malevolent critics.

my song, though no limb is wanting, as if it could be measured with the closed fist."

3. "That son of Kuru,¹ who had enjoyed the earth that is encircled by the girdle of the oceans rich in gems, fell with broken thighs and, lying all alone, was devoured alive by wolves."

4. "Shepherds conquered Vijaya, the conqueror of the universe, dry grass destroyed the Vṛishṇi tribe; hence ponder long on all this and yield up your hearts to the sentiment of Quietism."

5. "May the dark blue radiance of Śauri's body protect (us),² that radiance which surpasses the resplendent beauty of an opened water-lily, in colour resembles a row of bees greedy of the pollen in the lotus that springs from the god's navel, and produces again and again in the lotus-face of Lakshmi, that is pure like the disk of the moon, a graceful radiant beauty charming through lines of fragrant musk."

6. "Thus, laved by the holy water from the sacred well of Vishṇu's tale, Kshemendra, though a common prattler, has now become a prince of poets."³]

The second MS., No. 6 of the Deccan College Collection of 1874/75, written in Devanāgarī characters on 211 folios in thirteen lines to the page, gives an abstract from the eighteen Parvans alone, and ends with the words: —

इति व्यासदासाख्ये मेन्द्रविरचितायां महाभारतमञ्जर्यां स्वर्गपर्व
चरमं समाप्तम् ॥ संवत् १६६९ वर्षे भाद्रपदे मासे गुरौ कृष्णपक्षे सौ-
राष्ट्रदेशे कनकवत्यां स्वपाठार्थं गढवी सद्देन नामा यश्वन्तस्य पुत्रेण
भाइयापौत्रेण ॥

The date corresponds to one of the years 1611—1613 A. D.

These two MSS. are derived from different originals and show considerable divergencies in their readings. The second has been subjected to a revision by a later scribe.

¹ I. e. Duryodhana.

² As there is no object for the verb *pâyāsuh*, it is necessary to understand *vaḥ* or *naḥ*. Possibly the reading is faulty and *°twisho jīyāsuh* to be read.

³ This is an allusion to the *rājyābhisheka*, at which the king must be sprinkled with water, brought from the most sacred Tīrthas. Strictly interpreted, the verse indicates that the Mahābhāratamañjarī was Kshemendra's first larger composition.

In order to determine the exact relation of Kshemendra's précis to our printed texts I have gone carefully through the first Parvan, which is reduced by Kshemendra to 1500 verses, whereas the text, as we have it, amounts to 8479.

The first question we have to answer is whether in our Mañjarî there are any omissions or additions.

1. Omissions.

There are two or three omissions which perhaps deserve special notice, though it must be confessed that it is difficult to draw any very definite conclusion from them.

The absence of chapter 129, in which the return of Bhîma from his sojourn among the Nâgas is related, brings about a want of consequence in Kshemendra's narrative. He may have assumed that it was unnecessary to dwell particularly on this point, as Bhîma reappears subsequently as one of the principal characters in the action of the poem.

Three other omissions are also remarkable. The first is the absence of the entire chapter 140 containing the advice of Kaṇika to Dhṛitarâshṭra along with the story of the cunning jackal. Similarly the whole of chapter 182, in which we read of the Brâhmaṇa who is devoured by Kalmâshapâda, has been left out. The list of the names of the Nâgas, chap. 57, is wanting. Besides these, we have several omissions which are due, it seems, to Kshemendra's desire to avoid needless repetitions: —

(1) The 4th chapter, which is only another form of the introduction to the work telling of the occasion that gave rise to the recitation of the whole;

(2) The 24th chapter, giving the story of the appointment of Aruṇa as charioteer to Sûrya; but it must be noticed that the beginning of this chapter agrees remarkably with the end of the preceding, as well as with the beginning of the following;

(3) Chapters 45—48, containing the story of the marriage of the Ṛishi Jaratkâru with Jaratkâru, the sister of Vâsuki, and the birth of their son Astîka; this is however only a repetition of chaps. 13—15;

(4) The enumeration of persons, chapter 63, vv. 91—127 (2420—2455);

(5) Chapter 66, which gives a genealogy of all beings, but is only another version of the preceding chapter;

(6) Chapter 94, giving a genealogy of the family of the Pauravas, different from that contained in the chapter 95, which is selected by Kshemendra;

(7) Chapter 139, describing the virtues and heroic deeds of the Pâṇḍavas;

(8) The first 19 verses of chap. 141, containing a shortened account of the whole Jatugriha Parvan;

(9) The verses 44 (7319) to the end of chap. 197, which give the reason why Kṛiṣṇâ had five husbands, and are only repetition of chap. 169, verses 6 sqq. (6426 sqq.).

At the other hand it is noticeable that Kshemendra does not omit sections which could be left out without injuring the story. For instance he gives us the contents of the second chapter (*Parvasaṅgraha*), which is however condensed by him into 7½ ślokas. Even such definitions as that of *akshauhini* down to that of *patti* in this chapter reappear in the Mañjarî. Chapters 49 and 50, too, mainly a repetition of chaps. 40—43, containing the narrative of the crime of Parikshit and his death by Takshaka are found in Kshemendra in a shortened form.

Finally I may mention that while Kshemendra passes over chap. 61 (*Bhâratasûtra*), which gives the contents of the epic, he does give an abstract of the following chapter (*Bhârataprasaṁsâ*) which stands in close connection to it. His words are: —

पुण्यं पवित्रमायुष्यमितिहाससुरद्रुमम् ।
धर्ममूलं श्रुतिस्कन्धं स्मृतिपुष्पं महाफलम् ॥

But we must not overlook the fact that Kshemendra employs the phrase *bhâratî kathâ* at the beginning of his version of chap. 59, and that this phrase occurs in chap. 61, as well as in chap. 62, but is qualified in the latter by the adjective *uttamâ*. This points to the fact that he had chap. 61 before him. The verse referred to is in Kshemendra: —

आस्तीकचरितं श्रुत्वा पवित्रां भारतीं कथाम् ।
शौनकेन ततः पृष्टो रोमहर्षि[र्ष]णिरभ्यधात् ॥

2. Additions.

At the beginning of chap. 78 we read of Śarmishṭhâ who is not described in the Mahâbhârata: —

हृष्टा ललास शर्मिष्ठा तनया वृषपर्वणः ।
दासीसहस्रानुगता सा विलासमदालसा ॥
वसन्तवातव्यालोललतालीलां व्यडम्बयत् ।

When Devayânî is thrown down into a well by the proud Śarmishṭhâ, Kshemendra makes the following remark: —

ऐश्वर्यमदमत्तेभ्यः कुशलं केन लभ्यते ।

At the beginning of chap. 81 the place to which Devayânî and her companions betake themselves is called in the Mahâbhârata simply *tam eva deśam*, while Kshemendra describes it in the following words: —

ततः कदाचित्सा बाला मल्लिकाकलिकाकुलम् ।
ययौ तदेव चूतालीसंसर्षि पवनं वनम् ॥

In chap. 99, when Dyaus at the instigation of his wife, and along with his brothers, steals Surabhi and is cursed in consequence by Vasishṭha, Kshemendra adds the following reflections: —

तेजसा सह नश्यन्ति स्त्रीजितानां हि बुद्धयः ।
एकस्याप्यपराधेन वृन्दमायाति वाच्यताम् ॥

In the introduction to chap. 125 we have a detailed description of spring and the longing of Pâṇḍu written in the Vasantatilakâ metre: —

अत्रान्तरे विजयमन्मथराजमन्त्री
संभोगभङ्गिनवनाटकसूत्रधारः ॥
शृङ्गारवारवनिताजनदुग्धसिन्धु-
ञ्चन्द्रोदयो मृगदृशामभवद्दसन्तः ॥
लीलावतीमुखरनूपुरपादपद्म-
पातैः स्फुरत्तरुणरागवशाद्शोकः ॥
येनाभवत्युलकितः कुसुमक्रमेण
तत्र प्रमाणपुरुषो भगवाननङ्गः ॥
तस्मिन्समुन्निषति मन्मथबालमित्रे
लीलागुरौ मधुपजालजटालकाले ॥

माद्री चचार कुसुमावचयाञ्जिताङ्गी
 शाखान्तरे तरलतारकुरङ्गदृष्टिः ॥
 तामिन्दुसुन्दरमुखीमथ राजचन्द्रः
 कान्तां ददर्श कुसुमायुधवैजयन्तीम् ॥
 दृष्ट्वैव च प्रसवपल्लवितानुराग-
 स्तस्याभवत्कुसुमितो मदनः सबाणः ॥
 श्रीणीतटे धृतपदो मदनालवाले
 हेलावलन्नयनपत्त्रयुतोथ तस्याः ॥
 चक्रे लसत्कुचफलः कुरुनन्दनस्य
 विश्रामकेलिमखिलां स्मरकल्पवृक्षः ॥
 शापाहिबन्धविनियन्त्रितमानसोपि
 पाण्डुः प्रियां नयनशुक्तिभिराचचाम ॥
 धत्ते निषेधविषये परमानुबन्ध-
 माञ्चा हि कामनृपतेरनुकूलवामा ॥
 संभाविताथ दयितेन शनैः स्मितार्द्र-
 ज्योत्स्नावदातकिरणाङ्कुरिताननाञ्जा ॥
 रोडुं शशाक न मनः प्रसृतं प्रियस्य
 को वा विधातृचरितं परिमार्ष्टुमीशः ॥
 तामञ्चलेन परिधाय निवार्य चेतः
 शापोपशान्तिनियमाद्दृढमालिलिङ्ग ॥
 अप्याकुलालिकुलज्जंकृतिभिर्लताभि-
 भीत्यैव पल्लवकरैर्विधुतैर्निषिद्धः ॥
 आलिङ्ग्य तां पुलकपीनकपोलभागा-
 मुन्निद्रनीलनलिनायतचारुनेत्राम् ॥
 उन्मादिनीं सपदि मद्रनरेन्द्रपुत्रीं
 केलीपलाशशयनं विजनो[ने] निनाय ॥

In chap. 172 Tapatî refers her wooer Saihvarāṇa to her father, and in the Mahābhārata her reason is given in the words *na svatantrā hi yoshitā*. In the Mañjarî we have more fully: —

वार्द्धके पुत्रनिरता यौवने भर्तृरक्षिताः ।
 शैशवे पितुरायताः [त्ताः] परतन्त्राः सदा स्त्रियः ॥

This verse is probably a recollection of Manu IX. 3:¹ —

पिता रक्षति कौमारे भर्ता रक्षति यौवने ।
रक्षन्ति स्वविरे पुत्रा न स्त्री स्वातन्त्र्यमर्हति ॥

In chap. 212 Kshemendra describes the beauty of Tiltottamâ in the verses: —

तस्या विलासवलितं लताञ्चलविसंस्थुलम् ।
क्वचिन्मधुकरापातकृतसीत्कारविभ्रमम् ॥
क्वचिद्वालानिलालीलदुगूलचलनाकुलम् ।
बभौ मनोभवाभोगविभागसुभगं वपुः ॥

In chap. 219 we read of Subhadra: —

करपल्लविनी श्यामा कटाक्षभमराकुला ।
सहासकुसुमा भेजे वसन्तमिव यौवनम् ॥
शुशुभे शशिशुभ्रेण हारेण हरिणेक्षणा ।
सा फेनवलये नेव नवयौवनवाहिनी ॥

At the end of the first book Kshemendra adds the following verses, which have nothing corresponding to them in the Mahâbhârata: —

श्वेतकेतोर्नरपतेर्बहुवत्सरयाजिनः ।
अविश्रान्तं निपीयाज्यं जाड्यं यत्प्राप पावकः ॥
पराक्रमेण तज्जिष्णोः प्रभावाच्चासुरद्विषः ।
तत्याज खाण्डवं दग्ध्वा हव्यानां चाभवत्क्षमः ॥
इति ऊतभुगकाण्डे प्रौढपार्थेषुपत्ना-
निलबहुलविलासः खाण्डवं निर्ददाह ॥
हठविदुरितलोकः किंच संकोच्य चण्डै-
र्विजयशरवितानैर्वृष्टिमाखण्डलस्य ॥

If we review these omissions and additions, we are justified, I think, in coming to the conclusion that they are just such liberties as any Kāvya poet would take in making a similar abridgement. With regard to the additions they represent the same character as those in Kshemendra's Bṛihat-kathâ. (See Lévi, Jour. As. 1885, VI, pp. 418, 419.) Further we may even from these points go further and say that his original

¹ [Or of the corresponding verses of the Mahâbhârata, see the Synopsis to my Translation of Manu. G. B.]

cannot have differed very essentially from our current texts. There are, it is true, certain other discrepancies between the two narratives, and these must be carefully examined before we came to a final conclusion. These differences divide themselves into two classes, variations in the divisions of the chapters and variations in the spelling of the proper names.

3. Division of the Âdi Parvan.

Section	Mahâbhârata	Adhyâya	Mañjarî	Section		
I	Anukramaṇikâ	1	Anukramaṇikâ	I		
II	Parvasaṅgraha	2	Paushya	II		
III	Paushya	3, ^{170. n.} _{832. c.}				
IV	Pauloma	4	} ¹ Pauloma	III		
		12				
V	Âstîka	13	} ² Âstîka	IV		
		58				
VI	Aṁśâvatarāṇa, B. (Âdivaṁśâvatâ- raṇa, C.)	59	} Aṁśâvatarāṇa	V		
		64				
		65				
		67			³	
		68				
		74	} Śâkuntala	VI		
		75				
		85			} Yâyâta	VII
		86				
VII	Sambhava	93	} Uttarayâyâta	VIII		
		95			⁴	
		96	} Bhîshmotpatti	X		
		100, ⁴⁴ ₄₀₁₀				
		124	} Kurupâṇḍavotpatti	XI		
		125			Pâṇḍuvipatti	XII
				126	} Astradarśana	XIII
				137		
138						
		140	Drupadaparâjaga	XIV		
		140	⁶			

¹ The 4th chap. is wanting in the Mañjarî. ² Chaps. 24, 45—48, and 57 are wanting. ³ Chap. 66 wanting. ⁴ Chap. 94 wanting. ⁵ Chap. 129 wanting. ⁶ Chaps. 139 and 140 wanting.

Section	Mahâbhârata	Adhyâya	Mañjarî	Section					
VIII	Jatugriha	141 } 148 }	Jatugrihadâha	XV					
					IX	Hiḍimbavadha	149 } 151 } 152 }	Hiḍimbavadha	XVI
XI	Chaitraratha	157 } 164, $\frac{9}{6303}$ } 165 } 167 }	Bakavadha	XVIII					
					XII	Svayaṃvara (Draupadīsvayaṃvara, C.)	165 } 167 } 168 } 170, $\frac{58}{6493}$ }	Dhṛishtadyumna- draupadīvarṇana	XIX
XIV	Vidurâgama- mana, C.)	173 } 174 } 180 }	Tâpatya	XXI					
					XV	Râjyalâ- bha, C.)	174 } 180 } 181 }	Aurva	XXII
XVII	Indraprasthe yudhi- shṭhirarâjyârdha- prâpti	183 ¹ } 184 }	Draupadīsvayaṃ- vara	XXIV					
					XVIII	Sundopasundopâ- khyâna	184 } 192 }	Pañchendropâ- khyâna	XXV
XX	Kṛishṇâvivâha	193 } 195, $\frac{32}{7250}$ }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI					
					XXI	Kṛishṇâvivâha	195, $\frac{32}{7250}$ } 197 }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI
XXIII	Kṛishṇâvivâha	198 } 199 }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI					
					XXIV	Kṛishṇâvivâha	199 }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI
XXVI	Kṛishṇâvivâha	200 }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI					
					XXVII	Kṛishṇâvivâha	206 }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI
XXIX	Kṛishṇâvivâha	207 }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI					
					XXX	Kṛishṇâvivâha	208, $\frac{8}{7603}$ }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI
XXXII	Kṛishṇâvivâha	212, $\frac{24}{7735}$ }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI					
					XXXIII	Kṛishṇâvivâha	212, $\frac{24}{7735}$ }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI
XXXV	Kṛishṇâvivâha	212, $\frac{24}{7735}$ }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI					
					XXXVI	Kṛishṇâvivâha	212, $\frac{24}{7735}$ }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI
XXXVIII	Kṛishṇâvivâha	212, $\frac{24}{7735}$ }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI					
					XXXIX	Kṛishṇâvivâha	212, $\frac{24}{7735}$ }	Kṛishṇâvivâha	XXVI

¹ Chap. 182 wanting.

Section	Mahâbhârata	Adhyâya	Mañjarî	Section
		213 } 214 }	Ulûpîdarśana	XXIX
XV (XVI)	Arjunava- navâsa	215	Chitrângadâsam- gama	XXX
		216 } 217 }	Babhruvâhana- janman	XXXI
XVI (XVII)	Subha- drâharaṇa	218 } 219 } 220 }	Subhadrâharaṇa	XXXII
		221, $\frac{1}{7963}$ }	Haraṇakârikâ	XXXIII
XVII (XVIII)	Haraṇâ- haraṇa	221, $\frac{61}{8021}$ }	Abhimanyujan- man	XXXIV
		221, $\frac{77}{8037}$ }	Draupadeyot- patti	XXXV
		221, fine }		
XVIII	Khânḍavadâha	222, $\frac{1}{8050}$ }	Śvetakyupâ- khyâna	XXXVI
		224, $\frac{14}{8166}$ }	Puchchhakhaṇ- ḍana	XXXVII
		227, $\frac{11}{8243}$ }		
	(XIX Khânḍava- dahana, C.)	227, fine }		
		228, $\frac{1}{8285}$ }	Indraparâjaya	XXXVIII
		228, $\frac{24}{8308}$ }		
		228, fine }	Mayarakshaṇa	XXXIX
XIX	Mayadarśana	229, $\frac{1}{8331}$ }	Mandapâlopâ- khyâna	XL
		234, $\frac{4}{8464}$ }	Khânḍavavana- dâha	XLI
		234, fine }		

In comparing the divisions of the Mañjarî with those given by the Mahâbhârata one is certainly struck by the fact that the former seem to agree better with the course of the narration. There is only one exception in which the detailed text is better than the résumé, viz. the section entitled Bakavadha. When the Âsura has been slain by Bhîma, the citizens rush out of the town to exult over the dead body, and the description of their doings closes the section very appropriately. This is the division in the Mahâbhârata, whereas in the Mañjarî this episodical event makes the beginning of the next chapter, with the subject of which it has nothing to do. On

the other hand the following divisions of the Mañjarî are preferable: —

(1) Chaps. 65—67 give the pedigree of the Devās, Dānavas, Rākshasas etc., and form part of the Amśāvatarāṇa. With chap. 68 begins the story of the Kuru family. Hence, if we accept the division of the Mahābhārata, which unlike the Mañjarî, does not detail the events down to chap. 140, it would have been more fitting to begin the section Sambhava with chap. 68.

(2) Chaps. 149—151 are taken up with the lamentations of the citizens, who come to visit the place where the Pāṇḍavas are presumed to have perished, and with the circumstances that accompany the flight of the princes. A good narrator would certainly stop after having related the burning down of a house with its inhabitants, and leave the events that follow this disaster to begin a new section, — as is done by Kshemendra. On the contrary the Mahābhārata makes a pause between chaps. 151 and 152, although both are occupied with the adventures which occur to the five brothers after their escape from the Jatugriha.

(3) Chap. 156 relates how the Pāṇḍavas repair to the house of the Brāhmaṇa, who is saved from the Rākshasa Baka by his guests. It seems better to make this the introduction to the Bakavadha, than to append it to the Hiḍimbavadha, as is done by the Mahābhārata.

(4) The same may be said of chap. 183, which forms the conclusion of the section called Chaitraratha in the Mahābhārata, although it is entirely extraneous to the subject treated of there, whereas in the Mañjarî it is transferred to the Draupadīsvayaṃvara, in which the purohita Dhaumya, whose choice is related in the chapter referred to, acts a part.

(5) The Mahābhārata finishes a section with chap. 192, although Drupada addresses in its last verses a question to his son Dhṛishṭadyumna, who answers his father in the beginning of the next section. The Mañjarî avoids this untimely break.

(6) Chap. 218 tells us of the meeting of Kṛishṇa and Arjuna and how the two heroes went to mount Raivataka, where Arjuna carried off Subhadrâ. As this latter event fills up

chaps. 219 and 220, it seems quite natural to make chap. 218 an introduction to these chapters, as the Mañjarî does.

4. The Proper Names.

Chap. 32.

Instead of Bhaumana or Bhauvana, which in the Mahâbhârata is a name of Viśvakarman, we find in the Śâradâ MS. the following: —

निहत्य विश्वकर्माणं भवने सोमरक्षिणाम् ।

Chap. 95.

The pedigree of the Pûruvaiṅśa as given by Kshemendra is nearly identical with that found in the Mahâbhârata. The following differences seem, however, noteworthy: —

The names of Jayatsena, between Sârvabhauma and Avâchîna, and of Ariha, between Avâchîna and Mahâbhauma, as well as between Devâtithi and Riksha, are omitted. In the latter case, however, Ariha is represented by Pada, as may be seen from the following synopsis.

Mahâbhârata: —

Devâtithi
Ariha
Riksha
Matinâra

Mañjarî: —

Devâtithi
Pada (Rîcha, Dev. MS.)
Daksha (Kaksha, Dev. MS.)
Matinâra

There are also omitted: — Vidûratha, son of Kuru, Pratiśravas, son of Bhîmasena, and Bhîshma, son of Śântanu; the last probably because he is outside the direct descent.

Instead of the first Janamejaya, son of Pûru, the metre requires the spelling Janmejaya: —

जनमेजयस्तस्य सूनुः प्राचीधन्वा ततोभवत् । (Śâr. MS.)

जन्मेजयस्तु तत्सूनुः प्राचीन्वानोभवत्ततः (Dev. MS.)

His son is named Prâchîdhanvan (Prâchînvâna, Dev. MS.) in lieu of Prâchinvat.

Instead of Ahamyâti the Śâradâ MS. gives (*prima manu*) Aśamyâti; instead of Avâchîna, Arâdhîna (Arâchîna, Dev.);

instead of Ayutanâyin, Ayutanâmin (Ayutayâjin, Dev.); instead of Taiisu, Trasu (Trapu, Śâr. sec. m.); instead of Îlina, Nalina (Kulina, Dev.); inst. of Dushyanta, Dushvanta (Duhkanta, Dev.); inst. of Bhumanyu, Bhimanyu; inst. of Vikuṅṭhana, Vikuṅja, *p. m.*; Vikuṅcha, *s. m.*; inst. of Anaśvan, Abhishvan.

Chap. 99.

Uśinara's daughter is named Ajirâvatî (Añjitâvanî, Dev.) instead of Jitavatî.

Chap. 130.

The name of the Apsaras, who beguiled Gautama, is Jâlapadî instead of Jânapadî.

Chap. 170.

Instead of Somâśrayâyaṇa, the name of the place to which the Pâṇḍavas betake themselves, we read Somaśravâyaṇa[ṇa].

Chap. 175.

When the cow Nandinî is driven away by Viśvâmitra, she produces, to defend herself, many peoples. The passage is rendered by Kshemendra in the following manner: —

द्वियमाणा ततस्तेन सासृजत्य(ः)ल्लह्वान्वात् ।
 शकृतश्च शकान्वीरान्योनिजान्यवनानपि ॥
 दरत्तुरुष्कचीनांश्च स्लेच्छाञ्शोकारणेक्षणा ।

The Darads and Turushkas do not appear in the Mahâbhârata.

Chap. 197.

Instead of Bhûtadhâman, one of the five sons of Indra, Kshemendra gives Ghṛitadhâman (Ghṛitidhîra, Dev.).

Chap. 204.

Instead of king Ambuvîcha we find in the Mañjarî Ambarîsha (Ambujîvin, Dev.).

To sum up the preceding remarks, we may say that several formes found in the Mañjarî are without doubt better and older than those given by the editions of the Mahâbhârata,

although, of course, only a critical edition of Kshemendra's work would enable us to settle every question with certainty.

Thus Duḥkanta, which stands for Duḥkhanta i. e. Duḥshanta or Dushshanta is the original name of the famous king, from which all the numerous variations can be derived by means of clerical mistakes (*dushyanta*, *dushvanta*), or bad pronunciation (*dushmanta*).

To the same class belong the names Ajirâvatî, Jâlapadî, Ambarîsha for Jitavatî, Jânâpadî, Ambuvîcha.

For Nalina compare Malina of the Vâyupurâṇa (Wilson-Hall, Vish. Pur. IV, 130).

Bhimanyu instead of Bhumanyu is due to a peculiarity of the Kaśmîrian pronunciation (Bühler, Kaśm. Rep. p. 83).

Clerical mistakes are Arâdhîna for Arâchîna; Ayutanâmin for Ayutanâyin.

5. Verbal agreement.

After having given in the preceding paragraphs an account of the differences that exist between Kshemendra's abstract and the Mahâbhârata, I give here a selection of passages taken from both works which, I hope, will confirm from a positive point of view the conclusion alluded to above, namely that Kshemendra's original did not differ from the Mahâbhârata, as we have it at present, in any other way, than two classes of MSS. differ from each other. The corollary of this fact is that whoever tries to restore the original readings of the great poem, must carefully examine Kshemendra's résumé.

Mahâbhârata.

Mañjarî.

1.

शौनकस्य कुलपतेर्द्वादशवार्षिके
सत्ते ॥

चित्राः श्रोतुं कथास्तत्र परिवव्रुस्त-
पस्विनः ॥

बृहदण्डमभूदेकं प्रजानां बीजमव्य-
यम् ॥

शौनकस्य मुनेस्तत्र सत्ते द्वादशवा-
र्षिके ॥

तं पप्रच्छुः कथाश्चित्राः परिवार्य
तपस्विनः ॥

बृहदण्डमभूदेकं प्रजाकारणमव्य-
यम् ॥

2.

अष्टादश समाजगुरुराहो ह्यो अहो ह्यो दशाष्टौ च तत्रैव
युयुत्सया । समेत्य तं द्विजा- निधनं गताः ॥
स्ताश्च तत्रैव निधनं गताः ॥

13.

ब्रह्मचारी यथाहारस्तपस्युग्रै रतः जरत्काररिति ख्यातो ब्रह्मचारी
सदा । जरत्काररिति ख्यात पुरा व्रजन् ॥
उर्ध्वरेता महातपाः ॥

59.

तस्मिन्परमदुष्पारे सर्पसत्त्रे महात्म- कर्मान्तरेषु सत्त्रस्य प्रणम्येश्वर-
नाम् । कर्मान्तरेषु यज्ञस्य स- मच्युतम् ॥
दस्यानां तथाध्वरे ॥

63.

तुण्डयुद्धमथाकाशे तावुभौ संप्रच- श्लेनादन्यखगाकृष्टमपतवमुना-
क्रतुः । युद्धयोरपतद्रेतस्तच्चापि भसि ॥
यमुनाभसि ॥

74.

भस्त्रा माता पितुः पुत्रो तेन माता भस्त्रा पितुः पुत्रो येन जातः
जातः स एव सः । भरख स एव सः । भरख पुत्रं दुःकन्त
पुत्रं दुष्यन्त मावमंस्थाः शकुन्त- मावमंस्थाः शकुन्तलाम् ॥ (In
लाम् ॥ the Dev. MS.)

76.

आहुतं चाग्निहोत्रं ते सूर्यश्चास्तं अगोपाश्चागता गावो व्यक्तं तात
गतः प्रभो । अगोपाश्चागता हतः कचः ॥
गावः कचस्तात न दृश्यते ॥

100.

तच्छ्रुत्वा दुष्करं कर्म कृतं भीष्मेण स्वच्छन्दनिधनं तस्मै ददौ तुष्टः
शान्तनुः । स्वच्छन्दमरणं तुष्टो पिता वरम् ॥
ददौ तस्मै महात्मने ॥

114.

अथ पारसवीं कन्यां देवकस्य म- भीष्मः पारशवीं कन्यां देवकस्य
ह्रीपतेः ॥ महीपतेः ॥

121.

पतिं विना मृतं श्रेयो नार्थाः क्ष- विलपन्ती न तत्याज तद्व्रतिं गन्तु-
त्रियपुङ्गव । त्वन्नतिं गन्तुमिच्छा- मुष्यता ॥
मि प्रसीदस्व नयस्व माम् ॥
सा तेन सुषुवे देवी श्वेन भर- सा - - चीञ्शाल्वाञ्चतुरो मद्रा-
तर्षभ । चीञ्शाल्वाञ्चतुरो म- न्पुत्रान्प्राप महीपतेः ॥
द्रान्सुतान्भरतसत्तम ॥

123.

एष धर्मभृतां श्रेष्ठो भविष्यति अयं धर्मभृतां ज्येष्ठो धर्मसूनुर्यु-
नरोत्तम ॥ धिष्ठिरः ॥

128.

शतमेकोत्तरं तेषां कुमाराणां म- शतमेकोत्तरं राज्ञः कुमाराणां म-
हौजसाम् ॥ हौजसाम् ॥

145.

अलोहं निशितं शस्त्रं शरीरपरि- यः कायकर्तनं तीक्ष्णं वेत्ति शस्त्र-
कर्तनम् । यो वेत्ति न तु तं मलोहजम् ॥
घ्नन्ति प्रतिघातविदं द्विषः ॥

153.

मयि तिष्ठति दुष्टात्मन्न स्त्रियं हन्तु- नैनामर्हसि हन्तुं त्वं मयि जीवति
मर्हसि ॥ राक्षस ॥

169.

तामथ प्रत्युवाचेदमीशानो वदतां तस्याः पञ्चगुणां वाचं निश्म्य गि-
वरः । पञ्च ते पतयो भद्रे रिजापतिः । पञ्च ते पतयो भद्रे
भविष्यन्तीति भारताः ॥ भविष्यन्तीत्यभाषत ॥

177.

ततः पाशैस्तदात्मानं गाढं बद्धा पाशैश्च दृढमात्मानं बद्धा नव्याम-
महामुनिः । तस्या जले महान- पातयत् ॥
द्या निममज्ज सुदुःखितः ॥

187.

तत्कार्मुकं संहननोपपन्नं सञ्चं न धनुषस्तुलनं तस्य मनसापि सुदुः
शेकुर्मनसापि कर्तुम् ॥ सहं । लेभिरे (मेनिरे Dev.) ॥

190.

किं त्वं साक्षाद्भुवेदो रामो वा धनुर्वेदोसि किं साक्षाद्रामः शक्रोथ
विप्रसत्तम । अथ साक्षाद्भरिहयः वा द्विज ॥
साक्षाद्वा विष्णुरच्युतः ॥

195.

भवान्वा विधिवत्पाणिं गृह्णातु गृह्णातु विधिवत्पाणिं मत्पुत्र्याः
दुहितुर्मम ॥ श्वेतवाहनः ॥

197.

तां गच्छन्तीमन्वगच्छत्तदानीं सो- तामेवानुव्रजञ्चक्रो ददर्श गिरि-
पश्यदारात्तरुणं दर्शनीयम् । मूर्धनि । सिंहासनस्थं पुरुषं
सिंहासनस्थं युवतीसहायं क्री- कान्तं प्रणयिनीसखम् । क्रीड-
डन्तमचैर्गिरिराजमूर्ध्नि ॥ न्तमचैः ॥

215.

हिरण्यविन्दोस्तीर्थे च स्नात्वा पुरु- हिरण्यविन्दोस्तीर्थे च स्नात्वा प्रा-
षसत्तमः - - प्राचीं दिशम् चीं दिशं ययौ ॥
- - जगाम ॥

6. The story of Astika.

To show the manner in which Kshemendra executed his task I give the *Āstika Parvan*, the only section of which the beginning and end, with the exception of the *Anukramaṇikā*, agree with the corresponding ones in our *Mahābhārata*.

[अथास्तीकपर्व]

श्रुति मुनिभिः सूतः पृष्टोस्तीककथां पुनः ।
 प्राह याथावराख्यानां कुले जातो महाद्विजः ॥ [१]
 जरत्काररिति ख्यातो ब्रह्मचारी पुरा व्रजन् ।
 ददर्श वीरणस्तम्बलम्बमानान्पितामहान्^१ ॥ [२]
 अधोमुखान्महाकूपे मूषकग्रस्तधारणान् ।
 कथितान्वयनामानं कथितास्तं बभाषिरे ॥ [३]
 त्वद्ब्रह्मचर्यविच्छिन्नपुण्यसंतानतन्तवः ।
 अकालमूषिकाक्रान्तास्तवैव पितरो वयम् ॥ [४]
 ततस्तद्वचसा चक्रे स पुनर्दारसंग्रहम् ।
 न सनाम्नीं विना भार्यां भजिष्यामीति सर्वदा ॥ [५]
 अथ कालेन स प्राप विधिदिष्टादयाचकः ।
 वासुकेरनुजां जायां सनाम्नीमेव संयमी ॥ [६]
 गर्भोस्तीत्यात्तनामानं तस्मात्पुत्रमवाप सा ।
 अस्तीकं सर्वनागानां मातृशापनिवर्तनम् ॥ [७]
 शौनकेन पुनः पृष्टो मातृशापस्य कारणम् ।
 नागानामवदत्सूतः पुराणाख्यानकोविदः ॥ [८]
 भर्तुर्वरात्कश्यपस्य गर्भं दत्तसुते मुनेः ।
 सुषुवाते पुरा कद्रुर्विनता च खगोचितम् ॥ [९]
 अण्डेभ्यो निःसृताः पूर्वं कद्रुपुत्रा यदाहयः ।
 बिम्बेदाण्डद्वयादेकमीर्षया विनता तदा ॥ [१०]
 अपूर्णाण्डविनिर्भेदादनूरुररुणोभवत् ।
 मातरं कुपितो दास्यं यास्यामीति शशाप सः ॥ [११]
 कालेनाथ भगिन्यौ ते दिव्यं ददृशतुर्हयम् ।
 यस्योरुमन्द्राक्रान्तक्षीरोदाणींसि जन्मभूः ॥ [१२]
 अमृताहरणे यत्नमाश्रितैर्देवदानवैः ।
 मध्यमानोद्विणा पूर्वं ददौ चण्डीशमण्डनम् ॥ [१३]
 शशाङ्कं कौस्तुभं लक्ष्मीं स्वधां धन्वन्तरिं तथा ।
 पीयूषमश्वराजं च सुरेभ्यः क्षीरसागरः ॥ [१४]
 वञ्चयित्वा स्वयं विष्णुः स्त्रीरूपेण महासुरान् ।
 सुधां जहार सहसा तदृत्तां च पपुः सुराः ॥ [१५]

^१ वीरणस्तम्ब is explained in the margin of the Dev. MS. by वालानुं थुंबडुं.

राहोस्त्रिदशरूपेण पीयूषं गिरतस्ततः ।
 हरिश्चक्रेण चिच्छेद कण्ठप्राप्तामृतं शिरः ॥ [१६]
 सूचितः सोमसूर्याभ्यां तद्वधात्तच्छिरस्ततः ।
 तपो घोरतरं चक्रे येन तावन्ति पर्वसु ॥ [१७]
 अमृतोत्थं भगिन्वी तं दृष्ट्वाश्वं धवलं पथि ।
 किंवर्णोसाविति स्वैरमूचतुस्ते परस्परम् ॥ [१८]
 विनता सित इत्याह कद्रूश्चासितवालधिम् ।
 पणं दास्याथ चक्राते विवादेनेति ते ततः ॥ [१९]
 अथाब्रवीत्पुत्रान्कद्रूनागान्कलुषमानसा ।
 श्वेतः सुरहयः पुत्राः कृष्णवालो विधीयताम् ॥ [२०]
 इति श्रुत्वा न चक्रुस्तत्पापभीता भुजंगमाः ।
 वितते सर्पसत्ते वो भविष्यत्यप्रिरन्तकः ॥ [२१]
 प्रत्याख्यानरूषा कद्रूः शशाप तनयानिति ।
 शेषिर्भुजंगैरसिते विहितेथ तुरंगमे ॥ [२२]
 दास्यं जगाम विनता विजिता व्यालचेष्टितैः ।
 अथापराण्डादुदगात्ररुडः कनकच्छविः ॥ [२३]
 चंचन्निजप्रभापुञ्जव्यञ्जितानन्तविक्रमः ।
 स्तूयमानः सुरैः सर्वैः स यथी मातुरन्तिकम् ॥ [२४]
 प्राज्याज्यवर्धमानस्य कृषाणोः^१ श्रियमुद्वहन् ।
 कद्रूं वहन्तीं स्कन्धेन सव्याजपणनिर्जिताम् ॥ [२५]
 मातरं विनतां तार्क्ष्यः प्राप्य शुश्राव तत्कथाम् ।
 मातुर्गिरा स भुजगानुवाह भुजगाहितः ॥ [२६]
 नीत्वा सूर्यरथाभ्यर्णं गाढसंतापमूर्क्षितान् ।
 सुपर्णेनोह्यमानांस्तान्दृष्ट्वा कद्रूर्निजान्सुतान् ॥ [२७]
 दह्यमानान्निविकरैस्तुष्टाव मरुतां पतिम् ।
 तद्विनिर्मितमेघौघवृष्टिनष्टातपक्लमाः ॥ [२८]
 नन्दन्तो भुजगाः पृथ्वीं बभ्रमुस्तार्क्ष्यवाहनाः ।
 दास्यं श्रुत्वाथ भोगिभ्यः पीयूषहरणावधि ॥ [२९]
 तदा तदाहितोद्योगस्तार्क्ष्यः पप्रच्छ मातरम् ।
 मातर्दास्यविमोक्षाय गच्छाम्यमृतमञ्जसा ॥ [३०]
 समाहर्तुं सुरान्निप्रं भोजनं मे समादिश ।
 साब्रवीदस्ति जलधेः कूले सुबहुलान्वयः ॥ [३१]

^१ कृषाणोः Dev.

निषादलोकस्तेन त्वं विपुलां तृप्तिमाप्नुहि ।
 निषादमध्यगस्तत्र स रक्ष्यो ब्राह्मणस्त्वया ॥ [३२]
 द्विजकायाग्निदग्धानां श्रूयते नोद्भवः पुनः ।
 तांस्ते भक्षयतः कण्ठे यस्तप्तवडिशायते ॥ [३३]
 उत्किरन्निव मर्माणि स ज्ञेयो ब्राह्मणस्त्वया ।
 स धीवरनिवासोपि न भ्रष्टो निजधर्मतः [३४]
 अलुप्तसंध्यः सततं न हि जात्या तिरस्कृतः ।
 स्वस्ति तेस्तु व्रज क्षिप्रमिति मातुर्गिरा खगः ॥ [३५]
 प्रययौ पक्षविक्षेपवातविक्षोभिताम्बुधिः ।
 सोऽभिकूलाश्रयं भुक्त्वा दाशानां^१ विपुलं कुलं ॥ [३६]
 कण्ठे वडिशवल्लपं त्यक्त्वा तन्मध्यगं द्विजम् ।
 व्रजन्नवाप जनकं कश्यपं तेजसां निधिम् ॥ [३७]
 अमृताहरणोद्योगं निवेद्यास्त्रे प्रणम्य सः ।
 भोजनं दिश मे तात न तृप्तोस्तीत्यथाभधात् ॥ [३८]
 तं प्राह कश्यपः पुत्र सरस्वस्त्रिन्महाकृती ।
 अनेकयोजनायामौ स्थितौ कुञ्जरकच्छपौ ॥ [३९]
 पुरा धनविभागोत्थकलिना वणिजौ मिथः ।
 शापादेतां दशां यातौ सुप्रतीकविभावसू^२ ॥ [४०]
 तौ भक्षयेति तच्छ्रुत्वा ताच्छ्रौं विक्षोभ्य तत्सरः ।
 चरणाभ्यां समादाय तौ जगाम महाजवः ॥ [४१]
 दिव्यवृक्षवनं गत्वा सोथ रोहिणपादपम् ।
 प्राप काञ्चनशाखायामाश्रान्तः समुपाविशत् ॥ [४२]
 शतयोजनविस्तीर्णा शाखा स्पृष्ट्वैव तत्पदा ।
 अभ्यज्यत मुनिव्याप्ता चञ्च्वादाय स तां ययौ ॥ [४३]
 लम्बमानैस्तपः क्षामैर्वालखिल्यैरधोमुखैः ।
 जीर्णैर्यमिति जग्राह भीत्या तां पतगेश्वरः ॥ [४४]
 स कश्यपं समभ्येत्य सशाखागजकच्छपः ।
 किं करोमीति संभ्रान्तमानसः पर्यतप्यत ॥ [४५]
 प्रार्थिताः सुतवात्सल्यात्कश्यपेन ततः स्वयम् ।
 शाखां त्यक्त्वा ययुः सर्वे वालखिल्यास्तपोजुषः ॥ [४६]

^१ भिल्लानां Dev. in the margin.

^२ सुव्रतीक° Śâr.

वाक्यात्पितृर्हिमगिरौ त्यक्त्वा तां भक्षितामिषः ।
 जगाम शक्रभवनं पीयूषहरणोद्यतः ॥ [४७]
 तपसा वालखिल्यानां जातो जेता स वज्रिणः ।
 इन्द्रः सर्वविहंगानां वाहनं वरदो हरेः [४८]
 कश्यपस्य पुरा यज्ञे सुरसिद्धिर्षिचारणाः ।
 अवहन्क्रतुसंभारमनारतमवारिताः ॥ [४९]
 इध्माहारं समाधाय स्वयं पर्वतसंनिभः ।
 आगतो वृत्रहा तत्र वालखिल्यान्यलोकयत् ॥ [५०]
 अङ्गुष्ठाग्रसमुत्सेधान्स तान्दृष्ट्वा तपःक्षमान् ।
 पलाशतूलिकामात्रभारसंपीडिताङ्गकान् ॥ [५१]
 सीदतो भूमिधरवद्वारिधौ जलपूरिते ।
 जहासात्यबलानिन्द्रः को वा लक्ष्म्या न माद्यति ॥ [५२]
 ते तस्य हासात्कुपिता घोराभिष्टिं प्रचक्रिरे ।
 कश्यपस्य सुतो भूयादिन्द्रजिद्वलवानिति ॥ [५३]
 तत्प्रभावात्समुद्भूतो ययौ जेतुं सुरेश्वरम् ।
 मार्ताण्डशतसंवीतः सुमेरुरिव जङ्गमः ॥ [५४]
 स प्रविश्य दिवं देवानजयद्विजयान्वितः ।
 जित्वा शक्रं रणे वीरो मोहयित्वा सुरान्रणे ॥ [५५]
 निहत्य विश्वकर्माणं भवने सोमरक्षिणाम् ।
 पक्षाक्षेपसमुत्थेन रजःपुञ्जेन भीषणौ ॥ [५६]
 निरस्य रक्षाभुजगौ विदार्याथ स पञ्जरम् ।
 सुधां भ्राम्यन्महाचक्रां जहार बलदर्पितः ॥ [५७]
 अपीत्वैव समादाय पीयूषकलशं जवात् ।
 तं प्रयान्तं विभुर्दूराद्दर्श कमलाधवः^१ ॥ [५८]
 अलौल्येन तवानेन प्रीतोहं पतगेश्वर ।
 वरं गृहाणेत्यवदत्ततस्त्वं भगवान्हरिः ॥ [५९]
 सुधां विना स्याममरस्तवीपरि सदा स्थितः ।
 वरं गृहाण मत्तोपि तमित्याह स पश्चिरात् ॥ [६०]
 तच्छ्रुत्वेत्याह भगवान्सर्वमेव भविष्यति ।
 वाहनं मे भवान्भूयात्तार्क्ष्योप्याह तथेति च ॥ [६१]
 विष्णोर्वाहनतां प्राप्य ध्वजोपरि च संस्थितिम् ।
 ब्रजन्पश्चात्सवज्रेण वज्रिणाभ्येत्य ताडितः ॥ [६२]

^१ Explained by कृष्णः in the Dev. MS.

तेनाहतोप्यव्यधितः स्वपत्नं शतयोजनम् ।
 स्वयं तत्याज मानोस्तु वज्रस्येति विहस्य सः ॥ [६३]
 निर्जितेन सुरेन्द्रेण सख्यं कृत्वा जगाद तम् ।
 पन्नगेभ्यो मया न्यस्तं हर्तव्यममृतं त्वया ॥ [६४]
 उक्तेति गत्वा भुजगान्दत्त्वा तेभ्यः सुधां खगः ।
 विधिवत्पीयतामेतद्वीतदास्यो भवेदिति ॥ [६५]
 सुधां कुशेषु संस्थाप्य स्नातुं यातेषु भोगिषु ।
 तार्क्ष्येण प्रागनुज्ञातो जहरिन्द्रीथ तां जवात् ॥ [६६]
 वञ्चिता भुजगा दृष्ट्वा सुधालिप्तं कुशासनम् ।
 लल्लिङ्गदीर्णजिह्वाया येन प्रापुर्द्विजिह्वताम् ॥ [६७]
 ततः प्रभृति दर्भाणां पूतता हव्यकव्ययोः ।
 शक्रवक्याच्च भुजगा ययुस्तार्क्ष्यस्य भक्ष्यताम् ॥ [६८]
 इत्येतन्मातृशापस्य कारणं कीर्तितं मया ।
 शेषवासुकिकाकोटतक्षकैलादिभोगिनाम् ॥ [६९]
 ततस्त्रीत्रेण तपसा वरान्प्राप्य पितामहात् ।¹
 उवाह तन्निरा शेषः पृथ्वीं सगिरिकाननाम् ॥ [७०]
 मातृशापपरित्यक्ता² वासुकिप्रमुखास्ततः ।
 अमन्त्रयन्त सहिताः सर्पसत्प्रतिक्रियाम् ॥ [७१]
 केचिदाङ्गः क्रतौ तस्मिन्वयं सर्वे³ सुसंहताः ।
 करिष्यामो विषोल्काभिरुपायैर्वा चतुर्विधैः ॥ [७२]
 ऐलपत्रस्ततः प्राह वासुकिं धीमतां वरः ।
 अवश्यभावाच्छापोसौ⁴ मातुः शापात्समुत्थितः ॥ [७३]
 श्रुतास्तस्मिन्मया शापे मातुरुत्सङ्गशायिना ।
 कद्रूरहो नु तीक्ष्णेति देवानां ब्रुवतां गिरः ॥ [७४]
 सुरैः कौतुकिभिः पृष्टः शापशान्तिं चतुर्मुखः ।
 उवाच पापनिरता दन्दशूकाः प्रमादिनः ॥ [७५]
 सर्पसत्त्रे प्रयास्यन्ति तीक्ष्णा विषधराः क्षयम् ।
 यायावरसुतः शेषान्धर्मस्थान्मोचयिष्यति ॥ [७६]
 उत्पत्यते मुनेः सूनुर्नागानां स्वसुरेव सः ।

1 ब्रह्मणः Dev. in the margin.

2 परित्रस्ता Dev.

3 विघ्नं instead of सर्वे Dev.

4 भावी शापोसौ Dev.

जरत्कारोर्जरत्कारोरस्तीक इति विश्रुतः ॥ [७७]
 श्रुतमेतन्मया पूर्वं बालेन भुजगाधिप ।
 इत्थैलपत्रादाकर्ण्य वासुकिर्भयमत्यजत् ॥ [७८]
 कस्यचित्त्वथ कालस्य परिचित्पाण्डुवंशजः ।
 मृगानुसारी विपिने बभ्राम वसुधाधिपः ॥ [७९]
 मौनव्रतं पुरो दृष्ट्वा समीकं सोब्रवीन्मुनिम् ।
 अपि दृष्टस्त्वया मार्गे कुरङ्गो मच्छराङ्कितः ॥ [८०]
 इति पृष्ठो यदा किञ्चिन्नोवाच स मुनिस्तदा ।
 शवं भुजगमादाय स्तन्धे तस्य ययौ नृपः ॥ [८१]
 अथ तत्तनयः शृङ्गी महाकोपी विलोक्य तम् ।
 पितरं सर्पसरघाविषविस्फोटदूषितम्¹ ॥ [८२]
 स्फूर्जद्विषस्तक्षकाग्निः सप्ताहेनैव ध्वस्यति ।
 तत्कर्तारं शशापेति कम्पमानकराधरः [८३]
 तच्छ्रुत्वा करुणासिन्धुः समीकः पृथिवीभुजः ।
 समीपं प्राहिणोद्धृतैः² शापोयं रक्षतामिति ॥ [८४]
 मुनिशापपरिचस्तः परिचिन्मन्त्रिणां धिया ।
 मन्त्ररक्षौषधिब्रातैर्विदधे गुप्तिमात्मनः ॥ [८५]
 सप्तमेहनि संप्राप्ते तक्षको विधिचोदितः ।
 निर्दग्धं पृथिवीपालं प्रययौ हस्तिनापुरम् ॥ [८६]
 स ददर्श पुरो विप्रं कश्यपं विषमन्त्रिणम् ।
 परिचिद्रक्षणायातं दरिद्रं द्रविणार्थिनम् ॥ [८७]
 तस्य व्यवसितं सर्वं श्रुत्वोवाच भुजंगमः ।
 अहं स तक्षको नाम मां जेतुं कः प्रगल्भते ॥ [८८]
 तं रक्षसि नरेन्द्रं चेन्नया दग्धं महाद्रुमम् ।
 संजीवयैनं जानामि तत्तेहं विषमन्त्रिताम् ॥ [८९]
 इत्युक्त्वा विषवेगेन न्ययोधं सोदहत्क्षणात् ।
 सशाखपुष्पपत्रं च चक्रे मन्त्रेण तं द्विजः ॥ [९०]
 तत्प्रत्ययाद्धनं तस्मै निवर्तस्वेति तक्षकः ।
 प्रसाद्य प्रददौ भूरि प्राप्य विप्रञ्च तद्ययौ ॥ [९१]
 कालदग्धं नृपं ज्ञात्वा याते दिव्यदृशिद्विजे ।
 तक्षकस्तापसाकारान्सर्पान्नाञ्जे व्यसर्जयत् ॥ [९२]

¹ सरघा मधुमक्षिकेत्यमरः Dev. in the margin.

² °द्धृतं Dev.

तं समेत्य महीपालं कृत्वाः स्वस्तीति वादिनः ।
 फलानि च ददुस्तस्मै पुष्पाणि च कुशैः सह ॥ [९३]
 तत्फलान्तरनिर्यातं कीटं ह्रस्वतरं नृपः ।
 दृष्ट्वाब्रवीन्मुनेः श्रापं मानयामीति युक्तिः ॥ [९४]
 कृमिस्तक्षकनामासौ क्षणान्निध्या दशत्वयम् ।
 इति ब्रुवाणं सचिवांस्तक्षकस्तमवेष्टयत् ॥ [९५]
 ततः स्फूर्जद्विषज्ज्वालावलयेन समन्दिरम् ।
 भूपतिं भस्मसात्कृत्वा भोगीन्द्रो नभसा ययौ ॥ [९६]
 निर्दग्धे नृपतौ तस्मिन्सत्पुत्रो जनमेजयः ।
 राज्ये वृतो मन्त्रिवरैर्भार्यां भेजे वपुष्टमाम् ॥ [९७]
 रममाणस्तथा तन्व्या वरोद्धाने स भूपतिः ।
 याते काले पितुर्वृत्तं शुश्रावामात्यमण्डलात् ॥ [९८]
 स मन्युवन्द्दिसंतप्तः सर्पसत्ते प्रतिक्रियाम् ।
 चकार सर्वनागानां विवेच्य ब्राह्मणैः सह ॥ [९९]
 तस्मिन्व्यालोलविस्फूर्जज्वालालीढनभस्तले ।
 भुजगाः सर्पसत्त्रायौ निपेतुः कुञ्जरोपमाः ॥ [१००]
 विषामिधूमश्यामानां स्फुलिङ्गाचिररोचिषाम् ।
 मेघानामिव संरम्भः पततां भोगिनामभूत् ॥ [१०१]
 दह्यमानेषु सर्पेषु सर्पसत्ते महीभुजः ।
 सुरेशं शरणं याते मन्त्राकृष्टे च तक्षके ॥ [१०२]
 सेन्द्रं तक्षकमाकृष्य निपातयत पावके ।
 इति ब्रुवाणे भूपाले खं प्राप्ते च शतक्रतौ ॥ [१०३]
 तस्मिन्नवसरे भीतः कम्पमानः कृताञ्जलिः ।
 अस्तीकं वासुकिः प्राह स्वस्तीयं रक्ष मामिति ॥ [१०४]
 स तथेति प्रतिश्रुत्य जनमेजयभूपतेः ।
 अवाप्य यत्नवसुधां द्वाः स्त्रीरावेदितोविशत् ॥ [१०५]
 ततो मन्त्रबलात्तस्ते तक्षके वज्रिणा सह^१ ।
 तिष्ठेत्यस्तीकवचनाल्लम्बमाने क्षणं स्थिते ॥ [१०६]
 निर्दग्धभुजगव्रातवसाविपुलकर्दमाः ।
 मेदोनद्यः सुविपुलाः प्रययुः सरितां पतिम् ॥ [१०७]
 अस्तीकोथ नृपं प्राप्य स्वस्तिपूर्वां स्तुतिं व्यधात् ।

^१ ततो मन्त्रबलात् शुल्ले तक्षके वज्रिणः करात् Dev.

सोमेन्द्रवदणादीनां यज्ञैस्तुल्यः क्रतुस्तव ॥ [१०८]¹
 इति स्वस्तिस्तुतिकृते तुष्टस्तस्मै स भूपतिः ।
 ददौ वरं तद्वराच्च स ररच्च फणीश्वरान् ॥ [१०९]
 अस्तीकस्वाथ वचसा सर्पसत्ते महीभुजः ।
 निवृत्ते सर्वनागानां शेषाणामुत्सवोभवत् ॥ [११०]
 ॥ इत्यादिपर्वण्यस्तीकम् ॥

Appendix.

1. Some Remarks on Kshemendra's Abstract of Parvans XII and XIII.

The twelfth (Śānti) and thirteenth (Anuśāsana) Parvans contain much that may be regarded as of later origin than the bulk of the work. For the long admonitions delivered by the dying Bhīshma to Yudhishtira are intermingled by tales and precepts, many of which are found again in Manu, the Purāṇas and the Hitopadeśa. It is therefore particularly interesting to ascertain the manner in which Kshemendra has treated these two books in his résumé.

As regards the Śānti Parvan the most striking fact is that the abbreviator omits altogether the twelve chapters 342 to 353 treating of Nārāyaṇa. Are we justified in supposing this was lacking in his original too? It is impossible to speak with confidence on this point, but the following reasons may be alleged in favour of such a view.

In the preceding chapters, as well as in the following, Bhīshma is the speaker, whereas in the portion referred to his place is occupied by mythical persons, viz. Śaunaka, Naranârāyaṇa, Pitāmaha, Bhagavat, Rudra etc. He and his interlocutor only appear again in chap. 354. The circumstance that long portions in prose interrupt the versified text seems also to be noteworthy. Besides the legend of Nārāyaṇa, who is the

¹ The verse 108, b is missing in the Śâr. MS. After it the Dev. MS. adds:

तथा मान्धातृनघुषादीनां क्रतुभिर्त्तमैः ।

principal person treated of, there are legends about Vṛishākapi, Dadhīcha, Kaiṭabha, Hayagrīva, etc., all well known from the Purāṇas, but having little, if any, connexion with Dharma, the main subject of the whole Parvan. Nārāyaṇa is the hero of the preceding chapters 336 to 341, and it is possible therefore that the chapters in question may have been added as an appendix to them after Kshemendra's time.¹

The other omissions are such as can be reasonably assigned to a poet engaged in a task like Kshemendra's. Moreover most of the chapters left out are very short, as will be seen by the following abstract: —

Chapters	Remarks	Number of verses
16, 17	Speech of Bhīma and Yudhishṭhira's answer. By this omission the harangue of Arjuna, in chaps. 15 and 18, is connected most suitably	53
19	Speech of Yudhishṭhira	26
20, 21	Speech of Devasthāna	34
22	Speech of Arjuna	15
26	Speech of Yudhishṭhira	31
27	Speech of Vyāsa to console Yudhishṭhira . .	33
32	Speech of Vyāsa on Prāyaśchittas	25
43	Praise of Vāsudeva	17
78	On what is permitted to a Brāhmaṇa assailed by misfortune	44
79	On the Brāhmaṇas	21
92—94	General precepts on Dharma	71
99	A variation of the preceding chapter (98) . .	18
100—102	On Senānīti, seem to be another recension of chaps. 95—97	111
108	On veneration of parents and Gurus	34

¹ [This conclusion is certainly improbable, as for as chapters 352 and 353 are concerned. For they are quoted by Śaṅkarāchārya in the commentary on Śārīraha Sūtras II, 1. 1, see Bhāṇḍārkar, Transactions of the VIIth Int. Or. Congress, Aryan Section, p. 105, and Deussen, Die Sūtras des Vedānta p. 259. G. B.]

Chapters	Number of verses
114	How to deal with a fool 21
129	How Svarga can be attained 11
	(With chap. 130 the Rājadharmās end) . . . 565
142	General precepts for a king 38
	(With chap. 173 the Âpaddharmās end) . . .
181	On Karmavipāka 20
208	On Ṛishis and Diśas 36
301	On the Yoga 62
302	On the Sâmkhya 115
310	Praise of the Dharma 25
320	How to escape death 15
	(With chap. 366 the Mokshadharmās are at an end. It is to be noticed that this chapter corresponds to chapter 367 of the Calcutta Edition, in which by inadvertance the figure 256 has been passed over) 273

The number of verses left out by Kshemendra amounts to 1633, and is certainly not too great, in proportion to the 13943 (or 13186, if we deduct the episode of Nârâyana in which case the proportion is yet more favourable) of the original. However, I must call attention to the fact that this proportion is perhaps not quite exact. Indeed it is sometimes difficult to say, whether in Kshemendra's abstract any given chapter is represented or not; very often only a single word may be taken as an allusion to it. The finest specimen of Kshemendra's method in this respect are the following verses, each of them corresponding successively to one of the chaps. 158—164:—

लोभ एव महत्पापम् । जानमेव परं महः ॥
दम एव महाशान्तिः । तप एव परं पदम् ॥
सत्यमेव परं पुण्यम् । श्रेयः क्रोधादिनिग्रहः ॥
अनृशंस्त्वं परं स्वर्गम् । सारोयं धर्मवादिनाम् ॥

In the Anuśāsana Parvan Kshemendra passes over three larger portions, viz. chaps. 30—37, 125—138, and 160—164. The first section, comprising 260 verses, treats of the Brâh-

maṇas, and the reverence which must be paid to them. In chap. 30 the story of Vītahavya who, although a Kshatriya, obtained the dignity of a Brâhmaṇa is told. The next chapter reminds one of chap. 8; both beginning with the words *ke pûjyâh*. The omission of chap. 32, which gives the well-known fable of the hawk and the dove, is surprising.

The second section amounts to 355 verses. Chapters 125 to 134 are linked together all treating of secret doctrines (*rahasya, guhya*); the remainder of Bhojya (persons worthy of being fed), Prâyaśchitta and Dâna.

Chapters 160 and 161 of the third section, which consists of 166 verses, give the praise of Îśvara, the other three give general remarks on Dharma.

Besides these three sections the following single chapters have been omitted by Kshemendra: —

Remarks		Number of verses
Chapters		
13	On the qualities of Kâya, Vâch, etc.	6
24	Sins equally heinous as Brahmahatyâ	12
46	Praise of women	15
47	On inheritance	61
49	On offspring	27
75	Rewards of Dama, Satya, etc.	42
97	Duties of a householder	25
105	Duties of young and old	19
108	On the Tīrthas	21
109	On fasting	17
110	On the relations between the limbs of the human body and the Nakshatras	10
150	On the prayer called Sâvitri	83
		338

By adding the number 338 to the number of the verses of the three sections we obtain 1119; as in the Mahâbhârata this Parvan amounts to 7796 verses, it follows that Kshemendra shortened it more than the Sânti Parvan, in which the proportion is nearly 1 to 9, or even 1 to 16, if we admit that the

Nârâyana-section did not belong to the original. This relation could only be attained for the Anuśāsana Parvan, if we assume the want in his original of about 700 verses out of those passed over by Kshemendra, but I do not see how this admits of exact proof.

2. The Divisions of the Mahâbhârata according to Kshemendra.

It is perhaps proper to add in this place some general remarks on the divisions of the whole of the epic, as compared with those of the summary. The Eighteen Parvans into which the Mahâbhârata is divided are found again in the Mañjarî, but the number is made up by separating the Gadâ Parvan from the Śalya Parvan, and by bringing the Śânti and Anuśāsana Parvans into one book. In the Devanâgarî MS. the Aishîka Parvan is separated from the Sauptika Parvan, and so we have nineteen Parvans. On the last folio of this MS. there is found an enumeration of the Parvans, written by an other hand, in which the number turns out to be twenty, the Anuśāsana Parvan being reckoned as a separate book, as in the current editions of the Mahâbhârata. But it seems, as if the writer had been afraid to give more than the orthodox number, and therefore he adds at the end of his calculation: — *atra gadâparvaṇâ saha śalyam 1, svargârohaṇena saha yânam* [i. e. *mahâprasthânikam*] 1, *evam* 18.

In spite of this remark I have little doubt that the division given by the Śâradâ MS., which separates the Gadâ Parvan and combines the Śânti and Anuśāsana Parvans, was an old one, perhaps older than the division given by our texts of the Mahâbhârata.

In favour of this opinion the following reasons may be given.

First, the Anuśāsana Parvan is only a continuation of the preceding, and has nothing to do with the leading story. The short account of Bhîshma's ascending to heaven, found at the end, could just as well stand at the end of the Śânti Parvan.

Secondly, the Anuśāsana Parvan is not known to the Hindus, who have emigrated to Java and Bali (Weber, Ind. St. II, 137).

Thirdly, in many MSS. of the Mahābhārata the two Parvans referred to form but a single book (Weber, Verz. Berlin. Hdschr. No. 389—391).

Fourthly, Alberûnî supports the same view in his account of the Mahābhārata (Sachau's Transl. I, p. 133).

Fifthly, I may adduce the fact that Burnell in speaking of the South-Indian recension of the Mahābhārata does not give the number of the chapters contained in the Anuśāsana Parvan. Unfortunately he does not explain this deficiency, but perhaps it was because this book did not exist in the Grantha recension (Aindra school, p. 77).

On the other hand the Gadâ Parvan is counted as a separate book in Burnell's MSS., as well as in different Devanâgarî MSS. (Weber, Verz. Berlin. Hdschr. I, p. 103 sqq.) and by Alberûnî.¹ This was the case too in Java and Bali.

¹ It is difficult to account for the omission of the Âdi Parvan made by the Arabian writer. I cannot agree with Prof. Weber, who is of opinion that this Parvan was unknown in Northern India in Alberûnî's time (Monatsb. Berlin. Akad. 1887, t. XLV, p. 910), as Alberûnî wrote nearly at the same time as Kshemendra who does give it. Perhaps Alberûnî was told by his Pandits that there were 18 Parvans, but that this number was not made out in the same manner every where. In thinking over the question he may have come to the erroneous conclusion that Âdiparvan, which signifies beginning book, was in reality not a separate book, but only another title for the first book, the Sabhâ-Parvan, as we can speak of Genesis or the first book of Moses. (J. K.) [I fully concur with Professor Kirste in his belief that the omission of the Âdi Parvan in the list of the sections of the Mahābhārata is due to a blunder of Berûnî, who, as I have shown in the Indian Antiquary, vol. XIX, p. 381 ff. is very inexact in his statements regarding Indian literature and languages. Professor Kirste's ingenious explanation of the omission is probably correct. The blunder, which it imputes to Berûnî, is very similar to others, which he doubtlessly committed. G. B.]

Additions.

P. 6. See now Mr. K. B. Pâṭhak's paper on Kumârila and Bhartṛihari in the Journ. Bombay Br. Roy. As. Soc., which together with another essay¹ on the references of Kumârila to the Jaina authors and of the Jainas to the Tantra-vârttika clearly proves that the great Mîmâṃsaka flourished in the first half of the eighth century or just about the time to which he was assigned conjecturally.

¹ Sent in to the late ninth International Oriental Congress.