USE OF THESES

This copy is supplied for purposes of private study and research only. Passages from the thesis may not be copied or closely paraphrased without the written consent of the author.
Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the Australian National University

The Development of the Story of Tulādhāra in the Mahābhārata with reference to the ideal of non-violence

Ian MacLeod Proudfoot
January 1977
Except where otherwise acknowledged in the text, this thesis represents the original work of the author.
ABSTRACT

The history of a conception like ahimsā presents problems of interpretation which can best be overcome by analysing a self-consciously developed tradition which embodies changing or differing views. The Mahābhārata comprises such material, but it cannot be validly employed unless segmented on grounds extrinsic to the issue under examination. Taking the story of Tulādhāra (Nbh.xii. 252-257) as a paradigm, a segmentation of the material on internal formal evidence proves feasible. From the analysis of that material conclusions are drawn concerning the character and history of the Mokṣadharma text tradition.

From a consideration of the material segmented into its historically separate components, light is cast upon some aspects of the evolution of the ideal of ahimsā. The analysis discusses the implications of the trader hero as an embodiment of disinterested non-involvement, and the association of the ideal of ahimsā with altruistic reciprocity, with brahmanic disputes over the proper form of the sacrifice, and with the virtue of cow-protection.
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Parameters of the subject

Ahimsā, "harmlessness", is a lexical form which covers a complex of ideas. It is not possible to give a precise definition of its meaning without having regard to the context in which it is used. Ahimsā may connote not causing injury, or not adopting an aggressive attitude, or not having an unstilled spirit which could produce aggressive emotions; it may imply not taking life, or not causing pain, or

1 Of the translations offered by MW (s.v. a-hinsaka, p.125) 'harmlessness' has the advantage of not prejudicing the distinction between 'non-injury' (the effect on the object) and 'non-injuriousness' (the quality of the subject), which may be analytically useful.

2 Etymology could not contribute much in any case, but especially not in respect of ahimsā. While the true derivation of hims- is from ā́hīs- 'verletzen' (Lüders, "Vedische heṣant, heṣa, heṣās", pp.774-778; Thumb, Handbuch des Sanskrit, vol.ii, p.271, § 506 n.2) the interpretation of hims- as a quasi-desiderative stem from ā́han may more closely reflect usage (Schulze, Kleine Schriften, p.545,n.4).


4 E.g. Manu 11.223 for ahimsā as a penitential discipline.


6 E.g. Mbh.iii.199,27-29; Manu 6.68-69.

7 E.g. Mbh.xii.269,5 where this is implied by the context. In the stanza refraining from himsā is equated with amicable behaviour (maitrāyaṇagātī) and opposed to acting with hostility (vairā) in any way.
not causing an apprehension of injury. It is not difficult to apprehend the area of meaning common to these definitions, but at the same time it will be evident that an adequate lexical treatment of the term would require that *ahimsā* - and its converse, *himsa* - be considered right across the range of its exemplifications: what ramifications has *ahimsā* as a principle of social morality? as an ascetic ideal? as a quality of sacrificial procedure? and so forth.

The application of a single lexical form in these various contexts is prima facie evidence that the activities and attitudes to which it is applied were perceived as having an essential element in common, as standing in at least a classificatory relationship to one another. To give more than a lexical sketch of

---

8 E.g. Mbh.xiii.116.12, 13, 25; 117.37-38 as the culmination of a discussion of reciprocal fearlessness (abhaya); Cf. Maitareya Samhitā 1.5.11 cit. Schmidt "Origin of Ahimsā", p.649, and Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1.4.16.

9 The ramifications of *ahimsā* as an ethical principle guiding interaction with others are spelt out in Mbh.xi.7.19-20, and 26*. The distinction between social and ascetic virtues is seldom clear-cut since both require suppression of egoistic passions, however recommendations of *ahimsā* as the foremost virtue for all classes (Manu 10.63), Yājñavalkya-dharmaśāstra 1.122 etc.) clearly mark it as a principle of social behaviour, as does its mention in Arth.1.3.13-14 and in Aśoka's inscriptions (e.g. Fourth Rock Edict as *avīhīsa bhūtanam*).

10 Ch.Up.3.17.4. See also the many dharmaśātri passages discussed by Schmidt, "Origin of Ahimsā", pp.636-640 with respect to the sannyāsin, vānaprastha and brahma-cārin.

11 That this is a special case is clear from Manu 5.44 which declares that injury caused in a sacrifice is not injury: *ya vedahīta hiṃsā...ahimsā eva tām...* See further below, p.50 and n.153.
the meanings of ahimsā however, it is necessary to take
cognizance of the value or practice it expresses in
relation to other elements of the institution involved.
Once the ambit of the investigation is thus redefined, the
complexity of the treatment increases exponentially. Each
of the institutions or areas of activity upon which the
concept ahimsā impinges has its own dynamic and its own
ambiguities. But furthermore, elements of each institution
are liable to interact with elements of others, and not
necessarily in ways which have any direct bearing on ahimsā.
Thus, for instance, the protection of the cow and
opposition to blood sacrifice may be seen as
exemplifications of the ahimsā value as it relates to two
institutions, but there are at the same time other relation-
ships between the values and roles associated with the cow
and the conduct of sacrifices: the cow is one of the
sacrificially fit (medhya) animals; it is the sacrificial
officiant's honorarium (dakṣinā) par

\[13\] I.e. man, horse, bull, ram, goat: RV.10.91.14; AV.11.2.9; TS.4.2.10.1-4; Śbr.6.2.1.15; 10.2.1.1
e etc., Aitareyabrahmana 2.5.
excellence; the produce of the cow, especially milk, is essential for sustaining the sacrifice in all its forms. Each of these relationships may be defined or explained without touching on any exemplification of ahimsa, but in terms of the cow's ancient role as a form of transmutable wealth having

Although dakṣiṇā may take many forms (AV.9.5.29; ŚBr.4.3.4.25-27, 11.1.3-7) and in practice for larger sacrifices may have involved payment in gold or coin (ŚBr.4.3.4.19-22; Mbh.xiii.337*9-13) the cow nevertheless seems to have been considered the ideal form of dakṣiṇā (ŚBr.4.3.4.7. stating that gold is only a convenient substitute for cows) which is accommodated in the ritual (ŚBr.11.1.6.22 etc.). Aside from historical reasons, the cow's preeminence may be attributable in part to its role as the daksīṇā of the larger sacrifices (ŚBr.4.3.4.2-3; cf.11.1.3.7; Renou, Vedic India, p.108; Heesterman, Royal Consecration, pp.162-166) or the role it plays in providing milk used in the sacrificial rites (ŚBr.14.3.132-35 offers this explanation).

See Renou, Vedic India, p.102, § 201 on the āgnihotra of which the milk oblation is an intrinsic part. In śraddha offerings, food prepared with ghee is preferred (as, e.g., Āpastambadharmasūtra 2.8.19-20) while the Viṣṇudharmasūtra 78.53, 80.12 declares that śraddha offerings of milk give the longest satisfaction to the ancestors, a view not current in earlier texts. Thus it comes to be said that cows alone make offerings to gods and ancestors (havya-kavya) possible (Mbh.xiii.75.21, 82.188d, Viṣṇudharmasūtra 23.58) and that by virtue of giving milk for morning and evening homa they sustain the sacrifice (Mbh.xiii.77.7cd-3.i-7 capitāḥ; goṣṭa yajñāḥ pratisthitāḥ; 80.2 - 2cd: dhurayani prajās cēmah jayāsan haviṣa tathā).

Finding its expression in the use of cattle as a unit of exchange. To the evidences of note 91 below should be added the famous soma-haggling of ŚBr.3.3.1.7 bargained in portions of cows and gold. See Bose, Social and Rural Economy, vol.1, pp.352-353, on units of exchange. The conversion of penances into cow-giving (sc. to brahmans) is a survival of the practice: Manu 11.128, 129, 131; Kane History of Dharmāśāstra, vol.4, p.127, gives śrutasūtra references. Similarly the idea that the gift of a cow may be transmuted into gold etc., Mbh.xiii.75.15. Cf. Sundara Ram, Cow Protection, p.76.
become institutionalized into an appropriately
unmercenary manner of paying brahman's fees, or in
terms of the notion of clean and unclean animal foods\textsuperscript{17}
and their suitability for consumption by both gods and,
concomitantly, men;\textsuperscript{18} or in terms of dietary
availability and economic constraints.\textsuperscript{19} But that
does not preclude each or all of these relationships
reinforcing or controverting the role of ahims\textsuperscript{a} with

\textsuperscript{17} The class of bhak\textsuperscript{a}ya foods (translated by Alsdorf, 
Vegetarismus and Rinderverehrung, p.573, as 'koscher') is defined in Manu 5.5-22ab. It encompasses the medhya animals (cf. Manu 5.17) but much else besides. The ritual distinction between medhya and bhak\textsuperscript{a}ya is not clear, for Manu 5.22 explicitly allows bhak\textsuperscript{a}ya animals and birds to be slain (vadh\textsuperscript{a}ya) by brahmans for sacrifices (yajn\textsuperscript{a}rtham) or to feed dependants. Offerings of bhak\textsuperscript{a}ya food are prescribed for the s\textsuperscript{r}addha: Manu 3.269-273, Vi\textsuperscript{g}\textsuperscript{n}udharma\textsuperscript{u}stra 80. Yet the force of ŚBr.1.2.3.9 (and Aitareyabrahm\textsuperscript{a}na 2.8) is that non-medhya animals (omedi\textsuperscript{h}ya) should not be eaten (e\textsuperscript{g}\textsuperscript{\acute{u}}m n\textsuperscript{a}\\\textsuperscript{s}ni\textsuperscript{y}at) at a sacrifice. Cf. ŚBr.11.7.1.2, which may imply the reverse.

\textsuperscript{18} Rām.2.95.31: yedannaḥ puruṣo bhavati tadaṁṣ
tasya devatāḥ, cit. Kane, History of Dharma\textsuperscript{a}stra, vol.iv, p.416, with references to quotations in later literature.

\textsuperscript{19} There is general agreement that the dietary resources of vedic times conditioned the kinds of offerings made: Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, vol.ii, p.147, excepting the horse sacrifice; Potdar, Sacrifice in the Ṛgveda, p.30; Renou, Vedic India, p.95; Oldenberg, Religion des Vedas, p.352; Schelrath, "Opfergaben", p.130, dissents. If this correlation is valid, it is relevant to observe that the dietary and productive role of cattle, especially with regard to providing meat or traction for ploughing is significantly different in a pastoral or mixed economy characteristic of vedic times (see note 132 below) as against the predominantly agricultural economy of classical and later times. See Harris, "Cultural Ecology", esp. pp.52-53, and compare the restrictions on cattle slaughter imposed during the 1944 Bengal famine, listed on p.57, with Gau\textsuperscript{t}amadharma\textsuperscript{u}stra 17.30.
respect to the cow or the sacrifice. When the dakṣiṇā cow acts as a substitute for sacrificial offering, for whatever original cause or motive, we observe a practice which has the potential for undermining the animal sacrifice rituals (either by providing an alternative procedure or by undermining the credibility of the sacrificial ritual itself) and which at the same time is relevant to the implementation of cow protection. Similarly, the notion that the cow supports the sacrifice with its products has in some contexts been proposed as a substitute for the notion that the cow is fit for sacrificial slaughter — making a bloodless cow-sacrifice feasible. Similar complexes of relationships between institutions in which the value ahīṁsā is exemplified will be met at every turn. In the upshot a picture emerges of a cluster of institutions in which the value of ahīṁsā is exemplified and a network of interrelationships linking the institutions but not necessarily intersecting with the focal value.

20 See below, note 136.
21 E.g. Mbh.xii.255.35-37, 260.27.
22 These will be discussed below, pp.26-61.
23 A study suggestive of the complexity of relationships towards which we must be sensitive is Gusfield, Symbolic Crusade. He describes the interrelationship between the ideological values of the quasi-religious temperance movement and prohibition legislation in the United States with a cluster of social, ethnic and political correlates which may prima facie have no intrinsic orientation toward the temperance question. See his general and methodological observations, pp.5-31, 112-116, 169-174.
It goes without saying that the configuration of relationships between institutions and ideologies clustering around ahimsā will not have remained unchanged across time, or from place to place.\textsuperscript{24}

Descriptive techniques

The relationships linking institutions and practices associated with ahimsā are not only potentially exceedingly complex, but they are open to treatment by alternative modes of description. So, for instance, some of the confusion abounding in accounts of the roots of the value and practice of ahimsā has arisen from a failure to distinguish between historical and non-historical modes of description. Thus when in Gonda's Religionen Indiens we read:

\begin{quote}
Der auf die Dauer einflußreichere asketische Standpunkt wird aber, anfangs gewiß nur in engeren Kreisen, daneben laut: man bringt die Opfer im Geiste oder mit 'vegetarischen' Substituten dar ...: Brahmanen dürfen kein Fleisch essen. Es scheint, daß diese Ahimsā-Praxis, die Schonung alles Lebens, das freundliche Mitgefühl allen
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{24} So, by way of illustration, in more recent times new elements have entered the configuration of relevant institutions, with the cow having become a symbol expressing Hindu-Muslim communal tensions and conflicts between traditional values and secular modernization: see Parel, "Political Symbolism", and Leitner's two articles on cow-killing riots. Further, Krishnaswamy, "Hindu-Muslim Riots": Sundara Ram, Cow Protection, pp.8, 93-94; and note Gandhi, How to Serve the Cow, pp.3-4, 19.

The better documented circumstances of the cow's political and cultural symbolism in recent times illustrates not only how the elements involved may change according to historical conditions, but must also underline the fact that links between social or political issues and overtly religious values may be indirect but no less potent on that account.
Lebewesen gegenüber, die den späteren Generationen als Eckpfeiler von Indiens Moral, als Haupttugend seiner Menschlichkeit erschien, sich von der Kuh aus auf die anderen Tiere ausgedehnt hat. Dabei wird betont, daß ein wohlwollendes Verhalten des Geschöpfen gegenüber (Adroha) den Zustand von Ruhe und Sicherheit (Abhaya) herbeiführt, der den Menschen in Frieden und Harmonie mit seinen Mitgeschöpfen leben läßt.25

Alongside:

... der Vegetarismus [ist] ein Ausfluß der Ahimsa-Idee, des Glaubens an die Gegenwart Gottes in allem Lebendigen und der damit verbundenen Ideale des aktiven Wohlwollens (Maitri), des Mitleids (Karma) und des Altruismus.26

It appears that we have divergent statements concerning the motivation for and origins of the practice of vegetarianism. One aspect of the inconsistency becomes clearer when we look at a passage by Alsdorf in similar vein:

Wann wir oben feststellten, daß die Ahimsā ursprünglich mit Ethik [sic] in unserem Sinn nichts zu tun habe, sondern ein magisch-ritualistisches Tabu auf das Leben sei, so widerspricht dem natürlich nicht, daß die Inder ihr doch schon bald die auch heute noch gültige ethische Begründung unterlegten. Im Manu ist davon wenig zu spüren, umso mehr tritt sie in unserem Mbh-Traktat hervor. Ihr Haupt-Leitsatz ist das atmaupamya, das Den-Andern-gleich-sich-selbst-Achten; ...27

Although Alsdorf does not explicitly state this, it is clear that he is distinguishing between a diachronic account of ahimsā which would trace the evolution of institutions back through time, and synchronic accounts of ahimsā describing the relationship between

25 Gonda, Religionen Indiens, p.315.
26 Gonda, Religionen Indiens, p.349. Note that in his "Mensch und Tier", p.114, Gonda takes up yet another position, roughly consonant with that of Hopkins quoted below.
27 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.589.
institutions or ideologies which is evidenced at a particular time - in this case in the period of the later epic literature. Using Alsdorf's implied distinction we are able to explain one aspect of the divergence in Gonda's statements: while the first statement speaking of the increasing influence of ascetic practice and the extension of the ahimsā principle from the cow to other animals is clearly a diachronic statement, his later characterization of vegetarianism as a by-product or outgrowth (Ausfluß) of the ahimsā ideal may be taken as a synchronic statement, and indeed it occurs in the context of a series of timeless generalities defining the essence of Hinduism.

Some ramifications of the distinction between these modes of description may be elucidated by considering a quotation from Hopkins on the same issue:

The Brahman soon rose above the old savage notion that "the eater will hereafter be eaten by the eaten", as a reason for not killing animals. He began to see life as a whole and ... he declared that "to take oneself as the norm" in ethics was the inevitable corollary of "every soul is part of the All-soul" in philosophy. Love they neighbour as thyself, in a new interpretation, became his rule. Moralizing his law of retribution he turned it for himself into a law of mercy. As I suffer (said he), so suffers the one whom I hurt; and the animal pleading for life suffers as well as the man injured and dying. To injure this other life, which in reality is one with my life, as both our lives are one with divine life, what could be more sinful?28

It will be noticed that Hopkins refers to the same justification of abstention from meat eating as was

28 Hopkins, Ethics of India, p.231.
mentioned by Alsdorf in the quotation above, but that Hopkins places it in an historical framework, implying that the atmaupamya conception arose as a rationalization of non-injury. Alsdorf does not commit himself on whether the atmaupamya conception arose as a rationalization of ahimsā or whether it has come to be adduced by later thinkers in support of ahimsā. Gonda in his first statement sees the conception of man’s participation in nature as a reinforcement of the abstention from meat eating, and in his second statement implies that it is the source of the practice. Thus all four statements agree that a relationship between these elements exists, but each differs in assessing the causal impact of one element upon the other. Since all four statements describe virtually the same material, we are led to the conclusion that the description of relationships between practices and/or values has no inherent causal signification. When Manu says:

Meat can never be obtained without injury to living creatures, and injury to sentient beings is detrimental to (the attainment of) heavenly bliss; let him therefore shun (the use of) meat.29

it is purely a matter of interpretation whether this statement is taken as a rationalization or an explanation for abstention from meat eating. The distinction rests solely upon which element in the equation the analyst chooses to invest with logical priority.

29 Manu 5.48 (trans. Bühler):

\[
\text{नकर्त्वा प्राणिनां हिंसाम् मांसम् उत्पद्यते क्वाचित्} / \\
\text{ना का प्राणिवधात् स्वार्यास् तस्मान मांसम् विवर्जयत्}\
\]
When, therefore, Gonda in his second statement implies a causality in deriving the practice of vegetarianism from the conception of the in-dwelling ātman, we are entitled to recognize this causal nexus as the product of the proclivity of a student of the history of ideas to view principle as expressed by practice, to explain the less abstract in terms of higher abstraction. In adopting this mode of description Gonda shares the company of the composers of parts of the didactic portions of the Mahābhārata, who set out to elucidate moral principles by depicting practice. As against this, others might elucidate practice with ideology. Anthropologists and the authors of the Brāhmaṇa texts tend for different reasons to view ideology as a justification or rationalization of practice.

The conclusion is, then, that the ascription of causal value to relationships between elements of an institutional or ideological complex is a technique of description. It is useful as a means of cutting the Gordian knot of inextricable interdependencies by bringing to bear an extrinsic principle of descriptive organization which will allow an analytically satisfying account of the network; but it is only an expedient.

Approaches to historical description

The publication of Alsdorf's study Beiträge zur Geschichte von Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung in Indien and the article by Schmidt on "The Origin of

For details of publication etc., see Bibliography.
Ahimsa, which it provoked, has brought discussion of the historical evolution of the ahimsa ideal to a new level, not only by suggesting some tentative conclusions, but also by providing a coherently organized sample corpus of materials and a framework of reference upon which future studies may be nurtured in their early stages. There is little point in traversing again the materials they have collected and used in support of their historical observations. Rather, with future considerations of the evolution of the ahimsa ideal in mind, it will be more constructive to comment upon some of the problems of interpretation which are manifested in these two studies. In doing so, we may be assisted by bearing in mind the observations set down in the preceding pages.

A. ALSDORF: A PRIORI IMPUTATION OF CAUSALITY

The modest title of Alsdorf's work belies the fact that he does in fact discuss the history of the ahimsa ideal under the guise of discussing vegetarianism.

Opening his argument, Alsdorf uses contemporary materials to explain the relationship between the ahimsa ideal, vegetarianism and cow protection. He presents the ahimsa ideal as the motivation of various actions involving either kindness to animals or the refusal to take animal life, and points to vegetarianism (defined as abstention from meat) as the

31 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, pp. 539-561.
most striking and economically telling consequence of
the ahimsā ideal. On the basis of this relationship, he proceeds to treat vegetarianism as the expression
par excellence of ahimsā. Shifting to consideration of historical data, Alsdorf points out that the two "reform religions" placed great stress on the ideal of ahimsā. However examination of the earliest sources shows that both Buddhist and Jain monks, although strongly enjoined to practice ahimsā, were permitted to consume meat so long as they were not the cause of the killing necessary to provide it. From this observation, Alsdorf draws the conclusion that ahimsā originally had nothing to do with ethics in the western sense, but was rather based on a magico-ritual taboo on [the taking of] life which was egoistic in its application. Alsdorf goes on to imply that this is in fact the essence of ahimsā as manifested in vegetarianism by pointing out that the strictest observance of vegetarian diet can go hand in hand with ill-treatment of cattle and refusal, for instance, to put a cow in the death-throes out of its misery. Thus, Alsdorf concludes, to trace the origin of ahimsā manifested in vegetarianism we must seek the source of this taboo on taking life.

What assumptions are implied in Alsdorf's line of argument, and what effect have they had on the conclusions he has proposed?

32 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.559.
33 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, pp.561-71.
34 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.571.
35 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, pp.571-572, 609-610.
Alsdorf has not consistently distinguished between the imputed logical priority of description and a true causal relationship. By declaring that vegetarianism is inherently a consequence (Folge) of the ahimsā ideal, Alsdorf permits himself to assume that it is possible to hold a constant relationship between the two elements of the equation through time so that a statement about vegetarianism is ipso facto a statement about ahimsā. This identification runs unchecked through the whole of Alsdorf's argumentation, strongly moulding the way he deals with his data.

Rather than feeling obliged by the evidence concerning the Jain and Buddhist monks to reassess the one-to-one correspondence he had posited between vegetarianism and ahimsā, Alsdorf chooses to redefine the essential nature of ahimsā in accordance with the demands of the evidence. He infers that in essence ahimsā is a taboo on killing or causing death. By pointing to the seeming anomaly of the modern practice of vegetarianism going hand in hand with cruel treatment of animals, Alsdorf argues that in essence vegetarianism is a manifestation of the same taboo. On the basis of this surprising line of

36 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.559: "Die augenfälligste und wirtschaftlich einschneidendste Folge der Ahimsa...", p.572: "...der Ahimsa und ihrer vegetaristischen Konsequenz ...".

37 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.571, "... die eigentliche Natur der Ahimsa ...".
argument, Alsdorf concludes that the origin of the ahimsā ideal will be revealed by tracing the origins of vegetarianism.

The effect of Alsdorf's tenacity in holding to his assumptions is to limit severely the range of materials he considers useful for a history of ahimsā. This is most straightforwardly observable when Alsdorf passes over the whole question of ahimsā as a principle of social ethics, regarding it as a subsequent and for Alsdorf therefore subsidiary overlay of the original and essential concept. Schmidt too notes that Alsdorf does not take up discussion of ahimsā as the foremost obligation of the brahmanic renouncer, "obviously, because it does not furnish any material for the history of vegetarianism."  

The common ground between the two seems to rest in nothing more than Alsdorf's opinion of their irrationality or non-moral quality, implicit in his use of the word "Tabu". In the first place, Alsdorf observes the fact that his redefinition of essential ahimsā was forced upon him by the realization that adherence to ahimsā is not inevitably associated with the practice of vegetarianism. In place of concomitance, Alsdorf puts forward as common ground a lack of rationality or moral nature. Against this it may be objected not only that a shared absence is not a positive resemblance, but also that the determination of irrationality or non-moral character is very much a personal value judgment on Alsdorf's part: it cannot even be characterized as a western view of what comprises rational ethics. Given the Indian extension of ethical values to the animal kingdom, the refusal to hasten a cow's death (cited by Alsdorf, p.15) raises precisely those issues under debate in the West in connexion with euthanasia or abortion. The implications of the issues are lucidly set out in Sinha, "Ahimsā: an analysis", pp.252-254.

38 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.571.
More subtle and perhaps more insidious is the effect wrought on the core of Alsdorf's treatment, the consideration of Manu 5.5-56. This section of Manu's lawbook deals with rules governing permitted and forbidden foods. Alsdorf partitions it into three sections: the first describing clean and unclean foods, the second dealing with meat-eating at sacrifices, and the third enjoining absolute ahimsā and total abstinence from meat-eating. In the sequential juxtaposition of these three inconsistent and sometimes contradictory passages, Alsdorf sees a fossilized record of an historical sequence of ideas.

He supports this conception by pointing out that the first section is also represented in older dharmasūtras whereas the last section embodies the view espoused in later commentaries and legal digests. Alsdorf asserts that the rules concerning clean and unclean food have no relevance for the history of vegetarianism. He establishes this by appealing to the Judaic (1) tradition to prove the lack of any necessary connexion between the two; and from the inference that there is no necessary connexion Alsdorf rules out a direct causal connexion and concludes that there is no historical connexion.

41 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, pp.572-577.
43 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, pp.577-578, 585, 597-601.
44 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.572, n.2.
sections of Manu 5.5-56 he therefore finds diametrically opposed values: the first having no relevance to the history of vegetarianism and permitting meat-eating both sacrally and otherwise; the third strongly championing abstention from meat-eating under all circumstances. Alsdorf conjures up the image of a collision between the newly emerging values of vegetarianism-cum-ahimsā and the conservative inertia of tradition.45 The second section, which permits meat-eating only at sacrifices, Alsdorf sees as an ad hoc expression of a compromise position.46

Alsdorf's evaluation of Manu 5.5-56 invites two observations:

First, Alsdorf makes nothing of the fact that the author of Manu saw all the rules as having an element in common:47 all are concerned with governing the consumption of food. If nothing else this is suggestive of how practice may be instrumental in creating linkages between ideologically unrelated institutions. However because of his commitment to a simple causal relationship between vegetarianism and ahimsā, Alsdorf is precluded from exploring more subtle patterns of multiple causation; his a priori assumption itself provides the rationale for putting such possibilities out of mind.

45 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.574.
46 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, pp.574-575. The same view is taken by Vora, Evolution of Morals, p.227.
47 Cf. Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.573, n.2, last sentence.
Secondly, Alsdorf’s view that in Manu 5.5-56 we see the institution of vegetarianism moving into alien territory denies him the opportunity of considering whether or to what extent the "ancient doctrine" that killing in the sacrifice is not killing might have played in the history of ahimsa and of vegetarianism. Schmidt’s treatment of the question reveals how fundamental and debilitating this omission is: the doctrine, after all, implies that in the institution of the sacrifice too there was recognition that life taking was to be avoided. Since this doctrine is even on Alsdorf’s confession ancient, predating Manu (it figures as a persistent theme running through the Brahmana texts), the fact that Alsdorf’s a priori limited field of argument allows him only to note in a subordinate clause that the allegedly compromise view set out in the second section of Manu’s passage simply happens to be facilitated (erleichtert) by this doctrine shows up the serious shortcomings of his approach.

It will have emerged from this survey of Alsdorf’s argumentation that by defining at the outset on synchronic grounds the configuration of relationships which he will trace through history, he has left no room for his investigation of historical data to refine or redefine the relevant configurations of

48 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p. 574: "die ... uralte Lehre".
50 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p. 574.
relationships. He has effectively blinkered himself into pursuing relentlessly a unilinear evolution through time. The limitations inherent in this approach are well illustrated by the conclusions which Alsdorf offers concerning the origins and the cause of the rise to prominence of the ahimsā ideal. By locking himself into a single causal bond he has excluded the possibility of invoking extrinsically motivated changes in practices or values, for to do so would carry with it the implication of multiple causation. He is therefore reduced to pursuing his strait path as far as the data will allow, and then crossing the threshold of the unknown or unattestable. Thus for the origin of vegetarianism and therefore ahimsā, Alsdorf falls back on the Indus civilization, the main qualification of which appears to be that because of the lack of any decipherable literary documentation we have no access to its thought. As the motive or cause of wider application of the practice of vegetarianism and adherence to the ideal

51 The same observation applies a fortiori to a Levi-Straussian structuralist study of the kind mounted by O'Flaherty, Asceticism and Eroticism, which is fettered in carefully forged shackles of the author's own making. With the assumption that one can discover "the key to the Hindu world view" (p.1: my emphasis), the study is prejudiced at the outset when it is launched by imputing a central paradox (pp.4-11) and setting out the categories of conception which the mythological material will be made to illustrate (pp.23-30). It is therefore no surprise to find that the conclusion in the last chapter (pp.314-318) amounts to a restatement of the assumptions set down as the basis of analysis in the first chapter.

of *ahimsa* Alsdorf proposes only the effect of "einer gemeinsinndischen Geistesbewegung". Not being further defined, this is no explanation. In accordance with the observations made in the preceding section, we can see that Alsdorf is extrapolating into the unknown on the basis of a principle of description the virtue of which lay only in its expediency for the treatment of known materials.

B. SCHMIDT: UNSTRUCTURED DESCRIPTION

The extent to which Alsdorf has preempted his own analysis is evident when his work is placed beside Schmidt's "The Origin of Ahimsa". Unlike Alsdorf, Schmidt does not set out to organize his material around a consistent theme or portray a pattern which will account for the evolution of the ahimsa ideal or of any aspect of its practice. Rather, Schmidt submits to the judgement of Manu: "I take as a starting point all the contexts in which the injunction of ahimsa is given by the Manu-Smrti - which reflects a fully developed ahimsa-doctrine - and try to trace them back to earlier sources." By adopting this tactic, Schmidt attempts to avoid prejudicing his analysis by questionable presumptions of his own making, and in this his method represents an advance on that of Alsdorf. In the result, Schmidt offers a less tightly structured (but not less logical) argument which provides more valuable and authentic insights into the topic.

---

53 Alsdorf, *Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung*, p.605.
It is by following Manu that Schmidt is led to place the injunctions of ahimsā on all brahmans and with special insistence on brahmacārins and sāṃnyāsins side by side with statements that the sacrifice involves no injury. By filling out Manu's references with Brāhmaṇa material revealing that the sacrificial ritual was predicated on the need to avoid injury, Schmidt is led into fruitful speculation about possible links between the fundamental principles underlying the sacrifice and Manu's particular emphasis on ahimsā as a principle of renunciation expressed in the vow of the brahmacārin who has not yet mastered the ritual means of neutralizing harm and of the sāṃnyāsin who has renounced participation in ritual observances and has internalized the sacrifice.

However, the references to ahimsā in Manu are not sufficient to sustain the whole of Schmidt's argument. Looking for an explanation of the devaluation of the efficacy of the sacrifice and the rise of ahimsā as a principle of activity capable of being extended across the whole gamut of social life, Schmidt turns to consider the growth of the ideal of internalized sacrifice and the renouncer's aim of attaining release from rebirth. In doing so he is still considering realities attested by Manu; but in proposing explanations of their interrelationships he is obliged to make inferences quite unsubstantiated by Manu's text. This is not a flaw in Schmidt's management of his argument, for it is most improbable - indeed inconceivable - that any single text should have comprehensively described the social and ideological complexities which need to be accommodated in a
satisfactorily full account of the history of an idea or practice. It is to be expected that much will not be evident in Manu either because a dharmaṃṛti is neither a ritual handbook in the brahmaṇa style nor an inspirational manual of meditation like an upaniṣad, or because it occupies a certain place in time. Changing values are more likely to be spelt out circumstantially at a time when it is perceived that new relationships are being forged and require rationalization or propagation: it would appear that the conception of transmigration and the option of the renunciatory life as an alternative to the sacrificial tradition were settled matters by the time of the composition of Manu. Thus either because of its nature or its place in time, Manu may provide only vestigial records of settled position when an explanation must be couched in dynamic terms.

Nevertheless as soon as Schmidt moves beyond mapping out interrelations between institutions associated with ahiṃsa by Manu, he loses Manu's authentication for his hypotheses. Thus while Schmidt's passive approach to setting up his study promised a more sensitive and authentic treatment than Alsdorf's more structured approach, Schmidt too is ultimately forced into making the same kind of analytical decisions which governed Alsdorf's treatment from the beginning. Since it is precisely in evolving explanations which will give coherence to the collected data that Schmidt ventures beyond Manu's testimony, we may wonder whether Schmidt's technique has achieved much in putting explanations for the rise of ahiṃsa on a firmer footing.
These qualms are not allayed by consideration of Schmidt's conclusions as against the evidence of Manu. In the final sentences of his article, Schmidt states:

The primitive idea of the inverted world..., where one suffers the same fate one has caused to other beings, and the transmigration doctrine, both of which Manu adduces in order to justify the injunction of ahimsā will however have contributed more to the spread of 'non-violence' than any ethical motive. The ethical motivation is secondary, the original motive was fear, a fear that resulted from the breakdown of the magico-ritualistic world-conception, but paved the way for establishing higher virtues.55

It may immediately be remarked that Schmidt confounds synchronic and diachronic description in labelling the ethical motivation of ahimsā "secondary". The fact that Schmidt's argument has suggested that fear of the inverted world is older than the ethical justifications which Manu gives ahimsā gives no ground for concluding that the ethical motive has contributed less to the spread of non-violence. Indeed Manu 5.45-56 strongly suggests that for the compiler of Manu the ethical motivation for ahimsā in its special application was paramount;56 Manu mentions the motive of fear of retribution only through the peculiarly indirect means of recording the folk etymology of maṁsa (meat).57 Thus we see that Schmidt's hypothesized development of the ahimsā ideal seems to say one thing, while Manu says another. The two are not necessarily

56 Manu 5.45-49, 52.
57 Manu 5.55.
incompatible if a distinction is made between diachronic and synchronic descriptions, and allowance is made for changes in patterns of relationship through time. But Schmidt does not observe such a distinction, and we therefore find that he is prepared to back his own inferences against the overt testimony of Manu.

Whether or not Schmidt’s rejection of Manu’s testimony on the ethical justification of social ahimsa has been executed validly, it may nevertheless be correct. As Schmidt demonstrates, the relationships from which he constructs his historical explanation are evinced in other texts. Since the Manusmriti has a particular outlook and belongs to a particular time, there is no inherent reason why Manu should be the arbiter of historical developments for all time. Schmidt is therefore not precluded from giving the ascetic tradition primacy over social values in his historical explanation. However since the same circumstances which limited Manu’s influence must also apply to any text or class of texts from which Schmidt has inferred his hypothesis of historical development, we are left to wonder what has given his interpretation sufficient strength positively to override the testimony of Manu.

With this question in mind, we may weigh the cogency of Schmidt’s interpretation against two factors. Beside the dharmasutra, the evidence of which could be used to support the claims of either renunciatory or social ahimsa, Schmidt draws his inference from the evidence of the upanisads. The upanisads are of course
preeminently the texts of renunciatory asceticism. 58

In accounting for the change which brought prominence to the ahimsā ideal in fields of life outside the sacrifice, Schmidt proposes as the first cause the rise of the idea of a chain of rebirths, and the renouncer's desire to break out of this chain. Again the upaniṣads are his source for this association of ideas. 59 However Schmidt does not show that the rise of this new conception was itself intrinsically linked with the ascetic tradition; he is able only to show that it receives its first mention in such a context. Nor is any intrinsic connexion obvious. As the idea of rebirth has obvious ethical applications it might equally well be hypothesized that it arose as a new social philosophy rationalizing disparities of wealth or a crystallizing social structure. Prima facie such a suggestion certainly has no more strength than Schmidt’s hypothesis, but the fact that it can be credibly proposed at all shows that it may indeed be possible to turn Schmidt’s assessment of what are primary and secondary motivations for ahimsā on its head.

In view of these qualifications of Schmidt’s conclusions, it may be doubted that Schmidt’s technique of analysis has in the end been able to place the explanatory element of his hypothesis on a firmer theoretical footing than Alsdorf achieved;


which is not to say that Schmidt's treatment is not more credibly handled.

Elaboration of complexes surrounding ahimsā

A. ASSOCIATIONS IN A LIMITED CORPUS

The inherent selectivity of a description which takes Manu's usage of the term ahimsā as its point of departure is nowhere more evident than in the resulting neglect of all consideration of the special position of the cow. In contexts other than Manu, cruelty to cows and their slaughter are depicted as the most heinous infringements of the ahimsā principle. Even though Manu and other lawbooks hint at some such association of ideas, because the word ahimsā is not used in these contexts it is questionable whether any connexion should be drawn between the attitude to cows and the ideal of ahimsā so far as the dharmasūtrā literature is concerned. Manu's reticence

60 See below, pp.539-54; relating to Mbh.xii.257.17-38; Mbh.xii.257.3; xiii.73.3-4.
61 Manu ii.80, on the great virtue of saving the life of a cow or a brahman.
62 Note Baudhāyanadharma-sūtra 2.2.4.21, cit. Schmidt, "Origin of Ahimsā", p.633 and n.3, on cruelties perpetrated against bulls and cows in the service of man. A similar passage appears at Vasiṣṭhadharma-sūtra 2.32.
63 Schmidt rightly refrains from relating the virtue of cow-protection in Manu 10.62 with the mention of ahimsā as the foremost dharma incumbent upon all four classes in 10.63.
in this area is valuable as one datum to be considered alongside others; but the notion that his reticence should act as a restriction on the scope of a treatment of the history of ahimsā has no obvious recommendation. Once the potential relevance of attitudes to the cow is accepted, it follows that it is desirable for any general study of ahimsā at least to touch upon the matter. That much may be said without prejudging the question of whether the idea of the sanctity of the cow has contributed to the development of the ideal of ahimsā or the ideal of ahimsā has contributed to the concept of the sanctity of the cow; and without assuming that the relationship between these institutions has been constant through time.

It is worthwhile lingering over the question of cow protection, not merely as an illustration of Manu's limitations, but because it is a subject which has attracted rather more scholarly attention than other reaches of the ahimsā complex and which, perhaps as a result of this attention, throws into relief problems of analytical procedure.

While the concept of ahimsā as an ideal has been most readily defined by appearances of the lexical form, the concept of the sanctity of the cow would seem more readily to lend itself to definition in concrete terms. Without a lexical crutch to lean on, we have the task of laying down an a priori working definition of what should be taken to indicate an aura

---

64 Crooke, "Veneration of the Cow"; Muusses, *Koecultus bij de Hindoes*; Brown, "Sanctity of the Cow"; Alsdorf, *Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung*. 
of special sanctity surrounding the cow. If, fulfilling this requirement, we propose to accept evidence of specific injunctions against killing the cow or eating beef, then in the use of the word agn̄ya in the Rigveda and the Atharvaveda we have something of potential significance. Later scholiasts and traditional scholars have almost universally taken the word to mean 'not to be killed'. For them this word alone gave the authority of Revelation (śruti) to the doctrine of the inviolability of the cow. Nevertheless there is some doubt over whether this later understanding of the word precisely accords with its literal meaning or its signification in the vedic texts in which it appears.

Neither the etymological derivation of this word nor the contexts in which it is used allow any confident statement about its meaning, signification or connotations. Because agn̄ya is an unexpected form of gerundive derived from /han some attention has been

65 The telling exception is Yāska's Nirukta, the gloss closest in time to the vedic texts themselves. Yāska ambivalently offers both the conventional interpretation and the suggestion that agn̄ya is a haplological form meaning aghagn̄i "destroyer of evil": Nirukta 11,43. Cf. Bailey, "Dvarā matinām", p.48; Schmidt, "agn̄ya-", p.1; Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, vol.ii, p.772.

66 Mbh.xii.254,45, cit. Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.622, n.3.

67 The RV. also has hantva, but only once: Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rigveda, col.1646. The unstable intonation āgn̄ya/agn̄ya is not significant: see inter al. Knauer, "Betonung der Composita", pp.45-46, 65.
given to exploring the possibility of alternative derivations.

Bailey has argued for a derivation from the proto-Indo-European root signifying "schwellen, strotzen, Fülle". The masculine form aghnya he invests with the connotation 'exuberant', paralleling with it what he claims are cognate forms ahanya and ahana.

Weber too has associated aghnya with the last two forms. Pointing to the metaphorical identification of cows and the rays of dawn embodied in the ambiguity of uṣrā, uṣryā, he has unsuccessfully proposed that in accordance with the conventionally accepted

68 Bailey, "Dvārā maṭinām", p.46. He refers to the cognate form aghnya occurring once in the Zend-Avesta, Yasna 38.5. For the PIE root, see Pokorny, Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, p.491, s.v. 1.ghñen. Bailey has the initial a- not as privative but as a reflex of PIE *o-, cf. Pokorny, ibid, p.280, s.v. e, o, and Mayrhofer, Etymologisches Wörterbuch, vol.1, p.84, s.v. ahanāh.

69 The derivation of ahan is from PIE *agh-er- or similar forms with the palatalized gh (Pokorny, Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, s.q.v., p.7) the reflex of which in Sanskrit is regularly ḷ (Thumb, Handbuch des Sanskrit, vol.1, p.286, § 124), Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, vol.ii, p.146, brand the derivation "illegitimate".

As Schmidt notes in another connexion: "Auffällig ist, daß die mythischen Kühe par excellence, die Morgenröten, nicht aghnya genannt werden" ("aghnya-", p.42).
derivations of ahanyā and ahanā, 70 aghnyā too, as a cognate form, should carry connotations of brightness and light.

Even when Weber’s etymology is rejected, and Bailey’s is put aside as speculative, 71 the matter is not settled, for the derivation from ṣ han has itself attracted divergent interpretations. In the face of the conventional wisdom, Schmidt has proposed that aghnyā is better construed not as a gerundive form but as the mark of a secondary adjectival or substantival

70 As, e.g., at Weber, Indische Studien, vol. 17, p. 307.


71 Neither Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p. 623, nor Schmidt, "aghnaya-", p. 5, are willing to concede more than this. Both throw doubt on his etymological hypothesis, but neither notes that the elision of the stem vowel seems to support the ṣ han derivation. See the secondary formations listed by Pokorny, Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, s.v. 1, 2 gāhnen-, p. 491, and Thom, Handbuch des Sanskrit, vol. 1, p. 243, § 88.

A flaw in Bailey’s argument is that he gives the Avestan agānaya equal weight with all the RV and AV occurrences of aghnya. For the deduction of a prototype form by the comparative method this is valid, but when it is a case of contextual inference upon which to choose between derivation from homophonous prototypes the inference from a single item loses its unique authority.
Such a construction would produce the meaning "durch Nichttötung charakterisiert".\textsuperscript{73}

The next stage in our march into uncertainty comes with the realization that even if the etymology and the formation of the word were settled, and hence its literal meaning known, there would still be disagreement over its signification. Schmidt notes that his proposed literal meaning 'characterized by not-killing' may be understood as litotes signifying either that cattle are the tame animals par excellence, contrasting with wild animals in not being dangerous to men, or alternatively that the cow and the bull preeminently provide the life force, which distinguishes them from destroyers of life.\textsuperscript{74} And on the other side, among scholars who have accepted the gerundive construction of $\text{aghnya}$, there have been several interpretations of the signification of the meaning 'not to be killed', all attempting in one way or another to accommodate to the well attested vedic custom of slaughtering cows for sacrificial and other purposes. Should the word, then, be taken to signify 'difficult to overcome', applying in the first instance to bulls

\textsuperscript{72} Either (a) by adding privative $\text{a-}$ to $\text{*-ghnya}$, an abstract noun stem derived from the verbal stem, giving $\text{*aghnya}$ 'not-killing', which may be construed as a bahuvrīhi 'characterized by not-killing'; or (b) by similarly generating a verbal noun $\text{*aghna}$ 'not-killing', from which by secondary derivation the adjectival form $\text{aghnya}$ 'characterized by not-killing' may be generated. Schmidt, "$\text{aghnya-}$", pp.44-45.

\textsuperscript{73} Schmidt, "$\text{aghnya-}$", p.44.

\textsuperscript{74} Schmidt, "$\text{aghnya-}$", p.45.
and only by extension to cows? or, 'impossible to be killed' alluding to the notion that a sacrificial victim's life is not taken but is transported to the next world? or, 'which should not be killed' in an optative sense? In this last case, should the exhortation be given reference to profane killing only? or to economically valuable milch-cows only? or might it reflect an ideal general precept which was honoured only by a certain school of brahmans?

75 Böhtlingk and Roth, Sanskrit Wörterbuch, s.v. ághnya, vol.1, col.45-46. Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, vol.ii, p.146, n.13, accept this explanation as quite possible; Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.622, regards it as very improbable.

76 Keith, Veda of the Black Yajus School, p.9, n.1, on T.S. 1.1.9 d. Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.623, favours this interpretation; Schmidt, "aghnya-", pp.7-8, elaborates this interpretation, but at p.43 gives good reasons for abandoning it.

77 Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rigveda, s.v. (ághnya) ághnia, col.12; Mayrhofer, Etymologisches Wörterbuch, s.v. ághnya, vol.1, p.19, accepting the interpretation of Schulze (see note 80 below); Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p.151.

78 Muusses, Koecultus bij de Hindoes, p.6.


80 Schulze, Kleine Schriften, p.207; Mayrhofer, Etymologisches Wörterbuch, vol.1, p.19, s.v. ághnya, accepts this interpretation.

might it imply that cows are not to be slaughtered by ksatriyas but given to brahmans for sacrificial killing? 82

Attempts have been made to support most of these richly various interpretations by appeal to contexts in which the word is used in the Rgvedic and Atharvavedic hymns. And of course it may be possible to illustrate an interpretation from particular selected contexts, but it is not until all contexts in which both the feminine and masculine forms appear have been accounted for that we may speak of any valid contextual corroboration. 83 Although in Atharvaveda 10.9 the aghnya is pictured as the centrepiece of a sacrifice, there is no general contextual support for the notion that aghnya consistently stands in any particular relationship to the sacrifice, despite the implications of the above-mentioned interpretations.

In short, it appears that when all its occurrences are taken into account aghnya is not contextually

82 Schmidt, "aghnya-", pp. 7-8.

83 A single occurrence is sufficient to refute an interpretation. Note the dispute between Brown and Schmidt over whether aghnya in Atharvaveda 10.10.1 refers to a sterile cow, a potential refutation of Brown's application of aghnya to the milch-cow. (Brown, "Sanctity of the Cow", p. 33, 34 and n.18; Schmidt, "aghnya-", p. 5; Brown, "La vache sacrée", Annexe, p. 664.)

84 References to 'quieteners' (śamītāraḥ, AV.10.9.7) and cooks and cooking (paktāraḥ AV.10.9.7, 25; pacati, AV.10.9.4) make the killing and consumption of this cow unquestionable.
distinguishable from the most common word for cow, 85

In order to account for this indiscriminate usage but at the same time explain the etymology of the word, several scholars have proposed that agn̄ya should be seen as a kenning for ḡ (that is, an interchangeable poetic synonym used for the sake of variety or metri cause) which belonged to the Vedic mantra literature and did not survive as a living usage beyond that. Although by so doing, they are enabled to see agn̄ya as a fossilized evidence of some proto-Aryan attitude towards the cow, the fact that the word has become a mere kenning in surviving Vedic literature means that it has nothing to tell us about early Vedic society. Thus, despite its promise, agn̄ya has nothing more to tell us about the sanctity of the cow than we would

85 See Schmidt, "agn̄ya-", pp.41-42, noting that agn̄ya never applies to cows as dawn's rays, and p.45.

86 Gonda, "Epithets in the R̄gveda", p.245n. The idea of the kenning is implicit in the proposal of Böhtlingk and Roth (Sanskrit Wörterbuch, s.v. agn̄ya, vol.1, col.45-46) that the sense "schwer zu besiegen" has been transferred from the masculine to the feminine form, and also in the proposal of Brown ("Sanctity of the Cow", pp.32-33) that the reverse transfer is involved. Alsdorf (Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, pp.623-624) accepts the idea, proposed but subsequently abandoned by Schmidt as lacking credibility given the straightforwardness of agn̄ya construed as 'not to be killed' (Schmidt, "agn̄ya-", p.8). Dismissing Brown's proposal as unsubstaniatable (p.5), Schmidt nevertheless finally argues himself that agn̄ya should be regarded "als dichterisher Ausdruck", arguably credible given his obsolete, and hence obscure, derivation.
learn from a general study of the position of the cow in vedic literature.

So much scholarly attention has been lavished upon aghnya precisely because there is no unequivocal evidence in the vedic mantra material for a special sanctity attaching to the cow.87 In the thought-world

87 Kane, History of Dharmasastra, vol.ii, pp.772-773; Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p.151; Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, vol.ii, p.146; Hopkins, Religions of India, p.156; Sundara Ram, Cow Protection, p.38; Kane, History of Dharmasastra, vol.ii, p.772, all adduce passages as specific evidence of the cow's sanctity. Upon examination all require qualification. On RV.8.101.15-16 (ma gam anagam aditi vadhistha ... devam gam) see Geldner's note to his translation of st.16, with which Schmidt, "aghnya-", pp.5-6, concurs. Muusses, Kaeelstudis bij de Hindoes, p.5, offers an alternative qualification. The import of AV.2.26 is better conveyed by Whitney's headnote to his translation than the imputation of Sundara Ram. RV.6.28 is more credibly interpreted in the headnote to Geldner's translation than by Kane. In AV.12.4, 12.5, the reference is specifically to the brahman's cow, not the cow as such. The idea that gods reside in the cow's limbs, AV.9.7, 10.10.5, need not be as Muusses suggests (op.cit.,p.19) a forerunner of the puranic view, but may be one of a range of sacrificial identifications, cf. AV.9.4. Equally RV.6.28.5 must be shown to be more than poetical metaphor. Other passages, RV.4.1.6, AV.14.1.35 etc. are no more than allusions to the cow's beauty. For discussion of other passages, see Muusses, op.cit., pp.3-24. Of some significance may be the taboo against kicking a cow (AV.13.1.56) and the use of cow dung and urine as agents of ritual purification (AV.12.4.9, noting Whitney's commentary) and the role of the cow in cremation, as the anustarani (AV.18.3.4) or in the dressing of the limbs of the dead in cow-hide (AV.12.3.1, 18.2.58; RV.10.16.7, also Muusses, op.cit., p.60). Yet Brown is probably right to observe, "Yet in all this richness of reference to cattle there is never, I believe, a hint that the animal as a species or the cow for its own sake was held sacred and inviolable", "Sanctity of the Cow", p.31; also Hillebrandt, Vedische Mythologie, vol.ii, p.393.
and poetic imagery of the Vedic texts the cow certainly assumes a number of important roles clustered around the portrayal of the cow as a form of wealth, as a source of wealth, and a source of life and nourishment. The cow is the object of real and symbolic booty raids, and is a reckoning of property and value. It is a source of natural

88 RV.3.31.8-10, 5.63.5; AV.6.67.3; often conducted with Indra's assistance, RV.7.32 and 1.33.1, 1.91.23, 6.26.2, 6.59.7; associated with the search for Lebensraum (varivas): RV.6.44.18, 6.47.20, or watering places, RV.4.24.4.

89 Indra's gaviṣṭi is a theme of countless hymns, in which he liberates booty of cows, soma, the seven rivers, waters, horses, gold, plants and vegetables, the day, open air, sons and grandsons: RV.1.32.11, 12, 1.7.3-6, 2.12.3, 3.34.9-10, 4.41.6, etc. The booty is portrayed preeminently as cow-wealth (RV.9.22.7: vasu gavyani), especially cows which contain ripe milk (RV.6.17.6: pakvam), prototypically the ever-milking cow (RV.10.74.4). The gaviṣṭi is a frequent metaphor, as of soma seeking milk, RV.9.16.6. As the means of obtaining everything good, the gaviṣṭi has ritual and moral ramifications: the liberated cows are sought in order to provide dakṣinā and homa for sacrifices (RV.10.28.7, 4.50.5), and once liberated give milk for truth (RV.4.23.10: rātiyā ... duhātē) and, once released, run 'auf dem rechten Weg' (RV.10.108.11: yamtu rtena, trans. Geldner; 4.23.9).

90 That wealth in cows is reckoned the primary or sole form of wealth is evident in RV.6.28.1-7, AV.4.21: RV.7.56.17, 4.42.10, 19.38.2; AV.1.31.4, 10.6.33, 19.15.1. In other contexts it is mentioned alongside a wife (RV.10.34.13), horses (RV.1.48.2, 6.45.21) together with gold (RV.9.61.3, 3.34.9-10).

91 RV.8.1.5; buying 'Indra' for ten cows, RV.4.24.10; a reckoning of indebtedness, RV.4.24.1; but note other means of exchange in AV.4.7.6. See Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, s.v. kravya, vol.1, pp.196-197.
bounty of all kinds, and especially symbolizes as a bull generative power and as a milch-cow nurture. As the universal mother, the cow figures in the

92 Hence the figure of the omni-form milch-cow which satisfies all desires (viśvarupā dhenu kāmadugha, AV.4.34.8) by milking inexhaustibly. The imagery is usually metaphorical (RV.2.32.3, 9.31.5, 10.122.6) applying to the earth (AV.12.1.45) to Prśni the raincloud cow (RV.8.7.16), or to the sacrificial offering (AV.4.34.8, 18.4.32-34, with reference to a sheep in AV.3.29, a goat in AV.9.5.10); but occasionally a real cow may be intended (RV.10.133.7). Cf. Lommel, Alten Arier, p.113.

In RV.8.14.1-3 the cow is seen not only as a source of present bounty but also future wealth.

93 AV.3.23.4.

The cosmic bull has fury as his testicles and progeny as his virile member (AV.9.7.13); hence the bull as Parjanya the thundercloud who fertilizes the earth with the semen of his rain, impregnating all plants (RV.7.101.1-3, 5.83.1, 7, 9; 3.56.3, 1.160.3). See also Brown, "Creation Myth", pp.87, 93. Jacobi, "Cow (Hindu)", p.225a interprets AV.4.11 - with which RV.10.31.8 may be compared - as picturing the primeval ox as generative principle, but although the ox bears the world, its generative power is expressed only in the metaphor of milking (cf. RV.10.11.1).

However, this is not necessarily the predominant imagery associated with the bull: e.g. the identification with Rudra emphasizes the bull's roaring, his strength, his destructive, unassailable nature (RV.2.33.7, 8, 15; 1.94.10; 3.44.4).

94 For the cow as universal mother, AV.10.10,18,26; 4.39.2-8; RV.3.39.6, 6.50.7 (implicitly: viśvasya sthātur jagato janitrīp, 'die Mutter von allem, was steht und geht', trans. Geldner). Also Brown, "Creation Myth", p.93.

The cow and her calf provide a paradigm of attachment and kindness: RV.1.32.9, 2.34.8, 5.52.15, 9.105.2; AV.12.3.37; cf. AV.6.70.1. See also note 98; Lommel, "Mutter und Kind", pp.277-279.
cosmogony. As a maternal source of beneficial products the cow is identified with the earth; and similarly with the sacrifice and with mantras which bring wealth. Because she supplies milk, the cow is depicted as the supporter of the milk oblation; and

95 Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, vol. ii, p. 146; Jacoby, "Cow (Hindu)", p. 225 a; Agrawala, "The Four-Horned Bull", p. 30. RV. 4. 58. 4, 10. 61. 19; AV. 8. 10. 12-17, 8. 9. 24, 10. 9, 10. 10. Note also the idea of a bull and cow who assume all forms, RV. 3. 38; AV. 9. 7. 25-26; constructed by the Rbhus, RV. 3. 56. 2, 4. 33. 8, 4. 56. 3. However the cow is not invariably part of descriptions of creation, AV. 10. 7, 10. 8.

96 As the earth (virāj, prthivī, bhūmi): RV. 10. 73. 9; AV. 8. 10. 24, 12. 1. 9, 45, 59; from which all creation milks its subsistence: AV. 8. 10. 22-29; or as heaven RV. 9. 18. 5. In a few contexts the imagery is associated with agriculture: RV. 4. 57. 4-8, 10. 97-8; AV. 3. 17. 4, 9.

97 AV. 4. 34. 8, 18. 4. 32-34; see note 92 above.

98 Like cows, mantras have secret names: RV. 4. 1. 16. The mainsprings of the identification are, however, that like cows, mantras produce wealth: RV. 4. 41. 5, 1. 139. 7, 1. 164, 40-41, 8. 100. 11, 10. 101. 9; and that they sound like cows lowing to their calves (i.e. summoning the gods to whom they are addressed): RV. 6. 48. 11-13 (with Geldner's note to his translation), 8. 95. 1, 9. 12. 2; 7. 32. 22, 9. 94. 2, 10. 119. 4; cf. 9. 32. 5! Conversely the strong bond between a cow and its calf is reversed, making the mantras calves which unswervingly seek the cow (i.e. the god) to whom they belong and from whom they draw nurture: RV. 9. 100. 1 (and other references noted by Geldner at this place), 7. 18. 4, 8. 43. 17, 9. 61. 4. See also Schmid, "Die Kuh auf der Weide", pp. 1-6.

99 In the morning oblation, RV. 1. 164. 5, 9, 26-29; 6. 28. 1; for gharma AV. 7. 73, cf. AV. 4. 11. 5; for the ancestors, AV. 18. 2. 30. Also, as in note 89, RV. 4. 50. 5; 3. 31. 11. The point is repeatedly asserted that the cow produces cooked or ripe (pakva) milk: RV. 4. 3. 9, 10. 65. 6; 1. 62. 9, 3. 30. 14, 6. 72. 4, 8. 89. 7, etc., the significance of which seems to be that milk is unlike other foods which are not fit for consumption by men or gods in a raw state. For a survey of this usage, see Bourgaigne, *Religion védique*, vol. II, p. 83 and note 4.

On associations of the cow and ḫūja, the personification of the milk oblation, in the ancillary literature, see Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 124.

The cow is similarly linked with the soma offering, RV. 10. 49. 10, 10. 169. 3; also RV. 8. 69. 3, 6.
the pressing of soma is metaphorically portrayed as
the milking of a cow. In fact, milking is a
metaphor for producing any desirable product. The
cow's association with fertility and sustenance of life
carries over into the depiction of clouds whose
rain-milk nourishes the earth, and with waters,
which are a source of fertility awaiting liberation by

100 Since the soma-pressing involves the extraction
of a vivifying liquid which was mixed with milk
(RV.9.98.3, etc.; Schlerath, "Opfergaben", pp.133-
134) there is scope for a multiplicity of metaphors.
The soma juice is seen as a bright cow (RV.1.84,
10.11; 3.44.5) going to its calf (RV.9.13.7). The
soma juice is also described as bright milk (RV.1.
84.11, 2.13.1; also RV.9.19.5) especially as
produced from the Prāśi cow (many references listed
at Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p.125) or Tvāṣṭṛ's
wonder-cow (see Geldner's note to his translation
of RV.1.84.15). The stones which crush out the
juice are therefore cows (RV.9.99.3) or udders
(RV.8.1.17) and the pressing is equated with milking
(RV.9.72.6, 3.36.6-7). Throughout RV.9, soma is
repeatedly depicted as a roaring bull set among the
cows (sc. milk), more rarely being compared with a
horse (e.g. RV.9.6.5) for vigour and speed in
gaviḍi raids.

101 Thus dvah is used without reference to cows, e.g.
AV.3.17.4,9 of a furrow rich in milk; AV.12.1.45
of the earth; RV.8.52.4 of Indra milked by a
worshipper. Note also the soma-related imagery of
note 100.

102 RV.1.164.7; 2.34.5, 6; 3.55.16; AV.4.15.1, 5;
thunder is the lowing of the cow-cloud, lightning
is its calf: RV.1.38.8. The Maruts, storm-gods;
who are the sons of Prāśi the dappled storm cloud,
milk an inexhaustible cow for rain, RV.5.55.5;

103 RV.1.160.3, 2.34.10, 5.63.5, 6.70.1-5; AV.4.15.6.
Rain is milk tipped from a pail by the Maruts: RV.
5.53.6, 5.59.8; also RV.1.166.3. Rain is also seen
as ghee: RV.1.85.3.

104 Thus waters are described as cows: RV.9.108.6
(usriya apya ... gā[ḥ]), RV.7.23.4, or as milk: RV.
10.9.9; rivers run with milk: RV.10.75.4, 10.64.9,
7.36.6, or have milk as their foam: RV.1.104.4.
They roar and run together like cows: RV.8.70.4, 10.75.4,
1.22.2, and conversely cows run together like streams:
RV.1.32.12; 9.107.9, 1.112.18 (goānas,
Indra in his cosmic booty-raid against Vṛtra. There is also an identification with life-giving light, with Aditi, the unbounded heavens who is mother of the bright gods (devas), and especially with the dawn which brings the world to

105 The centrality of this phenomenon in the ṛgvedic Weltbild and its multifarious ramifications are evident from the survey of interpretations of the vedic mythology given by Dandekar, Vedic Religion and Mythology, passim. See also notes 89, 104, 109 and RV.4.58.4 in which the Panis hide the cow containing the cosmic seed.

106 Like cows, light is desirable booty: RV.9.76.2, associated with Lebensraum: RV.7.5.6, 5.80.2, and engenders wealth RV.5.80.3. Light moves like a sea of cows (goarāgas): RV.2.34.12, and the cows' ripe milk is identified with light and dawn: RV.3.30.14. Cows seek the light but are held in darkness by Vṛtra: RV.10.67.4. Note however that night is also a cow in RV.10.61.4, AV.19.49.8, and probably RV.3.55.11-12.

107 RV.10.63.3; 9.96.15 (with the note to Geldner's translation); 1.153.3, and Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p.122; Muusses, Keecultus bij de Hindoes, p.8; Jacob, "Cow (Hindu)", p.225a and n.; however note Brown, "Creation Myth", p.93n, who credibly remarks that the identification is only a functional metaphor and not of mythological significance. Aditi's milk is soma: RV.1.96.15,10.11.1.

108 This is sometimes implicit when the gods (adityas) are said to be born of Aditi: RV.8.94.2, 10.63.2 cf. AV.4.39.6. Elsewhere the gods are called gojata: RV.6.50.11, 7.35.14. Indra is born of the cow virṣaj: AV.8.10.12-17; or, born of a grṣti cow, is called garṣyaya: RV.4.18.10, 10.111.2. Agni is metaphorically born of a cow: RV.10.31.10. The Maruts are begotten by the bull Rudra and the cow Prāṣni: RV.2.34.2; RV.1.23.10, 5.52.16, etc., 6.66.1, 7.56.4, 8.20.8.

109 In connexion with being rescued from Vṛtra: RV.4.3.11, 6.17.5, 10.67.3; as opening up Lebensraum: RV.1.92.4; with the sun as a bull: RV.3.44.4; or the dawn-cow's calf: RV.1.164.17.
life and whose rays, like the cow-waters, stream forth when they are liberated from the dark underworld.

While the compass of this imagery is even wider than this survey has suggested, and while it is rich in implications touching the economic, social, political and religious dimensions of the early vedic Weltanschauung, it remains true that all the evidence adds up to nothing more than an abundant

110 RV.1.113.6, 4.51.5, 5.79.8, 7.77.1, etc. Cows low to dawn, who brings forth truth and goodness, RV.7.75.7, and all forms of wealth, RV.5.79; 7.41.7, especially wealth in cows and horses, RV.1.92.14, 1.123.12 - on the attribute gomati, see Gonda, Epiteths in the Rgveda, pp.103, 195.

111 RV.4.52.5. Usas, dawn, is frequently called mata gavam: RV.1.124.5, 4.52.2-3, 7.77.2, which, like gomati, may refer to her rays which are in some contexts indistinguishable from cows: RV.1.6.5 (usriyāḥ) trans. Geldner: "Kühe"; trans. Ludwig no: "morgenstrahlen"), 1.48.15, 1.92.12, 6.65.5, 7.79.2. On usriya, see Bergaigne, Religion védique, vol.1, pp.315-317. The dawn's rays stream forth from the darkness of Vṛtra's cave as cows: RV.4.1.13, 7.79.4; cf. 3.31.4. And cows draw dawn's wagon, RV.1.92.2, 5.80.3; cf. RV.7.75.6.

112 Note for instance the cow as the exemplification of rta, the order of nature, because of the regularity of her daily movements out to pasture and home to the stall at night (RV.9.66.12; 4.34.5, 6.61.1; cf. AV.7.75.2 and the note to Whitney's translation), her regular milking (RV.1.73.6, 1.4.1, 2.2.2.), and the reliability of her attachment to her calf (RV.10.149.4). For a later application of precisely this analogy with respect to karman, cf. MBh.xiii.7.22-23. The cow's identification with rta is also an aspect of the gaviṣṭi complex, cf. RV.5.45.7.
While Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, vol. ii, p. 147, fairly observe that "mythical considerations, such as the identification of the cow with earth or Aditi ... are, of course, much more than an effort of priestly ingenuity", the implied alternative is not necessarily veneration of the cow. That Vedic references to the cow are metaphorical rather than allusions to some cult of the cow is suggested by:

(a) the fact that in a hymn such as RV. 1.164 which continually refers to the cow, the cow exemplifies relationships focussed on other matters and there is no coherence in the references to the cow: st. 5, Agni or sacrifice as a calf; st. 7, cows as rainclouds issuing from the sun's head; st. 9, cow lowing to calf as a sign of longing associated with the morning sacrifice; st. 17, dawn as a cow, the sun her calf; stt. 26-29, the cow as milk and the calf the milk saucepan allegorizing the pravargya ceremony; stt. 40-41, the cow as a Mantra (ṛc) which provides bounty.

(b) the interesting observation by Gonda, Epithets in the R̄ṣiṣveda, p. 245, that while the cow figures largely in Vedic mythopoeic thought and figures frequently in similes, the cow itself is "strikingly poor" in epithetical attributes.

(c) the fact that cows are not consistently mentioned in normally appropriate contexts: RV. 1.89. 3-4, has rivers, mother earth and soma, but no cows; RV. 3.39 gives the sheep the cow's usual role of fulfiller of all desires (st. 2); RV. 8.47, devoted to the Adityas, mentions their mother Aditi but not as a cow; etc.

(d) cow metaphors or similes occur in apparently quite unmythological contexts: RV. 1.91.13, AV. 14.2. 53-58, etc.

Attempts to reduce the complex imagery of a cow-herding people to give 'cows' a single significance - as with Apte, "Allegorical Significance of the word 'cows'" and, less narrowly conceived, Brown, "Creation Myth", p. 96 - inevitably fail to do justice to the evidence. Conversely, neither is much fruit borne by Lommel's exculpation (Alten Arier, pp. 112-113) of myth as dream, in which consistency is not to be expected.

to suggest a degree of veneration which would qualitatively distinguish the cow from, for instance, the horse; and nothing to suggest that there was any taboo which would hinder the killing and consumption of the cow like other medhya animals.

Some time has been spent pondering the aghnya question and references to the cow in vedic hymns because the easily circumscribed boundaries of the corpus of material and the uncertainty attaching to it

114 (cont.) vaśām deva upa jīvanti vaśām manuṣya uta, trans. Whitney: 'On the cow the gods subsist; on the cow men also'.

The capture and guarding of cows is an important element in the articulation of ṛgvedic political structures. The image of chaos is cows without a herdsman: RV.7.18.10; while it is the gopīṭha who is able to bestow freedom from fear (bhaya) on his clients, RV.10.35.14. The Bharata host is called gavyan grāmāḥ: RV.3.33.11, 12; and there is a whole terminology of conflict and warfare compounded on go: gosu, gojit, gosan, gosuyadh, gopa, gokama, etc, not to mention gaviṣṭi. This influence penetrates into social organization in the gotra.

115 This will be evident from a comparison of the long entry "§ 60. The Horse" with the shorter entry "§ 61.A. The Bull ... B. The Cow", in Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, pp.148-151. While it may be true that the cow's range of metaphoric reference is more richly developed, and that the horse occasionally takes on functions primarily the cow's (thus RV.10.76.3, with soma as a goarnas of mare's milk; RV.3.7.2 calling mares milch-cows), nevertheless there is great significance in the fact that legendary horses are recognized individually and distinctively named in the vedic hymns, whereas cows or the cow appear only with a collective identity. The exception might be Prśni the cloud-cow, but her differentiation from other cows is functional rather than ideosyncratic. Lommel, Alten Arier, pp.118-124, would add Sabardugha and Visvarupa. Gonda's observation of the cow's remarkable poverty in descriptive attributes (see note 113 above) underlines this point.

Schmidt, "aghnya-", p.43, rightly states that "das Rind weder als das häufigste noch als das vornehmste Opfertier betrachtet werden kann", presumably with implied reference to the goat and the horse respectively. Note the hymn to the horse: RV.1.16.3.

116 See notes 13, 17 and 18 above.
promised to make transparent problematical aspects of
the treatment of the history of ideas. Let us now
spell out the lessons:

First, in the light of the fact that some analysts
have concluded that aghnya has no distinctive range
of connotations which would differentiate it from go,
the range of proposed interpretations put forward in
order to explain its alleged import represents a
striking warning of how arbitrary and uncontrolled
are the linkages between institutions which may appear
plausible to non-participants in an historical
culture. Should aghnya never have meant 'not to be
killed', the point is underscored.

Secondly, even though there is no evidence that later
manifestations of the cow's sanctity (viz.
abhorrence of cow killing and of beef eating) are
present in the milieu portrayed in the vedic hymns,
it is nevertheless clear that the cow was
significant in the vedic Weltbild. How far, then,
would it be justified to see here the seeds of
later cow veneration such as is evinced in the
Anusasananarvan 117 which need only time to germinate?

117 Mbh.xiii.70-82, 51.27-33, 68.6-12, generally in
praise of cows, describing the virtues of giving
them (sc. to brahmans), the ways in which cows may
be honoured, together with descriptions of goloka,
the highest heaven obtained by austerities performed
by a cow, which is accessible to good men who
honour cows. See further Ganguli, "Cattle Rearing",
pp.220-221; Jacobi, "Cow (Hindu)", p.226a;
Dikshitar, "A Note on Cow Veneration". Cows may be
worshipped with mantras(Mbh.xiii.App.I.No.14,243-
254), by devotional practices (Mbh.xiii.77.15), by
circumambulation (Arth.l.19.1), by feeding them or
making gifts for their use (Vasiṣṭhadharmsūtra
29.11). One must avoid disrespectful actions
Most of the explanations which invoke parallels for cow protection from other Indo-European cultures - most usually the early Iranian - seem to predicate some latent tendency in Aryan culture which although not fully manifest in Rigvedic society was destined to develop with the passage of time. The nature of this latent force and its modus operandi are not specified, so that it is difficult indeed to distinguish it from the pseudo-causality of the analyst's historical hindsight. In effect, it is merely another kind of mystification. True explanation of how the roots of later veneration came to fruition requires a

(Cont.) toward the cow (Manu 4.39, 48, 58, 59 and parallel passages; Mbh.xiii.App.I, No.14, 225-233; xiii.357*; Ram.2.1793*.1-2). One who so much as permits a cow to be killed rots in hell for as many years as there were hairs on her body (Mbh. xiii.73.4; cf. Manu 5.38). The cow pen is hallowed ground (Vasishthadharma sutra 22.12, Manu 5.124) and the cow is ritually pure (Manu 4.142, except perhaps for her mouth: compare Manu 4.209 with Visnudharma sutra 23.43). Cow dung is ambrosia (Mbh.i.3.174), the goddess Sri resides in it. Yet as if to emphasize that sanctity adheres in the cow herself, cattle-raisers are shunned (Manu 3.154, 10.92).

Specifically to Greek material well-known to classical scholars: Schulze, Kleine Schriften, p.207; Schlerath, "Opfergaben", pp.129-150; Bailey, "Dvāra matinam", pp.49.

Schlerath, "Opfergaben", pp.130-134; Muusses, Koecultus bij de Hindoes, pp.102-108; S. Ram, Cow Protection, pp.88, 79-82, 84; Bailey, "Dvāra matinam", pp.48-49 (not related to aghnya); Kambolykar, Athavavedic Civilization, pp.293-308; Jacobi, "Cow (Hindu)", p.225a; Ganguli, "Cattle Rearing", p.221; conversely there are many suggestively valuable insights in treatments of the Zoroastrian 'revolution' as a model in which pastoralism and settled agriculture interact on the moral and religious planes: see Zachner, Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism, esp. pp.34, 84-87, 101-102, 125-131. The testimony of Yasna 29,32 linking the protection of the cow to these social and economic conflicts is especially interesting: Thommel, "Die Klage des Rindes", and "Yasna 32".
description of changes which have impinged upon the old values to produce the new.

The detection and description of such changes will clearly not be feasibly based on the testimony of any single later text which records only some later generation's perceptions and memory of tradition. The shortcomings of such limited testimony were noted in connexion with Schmidt's reliance on Manu. Yet the alternative, a collection and exploration of all material relevant to the position of the cow in texts chronologically placed between the Rgveda and the time of the Anuśāsanaparvan of the Mahābhārata, will be either impracticable or insensitive, for reasons we discussed while dealing with Alsdorf's history of ahimsā and vegetarianism: beside the practical problem of logistics involved in assembling and synthesizing a great amount of material, there is the theoretical problem of defining what is relevantly considered and what is not.

B. ASSOCIATIONS IN AN UNLIMITED CORPUS

The full extent of this last problem, which bedevilled Alsdorf's treatment, is revealed clearly in connexion with the cow. Our survey of Rgvedic mythology and poetic imagery has shown that the cow figures in several significant institutions which also have, over time, other connexions with the development of the ahimsā ideal. We have previously

120 See pp. 21-22, 24-26 above.
121 See pp. 18-20 above.
noticed the involvement of the cow with the sacrifice, both as a suitable (medhā) victim and, by virtue of its historic economic role as an embodiment of wealth, as the sacrificer's honorarium (dāksinā), and as the supporter of the sacrifice by virtue of its supplying milk for the oblations (homa). When we observe that a guest (portentously referred to as gogha 'cow killer' in early texts) may exercise discretion at the madhuparka over whether a cow is slaughtered in his honour or set free, is it preferable to view this as springing from a recognition of the virtue of sanctifying bulls and cows set free to roam at will.

122 See pp.3-4 and notes 13, 14, 15 and 16.
123 Or rather, with Pāṇini's construing of the compound with dative force, "he on whose coming the cow is killed in order to give him, that is to say, a guest' ... applicable to the priests, guests, sons-in-law, etc."; Vasu, Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini at 3.4.73. See also RV.10.68.3, 10.85.13, but cf. 10.28.1. Evidences of the practice are adduced by Mitra, "Beef", pp.176, 192; Jacobi, "Cow (Hindu)", p.225b and n.; Ray, "Food and Drink", p.25; Prakash, Food and Drinks, p.38; Bose, Social and Rural Economy, vol.1, p.77; Chattopadhyay, "Beef Eating", pp.50-51 and n.
124 Muusses, Koecultus bij de Hindoes, p.52 and n.1 lists relevant passages in the grhyasūtras with some dharmaśāstra references; also Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.574 and n., 612; Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, vol.ii, p.776; Bose, Social and Rural Economy, pp.76 and n., 77. Brown, "Sanctity of the Cow", p.31, and Alsdorf, ibid., advert to the reception of soma described in SBr.3.4.1.2, Aitareyabrahmaṇa 1.15.
125 The ceremony is described by Ganguli, "Cattle Rearing", p.225. The special privileges attaching to such bulls is evident from Arth.3.10.24; Manu 8, 242; Viṣṇudharmaśātra 5.150; and probably Aśoka's Pillar Edict 5 (on which see Bloch, Inscriptions d'Asoka, p.166; Thapar, Aśoka, p.264 and Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.615). Bulls might be set free at śrāddha ceremonies; MBh.xiii. App.1.No.14, 146, 154-157; Viṣṇudharmaśātra 85.67. Although Muusses, Koecultus bij de Hindoes, p.77,
or as betokening changing attitudes or conflicting attitudes to the conduct of blood sacrifices, or of sacrificing the cow in particular, or as evidence that the ideal role of sacrifice in feeding gods, manes, and guests was falling into disuse, or

125 (cont.) treats the latter as a development of the vṛṣotsarga ceremony of Paraskaragrhyasūtra 3.9 and Śaṅkhāyaṇagrhyasūtra 3.11 there seems little connexion beyond the use of the expression vṛṣam utsṛjeta. In the grhyasūtra ceremonies, intended to prosper the herds (Śaṅkhāyaṇagrhyasūtra 3.11. 4, 14), the bull is not let loose but set among the cows to procreate. Nor is the association of the vṛṣotsarga with the śūlagava sacrifice (Paraskaragrhyasūtra 3.9.9-10) of a bull dedicated to Rudra for which a bloodless rite is also described (Hirayakeśigrhyasūtra 2.8, Āpastambagrhyasūtra 7.19.13-7.20.19; cf. Asvalāyanagrhyasūtra 4.8, Paraskaragrhyasūtra 3.8) helpful since there is still no suggestion that the bull is set loose.

126 Such a change of attitude is implied in the declaration of later legalists that the slaughter of a cow for a guest is kalivarjya, i.e. was formerly permitted but because of the spiritual feebleness and perversion of the Kali age can no longer be allowed. See Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.601, quoting kṛtyakaipataru 3.190 on Yājñavalkyadharmaśāstra 1.109 which demands the killing of an ox or goat; also Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, vol.iv, pp.945-946.

127 So Mbh.iii.199.4; cf. Manu 5.41; Vāsiṣṭhadasaharmaśāstra 4.6; Śaṅkhāyaṇagrhyasūtra 2.14.19; 2.17.1, etc.; Āpastambagrhyasūtra 1.3.9. Note Schlerath's argument that the sacrifice is essentially a guest-meal for communion with gods or forefathers: "Opfergaben", passim.
had only ever been an ideal? To account for this phenomenon, and to assess the contribution it may have made to the history of the sacrifice, of the ahimsā ideal, of the veneration of cows, or to social history, one would have to weigh up the explanatory power of each interpretation vis-à-vis the others either by delving ever more deeply into the workings of each institution involved, or by short-circuiting the process with an a priori predisposition to favour one of the possible explanations. The demands of the former will probably make it infeasible to do justice to reality, while the latter has a positive potential for perverting it.

Again, how is it that the cow comes in later?

128 On the evidence available it is plausible to argue that the madhuparka reception of a guest will rarely ever have involved cow slaughter. Several of the grhyasutras which suggest that a guest might graciously waive the honour of cow slaughter on his behalf are also those which insist that meat must be served at the madhuparka (nāmaṁ so madhuparko bhavati, Āśvalāyaṇagṛhyaśūtra 1.24.3; Hiranyakesigṛhyaśūtra 1.13.10; Pāraskaragṛhyaśūtra 1.3.29; also Śāṅkhyāgraṇṭhāyaśūtra 2.15.2; but note Kāthakagṛhyaśūtra 24.21 quoted by Muusses, Koeelntus bij de Hindoes, p.52n, which allows non-meat offerings). The reception of a guest described in AV.9.6 mentions serving meat (stt.39, 43) but not slaughtering a cow. From this we may infer that the reluctance to slaughter does not arise from qualms over the violation of the cow or goat offered. More likely the problem is the expense, as indeed Vijñānāsvarā recognizes in his commentary on Yājñavalkyadharmaśāstra 1.109 quoted in Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.601 and n. 2. The prescription of a goat as alternative to the cow offering may be a product of the same pressures. This interpretation in no way contradicts the historical evidence of cow-killing for honoured guests, for unsurprisingly those celebrations whose memory history has preserved were grand royal receptions, remembered on that account. [It is incidentally interesting to note that in the ŚBr. reception of King Soma (see note 124 above) at an animal sacrifice, after the propriety of offering an ox or goat to a guest is acknowledged, Soma is given only a sacrificial cake (ŚBr.3.1.15). He of course could not have refused the ox!]
literature to be seen as the sacrificial animal par excellence? Is this attributable to changes in the economic milieu of the societies involved, or to a rise in the esteem in which the cow was held, or from the fact that the cow was preeminently associated with non-animal sacrifices as daksīna or as the supplier of milk? Can any or all of these changes be attributed to the increasing vigour of the ahimsā ideal, or to a shift from pastoral or mixed

129 Although the goat may have been more frequently sacrificed (Renou, Vedic India, pp.45-96, 101, 104; and note 128 above) and although the asvamedha horse sacrifice is the most prestigious of sacrifices (Rām.7.90.12, "Northern" Recension) it is the cow which is identified with the sacrifice (AV.10.10.3, 6, 25, 27, 29, 34; ŚBr.2.2.4.14) and even in the asvamedha the cow is acknowledged as the embodiment of all sacrificial victims (ŚBr.1.3.2.3). Note especially Bergaigne, Religion védique, vol.I, p.317, on RV.1.173.8. The cow's meat gives the ancestors the longest satisfaction in a śrāddha offering (Āpastambadharmasūtra 2.16.26; Manu 3.271; but cf. Gautamadharmsutra 15.15. Kane, History of Dharmasāstra, vol.iv, p.423). See also Kane, op.cit., vol.ii, pp.776-777; Bose, Social and Rural Economy, vol.i, pp.81-82; Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.574; Schmidt, "aghnya-", p.43.

130 See note 15 above, and additionally Mbh.xiii. 51.28-29; 76.14; 82.16. On daksīna as the cow's preeminent role in even vedic animal sacrifice, see Renou, Vedic India, p.101, and note the pervasive presence of cows as daksīna in Heesterman, "Significance of the daksīna", pp.246-247, 251-254. Also RV.6.28.3, 10.28.7, 10.62.7; AV.18.4.50.

131 Gonda Religionen Indiens, p.315; Kane, History of Dharmasāstra, vol.ii, p.780. Such a causality might be implied in the characterization of paśubandha as himsāyajña, as in Matsyapurāṇa 143. 30-32 (quoted by Kane, op.cit., vol.v, p.946), or statements that it involves himsā, as e.g. Mbh.xii. 257.3, or that offering meat at śrāddha is incompatible with the acceptance of ahimsā as supreme dharma, Mbh.xiii.116.1-2. The doctrine that himsā performed in accordance with vedic prescript is not himsā, Manu 5.42, etc., points in the same direction.
economics to a predominantly agricultural economy, or is the new view a function of a shift in the social standpoint from which the sacrifices are considered? With informed imagination the hypothesizing of relationships can be extended indefinitely, and the necessary scope of the investigation concomitantly enlarged.

On another tack, the earliest explicit prohibitions of cow killing come in the Atharvaveda with its

132 On the shift to an increasingly agricultural economy, see Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, s.v. kṛṣṇa, vol.i, pp.181-183. Possible implications are discussed in Kosambi, Indian History, pp.157-158, and Proudfoot, "Economic and Social Background", pp.337-338, 340. Cf. Varma, "Origins and Sociology of Moral Determinism", pp.31-37, 45-47. See further below, n.139 and 146. Note especially the apposite and sensible observation of Harris, "Cultural Ecology", p.56, concerning the relationship between notions of the cow's sanctity and the dependence of a peasant agriculturalist on even a single cow or bullock for economic viability. See also his comment to Heston, "Approach to the Sacred Cow", pp.199-201; his position is not refuted by the findings of Raj, "Investment in Livestock".

133 Beside differences of time, it is clear that the brāhmaṇas describe what might be characterized as public rites of a wealthy élite while at the other end of the spectrum the purāṇas depict folk rites accessible to the poorest, non-brāhmaṇ, devotee. Where should the incantations of the AV., the gṛhyaśūtras, the dharmaśāstra be placed on this spectrum? The Mahābhārata depicts a diversity of observances not admitted by any dharmaśāstra.

Hearing in mind the discussion of forms of the madhuparka in note 128 above, it is revealing to turn to the Viṣṇupurāṇa passage 3.24-30 cited by Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, vol.iv, p.425, in which forms of śraddha offering are laid down, allowing the poor man to substitute for a sumptuous meal of meat a serving of vegetables given to a brāhmaṇ, or failing that one day's grass to a cow, or failing that simply a reverencing of the fathers. Here we have an apaddharma of sacrificing.

For discussion of a divergence of views over animal sacrifice distinguishable in terms of brahmānic interest groups, see below pp.571-580.
strictures against those who would kill the brahman's cow.\textsuperscript{134} In what respect, then, might the veneration of the cow have been encouraged by the association of the cow with brahmans? Is the later-evidenced exhortation to protect cows-and-brahmans (\textit{gobhrāhmaṇa})\textsuperscript{135} a reflex of this association, arising through the practice of bestowing cows on brahmans,\textsuperscript{136} or from a romanticized

\textsuperscript{134} Along with a general concern for protection of the brahman's property (AV.5.18; 5.19, esp.9; cf. Baudhāyana
dharmaśāstra 1.5.16; Mauss, The Gift, p.56) there are particularly vehement denunciations of those who withhold cows rightfully the brahman's (AV.12.4 passim) and/or slaughter the brahman's cow (AV.5.18, 5.19 passim; 12.3,44, 46). So overwhelming is concentration on the cow that Whitney has been misled into entitling AV.5.19, "The brahman's cow" when in fact it deals generally with oppressors of brahmans. While for the misappropriator the brahman's cow is a scourge (AV.12.5,13-23, 40-73), a source not of milk but of poison (AV.12.4.39), and an inversion of all the cow's beneficial qualities (AV.12.4.1, 2, 25) which is inedible to him (AV.5.18.1, 3), whose slaughter is as it were a 'black yajña' (AV.12.5.24-39), whose milk is harmful in śraddha offerings (AV. 5.19.5) - for the brahman she is a veritable kamadhenu (AV.5.11, 7.104.1) and bestows blessings in the hereafter upon its giver (AV.12.4.36). Brown, "Sanctity of the Cow", p.34 on AV.12.4 is right in observing that the punishment for slaughtering the cow "follows not because the animal eaten is a cow but because it belongs to the brahman as his right". Discussing AV.5.18, 5.19, Mauss, Kœcul tus bij de Blin does, pp.20, 22, makes the same point. Such discrimination is not exercised by Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, vol.ii, p.773, or Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p.151.

\textsuperscript{135} E.g. Viṣṇudharmaśāstra 3.45, 16.18; Manu 11.79-80; Rām.1.26.5, 3.23.28; inscriptions adduced by Sankalia "[The Cow] in History", pp.14-16, also the Junagadh inscription of Rudradaman, Epigraphia Indica, vol.18 (No.6), p.49 and n.2. Not to provide protection for brahman's cows is a slur against the king's honour, Mbh.ii.205.5-22. In law matters touching cows may be treated alongside those applying to brahmans: Arth. 1.19.29, Manu 8.112, Nīlamārtandaśa, 642*; xiii. App.I. No.14. 443-444. The two are singled out for special marks of respect in Āpastamba
dharmaśāstra 1.11.31.6, Manu 4.162, Mbh.xiii. 148.16.

\textsuperscript{136} The giving of cows is a virtue in itself: Viṣṇudharmaśāstra 9.5-10; Vāsishtha
dharmaśāstra 29.11; Mbh.xiii.58.5 and many stanzas in xiii.65, 70, 72,
The gift of a tawny (kapila) cow is especially favoured, probably - like the vedic dappled (pśni) cow - as a kamadhenu with cosm(ogon)ic connotations: Mbh. xiii. App. I. No. 14, 405-406, 426-431; 76.9-33, esp. 18, 30; 77.12; 78.8 and Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, vol. ii, p. 783, quoting from Smrīticandrika; cf. AV. 5.11.1, 7.104.1. The reward of giving may be a future existence in the cow heaven (goloka), described in sensuous detail in Mbh. xiii. 72.5-14; 80.18-29; 82.35-40; or in reciprocation for giving the cow - which represents the earth (see note 142 - the giver may gain the earth: Mbh. xiii. 61.27; Mauss, The Gift, p. 55, and notes. But the gift may be made on particular occasions and may thus impinge upon other institutions. Cows are distributed to brahmans on the occasion of great sacrifices, but not necessarily as daksīnā for officiants: Brhadaranyaka Upaniṣad 3.1.1-2; 7.1.71.20-24; Heesterman, "Significance of the daksīna", pp. 242-245. Might this be interpreted as an outgrowth of the giving of daksīna, or as is explicitly stated in Mbh. xiii. 65.42ab, a diversion of cattle which would formerly have been sacrificed? An analogy with the latter development is the bestowal on brahmans of the vaṭtarāṇi cow at a cremation rather than sacrificing the anustaraṇī cow; this is discussed by Muusses, Keëcultus bij de Hindoes, pp. 58-61, 75-76; see also Oertel, "Jaiminiya Brähmana", pp. 112-113.

In other cases the gift of cows acts as a dispensation for sins: Viṣṇudharmasūtra 50; Manu 11.116-117, 128-145; Yājñavalkyadharmaśāstra 3.263-277. Is this a form of wergeld (in which case it has no connexion with animal killing), or does it arise because cow giving is inherently a virtue which can counteract evil (as Mbh. xiii. 61.52; 75.2), or because of the purifying power of the cow (see note 144 below, noting here the expiations prescribed by Manu 11.145, 149 - by drinking milk; 11.144, 150 - by eating ghee; 11.203 - by touching a cow). All the above appear unconnected with the vedic practice of giving twinning calves to the brahman (AV. 3.28.1) as a precaution against their unnaturalness. The brahman's claim over the barren cow (vaśaṇa) may have been similarly based (AV. 12.4.3) but in later sources (Kātha Upaniṣad 1.1.4; Mbh. xiii. 65.41; 76.6-7) the gift of such a cow to a brahman brings disaster upon the giver.

However the AV. data is difficult to interpret. It is not clear that the vaśaṇa cow claimed by brahmans in AV. 12.4 and 12.5 is necessarily a barren cow (it can be milked, AV. 12.5.53; but AV. 12.4.35 is at best ambiguous on this point; AV. 12.4.39 is metaphorical), nor is it clear that the cow became the brahman's possession (a dubious proposition economically in any case); it is noteworthy that the primary complaint made in AV. is not that the brahman's cow is stolen, but that cows which are rightly the brahmans are withheld (AV. 12.4.51-52, cf. a ṣūda in AV. 12.5.11,
notion of the vanaprastha brahman with the cow which provides his homa milk and much of his sustenance?\textsuperscript{137} Insofar as the concept has political implications, what political conditions might cause it to arise and flourish?\textsuperscript{138} In what sense have we to deal with an inversion or reaction against the ṛgvedic view of the

\textsuperscript{136} (cont.) 15,46, also 56, trans. Whitney 'take to oneself' the subject being the cows' owners) and cooked privately (\textit{aṁaḥ}, AV.12.4.38) by others (AV.12.4.51-53; 5.19.4). The brahman's demand may therefore be either for the right to sacrifice the cow on behalf of its owner (perhaps implied by \textit{devānām gāṁ} in AV.12.4.12, by 12.4.40, and inversely by AV.12.5 with its cursing of every step of the killing, cooking and carving up of the cow; cf. sacrifices of the barren cow (\textit{vaśāḥ}) in ŚBr.13.5.4.26; 13.6.2.16) or to be given the cooked cow as \textit{dakṣiṇā} on the analogy of the anvāhārya \textit{dakṣiṇā} of TS.1.7.3.1-3 where the brahmans represent openly the gods' secret reception of the sacrifice, a notion matched in AV.12.4.10, 26. Perhaps there is a parallel in AV.9.5 which describes the giving of a cooked goat to the brahman but separately specifies accompanying \textit{dakṣiṇā} (AV.9.5.27-28) implying that the goat is given over for sacrificing. Yet the brahman is depicted as choosing the cows he wishes to be given (AV.12.4.1), and how can a cow once given be given again to other brahmans by her first owner (AV.12.4.22-23)? Much remains obscure, partly no doubt because we have access to one side of a debate on issues of which we are ignorant. How this material relates to the history of the sacrifice, of the institution of \textit{daksina}, or of the bestowing of cows on brahmans therefore remains unclear.]

\textsuperscript{137} Mbh.xiii.82.20; viii.29.32; i.3.33-44; i.165.9-17 (it is a kāmadhenu); cf. Ch.Up.4.4.5 where the teacher has a large herd of cattle. Mookerji, \textit{Ancient Indian Education}, pp.xxviii-xxix.

\textsuperscript{138} Many references picture mortal conflict in time of war or against bands of robbers such as might flourish in times of disorder: Āpastambadharmasūtra 1.9.24.21; Baudhayanadarmasūtra 2.2.4.18; Gautamādarmasūtra 10.17-18; Manu 10.62,11.80; Yājñavalkyadharmaśāstra 3.27; Mbh.x.6.21-22. For Arth. material see note 139 below. Aśoka's Rock Edict 13 (Bloch, \textit{Inscriptions d'Aśoka}, p.128) is interesting in pointing out that brahmans and śramaṇas suffer particularly under conditions of war.
cow as booty? Might we see in the proclamation of a political duty to protect cows-and-brahmans an attempt by the brahman class to counter a political vulnerability by allying themselves with the sacrosanct cow? Or, is there in this pairing a symbolism of the community's pillars of material and spiritual well-being? Should the cow's role in this symbolism be linked with the identification of the cow and mother earth, the source of wealth and bounty, or is it a

The concern of Kautilya with the suppression of cattle raiding is evident from the duties of the superintendent of Pasture Lands, especially with regard to isolated regions (Arth.2.34). It is noteworthy that while Kautilya in consonance with his usual pragmatic moderation prescribes only the middle fine for violence for the common theft of a cow or other large animal (Arth.3.17.9), he prescribes the death penalty for stealing a herd of ten or more cattle (Arth.4.11.15-16). Killing or stealing any animal from the royal herd is however also punishable by death (Arth.2.29.12) and - significantly - royal protection could be bought for private herds when there was fear of enemy hordes or forest tribes (paracakraṭavibhayād) in accordance with the law of protection (palanadharmepa, Arth.2.29.7). For other notes on cattle raiding, see Johnston, "Cattle Theft".

Once again AV. is revealing: those who scourge the brahmans are kṣatriyas (AV.12.5.5-11, 14) who insult him and consume his cows (AV.5.18, 5.19), against whom the brahmans can make only hysterical threats (AV.5.18.10-11) that his authority will dwindle (AV.5.18.4). The brahman's cow will itself attack the kṣatriya (AV.5.18.11, 19.7, 12.5). Note too the story of the attempted theft of Vasiṣṭha's kamadhenu (Mbh.i.165; Rām.1.52.1 - 54.7) in which the cow produces armies of Mleccha (1) warriors which crush the armies of the oppressor king, who thereupon forswears his kṣatriya existence and acknowledges brahmanic power.

This implication is present in passages like Mbh. vi.116.12, xii.11.11 which make the cow the supreme representative in the animal world as the brahman is of the human world. It is a theme picked up by later propagandists: Sundara Ram, Cow Protection, pp.20 et seqq.; Gandhi, How to Serve the Cow?, pp.3, 73.

'SBr.3.4.1.13 'prosperity means cattle' (paśavo vai rayaspoṣāh). Viṣṇudharmasūtra 88.1-2, Mbh.xiii.61. 27 on the productive cow as the earth, also Jacobi, "Cow (Hindu)" p.225a; Renou, "Élèments védiques", pp.355-366, § 33.
straightforward reflection of the cow's productive capacity in the dairy and as a draught animal? A

Does the cow's important role in the expiation of ritual sins contribute to the symbolism? A subsidiary but not necessarily irrelevant interest concerns the relative eclipse of the bull embodying fatherhood and the active generative force by the cow embodying motherhood and nurture. Are sociological or psychological factors at work here? or is it that

A view appealing to rationalists (see Harris, "Cultural Ecology", passim; Bose, Social and Rural Economy, vol.i, p.81, and his "Animal Preservation"; Kanjilal, "Cow Protection", pp.1022-1025; Ganguli, "Cattle Raising", passim) which finds some support in restrictions on killing milch cows and draught oxen: Arth.2.26.10-11; Gautamadharmasutra 17.30, Vasisthadharmasutra 14.45-46, although the latter two are directly contradicted by Āpastambhadharmasutra 1.5.17.30 (see Alsdorff, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.616) and possibly Asoka's Pillar Edict 5 which significantly refrains from specifying these animals as protected (cf. Chattopadhyay, "Beef-eating in Mauryan Times"). Bose, op.cit., vol.2, p.327 (and vol.1, p.137n.) and Ganguli, op.cit., p.223, take tax rates to index the value of cows to the national wealth, but their inferences are inconclusive.

Many references are collected at Muusses, Koecultus bij de Hindoe, pp.51, 67-70, and Kane, History of Dharmasāstra, vol.ii, p.773; also Gonda, Religionen Indiens, p.115; Karambelkar, Athavavedic Civilization, p.85. Mbh.xiii.80.39ab (gāvah pāvitrāḥ pūnyāḥ ca pāvamāḥ paramam mahat).

The cow's urine, dung, and the pāṇca-gavya concoction of cow products all have purifying powers (Manu 5.105, 121, 124; 11.92, 213, and parallel passages) as does touching a cow (Manu 5.87) or scratching a cow's back (Vīṣṇudharmasūtra 23.60), or the penance of living with cows as a cow (Manu 11.111, 116). As remarked above, note 136, cow-giving figures as a commutation for expiatory penances, even when the crime is brahman killing (Manu 11.79-80).

Cf. Mbh.xiii.118.26 honouring mother and brahman; Gandhi, How to Serve the Cow?, p.4: "Mother cow is in many ways better than the mother who gave us birth".
the model of fecundity without aggressiveness is more in keeping with the ideology of settled agrarian communities?\textsuperscript{146} or is it simply a by-product of the veneration surrounding the cow because of its involvement in other institutions?\textsuperscript{147} The questioning is endless.

\textsuperscript{146} It may be possible to detect such a thread running through the Asokan inscriptions. In view of the materials set out in note 139, the Kandahar Bilingual Rock Inscription (Greek) is interesting in linking the suppression of hunting with the king's refraining from consuming living things and the attainment of an agreeable and prosperous life for all (see Robert, "Observations", p.14, on the connotations of \textit{euthénia}). This is to be construed beside the thirteenth Rock Edict in which the pacification of forest dwellers (sc. ? non-agriculturalists) is the means of attaining the king's intention "qu'il y ait chez tous les êtres, sécurité, maîtrise des sens, équanimité et douceur" (trans. Bloch, Inscriptions d'Asoka, p.129: \textit{savvabhūtānām achatīrī ca sayamaṁ ca samacairāmm ca māddavām ca}). It is not necessary to attribute revolutionary changes to Asoka's reign (as Thapar, Asoka, p.215) in order to appreciate the gulf between Asoka's recasting of the royal hunting tour into a "tournée de la Loi" (\textit{dhammayatā}) and the rājasuya of Śrī.5.4.3 in which a mock gaviśṭi raid reminds us of an essential aspect of the older ideology of kingship (cf. Renou, \textit{Vedic India}, p.108, § 213).

Note however that in the Asokan inscriptions this outlook is not given any explicit connexion with the cow; although their evidence is not necessarily irrelevant on that account. Might the story of Kṛṣṇa's victory in his dispute with Indra be relevantly considered here? (Gonda, \textit{Aspects of Early Vaisnavism}, p.156; Vaudeville, "Mythe de Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla", pp.743-744).

\textsuperscript{147} In addition to points already made, the cow's association with the Kṛṣṇa-cowherd cult might be mentioned here: Vaudeville, "Mythe de Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla", esp. p.758; Gonda, \textit{Aspects of Early Vaisnavism}, p.156.
C. OTHER DIMENSIONS OF THE AHIMSA COMPLEX

Needless to say the definition of relevance is not made easier when the focus of interest is something less concrete than the cow. For instance, in a treatment of the ethical aspect of the ahimsa ideal, one is faced with the difficulty of determining whether values described by other terms such as karuna (pity), maitri (sympathy), daya (compassion), atmaupamya (empathy), adroha (lack of malice) and akrodha (lack of anger) should be treated as equivalent to ahimsa or distinguished from it. The objective manifestations of all these values may be indistinguishable, and some may be used in contexts where ahimsa also appears, but it cannot automatically be assumed that ahimsa carries the same import as the other terms, the less so since ahimsa may apply according to context to social

148 Although Gonda, in the quotation above (Religionen Indiens, p.349), associates ahimsa with maitri 'Wohlwollen' and karuna 'Mitteid', in the dharma smritis and the Mahabharata it is akrodha 'lack of anger', adroha 'lack of malice' and daya 'compassion' which seem closest to ahimsa. The first two are sometimes both included in catalogues of virtues from which ahimsa is absent: Āpastambadharmaśutra 1.8.23.6; Baudhayana dharmaśutra 2.6.11.25; Mbh.xii.60.7-8 (sādhāraṇadharmaśa); cf. the usage of adroha in Manu 4.2. The phrase na yuddha seems sometimes to act as a verbal form for ahimsa when it does not imply killing. Alternatively, daya is sometimes apparently a substitute for ahimsa: Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 5.2.3; Mbh.xiv.94.31; Schmidt, "Origin of Ahimsa", p.655.

Besides other comparable usages such as nirvairata 'lack of enmity' (Mbh.xv.35.9) and anrūṣamsa 'lack of cruelty' (Mbh.xii.285.22-23), the variety of terminology used in the Asokan inscriptions might also be noted: see Dikshitar, Mauryan Polity, p.251, plus daya and panaadakkhina from Pillar Edict 2.

Paraphrases built around such forms as
morality or ascetic practice. Then there is the matter touched upon by Schmidt, of whether it is valid to see dispassionate harmlessness in the ascetic arena and compassion or kindness in the field of social morality as transmutations of the same fundamental value of ahimsa—or is this correlation too simplistic? An associated question is whether abhaya is a "quasi-synonym" of ahimsa given the former's implication.

148 (cont.) sarvabhūtahita(rat) or the like (Mbh. xii.234.5; Manu 5.46) open up another field for comparison.


150 Cf. Filliozat, "Doctrines indiennes de la charité". The question has also been raised of whether Indian ethics does not consist in self-centred ascetic ideals applied to social behaviour. Is there a truly altruistic morality (Hopkins, Ethics of India, esp.178-183) or only a striving to divest oneself of contaminating involvement (McKenzie, Hindu Ethics; Kalghatgi, "Jaina Doctrine of 'Ahimsa'", pp.21-24)? There are positively extrovert injunctions (Manu 6.48), purely altruistic justifications (Mbh.xii.237.25-26), and examples of self-sacrifice (Mbh.iii.130.19-131.30), yet it is certainly true that ethical values are often negatively expressed (Mbh.xiii.13 illustrates this well). Since a morality which does not rely on the agency of divine retribution for enforcement must appeal to enlightened self-interest, it is difficult to distinguish form (Gonda, "Why are ahimsa and similar concepts often expressed in a negative form?") from substance. On the secondary role of ethical thought, see Hopkins, op.cit.; pp.72, 88; articles by Mahadevan, Raju and Nikhilananda in Moore, The Indian Mind. Cf. Sharma's apologetic Ethical Philosophies of India.

of reciprocal bestowal of freedom from fear. 152

Conversely one must be aware that phenomena which have the same outward form may not warrant the same interpretation in different times and places. For instance, the same sacrificial ritual laid down in the brāhmaṇa texts as a means of amnulling the injury caused to slaughtered beasts 153 later comes to be seen as the very embodiment of violence in contrast to the harmless offering of puja. 154

152 The reciprocity is evident in all such cliché passages as Manu 6.39-40; Bhūs. xii.254.16-17, 25-25, 30-31. As a prerequisite for the stilled consciousness of the restrained mind, Bhūs. xii.232, 4, 290.54 (Hopkins, Great Epic, p.181), abhaya is a form of non-attachment which implies ahimsa on the subject's part and engenders confidence in the object, Bhūs. xiii.114.3-10, liberating the natural harmony of relations, Bhūs. xiii.5.9-10. Hence the romantic picture of ascetics' forest hermitages, as in Bhūs. ix.36.61, xiii.14.33, 42-43. Cf. Arth. 2.4.2 (see also p.220, n.14 below). Alternatively, abhaya may be conceived as a withdrawal from the dog-eat-dog natural process of the matsyanyaya (cf., Bhūs. viii. 24.7-8), which is itself an embodiment of fear and may be controlled only by means of fear manifest as danda, Bhūs. xii.15. In the terms of this last conception, the granting of abhaya may be a political act, Bhūs. xiii, App.I, No.8, 5-19, 68-70.

153 See Hoens, Sānti I, esp. pp.47-56, noting the identity in some contexts of sānti, ahimsā and aghata. Schmidt, "Origin of Ahimsa", pp.646-649, covers the same material. The brāhmaṇa texts are ambivalent over the injury involved in the paśubandha. Its presence may be either acknowledged and avoided (ŚBr. 3.8.1.10, 15) or neutralized (ŚBr. 3.6.4.9-10, 13-14; 3.8.2.8-13; 3.8.5.8-10; 11.7.4.3), or its reality may be denied (ŚBr. 3.7.3.4-6; cf. Manu 5.39; note the use of saṃpādavya- to mean 'sacrificially kill': Oertel, "Euphemismen in der vedischen Proza", pp.6-8, 44).

154 As at Bhūs. xii.257, xii.323.10-11. Note the telling implication of the simile of Rāma, 3.1271*, 3-4 (cit. Vyās, "Sacrifices in the Ramayana Age", p.313) which assumes the victim's suffering; but also the intriguing story of Satya and Dharmà incarnate as a deer, Bhūs. xii.264, which champions ahimsā over animal sacrifice, but accepts that a victim may acquiesce in the sacrifice and will achieve heaven thereby.
may one impute motive from externals alone. There is no reason to link Kautilya's animal reservations with the later duty of kings to protect cows: it is more than likely that Kautilya's reservations were royal game reserves.  

Methodology for useful study

This survey of complexes of values and practices associated with ahimsā has been intended only to illustrate how unarticulated our conception of the issues relevant to a history of ahimsā remains. The studies of Alsdorf and especially Schmidt have produced suggestive insights, but they remain very much the hypotheses of their creators. Given the present rudimentary state of our understanding of the history of ideas in early India and the difficulties inhering in dealing with open-ended diachronic surveys when the historical evidence is not abundant and not necessarily representative of the complexity of social reality, it is probably still premature to embark upon a comprehensive study of even any aspect of the history of ahimsā. Rather, the present requirement would seem to be for intensive studies conducted on a small scale with the aim of highlighting synchronic relations which may validly be imputed between ahimsā and other institutions and practices. Once a number of these

155 Arth.2.2.3-4. The idyllic image is reminiscent of the ascetics forest settlements referred to in note 152 above, for which cf. Arth.2.2.2.

156 Cf. Arth.2.26.4-6.
Studies have been accumulated, some attempt might be made to synthesize their revelations in the hope of providing a less arbitrary set of working hypotheses than is at present deducible from more ambitiously conceived synthetic studies. However for the success of this undertaking it is essential that the initial studies of modest scope be not themselves prejudiced by arbitrarily imposed delineations of relevance, which would annul the usefulness of their integration into any wider framework.

We have within Alsdorf's wide-ranging treatment of vegetarianism the prototype of a specialized intensive study of this kind in his treatment of the rules governing consumption of food in the legal tradition. So long as he is dealing with a homogeneous and interrelated corpus of material - the dharmaśūtras, dharmaśāstras, commentaries and nibandhas - and so long as he concentrates on the historical development of a specific topic - the rules relating to food consumption - Alsdorf is able to keep at bay many questions of relevance and definition. By studying the development of a continuing and self-conscious tradition, whose later contributors were aware of what had preceded them, he is able to let those contributors make the interpretative decisions which he would otherwise have had to impose on his own authority. But in addition to this, examination of a self-conscious tradition of this kind is especially valuable in enabling us to identify with confidence the thesis and synthesis of each dialectical progression.
We have the thesis in the text as known, and the synthesis in the text as glossed, interpreted, expanded, or passed over by later contributors to the tradition. We are therefore in a uniquely favourable position to draw inferences concerning the antithesis, the motivation for the change external to the tradition: to see the harsh light of social reality throwing shafts of light into the dark tunnel of scholarly transmission.

The engineering of self-limited studies of self-consciously developed tradition is feasible where there are identifiable contributions to a corpus made by various authors who may be ranked in time. The legal tradition, used by Alsdorf, is an invaluable mine of information on social, institutional and ideological history which fulfills these qualifications, as Kane's History of Dharmaśāstra richly illustrates. But the same conditions may be met in texts belonging to an intensively interpolated tradition, such as that of the epic and purānic literature.
CHAPTER II

The conversation of Tulādhāra and Jājali in the Nokṣadharmaparvan of the Mahābhārata has long been recognized as a locus classicus of the ahimsā ideal. The story's particular interest lies both in the manner in which Tulādhāra makes non-injury the coping stone of a wide-spanning philosophy of life and also in the debate he conducts with Jājali on the compatibility of the ahimsā ideal and the ideology of sacrifice. This episode of the Mahābhārata pretends to represent non-injury in a living situation, as a part of the complex real life of individuals, not drily compartmentalized as a grey enumeration of ideal duties such as may be

1 Tulādhārajājalisamvāda, Mbh.xii.252-256, together with which must be taken the dependent Vicakhnugīṭā, Mbh.xii.257. Translations of the Bombay (Vulgate) edition (xii.260-265) are offered by Dutt, Mahābhārata, Shanti Parva, pp.386-395, and in the name of P.C. Roy, Mahābhārata, vol.ix, pp.248-268; and of the older Bombay and Calcutta (Vulgate) editions (xii.261-266) by Deussen, Vier philosophische Texte, pp.416-437.

2 Winternitz, History of Indian Literature, vol. I, p. 365 (= Geschichte, vol. I, p.385): "This Itihasa-dialogue is so important in the history of Indian ethics, that it merits being given here in extract: ...". Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata und seine Theile, Bk.I, p.36, selects a reference from the episode as one of three evidences that "die späteren, didaktischen Theile des Gedichts erklären sich für die ahimsā". Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, pp.593-594, discusses the Tulādhāra episode and the auxiliary episode of King Vicakhnu as one of four clusters of Mahābhārata material which deal with "der kritische Kernpunkt des Ahimsa-Problems ... das Tieropfer" (p.590). See also Vora, Evolution of Morals in the Epics, pp.222-223; Gonda, Religionen Indiens, p.282,313; Bose, Social and Rural Economy, p.69. The Tulādhāra episode has been retold in the Itihāssamuccaya anthology (Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata und seine Theile, Bk.II, p.221 and Bk.III, p.58).
From this point of view, the Mahābhārata material is a potentially richer source for understanding the implications of the ideal than the legalisms which Alsdorf so efficiently exploited. But at the same time, the idiosyncrasy of Mahābhārata episodes places greater difficulties and uncertainties in the way of interpreting them.

Before commencing a study of the Tulādharma episode, it is necessary to consider the nature of these difficulties and uncertainties of analysis, and how the difficulties may be turned to advantage and the uncertainties made less.

Using Mahābhārata materials

Alsdorf's study has pointed up the great analytical value of identifying disparate materials juxtaposed in a single text sequence. In such a situation it is possible not only to compare and contrast the component materials themselves, but more importantly to examine the relationships in which they stand one to another. If the combination of disparate materials is a virtue, then the Mahābhārata is the embodiment of all that is good. In the controversies which have raged back and forth across the terrain of the Mahābhārata authorship question, it has never been responsibly denied that the Mahābhārata - especially in its didactic sections - is a compilation which has brought into intimate juxtaposition materials of differing origins often.

---

3 A point stressed by Hopkins, Religions of India, pp. 349-350 and p. 365.
expressing seemingly quite distinct points of view.\(^4\)

In this respect, the Mahābhārata is potentially a richer source for an understanding of the dynamics of intellectual life than texts which more single-mindedly expound a unitary point of view. The encyclopaedic range of topics it encompasses and the free-ranging coverage it gives them add another dimension to the Mahābhārata's synthesis of diversity. In short, for a history of thought, the chaos which makes the Mahābhārata a "literary monstrosity"\(^5\) is also its particular strength.

It is therefore doing less than full justice to the Mahābhārata material to treat it in the manner characteristic of survey works, that is either by generalizing a timeless synthetic Mahābhārata view,\(^6\)

\(^4\) Dahlmann, *Genesis des Mahābhārata*, pp.119-130, argues only that there was a single process of compilation; Sukthankar, *On the Meaning of the Mahābhārata*, pp.22-23, pausing in his polemic, retreats even from this position.


\(^6\) As examples:

Sukthankar, *On the Meaning of the Mahābhārata*, gives a discussion of the contents of the Mahābhārata (pp. 32-124) which is thoroughly synthetic (esp. p.123).

Held, *Ethnographic Study*, by and large exemplifies this approach: pp.27-29, esp.30, 31-34, 303-324, treating almost exclusively the content of the admittedly older narrative sections. Held acknowledges a development of the Mbh. tradition (pp.344-345) - in Held's ethnomystical terminology "it grew with the years" (p.343, his emphasis), but with breathtaking effrontery emasculates Dahlmann, stripping him of his theory of a single redaction, in order to enlist his support for the idea of a corpus the parts of which "belong to one another genetically" (p.342). In any case, Held has reduced his study to such a debilitating degree of generality (p.341 "It will now be fairly clear that Sāṃkhya and Yoga have always been so intimately connected with one another, because they both belong to the essentially spiritual sphere of the initiatory ritual") that chronology is hardly relevant (pp.344-345).
or by admitting a diversity of views and arranging them
according to necessarily a priori or independently
deduced assumptions about historical changes in values
and outlook.7 The product of the former tendency reduces

6 (cont.) and he can give full rein to
his professedly scientific notions of the evolution
of social institutions.

Hopkins, Great Epic,
side-steps the problem in his survey of Epic
philosophy (pp.85-190) by limiting himself to "the
great systems of philosophy expounded in the later
epic" (p.85). However in the epic chapters of his
Religions of India (ch.xiv-xv), he consistently
observes diachronic distinctions.

7 As examples:
Jayal, Status of Women, discusses sensitively and
clear-sightedly the methodological problems of
coping with the Mahābhārata corpus in view of its
embracing chronologically, regionally and socially
diverse materials (pp.vi, 3-12, 287). She
distinguishes broadly between older (narrative core)
and younger (pseudo-Epic) attitudes, but
acknowledges that they are often intermingled (e.g.,
p.102). The difficulty of applying a consistent
standard without non-ideological criteria is
illustrated in her chapter XI where contradictions
are taken to portray women's multifaceted
characters.

Vora, Evolution of Morals, in places takes a broad
stratigraphy of the Mahābhārata into account (pp.xii,
69, 206) or extrapolates a trend of development from
upaniṣadic and smṛti literature (pp.221-224). At the
same time she synthesizes contradictory statements
with regard to ahimsā inferring from them "a
hesitant attitude", "a compromise", which "presents
a period of transition" (p.277). Vora de-emphasizes
the factor of chronological layering as against
other variables: the relative importance of given
moral principles in different periods (p.xiii), the
distinction between ideal and practice or enlightened
and popular morality (pp.xiv-xv) and the question
of whether moral acts are ethically inspired - all
matters to be evaluated by reflecting on the ideals
themselves (p.xiv).
the rich variety of Mahābhārata evidences to a
generality which may be more misleading than it is
informative. The latter approach, while more sensitive
to the Mahābhārata material, suffers by subjugating
the Mahābhārata evidences to the convictions of the
analyst or to the pattern of developments deductible
from the evidence of other less internally diverse works
widely separated in time. A symptom of the anaemia of
this approach is the passive use of Mahābhārata
passages as illustrative material only.8 The handling
of Mahābhārata material in this manner is not only
unconstructive, it is also open to uncontrollable
vagaries of interpretation. To appreciate this point
it is only necessary to put side by side the following
quotations. The first is from W.N. Brown:

The Mahābhārata, taken as a whole, shows
Brahmanic rule and popular practice to be at
variance. In one passage the text states that
he who kills a cow lives as many years as
there are hairs on the cow's body ... and
various other passages command Ahīṃsā. Yet
elsewhere meat-eating is mentioned in a
casual manner and the existence of a butcher
shop is nothing out of the ordinary.9

the second from Holtzmann:

Dem Nahusha wird es als Ketzeri e angerechnet,
dass er das Tödten und Opfern von Thieren für
unrechtmässig erklärt. ... Dagegen die späteren,
didaktischen Theile des Gedichts erklären sich
für die ahīṃsā;10

8 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung;
acknowledging the difficulties of chronological
determination (pp.585-586), adduces Mahābhārata
material (pp.586-597) only in elaboration of
conceptions the chronology of which he had
previously deduced.


10 Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata und seine Theile p.36.
What Holtzmann's predilection would have as a differentiation of antiquity, Brown sees as a differentiation of popular practice and brahmanic ideal. It is only an added complication that Brown should cite the Dharmavyādha episode\textsuperscript{11} for his instance of the butcher's shop when the hero of the episode, the pious hunter, is at great pains to dissociate himself from killing or eating meat.\textsuperscript{12}

Plucking references out of the massive corpus of Mahābhārata material proves nothing more than that the devil can quote scriptures to his own purpose. The wealth of material is so great and the relationship of various passages one to another is so indeterminate that the Mahābhārata is capable of contributing neither confirmation nor refutation of any hypothesis argued on extrinsic grounds.

The amenability of higher criticism to be turned into self-fulfilling prophecy through unconsciously circular argumentation not stabilized by objective underpinnings is well illustrated in the case of the Bhagavadgītā, that part of the Mahābhārata which, with the exception of the early chapters of the Ādi-parvan, has received most attention from critical analysts.\textsuperscript{13} Reputable scholars have argued that the extant Bhagavadgītā represents a Vaiṣṇava revision of

\textsuperscript{11} Mbh.iii.198-206; the specific reference is Mbh.iii 198.10.

\textsuperscript{12} Mbh.iii.198.31-32.

\textsuperscript{13} van Schroder, Der Erhabenen Sang, pp. vii-xv, and Kühr, Quest for the Original Gītā, pp. 7-12, survey the major interpretations.
an older pantheistic poem;\(^{14}\) the converse: that it is an older pantheistic poem; the converse: that it is a theistic work with accretions of vedāntic material;\(^ {15}\) and the radical alternative: that it is wrong to "apply Procrustean methods, and by excisions ... to force into a unified mould the sayings of a writer who never dreamed of the necessity or desirability of such unity".\(^{16}\) The diversity of interpretations is not attributable to careless or superficial study, but to the inevitable subjectivity of argumentation which feeds on the stuff of its own conclusion.

The two requirements for a fruitful exploitation of the Mahābhārata's wealth of information are a sound delineation of the component passages which may be regarded as the units making up a given Mahābhārata tract, and a reasoned account of their association in the context where they are found. Dealing with dharmaśāstra materials, Alsdorf was greatly assisted in mounting his argument on these points by the availability of several analogous, even cognate,

---

\(^{14}\) Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata und seine Thoile, Bk. II, pp.163-165; similarly Hopkins, Religions of India, pp.389-400.

\(^{15}\) Garbe, "Bhagavad-Gītā", E.R.E. vol.1, p.596a-b; and his Die Bhagavadgītā, pp.7-8, 12-15.

\(^{16}\) Edgerton, Bhagavad Gītā, p.108. Also Ziehen, The Bhagavad-Gītā, pp.1-2, 4-5. Garbe, Die Bhagavadgītā, pp.8-11, argues to refute such views. Deussen, Vier philosophische Texte, pp.v-vi, adopts a position similar to Edgerton's, but sees the work not as a synthesis but as an organic expression of a philosophy transitional between upanisadic thought and the later systems.
works in the genre\(^{17}\) and others in a continuing scholastic tradition,\(^ {18}\) which enabled him to draw telling inferences establishing a chronology on the basis of comparative study.\(^ {19}\) Such facilities are rarely afforded the Mahābhārata analyst.\(^ {20}\)

Consequently he is left to fall back on the internal evidence of the Mahābhārata tradition itself for his deduction both of the segmentation of the text and of the interrelations of the segments.

As the area of analysis will thus tend to be restricted to the bounds of the Mahābhārata tradition, it may be an instructive beginning to look at the major theories of the overall development of the Mahābhārata seeking a general orientation for our treatment of a single episode. Appreciations of the construction of the extant Mahābhārata text have ranged across a spectrum from the holistic to the

17 Alsdorf, *Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung*, pp.572-585.
19 Although in fact Alsdorf is not averse to tidying up inconveniently unchronological evidence so that a unilinear development of the ahimsā ideal can be postulated (e.g. *Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung*, p.598). His handwringing over the relationship between Vasiṣṭhadharmasūtra and Manavadharmasastra and his solution to the difficulty he sees, which involves the positιng of a now lost version of Vas.\(^4,4\) (p.585) and interpolation from Manu (p.580) seems to invoke interpolation for ideological convenience.
20 Some cases which spring to mind are Morton Smith's use of three Ambā stories in the Mahābhārata ("Story of Ambā", pp.85-132), which was not profitable; Hopkins' comparison of the Rāmpākhyaṇa and Rāmayāṇa (*Great Epic*, pp.58-84), which is not helpful for details of textual reconstruction; the comparison of Mahābhārata material with purāṇic parallels (for which see Holtzmann, *Das Mahābhārata und seine Theile*, Bk. IV, pp.29-58), but as in the case of Lüders"
The foremost exponent of the syncretic or holistic view has been Joseph Dahlmann. In his *Genesis des Mahābhārata*, he accepts that the Mahābhārata contains masses of discrete materials which in some cases had existed independently prior to their incorporation in the Mahābhārata, but argues that the process of compiling these diverse materials was undertaken at one time, on a single plan which reflects a coherent view on topics of dharmaśāstra. This conception of the composition process allows Dahlmann to attribute what others would see as symptoms of a process of accretion to the composite nature of the Mahābhārata corpus. For instance, he argues that the repetitions of gāthā material in widely separated parts of the text are not evidence of interpolation but only evidence that as the rhapsodic framework which structures the Epic dialogue progresses the composer has drawn material from the same formerly

20 (cont.) comparison of Rṣyaśṛṅga stories ("Rṣyaśṛṅga") and my own of Dharma-vyūdha stories in the Mahābhārata and Padmapurāṇa, the correspondences are generally so inexplicit and so partial as to be of little use.


independent **śāstra** to deal with situations or questions which recur as the frame story traverses similar ground. In opposition to this holistic position, the Occidental scholarly orthodoxy, led by Holtzmann, Hopkins, Winternitz and Oldenberg, has seen the Mahābhārata as the product of a process of revisions and accretions widely separated in time and attributable to several or numerous hands. Two principal arguments are advanced in support of this position: first, that the disorderliness and inherent improbability of parts of the text and the incompatibility of values expressed in the text are such that it is more happily attributed to several composers than to the incompetence of one; secondly, that the external evidence relating to content and style points to times of composition so far separated that development of the text over a long period of time seems to be suggested. It will be noticed that the assertions of both camps are in fact alternative interpretations of the same evidence. However, on specific


25 Holtzmann, _Das Mahābhārata und seine Teile_, Bk.I.

26 Hopkins, _Great Epic_, ch.5,6.


28 Oldenberg, _Das Mahābhārata_, pp.2-57.
points in which Mahābhārata passages can be dated on external evidence, and in the light of the persuasive evidence provided by the compilation of the Poona Critical Edition which irrefutably demonstrates that a great many accretions both extensive and minute have been added to branches of the Mahābhārata tradition subsequent to the time of the archetypal text, it is unreasonable not to accept that there has been accretion anterior to the archetypal text. Against the ever rolling stream of the Critical Edition's publication, latter day syncretists have been able only to inveigh and inveigle with obscurantist protest or chauvinist complaint.

While it may be that as an account of the present


30 S. Levi, "Compte rendu [1929]" and "Compte rendu [1934]", Biardcarr, "Textual Criticism", although acknowledging that "my mind is far from being as subtle as that of my paramaguru" (p.115), tries to develop S. Levi's objections to Western textual criticism. She falsely assumes that extant Mbh. manuscripts are independently originated records of an oral tradition (p.116) and shows little comprehension of the distinctions between oral and written transmission (p.123) or between forms of highly controlled and less controlled oral transmission (p.117). Attributing to the Critical Editors the desire of reconstructing a more 'truthful' text (pp.118-119), she points out that an older text is not necessarily more truthful (pp.118,122) and sees Nilakantha's Vulgate as preferable on this criterion to the Poona version (pp.120-121). Her summary statement of position is: "The only conclusion which suggests itself is that any locally accepted version is authoritative in its own right" (p.123). Bedekar, "Principles of Mahābhārata textual criticism", cogently defends Sukthankar on most of these points (pp.212-224).

31 Sukthankar, On the Meaning of the Mahābhārata, pp.29-31, 85-87, 124. The irony of Sukthankar's position and his reliance on the Vulgate text is rightly noted by the editor, p.ix.
form of the whole Mahābhārata corpus, Dahlmann's
syncretic approach must be discarded, that is not to
say that all contribution by Dahlmann to the debate
on how Mahābhārata material is to be handled for the
purpose of ideological analysis is invalidated. It is
a matter of disagreement among members of the atomist
party as to how frequently the Mahābhārata has been
subjected to revision and interpolation, and in
their general surveys they have tended to postulate the
interpolation of whole episodes or clusters of
episodes. Thus, when we come to analyse a single
episode, the atomistic theories offer no rule of thumb
disposing us to find either internal complexity or
internal unity in any episode. In principle, then,
when dealing with an episode, it is respectable to take
up a position anywhere in the spectrum from Dahlmann's
synthetic holism to an enthusiastic attribution of
every irregularity to the effects of interpolation.
Analysts tending to Dahlmann's position, who are wary
of too liberally positing interpolation, are obliged
either to demand less rigorous logic or consistency

32 Vaidya, The Mahābhārata, pp. 2, 147, proposes
three stages corresponding with the three recitals
mentioned in the Adivparvan; Holtzmann, Das
Mahābhārata und seine Theile, pp. 67-69, also
proposes three stages, but they are quite
unorthodox; Hopkins, Great Epic, pp. 397-398, sees
a multiplicity of accretions, but would rank them
in five main stages; Winternitz, History of Indian
countless interpolations without proposing
identifiable stages of development affecting the
whole epic.
from their single composer\(^3\) or to expend considerable effort in trying to comprehend an underlying or subtly-defined consistency which is not evident prima facie.\(^4\) The more willing the analyst to invoke interpolation, the more stringent the demands he may make of each of his several postulated contributors and the more easily he is able to impose his own conceptions of what conjunctions of ideas are appropriate and what are not.\(^5\) The residual value of Dahlmann's work is his warning against the dangers of excessive indulgence in suppositions of multiple authorship. He tellingly observes that while it is possible to track down apparent inconsistencies in the Mahābhārata, there is no theoretical barrier to continuing the process ad infinitum, reducing such an analysis to absurdity. Dahlmann points out that such a method of analysis permits the critic to attribute every contradiction apparent to him to the long cultural history of the Mahābhārata tradition and the diverse influences which have affected it. By doing so, he excuses himself from the task of giving a 'scientific' explanation of the contradictions or of considering

\(^3\) As, e.g., Edgerton, Bhagavad Gītā, pp.106, 108.

\(^4\) As, e.g., Deussen, Vier philosophische Texte, pp.v-vi, elaborated in his Nachvedische Philosophie, pp.15-18, with his redefinition of technical terms and hypothesis of the early undifferentiated nature of the later Saṅkhyā and Yoga schools. Dahlmann's jesuitical acuity has also excited comment, von Schroeder, Des Erhabenen Sang, p.vii.

\(^5\) A set of consciously ideological prerequisites are, for example, spelt out most patently in Khair, Quest for the Original Gītā, pp.115-120, xv; and passim.
them in relation to the whole. While the last part of Dahlmann's objection must be rejected insofar as it is possible to account for an interpolator's intention just as much as to impute a composer's, his general point that a discipline is removed from the analysis by the possibility of invoking interpolation as a *deus ex machina* is well taken. Elsewhere, Dahlmann stresses the importance of sensitively relating material to its context - to the speakers involved, to the precise aspect of the topic being considered, to the angle from which a question is approached. By undertaking such study in preference to crying "interpolation" at every turn, the analyst may be led to a deeper understanding of the meaning of his material. And yet, to make this ideal of restraint an absolute dogma, in the manner of Dahlmann, is only to indulge in mystification.

It will be seen that general considerations of analytical approach have little of practical value to tell us about the make-up of any given episode. They consist in subjective judgements of balance which offer no criterion for determining the optimum segmentation of a text. Thus, when Otto dissects the *Bhagavadgītā*

---

38 Dahlmann, *Genesis des Mahābhārata*, p. 130.
into an original stock and eight independent tracts, there is no reason to suppose that he is wrong. But it is essentially a matter of taste whether we prefer his segmentation to Garbe's twofold stratification, or Khair's threefold one. And Edgerton, who had no hesitation in excising many contaminations from his edition of the Sabhāparvan, nor in acknowledging that the Bhagavadgītā itself is probably an interpolation, and that "such interpolations are numerous in the Mahābhārata; so numerous that we may fairly regard them as a regular habit", is nevertheless still prepared to assert that the Bhagavadgītā should be seen as a unity which deliberately proposes alternative and logically incompatible ways of salvation. Thus the very diversity and seeming incompatibilities which inspired others to dissect and stratify the text provide Edgerton with the key to comprehending the meaning of this "frankly mystical and emotional" composition.

To put analysis on a less subjective footing, it is highly desirable that the segmentation and

40 Garbe, Bhagavadgītā, pp.6-18, 58, etc.
41 Khair, Quest for the Original Gītā, pp.37-46, 121-153.
42 Note especially Edgerton, Sabhāparvan, pp.xxxiv-xxxv. Edgerton's stance is more ruthless than Sukthankar's.
44 Edgerton, Bhagavad Gītā, p.193.
stratigraphy of a passage should be deduced as far as possible on grounds other than those relating to the imputed intentions of the one or several composers—that is, it should not be based primarily on inferences concerning the intended significance of the passage or parts of the passage. Attempts have been made to meet this desideratum both by bringing to bear the evidence of cognate material in sources independent of the Mahābhārata or appearing elsewhere in the Mahābhārata, and by using internal evidence of a formal kind, examining the text for flaws of construction, syntactic non sequiturs, and contrasts of style. The classic study combining external comparative evidence with the internal evidence of construction is Lüders’ analysis of the Rṣyaśṛṅga episode.⁴⁵ Studies relying more heavily on stylistic analysis, and based upon Hopkins’ study of epic versification, have been applied to particular episodes by Morton Smith⁴⁶ and on a broader canvas by Mary Carroll Smith.⁴⁷ Let us consider how successful these studies have been, and what we have to learn from them.

⁴⁵ Lüders, "Rṣyaśṛṅga", pp.90-103. Otto’s more contentious Urgestalt der Bhagavad-Gītā, ranks alongside Lüders’ study in methodological interest and could equally well have been considered here as a paradigm.

O’Flaherty, Ascenticism and Eroticism, pp.42-52, discusses the Rṣyaśṛṅga story from a totally different point of view, synthesizing all reflexes of the tale indiscriminately and applying extrinsic categories in order to elicit the supposed essential meaning (not form) of the story.

⁴⁶ Morton Smith, "Story of Ambā", "Story of Nala", and "Story of Sakuntalā".

⁴⁷ M.C. Smith, Core of India’s Great Epic.
Lüders' treatment of the Rāyaśṛṅga episode

Lüders' study of the Rāyaśṛṅga episode in the Tīrthayātra of the Āranyakaparvan is of interest both because it provides a paradigm for critical studies of Mahābhārata episodes and also because it indirectly illustrates the immense contribution the Poona Critical Edition has made to questions of text history. Lüders' article compares versions of the Rāyaśṛṅga story as they appear in ten or so sources, epic, purānic and buddhist; however since he commences his analysis by treating the Mahābhārata version and considers it principally in its own terms, it does no violence to take the Mahābhārata section of his article as a study in its own right.

Lüders does not set down a manifesto of analytical principles, but a consistent procedure of argumentation is deducible from his parallel treatments of two aspects of the story. In each case the foundation of Lüders' argument is that there are illogicalities in the progression of the narrative which are best explained as the products of a reworking of an older story. He demonstrates this by showing that the excision of certain verses and "slight changes" to others will greatly improve the cogency of the narrative. Having in this way identified and confirmed certain non-original materials, Lüders imputes from them the

48 Mbh.iii.110-113.

49 Lüders, "Rāyaśṛṅga", pp.90, 93; also pp.104-106 on the Rāmāyaṇa version.

50 Lüders, "Rāyaśṛṅga", pp.90-91, proposing that the text has been "leicht verändert"; p.92, setting out the segmented text, p.93.
intentions of the reviser - namely, the advancement of brahmanic prestige and the preservation of the princess' virginity. With those imputed intentions in mind, Lüders surveys the text identifying passages which contribute to realizing these aims, and, if they can be excised without harm to the remainder of the material, proposes that they too be regarded as accretions, or if it is not possible to excise them painlessly, proposes that they be regarded as revisions of earlier material. 51

By following this line of argument, Lüders moves from formal or logical grounds upon which key revisions can be deduced to imputing the reviser's intention, and only then argues from the imputed intention or ideological interest of the reviser in order to detect further accreted material. This procedure is impeccable: neither the fact of accretion nor the intention of the accreter are assumed a priori. The subsequent reversal of the direction of the reasoning - using deduction of intention to infer accretion - is a valid extension of the analysis, for it is improbable that every piece of accreted material should happen to be detectable on formal or structural grounds. Consequently, without this further step, the analysis would most probably remain incomplete. However - and this Lüders does not acknowledge - accretions delineated on the criterion of content are established with less certainty than those complementarily attested on formal grounds. This qualification applies especially to

51 Lüders, "Rṣyasṛṅga", pp. 93, 102-103.
instances where the revision of pre-existent material is proposed, since in these cases the analyst's inference of revision and the deduction from which it is derived have to defend themselves before the highest court of appeal - the overt testimony of the extant text. 52

Having deduced and inferred a delineation of original and revised materials, Lüders then addresses himself to the problem of whether the story was incorporated into the Aranyakaparvan in its revised form, or whether the revision took place after the story had become ensconced in the Mahābhārata corpus. On the evidence of the introductory question, which, in view of its function in linking the story to its context, may be assumed to have been composed at the time of the first appearance of the story in the Aranyakaparvan, Lüders argues cogently that the revision of the story was subsequent to its incorporation in the Mahābhārata corpus. He deduces this from two pieces of evidence: the first being the fact that the introductory question assumes an (apparently) older version of the story in which the princess seduces Rāyaśṛṅga, which does not accord with the revised material which follows; the second being that the structure of the introductory question shows signs that the question itself has been revised to foreshadow the accretion of revised material

52 Thus in considering Lüders' emendation Sāntā > vēśya it is necessary to balance the requirement of multiple alteration against the strength of the inference based on the mention of Sāntā in the introductory question ("Rāyaśṛṅga", p.93).
in the body of the story. Lüders does not explore the contradiction between the two kinds of evidence he adduces in the introductory question.

Finally Lüders turns outside the Mahābhārata version of the story in order to draw inferences concerning the relative antiquity of the accretion-revision he has proposed. He does this by focusing attention on two short passages which have parallels in the Padmapurāṇa version of the Rāyaśṛṅga story sufficiently close to suggest genetic relationship. By arguing that while on the one hand these passages have features which suggest lack of originality in the Mahābhārata text on the other hand they are both at home in the Padmapurāṇa contexts, Lüders reasonably contends that the passages are accretions in the Mahābhārata corpus introduced by a transmitter who was acquainted with the Padmapurāṇa account of the story. Although it is possible to quibble at some of the grounds which Lüders chooses to put forward as evidence that the passages are accretions in the Mahābhārata, it may be granted that his arguments have sufficient strength to make the accretion of these passages a probability or better. From the relationship of the passages to the Padmapurāṇa version Lüders concludes that the general revision of the

53 Lüders, "Rāyaśṛṅga", pp. 92, 93.
54 Mbh. (Vulg.) iii.110.37ab = (C.E.) iii.110.543; Mbh. (Vulg.) iii.111.12 = (C.E.) iii.111.548; at Lüders, "Rāyaśṛṅga", p. 99.
55 He is on firmer ground arguing from cryptic sense, anomalous metre, and probably anticipation of plot development than from clumsy expression and defective internal syntax.
Mahābhārata story must have post-dated the composition of the Padmapurāṇa story.

As Lüders was working from the single testimony of the Vulgate text he did not have access to the readings of other branches of the tradition. It is interesting therefore to note that Lüders' analysis is at once magnificently confirmed and utterly destroyed by the new light cast on the text by the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata. The Critical Edition reveals that the two passages Lüders had singled out as almost verbatim quotations from the Padmapurāṇa are in fact contaminations which appear in only about half the collated manuscripts. In this respect Lüders' judicious eye was able to achieve through higher criticism of the Vulgate text what the compilation of a critical edition would powerfully confirm. But at the same time the Critical Edition shows that these passages are contaminations while the material comprising the other parts of Lüders' hypothesized general revision were already present in the archetypal text. Thus the testimony of the Critical Edition refutes Lüders' contention that there was a single general revision of the Mahābhārata material inspired by the Padmapurāṇa version. With hindsight we can recognize that Lüders' reasoning is shown thus to be ill-founded, it does prove that there was not a Padmapurāṇa-inspired revision, but without the benefit of almost verbatim textual parallels it is probably unprovable.

56 Mbh.iii.110.543*: 14 MSS, plus 2 MSS marg. sec. manu out of 28 collated MSS; Mbh.iii.110.548*: in the same N MSS. as the foregoing, but in no S MSS.

57 Lüders, "Rāvaṇarāgā", p.102. Of course, while Lüders' reasoning is shown thus to be ill-founded, it does prove that there was not a Padmapurāṇa-inspired revision, but without the benefit of almost verbatim textual parallels it is probably unprovable.
self-criticism on this point was deficient. Although the two passages of close verbal correspondence established that a reviser of the Mahābhārata version knew the Padmapurāṇa text, Lüders failed to demonstrate any relationship between these passages and the other materials he hypothesized as accreted. They shared no common theme; nor was it explained why the verbal correspondence should be manifest only in these incidental passages and not in those parts of the accretion more expressive of the reviser’s intentions. 58

It would be unfair to Lüders, however, not to point out that he had made an implied qualification of the Padmapurāṇa connexion, for while he calls the relationship of the paired passages in the Mahābhārata and Padmapurāṇa texts "undeniable" (unabweichlich), 59 he says only that "we might also accept" (dürfen wir aber auch annehmen) 60 that the major revision was inspired by the Padmapurāṇa version. Given this qualification, it is open to us to speculate that Lüders found the hypothesis of a single reworking attractive for its heuristic simplicity. Being simple, it is methodologically elegant. Nevertheless, the lesson of the Critical Edition is that such sheer

58 Indeed on the contrary, Lüders, "Ryaśṛṅga", p.102, points out the reviser’s freedom in developing his own elaborations. Nor does Lüders reflect sufficiently on the implications of his observation of verbal correspondences between the Padmapurāṇa text and parts of the Mahābhārata text which, in his reconstruction, belong on the older level (p.103).

59 Lüders, "Ryaśṛṅga", p.100.
60 Lüders, "Ryaśṛṅga", p.102.
elegance was not realistic in this case, and is perhaps therefore generally inadvisable. Furthermore, once the Critical Edition has separated in time the passages which establish unequivocally a debt to the Padmapurāṇa from Lüders' other hypothesized revisions, not only has the basis for attributing the earlier revision to influence of the Padmapurāṇa evaporated, but along with it also the association of the revision with any identified version of the story in which the two otherwise thematically independent elements of Lüders' postulated revision (viz. the advancement of brahmans and the preservation of the princess' virginity) were associated. 61 Thus, thanks to the Critical Edition, there is no longer any reason to attribute even Lüders' internally-deduced reworking to the hand of a single reviser. Since its component elements have no obvious connexion, it is not even heuristically advantageous to do so. The power of the analytical tool with which the Critical Edition has provided us may be gauged from the fact that in place of Lüders' twofold stratification of original and revised materials, on the basis of the evidence he himself adduces we are now obliged to think in terms of accretion on four levels between the original incorporation of the story and the Vulgate

61 Lüders had never adduced the conjunction of these elements in the Padmapurāṇa as evidence supporting the relationship, because some features of the expression given these themes in the Mahābhārata have no parallel in the Padmapurāṇa version and because in other respects there are divergencies of plot development. ("Ṛṣyaśṛṅga", p.102; also p.99).
text (viz. incorporation of original material; the two revisions thematically distinguished by Lüders; the contaminations). Thus the Critical Edition teaches us directly and by example that the history of the Mahābhārata has probably been more complex than there were hitherto grounds to suppose.

For analysis of other episodes in the Mahābhārata, Lüders' treatment of the Rāṣṭrapāla episode stands as both a model and a caution. Lüders' analysis is exemplary in its method of argumentation, moving to ideological inference only from formal criteria. It is also exemplary in distinguishing absolutely between the question of the relative antiquity of elements making up a story judged against an inferred prototype and the question of the relative antiquity of the incorporation of materials into the Mahābhārata corpus. (This is the fundamental issue upon which Dahlmann and the atomistic school part company). On the other hand, Lüders' treatment of the episode has a cautionary sequel which points up the dangers inherent in a too enthusiastic embracing of presuppositions inspired purely by methodological concerns.

With an analysis of specifically the Tulādhāra episode in mind, it should also be observed that the Rāṣṭrapāla episode is narrative in presentation rather than didactic. Because of this, Lüders' task in building arguments on inconsequentialities in plot

62 In fact, since there are other contaminations in descent lines collateral to that of the Vulgate text, this understates the complexity of the history of the tradition.
development which are devoid of direct ideological significance will have been easier than the task of the analyst of a tract in which a large part of the material has the form of a statically conducted colloquy and in which accretions or revisions may be expected to deal purely and directly with ideological interests. To cope with such didactic material, perhaps Otto's analysis of the Bhagavadgītā provides a more relevant exemplar. In his deduction of an old continuum, now fragmented through interpolation, Otto offers useful insights into how Lüders' use of evidence in the introductory question can be developed to include details of the setting of the dialogue and the concluding statement as well. The inferences derived from these elements of structural significance can then take the place of plot-derived inferences in analysis of a narrative episode.

Statistical analyses of style

Metrical and stylistic criteria did not figure largely in Lüders' analysis. Yet because metrical patterns and other symptoms of style are objectively quantifiable there should be a great deal to gain from developing the use of such criteria as a means of minimizing the otherwise considerable reliance on the analyst's discretion. Moreover with the aid of the

63 Otto, Urgestalt der Bhagavad-Gītā, pp.7-14. The overall validity of Otto's analysis is not at issue here.

64 Lüders, "Rṣyaśṛṇga", merely mentions a redundant vocative (p.91), speaks of awkward expression (p.101) and notes the śloka: tristubh contrast (p.100).
modern digital computer both the burdensome tasks of making the quantifications themselves and of eliciting their significant patterns are very much lightened. Since criteria of style apply equally, regardless of whether the passages in question are narrative or didactic in content, it may indeed prove particularly worthwhile for our purposes to consider how stylistic analysis might be validly conducted and whether its application to the analysis of Mahābhārata episodes will produce useful results.

An extended attempt to apply stylistic criteria to the analysis of Mahābhārata episodes has been made by Morton Smith. His aim is to use statistics of style as an ancillary aid to literary criticism, asserting that the key decisions in dismembering a passage must continue to be made on "literary" (sc. higher criticism) grounds. While it is not necessary to linger over Morton Smith's cavalier dogmatism on certain principles of higher criticism, we may notice that he adduces style as only one of six criteria upon which accretion can be identified. Yet when we turn aside from his expressed methodology to examine his actual method of argument, it becomes clear that Morton

65 Morton Smith, "Story of Ambā", "Story of Nala", "Story of Śakuntalā"

66 Morton Smith, "Story of Nala", p.360

67 Morton Smith, "Story of Nala", pp.369-370. Most surprising are his pronouncements that repetition is "universally agreed to be a fault in narration" which probably indicates interpolation (p.369) and that if "an excision produces simplicity, that is not a vice" (p.370). See also "Story of Ambā", p.87, and the puzzling statement about anticipation of repetition, p.90.
Smith commonly adduces style as the arbiter or persuasive corroborator of what could otherwise have advanced no further than the status of hypothesis or speculation. Thus for the conduct of Morton Smith's analysis, the effect of introducing quantified stylistic criteria has been to dilute the discipline of structural analysis of the type exemplified by Lüders' study. The availability of quantitative data against which Morton Smith may test his hypotheses has freed him to throw up segmentations of his material made on highly subjective grounds (including intuitive appreciations of style, and the psychology of the characters) with little disciplined argument or discussion of alternatives. Since Morton Smith is able to acquiesce in the justness of his proposals so long as there are stylistic statistics which appear to confirm the different authorships of the segments he has delineated, the question of how valid his statistics and the use he makes of them becomes more than a subsidiary

---

68 As Morton Smith, "Story of Nala", p.370, rather disarmingly puts it, "The effect of our excisions on the statistics, however weak in itself, is not quite irrelevant". Cf. his earlier statement of methodology, pp.359-360. The entanglement of statistics and literary criteria is especially well illustrated in "Story of Śakuntalā", passim.

69 E.g. Morton Smith, "Story of Śakuntalā", p.166, speaking of C, one of four posited authors: "He tells his story quickly and with humour, and even if A did not have much of that, he could recognize it"; "Story of Nala", p.375: "the hysterical style of the inserter", note esp. p.370.

corroborative issue: it is the central issue upon which his analysis hangs.

The remarkable fact that stylistic criteria never fail to corroborate Morton Smith’s segmentation suggests any one of three causes: it may be that Morton Smith’s application of structural and intuitive criteria to the task of segmentation has been unerring; it may be that he has previously tried and discarded uncorroborated alternative segmentations - although he never mentions having done so; or it may be that his statistics of style in fact lack the discriminating power to deny apparent corroboration to any proposal. In view of the inherent improbability of the first cause, the last possibility warrants critical examination.

Morton Smith tabulates as his primary indicators of style six sets of mutually exclusive variables from which it is his intention to draw statistical inferences:

- metrical patterns (5 classes);
- vocatives (2 classes);
- expressions of past tense (7 classes);
- verbal constructions (3 classes);
- compound construction (5 classes);
- compound length (2 classes).

In addition he brings further indicators to bear in specific cases:

---

frequency of certain particles; selection as between lexical synonyms; frequency of verbal forms; ratio of compound to simple verb stems; range of vocabulary.

Although this array of indices is impressive, Morton Smith deploys his armory of figures in strategies such that there is seldom any doubt that he can prove what he wishes. In the first place, he does not make allowance for the fundamental statistical reality that it is highly improbable that two samples taken from the same corpus of material should match each other exactly in any number of given parameters. The statistician's task is therefore not to demonstrate that there are differences between two samples, but to determine whether or not the degree of difference is so great that it is significant. Only if there is a significant difference (at a prescribed level of certainty) has one the right to conclude that the samples examined are not likely to have been drawn from the same corpus. Secondly, Morton Smith does not allow for the fact that in order to calculate the degrees of significance of difference, it is necessary to have a statistically viable quantity of material. Morton Smith is not only prepared to compare ludicrously small

74 Morton Smith, "Story of Nala", p.369.
77 Jacob, Ramāyaṇa, p.24, notes this limitation on the usefulness of the technique. Word frequency counts in a corpus as large as the entire Sāhpāparvan may be valid (Van Nooten, Mahābhārata Text Analysis, pp.76-77) but does not fit the scale of Morton Smith's analyses.
samples but even when working with larger samples never attempts to balance the degree of difference against the number of observations comprising the data. Because he is prepared simply to amass figures and jump to intuitive conclusions about their significance, Morton Smith has not in fact reduced the subjectivity of his analysis one whit by all his quantifications. Furthermore, because he purports only to corroborate with statistical relationships deduced on the literary grounds of higher criticism, he permits himself the freedom of rummaging through his capacious bag of criteria to pick out two or three which will register what give the appearance of being impressive or at least noteworthy differences. Thus not only does he give his quantifications intuitive non-statistical interpretations but his employment of criteria is selectively turned to produce the result he requires.

Our conclusion, then, must be that despite his


79 Note Morton Smith’s inconclusive and unsatisfactory statement at "Story of Nala", p.360; further as an illustration of his breathtaking nonchalance, p.382: "The vocabulary of A might seem to be wider than B; 171 different [verbal] roots are used, and 170 different compounds made in A, B has 196 roots, and though excess must diminish inversely with the length, 26 roots for 220 lines seems little, 239 different compounds are made, so again there is the impression of more compounds". The statistical problems and logical presumptions implied by this statement are not discussed.

80 E.g. Morton Smith, "Story of Nala", p.382: compare his treatment of simple verbs and verbal compounds, or differences of vocabulary; or "Story of Śākuntalā", p.172.
exuberant quantifications, a statistical determination of stylistic differences has remained just as elusive for Morton Smith as it would have been for a self-confessedly subjective literary critic. While this is undoubtedly attributable in part to Morton Smith's rigorous use of quantified stylistic data, it may also be the case that the material involved is simply not amenable to a properly statistical analysis of style. The extent to which the latter possibility may be the case can best be gauged through considering the demands of a disciplined statistical analysis. For this purpose, the example of Trautmann's study of Kautilya's Arthasastra provides instructive insights.

Trautmann's fascinating study of the Arthasastra authorship problem draws upon analytical techniques developed for deciding questions of disputed authorship of western classical and modern writings. Trautmann's task is to apply the fundamental principles of these statistical analyses to the particular circumstances of the Arthasastra in order to determine whether there had been multiple authorship of the extant text, and - if it should emerge that there had been - to identify the contributions made by each contributing author.

From Trautmann's treatment it is clear that a

\[81\] Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra.

\[82\] Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, pp. 78-81.

He appears to have followed Morton, "Greek Prose", both in some details and in the strategy of approach.
reliable and objectively interpretable quantification of style will be produced only by an analysis which is built around certain indispensable requirements - of which Morton Smith took cognizance. First, since the analysis is based upon the statistically described frequencies of elements of style it is absolutely necessary to have samples sufficiently large to produce discriminating results. The more frequent the occurrence of the element of style, the less bulky the sample of the text will have to be; the converse applies for more thinly distributed elements. For a range of discriminators not different in kind from most of those proposed by Morton Smith, Trautmann considers a sample of 2,000 words in length the minimum sample upon which reliable results can be generated. For rarer markers of style, such as the less common particles or combinations of particles

Trautmann, Kauṭilya and the Arthasastra, pp.81, 85, 115.

Trautmann, Kauṭilya and the Arthasastra, employs particle frequency and frequency distribution (pp. 82-88) and compound length distribution (pp.130-131) as his principal criteria. As Trautmann uses 20 word blocks instead of sentences for quantifying frequency distributions he is not able to employ the useful test of positional distribution suggested by Michaelson and Morton "Positional Stylometry", which his data would otherwise have supported.

Trautmann, Kauṭilya and the Arthasastra, p.82 equivalent to 300 sentences of prose, p.97-98 or 300 slokas.

van Nooten, "Redundancy in Mahābhārata Verse Composition", treats the Sabhāparvan (2,239 stanzas), prose passages (6,120 words), and the Naïopākhyāna (approx. 800 stanzas) to examine the occurrence of particles and adverbs, some of low frequency.
or lexical usages, correspondingly larger samples would be necessary. Secondly, the statistics derived from these samples must be subjected to mathematically respectable tests of significance: only if the difference between the statistical description of two samples of material is calculated to be of such a degree that there is only a small chance that it would arise in random sampling from the same corpus of material can it be presumed that the work of different authors is involved. Thirdly, while it holds true that the comparison of sets of statistics indicates the probability of different authorship if there are significant differences in the stylistic data, the lack of significant difference cannot conversely lead to a presumption of common authorship.

It is perhaps the requirement of a statistically viable sample which represents the most serious obstacle to the application of a statistical analysis of style to the Mahābhārata. The evidence of the Critical Edition with respect to contaminations (the euphemistically termed "star passages") and the

87 Cf. Morton Smith, "Story of Nala", pp.382-384, for illustrations of some low frequencies among even commonplace roots.

88 Trautmann uses the $\chi^2$ test and - for sentence length distribution - the $F$ test of variance ratio: see pp.85-86 and p.124.

89 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasāstra, p.89. Cf. Morton Smith, "Story of Śakuntalā", p.175, directly contradicts this position, and would use metrical scansion statistics to demonstrate that a single author had contributed to both the Nala and Śakuntalā stories.
implications of the higher criticism conducted by Ludwig and others suggest that the contributions of various hands to the extant Mahābhārata text have often been so short that no statistically valid conclusions can be derived from them. Yet in every circumstance where interpolations of less than three hundred stanzas are either posited or suspected, the technique of statistical analysis is utterly debilitated.

Beside this practical limitation on Mahābhārata studies, it is necessary to take into account a theoretical problem which Trautmann touches upon but of which he does not develop the ramifications. Trautmann points out that in order to produce valid results it is necessary to work from quantifications of criteria which are effective discriminators of style. The determination of which criteria are effective discriminators presents no difficulty when the statistical analysis is intended to deal with a passage of disputed or unknown authorship seeking to attribute

90 See pp. 86-87 above.

91 The whole story of Rāṣāyana falls well below Trautmann's statistical threshold, as does the story of Julādhara abhor of its contaminations but including its ancillary chapters. All the interpolations identified by Garbe in his Bhagavadgītā, even if attributed to a single author, also fall below the threshold; likewise each of the revisions hypothesized by Khair, Quest for the Original Gītā; and a fortiori the same applies to Otto's Urgestalt der Bhagavadgītā.

92 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, p. 89. Trautmann's contention that the assumption that a given word is a good discriminator cannot be proved should be qualified as applying only to hypothesized general discriminators.
it or refute its attribution to a given author of whom there are other writings of undisputed authorship available for comparative analysis. In such a case it is possible, by submitting to comparative analysis samples from his writings together with the writings of others which are ostensibly similar, to extract constant and contrastive elements of the known author's style which will therefore be capable of acting as significant discriminators of his style when the passage at issue is tested. In the case of the Arthasastra, no other works attributable to "Kauśilya" or any of the hands which may have been involved in the compilation are available for collateral testing. To circumvent this difficulty, Trautmann hit upon the tactic of making comparative analyses of other quite unrelated and dissimilar works of known authorship in order to deduce a generalized statement about criteria likely to be effective discriminators universal to the Sanskrit language. 93 At best this compromise with necessity must reduce the discriminating power of the chosen criteria by limiting the range of indicators which can be regarded as generally safe; 94 at worst, we can never be sure that the generally discriminating criteria will

93 Trautmann, Kauśilya and the Arthasastra, pp.91-114, 123-130.

94 Cf. Trautmann, Kauśilya and the Arthasastra, p.92, on the possibility of assigning weights to the relative discriminating power of certain words.
be reliable indicators for a particular author. In order to minimize the danger of using sporadically unreliable indicators, Trautmann emphasizes the helpfulness of "utterly mundane" elements of style which are unlikely to be affected by an author's conscious striving for effect. However, even if a pattern of usage is unconscious, this does not mean that it is impervious to being affected by the content or conscious (rhetorical) style of a passage. In fact Trautmann incidentally notes one case where such an effect is suggested.  

Stylistic analysis of the Mahābhārata, too, has to be undertaken without the availability of control writings which can be attributed to known hands. Consequently the power of such analysis must be reduced, just as it was with the Arthasastra. At the same time it is probably true that Trautmann's ingenuity has provided a workable substitute procedure by proposing general discriminators. Indeed, analysis of Mahābhārata material should be benefited somewhat by the applicability of additional criteria relating to metrical elements of style.

95 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, pp. 79-81. Examples are common particles (atha, api, eva) and metrical forms (pathyā: vipulā ratio, types of vipulā, etc.).
96 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, p. 116, on the heavy use of vā in Book 7.
97 The statistics of pathyā/vipulā sloka scansion in proportion to one another, pioneered by Hopkins, Great Epic, pp. 219-252, and employed by Morton Smith, are most promising. See also Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, pp. 109-112. The sporadic distribution and small proportion of triśṭhūḥ stanzas are limitations on their general statistical usefulness, although special studies may be tailored around their patterns of occurrence, e.g. Mary Carrol Smith, Corr. of the Great Epic.
A further dimension is lent to the theoretical problems of statistical analysis by the fact that in Arthasastra and Mahabharata studies we are investigating not unitary works of either known or disputed authorship but composite works whose authors are not only unknown from other writings, but whose contributions to the composite work are not necessarily defined with accuracy or certainty. \(^98\) How, then, is the analyst to proceed with the identification of samples of material which can confidently be attributed to a single author? Failure to eliminate interpolations will vitiate the analysis by diluting or skewing the statistics. If the delineation of component segments of the composite work is done on non-statistical grounds, then the statistical analysis is only as valid as the assumptions of authorship upon which it is based: it does not offer any confirmation or refutation of the hypothesized segmentation; it only offers results which are based on that segmentation. \(^99\)

Trautmann copes with this sampling problem by arguing that each of the books into which the Arthasastra is divided is the composition of a single author. \(^100\) His argument in support of this presumption I find

\(^98\) Cf. Morton Smith, "Story of Nala", p.366, on adhyāya divisions.

\(^99\) This is a corollary of the point made earlier that lack of significant difference between samples is not positive evidence of common authorship.

\(^100\) Excepting the verse colophons associated with chapter divisions, Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, pp.70-76.
unconvincing; consequently, in my mind, it is very doubtful indeed that his carefully disciplined statistical treatment has produced results of any validity.

Nor is it feasible to generate the segmentation of a passage through any statistical analysis of style. It may seem, prima facie, possible to exhaustively test all possible segmentation patterns on the assumption that the segmentation which gives either the largest number of significant differences or a significant difference at the highest degree of certainty is most likely to delineate the contributions of accreters. Given an indeterminate but arbitrarily limited number of authors making contributions of indeterminate size and indeterminate and not necessarily continuous placement, and given a certain number of stylistic discriminators, the number of hypothetically possible segmentations and of the calculations for testing them would be extremely high, although doubtless not beyond the capacity of a digital computer to handle. The infeasibility of the proposal arises rather from several theoretical obstacles: first, that even when a large bulk of material is being subjected to statistical segmentation, and when the number of contributing authors is arbitrarily limited, a large proportion of

\[\text{See Appendix, pp. 645-657 below.}\]

\[\text{Without this limitation, the analysis would tend to resolve itself into the most diverse result of a number of segments equal to the number of basic units of analysis.}\]
hypothetical combinations would be statistically vitiated by containing one or more segments of a sample size too small to allow calculation of significance of difference; secondly, that there are no realistic criteria for preferring several significant differences at a certain degree of certainty to a single significant difference at a higher degree of certainty; and, thirdly, underlying the second objection, that it is improper to turn the analytical procedure on its head, to use statements concerning the statistical probability that a relationship of a certain kind exists between given knowns to posit a single most probable relationship between unknowns.

In sum, it seems that statistical studies of style will not make any contribution to the analysis of the Mahābhārata text beyond corroborating (but not proving or refuting) segmentations which happen to comprise components large enough to provide a statistical base. In the fundamental problem of deriving the segmentation, we have no alternative but to try to push further along the jungle path which Lüders began to clear.

Proposing a workable methodology

The desideratum for an analysis of the authorship of a Mahābhārata passage is that, given the material extant, it should produce the conclusion which most

---

103 In practice of course the observations of pp. 95-97 apply and it is likely that not only some samples but even the whole corpus will be disqualified.
nearly corresponds with the historical reality of the
composition and transmission of the text. Since we
have no means of knowing the historical reality except
through analysis of the text, it becomes doubly
necessary that the analysis should proceed
scientifically. Because the results cannot be
corroborated or refuted from any independent source,
their only recommendation can be that the process of
analysis which produced them was subject to internal
corroborations and exposed to potential refutations at
every turn of its development. While this in itself is
no guarantee that the results will have any
verisimilitude, at least there is no procedure which
can produce more authoritative results.

Although at first sight the approach may seem
somewhat Luddite, the most reliable and productive
principle of analysis is simply to let the text speak
for itself as far as possible. Imputed relationships
of the material for analysis with other presumed like
or cognate passages in related or independent
traditions may have suggestive or corroborative value,
but in the last analysis the precise nature of their
relationship with the text at issue and therefore
their significance for unravelling it can only be
determined in terms of that text itself. Even Lüders,
despite his comparative purposes, felt unable to use
comparative material for more than corroboration of
accretions he had deduced from his study of the
Ṛgveda episode itself. Furthermore, by focussing
his analysis in the first place solely on the
materials of the passage for analysis, the analyst imposes upon himself the healthy discipline of giving the text - read in its plain sense and construed in the context it provides itself - the preemptive power of interpretation. The text in other words retains its authentic taste stewed in its own juice, not marinated with exotic sources.

With all the goodwill and sensitivity in the world, however, the analyst will stumble over passages which, read plainly, do not make good sense or do not make sense at all. Since it is the fundamental assumption of rational analysis that an author does not write nonsense, it is in situations where the extant text appears to lack straightforward sense that interpolation, textual derangement, or omission should be hypothesized. In some cases the incoherence or self-contradictions of the text will be beyond doubt; in others, however, the analyst will be called upon to exercise discretion in deciding the question of degree which separates permissible latitude from impermissible laxity. It is both inappropriate and unwise to place demands of absolute consistency and flawless expression on an author: in the first place it is unreasonable to expect superhuman perfection from a

\[104\] Cf. Esteller's statement of Lüders' "rationality principle" ("The Mahābhārata Text Criticism", p.248). Lüders would not, I think, concur with Esteller's outrageous damning of the licence, gullibility, nonsensicality and devilry with which the tribe of scribe transmitters has degraded an original authentic and faultless text (pp.248-257). Even interpolators are rational beings (see pp.109-110 below).
human composer, especially one who is often not composing ex nihilo or in vacuo, but adapting his memory's half-formed metric phrases or rhetorical sequences with an eye to the context for which his composition is intended; and in the second place, in demanding more than a reasonable freedom from inconsequentialities there is a danger that the analyst may define as stringent requirements his own predispositions. Morton Smith is, I fear, guilty of many offences of this nature. It is reasonable to expect of a composer only competent coherence, not more.

The fact that judgement of degrees of delirament may be discretionary will generally not weaken the analysis, however, for it is only the basis for hypothesizing interpolation. Confirmation of the hypothesis depends on the application of a test: simply, whether or not the text is improved formally and structurally with the excision of the hypothesized interpolation. If the excision leaves a hiatus or makes the text less consequent, then there is a presumption against the proposed interpolation. The practical application of this test may involve a balancing of the infelicities created by excising the material against those perpetuated by leaving it in place. But the necessity for such a decision is ultimately inescapable; it lies at the heart of the analytical method, for the ultimate justification for

105 Such structural and formal (syntactical) tests of continuity are to be distinguished absolutely from subjective assertions like that of Garbe, Die Bhagavad-Gītā, p.16.
the analysis is that by segmenting a passage into discrete components attributable to various hands the good sense of the sum of the parts may be made greater than the sense of the whole.

The validity of this test for hiatus hinges upon an assumption that, in the absence of indications to the contrary, everything which was ever present in the tradition is now present, i.e. that nothing has been lost or revised. A practical corollary of this assumption is that textual asperities are always to be attributed to the disruption attendant upon incorporation of an interpolation rather than to omission. Whether or not this assumption accurately reflects the reality of a stable text tradition is immaterial: it is a methodological imperative. Since it is possible to support or refute argument only on the basis of extant evidence, to change or revise the extant material without positive textual support is tantamount to tampering with the evidence. An interpreter's guess about omission or revision remains impermissible because there is no way in which it can be shown to be incorrect, and hence no way to confirm it logically. Moreover, a too-ready resort to emendation by the analyst may palliate vexations which might better be diagnosed as symptoms of interpolation.

106 Such a phenomenon may be extrapolated from Deussen's emendation of ahimsa > anahimsa- in Mbh. xii.256,6a (Vier philosophische Texte, p.434, as 265,6), on which see pp.323-324, n.69 below.
Because we have only the extant material available to us, we cannot directly gauge how likely it is that our analysis will be vitiated by its ignorance of alterations made to the older parts of a text in the course of accommodating new material. With the evidence now provided by the Critical Edition collation, however, we are able to judge the frequency of such alterations in the tradition since the time of the archetypal text. While evidence arising under later conditions cannot be applied unthinkingly to the development of the tradition prior to the archetypal text,\(^\text{107}\) it is nevertheless the best evidence we have. To anticipate parts of the following analysis of the Tulādhāra episode, it emerges that there is no evidence of deliberate dropping of material the excision of which would improve the reading of the text.\(^\text{108}\)

Edgerton, too, observes that so far as the Sabhaparvan text is concerned, "probably not one of the some fifty MSS I have studied for Book 2, nor any of the genealogical ancestors, ever deliberately or unintentionally omitted a single line of the text; ... and it appears that no scribe, no redactor, ever knowingly sacrificed a single line which he found in

---

\(^{107}\) Cf. my comments below, p.626.

\(^{108}\) This is strikingly illustrated by the survival of the misplaced Mbh.xii. 255.35-36 and 256.22cd in 5 manuscripts, see pp.353-354, 389-390. It should be noted however that these are imputations drawn from an analysis conducted on the assumption that there have not been deliberate omissions. Nevertheless I am not aware of situations where the possibility of assuming deliberate omission would have been notably advantageous.
his original. Not even if he found something which seemed to him incomprehensible, inconsistent with the context, irreligious or immoral. There are of course many instances of accidental loss, as for instance through haplology, but because such omissions are random and because there is also evidence of a compensating factor in restitution by contamination from collateral versions, they are probably not a serious threat to the analysis. With revisions, the situation is somewhat different. The collation of the Critical Edition does indeed provide evidence of revisions where the context of the material has been so changed by interpolation that it has come to be felt necessary to harmonize the sense of the older material with the new. From the theoretical point of view the implications of this are unfortunate, for however probable a revision may seem, invocation of textual alteration without textual support must remain impermissible; and even in

109 Edgerton, Sabhaparvan, "Introduction", p.xxxiv. Note especially Sukthankar, Adicarvan, "Prolegomena", pp.lii-liii; also his "Epic Studies 3", pp.273-275, concurs. Note however an instance in which Belvakantr thinks material has been deliberately omitted from Śī alone (Śāntiparvan, "Introduction", pp.xxii-xxiii); the case may however be one of incomplete distribution of a contamination.

110 E.g. the emendations spardha > śraddhā of Mbh.xii. 256.6c and 16a (see p.226 below) or saṃbhārati saṃbhavati of Mbh.xii.255.37f (see p.191 below).

111 Lüders' emendations śānta > veśya is backed by evidence of the story's introduction. See note 52 above.
cases where there is indirect textual support for an emendation, argumentation which does not involve revision should generally be preferred to the alternative.

Elegance is added to the analysis by taking consideration of the hypothesized interpolation one step further and attempting to give a credible account of the motivation for its composition. This involves determining the point or aspect of the older text which inspired the interpolator to compose or insert his contribution, and accounting for the placement of the interpolation in relation to the postulated point of attraction. Being argued ex hypothesi, the treatment has no predicative value. The virtue of the exercise is that it carries the spirit of the analysis across into the realm of interpolation. The discipline of the principle that the text is to be understood read in its plain sense and construed in the context it provides itself is not dissipated by the necessary redefinition of context: even when interpolation is proposed, the context remains partly that supplied by the prior text. Dealing with the products of two minds, the analyst has more flexibility in accounting for inconsistencies of outlook or infelicities of plot development, but he is never released from the obligation of justifying his inferences on the basis of the interpolator's composition and the prior text as it may have appeared to him. While it is credible that an interpolator's comprehension of the totality of the prior text may
have been deficient or that he may have overlooked subtleties implicit in the outlook of an earlier composer, it is neither necessary nor warranted to believe that the interpolator's work is the product of an inferior mind. By withholding such derogation, the particular riches of the Mahābhārata corpus are unlocked. In an intensively interpolated tradition, there is ample opportunity to observe and describe the meeting of minds which occurs between every interpolator and his predecessors.

The results of analysis conducted on the lines indicated are the more reliable the more strictly the initial segmentation of the text and hypothesizing of interpolation is derived from formal or structural grounds. Delineation of an interpolation through complementary faults of syntax in the extant text is a far sounder base for the hypothesis than, for instance, an apparent shift of lexical usage. Both are preferable to the imputation of a shift of ideological position. The more formal the criteria, the less scope there is for the intrusion of the analyst's preconceptions. Not only is the analysis more securely founded in more objectively discernible features of the text, but it need hardly be added that when the analysis of Mahābhārata material is being

112 The problematical nature of argument based on "jedes inhaltliche kriterium" is well illustrated by Ruben's discussion, "Schwierigkeiten", pp. 253-254. Sukthankar, "Epic Studies 3", pp. 263-264, seems to have misunderstood Ruben's point.
undertaken with an interest in moral history in view there is an additional impulse for the analyst to indulge in self-fulfilling prophecy and therefore even more reason to be wary of ideologically mounted segmentations.

It should also be noted that segmentation on other than formal or structural grounds does not offer the opportunity for distinguishing between materials compiled by a single composer and materials properly attributed to separate contributors to the Mahābhārata corpus. While this is an essential distinction for reconstructing the history of the text tradition, it might be thought that the distinction is rather academic so far as a history of ideas is concerned: what does it matter if distinguishable materials were combined for incorporation or incorporated separately? But unless this distinction is observed we lose a part of the special contribution which the Mahābhārata can make to a history of ideas by giving an insight into how related ideas were dynamically related in the minds of earlier writers. Only if we can presume that certain materials were, in the mind of an unknown composer, relevantly combined in the exposition of his ideological outlook can we use them to attempt to discern the coherent thread, the angle of vision, which binds his composition into a whole. If every ideological conception were segmented and considered as an individual entity vis-à-vis the remaining text our insights would be very much shallower.
Nevertheless it cannot be overlooked that interpolation may have taken place without leaving formal or structural traces. In such cases it would produce greater verisimilitude in the analysis to accept a segmentation based on ideological grounds. The obstacle to doing so, however, is the impossibility of determining when, short of outright contradiction in the text, such ideologically generated segmentation would be justified. Since there is no way of separating judgements on this question from the analyst's own perceptions (or preconceptions), it is methodologically preferable to adopt a conservative formalist position. The results will be more, not less, interesting.

The supreme potential of the Mahābhārata corpus for the history of ideas is, thus, a product of precisely those qualities which have in the past made scholars shy of drawing upon it. It encompasses a

113 See cases discussed below, pp.153-158, 198-212.
114 On the unattractiveness of Mahābhārata didactic material, it is only necessary to quote Oldeburg's strong language condemning the Śāntiparvan as a jumble of countless episodes (Das Mahābhārata, p.76) whose treatment is matched in its bulk only by its superficiality and sloganizing, full of crass contradiction (p.77). The presentation is long-winded and monotonous; the content is wretched: "... unter den Wüsten der indischen Literatur die Bhīṣmareden als eine der wüstesten erscheinen..." (p.78). He is, perhaps, outdone only by Venkatachallam Iyer, Preliminary Chapters of the Mahābhārata, who calls the Śāntiparvan and Anūsasana-parvan "stupendous forgeries unsurpassed for the daring involved in the enterprise" (p.271), adding that "we should thank ourselves that the chapters [of sermons] are no greater than they are in number" (p.273). See also Esteller, "The Mahābhārata Text Criticism", p.232.
vast amount of material on diverse topics, and has been subjected to intensive interpolation over many centuries. While on the one hand this makes the corpus as a whole dauntingly unwieldy, on the other hand detailed and disciplined analyses of Mahābhārata episodes promise insights into the intellectual life of early India with an intimacy not available from any other source.
There follows an analysis of the story of Tulādhāra, the Bearer of the Balances, from the Śāntiparvan. In the analysis, formal structural criteria - principally infelicities of syntax and discontinuities of structure - are used first to segment the material of the episode into discrete passages whose separability is attributable to historical processes of accretion, and secondly to determine the antiquity of the segments relative to one another. This segmentation and stratification is undertaken not in ignorance of the meaning of the stanzas analysed, but without taking cognizance of ideological stances.
Chapter 252 is a prologue to the recounting of the Tulādhāra story. It is neither feasible nor profitable to begin the analysis of the story here both because of the absence of structural grounds for any internal segmentation and because of the prologue's lack of an intimate structural relationship with the story following.

It may be presumed that from the time the story first appeared in the Śāntiparvan there was a prologue of a similar kind which, by raising issues and posing questions, bound the story into the broader setting of the moral questioning of Bhīṣma by Yudhiṣṭhira. Unless evidence to the contrary appears later in the analysis, there is no reason to suppose that the earliest form of the prologue differed greatly from the form presented by the Critical Edition.
CHAPTER 253

In contrast with the prologue, a preliminary reading of the material of Chapter 253 reveals a major structural discontinuity in the following stanzas:

11 Having been thus addressed by [those] ghosts, Jājali departed, downhearted. When he arrived at Vārāṇasi, he spoke to Tulādhāra [in the following] words:

Yudhiṣṭhira said:

12 What were the meritorious works Jājali had previously performed by which he achieved this greater success? Please relate this to us, sir.

The former stanza brings the opening part (1–11)² of the chapter to a close, and appears to lead on to a conversation between Jājali and Tulādhāra. However, the stanza which follows it is a question, uncalled for by the context, which introduces the description of Jājali’s penance in the forest when birds nested in his hair (13–46). This description traverses again the ground covered by the first part of the chapter. The common function of the two passages with regard to the development of the story is shown clearly in the rebukes delivered to Jājali, in the first case by watching demons:

1 Figure in parenthesis refer to stanzas in the chapter under discussion.
7 ... You should not talk like that.

8 Even Tulādhāra, a trader by profession and famed in Varaṇaṣi, would not be worthy to speak as you have, excellent brahman. and in the second case by the more prosaic heavenly voice:

42 ... In dharma, even you are not the equal of Tulādhāra, o Jajali.

43 Indeed, even Tulādhāra, [who is] very wise, [and] lives at Varaṇaṣi, would not be worthy to speak as you have spoken, o brahman.

The presence of such duplication, redundant in the development of the story, is most simply explicable by assuming accretion.

Taking up the assumption that accretion has taken place, we are confronted with the further problem of determining what part of the chapter is the more original, and what has been more recently added. On this

3 253.7ed, 8:

[abruvam ca piśacas taṁ] nāivam tvam vaktum arhasi/
tulādhāro vanigdharma vāraṇasyam mahāyaśaṁ /
so 'py evaṁ nārhatे vaktum yathā tvāṁ dvijasattāma/

4 253.42, 43:

[athantarikṣe vāg āśīt taṁ sa śuṣrūva jājaliṁ] dharmena na simas tvām vai tulādhārasya jājale/
vāraṇasyaṁ mahāprajñāṁ tulādhārāṁ pratiśnitaṁ /
so 'py evaṁ nārhatे vaktum yathā tvāṁ bhaṣase dvija /

5 The nature of the alternative parallel accounts makes the possibility that we are dealing with a conflation of two versions of the story prima facie attractive. In fact analysis of later chapters will prove that conflation has not been at work. But in any case the question has no significance for our present purposes. If conflation is defined (a) loosely, as the combination of parallel reflexes of a common prototype, then the concept is inapplicable for our analysis since we are here concerned not with the ultimate sources of the materials of the text but with the manner in which they have been combined; or (b) closely, as multiple contamination between collateral exemplars such that neither was consistently the base text, then the concept is inapplicable to the analysis of a single instance of contamination, for which there must by definition always be an ad interim base (recipient) text.
question, a first and elementary observation is that the passage appearing first in the text is prima facie more likely to be original than accreted, simply because accretions may generally be expected to fall after the material to which they have been attracted. A more cogent argument may be mounted on the evidence of the juncture between stanzas 11 and 12 itself. 6 In the first place, the roughness of the juncture indicates that the text as it existed prior to the interpolation was in a fixed, i.e., written, form. 7 It is not credible that so dramatic a discontinuity as that between stanzas 11 and 12 would have been preserved—or indeed would ever have arisen—in the course of oral transmission. 8 Given, then, that we are dealing with written transmission, we may go on to observe that the original material is likely to appear more conservative in form, having been given its shape before interpolation occurred, whereas the material being interpolated may appear more comfortably accommodated to its context. With respect to the pre-existent text, the interpolator is essentially a transmitter, and as the transmitter of a fixed text his relationship to the material is a passive one. By

6 Not much store can be laid by the fact that the former passage (1-11) begins with the introductory formula one would expect to find at the beginning of an episode while the latter begins with the less specialised question-and-answer technique. Both of these are purely formal devices easily manipulated by a composer or an interpolator.

7 This presumption accords with the conclusion reached on different grounds at p. 413 below.

8 Cf. Lord, Singer of Tales, pp. 95-98.
contrast, when he is involved in working an interpolation into the pre-existent text of a story, he takes an active role more analogous to that of composer. In this light the seemingly inept conclusion (11) of the former part of the chapter is comprehensible if taken to be original material and not as the end of an interpolation: one would have to suppose that an interpolator was acting quite mindlessly to have produced such an ill-considered transition back to the older text. The charge of ineptitude may be averted by assigning the now awkward conclusion (11) to a pre-existent written text.

If the retelling of Jājali's exploits (12-45) by the narrator, Bhīṣma, may thus be regarded as an accretion, what of the later recapitulation of Jājali's doings (47-51) put into Tulādhāra's mouth in order to demonstrate his clairvoyance? This passage (47-51) is only loosely tied to what falls before it in the text. Its connexion with the interpolated account of Jājali's penances (12-45) therefore cannot be taken for granted.

It is at least a possibility that in Tulādhāra's recapitulation we have a resumption of the older interrupted material (1-11); or alternatively, it may be an independent interpolation even younger than that already identified. The former possibility may be ruled out simply on the evidence of the content of Tulādhāra's recapitulation. The birds, which appear in Bhīṣma's second account (13-45) but not in his first (1-11), figure prominently in Tulādhāra's
account,9 and indeed the 'punch line' of Tulādhāra's speech is his sarcastic reference to Jājali's raising of sparrows.10 In one instance, Tulādhāra uses a phrase exactly matched in Bhīṣma's second account.11 Tulādhāra's knowledge of these aspects of Jājali's penance mean that his account cannot have been composed earlier than the interpolation already identified (12-45). The fact that Tulādhāra puts Jājali's place of penance in a tidal swamp, a detail found only in Bhīṣma's older account of Jājali's ascetic exercises (13-45),12 in no way contradicts this conclusion: any interpolator has the opportunity to acquaint himself with material older than his own.

This conclusion does not close the door to the possibility that Tulādhāra's recapitulation (44-51) may be younger than everything preceding it in the text. But on the other hand there is no compelling reason against seeing both the incident involving the birds (12-45) and Tulādhāra's retelling of it (47-51) as parts of a single accretion. There is no sharp structural discontinuity separating the parts as there was between Bhīṣma's two accounts of Jājali's penances. Thus the apparent redundancy of Tulādhāra's

9 253.49, 50.
10 253.50cd: manyamānas ... dharmam caṭaprabhavanam.../
   On the significance of this, see p.497 below.
11 amara gaṇasā āpamanavas in 253.44a and 51a. There are of course other shared usages, but it is only to be expected that common words will be repeated when the same story is told, and no conclusion can be drawn from them.
12 253.2c: sāgaroddeśam; 253.48a: sāgaranupam.
clairvoyant session is probably better seen not as a flaw in the presentation which calls for a rationalizing explanation, but rather as the employment of a stock-in-trade of story-telling.\textsuperscript{13} It is not necessary nor wise to separate Tulādhāra's recapitulation (47-51) from Bhīṣma's second narration (12-45).

\textsuperscript{13} Compare for example Mbh.iii.198.12-14, or the constant recurrence of this technique, used for rhetorical effect, in a related story in the Padmapurāṇa (5.47 AnSS, = 1.52 VSP.).
CHAPTER 254

The second chapter of the story is far more intractible. It seems ideologically homogeneous enough, but certain formal features hint at a complexity of structure.

There are several instances of discontinuity, as for instance in the following inconsequential passage:

They speak of the gift of freedom from fear of [any] creature as the highest of all gifts. This is the truth I tell you; believe [me], O Jájali.

Even he who has been fortunate [will] again become unfortunate. Seeing the dissipation of works, men always spurn [them].

In another case, a description of the randomness of social values switches without warning to a eulogy of fearlessness? There are yet other cases of out-and-out incoherency.

Looking beyond particular instances of discontinuity, a survey of the chapter reveals a kind of patchwork pattern. Materials which resemble one another closely with regard to subject matter and mode

1 254.33, 34:
   dānaḥ bhūtabhayasyāhuh śarvadānebbhya uttamam /
   bravīmi te satyam idam śraddhāsa ca jājale //
   sa eva subhago bhūtvā purnar bhavati durbhagaḥ /
   vyāpattīṃ karmāṇāṃ dṛśtvā jugupsyanti janāḥ sadā//
   Other instances similar to this are 254.20/21;
   254.50/51/52.
2 254.21-24 on the randomness of social values;
254.25-26 eulogy of fearlessness.
3 254.26/27. Further analysis will show that translation of the extant text is unjustifiable. Note the difficulties native commentators seem to have experienced with stanza 27: see extracts in Critical Edition, Apparatus Criticus.
of expression are found scattered about in various parts of the chapter interrupting one another. Abstract discussion of the nature of dharma occurs in at least two places \((C, E)\) separated by some eighteen verses. Similarly statements concerning fearlessness and similes illustrating the effect of terror occur in two places \((PB, RDQ)\) separated by eight verses of abstract dharma discussion \((C)\). Even more curiously, the merchant's personal statements of his philosophy of life are found near the beginning of the chapter \((A)\) and right at the end \((G)\), with no fewer than seventy verses intervening.

**Identification of old material**

These features must raise a suspicion that interpolation has had its effect here as it had in chapter 253. Since the confusion and complexity of this chapter appears greater than that of the straightforward narrative of chapter 253, we must adopt different tactics in order to unravel the material. We may conveniently begin with the assumption that even in its most rudimentary original form the episode must have had a story line expressed in the simplest of plots. As a first step in tentatively identifying old materials we might therefore attempt to pick out those strands of the story which are demanded by the most elementary

---

4 Letters in parenthesis refer to sections of the text defined in Table I. For easy reference use of Table II is suggested.
conception of the story line, or implicit in it. The elements so identifiable are few.

First, the fact that the name of the hero of the story is Tulādāhāra, the balance-holder, is closely linked with his statement that:

12 ... My balances stand level with regard to all creatures, o Jājali.⁵

Now, there is no reason to suspect that the hero of the story was ever nameless, and no grounds for believing that he was ever called anything other than Tulādāhāra. Yet without this verse the relevance of the hero's name to the material comprising the story is obscure.⁶ Hence it may be presumed that this verse is as old as the naming of the hero; in other words it is likely to be original.

Secondly, it is a necessity that the brahman ask the merchant a question if he is to elicit the merchant's exposition of his knowledge. This is the story's raison d'être. In the text as it stands, the brahman's question is put in a group of three stanzas (KZ). However, the actual request for information is

5 254.12 cd: tulā me sarvabhūteṣu saṃtīṣṭhati Jājalc //

6 It could be argued that the verse 12 cd is nothing but the work of a punster, and is thus a most likely kind of young accretion, which is therefore of little value in establishing alignments. But then a further question may be asked as to why the hero was called - of all things - Tulādāhāra? Is it simply because this is a fitting name for a merchant? If so, why was the hero conceived of as a merchant? And why is it precisely this aspect of his calling, and not for instance the kind of goods in which he dealt, which inspired his name? Cf. 255.1b, where tulām diharayatā tvayā may well be nothing but a play on words - on other grounds it will be shown that the passage is young (see pp. 212-214). Meanwhile it is interesting that there, unlike 254.12 cd, the play on words has no obvious significance for its context. On the use of puns, see also p. 332 below. (Cf. p. 231.)
made only in the last of the three stanzas (3; Z).
The immediately preceding stanza (2) is prefatory elaboration. The first of the three stanzas (1) serves to link this chapter with the material falling at the end of the previous chapter (ch.253), which, we have already concluded, does not belong on the oldest level of the story's development. Moreover, by stating that Jājali had just been addressed by Tulādhāra, this stanza (1) puts itself in harmony with the later-aligned material but quite at odds with the concluding stanza of the oldest material of the first chapter (253.11) where we are told that Jājali is about to speak to Tulādhāra. The first stanza (1) of chapter 254 therefore cannot be older than the interpolation into chapter 253. By thus eliminating the first stanza (1) and regarding the second (2) as embroidery, we reduce the structurally-demanded minimum question to a single verse:

3) You have gained a consummate understanding. Whence has this come to you? Tell me all about this [matter] in full, 0 perceptive one. 7

And this question, once asked, must be answered:

4) Addressed thus by that famous brahman, Tulādhāra, [who was] aware of the essential meaning of dharma [although but] a vaiśya, taking pleasure in knowledge, then spoke of the subtleties of dharma to Jājali [who had the power resulting from] unnatural penances:

7 254.3:
adhyaṁa naisthikīṁ buddhim kutas tvāṁ idam āgatam / 
etad ācakṣyā me sarvaṁ nikhilena mahāmāte //
"I know, O Jājali, [about] the abiding dharma, including its secret aspects ... "

And as soon as we put this down as a tentative minimum answer, we find ourselves led on into other parts of the chapter. The general tenor, and even some of the very words, of this introduction to the merchant's answer is picked up again much later in the chapter (in E).

Because of its subtleness, the deeply hidden [true dharma] cannot be [directly] discerned. By itself the similarity proves nothing at all; but it has a potential which may be activated by other factors.

Finally, in judging oldness, we may draw upon the evidence of the preface to the whole episode (ch.252). This preface gives a survey of the issues the story following was intended to illustrate. They include the problems posed by conflicts of ūruti and smrti; the question of the motivation of actions; and the relativity of the value of actions.

8 254.4, 5ab: evam uktas tulādharo brāhmaṇena yaṣasvinā / uvyāca dharmasūkṣmaṁ vaiśyo dharmārtha tatattvavit / jājaliṁ kaśtatapasam jñānatrpitaṁ tada nṛpa // vedāhaṁ jājale dharmam sarahasyam sanātanam /

9 254.36ab: sūkṣmatvan na sa vijnātum śakyate bahumijnah /

10 The shared words and ideas, involving subtlety (4c dharmasūkṣmaṁ, 36a sūkṣmatvat, 35b sūkṣmo) and imperceptibility (5b sarahasyam, 36b bahumijnah), are not unusual and not enough to build any theory of relationship upon. It is valid to use them for the limited objective of distinguishing one attitude towards dharma from others expressed in the chapter, without on that basis proposing links between the verses classed together.
... No behaviour [which is] good for everyone can be discerned,

For, the behaviour] by which one person profits, grieves another ... 11

The most fundamentally puzzling issue seems to be that posed by the preface in the following terms:

The behaviour of the good is considered [to constitute] dharma; the good are defined [in terms of their] behaviour. How can what ought and what ought not to be done [then be distinguished if] the behaviour of the good has no [intrinsic] attributes?12

It is striking that nothing in the introductory chapter foreshadows the concern with fearlessness or harmlessness13 so prominent in the extant chapter 254. Now, by virtue of its position, the preface to a story is likely to remain unaffected by accretions inspired by the meat of the story itself and may therefore be expected to be a conservative indicator of its contents. If some issues dealt with in the story are raised in the preface while others are not, it follows that the parts of the story which deal with matters mentioned by the preface are more likely to be the older.14 In the present case, the preface seems to

11 252.17cd, 18ab:
na hi sarvahitak kascid acarah sampradaya // tenalyayah prabhavati so para badhate punah //

12 252.5:
Sadacaro mato dharma santas tv acaralaksanah / sadhyasadhyap katham sakya samadacaro hy alaksanam //

13 Except if it is taken as implicit in the statement that many men have adopted kṣatriya ways, 252.17ab. But in context this seems rather a complaint about the confusion of duties than any harbinger of an ahimsa discussion.

14 Whether or not the preface may be used to delineate original (as opposed to merely old) materials in the story following depends upon (1) whether the preface itself has been revised and (2) whether the story had any separate existence before the preface was composed as part of the process of incorporation into the Mbh. There is also the complication that elaboration of old or original material in the story may distort the picture.
call for a discourse on dharma, not one on harmlessness or fearlessness such as the extant text seems to offer. The implication is that those passages discussing dharma are more likely to be old than the others - always remembering that this is a general presumption which does not necessarily hold true of every stanza treating the subject.

Using the preface as a touchstone we are able to detect several potentially old passages. Reassuringly, the first mention of dharma comes at the beginning of Tulādhāra’s answer (Z), the oldness of which has already been suggested on different grounds; in stanza 9, dharma is identified with kindness to all; another cluster of several stanzas (C) vividly describes the confusion and randomness of ideas of dharma; the stanzas (E) whose affinity with the beginning of Tulādhāra’s answer (Z) has already been noted also speak of dharma; and, finally, near the end of the chapter (UF) dharma is mentioned again. The previously noticed patchwork quality of the chapter reasserts its presence.

Of the passages identified on this criterion, two (C, E) extend over several stanzas. It is noteworthy that both these passages treat of the nature of dharma rather than describing what constitutes it. The contrast between these approaches may be illustrated by comparing a quotation from C with stanza 9:
The abiding dharma has perished. Bemused by notions of right behaviour anyone will become confused whether he is a scholar, ascetic, or man of influence.  

He who is always the friend of all, and who is devoted to the good of all in mind, word, and deed — he, O Jājali, knows dharma.

A characteristic of the treatment of dharma offered by the two main verse groups (C, E) is that in both contexts dharma is contrasted with the concept of a code of behaviour (acāra). The significance of this point lies in the fact that this is precisely the contrast drawn in the key stanza of the preface quoted above. Thus there are grounds for distinguishing stanza 9 from C, E — with the presumption of originality attached to C, E.

Prima facie original passages are therefore: verse 12 cd, which explains the hero's name; Z, which is structurally necessary and which mentions dharma; and C, E which discuss dharma in the same manner as the preface. The hypothesis that these passages are original may be verified or refuted by the success or failure of an attempt to use them as fixed points underpinning an analysis of the structure of the whole chapter.

15 254.21:
pranastah saśvato dharmaḥ sadacāreṇa mohitah /
tena vaidyās tapasvī balāvān vā vimohyate //

16 254.2:
sarveṣāṁ yah suḥrṇ nityāṁ sarveṣāṁ ca hite rataḥ /
karmaṇā manasā vacā sa dharmaṇ veda ṛṣa jājale //

17 252.5, at page 128.
Restitution of an old continuum

Let us embark upon this analysis by further considering the relationship between the two principal passages C, E just discussed. If we tentatively assume that the intervening material (RDQ) is spurious, we find it is possible to run straight on from the former passage (C) to the latter (E) keeping good sense and coherency. Only a minor grammatical awkwardness remains. The second passage (E) begins with the phrase sa eva, which is not unacceptable as it stands but which would sit more easily if it were related to some correlative which our proposed reconstruction does not supply. This want is supplied, however, when the intervening material (RDQ) is examined.

Of the material falling between C and E, one stanza (D) is remarkable for being at best very obscure and at worst unintelligible as it stands in the Critical Edition text:

```
sahāyavān dravyavān yah subhago 'nyo 'paras tathā/
tatas tān eva kavyah ṣāstreṣu pravadantye uta /
kīrtthyartham alpaśūlekhāḥ pāvavāḥ kṛtśanānirṇayāḥ//
```

Symptomatically the editors have felt obliged to quote several valiant attempts by commentators to give the stanza some meaning. Now, it is possible to show

18 254.34a.
19 254.27.
20 C.E. Apparatus Criticus 12.254.27, also the editors' own comments in the Critical Notes, Śāntiparvan, p.2190. Also Roy, vol.9, p.256, n.4, who concludes: "It is almost impossible to understand Verses such as these without the aid of the Commentator". Deussen, Mokshadharma 263.26[cd] - 27, ingeniously makes good sense by making 27 ab qualify ācāraḥ of 24 ef. He reads 25 and 26 before 24 ef.
with some certainty that the material (R) separating this obscure stanza (D) from the dharma discussion (C) preceding it should be excised from the Critical Edition text. 21 This has the effect of causing the obscure stanza (D) to be read directly after C. In view of the obscurity of D in the context given it by the Critical Edition text, it is worthwhile considering whether its juxtaposition with C now throws any light upon its meaning. Specifically, the juxtaposition with C brings forward the possibility of associating D with the dharma discussion (C) preceding it, rather than with the stanzas dealing with fearlessness (Q) following it. The new association has nothing to recommend it directly. However it may be remarked that the first verse of D contains a correlative \textit{yaḥ} which would provide an appropriate referend for the \textit{sa eva} of the first verse of E, if only the two could decently be brought into proximity. As a means of achieving this, one might propose a hypothetical reconstruction which would assign the material (Q) intervening between D and E to a later alignment, leaving D as part of an interrupted continuum shoulder to shoulder with C and E. Whether only the first verse of D, which contains the correlative \textit{yaḥ} is to be aligned with C and E, or whether the whole stanza should be left intact makes little difference to this proposition; it is a matter to which we will return later. 22

\begin{footnotes}
\item[21] See pp. 268-272 below.
\item[22] See below, p.161. Despite the fact that the \textit{tan} of 27c appears to provide a (grammatically incorrect) link with the \textit{yaḥ} of 27a and the \textit{sa eva} of 34a, it is later argued that 27cdef belong with Q not D.
\end{footnotes}
The conjunction of D and E produces a most satisfactory result:

\[ D = 27ab. \] [He] who has friends and wealth, [who is] fortunate, outstanding, unrivaled.

\[ E = 34. \] Even he who has [thus] been fortunate, again becomes unfortunate. Seeing [this] dissipation of works men are always wary [of them].\[23\]

Although a cursory glance may make the repetition of the word subhaga (fortunate) in each of the stanzas now joined appear redundant, it should be noted that the occurrences are functionally distinct: the former being complementary to sahāyavān (having friends) etc.; the latter being a contrast to durbhaga (unfortunate). In this light the repetition becomes a bond between the verses in question, rather than an objectionable awkwardness.

Although the hypothesis has thus produced a result satisfying the purpose for which it was proposed, it has not yet been demonstrated that the hypothesis itself is necessary\[24\] or viable. The acceptability of the proposition is entirely conditional upon our being able to account for the interpolation of the intervening material (Q), which we have tentatively shut away on a younger alignment. For reasons of convenience only, discussion of this matter will be

\[23\] 254, 27ab, 34:

sahāyavān dravyavān yaḥ subhago 'nnyo 'paras tathā /
sa eva subhago bhūtvā punar bhavati durbhagaḥ /
vyāpattim karmanām drśtvā jugupsyanti janāḥ sadā //

For the interpretation of 27b I have relied upon the C.E. Critical Notes, Sāntiparvan, p.2190.

\[24\] Deussen's solution to the problem (note 20 above), however unsatisfactory, remains as a reminder that an alternative exists without resorting to the realignment proposed.
reserved, but the later discussion will demonstrate beyond doubt that Q has been interpolated. With this assurance, there is no obstacle to our acquiescing in the proposed co-alignment of C,D,E.

One of the clues which led us to suspect some common ground between C and E was the particular standpoint from which dharma was discussed: it was contrasted with the concept of the code of behaviour (acāra). Looking at the chapter overall we find that the term acāra has a potentially significant distribution. It occurs twice in C; once in E; and once more along with two cognate forms near the end of the chapter (in UF). We are naturally led to inquire whether the context in which the last occurrences appear (UF) is at all similar to that of the earlier occurrences (C,E). And indeed the contrast between dharma and acāra characteristic of C,E is continued here too. It is made quite explicit in the following verse:

50 For [this] reason one should seek [true] dharma and not follow the ways of the world ...\(^29\)

Examination reveals a further similarity between E and UF, in that both make statements about "discerning, becoming aware of" (ava √ budd) types of behaviour (acarās).\(^30\)

---

\(^25\) See pp.158-163 below.
\(^26\) 254.22a, 24c.
\(^27\) 254.36b.
\(^28\) 254.49b (acāra), 49c (acāritatva), 50b (-carita).
\(^29\) 254.50ab:
\[\text{kāramād dharmaṁ anvicchen na lokacaritam caret /}\]
\(^30\) 254.56cd (anyān acarān avabudhyate) and 49abd (idr̥sān ... acarān ... nāvabudhyase). See further pp.138-139 below.
The potential continuity implied by these common qualities naturally raises the question of the status of the intervening material (MN). Although in its own terms MN is quite heterogeneous, as we shall see, it is sufficiently discrete in style and homogeneous in subject matter to be dealt with as a unit insofar as questions relating to its alignment vis-à-vis the rest of the episode are concerned.

An important reason for thinking that MN is an interpolation is that it is out of tune with the gist of the stanzas before and after it (C, E and UF). MN is devoted to describing and expressing dismay at evil deeds involving injury. This concern seems to be introduced by the mention in the last verse of E of "other kinds of conduct" which are contrasted with dharma. The interpretation of "other kinds of conduct" as being evil, which is the attitude adopted in MN, may perhaps have been engendered by a confusion over the possible meanings of upalabhya, either 'grasping' or 'reviling'. But wherever the roots of MN's interpretation lie, it remains the case that to regard "other kinds of conduct" as intrinsically evil is to depart from the sense of C and E and therefore also from the intent with which the verse 36cd was composed. Close reading of C and E reveals that the characteristic which distinguished these "other kinds of conduct" from dharma was that

31 See below, pp. 164-166.
32 In style it is most strongly characterized by the alternation of descriptions of evil practices and rhetorical questions addressed to Śajali.
33 254, 36cd, see note 30 above.
34 See below p. 176 for further discussion of upalabhya.
they were motivated and hence of limited validity.

There is no implication that they are any more or less intrinsically evil than any other actions. This is evident from certain stanzas of C and E:

22 [One who was] wise [concerning] codes of behaviour would immediately obtain [understanding of] dharma ...

35 O Jājali, in this world there is [no code of] dharma, however subtle [in conception, which is] unmotivated: [any] human pronouncement on dharma is made with past and future [interests] in mind.

Stanza 35 is speaking of human attempts to approximate dharma, not of wilful or conscious departure from accepted moral ideals; it asserts that moral striving itself is inevitably flawed. In view of the import of stanza 35, the significance of the phrase "grasping [the nature of] other kinds of conduct" would seem best understood as relating to the limited validity of human conduct as an expression of dharma, not to necessarily immoral kinds of conduct. Yet it is this latter interpretation which has been developed in M. Thus, the moral stance assumed by M does not seem to be in harmony with the approach of C-E to the dharma question.

Furthermore, the emotional condemnation of evil deeds which characterizes M runs counter to the attitude expressed by Tulādhāra in the context of explaining the significance of his name:

35 254.22ab:  
ācārān jājale prājnāḥ ksipraṁ dharmam avāpnyat /

36 254.35:  
akāraṇo hi nōhasti dharmāḥ sūkṣmo 'pi jājale /
bhūtabhavyārtham evēha dharmapravacanam kṛtam //

37 254.36cd: upalabhyāntarā cānyān ācārān ... /
11 I am not in accord or disaccord; I neither hate nor love; I am neutral with regard to all creation. Mark my custom, Jājali.

12 ... My balances stand level with regard to all creatures.38

The same attitude is struck in a stanza (G) which falls after M. Here Tulādhāra speaks in similar vein:

50cd, 51ab: If one man were to injure me and one man to praise me, listen o Jājali, [to my reaction] in such circumstances: for me both those would be the same, since for me pleasant and unpleasant do not exist.39

Thus M's judgemental attitude seems incompatible with Tulādhāra's outlook expressed in A; and additionally, in view of the affinity of A and G, M may be seen to differ from materials occurring both before and after it.

Although such impressions are inconclusive in themselves, they provide grounds for undertaking a structural study to determine whether or not M's characteristics can be explained by the fact that it is the work of an interpolator.

The discussion so far has avoided comment on several verses (NUF) appearing at the end of M. With regard to N, there is no difficulty in seeing it as a conclusion associated with M. The affinities of U and F are, however, not immediately obvious. The former stanza (U) perpetuates the reinterpretation of the

38 254.11, 12cd:

nānurudhye virudhye vā na dveśmi na ca kāmaye
samo 'smi sarvabhūtesu paśya me jājale vratam //

... tula me sarvabhūtesu sama tisthati jājale //

39 254.50cd, 51ab:

yo hanyād yaś ca mām stauti tatāpi sṛṇu jājale //
samau tav api me syatam na hi me stāh priyapriye /
significance of "other kinds of conduct" which marked M(N):

49 O Jājali, you do not realize the true nature of such pernicious and frightful kinds of behaviour because in this world even what is mere usage is considered perfect.

Yet at the same time it could not be said that U was intimately tied to M, for with the conclusion (N) to the Nahuṣa incident (46–48) M had been brought to a finish ahead of U.

Perhaps the best clue to the history of U lies not in its content, but in its close formal resemblance to the last verse of V, in which the phrase "other kinds of conduct" was introduced. The Sanskrit text reveals this more clearly than a translation:

36cd: upalabhyāntarā cāṇyān acarān avabudhyate //

49: Īdṛśān aśivān ghorān acarān iha jājale / kevalacaritatvāt tu nipuṇān navabudhyase //

Comparison of these two passages reveals a remarkable characteristic of stanza 49(U): it contributes nothing new at all to the development of the story's plot or line of thought; it only recapitulates. The perniciousness and frightfulness of accepted modes of conduct have been amply exemplified in the ten or so stanzas comprising M. The point that common usage may mistakenly be considered perfect was made in stanza 44. What remains of stanza 49(U) is then only empty.

40 254.49:

Īdṛśān aśivān ghorān acarān iha jājale / kevalacaritatvāt tu nipuṇān navabudhyase //

41 254.44ab: ... saādhy iti manyante sa ca vṛttiḥ sudarūpā / 'They consider that it is worthy, but that livelihood is very cruel.'
verbiage: idrśa 'such', which extends the status quo; iha 'here', which is hardly meaningful; the vocative jājale, which is ballast; and the verb avabudhyase 'you perceive' which parallels that of verse 36cd (in E).

Thus, in form U has an affinity with the last verse of E; in theme it conforms with M; it is not intimately bound to M, and it is an insubstantial contribution to the story. All these characteristics and relationships are explicable if we see MN as an interpolation and U as a device by which the incorporator of MN sought to return to the material he had breached (i.e. E-). Occasioned by the insertion of the interpolation MN and probably composed by the interpolator, U would naturally reflect the interpolator's fundamental attitudes including particularly his understanding of "other kinds of conduct". At the same time the function of U as a bridge back to interrupted material accounts for the influence of the last verse of E upon U. The desire of the incorporator of MN to pick up the threads of CDE would account for his having modelled U on the last verse of E as a kind of recapitulation.

The alignment of the third-following verse (F) is less simply decided:

50ab kāraṇād dharmaṁ anvicchen na lokacaritām
caret /

50 (....)43 one should seek [true] dharma and not follow the ways of the world ...

43 The kāraṇād is left untranslated in deference to the discussion which follows, pp.140-144.
Is F to be seen as the last part of the bridge (U-) back to the pre-existent text (E-), or the first part of the resumed prior text heralded by U? Unfortunately F is so colourless in meaning it would be equally in place in either context.

The opening word of the verse (F), karanaṭ is worthy of particular attention. The commentators quoted by the editors of the Critical Edition gratuitously interpret it to mean "because of revelation"; Nilakantha glosses it "from a motive". These glosses are of interest when combined with observations concerning two other occurrences of forms of the stem karanaṭ.

One of these occurrences is in a context very similar to this in a verse from the next chapter:

255.40cd karanaṇāi dharmam anvicchan na lokān āpнутे śubhan ///

255.40 ... [he who] persues righteousness with motives [will] not obtain pure realms [after death].

In this case the commentators gloss karanaṇāi to mean "with wordly motivations", an interpretation which

44 254.50a App.Crit.: Arjunamīśra - karanaṇāi śrutaṭeḥ; Paramananda - śrutaṭyādeḥ.

45 Nilakantha in Kṛṣṇadēkara edn. 262.53: karanaṇāi hetuṭaḥ yena bhutanam abhayanam ... ("with the motive of [gaining] freedom from fear of beings").

46 255.40c App.Crit.: Arjunamīśra - karanaṇāi svargaṇapradahakamanānādibhīḥ antavatphalaiḥ ("with motives directed to finite ends like the desire to reach heaven, to have sons or to gain wealth"). Nilakantha is less down to earth, Kṛṣṇadēkara edn., 263.41: karanaṇāi arthīvasamarthavatvavidvatvatvātarmāyaiḥ ("according to means, [that is] with varying emphases on supplication, resources, and knowledge").
seems fully justified by the general sense of other material in the chapter. This interpretation has significance for F not only because of the formal parallelism between this verse and F, but also because the parallelism itself suggests that this verse concluding chapter 255 has been modelled on F. In these senses the verse of chapter 255 provides an unintended or indirect gloss on the parallel verse of chapter 254. This is paradoxical, for although the kārāṇāt of chapter 254 (F) may have been suggested to the composer of the chapter 255 material the idea of motivation, had he considered it more carefully he could not have taken it in that sense since in his verse in chapter 255 he directly negates what would be the import of the verse in chapter 254 if kārāṇāt were understood in the sense his "gloss" demands. So, in this sense, the comparison with the chapter 255 version reinforces the evidence of the later attempts by commentators to gloss the word by confirming the difficulty of taking the kārāṇāt of F in the sense of "with a motive" without resorting to over-elaborate qualifications. In view of the problems thus revealed, it seems preferable to retreat to a simpler alternative interpretation which would see the word not as an independent semantic unit but as having the effect of a conjunction. In this sense it would be translated 'hence'.

47 E.g.: 255.33: The gods recognize as a brahman him [who is] uneager, lacking initiative, unconcerned to honour or praise [and] unwearingly weary of actions.

48 This is substantiated in the notes to Table XII.
The other relevant occurrence of the stem karaga falls earlier in chapter 254, in the dharma discussion passage (E) preceding MN. In this instance the form is akaranah, indisputably a bahuvrihi meaning "unmotivated". Its position means that if we take F to be the resumption of the older material interrupted by MNU this akaranah falls only four verses ahead of the karaga of F in this older alignment. We would then be confronted by the uncomfortable prospect of finding karaga appearing in a neutral sense (as a conjunction) only four verses after akaranah had been used in a different sense and in a manner which placed considerable emphasis on it. The desirability of avoiding such a situation must weigh against seeing F as the resumption of the breached older material (CDE-).

But the matter does not rest there. The juxtaposition of the two karana forms of E and F may appear undesirable, but the alternative assumption that F is part of the preceding interpolation MNU also has unpalatable consequences. For a start, it is striking that the karana verse (F) is couched in impersonal terms, whereas the whole of the preceding interpolation (MN) and its seeming conclusion (U) are

---

49 254.35a; text at p.136, n.36 above.

50 It is in an initial position followed by the emphatic hi, used predicatively not attributively.
systematically personalized by the use of the second person in verb forms or by vocative reference to Jājali, even where this involved the interpolator in modifying the material copied into U. It seems somewhat strange then that in the morally climatic instruction comprising the kāranat verse (F) the composer should suddenly have changed his approach altogether, completely dissipating the rhetorical momentum built up in all his earlier stanzas (MNU). It reads badly. On the other hand if F were accepted as indeed the resumption of the breached older material (CDE-) then its impersonality would be quite in character. From another angle it is difficult to explain why the interpolator of MNU- should have - as it seems - rounded off his interpolation and made a transition back to the breached text (in N, U) only to add a didactic afterthought in F. The self-sufficient structure of MNU would therefore argue against the addition to it of F.

These are significant objections to appending F to MNU. The advantages of accounting for the impersonality of F and of explaining the nature and position of U are sufficient to outweigh the squeamishness which might be felt over the proximity

51 254.38b, 39c, implicitly in 41, 43c (first person, addressing Jājali), 44f, 47d, 49b, d.
52 254.36d: avabudhyate to 49d: avabudhyase.
53 It might be argued that F is by way of a generalized conclusion and therefore fitfully expressed impersonally; but if the impersonality of F is to be explained thus, how is the personalization of U (vis-à-vis E) to be explained?
of कारणत in F and अकारणाह in E in a restored continuum.

Thus far we have been able to give reasons for believing that Z and CDEF are materials of the oldest alignment, and in doing so we have been able to demonstrate that K, R, Q, MNU belong to younger alignments. This leaves an intermediate class of materials (LAPB, GV) whose alignment remains indeterminate. With regard to LAPB, since this block of material falls between two identified old passages (Z and C), and since it includes verse 12cd, to which a presumption of originality attaches, it is reasonable to start from the position that LAPB too belongs to the oldest alignment. The situation of GV appears less clearcut at first sight but its contiguity with F and the resemblance between G and part of LAPB must be borne in mind.

Structure of the merchant's reply

By eliminating the materials already identified as interpolations (K, Q, R, MNU), we find that the merchant's reply to Jājali's question (Z) follows this outline:

(i) an exposition of his mode of living and the identification of this as dharma (L);

(ii) an exposition of his attitudes, which are shown to lead to harmless conduct (APB);

(iii) a discourse on the unknowable nature of dharma, extended logically to a rejection of human moralities (CDEF);
This crystallization of the answer's line of thought reveals a certain maladroitness. It is neither logical nor natural to begin an explanation of the nature of dharma by claiming that one's own virtuous conduct constitutes dharma:

(i) [He] who is always the friend of all, [and who] is devoted to the good of all in thought, word, and deed — o Jājali, he knows dharma.

only to pass on to observations like:

(iii) o Jājali, in this world there is no [code of] dharma, however subtle [in conception, which is] unmotivated: [any] human pronouncement on dharma is made with past and future [interests] in mind.

The internal inconsistency of the reply revolves around the approach to discussing dharas. We have noted above that the identifiably old passages C, E and F were concerned to "treat of the nature of dharma rather than describing what constitutes it". In those passages, which belong here to (iii), the conception of dharma is counterposed against the notion of codes of behaviour. In complete contrast to this perception is the first part of the merchant's reply (i) in which dharma is straightforwardly identified with a certain kind of behaviour:

6 ... such conduct is the highest dharas.

Why, too, having been asked about the secret of dharma, should one reply by outlining one's mode of living?

54 254.9; text at p.130, n.16 above.
55 254.35; text at p.136, n.36 above.
56 Page 129 above.
57 254.6c:
yā vyātti p a para dharmas ...
On the other hand, when Tulādhāra describes his attitudes in (ii) he does not go so far as to equate his resulting behaviour with dharma; he never passes beyond speaking of it as a 'mode of life' (vṛttā)\(^59\) or 'custom' (vṛata).\(^60\) Thus, on the criterion of the way in which dharma is perceived, one can detect an affinity between (ii) and (iii), and an estrangement of (i).

A similar result can be obtained in quite another way. Being didactic in purpose, this episode has its raison d'être in a conflict of values. It is to be expected that the brahman's misbehaviour and the merchant's salutary instruction stand in an antithetical relationship if the story is to have point. Now we have seen that the older material of chapter 253 shows the brahman to be overweening in his pride in his own achievements. How does the merchant's instruction counter this?

The beginning (i) of his talk has little obvious application. Had the brahman caused injury in his arrogance, the merchant's example set out in (i) would have some pertinence; but this was not the case. By contrast, the latter parts (ii, iii) of the merchant's answer are quite apposite: what better antidote for overweening pride than the fostering of an attitude of indifference to human concerns?

34 Even he who has [thus] been fortunate [will] again become unfortunate. Seeing the dissipation of works, men always spurn [them].\(^61\)

---

59 254.20c. 60 254.11d. The word dharma also occurs in 254.18, which will later be shown to be an accretion (P); but in any case its sense there is conformable to the C-F attitude.

61 254.34; text at p.133, n.23 above.
So, again, we find common ground between the latter parts (ii, iii) of the merchant's answer, and an isolation of the first (i).

With (ii) containing verse 12cd and (iii) presenting the major dharma discussion couched in terms foreshadowed in the preface, there is no doubt that (ii)-(iii) have a better claim to originality than (i). Furthermore, on the basis of the point made in the previous paragraph, it is (ii)-(iii) which comply with the demands of the original plot. Therefore, given that (i) is so strongly distinguishable from (ii)-(iii), we have grounds for suspecting that (i) is an accretion.

In our analysis of chapter 253 we detected a rewriting which, by bringing birds to nest in Jajali's matted hair, introduced a motif involving the ideal of harmlessness. This virtue is also extolled in the first part (i) of the merchant's speech. It seems conceivable therefore that the suspected accretion (i) may be a further product of the same rewriting. This blithe hypothesis finds support from two directions.

First, it finds support in further consideration of the dialectic linking chapters 253 and 254. On the oldest level of chapter 253 the brahman's shortcoming is pride in his mystical powers; in the younger material of chapter 253 this is redefined as pride in his having, through a penance of non-injury, successfully raised birds nesting in his hair.62

62 As in 253.6 and 253.39.
In other words, the existing situation has been reworked to involve non-injury and fearlessness; but the fault remains pride. Turning to the merchant's response to the brahman we find that the initial emphasis (i) is placed upon the merchant's own achievements in the direction of non-injury. If the account of the merchant's adherence to the ideal of non-injury has any place in the development of the story, it should represent an implicit rebuke to the brahman; but in fact the brahman has nothing to answer for on this score, having equalled if not outdone the merchant in devotion to non-injury. Even for the reworked story, then, the logically valid rebuke to the brahman remains in (ii)-(iii) with Tulādāhāra's preaching of indifference. In this light, a credible explanation for the presence of (i) in the merchant's reply would be that the material has been retouched with the same brush which was applied in reworking the material of chapter 253. In this way the illogicalities of development between chapters 253 and 254 may be put down to one interpolator's consistent proclivity for preaching non-injury.

Secondly, evidence of a purely formal kind may lend support to the notion that L (= i) has been accreted on to older material. The last verse of L (vs.9cd) closely follows the wording of the answer begun in the last verse of Z (vs.5ab): 63

---

63 Z classes together 254.3 the minimal question, 254.4 the editorial device to change speakers, and 254.5ab the minimal answer (see pp.126-127 above) on the grounds that the last element is structurally inseparable from the first. However if this should be disputed it does not invalidate the present argument since 5ab would then be assigned to L, putting the parallel verses at the beginning and the end of the hypothesized interpolation, and thus retaining them as markers of the segmentation.
vedâhaṃ jājale dharmam ... / 5a
... sa dharmam veda jājale / 9d

It is attractive to see this parallelism as arising from the desire of an interpolator to return, in 9cd, to the terms of the pre-existent text which was his springboard. This suggestion that 9cd was intended as a recapitulation of 5ab gains somewhat from the fact that the first foot of 9cd is purely makeweight ballast. However the parallel wording is so unremarkable and straightforward that it would be idle to use the resemblance as anything more than corroboration for a suspicion kindled with other fuel.

If, in the light of the above arguments, we remove L from the earliest alignment, it comes about that A follows directly on from the brahman's question (Z). Since A's first-person style provides a continuity with the last verse of Z (5ab), there is no reason to dispute this result.

Passages treating of non-injury and unfearsomeness

The proposal that L should be assigned to the same alignment as the extensive additions to chapter 253 carries with it the implication there may have been a large scale revision of the story in favour of questions relating to non-injury and unfearsomeness. We have not yet, however, fully considered the status of some of the passages touching on these topics. It behoves us to do so now.

The first such passage associating Tuladhāra with the practice of non-injury is a stanza which follows K apparently as a preface to Z. It gratuitously
describes Tulādhāra:

2 Selling all sorts of juices and aromatics, o trader, as also [the bark and leaves of] trees and herbs and their fruits and roots, ... 64

Similar information is found in the first part (L) of the merchant's reply:

7,8 From wood and grass [already] cut have I made my house. Resin, padmaka wood, lotus stamens, and all kinds of aromatics, and all the many kinds of juices except wines I buy from others and sell without deceit, o wise seer. 65

This second passage (7-8) refines and extends the first (2) by excluding wine from the merchant’s stock, by drawing out the implication that as a middleman the merchant’s hands are in no way soiled, and by describing his dwelling as well as his livelihood.

Argument concerning the alignment of the two passages is sterile and inconclusive if based upon comparisons in vacuo: is the similarity of stanza 2 and stanzas 7-8 to be seen as unseemly redundancy to be lessened by assigning the passages to separate alignments, or is it to be seen as a deliberately contrived rhetorical device whereby the brahman’s scepticism (stanza 2) is turned against him (stanzas 7-8) requiring both passages to be placed on the same alignment? The straightforward and appealing notion

64 254.2:

\[
\text{vikṛṭānaḥ sarvarasān sarvagandhām ca vāpija / vanaspatīn oṣadhiṣ ca teṣāṁ mūlapalāṇi ca} \\
\]

65 254.7-8:

\[
\text{paricchinmaḥ kāśyaphatprair mayēdaṁ saraṇam kṛtam / alaktaṁ padmakaṁ tuṅgaṁ gandhāṁ cocośacāṁs tathā//} \\
\text{rāṣāṁ ca tāṁ tāṁ viprarse madyavarjān ahāṁ bahūn/} \\
\text{krītvā vai prativikṛṁne parahastād amayaya} \\
\]
that stanza 2 has provided a point of attraction for the therefore younger material comprising stanzas 7-8 has to be discounted against the evidence from chapters 252 and 253, that in its oldest form the story had no concern with any non-injury question - while this concern seems to underlie stanza 2. Imputation from the tendencies of other parts of the story cannot, of course, absolutely rule out the possibility that stanza 2 was present in the oldest alignment. If this had been the case, the relationship between stanza 2 and stanzas 7-8 might be accounted for by suggesting that the mention of the merchant's occupation might have been the trigger for the general reworking of the story which included stanzas 7-8. It could be cogently argued against this contention that the alternative penance stories of chapter 253 are a more likely indication of the inspiration of the revision, especially in view of the fact that the penances fall before the descriptions of the merchant's occupation, requiring a proposed influence from stanza 2 to have been extensively anticipated; but even then, although stanza 2 might not have been a specific point of attraction for the rewriting, and could not on that ground be deemed older than stanzas 7-8, it remains a possibility that an older stanza 2 might have exercised an influence over the choice of matters specifically taken up in the rewriting such as would account for the composition of stanzas 7-8.
Since stanza 2 stands on a watershed between stanza 1, which is bound to the interpolated material of chapter 253 (having a function parallel to that of 253.11 on the older alignment) and stanza 3, which has been identified as the minimum introductory question required on the older alignment, it is especially useful to consider the relationship of stanza 2 with its immediate proximity. Syntactically, stanza 2 is bound to stanza 3, the *vikriṇāṇaḥ* ('one who sells' - 2a) making explicit the subject of *adhyāgaḥ* ('you have gained' - 3a). However the bond is a simple contrivance and, insofar as stanza 3 stands quite as well alone, it is not conclusive evidence of the affinity of stanza 2. Another possible link between stanzas 2 and 3 is implicit in the *kutas* of stanza 3. This form of interrogation is fittingly addressed by a brahman to an upstart merchant, but it becomes rather more pointed if read in conjunction with stanza 2, which emphasizes the merchant's active involvement in mundane affairs. Regarding *kutas*, then, the alternative conceptions are that a rhetorical flourish was intended - which would place stanzas 2 and 3 in the same alignment; or that it is a happy but

---

Page 126 above. It is conceivable that the original minimal question has been discarded in the rewriting. This possibility is not considered both because there is no positive evidence in its favour and also because of a presumption that the tradition has been highly retentive. The survival of 253.11 is sufficient exemplification of the conservativeness of the tradition.

67 It is not necessary to assume that the kinds of merchandise mentioned in stanza 2 were originally intended to have relevance for the ideal of non-injury. This ideological question is not properly considered here. See below, pp.170-174 and Table XI.

68 Deussen (at his 263.2), who does not assume any segmentation, accepts this construction, supplying ohwohl.
coincidental product of the reinterpretation of an older phrase - which would place stanzas 2 and 3 in differing alignments. Weighing these alternatives alongside the syntactical evidence, the balance seems to tip in favour of co-alignment of stanzas 2 and 3 on the older level.

The next crux involves the stanzas which fall immediately before the presumably old reference to Tulādhāra's balances (12cd). The Apparatus Criticus of the Critical Edition reveals a widespread variation of text-order involving a transposition of stanzas 10 and 11, and a similarly distributed omission of verse 12ab. Such characteristics are symptomatic of contamination. However a closer examination of these variations to be undertaken in Part B will leave us with no reason to doubt the wisdom of the critical editors in declining to excise this material from their reconstructed archetypal text. 69 There is thus no ground for distinguishing the alignment of stt.10-12ab from that of verse 12cd.

Stanzas 13-15 continue in the same vein as the stanzas leading up to verse 12cd, and may therefore reasonably be combined into A. With stanzas 16-20, however, the matter is not so straightforward.

Stanzas 15-19 (P) contrast remarkably with A in their impersonality. While in A the merchant has

69 See below, pp.404-406.

For reasons which are not clear, the editors of the Critical Edition have placed verse 12ab of stanza 12 before verse 12cd while the Apparatus Criticus reveals that manuscripts which witness 12ab invariably place it after verse 12cd.
consistently spoken in the first person and described his own attitudes and activities, in these four stanzas (P) not only is the subject an impersonal third person, but no attempt is made to harmonize the material with the context of the Tulādhāra story— for instance by inserting some token vocatives (jājale etc). In this respect the impersonality of P exceeds that of the abstract discussion of dharma in CDEF where the impersonality which flows partly from the abstract nature of the subject has been diminished and some attempt made to knit generalities into the particular milieu of the story by a judicious sprinkling of vocatives. Another formal characteristic marks off these impersonal stanzas (P). Each of the four stanzas has a counterpoint structure in which certain acts or attitudes are enumerated and said to have certain consequences. This self-sufficient form is characteristic of pious aphorisms. That this is what the stanzas are is further suggested by the inappropriate stock subject (dvijah) of stanza 16,70 and confirmed by the noticed occurrence of

70 [Belvalkar marks the reading dvijah uncertain in Critical Edition text since, of those manuscripts which do not follow a completely different reading, most E and many S manuscripts read dvija. He is undoubtedly right to prefer dvijah both because of its distribution among the manuscripts and because it is probably the harder reading.]

Although not too much should be made of the presence or absence of a visarga, it is noteworthy that 16cd has the impersonal reading dvijah where a vocative relating to Jājali, dvija would have done equally good metrical service. While dvijah is precisely what one would expect in a stanza drawn from a brahmanical corpus, the application of this point to P’s alignment may be debated. Note that elsewhere in the oldest material (ZA, CDEF) the vocative address used is jājale, once viprāraja, never dvija or brāhmaṇ. For the sake of contrariness only, it might be argued from this that the composer of ZA, CDEF cannot be expected to have conceived of the possible alternative reading—in which case the reading adopted is no argument against P’s early alignment.
stanzas 16 and 17 in other places. On these grounds the four stanzas of P are readily distinguishable from A and the rest of the older material. But this is not to say that they are interpolations which have interrupted an older continuum.

One way it might be shown that P is such an intrusion would be by demonstrating that A meshes so intimately with B or with C that P or PB can only be attributed to a later alignment. As the earlier breakdown of Tulādhāra's reply into three sections implies, no intimate relationship between Tulādhāra's description of his mode of life (A) and his discourse on dharma and codes of behaviour (C- ) is evident to me. The alternative idea of a continuum AB, however, does find some support. Unfortunately stanza 20 is syntactically self-sufficient, denying us any of the most valuable, formal, evidence of continuity. But it may still be noted that like A (but in contrast to P) B has Tulādhāra again speaking in the first person:

20 I follow the hereditary practice of [my] right-acting, noble-minded, and gentle ancestors.

In content, too, B seems to show affiliations with A. When Tulādhāra speaks of following the hereditary practice (vṛttta) of his elders he doubtless refers to

---

71 The App. Crit. of the C.E. lists variants of 16 and 17 in other Śāntiparvan contaminations and of 17 in an upaniṣadic and a purāṇic source. Cf. also Manu 6.40.
72 254.20:
    yathāvad-vartamanānām vṛddhānām putrapautriṇāṁ /
    anuvartāmahe vṛttam ahimsāraṇāṁ mahatmanāṁ //
spice-selling, which gives B links with Z (stanza 2) and A (verse 12cd), but not with P. Only with his characterisation of his forefathers as 'gentle' (ahimsa) does Tuladhara provide a possible link with P. Yet not much can be made of this point, for nowhere in the preceding passages (ZAP) is non-injuriousness (ahimsa) discussed explicitly. To proceed further on this tack is not fruitful because associations can be proposed both with the concern with unfearsomeness (abhaya) of P and with the nature of Tuladhara's family trade as described in Z - the impression created by the rest of stanza 20 (B) predisposing us to favour the latter. Neither is it wise to put store by these arguments, for with them we transgress into the ideological dimension of the material.

Thus, while the impression grows that P is out of sorts with the enveloping AB, there is no unequivocal demonstration that P interrupts any older continuum. The only avenue remaining open to us in determining P's status is therefore examination of P's content vis-à-vis the verses surrounding it - a procedure unlikely to produce solid results since the aphoristic self-sufficiency of the P stanzas and the probability that they were not composed ad hoc but culled ready-made from the composer's (or transmitter's) memory mean that the general presumption that that hiatus or lack of consistency are likely marks of a later
hand loses some of its force here. 73

At the outset let it be noted that P has some ground in common with A. The first P stanza comes close to paraphrasing a stanza of A:

16(P): When he is not afraid, and when he does not inspire fear; when he does not desire or detest, then a brahman is successful indeed. 74

11(A): I am not in accord or disaccord; I neither hate nor love; I am neutral with regard to all creation...

Beyond that, however, points in common are not easy to detect. The mention of dharma in 18ab of P is ambivalent: it may be construed literally to say that dharma does not exist and never has; or, more satisfactorily, it may be construed rhetorically to say that dharma consists in nothing more nor less than unfearsomeness (18cd). In either case it has no parallel in A and runs contrary to the position of CDEF on dharma: that there is a dharma but it has become unknowable. Nevertheless, as noted above, this inconsistency may just as well be attributed to the fact that the stanza (18) is a stock item used by the composer of ABC- as to its later accretion.

It is in the combination of formal and topical data that the solution to this impasse lies. While P

73 The maxims are as likely to have been known to the composer of AE as to any other individual transmitter of the text. On the other hand, it might equally be argued that since the stanzas are not ad hoc but seemingly drawn from some stock, the number of transmitters capable or likely to have interpolated them is greater as the task is less demanding.

74 254.16:
yədā cāyam na bibheti yədā cāsmān na bibhyati /
yədā necchati na dveṣṭī tādā sidhyati vai dvijaḥ //

For text of 254.11 abc, see p.137, n.38 above.
consistently concerns itself with abhaya from beginning (16ab) to end (19cd), there is no explicit concern with abhaya elsewhere in the old material of the chapter.\textsuperscript{75} The coincidence that mention of abhaya should be precisely coterminous with the structurally distinct P stanzas sits uneasily unless it is assumed that P has been interpolated into AB by a later transmitter, who had this concern. This argument, although not weighty, seems sufficient to tilt the balance of probabilities in favour of P's later alignment.

If this segmentation is accepted, the parallelism of the first stanza of P with a stanza of A, both quoted above, may be taken as evidence of the point of attraction which motivated the interpolation of P. The point of insertion not unreasonably falls at the end of Tuladhrā's characterization of his attitudes (A) and before he speaks of his deeds (B).

A pair of stanzas showing some resemblance to P falls a few verses later, interrupting the flow of the dharma discussion (CDE-). This short passage (R) is dealt with in Part B,\textsuperscript{76} where it is shown to be a contamination. In many ways the case of R has a parallel in that of Q,\textsuperscript{77} which is the next passage to be discussed.

The stanzas comprising Q also appear as a diversion in the dharma discussion (CDE-).\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{75} This excludes Q and R from consideration. Later discussion will show them to be later than and inspired by P: pp.158-163.
\textsuperscript{76} Pages 267-273 below.
\textsuperscript{77} See Table VIII and its exposition.
\textsuperscript{78} Pages 133-134 above.
The most striking feature of this diversion (Q) is its common ground with P, also dealing with fearlessness, which has just been discussed. Indeed, two stanzas of Q:

30 He of whom no creature is afraid, none at all in any way whatsoever, attains freedom from fear with respect to all creatures, a great sage.

31 He of whom the world is afraid, as of a snake in one's house, does not achieve dharma in this world or the next.\(^{79}\)

seem to restate stanzas of P occurring some ten stanzas earlier:

18 ... He who is not fearsome toward any creatures gains the state of fearlessness.

19 He of whom the whole world is afraid, as of the jaws of death, because of his harsh speech and violent actions, achieves [only a state of] great fear [himself].\(^{80}\)

It is not feasible to explain the close similarity of P and Q by proposing that they are remnants of a submerged continuum because the intervening material (BCD) is older than they. Nor can it be suggested that a textual disturbance has transposed material in such a way that once-joined passages have become separated (e.g. by transposing BCD and Q). The improbability of such an

\(^{79}\) 254.30,31: yasmān nōdvijate bhūtam jātu kincit kathamecana / so 'bhayaṁ sarvabhūtebhyaḥ sampāṇotī mahāmune //

\(^{80}\) 254.18cd,19: yo 'bhayaṁ sarvabhūtanam sa prāpṇotī abhayam padam // yasmād udvijate lokaḥ sarvātu tveṣmāgatād iva /

na sa dharmam avapnoti iha loke paratra ca //

vakkrurad daṇḍaparasyat sa prāpṇoti mahād bhayaṁ //
occurrence is very great indeed. Nevertheless, it is unrealistic to deny that $P$ and $Q$ are related in any way.

The parallelism of the stanzas quoted above is sufficiently close to suggest that in some way $P$ and $Q$ may be paraphrases or counterparts, one of the other. This observation taken together with the awkwardness of $Q$ in its present placement in the text suggests that $Q$ might conceivably have been intended at the time of its composition to be a substitute for $P$. The test of this hypothesis is the insertion of $Q$ in the place occupied by $P$. This experiment is, however, unsatisfactory, for whereas $P$ introduces the subject of fearlessness gently, linking it (in 16) to the indifference which was the subject of the preceding stanzas (A), $Q$ launches abruptly into a eulogy of the gift of fearlessness (28,29). Now, since without the presence of $P$ the topic of fearlessness would not have been raised before that point, it is clear that $Q$ cannot simply be exchanged for $P$.

Another possibility is that $Q$ had originally been intended as a commentary on $P$ which subsequently

---

81 The objection to such an assumption is discussed in relation to an analogous case at pp.286-289 below. In the alternative, the possibility of mistakenly discontinuous incorporation on a young level is to be discounted against the implications of the parallelism discussed in the next paragraph.

82 A variation of this hypothesis is that $Q$ might be present as the result of conflation with a collateral version of the tradition in which it appeared in place of $P$. The test of mutual substitution is also appropriate in determining whether or not this had been the case.

83 See pp.157-158 above.
became incorporated in the text proper. A close analysis of the relationships between P and Q amply supports this hypothesis. The dependence of the early stanzas (28, 29) of Q on the first stanzas (16, 17) of P for the introduction of the topic of fearlessness, and Q's more elaborate statements paralleling the sense of P are features we might well expect if Q had been composed as a commentary on P. But above all, if Q were a commentary on P, light would be cast into the obscurity surrounding the stanza which falls between D and Q in the Critical Edition text:

27cdef: For this they are mentioned [favourably] in the law books by the wise, [who are] little concerned with fame, acute, and fully rational.84

These verses are far more satisfactorily related to the inspirers of fearlessness described in P than to the wealthy and powerful mentioned in D - which is the reference suggested by the Critical Edition text. By positing this new referend and regarding 27cdef not as part of D but as the beginning of Q we not only avoid an asperity in the reconstituted dharma discussion passages (CD + E)85 but we may also do without the forced interpretations of 27ef found necessary by the editors, commentators, and translators of the text86 so long as it followed D. Once related to P, the verse makes good enough sense

84 254.27cdef:
   tatas tān eva kavayaḥ śāstreṣu pravadanty uta /
   kīrtthyarthatam alpaḥ lekhaḥ paṭavaḥ kṛṣnaniṁrayaḥ/
85 Cf. p.132 above.
86 Page 131, n.20 above.
read plainly. Furthermore the gist of the stanza 27cdef is suited to introducing a commentary: it explicitly appeals to the opinion of respected and intelligent authorities.

For these reasons the hypothesis that Q is an incorporated commentary on P appears to have some validity. In fact, a verse-by-verse comparison of the material makes the conclusion inescapable. Such an analysis is offered in the notes to Table VIII. But granted this conclusion, certain problems remain unresolved.

One problem is the question of how Q came to be placed where it is, detached from the material which inspired it (P) and breaching a run of quite distinct material (CDE). The last verse of Q:

33 ... This is the truth I tell you, have faith [in it], o Jājali.87

can only be understood as a concluding device intended to neutralise the preceding line of thought. Its presence is comprehensible only if it is assumed either that Q had been designed for incorporation when composed, or that the incorporation itself was not a blind mechanical accident. Yet Q is so clearly misplaced in extant texts that we are therefore obliged to fall back upon the assumption that some feature of the manuscript, unknown to us and at which we can only guess, 88 led the interpolator

87 254.33cd:
bravimī te satyam idam śraddadhasva ca jājale //
88 The earlier (pp.159-160) strictures against textual derangement do not rule out copied-in interleaved material, for this does not involve the same coincidence of complementary accidents. Confusion over insertion markers is also possible.
mistakenly to insert Q where it now stands.

A second problem is the question of how Q came to deal with just that material we have delineated as being itself an earlier interpolation (P), no more, no less. To read the segmentation of P back into the text is unacceptable analytical hindsight,89 for P will no longer have existed as identifiable discrete entity from the moment it was incorporated into the text. Therefore, we must assume that P had probably lost its separate existence at the time when the author of Q took it up for comment. But to explain what led Q's author to single out the material of P it is probably not necessary to look beyond the style and content of the stanzas involved (P). As previously noted, unlike their immediate surroundings they are impersonally-expressed statements of teaching. From the fact that some stanzas of P have identified occurrences outside this story90 we may prima facie deduce that the style of these stanzas and the nature of their subject matter are of a kind with which a commentator will have felt at home, so to speak. It should be recalled that P itself began life as a transmitter's elaboration of the passage (A) preceding it. That such material should prove attractive to later commentators is not to be wondered at.

89 It is germane to recall the lengthy discussion and indirect argument resorted to in achieving the segmentation (pp.153-158). But this is not to imply that the opaqueness of the segmentation itself is relevant to the behaviour of a later interpolator: whether or not he was building on to an historical interpolation will hardly have been of concern to him, even if it were possible for him to be aware of the history of the text.

90 See p.155, n.71 above.
The interpolation MNU

Of the interruptions to the dharma discussion (CDEF) only MN remains. We have already touched upon the explanation of how MNU came to be inserted where it is, through a misunderstanding of the nature of treatment of dharma on the oldest alignment.91

The material constituting MN appears to cover a number of concerns:

- a plea against cruelty to beast (37-38),
- and man (38c-39);
- a statement that the gods dwell in higher forms of life (40),
- and the conclusion that to sell them is wrong (41);
- a description of cruelty to cattle (42-43);
- a statement of the evilness of agriculture (44);
- a statement of the inviolability of the cow (45ab),
- and stories illustrating the last point (45c-48).

Beneath M's rather disjointed appearance, there appears to be an intermittent thread of concern with the treatment of cattle. It may also be said, negatively, that there is nothing structural which demands the assumption of any internal accretion within MN, although the structure would allow it at every turn.92

91 Pages 135-136 above.
92 The consistently fragmented arrangement of the material in N would make an interpolation which conformed to that pattern undetectable. Moreover I suspect that such an easily penetrated passage may attract interpolators. Note the accretion in the Vulgate after 41ab, which is noted as a contamination in the Apparatus Criticus (Mub.xili.254,704*). Juxtaposition of the cursory mention of Pūñadhara (45) with the far more circumstantial account of Nakṣaṁ (46-47) is suspicious.
The cases in which one might be particularly suspicious are therefore those where there seems to be some thematic deviation from the line of the unifying thread. Examples are the mention of the sale of oil, ghee, etc (41) and the condemnation of agriculture (44). However with deeper appreciation of the internal structure of M even this suspicion will be allayed. It will be observed that the interpolation MN is, throughout, composed of impersonal, generalized statements alternating with clauses couched in terms of direct address, individual in their reference: rhetorical questions, enunciations of personal moral stands, words of persuasion.\(^93\) The concluding stanza (U) of the interpolation should be included in this latter category too.\(^94\) This interleaving of impersonal sections with direct speech interstices may be interpreted as a technique of bonding designed to accommodate undigested material into the direct-speech framework of the story. The impression that this has been the case is reinforced by the knowledge or imputation of external allegiances for most of the materials between the bonds: the story of Prśadura is merely alluded to, with a brevity which suggests audience familiarity with the allusion; the story of Nahuṣa, the opening statement on cruelty to cattle, the stanza decrying agriculture, and the idea that

\(^93\) This is set out in Table IV.
\(^94\) Note particularly the personalization of -budhyate (36d) to -budhyase (49d). The parallel texts were compared at p.138 above.
the gods dwell in the higher animals — all these are known elsewhere. In this respect the condemnation of agriculture, which appears almost verbatim in Manu, is of particular interest since we earlier mentioned it as a seeming aberration in the development of MN’s theme. However, while this stanza (44a-d) may seem thematically awry it is in fact tied into the overall theme by the third verse (44ef) of the stanza, which links agriculture with the lot of cattle:

44 ••• Likewise reflect upon the oxen [labouring] in the yoke, o Jajali.

Since this bonding technique matches the structural pattern on which the remainder of MN has been built up and given that the raison d’être of the structural pattern is indeed probably its capacity for digesting roughage, there are no sufficient grounds for attributing stanza 44 to any hand other than that of the composer of the whole of MN. What applies to stanza 44 applies a fortiori to the other components of MN.

Concerning the alignment of MN, the second passage we singled out for particular attention is potentially revealing: that is, the mention of the selling of goods found in stanza 41. As one of the

95 The opening description of cruelty to cattle is very close to that of Mbh.xii.15.51 (noted in App.Crit.); the idea that the gods dwell in the higher animals is expressed, for instance, in the immediately juxtaposed contamination Mbh.xii.254.704*; the condemnation of agriculture is matched almost precisely in Manu 10.84 (noted in App.Crit.); for the stories of Prsadha and Nahusa see p.538 below.

96 254.44ef:
   tathai’vanaduho yuktāau samavekṣasva jajale //
interstices of direct address, this stanza of ad hoc composition may be expected to provide a more sensitive gauge of MN's alignment than would the undigested materials with their external relations, especially as the motivation proposed for the composition of the interstices of direct address would make them more responsive to the context of the preexistent material. Since, as we have seen, the sale of merchandise by the merchant has been touched upon twice elsewhere in the chapter (st.2 of Z; stt.7-8 of L), comparison of stanza 41 with those passages is especially invited. Stanza 41 reads as follows:

tāni jīvāni vikṛīya kā mṛteṣu vicāraṇā /
kā taile kā ghrte brāhmaṇ madhuny apṣv aṣadhāṇa va /

This has been understood by translators 97 to be a disclaimer by the merchant:

97 Dutt, xii.262.43: "There are men who maintain themselves by trading in living creatures. When they acquire a living by such a sinful trade what scruples have they in selling dead carcasses? ... ⅓ (... The man who sells those can never acquire success.) But what fault is there in selling oil, clarified butter, honey or drugs, 0 twice born one?" Roy, xii.262, is not significantly different.

Deussen, Mokṣadharma-parvan, adhy.263.41: "Wenn man diese noch bei Lebzeiten verkauft, wie sollte man Umstände mit ihnen machen, wenn sie tot sind! ⅓ (... wer so etwas verkauft, kann nicht glücklich werden.) Aber welches [Bedenken] könnte bestehen beim Verkauf von Sesamöl und zerlassener Butter, o Brahmaṇe, von Honig und Kräutersäften?"

Both translations follow the Vulgate text which has an interpolated stanza (Śāntip.70*) 41ab x 41cd of the Critical Edition text; the last foot of that stanza is included in parenthesis in the quotations above.
If these [cattle] are sold alive, what scruples [would one have over selling them] dead? [But] what [scruples can there be about selling] sesame oil, clarified butter, honey, water, or herbal mixtures, o brahman.

In other words he is taking pains to point out that the merchandise he sells is not objectionable, as selling cattle products would be. In this way stanza 41 is seen to fulfil its function as a device by which the preceding stanza (40), which describes the divinities resident in (living) animals is applied to the situation in the Tuladhara story. Insofar as stanza 41 is thus a vindication of the merchant's profession it conforms to the tendency of the previous mentions of trade in stanza 2 and in stanzas 7-8 and it is open for one to suggest that all three references (or at least stanza 41 and one other) may represent the continuing interest of a single composer.

This approach to the question is, however, seriously open to challenge. First, it needs to be noted that there is nothing at all in stanza 41 itself to justify the understood conjunction "but" supplied by translators to throw the second verse into opposition to the first. This has been supplied, apparently, in order to bring the purport of the verse into harmony with the broad context of the story. This procedure is a necessary and justifiable one in translating or interpreting a text, but it creates a circularity of argument when it is on the basis of the stanza thus interpreted that argument is adduced concerning the relationship of the stanza to the context which inspired the interpretation.
In the instance of stanza 41, however, it happens that this frustration can be sidestepped by demonstrating that the stanza is better interpreted in terms of a context outside chapter 254.

The editors of the Critical Edition have noted that stanza 44, dealing with agriculture, is matched almost verbatim in book 10 of the Mānavadharmāstra. They have not observed that the general concerns of the first half of M are also matched in the same section of Manu. This fact is most simply shown by compiling a short concordance of parallel passages such as is set out in Table X. From this tabulation it emerges that there is no one-to-one relationship between M and the text of the Mānavadharmāstra, that certain parts of M do not appear in the Mānavadharmāstra at all, and that even the parts of M which are matched do not follow the sequence of the Mānavadharmāstra. Yet it is also difficult to deny that the two passages have some affinity. The constellation of material in the first part of M; the virtually verbatim quotation of Manu 10.84; and the particular items of merchandise mentioned in stanza 41, all indicate that the selection of taila as one of the prohibited substances has particular diagnostic value for it seems to be mentioned only in Manu and not in other major law books (Gautama, Apastamba, Baudhāyana, Vāsiśtha, Yājñavalkya, Nārada). It appeared in Śaṅkhālikhita, quoted by Kane, History of Dharmāstra, vol.II, pt.1, p.128,n.280, and in Mbh. v.38.5, but neither of the last two contexts is comparable to that of stanza 41. Kane does not mention sesame oil at all in his synoptic survey, History of Dharmāstra, vol.II, pt.1, pp. 126-129. On the other hand not too much should be made of this, for the grain sesame (tila) is frequently listed and may be intended to subsume the oil in some cases, though both Manu and Śaṅkhālikhita appear to make a distinction.
Manavadharmasāstra or some source like it\(^99\) has contributed to M. It may be that the imperfection and insquentionality of the match and the lack of total dependence on Manu are to be explained by the nature of M's construction: firstly, the way in which M has been laced with interstitial rhetoric would militate against verbatim quotation and is to that extent inimical to sequential copying; secondly, the elaboration in M which corresponds to Manu 10.83 suggests that the composer of MN was drawing on a knowledge of Manu for inspiration, not as an exemplar.

Insofar as an affinity with Manu is accepted, a redefinition of the context in which st. 41 is to be interpreted is called for. How far does the meaning of stanza 41 remain faithful to the prescriptions of Manu, and how far has it been acclimatized to the atmosphere of the Tulādhāra story? One method of gaining an estimate of this without prejudice, is to compare the lists of merchandise given in each of the relevant passages of Tulādhāra's story (stt. 2, 7-8, 41) and the Manavadharmasāstra (10.86-89). The comparison is set out in Table XI. Stanzas 2 and 7-8 show great similarity, both listing

\(^99\) Since there is no reason at all to suppose that the composer of M was quoting directly from any text (see next note), greater precision would probably be unattainable if sought. The affinity between the Manu law tradition - not always the Manavagṛhasthāna - and parts of the Mahābhārata is well established (Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, vol.I, pp. 151-156; Hopkins, Great Epic, pp. 17-23; Buhler, Laws of Manu, lxxv-xc; its presumption here needs no special defence.
categories rasa (condiments) and gandha (aromatics) along with more specific categories (st. 2) or examples of the same categories (stt. 7-8). Since we earlier concluded that stanza 2 is likely to belong to the original story and stanzas 7-8 to the IIInd alignment, their similarity must be attributed to a dialectical relationship, stanzas 7-8 implicitly referring to stanza 2 in order to refute the doubt or condescension expressed there. For the purpose of comparison with other lists of merchandise, stanzas 2 and 7-8 may therefore be taken as one. Comparing st. 41 with stt. 2 and 7-8 on the one hand and with Manu on the other, the direction of st. 41's allegiance is clear. It noticeably lacks any mention of the two major categories - rasa, gandha - which dominate stt. 2 and 7-8. Against that its specification of goods is well represented in the Manavodharmasāstra, particularly in 10.88. Thus stanza 41 shows itself more aware of Manu than of the other passages in Tulādhāracā's story.

This has implications for the translation. In Manu the specific goods listed in 10.86-89, which may not be sold by a brahman even when he has adopted a vaisya mode of life, include both oil, clarified butter, honey, etc as well as cattle. In this light there must be considerable doubt over the justness of the interpretations of stanza 41 which threw the two verses of the stanza into opposition. The example of Manu would suggest a preferable and simpler translation as follows:
If you would sell these cattle alive, O brahman, why demur over selling them dead, or over selling sesame oil, clarified butter, honey, water or herbal mixtures?

With the reinterpretation of stanza 41 suggested by Manu, which reverses the sense of the second verse of the stanza, the previously hypothesized relationship between M and the other passages mentioning sale of merchandise clearly needs review. Reconsideration reveals that not only do the listed commodities in stanza 41 have little in common with those of stanzas 2 or 7-8, but also that even where there are points of contact, these themselves support arguments against any close relationship.

A point on which direct comparison is feasible is the exclusion of wine (madya) from the juices (rasa) the merchant claims to sell in stanzas 7-8. Now, overall, stanzas 7-8 and 41 are opposed in that they list respectively merchandise approved and disapproved by the merchant, so that by being excluded in stanzas 7-8 wine is placed on the same footing as the commodities mentioned in stanza 41. However since wine is not listed in stanza 41, the exclusion in stanzas 7-8, far from being an element showing affinity only raises the inescapable question of why in stanzas 7-8 the merchant should have gone out of his way to exclude solely wine from his stock, when later, in stanza 41, he was to denounce many other commodities, but not wine. This inconstancy makes it hard to imagine that both
stanzas 7-8 and stanza 41 are the work of a single composer; it does not rule out seeing stanza 41 as a younger extension of stanzas 7-8.

The second point allowing direct comparison is the mention of plants and herbal mixtures (oṣadhi, ausadha\footnote{Manu 10.87: oṣadhi; stanza 2: oṣadhi; stanza 41: ausadhesu.}). In this instance it is stanza 2 which appears to have an element in common with both stanza 41 and Manu. Moreover in all three contexts the sale of plants or plant products is considered as worthy of condemnation by a brahman. However, this harmony is deceptive: reference to Table XI and the notes attached to it will remind us that it was suggested there that the class oṣadhi of stanza 2 was dialectically counterpointed by the specifics alakta, tunga of stanza 7-8. In view of the

\footnote{Attempts to explain this seeming fickleness are not convincing. One such argument is that in stt. 7-8 the merchant is excluded from selling wine, whereas in st. 41 the brahman, by virtue of his position, is subject to a more comprehensive range of exclusions and that the exclusion of wine (mentioned in Manu, see Table XI) applies a fortiori without being stated. This is not acceptable because in stt. 7-8 the merchant recommends to the brahman (implicitly) a mode of living the virtue of which is its harmlessness. Since the exclusions of st. 41 are also in a context of deploring injury they are equally relevant in stt. 7-8. The falsity of distinguishing st. 7 and st. 41 is underlined by the fact that the merchant is the mouthpiece in both instances. Another argument is that in st. 41 the composer is influenced by Manu, and this explains the elaboration he himself had not anticipated in stt. 7-8. The effect of this influence cannot be denied; but once it is accepted, the significance of the selling referred to in stanza 41 has to be seen in the context of Manu. When this is done, there is no longer a link of common motivation between stt. 7-8 and st. 41, only a coincidental similarity offering no basis for postulating a common composer in the first place.}
correspondence of other elements between stanza 2 and stanzas 7-8\textsuperscript{102} and the proximity of the two passages in the text, this matching is hard to reject. Its acceptance, however, breaks down the united front of stanzas 2, 41 and Manu, for the implied denigration of the sale of plants by the brahman in stanza 2 is repudiated by the merchant in stanzas 7-8. In short, we find the following sequence:

2: brahman implicitly denigrates sale of plants;

7-8: merchant says his virtue lies in the fact that he does sell such products (and implicitly recommends the practice);

41: merchant implies that the brahman should object to the sale of plant products.

The incompatibility of the two statements made by the merchant (stanzas 7-8, 41) underlines the lack of intimacy and awareness buffering stanza 41 from both the earlier passages.

But if it was not out of deference to earlier passages in the Tulādhāra episode, why was selling mentioned at all in M? Stanza 41 leads the topic of the treatment of cattle into the topic of their sale. The former is quite in harmony with concerns expressed elsewhere in MN; the mention of forbidden merchandise, however, has no relevance to any other part of MN. As it has not been directly inspired by the discussions of merchandise in stanzas 2 or 7-8, how is its presence to be explained? Part of the answer undoubtedly

\textsuperscript{102} See notes to Table XI.
lies in the fact that the passage in Manu with which M has much in common is also concerned with the question of merchandise forbidden to a brahman engaged in trade. It is therefore possible that stanza 41 is the offspring of the secret union of M with Manu 10.81-88 rather than of M's marriage to the Tuladharā story. As none of the other interstices of direct address in MN makes reference to other materials of the Tuladharā story outside the interpolation MN, stanza 41 is not exceptional in this regard. However merely to have pointed out that Manu 10.81-88 includes reference inter alia to the selling of merchandise is not by itself sufficient to explain why the composer of MN should have considered such material appropriate and worthy of inclusion in his composite interpolation. A full explanation must be part of a consideration of the intended relevance of MN to the context into which it was interpolated.

The relationship of MN to earlier materials of chapter 254 has been touched upon in the course of the preliminary segmentation by which M was delineated. It was there proposed that the evils described in M were illustrations of activities the interpolator understood to be referred to in verse 36cd:

103 The analogy between st. 41 and the other interstices is, however, not perfect; for with the exception of verse 43cd the other interstices are rhetorical and not substantial in the sense of introducing any new thought. 104 Pages 135-136, 138-139 above.
... But [true dharma] is perceived when other kinds of conduct are reviled.

The translation given here differs from that offered at pages 127 and 456 in understanding upalabhyā in a different sense. Lexicographers distinguish the forms upaḷabhya 'obtain; understand' and upaḷabhā 'censure, revile', but a comparison of 254.36c (upalabhya with 256.17c (upālabdha)) where the root has the same meaning suggests that in practice the distinction may not be well observed. Therefore I believe it reasonable to propose that MN's interpolator understood the upalabhyā of 254.36c as meaning 'censuring'. Certainly this proposal sits well with the interpolator's paraphrase of stanza 36 in his conclusion (v) and also with his condemnatory outbursts punctuating MN. Particularly noteworthy is his first rhetorical exclamation, "How can you not denounce them!

Yet even with the understanding that a survey of unrighteous activities was felt to be called for, we must still ask why just those unrighteous

105 Monier Williams distinguishes the two forms, and would have 'censuring' as upālabhā; but cf. Böhtlingk and Roth as at p. 459 below.
106 256.17cd: samyak cālīvam upālabdho dharmaś cōktah sanātanah //
107 That both usages are attributable to the composer of the 1st alignment material strengthens the contrast itself but not its relevance to comprehending the stance of the composer of MN. The distinction is not emasculated by the likelihood that the vowel of 256.17c was lengthened metri causa.
108 254.38b: tān kathm na vigarhase /
activities described in M have been singled out for attention. To some extent we may put the choice down to the interpolator's personal viewpoint, but insofar as he appears to have adapted material from Manu or a similar source we are justified in putting the more specific question of why the interpolator's mind should have turned to a passage in Manu dealing with the activities forbidden to brahmans even under the indulgences applying in adversity, i.e. under the prescriptions of āpaddharma. Once again the conclusion of the interpolation (U) throws some light upon how the interpolator perceived the relationship of MN to its context. In U, he says:

49 O Jājali, you do not realize [the true nature of] such pernicious and frightful kinds of behaviour because in this world even what is mere usage is [considered] perfect.\textsuperscript{109}

In this stanza he implies that he saw the evil practices he condemns were widely practised, wrongly, by those whose behaviour was commonly taken as exemplary. From this we may deduce that he may well have had brahmans in mind - which is wholly appropriate considering that he is addressing Jājali. If we assume then, that the interpolator had brahmanic conduct in mind, we do not have far to look for an explanation of his interest in āpaddharma prescriptions. It would be quite credible that the interpolator should have seen in the older material, and especially E, a

\textsuperscript{109} Text at p.138, n.49 above.
statement about the dissuadence of pure dharma and determinations of dharma made to suit circumstances, taking this to be an allusion to the rules of āpaddharma. Read cursorily, E may give such an impression:

*34 Even the fortunate have fallen upon hard times ...

*35 There is now no pure dharma, but a prescription of dharma has been made to deal with conditions of the day.

*36 ... One should be awake to other kinds of behaviour, reviling them.110

In this reading of E, the "other kinds of behaviour" are thus practices which transgress even the dispensation granted to brahmans in adversity. This, then, is a possible explanation of why M's composer drew on Manu as he did; and also of why he may have considered even Manu's restrictions on brahmanic trading a relevant reinforcement for his own views on the maltreatment of cattle.

Nevertheless, not every part of MN is explicable through reference to Manu. It is true that his comments on agriculture are attributable to the influence of Manu.111 But his

110 I.e. reading 254,34ab, 35, 36cd. This is a paraphrase only, designed to convey a possible superficial impression of the passage.

111 While the fact that it is attributable to the influence of Manu devalues its importance so far as giving us an insight into the personal proclivities of M's composer is concerned, it is interesting to note that the one change made in M's version of the stanza (Manu 10.84: vṛttir sadvigarhitā; M: vṛttir sadārūnā) serves to stress the cruelty rather than simply the objectionable nature of agriculture.
concentration on injury to cattle flows neither from the carte blanche he was given in E's reference to "other kinds of behaviour", nor from Manu, who on the contrary spends more time over legalistic prescriptions concerning trading. The answer may simply be that the interpolator considered injury directed toward cattle as the most heinous sin most obviously demanding a brahman's revulsion. It is arguable alternatively or additionally that the story as it stood at the time MN was accreted may itself have given the impression that objectionable action was synonymous with that involving injury (himsā). Certainly by the time it had undergone its first revision (alignment II), the story would have given the appearance of being in praise of non-injury. But even taking this into account, it is still the interpolator's contribution that he saw injury to cattle as the major manifestation of sinful behaviour.

To return at last to the question of MN's alignment, it has been argued that M's mention of selling is best explained through reference to Manu and imputations concerning the interpolator's understanding of DE, and that no case can be made out for affinity with either of the earlier passages mentioning selling (Z, L). On the contrary, reasons have been advanced against ascribing MN to the composers of either L or Z, L. Although MNU breaches material of the 1st
alignment \((E \times P)\), in view of the interpolator's particular focus of attention when he moves beyond Manu, discussed in the previous paragraph, it seems wise to regard MN as younger than alignment II. Whether or not MN is younger again than P is not deducible from this chapter.

**Concluding stanzas**

Finally, at the end of the chapter, we come across a couple of stanzas we have not yet discussed. The last three verses of the chapter (V) unambiguously constitute a concluding device. They are best discussed later in conjunction with the other internal divisions of the episode.\(^{112}\)

The stanza (G) preceding that conclusion is more problematic. It has a close affinity with the first substantive stanza\(^{113}\) of the merchant's answer (A):

50cd 51ab (G): If one man were to injure me and one man to praise me - listen, o Jājali [to my reaction] in such circumstances: for me both those would be the same; pleasant and unpleasant things have no existence for me.\(^{114}\)

10 (A): I do not praise or condemn the deeds of others [for], o wise seer, I see the variety of the world [as consisting] in only the inert etherial element.\(^{115}\)

---

\(^{112}\) See below, pp. 247-259.

\(^{113}\) I.e. after 254.5ab (Z), the structurally-bound beginning of the answer which has no content beyond its formality.

\(^{114}\) 254.50cd51ab:

yo nānyād yāṣ ca mām ātāti tatrāpi śṛṇu jājale//
samau tav api me syātām na hi me stāḥ priyāpriye/

\(^{115}\) 254.10:

nāhaṣa pareṣan karmāṇi prāṣṭāsāmi śapāmi ca /
ākāśasya eva viparṣe paśyaṃ lokasya citratām//
This likeness has the effect of making G appear otiose. None of the material which follows the chapter - a discussion of sacrifice\footnote{116} and a demonstration of unfearsomeness\footnote{117} - calls for this statement (G). Rather G seems to be a check in the story's thought progression.\footnote{118}

As the content and position of G, taken jointly, are thus not readily explicable, the affinity of G with A inspires three possible resolutions of the difficulty: (1) the assumption that G is a later accretion intended to embroider A; (2) the assumption that in some way G and A were once in closer association than is now the case or were components of a now-disturbed continuum; or (3) the interpretation of G as having been intended as a recapitulation of the merchant's attitude to life. The first possibility lacks any positive recommendation and does nothing to explain the placement of G. The second inspires a whole range of subsidiary hypotheses. But given that the displacement of a single stanza (G) is inherently unlikely, all the more so must be the grandiose schemes of textual disarrangement which would be necessary to bring G and A into closer association. Such a proposal

\footnote{116}{Chapter 255.}
\footnote{117}{256.1-6, 16-19.}
\footnote{118}{In contrast to G, 254.M and 255 share common concerns. That G has the appearance of a check does not necessarily imply misplacement of it, however. The subsequent accretion of material without affinity to G will have produced the same effect.}
would need corroboration with respect to motive, occasion and process. We may spare ourselves this arduous ratiocination by placing our trust in the third possibility if for no other reason than that G, being contiguous with a stanza of the oldest alignment (P), should benefit from a presumption of antiquity as it stands in the text. In this act of faith we are anticipating the results of analysis of later chapters which will reveal that G is fittingly and adequately explained as a recapitulation of the merchant's discourse.

119 At one stage in the development of this analysis, I worked out a possible scenario of this kind which warrants recording here as a warning that the possibility should not be dismissed simply because of its apparent complexity. The hypothesis was that the original material read ZCDEFGAB. At the time of the rewriting of 253 and the incorporation of L in 254, the interpolator, faced with the utter incompatibility of L:C (stt.9,21) moved forward to a stanza more consonant with L, viz A, and thence worked through the remainder of the material B, thence CDEFG. This hypothesis explained motive, occasion and process - the latter not very credibly. It reunited GA; explained the hiatus B:C; and accounted for G's isolation at the chapter's end. It did not explain why the interpolator of L moved on to A passing over G (human error?). More crippling, it regarded ch.254 as a discrete unit of text, whereas there is evidence that this was very probably not so on the earlier alignments of the text. (See pp.244-262 below).

120 Pages 242-243 below.
Chapter 255 presents itself to us as a discrete entity: it is structurally detached from the surrounding text by the presence of introductory and concluding stanzas.

The introductory stanzas (1-3) see an interlocutor, in this case Jājali, stating his objection to views expressed earlier in the episode:

3 ... You are mouthing nihilistic 
[ideas]. [If they were accepted] our world would come to a standstill, completely ceasing from [productive] activity.1

This of course invites further argument - which is just what follows. The protagonist, Tulādhāra, goes on to declare the subject of the discourse which follows:

4 Jājali, I will discuss [the topic of] livelihood.2

This structure shows that the bonds with what has appeared earlier in the story are not intimate.

At the end of the chapter the transition back to the storyline, which is picked up again in ch.256, is of the loosest kind. It relies upon the editorial intervention by the omniscient Bhīṣma:

1 255.3bcd:
   ... nāstikyam api jalpasi /
   na hi varted ayaṃ loko vārtām utarpīya kevalam //

2 255.4a:
   vakṣyāmi jājale vṛttim ... /
   It should be remarked that "subsistence" is an inadequate translation of vṛtti in that it does not convey the complementary sense "course of action" which in this context links vṛtti to the performance of sacrifices which sustain life. See p.546 below.
Thus Tuladhāra extols such duties [as] these, endowed with propriety [and] unceasingly followed by the good. This completes the impression of a chapter which is but loosely bound to the rest of the episode, and which may therefore conveniently be considered first in its own ambit.

Internal segmentation of the chapter

Chapter 255 has some marks of internal division and even dislocation. After the opening exchange between Jājali and Tuladhāra, Tuladhāra punctuates his discourse with several rhetorical references to Jājali. Three of these attain at least sloka length and therefore cannot be dismissed as merely metrical make-weights:

27 ... That is my considered opinion, o Jājali, taking everything into account.

32 ... I present such [a doctrine] to you [by way of] highlighting mental renunciation.

34 ... By what course [should] he proceed, o Jājali ...

Appearing very shortly after these, we find an elaborate statement and question by Jājali which gives every appearance of introducing new material.

We have never heard this principle from the Sages. I ask you about this difficult [concept], o trader, [for] earlier times the seers never took cognizance of it, nor, moreover, did they establish it.

3 255.41:
etān īdṛṣṭakān dharmāṁs tuladhāraḥ prāṁsati /
upapattāḥ hi sampannāṁ nityām sadbhīr nisevītaṁ //
4 255.27cd:
iti me vartate buddhīḥ samā sarvatra jājale //
5 255.32cd:
buddhityāgam puraskṛtya tādṛśam prabravīmi te //
6 255.34d:
... xām gatiṁ yāti jājale /
Indeed with this self-resort cattle
would not achieve bliss; how, then, could
anyone achieve bliss by private actions,
o trader. Propound this for me, o very
wise one; I have firm faith in you. 7

However it is not valid to take these verses at face value
and without further ado to cut the chapter into three or four
segments. Only in the case of the last quoted stanzas (35-36)
does the Critical Apparatus yield any potentially revealing
data. Let us therefore take up consideration of this
passage first.

The accretion 255.35-38ab

As a glance at Table XVIII will reveal, the Critical
Apparatus evinces a remarkable variety of text orders in the
collated manuscripts underlying stanzas 34-38 of the Critical
Edition. Some ramifications of the variation are dealt with
in Part B. 8 For our present interest in segmenting chapter
255, some generalized remarks will suffice.

The divergent text-orders of stanzas 34-38 can be
rendered down into a small number of patterns 9 in which
it becomes clear that we have to deal with two principal
constants: first, the verse-run 35-38ab which recurs in
uninterrupted sequence in all the collated texts; and,
secondly, the verse-pair 34ef38cd also found in all but
two of the collated texts, sometimes before, sometimes

7 255.35,36:
\[
na vai muninam sr
\]
\[
prchami tvam vanija kaṣṭham etat /
purve purve cāasya nāveksamānā
nātah paraśaṁ tām rṣayah sthāpayanti //
asmim evātmatīrthe na paśavah pṛapnuyah sukham /
atha svakarmanā kena vanija pṛapnuyat sukham /
śāmsa me tan mahāprajñāh bhrṣam vai śraddadhāmi te //
\]

8 Pages 389-403 below.

9 See Table XVII. Although at first sight this
simplification appears to take excessive liberty with the
materials, it will appear from the discussion in Part B
that no violence has been done.
after 35-38ab. Hovering about these shifting constants
is a duplication of 34ef witnessed in about half the
collated manuscripts. Both because it is the most
strikingly anomalous feature of the texts as they appear
in chapter 255, and also because of the implications it
may have for the pairing of 34ef38cd, the duplication of
34ef is the best starting point for our analysis.

Verse 34ef is duplicated in the largest group of N
texts and, with differing placements, in M5. Since the
duplication is not distributed universally, it may be
presumed an innovation in those texts witnessing it.10
It is therefore in order for us to consider alternative
circumstances under which the innovation might have
arisen. For the duplication in M5, facilitating
conditions do not readily spring to mind.11 The
duplication in the majority of N manuscripts, however,
suggests more than one possible set of circumstances.
On the one hand, the duplication may be the product of a
conscious revision intended by some editor-transmitter
to give some intelligibility to 38cd, probably12
arising through the influence of the example of the

10 Thus *D57 should be considered a text like the
majority of N texts, in which 34ef2 has not been
accreted, rather than one from which 34ef2 has been
omitted.
11 Verse 34ef2 cannot have been introduced to
chaperone 38cd; nor is there an extant source which
could have infected 34ef2 in its M5 position. The
alternative is that 34ef1 is the later accreted, in
which case the M5 text must already have been
disordered (34abcd38cd34ef39) before the interpolation
of 35-38ab in the S position (38cd x). Either in
the same transfer, or subsequently, the seeming
lacuna 34cd x 38cd in M5 compared with other S texts
might then have filled from an S source.
12 The alternative is that the revision was generated
internally through the conscious repetition of 34ef.
It is unlikely because while it (unnecessarily)
demands awareness and critical distance on the part
of the reviser, we find only the duplication of 34ef,
not its removal to the more fitting placement.
visibly superior reading of another text in which 34ef and 38cd occurred together - such as **K124. On the other hand, the duplication may have arisen unintentionally in the course of incorporating a contamination. For a notion of what this contamination would have been, we do not have to look beyond the verse-run 35-38ab which, under this dispensation, may be seen as a wedge driven at different points into an older continuum 34abcdef38cd. In this case, the doubling of 34ef in other-N might have arisen as a by-product of the misplacement of the accretion in a copying from **K124, which would have created the impression that 34ef was missing from the recipient text when in fact it had mistakenly been pushed to the other side of the point of insertion of the contamination. In this case, too, 34ef\textsuperscript{2} of other-N will have sprung from **K124.

Thus the idea that 34ef38cd is a constant around which swirl the extant text-orders is laid to rest; but, ironically, only by accounts of the extant texts which presume the unoriginality of versions which separate 34ef from 38cd. This presumption is explicit in the second alternative explanation, which

13 Only M5 reads 34ef in an analogous position, but in that case the symmetry of donor and recipient is imperfect (recipient: 38ab x 38cd; M5: 38ab x 39; K124: 38ab x 38cd).

14 The procedure outlined here is entirely similar to the processes proposed to explain the duplication of 24ef in the incorporation of 254,R. See pp. 267-272.

15 Diagrammatically:

\begin{verbatim}
**K124 : 34abcd 35 36 37 38ab 34ef 38cd 39
recipient text : 34abcdef 38cd 39
*other-N : 34abcdef [35 36 37 38ab 34ef\textsuperscript{2}] 38cd 39
\end{verbatim}
juxtaposed J4ef, J8cd in an older continuum; it is implicit in the first alternative explanation, whereby later revisions recognize and attempt to restore the pristine text. In both cases, in the manuscripts concerned, the separation of J4ab and J8cd has come about by virtue of the interposition of stanzas 35-38ab. Consequently there is little doubt that it is realistic to see 35-38ab as a contamination, and to excise it from the critically reconstructed archetype text.

The formally-derived segmentation finds ample corroboration in the content of the passages under examination. Stanzas 35-38ab have every mark of being an interpolation, with their elaborate introductory question, its controversial stance,¹⁷ and its statement that their motivation is to allay an impression of unorthodoxy perceived in the uninterpolated text.¹⁸ But above all, as the next few paragraphs will show, the relationship of the particular matter at issue in these stanzas to the rest of the chapter demands segmentation of the kind we have proposed.

¹⁷ Note the melodramatic proclamations of disbelief in stanza 35 and the reference to a "difficulty" (kastam etat), intended of course as a mystification anticipating the proud composer's solution.

¹⁸ The composer of stanza 36ab is concerned that the new modes of sacrifice described in the material as he found it seemed to eliminate cattle (pašavah) as indispensable partners in the sacrifice who themselves benefited from their part in the rite. This, it will be recalled, is a point raised in the question which introduces the chapter (st.1-3) but which had become progressively obscured until, in stanza 34, the sacrifice itself is in question.
Although it is generally valuable for understanding the relationship between the older text and a newly composed accretion to determine which of the various placements of an interpolation was the one intended by its composer, in the present case it might be thought possible to dispense with this preliminary, for the link between 35-38ab and the archetypal text is made plain by the first specific verse of the interpolation's introductory question, 36ab. Verse 36ab makes mention of the self (atman) as a place of pilgrimage (tirtha), a conception also expressed in the archetypal text in verse 39cd:

36a: With this same self-resort...
39c: ṇājälī, [your] place of pilgrimage is [your] self.

It is noticeable that the first statement, in the interpolation, assumes that reference to the conception has already been made or at least that the notion is one we are familiar with. On the other hand, the treatment of the matter on the older level in 39c gives no indication that prior knowledge of the concept is expected of its audience. In fact the intent of stanza 39 seems to be to spell out the concept both explicitly, and with metaphorical examples. On this evidence we are hard pressed not to assume that the verse of the interpolation makes reference to stanza 39, the last substantive verse of chapter 255.

19 asmīn evātmatiṃtīrthe...
20 jājale tīrtham ātmāiva...
21 This is the force of asmīn eva.
This link would suggest an intended insertion point after stanza 39 and before the chapter's conclusion in stanzas 40-41, a convenient interstice into which an interpolation might be slipped. But the interpolation does not have this placement in any of the collated texts - and must therefore be assumed never to have had it at all. Some insight into why we are faced with this contradiction may be gained by a closer analysis of the make-up of the proposed interpolation 35-38ab itself. The variæ lectiones collated in the Critical Edition reveal that in several S texts 35-36ab are not found preceding 36cd-38ab at all. Rather than assuming an inexplicable loss we are wiser to regard 35-36ab as a secondary contamination built upon the earlier one, 36cd-38ab. The justification for this interpretation will become fully evident in Part B.22 Its immediate relevance is that the older contamination, which has determined at least the first placement of 35-36ab, is stripped of its reference to Ātmatīrtha.

The older contamination now begins with a question about efficacious private rites:

36cd: By what private rite, then, may one achieve bliss, o trader? 23

This question may be understood as having been inspired by the verses of the archetypal text its composer had before him: a common thread running through 34, 38cd, 39 is the principle that sacrifice is possible without

22 See pp.389-392 below.
23 Text at p.185, n.7 above.

Context suggests the translation of svakarman with "private rite" rather than the more usual "one's own occupation or duty" (M.W.); but this interpretation is not essential.
brahmanic officiants. As stanza 34 asks:

34abcd: By what course [should] one proceed, o Jajali, [who] pursues a common means of subsistence, [who] does not officiate at rites, does not conduct sacrifices, [and] does not give to brahmans [at sacrifices]?24

Verse 38cd suggests a positive alternative in advocating the use of sacrificial cakes in place of animal offerings. The contamination 36cd-38ab gives a more fully developed illustration of what kind of sacrifice can be conducted using one's private resources. Its key lies in its last verse:

38ab: And with this ceremony, one achieves [the desired result] while employing [only one's] wife.25

In this light, the account of the cow's association with sacrifice in stanza 37 can be seen not to have been concerned with the fate of cattle, but rather the way in which a family's resources (the products of the cow, the labour of the wife in preparing them) can provide all that is necessary for a simple private rite. Only with the subsequent appendage of 35-36ab is the thrust of stanza 37 changed, making verse 38ab virtually incomprehensible and leading to the widespread emendation of 37f so that the cow no longer "supports" (sambharati) the sacrifice, but participates (sambhavati) in it.26

24 On this stanza, see further p. 194, n. 37.
25 25.38ab:

paññha cārena vidhūna prakarotī niyojayan /

26 Both sambharati and sambhavati have numerous witnesses (in 19 and 16 manuscripts respectively) arranged in strong distribution profiles (see Table XXXVI). The Critical Edition proposes sambhavāti as the original reading, presumably on the grounds of its representation in the textus optimus K1, possibly on the grounds of the sense of the text as it stands in the Critical Edition. However the history of the accretions makes it preferable to take sambharati as the earlier reading (though not of course part of the archetype) since sambhavati then becomes an explicable corruption.
This understanding of the contamination 36cd-38ab solves any difficulty over its point of insertion. It is aptly placed as we find it in the S texts, after 38cd: the verse in the archetypal text which also illustrates a mode of humble sacrifice. On totally different grounds, we will see in Part B\(^2\) that the contamination 36cd-38ab did indeed begin life in S.

The secondary accretion 35-36ab now becomes the work of a composer who had before him not only the archetypal text 34,38cd,39 but also the interpolated 36cd-38ab. His mock concern with the fate of cattle denied a sacrificial death will therefore have been inspired not only by the single mention of cattle in verse 38cd, but no doubt also rather more by the extended concern of stanza 37abcdef. The otiose parallelism of 36ab and 36cd, too, is well accounted for if the composer of 36ab had 36cd before him. Indeed he may have intended 36ab as a substitute for 36cd.

**Segmentation of the main discourse**

We may now investigate the possibility of segmenting what remains in chapter 255. We have already noticed\(^2\) that certain verses have the appearance of being joints in a composite structure. Whether or not they are so, and whether or not they betray shifts from material on one alignment to material on another can be determined only by studying the text for indications of complementary flaws in its make up.

The first part (4-27ab) of Tulādhāra's discourse

\(^{27}\) Pages 392-393 below.
\(^{28}\) Pages 184-185 above.
deals with the true Brahmanic sacrifice, contrasting it with the misapprehensions and malpractice afflicting current sacrificial conduct, and advocates non-injurious personal sacrifice (svayajña). Although Tulādhāra’s expatiation sounds discordant at some points and seems to lack cogency, virtually all its contents contribute to answering Jājali’s objection as stated in stanzas 1–3. Its line of thought appears to culminate immediately before verse 27cd – one of the punctuating pauses which are the joints of Tulādhāra’s exposition – when stanza 26cd27ab rather ponderously answers the question which launched the discussion:

1: The duty which you have thus expounded, o holder of the balance, will stop up the door to heaven and the livelihood of [all] creatures.

26/27: Without departing from the conduct of their personal duty, [those whose] rites are perfect, through a desire to benefit creatures, would enable creatures to attain heaven.

Since it follows this answer, verse 27cd begins to take on the appearance of a conclusion:

27cd: That is my considered opinion, o Jājali, taking everything into account.

But the material which follows it continues brusquely on, not pausing for any form of introduction. In the few stanzas (28–32ab) before he next draws breath (32cd), Tulādhāra describes a higher mode of sacrifice,

---

29 Notably in 255.5 and 255.15-16.
30 At 255.17-27ab.
31 255.1: yathā pravartito dharmas tulāṃ dharayata tvayā / svargadvāraṃ ca vṛttim ca bhūtānām avarotsyate //
32 255.26cd,27ab: pariniṣṭhitakarmanah prajānugrahakāmyayā // prāpayeyuh prajāḥ svargaṃ svadharmacaranena vai /
the mentally-impelled cow sacrifice, the performance of which ensures permanent release from rebirth.

Following stanza 32 the same pattern is repeated, with Tulāḍhāra's exposition continuing unabated. In this final section of his discourse (33-34, 38cd-39), as we have seen, he stresses that the mundane offerings at the disposal of the lowly are as efficacious as any more elaborate sacrifice.

The brevity of the last part of the discourse means that there is scarcely room to develop any idea with the fullness that leads to easy comprehension. We must therefore look closely at what material there is if we are to define its message with the sensitivity needed for comparison with other parts of the chapter.

The subject of Tulāḍhāra's rhetorical question in 34 is one who does not officiate at rites sponsored by others, who does not conduct sacrifices of his own and does not make presents to brahmans who officiate at sacrifices on his behalf, and who pursues a means of subsistence involving him in vulgar social intercourse. If the reference to non-participation in sacrifice is to have any point, we must infer that the composer of this description had a brahman in mind. The incongruity

---

33 255.30-31.
34 255.29ab.
35 From the rhetorical question (34abcd) to the formulaic conclusion of the chapter (40-41) is a mere two stanzas' distance. The relationship of 33 to the material following the rhetorical question has yet to be defined.
36 And it is therefore a brevity especially ill-befitting 34...39 if it were an interpolation in its own right.
37 34ab: nāṣṛavayāna ca yajana ca dañadda
brahmāneṣu ca /
In view of the first two verbs it is fair to infer that making gifts to brahmans in payment for conduct of a rite is what is intended by the last phrase. However this assumption is not required for the argument.
of Tulādhāra the vaiśya merchant lecturing Jājali on brahmanic duties has long since ceased to be surprising and is certainly not an objection to this inference. (It is, however, a measure of how far we have come from the original story).

The fact that brahmans might sacrifice on this man's behalf does not exclude him from the brahman class himself. Moreover, only for a brahman is the disparaging mention of involvement in the workaday round (gramyā vṛttī) fitting. The term grāmya is loaded with connotations: implying involvement in the civilized life of settlements, it stands opposed to the mode of existence of the vānaprastha, who leaves society behind. We may undoubtedly infer therefore that the subject of 34's question is a brahman householder.38

The answer to the question recommends the offering of purodāsa, the offering cake made of grain. It is probable that the composer had in mind the daily offering enjoined upon the householder, and particularly the brahman householder, known variously as agnihotra, devayajña, vaisvadeva, or simply homa,39 in which cooked foods and sometimes specifically grain cakes40 are to be offered as oblations in the household fire.

38 Grāmya vṛttī thus becomes a synonym of grāhasthādharma, but not of grāhasthārāma. The point of the question and answer is that the householder's life may be ritually the equal of that of the vānaprastha. This passage thus sees the householder's estate not as an inferior stage in a progression of life stages in accordance with the theory of the four āśramas but rather as an alternative destiny - no doubt a more representative depiction of social reality.
40 See Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, vol.II,pp.681, on the most desirable offerings - food made from barley or rice. This is the purodāsa of 38c.
Manu certainly concurs with the composer of 34...39 over the merit accruing to a householder from daily attendance to these observances. It is most significant that this offering must be conducted by the householder himself in his wife's presence — Manu indeed positively forbids the employment of an officiant for the vaiśvadeva offering. Thus the answer complies with the specifications laid down in stanza 34 which spoke of one who does not give to brahmans.

By way of elucidating 34...39, I quote a passage from Kane's *History of Dharmaśāstra* which brings out clearly the attitudes so briefly alluded to in the text. Describing the daily rites enjoined upon the brahman householder, Kane is speaking of the five mahāyajñas, of which it is the devayajña which involves homa offerings:

41 Manu 3.93 (trans. Bühler): "That Brāhmaṇa who thus daily honours all beings [in the Vaiśvadeva and Bali offerings] goes, endowed with a resplendent body, by a straight road to the highest dwelling-place (i.e. Brahman)".

42 See Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol.II, pp.683-684, for a very interesting discussion of the wife's role in the sacrifice. The wife should always attend the sacrifice and in her husband's absence she may officiate. If she is absent or dead either a substitute wife or an image of the missing wife should be present. The nature of the wife's participation in the celebration is revealed in a controversy outlined by Kane over whether the presence of an image of the wife is sufficient to validate the sacrifice. The argument against the use of an image was that "the wife's cooperation is required in such actions as looking at the clarified butter, in unhusking grains etc. and as an image of kuśa or gold cannot perform these acts, the image cannot be employed in place of the wife".

43 Manu 3.83 (trans. Bühler): "...let him not feed ... any Brāhmaṇa on account of the Vaiśvadeva offering".
... The word 'yajña' applied to these five daily duties is figurative and the adjective 'great' is applied only for belauding them. ...

It will be noticed from the description of the five yajñas given below that they are distinguished from the solemn śrauta sacrifices in two respects. In these five the chief agent is the householder himself, he does not need the help and ministration of a professional priest, while in the śrauta sacrifices the priests occupy the most prominent place and the householder is more or less a passive spectator or agent in the hands of the priests who direct everything. In the second place, in the five [maha]yajñas the central point is the discharge of duties to the Creator, to the ancient sages, to the Manes, and to the whole universe with myriads of creatures of varying grades of intelligence. In the śrauta sacrifices the main-spring of action is the desire to secure Heaven or some object such as prosperity, a son etc. Therefore the institution of the five sacrifices is morally and spiritually more progressive and more ennobling than that of the śrauta sacrifices.

The sentiments that promoted the performance of these five observances appear to have been as follows: Every man could not afford to celebrate the solemn śrauta rites prescribed in the Brāhmaṇas and Śrauta sutras. But every one could offer a fuel-stick to fire that was deemed to be the mouth of the great Gods of Heaven and thus show his reverence and devotion to them.⁴⁴

The difficulty in deciding how the three sections of Tulādhāra's discourse (4-27ab, 28-32ab, 34...39) outlined above hang together is that the structural signs are ambivalent or inconclusive. In verses 27cd and 32cd he purportedly tells his audience in plain terms why he has made the intervening remarks (28-31). The verses seem intended to complement one another; together they might be paraphrased as follows:

* That is my considered reply to the question you raised. ... I have also elaborated a special case which represents a variation on the principle.\(^4^5\)

If we take Tulādhāra at face value, the material he has thus delimited (28-31) is no more than a digression which he added to his already complete reply (4-27ab) by way of offering a more esoteric alternative solution to the problem put by Jājāli in 1-3. Prima facie this claim is plausible. But however disarming Tulādhāra may be, we cannot accept his assurances uncritically in view of the fact that the very verses (27cd, 32) which relate 28-31 to its context could well be the transitional devices of an interpolator inserting new material into an older discussion.

To determine whether we have to deal with an interpolation here, and whether 27cd-32 should be segmented from the surrounding material, we should turn

\(^{45}\) Literally:

27cd. That is my considered opinion, taking everything into account, o Jājāli. [Continuation of instruction]
32cd. I present such [a doctrine] to you [by way of highlighting mental renunciation.
27cd: iti me vartate buddhiḥ same sarvatra jājale //
32cd: buddhiyāgaṁ puraskṛtya tādṛśaṁ prabravīmi te //

Tulādhāra is made to restrict his alternative solution to those sufficiently spiritually advanced (vas tathābhavatātaṁ, 31c), reaffirming the plant offerings as suitable for those not so developed (te na tādṛśaṁ, 32c).
first to other formal or structural evidence. Positive
structural evidence that 27cd-32 is an interpolation
could be produced by demonstrating that 4-27ab and
(33)34...39 constitute an interrupted continuum;
corroboration could be supplied by accounting for the
motivation and placement of the interpolation.

But before any of these issues can be taken up, it
is necessary to determine the affiliation of stanza 33.

33 The gods recognize as a brahman him
[who is] uneager, lacking initiative,
unconcerned to honour or praise, [and] unwearyingly weary of action. 46

The possibilities are that 33 is a continuation of the
closure of 27cd-32, or that it should be aligned with
the interrupted continuum either as an extension of the
first section of Tulādhāra's discourse or as a prelude
to the question posed in 34 which ushers in the last
part of the discourse. The last possibility has least
to recommend it; 33 is inappropriately applied to a
brahman householder bound to the daily round of
grāmyā vṛtti. But unfortunately the colourless
generality of stanza 33 is such that it could be
associated with either 26cd27ab or 32 with equal
conviction.

In reconstructing the hypothesized interrupted
continuum we are therefore obliged to take account of
the alternative alignments of stanza 33. But whether
the juncture required is 26cd27ab + 33 or 26cd27ab + 34,
the relationship between the reunited parts is not

\[ \text{255.33:} \]
\[ \text{nirāsīsam anārāmbhaṁ nirnamsakāram astutim /} \]
\[ \text{aksīnam ksīnakarmānaṁ taṁ deva brāhmaṇaṁ viduḥ //} \]
intimate: we have already noted that 26cd27ab is an answer to Jājali's initially proposed question, while 34 is a rhetorical question which introduces a new dimension of the discourse. Continuum or not, continuity is not evident microtomically.

Yet while we have failed to provide positive structural evidence of interpolation, if we tentatively proceed on the assumption that there has been interpolation, we are able to offer credible accounts of its motivation and placement. As we have seen, the ideas of 27cd-32 are presented as an alternative to the mode of sacrifice enjoined in previous verses. A particular trigger for the description of alternative paths to heaven may have been the mention in 26ab of sacrificers who carry out the sacrifice "by attending to their own affairs", but it is not necessary to assume this, for 27cd-32 may be seen as an alternative to 4-27ab as a whole. At any rate it is most striking that the second part of the discourse should begin immediately after the stanza in which a full answer to Jājali's initial question is given. This is unlikely to be a coincidence; but at the same time, if 33 were included on the older alignment (...26cd27ab, 33, 34...), it would have taken a very astute mind indeed

47 26ab: svam eva cārthāṁ kurvāṁ yajñāṁ cakruḥ punar dvijaḥ
The first phrase has perhaps the force of "attending to their own interests". Note that the presence of punar implies an alternative - the alternative its composer had in mind was the sacrifice conducted by rtvij priests (25cd), but it may well have stimulated the interpolator's proposal of another alternative.
to detect that the first part of the discussion had come to its conclusion with 26cd27ab rather than running on through the inoffensive J3 to the structurally distinctive question of J4. All difficulties over placement evaporate if J3 is put on the younger alignment while at the same time 27cd is placed with the older material (...26cd27ab, 27cd, J4...). Under this dispensation, rather than being part of a framing device for 28-32, verse 27cd would mark the conclusion of the first part of the discourse; and indeed, taken by itself, 48 27cd purports to do just that. The emplacement of 28-32 immediately after so emphatic an indicator of completion as 27cd and before the rhetorical question of J4 is readily understandable.

Thus the attendant circumstances of interpolation are all to hand; only the compelling structural evidence of disruption occasioned by the interpolation is lacking. The hope of putting wind in the sails of this becalmed cutter compels us to turn to consideration of the content of the materials. If it comes about that we are able to discover fundamental incompatibilities in the standpoints from which the composers of sections of the discourse have worked, then segmentation may be justified.

With this in mind, it does not seem impertinent to register some scepticism over the manner in which a single composer of the whole of 4-33 seems to have developed his line of thought. Why should he touch

48 I.e. overturning the association with J2cd which we have hitherto accepted. See p.198 above.
upon the subject of true and degraded forms of sacrifice (5, 15-16), expound the idea of one form of sublimated sacrifice in his stanzas relating to sacrifices of truth and restraint (17-18), develop the idea of self-satisfaction being equivalent to divine satisfaction (18-20 etc.) - and yet go on to conclude with a recommendation of simple pūjā, without giving any hint at all of the apparently germane doctrine of self-activated sublimated sacrifice which he is to begin propounding not eight stanzas later (28-32ab)? It is a fine point of judgement whether the latter conception is sufficiently differentiated from the former topics of discussion to make its reservation for separate treatment credible.

Nor does it help greatly to bring the last section of the discourse (34...39) into consideration. Because stanza 34 opens up a new angle to the discussion, we cannot expect its topical relationship with connected materials to be simple and direct. Insofar as the relationship will to some degree be a dialectical one, it is all the more difficult to ascertain continuity of thought development.

Applying the dialectical principle to the opposition of grāmyā vṛtti and vānaprastha outlined above, we might look for a relationship between 34...39 and a passage concerning the practices or attitudes of a vānaprastha brahman. These we find in the first segment of Tulādhāra's discourse, which preaches throughout the discarding of the outward
practices of religion with their mean and ignoble associations \(^{49}\) and the cultivating of an expansive, ecstatic state of mind \(^{50}\) which leads to perfect works, \(^{51}\) harmless living, \(^{52}\) and the firm conviction of those making the passage across to the farther bank. \(^{53}\) The association with the forest-dweller is buttressed by the mention of individually conducted offerings of natural forest products, \(^{54}\) the oblation characteristic of a vanaprastha brahman. \(^{55}\) In this connexion it is noteworthy that the offering of the sacrificial cake is described in \(^{34}\)ef \(^{38}\)cd as a 'godly' (\(dai\text{vata}\)) practice. \(^{56}\) This reference might be compared with the following passage in the first part of the discourse:

\(^{49}\) Esp.255.13-15.
\(^{50}\) Esp.255.17, 19-21.
\(^{51}\) 255.26.
\(^{52}\) 255.24.
\(^{53}\) 255.22-23.
\(^{54}\) 255.25-26.
\(^{55}\) Manu 6.7, which recommends "various kinds of pure food fit for ascetics or ... herbs, roots and fruit" for observance of the five mahāyajnas. In context it is clear that in fact specifically the devayajña is meant. It is significant that this observance is the first prescribed for the vanaprastha by Manu. See also Kane, History of Dharmasāstra, vol. II, p. 920.
\(^{56}\) Accepting the reconstruction of the verse \(^{34}\)ef proposed by the editors of the Critical Edition, that is, reading \(i\text{dam}\) rather than \(i\text{stam}\):

\(i\text{dam} / i\text{stam} tu dai\text{vata} \text{krtva yathā yajñam avāpnu\text{yat}} /\)

As \(i\text{stam}\) is found in all S texts except G\(^{36}\), a preference for \(i\text{dam}\) on distributional grounds is not beyond question, as the C.E. editors remind us by applying the wavy line. However it seems likely that the self-explanatory phrase \(i\text{stam}...dai\text{vata}\text{m}\) has been substituted as a lectio facilior for the unclear \(i\text{dam}...dai\text{vata}\text{m}\). Substitution of \(i\text{dam}\) for an original \(i\text{stam}\) is more difficult to comprehend.

[Note that the import of \(i\text{dam}...dai\text{vata}\text{m}\) might have become obscure as the result of the interposition of 28-33 between \(^{34}\)ef and the earlier part of Tulādhāra's discourse, up to 25].
In fact a properly made oblation is what pleases the gods. According to the teaching of the scriptures, worship of the gods may be by paying homage, by oblations, by recitations and by (offering) plants.\textsuperscript{57}

Mention of devata would hardly be significant in itself;\textsuperscript{58} but here it is associated with offerings and practices which conform to what is described as daivata, godly, in 34ef38cd.\textsuperscript{59} Less specifically, the points made in 34...39 - that sacrifice need not be elaborate and that by drawing upon his own spiritual and material resources an individual is potentially self-sufficient in achieving religious advancement - are also the fundamental themes of 4-27ab. In 34...39 they bear upon the condition of the brahman householder, in 4-27ab upon the condition of the vānaprastha; but their constancy is demonstrated by the culminating stanza of the chapter:

39 All rivers are Sarasvatīs, all hillocks are holy. O Jājali, [your] place of pilgrimage is [your] self; do not go about as a pilgrim.\textsuperscript{60}

This stanza does not answer Jājali's initially posed query directly - stanza 26cd27ab does that. But it is a fitting summation of either 4-27 or 34...39, or both of them.

\textsuperscript{57} 255.7ef8:
\begin{verbatim}
tad eva suk̄taṁ havyāṁ yena tuṣyanti devatāḥ //
naṁaskāreṇa haviśā svādhīṇāyaḥ ausadhaṁ tathā /
pūjaḥ syād devatām hi yathā śastraṇidāraṇām //
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{58} Cf. for instance stanzas 28-29 which see certain types of sacrifice leading their performers along heavenly paths (devayāna) to the hereafter. Here there is only a distant verbal correspondence with nothing in sense to recommend it.

\textsuperscript{59} The correspondence is unimpaired by the possibility that in daivata we have a shorthand for devayājña. Since this is in fact what 7ef8 describe, the same destination is reached by a slightly different path.

\textsuperscript{60} 255.39:
\begin{verbatim}
sarvā nadyāḥ sarasvatyaḥ sarve pūyaḥ śiloccaḥāḥ /
jaṇale tirtham śtāviva mā sma deśātithir bhava //
\end{verbatim}
However the conclusion that 34...39 and 4-27 show some affinity has no value unless it can be additionally shown that the intervening section 28-33 departs fundamentally from the common ground of the other two sections. Like 4-27, 28-33 applies to the vanaprastha brahman in contrast to 34...39. The second section of Tulādhāra's discourse, 27cd-32, describes mentally-impelled sacrifice. Pace Manu, who describes householders performing such mental feats, the practice sits more easily on the shoulders of a brahman of more advanced spiritual achievement than on those of a careworn pater families. Furthermore, in depicting an individual mode of sacrifice, 28-33 is on common ground with both 4-27 and 34...39.

We are thus in the position of being able to show a close affinity between 4-27 and 34...39 but of not at the same time being able to show that 28-33 is alien to the other passages. In conclusion, then, in several respects - both in structure and in content - there are indications that 28-33 could be an interpolation. However, none of these indications is sufficiently strong itself or well enough corroborated for us to blunt Occam's razor by departing from the conservative principle of presuming unity rather than segmentation.

The possibility of further segmentation

The tripartite segmentation of Tulādhāra's discourse was postulated on the basis of the occurrence of what appeared to be markers of transition from one section to another (viz 27cd, 32). There are no other overt signs of structural complexity in the
unsegmented material of the chapter, but this should not blind us to the possibility that not every interpolation need be so tellingly signposted. We should therefore keep an eye cocked for other, less obvious symptoms which might lead to the uncovering of accretion.

Because of their brevity, it is prima facie improbable that the second or third sections of Tulādhāra’s discourse are liable to further breakdown; but it is quite conceivable that the first section, which is far longer, might embrace one or more interpolations. In fact, in at least one part of the first section of the discourse some seeming discontinuities do coalesce with more objectively definable infelicities of structure. These symptoms of accretion cluster around 10cd-12cd.

Verses 10cd-12cd offer a brief, discrete, and self-sufficient statement about the cosmic function of the sacrifice in sustaining life:

10cd From the sacrifice comes progeny as [naturally as] pure water [comes] from the sky.
11 The oblation cast into the fire, O brahman, attends upon the sun; from the sun comes rain; from rain, food; from that, progeny.
12abcd By this well performed [observance] in the past [men] have obtained their every wish: the earth [gave] crops uncultivated and plants grew from blessings.62

The passage echoes and elaborates upon Jājali’s initial

62 255.10cd,11,12abcd:
yajñāt prajā prabhavati nabha'o 'mbha ivāmalam //
agnau prastānuhitir brahmanādityam upatiṣṭhati /
ādityāj jāyate vrṣṭir vrṣṭer annam tataḥ prajāḥ //
tasmāt svaṃśhitat purve sarvān kāmāṃs ca lebhire /
akṛṣṭapacyā prthivī āśīrbhir vīrudoḥ 'bhavan /
questioning concerning the maintenance of life without sacrifice initiates a series of transmutations of matter which ultimately supports life; Jājali's question argues that the transmutation of plants and animals into the food of men inevitably takes place and that the sacrifice is a natural part of the process. Despite its affinity with the introductory question, however, 10cd-12cd noticeably diverges from the interest of verses 9-10ab preceding it, which deal with sacrificing from rather a different angle: discussing the principle that the fruit of the sacrifice is determined by the attitude of those who conduct it. Admittedly the cryptic obscurity of 10ab does not embolden one to make dogmatic statements about the transition from 9-10ab to 10cd-12cd; but even the fact of 10ab's obscurity is potentially significant for the disposition of the text.

Suspensions that 10cd-12cd might be an interpolation are fuelled by the complementary discontinuity which follows upon 12cd. Between 12abcd and 12ef there is a shift of tense from past to present. The subject of 12ef, te, parallels the ye of the following verse 13ab but has no explicit referend in 10cd-12cd. Moreover in 12ef Tulādāhāra again takes up the subject of the fruits of sacrifice - his topic in 9-10ab - and associates those fruits with the conduct of the sacrifice and the state of mind of the performer in terms which mirror those of 10ab. It seems that our comprehension of both 10ab and 12ef stands to gain by the conjunction of these verses in a new stanza:

63 12b: lebhire (perf.); 12d: abhavan (imperf.).
Reading the verses together, the te of 12ef might thus be related to yajamana and rtvij, their unconcern about the fruits of sacrifice being respectively with regard to the merit accruing to the patron and with regard to [the effects of] the rite itself. The fit is not perfect, but 10ab and 12ef demonstrably have elements in common which span the intervening material.

One theme which is carried through from the preceding material (9-10ab) into 10cd-12cd is an interest in how the sacrifice is the life-source of progeny, as I have understood prajā. Yet examination of the senses in which the word prajā is employed transforms this point of seeming continuity into yet further evidence of disjunction.

In the first two instances, prajā(h) denotes the offspring of the sacrificer; in the latter two instances the sacrifice is viewed cosmically and prajā(h) refers to all living creatures. Even making allowance for the fact that translation tends to make the distinction more glaring - Nilakantha for instance perceived no difficulty in these usages⁶⁴ - the different senses the word has do betray an undeniable shift of reference between 9-10ab and 10cd-12cd.

⁶⁴ Nilakantha is quite content to introduce his commentary on stanza 10 by saying "The second [verse, 10cd,] glosses [the first, 10ab]." He does not subsequently remark upon any use of prajā(h).
The notion that 10cd-12cd might be an interpolation thus finds support on two grounds. But before moving to what appears the inevitable conclusion, it is necessary to take stock of the material we would be excising. A most noteworthy fact about the material is that at least one stanza is also known in sources outside the Mahābhārata tradition. On the one hand this fact may lend support to the idea that 10cd-12cd is an interpolation, lifted from elsewhere and inserted in its present place. But on the other hand it is also conceivable that the composer of the older level of chapter 255 used material he knew from another source in putting together his composition. It is to be expected that materials constructed ad hoc and materials drawn from stock, as it were, may not match perfectly. Consequently a prefabricated section of a composition may evince some of the symptoms of an interpolation. In the present case it is quite conceivable that 10cd-12cd were quoted from memory by the same composer who, in the passages preceding and following, maintained a concern with the relationship of the fruits of the sacrifice to the attitude of the sacrificer etc. Thus 10cd-12cd may have the nature of a parenthesis rather than an intrusion.

It will be seen that the same ambiguity surrounds the shift of sense in which pražā is used. The shift

---

65 The editors of the Critical Edition note that 255.11 and Manu 3,76 offer variants of the same stanza. Are we to assume that the 'celestial water' simile or the very compactly constructed verse 12cd were ad hoc compositions? On purely intuitive grounds I suspect not.
is explicable as the product of the changed frame of reference of the quoted passage, a divergence of which the composer need not have been aware; - or, of course, as evidence that 10cd-12cd is an interpolation intruded by a transmitter whose memory was jolted by the occurrence of the yajña-prajā pair in 9-10ab but who was not fully sensitive to the point being made.

The key to this dilemma probably lies in verse 12ef. We noted above that 12ef shares with 10ab a pairing of ātman and yajña and that read together those two verses 10ab12ef seemed to make sense. However we did not look beyond that hypothetical stanza to examine whether it was comprehensible in context. It is doubtful that it is. In 4-8 Tulādhāra emphasizes that contemporary sacrifice is of the degraded ksatriya form which has been fostered by brahmans for motives of greed; and in 9-10ab he sets down the general rule that through the accumulated merit of sacrifices men beget sons who reflect their character, wicked, greedy, or honest. In view of 4-8 however it is implied that for those involved with ksatriya sacrifice, the result will be bad. This is later made explicit in 13-14 where Tulādhāra states that by worrying over the fruits of the sacrifice, men become evil natured and meet an evil end. Where does 12ef, with its reference to those who do not look for any reward fit in? There is no difficulty in understanding its significance so long as the description of the alternative to ksatriya sacrifice, the unsullied, pure sacrifice of former times precedes it. This is the case if 10cd-12cd is
not taken to have been interpolated. While 10cd-12cd remains part of the discourse, 12ef may be read as a statement of the ramification of 10cd-12cd which is parallel to and counterpoised against the statement in 13 which applies to the degenerate contemporary sacrifices. By interpreting the development of the line of thought in this way then not only is 12ef accommodated in its context but furthermore, since 12ef is given the function of leading a specific account of former practices back to the domain of generalized rule, the shift of tense from past (12abcd) to present (12ef) is not completely inexplicable.

Considerations surrounding 12ef thus provide stronger arguments for regarding 10cd-12cd as an integral part of the discourse than for excising it. This result does not conflict with the principle of not assuming segmentation without cogent grounds.

The case of 10cd-12cd has attracted lengthy comment because it exemplifies the problems facing the analyst of non-narrative passages in the Mahābhārata text. It is unrealistic to imagine that non-narrative passages are unique, composed ex nihilo, and not assemblages of material known to the composer from other contexts and sources and digested to a greater or lesser degree. The composer of such passages might often be more truly styled a compiler. Thus it may be that ideologically-focussed passages have the form of a string of pearls ordered in a progression of size and colour and strung together by the compiler, the beauty of the finished product depending both upon the
matching of the pearls and the competence with which they have been strung. In such circumstances, materials which are not positively branded as interpolations by crass misunderstandings on the part of their composers, or by demonstrable disruption to a pre-existent text, cannot be assumed to be accretions even when they appear discrete and poorly integrated with surrounding passages. And this is so only partly because due allowance must be made for the almost inevitable asperities in a mosaic composition; there is also the overshadowing methodological requirement that we adopt a rigorously conservative approach to segmenting the received text or else invalidate all our analysis by falling into self-vindicating judgements about coherence and the message of a given passage. Consequently, although the degree of fragmentation revealed in other parts of the episode and the interpolation-prone didacticism of the discourse both suggest that there is every likelihood that other accretions are present, we are constrained from supposing that this is so by lack of positive proof.

**Alignment of chapter 255**

The alignment of the oldest material of chapter 255 (1-34, 38cd-41) is revealed by the introductory

---

66 One such instance is stanza 14 in which we observe heavy-handed repetitions of pāpa and aśubha, and in which the second occurrence of pāpa is coupled with a whole half verse of metrical padding (sadaīvēhā dvijottama). Verse 14ef could justifiably be seen as an empty transitional device, but whether from an interpolation back to pre-existing text or from a stanza (14abcd) quoted from memory back to ad hoc composition, we have no way of knowing - unless it were possible to trace 14abcd elsewhere.

67 See the discussion of methodology above, pp. 104-105.
question in which Jajali explicitly refers to previous discussions. Jajali is concerned that in these previous statements Tuladhāra has seemingly ruled out agriculture or exploitation of cattle as means of sustaining human life. Now these issues are brought to light only in 254.37-48 (MN): it is therefore appropriate to put the oldest material of 255 either on the same alignment as 254 MN or on a younger alignment. As an objection to the co-alignment of 254 MN and the oldest material of 255 it might be claimed that they cannot be attributed to the same composer because even when it touches on very germane material—for instance, in the condemnation of Nahuṣa's cow slaughter—254 MN never shows any consciousness of what is to come in 255. If the two passages are the work of one composer why did he not develop the points reserved for 255 in his extensive interpolation in 254? The answer is simple: the passage in 254 which inspired 254 MN's composition limited it to describing "pernicious and frightful kinds of behaviour". Co-alignment of 254 MN and the oldest 255 material therefore remains a possibility.

We may be able to be more precise about the alignment when we have studied the affinities of the conclusion of chapter 255. Since it is reasonable to expect that the old material of 255 would have been provided with some conclusion to cushion the rough

---

68 I.e. Īdrāṇ aśivān ghorān ācārān (49ab), the interpolator's own gloss upon anyān ācārān (36cd). See pp.138-139 above.
transition back to 256, there is no reason to suppose that the extant conclusion of the chapter (255.40-41) was not part of the oldest 255 material (S). It follows that any inference we can make concerning the alignment of 255.40-41 also speaks for the alignment upon which the whole of the older material (S) was incorporated into the episode. But the problem of conclusions to chapters within the episode is an intricate one, warranting treatment in its own right. For the moment we must rest content to say that 255.1-34, 38cd-41 (S) may, at the earliest, belong on the same alignment as 254.37-48 (N).

---

69 Pages 244-262 below.
In chapter 256 we find the dénouement of the Tulādhāra episode. Having stepped around the parenthesis which was chapter 255, we presumably return at least in parts to older levels of the story. The analysis of chapter 256 is complicated by fundamental variation between the collated manuscripts at some pivotal points. However, the lack of unity of witness can also be exploited with the result that the main lines of the chapter's structure can be firmly drawn.

The most noteworthy divergences revealed by the collated manuscripts are of two kinds: variant readings of key words and variant text orders. As the analysis proceeds it will become plain that these two classes of variants are by no means independent. To unlock this relationship it is convenient to begin with a consideration of the problems associated with two cases of variation in the reading of words or phrases.

The problem of speakers

A seemingly insignificant divergence\(^1\) between the collated witnesses underlies the tvā of verse 15cd:

CE 256.15cd:

\[
\text{vāyam jijnāsāmanās tvā samprāpta dharmadarśanat//}
\]

\(^1\) Another divergence in this verse, evam : vāyam (Śi K12 TG: rest) is not discussed because (i) the emendation vāyam > evam looks very much like a lectio facilior, particularly in view of the difficulties associated with interpreting this verse; (ii) except with the concomitant emendation tvā > tu, which no manuscript witnesses, reading the verse evam offers no significant alternative in sense. The distribution of evam is sufficiently strongly dispersed for it not to be ruled out merely on distributional grounds.
There is no doubt that the editors of the Critical Edition have reconstituted the text correctly here having regard to the range of variants and their distribution. However abandonment of the Vulgate version of the same verse -

\[ \text{Vulg.264.18cd:} \]
\[ \text{vayam jijn\text{\textasciitranscripta}sam\text{\textasciitranscripta}\text{\textasciitranscripta} tu sampr\text{\textasciitranscripta}\text{\textasciitranscripta}pt\text{\textasciitranscripta}\text{\textasciitranscripta} dharmadar\text{\textasciitranscripta}\text{\textasciitranscripta}n\text{\textasciitranscripta}t} // \]

raises a new problem of comprehension. A precondition for interpreting the verse is to determine who the parties involved are, and above all whom the \textit{vayam} denotes. In the Critical Edition version it is inescapable that the pronouns \textit{vayam} and \textit{tv\text{\textasciitranscripta}a} must refer to different people. The Vulgate, lacking \textit{tv\text{\textasciitranscripta}a} does not have this distinction to make and the \textit{vayam} is easily read as an 'editorial we' \cite[employed by Bh\text{\textasciitranscripta}sma or any other speaker to whom the words preceding might be attributed. Furthermore, with regard to \textit{dharmadar\text{\textasciitranscripta}\text{\textasciitranscripta}n\text{\textasciitranscripta}t} it was possible for \textit{Nilakantha}, following the Vulgate text, to give the gloss, "We have received dharma from a sage called Dharmadar\text{\textasciitranscripta}\text{\textasciitranscripta}na". Such an interpretation sits awkwardly in the presence of the \textit{tv\text{\textasciitranscripta}a} of the Critical Edition.

The Critical Edition version thus presents us with several questions:

\cite{Belvalkar, \textit{Sanskrit Grammar}, para.193.3b.}
(a) who is speaking (vayam)?
(b) to whom (tvā)?
(c) how is dharmadarśanāt to be understood?

The difficulty in answering these questions lies chiefly in trying to reconcile the content of this verse (15cd) with attributions of speech found in the rest of the chapter.

The last speaker introduced with an extra-metrical indicator is Bhīṣma (4 x 5). On the other hand Bhīṣma immediately (5) refers to the birds previously pointed out by Tulādhāra as emitting cries: this might be taken as an introduction to words spoken by the birds.6 Following shortly afterwards (7cd) a quotation from the Song of Brahman is introduced,7 to conclude in verse 15ab, i.e. immediately before the verse we are discussing (15cd), so presumably stanza 15 returns us to the speaker who introduced the quotation. The conclusion of the episode (17-), following two stanzas later, seems to attribute the preceding material to Tulādhāra.9 Thus the text suggests three possible

---

6 The presence or absence of a speaker indicator referring to the birds is not of determining significance since the text is not consistent in this matter. Esteller, "The Mbh. Text Criticism", p.255.
7 256.7cd:
atra gāthā brahmagītāṁ kīrtayanti purāvīdāṁ //
Concerning this, guardians of tradition recite [the following] verses sung by Brahmā.
8 256.15ab:
iti dharmah samākhyaṭāḥ sadbhīr dharmārthadārśibhiḥ /
This is the dharma related by the good, who perceive the meaning of dharma.
9 256.17:
evām bahumāt ārtham ca tulādhārenā bhāsitam /
   samyak caīvam upālabhī dharmas cōktaḥ sanātanaḥ //
Thus did Tulādhāra speak [with] wide-ranging significance; and thus rightly perceiving [it], told of the abiding dharma.
speakers of verse 15cd: Bhīṣma, the birds, and Tulādhāra. It is our task now to test each possibility, first against the content of verse 15cd itself and then against the indirect evidence adducible from the rest of the text.

On the testimony of verse 15cd alone, Bhīṣma may be disqualified. When Bhīṣma speaks he addresses Yudhisthira. It is not conceivable that Bhīṣma, Yudhisthira's constant preceptor, should say:

"Desiring to learn we have approached you [Yudhisthira] ...". 10 A similar objection applies in Tulādhāra's case for it was Jājali who approached him and not vice versa. Moreover Tulādhāra's personal use of an honorific plural (vayām) in addressing the brahman Jājali (tvā) is hard to explain. Finally, the attribution of speech to Tulādhāra in stanza 17 is less than decisive because stanza 17 is as likely as not a generalized conclusion to the whole episode which has little regard to the specific material preceding it.

With regard to the remaining possibility, that the birds are speaking, it is wise to consider first whether the manner in which the birds' song is described can justifiably be read as an introduction to something more than chirping. Taken literally, the terms used are ambiguous:

\[
5cd: \text{vacam uccārayan divyām dharmasya vacanāt kīla} /\]

... uttering a wonderful cry in accordance with the dictates of duty.

10 Taking jijnāsa- to mean "to wish to know or become acquainted with or learn, investigate, examine... Mbh. etc." M.W. This opinion will later be revised, but the objection raised here is sustained by the force of samprāpta "having approached" alone.
This phraseology may or may not imply that words were spoken. Perhaps some relevant imputation can be based on the description of the birds' cry as "wonderful, heavenly" (divya). This word seems to portend something more than the fact that the birds' cry was heard coming from the heavens. However, granted this, the cries may be "wonderful" because of their content or just because by answering at all the birds vindicated Tulādhāra's teaching. If it is the content which is wonderful we should expect that a quotation should follow in our text, but not otherwise. The rest of verse 5cd throws no light on the question, but other considerations do. Looking broadly at the development of this cameo, the emphasis placed on the fact that the birds emitted a cry seems unwarranted unless it is to introduce something spoken by the birds. If the cry of the birds alone had been intended to be the climactic illustration of harmlessness in action, it is curiously ineffectual.

After what Tulādhāra says in stanza 3 -

3 Call them as they alight here and there, 0 great brahman, [and] watch them cling to [your] arms and legs and all over [your] body.  

- the strongest proof that Tulādhāra's teaching is right would be for the birds to do just that, to alight on Jājali. We are not told that they do so,  

11 Cf. the bald statement of 253.42a: antarikṣe vak.  
12 256.3: āhvaśāśiṣā mahābrahman viśāmaṇāṁ tatas tataḥ / paśyāṁ hastapādesu ślistāṁ dehe ca sarvasaṁ //  
13 In fact it is likely that samprāptāḥ (15d) had been intended to convey this - the more so in the light of our later discussion of jñānasamanās - but even if this is so, the deed is presumed rather than pointedly stated.
but instead that they "utter a wonderful cry". Now it is unusual and noteworthy if birds perch on a man, but not if they emit cries when he calls them. Tulādhāra is thus very poorly rewarded... unless the birds go on to say something significant. What follows verse 5cd in stanza 6 would certainly fulfil this function: the birds would confirm in words what Tulādhāra has been preaching. This is particularly effective as a denouement because the birds were party to the situation in which Jájali's trouble arose. On these grounds it is fitting that the birds speak.15 The plural of the first person pronoun (vayām) used in 15cd is most appropriately applied to the many birds.

The remarks which follow immediately after stanza 5 are directed to Jájali, as witness the vocative brahman of 6c. From this it follows that while the speakers (vayam) of verse 15cd are identified as the birds, their audience (tva) will be Jájali. But in this case how is it that the birds, who come to confirm Tulādhāra's teaching and to impart moral advice to

14 It is also a conventional proof of unfearsomeness (abhaya) as, for instance, in the recurrent theme of the tameness of wild animals in the vicinity of a forest hermitage and their fearlessness in approaching the ascetics dwelling there. Cf. Mbh. ix.36.12, xiii.14.33, 42-43, etc. Also Rām 2.54, 2.119, 3.1, 3.11, and conversely 3.2.
15 This has some support in the tradition. Paramananda's commentary quoted in the C.E. Apparatus Criticus glosses "vayam iti paksivākyam". Nilakantha does not gloss vayam. Note too that four of the collated witnesses (K6 Da34 M5), all of whose texts have tvam not tu, show that they at least have not assumed that Bhisma was speaking by reintroducing him with a speaker marker one stanza later (16 x 17). The Vulgate concurs with this (Vulg.264.19 x 20).
Jājali, say in verse 15cd that they have come to Jājali "desiring to learn" (jijnāsamanās)? It is necessary to reexamine our interpretation of this word. In the Vulgate text jijnāsamanās appears absolutely, in agreement with vayam, and is therefore to be taken intransitively. With the restoration of tvā in the Critical Edition it becomes possible to take jijnāsamanās transitively, whether the syntax is construed to tie tvā to jijnāsamanās or to samprāptā. In its transitive sense jijnāsamanās has a range of meanings highly appropriate to the development of the story. Applying this sense of the word to verse 15cd would allow interpretation along the following lines:

15cd: Wishing to test [you], we have come [to you]...

In this redefined context, the understanding of dharmadarśanāt presents no problem:

15d: ... out of a sense of duty.

Now, if by jijnāsamanās we understand that the birds wish in some way to put Jājali to the test, it is in order to enquire as to the nature of this test. It might convey nothing more than that Jājali was being

---

16 Böhtlingk and Roth, vol.3, column 138:
"desid. jijnāsate 1) zu kennen - , zu wissen - , zu erkennen - ,
kennen zu lernen begehren; untersuchen, prüfen, auf die Probe
stellen...". A usage closely analogous to that suggested in
this context is found in one of the examples cited by
Böhtlingk and Roth: in Rām.3.59.15 Śīta has disappeared and
Lakṣmanā tries to console Rāma and spur him on to search
for her:

vitrāsayitukāma va līṇā syāt kānana kvacit /
jiṇāsamāna vaidehi tvām mām ca puruṣārṣabha //
Śīta may be hiding somewhere in the forest wishing to
frighten [us] and put you and me to the test, o bull of men'.

More closely parallel to the usage of 256.15c are two
occurrences associated with the story of how Indra and Agni
put King Śibi to the test (Mbh.iii.11.131):

Mbh.iii.130.19ab:
jiṇāsamānau varadau mahātmaman uśinaram /
trans. van Buitenen: "Desirous to try the great-spirited
Uśinara, and willing to grant a boon, ...

Mbh.iii.131.28cd:
jiṇāsamānau dharme tvām yajñāvātam upāgatāu //
trans. van Buitenen: "We have come to you in your offering
grove to test you in the Law".

---
exposed to the birds' instruction; but if the testing is conceived in any practical sense, it can only mean that the birds alighted upon (samprāpta-)

Jājali to allow him to prove that he had reformed, that his spirit was again calm enough for them to remain in peace. It is this which Tulādhāra foreshadows in stanza 3. If we adopt this interpretation, we have a satisfactory climax to Jājali's dealing with the birds and an unstrained reading of verse 15cd.

Emendations from spardhā to śraddhā

A second set of problems is raised by another emendation uncovered by the Critical Edition. In two places spardhā appears as śraddhā in many manuscripts, including the Vulgate.

6c: spardhā nihanti vai brahman ... //
16a: spardhām jahi mahāprajña ...

There can be little doubt that the readings supplied by the editors of the Critical Edition represent a correct reconstitution. The principle of lectio difficilior alone justifies their choice. But restitution of the original reading does not end the interest of these emendations. In view of their widespread distribution and their parallelism, despite a considerable

17 Samprāpta- may itself be translated 'alighted upon' if the force of sam- is taken to be to underline the completeness of the action. Against this it may be that sam- is appropriate in view of the gathering of numbers of dispersed (256, 2, 3) birds, or that it is simply an intensifier of little significance in this common combination. In view of the implications of jijnāsamana- in this verse I think the translation "alighted upon" is warranted here.
separation (of 10 or 12 stanzas, depending upon the manuscript), we may gain some insight into the evolution of the extant texts if we can account for the changes in these two cases.

A: 6c

In the first instance (6c) the motivation is revealed by the range of variants offering. Broadly, the W manuscripts retain spardhā; the E manuscripts have śraddham; and the S manuscripts have himsā.18

Such a degree and diversity of variation is unlikely to have arisen through random error in transmission. It is more satisfactorily explained by the cryptic nature of stanza 6. It seems to have been the case that to certain transmitters spardhā 'competitiveness', an unusual word, added nothing to the comprehensibility of the stanza. No doubt because the first verse (6ab) is concerned with ahimsā and because the second verse (6cd) makes considerable play with āhān forms,19 a seemingly more amenable subject suggested itself in the form of himsā 'injury', which has displaced the older reading in S manuscripts. The E manuscripts have arrived at a similar solution by different means. In them the subject spardhā (nom.) was replaced by a similar

---

18 See Table XIX.

19 Accepting for the purposes of this argument the traditional etymology which takes himsā as a desiderative formation deriving from āhān. Whether or not this belief has any foundation in fact is irrelevant here.
form 20 śraddham (acc.) as an object, leaving the verb without an explicit subject. The subject would then be supplied by inference from the previous line: 21 so here too we find himsa the subject, in this case understood.

B: 16a

In the second occurrence of spardha only the E manuscripts offer a variant reading. 22 Those manuscripts have emended the spardham jahi ('cast down competitiveness') of the critically reconstituted text to śraddham kuru ('have faith'), a change so radical that it can only be explained by assuming a deliberate revision in favour of a reading which seemed more appropriate. This raises two questions: why was the phrase śraddham kuru chosen? and why was it decided that spardham jahi needed to be replaced?

In answer to the first question it suffices to 20 The similarity was probably one of sound alone. According to Prof. Basadham there seems to have been little chance of visual confusion arising from the scripts historically used.

Since spardha: śraddham evince a clear similarity, it is conceivable that the emendation arose through unconscious error in transmission, rather than revision. In either case, the obscurity of stanza 6 will have contributed to the result if only by creating a propensity for error. The conjunction of the two emendations (> śraddham; > himsā) points to a common source of difficulty.

21 An obstacle to this interpretation is that 6ab mentions only ahimsā whereas the Vulgate 6cd requires himsā to be supplied. Nilakantha takes some pains to 22 explain this transformation: see the exposition of his commentary at p.323, n.69 below. The only alternative to Nilakantha's interpretation I can see would be to take nihanti impersonally, inferring its subject from the object of the second foot (6d), tap naram.

22 See Table XIX.
look at the context in which verse 16ab is found. The verse (16cd) immediately following makes a word-play on śraddhā as an element of Tulādhāra's character:

16c: śraddhāvān śraddadhānaś ca ...

Faithful and believing ...

This, together with the fact that praise of śraddhā had been the constant topic of the ten preceding stanzas, is sufficient to explain the direction of the change.

The second question, of why a change was made at all, is less simply dealt with. At least one transmitter of the E recension text felt it warranted to alter śardham jahi to śraddham kuru. The primary cause of this new approach to the text may have been a personal preoccupation of the transmitter, or his reaction to some changed or latent quality of the text itself. Since we can infer the preoccupations of the transmitter only from the evidence of his handiwork in the text, explanations of one in terms of the other are logically incestuous and cannot be more than speculative. Consequently it is more useful to begin by examining causes from the other angle - that is, to look to changed or latent qualities of the text - because this approach allows us to adduce evidence

---

23 I.e. stt. 20-22ab, 7-15.

The manuscripts in which the emendation is found are all among those which have a text order alternative to that of the Critical Edition. Compare Tables XIX, XX.

24 The incidental question of whether this alteration was a single revision which has been inherited by the extant manuscripts from a single parent text or one which has spread by contamination across several descent lines is reserved for comment in Part B.
beyond that of the emendation itself, from other parts of the text. Ultimately the only fruitful question which can be put is: have we any evidence that the complexion of the (E) text had been changed, for instance by accretion, in a way which could explain the alteration? If this question cannot be answered positively, some combination of the alternative, unattestable causes will have to be assumed. It should be stressed that factors such as the transmitter's predisposition or defects in a manuscript which, because their evidence is restricted to the point at issue itself, are incapable of corroboration, are not thereby rendered any the less likely.

The accretion of śraddhā material

Our search for an accretion is restricted by the requirement that it have a nature which might induce the change to śraddhātm kuru. We may surmise that it emphasizes or has relevance to faith (śraddhā). Looking at the chapter in the light of this hypothesis we do indeed find a considerable amount of material intensively focussed upon śraddhā. If it could be shown that such material had been accreted, preferably at a late stage in the development of the tradition, then the impetus for a subsequent "improvement" in one recension (E) would be plausibly accounted for.

---

25 This possibility is mentioned first because experience has shown that it is a likely occurrence and it is the kind of change which, in a very obvious way, has the potential to account for the alteration in question. The fact that in the upshot this suggestion proves to be fruitful is not due to any initial jumping to conclusions or loading of the argument.

26 See Table XXI, column A.
Analysis of the śraddhā-focused materials in this chapter must pass an initial hurdle in that the collated manuscripts fall into two camps over the placing of some of the śraddhā material. The lines of battle correspond closely with the boundary lines of descent groups proposed by Edgerton for another part of the Mahābhārata text. In ordering their text the editors of the Critical Edition have followed the W recension; the E,S recension manuscripts witness the alternative text order, which for convenience may be referred to as the Vulgate order.

The Vulgate order reads incomparably better than the Critical Edition order. The following verses are proof of this:

(a) vāgvrddham trāyate śraddhā manovrddham ca bhārata /
(b) śraddhāvṛddham vaṁmanasi na yajnās trātum arhati /

In the Critical Edition, the former (a = C.E.256.22ab) is the penultimate verse of the chapter, followed only by a concluding formula (22cd) while the latter (b = C.E.256.7ab) bursts upon us unintroduced immediately after verse 6cd which details the ill-effects of ambitious striving (śprardhā). Neither position has anything to recommend it. In the Vulgate texts on the other hand the verses are juxtaposed in

27 See Table XXI, comparing columns B and C; and Table XX for manuscript distribution of the two orders.
the order in which they are quoted above
(a = Vulg.264.9ab; b = Vulg.264.9cd). This ordering has
the considerable advantage of making sense, and it
combines verses which are rhetorically a pair. Moreover,
the first stanza of śraddhā material as it appears in the
Vulgate text order (i.e. Vulg.264.7 = C.E. 256.20) stresses
not only faith but self-control and calmness, and thereby
provides a fair continuity of thought from the preceding
stanza of non-śraddhā material (i.e. Vulg.264.6 = C.E.256.6)
which deprecates competitive involvement.29 All of which
makes it hard to understand why, in the face of good
sense and the great majority of witnesses,30 the editors
of the Critical Edition chose to depart from the Vulgate
text order.31

29 As we are considering whether the accretion of the
śraddhā-focused stanzas might help explain
emendations in the E texts, our inquiry disposes us
to assume that the E texts retained the original
reading śarada in 6c until after the incorporation,
or at least the composition, of the śraddhā stanzas.

30 In fact three-quarters of the collated texts follow
the Vulgate order (28:9); but more significantly a
majority of Edgerton's recensions support the Vulgate
(E,S: W). Note however that the present analysis is
not relying on support from one or another group of
manuscripts, but upon internal evidence.

31 A choice which is the more puzzling when it is
recalled that the manuscripts used in reconstituting
the Critical Edition have all, in accordance with
the procedure laid down by Sukthankar (Adiparvan,
"Prolegomena", p.lv), been collated against a Vulgate
text, which of course followed the verse order
rejected by the editors of the Critical Edition.
In the absence of any discussion of the principles
of mechanical procedure of collection by
Belvalkar in his "Introduction" to the
Śantiparvan, and in the absence of any
mention of the decision in either the Apparatus
Criticus or the Critical Notes, we may only
speculate broadly on the factors likely to have
swayed the editors' minds. A primary factor
is no doubt the great favour in which the Kaśmīrī
texts (Ś, K) were held by the editors. Sukthankar
is lavish in his praise of them (Adiparvan,
"Prolegomena", p.xlii, lii, lv, lvi, lxxiii;
cf. Belvalkar, Śantiparvan, "Introduction", p.cixii - the
manuscript Ś1 of Śāntiparvan is not the same as that of Ś1 of Śāntiparvan but most of the comments apply to Kāśmīrī texts as a class), and no doubt justifiably so - in 6c for instance they have preserved the original reading spardhā against the divided opposition of all other versions. Yet it goes without saying that the trustworthiness of a text is statistical and does not hold good in every case. It is covertly suggested here that while using a Vulgate text as editio princeps for collation purposes, the editors have at least leaned heavily upon Ś1, the textus simplicissimus, in fixing the form of their text above śloka level. Sukthankar says as much when he declares: "...it [Ś1] must contain ... less spurious matter than any other known version. That is precisely the main reason why it is taken as the norm for this edition." (Śāntiparvan,Prolegomena, p.xlvii; Sukthankar's italics). Such a practice is no more valid in reconstructing a critical text than would be the publishing of a manuscript as found with variae lectiones notes - a suggested procedure which Sukthankar warmly condemned (Śāntiparvan,Prolegomena, pp.lxxxiii-lxxxvi). In mitigation, but by no means as a defence, it may be submitted that the mechanics of the collation process inevitably focus attention on the problems of restitution of syllables or words, not whole ślokas, and much less chapters: it is likely that the problem posed by the competing text orders in chapter 256 was simply never noticed. The fact that it is not noted in the Critical Notes is passive support for this supposition. Alternatively, the point may be made that the primary dichotomy of N and S recensions proposed by Sukthankar (and accepted with refinements by Belvalkar - for whose view we are forced to rely on the Pedigree of MSS. he describes and illustrates in Bhīṣmaparvan,Introduction, pp.cxiv-cxv) may have obscured a strong distribution which would have been evident in Edgerton's threefold primary division - W: E,S - although ideally this should not have happened (Edgerton, Śāhanāparvan,Introduction, p.xlix. Cf. Sukthankar, Śāntiparvan,Prolegomena, p.xci and "Epic Studies I", p.162).
So far as the position of the sraddhā-focussed material within chapter 256 is concerned, the importance of deciding that the Vulgate text-order is preferable to that of the Critical Edition is that in the Vulgate texts virtually all the sraddhā stanzas appear in a block. 32 This means that, if there has been any accretion at all, it is feasible - but still a totally hypothetical suggestion - that all the sraddhā material may belong to a single interpolation. If this were shown to have been so, it would mean that the complexion of the chapter has been radically changed at a blow. Let us investigate this hypothetical suggestion.

If the sraddhā block (Vulg.264.7-17 = C.E.256.20-22ab, 7-14) were an interpolation, it is possible that this could be demonstrated from the extant texts by probing for symptoms of an underlying breached continuum. The result of an application of this test is illustrated by bringing together the stanzas appearing before (Vulg.264.6 = C.E.256.6) and after (Vulg.264.19 = C.E.256.16) the sraddhā block.33

6 ahimsādikṛtāṁ karma iha caiva parātra ca / sparśhā nihanti vai brahman sāhata hanti tāṁ naram //

Competitiveness destroys the merit generated by harmlessness, among [other practices], both in this world and the next, o brahman. If it is not destroyed, it destroys the person [who is its host]. 34

32 See Table XXI, column C and note 3.
33 Including for the moment the apparent conclusion of the block, C.E.256.15 = Vulg.264.18.
34 Construing, with Belvalkar (Sāntiparvan, Critical Notes, p.2192), the sāhata of the texts as sāhata = sā + āhata. See p.498 below.
16  spardhāṁ jahi mahāprājña tataḥ prāpsyasi
yat param /
śraddhāvāṁ śraddadhānas ca dharmāṁ
caivēha vānijaḥ / ...

[Therefore] strike down your competitiveness, o highly intelligent one. By doing so you will attain to the supreme [state]. This merchant here is faithful, believing and pious ... 35

These stanzas make sense read consecutively; they share the only two occurrences of the word spardhā in the episode: the intricate play with han forms in the former is given point by the latter; it might even be suggested that the phrase śraddhāvāṁ śraddadhānas is the stylistic touch of the same composer who constructed pairs like sāhata hanti and (if we are correct in rejoining these verses) spardhā nihanti : spardhāṁ jahi.

In view of these points it is difficult to accept that these verses should be separated by some dozen extraneous stanzas. The evidence, then, suggests that the interpolation hypothesis has some foundation.

To say that it is desirable that stanzas 6 and 16 should be brought into closer proximity is not to have defined the boundaries of the separating intrusion with precision. The differing text orders of the Critical Edition and Vulgate groups would lead one to believe that the fracture between older and younger alignments

35  For notes on this verse, see p.499 below.
occurs directly after stanza 6.  

For the conclusion of the interpolation, evidence of differing text orders is not readily available. The alignments of stanza 14, a full-blown śraddhā piece, and stanza 16, which we have fixed in the older continuum, are not in question, but stanza 15 is left in limbo. Since verse 15ab opens with iti ('thus') we may thus presume that it is tied to the material preceding it, and is therefore a conclusion to the śraddhā material. At first glance, verse 15cd reads on well from verse 15ab. Moreover to assign verse 15cd to the breached continuum (-6, 15cd, 16-) rather spoils the rhetorical coupling of śraddhā nihanti (6c): śraddhāṃ jahi (16a). But unfortunately this must be so, for the śraddhā material is put in the mouth of Bhīṣma. This is not made explicit in the text but is simply deduced from the use of vocatives which can apply only to

36 A beginning to the śraddhā material alternative to Vulg.264,7 (= C.E.256.20) is difficult to conceive of. Vulg.264,8 (= C.E.256.21) is perhaps the only possibility. However, the probability that Vulg.264,7-9ab (= C.E.256.20-22ab) was moved by an independent, random disruption of the text in the W recension is very slight indeed - 2% if Vulg.264,7 begins the śraddhā block; 7% if Vulg.264,8 does. On the other hand if the displacement of Vulg. 264,7-9ab is seen as part of the incorporation process of the accretion of the śraddhā material the improbability disappears, and it is a corollary of this interpretation that the śraddhā interpolation will have begun with Vulg.264,7 (= C.E.256.20).

37 The fact that all M texts insert 22cd between verses 15ab and 15cd is obviously relevant, but its interpretation is not easy. Prima facie it is likely that comments similar to those of note 36 above would apply here too. The matter is discussed further at pp. 253-257 below. Note also that B6 inserts a speaker marker at this point, but probably only because 15ab is so clearly a conclusion and because of Tulādhāra's credit in 17.

38 At a minimum this would include the Song of Brahmā introduced at C.E.256.7cd and encompassing stanzas 8-14.
Yudhiṣṭhira. Now we have already seen that in verse 15cd the birds are speaking, so we have no alternative but to assign this verse to the breached continuum.

In seeking to explain the emendations of spardhā in some recensions, it is therefore not necessary to look beyond the fact of the insertion of a large block of stanzas intensively focussed upon śraddhā into an older text where the concept was only incidentally mentioned. It happened that the intrusion divided the two occurrences of spardhā from one another and disrupted the context which revealed their sense, leaving the way open for editorial revision by later transmitters.

The intended role of the śraddhā interpolation

Until now our argument has been directed to discovering whether or not an interpolation of śraddhā-focused material has been intruded into chapter 256. Having found that it has, we now have to look at a number of questions raised by its presence. First, perhaps, how is the placement of the śraddhā

39 nyāsa C.E.256,21b; bharata C.E.256,22b.

The diversity of readings underlying these undoubtedly correct reconstructions is considerable, see Table XXII and the notes accompanying it.

40 It is true that until now we have implied that all material falling between stanzas 6 and 16 can be attributed to the birds. This was not due to any neglect of the present evidence because the Song of Brahmā (st.8-14), which contains no vocatives at all, made up the bulk of the śraddhā material appearing between stanzas 6 and 16 in the text as ordered in the Critical Edition. It is only now that the evidence of the Vulgate-ordered texts has allowed us to reconstitute the śraddhā material to include the introductory stanzas 19-22ab that the difficulty of the vocatives arises.

41 256.16c, describing Tulādhāra's good character.
material to be explained? A corollary of this question is that of the point of attraction, and thence we are drawn into consideration of the motivation of the composer of this interpolation.

The outstanding theme of the so-called śraddhā material is its consistent exaltation of the virtue of faith. Looking at the material of this chapter outside the accretion it is striking that faith (śraddhā) is mentioned in only one place and there in a rather conspicuous manner:

16cdef: śraddhavān śraddadhānās ca dharmāmś caīvēha 
vanijah /
svavartmapi sthitaś caīva garīyān eṣa
jājale //

O Jājali, this merchant, faithful, believing, and deeply devoted to dharma in his activities, and steadfast in his own path, is superior to you.

As this is the only observable common ground between the older text and the accretion it is fair to assume that verse 16cd supplies the point of attraction. We might therefore expect the intended point of insertion at any suitable place after stanza 16. This broad statement is corroborated by the fact, just noted, that the material of the śraddhā interpolation is put in the mouth of Bhīṣma. Since Bhīṣma impliedly begins speaking only in stanza 17, on this ground too we might expect the intended point of insertion to fall somewhere after stanza 16.

42 This is to be inferred from the attribution of speech to Tulādhāra in 17ab (evaṃ . . . tulādhāreṇa bhāsītam), which can only be placed in Bhīṣma's mouth.
Within these terms of reference, the two possible placements which come to mind are:

(a) insertion immediately after the point of attraction (16 x 17); 43

(b) as an extension to Bhīṣma's conclusion of the episode (19 x 22cd).

Before any confident choice between these alternatives could be made it would be necessary to formulate a comprehensive explanation of how the extant placements arose. This I am not able to do, although the matter is discussed further in Part B. 44 As an expedient, let us proceed on the assumption that the intended point of insertion was after Bhīṣma's conclusion (19 x 22cd) on the ground that in the W recension at least the interpolation begins at that point while no manuscript shows interpolation at the alternative point (16 x 17).

What motivated its composer to append this postscript to the Tulādhaveṇa episode? The make-up of the interpolation itself yields a few clues. A cursory inspection reveals that the interpolated material is not a unitary whole. After the first three stanzas we are introduced to an encapsulated quotation:

7cd: Concerning this, guardians of tradition recite [the following] verses ascribed to Brahmā. 45

43 Following the text order of the Critical Edition, viz. 17-18-19. There is a widely witnessed alternative, 18-19-17. Which is preferable is not significant in our present discussion.

44 Pages 285-290 below.

45 Text at p. 217, n. 7 above.
which is concluded at the end of the interpolation:

15ab: This is the dharma related by the good, who perceive the meaning of dharma.

Whether or not we believe that the alleged quotation had a life outside this episode, the first three stanzas and the conclusion may confidently be assumed to have been composed ad hoc with the configuration of this story in mind. The burden of these stanzas (20-22ab, 7ab) is not different from that of the quotation (8-14) but it is in these stanzas alone that we find the vocatives pertaining to Yudhishthira. The overt function of this interpretation is thus to introduce and identify a quotation extolling the virtue of faith in a way which clothes the quotation in an authority independent from the rest of the episode, and furthermore in a self-evidently brahmanical authority.

Can we learn anything by asking why it was felt desirable to assert this point of view in this manner? Perhaps not: a wilful interpolator may simply have appended this material to satisfy a doctrinal conviction his attention caught by verse 16cd. An alternative assessment of the function of the interpolation is

\[\text{\[46\] 256.15ab:}\]

\[\text{\textit{iti dharmaḥ samākhyaṭaḥ saddhir dharmathadārśibhīḥ /}}\]

\[\text{\[47\] Of the other gāthā brahmagītāḥ I have been able to locate in the Mahābhārata, xii.134.1-10 have nothing in common with the present stanzas, while xiii.35.4-12 could not be said to have an especially close relationship, although there is a mention of faith, śraddhā (10a). Cf. also the gāthā yajnagītāḥ of Mbh.xii.60.46-52. Despite the lack of parallel passages, the manner of citation and the attribution to Brahma make ad hoc composition unlikely.}\]
suggested by comparison with the story of Dharmavyādha. The parallel is instructive because in both stories non-brahman heroes instruct brahmins. In the story of Dharmavyādha a whole sub-plot has been appended at the same point in the story: that is, just after the hero has shown the brahman the error of his ways and just before the winding up of the episode.

In the case of Dharmavyādha, the sub-plot explains how in an earlier life Dharmavyādha had been a brahman. The purpose of its inclusion was clearly to explain how it came about that Dharmavyādha, a śūdra and a butcher to boot, was able to give spiritual instruction to a brahman. In the story of Tulādharma a similar unpalatable situation arises, in a less extreme form.

The climax of the story sees Tulādharma, a vaisya, proved right in his spiritual advice to a brahman. Indeed the terms in which the verdict is delivered rub salt in the wound:

[The birds say:]

16cdef: O Jajali, this merchant, faithful, believing, and deeply [devoted to] dharma in his activities, and steadfast in [his] own path is superior [to you].

In this offensive stanza, in which Jajali is humbled, it appears to be suggested that Tulādharma's prime

---


49 The subject is the story told of Dharmavyādha's previous life, in which he was a brahman who mistakenly shot a rsi, iii.205.14-206.28. It is placed between the Butcher's fault-finding iii.205.7-10 and the conclusion iii.206.30-32.

50 Text at p.234 above.
virtue is faith - a quirk of this stanza, quite incidental to the story. By emphasizing the paramountcy of this virtue and by doing so on self-proclaimed orthodox grounds extrinsic to the episode, the interpolator legitimizes Tulādhāra in a way which short-circuits the tensions of his confrontation with Jājali.

We may therefore put up a polarity of possible motivations, suggesting on one extremity that the accreter was insensitive or unaware of the development of the story, his addition being simply a doctrinal barnacle; or on the other extremity that the accreter was sensitive, perhaps hypersensitive, to irritations in the story and has sought to apply his own soothing balm. Can we draw out any features of the interpolation itself which would incline us to one view or the other? The motivational distinction between neglect and turning aside is not one likely to be revealed by symptoms of a formal kind. Most of the conceivably pertinent features of the text point equally well in either direction. For instance, the

51 See pages 231, 234 above.
52 This observation applies to the facts, among others,
(a) that the story in no way invites the hymn to ēuddha, which has been seemingly accreted in spite of the story;
(b) that the interpolation relies upon and pretends to embody material extrinsic to the story;
(c) that the introductory section of the interpolation is aware of the frame into which it is inserted, while the rest of the interpolation is oblivious to it;
(d) that the virtue of faith is praised explicitly at the expense of competing virtues (22ab7ab).
conviction that the interpolation is analogous in intention to the sub-plot appended to Dharmavyādha's story draws strength from the coincidence that the mention of śraddhā upon which the interpolator dilates happens to occur in one of the small number of passages where Tulādhāra is explicitly praised. The converse of this observation is simply that the mention of śraddhā in stanza 16 is virtually the only one in the episode when the interpolation is excluded. Which singularity is significant?

Faced with this quandary, it would be fallacious for us to give the benefit of the doubt to sensitivity on the grounds that this assumption is in harmony with the philosophy of our analysis. The presumption of reasonableness is an a priori supposition which may or may not be borne out by the unfolding analysis. Even if it is borne out by and large, there is no justification for invoking its authority to decide particular cases. The present issue must therefore be left undecided, with this rider: that the alternatives of barnacle and balm are not necessarily a dichotomy. It is eminently conceivable that some transmitter of the text saw the potential of the śraddhā of stanza 16 as a legitimation of Tulādhāra because of his own penchant. This perception of the motivation does not

53 He is praised in 253.8-9, 42-43, 254.3-4, 256.16.
54 The phrase śraddhadhami te (255.36f) may of course be ignored; likewise śraddhadhasya (254.33d). There are no other uses of the stem.
55 Page 104 above.
preclude the first proposed alternatives and is not offered with a coward's shrug. The question is still as open as it ever was, but it may be that the answer is not significant.

Stocktaking: alignment of uninterpolated material

At this point a stocktaking will reveal that through our discussions of verse 15cd, of stanzas 6 and 16, and of the block of āraddhā material, we have shown that radical change has overtaken this chapter in the course of transmission with the incorporation of a large bulk of āraddhā-focussed material, and that this development accounts for the emendations away from spardhā (st.6, 16) witnessed in many extant texts. Furthermore, by delineating the interpolation (20-22ab, 7-15ab), we are enabled to make observations about the uninterpolated material (1-6, 15cd-19, 22cd). There is no doubt that while Tuladhāra speaks (1-4) and the birds sing (5; 6,15cd-16) what unfolds is the birds' story; that is, it belongs on the IInd alignment.56 The concluding stanzas (17-19, 22cd) on the other hand do not reveal their allegiance so eagerly. They deserve further discussion.

Conclusion of the episode

The concluding stanzas of the episode (17-19, 22cd) exhibit a disconcerting array of variant text orders and readings, the analysis of which is exceedingly complex. Here, in the main body of our analysis, it suffices to say that it is possible to

56 See Table II.
argue with some conviction that in the ancestral text the conclusion of the story comprised stanzas 17 and 18 alone and that all other material (st.19; repetitions of vs.17ab and st.20; vs.22cd) consists of accretions which do not belong in the critically reconstituted text. The details of the argumentation by which this result is achieved have been relegated to Part B, but a glance at Tables XXIX and XXXIII will indicate the general thrust of the argument.

We have the choice of aligning this conclusion with either the oldest material of the story (Ist alignment) or with the revised material of the birds' story (IIInd alignment). The fact that all the preceding uncontaminated material of the chapter (1-6, 15cd-16) forms part of the birds' story may perhaps create an expectation that 17-18 too belong on this IIInd alignment. On the other hand presumably the story had some form of conclusion even on its earliest level. If we allocate 17-18 to the IIInd alignment, the Ist alignment material will have come to an end with GV in chapter 254. However V is a purely passive conclusion which offers no resolution to the opposition between Tulādhāra and Jājali which has been set up in the Ist alignment plot. Stanzas 256, 17-18 do supply such a resolution, and in this important respect they are therefore more appropriate as a conclusion to the Ist alignment material than 254.V would be.

To attribute stanzas 256,17-18 to the Ist

---

57 Pages 329-353 below.
alignment is not to leave the IIInd alignment unconcluded. The testimony of the IIInd alignment materials appearing in chapter 253 and 254 reveals that the reviser responsible for their composition was working within the framework established by the Ist alignment story: 253.12, although introducing a replication of 253.1-11, assumes and implicitly acknowledges the existence of the older material; 58 the interpolation 254.5cd-9 (L) is introduced by Ist alignment material (viz. Z). In view of these instances of the IIInd alignment reviser's demonstrable awareness of the older framework of the story it is hardly possible to object to an assumption that he acquiesced in retaining the original conclusion in stanzas 17-18 to serve as well for the conclusion of his reworked version of the story.

The juxtaposition of stanzas 256.17-18 and 254.V on the Ist alignment is an embarrassment in view of the fact that both have the nature of formal conclusions. Consequently the placing of stanzas 256.17-18 on the Ist alignment would require the exclusion of 254.V from that alignment. This presents no difficulty, however, as 254.V is credibly regarded as a transitional device leading into 255.S.

It might be noted incidentally here that with this reconstruction of the Ist alignment material we find ourselves in a position to throw new light on the

58 Yudhiṣṭhira's question about Jājali's penances implies that Jājali has already been introduced, as he has in 253.1-11; it makes no sense coming directly after 252, or 251.
hitherto seemingly anomalous isolation of G at the end of chapter 254. Once G is seen to have been the stanza immediately preceding the conclusion (stanzas 256.17-18) of the 1st alignment, its significance becomes readily comprehensible: its function will have been to provide a summary statement of Tulāḍhāra's code of values in anticipation of the immediately following conclusion and resolution of the plot in which the effect of Tulāḍhāra's teaching and example upon Jājali is described.
INTERNAL CONCLUSIONS AND CHAPTER DIVISIONS

It is hard to credit that the Sāntiparvan ever existed without internal divisions. Without divisions the continuous text would be impractically unwieldy for any purpose: recitation, copying or study.\(^1\) Furthermore, the method of arrangement of material in the Sāntiparvan provides natural cleavages which allow the story to be broken up into self-consistent blocks, the frame story of Bhīṣma and Yudhisthīra embodying discrete passages of preaching often illustrated with equally discrete illustrative tales. For instance, from its earliest presence in the Sāntiparvan, the Tulādāhāra story will have been clearly delimited by its introductory stanza, which is virtually an anticipatory colophon:

253.1: On this point men quote the ancient story [of] Tulādāhāra's talk on dharma with Jājali.\(^2\)

and its closing stanzas, which repeat the same phrases:

256.17: Thus did Tulādāhāra speak [with]

highly admirable significance, and thus too,

with a proper grasp [of the subject],

told of the abiding dharma.

---

1 These comments are inapplicable to an orally transmitted tradition, for which copying and contemplative study are not in question. However it is improbable that the Sāntiparvan was ever part of an oral tradition. See further pp.413-418 below.

2 253.1:

\begin{verbatim}
atrāpy udāharantīmam itihāsam purātanam /
tulādhārasya vākyāni dharme jājalinā saha //
\end{verbatim}
18: After he had heard the words of Tulādhāra, famous for his fortitude, the brahman entered into [a state of] tranquility, o Yudhisthira.

However while, on these grounds, it is probable that the oldest forms of the Śantiparvan knew internal divisions, it cannot be true that the divisions were precisely those which we find in the text - the extant chapter (adhväya) divisions. The preceding analysis of the Tulādhāra story has revealed that it was once a fraction of its present length, and would hardly have been able to sustain its present five-chapter format. On the oldest alignment the story had only the bulk of a single medium-length chapter in the extant text. It is therefore more likely than not that the episode began life as a single chapter of the Mokṣadharma parvan, exactly like the story of Cirakārin immediately following in chapter 258. Whether or not this was so, Table XXXIX shows that the extant chapter 255 had no substance until the IIIrd stage of the text’s development, and that in the archetype text (ω) it is unlikely that chapter 257 had existence as a separate chapter, for if it did it can have amounted to no more than two stanzas (257.12-13).

3 256.17-18:

Note that while the Critical Edition has reconstituted the Śantiparvan in 353 adhyāyas, the Adiparvan parvasamgraha as reconstructed allows only 339 (Mbh.i.2.199). The discrepancy is indicative of changes in chapter division but not a basis for an analysis of the kind mounted by Venkatachellam Iyer, Preliminary Chapters of the Mahābhārata.
What then can we deduce about the appearance of chapter divisions in the episode? The extant chapter divisions are marked by colophons. Being extrametrical, however, the colophons lie beyond the controlled transmission of the text proper and are particularly subject to editorial tampering. Consequently, the forms of the colophons are not a fruitful source of inference through which to attack the question of how the chapter divisions have arisen. We would do better to examine the concluding stanzas which are proximate to the chapter divisions but yet part of the metrical text. The study of these internal conclusions will allow us at the same time to gather up some loose threads left dangling in the previous chapter-by-chapter analysis.

5 The colophon titles are set out in Table XLI. The magnitude of variation attests to the liberty with which editors have treated the colophons. Nevertheless, beneath the variation, there is a distribution pattern which leads to the conclusion that the names given to individual adhyayas are not as old as the archetype text. The evidence suggests that the practice of labelling each constituent chapter with the title of the episode (Tuladharajajalisaamvâdaḥ) or subtitling it as a particular part of the episode (e.g. Tuladharajajalisaamvade vismayah) is a relatively late development in the scribal tradition. The only case in which a descriptive colophon seems likely to have appeared in the archetype text is that at the end of chapter 256 (and thus at the end of the episode) in the form of Tuladharajalisaamvâdaḥ samâptah.

The danger of using colophons for any text-historical purpose is underlined by the case of chapter 257. Although the Vicakhu material cannot be attributed to the archetype text, the colophon label Vicakhmuṛîtaḥ has a distribution very nearly as wide as the episode-concluding colophons of chapters 256 or 258. The determining factor seems not therefore to be the relative antiquity of the colophon (and hence the division) but rather the nature of the material and its attractiveness for the classifier.
For this twofold purpose, the internal conclusions of which we must take cognizance appear at the end of chapter 255 (W), near the end of chapter 254 (N, U) and at the end of chapter 254 (V). These passages are set out for comparative reference in Table XII.

Examination of Table XII will reveal formal affinities between the conclusions set out there. The conclusion of chapter 255 (W) has parallels in U and F, and in V, all of chapter 254. The conclusion of chapter 254 (V) is a "blind" concluding technique, which could be applied to virtually any expository material. However in choosing to describe the dharma it praises as naipunyena-opalakṣita7 'marked by

---
6 The conclusions found in chapter 256 (stt.17-18, 19, 22cd) are fully discussed elsewhere. Since these conclusions have no formal resemblance to any of the internal conclusions preceding them, and since the positioning of the final conclusion is not amenable to the influence of the increasing bulk of the episode, we may leave aside consideration of these conclusions. The case of chapter 253 will be discussed subsequently: it differs from chapters 254 and 255 in lacking a metrical concluding device.

The letter code is that set out in Table I.

7 In many manuscripts: nipunena-opalakṣitaḥ/-kayate "valued by the perfect man".
perfection' it may well be echoing the reference to nipu ̄na 'perfect' behavior of U. 8

It has earlier been demonstrated that the conclusion of chapter 255 (W) is in part a recapitulation of UF, and that the composer of U was also responsible for N. The consequent question of whether the older material of 255 and MN were composed simultaneously or not has been raised but not positively answered. 9 Only now by considering the full range of possible sequences of accretion in turn, and bringing to bear upon them inferences from the formal characteristics of the

8 That this parallelism is not coincidental is perhaps suggested by the fact that the naipu ̄nepalaksitah of V is contained in a syntactically and formulaically supernumerary verse (52cd) - a fact which is made the more evident through the comparison of V and W. It is thus possible that this verse (52cd) has the purpose of adapting the "blind" conclusion V to its context.

9 Pages 212-21½ above.
conclusions and our knowledge of the expansion of the text is there hope that an answer may be found.

The possibilities are:

(1) that MNU, V, SW were all composed simultaneously. Against this proposal we may raise a two pronged objection. If the composer of W had also composed U and V it is difficult to believe that he should have mistaken F for part of the concluding material of 254, yet we find it reproduced as such in W. Alternatively, if it is assumed that the composer of U, V, W saw fit to use F in W although aware that it belonged to the older text, it is still true that he did not use G (which is inherently unsuitable for inclusion in any conclusion). If he baulked at including G in W, it is unexplained why he did not incorporate chapter 255 after U(F) instead of after GV. Although G is the end of Tulādhāra's preaching and 256.1 is the beginning of his practical demonstration of his message, G would have been capable of functioning as a bridgehead for 256.1-. Moreover, the subject-matter of chapter 255 relates to N, not to G. Whichever part of this twofold objection is applicable, the proposition fails.

(2) that V was composed first, and MNU, SW subsequently but not necessarily simultaneously. This proposal defuses the second of the alternative objections to the first possibility. But making V prior to NU raises a question about the common ground these passages share, both in general tenor in their appeal to the authority of a variety of religious
virtuosi, and specifically with their use of nipuṇa/naipuṇya. To the extent that these are not just stock elements likely to turn up in any conclusion, it is preferable to have N composed and available as a model for V. A more telling objection arises from the difficulty of explaining the presence of V on any alignment anterior to NU and S. In view of the brevity of the fragment of the episode which would have followed V, such an internal conclusion would not have been well placed. Nor is it easy to say why V should have been part of the original composition of either the oldest material (stage I) or the first rewriting (stage II): in the first case it is otiose, immediately preceding the conclusion of the episode; in the latter case it is an impersonal disruption to what

10 The alternative, that NU should have been influenced by V, is not attractive (a) a priori because by position NU precedes V in the text; and (b), less cogently, because of the make-up of V (see note 8 above).

11 As a minimum, the material following might have been four verses on the oldest level (256.17-18); at the maximum 20 verses in the archetypal text (256.1-6, 15cc-18).

12 The possibility that V was the conclusion of the episode in its oldest form must be mentioned. In this case, 256.17-18 could be seen as having been added in the large scale IIInd alignment version. This interpretation is not attractive in that it overlooks the fact that 256.17-18 concludes the dharma discussion in a manner harmonious with the attitude of CDEF - by referring to comprehension of the nature of dharma (upālabhdho dharmas) rather than defining its manifestations (śrāvakam dharmaḥ of 254.V). The passage 254.V shows no such discrimination, and indeed appeals to the arbiters of morality who are implicitly discredited by CDEF (e.g. stanza 21). Furthermore the particular aptness of the brahman's achievement of sānti makes 256.17-18 a far more satisfactory conclusion to the older story than V, with its stock generalities. All this is to say nothing of the similarities between N and V.
Tulādhāra says, which serves only to undermine the point he makes with his empirical demonstration using the birds.

(3) that NU, V were composed earlier than W, which was later added with S.

This account has the advantage of allowing W's recapitulation of F alongside U: once the interpolation MNU was in place, the historical relationship of F and the later accreted U will have been completely obscured. The account has the disadvantage of making it even harder to explain V's position than was the case with (2). Even in the unlikely case that it was desired to split the material of 254-256 into two chapters, there seems still no call for V: N is a well articulated and better placed point for insertion of a colophon. Earlier comments on the relationship of 254. G to 256.1 made above, apply here.

(4) that MNU is older, V and W being composed at the time of the interpolation of S.

This arrangement has the advantage of putting NU down as a model for V and of separating the composition of NUF... from that of W, thus allowing the lack of discrimination between NU and F shown in W. In this proposal the position of V is explicable with reference to the new material. It may be seen as a winding-up device providing a neutral transition to the interpolation (S). Hence, for this proposal, it is not significant whether V was intended as a metrical chapter-dividing colophon or was later used as such; but in either case the objections raised above to its
having been so intended no longer apply when S is interposed between V and the end of the episode. On the other hand, whereas previously the placement of V called for explanation, it is now the placement of S together with its satellites V,W which is at issue.

We have earlier noted that the old material of chapter 255 (S) focusses on the matters raised in chapter 254 by MN. The obvious question is therefore once again why chapter 255 was not added after N(U) rather than mid-stream in Tuladhāra's first-person statement (254.G x 256.1-4). Had NU and S been composed by the same hand, as was a possibility under (1) above, the question might have caused some anguish; but if NU is older than the material of S, the question loses its sting. The concerns expressed in the old material of chapter 255 (S), relevant to N, make not only U but also F very much to the point in that together they characterize the behaviour described in N as repugnant and warn against following the ways of the world.

Thus, the matters the composer of the old material of chapter 255 (S) wished to discuss had not concluded with the end of N, which therefore did not offer an apt point of insertion for his interpolation. Furthermore, it has to be remembered that MNU is a considerable bulk of material. Not only will it have comprised nearly half of Tuladhāra's preaching in the text as it then

---

13 Page 213 above.
14 254.49ab.
15 254.49cd50ab.
stood, but by virtue of coming toward the end of Tulādhāra's preaching, it occupies the position of influence in forming the reader's impression of the tendency of Tulādhāra's discourse. Thus it becomes understandable that the composer of S may have viewed the concerns of MNU as the dominant concerns of the whole sermon and appended his elaboration at the end of the sermon - which is where it appears (254,G x).

The fact that the interpolator of S, who was presumably also the composer of W, failed to divorce NU from F may corroborate this explanation, but does not confirm it.

While none of the above proposals is without blemish, (2) and (4) appear the least flawed. Of this pair, it is (4) which leaves the least undone; and therefore it is to be preferred. Implications of proposal (4) are that the oldest material of chapter 255 (i.e. S) should be placed on an alignment younger than 254,MNU, and that the internal chapter division 254 x 256 became a possibility only with the interpolation of the oldest chapter 255 material - by which the bulk of 254-256 was increased from about 54 stanzas (109 verses) to a conservative 95 stanzas (190 verses).

16 Approximately 30 verses out of 80 (including in the latter total the material of the 1st and 2nd alignments plus P,NU).
17 The sermon at that time consisting of KZLAPBCDEMNUG.
18 It is not a positive recommendation that the author of W overrode a distinction which, because it is purely historical, he could not have been aware of. The reflection of UF + V in W to the exclusion of G is in any case explicable in purely topical terms, as the earlier part of this paragraph indicates.
19 I.e. 254. KZLAPBCDEMNUG (omitting V) + 256.1-6, 15cd-18.
20 Adding 255.1-27ab, 33-34, 38ab-39 (S) the flanking 254.51ab-52 (V) and 255.40-41 (W). The estimate is conservative in assuming that no further accretion has taken place in 254 (e.g. Q).
Whether the chapter 255 material was inserted as a discrete chapter, or whether later editors used the heavy-handed transitions flanking it \((V,W)\) as the occasion for their segmentations is not determinable.

Possibilities of a different species arise if \(W\) is treated not as a unity, but as made up of two component parts: 255.40 (\(Wa\)) and 255.41 (\(Wb\)). It will be noted that \(Wa\) parallels NUF, while \(Wb\) parallels \(V\). Hence it may be proposed:

(5) that either concurrently with the composition of MNU, or after it, \(S\) with \(Wa\) as conclusion was composed; and that subsequent to the composition of the chapter 255 material \((SWa)\) the story was broken up into chapters with the interposition of \(V\) and \(Wb\).

This class of proposals retains the advantage of proposal (4) above in not making the placement of \(S\) dependent upon a pre-existent \(V\); but in addition it pretends to give an account of the seeming overkill of the double conclusion of chapter 255 \((Wa, Wb)\), which has until now gone unremarked. Thus it gives a fuller account of the extant text than proposal (4) but at the same time involves a more complex development of the text and rests on some assumptions about the introduction of chapter divisions.

In the archetype text \((\omega)\)\(^2\) the chapter divisions of the episode all fell at points in the text where there was a change of speaker. From this coincidence,

---

\(^2\) That is, excluding from consideration the later chapter division 256 x 257, where there is in fact no change of speaker.
two inferences might be made. It may have been that the chapter divisions came to be imposed at such points in the text because they marked clear structural interstices and often represented a turn in the story's line of thought or a stage in the development of the narrative. Alternatively, it may have been that the editors who determined that the text should be segmented into chapters also considered that these divisions were customarily and therefore appropriately marked by an exchange of speakers - and may have been prepared to supply the exchange where it was lacking. Although contrary, the inferences are not mutually exclusive. The latter alternative does not even arise, of course, when the exchange of speakers is part of the dialectic by which the story advances. But this is not the case with W: without Wb, the chapter division 255 x 256 would have interrupted a continuing discourse by Tulādhāra. Thus in the case of Wb, it is an open question whether its presence attracted the chapter division, or whether the chapter division occasioned the insertion of Wb. The pointlessness of Wb suggests the latter.

The same account could be offered for V, for it no doubt owes its position to the change of speaker from Tulādhāra in 254.52 to Jājali in 255.1. However, 22 The fact that elsewhere in the Mokṣadharmaparvan there are cases of chapter division unaccompanied by change of speaker does not rule out this imputation so long as the great majority of chapter divisions do correspond with changes of speaker.
unlike Wb, V is not otiose: it cushions the jump from 254.FG to Jājali's question. Furthermore, we have already noted that, given that V was not present before the accretion of S,23 the transmitter responsible for the placement of S must have been aware that with 254.G, Tulādharā's preaching had come to an end. This awareness is embodied in V. Thus, although it always remains possible that V was added later in the process of making chapter divisions, it seems better to take it as having been composed in conjunction with the incorporation of S. And yet by introducing V on this alignment, we revive the question of how Wā came to be modelled on UF when V, the handiwork of the same composer to whom Wā would be attributable, is a more obvious source.

This impasse becomes negotiable with the understanding that the composition and the incorporation of new material are two distinguishable processes which are more likely than not to be attributed to different transmitters.24 Given the distinction between these processes, a development along the following lines may be suggested:

(5a) SWā was composed as an adjunct to Tulādharā's advice and was intended for incorporation at the end of Tulādharā's advice-giving (254.G x 256.1), the conclusion Wā echoing the verses in the existing text (UF) which summed up the moral which the composer of S took up for further

---

23 See discussion at p.251, §(3) above.  
24 Cf. pp.289-291 and n.7 below.
discussion. At the time of composition, SWa was still a satellite to the text proper. Then, upon the incorporation of SWa, the stanzas V and Wb were added fore and aft, both to act as buffers between the accretion and the breached older text, and in conjunction with the division into chapters, which (it will be assumed) was introduced in the process of incorporation.

Two aspects of the proposal need clarification. First is the question of whether MNU was composed contemporaneously with SWa or was already present in the text against which S was composed. Without again canvassing earlier inconclusive argument, it is sufficient to revive the point raised in discussion of proposal (1) above that unless MNU had already been incorporated in the text, the association of U and F in Wa is barely credible. Therefore it is preferable to assume that MNU entered the text on an alignment older than that of SWa. The most substantial argument in favour of making the composition of MNU and SWa contemporary is that Wa, itself a transition back to the preexistent text, is modelled on U which had a similar function when composed but which, not being a stock formula, is not so easily recognized as a concluding device once incorporated into the text as would be the full-blowed distinctive conclusion found

25 I.e., the questions of why the point of insertion was at 254,Gx and not 254,Nx or 254,Fx; and of why U and not N provided the model for Wa. See above p.249 §(1), pp.251-253 §(4).
at the end of M (viz. N). The selection of U in preference to N as the model for Wa would therefore be conveniently explained if the composer of SWa had just turned his hand from NU. However, it requires a leap of faith to believe that the composer of MNU, SWa combined the last stanza of satellite material he had just composed (U) with material in the preexistent text (viz. F), especially since U in no way anticipates F but rather looks back to the stanza preceding the intended point of insertion (viz. E). It inspires less scepticism to separate the composition of MNU and SWa.

Second is the assumption that the chapter division took place along with the incorporation of S. From the time of the incorporation of S, the material of chapters 254-256 had attained sufficient bulk to invite segmentation. But this suggests only that the chapter divisions associated with V and Wb might have arisen at any time after the incorporation of SWa - possibly but not necessarily contemporarily with the incorporation. The assumption that the chapter division did arise as part of the process of the incorporation of SWa has in its favour only that there are no obstacles to such a proposal and that it gives an account of why a chapter division (255 x 256) was made so close to the end of the episode when it was not invited either strategically or by a change of speaker. In the light of this latter point, it seems preferable to co-align the incorporation of SWa, the composition and incorporation of V and Wb, and the institution of chapter divisions.
Thus if W comprises two separately accreted stanzas (Wa, Wb) it is reasonable to conclude not only that S belongs on an alignment younger than that of MNU, but also that the introduction of chapter divisions into the text has proceeded pari passu with the growth in bulk of the material and (here at least) was not the product of an independently motivated re-editing of the text. On the other hand, if the assumption that W is not an historical unity were invalid, in accordance with proposal (4) above we would still arrive at the conclusion that S is younger than MNU but we would have no positive reason for making the institution of chapter divisions contemporary with the incorporation of S. In view of the explanatory advantages of segmenting W, the former conclusion rests on a surer footing.

Of the four chapter divisions found in the archetypal text, two are thus accounted for through their relationship with S.

The division 253 x 254 is prima facie not attributable to the earliest form of the episode. This division intersects materials attributed to the IIInd alignment, inviting the imputation that the division too dates back no further than the material it bisects. This presumption is strengthened by the deployment of the text as it will have been on levels older than the IIInd alignment: the 253 x 254 division would have fallen only 22 verses²⁶ after the (presumably original)

²⁶ The notional division falling 253.11 x 254.2.
252 x 253 division; moreover the whole bulk of the story as it existed prior to the IIInd alignment accretion will not have amounted to more than the fit ingredients of a single chapter. 27 For these reasons it is likely that the chapter division 253 x 254 appeared on or after the IIInd alignment. Since the division coincides with a change of speaker (involving Bhīṣma, a figure in the emboxing narrative) which is an intrinsic part of the story's advancement, we have no grounds upon which to determine whether the chapter division 253 x 254 was instituted at the time of the incorporation of the large scale IIInd alignment accretion, or subsequently. It is conceivable that this chapter division was introduced by the same hand responsible for those associated with S, but there is no evidence to support this view.

Only the division 252 x 253 remains a candidate for originality. The notion that the Tulādhāra episode began life in the Moksadharmaparvan as a single chapter comprising both Yudhiṣṭhira's question and Bhīṣma's answering tale of Tulādhāra has the attraction of neatness and analogy with other episodes (like the immediately following stories of Cirakārin, ch.258, and of Dyumutsena and Satyavat, ch.259); nor would a single chapter of 108 verses be exceptionable to judge by the standards of the extant texts. 28 Furthermore it is easy to credit that the 252 x 253 chapter division should have been slipped in at any later time,

27 See Table XXXIX.
28 See Table XXXIX.
for the change of speaker always present will have meant that it was not necessary to manufacture any transitional device. Nevertheless, inasmuch as it lies beyond the capacity of this analysis to detect accretion within chapter 252 in which Yudhisthira poses his introductory question, the conservative conclusion will be that the bulk of the chapter has always been sufficient to sustain the existence of a separate chapter.29 Since it cannot be shown positively that the chapter division is not original, we are obliged to enter the provisional conclusion that chapter 252 has had a separate existence from the first appearance of the story in the Santiparvan.

From our study of V and W we concluded that we could probably draw the inference that chapter divisions had been added in step with the text's increasing bulk. Generalizing this inference beyond the cases of V and W enables us to propose a history of the chapter divisions and estimate the alignments upon which they appeared. At its earliest appearance in the Santiparvan, the Tulādāhāra episode will have comprised a mere two chapters: 252, 253-256; if indeed Yudhīsthira's question (ch. 252) can properly be classed as part of the episode at all. Subsequently, on the IIInd alignment, the bulk of the material would have been sufficient to sustain a second internal division: 252, 253, 254-256. On the same alignment upon which S was incorporated, further

29 Compare the 40 verses of chapter 252, with the 24 verses of chapter 257 in the extant text.
divisions were instituted: 252, 253, 254, 255, 256. Finally the latest of the chapter divisions found in the Critical Edition text (256 x 257) will have been implemented on an alignment younger than the archetype text (ω), in which only two stanzas (257.11-12) of chapter 257 were present. 30
Part B

CHAPTER III
INTRODUCTION TO PART B

Part B singles out certain passages of the Tulādāhāra story and related material in order to subject them to a detailed analysis of text variations collated in the Apparatus Criticus of the Critical Edition. The analysis is not undertaken in the hope of casting much new light on the evolution of doctrine or thought embodied in the Tulādāhāra episode, for the ideological content of the passages for analysis, so far as it is significant, has been touched upon in the broader framework of the Part A survey. Rather, the potentiality of the collated variants and the purpose for which they are analysed here lies in the information they can be made to yield up to us concerning the Mahābhārata textual tradition: that is, the manner in which the text has been transmitted, contaminated and altered in the course of its passage through time from the archetype (ω) to the extant manuscripts.

The passages chosen as particularly likely to elucidate the textual tradition are those for which the Apparatus Criticus reveals variations in text-order. It is widely accepted that even in heavily contaminated traditions text-order variations (including transpositions and omissions) are significant for deducing the lines of descent of extant witnesses.1 The value of text order variation

1 West, Textual Criticism, p.42; Reynolds and Wilson, Scribes and Scholars, p.190. A fuller discussion of the issues involved will be found at pp.420-435 below.
lies in the fact that in circumstances of written transmission it will tend to be a more conservative and stable element than verbal variae lectiones.

The conservation of text-order variation flows from the effect of scale: deliberate redactorial improvement of a text by reordering is a far more demanding task, requiring more critical detachment, than the alteration of the reading of a word or phrase; nor will a transmitter's attention span often have been so great that he has unconsciously reordered whole verses of his text, whereas the unconscious introduction of lectio facilior in a single word or syllable is a constant hazard of scribal transmission. The scope of errors in text-order arising through inattention is thus virtually restricted to omissions (especially by haplography) or transpositions of single sloka pairs. When confronted with a more extensive or more complex variation of text-order one is therefore entitled to suspect the intrusion of a disturbing factor into the tradition - above all, the incorporation of a contamination.

Once text-order variations have arisen, their stability is a function of their lack of susceptibility to spreading across a tradition by contamination from one text to another. The practice of filling out lacunae by comparing one manuscript with another will

See West, Textual Criticism, pp.20-22 and Reynolds and Wilson, Scribes and Scholars, pp.207-208 on semi-conscious or unconscious changes. All examples given are below sentence or verse level.
clearly not contribute to the spread of omissions; nor are transpositions likely to move into other branches of the tradition in which their authority is challenged by the alternative text-order of the original version. Consequently every variation in text order recorded in the Apparatus Criticus has a special potential for defining the relationship between the manuscripts which share it: the distribution of the co-variants is a key to delineating groups of manuscripts related by common descent.

The passages selected for treatment in Part B are 254.10-12 (pp. 400-411), 254.25-26 (pp. 267-284), 255.35-38ab (pp. 389-403), and a large part of chapters 256 and 257.

---

3 When variation in text-order creates a (false) perceived lacuna in a particular context, a duplication of part of the transposed material may be introduced by contamination. The analysis following illustrates several such cases.
Establishing that R is a contamination

To understand the relationship of R to the material of chapter 254 it is necessary first of all to take cognizance of the remarkable variety of differing sequences of verses surrounding the two stanzas (25-26) of R. Examination of these sequences may yield some clue concerning the circumstances in which R became incorporated in the Sāntipārvavān corpus.

The details of the verse sequences, gleaned from the Apparatus Criticus of the Critical Edition, have been set down in Table XIII A. At first glance this table presents a bewildering chaos. But two predominant features emerge: first, in the majority of cases stanzas 25 and 26 appear intact together and in that order; and, secondly, in a smaller majority of cases verses 24ef and 27ab appear together in that order. Given this much, our next step must be to try to discover some pattern in the eddies washing around these two rocks of relative constancy. As a means of doing so, let us set up one of these constants as an axis about which the remainder of the material may be ranged. Because the pairing of verses 25-26 is most widely witnessed, it may prove the more enlightening criterion of arrangement.
With the new insight this approach gives us, it becomes possible to render down the diverse readings into three major classes. Within each class there are differing sequences which can be believably explained as having been generated from the hyparchetype of the class. These classes are tabulated in Table XIIIB.

The postulation of these three hyparchetypes raises important questions about the incorporation of R. The principle upon which a critical edition rests is that the reconstruction of an ancestral text is possible when it can be explained how every variant preserved in extant manuscripts could have evolved from a single archetypal reading. Conversely, in the case of a range of extant variants which cannot be believably reconciled it is not possible to reconstruct an archetypal reading with certainty, nor indeed even to assert that there was an antecedent reading which was part of the archetypal text at all. The alternative is the assumption that some branches - or the whole - of the manuscript tradition have been contaminated.

The variant verse sequences surrounding R exhibit some features symptomatic of common genetic descent from a single ancestral text: one is the fact that with insignificant exceptions the varying verse sequences comprise the same material, including R, in all the

---

1 This is a highly simplified statement. See Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, ch.5, sec.iii-v, vii for a fuller statement.

2 The most extreme case of this is where one or several groups of witnesses contain material not found in another group of witnesses. The so-called "star passages" of the Critical Edition offer many examples.
manuscripts collated for the Critical Edition.\(^3\)

Another is the fact that the classes which may be derived from the variants can be closely reconciled\(^4\) with the pedigree tree of the Mahābhārata tradition inferred by the editors of the Critical Edition on the evidence of other contexts, as will be evident from comparing the manuscript groupings of the classes set out in Table XIIIB with the Critical Editors' stemmas set out in Table XIV.

The greatest stumbling block in the way of accepting the notion that the extant readings are descended from a common ancestor is the difficulty of deriving the three postulated hyparchetypes which head each class of variants from any common archetype. If we were to apply the rule of thumb with which the editors of the Critical Edition have generally worked,\(^5\) the inclusion of \(*M\) and \(*E\) in one class of variants would probably settle the archetypal reading as that of hyparchetype I. But it is impermissible to acquiesce in this conclusion unless it can, as a

\(^3\) Universal distribution of variants is the expected norm for genetic descent, but its absence does not necessarily rule out reconstruction of a (hyp)archetype (note, for instance, the absence of st.26 in BO), nor does it invariably indicate genetic descent, for a corruption may affect all witnesses as the result of contamination.

\(^4\) The correspondence is not perfect: VI appears misplaced, while K6 and G1 are still unplaced. These doubts however are not invalidating because the stemma codicum is not definitive, nor agreed upon by all editors; neither is it likely to remain constant throughout the Mahābhārata. Note also Belvarkar's comments on the pedigree of his VI manuscript (Śāntiparvan, "Introduction", pp.xlv-xlvi.

corollary, be demonstrated by what processes of
displacement and textual disruption the hyparchetypes
II and III could have evolved.

The generation of type III from type I\(^6\) through
conscious redactorial revision is conceivable, for
the transporting of 25abcd26abcd forward over
24ef27abcdef does produce a better result by bringing
together two passages dealing with fearlessness
(R and Q). The complex displacement necessary to
generate hyparchetype II from I might predispose one
to invoke conscious revision as an explanation of the
changes here too. However this is not acceptable,
because the sense of the text is far from improved by
the reshuffle, particularly as the coherent sequence
25abcd26abcd is dismembered. The alternative to
conscious revision is unconscious scribal error. The
persuasive power of such an explanation depends upon
whether the mechanics of the necessary transformation
can be reduced to (a series of) simple and credible
errors. The generation of hyparchetype II from I
proposes the exchange of 24ef and 25ab over an intact
intervening three verses - a process which defies
imagination.

Thus, even allowing for the fact that the passage
CRDQ will scarcely have been comprehensible in the

---
\(6\) Working from type I only for convenience and not
because of any prior assumption. The generation of
type II from type III demands more complex
manipulation than would generation from type I.
The generation of type I from type II is no simpler
than its converse. Thus departure from type I offers
the paths of least resistance. The possibility that
all three types derive from an unwitnessed archetype
is made improbable by observations at the end of the
following paragraph (p.271 below).
ancestral text and would therefore have been particularly liable to disruption, the hypothesis of genetic descent from a single ancestral reading has not permitted a satisfactory account of hyparchetype II, nor of the aberrant cases of K6 and G1 whose demands are similar. But over and above the difficulty of generating hyparchetype II, the coincidence that the fractures created by the transposition of 25ab and 24ef between hyparchetypes I and II should mark the precise boundaries of the material (R) which has been shifted in hyparchetype III—in other words that two unrelated and differently motivated changes should have by chance operated on the same material—must deepen our incredulity.

Once it appears that the reconstruction of an ancestral reading is not feasible, we are forced to consider the alternative possibility: namely, that the tradition is corrupt and contaminated. From the tabulation of variants in Table XIV it emerges that stanzas 25 and 26 (R) might conveniently be taken as a contamination spread to all branches of the tradition by infection. Regarding R in this way, it becomes possible to account for (though not explain) the fickleness of its placement, and for the separate corruption of pre-existent text and interpolation. Even the derangement of the verses of R found in type II is no longer quite so puzzling: it is a kind of derangement which might well arise as a by-product of the characteristic mode of contamination, the incorporation of marginal addenda which are often cramped and poorly set out.
An additional recommendation for the assumption of contamination is that the same facilities it offers for an account of the hyparchetypes will also allow a more credible account of the two unclassed variants, K6 and Gl. In each case there appears to have been transposition of adjacent verses or stanzas in the older text before the incorporation of the contamination took place.7

In the light of the decisive advantages accruing from the assumption of contamination, it can be said with some confidence that the problems of reconstruction presented by the collated variants of the Critical Edition are symptomatic of the fact that an unrecognized corruption has been included in the critically reconstituted text. It follows that in the Critical Edition the offending stanzas (R) should have been relegated to the status of a "star passage". The reasons why this course has not been followed by the editors of the Critical Edition are not made clear.8

7 K6: 24abcd 27ab / 24ef 27cdef + 25,26
Gl: 24abcd 27cdef / 24ef27ab + 25; 26 om.

Although the transposition of verses of one stanza or of successive stanzas is not an attractive assumption, in the absence of any more satisfactory alternative account it remains the least of all evils.

8 It is remarkable that the text reconstituted does not correspond with any one of the 35 collated variants. Although unusual this is not incredible (cf. pp. 308-309) but the means whereby such a reading has been reconstituted would seem to call for some note. This is not provided in the Apparatus Criticus nor in the Critical Notes (Sāntiparvan, p.2190). Perhaps the truth is that, confronted with irreconcilable readings the editors simply followed their textus optimus (K1 at this point, since S1 is missing) except for the rearrangement of stt.25-26. It may be, too, that because of the verse-by-verse method of collation used by the editors that the full dimensions of the problem escaped them.
The process of the incorporation of R

The preceding discussion has shown that R is best taken as a contamination, younger than the ancestral text (ω). From the evidence set out in Table VIII, which compares the readings of P, Q, R, we may additionally surmise that R began life as a gloss on either P or Q. It may have been intended as a substitution for stanzas 18-19(P) or 30-31(Q) by way of correction, or as a commentary on stanzas 18-19, or as a record of variant readings of stanzas 30-31. In every case, R will not have been intended for separate incorporation into the text proper. The question of its point of insertion is therefore not worthy of attention, except as an exemplary lesson in the vagaries of the incorporation process!

It is not possible to reconstruct with full certainty the history of the first incorporation of this satellite material and its subsequent transference to the other manuscripts in the tradition. Nevertheless, a qualified proposal may be offered.

As the first step in working up such a history, it is first of all necessary to reexamine the typology of Table XIIIIB. This typology achieved the negative purpose of demonstrating a diversity of variation such as to rule out the reconstruction of a single archetypal reading. For a constructive attempt to portray the dynamics of inter-manuscript infection it may well need some refinement of its classification.

---

9 For discussion of these alternatives, see notes to Table VIII.
In some instances, no problem arises: the variants which only omit passages (B0, M5, V1) may be put down to scribal carelessness without further ado. However, variants which appear to add or duplicate certain passages call for closer attention.

One such case is the duplication of verse 25cd in T2G2 (type III, 1)\textsuperscript{10}. The explanation that this duplication might have resulted from correction of *T2G2 against some other manuscript is not available here because no collated manuscript witnesses a verse-sequence which could have provided a model\textsuperscript{11} and also because the emended text, as extant (T2G2), does not make sense. It is possible to attribute the irregularity to an unusual kind of scribal error, but this counsel of despair has no positive recommendation. The only imaginable alternative would therefore seem to be the incorporation of stanza 25 and stanza 26 separately. Suppose, for instance that the text of *T2G2 first embraced stanza 25, giving the reading:

\begin{verbatim}
24abcdef 27abcdef 25abcd 28abcd
\end{verbatim}

and that subsequently, by correction against another manuscript which contained stanza 26, the missing verses were introduced in such a way that the incomplete text was breached one verse ahead of the

\textsuperscript{10} Such references relate to Table XIllB.
\textsuperscript{11} It is possible that such a text might have existed but has no extant witness or no collated witness, but since we are constrained to operate within the limitations of the material at our disposal and since we have no positive reason to assume that there is such a lack in our material, the explanation cannot be allowed.
lacuna leaving an unnoticed remnant in the passively copied master text:

... 25abcd 26abcd ...
24abcdef 27abcdef 25ab|cd 26abcd 25cd 28abcd

While such a course of events is imaginable, it too has nothing to recommend it. However in this respect it is instructive to look at Gl. As already noted, the extant text of Gl is best accounted for by envisaging the embedding of a contamination in an already disturbed text. What is significant for us at this point is that the embedded contamination consists of stanza 25 alone. This provides a precedent for positing a text of *T2G2 which once contained stanza 25 alone.

The proposal of this two-stage evolution of *T2G2 inspires a search for possible sources of the successive infections. The parallelism of stanzas 25-26 with stanzas 18-19 and 30-31 leaves no doubt that they were first ingested into the Sūntiparvan text tradition as a pair. The insertion into Gl and *T2G2 of stanza 25 alone is therefore to be seen as the result of either defective copying or the copying of a defective source. It is interesting to note that BC witnesses a suitably defective text, for it too lacks stanza 26. Rather than assume that the same...

An alternative is that after the insertion of st.26, vs.25cd was mistakenly recopied from the master text. Against this is the evidence of the variae lectiones in which the second occurrence reads differently from the first (samprāṇoṭi : sa prāṇoṭi). However so much in the variae lectiones is inexplicable that this is not conclusive.
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Unless st.26, formerly present, has been lost in the extant text. Since Gl has no collated "cognates" which would decide this question no decision is possible. The issue is then: which alternative serves the larger explanation?

See Table VIII.
scribal omission afflicted these texts independently, it seems wiser to look for some relationship between BO on the one hand and Gl, T2G2, and all the *S (type III) texts on the other. It is in fact possible to draw up a scenario which uses such a relationship to account for the readings of all *S texts with a minimum of sophistry. The scenario is set out in Table XV. With BO as the model for the infection of Gl, the insertion point of stanza 25, before 24ef27ab in both cases, may be accounted for. If *T2G2 was first infected from Gl, the insertion point of stanza 25 there, following 27cdef, may also be accounted for. Since this placement of stanza 25 is characteristic of all *S texts, the presumption is either that **T1G36 was similarly infected from Gl or *T2G2 or that the infection was between Gl and *T12G236: the latter has the advantage of simplicity. Essentially, then, the placement of stanza 25 in the *S text is seen as dependent upon a transformation explicable in terms of the abnormal text order of Gl. Pursuing the development of the scenario a step further, stanza 26 will have been added to **T1G36 and *T2G2 ultimately by correction against some other type I (B689...M167)

---

16 However since the omission is haplographic the chance of independent omission is increased.
17 It cannot be proved or disproved that **T1G36 incorporated stanzas 25 and 26 either together or sequentially.
18 The sophistry consists in convenient manipulation of the proposed points of attraction governing infections, placing them sometimes before (B689...M167 → T1G36) and sometimes behind (BO → Gl) the point of insertion.
In the case of *T2G2 the stanza will have
been incorporated in the manner described above, with
the result that verse 25ab is duplicated. The
secondary infection of stanza 26 has not reached G1.

This is, I believe, a credible account of the
readings of the *S manuscripts. However it lacks
independent corroboration; its acceptability can
therefore be judged only relative to the likelihood
and completeness of any contending account.

In terms of the formulae inferred in Table XIIIb,
K7 has an ambivalent position: it may be classed as a
variant of either type II (K124) or type 1,3
(Ds12D469). The former derivation is the more complex
and lacks any compensating advantages; the latter is
both simple and corroborated by the evidence of the
variae lectiones which put K7 with Ds12D469 on several
telling points.21

The suggested derivation of Ds12D469 (i.e. as
type 1,3) also needs reviewing. Formulaic convenience
led to the duplication of 24ef being attributed to the
secondary accretion of its first occurrence. However
there are a number of ways in which the duplication

19 Can it be inferred from the variae lectiones
(Table XVI) that the texts providing the source of
the infection were **M1567?
20 For instance in the variae lectiones (Table XVI)
25d, first variation, has B0 sharing a variant with
G1 and the second occurrences of T2G2 as expected.
But the significance of this is diluted by the
absence of GJ6.
21 See Table XVI. Although the evidence of the
variant groupings is subject to reservations (see
n.12 above; and notice the presence of D57
extraneously) its support should not be altogether
denied the latter derivation of K7.
may have arisen and to arrive at the most reasonable account it is necessary to consider the practicalities behind each possibility. The possibilities are:

(a) 24abcd [24ef 25abcd 26abcd ] 24ef 27abcdef

This arrangement implies a process parallel to that proposed for the derivation of T2G2 from T1G36 where conflation involved copying in from a more complete text beginning at a point where the texts were still parallel before the lacuna, only to leave a duplicate remnant in the master text to be passively copied in afterwards. Such an account cannot be accepted in this case for no collated manuscripts other than those involved (Dsl2D467, K7) witness the verse sequence 24ef-R necessary to provide a source for the infection.

(b) 24abcd [24ef ] [25abcd 26abcd ] 24ef27abcdef

This arrangement accords with Table XIV in seeing the first occurrence of 24ef as a secondary accretion. This is possible, for most collated manuscripts witness the sequence 24abcd-24ef, although no others witness the complete sequence 24abcd-24ef-25abcd and only K124V1 approximate the placement of 24ef before R.

(c) 24abcdef [25abcd 26abcd 24ef] 27abcdef

This arrangement might conceivably have arisen through conflation, where material to fill a lacuna (R) in the master text was copied in from the contributing text beginning one verse late but continuing on until the texts again became parallel. In short, virtually the reverse of (a). This infection has a possible source in B689...Ml67. The misalignment of the contributing text which led to the copying down of 24ef before R is not explained.

(d) 24abcdef [25abcd 26abcd ] [24ef ] 27abcdef

This arrangement might have arisen through the incorporation of R at the point 24ef x 27ab followed by a subsequent "correction" of the text against another of, presumably, the B689...Ml67 kind, thus leading to the incorporation of a duplicate second 24ef.
As with (c), the divergent points of insertion assumed for Ds12D469 and B689...M167 are not explained. However the secondary accretion may be explained by a desire to improve the text actuated by the already-noted obscurity of 27ab. Once R was in place in *Ds12D469, 24ef may well have been seen as providing a more satisfactory transition between stanzas 26 and 27. Certainly, something was needed.

Of these possibilities, (c) and (d) have most to recommend them.

Both (c) and (d) are built around the assumption of a point of insertion for R the same as that found in the otherwise differing texts of K124V1 (type II). It is not easy to accept that the same point of insertion should have arisen in two branches of the manuscript tradition by independent processes, especially when we recall that all surviving placements of R are not original and are to that extent arbitrary. It is therefore worthwhile examining the range of possible relationships between Ds12D469K7 (type I, J) and K124V1 (type II) to see if any more credible alternative account emerges. Possible relationships are:

(e) **Ds12D469K7 and *K124V1 may have been generated from a common hyparchetypal text in which R was not fully incorporated but in which the intended point of insertion was indicated as 24ef x 27ab. If such had been the case, in *K124V1 the contamination would have been copied into the text out of order; in *Ds12D469K7 it would have been copied in undisturbed. This proposal is in harmony with (d)22 which also takes R to have been incorporated

22 And of course also (b). However in view of the recommendation of (c) and (d) in para.18, only (d) is considered here.
in *Dsl2D469K7 independently of the duplication of 24ef, which is not found in K124V1.

(f) A variation of (e) would derive *K124V1 from *D12D469K7 after R had been incorporated there, but before the duplicated 24ef had been added. This, too, is in harmony with (d).

Both (e) and (f) give feasible accounts of the relationship between texts of type 1,3 and those of type II. There is little to choose between them, and in any case both weigh in favour of (d) rather than (c) of the previous paragraph. In Table XV they are bracketed.

It remains to say that in the preceding discussion (pages 273-280) there has sometimes been the unspoken conception that R was first incorporated into some part of the **B689...M167 group of texts and was subsequently spread by infection to other branches of the tradition - to *Dsl2D469K7 with a shift in its placement. However there is in fact no indication23 as to which placement is the older: it is equally possible to draw up a scenario with the infection spreading from the hyparchetype of *Dsl2D469K7, illustrated in Table XV, as from some hyparchetype of the **B689...M167 group.24

23 That is, nothing is deducible from the dynamics of the variations in text order. Other sources of inference - the evidence of the variance lectiones; the distribution of variant groups - are equally inconclusive.

24 I.e., **B689,...M167 → *Dsl2D469 (without 24ef^2) → (K124 → V1) (Dsl2D469 with 24ef^2 → K7) ...the remainder as in Table XV.
The lessons of the analysis

The qualifications which pepper the preceding pages show that the reconstruction proposed there cannot be definitive in detail. The limitations applying to all Mahābhārata analysis too often leave a slack which must be taken up by the subjective estimation of probabilities. However while the finer lines may thus be blurred, the main features of the process of incorporation remain distinct. It is therefore worthwhile to conclude with one or two broadly based observations about the relationships between branches of the manuscript tradition revealed by this contamination.

The single point of most interest for our analysis of the remainder of the story lies in the fact that we have in R a contamination which has achieved universal distribution across all collated manuscripts. It must be recalled that the editors of the Critical Edition have regarded as contamination only material which is absent in one branch of the manuscript tradition.

See pp. 435 et seqq. Pages 279-280 above give examples of cases in which details of the method of incorporation or the direction of infection are not determinable but where the fundamental grouping of readings and the knowledge that they are infection transformations remains unchallenged. Similarly, pages 275-277 above make it clear that if Gl had not been included in the manuscripts selected for collation it would not have been possible to suggest the precise paths of infection contaminating the S manuscripts; but the S manuscripts would not thereby have been any less distinct as a variant group.

In Sukthankar's standard-setting Prolegomena to the Ādiparvan he discusses "spurious additions" under the headings 'Interpolation' (c-cii) and 'The "Additional" Passages' (xciv-xxvii). The examples are all passages which occur in one recension of the manuscript tradition only; even these cases are cut out defensively. But note also Sukthankar, "Epic Studies III" p.272, where he discusses variant placements of interpolated material.
The instance of R undermines this assumption seriously. Only because of variations in placement was it possible to state incontrovertibly that R was a contamination; it would otherwise have been difficult to disengage it from the text, as indeed the Critical Edition has not. Yet by its example R shows that there has been a sufficiently high intensity of contact between branches of the manuscript tradition to allow infection to run wild.

So the case of R raises the spectre of a text riddled with contaminations camouflaged by their universality. If this fear were found to have substance, further work based on the Critical Edition text would be virtually paralysed. However it is a matter of judgement whether the case of R in fact provides real grounds for such strong fears.

Despite lacunae in three manuscripts, R's effective universality is not to be denied: the omissions would not have been sufficient, alone, to raise the suspicion of contamination. But, the camouflage potential of universality of distribution is only fully achieved when the universal distribution is accompanied by uniform placement. The analysis of R illustrates both sides of this point: on the one hand variations of placement were the key which unlocked the contamination, and yet on the other hand uniformity of placement in some

---

28 Table VIII may have been sufficient evidence in this unusual instance.

29 The omissions of parts of R in B0, Gl, K7 are no more remarkable than the omissions of older material in V1, M5 also shown on Table XV.
variant groups obscured details of the infection paths. So, whether or not R carries any warning for the remainder of our analysis hinges entirely upon an assessment of the frequency with which error in placement will accompany transfers of infection. Prima facie R's message is that a contamination will probably not achieve universal distribution without at least one tell-tale error of placement. If further evidence should indicate that this is so, the fears engendered earlier will have been shown to be illusory.

However, the comfort offered by R in this matter lasts only so long as there are no grounds for thinking that R might have been in any way abnormally error-prone. On this point, two factors of possible relevance spring to mind. First, since R was never intended for incorporation into the text, it is in a sense alien to every part of the chapter: it has no welcoming niche or logical anchor in the development of ideas in the text, so the potential controls of structure and sense are inoperative in R's case. This of course need not be so with other contaminations. And yet, even granted that R's placements may have been less stable on that account, the analysis still reveals instances of infection where no contributing factor can explain away pure mischance. Secondly, since

30 E.g. relationships between manuscripts within the group B669...M167, and the relationship of individual manuscripts of this group with, for instance, Ds12D469K7 are obscured.
31 Two such cases are the inversion in K124V1 and the repetition in T2G2. In other cases it could be possible to argue that the poor sense of R inserted anywhere meant that editorial self-correction was in abeyance, but in these two cases the readings are so self-evidently inferior that no such mitigation may be pleaded.
the chance of error is a function of the number of separate transfers of infection, it is important to know whether R might have gained its universal distribution through an unusually large number of such transfers. This is a problem of relativities which it is not possible to illuminate very greatly while we are still dependent upon variations in placement to number instances of infection and without a stemma codicum which is accurate in detail.\textsuperscript{32}

The analysis of R, by itself, has produced few definite results of unqualified wider application. Its fundamental lessons might be summarised as:

(a) that there are unidentified contaminations in the Critical Edition's reconstituted text;

(b) that there may be contaminations in the text which cannot be detected if we have to rely upon defective distribution across the collated manuscripts or variations in text-order as our sole indicators; and

(c) that, at least in the Moksadharmaparvan,\textsuperscript{33} there has been infection within the manuscript tradition of great intensity, adding weight to (a) and (b).

\textsuperscript{32} See further pp. 446-447 below.

\textsuperscript{33} Didactic material is prima facie more likely to have attracted the attention of scholars and scholiasts, and to have suffered at their hands, than narrative or descriptive material. Cf. Belvalkar's Editorial Note, \textit{Santarpan}, vol.1, p.iii, and below, p.444.
The extent and probable intended placement of the śraddhāpraśaṃsā interpolated into chapter 256 have been discussed Part A,¹ where it was made clear that the extant placements of the interpolation, both in the Vulgate text order and in the Critical Edition text order, are defective and that neither can embody the intention of the composer of the praśaṃsā. The question foreshadowed in Part A of how the extant placements arose has not yet been answered; nor am I able to provide a complete answer in the discussion which follows. Nevertheless it is possible to deduce something concerning the processes underlying these placements, and incidentally to throw light on the circumstances which have moulded the conclusion of the episode.

Placements of the śraddhāpraśaṃsā in ch.256

Since it has been shown that the form and (in one version) attachment of the śraddhā interpolation indicate that it had been intended for incorporation wholly at the end of the episode, the crux of any account of the extant placements of the material is the point of insertion common to both Vulgate and Critical Edition orders: 6 x 15cd. There is no discernible reason why the text should have been breached at this point for the insertion of any śraddhā material, or

¹ Pages 226-235 above.
for any other interpolation. Hence we are faced with the unnerving situation in which - despite other disagreements - the two versions of the text agree in breaching the ancestral text at the same point, without justification, with different material. This coincidence of errors is a centrally-important point which must be accommodated in any account of the two orders. Even though it were to remain unexplained itself, its very existence has ramifications.

The first lesson to be drawn from the coincidence of errors is that neither of the extant text orders can credibly be derived from the other. At first sight it might seem reasonable that the less chaotically arranged Vulgate text order should have produced the Critical Edition text order through some process of faulty transmission, but on reflection this proves incredible. The crudity of the severance of 22ab from 7ab in the Critical Edition-order text indicates that the necessarily presupposed displacement of 20-22ab must be put down to an accident of transmission; conscious production of such a result is inconceivable. Given this, it taxes one's credulity to imagine that the required accident should have befallen a passage begun by just the verse (20ab) which at some previous time had also been the first verse of an interpolation (20-22ab, 7-15ab) which had been incorporated into the Vulgate-ordered text in an earlier and independent process, and moreover that the severed head (20-22ab)

---

2 No structural feature invites the berthing of an accretion here; to the contrary in fact in view of 15cd's utter dependence upon st.6.
should have come to rest in the text at 3 the place
where we had inferred on the basis of content the
composer of the complete interpolation (20-22ab,
7-15ab) had intended it to be attached 4 in the first
place.

The alternative proposition, that the Critical
Edition order gave birth to the Vulgate order, also
lacks persuasive force. Before the proposition can
be accepted with any confidence, it has to be explained
how the Vulgate-ordered text could have been generated
from the Critical Edition order to this end, it might
be hypothesized that the Vulgate text is the product
of a conscious redactorial effort. To rectify the
Critical Edition text by reuniting verses 22ab and
7ab. This proposal is suspiciously selective in
asking us to believe in a farsighted editor who
perceived that verse 7ab belonged with verse 22ab and
determined to unite them, whose sensitivity to the
text was so delicate that he also perceived a
discontinuity between stanza 20 and what preceded it,
and who was so willing to innovate that he linked these

3 Our precision in saying in Part A (p. 235 above).
that the intended point of insertion had been
19 x 22cd was based upon the presence of a fragment
of the interpolation at this point. Since in this
paragraph we are assuming that this came as a later
development, we must be content with the less
precise fixing of point of insertion at any place
after Bhīṣma resumes speaking (i.e. 16xx). The
point x22cd still seems the best offering, even on
this less stringent criterion.

4 This coincidence is made less striking by the fact
that the point of insertion does not fall directly
after the proposed point of attraction (st. 16) but
at the end of the chapter, also the end of the
episode - a place to which accretions might resort
faute de mieux.
two flaws in a common strategy to improve his text, and yet who was blind to the broken continuity between stanzas 6 and 16. But a greater objection is that, selectivity aside, the proposal requires us to endow the reviser with an unprecedented degree of critical detachment, editorial finesse and downright disrespectful radicalism in recognizing and pursuing the suggested means of text revision. On a second front, the proposal is deficient in that it envisages the Critical Edition text as the progenitor of all extant readings while also accepting the self-evident truth that verses 22ab and 7ab were first composed together. Acceptance of this latter fact means that the Critical Edition text cannot be taken to embody the oldest stage in the evolution of the text: it must itself have been derived from some older arrangement of the text in which 20-22ab, 7-15ab was a continuum. It is not explained how the Critical Edition text order might have arisen from that antique order, and while it is possible to invoke an accident of transmission there, such a deus ex machina does little to assuage our anxieties.

The fundamental reason for this cumulation of negatives is that the śraddha interpolation (20-22ab, 7-15ab) begins unannounced: it has no introduction. This means that once it has been incorporated into any text it has lost its individuality; and any hypothesized process of derivation which depends upon its reextraction, intact,
becomes inherently unlikely.\(^5\) This bar would not operate if it were possible in some way for the śraddhā material to have been at once part of and yet still distinguished from the body of the text at the time(s) when the two extant text orders arose. Such wishful thinking can be given expression in reality by assuming that the śraddhā material existed as a satellite to the archetypal text at the time the two variant orders arose. If this had been the case, the persistence of the interpolation as a distinct entity in each of the two patterns would no longer be a problem; and the shared peculiarity of the unwarranted point of insertion 6 x 15cd need not be the product of incredible coincidence, but could be attributed to some feature of the single archetypal text from which both extant versions have sprung. An account along these lines might be imagined thus:

The śraddhāprāsāmsā was composed or compiled by a transmitter of the text who wished to rationalize Jājali's position by capitalizing on Tulādhāra's orthodox virtue. He added his composition marginally or by interleaving (or both) on tc text I indicating that its point of insertion should be at the conclusion of ch.256. In the copying off of text IIA his instructions were partly followed and the first few

---

\(^5\) This statement may appear question-begging, for in this analysis we have in fact identified the interpolated material and in a manner "extracted" it. But on this, two points need to be made: (1) our identification results from systematic and critically detached searching founded on the expectation that accretion may have taken place; (2) the passage was only delineable initially because we were aware of the two differing text orders: without a critical collation of divergent text orders, the subsequently recognizable discreteness of the śraddhā material would not have been apparent (as it was not to the editors of the Critical Edition).
stanzas of his interpolation were inserted in their intended position, but owing to some peculiarity of Text I or the manner in which the new material had been attached to it, the copyist had already inserted the bulk of the prāśaṃsā after 256.6. In the copying off of text IIB the same features of text I led to the whole prāśaṃsā being inserted after 256.6.

It is possible to conceive of schemes which differ in points of detail, but the alternatives they offer are less likely and less simply enacted. Even in the account just outlined, clearly some things are still unexplained - above all, the undefined peculiarity of text I which led to insertions at 6 x 15cd. But an account of the kind outlined has the great advantage over those discussed previously that it requires us to believe in nothing unusual or improbable and no coincidence greater than that the text I should have been copied on two occasions after the śraddhāprāśaṃsā had been tied to it. More generally, the account proposed gains strength from the fact that its mechanism relies not upon any exceptional case of revision but upon the familiar process of expansion of the text through the incorporation of marginal or interleaved material.

An alternative possibility, that we have two independent ingestions from an outside source in which the śraddhāprāśaṃsā had a discrete individuality (e.g. in some well-known text), founders through lack of any explanation for the two insertions at 6 x 15cd if for no other reason. Another, that the material was part-incorporated into the hyparchetype of one variant group and then infected from that satellite position into another hyparchetype is rendered suspect by the insertions at 6 x 15cd, which would have to be explained by, for instance, assuming the concomitant copying of a mistaken insertion marker along with the interpolation.

See Sukthankar, Ādiparvan, p.xcv. The unexceptional nature of this process is witnessed by the state of some of the collated manuscripts in which new material has been added marginally or interleaved; and by the analysis of certain passages - notably 254.P, Q, R - which are explicable only through this process.
The question now arises as to whether we cannot be more precise over the identity of the texts labelled I, IIA and IIB. If we assumed that IIA and IIB were hyparchetypes from which all extant texts preserving their readings (the Critical Edition and Vulgate orders respectively) are genetically descended, thus dividing all the collated texts into a pair of complementary genetic groups, it would follow that text I could be none other than the ancestral text \( \omega \) from which all collated manuscripts are ultimately descended. It should be noted however that once the interpolation is incorporated into any text, in either text order, it may be infected in the form in which it stands into any collateral text and if its transfer were accomplished without error it would leave no trace in the extant witnesses. Therefore, all that acceptance of the hypothetical IIA and IIB necessarily implies is that there were at least two instances of infection; it does not imply that there were only two - although all things being equal there is a presumption in favour of fewer rather than more instances of infection. To gauge the most likely number of infections, and thereby to locate texts I, IIA and IIB on a stemma codicum, it is necessary to determine the standing of the variant groups defined in terms of Vulgate or Critical Edition text order vis-à-vis the groupings revealed by other variants in the text.

The variations to be considered fall naturally into two classes:

(a) variations which affect the \( \text{sraddhāprāśamsā} \) itself and which may therefore throw light on
the dynamics of its incorporations or reveal secondary groupings; or
(b) variations which affect the text surrounding the śraddhāprasāmsā, and which may therefore reveal competing groupings to which it is necessary to accommodate the conclusions drawn from (a).

Variations in the śraddhāprasāmsā

A variation of likely significance is that revealed by the anomalous text of K4, which reads 7-15ab in place but omits 20-22ab altogether. The precise correspondence of this lacuna to one of the fragments of the divided śraddhāprasāmsā of the Critical Edition text order makes it plain not only that K4 is a defective Critical Edition-ordered text (not a Vulgate-ordered text) but also that the absence of 20-22ab cannot credibly be dismissed as the aberration of a careless copyist who happened to skip five ślokās—despite the fact that the anomaly appears in a single text. It is too coincidental that the reading of K4 should have arisen through defective preservation of a once-complete Critical Edition-ordered text; rather it must be understood either as witnessing yet another, defective incorporation of the marginal śraddhāprasāmsā, collateral with *W and *ES, or as the result of an incomplete infection of śraddhā material from a Critical Edition-ordered source into a text which had no śraddhāprasāmsā. The latter alternative has the advantage of not unnecessarily complicating the processes of incorporation of the hypothesized marginal
şraddhā material, while itself assuming nothing that is not straightforward. In either case a collateral branch of the tradition has to be proposed alongside the Critical Edition- and Vulgate-ordered branches.

Another reading which has a potential for throwing light on the history of the şraddhāpraśamsā is that witnessed by the M texts where the şraddhāpraśamsā appears in the continuous, Vulgate form (6 x 15cd) but is immediately followed by 22cd, giving the sequence 15ab22cd15cd. It is remarkable what a handsome couple 15ab and 22cd make:

15ab This is the dharma related by the good [who] perceive the meaning of dharma.

22cd After instruction by this example, what do you wish to hear further?

Despite the attractiveness of this pairing, it is difficult to maintain that 22cd was originally composed as a conclusion to the şraddhāpraśamsā, as this reading certainly suggests, for to do so it would be necessary not only to explain why 22cd has been dropped from this context in all other texts but also to discount the fact that it appears throughout N consistently as the conclusion of chapter 256 regardless of the configuration of the şraddhā material. This constancy of placement and range of distribution suggests that 22cd might best be seen as part of *N, independent of, and presumably anterior

---

8 256.15ab:
iti dharmaḥ samākhyātaḥ sadbhir dharmārthadarśibhiḥ /

22cd:
yathaupamyopadeśena kim bhūyāḥ śrotum icchasi //
the incorporation of the śraddha material. For the same reasons, 22cd cannot be seen as having been part of the hypothesized satellite material from the incorporations of which the Vulgate and Critical Edition orders have been supposed to have arisen.

For the sake of illustrating where these observations have led us, the hyparchetypes proposed may be mapped out on top of a simple conventional stemma embodying the conventional primary two-fold N:S division. Since all the variations of the śraddhāpraśāmsā placement - the Vulgate-ordered text, the Critical Edition-ordered text, the partly uncontaminated text (*K4) - are represented in N, and since the Vulgate-ordered text and the Critical Edition-ordered text both have respectable representation in N but not in S, it is highly likely that the hyparchetype in which the śraddhāpraśāmsā first appeared as satellite material was a first generation descendant of *N. This can be said with

9 The assumption of priority depends upon the hyparchetype *N being more than an illusory construct expressing the affinity of the N texts. Given that *N is real, 22cd's claim to priority over the śraddhāpraśāmsā springs from the fact that its distribution covers exactly the whole N recension, while the Critical Edition and Vulgate text orders divide N into subgroupings.

10 See Table XXV.

11 In S, only G2 represents the Critical Edition text order. To place the first appearance of the satellite material in S would therefore mean proposing the ancestor of G2 and some other S text(s) as the originating hyparchetype, and proposing infection into N on a later level. Apart from being inherently less probable because of the isolation of G2 in S, there is the difficulty of explaining the broad agreement of the N partition with descent groups inferred by editors of the Critical Edition.
confidence, but not with certainty; it is the least complex solution.

The duplication of stanza 20

Discussion of the history of the śraddhāpraśamsā is not complete without consideration of the distributions of stanza 20. It is remarkable that this stanza appears twice in the S texts,¹² first at the head of the śraddhāpraśamsā and then again as the final stanza of the chapter, after stanzas 19, 17, 18.¹³ This latter occurrence calls for some explanation. The suggestion which first springs to mind is that stanza 20² in these S texts is the product of infection from a Critical Edition-ordered text in which the stanza 20 heading the śraddhāpraśamsā also follows stanzas 19, 17, 18.¹⁴ However, on the usual assumption that an infection is intended to rectify a perceived lacuna in the recipient text, it is hard to explain why the infection should have comprised stanza 20 alone without the immediately following stanza 21 and 22ab,cd.¹⁵ Until this selectiveness can be explained, the notion that the duplication has arisen from such a cause loses credibility.

¹² All S, excepting G2, plus D6 under different circumstances.
¹³ Or 17, 18, 19 in M5.
¹⁴ An obvious candidate for the source of the infection is the interloper G2 which, while cohabiting with Vulgate-ordered S texts, itself follows the Critical Edition order. Other candidates, selected for their relative affinity with S in other variations and their parallel ordering of stanzas 17-19, are K7D469.
¹⁵ Even if it were supposed that 22ab,cd were dropped because of incomprehensibility, stanza 21 is still in question.
An alternative approach to the question takes as its point of departure the fact that st.20 appears at the end of chapter 256 in the S texts. In this respect it has a complementary distribution with 22cd, which is the last verse of chapter 256 in the N texts. The cleanliness of the complementary division and its correspondence with the conventionally accepted N:S dichotomy invite us to presume that each reading has descended genetically from the hyparchetypes *S and *N respectively. Hence these counterpart readings might advantageously be discussed in tandem for the light each may throw upon the other's raison d'être.

From its content, it is clear that vs. 22cd was intended to provide a transition from the Tulādhāra story to a following episode by introducing a further question asked by Yudhīsthira. Yet what follows 22cd in all N texts is not a question asked by Yudhīsthira. The next chapter begins abruptly in a manner which would be jarring whether 22cd was present or absent:

257.1: On this point is adduced the ancient tradition chanted by King Vicakhnu out of compassion for living creatures.

In fact, the nearest point in the Critical Edition text to which the verse 22cd provides a satisfactory transition is the question put by Yudhīsthira later in chapter 257:

16 That it will lead to a question asked by Yudhīsthira is evident from (a) the fact that 22cd is put in Bhīṣma's mouth; and (b) comparison with other transitions from one episode or issue to another.

17 257.1: 

atrapy udāharantīmam itihāsam purātanam / 
prajānam anukampārtham gītām rajāṇa vicakhnunā //
257.12: Misfortunes militate against the body of one who does no injury. How can the bodily sustenance of one who abstains [from injury] be effected? 18

The inescapable inference is that 22cd was composed and incorporated with this or a similar 19 connexion in mind; not with 257.1-11 in mind, presumably because 257.1-11 did not then follow chapter 256 but has been added subsequently. Thus the N texts, which read 22cd at the end of chapter 256 probably once passed straight on into 257.12-13.

With the S texts, the picture is quite the reverse. There is no verse 22cd to act as a stumbling block obstructing a smooth passage from chapter 256 to chapter 257. In 257.1-11, King Vicakhnu preaches entirely conventional teachings concerning the degradation of Vedic sacrifice 20 to the degree that killing is now done for improper motives 21 and with improper rites, 22 so that now one should have recourse only to non-injurious puja. 23 Vicakhnu's teaching is thus in thorough agreement with the dominant themes of

18 257.12:
śarīram āpadaś cāpi vivadanty avihimsatah /
kathāṁ yātā śarīrasya nirārambhasya setasyati ///

19 An alternative would be 258.1. It is not credible that 257.1-11 formerly had an introduction (a question by Yudhiṣṭhira?) which has now disappeared. Not only is there no evidence that such an introduction ever existed, but it would have to be accepted that the introduction evaporated from a number of collateral texts while 22cd, composed when it was present, persisted.

20 257.4, 9, 11.
21 257.5cd, 10ab.
22 257.9.
23 257.10cd-11.
the fully developed Tulādhāra story. More importantly it also accords with the viewpoint expressed in the immediately preceding stanza 20:

which, in S texts, ends chapter 256:

256.20: The purported sacrifice enacted by fully self-controlled, faithful, imperturbable [men] is not to be dismissed out of hand as a [valid] sacrifice.

The compatibility of 256.20 and 257.1-11 suggest that either they were composed or incorporated together or that the presence of 256.20, presumably drawing the moral of the developed Tulādhāra story, invited the attachment of Vicakhnu's hymn by way of elaboration. Since 256.20 is branded by its deficient distribution as an accretion no earlier than *S and since, on the basis of the N reading we rejected the claim of 257.1-11 to have been part of the ancestral text (ω), there is no reason not to suppose that 256.20 and the following Vicakhnu hymn were in fact composed together, jointly drawing the moral of the Tulādhāra story.

In accordance with the foregoing it is possible to posit the following readings for the archetype and hyparchetypes:

24 Discussion of proper forms of sacrifice occupies part of chapter 254 and the whole of chapter 255. Vicakhnu's words in 257.2-3 ff strikingly recall the story of King Nahuṣa, 254.46-48, who is condemned by pūjīs for killing a cow.

25 256.20, following the reading of the second occurrence in S:

samanāṃ śraddadannānaṁ yuktānāṃ ca yathābalam* /
kuruvaṁ yajña ity eva na yājñā jātu nēsyate //

* See below p.318 for this reading.
\[ \omega: 256.18 \text{ or } -19, 257.12-13^{26} \]
\[ *N: 256.-22cd, 257.12-13 \]
\[ *S: 256.-20, 257.1-11, 12-13 \]

A feature of the readings underlying the critical reconstruction of chapter 257 which has not been mentioned is the duplication of 257.12-13 in T1G36 and 257.13 in D7G1. This irregularity offers corroboration for the hyparchetypes proposed above.

Since there are no grounds upon which to presume

26 For consistency with our treatment of 257.1-11, which we identified as a contamination, despite universal distribution, because of its dependence upon stanza 256.20\(^2\), it might be argued that we are obliged to confine 257.12-13 to the N recension alone, making its appearance contemporaneous with 256.22cd. However, while not denying the possibility that this was so, I believe that it is preferable to assign 257.12-13 to the ancestral text (\(\omega\)). Its case is to be distinguished from that of 257.1-11 on the following grounds: (a) it is not dependent upon 256.22cd in the substantial sense that 257.1-11 is dependent upon 256.20; 256.22cd is simply a mechanism by which a substantively neutral transition is accomplished; (b) if 256.22cd were aligned with 257.12-13, making the ancestral text (\(\omega\)) jump from 256.18 or 19 directly to 258.1, the situation is in no way improved, for 258.1 is yet another of Yudhîshthira's questions in relation to which 256.22cd might have had exactly the same function as it has been given in relation to 257.12-13. It cannot therefore be argued that 256.22cd and 257.12-13 necessarily appeared contemporaneously without going on to explain how it was that 256.22cd or something analogous had not been present in the ancestral text. On the other hand it might be argued with cogency that the incorporation of 257.12-13 would have provided an occasion, as well as the motive, for the composition of 256.22cd. (The later discussion of 256.17ab\(^2\) is enlightening here - see p.367). In circumstances of such indecision, I have erred on the conservative side, assigning 257.12-13 to the ancestral text.

As an ancillary remark only, and not as any part of the above argument, it might be added that the issue dealt with in 257.12-13 relates to ideas developed on the oldest level of the evolution of the Tuladhāra story.
internal replication, the simplest explanation of the anomalous first placement of 257.(12-13) in TG is to see it as having been derived from a source in which 257.12-13 followed directly on from the end of chapter 256. The hyparchetype *N has such a reading, and the extant forms of D7T1G136 may therefore be taken as indication that a hyparchetype in this configuration once existed, although no longer witnessed in that form.

The original context of stanza 20

The preceding proposals, which cluster around the duplication of stanza 20 in S, stand or fall by our ability to account for stanza 20 both as part of the Vicakhnu story as it seems to be in its second occurrence in S and as part of the śraddhā material as it seems to be in all recensions. In elucidating this dualism, it would be useful if we were able to point:

28 Taking it that 121-131 is the copy, producing a deviation from the more widely witnessed pattern - it is difficult to imagine the motive of a transmitter who would consciously produce this result; moreover the copying involves him in anticipation (bringing 122-132 forward to become 121-131). Nor do the variation profiles of 121-131 and 122-132 give any support to the idea of internal replication as they might have if, for instance, the readings 1 and 2 shared significant (i.e. non-grammatical) variants not witnessed outside TG. Such evidence is lacking.

If 121-131 were not the copy, but rather the older reading, this part of the discussion is short-circuited, as the primacy of the reading in which 12-13 follows directly after chapter 256 is not in dispute.

29 Whether through descent from the ancestral text (w), in which case 121-131 is the older reading, or through infection from a text in the configuration of w or *N, in which case 121-131 is the younger reading in TG, does not matter: in either case the placement can be traced back to an w-like text.
to which of the contexts is the older, concomitantly suggesting the processes by which the duplication arose. We have a choice between (a) deriving the stanza 20 of EW, which is part of the śraddhāpraśamsā, from S; or alternatively (b) deriving the stanza 20\(^2\) of S, associated with the Vicakhnu story, from the stanza 20 of EW.

In determining the direction of derivation the first factor we have to consider is the relationship of the stanzas 20 to their respective contexts, for it is necessary that in the source proposed as that from which the infection spread, stanza 20 should be shown to have a discrete entity - to be, as it were, detachable. Let us therefore examine stanza 20 in each of its contexts:

(a) in conjunction with the śraddhā material. The śraddhā material comprises a section denoted as "stanzas sung by Brahmā"\(^30\) introduced in verse 7cd and concluded in verse 15ab, together with three preliminary stanzas which introduce the stanzas sung by Brahmā and, apparently, link it to the story of Tulādhāra. It has been remarked elsewhere\(^31\) that the topic of the Brahmā hymn has only a superficial and tenuous connexion with any part of the Tulādhāra story. Whereas we then tied the whole of the śraddhā material to the mention of śraddhā in stanza 16, it has now become possible to put forward an alternative: that the śraddhāpraśamsā depends not from stanza 16 but from stanza 20. Analysis of the pivotal stanzas supports this view.

---

\(^{30}\) 256.7c: gāthā brahmagītah.

\(^{31}\) Pages 235-236 above.
śraddhā alongside other virtues
śraddhā vis-à-vis other virtues in sacrifice
śraddhā alone supreme

From the above it may be inferred that stanza 22ab7ab is in effect a recapitulation of stanza 20, revising it in the direction promulgated in stanza 21 and continued in the Brahma hymn, which follows. This arrangement, and in particular the order and substance of stanzas 21 and 22ab7ab, is entirely compatible with the notion that stanza 20 was an older base upon which sttt.21...15ab were later anchored. The common ground between stanzas 20 and 16 is as easily attributable to S as to EW. In content, then, stanza 20 may appear discrete from the remainder of the śraddhā material. However it is never to be forgotten that we have shown32 that all the śraddhā material, including stanza 20, took form as a satellite of *EW and that consequently stanza 20 and the remainder of the śraddhā material are not lightheartedly to be placed upon

32 Pages 289-290 above.
separate alignments.\textsuperscript{33}

(b) in conjunction with the Vicakhnu story.

By contrast, the relationship in which stanza 20\textsuperscript{2} stands to the Vicakhnu story is straightforward. The Vicakhnu song\textsuperscript{34} is relevant to stanza 20\textsuperscript{2} and directly, explicitly linked to it by the \textit{atra} ('concerning this') of 257.1a.\textsuperscript{35} Nevertheless, stanza 20\textsuperscript{2} is given some distance from the clinging Vicakhnu story by the chapter division which intervenes in all extant texts. With this division it is conceivable that although Vicakhnu's hymn may have been present in \textit{S} and dependent upon stanza 20\textsuperscript{2}, stanza 20\textsuperscript{2} might still have been copied out independently of the Vicakhnu material or, if the two were copied together, that in the recipient text stanza 20\textsuperscript{2} could nevertheless be dealt with as a discrete entity.

From a comparison of these contexts it emerges that by subject matter and internal make-up the Vicakhnu material has an intimacy with stanza 20 shared by the Brahm\textmu hymn; and that whereas the \textit{sraddh\textbar} material is bound tightly by extrinsic factors to stanza 20, the Vicakhnu story's bonds are looser. On the likely assumption that stanza 20 did have its

\textsuperscript{33} This issue has already caused us to d\textit{n}y the admissibility of deriving the stanza 20\textsuperscript{2} of \textit{S} through part-copying of the \textit{sraddh\textbar} material of a \textit{W} (= Critical Edition-ordered) text. See p.295 above.

\textsuperscript{34} 257.1 tells us that stanzas 2-11 are \textit{itih\textdasam pur\textbar tanam} \ldots \textit{gita\textam raj\textbar na vicakh\textdu}, \ldots[an] ancient tradition chanted by King Vicakh\textnu."

\textsuperscript{35} 257.1ab:
\begin{quote}
\textit{atra\textbar py ud\textbar harant\textbar imam itih\textdasam pur\textbar tanam} / \\
"On this point men adduce this ancient tradition...".
\end{quote}

The force of \textit{atra} is weakened somewhat by the formulaic nature of the verse.
origin in combination with one of these extant elaborations, the choice will have to be the Vicakhnu story in S.

This result is inconclusive in two ways. First, because we have not given an account of credible processes by which our chosen derivation (S → N) might have occurred. Second, it may well be that there are advantages in assuming that stanza 20 arose in combination with the Vicakhnu material (the honing of Ockam's razor; the difficulty of otherwise accounting for the impetus behind stanza 20) but nevertheless it is not certain that stanza 20 did not arise independently and to the extent of that uncertainty our preference for an origin of stanza 20 in S must be conditional. It behoves us, therefore, to investigate possible schemes of infection in each direction, looking for corroboration or refutation of our tentative conclusion.

For the sake of controversy let us first suppose that the earliest appearance of stanza 20 was in some source other than S. The constraints of its association with the śraddhāpraśamsā in varying placements mean that it began life as satellite material; the content analysis of stanzas 21, 22ab7ab implies that stanza 20 existed prior to the bulk of the śraddhā material. Within these parameters, the scheme set out in Table XXVI is the most elegant which can be devised. The arrangement depicted there offers simple accounts of the presence of stanza 20 in S; of the compound structure of stanzas 20, 21, 22ab7ab; and of the shared point of
insertion of stanzas 20 and 20² in W and S respectively. On the other hand, it requires multiple derivation from a single manuscript (ω) to which it imputes a great longevity or authority.³⁶ The proposal also has the disadvantage that it is incompatible with the attribution of verse 22cd to *N because it derives K4, E and W from the same parent text which spawned S, where verse 22cd is not present; - which does not assist in attempts to account for stanza 22cd.³⁷ Finally, it is not easy to account for stanza 20's composition when it appears at first alone rather than as a prelude to the Vicakhnu material.

An alternative array of processes would transfer stanza 20 from **S to become a satellite of *EW. The more credible of these processes³⁸ propose that stanza

-----

³⁶ These qualities, particularly that of great authority, are more convincingly attributed to the ancestral text (ω) from which all the collated texts descend than to any other. This mitigates; does it exculpate?


³⁸ Other hypotheses do not depend upon the stanza 20 + Vicakhnu combination but they are not discussed in detail here because they cannot challenge the N → S derivation already outlined for simplicity. As an example of such an hypothesis note the following sketch and outline.

---
20 and the Vicakhnu story arose in combination and that stanza 20 was embellished with stanzas 21...15ab by the same hand which added it as a satellite to *EW, thereby avoiding shortcomings which made the N → S process described in the previous paragraph suspect. The most attractive of these processes would be outlined thus:

Stanza 20 was composed in *S as a prelude to the Vicakhnu material. The formal (chapter) division separating stanza 20 from Vicakhnu's song allowed stanza 20 to be singled out for independent infection as a satellite to *EW with elaboration in the form of the śraddhā material. The Vicakhnu story arrived in EW texts by a later process of infection.

This proposal has no positive evidence to corroborate it, but in certain respects it gives accommodation where other proposals give none. First, if 257.121-131 is the result of infection39 this proposal offers a more credible range of potential sources of infection by delaying the incorporation of the Vicakhnu material into EW texts.40 Secondly, given

38 (cont.) Stanza 20 appears alone in *S, is transferred and elaborated in *EW. Subsequently in **MT2, stanza 20 is elaborated with the Vicakhnu story which in turn contaminates all collateral branches including K4, with a misplacement in *D7T1G136 which explains the anomalous placement of 257.12-131. A subsequent correction (from ? M) accounts for 257.12-132. This explanation has no advantage over those discussed in the body of the text in that it too assumes separate infections of stanza 20 and the Vicakhnu material. What it gains by not having to explain the divorce of stanza 20 and Vicakhnu it loses by having to account for the appearance of stanza 20 alone in S.

39 Note that this is not necessarily the explanation of 257.12-131. See p. 300 and nn. 28, 29 above.

40 If *M and not *S is seen as the source of the *EW infection, the D7T1G anomaly may be put down to an independent infection **M → **D7T1G136. Cf. the scheme outlined in note 38 above. However there is no reason to think that *S was not the infection source.
that there is a divorce of stanza 20 from the Vicakhu material, the separation is better put in *S than in *EW. It is no less likely (since in either case it springs from the same structural discontinuity: the chapter division) but separation in *S relieves tensions over the Vicakhu material's non-participation in the śraddhāpraśāsanā's placement acrobatics, and further over the fact that the presumably older verse 22ed intervenes between stanza 20 and the Vicakhu story in all EW texts. Finally, the combination of stanza 20 and the śraddhā material in the position of satellite makes it prima facie desirable that the insertion of stanza 20 and its elaboration should be attributed to the same hand. This desideratum is well served by the notion that stanza 20 was alone plucked out of *S because of its particular attractiveness to some transmitter-editor. Completing the circle, we might also say that the śraddhāpraśāsanā gives us an

\[41\] The alternative would be that stanza 20 and the Vicakhu material were together transferred to *EW from *S, but once attached to *EW were treated separately, presumably because the formal (chapter) division of *S was maintained or exacerbated in the infection onto *EW. See further the following note \[42\].

\[42\] It might be argued from Vicakhu's universal distribution that its transfer is best placed on the earliest possible alignment, i.e. contemporaneously with stanza 20. But to allow this embroils us in insupportable complexities: was stanza 20 added marginally to *EW while the Vicakhu material was interleaved in a new chapter, thus explaining their separate fates? Is the contaminator of stanza 20 and the Vicakhu material likely to have given stanza 20 a new elaboration in the śraddhā material to boot?

\[43\] Despite the qualifications of note 36 above.
Inkling of the contaminator's motivation in adding stanza 20 to his text (*EW).

From this discussion of credible processes of infection in the preceding two paragraphs, it seems that inconclusive backing is given to the idea that stanza 20 arose in *S as a prelude to the Vicakhnu story and upon addition to *EW received elaboration in the form of the śraddhāprāśamsā.

The original reading of 256.20b

Another way in which this conclusion may be tested is by studying the variant readings of stanza 20 to determine whether any lines of derivation can be inferred from them. For 20a,c,d the variants recorded are insignificant; in the case of 20b however there is a wide divergence of readings.

In setting down the original reading of 20b, the editors of the Critical Edition have fixed upon samyatānām sucetasām. Although they offer no justification for adopting a reading witnessed in only six of the collated texts, it may be presumed that this reading was selected from those extant on the grounds that of the two readings represented in both N and S it makes the better sense. Amidst the considerable variety and diversity of readings underlying 20b, however, it is not necessarily true that any extant text preserves the original reading.

44 K6 D236'8 Dn14 Gl: not a distinguished distribution.
45 The alternative is sammatānām sucetasām, represented in 24 collated texts.
Reconstruction of the original reading should therefore not aim primarily to select the extant reading with the most impressive qualifications of distribution or sense, but should rather try to work out how all the extant readings have been generated.

In the present case this task is conveniently undertaken in two stages: first, by taking the smallest sense unit and considering each of the phrases comprising 20b separately; and secondly, by considering 20b as a whole.

The first phrase of 20b:

1. **samyatānām**
   - "of the self-controlled"
   - K6 D236 18 Dmi4 G1 [C.E.]

2. **tanmatānām**
   - "of those who are considered to be such"
   - S1 K127

3. **tanmatinām**
   - "of those who are so minded"
   - D4

4. **sanmatinām**
   - "of the noble minded"
   - D6 2 9

5. **sammatānām**
   - "of the highly honoured"
   - V1 B06789 D57 Dsl2 Da34 T1 1 G2 1 1 6 1 Ml 1 5 1 6 1 1

6. **sammitanām**
   - "of the measured-out" (sic)
   - T2

7. **yuktānām ca**
   - "and of those who are engrossed"
   - G2, all S 2

To this array of variant readings we must apply the dilemmatic rules of thumb that the lectio difficilior is the more primitive but that readings which are
defective in sense are corruptions. On grounds of lack of good sense inherently or in context, readings 2 and 6 may be disqualified. Probably 3 should follow them. At any rate 2, 3 and 4 are a clump of closely related readings which may be arranged in a chain of deterioration $4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2$ leading from good sense to no sense. Once disqualified, 6 may be put down as an aberrant copy of 5.

Having eliminated inferior readings, we are left with four principal readings:

1. $samya^\text{ā}tanam$
2. $sammatanam$
3. $sammatanam$
4. $yuktanam ca$

Of these, 1, 4 and 5 clearly have greater affinity with one another than any one of them has with 7. It may be observed further that each of 1 and 4 has a greater resemblance to 5 than either one does to the other.

From this we may infer either that 5 is the source from which 1 and 4 have derived independently, or that 5 is a link through the medium of which either 1 or 4 has derived from the other. The relationship of 1, 4 and 5 with 7 is less intimate. None of 1, 4 and 5 is

---

46 Given the general presumption that composers produce coherent material, which may suffer corruption or revision at the hands of transmitters, argument imputing coherence to the oldest reconstructible reading is not ipso facto valid when the oldest reading is that of the ancestral text ($\omega$), for that is the legacy of a composer and transmitters. On the other hand, argument imputing coherence to the parent reading of a contamination is valid for that is the first-hand work of a composer (so far as the tradition is concerned). Note however that it cannot be argued that the parent reading of a contamination is necessarily the most coherent extant reading.

47 Diagrammatically, either $5 \rightarrow 4$ or $1 \Rightarrow 5 \Rightarrow 4$.
particularly close to 7 in meaning; in form alone 1 has a tenuously greater similarity to 7. Solely from this last point it might be inferred either than 1 was the source from which 7 sprang, or vice versa. In the former case, either 1 or 5 would be the oldest extant reading; if the latter, the 7 would be the oldest extant reading and 5 a bridge in the derivation chain 1 5 4. Whether either of these insecurely founded inferences will prove to be probabilities depends upon analysis of the second phrase and of 20b as a whole.

The second phrase of 20b:

11 sucestasām "of the intelligent"
   V1 B06789 D2356178 Dn1 Ds2 Tl121 G13161 M1516171
12 svacetasaṁ "of their own minds"
   K6 Ds1
13 sucestasa "intelligently"
   Dn4
14 yathābalam "to the limit of one's strength"
   G1 K127
15 grathābalam ? "gathering one's power"
   G2, all S2

48 I am reluctant to put 5 down as the oldest (extant) reading for reasons of sense. The other characteristics listed in 20ab are calmness, faithfulness, and wisdom. The characteristic added by 1: self-control or by 4: purity of mind are, like the rest, inherent qualities. That added by 5: high esteem is an extrinsic attribution which ill fits the list. Such an argument would have no validity were it not for the fact that, being a contamination, the earliest appearance of 20 in the tradition is synonymous with its composition (at least so far as the tradition is concerned). We are therefore promoting 5 not to the status of a mere ancestral reading (ω) but to the status of an original reading (pseudo-α). On this, see note 25 above. The Critical Edition editors, it seems, shared these qualms concerning 5.
On the grounds of lack of sense (12) and poverty of witness (13) combined with affinity in form, 12 and 13 may be eliminated as being corruptions of 11. The reading grāthābālam of 15 is puzzling. This compound is unknown to lexicographers and receives no special note or qualification from the Critical Edition editors. It is likely therefore that it is simply a misprint and in fact should be read as yathābālam.

I will proceed on this assumption.

The second phrase of 20b is thus resolved into a pair of irreconcilable readings which have nothing in common beyond metric suitability. The sub-variants of each of these principal readings may be attributed to carelessness in copying or unconscious error, but the two principal readings cannot be explained other than by supposing that a conscious substitution has been made - in one direction or the other. To arbitrate between the principal readings on their claim for originality we must turn to consider 20b as a whole, taking the first and second phrases in conjunction.

49 Mw, GStP, Pratīka index.
50 I.e. a compositor's misreading of य with य, or broken type य. The foreshortened य of य might be the remnant of a fractured य.
51 If this assumption is wrong, the effect is to rule out the possibility of 15 being the oldest form. For reasons outlined in note 45 above, a directly attested parent reading (here, of a subgrouping deriving from a parent either original or consciously revised) should have coherence as a minimum qualification. Hence in the present case it would be better to see grāthā as a corruption of yathā- than to see yathā- as a lectio facilior for grāthā-, for how then is grāthā- to be explained?
Both phrases of 20b:

21 \((1 + 11):\) \(\text{samyatānām sucestāsām}\)

"of the self-controlled [and] intelligent"

22 \((5 + 11):\) \(\text{sāmmatānām suctēsām}\)

"of the highly honoured [and] intelligent"

23 \((3 + 14):\) \(\text{samatīnām yathābalam}\)

"of those who are noble minded to the limit of their strength"

24 \((7 + 14):\) \(\text{yuktānām ca yathābalam}\)

"and of those who are engrossed to the limit of their strength"

These four collations cover all witnessed combinations of the six principal readings. In 21 and 22 the elements making up the combination are in apposition, being syntactically parallel and having no conjunction of sense. In 23 the second element \(\text{yathābalam}\) is adverbial, dependent in sense upon the first, but in effect otiose as the translation reveals. In 24 the second element is again adverbially dependent upon the first.\(^{52}\) In this context however \(\text{yathābalam}\) gives less the impression of being a vacuous metric plug and more of being a completion of the sense of the first element, \(\text{yuktānām}\), which is by itself indefinite enough to invite intensifying or specifying qualification. All in all, 24 seems a much tighter construction, not only as between the elements of 20b but, because of the \(\text{ca}\) following \(\text{yuktānām}\), throughout the whole of 20ab as well.

\(^{52}\) And perhaps also upon the prior element of 20a - this may be the force of the \(\text{ca}\).
Surveying the readings of 20b, it is noteworthy
that the major divisions between variants in each
phrase do not correspond. At first glance it might
be supposed that 23 is somehow the golden mean from
which all other readings have diverged, but this line
of thought is specious since it is statically
concerned with resemblances; it does not deal
dynamically with derivations. In fact, placing 23 along-
side 24, we do better to see 23 as a derivative of
24 than vice versa for two reasons. First, as we
have just observed, the reading of 20b in 24 is more
tightly integrated with 20a and lacks 23's seeming
redundancy - virtues in 24 which are easier to attribute
to an original composition than to envisage as having
arisen through tampering with an older but less coherent
reading. Secondly, if we deduce from the great
difference between sanmatinam and yuktanam ca that their
relationship has involved conscious revision, it is
hard to see what would have been gained by glossing
sanmatinam with the less informative yuktanam, but not
hard to imagine the reverse. A fortiori the same
arguments establish the primitiveness of 24 vis-à-vis
21 and 22. In these cases the substitution of sucetasam
for yathabalama further underlines the relative
cohesiveness of 24.

Since 23 has the closest affinity with 24,
sharing with it the reading yathabalama, it is to 23
that we must look for the link between 24 and the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>21</th>
<th>saṃyatanaṃ</th>
<th>suceotasam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>sammatanaṃ</td>
<td>suceotasam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>sanmatinam</td>
<td>yathabalama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>yuktanam ca</td>
<td>yathabalama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more-alike readings 21-23. In the light of the
evidence of the whole foot, our earlier \textsuperscript{54} proposition
that the link lay with 21 on the basis of a slight
formal resemblance in the first phrase (1: \textit{samyatānām;
7: yuktānām ca}) is seen to be insubstantial.
Nevertheless our other comments concerning various
possible degeneration patterns revealed formally by the
first phrases hold good. Given 7/24 as the primitive
reading and 4/23 as its first extant derivative, 5/22
will be the intermediary through which 4/23 ultimately
gave rise to 1/21.\textsuperscript{55} The question remains, however, as
to whether this arrangement, hypothesized on the basis
of static, formal comparisons is feasible dynamically;
that is, whether we can give a credible account of how
the changes it implies occurred.

\textbf{24} \rightarrow \textbf{23} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Our earlier comments on glossing provide a probable explanation: sanmati is a more explicit, specific and informative denotation of the purity of mind intended by yukta in this context. The substitution may therefore reasonably be put down to a transmitter's conscious improvement. The fact that yathābālam seems to have lost its force in 23 is a sign that this change has occurred rather than an objection to it; it is a symptom of the narrow focus or timid approach of the reviser.}\textsuperscript{56}

\textbf{23} \rightarrow \textbf{22} \hspace{1cm} \textit{The reading sanmati of the first phrase has been changed, unconsciously, to a lectio facilior}

\textsuperscript{54} Page 311 above.
\textsuperscript{55} Reference to note 53 above may be helpful.
\textsuperscript{56} The reviser is also a copyist and shares the copyist's phrase-by-phrase awareness.
in the more common\(^{57}\) but less appropriate saqmata.

This change in the first phrase makes the second phrase of 2\(\text{3}\) yathābalam worse than otiose; it has become nonsensical. Whether the first phrase was changed before or at the same time as the second, it is easy to appreciate that some transmitter could have perceived the need for improvement. The substitution of sucetasam for yathābalam did away with four syllables of dross and enriched 2\(\text{0}\)ab by adding a fourth attribute of the successful sacrificer to the existing three. Yet, while it is undeniably an improvement and consciously made,\(^{58}\) the change is a modest one, which would not have taxed a competent transmitter in his sleep: sucetasam\(^{\text{m}}\) is a pallid metrical formula-word which in the right context may be used to close

\[^{57}\text{A measure of frequency of occurrences initially in padas in the epic style may be derived from the Pratika index:}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>form</th>
<th>other appearances of this form</th>
<th>other declension forms of the stem</th>
<th>compounds beginning with stem</th>
<th>frequency ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yuktānām</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>countless</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanmatānām</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sammatānām</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samyatānām</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>plus other verbal nouns</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^{58}\text{See p.312 above.}\]
the sloka facilely, without adding much to what it conveys.

22 → 21  Samyata is both an improvement in sense over sammata, in that samyata is like the other characteristics listed an inherent quality, not an attributed one, and at the same time is very close to sammata formally, both in sound and (Devanāgarī) script. Should the change be put down to conscious revision or an unconscious shift to the more common lectio facilior samyata? The polarity is false: a transmitter's expectation may dispose him to an unconscious error in transmission which results in a lectio facilior superior in every way to the earlier reading, but less original. This is sufficient explanation to make the appearance of samyata credible. Thus, the dynamics of deviation are conformable to the pattern which was proposed on formal grounds.

What does this analysis of the readings contribute to our understanding of the history of stanza 20? Until now we have considered the readings per se, without regard to their distributions among the collated manuscripts. Once we match the principal readings and their inferior derivatives with distribution groupings, their significance becomes clear.

21: samyatañām sucetasām
   K6 D23D8 Dn14 G1

22: sammatāñām sucetasām
   V1 B06789 D57 Ds12 Da34 T1 G3 M1

23: sanmatāñām yathābalam
   S1 K127 D46
24: yuktānāṁ ca yathābalam
t1 2 2 g1 2 3 2 6 2 m1 2 5 2 6 2

Of primary importance is the assurance that our identification of 24 as the primitive reading completely confirms the conclusion we derived from the study of context - viz. that stanza 20 is best seen as having arisen first as stanza 202 of S. For the rest, the analysis of the readings is entirely compatible with the consequences of that first premiss: that 20 was infected from *S into the satellite *EW. The more-alike readings 21-23 can be seen as the product of this infection, and it is even possible to reconstruct the probable reading of 20b as it stood as a satellite of *EW.

The analysis of 20b throws light on other aspects of the tradition too. The principal readings and their derivatives can be arranged in a stemma which should give insight into lower level manuscript descent groups - always with the proviso that conflation may have blurred the boundaries somewhat. The data available is set out in Table XXVIII with some comments on noteworthy points. One case which merits special mention is that of G2 which, unlike the other S texts, has the śraddhāpraśamsā in the Critical Edition form, and only one occurrence of stanza 20 - in a position which places it at once at the head of the śraddhā material and in a position equivalent to that of the second occurrence in the other S text (i.e. 18x). The fact that the sole stanza 20 of G2 has the original S reading yuktānāṁ ca yathābalam and not the reading of any W / Critical Edition-ordered text (Śkl 27, D6 2 9,
D4) leads us to infer that G2's reception of the śraddhāprasāmsā contamination most likely took place after stanza 20 was already present. 59

Variations outside the śraddhāprasāmsā

As foreshadowed in page 291 above, a complete analysis requires us to accommodate the distribution profiles of variations associated with the incorporation of the śraddhāprasāmsā with the profiles of other variations. Worthy of consideration are (a) the unusual wealth of variant readings underlying 6cd; (b) an intrusion of extraneous material between 16ab and 16cd where the TG manuscripts and some others repeat or read for the first time several verses (255, 35, 36ab, 38ab) more authoritatively witnessed in chapter 255; and (c) the wonderful profusion of text-orders underlying the conclusion of chapter 256 and chapter 257, so tangled that they must be taken together.

(a) 6cd

The circumstances surrounding the emendations of

59 This assumes that a Critical Edition-type reading in G2 has not subsequently been corrected. Granted this, it would appear that G2 is an S text by birth, but has been partly raised in an N environment and has adopted some N mannerisms. This biography contrasts with that proposed by Belvalkar for T2 (śantiparvan, Introduction, p.cixx), another text collated from Lahore. Belvalkar says that although named for its T[elugu] script, T2 is in fact a K text whose intercourse with S texts has given it a Carnatic colouring. Yet it is interesting to note that Belvalkar's treatment of 'star passages' (p.cixxvi) suggests that in this area G2 has more in common with N than does T2. On this criterion alone, T2 would be a fortiori a S text too. Since both texts are extant in K territory (see Table XXIV) it is worth considering that the history of T2 might parallel that of G2.
6c and the motivations for its revisions were skated over lightly in Part A. Beneath the generalizations advanced there, lies a variety of variation in 6cd that invites treatment similar to that we have applied to 255.37a and 256.20b.

The principal variants of 6cd are:

1. spardham nihanti vai brahman sāhata hanti tam naram
   S1 K12 [C.E.]

2. śraddha vai vardhate dharmam sāhata hanti tam naram
   K7 D469

3. śraddhā nihanti vai brahman sāhata hanti tam naram
   K46 V1 B06789 Da3 634 Dn14 Dsl D238

4. himsā nihanti vai dharmam sa hato hanti tam naram
   T1 Gl 6436

5. spardham nihanti vai dharmam sa hato hanti tam naram
   D765 T2 M167

6. spardha nihanti dharmam vai sa hato hanti tam naram
   M5

The variety of readings issuing from the archetypal 6cd indicates that more than one copyist found the verse worrisome. A passage which gave Nilakantha pause no doubt bewildered lesser minds than his. As for us, in

---

60 Pages 223-224 above.
61 Pages 598-600 below.
62 Pages 308-318 above.
63 Da3: śraddha. The reading is probably nothing but a casual vagary.
64 Gl: sa tato.
65 D7: spardham nihanti vai dharmam sa hato hanti tam naram/
   This reading has not been made a principal on the assumption that it is a hybrid reading symptomatic of D7's fence-sitting on the N:S frontier, sa hata being an imperfect correction of the reading witnessed in D7's alter ego D5:
   spardham nihanti vai brahman sa hata hanti tam naram/
   against the T2 M167 reading:
   spardham nihanti vai dharmam sa hato hanti tam naram/
66 See below, n. 69.
retracing our path through the maze we have hold of the
two-stranded clew of access to a wide range of variant
readings and an inkling of historical circumstances in
which the verse evolved. Let us hope that is
sufficient.

For reasons extrinsic to the verse, it is certain
that in its archetypal form it began with spardham. 67
However the difficulties which have beset copyist and
commentator alike seem to have revolved not so much
around this word as around the unspecified subjects of
the two clauses of 6c,d. With historical detachment
we can see that the subject of nibanti (6c) lay across
the enjambement in ahimsadikrtam karma (6a), but this
construction was not patent to several transmitters,
as their variants let us infer. A second problem, or
rather a second dimension of the same problem, arises
over the referend of the denominative pronoun of
sahatā/sa hato (6d). The reading sa hato is
straightforward: being masculine it finds its referend
not in the subject of the preceding foot (variously
karman n., spardhā f., himsa f.) but in the object
dharmam which is supplied in just those texts which
have sa hato. By contrast sahata labours under a
crippling ambiguity. For sahata can be construed as
sa + hata 'she, destroyed' or as sa-[a]hata 'she,
intact'. In either case the referend is feminine, but
depending upon the manner in which the phrase is broken
down the fitting referend may be śraddhā 'faith',

67 See pages 222, 233 above.
which is desirable, or spardha 'competitiveness',
which is not. 68

The S texts (4,5,6) invariably read dharmāṃ sa
hato. Taking this reading as a starting point it is
simple to deduce the hyparchetypal *S reading.
Versions 4 and 6 make sense by their own lights;
version 5 does not, for it gives nihanti two objects.
One of these objects is spardha of the ancestral
reading, not preserved in 4 or 6. Version 5 is
therefore closer to the archetypal text (ω) than
either 4 or 6 in retaining spardha and at the same
time in its fault it contains the seeds of versions 4
and 6 each of which may be accounted rationalizations
of 5, which attempt to supply a fit subject for the
predicate nihanti dharmāṃ. It is not feasible to
derive version 5 from 4 or 6; therefore version 5 may
be taken to preserve the reading of *S.

With the remaining readings 1-3 the water is more
muddied, version 2 being most obscure. As between 1
and 3, which differ only in reading spardha or
Sraddha initially, there can be no question that
version 1 is closer to the archetypal text. Moreover
the generation of version 3 is convincingly explained
as the result of mistakenly construing sahata as
sā hata and the consequent need to supply a suitable
referend. Given the need, Sraddha is both an

68 When all is said, it calls for some tolerance to
accept the sense of any but variant 1, for no
quality however potent its virtue is in a position
to destroy (hanti) when it is itself destroyed
(hatā/hato). Only if undiminished (ahatā) can it
exercise power for good or ill.
unsurprising and unsatisfactory choice: unsurprising, in that it is close to spardham in form and suggested by the tenor of the surrounding text after the incorporation of the śraddhāpraśāsa; unsatisfactory, for by reversing the moral charge of the object of nihanti it becomes exceedingly difficult to find a subject for nihanti, and not easy to understand the significance of either the preceding verse (6ab) or the following foot (6d). This is the problem which exercised Nilakantha's not inconsiderable ingenuity. 69

Nilakantha read version 3 of the passage:

ahimsadikrtam karma iha caiva paratra ca / śraddham nihanti vai brahman sā hatā hanti tam naram //

His interpretation of 6cd supplies nihanti with the subject himsa inferred from 6ab although this reverses the plain sense of the first verse. Nilakantha is at some pains to explain this transformation (Vulg.264.6 comm.):

ahimsādīti / himsā ādipadārthaḥ iha paratra ca pratyaksaphalam iti śeṣah / tatra hi phalam anubhavana darśayitvā himsaphalam āha - śraddham iti / himsā śraddham viśvāsam nihantīty adhaśhṛtya yojyam / tam viśvāsaghatinam //

Non-injury etc: The opening phrase means "injury". "Having direct consequences" is to be understood with "here and in the next world". When the result of actions of this class (tatra) are obvious people] call them the result of injury. - Faith: [Read] "Injury destroys faith [i.e.,] confidence" supplying [the subject] by inference. That [man means] one who destroys confidence. The thrust of Nilakantha's argument seems to be that verse 6ab and 6cd are to be read in the first instance as independent units. To have any sense at all, the bald statement of 6ab must be taken as a statement on the topic of where the actions in question have effect. Hence the relevance though not the justification of Nilakantha's adjunction of pratyaksaphalam. Nilakantha proceeds to observe that results which are directly perceptible are generally acknowledged (āha) to be those flowing from acts of injury and not, he implies, from acts of non-injury. The idea seems to be that himsā is
It is with version 2 that serious questions of derivation arise. Version 2 represents a total rewriting of 6c at the same time incorporating the term śraddhā, as found in version 3 but now as the subject of nihanti, and the object dharmam, which it shares with versions 4-6 but does not accompany with their concomitant change to sa hato in 6d.70 The first issue this variant raises is whether the archetypal text (w) read dharma (versions 2, 4-6) or braman (versions 1, 3). We have condoned the polygamy of śraddhā and dharma in *S, and therefore have no grounds to forbid them to cohabit in w itself. To permit this does not oblige us to make dharma a reading in the verse as originally composed however.

Since śraddhā is without question a reading of the verse as composed (as well as of the archetype) and

69 ... (active and) observable while ahimsā is (passive and) imperceptible. The destruction of faith in verse 6cd is an example of a directly perceptible result, which is thus attributable to (an act of) injury and not, as 6ab might suggest at first sight, to non-injury.

Nilakantha's interpretation of 6cd therefore boils down to something like "[Killing] kills trust; killing trust kills the killer". The sublety of Nilakantha's remedy contrasts remarkably with Deussen's ham-fisted demand that ahimsā of 6a be emended to a hypermetric anahimsā-(Vier philosophische Texte, p.434; 265,6). The only alternative interpretation of the version 3 text of which I can conceive would be to take nihanti impersonally, inferring its subject from the object of 6d, ta'nāram.

The natural beauty of the Critical Edition's version 1 reading needs neither Nilakantha's coiffure nor Deussen's wig.

70 With the feminine subject śraddhā the alteration to sa hato is not necessary. Note the amphibious reading of D7 sa hato which, despite its appearance of being some kind of transitional form between versions 2 and 4-6, is more probably otherwise explained (note 65 above).
constitutes the proper object of nihanti, and since it is preferable to attribute a solecism like this double object to the myopic tinkering of a transmitter than to crass incompetence in a composer, the reading dharmam might be proposed for the archetype without prejudice to the original reading. To do so would produce an archetypal reading which, like *S, made poor sense and thereby contained within it the seeds of change. The reading might have been:

\[ \omega : \text{spardhām nihanti vai dharmam} \]

\[ \text{sā [']hātā hanti tam naram} // \]

wherefrom the *S emendation to sa hato would be a rationalization springing from difficulty in construing sahātā and the desire to accommodate dharmam; the emendation witnessed in versions 1,3 would be the removal of the otiose second object dharmam by inserting the stock filler brahman in its place, and the emendations of version 2 would be a thoroughgoing revision salvaging dharmam's position. But such an explanation is suspect for a long list of reasons. Firstly, because the texts which witness version 2 are alone in also substituting dharmam for karma in 6a. Since this emendation to dharmam is evidently an innovation in version 2, one is inclined to assume the second dharmam of 6c to be a bird of the same feather. Secondly, because even when dharmam is installed in the archetype (ω) it is still necessary to speak of version 2 as a fundamental revision because no other...

---

71 The sense of 6ab as revised thus is not at all clear to me. It does not seem possible that dharmam was taken as neuter.
explanation is sufficient to explain the presence of vardhate 'prospers' in place of nihanti 'destroys'.

Nothing is gained by dharmam's elevation to archetypal rank. Thirdly, because we are inferring much about the archetype (w) on the basis of a reading which by any account is at least partly a conscious departure from the archetypal text. Fourthly, because in divorcing the origins of dharmam and sa hato, which we at first envisaged having arisen jointly in *S, we have denied ourselves the opportunity to give a comprehensible explanation of why dharmam should have arisen either in *S or in version 2. Fifthly, because we are compelled to assume a nonsensical parental reading without attestation. And lastly, because unless dharmam is an original reading, the argument is circular in proposing an error in the emendation of some original reading to dharmam and then the undoing of the error in versions 1 and 3 by emendation to brahman.

It is altogether more straightforward to say nothing about version 2 other than that it is a recasting of 6a,cd. It may owe the inspiration for its śraddhā to the śraddham of 373 or for its dharmam to

---

72 This was not the case with our positing of a nonsensical *S, for we were there attributing to the hyparchetype a reading extant in the version 5 manuscripts. The objection registered here and the admission of a possible flawed archetype at the beginning of this paragraph are not contradictory. The initial point dealt with what was admissible as an hypothesis; this latter point comments upon the relative heuristic extravagance of of such an hypothesis.

73 Or vice versa. Or, śraddhā forms being so strongly suggested by the milieu provided by ch.256 as it stood after the incorporation of the śraddhaprasāmsa, the two readings may have no direct link.
but it is too far removed from either source to propose any direct influence, nor is it fruitful to argue over whether 2 is a reworking of 1 or 3. We can but savour the irony that, taken alone, version 2 offers the least difficult reading of ēd of all six principal versions. However, lectio facilior is by itself not a recommendation of originality.

The archetypal reading (ũ) is thus best retained as it is found in the Critical Edition (i.e. as version 1). As dharmendra hato is presumed to be an innovation in *S inspired by the difficulty of construing sāhata, brahman should be allowed to retain its place in the archetype. This conclusion means that we cannot make any statement about the affiliations of texts which preserve the ancestral reading; but we are enabled to assign the majority of manuscripts tentatively to descent groupings on the evidence of the emendations they witness. Thus versions 2, 4, 6 all define primary groupings, while 5 together with 4 and 6 comprise an older grouping. The case of D7 may be understood as an instance of contamination between texts of two versions. The mountain has laboured and brought forth a mouse.

Although rightfully a subject for consideration

Although, as already pointed out, the dharmendra of 6a in version 2 makes this relationship dubious. The reverse transfer (dharmendra 2 → 5) is hardly imaginable both on grounds of likely relative alignment and on grounds of the inexplicably selective reception by 5 which ignores the substantively significant śraddhā vardhate.

For a possible indirect influence, cf. p. 383 and n. 18 below.

See note 65 above.
here, the matter of the intrusion of 255.35-36ab, 38ab into the chapter 256 text of many S manuscripts is better deferred to a later part of discussion. Until the relationships between branches of the text tradition are known in more detail and with more certainty, little of a specific nature can be inferred concerning this intrusion. It is fully discussed below.77

(c) Conclusion of 256

Undoubtedly the episode's most complex - and therefore potentially most revealing - variations underlie the conclusion of chapter 256.78 It is of course less surprising to find an accumulation of accretions at the end of an episode than anywhere else as it is especially tempting to the officious, unimaginative, or fractious editor to make sure he has the last word.

In the variegated text orderings collated behind stanzas 17, 18 and 19 of the Critical Edition, it is possible to discern a pattern which arises from the interplay of two independent variables. One variable is the position of verse 17cd-18 relative to stanza 19. Three text types are distinguishable on this criterion:

- type A - in which 17cd-18 is not present at all;
- type B - in which stanza 19 precedes 17cd-18; and
- type C - in which 17cd-18 precedes stanza 19.79 The other variable is the duplication of verse 17ab. The criterion of the presence or absence of duplication

---

77 Pages 389-403.
78 See Table XVIII.
79 For these texts set out in full, see Table XXIX.
drives a dividing line right across the classes of
texts differentiated on the first criterion.\textsuperscript{80} Without
prejudice to further analysis, it seems that a first
step in fathoming the extant diversity of text orders
comprising the conclusion would be to attempt an account
of the comparative distribution and oldness of these
two independent variables.

\textbf{Duplication of verse 17ab}

Looking first at the reduplication of verse 17ab,
we find two noteworthy phenomena: (a) in surveying the
shifting sands of stanzas 17, 18 and 19, it is always
possible to fix the position of 17ab by observing that
it invariably either precedes or frames (i.e. precedes
and follows) the verses 17cd-18, regardless of how
these stand vis-à-vis stanza 19; (b) in the type A
text it is precisely verses 17cd-18 which are absent.

\textit{Prima facie}, the combination of these two factors
appears to be explicable if the original text had had
the form witnessed by the type A text, and if the
verse 17ab found there had served as an anchor point
for the insertion of an interpolation comprising
verses 17cd-18 (which did not affect the type A text).
The repetition of 17ab might then be explained as the
product of mistaken recopying of the anchoring verse
when the transmitter resumed the run of the base text.\textsuperscript{81}

On this reckoning, both the constancy of the

\textsuperscript{80} See columns 4 and 5 of Table XX. It might be
remarked in passing that the variant groupings
associated with the duplication of 17ab\textsuperscript{2} are never at
odds with the variant groupings defined by
śraddhāpraśāsā placements.

\textsuperscript{81} Cf. above, p. 275 where this phenomenon is
described more fully.
relationship between 17ab and 17cd-18, and the occasional duplication of 17ab are accounted for.\(^{82}\)

However, a critical examination of the evidence reveals no support for such a contention. Let us ask first how we should interpret the lack of 17cd-18 in the type A text. The lack of 17cd-18 here might be the product of either of two processes: (a) as suggested above, it may be that the type A text is an uncontaminated text which has not incorporated 17cd-18 and preserves an older reading; or (b) the type A text may embody a defective copying of a text of the type B with repetition of 17ab, in which the copyist has jumped from the first occurrence of 17ab to the second, inadvertently omitting the intervening verses.

Considering the case on its own merits, there is a far higher probability that we have here a case of haplology than that type A represents an older reading. The reasons for this preference are simply stated. First, the type A text is witnessed in a single manuscript, and a quick survey of the Apparatus Criticus will be enough to reveal that omission of a verse or two in a single manuscript is nothing out of the ordinary. Secondly, the single manuscript involved, V1, is by no means an isolated exemplar of the tradition. An analysis of its variae lectiones\(^{83}\) shows that it has been intimately associated with a fluctuating group

\(^{82}\) The shifting placement of 17ab, 17cd-18 is not explained. Only by assuming that in some base texts 17ab followed st.19 could the variety of extant orders be accounted for. It is noteworthy that the sequence '19,17ab,22ab reads very well.\(^{83}\) See Table XXX.
of E texts and has negligible independent variation. Given the proclivity of transmitters to fill out perceived lacunae in their texts which is as evident from other instances of infection as from the whole history of the Mahābhārata, it is hard to believe that V1 should have been preserved throughout its descent from the archetypal text unscathed by a development which is supposed to have afflicted all other manuscripts across the board from Ś1 to M7. In this light it is more likely that the omission of 17cd-18 in V1 is due to a momentary aberration in transmission than that it is the sole uncontaminated survival of an older reading. We are therefore justified in regarding V1 as the defective descendant of a text in the mould of BO or D8, the extant texts with which V1 has the closest affinity in other respects.85 Hence it would be ill-advised to see V1 as giving any support to the contention that 17cd-18 is a contamination.

Just as upon close examination, V1's testimony has proved to be misleading, so it is also with the inference that the repetition of 17ab could be put down to the mistaken recopying of the verse in the older text which was the point at which the intervening interpolation (17cd-18) was attached. Although prima facie plausible, this inference has to accommodate a

84 Both in the sense that perpetration of the haplology required only a momentary lapse of concentration and also in the sense that the defect may well have proved ephemeral: it is conceivable that it might not have survived V1, being remedied at the next copying by conflation, or before then by correction.

85 I.e. being of the same type (B) and having the highest number of shared variants. See Table XXX.
certain difficulty: in all the collated texts in which 17ab is duplicated, with one exception, the first occurrence of 17ab (17ab₁) reads differently from the second (17ab₂) -

\[
\begin{align*}
17ab₁ & : \text{ evam bahuvichārtham ca} \\
17ab₂ & : \text{ evam bahumatārtham ca}
\end{align*}
\]

All S and some W texts, which have no duplication of 17ab, read the second version (17ab₂: bahumatārtham) although by position (x 17cd18) their readings are aligned with the first occurrence of 17ab in those texts which do duplicate the verse. Conversely, only three of the nineteen texts which have no duplication of 17ab witness the reading of 17ab₁ (bahuvidhārtham). There is clearly a high correlation between the duplication of 17ab and the reading of bahuvidhārtham in the first instance.

To maintain our hypothesis that the doubling of 17ab arose through the recopying of 17ab in conjunction

---

86 That is, the pair of Da manuscripts. Da3 has the 17ab₂ reading in both places; Da4 has the 17ab₁ reading in both places.

87 Taking D469 as W texts on the basis that they follow the Critical Edition text order (IIA) also witnessed by Šk. (See Table XX). The variant readings of 17a are set out in Table XXXI.

88 That is, K47 B6. In view of the preceding paragraph, V1 has been read as if it were B0 or D8. For Da3,4 see note 86 above: I assume henceforth that each of the pair has been corrected internally for consistency, albeit in opposite directions. K47 may have the bahuvidhārtham reading through correction against some E text, or by virtue of being conflations of W and E texts. See Belvalkar, Sāntiparvan,"Introduction," pp.xxxiv; xliii-iv on the relationship between K47 and W and E texts, noting however that K7's most intimate relations with (conventionally described) E texts are with D49. B0 may be the product of perspicacious revision or simple erroneous omission.
with the incorporation of an interpolation (17cd-18), we are required to demonstrate the derivation of 17ab\(^2\) from 17ab\(^1\) or vice versa, in a way which at the same time accounts for the distribution of the variant readings. Effectively\(^89\) we are presented with a choice of assuming either that at the time of the recopying, the base text read **bahumatartha\(\_\)** in 17ab and that the new text 17ab\(^1\) came to read **bahuvidh\(\_\)artham**; or that the base text read **bahuvidh\(\_\)artham** but in the new text 17ab\(^2\) came to read **bahumatartha\(\_\)**.\(^90\)

Let us take up the second possibility first. For a start it is not prima facie likely that **bahuvidh\(\_\)artham** was the reading of the base text. The testimony of the distribution profiles of the major variants suggests that, on the contrary, **bahumatartha\(\_\)** was the ancestral reading. There are three principal variants:

\(^89\) The idea that the text alteration might have occurred when subsequent copies were made from the hyparchetypal reduplicating manuscript rather than in the process of copying off the hyparchetypal reduplicating manuscript itself is not supportable: we would then be dealing with at least two genetic groups and we would have to assume either that the same alteration occurred independently on separate occasions or that the alteration arose in the copying off of one sub-version and subsequently infected the other duplicating manuscripts (except perhaps Da\(\_\)j). The close correlation between duplicating texts and the new reading reduces the probability of the latter proposal. Since the correlation is not perfect (note K47), this is not an absolute objection, but means that the proposal is not preferable to attributing the new reading, and the duplication, to *E.

Alternatively, it might be imagined that the reading of 17ab\(^1\) was "corrected" during the life of the reduplicating hyparchetype but before the parental texts of the extant witnesses were copied from it. This would have produced the required result, but there are no grounds for proposing such an alteration beyond its convenience.

\(^90\) Of course no inference concerning the original reading may be drawn from Vl since it may have preserved either the first or second of its formerly duplicated readings.
bahusahārtham  "much in a similar vein"
Ś1 K1 + K2 91

bahumātārtham  "of highly admirable significance"
K0 2 V1 B0 2 7 2 8 2 9 2 D2 2 4 9 2 6 7 2 Dn1 2 4 2 Ds1 2 2
Da3 12 T12 GL236 M1567

bahuvidhārtham  "on many divers topics"
K46 17 B0 1 6 7 1 8 1 9 1 D2 1 3 1 5 7 1 8 1 Dn1 1 1
Ds1 1 2 1 Da4 12

None of these variants presents any difficulty of interpretation and it is not possible to show that any one of them has any claim to priority on the basis of meaning or context; only their distribution profiles distinguish them. Bahusahārtham has no support beyond the Sarada text and its cronies. For the rest, bahumātārtham, with witnesses in W 92 and throughout E and S has a far more strongly dispersed distribution than bahuvidhārtham. On this criterion, it is likely that bahuvidhārtham of 17ab1 is the innovation, not bahumātārtham of 17ab2.

A second point is that since the reading bahumātārtham has a wide currency outside the E texts which have doubling of 17ab, it would be far-fetched to propose that this reading arose spontaneously and independently in E. And yet to attribute the

91 Taking K2 as a derivative of the Ś1K1 reading. This is justifiable on the basis of the small divergence of a single aksara; and the intimacy of K2 with Ś1K1 elsewhere.

92 Taking D469 as W texts for the reason that they follow the Critical Edition placement of the Śraddhā material. See Table XXX.
distribution of bahumatartha to infection into or out of *E or an E text is not permissible for by position the readings outside E bear upon 17ab¹ not 17ab² and it would therefore have to be explained why 17ab² was involved in this process while 17ab¹ stood aloof.

We are thus lead to ask the converse question: can an original bahumatartha have been changed into the bahuvirdhārtha of 17ab¹? Assuming that this change occurred in the process of copying which produced the duplication of 17ab², it is conceivable that, although the base text read bahumatartha, the copyist substituted bahuvirdhārtha in the first place only. Against this it may be argued that the scribe who wrote bahuvirdhārtha once (17ab¹) might be expected to do so a second time as well (17ab²). 93 Since the variation may well have been unconscious, 94 I hesitate to call this objection decisive; it does however highlight the insubstantial nature of the proposal.

Thus it emerges that, should we wish to explain the duplications of 17ab as by-products of the incorporation of 17cd-18, it is possible to conceive of a process by which bahumatartha might have been altered to bahuvirdhārtha in 17ab¹. It will also have become clear that there is no inherent likelihood that the alteration has taken place in the manner proposed -

93 This was assumed in the case of Da. See note 88 above.
94 That the alteration was unconscious is suggested by the absence of any discernible motive for correction. None of the variants is objectionable (see p.334 above) and the word is in any case simply pro forma.
so that while the interpolation of 17cd-18 is still permitted as a possible explanation of the circumstances of the duplication, it is in no sense corroborated by the foregoing discussion. The promise held out by 17ab has proved to be as illusory as that offered by V1's "type A" text. Hence it is discreet to put to one side for the moment, the idea that 17cd-18 was interpolated and to seek out and test other explanations of the disorderly text.

The attractiveness of the notion that 17cd-18 had been interpolated was that here we seemed to have a single explanation for both the divergence of text orders and the duplication of 17ab. Since we are no longer proceeding on that premiss, we are free to treat those two variables as separate issues, initially at least.

**Variant text orders of 256.17-18, 19**

Let us therefore turn first to take up the question of how the divergent text orders B and C might have arisen. With 17ab temporarily hors de combat we are in a position to regroup our formation: the single variable differentiating the text types B and C is now the placement of st.17-18 relative to st.19.95 It is conceivable that such variation might have arisen either through revision of some texts or through the partly-misplaced incorporation of an interpolated st.17-18 or st.19.

Revision - or rather, the rearrangement of an existing text - might have come about consciously or

95 For text types B and C, see Table XX and Table XXIX.
as the result of accident. The acceptability of an assumption of accident is lessened somewhat by the likelihood that the revised version thus produced will have to be assumed to have been infected as a correction from its source into collateral branches of the tradition, something which is easier to comprehend if the revision had been conscious - a response to some stimulus for change which would then also have encouraged the infection of the innovation across into collateral versions. So, if the notion that change has been wrought by conscious revision is to be made credible, it is necessary to show a discernible and strong impulse motivating it. Unless this can be demonstrated, the more complex process of reworking existing material is not to be favoured over the simpler one of interpolating new material.

It is unavoidable that a discussion of possible motives for the reworking of the conclusion should be caught up with attempts to determine which of the extant orders B and C was original and which was the innovation. The two questions run in tandem; any

96 The demand for an identifiable stimulus may be pitched too high, but there is no alternative to doing so until we know more of the influence of particular hyparchetypes in transmission chains - until we have grounds for knowing whether a reading of *VIBH238 (if, indeed, such a hyparchetype ever existed) or a text order followed by Arjunamisra, for instance, will on that account alone have been likely to lead to the revision of certain other hyparchetypes. Such a profound understanding of the stemma is still a long way off.

97 As, for instance, it was possible to show with the revisions of spardhā to śraddhā in 256.6c and 16a, which sprang from the interposition of the śraddhāprasāmsa (pages 222, 233 above) or with the revision of sambharati to sambhavati in 255.37ef after the interpolation of 255.36ab (page 191 above).
statement about one says something about the other. Nevertheless the link between them is not rigid. It does not automatically follow that the better reading is either older or younger than the worse; the conclusions to be drawn depend entirely upon an estimation of how striking the inadequacies of the worse reading might have been to potential revisers. Thus two phases of inquiry are to be distinguished: in the first place, the identification and comparison of better and worse readings; and then, consideration of whether a viable setting for revision has been revealed.

The touchstones against which the quality of the rival readings may be tested are (a) the distribution profile of each variant across the collated texts, and (b) the content and form of the stanzas comprising the conclusion and their relationship both to one another and to the material from which they follow (i.e. st.16).

Without far more precise knowledge of the interrelations between lines of transmission than we presently have, nothing very useful can be said about the distribution profiles of the variant text-orders. Neither predominates in number of witnesses; one prevails in the S manuscripts, but the other is found in the influential Saradā-Kaśmirī version.98

98 That we are reduced to such crude observations is indeed an index of the poverty of our knowledge of the tradition. A more sophisticated statement would speak not of extant texts but of the hyparchetypēs back to which the variant can be inferred and the relative susceptibility of pairs of hyparchetypēs to cross-infection, but for such inferences a keener insight into the history of the text tradition than we have at present would be required. See Maas, Textual Criticism, pp.6-7, and Reynolds and Wilson, Scribes and Scholars, pp.141-142. In view of the
In the matter of content, our inquiry into whether one of the alternative orders is more elegant than the other has to examine two matters: the compatibility of the differently-ordered conclusions with the material leading up to them; and the sequential compatibility of the stanzas 17-18 and stanza 19 in each of the arrangements.

Comments concerning the relationship between the two types of conclusion and the earlier material of the chapter, here defined as stanzas 15cd-16, are limited through the effect of the natural boundary between the body of the episode and its conclusion.

One feature which flows across this boundary is the question of speakers, discussed at length in Part A. The same ground need not be traversed here: it suffices to say that the beginning of stanza 17, "Thus Tulādhāra spoke...", is a little disconcerting to a reader who was aware, as he had every reason to be, that Tulādhāra was not speaking in the immediately preceding passage (st.15cd-16) of the archetypal text (ω). This is without doubt a shortcoming in type C texts. It is also true that in the type B texts which open the conclusion with st.19 the problem surrounding the identification of speakers is less striking. Stanza 19 simply does not nominate any

---

98 (cont.) intensive contamination which is evident in the Santiparvan tradition, such sophistication may be unobtainable. See below, pp.421-422.

99 This restriction, to the two stanzas preceding, is necessary until we know whether or not the bifurcation into texts of type B and C is older or younger than the incorporation of the śraddhā material at 6 x 15cd.

100 Pages 217-221 above.

101 256.17ab: evaṃ ... tulādhārena bhāsitam /
speaker at all, while its opening phrase in fact establishes some "distance" from the preceding material. Thus the jump which jars in texts of type C is cushioned here, and when stanza 17 eventually comes around the attribution of speech to Tulādhāra is more easily given a generalized application: it may refer more broadly to the whole episode. In this sense, then, the type B text has a more elegant - or rather, less awkward - reading than texts of type C.

That being so, it remains to be seen whether this is a disparity which could credibly account for the genesis and infection of a revision. In this connexion, the fact that certain type C texts prefix the "Thus Tulādhāra spoke ..." of stanza 17 with an extra-metrical rubric "Bhīṣma said" is pertinent. The perpetrator of this very late innovation certainly had his eye cocked for speakers, but he was content to take stanza 17 (of type C) at its word as the beginning of an editorial intervention, without meddling further. This should remind us that while the question of speakers has bulked large in our analysis, a reader whose interest lay not in the hidden historical structure of the episode but rather in its meaning need not have been troubled by it much or at all. Even if he had been aware of a difficulty, it remains doubtful that he

102 256.19a: tata 'cireṇa kālena ... /
   "Then, after a short time ..."

103 K6 Da34 M5.
should have resorted to revision as a means of overcoming the problem, especially when a revision will produce a solution which will only obscure the issue which had inspired the revision rather than clarifying it.

In the light of these observations, it seems that one cannot make out a respectable case for revision on the grounds of context.

Consideration of the internal consequentiiality of the two types of conclusions is more taxing. In the very broadest terms it appears that each type follows an acceptable logic: type B concludes the narrative body of the story with the translation of Tulādhāra and Jājali to heaven (st.19) and then rounds off the episode by describing the impact of its message (stt.17-18); type C highlights the significance of the moral of the story (stt.17-18) and then describes the

It might be argued that the insertion of the extra-metrical bhīṣma uvāca is an attempt to put some psychological distance between the statement that Tulādhāra had spoken thus and the preceding speech which was not his by underlining the discontinuity between the body of the episode and the editorially introduced conclusion. Viewed thus, the function of the rubric is parallel to that of the reordering which in other versions produced type B texts. Yet even if we accept that the rubric might have been intended to have this function, it may at the same time be seen as an illustration of a far simpler - and presumably more obvious and therefore more likely - solution to the difficulty. Beside it, resort to the far more complex process of revision is using a sledgehammer to crack a nut.

The above has the weakness of argumentum e silenctio in that we are drawing conclusions from what an author has not done as against what he might have done. But since our job is to estimate the likelihood of a certain path having been followed to achieve a certain end it is valid to note that the path and its destination match relatively ill compared with another path and the same destination. The alternative is not that the first path might have led to another destination, but that the journey may not have been undertaken at all.
aftermath as a means of concluding (st.19). Perhaps at first glance, type B seems to offer a neater arrangement, but since type C is not at all objectionable it is pointless to look here for any impulse leading to revision.

However, while there might be little to choose between the broad brush-strokes of types B and C, the detailed line-work tells another story. Closer examination of the type B text reveals two curious features. One is that the verb of verse 19cd (viharotām) is cast in the optative, virtually a future-in-the-past, while the conclusion in stanza 17-18 reverts to the imperfect (anvapadyata), a narrative past. The other is the fact that, after we have been told that Jājali has gone to heaven and is disporting himself there fittingly (st.19), the summation of the story (stts.17-18) recalls, again, that Jājali 'attained bliss' (śāntim anvapadyata). The immediately preceding (st.19) mention of Jājali's happy fate makes it clear that his death and removal to a higher realm is meant to be conveyed by this phrase, but this is incidental to the story and adds nothing to our appreciation of Tulādhāra's teachings, which are the focus of the rest of the conclusion (stts.17-18ab). Why has Jājali's death been singled out for special mention? A comparative study of the type C text shows on the other hand that in the arrangement found there the use of tenses is orderly, with the narrative past leading up to the summation of the story (stts.17-18), and the aftermath seen from
that point in time as having been in the future. Furthermore, the problem surrounding the twofold mention of Jājali's blissful afterlife melts away, for in the type C text the first mention (st.18) leads on to the second (st.19), in which the point being made appears to be that both Jājali and Tulādhāra have attained heaven. On these questions of detail, then, the type C text emerges as a far more elegant version.

Before going on to discuss the implications of this observation, it is worthwhile pausing to consider another curious syntactic feature in these concluding stanzas the significance of which is less immediately obvious. This is the construction of stanza 19abcd. The second foot of this stanza invites particular attention.

19b: ... tulādhārāḥ sa eva ca /

Stanza 19 has consistently been taken as a self-sufficient unit of meaning, quite reasonably, and in view of the dual forms following in the rest of the stanza, the second foot has accordingly been given the meaning:

19b: ... Tulādhāra and he [i.e. Jājali]

Is this justified? Were it not for the following duals, it would be the natural reading of this foot to take saḥ adjectivally as qualifying tulādhārāḥ,

105 mahāprajñā, 19c; viharetām, 19d; and by implication, svām svām sthānam.

106 Roy and Dutt both translate "Tuladhara and Jajali, both..."; Deusen has "Tulādhāra und auch der andere...". Nilakantha does not gloss this phrase.
rather than pronominally, standing in apposition to tulādharāḥ. One does not have to look far afield for other instances of this adjectival construction—it appears in verse 18b! 107

On this question, the feeble voice of the particles used in verse 19b is inconclusive. The combination eva ca is most probably primarily a metrical plug, of which not too much should be made. 108 Nevertheless, one cannot but wonder why the composer, if he had here wished to convey a cumulation of both Tulādharā and Jājali (saḥ) should have chosen the type of construction he uses here. Comparison with, for instance, 258.75cd:

... svargaṃ gato vipraḥ putreṇa sahitā tadā //

The brahman then went to heaven along with his son.

which occurs in a precisely parallel context, 109 does provoke the question of whether 256.19 should not be distinguished in meaning as it is in construction.110

107 sa dvijah, 18b, in reference to Jājali. Cf. also tena tulādharēṇa, 254.1ab.

108 Van Nooten, "Redundancy in Mahābhārata verse composition", p.56, §13, and p.57, Table II, notes that in the Sabhāparvan eva ca was a moderately common combination, and that generally eva retained its restrictive or emphatic quality but that at other times the coupled particles were simply equivalent to ca. Names are often joined by this latter usage, in which cases the form eva ca is preferred to ca for metrical convenience.

109 Like 256.19, in the Critical Edition text, it is the concluding verse of an episode, in this case the story of Cirakarin (ch.258).

110 It might well be argued, however, that the two are distinguished in meaning in that 256.19b expresses the equality of the members of the pair, while in 258.75 prominence is given to the brahman at the expense of his son.
Supposing for a minute that the first part of stanza 19 does refer to Tulādharā alone, how could this be squared with the rest of the stanza, which is unrepentantly dual? To begin with, it might be pointed out that an appropriate meaning can still be salvaged from the stanza if the implicit subject of the gerundive phrase\textsuperscript{111} \textit{divam gatvā} is taken as \textit{tulādharah saḥ} (singular) rather than \textit{mahāprajñānu} (dual). Such an enjambement of the gerundive is not unusual. However if this device allows us to read verse 19b as conveying the singular, there are ramifications for the placing of stanza 19 in context. So long as verse 19b was seen as expressing a duality, the stanza was a self-sufficient unit; whereas if verse 19b refers only to Tulādharā, it may be that we must turn to other stanzas to supply the other half of the composite subject.

On this new basis, still only a tentative one, it becomes relevant to turn back to a comparison of the contexts which each of the text orders B and C provides for stanza 19. In doing so, we should of course take into account the other aspects of stanza 19 already touched upon, viz. the use of the optative mood and the time phrase which introduces the stanza (\textit{tato ācireṇa kālena}) which, together, create the impression that stanza 19 is later in time and contingent upon some

\textsuperscript{111} The stock phrase \textit{divam gatvā} may be taken de facto as a compound verbal form, a unit for syntactic purposes.

\textsuperscript{112} Alone \textit{tataḥ} would have only the force of a cumulative conjunction; joined with \textit{ācireṇa kālena} it is flushed with its full literal significance.
circumstance described prior to it.

Texts of type B read stanza 19 directly after stanza 16. Insofar as stanza 16 is addressed to Jajali by name,\(^{113}\) it is conceivable that it indirectly supplies the other half of the composite subject of stanza 19. But given that Jajali is mentioned only as the object of address in stanza 16 while on the other hand Tuladhara is the explicitly described subject of the last two verses, it is hard to see why the first verse of stanza 19 should also single Tuladhara out for specific mention, to the exclusion of Jajali. Furthermore, it is not the fate of Tuladhara, but the fate of Jajali upon which the denouement of the story could be expected to turn: it is thus that the impact of Tuladhara’s teachings might be demonstrated. Viewed in the light of the interpretation of 19b as referring to Tuladhara alone, then, the text does not appear wholly satisfactory. Unless the type C text proves more satisfactory, it will be necessary to discard the new interpretation of verse 19b.

The texts of type C read stanza 19 directly after stanza 18. In contrast to stanza 16, stanza 18 makes explicit reference to Jajali. But more than that, it does so in a manner which parallels the reference to Tuladhara in stanza 19.\(^{114}\) Thus stanza 18 and the first part of stanza 19 may be envisaged as a pair of arms hinged in the duality of the latter part of stanza 19. The use of tenses and the time dimension, as already mentioned,\(^{115}\) dovetail into this interpretation

\(^{113}\) mahāprajña 16a; jajale 16f.
\(^{114}\) sa dvijaḥ 18b, cf. tulādhāraḥ saḥ, 19b.
\(^{115}\) Page 342 above.
of the passage with a geometry whose neatness can be fully appreciated only in diagrammatic form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present (imperf. narrative past)</th>
<th>sa dvijah</th>
<th>śāntim anvapadyata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion of action of story; transition to future</td>
<td>tatah</td>
<td>acireṇa kālena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceding phase yet to take place</td>
<td>tulādhārāḥ saḥ [eva ca]</td>
<td>divaṃ gatvā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized future (opt.)</td>
<td>mahāprājñāu</td>
<td>vihāretāṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent with preceding</td>
<td>svam svam sthānom</td>
<td>upāgamya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text:

(18b) sa dvijah ... (18d) śāntim evanupadyata
(19a) tato 'cireṇa kālena (19b) tulādhārāḥ sa eva ca
(19cd) divaṃ gatvā mahāprājñāu vihāretāṃ yathāsukham
(19ef) svam svam sthānam upāgamya svakarmaphala- nirjitam.

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, it emerges that both in consideration of detail relating
to the treatment of Jājali's fate and on the basis of covert syntactic structure, the type C text is superior. At the same time it should be recalled that we previously concluded that neither of the text-types was so flawed as to provide a credible stimulus for revision in either direction. That conclusion is unaffected by our subsequent consideration of unobtrusive aspects of the texts. Consequently, while it has been shown that on two separate grounds the text of type C has greater cogency and coherence than that of type B, it has not been shown concomitantly that revision might account for the bifurcation of the two text-types. In accounting for the coexistence of these two text orders we therefore fall back by default on the alternative hypothesis of partly misplaced interpolation.

What has been interpolated? Since stanzas 17-18 and stanza 19 alternate in position with one another in each of the text types, one might suspect either one of being the partly misplaced interpolation. However, by assuming that the purpose of the accretion will have been to elaborate the preexistent conclusion, applying the rule of thumb that an interpolation follows its point of attraction, and further assuming that the new material is correctly implanted in the superior version of the text, which is type C, we arrive at the conclusion that the interpolation was stanza 19.

116 Pages 342-343 above.
117 Pages 343-347 above.
118 Pages 341-342 above.
This inference finds some corroboration in that it pleasantly explains the sequence of tenses employed in the conclusion. Stanza 19 takes as given what has been related up to stanza 18 and, on that platform, speaks of what would have come later; - a perspective on events natural for a composer who was inventing a new final stanza to be built on to preexisting material.

The inference that stanza 19 is an interpolation has another pleasant effect in throwing light upon a sticky patch in the text which we have so far side-stepped. Because of the presence of stanza 19, which tells us how Jājali was to disport himself in the next life, we have until now taken the phrase śāntim anvapadyata in verse 18d to refer to Jājali's death. However, against the background of the story as it unfolds in the ancestral text, this interpretation is not satisfying. The story is set in train by Jājali's emotional involvement in his achievement as an ascetic - his pride at first,119 and then his disappointment after being rebuked.120 In the wake of this introduction, a constructive conclusion might be expected to demonstrate the efficacy of the advice proffered by Tulādhāra on lack of emotional involvement121 and the futility of actions122 by portraying the reform of Jājali's mental outlook. Hence, the conclusion has a positive contribution to make to the development of the story if Jājali's

119 253.6.
120 253.11.
121 254.10-15, 50cd51ab.
122 254.21, 23-27ab, 34.
attainment of Śānti is understood not as an allusion to his death, but rather as a direct statement that, as the result of hearing Tulādhāra's advice, he achieved the state of mind described as Śānti, tranquility of spirit. Once the contamination, stanza 19, has been excised, there is no reason why the archetypal text should not be given this straightforward meaning. 123

The potential ambiguity of the phrase Śāntim anvapadyata lies at the heart of an account of stanza 19's content. The composer of stanza 19 had undoubtedly taken Śāntim anvapadyata as an allusion to Jājali's death, for only in this case can his complementary mention of Tulādhāra's ascension to heaven and the concluding mention of the pair's respective fates in the life hereafter be explained, as having been seen by him as restoring a wholeness or balance missing in the conclusion of the story as he found it. It is ironical that by his "improvement" he gave a new twist to the conclusion which weakened its relevance as a denouement of the original story. However, at the time when any contamination might have been added to the tradition (i.e. post-ω) the original story-line will have been thoroughly obscured by earlier accretions.

123 Although speaking of st.17-18 in the archetypal text, and considering its best sense in that text, the interpretation of its intended meaning must have regard to its alignment on the oldest level of the story (see p. 241 above) consequently the explication of the development of the story has been restricted to material of alignment I. The contention is not diluted, however, by the presence of materials of alignments II and III in the archetypal text. On the contrary, given the references to Jājali's impatience (amarṣavaśa: 253.44a, j1a) and pride (spardhā: 256.6c, 16a) on alignment II the point is made all the more forcefully.
From the foregoing discussion it emerges that:

(a) the interpolation which produced the variant orders B and C was stanza 19, not as earlier suspected 17cd-18;

(b) that the text order C is the original order - i.e., when stanza 19 was composed it was intended for insertion after stanza 18; and

(c) as a corollary of the first point, that 17ab\(^{2}\) of the E texts is not explicable as a recopying associated with the interpolation of 17cd-18.

**Constructing a stemma**

To sum up our achievement so far: we have been able to distil the ancestral text by extracting from it stanza 19, on the grounds just outlined,\(^{124}\) and verse 22cd, on the grounds of its absence in the conclusions of S.\(^{125}\) Although we have not yet been able to account for the duplication of 17ab, there is little room for doubt that 17ab\(^{2}\) of E is not also an accretion, marked as such by its redundancy and limited distribution.\(^{126}\) The concluding stanzas of the ancestral text (\(\omega\)) may thus be recorded as:

- 16, 17, 18

And yet, before our knowledge of the tradition can be advanced much further, it is necessary to consider how the interpolation of stanza 19 can be accommodated in a stemma alongside the interpolation of the \(\text{straddha}\) material. Both these interpolations

---

\(^{124}\) Pages 348-349 above.

\(^{125}\) Page 296 above

\(^{126}\) Implied throughout pp. 329-333 above.
have attained global distribution in the collated texts, but their variant groupings intersect so sharply that it is not possible to fix both on a stemma drawn up solely along lines of genetic descent. While one of the variations may have reached its extant deployment primarily through genetic descent from a minimum number of hyparchetypes, the other can only have transgressed the boundaries of the groupings of the first by contamination. With this in mind we might pause to consider whether the stanza 19 (B/C) dichotomy should be given primacy over the śraddhāpraśānga (C. E./Vulg.). A decision in this matter has profound effects for our understanding of text relationships since the primary dichotomy will be the closer reflection of the configuration of the major recensions of the tradition.

It would be question begging to argue that either stanza 19 or the śraddhāpraśānga has a claim to primacy because its variant groups correspond more closely with the conventionally accepted recensions. In any case, neither shows a compelling compliance with the notional recensions mapped out by Sukthankar, Bolvalker or Edgerton.127

To arbitrate between the rival claims of stanza 19 and the śraddhāpraśānga for priority, our appeal lies to the verdict of the fragmentary and textual variants we have not yet fully considered. The preferred configuration of the tradition will be that

127 Illustrated in Table XIV.
which more adequately accommodates not only the variants of stanza 19, stanza 20, and the śraddhāprāṣāmsā, but also of verse 17ab, verse 22cd, and the Vicakhu story, together with the textual emendations of 256.6c and 256.16a recorded in Part A. Since we now know the beginning of the stemma (ω) and have the end (the collated readings), our task is that of connecting the root to the branches by drawing up a stemma with a scheme of contaminations involving those significant variables.

The fossil readings of S

Until now our attention has focussed upon questions surrounding the genesis of new readings and not the details of their subsequent distribution, their absence or anomalous placement in some texts. However now that it comes to delineating a stemma and infection paths these very omissions or anomalies offer clues to older links in the manuscript chain which are no longer directly witnessed. The S texts, in particular, have valuable testimony to give.

The evidence of M concerning 22cd

As we observed earlier, all the M texts share the peculiarity of reading 22cd after 15ab, that is at the end of the śraddhā material. The śraddhā material itself is incorporated in the Vulgate order shared by the non-W texts. How then has this verse 22cd, which in all its appearances elsewhere is a conclusion to

---

128 Pages 222-226, 230-233 of Part A, and Tables XIX, XX.
129 Page 291 above.
the episode as a whole, come to be attached to the end of the śraddhā material in the case of M? There is no extant witness of a text which could have imposed 22cd by itself upon M at that point. We must therefore consider the alternative, that 22cd came to M as part and parcel with the śraddhā material. But there is no other text which joins 22cd to the tail of the śraddhā material. In the Critical Edition-ordered texts, 22cd in effect interrupts the śraddhā material (22ab x 7ab). The Vulgate text order presents the elements in order and gives the śraddhaprāṣāmsā the required point of insertion (6 x 15cd) but in it the śraddhaprāṣāmsā and 22cd are not contiguous. Other, less straightforward explanations must be sought.

1 It might be thought that M drew its interpolation from some source that read the śraddhā material in fine concluded by 22cd; thus:

15cd 16 17 18 |20 21 22ab 7-15ab 22cd

The idea that such a text might once have existed is attractive only insofar as it embodies a better incorporation of the śraddhā material than any attested text. However the proposal is unacceptable because

130 Unless it be assumed, without evidence, that METG or MTG derive from a common ancestor, all except M having shed the otiose 22cd, E regaining it as a concluding transitional device. Beside the methodological objection to assuming loss, we have the empirical restraint that 22cd placed after 15ab has not been seen as worthy of being dropped from any descendant of the M hyparchetype.


Is it possible that the putative reading of the śraddhaprāṣāmsā complete immediately before 22cd is yet another incorporation of the satellite śraddhaprāṣāmsā of *EW? or is it perhaps to be viewed as the reading of an extinct branch of the tradition from which the śraddhaprāṣāmsā was extracted to become a satellite to *EW?
it fails to account for the Vulgate text insertion point (6 x 15cd) which M shares with ETG.

Alternatively, having taken its śraddhapraśāmsā from a Vulgate-ordered source, M might subsequently have absorbed the accretion 22cd from a putative text of the kind proposed just above. In this way the insertion point (15ab x) is explained. Yet this proposal, too, seems unlikely. The infection of 22cd would have had to have been transferred between texts which were far from running parallel, making collation or correction correspondingly more difficult. Furthermore it seems more likely than not that a transmitter intending to transfer 22cd into another text would have seen it as the final verse of the episode (which is clear enough from its content, too) rather than as a sequel to the śraddhā material, and would have positioned it accordingly. The constant final position of 22cd throughout EW in the face of differing precursory stanzas (22ab, 19, 17ab) reinforces this impression. To support such hypotheses the creation of a special, otherwise-unattested text does not seem warranted.

To avoid this necessity, it is possible to

132 Or, M may be a descendant of the hyparchetype (? *EN, *ES) in which the Vulgate order originated.

133 This point is valid only if 22cd proves to be younger than at least one of its extant precursor stanzas, as it will - see pp.357-358 below.

134 To support the candidature of the putative text by claiming that it was the source from which the satellite śraddhā material was extracted, and that thus it might be said to have supplied both the conclusion (22cd) and the śraddhapraśāmsā - the latter indirectly - fails to simplify the problem.
imagine that the M reading might have arisen through contamination from an E text, from which additions were partly incorporated in *M—say, in the form of marginalia. If we further assume that the śraddhāprasāmsa and 22cd were drawn into M from the same source at the same time, their (erroneous) conjunction might be seen as the heritage of their co-tenancy of the *M margin.

proto-*M (base text): 15cd 16 (19) 17 18 20

E (infecting text): śr.pr. 15cd 16 (19) 17 18 22cd

satellite to *M: śr.pr. + 22cd

*M: śr.pr. + 22cd 15cd 16 (19) 17 18 20

This explanation has nothing to recommend it except the paramount virtue that it does not require the invention of an otherwise-unattested senior branch of the text tradition. In view of the objections to all alternatives, we have little option but to adopt this account.

The implications of acceptance of this last account and of the discussion preceding it are as follows:

1 The uncontaminated *M and a fortiori *S itself knew neither the śraddhā material nor 22cd.

2 The source of M's infection was a text which contained the Vulgate incorporation of the śraddhā material, 22cd, perhaps stanza 19, but not 17ab which is not included in the additions made to *M. In other

135 For the inclusion of stanza 20, see above p. 306 and note 40.
words the source was an E text which did not yet repeat 17ab.

3 Since TG lack 22cd, they owe their śraddha material to an independent process of contamination from a Vulgate source other than M. In this regard the attribution of the original śraddhapraśasa to a hyparchetype within the N recension made earlier on other grounds 136 is confirmed here.

The evidence of G2 concerning 22cd

In its incorporation of the śraddhapraśasa G2 conforms to the Critical Edition order, but along with other S texts it lacks a final 22cd. Given that G2, genetically an S text, 137 has its śraddhapraśasa at second hand from a Critical Edition-ordered source, it is not conceivable that the contiguous 22cd should not have been transferred in the same process had it been present. 138 Thus G2 has preserved an old W (= Critical Edition-ordered) reading unattested elsewhere in which 22cd was not yet present.

The evidence of G2 relates to a W source; that of M to an E source. These horses of different colours are not to be harnessed abreast. However, pulling alone, G2 will take us some distance. It will be recalled that we had earlier 139 attributed 22cd to *N

136 Pages 294-295 above.
137 Pages 318-319 and n.59 above.
138 While a sensitive editor might have baulked at using 22cd to lead into the Vicakhu story (as it would in G2), we can hardly attribute great powers of discrimination to a copyist who was prepared to reproduce the chaotic and unintelligible Critical Edition-ordered text, and to end his chapter with 22ab!
139 Page 296 above.
on the grounds that its distribution was precisely
coterminous with the non-S texts. On G2's evidence,
22cd must be at least one generation younger. To
continue to cope with its universal N distribution, and
its priority over the EW incorporation of the Vicakhnu
story, the first appearance of 22cd is best ascribed
to one of the hyparchetypes *E or *W with an infection
across from one (or a reflex of one) to the other (or
reflexes of the other). Thus, comments made concerning
*N on pages 296-298 above now apply to *E and *W;
and the migration northwards of the Vicakhnu story,
already put on an alignment younger than *EW, must
now be additionally fixed as having occurred after the
composition of 22cd.

The evidence of M5 concerning stanza 19

Among the M texts, M5 stands out as a special
case. As far as the śraddha material and 22cd are
concerned, M5 conforms to the rest of the M group, but
for the order of its final stanzas (17, 18, 19) it
seems to have led a life of its own. While we must
attribute the shared features of śraddhaprasāmsa + 22cd
to *M, we should not so ascribe any features
in which M5 differs from other M texts. Hence we may

---

140 Pages 296-297, 307 above.
141 Page 306 above.
142 Once in place in one EW text, it is conceivable
that 22cd spread to other EW texts anachronistically.
A higher level of involvement is implied in composing
than in copying.
143 Since, in the absence of evidence to the contrary,
it is assumed that shared readings are genetically
inherited - i.e., that all the collated M texts,
which read 15ab, 22cd, 15cd, derive from *M with the
same reading.
provisionally regard M5: M167 as the first bifurcation of the M descent group - a suggestion which finds support elsewhere. The singularity of the conclusion in M5 rests in the placement of stanza 19. In the face of all other S texts, M5 reads stanza 19 in the type C order: after, not before, stanzas 17-18. From this we may make the obvious inference that M5 owes its stanza 19 to a source independent of that (or those) which gave stanza 19 to the rest of M. But additionally it is significant to note that stanza 19 has come to M5 later than the śraddha material and that stanza 19 cannot be attributed to *M, and may be presumed not to have been present in the E source from which *M drew the interpolation of śraddhāprasāṃsā + 22cd either. This conclusion, of course, applies to a single, unidentified E text and cannot automatically be extended to cover the whole recension. Nevertheless it is suggestive. Moreover it corresponds with the presumption of the śraddhāprasāṃsā's greater antiquity which flows from the fact that the Critical Edition/Vulgate dichotomy corresponds more closely to the conventional wisdom concerning manuscript groupings than does the type-B/type-C dichotomy. For these reasons it is more likely than not that the

144 See Table XVIII, noting the reading 255,35\(^2\), 36ab\(^2\), 38ab\(^2\) where only M5 follows the TG reading; or Table XVII, noting the reading 255,34ef\(^2\) where M5 alone of the S texts has this N accretion.

M5: M167 is best put as the first M bifurcation since while M167 differ among themselves (M7: M16) none of the trio has significant combinations with M5 against its fellows.

145 Assuming that we are dealing with a case of contamination. The only alternative is to have the type C text order originate in M5, which in view of the isolation of M5 in S must be inherently improbable.
śraddhāpraśaṃsā was present in the E tradition before stanza 19.\textsuperscript{146}

It is noteworthy that M5 has no reduplication of 17ab. Since it is prima facie more likely that M5 was infected from an E than from a W source on geographical grounds,\textsuperscript{147} it might be taken that the absence of 17ab\textsuperscript{2} in M5 indicates its absence in the source of infection since whenever 17ab\textsuperscript{2} appears in E type-C texts it is contiguous with stanza 19. Hence M5 may show that stanza 19 was present before 17ab in at least one type-C text. Note that such a text has a possible extant reflex in B6.\textsuperscript{148} It must be stressed however that the inferring of this alignment is subject to heavy qualification.\textsuperscript{149}

\textsuperscript{146} Note that, beyond its other limitations, the evidence does not extend to any W text. Nevertheless there is no reason not to believe that stanza 19 is not younger right across the board.

\textsuperscript{147} See Table XXIV.

\textsuperscript{148} Insofar as it is assumed that 17ab\textsuperscript{2} has spread by contamination it does not follow that *M5 was in contact with a direct ancestor of B6.

It is more attractive to account for B6 as an uncontaminated survival of an earlier text now that this seems possible than to have to invoke ad hoc excuses for the loss of 17ab\textsuperscript{2}, which were all that we offered previously. See note 88 above.

\textsuperscript{149} From the fact that M5 has no duplication of 17ab it may be inferred either that *M5 took stanza 19 from a C-type E text which did not then have 17ab\textsuperscript{2} or that *M5 took stanza 19 from a C-type W text in which there was and is no question of reduplication of 17ab. There is little evidence to sway us in favour of either possibility. The variae lectiones do not give M5 any variant readings peculiarly or predominantly of type C. It might be supposed that if *M had been indebted to E sources for its Vulgate śraddhā material, then it is not unlikely that *M5 has been similarly indebted. But there are two quite independent instances of infection in question here. And in any case if we could be sure of *M5 contact with an E source, it is hard to know what to do with the array of conclusions this knowledge would inspire. Not only would the usual disclaimers about
Concerning the alignment of stanza 19 vis-à-vis 22cd, M5 is not helpful. 150

Stocktaking

To take stock of the deductions we have been able to make so far, it is most convenient to list the accretions discussed in the order of appearance in which they are known to us. Unfortunately, for reasons already given, 151 the list does not necessarily apply in toto to any one recension or text, nor does it necessarily list items in order of composition. 152 The list simply shows when each accretion becomes visible for the first time. In order that it might not mislead in this matter, the list includes an indication of the limitation hedging in each item listed:

149 (cont.) generalizing evidence from a particular text apply, redoubled in strength by the thorn of B6, but we would also have to bear in mind that the E source of M5's stanza 19 would have had to have been a type C text, obliging us to be very chary of pontificating on the history of type B texts. Might 17ab2 have been present in type B texts while stanza 19 was still confined to the type C texts in which it was born? 150 That stanza 19 was introduced without the final 22cd is not a strong indication that 22cd was not present in the infection source. Its dormancy may be explained otherwise: by its separation from stanza 19 in the source text (e.g. by the intervention of 20-2lab in W) or potentially in the recipient text by the intervention of 202 between 19 and the chapter end. It is also to be borne in mind that the contamination of stanza 19 involves a single stanza and does not require the assumption of extended comparative correction as the simultaneous incorporation of śraddhaprāṣāma + 22cd docs.

151 Especially at pp. 357, 359.
152 Page 360 and n. 146 above.
As the form of the latter part of the list reflects, the order of composition and the processes of incorporation of verse 22cd, stanza 19, and verse 17ab are still not clear. These teased ends of the main threads can be unknotted, but only by painfully vigorous combing. The analysis which follows is therefore to be seen rather as an illustration of a possible resolution than as a definite solution to the problem. It conveys an impression of the general dimensions of the text's evolution. If we cannot be sure that the developments described are exact reflections of historical reality, we may be confident of the reality of a process of development resembling that outlined. Since two of the three accretions to be discussed (viz. 17ab and 22cd) are purely mechanical and without ideological import, we lose little through uncertainty about their precise ranking vis-à-vis one another - for even with a whole range of alternative hypothetical accounts we can gain a fair impression of the degree of complexity of development underlying the extant texts.

**The history of 17ab**

Beginning the unravelling, let us turn back to the
endeavour which largely set this argument in train: the search for an explanation of $17ab^2$. In our earlier study\textsuperscript{158} of the contrasting readings of $17ab^1$ (bahuvidhārtham) and $17ab^2$ (bahumatārtham) in the E recension, we noted that the reading of $17ab^2$, witnessed in W and S as well, will have corresponded with the ancestral ($ω$) reading of $17ab^1$.\textsuperscript{159} At that point we attempted to explain this deployment of variant readings as the result of a process of copying wherein the duplication of $17ab$ was created at the same time that the reading of $17ab^1(1)$ was altered away from the ancestral ($ω$) form. This proposal was rooted in the notion that the intervening verses $17cd-18$ were interpolated - a view which has since been shown to be misguided.\textsuperscript{160} Not only has the occasion for recopying thus been removed; but considerations which have subsequently come to light would probably rule out the process anyway. Copying from proto-*E\textsuperscript{161} to create *E does not explain the absence of $17ab^2$ from B6 nor the provocative testimony of M5;\textsuperscript{162} copying from *E to create two or more hyparchetypes is not a possibility since it is unbelievable that the same random error altering the first reading should have recurred.

Once the possibility of internal generation of the two E readings is disposed of, we are compelled to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{158} Pages 328-336 above.
\item \textsuperscript{159} Pages 332, 333-334 above.
\item \textsuperscript{160} Page 351 with pages 335-336 above.
\item \textsuperscript{161} Although assumed to be $ω$ at pp. 332-335, subsequent analysis would have it as *EW/*(N-K4) - see Tables XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV.
\item \textsuperscript{162} Pages 253-257 above.
\end{itemize}
review the idea that $17ab^2$ has been imported into E from a non-E source which shares the reading bahumatārtham. In our previous comments on $17ab$ we noted and rejected this idea, but those comments were construed on the basis that $17ab^{(2)}$ was infected into E alone and for its own sake. To revive the proposal, it falls to us now to consider whether $17ab^{(2)}$ might not have lodged in E having entered as it were on the back of another accretion. The two candidates for $17ab^2$'s mount are of course the two fragmentary accretions with which we find $17ab^2$ associated in E: stanza 19 in the type C texts, verse 22cd in the type B texts.

Because $17ab^2$ is consistently placed at 18x, it is a straightforward matter to conceive of its transfer from association with stanza 19 (18 x 19) to juxta-position with verse 22cd (18 x 22cd), or vice versa. Not surprisingly in view of its undistinguished content and brevity, verse $17ab^2$ itself gives us no clue as to which of these two accretions it owes earlier allegiance. With 22cd, it forms a nice unity of sense:

$17ab$: Thus did Tulādhāra speak with highly admirable significance.

$22cd$: After instruction by this example, what do you wish to hear further?\(^{163}\)

The compatibility of these two verses might kindle the suspicion that $17ab^2$ and 22cd have not simply fallen together here through transfer from the alternative

\(^{163}\) Adopting the $17ab^2$ reading bahumatārtham (as C.E.):

256.17ab\(^2\), 22cd:

```
evat bahumatārtham ca tulādhārena bhāsitam /
yathaupamyopadeséna kim bhuyah śrotum icchasi //
```
type-C text, but rather that it is to their conjunction that we might look for an explanation of how 17ab\(^2\) entered E. In the alternative, however, we might equally well ask whether 17ab\(^2\) was not first associated with the type-C text, having been added (perhaps contemporaneously with 22cd) in order to mark off stanza 19, transforming it from a continuation of stanzas 17-18 into a postscript in its own right. From the way in which speaker-markers have been inserted\(^{164}\) we have confirmation that a number of extant type-C texts have been interpreted thus.

Content and context are no help; our sole criterion for deciding which (if either) of 17ab\(^2\)'s allegiances offers a satisfactory account of the extant texts is the viability of the processes each requires. If it is supposed that in its first appearance in the E recension 17ab\(^2\) was associated with stanza 19, the implication is that 17ab\(^2\) has arisen as a by-product of the transfer of stanza 19 from WC (where stanza 19 will have been composed\(^{165}\) into E. It is perhaps

\(^{164}\) I.e. between 17ab\(^2\) and 19 in B789, D57 - about one third of the texts which repeat 17ab\(^2\). I have not advanced arguments to explain the placements of speaker-markers nor have I used them as evidence in constructing any stemma (except in showing how some transmitters have understood their texts) because, being extra-metrical and having the status of rubrics, they are liable to a more loosely controlled transmission. Their patterns appear consistently erratic beside those of other variations.

\(^{165}\) M5 itself is a theoretically possible place of composition, but in view of the distribution of the text type-C variant is prima facie an unlikely one. (Cf. note 145 above). It is also possible to construct highly complex and unreasonable procedures which would put stanza 19's composition in E and still allow it to bear in 17ab\(^2\) from W. (st.19 composed in \(\ast\)Eca \(\rightarrow\) \(\ast\)WC \(\rightarrow\) \(\ast\)Ecb with 17ab\(^2\); 17ab\(^2\) \(\ast\)Ecb \(\rightarrow\) \(\ast\)Eca, where Eca and Ecb are subgroups within EC).
conceivable that the contaminator, who more than any other transmitter will have had reason to be conscious of stanza 19's status as an auxiliary conclusion because it was lacking in his E text, should have chosen to finish off his base (E) text by inserting 17ab immediately after the existing conclusion (17-18) preparatory to inserting stanza 19 itself; and additionally that he should have drawn 17ab (2) from the same W source as that from which he took stanza 19.

The derivation of E's bahumatărtha reading through such a process of infection is vitiated by the fact that none of the appropriate source texts of WC have the required reading: they offer either their own distinctive variant (WC: bahusahărtha) or the reading of E's 17ab (bahusahărtha). In addition, there is the compound dissuasion of M5 and B6. As we have concluded that M5 drew its contamination from an E text, then both M5 and B6 witness an EC reading in which stanza 19 is present without 17ab. It is not easy to accommodate such readings in the currently

165 (Cont.) There is no intrinsic reason for preferring either WC or EC as the place of composition of stanza 19. We may note, however, the conventional wisdom that the predominantly Devanagari E is a vulgar tradition "which facilitated contamination and conflation" (Sukthankar, Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", p.lxiii), through whose agency stanza 19 would have most easily achieved its extant universal distribution.

166 The conclusion is set down in p.351 above.

167 For this reading see Table XXXI and page 334 with note 91 above.

168 Pages 356-357 above.
proposed scheme\textsuperscript{169} for they refute its fundamental assumption by testifying that stanza 19 has had an existence in E independent of 17ab\textsuperscript{2}.

If, then, it is supposed that in its first appearance in the E recension 17ab\textsuperscript{2} was associated with 22cd in texts of the type B, the following processes might be envisaged: Having been composed in *W to smooth over the jagged edge of the transition 256.22ab : 257.12, 22cd will have inspired the composition of a similar transition in E, in this case a couplet comprising 22cd with 17ab\textsuperscript{(2)}. By culling verses from his W source, the contaminator of E will have been able to put together a more polished transition than that provided by the brusque single verse of W. From its vantage point in the EB texts, 17ab\textsuperscript{2} will have begun to infect the EC texts in which stanza 19 may have been already present,\textsuperscript{170} and, maintaining its 18x position, will have driven a wedge between stanzas 18 and 19. The spread of this infection is apparently not complete, hence the case of B6.

This account is not hindered by the obstacles which obstructed the first. There is no difficulty in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{169}Even if 17ab\textsuperscript{(2)} + 19 had been infected from WC into only some of the non-B E texts, unless we are prepared to posit two independent infections from WC into E (alongside the separate infection from WB into E), the remaining E texts will have had to rely on drawing st.19 from EC texts in which 17ab was already present - i.e. st.19 composed in WC, WC → WB → EB; WC → ECa + 17ab\textsuperscript{(2)} → ECB, or WC → ECB, WC → ECa + 17ab\textsuperscript{(2)}, 17ab\textsuperscript{2} → ECb → ECB. Alternatively see note 165 above.
\item \textsuperscript{170}There is no reason not to assume that stanza 19 was composed in *EC. See latter part of note 165 above.
\end{itemize}
accommodating EC texts which have stanza 19 but not 17ab\(^2\) such as were M5's likely source; the case of B6 is incidentally explained, although a little special pleading is necessary to cope with the presence of 22cd without 17ab\(^2\) 171; the origin of the transition based on 22cd is convincingly put in W where it was more obviously needed and hence more convincingly motivated, and where it appears in its more primitive single-verse form; but above all, *W, the text from which the borrowing of 22cd into EB is proposed, is a potential source of the reading bahumārtham. The principal weakness of the account lies in the lack of an exact model to act as source for the contamination 17ab22cd and our compensatory invocation of an author's ingenuity, combining two verses which lay some eleven verses apart in W. Another weakness, though not necessarily an objection, is the assumption that although 17ab\(^2\) and 22cd were allegedly transferred from EB to EC together, they were implanted in EC as if they were two independent verses, with 22cd maintaining its final position and 17ab\(^2\) its 18x position.

A more serious objection lies in the fact that, while the first account implicitly assigned 22cd to *E, this second account introduces 22cd into the E

\[171\] The difficulty is that unless B6 is assumed to have taken 22cd independently from a W source, the E source of its final verse will have contained 17ab\(^2\) as well. Can we argue that 22cd's more conspicuous final position made it more prone to be noticed by a transmitter comparing his text with another?
recension a generation later (in EB) and in such circumstances that it is invariably linked with the EB innovation, 17ab\(^2\). This contradicts the testimony of *M. The hyparchetype *M has incorporated a Vulgate-ordered śraddhāprāśaṁśa in conjunction with 22cd, a combination found only in E texts. It incorporated neither stanza 19 nor 17ab\(^2\) despite the fact that, had they been present in the contributing E text, one or both 172 would have been contiguous with 22cd. On *M's evidence, therefore, there must once have been an E text which included 22cd but not 17ab\(^2\). To meet this requirement by having 22cd infected\(^1\) into *E rather than *EB is to refute the plausible account of 17ab\(^2\)'s composition on the occasion of 22cd's incorporation in *EB. The situation can be retrieved by assuming that EC had derived 17ab\(^2\) and 22cd not through a secondary contamination from an EB source, but rather through two separate infections: one of 22cd from W; the other of 17ab\(^2\) from EB. Under this arrangement, *EC is a suitable source for *M's borrowing. Furthermore the case of B6 and the asymmetrical distributions of 22cd and 17ab\(^2\) it records ceases to be a problem. Since all EC texts owe 22cd and 17ab\(^2\) to different sources, their incorporations

---

172 I.e. 17ab\(^2\) is contiguous with 22cd in EB; 17ab,19 is contiguous with 22cd in EC.
173 Or composed (22cd *W → *E, or *E → *W). But in accordance with our earlier comment on W's greater need for a transition healer (p.368 above), infection into E is preferable. The supporting argument of the relatively greater primitiveness of form of the W conclusion (p.368) cannot be applied here.
into EC can be placed on different levels: the universally present 22cd being genetically inherited from *EC and the incompletely distributed 17ab\textsuperscript{2} coming in on a younger alignment. Not only is B6 thus explained without special pleading, but more valuably, the independent entry of 17ab\textsuperscript{2} and 22cd into the EC texts removes the difficulty over their separation on either side of stanza 19.

The amended proposal outlined in the previous paragraph is illustrated in full as Table XXXIII. It is not a perfect solution. Apart from anything else, nothing we have said to date explains how the bifurcation B/C arose - i.e. how stanza 19 came to be misplaced in the type B texts. This is not necessarily a flaw in the argument: it is quite possible that this is just a case of random error arising in the course of incorporation. Such a supposition leaves the structure built upon it vulnerable to challenge from any account which can provide a positive motivation or an occasion for the change or can mitigate the degree of error assumed. But until such a challenge is mounted, the account is no more than vulnerable: it is still intact.
DEVELOPING THE STEMMA

In support of the analysis in Part B a series of charts in which proposed stemmas and the infection paths they imply are set out (Tables XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVII, XXXVIII).

Depictions of the stemma

The principle upon which the stemmas depicted have been drawn up is that the diagram should embody the conclusions reached in the foregoing analysis and portray them with the greatest possible efficiency, that is with the smallest number of contaminations. This may mean advancing the alignment on which infection, accretion or emendation occurred to the oldest possible level, where it can affect the largest number of progeny with the smallest number of contaminations. For example, in Table XXXIII the Vicakhnu story might have spread from any S source on any alignment younger than that illustrated, but the younger the alignment the more instances of infection involved and the greater the chance of erroneous placement or imperfect distribution - which are not evidenced. Conversely it may be more efficient to place a contamination affecting a single text on a younger alignment than that theoretically possible. For instance, 257.12-13 might have been transferred to *T1G36 from *EW, but if the infection is deferred to take place from *E, the passage can travel in company
with the śraddhāprasāma. And ultimately, in less tractable cases, the question of efficiency may come down to a decision between potential infections: is it more efficient to propose contamination of an emendation or of an accretion? On the ground that the former requires more enterprise on the part of the transmitter who has not only to detect the divergence but must also be prepared to discard the reading he has inherited, the path of least resistance, and therefore most efficiency, is to prefer accretion as the candidate for infection.¹ A priori judgements such as these have fleshed out the bare bones of the chart. Reality, ungoverned by our empirical generalizations, may have been quite the reverse in any number of individual cases; but until we have evidence of law-breaking we must presume innocence.

Depiction of the stemma is in one sense a violation of the spirit of the analysis whose blood it draws. The constraints of draftsmanship alone make it necessary to make seemingly definitive assignments rather than setting down the range of possibilities in all their shades of probability. It is not profitable to catalogue, much less illustrate, the long list of possible alternative arrangements which differ only in detail from what is portrayed on the charts: it makes but an ounce of difference whether, say, the Vicakhaṇu story was interpolated into *E and *W from *T126136 or from any other S source, or from each separately.

¹ It is also methodologically preferable, cf. page 106 above.
Nonetheless, relationships of all degrees of certainty are set down in equally black ink.

And yet in another sense the diagram rises above the analysis for it demonstrates how explanations of the parts can be knitted together into a whole. Moreover it imposes a discipline upon the depiction of the stemma by fixing the oldness of every change relative to other changes. In the analysis we had been content to note, for instance, that *G2 took its śraddhāprāsaṁśā from a Critical Edition-ordered text which had not then accreted 22cd, and that *M took its śraddhāprāsaṁśā from a Vulgate-ordered text in which 22cd was present. Only by drawing up a stemma and synchronizing the texts with horizontally-drawn infection paths for both the śraddhāprāsaṁśā and 22cd does it become fully obvious that this must mean that *G2 had an existence separate from the remainder of TG on an older alignment than that of the first bifurcation in the M group.

Notes on the stemma charts:
A Chapters 256, 257

Most of the detail depicted in the first and simplest stemma (Table XXXIII) is comprehensible in terms of the analysis developed hitherto. Discussion of several points which warrant clarification or comment will lead us on to the ever more comprehensive second, third and fourth stemmas (Tables XXXIV, XXXV, and XXXVII).

With regard to K4, the scheme shown in Table XXXIII simply develops that proposed in Table XXVII,
where a defective incorporation of the śraddhāpraśamsā is pictured. The notion that the śraddhāpraśamsā was once present in full is ruled out of court in that it is impossible to explain how just those verses 20-22ab which we know historically to have comprised a discrete accretion should have been shed from K4.

It is only slightly less uncomfortable to have to accept that the verses 20-22ab were excluded from the infection process which brought the rest of the śraddhāpraśamsā to K4. Had K4 derived its śraddhāpraśamsā from the same source as that from which it derived the Vicakhnu story, 22cd or stanza 19, then it is inconceivable that the contiguous fragment 20-22ab should somehow have been overlooked by the contaminator. There is no source which has 22cd or stanza 19 without the śraddhāpraśamsā; therefore the only way in which the infection of K4's śraddhāpraśamsā can be isolated from other transfers is by advancing it to an older alignment. But even this least of evils is unsatisfactory in that if an old defective incorporation of the śraddhāpraśamsā and a subsequent large-scale infection arising from the correction and completion of K4 against an EC text is assumed, the source of the latter would have to have been an EC text which knew stanza 19 but not 17ab². This is a text type poorly represented in our stemma.³ And with

² The fragment 20-22ab will have been contiguous with other infections - in the Vulgate-order with 7-15ab; in the Critical Edition-order with 19 or 22cd.
³ Only by B6. If 17ab² did in fact not achieve its EC distribution with a single transfer, other EC texts may have had the B6 reading at an earlier stage of their evolution.
a comprehensive infection filling out K4 subsequent to the defective śraddhāpraśamśa it requires at least a suspension of disbelief to accept that the missing 20-22ab should not also then have been supplied in the position in which it was found in the source text. Our scepticism is not allayed by proposing that K4 suffered, rather, a number of petty infections: the problem is compounded.

Nevertheless, there are implausibilities in promoting *K4 to the status of a collateral of *EW and *S when it is not notable for having preserved old readings of critical significance. Unfortunately there is no way of putting down this upstart unless it could be made credible that K4 should have lost 20-22ab at a late stage, in which case K4 becomes a member of the W recension. An occasion for such a loss of material from the chapter-final position might have been the accretion of stanza 19. Copied in from an EC source, stanza 19 falls directly after stanza 18, as 20-22ab will have in *K4. Furthermore, in their EC source, the three verses of stanza 19 will undoubtedly have been combined with a fourth verse, 22cd, to make up two śloka couplets. A momentary lapse of concentration is all

4 It is only possible for K4 to have followed the W configuration (Critical Edition order), for only the detached fragment is juxtaposed with potentially independent accretions. Cf. note 2 above.

5 See note 3 above. Because stanza 19 has been placed after stanza 18 in K4 the conclusion that it was drawn from a C-type source is inescapable, yet in 19f we find a variant (svakarmaṇaparīvarjitaṁ, "having left behind [the influence of] their works" for C.E.: svakarmaphalanirjitaṁ) which K4 shares with B0, Dn14, Ds12, D238 alone, all the latter group being B-type texts.
that would have been needed for our copyist, following
the contours of his text, to be propelled into the
lullingly familiar formulaic conclusion of the
episode. 6 I consider this a feasible, though
speculative, 7 description of circumstances under which
20-22ab (or rather, 20-22cd) might have been omitted
from *K4. It would resolve the problem of K4's
ancestry, making *K4 a W text which began an
independent development on an alignment older than the
incorporation of stanza 19 into WB or WC. But other
K4 variations (the emendations of 6c and 17a and the
variant reading of 19f) are still not explained, and
until they are, the last word has not been said.
Nevertheless, K4 is pictured in its W descent in the
second and third stemmas.

Table XXXIII specifically excludes from
consideration a small number of E texts which exhibit
a seemingly random pattern of omissions and variant
distributions which impel us to give special
consideration to their place in the stemma. The
relevant variations, summarized in tabular form, are:

6—Note, too, that what follows 22cd in both K4
and the source text will have been the same: the
Vicakhmu story.
7 A possible corroboration using the variae lectiones
of 22cd to show that the extant 22cd in K4 has come
from an E source is not practicable because of
22cd's paucity of variation—something to be
expected in a verse so completely formulaic.
Dn4 and Ds2 witness the same readings and may be considered as one. Beyond that, given the number of variables, the three texts could not be more disparate.

Although the editors of the Critical Edition unhelpfully describe the omission of 16ef in B9Dn4Ds2 as an instance of haplology. One is loath to credit the same error having arisen independently in two texts. Nor can an omission spread by contamination. We are

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16a</th>
<th>16ef</th>
<th>19abcd</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>spardham jahi</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>spardham jahi</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dn4</td>
<td>śraddham kuru</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds2</td>
<td>spardham jahi</td>
<td>om. and marg.</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[ om: spardham jahi | present | absent | absent ]

---

8 Presumably by the annotation "om. (hapl.)" the editors imply that the copyist, misled by the similarity of (the opening of) 16ef and the verse following, jumped straight across 16ef, causing its omission. Not only can the same explanation not be applied to both B9 and Dn4Ds2 insofar as 16ef is followed by different verses in each case, but only in B9 does the required milieu for haplogy seem present. In Dn4Ds2, 16cd would seem the candidate for haplological omission.
thus obliged to take seriously the possibility that, whatever else their differences, B9 and Dn⁴Ds² are jointly descended from an ancestral hyparchetype *B⁹Dn⁴Ds² in which 16ef had been omitted. The obstacles in the way of such a construct are insuperable. First, B9 omits not only 16ef but also, two stanzas later, 19abcd. Now since stanza 19 has different placements in B9 and Dn⁴Ds² a hyparchetype *B⁹Dn⁴Ds² cannot have included stanza 19. The omission of 19abcd in B9 would thus have to be completely divorced from the omission of 16ef when for the evolution of B9 it is clearly preferable to suppose that one link in the *B⁹ chain was a highly defective text in which both omissions arose. Secondly, from the standpoint of Dn⁴Ds² the positing of a hyparchetype *B⁹Dn⁴Ds² omitting 16ef is also untenable. In B9, 16a has spardhāṃ jahi, the ancestral (ω) reading; Dn⁴Ds² have the innovatory E reading śraddhāṃ kuru. If these texts are descended from a single hyparchetype it must be accorded B9's ancestral reading. We are thereby manoeuvred into a position of assuming that some transmitter of *Dn⁴Ds² was meticulous enough to emend the *Dn⁴Ds² reading of 16a but so lackadaisical that he let the omission of 16ef pass unchecked. Such absurdities can be set aside at one stroke by denying that B9 and *Dn⁴Ds² are sons of the same father and - our rightful scepticism vanquished - proposing that the omission of 16ef had indeed occurred separately in two independent texts. We now see *Dn⁴Ds² with new eyes as the grandchild of *EB, owing its innovatory
readings and its placement of stanza 19 not to remarkable contamination but to unremarkable inheritance. 9

Both Vl and B9 have the peculiarity that in some respects they are branded as E texts, for instance in reading 17ab 10 in reading sammataḥ tam sucetasām at 20b, in reading śraddhaṁ in 6c 11 and witnessing the Vulgate-ordered śraddhāpṛaśamsā while, flying in the face of all this, both texts witness the ω reading śraddhāṁ jahi at 16a where every other E text reads śraddhāṁ kuru. It is self-indulgent and a debilitating complexity to think that *Vl and *B9, as E texts, once read śraddhāṁ kuru and have in their extant forms restored the ancestral (ω) reading at second-hand from some WS source. 12 Yet it seems harsh to disqualify Vl and B9 from membership of the E club over the issue of 16a alone. Perhaps the qualification for membership should be revised. The stumbling block is the association in the stemma (Table XXXIII) of the emendation of 16a and the Vulgate incorporation of the śraddhāpṛaśamsā. It was the incorporation of the śraddhāpṛaśamsā which set in train the impulse inspiring the emendation and undoubtedly the transmitter's involvement in the

9 Note especially that Dn4Ds2 has in 19f the inferior reading common to all other EB texts. See note 5 above.
10 By inference in Vl.
11 The force of śraddhaṁ as a particular mark of E texts is seriously qualified at page 382 below.
12 The issue of complexity aside, this notion is refuted in that motivation abounds for the emendation śraddhāṁ kuru > śraddhāṁ jahi, but not vice versa.
incorporation uniquely sets the scene for concomitant revisions. But this does not make it necessarily the case that the incorporation and the emendation were contemporaneous, and if it means that Vl and B9 can find a mansion in their father's house it may be worthwhile deferring the emendation of 16a. An alternatively attractive time at which to place the emendation would be alongside the composition of stanza 19, when we have evidence that one transmitter felt called upon to "improve" the substance of the text as he found it, and dared to do so. Might he have altered 16a too? If the new reading sraddha kuru were so assigned, its distribution would be neatly accounted for by assuming the transfer of the emendation from *EC to *EB along with stanza 19. Under this new dispensation, *Vl and *B9 may therefore be pictured as E texts collateral to *EB and *EC. Having branched *Vl and *B9 off from the rest of E before the incorporation of stanza 19 there is the opportunity for separate infections of stanza 19 into *Vl and *B9. In this light the fact that Vl is of the B type and B9 of the C type does not rule out descent from a common parent in which stanza 19 was still unknown. Whether or not a common parent *VlB9 ever in fact existed can be proved or disproved only by the cumulation of further

13 This point is qualified to the extent that the transmitter is merely incorporating, not composing or compiling.
14 The accretions of 22cd or 17ab have nothing to recommend them as likely occasions. The possibility that the emendation of 16a is contemporaneous with that of 6c is taken up below pp. 382-384. It is not adopted, on the testimony of D57.
variations. For simplicity's sake, I have assumed that there was (Table XXXIV).

The alignment of the alteration of 16a with the composition of stanza 19 will be adopted as a working hypothesis (Table XXXIV) but it must be stressed that this fragile conclusion rests on a balance of convenience: the smallest particle of information from a passage not considered here might tip the scales one way or the other, moving śraddhāṃ kuru up or down the stemma.

To conclude, it is an interesting speculation to reflect on whether the proposal that stanza 19 was transferred from EC to EB jointly with the 16a emendation might not have some relevance for an explanation of the shift of placement of stanza 19 from 18x in type-C texts to 16x in type-B texts.

In discussing the spardhā > śraddhāṃ emendations in Part A,15 we lumped the two emendations of 6c and 16a together and, by assigning the same motivation to each, implicitly attributed them to the same reviser. Subsequent refinement of our definition of variant groupings underlying 6c throws grave doubt on the validity of that presumption as none of the 6c variants is distributed coterminously with the 16a amendment to śraddhāṃ kuru. The distribution profile of śraddhāṃ kuru most nearly matches that of version 3 of 6c, but even here V1 and B9 have the emendation in 6c but not in 16a while D571 has the emendation in 16a but

15 Pages 222-226, 233 above.
16 As tabulated on p. 320 above.
17 Regarding the D7 reading of dharmaṃ for brahman as a late S-influenced emendation.
not in 6c. The matter of the position of the 6c emendation in the stemma thus comes down to a balancing of the interests of a simple account of D57 against those of a simple account of the infections of the emendation itself. The greater the antiquity we assign to the hyparchetype *D57 the fewer the instances of infection which will be necessary to carry sraddhā across the rest of the E recension, but correspondingly the greater the number of elements in the D57 text we are obliged to attribute to contamination (17ab2, C19, sraddhā kuru in 16a).

The solution to this dilemma illustrated in the first stemma (Table XXXIII) assumes no contamination of D57 at all, involving sraddhā in the maximum number of transfers. That sraddhā might indeed have spread in this manner is indicated by its appearance in K4 as the result of infection. Nevertheless the extent of its spread through E is remarkable, particularly in view of the fact that it is an emendation which, unlike an accretion, has to down a rival reading in the recipient text. Yet, lest we dismiss the proposal out of hand, two points of mitigation should be mentioned. First, the fact that we have two independent emendations of 6c, to sraddhā in E and to himsā in S, shows that it was indubitably perceived by transmitters as a problem reading open to "correction"; consequently the influence of the glosses of authoritative commentaries can be invoked both as the source of the new reading and as the medium of transfer of the emendation. The characteristic method of
commentary by paraphrasing with a series of glosses provides any puzzled transmitter with a readily accessible source of "corrections" for readings he finds difficult. The power of the commentator's example is magnified if the commentary is written on the margins of the text proper so that in transcription both will be copied or at least read in close proximity; and all the more so if the commentary adopts an innovatory reading as its standard. The second point of mitigation is the nature of the emendation. Amounting to little more than a spelling change, it demands a lesser act of faith on the part of the transmitter to correct what must have seemed a minor discrepancy than it would for an emendation more radically different in form.

As an alternative solution, in the second stemma (Table XXXIV) the hyparchetype *D57 is advanced to the point where there is a minimum number of transfers of śraddhā (viz.: one, into K4) with the assumption that several elements of *D57's text are present through contamination. Since it is unnecessary to propose several transfers into D5, D7 - all the contaminated material may be assigned to a single transfer - this

18 In the case of 6c, Nilakanṭha, Vādirāja and Paramananda all adopt the reading śraddhā(m). Cf. 16a, which is not glossed by Nilakanṭha, where Paramananda adopts śraddhā kuru and Vādirāja adopts spardhaṁ jahi. See also Sukthankar, Ādīparvan, "Prolegomena", pp. lxxix-lxxx, on the influence of commentators' glosses.
seems a most straightforward disposition. 19

Thus the idea that 6c was emended at the same time as 16a in a single revision is seen to be quite inadequate to deal with the realities of the various lectiones. On the arguments considered so far, that particular emendation of spardha which produced the version J (śraddham...) reading of 6c is probably best placed on its oldest possible alignment. The stemma and infection paths of the second stemma (Table XXXIV) are thus worthy of promotion to the heady status of working hypothesis.

B Chapter 254.25-26

The variations of chapters 256 and 257 can take us only so far in detailing a stemma. We can gain further insight into the stemma and infection paths deduced on that basis by integrating with it the information derived from analysis of 254.25-26 which is set out in Tables XV and XVI. This information is particularly valuable because, owing to numerous errors of incorporation, it has been possible to

19 It is no objection to this proposal that it involves the incongruity that 16a should have been emended while 6a was not, when the substitution of śraddham kuru for spardham jahi in 16a, unlike the 6c emendation, involves a major substitution. Whatever our feelings on the matter, the testimony of the extant texts D5 and D7 is incontrovertible evidence that somehow this has in fact come to pass. For rationalizations of the phenomenon we could argue that it was precisely the greater magnitude of the emendation which forced 16a on the attention of an editor who overlooked 6c; or that the proximity of other text improvements (viz. the addition of st. 19, vs.17ab2c) focussed an editor's attention on the latter part of the chapter.
describe in some detail and certainty how the accretion spread.\textsuperscript{20} It is therefore pleasing to find that the demands of 25-26 can be comfortably met by the previously deduced stemma. Indeed, although it is necessary to introduce a small number of hitherto unattested infections, by and large the processes of transfer of 25-26 are explicable using manuscript contacts already posited. The integration of 254,25-26 with the stemma ii scheme is set out in stemma iii (Table XXXV).

The only problem of interpretation worthy of remark is the question to which of the several hyparchetypes which read 25-26 at 2\textsuperscript{ha}r x 27ab the initial incorporation of the accretion should be assigned. There is nothing in the text formation, which is distributed throughout M and widely in E, which would give either *M or any E hyparchetype the preference in this contest, and we are therefore obliged to fall back on the persuasive evidence of infection paths already postulated for the contaminations of chapters 256 and 257. Since a contamination taking śraddhāprāśāmsā + 22cd from E to *M has been postulated already and since no transfers from M to E have been proposed,\textsuperscript{21} it would be needlessly obtuse not to seize upon the facility offered to convey 25-26 from E to *M as well. This

\textsuperscript{20} See pages 273-280 above.
\textsuperscript{21} In fact when we come to discuss 255,35-36ab such a transfer will be proposed (by deriving the Vicakhmu infection from *M instead of G1). However this need not affect the present analysis since the alignment is too old to be relevant.
leaves the probable initial incorporation of 25-26 somewhere in E on an alignment older than the infection into *M. Within E the fact that Vl has a reading of 25-26 infected from **K124 indicates that at the time of that infection *Vl was without 25-26. The implication of this is that no ancestor of Vl in the E recension can be credited with having the accretion. Thus, between them, Vl and the infection into *M define the upper and lower limits of the area in which the initial incorporation of 25-26 may be put: that is, in an antecedent of *EC after the Vl,EB : EC bifurcation but before the composition of stanza 19. Since there is no irregularity in B9's incorporation of 25-26, the initial incorporation is best placed on an alignment older than the inception of B9's independent transmission. Located thus, 25-26 is in a position to achieve the necessary distribution within E by joining in the transfer already mapped out which carries stanza 19 and the emendation of 16a from *EC to *EB.

Since *WC,Kh has been made to derive its twisted interpolation of 25-26 through the agency of a predecessor of *WB at a time when that text apparently did not include 24ef, it is necessary to propose two transfers from E sources into the WB line: the first

22 Since this exclusion involves the hyparchetype in which 17ab had its inception, it nicely complements our earlier desideratum that the transfer of śraddhaprasāmsa + 22cd (and now 25-26 too) to M should have been from a text which was ignorant of 17ab.

23 Since this is the terminus ante quem for the infection into M which already witnesses the presence of 25-26.
conveying 25-26; the second, a product of the misplacement of the first incorporation, introducing 24ef(2). To date (stemmas i, ii) we have needed to posit only one such transfer to carry Bl9 into *WB. The other transfer we must now envisage should be aligned on an older level than the Bl9 transfer, for when *WC,K4 took over 25-26 from the WB line it did not take over Bl9 even though, on the evidence of K4, it will have lacked stanza 19 altogether. The implication is therefore that Bl9 was not present in the text from which *WC,K4 drew its 25-26 contamination. Since 24ef was also lacking there, it is appropriate to introduce Bl9 and 24ef jointly through the second transfer.

The affiliation of K6 is greatly changed. Whereas in stemmas i and ii K6 was grouped with B78 as a descendant of *EC, the evidence of 25-26 refutes that relationship. As we have seen, the disturbance of the K6 text surrounding 25-26 indicates that K6 must have gained 25-26 through infection; and therefore K6 cannot be the descendant of a text in which 25-26 had already been incorporated. The corollary of this disinheritance is that any features of the E recension which make their appearance on a younger alignment or on the same alignment as 25-26 must also be present in K6 through contamination. This observation applies to the sraddham kuru amendment of 16a and stanza 19, and may or may not apply to 17ab depending upon which blood line K6 chooses. On the conservative principle that the less attributed to contamination the better, K6's ancestry is traced back to a position collateral with *V1,E3.
Hitherto the only marks of *Gl's individuality taken into account have been the omission of 257.121 and a variant reading of 256.20t. Consequently, *Gl has been deemed a collateral of *TlG36 of very late deviation. Now, the disarrangement of the recipient text makes it unarguable that *Gl already existed as an independent text at the time when 25 was incorporated. The question is whether this observation extends *Gl's lifetime by pushing the *Gl : *TlG36 bifurcation up to an older alignment or whether it makes the alignment upon which 25 was introduced into TG very young. The answer lies in the contamination B19 which Gl has in common with all TG texts and which must have come directly or indirectly from a N source. Since the same distribution and origin are attributable to 25 it is most efficient to envisage the spread of 25(26) and B19 through the TG texts in company. Such an arrangement, illustrated in stemma iii, enhances *Gl's antiquity.

The movements of 26 within TG can be retraced with some certainty. The association of 26 and the duplication of 25cd in T2 and G2 rules out these texts as a likely place of the first TG incorporation of 26;

---

24 See p.299 above. If it be assumed that *Gl was originally lacking the 121-131 contamination altogether and that its reading of 131 alone stems from a defective infection rather than omission in transmission, *Gl's independence of *TlG36 would date back to an alignment older than the incorporation of the Vulgate śraddhāprāśaśā (with 121-131) into *TlG36. Although there is no difficulty in making the B19,25 transfer into *Gl the vehicle of the Vulgate śraddhāprāśaśā as well, nothing is gained by doing so. The stemma follows the conservative principle of relying upon descent rather than infection wherever possible.

25 See p.317 above.
unless two independent infections have brought 26 into TG, the presence of 26 in T2,G2 is to be derived from **T1GJ6 where the faulty duplication of 25cd is not found. Since 26 is altogether absent from G1, this leaves *T1GJ6 as the first TG encampment of 26.

C Chapter 255.34-38

Unlike 254.25-26, the history of 255.35-38ab does little to confirm the stemma. On the contrary it serves as an illustration of how knowledge of the disposition of the stemma and its infection paths can create light out of that which would otherwise be without form and void.

The treatment of 255.35-38ab in Part A was limited in that it was confined to a consideration of the evidence offered by chapter 255 when it happens that the most outrageous variations are embodied in verses which have thrust their way into chapter 256. Nevertheless the limited resources of chapter 255 enabled us to analyse variations in text order and duplication of verse 34ef to such effect that 35-38ab was identified as a contamination which had been imposed upon the archetypal text 34abcd38cd39. But now we are obliged to face up to the complications inherent in the senseless intrusion of 35-36ab into chapter 256 at 16cd x ef present in nearly all S texts.

---

26 Pages 185-192 above.  
27 In the case of M7, 35 and 38ab only appear at 256.16cd\textsuperscript{1} x 16cd\textsuperscript{2}.  
28 Exceptions being M16.
few S texts (D7, M57) 35-36ab are repeated in 256, having been read in 255 as well; in others (T12G1236) these verses are absent from chapter 255 and appear only in 256. In every case where 35-36ab appear in 256, verse 38ab is in league with them; but in every S text, 38ab appears in chapter 255. Of all the S texts, only M16 are not caught up in this circus, although they provide their own side-show by reading 35 but not 36ab in 255.

A discerning eye will be immediately caught by the case of another manuscript which omits 36ab, namely M7. It is to be noted at the outset that the omission of 36ab in M7 occurs in 256, while that in M16 it is in 255. It is therefore not to be automatically assumed that the omissions spring from the same root; and indeed further examination shows that they do not. The texts of M1,M6 share with M5 the reading paśavaḥ in 255.36cd. Since M7 has here a totally aberrant reading there is no obstacle to assuming that *M read paśavaḥ in 255.36cd. Given this *M reading, the omission in M16 is well explained as an instance of haplology which arose in *M16.

The same explanation is not available for M7's omission in 256. Nor can it be thought that the deficient M7 reading represents a copying of the 255

---

29 D7 has adopted the S reading in ch.256 while maintaining the ch.255 reading like all N texts.
30 For vānija (C.E.), paśavaḥ (M156), N7 has jamtavaḥ, perhaps as a gloss on paśavaḥ as "mere men", or "individual souls".
31 On this reading see further below, note 44.
reading of M16. The possibility of such copying is ruled out by the duplication in M7 of 256.16cd. The duplication of material before and after an interpolation is the kind of anomaly we have learnt to associate with incorporations in which the point of insertion has been misjudged, leading to a copying across of additional material from the source text. In the present case, the duplication of 256.16cd in M7 would require an infection source which already read 35(36ab)38ab in 256. The variae lectiones of 35,38ab and 256.16cd point to T2,G2 or M5 as most likely sources. However, while this insight into M7's history makes unlikely any connection with M16, it does nothing to explain M7's omission of 36ab! It is not enough to point to the nonsensicality and hence instability of the passage in 256.

For good or for bad, it is beyond question that 35-36ab,38ab make no sense at all in their chapter 256 placement, nor indeed do the combined verses 35-36ab,38ab considered in themselves; whence the inescapable inference that the displacement or repetition of these verses has not arisen through any conscious process, but as the result of some defect in transmission. It may have been either that 35-36ab,38ab was at one stage erroneously dropped from 255 and imposed upon 256 or that 35-36ab,38ab constituted a separate accretion which was misplaced upon insertion into certain S texts. The latter alternative has simplicity in its favour.

32 Taught by 254,25-26, pp.274-275 etc.
33 The variae lectiones are set out in Table XXXVI.
Furthermore we have seen in Part A that if 35-36ab is regarded as a separate and subsequent accretion added to the earlier accretion 36cd-38ab, the text thus segmented becomes more comprehensible, and that the close parallelism of 36ab and 36cd is tidily explained. Since 35-36ab constitutes a major part of the misplaced material these observations, too, lend weight to the notion that the S misplacements are attributable to a separate incorporation of 35-36ab rather than to textual disturbance. (Discussion of the status of 38ab will be stayed for the meanwhile)

Since the verses 35-36ab occur only in their misplaced position in T12G1236, it must be inferred that *TG had 36cd- without the secondary accretion. Since, further, no M text deviates from the *TG placement of 36cd-, it is best inferred that *S itself had 36cd- without the secondary accretion. This attribution, argued here on purely formal grounds, nicely confirms the analysis of content in Part A where it emerged that the S placement of the contamination is the only apt one, and therefore most likely the original one.

Although it may thus be inferred that *TG had 36cd- without the secondary accretion, the same will not have been true of *M. On the direct testimony of M16 and the indirect testimony of M7, *M167 will have read 35-36ab in chapter 255; and since the sole

34 Part A, pp.190-191.
35 Part A, p.192.
36 M5's deviation is not significant. See p.186, n.11.
37 Pages 190-192 above.
remaining M text, M5, has occurrences in both chapters 255 and 256 it would be churlish not to attribute the chapter 255 occurrence to *M, and to put the chapter 256 occurrence down to infection from a non-M S source. There is nothing in the extant texts to suggest that the E, W texts ever knew the older interpolation 36cd- without its younger attachment 35-36ab. We may therefore assume either that 35-36ab had its origin in *M, the joint contamination 35-38ab being transferred thence to E, W; or that 35-36ab was composed on the occasion of the first incorporation of 36cd- into an E, W text, being transferred thence throughout E, W as a joint contamination 35-38ab.

Definition may be given to the infection paths implied by either of 35-36ab's putative places of composition by applying to them the constraints and facilities embodied in the stemma as deduced so far. In the case that 35-36ab was composed upon the first incorporation of 36cd- in E, W, the transfer of the older interpolation might have been sourced from any S text for which we do not have good reason to believe that 35-36ab was already present, in whatever placement. The most generous listing of such texts would include *S, the older stages of *M, *TG and - since all TG texts are affiliated by cross-contamination as well as by descent - the stages of *G1, *T1G36, *T2 and *G2 which antedate a postulated transfer\textsuperscript{38} which might have borne in 35-36ab. From these eligible texts, two

\textsuperscript{38} I.e. that which has distributed 25,819 throughout TG.
transfers to EW have already been proposed: the older bearing stanza 20, the younger the Vicakhnu story. The former is not a fitting vehicle to convey 36cd- northwards, both because of the exclusiveness of that transfer as it was originally proposed, credibly involving stanza 20 only,\(^{39}\) and also because incorporation into EW on that early alignment does not give scope for the separate incorporations required to explain the differing placement of the accretion in version 1 (K124) vis-à-vis versions 2, 3 (remainder of N).\(^ {40}\) The younger transfer, of the Vicakhnu story, also falls foul of the second objection so long as the stemma remains as it has been drawn hitherto. However, it is opportune to recall that the version 1 reading has been proposed as the source of 3\^4ef\(^2\) in version 2 (all E except D57, plus K7D469). To derive version 2's widespread N distribution within the framework of the existing stemma iii would require a frightening number of instances of infection and otherwise unattested transfers. Yet it is surely not without significance that the very E texts which have escaped the second imposition of 3\^4ef, D57, are just those to whose ancestor the stemma accords the greatest antiquity within the E recension. The trick is, then, to get the interpolation of 35-38ab into *K124 early enough to be able to transfer 3\^4ef\(^2\) from *K124 into E soon after the beginning of *D57's separate transmission. This manoeuvre can be accomplished and the already-
postulated $S \rightarrow EW$ transfer of the Vicakhnu story made useful by advancing the $K124 : K7D469$ bifurcation to an alignment older than the Vicakhnu infection. Realignment of the $W$ materials in this way would mean introducing the Vicakhnu infection not into $*W$ but rather into $*K124$ alone. With the realignment, 35-38ab may be transferred into $*K124$ jointly with the Vicakhnu material. Similarly the transfer of 22cd into $E$ which formerly sprang from $*W$ may now be sprung from $*K124$, thus providing a vehicle by which 34ef(2) might be conveyed into $E$. Under this arrangement, $K7D469$ would owe its 35-38cd,34ef and its Vicakhnu story to a contamination from $E$ on a younger alignment: the transfer of 254,25-26 and 256,B19 provides the occasion; the $E$ derivation is of course suggested by the version 2 reading in $K7D469$. All these additions and modifications in the stemma are incorporated in stemma iv (Table XXXVI).

In the alternative case, not yet considered, that 35-36ab was composed in $*M$, the only change to be made to the arrangements outlined above is that the source of the Vicakhnu story infection with which we have supposed 35-36ab to have been carried into $EW$ should be pinpointed as $*M$ rather than assigned to an indeterminate $S/TG$ text. 42

41 Only "suggested" because the alternative is arguable, that the version 2 text-order originated in $*K7D469$ and spread thence throughout $E$ except to $D57$. While undoubtedly a possibility, this argument is not blessed with simplicity.

42 Page 305 speaks only of **S.
Which of the places of composition proposed for 35-36ab sits more comfortably on the stemma is not clear. The opportunity for transferring an EW-composed 35-36ab into *M is provided by the major transfer of 254.25-26, Vulgate šraddhāprāśaṃśa + 22cd. But on the other hand, if our earlier arguments are valid, this transfer will have its source in a text in which 34ef² was already ensconced. It is more awkward to explain why 34ef² was not added into *M when the nearby 35-36ab were, than if it were the case that 35-36ab were already present in *M — especially since subsequently it appears to have been thought worthwhile incorporating 34ef² separately in M5. For these reasons, in stemma iv the composition of 35-36ab is placed in *M. To examine whether this attribution throws new light on the readings of 36b and *M's 36d is an interesting exercise, but no more than that.

43 This seems to be the only explanation for M5's 34ef². Note that remarks accounting for 34ef²'s popularity in E by pointing to the improved sense of 36ab when read alongside 34ef also apply in this case (p.186 above).

Argument over the absence and presence of 34ef² in *M and M5 may be fallacious not so much because it may assume that one transmitter necessarily thinks identically to another but because it would use that belief to explain inconsistent actions of two transmitters. Whether we like it or not, and whether 35-36ab came into *M with the šraddhāprāśaṃśa or not, 34ef² will have been just as much present in the source of that infection as it was in that of M5's C19. Nevertheless, the very difficulty vitiation the argument highlights the unlikelihood of 34ef² having been overlooked in any transfer of 35-38ab.

44 See above p.390 and note 30 for the *M reading.

*M read paśavah for the vāniṇja of the critically reconstructed reading of 36d. This repeats the
reading of 36b, thus:

36ab \[ \text{paśavaḥ prāpnuvuh sukham} \]
36cd - \( ^{*} \text{M} \) \[ \text{paśavaḥ prāpnuvuh sukham} \]
- C.E. \[ \text{vāṇija prāpnuvāt sukham} \]

In \( ^{*} \text{M} \) the parallelism of the readings b and d has led to the omission of (b)c(d) by haplology.

On the assumption that no author would intentionally create a redundancy of the dimensions of that in \( ^{*} \text{M} \), we may reasonably presume that in its older stages \( ^{*} \text{M} \) too had the original reading vāṇija and that d has been assimilated to b by careless copying on an alignment younger than the incorporation of 35-36ab. Even so it must be conceded that the reading of 36abcd was never pretty.

The alternative, that in \( ^{*} \text{M} \) we have an original d reading - and that b was deliberately composed in imitation of d because ab had been intended not to precede but to replace cd, has a superficial plausibility. The notion seems to conform well to the make up of 35-36ab, which comprises two tristubhs of general rhetorical exclamation (35) and one anūṣṭubh of relevant questioning (36ab). But this structure is susceptible to other explanations (e.g. the drawing of the rhetoric from an outside source) and we have noted elsewhere the best argument for leaving 36d in its C.E. form: that the question it poses is that answered by 38ab, to which 37 is but a preface.
It remains to describe the path of the back-infection into the TG texts which has given rise to the misplaced occurrence of 35-36ab. Although all TG texts are affected by the misplacement of 35-36ab in chapter 256, it is unfortunately improbable that the back-infection was imposed upon "TG. This is not for the reason that T2 : G2 : T1G136 are differentiated on an alignment too early for the interpolation of 35-36ab into their parent text, for it is feasible to prolong "TG's life span the little which would be sufficient to allow an infection of 35-36ab from M on the same alignment as that already posited for the

45 It is inherently more likely that the misplacement arose in a text which otherwise lacks 35-36ab (T6) than in one in which 35-36ab also appears in the intended position (M5). The very fact that the segment in question comprises just 35-36ab is credibly explicable only as having been produced by the reaction of an editor to a perceived lack in his text. Thus we have as alternatives the misplacement of an infection (TG) or the double placement of an infection (M). Although the latter is not impossible (it might have occurred through the agency of satellite material) it is clearly not the preferable assumption.

From another angle, if we accept that it is likely that 35-36ab originated in *M, the composition of the infection cannot be explained as the reaction to any perceived lack, and the misplacement is to that degree additionally unlikely to have first occurred in M.

The fact that 38ab accompanies these verses is inexplicable, but undoubtedly weakens the argument. See below, p.403.
35-38ab, Vicakhnu infection from *M into *E. Rather it is because what is gained in the simplicity of accounting for the distribution of 35-36ab by attributing it to *TG is more than lost elsewhere. It should be recalled that the infection 25,Bl9 also infests all TG texts, but it is impossible to extend *TG to the alignment which would enable it to receive this infection. Thus with 25,Bl9 we have a precedent

---

46 An infection of 35-36ab from *M into *TG is feasible on the stemma as drawn, but transfer of the material on the same alignment as the *M → EW infection does not require us to push the composition of 35-36ab to an older alignment than would otherwise have been required.

To prolong the life of *TG down to the level of the *M → EW transfer it is necessary to put the contaminations which differentiate G2 : T2 : T1G36 on a younger alignment than the *M → EW transfer. For G2, the obstacle to doing so is the appearance of 22cd in *W, which should arise before the incorporation of the Vicakhnu material but which cannot be present in the source of G2's śraddhāpṛaśaṃsa. This impasse may be circumvented by assigning the composition of 22cd to the creation of *S1K124 thus satisfying the anticipation of Vicakhnu, but leaving *K7D469 without 22cd to provide the source of G2's śraddhāpṛaśaṃsa. For T1G36 the critical factor is 121-131, which must have come from a source into which Vicakhnu had not been incorporated. However it will be recalled that in our discussion of the duplication of 12-13, it was not clear whether 121-131 or 12′-13′ constituted the interpolation and it is quite possible to envisage the latter having been interpolated along with the Vicakhnu material with the joint infection being mistakenly implanted after 121-131.

Alternatively the composition of 20 + Vicakhnu might be attributed to *M rather than *S, providing *T1G136 with collaterals (*T2, *G2) which lacked the Vicakhnu material until infection on a much younger alignment.

Such arrangements are not attractive; they add unnecessarily to the complexity of the stemma.

47 The incorporation of 25 itself reveals *G1 as an already independent text. *G2 must also have separated from the other TG texts before this alignment. Even if, as we imagined in note 46 above, 22cd had been composed in *S1K124, it will still have found its way into E earlier than the composition of 19, and is therefore poised ready for infection into *K7D469 along with the Vicakhnu material at the
which has blazed a trail through the TG forest which might equally well be followed by 35-36ab. The association of 35-36ab with the 25,Bl9 transfer has the advantage that it avoids having to explain how it could be that 25,Bl9 were transferred into a TG text without the concomitant transfer of 35-36ab in place in chapter 255. If 35-36ab had indeed been incorporated in chapter 256 in *TG it is only to be expected that a comparison of texts which led to the identification of 25 and Bl9 as materials missing in the TG text would also reveal the deficiency in chapter 255's intervening material. 48 This impasse does not arise if instead of positing an otherwise unattested transfer *M → *TG we make use of existing facilities to envisage 35-36ab entering a TG text along with 25,Bl9 and being displaced in the process of this first TG incorporation.

The 25,35-36ab,Bl9 tripod is, however, a shaky one. Inspection of the variae lectiones of 35-36ab 49 reveals that while D7,G1,T1G36 share readings of

47 (cont.)

earliest opportunity. This opportunity is provided by the transfer of 25,26 which anticipates the composition of 19 in E, Bl9 being transferred into *K7D469 only later in company with 24ef(2). Thus there is no W (C,E.-ordered) source which can source G2's śraddhāprasāmsā on an alignment younger than the composition of 19.

48 This point is weakened by the non-transfer of 17ab222cd, a stanza already present in the E source of the infection and moreover proximate to Bl9. On the other hand we have the persuasive, but not substantive, testimony of M5,M7 where the lack of 35-36ab in 256 was perceived and remedied, this despite the presence of the same material in 255.

49 See Table XXXVI.
35-36ab which are relatively divergent from the N readings, T2G2,M5,M7 have readings of much greater affinity with N. Consequently the former readings can be derived from the latter, but not vice versa. This insight is devastatingly applied to the assumption, arising from the analysis of 25,26, that G1 was the first port of call for the 25,35-36ab,B19 infection. Yet although the manner of the incorporation of 26 in T2,G2 and its absence in G1 shows that at one time 25 was found alone in every relevant TG hyparchetype and to that extent any one of them is a candidate for the first incorporation of 25,35-36ab,B19, the attribution of that first incorporation to any text other than G1 loses us the advantage that derivation of the TG readings of 25 from 80 via G1 enabled us to use G1's disturbed text as a stepping-stone which explained the novel point of insertion of 25(26) in TG.51 Thus unless the histories of 25(26) and 35-36ab can be made congruent we are faced with either the loss of an explanation for the placement of 25(26) in TG, or the separation of the 25 and 35-36ab incorporations with all the implausibility that would imply.

The readings of 35-36ab and the placements of 25

---

50 *T1G136 is spoken for inferentially. For the point of insertion *T1G136 reveals a direct or indirect dependence on G1. Because the fault in T2, G2 is not reproduced in T1G136 it is preferable to derive their stanza 26 from **T1G136 than vice versa. Thus *T1G136's dependence upon G1 is most likely to have been direct, and its incorporation of 26 will have come as an independent and younger contamination.

51 In that BO and G1 have 25 at x24ef, G1 and TG have 25 at 27ef x.
can be brought into harmony by proposing that *Gl was indeed the first recipient of the threefold infection but with the additional provision that the text created at the incorporation of this infection read 35-36ab in the N form, and that Gl's reading was changed to that which is distinctively southern in a subsequent recopying. It would then be conceivable that T2 or G2 derived its 35-36ab from the older *Gl while *T1G36 took its 35-36ab from the younger *Gl. Although this proposal is not one which immediately suggests itself on the basis of either 25 or 35-36ab considered separately, it is no more complex than any of the more obvious relationships between the TG texts: it assumes no more transfers; it assumes only one revision of the 35-36ab readings. The distinction of the proposal and the extent of its increased complexity is that it supposes that 35-36ab's reading was altered in an otherwise unattested recopying of *Gl rather than in the course of a transfer. To set a course between Charybdis and Scylla the trouble of taking a second glance at the compass is well repaid. The course is plotted on stemma iv.

In D7 there are two occurrences of 35-36ab. The first, in place in chapter 255, is an inheritance from D7's E forefathers. The second, in chapter 256, is conveniently sourced from Gl along with the equally otiose 257.13\(^1\); the readings of the second 35-36ab are in compliance with this derivation.

To pedigree the second occurrence of 35-36ab in M5 and M7 we are not able to avail ourselves of
previously postulated transfers. The material in M5 might have been infected from *T1GJ6, (*T2 or (*G2. In stemma iv I have preferred *T1GJ6 for no other reason than that it allows the infection to have taken place on an earlier alignment than the other sources would. Prima facie the material in M7 is most likely to have been infected from (*M5, although (*G2 and (*T2 are other possible sources.

Nothing in the foregoing discussion has cast any light upon the association of 38ab with 35-36ab in all the latter's Carnatic peregrinations. All that can be said with certainty is that since 38ab is invariably in the company of 35-36ab in chapter 256, the association must date back to the time of the first incorporation in chapter 256 in *T1GJ6. Whether or not some feature of that text or of the source text brought about the unlikely juxtaposition, or whether we are observing some transmitter's brave attempt to make sense of the nonsensical—these are subjects for speculation only. It is a matter for regret that 38ab remains intractable; its intractability casts a shadow over the rest of our treatment of 35-38ab.

The evidence of the variae lectiones of 35(2)-36ab(2), 38ab(2) is inconclusive (Table XXXVI), nor can much be made of the variae lectiones of 256.16cd, the second occurrence of which in M7 should be derived from the source text (M5, G2, M7 dharmaś; T2 dharmaśa; T2, M7 vanijaś; M5, G2 vanijā). Thus affinity of script is all M5 has going for it.

Perhaps the chance omission of 38ab in *T1GJ6 would explain how 38ab came to be copied into the margin along with 35-36ab when both lacks were noticed. The difficulty then becomes explaining 38ab's full restitution in 255 in T1GJ6.
D. 254.10-12

Finally we may hope to add some definition to the picture presented in stemma iv by accommodating in it the variant text orders which underlie 254.10-12 of the Critical Edition.¹ There are two variations involved, both widely distributed among E texts. In twelve of the collated manuscripts verse 12ab is absent;² and in ten manuscripts stanzas 10 and 11 are transposed.³ Since nine of these manuscripts⁴ lack 12ab and also transpose stanzas 10 and 11 one is entitled to suspect some connexion between the occurrence of these two variations.

A question raised in Part A is whether it is preferable to regard 12ab as a reading of the archetypal text (ω) which has been omitted in certain E texts, or as a contamination which, like 256.22cd, has not achieved universal distribution. The conventional wisdom is against assuming the loss of material and in favour of regarding any material which lacks at least near-universal distribution across the collated texts as a contamination not present in the archetype (ω);⁵ nor do the editors of the Critical Edition offer any justification of their

¹ These variations were touched on earlier in Part A, p.153.
² K4 V1 B06 Da3 Dn14 Ds12 D238.
³ V1 B08 Dn14 Ds12 D238.
⁴ I.e. V1 B0 Dn14 Ds12 D238.
⁵ Cf. above, pp.107-108. Ruben's discussion of omission in one recension ("Schwierigkeiten", pp. 253-254) is ill-founded and inconclusive.
inclusion of 12ab in their reconstructed archetype. However, in this instance it is possible to make out a persuasive argument that they have been right to retain it. As the basis for this argument it must be accepted that omission cannot be infected into collateral texts, and that it is not credible that the same random omission should have occurred on two or more separate occasions. Since there is no question of haplography with the omission of 12ab, the assumption that the absence of the verse is the result of omission will only be credible if all the extant texts in which the verse is lacking can be traced back to a common parent in which the unique scribal error of omission occurred. A glance at stemma iv shows that, as far as the stemma had been deduced to that point, all but three of the manuscripts which lack 12ab have been postulated to be descendants of the single hyparchetype *V1BODn14Ds12D238. The question therefore becomes whether the stemma should be redrawn so that the three outlying texts can also be made children of the common parent, or whether it is not simpler and therefore preferable to regard 12ab as an infection in the manuscripts where it does occur. This latter notion has the disadvantage that the hypothesized 12ab contamination has lodged in every one of the furthest reaches of the W and S branches of the tradition. Given the broad lines of the stemmatic form as already deduced, the attainment of such a distribution on an alignment sufficiently young for roughly half the E manuscripts
to have escaped infection would require an awesome array of infections not hitherto postulated. When the problem is seen in this light, the postulation of an omission occurring in a single hyparchetype is the preferable solution. The editors of the Critical Edition are hereby vindicated.

While acknowledging their proximity in the text, it is not clear how the omission of 12ab and the transposition of stanzas 10 and 11 should be connected. Unfortunately the Critical Edition Apparatus Criticus is suspect at this point, and may not give an accurate picture of the manuscript variations. Nevertheless from the information we have it is possible to support a definite conclusion.

Just as omission is not liable to transference into collateral texts, so too a variant text order which has no intrinsic recommendation of superior sense is not liable to infect collateral texts in which an alternative text order is already entrenched. Thus, like the omission, the transposition must be attributed to a single hyparchetype from which all extant witnesses have descended. From this it follows that all the manuscripts which witness both the omission and the transposition must be descended from a single hyparchetype in which both features were present. It does not follow, however, that both

---

6 See p.153, n.69, on the unexplained reversal of 12cd and 12ab. That the C.E. variants do not adequately represent the original readings is suggested by the text-order witnessed in the Vulgate-based Kiñjaradekara edition, viz. 11,12cd,10,13... (using the C.E. numbering).

7 Page 265 above.
features appeared for the first time in that hyparchetype, or indeed appeared contemporaneously in any hyparchetype. For testimony which will throw light on this latter point, we have to turn to those manuscripts which witness only one and not both features: viz. B8 with transposition only, and K4, B6, Da3, with omission only. Now, the presence of omission is only a minimum definition of a descent group. Since omission is susceptible to correction by subsequent infection in which a later transmitter rectifies a lack perceived through comparison with a collateral text, it will therefore be true that all texts which witness an omission must belong to a single descent group, but also that texts which do not witness the omission are not thereby excluded from the same descent group. On the other hand, the question of restitution does not arise with text transpositions, and consequently the witness of transposition is both a minimum and a maximum delineation of a descent group. Taking both these observations together, it is clear that the requirement of common descent for the nine manuscripts which witness both the omission and the transposition can be met by assuming that *B8 formerly witnessed not only the transposition but also the omission and that the omission has subsequently been restored from a

Or, rather, if it does it may be expected to give rise to duplication of part of the transposed material in an effect similar to that of the duplication of 256.20-22ab in D6. There is no duplication in the present case.
collateral text. On this basis, it may be unequivocally concluded that the omission arose in a hyparchetype *K4v1BO68Ds12Dn14D238 while the text transposition arose subsequently in a younger hyparchetype *V1BO8Ds12Dn14D238. This means that between the time of the omission and the transposition *K4B6Da3 had become branches of the tradition collateral to *V1BO8Ds12Dn14D238.

For the B and D texts, this conclusion necessitates some minor redrawing of stemma iv, adding definition and certainty to the portrayal of text affinities within E. It is noteworthy that Da3 and Da4, which had until now been assumed to be descendants of a young hyparchetype are shown by the evidence of 254.10-12 to be cousins rather than brothers: the association of each text with Arjunamiśra's commentary has, after all, proved not to be a mark of common descent. The manuscripts B8 is just as happily associated with V1, BO, B6 as it was with B7 in stemma iv. Only the maverick K4 presents us, yet again, with brain-teasing difficulties of interpretation. It is not easy to reconcile the omission of 256.20-22ab from K4, implying as it does an original incorporation of the C.E.-ordered

9 But note that no text without the omission can have had a transposed text order paralleling B8; the transfer must be assumed to have taken place in spite of this minor difficulty.

10 The position of the Da texts is thus analogous to that of the Dn and Ds texts. Thus Sukthankar's view (Ādiparvan, "Prolegomena", p.lxiv) concerning the late attachment of commentaries finds confirmation.
śraddhāprasāmsa, with the omission of 254.12ab: the former gives K4 a W parentage, the latter an E. To accommodate all the variations of K4, the stemma iv portrayal of the upper reaches of the E and W branches of the tradition has to be redrawn to place the omission of 254.12ab in a branch of N collateral to - and not descended from - the hyparchetype which contained the satellite material from which the twin Vulgate- and C.E.-ordered incorporations of the śraddhāprasāmsa occurred. The basis for the E and W branches we have hitherto postulated thus disappears, and the role of transfer by infection between collaterals becomes more significant in the development of the tradition. Furthermore it was previously suggested that K4's omission of 256.20-22ab might be seen not as the result of late conflation with an E source, but as an original feature of a defective incorporation of the C.E.-ordered śraddhāprasāmsa. The objection raised against this view was that it did not seem warranted to elevate K4's ancestry to the level of collateral with at least *E and *W, and perhaps *EW. Now that K4's pedigree has been extended to the degree required, on the authority of 254.10-12, there is no obstacle in the way of accepting defective incorporation as the explanation of K4's omission of 256.20-22ab.

11 See pp. 375-376 above.
12 See pp. 374-375 above.
13 Providing that it is assumed that 256.22cd has been infected into K4 from an E source - presumably along with 256.C19.
Whether this solution to the K4 conundrum is correct only synthesis of further "strong" variants, such as omission or text-order variation, will tell. If we take cognizance of the information set down by Belvalkar in his description of the K4 manuscript and text, the solution proposed in stemma v appears insupportable. Belvalkar's data records that throughout the Santiparvan K4 shares many non-haplographic omissions with Śi K12. This fact is irreconcilable with K4's shared omission of 12ab with V1 B068 Ds12 Dn14 D238, and therefore also with stemma v. In the light of Belvalkar's data, which deals with passages outside the material under analysis, we are faced with the alternative conclusions that K4 is in fact a conflated text or that 12ab is in fact an incompletely distributed contamination. In either case, stemma iv comes closer to giving a true picture of the stemma than does stemma v.

The case of K4 should stand as a warning that with the consideration of further stemmatically significant variations some other texts may also have to be dismissed as "eclectic on no recognizable

14 On the separative power of such variations in 'open' i.e. highly contaminated recensions see West, Textual Criticism, p.42; also Maas, Textual Criticism, pp.42-43.
16 Belvalkar, Santiparvan, "Introduction", p.xxxvii. Note that the omission of 254.12ab is not listed.
principles", to use Sukthankar's term. 17

The extent of the change between stemmas iv and v only underlines the fragility of our constructs.

17 Sukthankar, Ādiparvan, "Prolegomena", pp. iii, lxii.
APPLICABILITY OF STEMMATICA DESCRIPTION TO THE MAHABHARATA

The diagrammatic representation of stemmas IV and V shows that by using the evidence of stemmatically significant variations supplemented with some inferences concerning the infection paths of contaminations, it is possible to conjure up a stemmatic description of the Mokṣadharma-parvan text tradition. However, it is still open to question as to just how valid and how realistic this description of the text tradition might be. Several issues are in doubt:

(i) are the stemmas drawn the best possible given the available evidence?
(ii) is the available evidence of a nature that will sustain a stemmatic description of any reality?
(iii) is the technique of stemmatic description validly applied to the Mokṣadharma-parvan text tradition?

Before we can take any comfort in the black and white certainty of the drafted stemmas, it is necessary to consider these issues. Strategy decrees that we take up the last issue before the others.

Written and oral traditions

The most fundamental prerequisite for a stemma is that it must apply to a tradition completely
transmitted in writing. The construction of a stemma depends upon the marshalling of the testimony of extant texts in such a way that it is possible to work back from the extant readings to reconstruct systematically the readings of an archetypal text. The very notions that extant readings can be collated and compared in order to reveal an older reading and that these older readings should combine into a coherent text both make sense only if all the collated manuscripts have sprung from an archetypal text which had a fixed written form. In his introduction to the Sabhāparvan, Edgerton has unequivocally accepted this view:

... with due allowance for many minor uncertainties, and for errors in editing, [the reconstruction] is a text ... which once existed, and from which all MSS. of the work known to us are directly descended.¹

Since the whole conception of the Critical Edition rests foursquare on these assumptions it is curious that Sukthankar and Belvalkar have not felt able to concur fully with Edgerton's firm statement.² Sukthankar emphasizes the "fluidity" of the Mahābhārata tradition,³ going so far as to say that the two principal recensions are "in the final analysis, independent

¹ Sabhāparvan, "Introduction", p.xxxvi. Edgerton adds, a line or two later, "I believe firmly in the one-time real existence of this text". On Sukthankar's view of the status of the ancestral text, see Bedekar, "Principles of Mahābhārata textual criticism", pp.224-226.

² Sukthankar, Ādiparvan, "Prolegomena", p.cii, says that his task is not to arrive at an archetype, "which practically never existed". Note however his contradictory statement on the following page.

³ Ādiparvan, "Prolegomena", pp.lxxv-lxxix. Note the implications drawn from this statement by Hara, "Vālmīki, The Singer of Tales", p.119.
copies of an orally transmitted text".\(^4\) Belvalkar seems to agree.\(^5\) If this were true, a stemmatic treatment of the whole tradition would be a travesty of reality,\(^6\) and the entire Critical Edition project would be rendered invalid. However Sukthankar's reluctance to subscribe to Edgerton's position is due to his misunderstanding of the nature of oral tradition. To Sukthankar it seemed attractive to use orality as an explanation for the Mahābhārata's untamed text tradition,\(^7\) but in fact we shall see that evidence deducible from the text tradition itself overwhelmingly points to an archetype which had written form.

\(^4\) Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", pp.lxxviii, Sukthankar's emphasis. On the following page he adds that the text "was probably written down independently in different epochs and under different circumstances".

\(^5\) Neither in his Introduction to the Śāntiparvan nor in his Introduction to the Bhīṣmaparvan does Belvalkar make any explicit remark on the subject. From the manner in which he depicts the Pedigree of the Bhīṣmaparvan MSS (Bhīṣmaparvan, "Introduction", p.cxv) we may conclude that he saw N and S as independent reflexes of the oral tradition which leads back without intermediary to the Ur-Mahābhārata. It is striking that the archetype is given no place at all in this very detailed pedigree.

\(^6\) Although cf. Vansina, Oral Tradition, pp.121-129. The stemmatic portrayal he proposes for fixed oral traditions is designed to depict the historical relationship of one reflex to others rather than to enable critical restitution of an original version.

\(^7\) Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", p.lxxvi. Sukthankar's views are expounded and moderated in Bedekar, "Principles of Mahābhārata textual criticism", pp.218-220. The deference of Sukthankar and others to oral transmission is probably attributable in part to the high value placed upon committing to memory and reciting from memory in the Indian learned tradition.

At the back of every researcher's mind is the knowledge that the Vedas had been accurately preserved orally over three millennia. But the śruti offers no good analogy for the epic tradition. With the uncreate śruti whose every syllable has power and which lies at the heart of brahmanic orthodoxy, the high premium placed on absolutely accurate transmission led not only to the development of
In the first place, our analysis of the Tulādhāra episode has shown that at least the Mokṣadharmaparvan tradition already existed in written form on the oldest alignment deducible from this episode. The proof of this is the nature of the disruption caused by the interpolation of the second version of the introductory scene in which the brahman is sent in search of Tulādhāra. The first account was cut short in its tracks and left hanging most awkwardly — in a manner which indicates that the oldest alignment must already have had the fixity of form that goes with writing. As the alignment of this literate interruption is older than that of the archetypal text, a fortiori the archetype (ω) will have existed in written form.

Secondly, the very bulk of the text speaks volumes. The vast mass of material which constitutes the Critical Edition text of the Mahābhārata puts it far beyond the capacity of even the most gifted oral reciter. Bulk in itself is only a quantitative objection, but it becomes qualitative when a significant portion of the bulk is the formless conglomeration comprising the Śāntiparvan and the

7 (cont.) mnemonic techniques but also a copious auxiliary literature in written form which has the potential to stabilize the tradition. The Mahābhārata has lacked the incentive, the prestige, and the apparatus for such a controlled oral transmission. (For the concept of 'control', cf. Vansina, Oral Tradition, pp.33-34).
8 See Part A, p.119.
9 de Jong, "Recent Russian Publications", pp.28-29, reporting Grintser's views.
Anuśasanaparvan. It is inconceivable that any oral form of the Mahābhārata should have had these parvans in anything like their extent form—and indeed it may have lacked them altogether—for the kind of material presented by the Śāntiparvan and the Anuśasanaparvan does not lend itself to bardic recital since it is not amenable to the block-and-series theme-and-variation construction which comprises the grammar of oral transmission. A bard whose proficiency extended to a narrative of combats, battles, audiences, travel through forests, bejewelled with descriptions of prosperous cities, beautiful women, mighty warriors, powerful ascetics and the rest, in a performance continuing night after night, would still flounder in the masses of abstract didactic material which are without narrative form and, moreover, whose significance lies in the careful expression of doctrine on particular questions. For such material the formulaic mode of oral composition is of scant assistance indeed. The time for reflection needed to compose material like that in the Śāntiparvan is available only to the composer of a written text, who is not pushed inexorably onwards by the momentum of recital. Questions of recital aside, though, even

10 Hopkins, Great Epic, p. 381.
11a Grintser, Drevneindijskij Epos, "Summary", pp. 416-417, notes the collapse of the formulaic technique in parts of the didactic portions of the epic, in contrast to the narrative portions. But on his view of the composition of the 'pseudo-Epic', see de Jong, "Recent Russian Publications", p. 34.
12 Lord, The Singer of Tales, pp. 17, 22, along with pp. 92-96.
the composition of such a compendium of didactics as the Santiparvan is not credible without writing.

Thirdly, the technical evidence of other epic traditions which are transmitted orally reveals that oral recitation does not and cannot aim to reproduce an archetype exactly. Rather, in every oral recital, the bard recomposes a reflex of a prototype story. Each performance is a unique and unrepeatable event; each bard has an individual style and interprets the prototype individually.\(^\text{13}\) The prototype is a disembodied concept which lives vestigially in the collective memory of the audience and with sharper definition in the mind of the bard.\(^\text{14}\) The prototype is incarnated only in the bard's expressions of it. Thus, in recital, there is no question of striving for precision in reproducing the exact form of the prototype, for it has none.\(^\text{15}\) In the absence of a fixed recorded form of the tradition, there is no absolute standard against which to measure the variety of reflexes which find expression. Only the transmitter who handles written material has the means to identify errors (e.g., departures from a standard) and the liberty to cross-check, to reconsider and to make corrections in his text. The ephemeral nature of the spoken word means that for oral transmitters

---

\(^{13}\) Lord, Singer of Tales, pp.4, 17, 27, 78 and Chapter V, "Songs and the Song".

\(^{14}\) Lord, Singer of Tales, pp.21-29, 99-102; qualified by pp.78-79, 122-123.

\(^{15}\) Lord, Singer of Tales, pp.27-29, 99-102 and passim. Also Magoun, "Oral-formulaic character of Anglo-Saxon narrative poetry", p.447
imprecision and variation are not and cannot be an issue. It is understandable then that oral reflexes of a prototype vary considerably both broadly and in detail. It is therefore nonsense to imagine it possible to reconstruct a prototype by comparing records of its oral reflexes. Not only has a prototype no form in this sense, but the reflexes would be so divergent that direct comparison would not be feasible. An example of the order of relationship which exists between reflexes of a prototype has incidentally been mentioned by Sukthankar when he refers to the Jaiminiya Āśvamedhikaparvan. The relationship between oral reflexes of a prototype is not analogous to the relationship between recensions of the Moksadharmaparvan. It should be noted that the Jaiminiya Āśvamedhikaparvan was so divergent in form that it defied collation with the Critical Edition corpus.

On these three grounds it is beyond question that with the Mahābhārata we have to deal with a manuscript tradition descending from a written archetype. But this is not to say that the Mahābhārata tradition has not been affected in its development as a written tradition by virtue of evolving in a semi-literate culture which made committing to memory and reciting.

Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", p.1xxvi, referring to the Āśvamedhikaparvan of the Bhārata of Jaimini "which is totally different from our Āśvamedhikaparvan". See Karmarkar, Āśvamedhikaparvan, "Introduction", pp.xxiv-xliv. Cf. Lord, Singer of Tales, p.71, Chart V and Appendix II. Jacobi suggests that the widely divergent recensions of the Rāmāyana may be similarly explained, Rāmāyana, p.4, but the fact that any collation is possible refutes that view.
from memory an important part of scholarship. Such a milieu will have tended to impart to a written tradition the characteristic "fluidity" which has led Sukthankar and others to waver on the question of oral transmission. The tradition becomes susceptible to interpolation: scholars who have internalized the epic idiom and metre will have been capable of giving shape to new material as required. The tradition tends to show intensive cross-infection between texts: a scholar's memory and public recitations constitute channels of infection which do not involve direct contact between manuscripts. Under such conditions the tradition loses some of the predictability and conservatism of traditions transmitted by mere copyists; but its instability is an attribute not of any text but of the overall development of the tradition. Each manuscript text, including the archetype, has been just as fixed as writing can make it. There is a world of difference between a scholar committing to memory and reproducing extensive parts of the Mahābhārata as recorded in manuscripts, and a recital of the tradition

17 A cluster of elements is involved: the personal relationship between the guru and his students, which goes with oral instruction and requires that the student be a receptacle for knowledge rather than a critical or innovative recipient. (See Mookerji, Ancient Indian Education, pp.211-219) These elements are at least in part products and perpetuators of the scarcity of written material before printing.

19 Sukthankar, Ādiśāraṇa, "Prolegomena", p.xciv.
Thus any notion that the archetypal text was not fixed or that the recensions are independently rooted in oral tradition may be put aside: on these counts a stemmatic description of the Mokṣadharmaparvan tradition has nothing to fear. It is still an open question, however, whether the evidence contained in the collated manuscripts is of a nature which can sustain a valid stemma.

The problem of contamination

A stemma rests on the assumption that all exemplars and extant witnesses of the tradition preserve a blood-line, however degenerately. The contribution of the stemma to the critical process is first to eliminate from consideration texts which can be fully accounted for as copies of another witness, the readings of such codices descripti being of no critical value, and secondly to enable an editor to deduce from the extant texts the texts of hyparchetypes no longer extant. The archetypal reading is then

Ironically the distinction is not observed by Hara in his article "Vālmiki, The Singer of Tales". The fact that the Rāmāyana (and for that matter the Mahābhārata too) evinces certain stock formulaic devices in its composition, does not mean that the Rāmāyana text is an authentic record of an oral reciter's performance, nor that once committed to writing the tradition has retained its oral "fluidity". Failure to observe the same distinction vitiates much of S. Levi's criticism of the Critical Edition ("Compte rendu [1929]", pp.347-348; "Compte rendu [1934]", p.282; also Biaudeau, "Text Criticism", passim). Sen, "Oral Epic Poetry", pp.398, 403, 408, discusses the distinction perceptively.
judged not from the distribution of variants in the extant manuscripts, but from the potency of distribution of variants in the hyparchetypes. Both these strengths of stemmatic analysis are sapped when there has been contamination between collateral branches of the tradition. Stemmatic theory is thus seriously challenged by the presence of contamination. A contaminated text can never be a codex descriptus strictly defined, since it cannot be the reflex exclusively of a single exemplar. Again, contamination has the effect of producing variant groupings which do not always correspond with descent groupings, making it difficult to determine the hierarchy essential to a stemmatic description, and at the same time qualifying the usefulness of the deduction of hyparchetypes - for variant distribution patterns may be the product of horizontal as well as vertical transmission. Once it is established that one reading of any text extant or postulated is the product of contamination then every reading of that text becomes suspect proportionately. Hence, as contamination

21 Not necessarily selected from among the extant readings nor from those reconstructed for each hyparchetype; all exemplars may have readings altered in one way or another. See the treatment of 355.37a at pp.598-600 below.

The stages of analysis (i) hyparchetypes; (ii) archetype, should not be rigidly separated. As Ruben points out ("Schwierigkeiten", p.248) the reconstruction of a hyparchetype undertaken without an eye cocked for the readings of all other hyparchetypes underlying the archetype can lead to unstemmatic solutions.

22 Maas, Textual Criticism, pp.7-8; Reynolds and Wilson, Scribes and Scholars, pp.143-144; Greg, Calculus of Variants, pp.43-44, 56-58; Sukthankar, Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", p.lxxxii.
becomes more extensive, the mechanistic testimony of
the stemma must increasingly be shouldered aside by
subjective editorial judgement. Thus in a tradition
like that of the Mahabharata, which has been subject to
contamination, it is not only a more exacting task to
draw up a stemma; but once it is drawn up the stemma
is a less decisive authority for determining
archetypal readings than would have been the case with
a pure tradition.

However this is not to say that a contaminated
tradition is incapable of being described stemmatically.
It does mean, however, that the stemma, which depicts
vertical transmission (descent), cannot be a complete
description of the evolution of the tradition unless
accompanied by a complementary account of horizontal
transmission (contamination). The essential task in
creating a stemma under these conditions is to single
out those variant patterns most likely to be trust-
worthy and consistent indicators of vertical
transmission, i.e. distribution patterns of the
variants least likely to have gained currency through
contamination. Working in this vein requires
preparatory assessment of the inherent qualities of
various classes of variation similar to that offered

---

23 But without a firmly delineated stemma which
would allow one to distinguish genetic descent
groupings from the distribution profiles of
contaminations no estimate of the degree of
contamination pervading the tradition is possible,
and therefore neither is a judgement on the
desirability of allowing editorial examination to
overrule the apparent testimony of the stemma.
24 So, for instance, Greg cannot apply his calculus
in such conditions (Calculus of Variants, pp.43-44).
at the beginning of the analysis culminating in stemma v. 26. For this purpose variations may be put under three heads: variations of addition, substitution, and omission.

Of least value for their testimony as to vertical transmission are variations of substitution. Alterations of this class are unpredictable: it is impossible to tell whether the distribution of an emendation has been achieved by an alteration made once in an ancestral text or whether it has spread across collateral branches of the tradition as a better reading either through comparison of manuscripts or through the agency of a commentary or the like; and moreover the occurrence of the contamination is itself unpredictable as substitution implies a competition between the preexistent reading of the recipient text and the innovation, 27 and because the imperative of the collator's characteristic drive for completeness does not operate. The distribution of variations of addition promises to tell us no more about vertical transmission, for an accretion is consistently prone to contamination, not having to overcome a rival reading in the recipient text, and being noticeable and attractive to the transmitter who desires a complete text. Only insofar as an accretion has been

---

26 Pages 264-266 above.
27 Whether substitution is made rests either personally with the transmitter concerned, or with other considerations (the prestige of a text; the influence of a commentary; the ideological climate of the day) concerning which it is unlikely that our knowledge will ever be sufficiently penetrating to allow useful inferences. Cf. Sukthankar, Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", pp.lxxix-lxxx.
incorporated in differing placements has it the power to cast any light upon descent groups produced by vertical transmission, for it provides the negative discrimination that none of the texts belonging to one of the placement groups will be descended from texts belonging to the other group(s). Even so, membership in opposed placement groupings does not rule out common descent from a hyparchetype anterior to the accretion, a qualification which seriously limits the value of this evidence. By pleasant contrast, variations of omission provide potent information concerning vertical transmission since unlike an emendation or accretion, an omission will not be spread by contamination. Thus, as we noted in the introduction to Part B, every shared omission is most likely an indicator of common membership in a descent group. When the omission is non-haplographic this inference is all the stronger. Nevertheless some uncertainties hedge the interpretation of even such positive evidence. If the omission has a respectably numerous distribution it is necessary to ascertain whether it is a true omission or only the impression of omission left by an incompletely distributed accretion. And even then the distribution

28 Cf. the haplographic omission of 254.26 in B0 and Gl. See p. 276 and n. 16 above.
29 Note that 254.12ab, lacking in twelve manuscripts, has been taken as a true omission (pp. 405-406 above) while 256.22cd, lacking in only six manuscripts, has been taken as an incompletely distributed accretion (p. 356) for cogent reasons in both cases.
of a (non-haplographic) true omission cannot be taken to define the totality of the progeny of the parental hyparchetype in which the omission occurred, simply because omission is particularly prone to restitution in the course of comparison with other texts.

The drawing of the stemma depends fundamentally on correlating the data provided by true omissions and variations of placement of accretions. But since each of these indicators is subject to revision, neither permits absolute definition of the hyparchetype heading the descent group. In each case contamination may be invoked to expand or reduce the number of witnesses which belong to the genetic descent group. When it comes to placing hyparchetypes on the stemma, the invocation of contamination will have the effect of respectively raising or lowering the seniority of the parental text. Thus it is possible to manipulate the alignments of text disturbances relative to one another by reinterpreting the status of some readings, attributing now to contamination what had previously been attributed to inheritance and vice versa. Such uncertainties, and the consequent instability of the stemmatic description will be diminished in proportion as the analyst is able to take into consideration more, and more complexly overlapping, stemmatically

---

30 Since all collateral texts have the missing reading, every comparison with a collateral text may lead to restitution. The later the omission the less important this limitation.
significant variations. Hence, if the material is copious enough, if the analyst is dogged enough, and if the transmitters have been careless enough, there is no theoretical reason why the deduction of a stemma should not be feasible.

In their descriptions of the manuscripts chosen for collation, the editors of the Critical Edition have listed a selection of unique and shared readings by which they intend to convey an impression of the affinities of each text. Much of this material, dealing with variae lectiones and the distribution of "star passages" is not stemmatically significant. However the material listed includes transpositions of text-order and haplographic and non-haplographic omissions. As this is stemmatically significant information, it is worth considering whether it could be used to calculate genetic affinities which could then be diagrammatically portrayed in the form of a stemma codicum. In assessing the feasibility of such a project, we have to take account of two factors: the first relates to the manner in which the data is to be interpreted, the second to the reliability of the data provided. The data records of course only extant shared omissions and extant text transpositions. The usefulness of the data relating to transpositions is limited by the fact that the intensive study of the

31 Where separate instances of placement variation are cheek by jowl in the text and imputations about the relative priority of the accretions involved are possible, the birth pangs are mercifully eased. This was the basis of the analysis which led to stemma i/ii.
The text of the Tulādūra episode has suggested that the editors of the Critical Edition have tended to regard as transpositions of archetypal material what is more credibly attributable to the incorporation of contaminations. Whereas transpositions of archetypal material would give good delineation of descent groups, textual disorders associated with the incorporation of contaminations are liable to both vertical and horizontal transmission. Hence, unless it is known whether the transposition involves archetypal material or not, the evidence of the distribution patterns of text transpositions is doomed to remain ambiguous.

It is also to be remembered that the data for omissions is also merely a record derived from extant witnesses. As it is very likely that in many cases omissions have been restored in some manuscripts, the results must be interpreted with this in mind. The statistical consequence of this qualification is that an omission-delineated descent group cannot be expected to share a constant number of omissions. However since groups and sub-groups could only be defined and distinguished from each other and ranked by their differential rates of shared omission, once this concession to contamination is made, we lack firm criteria for divining the extent of sub-groupings, or determining whether sub-groupings exist. And to this debility must be added a concern over impurities in the data. The case of 256.22cd has shown that the listings of omissions include illusory omissions created by incompletely distributed contaminations.
As the proportion of illusory omissions is greater, so the discriminating power of the omission-derived statistics of affinity is diminished.

Only a practical exercise will show whether, despite all qualifications, the data will support a delineation of descent groups and sub-groups sufficiently distinct to provide the basis for a stemma codicum. A cursory examination of the information provided by Belvalkar in his account of the manuscripts selected for collation for the Śāntiparvan suggests that it would not be practicable to calculate clear-cut results using that data. Even given perfect data and the application of techniques of statistical analysis, there would be no guarantee of success. Should it prove not possible to draw up a stemma, or should parts of the stemma remain indistinct, it would be for lack of that careful sifting of the evidence which is practicable only as part of an intensive analysis of the kind we have applied to the Tulādhāra episode.

The single factor likely to do most harm to any attempt to draw up a stemma, whether by analysis in the conventional manner or by calculating degrees of genetic affinity, is the presence in the tradition of true conflation. The term conflation is often loosely

33 A clear-cut result seems unattainable because (1) the data is not complete — K14's omission of Mbh. xii.256.20-22ab is overlooked (cf. pp.374-376 above) and (2) there is prima facie evidence of irreconcilable allegiances, e.g. Sh shares transpositions of (archetypal) text with K124 in two instances, K24 in one case and K14 in one case. Belvalkar, Śāntiparvan, "Introduction", p.xxiii.

34 Note the skepticism of West, Textual Criticism, pp.46-47.
used to denote extensive emendation and accretion, but so long as it remains a question of the correction of the readings of a recipient text the areas of variation will not be stemmatically significant, and consequently it should not be beyond the ingenuity of a discriminating and persistent analyst to pick out the genetic ancestry of this "conflated" text. True conflation implies that there is, strictly speaking, no recipient text. This situation may arise in two ways: either when lost or damaged parts of one manuscript are restored by copying from another; or when a conscientious attempt has been made to compile an authoritative version by comparing the readings of several texts and following none.

The compilation of a new text on the basis of the compared witness of several others has the potential for wreaking havoc in a stemmatic description of the tradition. Un fortunately compilations are a hazard likely to be encountered in traditions marked by high levels of internal contamination. We have external evidence that the creation of a normalized text has probably been undertaken at least twice: once in

---

35 Sukthankar uses the term in this way: Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", pp.lxxxii-ii, especially evident in the phrase "indiscriminately conflated".

36 A conclusion supported by Greg (Calculus of Variants, pp.56-57) in his discussion of what he terms "correctional conflation", but on largely different grounds.

37 In Greg's terms, "editorial conflation" (Calculus of Variants, pp.57-58). Greg would probably consider restitution a special case of correctional conflation.

38 See West, Textual Criticism, p.38
conjunction with the composition of Nilakantha's commentary,\textsuperscript{39} and once in preparation for the installation of the ruler of Nepal.\textsuperscript{40} Doubtless there have been other cases too. Naturally, omissions are not likely to survive the process of normalization unless they are present in all the manuscripts available to the redactor for comparison; but since in any case omission provides only a minimum definition of a descent group, the newly compiled text might still be adequately described as a highly contaminated text. It is with variations of text-order that more serious difficulties arise. If the editor of the normalized text has judiciously adopted text-order readings from whichever of his sources seemed to him to provide the preferable reading at that point, the effect upon the stemma will be either to give the newly compiled text a false antiquity or to make it impossible to draw up a section of the stemma. If the text-order variants adopted from sources of differing genetic allegiance have arisen in the process of the incorporation of a contamination, the mixed allegiance of the normalized compilation will provoke a stemmatic description which will join the normalized text to the descent group from which some of its text-order variants have been taken, while assuming that the remaining text-order variants are attributable to contaminations which have entered

\textsuperscript{39} Sukthankar, \textit{Adiparvan}, "Prolegomena", p.lxv. Whether a text was actually compiled is not clear.  
\textsuperscript{40} Belvalkar, \textit{Santiparvan}, "Introduction", p.xlvii. 
\textsuperscript{41} Cf. Ruben, "Schwierigkeiten", pp.246-247, who points out that most conflation appears to have occurred between texts of the same recension.
by infection from collateral sources. This resolution advances the history of the normalized text as an independent tradition back to a stage in the development of its adopted family prior to the incorporation of any of the contaminations in which the normalized text differs from them. Thus the normalized text is given a falsely respectable ancestry and an illusory authority. If, on the other hand, the text-order variations involve transpositions of archetypal material, the collation of the normalized text will make it impossible to resolve the conflicting definitions of descent groups. This is simply illustrated by considering a hypothetical distribution of two such text-order variations A : B, C : D. If these occur in three manuscripts in the combinations A and C, B and C, B and D, there are three possible stemmatic resolutions (choice of the true description depending upon which variants are taken to represent the archetypal reading). If, however, a synthetic compilation based on the three posited manuscripts drew A and D from them, no stemmatic resolution would be possible at all. The result will be the creation of an 'open recension' and the vitiation of a section of the stemma.

Restitution is no more than a special case of compilation. While restitution on a small scale (restoring lost or damaged readings of parts of verses)

---

42 West, Textual Criticism, pp. 14, 37-38. Maas, Textual Criticism, p. 7, § 810. Although not directly attributing the phenomenon to conflation, Ruben, "Schwierigkeiten", p. 242 and n., discusses a similar case and concludes that a stemma is infeasible.
and on a large scale (supplying many consecutive
 chapters or even whole sub-parvans) may be merely
troublesome to the conventional analyst, restoration
involving the replacement of missing or damaged leaves
within a section of the text from which a stemmatic
description is being deduced holds all the dangers of
a compilation.

In practice however the threat posed by
compilations may be less severe than at first sight
appears. We may impute to the editor who synthesizes
a new version of the text the concern that his new text
should be both complete and replete with the best
readings on points where his manuscripts of reference
differ. However the magnitude of the task of compiling
a new version of even a single parvan of the
Mahābhārata is so great that it is unlikely that any
traditional editor would have had the capacity to consider
every variant on its merits both in context and
intrinsically. For the attainment of the two-fold
virtues of completeness and correctness, it would
suffice for the editor to work through a textus
optimus, adding and emending where reference to his
other manuscripts seemed to make it necessary. Where
such an approach has been adopted, in the significant
matter of placement variation the new text might be

\[43\] Since significant variation is not likely to be
involved in small scale patching, the repaired text
shows up on the stemma simply as extensively infected
from one outside source - a fair description of the
process anyway. Large scale restoration, which it
should be possible to detect, means that a stemma
drawn up through analysis of one section of the text
does not apply to the restored section, for which
another stemma giving the text in question a new
parentage must be drawn up.
expected to follow the textus optimus fairly consistently. Stemmatically, the newly synthesized text would then appear as a highly contaminated descendant of the textus optimus. That is a fair description, and does no damage to the stemma. For an illustration of the pervasive influence of a textus optimus in compiling a new text we have only to look to the Critical Edition. Compiled with an array of collation sheets and technical apparatus certainly unparalleled in the compilation of earlier normative editions, the Critical Edition nevertheless follows in the footsteps of its textus optimus (Ś1,K1) in all but one of the text-order variations covered in the Tulādhāra analysis, even when the text-order of the textus optimus is very much in a minority. Since the exceptional variation appears in a contamination, the effect produced is that when the Critical Edition text is plotted on the stemma codicum it appears as a highly contaminated collateral of Ś1K12. This is undeniably a distortion of reality — but would Sukthankar object very vehemently? One might also be sceptical of the position of the Nepalese text VI in

---

44 The exception being the placement of 355,34ef after 34cd, while K1 (Ś1 missing) has it after 38ab. See Table XVIII.
45 As with the śraddhapraṇamsa, 9 : 28 witnesses.
46 Sukthankar, Ādiparvan, "Prolegomena", pp.lxxxii-lxxxiii, lv, lvi; and p.xlvii where he states that Ś1 "is taken as the norm for this edition", the incunae being supplied by K1; but note also p.xlv. Belvalkar, using a younger manuscript, is less forthcoming (Śantiparvan, "Introduction", pp.xx, clxi). The use of a textus optimus is rightly criticised by Ruben, "Schwierigkeiten", pp.244, 252. Cf. Maas, Textual Criticism, p.19.
the stemma. And yet if the extant text was based upon a textus optimus which has not been collated - not an improbability - the delineation of Vl's ancestry may come close to reproducing reality. We cannot tell.

Our conclusion is, thus, that in practical terms the Moksadharma tradition with its heavy internal contamination is less easily reducible to stemmatic form than a pure tradition; and that, unless detected, certain developments of the tradition (in part facilitated by a milieu in which collateral transfers are rife) - namely, restitution and compilation - have the potential for distorting and vitiating parts of the stemma. Stemmatic description of the Moksadharma-parvan is not thereby invalidated in principle, for it is only by empirical enquiry that we can determine whether such processes have cast their spell over the tradition.

The difficulty in reaching such a determination is that text-order variants associated with contaminations will reveal their presence only by adding to the complexity of the stemma. Since we have no way of independently judging how complex a realistic stemma should be, we are in fact unable to guard against stemmatic distortions arising from this cause.

47 Furthermore, no dated manuscript shown on stemma iv as being jointly descended with Vl from *V1... approaches the age of Vl - Vl : 1516 A.D.; D3 : 1611; B0 : 1677; Dn4 : 1758; Dn1 : 1769. Belvalkar, Santiparvan, "Introduction", pp.x-xx.

48 Cf. West, Textual Criticism, p.31: "The attempt will succeed approximately in proportion to the freedom of the tradition from contamination". The comment applies to the deduction of a stemma from all variations without differentiating the stemmatically significant from the non-significant.
At any rate nothing in the foregoing comments positively rules stemma invalid as a stemmatic description of the text tradition of the Tulādhāra episode. But even if it may be valid in principle, whether it is a true representation of historical reality is quite another matter.

The realism of the stemmatic description

Leaving aside all the uncertainties associated with conflation and open recension, the stemma's trueness of line cannot surpass the value of the information upon which it is based. This is not an issue of the technical accuracy of the Apparatus Criticus - which is not in question - but of the representativeness of the collated material. It is not fruitful to speculate on how far the extant texts can be relied upon to have preserved reflexes of the historical tradition in its entirety. It is conceivable that recensions of the tradition have perished without issue, but since we can proceed only

49 Although internal inconsistencies occasionally make errors obvious: what is to be made of the headnote to the Apparatus Criticus for 254.12 unless Belvalkar has adopted a text-order witnessed by none of the collated texts? The notes to 255.34 and 255.38 conflict on whether K4 reads 34ef after 38ah. The description of the text-order of M5 255.34-39 is not clear.

50 Note Edgerton's reassuring remarks ("The Mahābhārata [Review]", p.187) concerning Sukthankar's collection of manuscripts for the Parvasampraha in the Adiparvan. The collection has not been so exhaustive for other parts of the tradition, and thus although the selection of manuscripts for collation may have been judiciously based on Sukthankar's experience with the Parvasamgraha, there will have been more room for important variant versions to escape notice. On Sukthankar's trial collation for the Parvasamgraha, see below note 56.
from the known to the unknown this is not something we
are likely to be able to say much about.\footnote{West, Textual Criticism, pp.35-36 discusses
difficulties which arise if there is contamination
from a lost branch of the tradition.} A question
which can be more usefully discussed is the effect of
the selection from the extant texts of only certain
texts for collation.

The selection of manuscripts for collation for the
Mokṣadharmaparvan is described by Belvalkar in his
introduction to the Śantiparvan. Broadly speaking of
over 180 manuscripts known to him in major collections
and catalogues, 35 have been enrolled in the collated
elite.\footnote{A tabulation of relevant figures is given in
Table XLII.} It was of course necessary to restrict the
collated sample; our interest is in the principles on
which the sampling was made and the implications this
has for our stemma. Belvalkar tells us that he has
attempted to emphasize diversity. Hence the B, D/K,
G manuscripts which exist in large numbers are
represented in the collation in proportions of 50% or
less, while S, V,\footnote{The Maithili script group is under-represented.
Although Belvalkar has collated the only \(V\)
manuscript which covers the whole Śantiparvan, the
"two or three others" which contained the
Mokṣadharmaparvan only were not, perhaps because of
difficulties of accessibility: Śantiparvan,
"Introduction", pp.ix and xlv.} M, are given full or nearly full
Some textual content extracted for the document appears below.

Sampling based on a classification of texts by script assumes that this easily identifiable external characteristic is symptomatic of provenance defined geographically or by Kulturkreis, that diversity of provenance is most likely to go hand in hand with diversity of witness, and that diversity of witness is of most value in critical reconstruction. All parts of the assumption are reasonable; and short of actually examining all the accessible texts and eliminating those whose variants seemed least distinctive in a trial collation of some few chapters, Belvalkar's strategy appears as likely to lead to a satisfactory selection as any other short cut.

However, for the purpose of determining the form of the stemmatic description rather than of facilitating critical reconstruction of archetypal readings, Belvalkar's policy of discriminating against the large script families (B, D) loses its rationale, as every manuscript has an equal chance of containing a stemmatically significant error. The most

---

54 Distortions in this allocation of representation are the over-representation of the huge DK group and the under-representation of the T texts. In the case of the T texts, the poverty of their representation stems no doubt from Belvalkar's dim view of the critical value of texts which hover on the N/S boundary (Belvalkar, Santiparvan, "Introduction", p.cixv, echoes Sukthankar, "Adiparvan, Prolegomena", p.lxiii). The generous representation of DK is less easily explained. Perhaps accessibility played a part.

55 This is not to say that they are borne out in analysis of the tradition.

56 As Sukthankar did with the Parvasamgraha of the Adiparvan, partly because of the intrinsic critical interest of the content of that section. Sukthankar, Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", p.v.
critically reproducible miscell-codices, so-called, have been sources and recipients of contamination and are thereby well placed to throw light on the transfers of contaminations essential to ordering the alignments of hyparchetypes within the stemma. The revolution caused in part of the stemma - and the solutions offered to outstanding problems - by the addition of V1 B9 Ds12 to the collated corpus between stemmas i and ii illustrates the stemmatic potency of critically unremarkable texts. Thus, imperfections in the stemma arising from selective collation are likely to have sprung not so much from the vagaries of selection of manuscripts for collation as from the inevitable practicality that there has had to be selection at all. In any case, it is a safe guess that any challenge to the stemma's validity posed by the selectivity of collation is insignificant beside the uncertainty arising from the problems of synthesizing and interpreting the collated material.

Finally, the verisimilitude of the stemma depends upon the success of the analysis itself - the handling of the available, chosen material. Unfortunately verisimilitude is an elusive quality not easily identifiable: realism and methodological elegance do

58 Critically these texts add nothing to the collation; they offer no new variants not already attested elsewhere. Their stemmatic potency lies in their recording new combinations of variants. From the experience with these texts, it probably follows that further additions to the corpus of collated texts would clarify the articulation of the stemma.
not inevitably go hand in hand. Heuristically the simplest and most consistent is the most elegant; hence the presumption that the simplest and most evenly developed stemma most closely corresponds with the historical reality of the tradition it portrays. But this is only a general presumption and is not prescriptive for any individual case. Thus when in stemmas iv and v the S tradition shows no internal differentiation over a considerable number of alignments in which N shows a healthy proliferation, making much of the S side of the stemma a "dead spot", we have something discomforting but not disconcerting. The reality may have been that the young aligned multiple transfers of the S texts arose more complexly and should be attributed partly to older alignments.\(^{59}\) Or the disparity may be the result of confusion caused by the presence of conflated texts in N; or it may be an illusion springing from the fact that more N witnesses have been collated than S witnesses, with N thus demanding more room on the artificial time scale\(^{60}\) to effect its bifurcations. But the disparity of development in N and in S might just as well be an accurate reflection of historical fact as an infelicity of analysis. Thus, to judge the realism of any one stemma by its formal elegance is

---

\(^{59}\) For instance 35-36ab, 38ab\(^2\) could be introduced into *TG or older alignments of the TG tradition directly from *M, at the cost of disassociating it from 256.B19 and of proposing additional transfers.

\(^{60}\) The scale is artificial in positing an equal elapsed time between each bifurcation.
inappropriate. This leaves us in a methodological dilemma. Because reality cannot be known independently of the analysis, analytical elegance is the only criterion on which alternative solutions can be evaluated. The identification of formal elegance with realism is therefore necessary as a working hypothesis; but the achievement of formal elegance is no corroboration of realism.

Behind this welter of qualifications, it may still be possible to discern, and accept, the broad lines of the stemmas proposed. It would certainly be foolhardy to believe that in stemma iv or v we are approaching a definitive stenmatic description of the Mokṣadharmaparvan. Stemma v accommodates eleven stemmatically significant variations taken from a sketch of only five chapters of the text. Inclusion of more material in the analysis, giving access to a larger number of stemmatically significant variations, might on the one hand allow a more definitive ascertainment of sub-groupings now proposed on the

61 Namely:

1) 254.10-11 (placement)
2) 254.12ab (omission)
3) 254.25-26 (placement)
4) 255.36cd-38 (placement)
5) 255.35-36ab (placement and incomplete distribution)
6) 256.7-15ab, 20-22ab (placement)
7) 256.17ab2 (incomplete distribution)
8) 256.19 (placement)
9) 256.20 (placement)
10) 256.22cd (placement and incomplete distribution)
11) 257.12-13 (placement)
basis of non-significant variations, but on the other hand it also has the potential for making sections of the stemma open recensions incapable of stemmatic resolution. With all those limitations and uncertainties in mind, it may still be useful to consider whether the hypothesized stemmas teach us any lessons about the nature of the Mahābhārata text tradition.

**Lessons from the stemma**

The hypothesized stemmas lay no claim to authority beyond the Mokṣadharmaparvan, and certainly not beyond the Santiparvan. In their broad lines and general characteristics, the stemmas allow us, therefore, a glimpse of the Mokṣadharmartha text tradition which may resemble or contrast with other parts of the tradition. The lessons the stemmas offer concern the shape of the evolving tradition and the incidence of contamination.

**Manuscript groupings**

The descent groupings deduced in the course of the stemmatic analysis do not confirm the assumption

---

62 As a minimum listing, the groups K7;D946; Ś1K12, Dn1;D2;D3;Dsl, Da3487; TLG36, M167 await authoritative dismantling with significant separative errors.

63 Aside from all other considerations, the validity of the stemma beyond the Mokṣadharmaparvan extends only to the manuscripts which also contain the Rājadhārma and Ātmadhārma parvans. Outside the Santiparvan the availability and selection of manuscripts is so different for each major parvan that the Santiparvan stemma has no application. By way of illustration, only six of 30 manuscripts collated for the Anuśasanaparvan also serve for the Santiparvan. (Śantip, D8 = Anuśasanap, Dn1; Dn4 = Dn2; K1 = D1; K4 = D2; K2 = D4; G1 = G3).
that script delineates text families. The boundary between the primary groupings $N : S$ does correspond to a distinction in scripts ($SVBD : TGM$); similarly within $S$ the early $TG : M$ split coincides with a script grouping boundary; but, with the near exception of $B$, no other descent groups differentiated on later alignments are coterminous with script groups. Thus we have three old clans, as it were, $[SV][BD]$, $TG$ and $M$, which are jointly characterized by script and descent. These clans, and not the single script families, may stand for distinguishable intellectual milieux.

The relationship between $TG$ and $M$ is worthy of comment. Stemmas iv and v suggest that while these clans share an abundance of inherited $*S$ readings, in their developments after $*S$ they have had less contact with each other than either has had with BD (i.e. $N$) texts. Here is confirmation of Sukthankar's impression that the $D$ texts have historically played a role as cross-cultural transmitters by virtue of their 'scriptum francum', Devanāgari.

65 Ignoring the single manuscript script groups, $S$ and $V$.
66 In stemma iv:
   $TG - M$ : possibly 1 transfer;
   $TG - N$ : 5 or 6 transfers;
   $M - N$ : 3 transfers.
68 The widely scattered provenances of the collated $D$ texts (see Table XXIV) are also suggestive of this go-between role, but that evidence relates only to the latest level of the development of the tradition.
For noting only is the observation that stemmas iv and v postulate N and S hyparchetypes, making the primary division of the tradition analogous to that proposed for other parts of the Mahābhārata by Sukthankar rather than to that proposed by Edgerton for the Sabhāparvan.

69 Although it is notable that while several innovations can be attributed to *S, *N's existence is not so multifariously attested. It is quite conceivable that with further analysis, it might be discovered that other "N" texts have had a descent like that proposed for K4 in stemma i.

70 Sukthankar, Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", pp.vii, xxxi-xlvi, followed by Belvarkar, Śāntiparvan, "Introduction", cli-xlvi. Cf. Edgerton, Sabhāparvan, "Introduction", pp.xi, xlv-xlvi, (xlvi-xlxi). Kulkarni, "Epic Variants", offers evidence too selectively to prove "how scientifically, precisely, and critically" Sukthankar's stemma has been constructed (p.51). But for his admirable caution, Edgerton would have had sufficient grounds for proposing the bifurcation E\(\Gamma\)W : S. His careful discussion of the significant relationships (evidenced by shared insertions) between E, W and S reveals that while there are 16 insertions common to W and all of E but absent or incompletely distributed in S, there are only four insertions common to S and all of E, two of which have placement differences in S vis-a-vis E! Given Edgerton's point that shared insertions may as well betoken early contamination as common descent, and despite the intrusion of complications over the relationship of N to VBD, the basic 16 : 2 statistic is sufficiently one sided to establish at least the possibility of a common descent for E\(\Gamma\). This Edgerton does not deny, but suggests that in absolute terms the numbers involved are too small to support any conclusion. However since *E, *W and *S must all be descendants of \(\omega\) (despite Edgerton's tendency in the later pages of his introduction to speak of them as 'independent') we must choose between a slimmer attested bifurcation and the alternative that E, W and S have sprung from three copyings of a single text (\(\omega\)). On the "Ambiguity of three texts", see Greg, Calculus of Variants, p.21.

The Śāntiparvan evidence is not directly relevant to Edgerton's case. Because of the different collations (note 63 above) each major parvan of the Mahābhārata is a new stemmatic regime. One must be cautious, therefore, in suggesting that even the pattern witnessed in one place will apply elsewhere. Note, however, that in his "[Review of] the Mahābhārata" Edgerton anticipates his proposal of a
Incidence of contamination

Stemmata iv and v suggest that the incidence of contamination between branches of the (Sāntiparvan) tradition is every bit as high as has generally been assumed.

In the Mokṣadharma parvan and similarly scholastically-minded sections of the Mahābhārata—especially the so-called 'pseudo-Epic'—the intensity of contamination is no doubt raised to heights not typical of the remainder. The great number of manuscripts comprising the tradition, together with the scholastic, controversial, non-particular, memory-worthy nature of the material, has undoubtedly made the Mokṣadharma parvan an intensively cultivated hothouse growth, luxuriant and tenderly susceptible to retraining by commentators and transmitters—as witness the bulk of the requisite Critical Apparatus.

By contrast, the Virāṭaparvan for instance exhibits accretion not accompanied by an intensity of contamination sufficient to maintain the homogeneity

(cont.) W recension by hailing Sukthankar's discovery of a Kāśmirī recension (pp.187, 188)—which Sukthankar had referred to only as a version.

70 Hopkins, Great Epic, p.381.

71 Over 78 texts of the Mokṣadharma parvan were known to Belvālkar, whereas only 43 are mentioned by Raghu Vira for the Virāṭaparvan. Raghu Vira, Virāṭaparvan, "Introduction", pp.ix-x.

72 Symptomatic of the especially elaborate attention the Mokṣadharma has attracted is the large number of manuscripts comprising this sub-parvan alone or in conjunction with the Rajadharma parvan or Ātmadharma parvan. Of manuscripts containing the Mokṣadharma text, two thirds of those known to Belvālkar did not contain the full Sāntiparvan text; and three fifths contained the Mokṣadharma alone. See Table XLII.
The Āranyaka-parvan story of Dharmavyādha provides a pointed comparison with the Moksadharma-parvan story of Tulādhāra. In the Dharmavyādha story the proportion of incompletely distributed insertions to cases of textual disorder (which probably betoken completely distributed insertions) is approximately 9 : 1; for the Tulādhāra story, the figures are approximately 3 : 8. This remarkable contrast between materials of a similar nature in different parts of the Mahābhārata highlights the untypical development of the Moksadharma-parvan.

A disturbing aspect of the contamination patterns revealed in stemmas iv and v is that they prove without doubt that material which was not present in the archetype can nevertheless achieve global distribution throughout the manuscripts collated, and presumably right across the tradition. This undermines a fundamental tenet of text criticism, that material witnessed in all recensions in similar form can ipso facto be attributed to the archetype with confidence.75

74 Yet as Ragu Vira notes (Virāṭaparvan, "Introduction", p.xvii) the Virāṭaparvan "enjoyed a greater popularity than any other parvan of the Mahābhārata". To its popularity we may attribute the great number and bulk of its accretions. The relatively lower intensity of contamination must therefore be put down to the lack of didactic material in the parvan and the consequently smaller interest it held for commentators. An even more striking example is the lack of concord between recensions of the Rāmāyaṇa tradition: Jacobi, Rāmāyaṇa, pp.3-4. Cf. note 16 above.

75 Ruben, "Schwierigkeiten", p.244, touches on this problem, offering no solution.
Of course global contamination can be simply identified if there has been some error of placement; but the possibility of cross-infection without error poses an insidious threat to the integrity of even the most conservatively compiled archetype text. That the relatively less fervid development of many parts of the Mahābhārata means that the phenomenon will be rarer there (accretions being both less numerous and less likely to achieve universality) is cold comfort. And colder comfort still since we have no way of knowing whether the Moksadharmaparvan is itself riddled with such undetectable accretions, or whether they are a rare phenomenon anyway.

Although by definition these accretions escape direct observation, the data of stemma iv allows some inferences to be made concerning their frequency. Stemmas iv and v describe a number of accretions which achieved universal distribution, but of course always with revealing errors of placement. Nevertheless the combination of these error-stricken accretions in a stemmatic analysis allows a conservative estimate to be made of the number of transfers involved in each one attaining universality; and this in turn enables us to form an impression of the relative frequency of error in the process of incorporating contaminations. Even if it is slightly exaggerated by the nature of the data, the carelessness of the incorporators is

The estimate is conservative because transfers within a placement variant group may have gone unremarked.
remarkable: 17 hits and 11 misses.\textsuperscript{77}

Now, the sample upon which this impression is based is biased from the outset inasmuch as it excludes from consideration contaminations with error-free incorporation. Yet further reflection leads to the judgement that the bias is probably not great.

Chapter 256 is a passage in which we can be fairly confident that we have identified every contamination. Verses 1-6, 15cd-16 are so cohesive that it is not credible that any part of them has not been present from the time of composition; the conclusion 17-19, 22cd is so utterly fragmented that there is simply no room for any further segmentation; only in the śraddhāprāśamsā is there room for an unidentified contamination, but despite its loose structure there is no positive reason\textsuperscript{78} to suspect that the śraddhāprāśamsā harbours an intruder. Thus, in the material comprising the extant chapter 256, there are probably four contaminations: the śraddhāprāśamsā, stanza 20, stanza 19 and verse 22cd. Of the four, one (22cd) has failed to achieve universal distribution

\textsuperscript{77} Based on stemma iv. "Misses" involve misplacement or transposition of material during transfer; they do not include the transfer of material already present in the recipient text in a different placement (although such transfers also leave evidence of contamination).

\textsuperscript{78} That is, nothing calls for the assumption of interpolation as, for instance, the discontinuities of 255.10-12 might (see pp.206-212 above). For reasons discussed above (p.302), stanza 21 is integrally bound into the śraddhāprāśamsā. However stanzas 9-15ab are neutral with respect to the possibility of interpolation. This is a weakness in the argument of this paragraph.

\textsuperscript{79} The stemmatically significant 17ab\textsuperscript{2} cannot properly be called a contamination.
and all the others are betrayed by some error of
placement. Only stanza 20 comes close to achieving
perfect distribution and placement: a reminder that it
is feasible. But - if it is permissible to generalize
from so small a sample - we may conclude that error-
free globally distributed accretion has not reached
plague proportions even in the unhealthy environment
of the Moksadharmaparvan.

Finally it needs to be said that the editors have
erred on the side of liberality in admitting material
into the archetype text. 80 We may infer that, in
most of the cases we have discussed, the editors, not
appreciating the intensity of contamination within the
Moksadharma tradition and not taking care to explain
varying text-orders, have been fatally impressed by
the universal distribution achieved by contaminations. 81

80 The present analysis suggests that about 21% of
the material admitted into the critically
reconstructed text should rather have been relegated
to the status of "star" passages. See Table XL.
Sukthankar (Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", pp.lxxvii-
Ixxxvii and xcvi) is permissive in this respect,
while as we have noted elsewhere, Edgerton
(Sabhâparvan, "Introduction", p.xxxiv), aware of
the problem, politely parts company with Sukthankar
by advocating a more ruthless excision of doubtful
passages. By contrast, as an illustration of
Belvekar's reluctance to relegate material to the
appendices, take the following comment: "The star
passage 724* might perhaps have been admitted into
our text, although it is not evidenced in the M
version (except M7) and in some K MSS.". The basis
of his regret over the excision of 724* was that
Arjunamiśra comments upon it! (Santipurvan,
"Introduction", p.cxxxviii).

81 By contrast, 256.22cd has been included in the
archetype despite its original appearance only in N,
probably because of the eminent good sense it makes
and because the method of collation appeared to give
it a representation in M which the change of
placement should have made obvious was a secondary
manifestation.
Development of the text tradition

It has never been credibly or responsibly suggested that the archetypal text (ω) which the Critical Edition aims to represent as accurately as possible is the 'Ur-Mahābhārata' - or even approximates it very closely. 82 Because in Part A we have shown that it is possible to detect accretions already entrenched in the archetypal text, we must regard the archetype (ω) as simply the oldest reconstructable descendant of an indeterminately older written parent text (α). As the stemmatic analysis presented here in Part B demonstrates the entry of new material into the Mahābhārata text tradition from the earliest depictable alignments down to the latest, it would be wilful not to extrapolate this phenomenon back into the earlier reaches of the development of the written text (α - β - γ - ... ω) which lie beyond the grasp of the lower criticism of stemmatics. Hence the stemmatic history of the text may be taken as confirmation that there is nothing irresponsible in proposing extensive

82 Pace S. Levi ("Compte rendu [1929]", pp. 347-348, and "Compte rendu [1934]", p. 282) who criticizes the Critical Edition because it attempts to but does not succeed in approximating the Ur-(Mahā)Bhārata, and Charpentier ("Besprechung [1932]", col. 277-278), who rejects this criticism not on the grounds that it is misdirected but that it sets an impossible task. Vaidya "[Review of] A Prospectus", p. 366, and Biardeau, "Textual Criticism", p. 119, adopt positions similar to Charpentier. Unfortunately Sukthankar's lack of clarity on the issue and the stemmas drawn by him (Adiparvan, "Prolegomena", p. xxx; Aranyakaparvan, "Introduction", p. xiii), Raghu Vira (Virāpparvan, "Introduction", p. xvi) and Belvalkar (Bhitānaparvan, "Introduction", p. cxv) all tend to create the impression that an original text of the Ur-Mahābhārata is the object of the reconstruction by not distinguishing between the archetypal text (ω) and the original text (α). See Table XI, II.
accretion in the development of the written text anterior to the archetype (w), as we have done in Part A. Had the stemmatic analysis not uncovered persistent accretion, then the arguments of Part A would be in jeopardy.
Having segmented the text of the Tulādhāra-Jājali episode and having reached some conclusions about the alignments and relative antiquity of the identified interpolations, we are now in a position to re-examine the material comprising the episode, considering the ideological standpoint of each discrete passage. Since we have segmented the text as fully as the evidence allowed, we are justified in assuming that each segmented passage conveys the viewpoint of one particular composer. Given individual and not composite authorship, it is appropriate to argue closely from the units of segmented text taking into account not only positive declarations of position but also elements which compromise, modify, or qualify the overt statements of ideology. Since it may be assumed that each composer has held a comprehensible (though not necessarily philosophically consistent) world view, it may even be possible to penetrate below the bald content of his statements to deduce something from the dynamics of the manner in which he presents his material.
Yudhishthira said:

Verily you have indicated the subtle marks of dharma [to me]. However a certain idea occurs to me, [and] with [your] permission I will speak of it. You have answered most of the questions in my mind, [and] I will not speak about this other matter, o king, out of [mere] argumentativeness.

Men may proclaim, enunciate, and refute these matters, [but] o Bhārata, it is not possible to know dharma in detail. [While] there is one dharma for a man in flourishing circumstances and another for a man in unfortunate circumstances, how is it possible to know in [all] their particulars [the dispensations covering various] misfortunes?

The behaviour of the good is considered [to constitute] dharma; on the other hand the good are characterized [as such] by [their] behaviour. How can what ought and what ought not to be done [then be distinguished if] the behaviour of the good is not a criterion? [It is] by [contrast with] the forms of dharma [that] it is evident that any common man is doing evil, [and conversely] from the forms of evil [that it is evident that] he is acting virtuously.

And again, a standard [of dharma] is enjoined by those learned in the Scriptures, yet the revelation [itself] tells us that [the authority of] statements in the Vedas diminishes with the succession of ages. Certain virtues obtain in the Kṛta age; different [ones] in the Treta age, and in the Dvāpara age; virtues are different [again] in the Kali age, being as it were fulfilled [only] as far as practicable.
The popular conception is that the pronouncements of tradition (constitute) the truth, (but) the
omni-faceted Vedas extend far beyond the tradition.

If (it is claimed that) all the (Vedas constitute)
a standard, then that standard does not exist. When
authority and authority are in conflict, where is
the prescribed rule? Whenever, as dharma wanes, a
rule is perverted by the powerful or the wicked, the
result is that the rule vanishes. Thus [the
distinctions between what] we know and [what] we do
not know, [and between what] can be known and [what]
cannot, are [respectively] finer than a razor's edge
and even weightier than a mountain. At first sight
[dharma] appears in the form of a fairyland city,
but when scrutinized by the wise it dissolves again
into invisibility. Like [water in] drinking troughs in
a cattle pen [or in] an irrigation ditch in a field,
obhārata, the eternal dharma is only remembered: it
has vanished without trace. The evil men [who]
engage in vain behaviour are legion, -- some out of
lust, others out of weakness or with other similar
motives. Dharma does indeed arise, but quickly
vanishes even in the worthy,[and] others call these
mad or deride [them],

Because the populace are inclined to abide by the
dictates of political [advantage], no kind of
generally-beneficial behaviour presents itself,
[for indeed the behaviour] by which one person
profits, grieves another. And even if yet another
[course of action] appears to fall in with [those],
[the correspondence is] fortuitous: [ultimately the
behaviour] by which one person profits, grieves
others. Modes of behaviour are universally
classified by diversity.

In olden days, long-established [custom] was
declared by the wise [to be] dharma; [thus] the
eternal convention [of today] is sustained by
[nothing more than] that custom of earlier times.
[Chapter 2]

Bhisma said:

253.1 On this issue [men] adduce the ancient story of Tulādharā’s words with Jājali on [the subject of] dharma.

2 Wandering in the forest there was a certain brahman hermit called Jājali. Having come to an arm of the sea, [that] great ascetic practiced austerities [there].

3 Restraining his senses, limiting his diet, clad in bark, seated on the antelope skin, with knotted hair, covered in dirt and mud, the intelligent ascetic [remained there] for very many years.

4 One day, o king, [as he] stood in the water, that wise seer, [who by now had become] charged with great power, travelled with the speed of thought throughout the worlds, observing [them as he went].

5 [Then, still] in the midst of the water, the ascetic came to reflect: "Even unto the encircling ocean I have beheld the wide earth with its woods and groves. There is no such one as I in this world of animate and inanimate beings. Who else could travel through the air like me [while still] in the water?"

6 As he spoke then, [standing] in the water, he was being observed by some demons; and some ogres said to him: "You should not talk like that. Even Tulādharā, [who] conducts himself as a trader famous in Vārāṇasī would not be worthy to speak as you have, excellent brahman." Addressed in these terms by the ghosts, the great ascetic Jājali replied: "I would like to see this wise and famous Tulādharā." When he said that, the demons lifted him out of the sea and said: "Off you go. [Just] keep on this path, o excellent brahman." Having been thus addressed by the ghosts, Jājali departed, downhearted.

When he arrived at Vārāṇasī, he spoke to

254.2 Tulādharā [in the following] words: "Selling [as you do] all sorts of juices and aromatics, forest
products and herbs and their fruits and roots, you
have gained a consummate understanding, o trader.
How has this come to you? Tell me all about this
[matter] in full, o perceptive one."

Addressed thus by that famous brahman, Tulādhāra,
[who, although but] a vaiśya, was aware of the
essential meaning of dharma and took pleasure in
knowledge, then spoke of the subtleties of dharma to
Jājali [whose proficiency, on the other hand, lay
in] strenuous penances. "O Jājali, I have knowledge
of the abiding dharma, including its secret aspects.

"I do not praise or condemn the deeds of others, o
wise seer, regarding the variety of the world [as
though consisting] in only the inert ethereal
element. I am never in accord or disaccord; I
neither hate nor love; I am neutral with regard to
all creation: mark my custom, Jājali. My balances
stand level with regard to all creatures,[and I am]
released from [regarding things as] desirable or
undesirable, having cast aside pleasure and passion.

Thus you, Jājali, the supremely intelligent, must
understand [that] I am neutral to all the world:
[to me] a lump of stone and [a piece of] gold are
the same. In my view [the following is] an analogy:
just as the blind, the deaf, the insane, those on
the verge of death, the unconscious, the aged, the
sick, and the feeble have no desire for sensual
enjoyments, so I too am devoid of desire for the
enjoyments of wealth and pleasure.

I follow the hereditary practice of [my] right-
acting, noble-minded, and gentle ancestors.

The abiding dharma has perished. Bemused by
[notions of] right behaviour, [everyone] becomes
confused, [whether he is a] scholar, ascetic, or
man of influence. O Jājali, [one who was truly]
wise [concerning] codes of behaviour would
immediately obtain [understanding of] dharma. This
would be [the case with one] who is restrained,
[and] acts properly, without enmity.
As, in physical terms, a piece of wood is borne along in a stream randomly, and may randomly join up with some other piece of wood, [and] then other logs join with them from here and there, with straw, wood, and refuse, from time to time, senselessly, - so it is with behaviour [in] this [world] as it arises from one source or another. [One] who has friends and wealth is fortunate, outstanding, and unrivalled; [yet] even he who has been fortunate [will] again become unfortunate. Seeing the dissipation of works, men always spurn [them].

O Jājali, in this world there is no [code of] dharma, however subtle [in conception, which is] unmotivated: human formulations of dharma are [invariably] made with past and future [interests] in mind. Because of its subtleness, the deeply obscured [true dharma] cannot be identified; only through grasping [the nature of] other [kinds of] conduct [can] it be conceived. For [this] reason one should seek [true] dharma, not follow the ways of the world.

If one man were to injure me and one man to praise me -- listen, o Jājali, [to my reaction] in such circumstances: for me, both those would be the same, since for me pleasant and unpleasant do not exist."

Thus did Tulādhāra speak [with] highly admirable purport, , and thus rightly perceiving [it], told of the everlasting dharma. After he had heard the words of Tulādhāra, famous for his fortitude, o Yudhīṣṭhīra, the brahman entered into [a state of] tranquility.
Notes to the translation

252.3ab: Deussen: "Diese [Elemente] erhalten unser Leben und schaffen es und lassen es entfliehen."
This interpretation does not seem to fit the context.

5d: alakṣyam, a karmadhūraya: 'no criterion'.

9: āmnaya 'tradition', seems to imply the traditional interpretation of the Vedas, with the implication that because of the narrowness of the human intellect, it fails to express the infinite range of knowledge contained in the Vedas.

10cd: pramāṇe cāpramāṇe ca viruddhe literally 'when authority and non-authority are in conflict'. apramāṇa might imply sādacāra or custom not based on Vedic authority, but in that case there would be little doubt as to the prescribed rule (śāstratā). Rather, in context with 9-10th it seems that two interpretations of the Veda may present themselves, in which case there is no clear means of determining what is authoritative and what is not.

12: I.e. our knowledge is so small that only a razor's edge separates it from ignorance; the distinction between what is known and what might potentially be known is, on the other hand, enormous.

14a: gobhyāșe < go + abhyāșe.

15a: ksayādi: for this unclear word, Deussen gives "aus ... Verlangen nach Veränderung".

17: mahājanāh 'hochsinnig Menschen' as Deussen has it, has little to recommend it in context. It may seem that 'great men' is a better version, since such men would indeed
have recourse to raṣṭadharma. However since stanza 17 appears to be a general statement, the sense 'population at large' is appropriate for mahājanāḥ, though this means giving raṣṭadharma the force of something like 'social competition'. This conforms with the conception of 18ab.

252.18cd: sa punaḥ: 'yet another' or 'it ... again'? Alternative translation 'If, again, it [appears] analogous [to some other, that is] by chance.'

The theme of the verse is picked up again in the analogy of 254.23, where the term yadṛcitam 'randomly' is used again.

252.20: The import of the stanza is obscure in this context. I take it to mean that dharma as declared by the wise is nothing but the fossilized practice of a past age which because of its antiquity seems eternal, when in fact it is just as limited as any other formulation of dharma: thus this stanza picks up again the thread of 9 above.

253. 8a: vanidharma: 'having trade as his custom'. The use of -dharaṇa here is, I consider, incidental to the idiom and has no relation to the discussions of dharma surrounding it.

254. 5ab: veda: 'I know', in view of the trend of the discussion, is better taken here as 'I know about' or 'I understand' - implying not that Tulādhāra can detail what comprises dharma, but rather that he understands its spirit.

254.12ab: See pp.404-406.

254.13d: samalostāśmakañcanam, bahuvrīhi agreeing with mām, 'regarding a lump of stone or gold as equal'. The compound is a cliché frequently used to express indifference to worldly values (cf. Mbh.xii.185.3, 215.6,
and has no direct connexion with Tuladhaṇa's activity as a merchant exchanging goods.


22a: ācāraṇa as object of prājñāḥ construed quasi-verbally.

22c: ādhubhir? instrumental of manner.

23a: iha 'in this world', here translated 'in physical terms'.

24e: ayam ācāraḥ 'behaviour in this world'.

27ab: Following the Critical Notes, anya 'egregious'; aparā 'peerless'.

36c: In anticipation of 50ab, it is tempting to read upalabhya 'grasping' as upalabhya 'reviling', which is metrically more normal. However the unanimity of the manuscripts and the fact that upalabhya is a lectio difficilior justify its retention. In 256.17c upalabdha has the sense 'grasped', suggesting that the distinction between upa/s labh and upā/s labh was not clearly made by the author of these verses. Böhtlingk and Roth, Sanskrit-Wörterbuch, recognize the confusion: s.v. / labh, -upa: 4) upā° fehlerhaft für upal°; -upa: 5) upalabdha fehlerhaft für upalabdha.

antara 'in the meantime, during'; here 'while', hence 'through'.

256.17c: upalabdha, for upalabdha, perhaps metri causa; but cf. 256.36c.
Interpretation

The material of the oldest alignment is self-sufficient. It poses a problem (ch.252) and sets out the answer by relating a story (ch.253-256) the point of which is relevant to the issue. This story itself is complete: it sets up a conflict (ch.253: Jājali vs. bhūtas and Tulādhāra), elaborates a solution (ch.254: Tulādhāra's teaching), and notes a resolution (ch.256: Jājali's sānti). It is on this level that the episode is most coherent, partly because it is presumably the work of a single composer and partly because, unlike later interpolators, the composer is not working within the constraints imposed by a pre-existent text but is rather, in this context at least, creating ex nihilo - giving him a free hand in choosing and structuring the story to express the point he wishes to make. Hence it is on this alignment alone that our analysis of the story's ideology is controlled: it is uncompromised by the disjunctive effects associated with the interpolations of later composers who are reacting in one way or another to the older material, introducing a variable into an equation of constants. In view of the tightness of the 1st alignment material, it is

1 It is not necessarily suggested that the story was composed by the author of the Sāntiparvan ab initio. It seems more likely that it has been inserted into the Yudhiṣṭhira-Bhīma frame (cf. pp. 415-417 above) however the Sāntiparvan's emboxing construction is so accommodating that it imposes no demands or predispositions on the material inserted.
especially rewarding to think through its associations of ideas and means of expressing values.

The problem posed to provide the rationale for telling the Tulādhāra story is that of the ineffability of dharma. Yudhīṣṭhīra points out the various ways in which human understanding limits and conditions men's perceptions of dharma. Men are unable to conceive an absolute definition of good, hence there is no unanimity over what is good. The difficulty of obtaining a clear perception of dharma is exacerbated by the fact that men inevitably think of it in its application to the human condition in all its distracting variety. Nor is it possible to fall back on traditional interpretations of dharma because they are themselves the product of limited human understanding, and have been subject to distortion in transmission. Moreover, difficulties of comprehension aside, the confusion is heightened by the human tendency to conceive and act upon dharma in pragmatic and self-interested terms. Thus limited and conditioned, man's understanding of the reality of dharma is infinitesimally small. He is, however, capable of becoming conscious that any understanding

---

2 252.3, 5, 7-8, 12-14.
3 252.9-11.
4 252.4, 15-19.
5 252.17-18ab; also 13.
6 252.11, 20.
7 252.17-18ab.
8 252.12.
he might think he has is illusory. This is Yudhîṣṭhīra's problem.

Tulādhāra's answer attacks the question in two ways: it deals with the conceptual problem presented by human inability to comprehend dharma; and it sets out a practicable mode of conduct which transcends the limitations of imperfect understanding.

On the first score, Tulādhāra picks up and restates certain of the propositions put forward by Yudhîṣṭhīra. He acknowledges that conceptions of good are confused to the extent that there is no understanding of dharma. In accounting for the confusion, Tulādhāra points out that actions and the fortune or ill-fortune they produce cannot be seen as parts of any ordered system (a quality implied in any notion of dharma, with its overtones of order), simply because they are totally random. For this reason alone, a human interpretation of dharma is as illusory as Yudhîṣṭhīra's fairyland city. But Tulādhāra makes the further point that interpretations of dharma are inevitably contingent upon the interests of those who formulate them. Consequently, Tulādhāra concludes, "one should not follow the ways

9 254.21.
10 254.23-24.
11 254.35-36 (Yudhîṣṭhīra's statement is at 252.13).
12 254.35.
of the world, [but] seek [true] dharma, and one can do this only by adopting a correct attitude to the ephemeral and contingent nature of all codes of behaviour. This, of course, Jājali had not done: his pride in his achievements as an ascetic shows ignorance of the meaninglessness of action.

But, if no code of behaviour is an expression of dharma, how should one act? Tulādhāra holds up his own life as a model. He acts, but with a complete lack of involvement in his activities. His occupation is one he has inherited; he acts it out impartially and disinterestedly. Whereas notions of good conduct depend upon social acceptance, Tulādhāra cares nothing for the praise or condemnation of others. One who strives to follow a patterned course of action has some end in mind, to which he is inescapably attached - Jājali exemplifies the case; moreover he must perforce invest his actions and his course of action with some importance, and by doing so falls prey to one or another illusory perception of dharma. Tulādhāra avoids this pitfall. His

13 254.50ab: dharmam anvicchen na lokacaritaṃ caret
14 253.5-6.
15 254.27ab, 34.
16 254.20.
17 254.11, 12cd-13.
18 252.5.
19 254.10-11ab, 50cd-51ab.
Tolstoyan vision of individual courses of action motivated with infinite variety, producing unpredictable patterns through random conjunctions, explains his total unconcern with what his behaviour might lead to. As he has no end in mind, his behaviour thereby ceases to be a course of action; it is a mode of acting. It is in harmony with dharma because it is not a striving after virtue humanly conceived and socially acclaimed.

The composer of the story conveys his message not only through the words he puts in the mouths of Yudhiṣṭhira or Tulādhāra, but also through the development of the story. In this regard special significance attaches to the intervention by demons and ogres which sets in motion the encounter between Jājali and Tulādhāra which lies at the heart of the episode. These supernatural beings speak as omniscient onlookers, and may thus be understood as expressing the view of the composer directly. We may infer that by

20 Tolstoy, L: War and Peace, pp.974-976, 1339-1347, 1420-1421, and part II of the Epilogue in general. Some parts of Tolstoy's philosophy come so close in expression to Tulādhāra's, that several brief quotations seem appropriate:

"The march of humanity, springing as it does from an infinite multitude of individual wills, is continuous." (p.974).

"[Seeking causes] I see only a coincidence of occurrences such as happens with all the phenomena of life." (p.975).

"Though the surface of the ocean of history seemed motionless, the movement of humanity continued as uninterrupted as the flow of time. Coalitions of men came together and separated again ..." (p.1339).

Tolstoy's discussion of chance and genius (pp. 1342-1349) closely matches Tulādhāra's interest in the rise and fall of fortunes and the dissipation of works.

21 253.7-11.
attributing words to superhuman beings the composer intended them to carry more than human authority. For the development of the plot, the significance of the supernatural intervention is that it makes the authoritative judgement of Tulādhāra's fitness to act as a model for Jājali; no further justification of Tulādhāra's position is offered. For the expression of ideas, the ghostly judgement is significant for the manner in which it describes Tulādhāra's position vis-à-vis Jājali. Although the whole progress of the story turns upon Jājali's submission to Tulādhāra, there is no explicit statement of Tulādhāra's superiority, only implication. Indeed, taking their words at face value, the demons, far from saying that Tulādhāra is in possession of the truth, or knows dharma, or is unmatched in virtue, say only that Tulādhāra too cannot claim any absolute superiority, only (by implication) a relative superiority over Jājali. Since this judgement is the key to the consequent unfolding of the story, and since it may be taken as a pure expression of the composer's view, the form of words chosen has ramifications for our understanding of Tulādhāra's teaching and example.

An insight into why the composer refrains from stating Tulādhāra's peerlessness or superiority in any absolute way may come from the passages which underline the futility of achievement. It is

22 Not strictly part of the story is Bhīṣma's concluding accolade (256.17-18) - and of course the very fact that Bhīṣma relates the story.
23 254.25-24, 27ab, 34.
understandable that the composer does not make claims on Tulādhāra's behalf which Tulādhāra would regard as repugnant and out of harmony with the attitude to life he propounds. The composer makes Tulādhāra deny the validity of all such evaluation. Since the denial is not merely a debating point, but part of the message which the composer is attempting to convey by means of the episode, it would be inconsistent for him to endow Tulādhāra with excellence. To put the matter another way, it appears that the composer has not conceived of Tulādhāra as superior to Jājali in any usual sense. Although, at the beginning of his discourse, Tulādhāra says that he 'knows dharma' or 'knows about dharma', in all the rest of what he says it is clear that what he offers is a heightened awareness of the delusions which beset the human condition. Tulādhāra does not recommend any actions which accord with dharma; he recommends an attitude. Even the attitude is not positively conceived, but is more often than not negatively defined. What Tulādhāra's example seems to recommend is passivity — and not a self-consciously cultivated passivity, which in the composer's eyes

25 254.34cd.
26 254.7ab. For the translation, see notes to the translation at the head of this section.
27 See the discussion of this point, pp.129-130 above.
An exception is the description of his ancestors' behaviour (254.20); however note the discussion of this information below.472.
28 Negations are found in 254.10, 11ab, 15. Other passages imply negation by stating Tulādhāra's indifference to commonly accepted values: 254.11cd, 12cd, 13, 50cd-51ab. The only positively expressed statement is 254.20.
would be a contradiction in terms, but the passivity which arises from an apathetic conviction that the ups and downs of human affairs are unpredictable, making exercise of the human will futile and emotional investment in outcomes senseless. Tulādhāra's position thus differs from Jājali's not in that Tulādhāra achieves anything greater, but indeed in the fact that he seeks to achieve nothing at all. So, it would be just as inappropriate for Tulādhāra to say that he had no equal in the world as it was for Jājali. Hence the ogre's words are apt: "Even Tulādhāra ... would not be worthy to speak as you have...". 29

Tulādhāra's function in the episode is to answer Yudhiṣṭhīra's complaint about the difficulty of knowing dharma. We have observed that in doing so he accepts Yudhiṣṭhīra's proposition that in practice dharma is unknowable and indefinable. Nevertheless, Tulādhāra does discuss dharma and thereby, however cautiously he treads, implies some conception of it. It is therefore legitimate to inquire into that conception of dharma which Tulādhāra alludes to on the composer's behalf.

During his discourse Tulādhāra mentions dharma a number of times, most often in connexion with the notion of acāra, code of behaviour. Before studying these key references, however, it is necessary to point out that Tulādhāra is not consistent in his use

29 253,8: tulādhāro ... so 'py evaḥ nārhate vaktum yathā tvam ...
of the word dharma. In stanzas 254.35 and 36 dharma takes on two different senses: in stanza 35 the reference is to something manifest; in stanza 36 to something imperceptible. Context makes it clear that in stanza 35 dharma is used as a shorthand denotation of the kind of dharma which might be set down in a prescription of dharma (dharmapravacana), but in stanza 36 the sense has changed, for this dharma\textsuperscript{30} is not enunciated in any prescription. The two senses are conveyed in the translation. We find an interplay — so typical of the disputatious, polemical style — between the alleged and the true: in this instance between "dharma" and dharma. Elsewhere in the episode it seems that dharma is used consistently in the unqualified sense.

From the relevance of the question of motivation and from the implication that it can be conceived in humanly understandable terms, it may be inferred that the "dharma" of stanza 35 implies a course of action. Whether the same is true of the true dharma mentioned elsewhere is not clear. The alternative interpretations would appear to be either (a) that dharma is conceived of as implying a course of action which is only ideally knowable but in practice unknowable; or (b) that dharma is quite different in nature from any conception associated with a course of action (\textit{ac\text{\-}\text{\-}\text{\-}\text{\-}\text{\-}\text{\-}\text{\-}\text{\-}\text{\-}}). The evidence of the passages which explicitly discuss dharma is somewhat

\textsuperscript{30} The dharma\textsuperscript{a} of stanza 35 is carried over here by the \textit{sub} of \textit{36ab}. 

ambiguous. The obvious sense of stanza 254.21 is that formerly dharma was recognized, and hence was recognizable and must therefore have been expressed in a kind of behaviour. It is the manifestation of dharma which has perished, not the ideal itself, for 254.22ab tells us that dharma might still be reached by the wise. Stanzas 254.21 and 22 relate dharma to courses of behaviour (ācāra) but do not make it clear whether men are unable to reach dharma because their minds are befuddled by false claims concerning the right ācāra, or because their minds are wrongly interested in pursuing the question of ācāras at all. The cryptic conclusion that the one who will reach dharma is one who acts "properly" is not illuminating. The other qualities of this successful person, viz. restraint [of mind] and acting without enmity, might be regarded as constituting a detectable manifestation of dharma, but the text does not say explicitly that this is so. The verse says only that one whose actions are performed in this state of mind may obtain [sc. an understanding of (?)] dharma.

Stanzas 36 and 50 are more enlightening. Here dharma is contrasted with courses of conduct (ācāra). Coming after stanza 35, 36ab certainly seems to imply that dharma could ideally be manifest as a course of action (ācāra), and that only because of its gossamer subtleness does the untainted ideal escape definition.

31 254.22c: sādhubhīr .. cared
32 254.22d: dēntaś cared adrohacetasā
by the human intellect. However when verses 36ab and 36cd,50 are read together, this interpretation appears inadequate. Verse 36ab explicitly states that dharma cannot be identified; verse 36cd says it can be conceived. Stanza 36 makes sense only if it means either that the conduct which embodies dharma can only be negatively defined, i.e. by dismissing contingent courses of action; or that dharma must be conceived in some terms other than those applying to courses of action (acāras). Stanza 50 brings down its verdict in favour of the latter alternative. It admonishes the brahman to seek dharma and to spurn the ways of the world. While it may be paradoxical to exhort someone to seek that which cannot be identified, it is nonsensical to exhort him to seek something which is known only for what it is not. The former proposition is a commonplace of mystical thought: what cannot be described may nevertheless be recognized intuitively by those who reach it. The latter proposition is psychologically unacceptable in asking the subject to spurn that to which his attention must constantly be directed in steering a course to his goal. Moreover, the notion of a negative definition does not sit logically with the assumption that the criteria against which the definition is drawn (viz. acāras) are random phenomena.

We are thus led to the conclusion that dharma is not definable in the way an approved course of conduct (acāra) can be. This conclusion throws further light on stanzas 21 and 22. The qualities of mind (viz.
restraint and absence of enmity) given in verse 22cd as the characteristics of one who will obtain understanding of dharma may now be seen as describing a prerequisite state of mind in the absence of which no vision of dharma is attainable.

This interpretation of the passages which directly mention dharma finds corroboration in the fact that in its terms the remainder of Tulādhāra's discourse makes good sense and contributes coherently to his fundamental contention. The remainder of his discourse is taken up with (1) an elucidation of his own state of mind,33 (2) the striking analogy of the stream of life,34 and (3) his explanation of why he follows the merchant's trade.35 Tulādhāra's descriptions of his own attitudes can be linked with the restraint and lack of enmity of verse 22cd. In all cases emotional dissociation is the name of the game. Lack of enmity may be coupled with Tulādhāra's stated indifference toward those who would do him down.36 Restraint of the mind or senses may be associated specifically with his statements of indifference to pleasures37 and generally with his attitude of non-involvement. The stream of life analogy forcefully depicts the futility of placing any value upon perceptions of right behaviour. It makes the twofold point that courses of

---

33 254.10-11, 12cd-15, 50cd-51ab.
34 254.23-24, 27ab, 34.
35 254.20.
36 254.50cd-51ab.
behaviour have only illusory significance and that through pursuing a course of behaviour one achieves only transient success - which is what Jājali had first achieved. Tulādhāra's explanation of why he follows a merchant's occupation is interesting because at first sight it seems a gratuitous intrusion into his discussion. If Tulādhāra is not laying down any course of action as an expression of dharma but rather is exhorting an *attitude* to activity, his particular occupation should have no relevance to the case. However we may see him making just this point when he tells us that he performs his occupation because it is his by birth. It is how he conducts his occupation which is significant, and detachment in a chosen profession is self-contradictory.

Thus, throughout his discourse on dharma, Tulādhāra is in fact telling us about the state of mind conducive to the apprehension of dharma. It is additionally noteworthy that the culmination of the discourse is not presented as Jājali's realization of the true dharma, but rather Jājali's achievement of *śanti*, the peace which comes with non-attachment. Thus even at the conclusion of the story, the state of mind or mode of perception of the subject is described, not dharma. However the logic of the story requires that as a result of his contact with Tulādhāra the brahman should indeed have gained an understanding of dharma, for this is the rationale of the story introduced by Yudhisthira's questions. On
this basis, śānti may be taken as concomitant with the subject's apprehension of dharma. Since the influence of Tulādharā's example and the world view upon which it was based have conduced to Jājali's śānti, we can probably go beyond our earlier suggestion that they were prerequisites in the absence of which apprehension of dharma was not possible, to say now simply that they are concomitant with the apprehension of dharma. Thus, insofar as dharma can be expressed in finite terms at all, these attitudes and views offer the most congenial approximation of it - always with the reservation that this is not the same as saying that dharma is manifest in these attitudes or views. So we may conclude that although Tulādharā never defines the unidentifiable dharma, the most suggestive descriptions of it which are conceivable are that considered emotionally it is śānti, transcendental detachment; and considered as a physical property or process it is analogous to the ākāśa in which the illusory distinctions of life consist or the stream in which life with its falsely significant coincidences is borne along. That the two aspects are mutually inductive demonstrates their essential unity: the attitude fosters the world-view; the world-view fosters the attitude.

The social setting of the ideology

The Tulādharā episode is informative not only for what it preaches, but also for the means by which it

39 Pp. 470-471 above.
40 254.10.
expresses its message. The strategy adopted by the composer to discuss Yudhishthira's issues, using an illustrative story as the vehicle for his reply, inevitably associates the doctrine preached with a social context. The composer has a brahman seeking advice from a vaisya; he has an ascetic learning from the example of a trader; he has a forest dweller come to learn in a great city from one engaged in social intercourse. Inasmuch as this setting is a by-product of the technique of presentation, it is only incidental to the ideology of the episode. Some significance, however, lies in the fact that the composer has chosen this particular social context in preference to others; and it is worth asking why.

Beyond that general observation, there is a particular reason to suspect that the choice of setting is not fortuitous in the case of this episode: the hero explicitly relates his occupation to the message he preaches. In verse 254.12cd, Tuladhara says "My balances stand level with regard to all creatures", using the conduct of his trade as a symbol of the attitude he espouses.

It would be possible to dismiss this as a play on words were it not for two points. First, we have the fact that this aspect of the merchant's occupation has sufficient significance to supply the hero's name. The attitude the hero exemplifies is thereby personified in the figure of the trader. Secondly, special emphasis is placed upon Tuladhara's occupation by Jajali when Jajali introduces his opening question:
"Selling all sorts of juices and aromatics, forest products and herbs and their fruits and roots, you have gained a consummate understanding, o trader. How has this come to you?"

In its context, this is a puzzling aspect of Jājali's question. If it has a point, prima facie it would appear to be that Tulādhāra is engaged in a vaiśya's occupation and could not be expected to have knowledge of use to the brahman Jājali. This theme is picked up a verse or two later when Bhīṣma refers to Tulādhāra as a vaiśya. However, as Tulādhāra's discourse develops, it begins to appear rather that in Jājali's question the composer was anticipating the later reference to Tulādhāra's use of balances: Jājali does not explicitly refer to Tulādhāra's social class, but goes into remarkable detail about the merchandise in which Tulādhāra deals: spices which must be weighed out, juices which must be measured out. In this light, we might conclude that in the composer's mind, Tulādhāra's occupation and his values are intimately linked.

It is the symbolism of the balances which most directly express the link between Tulādhāra's occupation and his attitudes. The balances (tulā) have connotations of indifference, evident in phrases like tulyanindastuti "indifferent with regard to blame or praise". Tulādhāra's balances weigh out the same

41 254.2-3.
42 254.4ab.
43 At, e.g., Mbh.xii.215.5a, in a passage expressing attitudes similar to those attributed to Tulādhāra in rc. The translation is given by A.W.
measure for all comers, without favouritism, in an 
impersonal way - mechanically, and thus disinterestedly.
In the West, the scales of justice symbolize some of 
the same values. When Tulādhāra says "My balances 
stand level with regard to all creatures" he is 
extending his manner of dealing with others from the 
commercial relations of his trade to the totality of 
his relations with all persons and things. He accepts 
a mechanical analogue as an adequate description of 
his actions. So far have his will and personality 
atrophied that he conceives of himself as an 
amaton carrying out certain actions unthinkingly. 
The absolute devaluation of will and ego implicit in the 
use of the balances is brought home forcefully by 
Tulādhāra in his comparison of his own attitude to 
that of the insane (umāttā), the unconscious 
(devair hitadvara), and others whose human faculties are 
defective. Tulādhāra thus demonstrates how he can 
deny his humanity and yet at the same time play a 
role in human society. The significance of 
Tulādhāra's being a petty trader is therefore at least 
in part that of providing a setting for his use of the 
symbolic balances, and secondly of making his stance 
credible by enabling him, as an independent pedlar who 
is his own master, to maintain both his impersonal 
attitude and his livelihood.

In terms of the composer's purpose, that is 
sufficient to account for his choice of the hero's 
occupation. It is questionable therefore whether we 

\[\text{44-254.} \]
would be justified in proceeding beyond the sufficient minimum of explication into interpretation. Would we be justified, for instance, in postulating that the composer saw the petty trader as an 'ideal type' in which the values he expounds were embodied? This is not a question which can be argued validly from the material comprising the episode; the matter comes down to an intuitive choice between regarding the story and its setting as merely an instrument of the storyteller's art, or regarding them as having moral connotations in their own right and contributing to the statement of values which the composer makes. In the first case one would have to imagine that the values expounded in the episode were first in the composer's mind, unembodied, and that he then devised or adapted the story we have as a suitable vehicle for dramatizing the values. In the second case one would have to imagine that, quite apart from the exigencies of composition, in the composer's mind the values expressed had had their pre-eminent embodiment in the way of life of the petty trader. A preference for the second alternative will arise, I suppose, partly from the analyst's proclivity for sociology; it will be justified if the opportunity for interpretation thus made possible is used to good effect.

The story is impelled to its end by the impetus generated from a polarity between the figures of Tuladharma and Jajali, the protagonist and antagonist
of the story. The story presents several contrasts, in each case one end of the polarity being identified with each of the principal characters. Thus the relationship between the two may be conceived as consisting in several different contrasts or, preferably, as a cluster of contrasts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jājali</th>
<th>Tulādhāra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a  brahman</td>
<td>1b  vaiśya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a  hermit</td>
<td>2b  trader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a  forest dweller</td>
<td>3b  townsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a  acting as individual</td>
<td>4b  participating in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a  striving and involvement in acāra</td>
<td>5b  detachment from acāra and lack of striving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each cluster of characteristics, 1-4 form a complex in the sense that each of these characteristics is an aspect of one or more of the others - a forest hermit inevitably acts as an individual; a trader is the urban dweller par excellence and will ideally be a vaiśya, and the urban dweller participates in social life. The nexus between 1-4 and the fifth characteristic is not at all obvious, however. It is the forging of an apparently paradoxical nexus which is the composer's ideological contribution in this episode. Prima facie, 5a and 5b should be reversed: it is the brahman forest hermit who has detached himself from striving

---

Phonemic analysis furnishes a useful analogy.
after worldly pursuits whereas, on the other hand, the trader's immersion in human intercourse is congenial to fostering competitiveness and lust after wealth. The composer's purpose is to demonstrate that 5a and 5b are indeed correctly placed as in the diagram above. He achieves this, as we have seen, by arguing that the manner of Jājali's acting as an individual and the manner of Tulādhāra's participation in social life are what is important, not the form of the activities themselves.

At first glance the diagram in the previous paragraph might suggest that the story centres on a deliberately-contrived paradox, and that the composer's aim is to show that the vaiśya out-brahmans the brahman. In that the brahman profits from Tulādhāra's example, there is an element of truth in this proposition; but it is not satisfactory to regard the story as yet another anti-brahmanic tale. For a start, as noticed earlier, the composer is at pains not to put

46 Elsewhere in the Moksadharma parvan attitudes of non-involvement are described in terms similar to the description of Tulādhāra's even-handed attitude (5b), but their application is generally to world-renouncing ascetics (parivarajakas, samnyāsins) or yoga adepts. Cf. 185.3; 215 esp. st.6-7; 270 esp. st.10; 308.36.

47 N.B. the discussions of the misunderstood relationship of ācāras to dharma, 254.36, 50ab and 22. See above pp.135-137, 145-146.

48 See pp.456-467 above. In this regard the present episode differs from similar but more overtly anti-brahmanic tales such as that of Dharmavāyadha. Cf. the resolution of that tale, llbh.iii.205.6-10, 206.29-30.
Tulādhāra's achievement above that of Jājali. Furthermore, the conclusion of the story comes with the brahman Jājali attaining the state of Śānti. Tulādhāra is shown to understand the contradiction between attachment to ācāra and apprehension of dharma, and from that it might be inferred that Tulādhāra too was living in a state of Śānti, but this is never stated. If it is assumed that Tulādhāra was in a state of Śānti, a statement to this effect would establish at least Tulādhāra's equality with Jājali, and perhaps his superiority. The omission of any such statement is hard to reconcile with the notion that the Tulādhāra story is an anti-brahmanic tract. Alternatively it may be assumed that the composer did not regard Tulādhāra as living in Śānti. This in fact seems the more likely view. The composer may have considered that although Tulādhāra's attitude was correct, he was because of his birth constrained to execute actions which, however detached his performance of them might be, precluded him from the absolute non-involvement of Śānti. Jājali on the other hand had already withdrawn from all constraints to action and was deficient only with respect to attitude. By profiting from Tulādhāra's example, Jājali would thus be able to rise to a more total detachment than Tulādhāra: in short, the brahman could achieve Śānti while the vaisya could not. Whichever of these

49 Although this qualification runs across the grain of the composer's fundamental view, I find it as credible as the nexus between 1-4 and 5 (p. 478) is paradoxical.
interpretations of Tulādhāra's state is accepted, no strongly anti-brahmanic tendency is evident.

Conversely, although it is true that the story contrasts Tulādhāra's understanding with the initial lack of understanding of the brahman Jājali, the fact remains that the story itself is related by Bhīṣma as an illustrative answer to Yudhiṣṭhira's queries about the problem of applying dharma to man in society. Nothing in Yudhiṣṭhira's questioning suggests that he was very concerned about brahmanic behaviour; on the contrary, in several contexts he gives his remarks an unrestricted application, speaking of 'any common man'... the powerful and the wicked... the populace, and looking at all modes of behaviour. Tulādhāra's reply continues in the same spectrum. He speaks of the general confusion afflicting not only the scholar and ascetic, but also the man of influence who has friends and wealth. Tulādhāra proposes universalistically conceived answers in response to Yudhiṣṭhira's general questioning. In interpreting the episode as a whole, then, it is appropriate to see the impelling dialectic as between

50 252.6ab.
51 252.11.
52 252.17; mahājanah, alternatively 'political leaders', but not brahmans.
53 252.19; sarveṣām ācārānām.
54 254.21.
55 254.27ab.
56 Cf. 254.21-22; 35-36 and 50ab.
Yudhiṣṭhira on the one hand and Tulādhāra, as Bhīṣma's spokesman, on the other. In this perspective, Jājali becomes a man of straw so far as the ideological development of the story is concerned. Tulādhāra's contribution is therefore best judged not in terms of his opposition to or complementation of Jājali, but rather in relation to Yudhiṣṭhira's questioning.

The element in Yudhiṣṭhira's introduction which is most closely picked up again in Tulādhāra's discourse is his comment on the diversity of modes of behaviour:

Furthermore, the evil men [who] engage in vain behaviour are legion, — some out of lust, others out of weakness or with other similar motives. Dharma does indeed arise, but quickly vanishes even in the worthy, [and] others call these mad or deride [them].

Because the populace are inclined to abide by the dictates of political [advantage], no kind of generally-beneficial behaviour presents itself, [for indeed the behaviour] by which one person profits grieves another. And even if yet another [course of action] appears to fall in with [those], [the correspondence is] fortuitous; [ultimately the behaviour] by which one person profits grieves others. Modes of behaviour are universally characterized by diversity.57

which may be compared with Tulādhāra's words:

The abiding dharma has perished. Bemused by [notions of] right behaviour, [everyone] becomes confused, [whether he is a ] scholar, ascetic, or man of influence.58

As, in physical terms, a piece of wood is borne along in a stream randomly, and may randomly join up with some other piece of wood, [and] then other logs join with them from here or there, with straw, wood, and refuse, from time to time, senselessly, — so it is with behaviour [in] this [world], as it arises from some source or another. [One] who has friends and wealth

57 252.15-19.
58 254.21.
is fortunate, outstanding, and unrivalled; [yet] even he who has been fortunate [will] again become unfortunate. Seeing the dissipation of works, men always spurn [them].

Interestingly, both passages seem at root concerned with the competition inherent in social life. Yudhishṭhara speaks of the result of following rājadharma, the purpose of which is to bring others under one's influence and to gain advantage at the expense of others. Tulādhāra speaks of those who have amassed wealth and influence, thereby (we may assume) obtaining for themselves dominant social positions. Yudhishṭhara objects to social competition as a basis for social morality on the empirical grounds that, although in the short run there may appear to be benefits, in the long run one man can only gain at the expense of others. Tulādhāra agrees with Yudhishṭhara's objection, adding another empirical dimension to the objection, namely that power and influence are impermanent and should be devalued on that account as well. Tulādhāra, however, goes beyond the empirical to explain why social standing is an ephemeral quality. He does so by drawing an analogy with the pieces of flotsam borne along in the stream, linking this image with his conception of the illusory and deluding nature of ācāra, adherence to which is a means by which social standing may be gained. Jājali is a case in point. He has followed an ācāra and claims social honour as a result (although now his actions have caused grief to others is not

59 \[254.23-24, 27ab, 34.\]
60 \[252.17, translated as 'dictates of political [advantage]'.\]
The main thread tying together Yudhisthira's and Tulādhāra's contributions to the episode would seem, then, to be a concern with social competition. It is fitting therefore to look at the values Tulādhāra personifies in the light of this concern.

It is not immediately obvious why the figure of a trader should exemplify values inimical to social competition. It is noteworthy that in the composer's portrayal of Tulādhāra he has not mentioned several of the attributes we tend to associate pre-eminently with the trader: his striving to maximize profit, speculation, self-seeking individualism. Needless to say these are elements of a stereotype arising in our minds partly because we tend to see the trader in the refracted light of our own social environment; but it is clear that the composer did not see Tulādhāra in the same way. Without reason to believe that the business of the trader has changed vastly, we are led to the assumption that it is the trader's social environment which differs. In elucidating the values which Tulādhāra was intended to exemplify it will therefore be useful to consider aspects of the social context in which he is pictured.

Stanza 254.20 puts Tulādhāra's occupation into a

---

61 It could be argued that his extravagant boasting in 253.6 is an implied denigration of others.

62 We are participants in a highly developed money economy which is, socially and politically, pre-eminently a plutocracy in which social standing and influence are rewarded by and are the reward of wealth. Against this experience we are inclined firstly to see the trader's activities as essentially commercial-economic in nature, and secondly to see the private economic sphere in which the trader operates as an important avenue of social mobility. We may thus tend to see the trader as typically one who is pursuing the rewards of successful private initiative.
social context. Here the composer has Tulādhāra inform us that his occupation of trader is his by birth. This information, which at first seemed gratuitous, may now be seen as refuting any notion that Tulādhāra is engaged in trade in the hope of making his fortune and gaining upward social mobility. On the contrary, taking stanza 20 with the rest of his discourse, Tulādhāra pictures himself as a disinterested functionary, a trader because he was a trader's son. And not only Tulādhāra, but also his forefathers adopted this attitude to trading, for he qualifies them as "acting properly" (yathāyadvartamāna) and "gentle" (ahimsā). In view of stanza 20's relevance to the rest of Tulādhāra's discourse, ahimsā might attract the translation "not aggressive".

Nevertheless it must also be significant that the composer appears to have felt called upon to insulate Tulādhāra from involvement in aggressive trading behaviour. The presence of stanza 20 may indeed carry implication that such behaviour was a part of the social image of the trader as a type. Indeed if we look to other sources for a sketch of the trader in society we find that Manu for instance excoriates him as a scourge (kaṇṭaka) on the body politic, guilty of fraud speculation and deceit. By pointing out that Tulādhāra was not a trader by choice, the composer is

63 Thus, the context does not require us to assume devotion to the ideal of ahimsā as non-injury.
64 E.g. Manu 9.292.
allowed to go on to purge him of the driving force behind such crimes of greed and ambition. Tulādhāra is thus not an incarnation of the typical trader tout ensemble, but a model in which the characteristics of the trader have been adopted selectively to conform with the composer's moral ideal.

It does not follow, however, that the composer's selectivity has been calculated or guileful, nor that it detracts from the realism of his presentation. The social image of an occupational type may contain contradictions, for it subsumes a number of distinct but overlapping images, each delineating a profile of the subject viewed from one standpoint and making implied comparison with a certain class of other types. The preoccupation of Manu and Kauṭilya with fraud, speculation, and commercial malfeasance arises because the trader's activity tends to be mentioned only where it impinges upon the ruler in his judiciary and fiscal functions. In other contexts in the dharmaśāstras, trade is presented as an honourable and useful, though not exalted, occupation. It is thus conceivable that the composer is not being wholly provocative or paradoxical in regarding the petty trader as a paragon of disinterestedness.

The composer's perspective upon the trader emphasizes his disinterestedness. The petty trader, with a multiplicity of suppliers and a multiplicity

---

66 Manu 9.329-332 and especially 333; but also 10.85 and 3.152.
of buyers, is not dependent for his livelihood upon the grace and favour of any individual. His gains or losses are not made at the expense of others, but as a result of the impersonal action of market forces. In this regard, he stands in contrast to those who strive after social advancement and influence by amassing wealth and friends. In amassing wealth and followers, social climbers involve themselves in bonds of reciprocity and debt-obligation with others.

Yudhishthira justly observes that advantage gained in this manner implies disadvantage to others. But, as Tulādhāra makes clear, it is not this imbalance or injustice itself which is objectionable, but the fact that those who measure success in terms of social relativity, who follow socially defined ācāras, cannot escape the limited horizons of human social existence.

Even Jājali, who, as a forest hermit, had withdrawn from active social interaction had not discarded his socially-limited consciousness: he strove to follow a socially-defined ācāra, and measured his success as relative to the achievement of others. Tulādhāra, on the other hand, is strictly impersonal and non-

---

67 This is implied by the nature of Tulādhāra's merchandise, which is highly varied (254.2) and his method of selling (254.12cd).
68 254.12cd.
69 Cf. 254.13.
70 254.27ab, 34.
71 252.18,19.
72 See pp.482-483 and compare Yudhishthira's concern with Tulādhāra's attitude in 254.13-15 and the moral of 254.34cd.
73 254.35.
competitive in his social interaction. Thus, the appropriateness of the trader as an exemplification of the ideal of non-involvement flows from the peculiar impersonality of the commercialized social relations involved in his livelihood.

In the course of Tulāḍhāra's declaration of his stance, the composer is at pains to stress that Tulāḍhāra's attitude logically arises from a certain perception of the natural order. In concluding this appreciation of the trader figure, I wish to suggest that this perception is particular fittingly associated with the trader and the impersonal relationships of commerce. To glimpse the affinity one has only to look at the rise of the commercially-oriented middle class in England and the concomitant development of new perceptions of society by the classical economists74 and liberal political philosophers.75 These thinkers envisaged a society composed of individuals pursuing each his own interests. An individual's success depended upon whether or not he happened to be acting conformably to the interests of other individuals.76 The operations of society were seen as governed by impersonal natural laws which acted in ascertainable ways in response to conjunctions of

74 Adam Smith and his school, see Gide and Rist, History of Economic Doctrines, pp.348-366.
75 Especially Bentham and the Utilitarians, see Taylor, History of Economic Thought, pp.118-145.
76 This may be inferred from the conjunction of the principles which classical economists saw as guiding economic behaviour: self-interest, free competition, supply and demand. Such a conception gained popular currency as an aspect of social Darwinism. See also Taylor, History of Economic Thought, p.80; Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations, I, pp.18-19.
individuals' actions. Such a world-view has several points of contact with Tulādhāra's "river analogy". Although the nineteenth century English thinkers related their world-view to a morality quite different from Tulādhāra's - for them, as positivists, the pursuit of individual interest was wise and natural; for the idealist Tulādhāra it is vain - the two world-views have a formal similarity. They share an atomic view of society: society having no intrinsic order, being in a state of constant flux, its movements consisting in impermanent conjunctions of individuals' actions. No Weberian or Marxian will be surprised that Tulādhāra and those other spokesmen for the bourgeoisie should have reached similar conclusions about the nature of their social existence. Adam Smith and the classical economists rationalize the commercialization of social values so keenly felt in their day and time;

---

77 See the so-called Fundamental Laws summarized in Gide and Rist, History of Economic Doctrines, pp. 355-360. Cf. Bentham's conception of society as a manipulable mechanical structure in which individual desires were played out, Taylor, History of Economic Thought, pp.120, 121, 127-130.


79 In this respect, Tulādhāra's "river analogy" bears comparison with Adam Smith's metaphor of the "invisible hand". Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations, I, p.477: "...he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention".

80 On the commercial roots of Bentham's hedonist principle, see Taylor, History of Economic Thought, pp.141-142. Also, pp.300-312.
Tulādhāra speaks as a member of a small class whose livelihood turned on monetized, depersonalized exchanges and depended upon the unfathomable operation of market forces.

If, in accordance with this interpretation, Tulādhāra's world-view is not merely an ideological construct proposed to rationalize his mode of living, but can also be seen as an outlook rooted directly in the merchant's experience of life, it seems preferable to assume that the composer has drawn on a widely-known ideal type in his portrayal of Tulādhāra, rather than that he has plucked his hero out of the air as an appropriate illustration of a practical implementation of his philosophy. On this basis, it might be just to conclude that in the original Tulādhāra story we find an expression of tension not only between active and passive participation in religious-moral life, but also between the values of an urban or commercial class and the values of the dominant and predominating non-commercial or non-urban classes. That the latter were the dominant values of the society in which the composer moved may be deduced from the fact that they are the point of departure from which the exposition of Tulādhāra's values is launched. Tulādhāra's views are presented as a paradoxically valid reinterpretation of the alternative, accepted, orthodox, but defective, position.
Yudhiṣṭhīra said:

What were the meritorious works Jājāli had previously performed by which he achieved this great success? Please relate this to us, sir.

Bhiṣma said:

That great ascetic was exceedingly intent upon terrible asceticism. He conscientiously bathed in a river morning and evening. That brahman attended the fires as was proper, and kept recitation [of the Vedas] uppermost [in his mind]. Conversant with the precepts applying to the forest-hermit, Jājāli became radiant with refulgence. [But although] devoting himself to truth and asceticism, he did not perceive dharma. Standing in the open in the rainy season, staying in water during winter, defying the wind and the heat of the sun in summer, [still] he did not find dharma.

His resting places were uncomfortable beds of various kinds and the ground; standing in the open during the rainy season, that ascetic would suffer water [to pour] from the sky on to his head again and again: so, o king, his long hair [was] moistened [and] became knotted; because of his constant wandering in the forest it became dusty and matted with dirt.

At one time that great ascetic, fasting, subsisting on air, stood as steady as a piece of wood, never moving at all. As he stood [there] motionless like a tree trunk, o Bhārata, a pair of sparrows made their nest on his head, o king. The wise seer compassionately disregarded that couple as they made their nest there in his hair with
straws of grass. As the great ascetic, acting as a
tree trunk, never made the slightest movement, the
pair happily dwelt there [on his head] in complete
confidence.

So, when the rainy season had passed and autumn
came, [the birds, married] according to the dowry-
less rite, after gaining confidence [from their
intimacy], became infatuated with love: they laid
eggs on [Jājali's] head. The wise [brāhmaṇa],
refulgent and utterly steadfast in his vow, became
aware of them. Being aware [of the eggs]; the great
ascetic Jājali made no movement at all: [now]
constantly firm-minded in dharma, he found no
pleasure in evil.

Then, o lord, the two [birds] would daily return
to his head, dwelling [there] in a relaxed and
joyful [manner]. And so, from brooding the eggs,
little birds were quickened and they prospered there
[on Jājali's head]; and [still] Jājali did not move
at all: firm in his vow, he thus stood motionless,
embodying dharma, intent upon [his purpose of]
protecting the sparrows' eggs.

Then, in the fullness of time, those birds were
born; and the ascetic became aware of those little
birds [who had now] sprouted wings. Then, one day,
as he regarded those birds, the supremely wise one
became extremely pleased [that he had been] firm in
his vow. Then [too] the [two parent] birds got
pleasure from seeing that those [children of theirs]
had hatched; and they dwelt there [on Jājali's head]
with their children, free from fear.

And the inspired one saw the fledglings flying out
and coming in again every evening; and [still]
Jājali did not move at all. As time passed they
constantly came back [to the nest] and set off again.
They were abandoned by their mother and father; but
[still] Jājali did not move at all. And so those
little birds went out on journeys lasting a day,
returning there [to Jājali's head] in the evening
for their night quarters, o king. In time the birds,
having flown away for five days, returned on the
sixth day; and [still] Jājali did not move at all.
Gradually, all those birds, [who had grown] strong
now, did not return for ever longer periods of
days. In time, [their] course through the sky was of
one month's duration - and still they did not come
[back], o king; [but] Jājali stayed.

After that, as they had disappeared, Jājali was
filled with wonder. He thought, 'I am a saint'.
Then arrogance possessed him.

Seeing thus that the birds had gone away, that
[ascetic], whose vow was disciplined and who was
honoured as being noble-minded, became very pleased
[with himself] then. That great ascetic bathed in
the river, made offerings in the oblation-fire, and
attended to [ceremonies for] the rising sun. [Because
he had] raised sparrows on his head, that expert in
mantras Jājali then burst forth [exclaiming] to the
world at large, 'I have achieved dharma'.

However, there was a voice in the sky, [and]
Jājali heard it [saying]: 'In dharma, even you are
not the equal of Tulādhāra, o Jājali; and indeed even
Tulādhāra, dwelling at Vārāṇasa, [who is] very wise,
would not be worthy to speak as you have spoken, o brahman.

The ascetic, possessed by impatience in his desire
to see Tulādhāra, o king, travelled the earth,
[making his] home where [ever he happened to be when]
evening [fell]. After a long time he came to the
city of Vārāṇasa, and [there] he saw Tulādhāra
selling merchandise. The latter, the merchant, as
soon as he saw that learned one approaching, rose
very excitedly to honour [him] with [an expression
of] welcome.

Tulādhāra said:

That you were indeed approaching, o brahman, I
knew without doubt. O superior brahman, listen to
the words which I [now] say.

Staying on the shore of the sea, you performed
great asceticism, but you had not yet conceived any
notion of dharma whatsoever. Then,
o brahman, through your success in penance, soon birds
were born on your head and you raised them. When
their wings had developed and they left on flights
hither and thither, you then thought the raising of
sparrows to be dharma, o brahman. But you heard a
voice in the sky [speaking] about me, o truest
brahman. Then, sir, possessed by impatience you came
here.
O truest brahman, tell me, what shall I do [which]
pleases you?

Bhiśma said:

Thus addressed by that intelligent Tulādhāra,
Jaṅjali, the expert in mantras, intelligent, then spoke
[these] words:

[Dharma] is recognized by men [to be] the ancient
[quality of] compassion for the welfare of all
creatures.

O Jaṅjali, I live by that conduct which is the
highest dharma, [that is,] without harm, or failing
that with a minimum of harm. From wood and grass
[already] cut have I made my house; resin, padmaka
wood, lotus stamens, all kinds of aromatics, and
all the many kinds of juice except wines I buy
from others and sell without deceit, o wise seer.
[He] who is always the friend of all, [and who]
is devoted to the good of all in mind, word and
deed, - he, o Jaṅjali, knows dharma.
It must be made abundantly clear [to you] whether this course is followed by good men or evil men.

[This] you will learn from what follows. As these many birds nurtured on your head are flying all about [including] hawks and other species, call them as they alight here and there, o great brahman, [and] watch them cling to [your] limbs and all over [your] body. The birds, cherished by you, cherish you [as their] father; and assuredly you are their father. Call [your] children, Jājali.

Bhīṣma said:

Thereupon Jājali summoned the birds, [and] verily at the behest of dharma, they sang with wonderful voices, [saying:] 'Competitiveness destroys in this world and the next and the merit generated by harmlessness, among [other practices] o brahman. If it is not destroyed, it destroys the person [who is its host]. We have alighted [on you] out of a sense of dharma, wishing to put you to the test. Strike down [your] competitiveness, o highly intelligent one. By doing so, you will attain the supreme [state]. [As things stand,] O Jājali, this merchant, faithful, believing, and deeply [devoted to] dharma in his activities, and steadfast in [his] own [appointed] path, is superior [to you].
Notes to the translation

253.17: This stanza appears redundant, but the text is not improved by its omission. Probably we have here a case of unimaginative over-elaboration.

18d: malino: Although presumably based on the root majina and therefore singular, this adjective is so much more conveniently construed as plural in agreement with jatāh that I suggest it owes its termination -ah to analogy with adjectival forms in -in.

21c: kurvanām nīdakam: The masc./neut. acc.sg. pres. part. active which is found in place of the expected du. kurvanā may be interpreted either as attraction to nīdakam or as agreement in sense with the du. dāmpati regarded as a collective sg.

23c: prajāpatya vidhi, a form of marriage involving no dowry, and therefore appropriate to birds. Manu 3.30.

d: visvasat 'from confidence', i.e. only after the pair have overcome their (conventionally expected) shyness and embarrassment at being thrust together may lovemaking take place.

27ab: andebhyas ... puṣṭebhyah is probably an ablative of cause, thus: 'as a result of the brooded eggs', i.e. 'as a result of the eggs being brooded'; prajāyanta here denotes the quickening of the embryo within the eggs, as it is clear from what follows (28a anḍāni) that the birds are not yet hatched (29b bāthuvus).

31a: abhisamvrddha MW 'having grown a very long time' (said of a tree, Mbh. xii). This meaning is not suitable here. To construe the word abhi (intensificative) + samvrddha
'full grown, grown up, thriving', may give the meaning 'fully developed', which might be appropriate for chicks as they hatch; hence the translation.

253.41a: \textit{sambhāvya}, repeating the form of 39c, where it had the sense 'to be honoured'; here it seems to have the sense 'causing to be raised'.

50d: \textit{dharman caṭakaprabhavam: 'that dharma is raising of sparrows', or, 'that dharma springs from the Sparrows', i.e. from the disciples of Vaiśampāyana and the Black Yajurvedic school. It is difficult to believe that the ambiguity is not intended, especially since the birds are generally referred to with the general denotation \textit{sakuna} or related forms. The parents are first introduced not as \textit{caṭaka} but \textit{kuliṅga} (20c). If the disciples of Vaiśampāyana represent obscurantist, self-seeking brahmans, while Yājñavalkya's White Yajurvedic school stand for enlightenment through meditative asceticism, the rebuke is well aimed at Jājali's "poultry" penance. (See Walker, \textit{Hindu World}, vol.II, p.612-613; and Böhtlingk and Roth, \textit{Sanskrit-Wörterbuch}, vol.2, col.922, s.v. caṭaka 2,b).
254. 1 : dhīmatā (b); dhīman (c).

254. 5cd: 'Dharma'] is supplied from the preexistent 5ab.

254. 7a : paricchinnailḥ: although not strongly represented, the var.lect. paricchinnailḥ gives a reading of better sense. Even if the C.E. reading is retained, the implication that the wood and grass was cut by others is inescapable.

256. 6a : karma: here not the works themselves but the merit earned by them which will bring its reward to the door in this world or the next. Cf. the Ist alignment usage at 254.34c (vyāpattiṁ karmāṇam) where the denotation is more likely the concrete results of deeds rather than their spiritual results.

256. 6d : sahaṭā < sa + ahata so: sa 'hata hanti 'that [spardhā (f.)] not killed kills'. Cf. sa hanta hanti 'that killer kills'. Deussen and Roy both construe the phrase as sa hata 'that being killed' supplying appropriately tenaîne referenda (Deussen ahimsā, Roy śraddhā) which are however not warranted by the critically reconstructed text. Helvalkar (Śāntiparvan, Critical Notes, p.2192) accepts the construction sa + ahata. An analogue, differing in having a positive value as its subject, is Manu 8.15:

dharma eṣa hato hanti dharmo raksati
raksitah /
tasmād dharmo na hantavyo mā no dharmo
hato 'vadī //
trans. Bühler:

Justice, being violated, destroys;
justice, being preserved, preserves:
therefore justice must not be violated lest violated justice destroy us.
For detailed discussion of this verse, esp. *jiññāsamanās* and *samprāptah*, see pp. 221-222, nn. 16, 17.

256.16c: *śraddhavān śraddadhānaś*: an anomalous *sañdhi* which only serves to emphasize the rhetoric of the part-repetition.

256.16d: *dharmāṇāś*, acc. pl. of *dharma*, might be taken as standing in the relation of object to *śraddadhānaś*, hence 'believing in dharmas', but this makes no obvious sense and moreover runs counter to the structure of the verse, in which the conjunctions *-ca ... -ca* would seem to make *śraddhavān śraddadhānaś* and *dharmāṇāś* co-ordinates on an equal footing.

In the light of these difficulties, the critical reconstruction itself should be reconsidered. Upon examination of the Apparatus Criticus, it emerges that only 4 manuscripts (Ś1 K12 D9) read *dharmāṇāś* while 25 manuscripts (K467 V1 B06789 D2345678 Da34 Dn14 Ds12 G2 M57) read *dharmāṇāś*, 7 manuscripts (T12 G136 M16) having unrelated readings. However attractive *dharmāṇāś* may be intrinsically as a lectio difficilior, the more objective criterion of variant distribution favours the originality of *dharmāṇāś* both with regard to the sum of witnesses and their distribution profile. It is hard to see why the Critical Editors have chosen the reading *dharmāṇāś* unless this is yet another instance of the overweening authority they bestow upon Ś1. It is even harder to understand why the subscript wavy line has not been applied. Whatever the explanation, the reading *dharmāṇāś* is technically preferable. It offers no difficulty of translation: '[devoted to] dharma'. Cf. Dutt and Roy 'of righteous
soul'; Deussen, taking dharmaś nominally, not adjectivally: 'die [verkörperte] Pflicht'.

cāiveha, although probably not much more than a metrical plug, I have translated as 'and deeply (eva) ... in his activities (iha)'.
The ideological position of the interpolator

Unlike the 1st alignment material, the interpolations comprising the 2nd alignment need little exegesis. The principal theme running through the 2nd alignment materials is easily identifiable and straightforwardly described. The interpolator writes in praise of compassion for all creatures, in the first place illustrated by Jājali's acquiescing in the birds' nesting in his hair, and subsequently proved to be efficacious by the birds' willingness to alight on Jājali's body. The absolute validity of such morality is established through the interpolator's identification of the qualities of compassion and benevolence with dharma. He has Tulādbhāra draw this equation before proceeding on to subtleties of the 1st alignment discourse - then of course rendered meaningless.

Earlier, as he forbears while the birds raise their young, Jājali is described as 'firm-minded in dharma' and 'embodifying dharma' - attributes of significance in the light of Jājali's prior inability to discover dharma through asceticism. In the climactic declaration of the 2nd alignment material, Jājali's forbearance is subsumed under the general rubric 'ahimsā etc.'. Hence it may be said that, taking the

1 254.5c sarvabhūtahitaṁ maitrā; 253.21a dayāvān.
2 254.9a sarveṣāṁ suhṛn nityaṁ; 254.9b sarveṣāṁ hite rataḥ.
3 253.25c dharme dūrtamanā nityaṁ.
4 253.28cd dharmātma ... samāhitāḥ.
5 253.15b, 16b.
6 256.6a.
IIInd alignment material as a whole, the equation ahimsā = dharma is advanced throughout.

Important for a fuller appreciation of the interpolator's view is his conception of how the moral force of ahimsā operates. The theme developed in the action of the IIInd alignment material, wherein Jājali's gentleness as an ascetic is reciprocated by the tame behaviour of wild creatures, draws on an ideological and poetical stock-in-trade. Its particular interest lies in the adaptation of the theme to the dialectical context of the existing story. Because the materials of the IIInd alignment have not been composed ex nihilo, there will inevitably have been interaction between the interpolator's opinions as they might be freely expressed and his reaction to the story framework he has inherited. In consequence, a recurrent problem in interpreting the IIInd alignment material is the question of how far the interpolator has been composing as a free agent and how far his treatment has been determined by the shape of the older material onto which he is grafting his interpolations. In the present case, treatment of the ahimsā theme is apparently affected by the dialectical context of the older Ist alignment material. The need to persuade Jājali calls forth an elucidation of the relationship between Jājali and the birds which explains their return to him; and the given fact that Jājali's behaviour is imperfect requires the discussion of a value opposed to ahimsā.

7 See p.220, n.14 above.
The value which is set up against ahiṃṣā is spardha 'rivalry, competitiveness'. The idea of Jājali's competitiveness is suggested by his arrogance and proud boasting in the initial part of the IIInd alignment story. It is assumed in the denial of Jājali's superiority over Tulādhāra, Jājali's 'overweening' impatience to see Tulādhāra may also be taken as a manifestation of his competitive outlook. In their conclusion, the birds too state that Tulādhāra is superior to Jājali, thus casting the relationship in competitive terms.

Now, since spardha is put forward by the interpolator as the antithesis of ahiṃṣā, it is prima facie valid to use negations of aspects of spardha as elements of definition of the interpolator's understanding of ahiṃṣā. However it is the old plot laid down on the Ist alignment which requires a flaw in Jājali's character. To the extent, therefore, that the choice of spardha as the antithetical quality has been imposed upon the IIInd alignment interpolator, spardha loses its validity as a negation of ahiṃṣā. It is difficult to determine how far the interpolator has in fact been predisposed. Was Jājali's vice of competitiveness already present implicitly in the Ist alignment material? The testimony is conflicting. On the one hand Jājali seems to exhibit competitiveness in his claim to superiority over all others, but in all other respects the Ist alignment does not see Jājali's attitude, for instance

---

8 256.6.
9 253.38-39, 41.
10 253.42-43.
11 253.44ab ...amārasaṇasam pāṇnas tulaṇḍhāradidekṣayā.
12 256.16def.
13 253.6ab na mayā sadṛśo 'stiba loke ...
his relations with Tulādhāra, as competitive.
Tulādhāra's superiority over Jājali is never explicitly stated. Jājali departs in search of Tulādhāra not impatiently but downheartedly. Jājali's flaw is not portrayed as competitiveness but as spiritual shortsightedness. Since this shortsightedness leads to selfish striving for success in social competition, one could infer that it would be inevitably accompanied by a spirit of competitiveness, but the Ist alignment material never takes up this dimension of the question. Thus, the Ist alignment material does not make it obligatory for the IInd alignment interpolator to propose competitiveness as Jājali's fault, but it would have predisposed him to do so.

If, then, Jājali's competitiveness was latent in the Ist alignment, it was the particular contribution of the IInd alignment interpolator to bring this quality into prominence. His elevation of competitiveness to new importance may be seen in fact to flow from his championing of the virtue ahimsā.

The IInd alignment interpolator has cast aside the disinterested amorality of the Ist alignment material. This shift of conception means that the Ist alignment view of Jājali's shortcoming being his attachment to a morality of limited validity becomes inappropriate: just as Tulādhāra's virtue is now in the IInd alignment a valid positive moral value, ahimsā, so Jājali's shortcoming must be a valid but negative moral value.

---

14 Pages 465-466 above.
15 253.11b vimanās.
In this translation of perspectives, Jñājali's involvement with actions (ācāra) and seemingly measurable achievement, not being attributable to his narrow vision, is explained now by a flaw of character, spardhā. Understood in this way, spardhā arises from a reformulation of a situation inherited by the IIInd alignment composer, and to the extent that the interpolator's freedom has thus been preempted, spardhā is not validly used as an antithesis to the virtue ahimsā.

However it may be cogently argued that ahimsā is itself merely a reformulation of the positive value expounded by the Istd alignment material. Tulādhārā's mode of life, with its passivity and lack of enmity, might be taken by a literal-minded transmitter as an expression of ahimsā in practice. Tulādhārā's Istd alignment statements that:

I am never in accord or disaccord;
I neither hate nor love; ...16

and:

[One who is] restrained, [and] acts properly, without enmity [would obtain understanding of dharma]. 17

and:

If one man were to injure me and one man to praise me for me both those would be the same ... 18

stand at no great distance from his IIInd alignment statement that:

16 254.11ab.
17 254.22.
18 254.50cd-51a.
I live by that conduct which is the highest dharma, [that is,] without injury, or failing that, with a minimum of injury. The principal distinction appearing to be that in the Ist alignment Tulādhāra speaks of his state of mind while in the IInd alignment he speaks of his actions. It must be recalled too that Tulādhāra had characterized his ancestors as ahimsa 'gentle'.

Yet, although such passages may suggest a mere reinterpretation of elements of the original material in the IInd alignment, it cannot be overlooked that the IInd alignment composer advances an ideology quite distinct from that of the Ist alignment composer. The difference in their approaches to the dharma question have been dealt with fully enough earlier in the analysis. The distinction is revealed in a comparison of several further passages which bear superficial resemblance. On the Ist alignment Tulādhāra states:

I am neutral with regard to all creation.
My balances stand level with regard to all creatures.
I am neutral to all the world.

while on the IInd alignment he makes statements in the following vein:

Dharma is ... compassion for the welfare of all creatures.

---

19 254.6.
20 254.20.
21 Pages 129-130, 135-137, 145-146 above.
22 254.11c.
23 254.12cd.
24 254.13bc.
25 254.5.
He who is the friend of all and is devoted to the good of all ... knows dharma.

On the 1st alignment, Tuladhrā's equanimity is nothing more nor less than an uncaring, uninvolved, emotionally dead passivity. He makes this point repeatedly, explaining for instance his indifference to injury and praise by pointing out that "the variety of the world [is] as though [it consists only] in the inert ethereal element", by asserting that for him "pleasant and unpleasant do not exist", and by comparing himself to a sick or mentally defective person who has no interest in life. On the 2nd alignment, by contrast, Tuladhrā is made to recommend feelings of compassion and fellowship with other creatures - an attitude incompatible with uncaring uninvolvemnt.

In addition, approaching the matter from a different angle, it can be shown that the 2nd alignment composer does not regard ahimsā as essentially a passive virtue.

---

26 254.9.

27 Cf. the inexorable and unemotional quality of sama attributed to Time (or Death), in Mbh.xii.220. 96:

\[ \text{purāṇaḥ śaśvato dharmah sarvaprāṇabhūtām samaḥ / kāla na parihāryaś ca na cāsyāsti vyātrikramāḥ} \]

'Death, the ancient eternal dharma, impartial towards all living creatures, is inescapable and makes no exceptions'.

28 254.10cd.

29 254.11b.


31 Cf. Mbh.xii.208.4 which warns against allowing one's mind to remain attached by empathizing with creatures (śaṅgāḥ ... bhūtanukampaya).
consisting only in refraining from harm. During the raising of the birds Jājali is described as 'compassionately disregarding' the nesting couple.\(^3^2\) While this involves refraining from action (viz. refraining from ousting the birds), it is not an abstinence which springs from uninvolved or disinterestedness. Beside the statement that Jājali refrains from action out of compassion, other points underline Jājali's interest in the welfare of the birds. At each stage of their growing up we are told that Jājali continued to be aware of their development and continued to keep still\(^3^3\) because he was 'intent upon protecting' them.\(^3^4\) Moreover it is only in a mechanical sense that Jājali's inaction could be considered passive. Allowing the birds to nest is not a natural reaction, and it is made clear that in standing still Jājali is undertaking a strenuous penance.\(^3^5\) Indeed, until the birds nested in his hair, Jājali's standing still had been just one of a number of terrible penances.\(^3^6\)

Why did Jājali not find dharma until the birds nested in his hair? We are not told. We are clearly

\(^3^2\) 253.21ab dayāvān ... upapraiksata.

\(^3^3\) 253.22a, 25b, 27d, 28d, 32d, 35d, 35d, 37d.

\(^3^4\) 253.28ab raksamānas ... yatavratah.

\(^3^5\) It is of course accompanied by fasting (253.19) and is the culmination of a number of ascetic exercises (253.13-18) undertaken by Jājali who was 'intent upon terrible asceticism' (tapasa yukto ghereṇa).

\(^3^6\) Cf. 253.19cd, before the birds alight, kāsthavad avyagro na cācala ... karnicita, and 253.22ab, after the birds alight sa na salaty eva sthānubhūtah ...
meant to infer that strict asceticism by itself is not sufficient. The conclusion to which we are inevitably led is that ahimsā is correlated with the discovery of dharma not because it involves refraining from action which might be harmful but because it is not egoistic. This is the only difference made by the arrival of the birds: before their arrival Jājali's standing still is an egoistic self-mortification; after their arrival it is altruistic self-denial. Although the text offers no explicit warrant for this interpretation of Jājali's penances, the later emphasis on Jājali's altruism and the logic of his success and failure in finding dharma both combine to make it credible.

Placing altruism at the root of Jājali's discovery of dharma has the advantage of elegantly integrating spardhā in the composer's scheme of values. Rivalry or competitiveness is an inherently egoistic attitude. Thus in the birds' concluding admonition we see in the spardhā - ahimsā antithesis a replication of the antithesis set up earlier in the IIInd alignment material between egoistic self-exertion and compassionate self-restraint.

The same insight allows us to see that the links between the Ist alignment's disinterested non-involvement and the IIInd alignment's compassionate restraint are mechanical, forged from the externals of behaviour rather than from attitudes or outlooks. It is therefore misleading to regard ahimsā on the IIInd alignment as merely a refurbishing of the
value expounded on the 1st alignment: its essence, altruism, is a novel contribution of the IInd alignment composer. It should be noted, too, that spardhā is counterposed against ahimsā in just this new dimension. Thus, even though it may be true that the inherited structure of the story demanded a flaw in Jājali's behaviour, and that the 1st alignment material would have inclined the interpolator towards a vice compatible with Jājali's self-satisfaction, it is inadequate to dismiss the choice of spardhā by the IInd alignment composer as an extraneous imposition into his exposition of the virtue ahimsā. It is therefore valid, in the context of the IInd alignment, to use spardhā negatively as a device for comprehending ahimsā.

The denouement of the interpolation

With this understanding of the relationship between ahimsa and spardhā and of their implications, we are somewhat better placed to appreciate the denouement of the IInd alignment material and especially the morally climactic pronouncement by the birds that "Competitiveness destroys in this world and the next merit generated by harmlessness". Since no ramifications of this statement are spelt out it is left to us to infer what we can from the context in which it is made.

The action of the denouement, and thus the culmination of the IInd alignment plot, is the birds'
alighting about Jājali's person. It is as they alight that they sing of competitiveness and harmlessness. This climactic scene serves as a vindication of the moral stance advanced in the IIInd alignment. By viewing the action in the context of the plot of the IIInd alignment we may be assisted in comprehending how it achieves this validation.

The idea which first springs to mind is, perhaps, that the alighting of the birds betokens Jājali's reform. This idea is attractive because of its simplicity and its satisfying resolution of the tension of the IIInd alignment by returning the relationship of Jājali and the birds to the status quo ante. Furthermore the idea seems to conform with the birds' statement that they had come to Jājali "wishing to put him to the test". The form of the test would then appear to be the birds' alighting on Jājali's body, thereby offering him the opportunity to repeat his acquiescence in their presence and thus to demonstrate that he is again intent upon altruistic kindness and not consumed by egoistic competitiveness.

However not every detail of the denouement fits neatly into this seemingly straightforward interpretation, and twinges of doubt arise. Firstly, it is never directly stated that Jājali has reformed. Although it could be argued that his reform is sufficiently implicit in the developing action of the story as to make an explicit statement unnecessary, one's suspicions are not allayed by the fact that when

38 jijnāsamanāḥ 256.15c.
the birds do proceed to remark upon Jājali's moral condition, after having alighted upon his body they point out Tulādhāra's superiority over him, leaving the implication that Jājali is still an unreconstructed sinner. Secondly, the birds alight on Jājali, they say, "wishing to put [him] to the test"; but in what regard precisely is Jājali being tested? In the account of Jājali's earlier ascetic exercises it is clear that an altruistic attitude was not a precondition for the birds' first alighting to nest in his hair. The fact that they were able to continue there in full confidence is attributable to Jājali's compassion, but when they first began nesting Jājali's attitude was not in question - only the circumstance that he was practiseing the penance of standing still. Therefore, to be strictly consistent with the early IIInd alignment material, the birds' alighting upon Jājali would not betoken his reform. In accordance with this view the birds' approach to Jājali and the words they utter should be construed as a warning to him for the future, not as a token of his reform.

In introducing the last segment of the IIInd alignment material (256.1-6, 15cd-16) the composer has Tulādhāra explain the significance of the birds' response to Jājali in these words:

It must be made abundantly clear [to you] whether this course is followed by good men or evil men. [This] you will learn from what follows.39

From this we may infer that the action of the birds is intended as a confirmation or refutation of Tulādhāra's
doctrine. Tulādhāra figures on the IInd alignment as a spokesman for non-injury, and so it follows that if the birds act properly they will be confirming the validity of that value. Thus the validation of the IInd alignment's ideological stance is not achieved by a test imposed upon Jájali by the birds, but by a test proposed for the birds by Tulādhāra. The fact of the birds' alighting is thus not the inception of a test of Jájali, but the conclusion of the test proposed by Tulādhāra.

And yet, notwithstanding this conclusion, it is hard to discard the notion that we are not meant somehow to infer Jájali's ultimate reform. There is a natural desire to resolve the story in dramatic as well as ideological terms. Furthermore, the Ist alignment conclusion, of which the IInd alignment composer was at

40 Esp. 254.6ab: adroheṇa (alpadroheṇa) bhūtanām 'with a lack of enmity (a minimum of enmity) toward [all] creatures', implying in practice non-injury or a minimum of injury, as subsequently illustrated in 254.7.

41 In this light the birds' intention with regard to Jájali, expressed by the word jijñāsanā hitherto translated as 'wishing to put to the test' would be more appropriate as 'wishing to deepen one's knowledge of' - a revision which does no violence to etymology or usage, involving only a change of assumption as to whether there is an uncertain outcome or not.
least passively aware, the result of Tulādhāra's advice. The IIInd alignment composer tells us that the validity of Tulādhāra's advice is attested by the birds. So, the birds' alighting upon Jājali does portend his ultimate reform, but only in a tortuously indirect way.

The operation of ahiṃsā-generated merit

Having concluded that the birds validate Tulādhāra's championing of non-injury, we are newly placed to reexamine the admonition addressed by the birds to Jājali:

\[ \text{ahimsadikṛtaṃ karma iha caiva paratra ca} / \]
\[ \text{spardhā nihanti vai brahman ... /} \]

Unless the phrase *iha paratra ca* is so formulaic as to have no meaning at all, its plain sense would apply its qualification to the merit (*karma*), rather than to the generation by harmlessness etc. (*ahimsadikṛta*) or to competitiveness (*spardhā*). It is easy to imagine the efficacy of merit in the next world (*paratra*); but the implication of the birds' statement is that ahiṃsā-generated merit has efficacy in this world (*iha*) as well. Applying this principle to the situation of the story, we may be justified in viewing the birds' response to Jājali's summons as a

---

42 From the fact that the IIInd alignment lacks its own concluding device we may infer that the interpolator had intended to fall back on the existing Ist alignment conclusion, and thus that he was aware of at least its presence and possibly of its suitability. It is in the Ist alignment conclusion (256.17-18) that Jājali's attainment of sānti is mentioned.

43 256.6abc.
demonstration of the efficacy of ahimsā-generated merit - in this case, of merit generated by the deeds formerly done by Jājali.

This interpretation of the denouement fares well when judged against other elements of the IInd alignment conclusion. Firstly, it is in harmony with Tulādhāra's statement that whether or not the birds respond will prove or disprove the validity of his teachings concerning the virtue ahimsā (exemplified as non-injury). Secondly, it does not require that Jājali should already have reformed at the time of the birds' alighting, since it is the residual power of deeds earlier performed by him and alluded to by Tulādhāra which is at issue. Consequently there is no difficulty over the birds' alighting, their warning to Jājali to desist from his competitiveness, and their declaration of his moral inferiority as compared with Tulādhāra. The question of Jājali's reform is shouldered aside by the principal point of the story, which is the demonstration of the power of ahimsā-generated merit: hence the lack of explicit reference to Jājali's reform.

All this is inference. Alongside it we have an explicit statement by Tulādhāra which runs along rather different lines. Explaining why the birds respond to Jājali's call, Tulādhāra says that as Jājali had cherished them, so they cherish him. Using the metaphor of family relationships, Tulādhāra

\[44\] 256.1.
\[45\] 256.2cd.
predicts that the birds will act toward Jājali as children to a father. This account of the birds’ motivation suggests that Jājali’s altruistic behavior has created a debt of gratitude with the birds, who will now obey Jājali’s summons and in doing so fulfill a duty analogous to that which children owe their parents in repayment for the care and trouble taken in raising them. Thus, Tulādhāra’s explanation accords with the tenor of the IInd alignment material in making it the altruism of Jājali’s action which impels the birds’ response. On the other hand, however, Tulādhāra gives no place to ahimsā-generated merit: he appears to see the relationship as consisting simply in a dyadic reciprocity.

Nevertheless, in view of some problematical aspects, Tulādhāra’s assurances cannot be accepted at face value. Puzzlingly, the composer seems to take pains to stress that birds other than those raised by Jājali obey his summons and alight upon him:

As these many birds nurtured on your head are flying all about [including] 46 hawks and other species, call them ... To dismiss this as an excess of enthusiasm on the part of the composer is not credible when this stanza is followed closely by the passage in which the composer had Tulādhāra assure Jājali that

\[ \text{ete ākumā ... śyenaś cānyāś ca jātayaḥ; āhvayēnān.} \]

Whether or not the hawks and other species were intended to be included in the class of birds reared on Jājali’s head is not clear; it is clear however that Jājali is advised to summon them.
To salvage some sense from this contradiction, it could be assumed that the composer saw Jājali as having established a reciprocal relationship with the whole species of birds as a class. In other words he saw the dyadic relationship between Jājali and the particular birds he raised as capable of being generalized. But once the dyadic relationship is generalized, it is no longer sufficient to explain the response to Jājali's summons solely in terms of dyadic reciprocity. Some additional element at least must be brought into play.

What this element is may be inferred from the previously made suggestion of a 'residual power of deeds earlier performed by [Jājali]'48. It is possible to conceive of the birds' debt of gratitude and the power of Jājali's deeds as two sides of the same coin. The reciprocity of the dyadic relationship may be envisaged as being impelled by the creation of credits and debits, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>birds</th>
<th>Jājali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>DEBTOR</td>
<td>+ CREDITOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the period between Jājali's acts of kindness to the birds (1) and the future repayment of his kindness by the recipients (3) there is an imbalance (2) in the credits and debits, thus:

47 256.4abc.
48 Page 515 above.
dyad. Whether this is described as consisting in a
debt which puts the debtor under an obligation or as
a credit which gives the creditor the power to call up
his debt is now seen to be simply a matter of viewpoint.

In this story, Jājali's kindness is never repaid -
and indeed, like a parent's, never can be fully
repaid. Therefore Jājali is left with a moral credit
to his name. This credit can be identified with the
'merit generated by ahiṃsā etc.' of which the birds
later speak. It is implied by both the surplus
budget of the dyadic book-keeping and the fact that
previously uninvolved birds respond to the call; and
it is stated later by those birds, that this credit
of accumulated merit is effective outside the bounds
of the generating dyad.

Returning now to the point established in the
first part of this analysis, the birds' warning to
Jājali that his accumulation of ahiṃsā-generated
merit will be dissipated by competitiveness (spardha) allows us to make some inferences about the nature of
the moral credit which has accrued to Jājali.
Unfortunately the inferences are not conclusive. On
the one hand, the accumulated merit may be seen as a
commodity which Jājali is able either to retain or
expend. He may expend it by, for instance, indulging

49 Cf. Mbh.xii.258, the story of Cirakāraṇa, showing
that the debt of obligation and loyalty to both
parents can never be overridden.

50 256.6a.
51 256.6b.
52 Pages 503-510 above.
in competitiveness (i.e. the quest for success and recognition) and thereby transmuting or externalizing his merit in purchasing wordly fame. If, alternatively, he does not so expend it, it will remain as an investment in the life to come, as the birds remind him. But on the other hand, abandoning the accounting approach altogether, Jájali's merit might be seen not as a neutral commodity but as a moral quality operating in accordance with its own nature. According to this view, it is particularly spardhā which will destroy ahimsā-generated merit because of the utter incompatibility of egoism and altruism. This interpretation is consistent with the composer's concern with altruistic motivation as inferred from the opening scenes of the story; it would also give point to the birds' specification of the particular kind of merit which will be destroyed by aggressive competitiveness, although this predictable specification may be merely a picking up of the thread of thought.

The antithesis of ahimsā-generated merit and competitiveness is expressed in another way by the birds when they warn that, if unchecked, competitiveness will not only annihilate ahimsā-generated merit but also destroy the possessor of the merit. This statement too may be interpreted in accordance with the alternative views put forward in the previous paragraph. Thus it may mean, on the one hand, that all the host's good karman (merit) will be dissipated and perhaps too that he will accrue bad karman, with
the consequence in either case that his fate in the next world at least will be gruesome. But the second view offers a more attractive interpretation. In its terms, firstly, for the present, Jājali's egoistic competitive state of mind negates the accrued merit of earlier altruistic actions; and, secondly, for the future, competitive egoism will so possess his spirit that he will be incapable of performing acts out of altruism. Jājali's case shows how the same act can arise out of altruism or inspire egoism. Thus, unless one is purged of competitiveness, actions involving others which might have generated merit if performed with kindness or compassion will fail to realize this potential and the actor will remain cut off from this avenue of moral advancement, sinking ever deeper into the mire of competitive passion. Such an account, I think, sits well with the birds' warning that '[competitiveness], if not [itself] destroyed, destroys its host'.

The IIInd alignment composer thus implies two distinguishable ethical systems: one attributing moral \textit{virtue} to relations of reciprocity; the other making \textit{virtue} a personal quality inhering in the doer of good. The two systems, while they may be incompatible or contradictory in all their ramifications, are here presented as mutually supporting. Therefore, in order to understand the contribution each makes to the composer's position, it is advantageous to take as the starting point neither of the principles involved, but instead the
composer's moral conviction of the value of compassionate behaviour. The IIInd alignment material explains, illustrates, justifies and reinforces this conviction through the interplay of the two principles. By invoking the principle of dyadic reciprocity, the composer is able to provide an empirical proof that the virtue of compassion has power and, furthermore, to provide a rational account of why the virtue has such power by appealing to the easily comprehended analogy of parent and child. However in this case and as a general rule recipients will lack the ability (or inclination\(^{53}\)) to repay kindnesses done them. In consequence there is a lack of self-evident incentive for performing an action which will activate only an obligation of reciprocity. It is by applying the principle of merit to generalize the applicability of the power of the virtue beyond the dyad that this incentive is created. Not only is reward then due to the virtuous man from the world at large, but if - as empirical observation reveals is often the case - it is not forthcoming in this world (iha), it will be in the next (paratva). Accordingly, in this view, lack of merit is not a neutral but a negative moral position fraught with dire consequences which may be similarly forthcoming in this world or the next. Thus, while the principle of reciprocity explains and illustrates the nature of moral power, the conception of

---

\(^{53}\) The birds, of course, do not lack this inclination, though the qualification of their action as performed _dharma _'out of a sense of dharma', may well show that the composer found a lack of such inclination conceivable.
merit provides the reinforcement and sanctions which motivate adherence to the morality.

Through this consideration of the IInd alignment material in its own right, we have thus been able to gain some insight into the ideological values and ethical philosophy of the composer. It is remarkable how far removed the outlook of the IInd alignment composer is from that of the Ist alignment composer.

The composer as interpolator

A full account of the IInd alignment must encompass not only a study of the material in its own right for the ideas its composer advances, but also consideration of it as an interpolation and in relation to the Ist alignment material.

The fate of Tulādhāra in the interpolation

The potential contradiction arising between the interpolator's expression of his own convictions and the constraint of having to accommodate them to the Ist alignment story is realized in the role of the eponymous hero, Tulādhāra. In the Ist alignment material the figure of Tulādhāra, the merchant, we have seen, of central importance as a uniquely appropriate embodiment of that composer's values. In the IInd alignment material the dialectic through which the story advances in plot and through which expression is given to the interpolator's views is that between Jájali and the birds. Tulādhāra's role has little more substance than that of the voice from the sky. His long philosophical and moral discourse
on the 1st alignment is subordinated to the new
dialectic of the 2nd alignment when Tulādhāra is
causd to refer - or defer - to birds for a verdict
on whether or not his preaching is true. Furthermore, as we have just seen, the interpolator has
moved away from the ideological stance which Tulādhāra
had personified on the 1st alignment, recasting the
story in favour of the virtue of compassion.

The composer of the 2nd alignment has thus
inherited a plot situation and a hero which do not,
prima facie, knit very well with his new story of
Jājali and the birds. But although Tulādhāra is
pushed to the periphery of the recast story, the
heritage of the 1st alignment ensures that he must
remain at least nominally the hero of the episode, for
it is by a comparison with Tulādhāra that the
supernatural forces rebuke Jājali. It is therefore
interesting to observe how the 2nd alignment composer
deals with Tulādhāra.

For the interests of the 2nd alignment,
Tulādhāra's impersonal social relations are no longer
appropriately the hallmark of his correctness.
Instead the interpolator proposes new grounds for
Tulādhāra's virtue. He gives Tulādhāra the power of
clairvoyance; he details certain of Tulādhāra's
actions - Tulādhāra lives causing as little harm as

54 256.1.
55 253.42-43 and 50.
56 253.47-51.
possible,\textsuperscript{57} he does not cut down trees to construct his house,\textsuperscript{58} he sells only approved merchandise and not wine, and he trades without cheating;\textsuperscript{59} he praises Tulādhāra for being faithful and steadfast in his allotted task.\textsuperscript{60} Whereas on the 1st alignment Tulādhāra's attitude and practices were inherently part of his occupation, it is noticeable by contrast that the virtuous practices ascribed to him by the interpolator are not at all inescapably linked with it. It is true that by gaining his livelihood as a trader, Tulādhāra has the opportunity to live causing a minimum of harm, but it is probable that the interpolator saw Tulādhāra as having personal virtue rather than embodying a generic virtue inhering in traders.

The conclusion that Tulādhāra's 2nd alignment virtue is personal may be deduced from the specific illustrations given by the composer. In the manner of constructing his house and in his refraining from selling wine, Tulādhāra is exercising a personal discretion not essential to his being a petty trader. His honest dealing can probably be put into the same category: there is no attempt to generalize the virtue (as there was on the 1st alignment with the symbolism of the scales) and it is consistent to view this quality in the same light as the unquestionably

\textsuperscript{57} 254.6.
\textsuperscript{58} 254.7ab.
\textsuperscript{59} 254.8b,c.
\textsuperscript{60} 256.16cdef.
personal virtues ascribed to Tulādhāra by the birds - viz. faithfulness, devotion to dharma, steadfastness. 61

Thus it appears that the interpolator, who by turning aside from the ideological stance of the Ist alignment material largely unmade Tulādhāra's contribution to the story, has set about remaking him respectable as the nominal hero of the recast story by ascribing personal virtues to him. The most outstanding instance of this personalizing of the hero's virtue is the interpolator's ascription to Tulādhāra of the faculty of clairvoyance. This makes him a most exceptional trader indeed, and in all likelihood this is what the interpolator intended.

It is an indicator of Tulādhāra's irrelevance to the dialectic of the IInd alignment that the interpolator has not only narrowed Tulādhāra's role as hero from that of exemplary paradigm to that of virtuous individual, but furthermore he has invested Tulādhāra with virtues which are not functional for the ideology of the recast story. One who steadfastly abides by his appointed task will not - it is true - succumb to emotions of competitiveness, and one who takes care to build his house from wood cut by others is not aggressively inclined toward other creatures; but on the other hand the gift of clairvoyance, which is a striking mark of spiritual power, has nothing to do with ahimsā or compassion. Nor has honesty in trade, nor faithfulness. Some insight into the interpolator's intention in heaping these virtues upon Tulādhāra is offered by his specification that Tulādhāra does not
sell wine. It might be imagined that he based this exclusion on the belief that intoxicants unleash the passions, lead to violence, and are thus inimical to the practice of ahimsa — in which case it would be appropriate for Tulâdhâra, as the hero of an ahimsa tract to be dissociated from any connexion with intoxicants. However textual comparisons reveal that the exclusion has been directly inspired by a passage in Manu (or a related lawbook) cataloguing merchandises allowed and forbidden to brâhmans who stoop to trade. In light of this fact, it would seem that the composer's effort has been directed not so much to giving Tulâdhâra a role in conveying the message of the recast story as to bolstering his respectability sufficiently to make credible the preference of the voice from the sky for him over Jâjali. Not surprisingly such a 'reformation' of Tulâdhâra undermines his credibility in relation to the IInd alignment story: building one's house from wood cut by others lacks the dramatic conviction of raising sparrows on one's head.

62 Himsa and the eating of meat are frequently linked with intoxicating liquors: see esp. the association of hunting and intoxication. Mbh.iii.124-125, and other references dealt with by Winternitz, History of Indian Literature, vol. I, pp.343-345 (= Geschicht, vol. I, pp.333-335) or meat and wine as offerings to Yakṣas and Rakṣasas, Mbh. xiii.101.60; note also Kapadia, "Prohibition of Flesheating in Jainism", pp.232-233. The two are often coupled with that other activity of unleashed passion, maithuna, as e.g. Manu 5.56.

63 See above,pp.170-171. That the exclusion is made by Manu possibly because intoxicants stir the passions and are inimical to self-restraint or ahimsa does not affect this argument about the composer's immediate purpose in including the detail.
The interpolation and the later development of the story

The reworking of the story which led to Tulādhāra's trivialization also took the story to the first stage of its mature development. With the incorporation of the IIInd alignment material the theme of the story becomes the championing of ahīṃsa: no subsequent accretion relates to the outlook of the older, Ist alignment material even in cases where the interpolation has been implanted in Ist alignment material. 64

To what is this total change in the course of the story's development attributable? Three possibilities suggest themselves:

(a) Since the turning point in the story's development falls between the original composition (Ist alignment) and the first of many interpolations (IIInd alignment), it might be that the change of direction should be seen as a degeneration arising from the clumsy hand and gross mentality of the interpolator incapable of comprehending Tulādhāra's subtlety regarding dharma and modes of behaviour, and falling in with the conventional prescriptive treatment of dharma.

64 E.g. 254.P, Q, R; 256.19.

65 This is put forward as a possibility not a description of fact. Although this view of interpolators and commentators has found expression most stridently by Esteller, "The Mahabharata Text-Criticism", pp.248, 257 and passim; see also Sukthankar, "Prolegomena", Adiparvan, p.iiv, and his description of all versions except S as indiscriminately conflated (lxxxiii and passim) — I have argued elsewhere that it is preferable not to deride interpolators as a class, but rather look to the conditions of transmission which have produced the results for which they have come to be castigated: pp.109-110 above.
(b) The continuing focussing of interest on ahimsa and ancillary topics may reflect a preoccupation of the times or the socio-religious milieux of the later transmitters of the Mahābhārata. The difference in ideological outlook fossilized in the levels constituting the story would then provide a stratigraphy of the intellectual history of the Mahābhārata tradition, revealing the Weltanschauung of its transmitters to have undergone substantial change between the depositing of the Ist and IInd alignments.

(c) It may be that the story's development on the younger alignments is to be explained by characteristics of the Ist and IInd alignments peculiar to this episode and not the basis for generalization concerning the interpolator's mentality or the transmitter's Weltanschauung. These possibilities are not mutually exclusive: (a) and (b) might be manifestations of the same outlook; (c) might provide conditions which would benumb transmitters, leading to (a) - or sensitize them, provoking (b).

The extent to which (a) and especially (b) were the most active ingredients in the mix could best be judged with the help of comparative studies. Thus, for instance, if comparison of the Tulādhāra episode with a number of other Śāntiparvan, or Mahābhārata, stories ostensibly concerned with ahimsa revealed that later accretions as a rule had tended to turn the
story around the ahimsā question then it would become reasonable to extrapolate from the generality to the particular case of the Tulādhāra story, attributing the thematic revision to a changed milieu of transmission of the parvan. However, since the comparative analysis of other episodes lies beyond the scope of this treatment, we are obliged to attack the problem using only internal evidence.

Unfortunately, so far as the accretion of the IInd alignment material itself is concerned, the internal evidence of the episode does not permit us any conclusive account. We are unable to proceed beyond the loosest speculation, even in determining whether the interpolator of the IInd alignment material was interested primarily in the ideological or the formal aspects of his Iist alignment anchor. On one side it might be argued that the baldness of the plot of the Iist alignment would have invited fleshing out by a transmitter aware of a prototype of the birds' story. Two factors which seem to show that the interpolator was primarily interested in the form of the plot of the story are, first, that although he intended his plot to supersede the older one,66 he reveals an awareness of details of the Iist alignment action in his recapitulation of Jājali's asceticism;67 and, secondly, that his contribution to the story is

66 To be inferred from the duplication of the opening scene in 253.13-46.
67 In his recapitulation (253.48) Tulādhāra places Jājali 'on the shore of the sea' in accordance with the Iist alignment (253.2) rather than the IInd alignment which mentions only a river (253.13, 40).
heavily weighted toward the realm of action and very light on preaching. Compare the following plot outlines:

Ist alignment:

A brahman practices asceticism and feels proud of his success. He is rebuked for his arrogance and sent to a merchant for rehabilitation. Heeding the merchant's advice, he achieves true bliss.

IIInd alignment:

A brahman practicing asceticism allows birds to nest in his hair. He remains still until the fledglings have grown up, learnt to fly, and left the nest; he feels proud of his achievement. He is rebuked for his arrogance and sent to a merchant for rehabilitation. The merchant preaches to him. The brahman calls birds to alight on him once again and, heeding the advice of the birds, achieves true bliss.

On the other side, it need not be inferred from the foregoing that the interpolator was indifferent to the moral content of his new material. The unresolved discord between the Ist and IIInd alignment conceptions of dharma show insensitivity, not lack of concern with ideological questions; an aspect of the IIInd alignment morality, the condemnation of competitiveness, is in harmony with Tuladhara's older attitude to life. And against the fact that the birds' brief moralizing renders Tuladhara's Ist alignment preaching functionally redundant68 must be weighed the observation that the interpolator has exercised greater care in welding his new

---

68 This is clear from the plot outlines immediately above. See also pp.522-523 above.
material on to the preaching of the 1st alignment than in joining it to the 1st alignment action. Thus grounds for imputing the interpolator's field of interest can be advanced indifferently in favour of either form or content. Regardless of whether the alternative is a real one, argument based purely on internal evidence unmoored in comparative analysis is thus seen to be doomed to drift on the currents of subjectivity.

While to account for the form and content of the IIInd alignment interpolation remains beyond our grasp, the same infirmity does not disable our understanding of the later stages of the story's evolution. For considering younger accretions we are able to bring into play not only the possibilities (a) and (b) foreshadowed above, but also (c), which concerned any particular configuration of the story produced by the association of the 1st and IIInd alignment materials. To the extent that the episode's later development can be accounted for by particularities of the story as it had congealed on the IIInd alignment, it may be assumed that there will be a correspondingly lesser likelihood that extrinsic factors like (a) the interpolator's congenital myopia and (b) the ideological milieu of transmission were decisive - or at least a correspondingly lesser justification for invoking them. Let us therefore examine the chemistry of the combination of 1st and IIInd alignment materials.

The materials of the two alignments differ in

---

69 Compare the abrupt interruption 253.12 with the continuity achieved by 256.1.
style. In comparison with the IIInd alignment material, the older material is concise and restrained, but also occasionally opaque. The IIInd alignment material is more verbose; its author has employed a diffuse style. There is a contrast between the sparing utilitarian use of vocatives in the Ist alignment material and the liberal use of formulaic vocatives as metrical plugs on the IIInd alignment.\textsuperscript{70} The aesthetics of the contrasted styles is not at issue here. For our present purposes what is significant is that the free flowing narration of events, with its low density of information, is both more easily comprehended and more memorable than the more demanding, abstract, Ist alignment material, with its frequently abstruse alternations between denotative and optative usage.\textsuperscript{71} Also more memorable are the few instances in which the IIInd alignment composer seeks to encapsulate part of his message in a rhetorically striking pun or play on words.\textsuperscript{72} Although in these cases sense may be sacrificed for sensation, the result undoubtedly impresses the memory. Thus, from the standpoint of style, the IIInd alignment material appears more potent than the older material.

The potency of the IIInd alignment material stems from more than style, however. Given its stylistic

\textsuperscript{70} Along with formulaic vocatives, I include other stock terms of reference (kennings) such as mahātaṇaḥ, dvijaḥ, dvijasattamaḥ, etc.\textsuperscript{168}

\textsuperscript{71} E.g., p.468 above.\textsuperscript{253.50}

\textsuperscript{72} Preeminently 253.50 (on the raising of sparrows) and 256.6 (sa 'hata hanti ...).
characteristics, the fact that the IIInd alignment material is more bulky than the Ist alignment material must have contributed to the strength of the impression it made. But beyond that, is the fact that the IIInd alignment material has a narrative presentation in which the plot development is instrumental in illustrating and driving home the moral message. By contrast the Ist alignment material is primarily expository with only rudimentary plot development. Consequently, with the accretion of the bulky IIInd alignment material with its strongly developed plot line, the older story line will have been overshadowed. On the IIInd alignment, is the story still one of a brahman seeking instruction from Tuladhāra (the Ist alignment plot structure) or rather of Jājali's penance with the birds and their later reunion (the IIInd alignment contribution to the plot)? Insofar as the plot generally lends itself to visualization to a greater degree than other aspects of a story, it will tend to strike the audience more vividly. In this respect, then, the new material will have come to dominate the story on its IIInd alignment.

We are therefore led to conclude that, in respect of style, bulk and construction, the new IIInd alignment material will have overshadowed the older material and transformed it once the two were fused. Hence, the fact that no subsequent interpolations pursue the concerns of the Ist alignment is adequately explicable in terms of the dynamics of the story's
particular development. By contrast with the IIInd alignment revision itself, which could not be adequately accounted for as generated from the character of the ISt alignment story alone, the subsequent interpolations are satisfactorily regarded as elaborations of the story as it stood on the IIInd alignment. There is therefore no warrant for invoking the decisive influence of extrinsic factors such as the ideological milieu of the transmitters in order to account for the later persistent concern with ahimsā questions.
The Third Alignment: MNU

From Alignment I, E

254.37 Those who castrate bulls, and those who pierce their noses, [who] make them bear heavy burdens and tether them, [who] break them in; [and those who] kill living [creatures] to eat them - how can you not denounce them?

38 Men exploit even men in servitude: they are made to work night and day by the infliction of beating and shackling - you know in your heart what suffering there is in these beatings!

39 All divinity resides in the higher animals: the Sun, Moon, Wind, Brahmā, Spirit, Will, Death - if [you would] sell these [animals] alive, o brahman, why demur over [selling them] dead, or over [selling] sesame oil, clarified butter, honey, water, or herbal mixtures.

40 Calves who have grown up happily in places free from gadflies and mosquitoes are frequently seized by men [who, although] aware [that they are still] dear to their mothers, lead them off to muddy places infested with many gadflies. Others waste away as overworked beasts of burden, contrary to precept. — I do not consider these actions any different from foeticide.

41 Agriculture is alleged to be virtuous, whereas [in fact] it is an exceedingly cruel livelihood: the iron-tipped wood [of the ploughshare] injures the earth and creatures who live in the earth. Likewise, o Jājali, reflect upon the oxen [labouring] in the yoke.

42 "Inviolable" is a term for cattle. Who then may kill them? [Anyone doing so] commits a grave sin like the cow-killer Prśadhra. Sages and ascetics declared this to Nahuṣa, "You have killed a cow, [which is] verily the Mother, and a bull, [which is]
the Progenitor. You, Nahuṣa, have done what may not be done. By your deed, we will incur peril". And those eminent sages inflicted one hundred and one diseases on all creatures, but especially on [Nahuṣa's] descendants, o Jājali. They told that foetus-killer Nahuṣa, "We will not offer up your oblation". Thus [was Nahuṣa] unhesitatingly informed by all those noble sages, seers, and ascetics, who knew the truth.

0 Jājali, you do not realize [the true nature of] such pernicious and frightful kinds of behaviour because in this world even what is mere usage [is considered] perfect.

To Alignment 1, F
Notes to the translation

254.41 : See pp. 167-168 and n. 97 above.

254.42c : jānān: singular for plural.

42e : bahudāṃśakuśān deśān: The form -kuśān has been preferred by the Critical Edition editors, probably on the ground of its representation in K1 and a respectable number of N manuscripts. The alternatives are -kulān, which has a weak Devanāgarī distribution, and -kṛtān, which is universal in S. Unless daṃśakuśā is some kind of grass or nettle unknown to lexicographers, the Critical Edition reading makes poor sense in context. The alternative -kulān makes excellent sense, 'with many swarms of gnats', but may probably be dismissed as a lectio facilior. The S -kṛtān is difficult to interpret, but if taken as 'infested (kṛta = placed) with many gnats' makes sense and is at the same time hard enough to have provoked the N variants.

45ab: Note the masculine gender of enān. One would expect a feminine in view of the association with aghnyā. Since gavāṃ is indifferently masculine or feminine and is plural, it might be concluded that the composer regarded aghnyā as a masculine nom.pl. aghnyā|h| 'bulls, oxen', an extremely rare usage known only in three Rgveda references.¹ It is probably more credible to explain the masculine enān by the observation that in the composer's mind the principle of inviolability was applied to all cattle - cows, bulls and steers. The Vulgate etā is a lectio facilior of unpersuasive distribution.

¹ See Bailey, "Dvārā Matīnām", p. 47.
45-46: The reference to Nahusa is explained in Mbh.xii.260.6ff, where Nahusa is depicted on the point of slaughtering a cow for the reception of a guest. The reference to Prșadhra is obscure to me, although clearly the composer expected his audience to understand the allusion (Sörensen, Index, s.v.).

46f: lapsyāmas tvatkrte bhayam. Although M.W. gives the lexicographers' meaning of bhaya 'disease', the sages will hardly suffer the disease they are about to inflict in 47ab. The idea seems to be that as a result of this heinous crime some disaster might come to pass. Deussen translates literally 'wir werden durch dich zu leiden haben' (at his 263.49). Dutt and Roy have simply 'we have been greatly pained by it'.

49: I.e. because they are commonly done, these deeds do not seem evil.

nipunā by saŋdhi < nipunāt agreeing with kevalacaritatvāt; nipuṇa 'perfect, clever', kevalacaritatva 'the condition of being mere usage'.
Interpretation

The interpolation MNU details the dreadful kinds of behaviour which its composer had thought were alluded to in the text he received.\(^1\) The interpolator's concern rests solely with the effect of actions, not with the attitudes or motivations accompanying them. This involves a certain reinterpretation of the story's earlier materials, in which the personal qualities of kindness, compassion, 'harmlessness etc.' were championed. By turning his attention entirely to the effect of actions, the composer of MNU has rendered these principles of motive down into a principle of outcome. All his examples involve actions which occasion pain or death to living creatures. Thus, although he happens not to use the word,\(^2\) it is fair to say that the evils he describes are contraventions of the principle of ahimsā in the sense of non-injury. We are dealing here with ahimsā conceived objectively, as a behaviour distinguished by the effect it has upon the sufferer, as opposed to being taken subjectively, as an attitude or behaviour distinguished by the intention of the doer; i.e. 'non-injury' as opposed to 'non-injuriousness'.

The composition of the interpolation was triggered off by the bald phrase anyān acārān which, even taken

\(^1\) Page 175-178 above.

\(^2\) Although he uses four ṛāh derivatives (including aghnyā in accordance with its folk etymology): 254.38a hatva, 44d hauti, 45a aghnī, 45b hantum arhasti.
as the interpolator took it in the light of the IInd alignment material, cannot be construed as a denotation more specific than would apply generally to behaviour infringing the principle of non-injury.

While its partial affinity with passages of similar form and content means that the interpolation was not composed ex nihilo, the structure of the interpolation permits us to see it as a catalogue of objectionable behaviours composed ad hoc, therefore representing the interpolator's own particular contribution to the story. He chooses to describe the activities he perceived as most dreadfully infringing the correct principle of non-injury. In this light, the catalogue takes on a special interest.

The interpolator has chosen to deal with injurious actions in three fields of activity: (1) the cruel treatment of men in servitude; (2) the injury caused to organisms in the soil by agriculture; and (3) the cruel treatment and slaughtering of (a) higher animals, (b) especially cows, calves and bulls. He thus saw a wide range of occupational activities as infringing the rule of non-injury. What is remarkable, however,

3 Mbh.iii.199.19-29. Affinities with Manu are dealt with above, pp.169-171, 174-175, and in Table X. Also Baudhāyanadharmasūtra 2.2.4, 21 cit. Smith "Origin of Ahimsā", p.623, n.3, and Mbh.xii.15.51.

4 See above, pp.165-166.

5 25h.38c-39.

6 25h.44abcd.

7 25h.40-41 and 38a.

8 25h.37, 42-43ab, 45-48.
is the fact that two-thirds\(^9\) of the bulk of his survey is directed to (3b) the treatment of cows, calves and bulls. From this we must infer that he was strongly of the opinion that harming cattle was the most heinous of the whole range of contraventions of the non-injury principle.

So, the first three composers who have had a hand in the story’s evolution have developed - or degraded - its main didactic interest from non-involvement on the 1st alignment, to compassion on the 2IInd alignment, to non-injury to cattle on the IIIrd alignment.

\(^9\) The breakdown is roughly -

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{No. } & \text{Category} & \text{Verses} & \% \\
\hline
1 & \text{men in servitude} & 3 & 12\% \\
2 & \text{agriculture} & 2 & 8\% \\
3a & \text{higher animals} & 3 & 12\% \\
3b & \text{cattle} & 17 & 68\% \\
\hline
\text{Total} & \ldots & 25 & 100\% \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Unclassified: 254.41cd, 48, 49.
2.55

The Third Alignment: SWa

SWa

From 254.6

Jājail said:

255.1 The dharma you have thus expounded, o holder of the balance, will stop up the door to heaven and

2 the livelihood of [all] creatures. [It is] indeed through agriculture [that] food is produced, [and] you too live on such [food], o trader. Mortals live off both cattle and plants; from this arises

3 the sacrifice. [Hence the doctrines] you are mouthing are nihilistic. [If they were accepted] our world would come to a standstill, completely ceasing from [productive] activity.

Tulādhāra said:

4 O Jājail, I will discuss [the topic of] livelihood. O brahman, I am not a nihilist; nor do I disparage the sacrifice. But [I do say this: that] it is very difficult to find someone who [really] understands the sacrifice. All praise to brahmānic sacrifice and those men who [really] understand the sacrifice! But brahmans have forsaken the sacrifice proper to them and now resort to kṣatriya

5 sacrifice. O brahman, grasping, materialistic, nihilistic [men], in their ignorance of vedic interpretation, have propounded untruth as [if it had] the semblance of truth. They do not wish to make an end of [announcing]: 'You should give this! You should give that!' This gives rise to theft and improper acts, o Jājali, [whereas] in fact a properly made oblation is what pleases the gods.

6 According to the teaching of the scriptures, worship of the gods may be [performed] by paying homage, by oblations, by recitations, and by [offering] plants.
Through the accumulated effect of the sacrifices of evil men, wicked offspring are born. From greedy men, greedy [offspring] are born; from honest men, honest [offspring] are born. The offspring [produced] reflects the attitude of the patron and celebrants [of the sacrifice].

Progeny comes from the sacrifice as [naturally as] pure water from the sky. The oblation cast into the fire, o brahman, [enters] the service of the Sun; from the Sun comes rain; from rain, food; [and] from that, progeny. By this well-performed [observance] in the past [men] obtained their every wish: the earth [gave] crops uncultivated and plants grew from blessings. Neither in themselves nor in [the offering of] sacrifices do they look for any reward whatsoever. [Those] who would sacrifice while in any way anxious over the reward from the sacrifice are evil, crafty, greedy, grasping men by nature. [Such a] one would indeed pass on to the world of sinners because of his impure action.

The man who would pervert authority with the unauthoritative is invariably evil-minded and of imperfect knowledge, o superior brahman. The brahman who knows [that in references to] "what should be done" what should be done is [in fact to create] fearlessness lives as Brahma [incarnate] in the world and is not further involved in the issue of what should be done. On the other hand we have heard imperfect works - [involving] both the harming of creatures and concentration on reward - called 'superior'.

All men [who offer] truth in their sacrifice [or who offer] restraint in their sacrifice, [who are] not greedy but satisfied in spirit, [in whom the spirit of] renunciation has arisen, [whose] selfishness is subdued, [who] know the truth about body and soul, [who are] completely conversant in personal sacrifice, [who] study the sacred knowledge and the revelation, - [such men] please the immortals. [In these cases] the total, divine,
absolute, Brahman [becomes] infused in [such a] brahman: consequently the gods find satisfaction in his finding satisfaction; they are satiated when he is satiated, o Jājali. As [one] satiated with all tastes desires none at all, so [it is with] the constant joyous satisfaction of [him whom] wisdom satisfies.

20 [Whoever] delight in dharma, rejoice in dharma, are of fully constant [spirit], seek for an ever-deepening understanding, whoever have knowledge and discrimination, [whoever] desire to cross beyond to that further [bank which is] always very auspicious and thronged by holy ancestors, [and who] when they get there neither regret nor waver nor tremble, - they are pure [and] achieve the state of Brahman in this world. They do not seek heaven, nor do they sacrifice ostentatiously; they follow the course of the good by [practising] non-injury to their utmost. They recognize trees, plants, fruits, and roots [as fit offerings], and do not have greedy celebrants [who are] after honorariums sacrifice for them; rather, simply by conducting their own affairs, the twice-born have in fact been carrying out the sacrifice. Without departing from the conduct of their personal duty, [those whose] rites are perfect, through a desire to benefit creatures, would enable creatures to attain heaven.

That is my considered opinion, o Jājali, taking everything into account.

28 O great sage, o bull among brahmans, [by virtue of] what they employ in [their] sacrifice, the wise always proceed along that path [which is] the way of the gods. For some [men there is] a return from the [destination, but] for the wise there is no return, [even though] both of them proceed in the path [which is] the way of the gods.

29 For the latter, oxen are yoked and draw [their burdens] by themselves and cows are milked by themselves, through the efficacy of mental volition. With sacrificial posts procured by
themselves [these men] sponsor lavish sacrifices. If one's soul has scaled such heights, one may kill a cow [for sacrifice]. [But] by the same token, o brahman, those [who have] no such [attainment] should sacrifice with plants. I present such [a doctrine] to you [by way of] highlighting mental renunciation: the gods recognize as a brahman [who is] uneager, lacking initiative, unconcerned to honour or praise, [and] unwearingly weary of action.

By what course [can] he proceed, o Jājali, [who] does not officiate at rites, does not conduct sacrifices, does not give to brahmans [at sacrifices], [who] pursues a common means of subsistence [as a householder]? By carrying out this godly [practice] it is just as if he were accomplishing a sacrifice, for it is said that the offering-cake is as sacrificially fit as any animal. - All rivers are Sarasvatis; all hills are holy. O Jājali, [your] place of pilgrimage is [your] self: do not go about as a pilgrim.

[One who] puts such righteous duties [as] these into practice [and yet] pursues righteousness with any motive does not attain the pure realms.

To 256.1
Notes to the translation

1c: vṛtti: 'livelihood' connotes a directed course of action, which inevitably impinges upon other beings. Alternative translations such as 'subsistence', 'occupation', unfortunately give the impression of a passively occupied position; 'living' gives pride of place to the preservation of life, a notion not implicit in vṛtti and which confusingly cuts across the central issue of the discussion in this chapter. The connotations of vṛtti come out clearly in 3cd where the root verb √vṛt is employed in describing the dynamic quality of (transmutations of) existence in this world. See Kangle, Kautiliya Arthasāstra, vol.III, p.1, on this word.

2cd: paśubhiś caṇḍadhībiś ca ... jīvanti 'they live off both cattle and plants'. Whether this implies the raising of cattle for meat as might be inferred from Deussen's 'Viehzucht' or simply the suffering and death afflicting cattle in the agricultural service of man (254.42-43) is not clear. Since the stanza opens with reference only to krṣya 'agriculture', I prefer the latter interpretation.

3a: yato. Deussen, "Und da durch das Genannte [Vieh und Kräutern]", or as I prefer: on the same principle, viz. that for the continuation of life, cattle and plants must be consumed.

3cd: na varted 'would come to a standstill'; vārtām utsṛjya 'ceasing from productive activity'. See note to 1c above.
svayajña: in this context since there is a contrast with kṣatram yajña, it seems that svayajña should be equated with the trānaṣayajña of 5a, and translated 'the sacrifice proper to them (or: to their class)'. The idea that there is a brahmaṣayajña which involves simple offerings of such food as is fit for the vanaprastha (fruits, flowers, roots etc.) as opposed to the kṣatrayajña centred on the animal sacrifice is developed in the dharmaśāstra commentaries (see Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, iv, p.424; v, p.1269, for the distinction in śrāddha offerings). The brahmaṣayajña offerings are mentioned in Sāb alongside spiritual activities which are a further sublimation of the sacrifice. Since these offerings and activities can be undertaken by an individual, svayajña could be taken as 'individual sacrifice' while indirectly referring to brahmaṣayajña.

On prajā(h), see pp.208-210 above. It has not been possible to retain in translation the effect of continuity engendered by the sustained use of prajā(h) and jayate.

Paramananda (quoted in the var. lect. of the Critical Edition) reads this verse with 10cd, taking it as an allegorical statement of the generative power of the sacrifice. Nīlakanṭha appears to read the verse as a sequel to 9 and manages to make sense of it much more simply (Kīṃjarādekara edn., vol.5, p.495: commentary to 263.10cd): "The second verse is a commentary [on the first]. [The verse beginning] 'Yajamāna' [signifies that] in accordance with the spirit in which celebrants
and patrons regard [the sacrifice, viz.] with or without desire [for offspring], there will be offspring for each of them. For it has been said thus: 'It has been observed that the fruit of the officiant's sacrificing with various rites is two-pronged, so I must sing for whatever is desired for either my patron or myself.' I have construed the loose syntax as follows: patron (nom.) and celebrants (nom.) as they are themselves (adverbial acc.) thus [obtain] offspring (acc.).

For a different interpretation, taking ātmānam as 'son', see Śāntiparvan, Critical Notes, p.2191.

10c: prājā: 'offspring' or 'progeny'. The sense in which prājā is to be understood depends upon whether 10cd is allied with 10ab, as Nīlakantha would have it, or with the treatment of sacrifice in stanza 11.

11bc: āditya "child of Aditi" signifies a divine being and at the same time sets him in the sky. The name is applied to Sūrya and Viṣṇu because they are embodied as the sun. In this stanza, however, āditya must be taken both as a natural phenomenon analogous to vr̥ṣṭi "rain" and as a deity who is the recipient of the oblation. The translation "Sun" has attempted to convey the ambiguity.

12cf: On the problems surrounding te and the shift to the present tense, see p.207 above.

13c: ājayante 'are born, are by birth'. Note that the usage of ājan here is quite distinct in meaning from that of 9-11, as is shown by the different syntactical construction.

14ab: The reading adopted by the editors of the C.E. makes the subject of this verse singular (sa ... gacched) in contrast to the plural subject of st.13 (ye ... yajeran ... ājayante). In half the manuscripts, including all the S manuscripts, the subject of ālab is also plural (te...
but no doubt the editors are right in preferring the harder reading. Examination of the variae lectiones gives further support to this preference.

14b: \(-karma\) 'by deed[s]' may, in view of what precedes it in st.1), have the more particular sense 'by rite[s]'.

15ab: \(\text{kartavyam iti kartavyam vetti yo}\) \(\text{brahmapobhayam}\)

An extremely difficult verse, only part of the difficulty turning upon resolution of the sandhi in \(\text{brahmapobhayam}\). I have resolved it \(\text{brahmâna} + \text{abhayam}\) (i.e. \(\text{brahmâno bhayam}\)) in harmony with Arjunamiśra. Nīlakanṭha would have it as \(\text{brahmâna} + \text{ubhayam}\) but pushes himself into sophistry in explaining its sense. The Critical Editors (Śāntiparvan, Critical Notes, p.2191) suggest \(\text{brahmâna} + \text{ubhayam}\) without explaining to what the \(\text{ubhayam}\) applies. A further difficulty lies with comprehending the phrase \(\text{kartavyam iti kartavyam}\). The interpretation '[(alleged) "duty" and [true] duty]', which the Critical Editor's \(\text{ubhayam}\) might imply lacks the support of any coordinative conjunction. The Critical Editors, in any case, propose to join \(\text{iti kartavyam}\) in a single phrase somewhat gratuitously glossed as 'the ultimate purpose underlying individual acts'; the alternative which I have followed is to join \(\text{kartavyam iti}\) similarly, to signify 'so-called duty', and to construe \(\text{kartavyam iti}\) substantively as one of the twin objects of \(\text{vetti}\) along with \(\text{abhayam}\), and \(\text{kartavyam itself adjectivally qualifying kartavyam iti}\). This gives the literal sense 'The brahman who recognizes obligatory duty
so-called as fearlessness'. If kartavyam is taken not in a simple attributive sense, which would reduce its significance to a rhetorical flourish, but in a denominative sense we arrive at a translation similar to that I have proposed: 'The brahman who recognizes as the obligatory duty fearlessness'. The implication that this is a true, essential duty which is to be distinguished from a less valid common conception of duty (kartavyam iti) conforms with the theme of the preceding stanza. Deussen, and probably Arjunamiśra, arrive at a rather similar sense by making kartavyam and kartavyam iti twin objects of vetti (Deussen) or a clause as single object of vetti (Arjunamiśra) taking abhayam as an adverbial accusative (Deussen) or a nominative in apposition to brahmanah (Arjunamiśra). In both cases the accommodation of abhayam unnecessarily strains the syntax.

l5d: naist kartavyatāṁ is nicely translated by Deussen, 'wendet sich nicht ... der Befolgung von Gebotenem zu'. In view of my translation of l5ab, I have taken kartavyatāṁ as 'the condition of being what should be done', hence 'the issue of whether [something] should be done [or not]'.

In order to bring out the particular applicability of these verses to the sacrifice, an emphasis which is indeed suggested by stanza 16, Professor Basham has suggested that kartavyatā in l5d implies all the complex brahmanic ritual observances and proposes the following elegant translation:
15. The brahman who knows that he has to give security [of life to animals which would otherwise be sacrificed], thinking '[this is what] has to be done', lives like Brahma in the world and does not go [into questions of] what ought to be done again.

16. On the other hand we have heard a worthless [sacrificial] act [called] superior. [In fact it amounts to] injury to all creatures and self-discipline for the sake of an [unworthy] end.

17d: āsannamatsaraḥ: for the sense of the stanza āsanna- must mean in this compound not 'nearby, reached', etc, but 'settled down', i.e. quiescent.

18b: svayajña- here seems to mean 'individually practised sacrifice', e.g. the offering of truth and restraint mentioned in 17a or perhaps the worship and vedic recitation mentioned in 8ab. Cf. note to 5c.

21c: asti naś tat tv ato bhūya iti, lit.: 'Saying "That we have. [This] is better than it!"'. I.e. not acquiescing in what one already knows, but pressing for more advanced understanding. Cf. the expository device used in Chandogya Up. 7 referred to in Śāntiparvan, Critical Notes, p.2191.

27b: svadharma-arapena vai 'verily through the performance of one's own duty', hence, without departing from the performance of that duty. Cf. svam eva cārtham kuruṇā of 26a.
31d: sa gam álabhuma arhati 'he may kill a cow [for sacrifice]', like the others preceding it is a deliberately perverse statement: all these actions take place in the mind (30d).

32b: te na tādrśāḥ 'those [who are] not such', i.e. who are unable to conduct sacrifices through the efficacy of mental volition. The alternative segmentation tēna tādrśāḥ 'such Menachen in dieser Weise' (Deussen) is followed by the printed edition of the Vulgate but contradicted by one of the two variae lectiones recorded in the Critical Edition Apparatus Criticus (viz. te ca tādrśāḥ). The Critical Edition segmentation has the advantage of better sense: in the alternative, tēna is redundant beside either tatha if taken adverbially, or oṣadhīḥhis if taken instrumentally.

32c: buddhityagaṇaḥ puraskṛtya 'putting mental renunciation foremost'. I construe with 32d, not 32ab as Deussen is led to by his segmentation of tēna tādrśāḥ.

34a: āśrāvayat 'calls out', a terminus technicus of the sacrificial ritual at which hired brahmanic specialists officiate (Ś.Br. 1.5.1.1. etc.); hence, 'officiates at a sacrifice'.

34b: na dādad brahmaṇeṣu, see p.194, n.37 above; probably sc. 'in the sacrifice'.

34c: grāmyaṁ vṛttim lipsāmaṇaḥ 'wanting to obtain a common means of subsistence', i.e. choosing to live as a householder (grāhastha) as opposed to embarking upon the life of a forest hermit (vanaprastha) - see pp.194-197 above. Another dimension is added to the grāhastha: vanaprastha dichotomy by the fact that the
Chāndogya Up. 5.10.3 contrasts those who pass by the devayāna panthān with those who live a village life (ya ime grāme ...) who will pass along the pitryāna panthān. Thus, in turning to this question, the composer may be continuing his reinterpretation of the Upanisadic doctrine.

34ef: idam tu daivatam kṛtvā 'indeed, doing the following godly thing'. On the reading idam in preference to īnām, see p.203, n.56 above. As discussed in p.204 and n.58 above, it is likely that this 'godly thing' is an allusion to the devayāja.
Interpretation

The interpolator of SWa purports to engage in a debate on the question of the relationship between non-injury and sacrifice. The debate is unreal in that the interpolator, having composed both challenge (1-3) and response (4-), knocks down his own man of straw. He will only ask a question he believes he can answer. The introductory technique of question-posing is a common structural device used to draw together loosely-related materials in the didactic parts of the Mahābhārata. But this is not to say that the question raised is no more than speculation or elaboration on the interpolator's part, for in the present case Jājali does not make a sympathetic or even neutral request for elucidation of a certain topic: he puts forward a cogent, logically expressed objection which invites not elucidation but refutation. It therefore seems at least credible that here the interpolator has set up an objection which would have had support from some thinkers of his day in order that he might show how it was ill-founded. Indeed, unless SWa has some polemical intent, its bulk would be remarkable. Thus, it seems likely that SWa reflects a real debate with which the interpolator was acquainted, if not involved.

Since Jājali's objection was composed in anticipation of Tulādhāra's response, it is both valid and valuable to consider them jointly for the light each throws upon the other.
Jājali advances what might be called a materialist view of the sacrifice which is quite in harmony with the understanding of the sacrifice put forward in the Vedas and Brāhmaṇa texts. In asserting that without sacrifice the door to heaven will be closed to creatures, he alludes to the belief that the victims despatched in the sacrifice are not killed but translated to heaven. In asserting that without sacrifice creatures will lose their livelihood, he reflects the view that sacrificial offerings bring prosperity to the patron and multiply his flocks. In asserting that “mortals live off both cattle and plants; from this arises the sacrifice”, he alludes either to the belief that by institutionalizing killing in the sacrifice men can escape the retribution which would otherwise follow the consumption of living beings, or to the notion that the gods, upon whom the welfare of the world depends, are to be nourished by sacrifice of the same food a man normally consumes.

1 RV.1.162.21; ŚBr. 3.8.1.10, 13.2.7.10-15, 13.2.8.1. ŚBr. 3.8.2.4-6 has the victim killed but reborn; similarly in the analogy applied to the soma sacrifice at ŚBr.11.1.2.1-2 (Schmidt,"Origin of Ahīṃsā",p.646); also Mbh.xii.264.8cd-19.

2 RV.1.162.22; ŚBr.14.1.1.3 and a fortiori 11.4.4.8-11.

3 Unless killed sacrally, victims will seize their killers and eat them in the next world, in which all roles are reversed. This is especially clear in Śāṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa 11.3 quoted by Schmidt, "Origin of Ahīṃsā",pp.643-644. Cf. the portrayal of the afterworld in ŚBr.11.6.1, esp. 3; and the popular etymology of māṃsah, Manu 5.55. Note the importance of proper disposal of the spit into which the victim’s pain is concentrated ŚBr.11.7.4. 3, 3.8.5.8-11, and the cleansing after the killing, ŚBr.3.8.2.30.
himself.\textsuperscript{4} In all this Jājali stands foursquare on the doctrines of the Brāhmaṇa texts.

However, to regard Jājali's position as no more than a collection of Brāhmaṇa doctrines relating to the sacrifice is not to do it justice. Jājali objects to non-injury also on the ground that it would rule out agriculture, upon which men depend for food. It may be that this is a rider tossed in to the discussion simply because it had been contentiously stated in MNU;\textsuperscript{5} certainly it is not explicitly dealt with in Tulādhāra's response. On the other hand, though, supplementing Jājali's objection with material drawn from Tulādhāra's response gives this element of the objection more significance. In his rebuttal, Tulādhāra seeks to explain how correctly-performed offering in the sacrifice will bring progeny to the sacrificers,\textsuperscript{6} and in doing so he describes a chain of life which may be schematized as follows:
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Tulādhāra adds that in accordance with this chain of cause and effect men formerly gained not only progeny

\textsuperscript{4} This is clear from Manu 3.70-147, esp. 108; 6.11-12.

\textsuperscript{5} 254.44.

\textsuperscript{6} Cf. RV.1.162.22; ŚBr.11.4.4,9, 14.3.2.1, etc.
but also crops and plants. Since food and the sacrificer are the two elements necessary for the making of an offering, the chain can be linked into a cycle:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Sun} & \text{oblation} & \text{rain} \\
\text{progeny} & \leftrightarrow & \text{food}
\end{array}
\]

In this context, Jājali's comments on agriculture have relevance to the other parts of his objection: all are links in a cycle of life which depends upon the sacrifice for its circulation. It is by means of the sacrifice that sustenance is translated from earth to heaven; therefore denial of the sacrifice would have the result that, in Jājali's words, "our world would come to a standstill, completely ceasing from [productive] activity".

Thus, Tulādhāra's response has to deal with the two interlocked problems of Jājali's conception of the sacrifice as involving killing and the function of the sacrifice in sustaining the circulation of life. Both

7 Cf. Ch.Up.1,8,4-7; ŚBr.7,4,2,22 (sacrifice produces rain); Mait.Up.6,37 = Manu 3.76 are equivalent to st.11 of SWa; Bṛhadār. Up.6,2,16.
8 255,Jcd.
9 Cf. Upaniṣadic teachings about the transmutations of food and life, a conception of life-sustaining death which, however, in those contexts is not specifically related to the sacrifice: Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.5,12,1, Taittirīya Up.2,2,3,2, Maitrāyaṇi Up.6,12.
concerns are present right from the opening stanza of Tulādharā’s reply:

O Jājali, I will discuss [the topic of] livelihood. O brahman, I am not a nihilist; nor do I repudiate the sacrifice.10

On the one hand, Tulādharā proceeds to argue that Jājali is mistaken in believing that sacrifice involves killing, and on the other hand that in various ways it is possible to maintain the circulation of life without sacrificial killing. Tulādharā never challenges Jājali’s conception of the cyclic chain of life itself.

On the first matter, Tulādharā asserts that sacrificial killing arises from a defective understanding of the sacrifice.11 He condemns that form of sacrifice on the grounds that it is not in accord with Vedic prescriptions truly interpreted but a perverted misrepresentation of Vedic teaching motivated by greed and desire.12 Beside its inherent iniquity, such sacrifice is to be shunned because its performance produces evil karman redounding against the sacrificer.13 Understandably perhaps, Tulādharā does not much elaborate the contravention of Vedic prescription, but rather makes the greed of sacrificers the mainspring of his objection to 'kṣatriya' sacrifice. Consequently at first sight much of his discussion seems to be diverging from the direction of debate foreshadowed by Jājali, and concern with injury in the sacrifice seems to have taken a secondary place. However Tulādharā

10 255.4d, 6c, 14e.
11 255.6-7, 14cdef, 24-25.
12 255.9, 14ab.
appears to associate greed in the sacrificers with the harm caused to sacrificial victims:

... we have heard imperfect works - [involving] both the harming of creatures and concentration on reward - called "superior". 14

The relationship between the two elements is not systematically expounded but can be confidently deduced. For Tulādhāra the 'ksatriya' sacrifice is the degeneration of a pristine rite which no longer obtains. In that pure sacrifice the offering of an oblation (havya) was sufficient to set in motion the life sustaining cycle, so that food was provided without further physical operation solely through the power of blessings (āsīrbhīr ... abhavan 17). Both the sacrifice and the productive activity it engendered were therefore totally free of injury to any creature. The departure from this simple, pure sacrifice Tulādhāra attributes to the greed of would-be officiants 18 and the desire of patrons for ostentatious sacrifice; 19 from these causes has developed the large-scale sacrifice involving animal slaughter, the

14 255.16.
15 255.10cd-12.
16 255.11.
17 255.12cd.
18 255.13 and 6-7; also 255.25.
19 255.24b; cf. 31b.
paśubandha. Hence when Tulādhāra speaks of celebrants, gifts to brahmans, etc., he is by implication speaking of sacrificial victims. But from the manner in which Tulādhāra explains his stance, one can only conclude that for the interpolator of SWa the question of injury in the sacrifice was an aspect of an issue with wider ramifications - including the question of employing celebrants in the sacrifice.

In this way the interpolator establishes his objection to sacrifice of the kind which involves killing. But in order to make a viable case he has also to show that the form of sacrifice which he urges is capable of fulfilling the function which his opponents claim for their animal sacrifices: that it can sustain the cyclic chain of livelihoods. In the course of his composition the interpolator returns to this problem several times.

He begins by setting down the previously mentioned idyllic picture of effortless spontaneous generation impelled by the power of the oblations of pure-minded men. By this he establishes that the

20 The kṣatriya sacrifice is seen as involving the killing of animals, as in, e.g.,Mbh.xii.169.31:

paśuyajñāīḥ kathāṃ himsāir mādṛśo yaṣṭum arhati / antavacbhīr uta prājñāḥ kṣatrāyājñāīḥ pisācavat //

'How could a wise man like myself make offerings with cruel animal-sacrifices, with kṣatriya sacrifices of limited [validity], like a Pišācā? - the Pišācas being notorious meat-eaters (see Manu 5.50); or in Mbh.xii.230.12a, where kṣatriya sacrifices are identified as arambhayajñāḥ 'sacrifices in which there is a taking hold [of the victim to slay it].

21 255.10cd-12.
present day 'kṣatriya' sacrifice is not the sole possible means by which the sustenance of the world can be maintained. Moreover, by attributing this ideal sacrifice to days of old - the Kṛta Age perhaps - he turns to revered antiquity for a platform from which to castigate animal offerings as a modern perversion. Yet although in this idyll the interpolator shows the chain of life to be supportable without sacrificial killing, he does not present this sacrificial form as a solution relevant to the contemporary situation. It is empirically observable that nowhere today do crops spring up without tilling. For credibility in his debate with Jājali, Tulādhāra is therefore constrained to offer currently-practicable approximations or alternatives to the ideal.

Tulādhāra discusses four practicable means by which, he asserts, the circulation of life can be sustained without sacrificial killing.

A. First and most cogently he suggests a solution based upon Upaniṣadic monism. Accepting that sacrificial killing is intended to sustain the cycle of life by transferring sustenance from this world to gods, any means by which the same effect will be achieved is therefore an alternative to blood sacrifice. By defining the purpose of the sacrifice to be the satisfying of the appetites of the gods, Tulādhāra is

---

22 Cf. Mbh.xii.200.35; on the other hand, under the lordship of Bali, the earth gave crops untilled, Mbh.xii.216.16cd.

23 Witness his use of past tenses and the adverb āyam.

24 255.17-20.
able to suggest that this can be accomplished through the non-corporeal sacrificial offerings of truth and restraint. Inspired by Upanisadic passages, Tulādhāra argues that Brahma possesses one in whom the spirit of abandonment has arisen and who is imbued with sacred knowledge. Since it is the precondition of the identification of a brahman with the Absolute Brahman that the brahman be completely devoid of passions and attachments, he may in consequence be called "satiated" or "satisfied". Now, since the gods are but manifestations of the Absolute Brahman, the gods and the Brahman-possessed brahman are not differentiable. Therefore the state of mind of the brahman, which is necessarily one of satisfaction, may be attributed to the gods. Thus, by virtue of the fact that the brahman achieves detachment and identification with Brahman, the gods are satisfied. Hence the gods are satisfied by sacrifices of truth and restraint - which Tulādhāra apparently envisages as renunciations made by one who possess true knowledge and who lacks greed. Perhaps the implied reasoning is sophistical,

---

25 The play on words with \sqrt{trp} forms in \text{255.19cd} has a parallel in \text{Ch.Up.5.19.2} (not 5.18.2 as in \text{Critical Notes, p.2191}) which is less ingenious but more persistent in its use of \sqrt{trp} forms. Furthermore the \text{Ch.Up. passage is also a recommendation of internalized sacrifice.}

26 The physical aspect appropriate for the analogy with food offerings in the sacrifice, which is better conveyed by 'satiated', is kept alive by the comparison with one who is sarvarasais triptaḥ (255.20a).

27 255.17ab.
but by its means of expression the notion gives the impression of having a vedantic imprimatur.

B. On a less mystical plane, and perhaps as a rider to the previous suggestion as much as an alternative to it, Tulādhāra asserts that the benevolently-directed power of one whose rites are perfect is sufficient to convey creatures to heaven.

... [those whose] rites are perfect, through a desire to benefit creatures, would enable creatures to attain heaven.29

The reference to perfect rites is clarified by praise in the preceding stanza for those who conduct their own offerings of trees, plants, fruits and roots.30 Their practice is contrasted with that of others who sacrifice with ostentatious offerings designed to win them fame, and who employ fee-hungry officiants. Thus we can conclude that by perfect rites Tulādhāra intends, at the minimum, a personally conducted vegetable offering. The fact that this implies bloodless sacrifice sits well with the attribution to those whose rites are perfect of the desire to aid creatures. Indeed the same thread runs through the stanzas which describe ritual forms: the avoidance of ostentatious sacrifice is juxtaposed with the practice of non-injury,31 and the eschewing of greedy officiants.

28 I.e. by its allusion to the Ch.Up. passage and its philosophy generally. Note however that the Ch. Up. passage was not directed to showing how the gods could be satisfied by sacrificial substitutes but to showing how the sacrificer himself would be satisfied by having offered sacrifice mentally.
29 255.26cd27a.
30 255.25ab.
31 255.24b:cd.
with the offerings of plants etc. \[32\] Hence we might infer that perfection of rites signifies more than ritual form: it involves attitude as well. And with regard to attitude, at the outset of this suggestion, Tulādhāra has identified those who sponsor ostentatious sacrifice with those who seek heaven, \[33\] setting over against them those of constant spirit who are free from worry over such concerns: "they ... neither regret, nor waver or tremble". \[34\] These latter are of such spiritual achievement that they attain the state of Brahman. \[35\] Thus, the perfect rite is a mark of those who have crossed to the further bank. \[36\]

To tie these threads of thought together, we may gloss stanza 26cd27ab, quoted above, by paraphrasing the composer's argument. One whose rites are perfect offers plants etc. On the one hand he does this as part of his striving to practise non-injury to the utmost. The fact that he makes this form of offering is therefore an expression of benevolence toward living creatures. On the other hand, by offering plants etc., he shuns the ostentatious sacrifice which is the resort of those who seek reward in heaven. He does so because his spirit is not anxious; and as his spirit is untroubled, he resides in the state of Brahman. We may infer from this that his spiritual

\[32\] 255.25ab:cd.
\[33\] 255.24a.
\[34\] 255.23ab.
\[35\] 255.23cd.
\[36\] As in 255.22b.
power is great, and his benevolence toward living creatures will be efficacious. Thus, by offering plants etc. a brahman in fact performs a sacrifice - not in the worldly sense that by his performance animals are despatched to heaven, but because his performance is the mark of one who has the spiritual power and benevolent disposition to confer the ultimate benefit upon living creatures: to enable them to reach heaven. The function of the (animal) sacrifice is thus fulfilled, although only plants are offered.

C. As his third solution to the sacrificial problem, Tuladāhāra proposes an alternative clearly distinguishable from his earlier approaches. He does so "[by way of] highlighting mental renunciation". At first glance, the form of sacrifice he depicts appears to resemble the spontaneous generation he had described "in former times". In the organization of the material the composer presents, however, no connexion can be detected. Neither is this surprising once more meticulous study has revealed several fundamental differences. First, the spontaneous generation is perceived as a physical reality (now in abeyance) while the practice outlined here is

37 255.27a. Presumably the beast attains heaven after its natural death. It seems doubtful that protagonists of the sacrifice would see this as a competent substitute for translating live victims to heaven: see note 1 above.

38 255.28-33.

39 255.32cd.

40 255.11-12.
attributed to the efficacy of mental volition and there is nothing to suggest that it takes place outside the sacrificer's mind. Secondly, whereas the spontaneous generation was sustained by oblation (prāstāhuti) consonant with Tulādhāra's conception of true brahmanic sacrifice, the practice outlined here is forcefully identified with the forms of the degenerate kṣatriya sacrifice: the sacrificial post of the animal sacrifice, the killing of a cow, and - most telling of all in view of the terms of Tulādhāra's denunciation of the kṣatriya sacrifice - very abundant sacrificial fees (dakṣīṇa) are mentioned. In short, it is only in their lack of coercion that these two forms of sacrifice resemble one another; in every way this mental sacrifice represents a sublimated kṣatriya sacrifice.

The manner in which the composer has introduced this section of his discourse is particularly interesting as an illustration of how he saw this mentally-impelled sacrifice as both related to but differentiated from the physical conduct of kṣatriya sacrifice. Tulādhāra broaches the topic by referring to the devayāna panthan 'the path which is the way of the gods'. In the Upaniṣads devayāna panthan is...
opposed to *pitṛyāna* panthan 'the path which is the way of the fathers', the former leading the departed soul of one versed in the esoteric significances of the sacrifice to reside in Brahman, the latter leading the departed soul of one aware only of the exoteric significance of sacrifice to ultimate rebirth. The composer of SWa states rather that it is the nature of the offerings made which determines the path along which the soul of the sacrificer will proceed. By this it seems that he intends to distinguish those who offer full-scale animal sacrifice on the Brāhmaṇa model from those who offer only the round of *gāṛhapatiya* sacrifices and *śraddhas*, which do not involve animal sacrifice. Further to this primary distinction, the composer envisages two ultimate fates for those souls which pass along the *devayāna* panthan: return and non-return. This secondary distinction conforms with the composer's view of the kṣatriya sacrifice as imperfect and his attribution to those who practise it of the desire to attain heaven, with the stunted spiritual awareness that implies. For such spiritual midgets there is no question of union with Brahman; and hence, for them, there is a return from the hereafter. On the other hand, one who is wise and who

---

46 Chandogya Upanisad 5.10.1-7; Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 6.2.15-16; Praśna Upaniṣad 1.9-10; Kauśitakibrāhmaṇa Up. 1.2-3 et seqq.
47 255.28a.
48 255.29cd.
49 255.24a (inversely).
50 255.29b.
has undertaken mental renunciation\(^{51}\) will fittingly rise to timeless absorption in Brahman, with no return.\(^{52}\) In this way, then, the composer acknowledges that both the mentally-impelled sacrifice and the degenerate physical sacrifice are generically related in that both conduct sacrificers to the same destination along the devayana panthan, but at the same time he would separate the sheep from the goats once they have arrived at their destination.

D. Finally, the composer suggests that by carrying out the simplest of offerings a brahman householder is "virtually"\(^{53}\) accomplishing a sacrifice.\(^{54}\) Both before\(^{55}\) and after\(^{56}\) his mention of this form of sacrifice, the composer is at pains to stress that the virtue of such rites lies in the fact that they do not involve reliance upon other officiating priests; indeed we saw previously\(^{57}\) that hired officiants were

\(^{51}\) 255.3lc and 32c taken together.

\(^{52}\) In so refining the traditional doctrine, the composer is in step with other later thinkers who found it unpalatable that both those knowledgeable in orthodox learning and those who have attained intuitive mystical insight should share the same destiny. In his commentary to Chandogya Upanishad 5.10.1, Saṁkara distinguishes those who through adoration of Brahma without attributes gain absolute immortality by merging with the deity from those who fulfil their religious obligations by reliance on the dictates of sastra and by penance, whose conditional immortality lasts until the destruction of this world. (Mitra (tr.) in Tatya (ed.) The Twelve Principal Upanishads, pp.569-572 n.).

\(^{53}\) 255.34f: yathā.

\(^{54}\) 255.34, 38cd-39.

\(^{55}\) 255.34ab.

\(^{56}\) 255.39, by implication.

\(^{57}\) Pages 195-196 and nn.42, 43.
prohibited from participating in domestic sacrifices of this nature. The typical domestic offering is a grain-cake, the purodāsa, and according to Tulādhāra the role of the sacrificial victim is taken over by the purodāsa. He explains this in a verse which probably implies that the sacrificial grain-cake is more fit for offering (medhya) than any animal victim. The idea that the sacrificial grain-cake is in some respects a counterpart of the animal victim has precedents in the Brāhmaṇa literature. In a phrase which is the ultimate source of inspiration behind the composer's own statement, the Śatapathabrahmaṇa states that the rice and barley of the grain-cake offered at an animal sacrifice "are the sacrificial essence of all animal [victims]."

As a result of the substitution of medhya for medha and the removal of the phrase from its context in the description of the animal sacrifice, the composer of Śva

58 Page 195, n. 40.

59 255.38cd. Literally "of all animals the sacrificially fit is said to be indeed the purodāsa". In the accompanying translation I have not conveyed the superiority of grain-cake which is not stated but implied. Non-grammatical arguments in favour of the composer's intention to imply the superiority of the grain-cake are (i) his earlier condemnation of the 'kṣatriya' sacrifice, which makes it unlikely that he would elevate it to parity with a bloodless form of sacrifice here; and (ii) the sentiment of the following stanza (39) which appears to equate every river with Sarasvatī (the analogy of which is the equating of the grain-cake with the animal victim) but in fact recommends the river over Sarasvatī in advising Jājali against actual Birtha-visited and in favour of a sublimated pilgrimage into the self (the analogy of which is the superiority of the offering of the unextraordinary but symbolic purodāsa over the actual sacrificial killing of animals).

60 Śur.3.8.3.1: ... tad yat purodāsam anunirvapati sarvesām va 'esa paśūnta medho yad vṛtihiyavau ...
has been able to use the phrase (deliberately or not) with quite different effect from that originally intended. In the Brāhmaṇa text the preparation of the cake is complementary to and contemporary with the cooking and carving of the sacrificial victim; in ŚWa the cake has become a substitute for the animal. It is probable that the same reinterpretation lies at the root of the later practice of making cakes in the shape of sacrificial victims, a practice unknown to early texts. The composer of ŚWa may have had this practice in mind; but whether he did or not, this last of Tulādhāra's four alternatives fulfills the sacrificial function simply by symbolizing the animal sacrifice.

Since the composer does not attribute the statement except with uc ye te, which does not imply any especially authoritative source.

Aitareya Br.6.9.1-4, goes a long way to establishing the puroḍāśa as at least equivalent to and possibly a substitute for the victim: 1. Sa vā esa paśur evālabhyate yat puroḍāṣas; 2. [identification of ingredients of cake with hair, skin, blood, bone, etc. of victim]; 3. sarveṣām vā eṣa paśūnāṁ medhena yajate, yaḥ puroḍāṣena yajate; 4. tasmād āhūḥ: puroḍāṣasatram lokyam iti. Keith translates lokyam with the sense of laukikam: "The cake offering is the people's sacrificial session". If this interpretation is not justified, then the Aitareya Br. does not go beyond backing the identification of the cake as a receptacle of the victim's medha. Whatever interpretation is to be placed on this passage, the composer of ŚWa does not show himself directly aware of it.

This is very clear from ŚBr.3.8.3.2; cf. also Kauśitaki Br.10.5. The purpose of offering the cake is to make the victim whole by restoring its medha. Aitareya Br.6.8.7-8.

Schmidt, "Origin of Ahiṃsā", p.629; however pace Schmidt the antapāsu of barley in Maitrāyaṇī Saghita 1.10.12 = Kāthaka Samhita 36.6 which he discusses seems to prefigure the piṣṭapāsu of later days. See also: Hoens, Santi I, pp.55-56. Manu 5.37; Rajatarangini 1.7 (quoted in Sundara Ram, Cow Protection in India, p.177).
Looking back over the solutions put forward by the composer in his attempts to bring into harmony non-injury and the sacrificial function, one cannot but be struck by the hesitancy of his advocacy. In the first place, the very fact that he offers four alternatives to the 'kṣatriya' sacrifice is suggestive of polemical counter-attack rather than confident defence of a firmly founded position. The impression is heightened by a lack of consistency in the fundamental assumptions underlying the alternatives offered. The first two proposals - the identification of the sacrificer with Brahman, and redemption of animals through benevolent desire - present radical alternatives to sacrificial animal slaughter which draw their rationale from sources independent of the sacrifice. The last two - mentally impelled sacrifice and the offering of sacrificial cakes - are sublimations of the kṣatriya sacrifice, the rationale of which cannot be comprehended without taking that sacrifice as the point of departure. Although the first two alternatives give Tulādhāra the opportunity to deny outright the validity of the very notion of sacrifice, he never does so. Rather, in accordance with his prefatory remarks, he treats the kṣatriya sacrifice as a manifestation of true sacrifice and therefore not essentially invalid but defective in that the circumstances attending its conduct are evil or that

65 255.4c "nor do I disparage (vinindāmi) the sacrifice".
66 255.6-7abcd, 13.
there are evils involved in the technique of its conduct. The essential validity of even the kṣatriya form of sacrifice is acknowledged by Tulādharā when he portrays it as effectively producing results — albeit undesirable results. In his treatment of the latter two alternatives, he goes further in idealizing even the form of the kṣatriya sacrifice and removing only the evil of the action expressing the form by making the acts imaginary or by symbolizing them.

The interpolator, thus, treads lightly in his assault on the kṣatriya sacrifice. How may we account for this accommodating approach? The interpolator himself suggests an explanation by the pains he takes in asserting that Tulādharā is not a nihilist and that his views do not necessarily mean repudiation of the sacrifice. In other words, the composer shows himself concerned to prove that Tulādharā does not leave the orthodox fold. To accomplish this he has to demonstrate that, although the challenge raised by Jājali places emphasis on the unorthodox implications of non-injury, in fact the non-injury ideal can be accommodated within brahmanic orthodoxy. Now, from Jājali's abuse and Tulādharā's self-defence we may imagine that the interpolator had in mind presumably contemporary extremes of opinion, with on the one side the upholders of 'kṣatriya' vedic sacrifice and the view of the afterlife in the other world which went with it, and on the other side those the first party would brand nihilists, who upheld the ideal of non-injury believing the sanctity of life in

67 255.16, 25cd.
68 255.9-10ab.
69 255.13-14ab.
this world to be an absolute value and (implicitly at
least) denying the sacrificers' world-picture. The
intention of the composer has been to moderate between
the extremes to produce a synthesis which will remain
acceptable to orthodoxy. His ambivalence toward the
vedic sacrifice is therefore understandable, as is also
his lack of consistency in fundamental assumptions.
While sacrificers and nihilists take ideal positions
with coherent ideologies, which SWa alludes to rather
than spells out, the composer's attempt to synthesize
by combining elements from each camp lacks an
independent ideological base and a coherence of its
own. It has significance only through implicit
reference to the poles of opinion between which it lies.
Consequently it is misleading to speak of the
composer's hesitant advocacy or to impute a lack of
conviction. The composer after all chose to expatiate
on the issue. The qualified tone of his composition
is thus best seen as a characteristic inherent in the
nature of his task: to compose a statement of position
which is moderate and apologetic, not radical or
rigorous.

While SWa might lack a consistent and independent
world-picture, this is not to say that it is without
coherent expression of values of its own. On the
contrary, Tuladhāra's statement reveals a consistent
emphasis on the personalization of religious
observance. The concluding stanza elegantly sums up
this theme:
All rivers are Sarasvatīs; all hills are holy. O Jañali, [your] place of pilgrimage is [your] self: do not go about as a pilgrim. 70

Tulādhāra's condemnation of particularly the socially-, outward-directed aspects of the 'kṣatriya' sacrifice also contributes to the message. But above all this principle finds expression in his biting denunciations of brahmans who officiate at the sacrifices of others: it is their evil nature which has created the kṣatriya form of sacrifice. 71 On this basis it might credibly be suggested that the composer of Śa is promoting a reform of the sacrifice which involves a turning away from externals, the internalization of a more mystical or devotional religious experience. The concept of satyayajña, the mentally impelled sacrifice, and the operation of an individual's benevolent intention all lean in this direction. However the fourth of the alternatives to kṣatriya sacrifice dealt with by Tulādhāra involves no such internalization. There is no mystical or devotional experience: all is performance of a prescribed ritual. The offering of the sacrificial grain-cake in place of an animal victim is a personalization only in the sense of individualizing the conduct of the rite: a sacrifice which would be conducted with hired officiants is replaced with an offering from which officiants are barred. Since all the previously mentioned cases of internalization are also satisfactorily seen as examples of individualization, the fourth case is decisive for

70 255.39.
71 255.6-7abcd, 14cde.
defining the composer's stance. In this light it seems that the concluding stanza should be interpreted materialistically and literally rather than metaphysically and allegorically. Through it, then, the composer is saying that the simple, humble and individual are preferable to the great, grandiose and public.

Since, as we have argued, the positions taken up in the debate of Śa are likely to have had reflexes in the composer's society, and since the composer supports the value of individualization not only positively but also negatively in attacks on 'professional' priests, it should be worthwhile considering the value in its social setting. The personal offerings recommended by Tulādhāra would be appropriate for vānaprastha meditators on the one hand or brahman householders on the other hand. The puroḍāsa offering (as described in Śa) and the pūjā of paying homage, of oblations, of recitations, or of offerings of plants are simple practices which fall within the householder's province. The sacrifice of truth, restraint, and the sacrifice impelled by mental volition are intended for brahmans whose spirituality has passed beyond the worldly involvement of the householder, while the recommendation of the offering of trees, plants, fruits and roots echoes the offering prescribed for the vānaprastha in Manu.\(^7_2\)

\(^7_2\) See above p.554.

\(^7_3\) Pages 195-196 above.

\(^7_4\) See p.203 and n.55 above.
Thus, Tulādhāra's four proposed alternative sacrifices extend across the range of mature religious activity of a brahman, whether he remains a householder until death or retires from society to adopt the vānaprastha mode of existence;\textsuperscript{75} hence the solutions advanced by the composer are fully adequate for the religious practice of a private brahman. Moreover since Tulādhāra twice states that different alternatives are appropriate for persons of differing degrees of spiritual advancement,\textsuperscript{76} it seems that composer was consciously aiming at comprehensiveness in his depiction of modes of private religious practice. By doing so, he sets up a total alternative to the depravity of brahmanic public practitioners. The lines of debate in SWa thus separate two social groups: the private brahmans, on whose side the composer writes; and the brahmanic professionals. Fragments of evidence in the interpolation corroborate the common-sense assumption that the public practitioners constitute a brahmanic élite whose members owe their superior secular standing both to their access to sources of wealth not available to private brahmans and to their association with those in a position to patronize their sacrifices.\textsuperscript{77} In the interpolation there is recurrent association of the 'kṣatriya' sacrifice with transfer of wealth to

\textsuperscript{75} Insofar as the religious activity of a sannyāsin is germane, it will be subsumed under the head of vānaprastha.

\textsuperscript{76} 255.32ab, and by implication in 255.34cd.

\textsuperscript{77} 255.6a, 7abcd, 13, 16d, 24ab, 25cd, 31b, 34b.
brahmans and acknowledgement of its function as a status symbol. Stripped of emotional appeal, the comparisons put down in stanza 39 are telling, too. At every turn we find the implication that the 'kśatriya' sacrifice is a high-status activity. Given this, we may view Śiva as an attempt to bolster the prestige or self-confidence of non-participating brahmans.

In such a context, the charge, defence and counter-charge of Jājali, speaking for the élite chaplaincy, and Tulādhāra may be seen as betokening the conflict of interest between brahman groups. On the one hand are brahmans whose socially-recognized position depends upon their mastery of a corpus of ritual material and who are able to support themselves through the exercise of their priestly functions. Speaking on behalf of private brahmans, Tulādhāra attempts to undermine the position of those professional officiants by declaring their rituals debauched and erroneous in technique and by condemning their acceptance of fees as corrupt. In the other camp, with Tulādhāra, are brahman householders who follow the indulgences of āpaddharma or who have become vānaprastha ascetics. Against them Jājali speaks only for three stanzas, and only as a devil's advocate. We are therefore left to infer the outlook of the brahmanic élite as best we can. For those whose position was legitimized by mastery of a controlled ritual corpus, the vānaprastha ascetic or mystic will have represented a charismatic challenge to be dealt with by accusations of deviance; - hence the
accusation of nihilism. Doubtless to those masters of the orthodox tradition whose hands were not soiled by the pursuit of any "common means of subsistence" (grāmyā vṛtti), brahmans reduced to śādharma deserved scorn, or perhaps pity, but not respect.

If there were any need for confirmation that this conflict between brahmanic groups is fundamentally important for understanding SWa, one could point to the curious circumstance that nowhere in Tulādhāra’s treatment of the problem of injury in the sacrifice is to be found the belief that injury done pursuant to vedic precepts is not injury. 78 Since the composer of SWa has paraphrased at first or second hand the Śatapathabrāhmana description of the animal sacrifice 79 one would not expect him to be ignorant of the text’s absolute insistence upon this point and the elaborate precautions taken in the preparations for the sacrifice to ensure that - in sacral terms - the victim’s life was not taken. 80 If he quotes from Manu, 81 the composer shows himself conversant with another text which preaches that principle. 82 Moreover, the several complementary alternatives to sacrificial

78 Manu 5.44 or 39. Cf. Chāḍogya Up. 15.1, ŚBr. 3.7.3.1-6.
79 See note 60 above.
80 See e.g. ŚBr. 3.8.2.12-13, 3.8.1.5 (the knife is a thunderbolt), 7.5.2.18-21 (fire is asked not to harm the victim), 3.7.3.1-7 (victim agrees to be sacrificed), 3.8.1.15 (manner of ‘killing’), 3.8.1.9 (protection of victim from external injury).
81 255.11 = (var.) Manu 3.76 or in the alternative Maitrayāni Up. 6.37.
82 Manu 5.39-44.
killing put forward by the composer show that his approach was eclectic and that its ideological foundation consisted in nothing more than seeking to accommodate the non-injury ideal in the orthodox tradition. Why then does he not mention this well-pedigreed orthodox doctrine when to do so would furnish a defence of the sacrifice and leave the ideal of non-injury intact? A possible reason could be that this belief had lost all credibility by the time of the composition of SWa. Prima facie this seems unlikely if only because it would seem, from his very attacks upon them, that animal sacrifices were not rare in the composer’s milieu, and the belief had significant expression both in ritual praxis and in the definitive ritual texts. If, moreover, as SWa suggests, officiants at animal sacrifices were under fire from those who condemned injury in the sacrifice, and were specifically accused of ignorance of vedic interpretation, it would be surprising if they had not put up this doctrine in justification of their practice. The alternative propositions are that the composer was aware of the belief but chose not to mention it or that for him it had no credibility. If we take the composer at his word as a defender of the sacrifice against the notion that it conflicts with

---

83 Pages 572-573 above.

84 ŚBr.3.6.4.1-16, esp. 10 (setting up yūpa), 3.8.1.5 (use of chip and ghee with knife), 3.8.1.9 (use of firebrands). Plus many references in Schmidt, "Origin of Ahipā", pp.646-648.

85 255.6a.
the non-injury ideal, it is not credible that he should have neglected this powerful argument. If, however, we accept that the composer's treatment is not a disinterested moral discourse but a polemic or apologia shaped by a clerical dispute, then we can see that he had every reason not to mention the doctrine, for in doing so he would have neutralized one aspect of his criticism of 'kṣatriya' sacrifice and made his own non-injurious alternatives unnecessary, in which case the grounds upon which he could advance the cause of private brahmins would have been very much weakened. On the other hand it may be that the composer has not been intellectually dishonest but that he himself gave the doctrine no credibility.86 In either case, his presentation of the discussion of non-injury and the sacrifice has been moulded by his identification with one party to a dispute.

Conclusion

We have seen, then, that SWa sketches the outline of a debate involving the ideal of non-injury and its ramifications for two fundamentally distinct views of life: one seeing life as a stage in a life supporting circulatory cycle; the other denying the reality of any such cycle and seeking to preserve each life as valuable in itself. These views were undoubtedly contentious - as the flourishing of the brand 'nihilist' suggests. But SWa never enters this debate,

86 Although, in this case, we might expect denunciation of the doctrine. This however is only argumtum e silentio.
for the composer never questions the validity of the
circulatory system with sacrifice as its heart. Thus
the composer of SWa has trodden a narrow path through
the wider issues relating to the non-injury ideal, of
which we catch glimpses only out of the corner of his eye.

At the same time it is clear that in picking out
the path he follows, the composer has not been guided
by landmarks of thought about non-injury. To any
discussion of the appropriateness of an absolute
prohibition of injury the question of agriculture,
raised by Jajali, would be significant; but the
composer lets it quickly slip from view, keeping his
gaze firmly fixed on the sacrificial fee accompanying
the animal sacrifice. The interest of private brahmans,
and the composer, in the ideal of non-injury is shown
by SWa to be limited to its usefulness in undermining
the symbolic or symptomatic mark which set the
sacerdotal élite above them: participation in large-
scale, sponsored animal sacrifices. By making a virtue
of their exclusion from such offices, brahmans without
benefice seek to enhance their unprivileged position.
In short, the composer of SWa picks up the principle
of non-injury to use it as a stick to beat his
opponents in a clerical feud. He applies the value to
advancing a certain sectional interest.

87 255.2.
When a brahman is not afraid and when he does not inspire fear in others, and when he does not desire nor detest, then he is successful indeed. When he does not exercise an evil disposition toward any creatures in thought, word, or deed, then he achieves Brahman. There is not, has not been, and never shall be any dharma whatsoever other than that implied by the fact that he who is not fearsome toward any creatures gains the state of fearlessness. He of whom the whole world is afraid, as of the jaws of death, because of his harsh speech and violent actions, achieves [only a state of] great fear [himself].
Notes to the translation

16b: yadā cāsmān na bibhyati, literally: 'and when others are not afraid of one'.

17: is noted in the Critical Edition App. Crit. as = (var.) Nāradaparivrājaka Up. 3.22 which however has the significantly different fourth pāda tādā bhayati bhaiṣābhūk.

18c: [a]bhayaḥ, 'not a danger, not dangerous'.

18d: abhayam, 'absence of fear, fearlessness'.

On the two usages of abhaya in 18cd, see Notes to Table VIII, s.v. 30a.

19d: mahād bhayam, 'great fear' or 'great peril/danger/distress'. See M.W. s.v. bhaya.

As mentioned above, the abhaya stanzas of P, along with those of Q and R, belong to a floating population of similar stanzas expressing this common theme. Cf. Mbh.xii.185.4; 213.14; 237.17; 261.32; 251.5-6, and further references given in the Critical Edition Apparatus Criticus.

1 Pages 154-155, 163 above.
Interpretation

Although on the Ist alignment Tulādhāra never touches on the topic of freedom from fear and lack of fearsomeness, stanza 16 neatly bridges any gap between the Ist alignment material and the interpolator's concern with values surrounding fearlessness (abhaya). By using an almost verbatim report (16c) of words spoken earlier by Tulādhāra as an analogue of his own contribution concerning fearlessness (16ab), the interpolator implies their equivalence and states their common ground as preconditions for the attainment of brahmanic success. Through stanza 16 the interpolator thus provides a justification for his composition of P by presenting it as a relevant extension of Tulādhāra's statement of values. But while the interpolator's motivation may thus be simply accounted for, that does not exhaust everything that can be said about the relationship of P to the idea expressed on the Ist and IIInd alignments.

By his manner of presentation the interpolator of P might seduce the reader into believing that he is doing no more than developing a particular aspect of Tulādhāra's Ist alignment position. This, however, would be a false impression. While the treatment of fearlessness in P has in common with the Ist alignment teachings that it recommends avoidance of aggression toward others, it is not clear that it does so on the same grounds. On the Ist alignment Tulādhāra presents non-involvement as the logical
outcome of an awareness of the impermanent and illusory nature of existence. In P there is no admission of the futility and randomness of human endeavour; rather to the contrary, P's treatment of fearlessness rests on the assumption that the attitude one adopts toward other creatures creates a predictable response in the environment. This assumption may not be evident from stanzas 16 and 17, where the subject is portrayed achieving success or attaining Brahman. It may however be inferred from verse 18cd where the result of the subject's not being fearsome (abhaya, not inspiring fear) is that he himself comes into a state of fearlessness. While this statement might be interpreted as referring to nothing more than a self-feeding subjective euphoria and thus to a circumstance divorced from the reality of external conditions, such an interpretation is difficult to sustain in the light of stanza 19. Stanza 19 is a mirror image of verse 18cd; and its subject is one whose attitude is defined in terms of the way it impinges upon the external world — viz. as causing other creatures to be afraid. His attitude is shown as manifesting itself in forms of aggressiveness. The result of his aggressiveness is that he himself comes into great fear. Nothing of stanza 19 can be construed as suggesting that the "great fear" is subjectively engendered; rather, everything points to its being an apprehension of reactions springing from the fear in others which has been aroused by the subject's aggressive attitude. If mahad bhayam is understood as 'great danger' then the point is made all
the more strongly. Thus in the light of stanza 19 one may reasonably contend that the same notion of external response underlies its direct negation in stanza 18, if not in stanzas 16-17 as well.

Hence, an implication of P is that there is a natural order, that phenomena are not random, and that a given attitude or action will produce a predictable response. Although presented as no more than a particular exemplification of 1st alignment ideas, in fact P can be seen to be rooted in a world-view fundamentally opposed to that put forward by Tulādhāra on the 1st alignment.

Building on the assumption of order in nature and the predictability of interactions, it is possible for P to assert that there is a principle of reciprocity governing actions, by which is provided a rationale for refraining from cruel actions and fearsome attitudes. Thus, in their application to social relationships, P's assertions are statements of an ethical system. There is a transparent appeal to enlightened self-interest in 18cd-19. But the ethical philosophy of P is sharply distinguished from the altruism preached on the IIInd alignment: while the IIInd alignment argues that a positively beneficial action will earn a repayment in kind, in P the desideratum is negatively conceived (and expressed) as a refraining from harm— in this case, from causing fear. This negative or passive perception of good is in harmony with the world-denying individuality and amorality of ascetic and
mystical thought.\(^1\) Because at the root this outlook rests on non-involvement with the exterior world, its application to ethical questions requires the assumption that there is a natural harmony which will assert itself if only no disturbing feature intervenes. Only given this assumption is non-involvement—with its objective product, non-interference—not only an ascetic ideal but also a social good.

This belief in an attainable natural harmony brings P into line with the romantic tendency in social philosophy which sees the conditions of the Krta Age always potentially close at hand. By contrast the cynical rationalism of the 1st alignment is incompatible with assumptions of underlying or potentially attainable social harmony and hence too with belief in the practical relevance of the Krta Age conception. On the 1st alignment Yudhishthira bemoans the passing of the golden age when dharma was manifest,\(^2\) but neither he nor Tulādhāra ever hint that the loss can be retrieved.

Thus, whether or not its composer intended it to do so, P in its juxtaposition here with the 1st and 2nd alignment materials throws some light upon the derivation of a social morality from an asocial ideal.

---

1 Cf. Mbh.xii.237.17:

\[ \text{abhayaṃ sarvabhūteḥbhyo bhūtānām abhayaṃ yataḥ / tasya dehaḥ vimuktasya bhayaṃ nāsti kutaścana} // \]

'Freedom from fear of all creatures arises [where there is] freedom from fear in [all] creatures; [hence] there is no fear from any source for one who is released from corporeal [concerns]'.

2 252.11-14.
Hence, the wise, little caring for fame, acute, and fully rational, mention them in the lawbooks. Through asceticism, through endowing sacrifices, and through prayers endued with wisdom, one achieves [ultimately only] whatever reward one gains in this world [as the result] of bestowing fearlessness on others. He who gives fearlessness to all creatures in the world [in place of] sacrificial fees achieves a gift of fearlessness [as meritorious as the sacrificial fees involved in] sponsoring all sacrifices. There is no dharma at all more excellent than harmlessness towards [all] creatures. He of whom no creature is afraid, none at all in any way, attains freedom from fear of all creatures, o great sage. He of whom the whole world is afraid, as of a snake in one's house, does not achieve dharma in this world or the next.

The very gods lose their way trying to search out the abode of the homeless one [who, identifying:] his own being with all beings, regards beings in the proper way. They speak of the gift of freedom from fear of any creature as the highest of all gifts. This is the truth I tell you; have faith [in it], o Jijali.

To 254.34 (E)
Notes to the translation

Explication of the passage is given in the Notes to Table VIII.

27c:  \( \text{tām} \) is taken to refer to the inspirers of fearlessness described in P. See p.161 above.

28c:  \( \text{prāpnoti} \) I have taken here to mean 'achieve [in the next world]' by way of implied contrast with \( \text{ihāśnute} \) 'gain in this world'.

29abcd:  is rather difficult to translate while retaining the sense of \( \text{dakṣīṇā} \) used in conjunction with \( \sqrt{\text{yaj}}. \) 29b \( \text{dadāty} \)

\( \text{abhaya} \text{dakṣīṇām} \), literally 'gives fearlessness as a sacrificial fee', has been translated as 'gives fearlessness [in place of] a sacrificial fee' although equivalence rather than substitution should be conveyed. 29cd is translated by Deussen as "der ist so gut, als wenn er alle Opfer darbrachte, und der erlangt als Opfergabe die Furchtlosigkeit". Roy has "...obtains the merit of all sacrifices and at last wins fearlessness for himself as his reward". However the syntax of the verse does not suggest that its two pādas should be read as discrete: the positioning of \( \text{sa} \) and \( \text{prāpnoti} \) rules this out. Thus a translation approximating those quoted would have to be something like '... gains the gift of freedom from fear [as he would have by] offering all sacrifices'. That \( \text{yajñā} \) should be a source of fearlessness is remarkable. However this interpretation of the verse is objectionable insofar as the subject is depicted as the recipient of \( \text{dakṣīṇā} \) when in the same verse he is made to sponsor sacrifices (\( \text{Ijānāh}, \text{ātmanepada} \)), and in the previous verse was
depicted as a giver of daksinā. Thus there is a double predisposition in favour of making the daksinā of 29d what the subject gives, not what he receives. Reading 29cd with this sense, suggests that what is being discussed is the magnitude of the daksinā the subject is able to disperse. A paraphrase of 29abcd might run: 'The gift of fearlessness to all creatures in the world considered as daksinā is the equivalent of the total daksinā which would be dispensed in patronizing all sacrifices'. Hence the translation offered.

32c : devāpi, double saṃdhi; similarly at Mbh. xii.261.21c and other references.

32d : apadasya padaiśiṇāḥ, 'seeking the abode of the homeless one' or 'following the footsteps of one who leaves no track'. The implication of the latter translation is that, like the gods, their quarry does not touch the ground as he walks; the implication of the former is that since he has identified himself with all beings, their quarry has lost all individuality and cannot be distinguished from nature.
Interpretation

Although Q was composed as a gloss on P, there is a significant shift of position between the two passages. Unlike P, which speaks only negatively of not being fearsome, not causing fear, etc., Q speaks of 'giving the gift of freedom from fear' as a means of earning merit.\(^1\) In doing so Q brings itself much closer to the notion of the active, merit-generating altruism of the IIInd alignment than to the abnegative spirit of P. The shift of position in Q is symptomised by the equation of bestowing fearlessness with offering sacrifices.\(^2\)

That the composer of Q in explicating P has slipped from the negative or passive conception of 'fearlessness' (abhaya) to the positive or active conception of 'the giving of fearlessness' (abhayadāna) is no doubt partly a reflection of the lack of any necessary empirical distinction between the positions, but this should not obscure the divergent philosophical ramifications of each view. Indeed the comparisons of P with the IInd alignment material, and of P with Q, should serve to remind us that our composers were not articulating abstractly-conceived philosophical systems but, on the contrary, were providing philosophically-based reinforcements for attitudes or practices which they saw, felt, or learned of - and which their experience invested with intrinsic values.

---

1 254.28cd; cf. Mbh.xii.237.26 for the bhūtābhayadānagāra.
2 254.29abcd; also 254.28a.
Other Third Alignment Accretions

From 254.51ab (G)

254.51cd  The wise praise such [a conception of] dharma as this. [It is] endowed with propriety; [it is] honoured eternally by ascetics and those of righteous character; [it is] marked by perfectness.

To 255.1 (S)

Wb

From 255.40 (Wa)

Bhīṣma said:

41  Tulādhāra extols such [conceptions of] dharma as these, endowed with propriety [and] unceasingly attended by the good.

To 256.1
Yudhisthira said:

257.12 Hardships are at variance with the requirements of the body for one who does no injury. How can the bodily sustenance of one who abstains from injury be effected?

Bhīṣma said:

13 [One] with the proper aim may carry out dharma by engaging in actions to the extent [necessary] for his body not to become feeble nor to pass into the domain of death.
He of whom no creature is afraid, none at all in any way, invariably gains freedom from fear of all creatures, o sage. He of whom the whole world is afraid, as of a wolf, [or] as all fishes, fleeing to shore from a roaring [monster] ... .

To 254.27ab (D)
Notes to the translation

25cd: krośatas tīram asādyā: Nīlakantha sees the roarer as the submarine Vadava fire. While this is as may be, Roy rightly rejects his view that the wolf (vrka) of 25b is an exemplification of the fire! Deussen offers an alternative interpretation which does not read krośatas as part of the absolutive clause but makes tīram asādyā merely an attendant circumstance of the fishes' contact with the source of their fear.

On the incompleteness of R, see Notes to Table VIII (near the end). Deussen supplies the following: "[der erlangt auch für sich keine Furchtlosigkeit.]". Roy concurs; and since we have demonstrated that R has analogues in Q and P, we can logically back their intuition.
Jājali said:

So by what private rite, o trader, may one achieve bliss? Propound this for me, o very wise one; I have firm faith in you.

Tulādhāra said:

Those not knowledgeable in the means of sacrificing should not [participate in] any celebration whatsoever. Would that [it were so].

In fact the cow provides [all necessary] ingredients for a celebration through its tail, horns, and hooves, and more especially in the oblations through its butter, milk, and sour-milk.

Employing [only one's] wife as well, through this prescription [of ritual] one produces [the desired result].
Notes to the translation

36c: svakarmanā 'by one's own works' but in this context karmān has its technical sense 'rite'.

37a: uta yajñānupāyajñā(ḥ)

uta is taken as an optative particle, accompanied in this case not by the usual potential verb-form (M.W.) but by the normative arhanti; uta is translated as 'Would that ...

yajñānupāyajñā(ḥ) is construed as yajña + an-upāya-jñā 'not knowledgeable about means with respect to sacrifice', i.e. not knowing the correct manner of conducting sacrifice.

For the above reading the Critical Edition has uta yajña utāyajña(ḥ). No doubt, in view of the bewildering variety of variants (see Table VII), this reading was the choice of the editors because it is attested by the greatest number of collated witnesses. On the other hand, there are objections to be made against it. With regard to syntax, the use of an impersonal subject with arhanti is unusual. But more important is the repetition of uta and the internal parallelism uta yajña: utāyajña which is not present in a considerable minority of manuscripts. The regularity of this repetition is the clear mark of a degenerate lectio facilior. It is therefore to be concluded that the Critical Edition reading cannot be accepted as original in toto, and that in all probability the second utā has less claim to originality than the lectio

Arjunamīśra adopts this interpretation:
yajñasya upāyaḥ hitam ye na jānanti /
difficilior of the predominating alternative form (a)nupa.

The majority of witnesses which read (a)nupa- also substitute ubhaya for the initial uta ya- (construing ubhayajña as ubhaya-jña 'knowledgeable concerning both' with the regular compounding adjectival form of ubha(ya), not the pronominal ubha). Objections may however be raised against the ubhaya-readings too. First, it may also be seen as a lectio facilior which has arisen through internal analogy, creating the two compounds in -jña, viz. ubhaya-jña and anupāya-jña. Secondly, there is no clue at all in the rest of the text as to what the duality expressed by ubhaya could refer to, much less what a compound such as ubhaya-jña + an-upāya-jña might signify. (Since the apparent repetition of yajña: ayajña in the texts which do not read ubhaya provides an appropriate duality it might be speculated that the ubhaya reading is a secondary formation which has cannibalized the sense of an older reading). Thus it seems unlikely that the composer put down a reading with ubhaya.

On the basis of the foregoing, we might expect that the original reading had an initial uta rather than ubhaya and a medial (a)nupa- in preference to a second uta. Combining these desiderata gives us the reading uta yajnānupāyajñā(ḥ) which at least makes sense if construed as I have suggested above.

Paramanandī suggests, without reference to the text, that the duality is the non-agency of the self on the one hand and the existence of actions on the other. Arjunamiśra notes that other commentators had it as action and Brahman but dismisses this as doing violence to the text and as unscriptural. (Critical Edition, App.Crit.).
It has the additional point in its favour that it supplies a personal subject for arhanti. Since the compound is so complex and is not conventional and since it happened to involve duplication of the syllables ya - jña and, besides, the vowels u - a as well, it is not surprising that an embarrassment of variants should have sprung up. All can be readily accounted for, with the possible exception of the appearance of ubhaya, presumably in *TG.

The reading thus reconstructed appears in only one of the collated manuscripts, D5. However the reading of D5 is quite likely to represent a correction of the D4679 reading against the Vulgate, being thus not original. The corrupt reading of K2 may be the best preservation of the original. It should be recalled however that it is not necessary that a critically reconstructed reading should have survived in any extant witness; the criterion is only that the greatest number of extant readings should be most credibly explained by taking it as a starting point.

37e: vālaiṁ śrāgena pādena, explained by Arjunamisra as providing the sacrificer's sacred thread (yajnopavīta), a substitute for the horn of the black antelope used in the dikṣā (ŚBr.3.2.1.18-31), and as the payment bargained in feet or portions (pada) of a cow, which is given to buy soma.

37f: saṁbharatī is the more likely original form (see p.191 and n.26), the Critical Edition's saṁbhavatī being a corruption. Both readings are well attested and the critical editors applied the wavy line to their choice. Stanza 37cdef is repeated at Mbh.xii.260.27abcd verbatim, with the same variae lectiones.
prakaroti 'produce, accomplish', with reference to the offering rather than 'marry' with patnīm as object. It is preferable to make patnīm the object of niyojayan 'employing, appointing'. Again, Arjunamīśra is reliable; Nilakantha embarks on a flight of fancy, taking Dutt and Roy with him. (Critical Edition, App.Crit.)
Interpretation

The interpolation T is simply a gloss on the fourth alternative to animal sacrifice put forward by Tulādhāra in ŚWa. Tulādhāra had asserted that one living in the householder's mode could sacrifice by offering the sacrificial grain-cake. As Tulādhāra had referred to the householder's offering vaguely as "this godly [practice]", the interpolator of T may have felt some additional explanation called for. In any case his interpolation shows how only a cow and a wife are necessary to conduct a successful sacrifice - resources within the grasp of a householder brahman.

1 255.3h, 38cd-39.
2 idam ... daivatan, 255.34e.
As preface to 255. T

[Jājali said: ]

35 : We have never heard this principle from the sages. I ask you about this difficult [concept], o trader, for in earlier times the seers never took cognizance of it, nor, moreover, did they establish it. Indeed with this self-resort cattle would not achieve bliss. ...
Notes to the translation

36a:  ātmatīrtha is translated cryptically as 'self-resort' partly in an effort to convey the fact that this is a shorthand reference to a concept spelt out in detail on an earlier alignment (st.39 of SWa), acquaintance with which is assumed here, and partly to convey the essence of the concept and the point of objection raised here. A translation 'with the self as one's object of worship' fails to convey the allusion to st.39.

36b:  paśavah interpreted by Nīlakanṭha as signifying 'cattle-like dull-minded men', but in view of the development of ideas in SWa and T the literal meaning is quite adequate.
Interpretation

Composed as a preface to T, this short interpolation might be dismissed as merely rhetorical embroidery - which it undoubtedly is. But in his brief three verses, the interpolator brings new life to some ideological issues which had seemed buried.

Most remarkably, although he is introducing a passage which extends and conforms with the teachings of SWa, in stanza 35 he reveals that he for one was fully aware of the fact that SWa's recommendations of private and personal sacrifice ran counter to generally accepted views of the Vedic tradition. In discussing SWa, we have argued that it is likely that the composer there was aware of doctrines contradicting his viewpoint but that he remained completely silent on the matter because of his partisanship in a dispute with custodians of Vedic ritual prescriptions.\(^1\) The interpolator of stanza 35 shows no such reticence, presumably because he was not operating under the same dialectical constraints. For him the fact that the teachings of SWa and T in particular seemed departures from Vedic tradition as thitherto accepted was a surmountable obstacle, not a fatal flaw. For us, however, it is interesting to see the interpolator admit what the composer of SWa could not.

In discussing this interpolation elsewhere,\(^2\) we have argued that the third verse, 36ab, had been

\(^1\) Pages 579-580 above.
\(^2\) Pages 192, 396-397, n.44.
intended as a substitute for 36cd. Since this involves reintroducing the question of how the sacrifice translates cattle to heaven (or, as the interpolator puts it, to bliss), we can see that the concern which had initially been expressed by Jājali is still alive in the interpolator’s mind. In his eyes, as in Jājali’s, the potential unorthodoxy of the new doctrine of SWa and now T lay in its lack of credibility in fulfilling this life-sustaining function. However it is probably wrong to conclude that the interpolator revived the question of the victim’s role in the sacrifice because he thought it had not been adequately dealt with in SWa. Since he is seen to be reacting most immediately to T, it is more likely that, considering this question important, he misconstrued T as a development of that topic, and wished to revise its introduction (36cd) to make its message clearer. By changing its context as he does, he converts T from a gloss on the fourth of Tuladhāra’s alternatives to 'ksatriya' sacrifice to a fifth alternative in its own right. The interpolator’s unspoken contention is that offerings based on cow products represent a kind of vicarious sacrifice of the cow itself. Thus, by contributing the materials of the offering, the cow is participating in a sacrifice and gains heaven thereby, as it would have done as a sacrificial victim. The subsequent alteration in many manuscripts of T’s phrase sampharati... gaur maham "the cow procures

3 255.1c.
4 K12 Ds12 D567 G1236 T1 M5.
materials for a [sacrificial] celebration", to
sāṃbhavati ... gaur makham "the cow participates in
a [sacrificial] celebration" puts a seal on the change
wrought by the interpolator of 35-36ab.
Faith, o king, is the goddess of pure light, daughter of the Sun, the giver and preserver of life, the repose of living souls. O Bharata, faith redeems a lack of prayer or a lack of understanding. A sacrifice replete with prayers and understanding cannot redeem a lack of faith. Concerning this, the custodians of tradition proclaim the verses sung by Brahma:

The gods [once] had the same attitude toward the sacrificial rites of one [who is] pure but faithless and of one [who] has faith but is impure. Having given thought [to the matter], the gods treated food [offerings] of both the miserly theologue and the generous usurer as the same. However] Prajapati told them that to do so was unjust. A generous man's [offering might be] purified by faith [or] on the other hand destroyed by lack of faith. The food [offerings] of the generous, of the miserly, or of usurers are not [ipso facto] fit for consumption [or otherwise]. He who has no faith is alone unworthy of [making] an offering for the gods. Those who know dharma know that the food [offering] of such a man cannot be consumed.

Faithlessness is the worst sin; faith is liberation from sin. [He who] has faith sheds sin like a snake its old skin. Of [all] means of purification, the superior one is inaction with faith: he who turns aside from sinful behaviour [and] has faith is purified indeed. What [then] is
asceticism, [correct] behaviour, or [affairs of]
the spirit to this man [who is] full of faith? -
whoever he may be [so long as] he has faith.

15ab This is the dharma related by the good
[who] perceive the meaning of dharma.
Notes to the translation

22a: vāgyṛddhāṁ, 'lack of prayer': /vṛddhī/ 'cut off'.

7c: /gāthā brahmagītāḥ/. Other gāthās attributed to Brahmā appear at Mbh.xii.134 and Mbh.xiii.13.4 - the latter being the most famous according to G.St.P. and M.W., no doubt because of their exaltation of brahmans. Neither passage has any topical similarity to the Ārddhapraśamsā. Note Dandekar's apt description of gāthās as "floating stanzas of popular wisdom" ("Origins and Growth", p.77).
256.19 Then, after a short time, as Tulādhāra himself went to heaven, the highly intelligent pair would live in bliss, each coming into the state appropriate to the fruits of his own works.

Note to the translation

On the syntax of this stanza, see pages 342-345 above.
After instruction by this example, what do you wish to hear further?
256.20 The purported sacrifice enacted by imperturbable, faithful, self-controlled, pure-minded [men] is not [to be] dismissed out of hand as a [valid] sacrifice. [Bhīṣma said:]

257.1 On this point men adduce this ancient tradition chanted by king Vicakhnu out of compassion for living creatures. When that lord of the earth saw a bull awaiting sacrifice and beheld the urgent bellowing of cows in the cattlepen beside the sacrificial ground, he made the exclamation: "May it be well with all cattle on earth". And as the slaughtering proceeded, that blessing accompanied it.

4 Injury is highly lauded by unprincipled, bewildered, nihilistic, doubting men [with] undeveloped [intelligence]. On the other hand the right-minded Manu declared: "Non-injury in all actions". Men do injury to cattle beside the altar because of feelings of desire. On that authority, the subtle dharma [which] should be performed is considered by the discerning [man] to be indeed non-injury, the best of all dharmas.

7 Fasting, becoming zealous [in asceticism], forsaking the [precepts of the] Revelation laid down in the Vedas, [and thus] pretending to [good] behaviour while being ill-behaved, are mean men motivated by [expectation of] reward. If men eat profane meat in the name of sacrifices, trees, and sacrificial posts, their practice is not praiseworthy, [for the use of] meat, honey, wine, fish, fermented drink, and sesame mash [as
sacrificial offerings] has been introduced by

10 deceivers: it is not enjoined in the Vedas. This
deivation has arisen from desire, folly, and
greed.

Brahmans recognize Viṣṇu in all sacrifices.
Traditionally offering to him has been made with

11 milk-porridge and flowers. Also to be sacrificed
are those [fruits and flowers of] trees prescribed
in the Vedas. in addition, anything else at all
which is fit to make [as an offering] and is well
prepared by pure, noble, clear-souled [men] is
worthy for the gods indeed.

To 257.12-13
Notes to the translation

236.20b: yuktānām ca yathābalaṁ for the C.E.
   sanyatānāṁ suṣcetasāṁ, see pp. 308-318.

20c: yajña ity [eva]: "purported sacrifice".

20d: na yajño jātu nēṣyati: literally 'is not
   regarded as not a sacrifice at all'.

257.2a: chinnasthūṇāṁ vṛṣaṁ 'a bull whose post
   was cut', i.e. for whose slaughter the yupa
   had been prepared.

5a: hi contrasts ahiṁsā with the hiṁsā of 4d,
   hence "on the other hand".

8a: vṛṣaṁ 'trees'. The significance of this
   is not clear: beside yupān mention of trees
   seems redundant.

8c: vṛthā maṁśāni khādanti: Whether vṛthā is
   construed adverbially or as the fore-member of
   the compound vṛthāmaṁsa the sense is 'they eat
   profane meat'. The meaning of stanza 8 seems
   thus to be that whether or not the motions of
   sacrifice have been gone through, meat remains
   unconsecrated because, so stanza 9 asserts,
   there is no vedic prescription enjoining the
   use of meat [in the sacrifice]. On this sense
   of vṛthāmaṁsa see Mbh.xii.214,11 and Manu 4.213.

9d: vedeṣu kalpitam probably carries the
   implication 'for use in the sacrifice' and in
   view of the preceding stanza I have taken it
   thus. For the purposes of this stanza itself
   the question is not significant, for what is
   not enjoined for consumption after
   purification in the sacrifice is a fortiori
   to be avoided in profane circumstances.
Interpretation

The Vicakhugita presents no difficulties of interpretation. It adopts an uncompromising stand against the sacrifice of cattle and concurs with Swa in attributing base motives to those who practise animal sacrifice. Unlike Swa, this interpolation is not apologetic, and is not reluctant to deny the validity of the animal sacrifice altogether. Thus in stanza 8 the interpolator states that, despite the protestations of its supporters to the contrary, the sacrifice is not in fact effective in making edible profane meat (vṛthamāmsa). The interpolator frequently speaks in terms of injury and non-injury but throughout the material injury is related specifically to the killing of cattle in the sacrifice. The opening scene establishes this preoccupation vividly; Manu's general exhortation to non-injury is immediately negatively exemplified by reference to the sacrifice of cattle; and of all the illicit sacrificial offerings he mentions, it is meat which is singled out for particular attention. In the prominence given to injury to cattle, then, the Vicakhugita resembles MNU. However this interpolation is distinguished from MNU

1 257.8.
2 257.2-3.
3 257.5ab.
4 257.5cd.
5 257.9.
6 I.e. in 257.8.
by its concern not with injury generally but with sacrificial injury specifically.

The interpolator's antipathies may thus be described. As for his proclivities, the conclusion of his composition shows that he favours the worship of Viṣṇu with non-injurious pūjā. Although the interpolator repudiates the animal sacrifice on the grounds that it is unvedic, when it comes to justifying pūjā he is much more liberal, admitting alongside the authority of the Vedas, the authority of tradition (smṛti) and simply of the usage of the good. We are entitled to think that the interpolator has indulged in special pleading on behalf of pūjā. For confirmation that this does indeed reflect the composer's mind we may turn to stanza 7. If we assume the interpolator's purpose to have been, like that of the composer of Śrāvaṇa, to damn animal sacrifice, then parts of stanza 7 are understandable: meanness and expectation of reward are appropriate attributes for proponents of the sacrifice, as also are transgression of Vedic precepts and hypocrisy. But beside these references there remains unexplained mention of fasting and (probably) ascetic penances. The condemnation of these practices as well makes sense only if it is supposed that the

---

7 257.10cd-11, although the term pūjā is not used; in conformity with 256.20 yajña is spoken of, 257.10f.
8 257.9, also 4b, 7b.
9 257.10ef.
10 257.11ef, also 10cd.
11 Depending on the interpretation of samśīto bhūtvā, 257.7a.
championing of puja was the interpolator's principal purpose, and that the attack on animal sacrifice was, in the context to which the interpolation attached itself, the most appropriate means to achieve that end.

The foregoing discussion\(^{12}\) has alluded to the fact that the Vicakhnugita, S(T)Wa, and MNU, have elements in common and that in the Vicakhnugita there is, as it were, a confluence of ideas which found their first expressions separately in SWa (forms of offering of the puja type\(^{13}\)) and MNU (radical non-injury, and a predominating concern with injury to cattle). However it does not follow from this that we may simply arrange the interpolations in chronological order - MNU, SWa, Vicakhnugita - to look for an evolution of ideas. Not only is it difficult to detect any consistency of development, but the spirit of the analysis of each passage has, I hope, shown that its interpolator was recording a particular reaction to the material he happened to inherit, expressing his own standpoint as a member of a diverse society. The individuality of each interpolation imposes an analytic discipline: only once allowance has been made for the motive and circumstances conditioning the individual interpolators' presentation of material can any valid comparative study of interpolations be made.

\(^{12}\) Page 616 above.

\(^{13}\) 255.8, 32ab, and probably 34ef.
Applying these guidelines, it becomes apparent that, for instance, no conclusion at all can be drawn from the fact that MNU condemns the injury of man by man in servitude\(^\text{14}\) while neither S(T)Wa nor the Vicakhnugītā so much as hint at it, for while the composer of MNU was intent upon cataloguing the most heinous varieties of injurious practice, the composers of the latter two passages were intent upon discussing the conduct of sacrifices. On the other hand it is potentially significant to observe that, in contrast to S(T)Wa and the Vicakhnugītā, MNU has no mention of injury done in sacrifice, because there is nothing to suggest from either the context of his interpolation or its content that his brief would have precluded or even discouraged mention of the subject by the composer of MNU. However, to be allowed to ask the question of why MNU should have remained silent over sacrifices is not necessarily to be able to answer it. Since we must argue e silentio, it becomes a matter of weighing up hypotheses.

One possible explanation of the reticence of MNU is that its composer did not consider the injury done to animals in sacrifice as worthy to be singled out for treatment, simply on the ground of its insignificance beside the magnitude of injury perpetrated through the commonplace everyday actions involved in servitude, agriculture, animal husbandry, exploitation of draught animals, etc. Yet MNU, it has been shown,\(^\text{15}\) is by no means an empirically

\(^{14}\) 25\(\text{4}\)·38cd-39.

\(^{15}\) Page 641 above.
balanced inventory of injuries; its particular concern is with injury to cattle, especially cows. Given this special interest, and given too that elsewhere the cow has the role of the paradigmatic sacrificial victim, it becomes difficult to credit that the silence of MNU's composer on the subject of animal sacrifice should spring from his fine sense of proportion. His silence appears especially remarkable in view of the fact that he does indeed mention sacrificial rites, but only as comprising oblation offering.

In this light, a second hypothesis, that the composer of MNU did not consider that sacrifice involved injury, becomes more attractive. Moreover, in view of his casual allusion to Nahuśa's oblation offering, it might also be inferred (although with less confidence) that he did not even consider the question as one at issue. Now since we have shown that MNU is earlier than SWa, and since in analysing SWa we proposed that it put forward the values of brahmans without sacerdotal functions in opposition to the brahmanic establishment, it could be concluded that the composer of MNU was writing at a time when the acrimonious debate vented in SWa was not raging. But alternatively - or additionally - it might have been that the composer of MNU was identified with what in terms of SWa would be the establishment camp, which may not have felt its position threatened: from the internal evidence of SWa itself we were able to conclude

16 255.31d; 257.2-3; by implication 255.37.
that its party spoke from a position of doctrinal weakness and social subordination. In this way it is probably permissible to use NNU and SWa together either to fix in an historical sequence the rise of the SWa debate in the brahmanic milieu of the Mahābhārata's transmission, or to round out our view of the debate by illuminating the attitudes of both parties to the conflict itself. That the conclusion remains qualified is a fault of the material; it is not because the analysis is ill-founded.
Retrospect

It is now the time to step back from the item-by-item analysis of the segmented text in an effort to discern from the distance any general ideological tendency which might be evident. Twice before we have attempted something of this kind, in the first place explaining the interest of later interpolations in the non-injury theme of the IIInd alignment to the exclusion of the ISt alignment theme,1 and in the second place concluding that the relationship of the three interpolations MNU, SWa and the Vicakhnugita did not allow the extrapolation of any trend in the association of the value of non-injury and notions of correct sacrificial conduct.2 Nevertheless, now, by bringing more material into the net and raising the enquiry to a higher level of generality, it does seem possible to discern one correlation: viz. that the later the material the more likely it is to embody that quintessentially brahmanic characteristic of preoccupation with sacrificial procedure. While this topic does not warrant a mention in the materials of the ISt or IIInd alignments or in MNU,3 it is the consuming passion of SWa,4 T,5 and the Vicakhnugita.6

1 Pages 527-534 above.
2 Pages 618-621 above.
3 See pp.539-541 above.
4 See pp.558-576 above.
5 See p.602 above.
6 See pp.616-618 above.
It figures significantly in the śraddhāprāśaṁsā where the sacrifice is chosen as the criterion by which the indispensability of faith and its paramountcy as a virtue are demonstrated. Reference to sacrifice is lacking in the brief four stanzas of P (and in its reflex R) but looms up in Q's exposition of P in the metaphor of bestowing fearlessness as if it were a sacrificial payment and in the equation measuring the virtue of not causing fear against the merit arising from sacrificing. Indeed, allowing for the fact that we are not able to determine whether P is older or younger than SWa, we may put down the rule that every substantial accretion (excepting only R) which has been added to the story on the alignment of SWa or later offers some discussion of sacrifice whereas on the other hand none of the materials earlier than SWa shows any concern with the topic. Thus there appears to be a change in the nature of the material accreted which coincides with the MNU: SWa divide.

In considering the nature of this change, the first point to be made is that it is not analogous to the change in direction of the story's development resulting from the impact of the IIInd alignment revision. The theme of the IIInd alignment was

7 256.22ab7ab, also 8,11.
8 254.29ab.
9 254.29cd.
10 I.e. excluding from consideration V, Wb, 256.19 and single verse contaminations.
11 The IIInd alignment mention of Jājali attending the fires in 255.14ab,40 is purely descriptive and not at all controversial.
consciously taken up for elaboration in MNū, SWa and the Vicakhāugaṭī. In all three cases the relationship is explicit. Although P has no direct relationship to the IIInd alignment, the non-injury theme figures in P and its reflexes Q and R. On the other hand, the IIInd alignment has cast no spell at all over T, nor over the introduction to T, despite the fact that both accretions are directly linked with SWa. Neither does the non-injury ideal play any role in the śraddhāpraśāmsā. In other words, the IIInd alignment revision has simply brought some similarly-minded material in its wake; it has not infected every subsequent accretion. By contrast, the interest in sacrifice, which might be said to follow in the wake of SWa, not only infuses materials related topically to SWa such as T, the introduction to T, and probably the Vicakhāugaṭī, but has also coloured passages like Q and the śraddhāpraśāmsā which have no connexion with SWa at all and speak of sacrifice in contexts and for purposes which have nothing in common with SWa and its dependent passages. In view of the distinction between the selective nature of the IIInd alignment's influence and the generality of the preoccupation with sacrifice there is clearly more to accounting for the latter than pointing to the presence of SWa.

Since the interest in sacrifice evident on the later levels of the text is not explicable in every case in terms of the internal dynamics of the story's

12 Note the introductory/connecting devices of 254.49, 255.1-3, 257.1, which establish points of reference.
evolution, the way is open to give factors extrinsic to the story a role. As the interest infuses accretions only later than a certain time, there is no basis for invoking some generally conceived interpolators' mentality; rather the explanation must involve a change in the consciousness of the transmitters of the tradition or, alternatively, a change of the class of transmitters themselves. Not surprisingly, it is impossible to demonstrate either of these changes purely on the internal evidence of one episode of the corpus: we are restricted to making only observations which remain inconclusive, recognizing that the power of confirmation or refutation resides in comparative analyses or independent sources of information.

The notion that a change of consciousness overtook the brahmanic circles who were the custodians of the Mahābhārata tradition has already been discussed in connexion with the contrast between MNU and SWa.\(^ {13} \)

It was pointed out there that while SWa consistently focusses its attention on the question of appropriate sacrificial forms, condemning the deviations of blood sacrifice, MNU, although listing several cruelties perpetrated against cattle and condemning cattle slaughter, gives no hint of disapproval or even concern with any question of sacrificial procedure. For our present purposes it is required only that we extend the application of our remarks on that point to cover not only SWa and the Vicakṣṇa-gītā but also the

\(^ {13} \) Pages 619-621 above.

remainder of the later accreted materials. By doing so we extend the transformation of consciousness which so narrowly identified brahmanhood with wardship of the sacrifice from the context of two or three accretions in our story to the whole history of brahmanic attitudes from the time of SWa until perhaps the fifteenth century. It would be fascinating to be able to date SWa approximately, but from the nature of our material, this is not possible.

The alternative is that there may have been a change in the class of transmitters such that from the time of SWa onwards the custodians of the tradition were closely interested in the sacrifice in a way earlier transmitters had not been. Noting that the passages concerned with sacrifice are all either younger than the ancestral text (ω) or conservatively attributable to the last alignment prior to the ancestral text, we may speculate on the significance of this near coincidence. Given that the ancestral text can be pushed back into the past only so far as the survival of collateral lines of manuscript descent will allow, the burgeoning interest in sacrifice could conceivably be roughly contemporaneous with the onset of a more scrupulous preservation of the text or a more prolific copy-making which has kept collateral versions from dying out. Could it be, then, that at the time of SWa and Q, the tradition became the preserve of scholars and scholiasts, whose interest in the Mokṣadharmaparvan

14 The earliest collated manuscript, Vl, bears the date 1516. The latest contaminations must have been incorporated in at least a first generation ancestor of this text.
was its didactic content and their ability to turn it, through incorporated and satellite commentary, into a compendium of brahmanic principles? Clearly at the time of the 1st alignment it had not had that character - for there a merchant's values and lifestyle are shown to be superior to a brahman's.
Has the attempted segmentation and analysis of the Tulādhāra episode been successful? This question may be asked and answered in two senses: on the one hand we may consider whether the treatment has been formally successful; and on the other we may wonder whether it has enhanced our understanding of the material comprising the episode.

In its formal dimension, the analysis must be considered a moderate success. It has been possible to segment the text on formal or structural grounds without recourse to assumptions of outrageous textual disturbance or of incredible quirks of transmission. It has not been necessary to assume any historical feature of the text not witnessed by extant texts: we have not had to propose that the archetype included emendations of any yet older material. Some details of the processes by which the text has reached its archetypal form may lack precise definition, but the segmentation has not left any loose ends in its account of the structure of the text. More positively, it has allowed us to align some of the segmented material according to the sequence of its incorporation. Moreover, this achievement, such as it is, has been wrought without taking cognizance of the ideological content of the materials under analysis. The temporal ranking of interpolations was deduced on grounds
divorced from any presupposition concerning the evolution of moral or philosophical values. Of course there are soft spots in the analysis. The expectation of segmentation may have led us to see discontinuity where none existed;¹ and on the other hand, the rigorous application of the test for hiatus when a postulated interpolation is excised may have led us to decline to segment where segmentation was required.² But so much of the analysis is firmly founded that such deviations are probably of only marginal significance. In its formal dimension, then, the segmentation and alignment has revealed that an analysis deduced from formal and structural grounds as foreshadowed in the opening statement of methodology is not an unattainable ideal.

With regard to interpretation, the segmentation has thrown new light on some parts of the text of the episode and the way in which they relate to one another. Because the interpretation of content has been conducted on the assumption that the segments have internal coherence of outlook, it would be fallacious to take a rewarding result as corroboration of the segmentation; but if there is more to be gained in understanding the text by considering its segments separately and jointly than by taking the episode as a whole, then the analytical procedure is at least shown to be fruitful. Certainly it has made clear some

¹ E.g., in considering 254.P (pp.156-158) where the example of Q and R might have unfairly swayed the argument. There is a danger that the working segmentation applied to ch.254 expressed by the letter code could have tended to self-perpetuation.

² E.g., in connexion with 255.9-12 (pp.210-212).
subtleties and distinctions which would not have been retrievable from the episode globally considered. The differing conceptions of dharma in the 1st and 2nd alignments and the parallel distinction of passive non-involvement and beneficent altruism would not have been deducible; nor in all probability could the fundamental conception of the sublimation of sacrifice in its cosmic role have been reasonably inferred in parts of chapter 255 without the more stringent definition of context and the higher expectations of coherence that segmentation brings. The lesson of the analysis for interpretation is, then, that any attempt to generalize the meaning of an episode must be treated with caution if not disbelief.

However, granted that the analysis has been successful within the limited compass of the Tulādhāra episode, we may still doubt its general relevance for the history of ideas. It must never be forgotten that the chronology established by aligning accretions has nothing direct to say about the antiquity of the ideas expressed nor indeed of the material incorporated. All it lies within our power to deduce is the chronological order in which material made its first appearance in the Tulādhāra corpus. It cannot be unthinkingly assumed that the chronology of the story's development will reflect chronological developments of thought at large because, except

3 Cf. Dandekar, "Origin and Growth", pp. 75-76. The point applies with less force to ad hoc compositions or compilations such as 254.NNU (see pp. 165, 167).
perhaps in the case of the 1st alignment, the story has never been a tabula rasa upon which every external influence will invariably have left its imprint. Rather, the occasion, if not the cause, of interpolation will have been the reaction of a transmitter to material already present in the story - this is a common-sense assumption which is often confirmed by the means in which new material is linked to old. Thus the story will tend to have a dynamic of its own, and the range of topics upon which comment is invited will tend to be fore-ordained. Consequently, the fact that the analysis is restricted to dealing with the evolution of a single episode limits the inference which can be drawn for a general history of ideas.

There are also kinds of selectivity not related to the specificity of an individual episode. The material which finds its way into parts of the Mahabharata corpus will reflect the particular involvements and interests of the class of transmitters in whose custody the tradition has been preserved and elaborated. It is of course open to question how far there has been homogeneity in transmitters' interests or milieu. For instance, Nilakantha or the compiler of manuscript VI will probably have approached the tradition in a

4 If new material is introduced with a question, specific reference may be made to the point of interest, as e.g. 255.1-3 or 255.36cdef and later 255.35-36ab. The question 253.12 is pro forma only. Note also the atra of 257.1.

normative spirit clearly not shared by the composer of the śraddhāprākāśa interpolation, or the reviser responsible for the Indo alignment revision. Nor can it be overlooked that idiosyncrasies of region or sect may enter a branch of the tradition hence infecting the whole, or that in different places we will find reflections of the interests of different brahmanic and even non-brahmanic classes and interest groups. The fact that all these factors are potentially covariable with the deducible chronological alignment of a segmented accretion means not only that it is not permissible to assume linear development of ideas through time as reflected in changes from segment to segment, but also that conversely when a particular class or group interest is identifiable (as in the case of the treatment of sacrifice in 255,Swa7) it cannot be generalized to all transmitters of the tradition through time. Such problems are not peculiar to the Mokṣadharmaparvan,Śāntiparvan, or Mahābhārata traditions. They are endemic in any study of historical documents of varying provenance and time; they are precisely the problems which faced Alsdorf in his survey of diverse materials. 8 It is just that the case is more complex with the Mahābhārata because it has incorporated distinguishable segments of material into its corpus in different places and

6 The pattern of spreading contamination discussed in ch.III,pt.B may reasonably be imputed to the history of the text tradition between the original (a) and archetypal (w) texts.
7 Pages 580-581 above.
8 Pages 62, 65-68 and n.8.
different times, so that the questions which generally arise when comparing the evidence of different unitary works arise in the Mahābhārata when comparing segments of single episodes. And yet the segments of Mahābhārata material have been incorporated in a single corpus, and are thus distinct but not unrelated. In this ambiguity lies the great potential of the Mahābhārata material for illuminating explication.

From the foregoing it is clear that not much can be made of the results of the analysis of a single episode. The character of such an analysis is so individual that one is constantly constrained to ask how typical of other episodes in the Śāntiparvan or Mahābhārata any development inferred for the Tulādhāra episode might prove to be. Analysis of other Mahābhārata episodes might indicate that some of the inferences drawn from the Tulādhāra episode in isolation require qualification or receive confirmation. On specific matters it would be especially interesting to discover whether other episodes which appear to express ideals of ahimsā have also been reworked to produce this impression in the way the Tulādhāra story has, and to discover whether in other episodes the same preoccupation with the sacrifice is evident in later accretions and contaminations. Overall, it would be illuminating to discover how far other passages which ostensibly deal with similar topics reveal, when segmented, constellations of ideas
similar to those evinced in the Tulādhāra material.

Would we find elsewhere the solution of sublimated sacrifice proposed in answer to the problem of sustaining livelihoods without causing death? What associations would we find between forms of sublimated sacrifice and progress along the devayāna path to heaven or release, or between sublimated sacrifice and pūjā, or between theism and pūjā, or between altruism and the harmless passivity of indifference, or between the bestowal of fearlessness and the non-involvement of self-abnegation or the reciprocity of altruism?

The insights the analysis of a single episode has given us could be magnified many times over if it were possible to compare materials drawn from complementary analyses.

What difficulties lie in the way of executing such comparative studies?

In the first place, it is a time consuming task to undertake the meticulous formal analysis which is necessary if ideological preconceptions are to be held at bay. Not until a complete account has been given of every salient feature of the text of an episode can much confidence be placed in the segmentation upon which an understanding of the parts relies.

Secondly, there is a difficulty associated with comparing materials aligned within one episode with materials aligned within another. Even within the Tulādhāra episode it was not possible to rank in time all the interpolations ascribed to the composite "IIIrd alignment" because the materials were not all
contiguous and therefore there was no formal or structural evidence from which to deduce the priority of one vis-à-vis another. The same difficulty applies a fortiori to material in separated and perhaps widely separated episodes. The characteristic Mahābhārata device for incorporating didactic material, whereby in reply to a question the narrator gives instruction or an illustrative moral tale, provides a loose emboxing structure which insulates episode from episode, frustrating any inference of dependence or priority across the dividing frontiers. Consequently insofar as comparisons of development through time can be mounted at all they will have to be inferred in the manner of archaeological stratigraphy: that is, when distinctive sequences of levels bearing categorized artefacts recur in separate sites, the strata comprising the sequences may be assumed to be contemporaneous. In view of the mercurial nature of the subject matter which has to be categorized and the fact that conclusions drawn from relationships between stratified segments are based on a compounded inference, such a stratigraphic parallelism is clearly a less controlled and objective basis for comparative study than the formally or structurally derived inferences possible within the framework of a single episode. Should the

9 So, p.180 above on P : MNU.

10 For a discussion of this and other constructional techniques, see Gerhardt, The Art of Story-Telling, ch.V (pp.377-412).
individuality of the development of episodes be such that a comparative stratigraphy proves infeasible, however, a comparative study devoid of any chronological pretension, looking only at the configurations of related conceptions, values and dogmas, may still be instructive.

A third, more fundamental difficulty may stand in the way of comparative studies: it may prove impracticable to segment other chosen episodes with the success we have enjoyed with the Tulādhāra story. As a rule of thumb, the larger the role of plot in an episode, the easier it should be to achieve an analysis based on non-ideological criteria. Lüders showed how the logic of the plot could be made to reveal inconsequentialities which, only after their initial postulation, could be invested with ideological motivations.11 In our analysis of the Tulādhāra story we have made use of plot structure to assist our identification of the Înd alignment revision,12 in aligning the concluding stanzas of chapter 256,13 and in identifying materials of the oldest alignment.14 By contrast, in the story of Dharmavyādha, where the plot closely resembles that of the Tulādhāra story, there are vastly more extensive impersonal didactic tracts which appear to lack any intimate relationship to the unfolding of the action of the story. In such circumstances, unless, fortuitously, there happen to be structural formations more revealing than the

11 Lüders, "Ṛṣyāṛṅga", p.93, on the anomalous role of the princess in the dénouement; and p.90 on the anomalous role of the bráhmans in the scene-setting.
12 See pp.117-118, 240 above.
13 See pp.241-242 above.
14 See pp.124-126 above.
standard question and answer format, or unless there happens to be formal detritus left behind by poorly engineered interpolation, it may prove impossible to cope with such tracts. It is ironical that the content of such amorphous passages may be just what is most interesting to the analyst pursuing the history of ideas.

But faint heart never won fair maiden. Only by attempting other analyses will the potentiality of comparative analytical study be revealed for what it is. A treatment of the story of Dharmavyādha would be a most promising first venture. This story shares some common ground with the Tulādhāra story in that it ostensibly concerns the ideal of non-injury and touches on some of the associated topics of concern.

15 A similar problem confronted Otto in his analysis of the Bhagavadgītā. By inference from setting and the introductory and intermediate questions he claimed to distinguish an old substratum from tracts subsequently inserted, but was not able to rank the tracts among themselves on other than ideological grounds. (Otto, Urgestalt der Bhagavad-Gītā and Lehrtraktate der Bhagavad-Gītā.

16 Mbh.iii.196-206 encompassing both 3(37,e) "The Devoted Wife" and 3(37,f) "The Colloquy of the Brahmin and the Hunter" of van Buitenen's translation since the introductory question at 196.1-13 anticipates both stories. The duty of familial respect seems to be the common concern of both stories.
raised in the Tulādhāra story. Furthermore, as just mentioned, its plot and setting closely parallel those of the Tulādhāra story: in both stories a brahman whose sin is arrogance is sent to seek instruction from a town-dwelling trader of humble status. The outward similarity is so striking that the two stories have in fact been seen as versions of a common prototype.

17 As for example: the anti-vānaprastha stance (205.7-8) which is a deep implicit theme of the Dharmavāyadā story; human concepts of dharma and the penalties of not comprehending true dharma (200.2-14); the virtue of hereditary occupation (198.19-20); the birth of good and evil men (200,29-30); the sanctification of meat and animals in sacrifice (199.9-11) and the question of whether death involves the loss of life or only its transmutation (200.23-28); justifications of animal sacrifice (199.5-10); and the question of agriculture (199.19-20). The passage 199.19-29 appears to be a dialectical parallel with the Tulādhāra story's 254.MN.

18 Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata und seine Theile, Pt.II, p.221. Cf. the linking of the stories in Dahlmann, Genesis des Mahābhārata, pp. 144-149, and Winternitz, History of Indian Literature, vol.I p.365 (vol. I, p.355). In fact in their original forms the stories probably had nothing in common except the motif of the brahman’s being humbled by learning virtue from a common man. The association of the brahman with birds in the Dharmavāyadā story and the IInd alignment of the Tulādhāra story appears fortuitous. Note that the two stories are confounded in the Padmapurāṇa story enjoining filial respect: a brahman who curses a crane (5.47.26-27) is sent by a divine voice (devavac) for moral rehabilitation at the hands of a candāla who is busy worshipping his parents (5.47.30-39), thence to a model wife attending her husband (5.47.64-67) who refers the arrogant brahman to one Dharmatulādhāra (5.47.69, 80) whose virtue is equanimity (5.47.94-95) but he too is too busy to instruct the brahman and sends him on! (Padmapurāṇa, An.S.S. version).
But at the same time the Dharmavyādha story offers the possibility of interesting contrasts by virtue of its appearance in a parvan of the Mahābhārata considered generally older than the pseudo-Epic - although of course it remains an open question whether this dating applies to even the earliest alignments within the Dharmavyādha story itself.

An initial probe into the Dharmavyādha story is suggestive of results which a full segmentation of the story might confirm. By taking account of the contents anticipated by the introductory question posed by Vaiśampāyana and by drawing inferences from the setting and development of the plot action of the story we may be able to discern the outline of the story's older materials. Both sets of information suggest that at the time of the incorporation of the Dharmavyādha story into its present context the predominating theme was the exaltation of wifely duty and filial piety, with an auxiliary theme that even those despised because of their wretched hereditary occupations have the potential for behaviour in accordance with dharma. It is interesting that neither Vaiśampāyana's question, nor Mārkandeya's narrative account of the butcher's trade, show any

19 Mbh.iii.196.11-12 relating to the Dharmavyādha story proper; also Mārkandeya's statement of intention, 196.15-19, and his colophon stanza 206.32.
20 This is explicitly stated in Mbh.iii.204.3. The brahman's sinfulness is rooted in his abandonment of his aged parents, 205.7-18ab, 206.33.
21 Mbh.iii.198.19-20.
interest in the issue of non-injury: the hero's occupation involves frightful practices which are socially degrading but not inherently sinful. Thus in the Dharmavyādha story we appear to have another case of material which at first had nothing to say about non-injury being retouched and revised with that interest in mind until the flavour of the episode was changed. A more detailed and circumstantial analysis of the Dharmavyādha episode may confirm or qualify this tentative conclusion. Whether such an analysis will throw into relief other points of similarity or of contrast, it is clear that in the Dharmavyādha story we have a body of material which may fruitfully be compared with the Tulādhāra episode.

However, until such comparative studies are undertaken, we have to remain content in the knowledge that our analysis of the Tulādhāra episode alone has permitted a fresh and more sensitive appreciation of its contents, and that its revision in favour of ahimsā and its later concern with sacrifice are prospective points for a Mahābhārata-generated history of ideas.

22 It is characterized as ghora 'frightful', but not as inherently sinful. MBH.iii.199.1-3, 14-15. Brown's remark on the unselfconscious description of Dharmavyādha's thriving butcher's trade ("Sanctity of the Cow", p.35) quoted above at p.68 is fully justified.

23 Regarding such passages as MBH.iii.198.31-33, in which the butcher/hunter denies killing animals himself or eating meat, as later accreted materials. Passages defending the butcher's killing, such as 199.4-34, similarly assume objections to the injury his occupation entails.
Beyond that, within its limited compass, this single episode has offered some suggestive comments on specific issues foreshadowed in the opening chapter of this treatment:

1 Objection to sacrificial slaughtering is revealed as a reaction against the pretensions of the officiants employed at the large-scale ceremonies of which the animal sacrifice was a part. In this respect the evidence of the Tulādhāra episode intriguingly falls in with Alsdorf's evidence of an anti-ritualist stance which was unconcerned with the issue of the slaughter of sacrificial victims. Nevertheless the evidence of the Tulādhāra episode shows that while the motivation for opposition to sacrifices involving killing may have been an inter-brahmanical interest-group conflict, the language of opposition—one might say, of dissent—is predominantly that of the ahimsā ideal.

2 Ahimsā is identified with a fundamental conception of the life-process and of the relationship between life in this world and the next, which controverted the view of life as a dynamism sustained in a circulatory exchange between this world and the hereafter in which sacrifice was an essential link. This insight puts a completely new complexion upon the reaction Schmidt proposed between the development of the notion of a chain of rebirths and the devaluation of the sacrifice

24 Alsdorf, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, pp.603-605.
in favour of renunciatory ahimsā.\textsuperscript{25} In the connexion implied in the Tulādhāra episode, the intermediacy of ascetic values is not involved.

By the same token, the Tulādhāra episode shows that there is not a one-to-one correlation between acceptance of one view of the life-process and the championing of the value of non-injury in sacrifice. Segment SW\textsuperscript{a} is an attempt to rationalize the value of ahimsā in application to the sacrificial presumption of the circulation of sustenance, not in refutation of it. This reminds us of a point too often overlooked, that the truth and virtue of the ahimsā principle has not always been self-evident\textsuperscript{26}: just as there have been defences of the sacrifice of animal victims against the challenge, so too there have been defences of ahimsā against the doctrines of proponents of animal sacrifice.

The relationship between 1st and 2nd alignment materials shows that a system of social values predicated on passive indifference is indeed distinguishable from one which conceives ahimsā as expressed in active altruistic behaviour. But equally significantly, the history of the episode shows that this distinction was not apparent to the 2nd alignment.

\textsuperscript{25} Schmidt, "Origin of Ahimsā", pp.650-655.

\textsuperscript{26} Such an assumption may have been made by Schmidt in his positing of an inevitable passage of ahimsā from the realm of ascetic life to the realm of social life, "Origin of Ahimsā", pp.654-655. It certainly underlies Alsdorf's explanation how the second section of Manu's rules of food consumption relates to the first and third sections, Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung, p.574.
composer. These observations refine our comprehension of what may be involved in Schmidt's proposed transmutation of ahimsā as an ascetic's value to dayā (compassion) in social applications.27

3a An analogous relationship between non-involvement and positive beneficence is reflected in P and Q with respect to abhaya. Comparison of these passages illustrates a distinction between abhaya as a quality of spirit and abhaya as an externalized reciprocity, while also showing that the composer of Q did not perceive the distinction.

4 On the triangle of the position of the cow, ahimsā, and blood sacrifice, the Tulādhāra episode only sharpens the complexity of possible relationships we had foreshadowed. Later in the story's development the cow appears both as the upholder of small-scale bloodless sacrifice28 and as the suffering victim of blood sacrifice.29 However, earlier in the story's development when cruelty to the cow and cow-killing appear as paradigmatic illustrations of the most heinous infringements of dharma,30 there is no hint of any relationship to the sacrifice whatsoever. Nor, moreover, is there any reference to the cow in the earlier statement

28 In 255.36cd-39 (T).
29 Implicitly in 255.35-36ab, and the Vicakhnu story.
30 In 254, MNU.
of objections to 'śatriya' sacrifice. Since this statement of objections follows in time the description of the sin of cruelty to the cow, we have — within the limited compass of this episode — positive evidence against any direct or causal relationship between cow protection and objections to blood sacrifice. It would appear therefore that the counterposing of cow protection against the blood sacrifice might be a later phenomenon, the question not being at issue in earlier debates about the sacrifice.

While inconclusive by themselves, these results have at least the power to warn us that to infer causes or origins as between abstractly conceived and generalized principles or ideals will prove a most unrewarding and self-indulgent intellectual amusement. Reality tends to be more complex and qualified than we care or are able to imagine. The rationalizations of one age may have little to do with the premisses of earlier debates; ideologies may be taken up as battle­ cries or shibboleths in conflicts tangential to the values overtly proclaimed; distinctions may be made at one time and not observed at another. Insight into such complexities is essential for an adequate history of ideas; and it is most likely to be gleaned from an accumulation of intensive self-defining studies of the kind offered here.

31 In 255.SWa.
APPENDIX

SOME QUALIFICATIONS OF THE RESULTS OF TRAUTMANN'S STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF STYLE AS APPLIED TO KAUTILYA'S ARTHASAstra

On the assumption that the Arthasastra is not the work of one hand—which it is his purpose to test—Trautmann hypothesizes that each of the books or clusters of contiguous books comprising the Arthasastra is derived from an originally independent treatise and that an 'organizing hand' who used the name Kautilya was responsible for the compilation of this material into the present form of the Kautilya Arthasastra. As evidence in support of this hypothesis, Trautmann points to the introductory statement of the text in which "Kautilya" describes the process of composition.1 After conducting his statistical investigations, Trautmann adds further evidence, presumably as corroboration, relating to references by Vatsyayana and Medhatithi which may imply the existence of a separate treatise bearing the title of Book 2 of Kautilya's work.2 Trautmann also sees the result of his statistical analysis as confirming the justness of his hypothesis of the diversity of authorship as

1 Arth. 1.1.1; Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, pp. 76-77.
between the various books; however, because there is no expectation of a standard or predictable result against which the validity of the results of Trautmann's analysis can be gauged, the particular results he obtains cannot properly be adduced as corroboration of the hypotheses which shaped the input which generated them. Finally, in order to interpret the evidence he has gathered, Trautmann invokes the analogy of Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra, pointing out that this work resembles the Arthaśāstra in style and in internal organization with divisions into books and topics alongside a division into chapters. The usefulness of Vātsyāyana to Trautmann's argument is that he provides a detailed introductory statement purporting to give information about the process of composition which strongly suggests that each of the seven books comprising the Kāmasūtra derives from an older treatise, the titles of which are given. Internal evidence in the Kāmasūtra text, in the pattern of its citation of earlier authorities, reinforces this presumption.

However, the analogy with Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra is at the very least questionable. In the first place the formal parallelism of the division into books, chapters, and topics, is not complete since, as

4 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthashastra, pp.73-74.
5 Kāmasūtra 1.1.1-19; Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthashastra, p.171.
6 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthashastra, p.172.
Trautmann acknowledges, in the Kāmasūtra all the divisions belong to a single system whereas in the Arthasastra the chapter divisions appear arbitrary and irrelevant to the division by books and topics, with which they are sometimes in conflict. (This incidentally raises a serious difficulty for Trautmann's supposition that the later 'tidying and organizing hand' of "Kauṭilya" was responsible for the compilation of the independent materials comprising the Kauṭilya Arthasastra, for the composition of Book 1.1 and Book 15, for the institution of the chapter divisions and the summary colophon stanzas which accompany those divisions, and also perhaps for the composition of one or more of the substantive books (1.2 - 14.). It does not seem credible that the mind which organized the collected material logically into books and topics and composed the survey of contents (1.1) which lists the material in those divisions, should also have instituted the chapter divisions and their accompanying apparatus. As Trautmann reminds us, the significance of the chapter divisions in the Arthasastra is unresolved. Secondly, the value of the analogy with Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra for Trautmann's purpose is dubious. Trautmann draws the analogy on the basis of similarity of prose style and

7 Trautmann, Kauṭilya and the Arthasastra, p.74.
9 Trautmann, Kauṭilya and the Arthasastra, pp.75, 78.
the shared system of internal division of the text by book, chapter and topic. But there seems to be no logical relationship between the analogous characteristics and Trautmann's essential question of whether material was compiled in blocks extending over whole books or by some more integrated synthesis. Perhaps Trautmann means to imply that the chaotic divisions of the Arthaśāstra text are a by-product of the fact that "Kauṭilya" found it difficult to manage the juggling of already extant materials, but if this is his implication, it is neither credible in view of the rational organization of the book and topic divisions, nor enhanced by any comparison with Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra.

Nor is the posited analogy of the Kāmasūtra with the Arthaśāstra profitable for consideration of points with bearing on the authorship question. The Arthaśāstra statement on composition bears no resemblance to that of the Kāmasūtra. It is nevertheless possible to argue from "Kauṭilya"'s introduction that his Arthaśāstra is a conglomerate work which supersedes previous works dealing with only

10 Trautmann, Kauṭilya and the Arthaśāstra, p.72, implies that an aim of the redactor was to achieve a certain number of internal divisions, but p.75 sees the significance of the anomalies of structure in the implication that "no single author working from scratch would be likely to create such anomalies".
sections of the whole area of knowledge, but this is not unequivocally the straightforward sense of the words used, and is not how Kangle, who had no axe to grind, understood their implication. This evidence

Extracting the implications from the contrast of ekam idam arthaśāstraṃ 'this single (treatise on the) Science of Politics' with yavanty arthaśāstraṇa purvācāryaṁ prasthapitaṁ ... tāṁ, 'as many treatises on the Science of Politics as have been composed by ancient teachers' (tr. Kangle, Arthaśāstra, 1.1.1, vol.II, p.15).

Even granted Trautmann's presumptions that there is internal unity of authorship within books and that the Arthaśāstra is a compilation in which earlier treatises have been stitched together on the analogy of the process of compilation claimed for the Kāmasūtra, Trautmann's further presumption (Kautilya and the Arthaśāstra, p.119) that contiguous books on related topics are likely to be attributable to the same original authorship is incomprehensible to me. While this conception complies with the Kāmasūtra model in assuming a number of earlier treatises each dealing with a distinct area of the subject-matter, it simultaneously rejects the Kāmasūtra model in which each book can claim derivation from a separate treatise. By suggesting common authorship of contiguous books on related topics, Trautmann is therefore implying a belief that only one arthaśāstra of a purvācārya was used to contribute material on each subject-area. Not only is there no positive recommendation for this idea, but it seems inherently unlikely and is suggestively argued against by the citation of numbers of authorities on the same questions in the polemical sections of the existing text. Furthermore, once he has rejected the Kāmasūtra model in this area, Trautmann is faced with accounting for the rationale of the book divisions in the text.

Kangle, Arthaśāstra, vol.II, p.15, note to 1.1.1: "prayāsas tāṁ sāṁprahṛtya: this implies that the work is in the main based on earlier works, though in a few places the author expresses different views. The idea in sāṁprahṛtya is that of bringing together rather than that of abridgement". Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthaśāstra, p.77, disputes Kangle's quite reasonable assumption that the plural form of arthaśāstra connotes treatises on the Science of Politics rather than Sciences of Politics. Surprisingly Trautmann does not comment on the implication of prayāsas. Kangle, Kautilya Arthaśāstra, pt.III, p.35, suggests that sāṁprahṛtya might also imply abstracting earlier verse materials in prose.
would be, at best, very slight indeed.

Another weakness of the analogy is that the citing of authorities in the Arthasastra follows a different pattern to that of the Kāmasūtra. In the Arthasastra there is no correlation of cited authorities with individual books; rather, on the contrary, there are several dialectical passages in which strings of cited authorities are refuted in turn. This evidence suggests that we should see the Arthasastra not as fitting the Kāmasūtra model, but as a consciously developed survey or debate incorporating excerpts of opinion from the Arthasastras of the pūrvācāryas. This interpretation has in its favour that it is quite in harmony with the Arthasastra's use of internal cross-references13 and the peppering of the text with iti Kauṭiliyaḥ attributions.

Trautmann notes that against his hypothesis, "[it] may be objected that the various observable features of style, the 'polemics', the cross-references, the peculiar expressions and terms, which pervade the work and give it its appearance of unity, could not have been found in independent works; .... Such well-defined features of style, because they are obvious and amenable to traditional methods of analysis, are the

13 In this respect only there is an analogy with, for instance, Manu. 3.16. See Renou, "Sur la forme de quelques textes sanskrits", pp.190 and 197n.30. Kangle develops this interpretation very cogently in discussing the method of citation of other authorities and the manner in which some opinions of the work are explicitly attributed to Kaṭāliya (Kauṭiliya Arthasastra, pt. III, pp.15-16, 52 and esp. p.60).

14 Renou, "Sur la forme de quelques textes sanskrits", pp.194 n.5 and 196 n.27(8).
basis of the general scholarly agreement on the Arthasastra's stylistic unity". He then makes the point that an observable stylistic feature such as the citation of earlier authorities is not itself evenly distributed within the text. However not only is Trautmann's evidence on this point somewhat misleading, but it is also difficult to appreciate the cogency of his objection, for only elements of style which are not liable to conscious manipulation can be expected to have consistent distribution in an author's writing. Thus his rather slighting conclusion that "[we] can scarcely expect traditional methods of stylistic analysis, therefore, to verify or falsify the hypothesis I have advanced concerning the Arthasastra's history" is perhaps an excess of enthusiasm, which might be excusable if, as Trautmann suggests, statistical analyses of style could provide objective confirmation or refutation of the hypothesis. And indeed they might - if only Trautmann were dealing with comparative statistical analysis involving works of known and unitary authorship. But he is not; and in the course of his methodological

15 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, p.77.
16 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, pp.77-78, lists a number of books in which there are no citations, not noting that two of them (Books, 6,11) are extremely brief and none of them are long. Kangle, Kautiliya Arthasastra, upon which Trautmann says he relies for the information, explicitly acknowledges this point (pt.III, p.53); he also offers explanations for the absence of citations in other books where they are represented (pt.III, pp.53-55).
17 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, p.80.
statements he has highlighted the difficulties which arise because of the lack of control samples of known attribution. Beyond applying some statistical tests which purport to confirm that his assumption of internal unity of authorship within books of the Arthasastra is justified, Trautmann did not discuss the problems which composite authorship would pose for his analysis - presumably because he did not consider the question seriously in doubt despite the acknowledged ambivalence of the non-statistical evidence. The validity of Trautmann's hypothesis, and thus of his whole study, therefore turns upon the question of whether the results of his statistical analysis prove the internal unity of authorship of the Arthasastra books as well as distinguishing between them. This question has two sides: it is necessary to consider whether the results are such as could confirm the hypothesis, and whether in any case the method of analysis has the power to prove or disprove the hypothesis.

To test the relationship both between Arthasastra books and between parts of books, Trautmann applies three criteria: the frequency distributions of ca and va; the frequencies of ca and va relative to one another; and the frequency distribution of ca and va.

18 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, pp.91-2.
19 Only ca and va occur sufficiently frequently to give consistently usable results. See Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, pp.82-83, 115, 117.
20 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, pp.84-88 and 115-118.
21 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, p.83.
compound lengths. Trautmann cautiously points out that it can only be inferred from other studies that these criteria of style will be reliable discriminators for the Arthasastra text. He is particularly ambivalent over the reliability of statistics of compound length. The key lies, therefore, with the ca and va statistics.

Now, when Trautmann compared samples drawn from within each of Books 2, 3 and 7, he found no significant differences as between the samples of Book 2 or of Book 3; however he found a highly significant difference in the distribution of va frequencies as between the two samples from Book 7 such that there is less than 0.5% probability of the variation being a random difference between two samples of the same population. Trautmann dismisses this "puzzling result" by pointing out that (a) the other discriminators give non-significant results, and (b) the contents of Book 7 arouse no suspicion of contamination. The unsatisfactory nature of these palliatives need not be laboured. The "other discriminators" consist of only the frequency distribution of ca and the (questionable) compound-

22 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, pp.130-131.
23 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, p.92-93.
24 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, p.131.
25 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, p.115, Table 4.13.
28 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, p.115 and Table 4.13. The other particles tested, eva, evam and tatra, did not produce useful data because of their low frequencies.
length distribution index; and Trautmann points out elsewhere that a non-significant result is simply inconclusive and not positive evidence for common authorship. The second mitigation (b) begs the very question which the statistical analysis of style is intended to penetrate - the detection of significant distributions where they are not obvious to qualitative or crude quantitative analysis. Having sought thus to undermine the significance of the result, Trautmann proposes to account for it as the product of "one of those 'outrageous events' which the statistician is bound to meet from time to time". Upon examination the nature of this outrage proves to be the adoption of a rhetorical style of presentation which sets out alternative circumstances or courses of action. This rhetorical device appears sporadically in parts of Book 7 and in other books as well. The distribution of this feature may be explained as a consequence of the incorporation of material from an original source in which this style of presentation was characteristic, or as having been adopted as suitable for discussing certain topics (e.g. foreign

29 Trautmann, Kauṭilya and the Arthaśāstra, p.89
30 Cf. Trautmann, Kauṭilya and the Arthaśāstra, p.78.
32 In parts of chapters 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 14, 15, 17 and 18.
33 5.1, 2; 9.6; 10.3; 12.; 13.
34 Cf. similar problems with the dialogue passages of Kalhana's Rājarānīgīti, Trautmann, Kauṭilya and the Arthaśāstra, pp.105, 108.
policy where contingencies beyond the ruler's control have to be allowed for). In the first case, Trautmann's presumption of the unity of authorship within books would be refuted; in the second case, the credibility of वा as a reliable indicator of authorship vanishes.

The second possibility inspires further comment on Trautmann's analysis of Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra. Here Trautmann's results are more consistent than for the Arthasastra: from tests of the frequency distributions of four particles and compound-length distribution he obtains reasonably consistent results showing non-significant variations between Books 1, 3, 4 and 5, and significant variations among all the remaining books. Trautmann thinks it fair to presume common authorship for Books 1, 3, 4 and 5. However, as noted above, he had also on the evidence of Vātsyāyana's opening statement on the process of composition postulated with better reason than in the case of the Arthasastra that each book of the Kāmasūtra is drawn from an originally independent treatise. How is the inconsistency to be resolved?

Trautmann proposes the following rationalization:

35 The relevant parts of Books 7,9,10,12,13 could all be said to fall into this category. However since there is a great deal of material on similar topics presented without this device, the correlation between content and style is low overall. Prima facie, the former suggestion made above seems preferable. Note the comments in broadly similar vein by Wright, "[Review]", p.208.

36 Trautmann, Kautilya and the Arthasastra, p.171.
"The statistical analysis of the Kāmasūtra shows that in the homogeneous core, Books 1, 3, 4 and 5, Vātsyāyana has succeeded in imposing his own style on the material he has reworked, while for Books 2 and 6, and perhaps the shorter Book 7, he has incorporated the existing monographs of different authors, abbreviating them but not so completely reworking them as to recast them in his own personal style; or to put it more circumspectly, he has in these cases so closely followed his originals that they have heavily influenced his style with their own. Something mediating between verbatim quotation and complete reworking must be envisaged. Since the results of the statistical analysis themselves are the only evidence for this "rewriting" hypothesis, it would be equally fair to conclude that, providing the hypothesis of separate sources for each book is accepted, the criteria applied in the statistical tests are either unreliable or insensitive discriminators of style, or of insufficient number and range to produce discriminating results.

To sum up. I believe that Trautmann's statistical analysis of style in the Arthaśāstra must be regarded as inconclusive. He leaves us with several unresolved questions:

37 Trautmann, Kauṭilya and the Arthaśāstra, pp.172-173. At this point one must also consider the point made by Burrow, "[Review]", p.199: "The question remains as to how original Kauṭilya was in his rehandling of the traditional material. ... There must have been some notable merit in the Arthaśāstra as composed by Kauṭilya to cause it to supplant all previous treatises, and this is incompatible with his having been the completely unoriginal compiler that he is made out to be [by Trautmann]".
Are the tests applied reliable discriminators of authorship, or only of rhetorical style?

Are the tests conducted on valid presumptions about the manner of compilation or composition of the work which are necessary for producing even potentially valid results?

Is it possible to select discriminators of style which will not be significantly distorted by editorial reworking? If not, can statistics of style ever be confidently applied to anonymous traditional works?

Trautmann's analysis and conclusions do not provide a refutation of Kangle's view that material from various sources is combined within the compass of single books, even chapters and topics. Kangle gives his view strong support with comparisons of details of content and, more significantly, with inferences from the method of citing authorities.\(^{38}\)
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Table I

Index to the letter code applied to chapters 254 and 255

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Mbh.xii 254.2-5ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>254.10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>254.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>254.21-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>254.27ab (Until page 133, D includes 27cdef)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>254.34-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>254.50ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>254.50cd-51ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>254.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>254.5cd-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>254.37-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>254.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>254.16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>254.27cdef-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>254.25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>255.1-27ab, 33-34, 38cd-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>255.36cd-38ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>254.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>254.51cd-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>255.40-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>(see above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II

Survey and depiction of alignments

over...
## Content

**Prague.** Yudhisthira asks Bhima about the elusive and complex nature of dharma.

Bhima replies, introducing the story of Dhrishti who achieves fantastic powers of mobility through penance. 

Dhrishti takes a walk in the forest. He then sets off to see Yudhisthira. He finds him and says:

Yudhisthira asks what penances Dhrishti had performed. Bhima assures Yudhisthira that birds nested in Dhrishti’s hair while he was sleeping. Yudhisthira then sets out in search of Yudhisthira. (12-46)

When Yudhisthira approaches Yudhisthira, the latter eloquently relates the events leading up to the visit. (47-51)

Thus addressed, Yudhisthira speaks:

Yudhisthira elaborates how Yudhisthira, a savior of kshatriyas, can only be consummated understanding. Yudhisthira begins to discuss dharma.

Yudhisthira says the highest dharma is known to all creatures and explains how his brotherhood causes a minimum of suffering.

Yudhisthira assures his audience of his sincerity, emphasizing his disinterestedness (“my great cause is always even”) and detachment.

Verses extolling fearlessness.

Yudhisthira says he defines his family’s hereditary behaviour.

Dharma is obscured by confusion.

Fearlessness leads to success.

Fearlessness leads to great rewards.

Arrows are发射ed; exceptions of dharma are contingent and not absolute.

A plan by Yudhisthira against cruel treatment of men and beasts (37-39) because the gods reside in higher forms of life (40), which avoids therefore not be said (41), Agriculture leads to cruel treatment of cattle (42-44). Above all, cows must not be killed (45-46).

These cruel practices must be recognized as such by Yudhisthira.

Reason is the criterion of right conduct. Yudhisthira again states his personal detachment.

Conclusion.

The true kshatriya sacrifice is conducted by Yudhisthira with two misinterpretations and malpractice afflicting current practices, advocating non-injurious personal sacrifice.

(106-123): on the illegibility of sacrificing for personal gain in the form of offspring.

The voluntary, implied cow-sacrifice as a higher mode of offering.

The virtues of the mind, non-violent, householders, sacrifice.

The advantage of simultaneous disbelieve: cattle cannot obtain bliss except through sacrifice.

Description of the method in which cattle products are used, but no cattle killed.

Praying with men inner resources is more effective than any outward action.

Conclusion.

To demonstrate the power of non-injuriousness, Yudhisthira tells Yudhisthira to call the birds. They alight on him and preach about his attitude.

In praise of faith (bhadraparadakam): faith is the all-rewarding virtue.

The birds urge Yudhisthira to be like Yudhisthira.

Having said what Yudhisthira has said, Yudhisthira acquires bliss (49).

Yudhisthira also test to demons.

The sacrifice of the self-restrained and selfless is unparternally valid.

In praise of faith (bhadraparadakam): without faith, sacrifice falls.

Conclusion.

Kings Visaka, rally against the cruelty of cow-sacrifice. Current sacrifice is degraded, offerings of fruits etc. are to be discontinued.
The text of the interpolation is segmented internally with direct-speech interstices italicized.

37. ye ca chindanti vrṣanān ye ca bhindanti nastakān
vahanti mahato bhārūn badhnanti damayanti ca

38. hatvā sattvāni khādanti tān kathām na vīgarhase

mānuṣa mānuṣān eva dāśabhogena bhuṇjate

39. vadhābadhavirohāhena kārayanti divāniśam
ātmakā api jñānai yad duḥkham vadhataḍāne

40. panceśu bhūteśu sarvān vasati daivatam
ādityāś canḍramā vāyur brahmā prāṇāṁ krutur yaṁ
divānitiśū varṇaṁ

41. tān jīvāṁ vibhūya kā mṛteśu vicāraṇā
dūte kā gṛhit brahmaḥ madhuny apor aṣṭadheṣu va

42. aṣṭamaṁśake ṛṣe sukhāṁ saṃvardhitān paśūn
tumā ca mātuḥ priyāṁ jñānām akrāmya bahudhā narāḥ
bhahudaṁśakulān desān nayantā bahukardamān

43. vāhāsamājītā dūḥyāṁ sidantye avidhināpore
na manye bhrūnāyatīṁ viśītāṁ tēna karanāṁ

44. kṣīṁ sūdhiv iti manyante sa ca vṛttih sudārunā
bhūmīṁ bhūmiśayāṁ caiva hanti kāśtham svomukham
tathābhividānuḥ yuktān samavekṣāva jājale

45. anānīyā iti gavaṁ nāma ka enāṁ kauṭum arhati

mahāc aakāṅkāsālam pṛṣadhro gālakham āvva

46. ṛṣayō yatayo hy etān nahuṣe pratyavedayan
gūṁ māterāṁ caḥy avadhīr vrṣabhāṁ ca praśāparim
skāryāṁ nahuṣākarsīṁ lapsyāmām tvat诃te bhavam
47. सतात्म काकाम चरोगन्धम सरवाभुतेव अपतायन
र्शयास से महाभगाह प्रायस्व एवं नि जाजाले
भ्रणाहम नाहुशम त्व अहुर ना ते होन्यामाहे हविष

48. इत्युक्ताहे ते महाकमाहम सर्वे तत्त्वार्थदार्शीनाह
र्शयो यतायाह संतास ताराभ प्रत्यावेदायान

इद्रि:न अप्वान स्नानाम अचारान इह जाजाले
केवलावरितात्तु नि:पिनान नवराथुळ्यासे
Table V: Development of ch. 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st alignment</th>
<th>2nd alignment</th>
<th>3rd alignment</th>
<th>W (archetype)</th>
<th>C.E. note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table continues with the rows and columns extending sequentially.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>51</th>
<th>absent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>uta yajñāḥ na vā yajñāḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>tata yajñāṇupāya jñāḥ [h]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7</td>
<td>ubhayatupāye yajñāḥ [h] (sic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K46 V1 B06789</td>
<td>uta yajñā utāyajñā [h]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dn14 Ds12 D238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daʒ4 Dą679</td>
<td>ubhayajñāṇupāya jñāḥ [h]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>uta yajñāṇupāya jñāḥ [h]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G36 T12 M57</td>
<td>ubhayasyāṇupāya jñāḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>ubhayāḥ syād upāya jñāḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>ubhāv asyāṇupāya jñāḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>upāya jñāḥ ['] upāya jñāḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>utāya jñāḥ ['] upāya jñāḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VIII

Paralleled texts of 254.16-19 (P), 254.27-33 (Q), and 254.25-26 (R).

...over...
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27c</td>
<td>tatas tāṁ eva karṣyath</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>yadā cāyam na libhethi</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>yadā na kūrute bhūvanam</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28a</td>
<td>tapoḥhir yajñadānaś ca</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29a</td>
<td>loke yah sarvabhūteṣuḥ</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>na bhūto na bhāriṣyaḥ ca</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30a</td>
<td>yo bhayaḥ sarvabhūṭaṁ</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>yasman nādviṣate bhūtaṁ</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31a</td>
<td>yasmat udviṣate lokah</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26a</td>
<td>yasmat udviṣate vidvam</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32a</td>
<td>sarvabhūteṣuḥ bhūteṣuḥ</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33a</td>
<td>dānam bhūteṣuḥ bhūṣyateḥ</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

Exegesis of 25/4.27-33 (Q)

27 does not parallel any part of the P material, but it is entirely fitting that such a verse should appear as the introduction to a commentator's gloss. It is a statement of approbation of the values expressed, specifically identifying them with the śāstra teachings (tatas tān ... śāstrea pravadanti). We need not be cynical to recognize in the string of epithets supplying the grammatical subject of the stanza (kavayāḥ; kīrtyaartham alpaḥleokbāḥ; paṭavāḥ; kṛtsnamirnayaḥ) the commentator's evaluation of scholastic opinion in general, and by implication of himself.

28 and 29abcd appear to offer commentary on 16 and 17, not pari passu but as a whole. Both pairs of stanzas deal with the fruits of fearlessness, but while 16 and 17 glory wholeheartedly in the power of fearlessness and indifference heedless of dogmatic concerns, 28 and 29 are more circumspect. Stanza 29 equates the practice of unfearsomeness with the sacrificial path, attributing to both the same end - viz. the gaining of a state of fearlessness. The idea that indifference and fearlessness alone lead to Brahman (see 17d) seems to have appeared a little radical to the commentator. Stanza 29 is even less enthusiastic, with its assertion that ritual actions are as efficacious as unfearsomeness and its implication that they are at least as efficacious.
The general impression conveyed by 28 and 29 is that they place the ideas propounded in 16 and 17 in a broader context which is thereby made less ecstatic and more scholastically orthodox. It may have been that the phrase of 17c karmāṇa manasa vācā was a particular incitement to the commentator; certainly in the listing of means by which one might gain the reward of fearlessness he offers counterparts to each of the elements of the phrase: 

\[ \text{tapobhir, yajñadānais = karmāṇa; vākyaiḥ = vācā; prajñāsritaiḥ = manasa.} \]

29ef paraphrases 18ab. Read literally 18ab appears to deny the existence of dharma, a rhetorical excess vexing to the scholastic mind and crying out for clarification. In 29ef the commentator interprets it, most probably quite correctly, as in fact meaning that no dharma exists which is superior to harmlessness.

30a, like 29ef, is a gloss on a difficult passage, in this case 18c. The difficulty arises from an odd juxtaposition of two uses (18c, d) of the word abhaya in quite opposed senses. In 18d abhaya is used in its usual sense 'without fear, fearless' substantively in apposition: abhayaḥ padam 'state of fearlessness'. In 18c however it has the unusual sense 'not fearsome, not inspiring fear', i.e. abhaya (18c) as opposed to the usual abhāya (18d). To read 18c with abhāya is to create a syntactic
infelicity wherein \(-bhūtānām\) (gen.) is used where \(-bhūtebhyaḥ\) (abl.) is expected and metrically permitted, and moreover to drain 18cd of any positive meaning. In 30a we find just what we would expect of a commentary: the hard readings explained. The difficult usage of abhaya\(^1\) is avoided by a paraphrase which replaces it with a clause which is quite different syntactically but which conveys the meaning precisely and without ambiguity.

30cd together complete the paraphrase of 18cd. The second occurrence of abhaya is retained, for its use in 18d was straightforward. The form sarvabhūtebhyaḥ is supplied by analogy with the sarvabhūtānām of 18c, where its syntactic context was different. The sa of 18d appears in 30c but its metrical shadow is preserved by the englobulation of sa prāpnoti to give samprāpnoti in 30d. It is interesting to note that in 25cd C has made use of an alternative rearrangement of the elements involved.

30b has no point of reference in the source material (\(P\)). Nevertheless it offers support for the assumption that in Q we are dealing with a gloss-by-paraphrase. The remarkable feature of 30b is that it is devoid of any meaning whatsoever. Now, in making a paraphrase, the commentator is restricted by the material he is expounding. To move substantially beyond it would be to misrepresent it. But at the same time, as we have

\(^{1}\)The difficulty of this reading is corroborated by the range of variants the word has inspired: 'bhavat in Tl C136; yataḥ in M1567.
seen, in elucidating 18cd the commentator has spread his paraphrase over three metrical feet (30a, c, d) leaving himself with one foot to fill to make up a two-verse śloka. Hence 30b, a foot of meaningless filling which is in its way quite a tour de force. The mahāmune of 30d is simply a less extreme case of the same phenomenon. Once the latter part of the source foot (18d) had been expanded to become a full foot in its own right (viz. 30c) the material remaining was insufficient to sustain a whole metrical foot, thus making it necessary to fill it out in an innocuous fashion.

31a and 19a need no comment.

31b and 19bc differ in form and content but are equivalent in function. In 31b the commentator elucidates the more general and elaborate 19bc with a concrete illustration.

31c offers a reinterpretation of 19d.

31d is a filler foot analogous to 30b. In this case the vacuum has been created by compression in Q, not expansion. Symptomatic of the formulaic emptiness of the foot is the repetition here of śloke following śokah at the beginning of the same stanza in 30a, used in a different sense. The point is that 30d is so much a stock filler that its component parts have long since ceased to have meaning in themselves.

Thus both 30 and 31 offer glosses rather than expository commentary, but they contrast in every other way. While 30 carefully recasts all the material it is glossing, expanding its single-verse source text, 31
is not only more brief than its source text, but is also content to reproduce one foot of the source text verbatim (31a) and in another case simply to supply an illustrative example (31b). These differences of treatment as between 30 and 31 are credibly explained as arising from the obscure nature of the material glossed by 30 and the transparent nature of that glossed by 31.

32 resembles 27 in not having a direct point of reference in P. Rather 32 is a stanza with a life of its own. The Apparatus Criticus of the Critical Edition lists other appearances of this stanza, twice elsewhere in the Mokṣadharmaparvan and once in the Anuśāsanaparvan; it also appears in Śaṅkara's Brahmasūtrasbhasya. Given this currency, it is acceptable to propose that this stanza has been added here by the commentator simply because it was a stanza familiar to him which seemed apposite to the subject at hand.

33, the last stanza of Q, falls into two discrete verses. The former verse (33ab) picks up the theme of the expository commentary of 28 and especially 29. In view of the fact that the latter verse (33cd) of the stanza is a concluding device of structural import, the former verse should probably be seen as a recapitulation designed to provide a conclusion to the stanzas of the commentary. If it is assumed that Q was not composed with incorporation into the text in mind, the discussion of pp.160-163 above
suggests that 33 and possibly also 27 would have been added by a transmitter preparing the commentary for incorporation. There is no way of knowing whether or not the same would have been true of 32.

The source of 254.25-26 (R).

On the one hand because of the intimate connexion of P with its context, and because Q can be shown to comment upon P, and on the other hand because R's variations of placement mark it as both an accretion and contamination, it has been inferred that the sequence of accretion has been P; Q; R. Although it is possible that Q too is a contamination and even that it is younger than R, the lack of disturbance in Q's placement makes this improbable unless a comparative study of readings should show that Q is better derived from R than R from Q, or R from P than Q from P.

Stanza 25 offers nothing definitive in either direction: P and Q parallel each other almost verbatim, and both are equally distanced from P by the use of the metrical filler foot jātu kimcit kathamścana (Q 30b; R 25b). The verb-forms of the second verse might be used to support a sequence of affiliation P sa prāpnoti → R sa prāpnoti → Q samprāpnoti (with Q's advancement of the pronoun sa by one foot to regularize the correlation yasmād ... sa ...).

However the variation is not significant. It is

2 Page 157 above.
3 Pages 269-272 above.
likely to have arisen through independent and perhaps unconscious scribal alteration, as witness the fact that many S manuscripts read sa\textsubscript{prapnoti} for the critically reconstructed sa\textsubscript{prapnoti} in R.

Stanza 26 is vexing. On the one hand the fact that in the extant texts Q offers a conclusion (31c) parallel to that of P (19d) while R remains curiously unconcluded places Q directly in the debt of P and rules out any straightforward derivation of Q from R. Yet against this, details of R's readings suggest a relationship with P which would exclude the intermediacy of Q. The observation that R (26ab) retains the sar\textsubscript{va} + loka compound of P (19ab) is trivial: the sar\textsubscript{va}, along with the vid\textsubscript{yan}, of R (26ab) are semantically neutral fillers which are just as likely a result of the compression of Q sarp\textsubscript{ād} ve\textsubscript{māgamat\textsubscript{ā}} (31b) to R vr\textsubscript{kād} iva (26b) as a faithful retention of an old feature of P. However the second verse of R's stanza 26 offers evidence of potentially greater substance. In P (19) types of sources of fear are set out: mṛtyumukha, vakkrūra, daṇḍapāruṣya. In Q (31b) a single illustrative example is substituted for the three generalities. In R (26bcd) two different illustrative examples are presented, and it is at least curious that they seem to parallel the first two of P's categories of sources of fear: thus vr\textsubscript{ka} = mṛtyumukha; kro\textsubscript{šant} = vakkrūra. Now, the R accretion breaks off apparently unconcluded at the end of stanza 26. The syntactic incompleteness of
stanza 26 may be put down to either incompetence in the composer or the loss from R of some concluding verse or stanza before or in the process of its first incorporation. With the hypothesis that R may be incomplete in the extant text comes the possibility that at the time of R's composition there was a correlative for dāṇḍapārūṣya as well. If all this were so, it would constitute decisive support for the direct derivation of R from P. However this potentially decisive evidence exists only as an hypothesis which rests ultimately on an assumption as to what might be absent from the extant text. So, it is still quite possible that R's composer had simply embarked upon a cumulation of examples which took control of syntax and sense.

Thus it will be seen that there are not strong grounds for overruling the probable order of incorporation which was inferred on extrinsic grounds, viz. P; Q; R. If nothing else, however, the study of P, Q, R serves to show that theoretically elegant constructs are always open to qualification in detail which may lead to fundamental challenge. In the present case, the analysis will have been muddied by the fact that the composer of the youngest interpolation, whichever that was, will have had both the remaining accretions incorporated in the text before him.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mbh. xii.254.16ab</td>
<td>yadā cāyaṁ na bibheti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.243. 5ab</td>
<td>na bibheti yadā cāyaṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 21. 4ab</td>
<td>na bibheti yadā cāyaṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.168.42ab</td>
<td>na bibheti paro yasmān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.313.33ab</td>
<td>na bibheti parāc ca yah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.App.I, No.4:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.693*.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harivaṃśa 22.40ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbh. xii.254.16cd</td>
<td>yadā nēcchati na dveṣṭi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.243. 5cd</td>
<td>brahma sampadyate tadā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 21. 4cd</td>
<td>tad ātmānaṁ prapaśyati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.168.42cd</td>
<td>yaś ca ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.313.33cd</td>
<td>brahma sampadyate tadā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.App.I, No.4:28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.693*.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harivaṃśa 22.40cd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit Text</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yadā na kurute bhāvaṃ</td>
<td>sarvabhūteṣu pāpakam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yadasau sarvabhūtānām</td>
<td>na krudhyati na duṣyati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yadā na kurute dhīraḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yadā bhāvaṃ na kurute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yadā na bhāvaṃ kurute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yadā na kurute pāpaṃ</td>
<td>sarvabhūteṣu karhicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yadā bhāvaṃ na kurute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karmanā maṇasa vācā</td>
<td>brahma sampadyate tada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**

- *Mbh.* xii.254.17ab
- xii.243.6ab
- xii.21.5ab
- xii.168.44ab
- xii.313.34ab
- xii.App.I, No.4:29
- i.693*.10
- Harivaṃśa 22.39ab

---

- *Mbh.* xii.254.17cd
- xii.243.6cd
- xii.21.5cd
- xii.168.44cd
- xii.313.34cd
- xii.App.I, No.4:30
- i.693*.11
- Harivaṃśa 22.39cd
attributed to Brhaspati
associated with analogy of tortoise withdrawing its limbs
associated with attainment of luminosity of the soul (ārṇmajyotis)
both emphasize disinterest in wealth specifically; the inversion of stanzas suggests a close relationship

Mbh. xii,254,16-17
xii,243,5-6
xii, 21,4-5
xii,168,42,44
xii,313,33-34
stanzas following reminiscent of 254,A
xii.App.I,
No,4:27-30
i,693*,10-13
Harivamsa 22,39-40
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu 10.81, 83-89</th>
<th>Mbh. xii. 254-34-41, 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. But a Brahmana, unable to subsist by his peculiar occupations just mentioned, may hire according to the law applicable to Kṣatriya.</td>
<td>*34. Even the fortunate fall upon hard times ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. [om.].</td>
<td>*35. A prescripition of dharma has been made to deal with the conditions of the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. But a Brahmana or a Kṣatriya living by a Vaiśya mode of subsistence, shall carefully avoid [the pursuit of] agriculture.</td>
<td>*36. One should be awake to other kinds of employment, reviling them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(which) abounds in injury</td>
<td>*37. Those who castrate [bulls], who pierce their noses, who make them heavy burdens, who burden them, who destroy their spirit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[which] abounds in injury</td>
<td>and depends on others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Baudhāyana-dharmaśāstra 2.4: (60) [If he learns by agriculture] he shall plough before breakfast (32) with two bulls whose noses have not been pierced, not striking them with the goad, [but] frequently caressing them.4</td>
<td>38.39. ... Men exploit even men in Sarvahā: they are made to work night and day by the infliction of beating and shackling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. [Some] declare that agriculture is something excellent, [and] that means of subsistence is blazoned by the virtuous; [for] the wooden [implement] with iron point injures the earth and [the beings] living in the earth.</td>
<td>40. [Some] declare that agriculture is something excellent, [whereas] it is an exceedingly cruel means of subsistence; [for] the wooden [implement] with iron point injures the earth and [the beings] living in the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. But he who, through a want of means of subsistence, gives up the strictness with respect to his duties, may sell, in order to increase his wealth, the commodities sold by Vaiśyas, making however the following exceptions.4</td>
<td>41. [If you would] sell these (animals) alive, a Brahman, why should you over [sell] them? dead, or over [selling] oil, clarified butter, wos, water or herbal mixtures!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 36. He must avoid [selling] ... cattle, ... 77. ... herbs ... 88. ... water ... meat ... clarified butter, oil, wax ... | }
Notes:

1. The passages tabulated are quoted in translation because it is not their form, but the gist of their contents which is to be compared. The translation of Manu follows Bühler verbatim, with one exception; that of the Mahābhārata text has been harmonized with Bühler's version where possible - i.e. in st. 64, 41.

2. Stanza 82 of Manu contradicts st. 83 and the more definitive st. 84 by recommending agriculture.

3. hīṃsāprāya - Bühler: "[which causes] injury to many beings". The translation given above is an alternative which seems to be supported by, for instance, Baudhāyana's comment in the same context, and later also Manu's st. 84.

4. The greater similarity of Baudhāyana to N on this point, but no others, emphasizes that it is unwise to assume that N was drawn directly from the text of Manu.


6. For fuller treatment of Manu 10.86-88, see Table XI.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>254</th>
<th>255</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U:</strong></td>
<td><strong>W:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49a</td>
<td>40a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idrśāṇaśivān ghorān</td>
<td>etān Idrśakān dharmaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acarān iha jājale</td>
<td>acarān iha jājale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wb:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50a</td>
<td>41a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāraṇād dharmaṁ avicchen</td>
<td>etān Idrśakān dharmaṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na lokacaritam caret</td>
<td>tulādhāraḥ praśamsati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wb:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51e</td>
<td>41a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etad idrśakaṁ dharmaṁ</td>
<td>etān Idrśakān dharmaṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praśamsanti maniśinaḥ</td>
<td>tulādhāraḥ praśamsati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52a</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upapattya hi sampanno</td>
<td>upapattya hi sampanno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yatibhiś caiva sevyate</td>
<td>nityam saddhir niṣevitaḥ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

The reasons for the differences between 254.50ab and 255.40cd are treated at pp.140-141.

255.41d is inspired by but only broadly copied from its model whereas 255.40b departs from the meaning of its model and yet, by an amazing sleight of syntax (254.49b acaraḥ acc.pl. of acara, cf. 255.40b acaraniḥ nom.sg.pres. part.P. of a car) manages to remain formally close to its model.

The table compares a continuous extract from 255 matched against intermittent but sequential verses from 254. Although the selection from 254 nearly corresponds with the units of accretion deduced in that material, drawing upon U and V but passing over G, the inference that W might reflect an old continuum U-V is inadmissible because of the presence in W of material paralleling F. The intermittent selection of 254 material must therefore at least in part be attributed to the fact that the copier was thoughtfully selective and not blindly imitative. This impression accords with that arising from the changes in sense observed between 254 and 255 analogues.

The processes of composition and incorporation of U, V, Wα, Wb are analysed more fully in pp.244-262.
Notes:

The reasons for the differences between 254,50ab and 255,40cd are treated at pp.140-141.

255,41d is inspired by but only broadly copied from its model whereas 255,40b departs from the meaning of its model and yet, by an amazing sleight of syntax (254,49b ăcăran acc.pl. of ācāra, cf. 255,40b ācaramm nom.sg.pres. part.p. of ācar) manages to remain formally close to its model.

The table compares a continuous extract from 255 matched against intermittent but sequential verses from 254. Although the selection from 254 nearly corresponds with the units of accretion deduced in that material, drawing upon U and V but passing over G, the inference that W might reflect an old continuum U-V is inadmissible because of the presence in W of material paralleling F. The intermittent selection of 254 material must therefore at least in part be attributed to the fact that the copier was thoughtfully selective and not blindly imitative. This impression accords with that arising from the changes in sense observed between 254 and 255 analogues.

The processes of composition and incorporation of U, V, Wa, Wb are analysed more fully in pp.244-262.
Table XIII A

Text-orders underlying 254.24-28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§1</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K124 V1</td>
<td>24abcdef 25cd 26 25ab 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>24abcd 27ab 25 26 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7</td>
<td>24abcdef 25cd 26 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0</td>
<td>24abcd 25 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>24abcd 26 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B67*9 Da34 Dn14 D23578 Ds12 D4 (twice) D69</td>
<td>24abcd 25 26 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 G36</td>
<td>24abcdef 27abcdef 25 26 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 G2</td>
<td>24abcdef 27abcdef 25 26 25cd 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M167</td>
<td>24abcd 25 26 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>24abcd 25 26 28cd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ignoring an earlier reading of 25cd after 19ab.
TYPE I

formula: \[25abcd 26abcd \text{ between } 24cd \text{ and } 24ef\]

hyparchetype: \[24abcd 25abcd 26abcd 24ef 27abcdef\]

variant 1: \[-26abcd\]
variant 2: \[-24ef 27abcdef\]
variant 3a: \[+24ef\]
variant 3b: \[+24ef - 25ab\]

TYPE II

formula: \[25cd 26abcd 25ab \text{ between } 24ef \text{ and } 27ab\]

hyparchetype: \[24abcdef 25cd 26abcd 25ab 27abcdef\]

variant 1: \[-27ef\]
variant 2: \[-25ab + 24ef\]

TYPE III

formula: \[25abcd 26abcd \text{ between } 27ef \text{ and } 28ab\]

hyparchetype: \[24abcdef 27abcdef 25abcd 26abcd 28ab\]

variant 1: \[+25cd\]

UNCLASSIFIED

G1 : \[24abcd 27cdef 25abcd 24ef 27ab 28ab\]
K6 : \[24abcd 27ab 25abcd 26abcd 24ef 27cdef\]
Table XIII A

Text-orders underlying 254.24-28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K124 V1</td>
<td>24abcdef 25cd 26 25ab 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>24abcd 27ab 25 26 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7</td>
<td>24abcdef 25cd 26 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0</td>
<td>24abcd 25 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>24abcd 26 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B67*9 Da34</td>
<td>24abcd 25 26 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dnl4 D23578</td>
<td>24abcd 25 26 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds12 D4 (twice)</td>
<td>24abcd 25 26 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 G36</td>
<td>24abcdef 27abcdef 25 26 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 G2</td>
<td>24abcdef 27abcdef 25 26 25cd 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M167</td>
<td>24abcd 25 26 24ef 27abcdef 28abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>24abcd 25 26 28cd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ignoring an earlier reading of 25cd after 19ab.
TYPE I

formula: 25abcd 26abcd between 24cd and 24ef

hyparchetype: 24abcd 25abcd 26abcd 24ef 27abcdef

variant 1:
-26abcd

variant 2:
+24ef 27abcdef...

variant 3a:
+24ef

variant 3b:
+24ef-25ab

B689 etc, M167

BO

M5

Ds12 D469

K7

TYPE II

formula: 25cd 26abcd 25ab between 24ef and 27ab

hyparchetype: 24abcdef 25cd 26abcd 25ab 27abcdef

variant 1:
-27ef

variant 2:
-25ab+24ef

K124

V1

K7

TYPE III

formula: 25abcd 26abcd between 27ef and 28ab

hyparchetype: 24abcdef 27abcdef 25abcd 26abcd 28ab...

variant 1:
+25cd

T36 T1

G1

T2 G2

K6

UNCLASSIFIED

G1 : 24abcd 27cdef 25abcd 24ef 27ab 28ab...

K6 : 24abcd 27ab 25abcd 26abcd 24ef 27cdef
Table XIV

A. Sukthankar's Pedigree of Ādiparvan Versions

| Source: Ādiparvan, "Prolegomena", p.xxx. The stemma of Āranyakaparvan, "Introduction", p.xiii, is not significantly different. Raghu Vira, Virāṭaparvan, "Introduction", p.xvi, differs only in combining the Sarada and K MSS. into one version. Sukthankar gives a brief note on each of the hyparchetypes represented by Greek letters, characterizing the type and extent of contamination present. The hyparchetype Ψ is the textus simplicior. |
Table XLV

B. Belvalkar's Pedigree of the Bhīṣmaparvan MSS.
"The complicated inter-relations between the versions, recensions and individual MSS. ... are graphically illustrated in the ... Pedigree, where it will be noticed that the actual MSS. have subscript numbers \( (S_1 K_2 E_3 D_4 M_5 D_1 M_2) \), while their hypothetical ancestors have subscript letters \( (S_B S_D S_N D_3 M_4) \), where the secondary letters denote the versions with which the major version is secondarily related. The connecting dotted lines indicate the direction of conflation. The upper or lower position assigned to the MSS. and to the versions in the chart has a rough chronological bearing. The Pedigree begins with the Bhārata of Vyāsa-Vaiśampāyana ... Between Suta's (or Sauti's) Mahābhārata ... and the Ur-Mahābhārata - the hypothetical ancestor of the present-day Mbh. MSS. - the poem must have undergone, in the course of oral transmission, a few further modifications and additions. All this uncertainty of text-transmission is indicated by the [broken] lines."

(op. cit., p.cxiv)

C. Edgerton's Stemma Codicum

Edgerton does not give a diagrammatic representation of the stemma codicum as he inferred it. However, the following comments show where he parts company with Sukthankar.

"The Siglum 'N'

"Following the usage adopted for other books, the Critical Apparatus of this book uses the Siglum 'N' to include all W and E MSS., that is all MSS. except S. For this book, however, it must be clearly understood that I do not regard 'N' as a historic reality. I do not believe that W and E are descended from a common secondary archetype."

(Sabhāparvan, "Introduction", pp.xlii-xliii).
Table XV

Possible paths of the infection R
Table XVI

Variant groups of Mbh.xii.254.24-27

Only significant variants are listed. Variation involving only one manuscript, variants which are purely grammatical alternatives or common formulaic fillers have been disregarded.

C.E.T. = reading of the Critical Edition. The variant group thus denoted comprises all manuscripts not separately listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 a. C.E.T. : Kl24 (synonym)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 b. C.E.T. : K6 88 (synonym)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T. : K6 BO6789 Da34 Da14 Da12 D238 (synonym)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 c. C.E.T. : V1 BO7 (syntax) : G2^2 (meaning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 d. C.E.T. : V1 BO7 T12^2 Gl2^2 MI567 (syntax, linked with c) : K7 D45679 (transposition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T. : Ds D28 : Kl47 V1 BO D4679 : Tl2^12 Gl2^12 36 MI567 (all formulaic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 a. C.E.T. : K7 D469 (meaning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T. : K46 T1 G236 (syntax) : K7 D45679 (meaning) : K2 (meaning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 b. C.E.T. : D57 (synonym)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T. : BO Da4 : K6 BO6789 Da3 Da14 Da12 D238 (both meaning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T. : D57 (meaning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T. : T2 : MI67 (? both synonymous) :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7 (meaning) : T1 Gl236 (meaning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>Text Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) K124</td>
<td>34abcd [35 36 37 38ab] [34ef 38cd] 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) other N mss.</td>
<td>34abcd 34ef [35 36 37 38ab] [34ef 38cd] 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) D57</td>
<td>34abcd 34ef [35 36 37 38ab] 38cd 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) other S mss.</td>
<td>34abcd [34ef 38cd] [35 36 37 38ab] 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) M5 (?)</td>
<td>34abcd [34ef 38cd] [35 36 37 38ab] 34ef 39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is simplified in that it disregards the omission of stt.35-36ab in several S manuscripts and the appearance of some verses in ch.256. For the full complexity of the situation, see Table XVIII, The text order of M5 is not clear from the App. Crit.
Table XVIII

Tabulation of text-orders underlying 255.35-256.22cd

KEY:

X  present in the position indicated

M  added marginally

(X)  damaged

R  second occurrence

[X]  disputed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table represents a schedule or a data table, with columns indicating different sessions or intervals and rows representing different categories or participants. The 'x' marks indicate presence or completion of tasks within each session.
### Critical Edition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>256.6c</th>
<th>256.16a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>spardhā nihanti vai brahman</strong></td>
<td><strong>spardhām jahi</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Š1 K12

- spardhā nihanti vai brahman
- śraddhām nihanti vai brahman

#### K4 V1

- śraddhā vai vardhate dharmaṁ (sic)
- śraddhām nihanti vai brahman

#### K7 D469

- śraddhām nihanti vai brahman
- śraddhā vai vardhate dharmaṁ

#### K6 BO6789 Dn14 Da12 Da4 D238

- śraddhām nihanti vai brahman
- śraddhām kuru

#### D5

- śraddhām nihanti vai brahman

#### D7

- śraddhām nihanti vai dharmaṁ
- himsā nihanti vai dharmaṁ

#### T1 Gl36

- śraddhām nihanti vai dharmaṁ
- dharmaṁ nihanti dharmaṁ vai

#### M167

- śraddhām nihanti dharmaṁ vai

#### M5

- kṛtam sarvam sadbhāve (sic)

#### G2
### Table XX

**Correlation of placement of āśraddhā material, the repetition of stanza 256.20, and the arrangement of the conclusion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sraddhā pr. placement c.e.</th>
<th>Repetition of 20</th>
<th>Recension</th>
<th>Arrangement of the conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning with 17</td>
<td>Repeating 17ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ś1K124</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7D49</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da34D57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D238Du14B09</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B78</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1G36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M167</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Stanza 20 is repeated in D6 by virtue of the repetition of stanzas 20-22ab in full. See columns 1, 2.

2. M1567 read 22cd at 15ab x 15cd but not as part of the conclusion. More precise and detailed information is collated in Table XVIII, from which this table is extracted.
Table XXI
Stanzas of ch. 256 containing śraddha forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W recension text order (C,E)</th>
<th>B,S recension text order (Vulg.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. First breakdown
B. Second breakdown

- no śraddha form in stanza
- śraddha form used in stanza
- emended in favour of śraddha

Notes:
1. The so-called Vulgate text order is a rationalized form which is in fact exactly represented only in B6. See Table XVIII.
2. The second breakdown \((B,C)\) differs from the first \((A)\) in that individual verses are grouped into blocks. Stanza 9 changes status because it is a parallel of st. 8 and closely linked in meaning to st. 10, both of which are śraddhiferous.

3. The duplication of stanza 20 in most S manuscripts has been disregarded, being judged the result of contamination.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Order</th>
<th>256.21b</th>
<th>256.22b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nrpa</td>
<td>ca bhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 K12</td>
<td>nrpa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K47 D49 D6²</td>
<td>nrpa</td>
<td>ca bhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1 B8 Da34</td>
<td>nrpa</td>
<td>ca bhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 marginally</td>
<td>nrpa</td>
<td>ca bhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6 B0679 Da14 Ds12 D236</td>
<td>dvija</td>
<td>ca bhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D57</td>
<td>dvija</td>
<td>ca bhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12 G136</td>
<td>nrṣu</td>
<td>ca ṇajale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>nrṣu</td>
<td>ca ṇajale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 sup. lin.</td>
<td>nrṣu</td>
<td>ca ṇajale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M15</td>
<td>nrpa</td>
<td>ca bhārata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

1. The listing of D6 twice results from the duplication of stt. 20-22ab in that manuscript. D6 lists readings of 21b and 22b as they occur in their Vulgate-order position; D6 as they occur in their Critical Edition-order position.

2. The Critical Edition reconstitution is undoubtedly correct. Individually the readings of both 21b and 22b have sufficient strength; in tandem they are incontrovertible. The replacement of vocatives referring to Yudhiṣṭhīra with others referring to Jājali is confined to the Vulgate-ordered texts (with the exception of G2) because in these texts the śraddhā stanzas run on from words of advice addressed to Jājali (6c: brahman). In the C.E.-ordered texts the same stanzas follow speech by Bhīśma (stt.17-19), and therefore there is no impetus for change.

3. The evidence of 22b and our comments about the impetus for emendation make it possible to account for an original nrṣa having given rise to both nrṣu (sounding similar, but not a vocative) and dvija (also a vocative, but with new reference). No such account can be constructed on an original nrṣu. Therefore the wavy line of the Critical Edition text is unwarranted. It arises from an overly mechanical collation.
### Table XXIII

**Variant readings shared by S and non-S texts in 256.20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the first position (6x)</th>
<th>In the second position (18x, 19x)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>20b:</strong> saṃmatanām</td>
<td><strong>20b:</strong> yuktānām ca yathābalām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for C.E. saṃyatānaṇām</td>
<td>for C.E. saṃyatānaṇam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1 B06789 DaJh Ds12 D57</td>
<td>T12 G1236 M1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 G36 M1567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20d:** cēṣyate for C.E. nēṣyate

| D7 T1 G136                 | T2 G2                           |

**Notes:**

20b reveals that whereas the first occurrence shares a common variant with a large body of non-S texts, the second occurrence has a uniquely S reading evincing no connexions outside the recension. It should be noted that G2 in which stanza 20 appears as part of a Critical Edition-ordered śraddhāprasāpṣaṁ nevertheless witnesses the distinctively S reading here.

20d has an undoubtedly corrupt reading. Its occurrence in D7 is yet another illustration of this text's close association with TG sources. But why should the corruption have affected the second occurrence of stanza 20 in T2 and not the first? The fact that T2 and G2 share the corruption is symptomatic of the close relationship between these texts observed elsewhere. The total absence of the corruption from all collated M texts is noteworthy.
Table XXIV

Geographic dispersal of texts at time of collation
Only hyparchetypes whose reality is positively suggested are marked with single asterisks:

*N: for reasons given on p. 294 and because of the absence of chapter-final 22cd in S

Notes:

The diagram ignores 257. (12^1-13^1) and G2

ω is a single manuscript which bears alternative denotations (\*SEW etc.) at various stages of its existence because during the stage(s) so labelled it was the ancestor of the subsumed witnesses.
Table XXVII

Provisional stemma showing infection paths of 256.20, the śraddhā material of ch.256 and the Vicakṣhru story of ch.257
The generation of variants depicted here is discussed on pages 308-319 above.
Table XXIX

Three arrangements of the concluding stanzas of chapter 256

Text order A:

witnessed in V1 alone

tato 'cireṇa kālena tulādhāraḥ sa eva ca
divam gatvā mahāprajāḥau vihareṇāṁ yathāsukham
svam svam ethānam upāgamyasvākarmacchālanirjitaṁ // 19
evam bahumatārtham ca tulādhāreṇa bhāṣitam // 17ab
yathāupamayopadeśena kim bhūyaḥ śrotuṁ icchasi // 22cd
Text order B:

without duplication of 17ab: K7 Dā69 T12 G1236 M167

with duplication of 17ab: BO B238 Da12 D164

tato 'cireṇa kālena tulādhāraḥ sa eva ca
divam gatvā mahāprājñau viharetām yathāsukham
svaṃ svāṃ sthānām upāgamyā svakarma phalanirjītam // 19
evāṃ bhuma tārtham ca tulādha reṇa bhāṣitam
samyak cāiva upālabhyo dharmaś cōktaḥ sanātanaḥ // 17
tasya vikhyātavīryasya śrūtvā vākyāni sa dvijah
tulādha rasya kaunteya Śāntim evānvapadyata // 18
[evaṃ bhuma tārtham ca tulādha reṇa bhāṣitam // 17ab]
yathaupamyopadeśena kiṃ bhūyaḥ śrotaṃ icchasi // 22cd

Text order C:

without duplication of 17ab: Ś1 K124 BO M5 and C.E.

with duplication of 17ab: K6 B789* Da74 D57
evāṃ bhuma tārtham ca tulādha reṇa bhāṣitam
samyak cāiva upālabhyo dharmaś cōktaḥ sanātanaḥ // 17
tasya vikhyātavīryasya śrūtvā vākyāni sa dvijah
tulādha rasya kaunteya Śāntim evānvapadyata // 18
[evaṃ bhuma tārtham ca tulādha reṇa bhāṣitam // 17ab]
tato 'cireṇa kālena tulādhāraḥ sa eva ca
divam gatvā mahāprājñau viharetām yathāsukham
svaṃ svāṃ sthānām upāgamyā svakarma phalanirjītam // 19
yathaupamyopadeśena kiṃ bhūyaḥ śrotaṃ icchasi // 22cd

*B9 om. 19abcd.
A. Variations in which Vl departs from the critically reconstructed reading in ch. 256, excluding stanzas 17-18 and the younger-aligned śraddhapraśamsā

256. 1b ayāṃ (C.E.) : vayaṃ  
    śritaḥ : śrītāḥ  
3a āhvaṇa : āhūya  
c paśyēmān : paśyātān, paśyētan  
padeṇa : pādaśca  
d dehe ca : deheṇu  
sarvaśaḥ : nityaśaḥ  
4c ca tvāṃ : tvāṃ ca  
d āhvaṇa : āhūya  
5a tena : te tu  
c uccāraṇa divyaṃ : uccārayantī sma  
6c spardhā : śraddhā  
15c tvā : tvāṃ  
16b yat : tat  
    d dharmavāḥ caivaḥ : dharmavāḥ caiva hi  
esa : eva  
19b eva ca : eva hi  

V1 B067  
V1 B089 Da34  
K6 V1 B06789 Da34 Dn1 Ds2 D23578  
K7 V1 B8 D469  
K6 V1 B06789 Da34 Dn14 Ds12 D238  
K67 V1 B8 Da3 Dn14 Ds12 D234089  
V1  
V1  
K467 V1 B0789 Dn1 Ds2 D235789  
K7 V1 B8 (marg.) D49  
K67 V1 B0678 (marg.) 9 Da34 Dn14 Ds12 D23489  
K46 V1 B06789 Da4 Dn14 Ds12 D238  
K587 V1 B06789 Da34 D45679 M57  
V1 G2  
K6 V1 B06789 Da34 Dn14 Ds12 D23578  
V1 B679 Da34 Dn1 Ds12 D2378 M5  
K2 V1
Superscript figures are the number of covariations of each independent variation with V1. Subscript figures are the average number of covariations for bracketed groups of texts.

himsā (6c)

spardham jahi (16a)

spardham (6c)

Duplication of 17ab

already discussed, merely readings of 6c, later

Indices of correlation plotted over other variations

conclusion: placement of 226d

supplementary notes: type-5 or type-c ordering of duplication of 17ab; incorporation of the
Table XXXI

Variant readings of 256.17a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First or only occurrence</th>
<th>Second occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 K1</td>
<td>bahusahārtham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>bahusamartham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K47, B6</td>
<td>bahuvidehārtham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D469, T12 G1236, M1567</td>
<td>bahusamartham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>bahusamartham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B06789, Dn14, Ds12 D23578</td>
<td>bahuvidehārtham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da3</td>
<td>bahumatārtham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da4</td>
<td>bahuvidehārtham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXXII

Stemma of variant readings of 256.17a (1)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\omega \\
bahumatārtham
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
*W: bahumatārtham \\
*E: bahuvidhārtham \\
*S: bahumatārtham
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
*WB: bahumatārtham \\
*WC: bahusahārtham
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Ś: K1: bahusahārtham \\
K2: bahusamartham
\end{array}
\]
Key to Stemma Charts

In addition to the symbols used throughout this work (listed on pp. xiii-xv above), certain conventions have been adopted in depicting stemmas.

Verse and stanza numbers are used without chapter identification as follows:

[254.] 10, 11, 12ab, 24, 25, 26, 27; 704*
[255.] 34, 35, 36, 38
[256.] 6, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22
[257.] 12, 13
śraddhāpraśāna/sr.pr. = 256, 20-22ab, 7-15ab
Vicakṣāmu = 257. 1-11

Draughting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copying (incorporation of infection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emendation in transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denotation of certain hyparchetypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable or appropriate source of infection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative source of infection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34ef of source text incorporated as 34ef² of infected text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition or innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the contamination paths are always drawn horizontally, the vertical placement of hyparchetypes has some reference to chronology.
Table XXXIII
Stemma and infection paths 1:
conclusion of 256 and 257 excluding VI, B9, Dn4, Ds2
(including 256.6c because of its parallelism with 256.16a)
Table XXXIV
Stemma and infection paths ii: conclusion of 256, 257
(showing N Recension only)
Table XXXV
Stoma and infection paths ill:
254, 25-26; 256; 257
Table XXXVI

Variant Readings of 255.34-39

omitting notice of certain variants occurring in only one manuscript, and marginalia in B6, B8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.F.</th>
<th>34c ide</th>
<th>34f yapa</th>
<th>35a vai</th>
<th>35a vun</th>
<th>35b tka</th>
<th>35c përra përra cëgja narakaj</th>
<th>35d milahe</th>
<th>para</th>
<th>tam tçajah</th>
<th>3ba amin</th>
<th>evúltarite</th>
<th>36x sähaj</th>
<th>36y sùr-keca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In ch. 256*

<p>| D7   |         |         |         |         |         |                                |            |      |          |         |            |           |             |
| G1   |         |         |         |         |         |                                |            |      |          |         |            |           |             |
| T1   |         |         |         |         |         |                                |            |      |          |         |            |           |             |
| G2   |         |         |         |         |         |                                |            |      |          |         |            |           |             |
| T2   |         |         |         |         |         |                                |            |      |          |         |            |           |             |
| M1   |         |         |         |         |         |                                |            |      |          |         |            |           |             |
| M2   |         |         |         |         |         |                                |            |      |          |         |            |           |             |
| M3   |         |         |         |         |         |                                |            |      |          |         |            |           |             |
| M4   |         |         |         |         |         |                                |            |      |          |         |            |           |             |
| M5   |         |         |         |         |         |                                |            |      |          |         |            |           |             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Višaj, pāriaṇīyaḥ</th>
<th>36c</th>
<th>36f</th>
<th>37a</th>
<th>37b</th>
<th>37c</th>
<th>37d</th>
<th>37e</th>
<th>37f</th>
<th>38a</th>
<th>38b</th>
<th>38c</th>
<th>Predī</th>
<th>Prakāśa, nīgajyaṃ</th>
<th>Prakāśa, nīgajyaṃ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Viṣṇuḥ, pāriaṇīyaḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table contains a series of columns and rows with various entries. The content appears to be a complex table or chart, possibly related to a specific subject or context.*
Table XXXVII
Stemma and infection paths iv:
254.25-26; 255.35-38ab; 256; 257
Table XXXVIII
Stemma and infection paths v:
Significant variations in the N recension
(254, 10-12, 25-26; 255; 256: 257)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>253</th>
<th>254</th>
<th>255</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>257†</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I original story</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II first revision</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III later revisions up to ω</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV contaminations after ω</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>(99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* numbers of verses (ślokārdhas)
† excluding 257.12-13 which have no evident intimate connexion with the Tulādhara story
Table XI

Growth of the episode

The prefatory ch. 252, present in the original text and probably not interpolated subsequently, is not included in this depiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original text</th>
<th>First revision</th>
<th>Archetype text</th>
<th>C.E. text including some contaminations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total 574 vers</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ch. 253
ch. 254
ch. 255
ch. 256
ch. 257 (excluding 257.11-12)
Table XI

Adhyāya colophon titles, chapters 252-258

252: untitled ŚI K1267 D469 V1 D08 D238 Dn4 Da12 T12 G1236 M15
  Yudhiṣṭhirapraśnah K6 Dn1 D57
  Tulādhrārajajalisamvādaḥ D679 Da34
  ācāraṇām anāikārīyaṃ M6
  ācārānekaGram M7

253: missing ŚI
  untitled G123 T12 M1
  Tulādhrārajajalisamvādaḥ K124 V1 D06789 Da34 Dn14 Da12 D23578 M57
  fājali tulādhrārasamvādaḥ K6
  Tulādhrārajajalisamvāde vismayah K7 D469
  Tulādhrārajajiḥ G6
  Tulādhrārajajalisamvāde tulādhrārasamāgamah M6

254: missing ŚI
  untitled G1236 T12 M1
  Tulādhrārajajalisamvādaḥ K1246 B0679 Da34 Dn14 Da12 D2348
  fājali samvādaḥ V1
  Tulādhrārajajalisamvāde vṛt티vigarhā K7 D5679
  fājali vāpyāhyāḥ himsārahitadharmapraśnam M5
  Tulādhrārajajalisamvāde dharmakathanam M6
  Tulādhrārajajalisamvāde satkathanam M7
255: missing  81
untitled  B7 D5 T12 G1236 M1

Tulādhāraṇa jājālīsāṃvādaḥ  K1246 V1 B0689 Da34 Dn14
Dn12 D234578 M56

Tulādhāraṇa jājālīsāṃvādaḥ saṃyāṣayogapā  K7 D6
Tulādhāraṇa jājālīsāṃvādaḥ satyātmayogapā  D9
Tulādhāraṇa jājālīsāṃvādaḥ buddhāsāminprayāśaṃsana  M7

256: untitled  Ds12 T12

Tulādhāraṇa jājālīsāṃvādaḥ samāptaḥ  81 K14 B6 Da34
Dn1 D234 G1236 M15

Tulādhāraṇa jājālīsāṃvādaḥ  K26 V1 B0789 D34 Dn4
Tulādhāraṇa jājālīsāṃvādaḥ śraddhāpraśāmsā  K7 D4579
Tulādhāraṇa jājālīsāṃvādaḥ samāptaḥ śraddhāpraśāmsā  M6
Śraddhāpraśāmsā  M7

257: colophon omitted  G2 T2
untitled  Dn4 Ds1 D7 T1 G13 M1

Vicakhnugūṭaḥ samāptaḥ  81 K12h (various spellings of Vicakhnugūṭaḥ)

Vicakhnugūṭaḥ  K67 V1 B06789 Da34 Dn1 Ds2 D2345689
Vicakhnugūṭam  M56
Vicakhnugūṭiḥ  M7
Himsāṇindana  G6

258: untitled  K6 T12 G3 M1

Cirakārikopākhyānaṃ  81 K1247 V1 B06789 Da34 Dn14
Dn12 D23456789 G126 M67
Cirakāryupākhyānaṃ  M5
255: missing  Š1 untitled  B7 D5 T12 G1236 M1

Tulādhāra-rajajalisaṃvādaḥ  K1246 V1 B0689 Da34 Dn14 Ds12 D23478 M56
Tulādhāra-rajajalisaṃvādaḥ samyaksayogaḥ  K7 D6
Tulādhāra-rajajalisaṃvāde satyātmayogaḥ  D9
Tulādhāra-rajajalisaṃvāde buddhismyapraśāmsanam  M7

256: untitled  Ds12 T12

Tulādhāra-rajajalisaṃvādaḥ samāptah  Š1 K14 B6 Da34 Dn1 D238 G1236 M15
Tulādhāra-rajajalisaṃvādaḥ  K26 V1 B0789 D34 Dn4
Tulādhāra-rajajalisaṃvāde śraddhāpraṣāmsā  K7 D45679
Tulādhāra-rajajalisaṃvādaḥ samāptah śraddhāpraṣāmsā  M6 śraddhāpraṣāmsā  M7

257: colophon omitted  G2 T2 untitled  Dn4 Ds1 D7 T1 G13 M1

Vicakhmu-gītāḥ samāptah  Š1 K12h (various spellings of Vicakhmu)
Vicakhmu-gītāḥ  K67 V1 B06789 Da34 Dn1 Ds2 D2345689
Vicakhmu-gītam  M56
Vicakhmu-gītiḥ  M7
himśanindanaam  G6

258: untitled  K6 T12 G3 M1

Cira-kārikopākhyānam  Š1 K1247 V1 B06789 Da34 Dn14 Ds12 D23456789 G126 M67
Cira-kāryupākhyānam  M5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Script Group</th>
<th>Comprising whole Sāntiparvan known to Belvalkar</th>
<th>Comprising Sāntiparvan plus another sub-parvan known</th>
<th>Comprising Mokesadharmaparvan alone known</th>
<th>Total for Mokesadharmaparvan known</th>
<th>Total for parts and whole Sāntiparvan known</th>
<th>% collated</th>
<th>% collated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (Māthila)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (incl. K)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4 or 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16 or 17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>? 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;Several&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26±</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46±</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78±</td>
<td>74±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Belvalkar, Sāntiparvan, "Introduction", pp. ix-xix

Notes:
1. by apportionment, probably about 6
2. "more than a hundred" is clearly a very general estimate; the associated figures are therefore fictions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Script Group</th>
<th>Comprising whole Śāntiparvan known to Belvalkar</th>
<th>Comprising Mekṣadharmaparvan plus another sub-parvan</th>
<th>Total for Mekṣadharmaparvan</th>
<th>Total for parts and whole Śāntiparvan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (Mahākāl)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (incl. K)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Belvalkar, Śāntiparvan, "Introduction", pp. ix-xix

Notes:
1. By apportionment, probably about 6
2. "more than a hundred" is clearly a very general estimate; the associated figures are therefore fictions