

THE PURĀṆA TEXT  
OF THE  
DYNASTIES OF THE KALI AGE

WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

EDITED BY

F. E. PARGITER, M.A.

INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE, RETIRED; LATE JUDGE, HIGH COURT, CALCUTTA

102909

*al*  
REVIEW COPY



HUMPHREY MILFORD  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO  
MELBOURNE AND BOMBAY

1913

## APPENDIX I

*The Account was originally in Prakrit.*

Proof is offered here of the statement made in the Introduction, § 15, that the Sanskrit account as it stands in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa is a Sanskritized version of older Prakrit śloka, as indicated by these peculiarities: *first*, certain passages violate the śloka metre, whereas in Prakrit form they would satisfy the metre; *secondly*, certain Prakrit forms actually occur, especially where they are required by the metre, which the corresponding Sanskrit forms would violate; *thirdly*, Sanskrit words occur at times in defiance of syntax, whereas the corresponding Prakrit forms would make the construction correct; *fourthly*, mistaken Sanskritization of names and words; *fifthly*, the copious use of expletive particles; *sixthly*, irregular sandhi. Those three Purāṇas will be dealt with first, and along with them such portions also of the Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu as have preserved the old śloka uncondensed; but the main portions of these two Purāṇas consist almost entirely of a condensed redaction, and their character will be considered afterwards.

i. As an illustration of the first peculiarity, the Mt and Vā<sup>1</sup>, when naming the last Paurava king, end the line thus (p. 7)—*Nirāmitrāt tu (or ca) Kṣemakaḥ*, 'after Nirāmitra was Kṣemaka'; where the *tu* or *ca* in the fifth syllable should be short but is long by position before *kṣ*. No one composing in Skt could end a śloka line with *Kṣemaka*, but its Pkt form *Khemaka* satisfies the metre perfectly. There can be no doubt therefore that this line was composed in Pkt originally, and that the Skt redactor restored the Pkt name to its Skt form and in so doing overlooked the fact that the change violated the metre. The fault was however noticed afterwards, because *eVā* corrects it by altering the half line to *bhavitā Kṣemakas tathā* (p. 7, note <sup>71</sup>). Precisely similar is the mistake in the line that ends with *samā bhoksyanti trīṃśatim*<sup>2</sup>, where no difficulty would occur in Pkt since *trīṃśati* would drop its *r* there<sup>3</sup>.

Again the Mt reads at the end of a śloka line, *aṣṭāvīṃśatir Haihayāḥ*<sup>4</sup>, where the fifth syllable is long by position contrary to rule; and here the literary Pkt form *viśati* without a termination would fit the metre. The Vā and Bḍ read instead *caturvīṃśat* (or *-vīṃśas*) *tu Haihayāḥ* and avoid the irregularity by reducing *vīṃśati*

<sup>1</sup> The Bḍ has lost this line in a large lacuna.

<sup>2</sup> P. 50 (*Dynasties of the 3rd Cent.*), l. 2; the differences of reading there do not affect this point.

<sup>3</sup> The phrase *ā-Manu-kṣayāt* in the Vā and Bḍ at the end of a line (p. 51, l. 8) does

not militate against this view, because the *kṣ* in the middle of this expression would have been *kkh* in Pkt.

<sup>4</sup> P. 23, l. 4: *bMt* avoids the fault by reading *aṣṭāvīṃśati*, keeping as near to Pkt as possible.

to *viṃśat* or *viṃśa* and replacing the lost syllable by a superfluous *tu*, which is the nearest approach to it. This expedient is very common as will be seen in the notes.

Next may be cited cases where a half line has a syllable too much, which would disappear in Pkt, and the significance of these cases lies in the fact that the superfluity was unnecessary since good Skt equivalents were available, if the verse had been composed directly in Skt. Thus the Bh has a śloka prophesying Viṣṇu's incarnation as Kalki thus—

dharma-trāṇāya sattvena Bhagavān avatariṣyati <sup>1</sup>.

The second half line has a syllable too much, but the Pkt verb *otarissati* would exactly suit the metre and was no doubt the word used originally, as dBh (an old MS of 1407) shows by reading *Bhagavān vatarisṣyati*, where *n* and *va* are separate letters. Many two-syllabled equivalents for *bhagavān* were available to suit the metre. Again eVā has for the first half of a line, *sapta varṇaṇi Devadharmā* <sup>2</sup>, where *varṇaṇi* is obviously a misreading of *varṣāṇi*, and there is a syllable too much; but the Pkt form *varṣū* or *vassū* satisfies the metre. To one composing in Skt *samāh* would have avoided all difficulty. Similarly bMt has the first half of a line, *aṣṭāvimsati tathā varṣā* with a syllable too much <sup>3</sup>, but the Pkt *aṭṭhāvissam* would rectify the metre; whereas one composing in Skt could have written simply *aṣṭāvimsati-varṣāṇi*, which is indeed the general reading of the Mt now. This instance may give us an insight into the process of Sanskritization, if, as the bMt reading suggests, the original Pkt was *aṭṭhāvissam tathā vassā*.

ii. Actual Pkt forms occur rather often. First may be cited the Vā and Bḍ line <sup>4</sup>—

sthāpayiṣyati rājāno nānā-deśeṣu te janā :

where *rājāno* and *te janā* are Pkt accusatives after the verb. They were misunderstood as nominatives, and the verb was altered to the plural in all copies of the Vā except eVā, and in the Bḍ. Similarly the Bh introduces the Bārhadratha dynasty with the old line <sup>5</sup>—

atha Māgadha-rājāno bhavitāro vadāmi te.

Here *rājāno* and *bhavitāro* are accusatives, hence the line is not Skt but is actually good Pali. BrBh correct the faults by altering *bhavitāro* to *bhāvino ye*. Again the Mt has a half line *prasahya hy avaniṃ nṛpaḥ* in many copies, and *prasahya vyasanī nṛpam* in some copies, while the corresponding reading of the Vā and Bḍ is *bālyād vyasaninam nṛpam* <sup>6</sup>. The Mt reading should evidently be *prasahya vyasanin nṛpam*, and points to a Pkt original something like *pasajjha* (or *pasayha*) *vasuniṃ* <sup>7</sup> *nṛpam*; but this when Sanskritized became *prasahya vyasaninam nṛpam* with a syllable too much, and so was adjusted in two ways, (1) the half-Pkt form *vyasanin* was used as an accus. in many copies and became corrupted to *hy avaniṃ*; or (2) the half line was emended to *prasahya vyasanāturam* in some copies. The Vā and Bḍ may have substituted *bālyād* (or *balād*?) for *prasahya* to rectify the metre.

Next may be cited a number of actual Pkt or half-Pkt words. All such forms cannot be deemed original, because the copyists, who were not always sufficiently literate, did write Pkt forms sometimes instead of Skt forms, but such deviations are

<sup>1</sup> Bh xii, 2, 16; omitted from p. 57.

<sup>2</sup> P. 29, l. 11, and note <sup>88</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> P. 19, note <sup>26</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> P. 52, l. 13 and notes.

<sup>5</sup> P. 14, note <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> P. 33, note <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> This would be the correct accus. in Pkt, see Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, § 405.

trivial and obvious mistakes<sup>1</sup>. It is different however when the Pkt forms violate grammar or sandhi, or suit the metre, and such are these—*uccādayitvū* (p. 53, note<sup>52</sup>), *mahāyāsūh* as a nomin. plural<sup>2</sup> (p. 51, note<sup>23</sup>) and *varṣā* (see p. 78). There are also instances of the Pkt genit. plural in °āna (p. 35, note<sup>41</sup>), and of its blending with *ante* into °ān.ānte, namely *kulānānte* (p. 50, note<sup>2</sup>) and *Aulhrānānte* (p. 59, notes<sup>51, 54</sup>; p. 61, note<sup>92</sup>). Other words appear to be Pkt survivals and not copyists' errors, such as *aṭṭitrimśat* (p. 19, note<sup>41</sup>), *athōchādyā* (p. 34, note<sup>3</sup>), *teśūcchannesu* (p. 48, note<sup>82</sup>), *samā* for *samās* before *tasmāt* in Vā genly (p. 34, note<sup>18</sup>), and *Aśakūh* in Vā and Bḍ (p. 24, note<sup>15</sup>). In an old verse lBh has *papannān uharisṣyati* (p. 26, note<sup>36</sup>), which seems more than a mere clerical error. Mistakes precisely like these are found in Buddhist Skt.

The Bhāgavata has an old verse—

yasmin Kṛṣṇo divaṃ yātas tasminn eva tadāhani  
pratipannaṃ Kaliyugam itī prāhuḥ purāvidah.

The Mt, Vā, Bḍ, and Vṣ all have this verse, but read the last half line *tasya saṅkhyām nibodhata* or in equivalent words<sup>3</sup>. The Bh reading appears to be the oldest version, because its verse is complete in itself and is obviously an old saying, whereas the last half line in the other authorities was evidently substituted to connect this statement with the following verse when this collective account was drawn up: the reverse is hardly credible. Further, one old Bh MS (lBh, dated 1407) reads *itī-r-āhuḥ purāvidah*, and this with its euphonic Pkt *r* is no doubt the original form, which in the process of Sanskritization was amended to *itī prāhuḥ* as in all the other Bh copies; here also the reverse is hardly credible. *Itī-r-āhuḥ* is the Pkt *itī-r-āhu*<sup>4</sup>. There are one or two other instances of an *r* inserted, which seems to be euphonic<sup>5</sup>; and it may possibly be that the final *r* in the nominatives of numerals is sometimes as much a euphonic Pkt *r* as a Skt *r* by sandhi<sup>6</sup>.

Similarly no doubt are to be explained the Bḍ reading of p. 62, l. 40 and the Vā readings in note<sup>31</sup> thereto. The reading in literary Pkt would have been something like *vassāna uccate Kali* or rather *vassāna-r-uccate Kali*. Turned into Skt, *varṣānām ucyate Kaliḥ* was good and sufficient, yet notwithstanding, the desire for an expedient to prevent the hiatus persisted in the Sanskritization, for *mVā* has preserved the euphonic *r*, and *bdḥVā* inserted *tu* instead. These were no doubt the original forms of the Sanskritizations, but it was perceived that no such expedient was wanted, hence most copies of the Vā dropped it. The reverse is not credible.

Most common is the use of numerals with the Pkt freedom from case-terminations, as well as only half Sanskritized, such as—*aṣṭāśūli* and *aṣṭāśīti*<sup>7</sup>, and *vimśati* often both in the text and in the notes. Some of these instances might be due to the carelessness of copyists in omitting visarga or anusvāra, but that does not account for all such peculiarities, since they are found in carefully written MSS and are sometimes obligatory for the sake of the metre. Thus the Vā and Bḍ read as the last half line of a śloka, *aṣṭāvimśati Maithilāḥ*<sup>8</sup>, and this was no doubt the

<sup>1</sup> E.g. see p. 2, note<sup>16</sup>; p. 43, note<sup>27</sup>; and these are found even in Bh MSS, see p. 46, note<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> This is possible only in Pkt and does actually occur, see Pischel, *op. cit.* § 409.

<sup>3</sup> P. 62, ll. 37, 38 and notes.

<sup>4</sup> See Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, §§ 353, 518.

<sup>5</sup> See *hatva-r* in p. 38, note<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> As in p. 43, l. 36, where the accusative would be proper.

<sup>7</sup> P. 25, l. 5 and note<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> P. 24, l. 6.

original reading because *fjMt* have it also; but the *Mt* has generally altered *viṃśati* to *viṃśās* (or °*śat* or °*śa*) *tu*. The *Skt* form *viṃśatir* would violate the metre, and the *Mt* has avoided the difficulty of Sanskritization by substituting *tu* for the final syllable. This is the converse of the first irregularity noticed above (p. 78), and many similar instances of *tu* substituted for a final *ti* will be found in the notes.

iii. Of the third class of peculiarities the following are instances. As the last half line of a śloka the *Vā* and *Bḍ* have in one place *varṣāṇi bhavitā trayah*<sup>1</sup>, and in another *tasya putraḥ samās trayah*<sup>2</sup>; and the *Mt* has in another place *bhaviṣyati samās trayah*<sup>3</sup>. In all these passages grammatical concord is violated, because (1) these are accus. expressions denoting duration of time, and (2) *varṣāṇi* is neuter, *samās* feminine, and *trayah* masculine and nomin.; but, if the *Pkt* *tao* be substituted for *trayah*, concord is established, because *tao* is both nomin. and accus. in all three genders<sup>4</sup>, and the metre also is satisfied. Such expressions could not have been composed in *Skt* originally. There can be no doubt that they were originally in *Pkt* and that, when the verses were Sanskritized, the exigencies of metre induced the redactor to convert *tao* into *trayah*, because the correct equivalents *trīṇi* and *tisrah* would not suit the metre<sup>5</sup>.

The same fault occurs in places where metre was not at stake. Thus all three *Purāṇas* read *catvāriṃśat trayas caiva* as the first half of a line<sup>6</sup>, where *samās* or *varṣāṇi* is implied and *trayas* is wrong as regards both gender and case. *CVā* attempts to rectify the discord by reading *trayam*. Similarly in another passage the *Mt* has *samās trīṇy evaṃ*, while the *Vā* and *Bḍ* read *samās tisra eva*<sup>7</sup>. It is impossible to suppose that these wrong expressions were composed originally in *Skt*, and they are intelligible as perfunctory Sanskritizations of *Pkt* expressions containing the numeral *tao*, or *tinī* which also is of all three genders<sup>8</sup>. Similarly we find the phrase *sasty-uttara-śata-trayam* used with *varṣāṇi* in the *Bḍ* and with *samāḥ* in the *Bh*<sup>9</sup>. Other instances are *saptasastis tu varṣāṇi*<sup>10</sup>, and *aṣṭāśitis tu varṣāṇi*<sup>11</sup>, where the case is wrong; *ye cānye Mleccha-jātayah*<sup>12</sup> which *eVā* has corrected to *yās cānyā*<sup>13</sup>; and perhaps *divyābdūni*<sup>14</sup> where the correct *divyābdūs* was as easy as in the *Bḍ*.

iv. Some forms of names look strange as *Skt* but are readily intelligible if they are mistaken Sanskritizations of *Pkt* forms. Thus the name *Śiśunāgu* as found in the *Bḍ*, *Vṣ*, and *Bh* appears as *Śiśunāka* in the *Mt* and *Vā*<sup>14</sup>. *Śiśunāga* as *Pkt* might naturally be Sanskritized as *Śiśunāka*, because a *Pkt* *g* often represents a *Skt* *k*: otherwise it is difficult to see how the form *Śiśunāka* could have arisen. Similarly *eVā* has *Sūnka* and *Sūnka* for *Sūnga*<sup>15</sup>; *eka-kṣatro* appears instead of *eka-cchatro*, and *eka-kṣa'trām* instead of *eka-cchatrām*<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> P. 32, l. 8. The *Mt* reads correctly *trīṇi varṣāṇi*.

<sup>2</sup> P. 43, l. 32. The *Mt* reads differently, *samā daśa*.

<sup>3</sup> P. 40, l. 15. The *Vā* and *Bḍ* omit this, except *eVā* which alters it to *samā-trayam*.

<sup>4</sup> Pischel's *Prakrit Grammar*, § 438.

<sup>5</sup> Unless he recast the line, which was obviously not attempted, except by *Mt* in the first instance, see note<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> P. 22, l. 14 and notes.

<sup>7</sup> P. 32, l. 7; but *dfjymMt* alter it to *tisro vai*.

<sup>8</sup> Pischel's *Prakrit Grammar*, § 438.

<sup>9</sup> P. 22, note<sup>46</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> P. 46, l. 7.

<sup>11</sup> P. 25, note<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> P. 3, l. 11 and note<sup>37</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> P. 60, l. 16 and note<sup>70</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> P. 21, ll. 1, 3; p. 22, ll. 15, 17; and notes thereto.

<sup>15</sup> P. 30, note<sup>50</sup>; p. 32, note<sup>47</sup>; p. 49, note<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> P. 25, l. 4 and notes<sup>14, 15</sup>.

In this class may be mentioned certain incorrect forms : thus the Vā generally reads *caturas* instead of *catvāras* in p. 34, l. 7 (note <sup>20</sup>), where the Pkt *caūro* may have been used as a nomin. though it is strictly accus.<sup>1</sup> So the Mt generally has *catvārimsad* instead of *catvāras ca* (or *tu*), which would be an intelligible mistake if the Pkt was *cattāri ca*, for *cattāri* though neuter was often used as masculine <sup>2</sup>. The plural verb *bhokṣyanti* instead of the dual in p. 50 (*Dynasties of the 3rd Cent.*), l. 2, would be correct in Pkt but not in Skt.

Vernacular names had to be Sanskritized and so developed strange forms ; compare for instance *Simuku* in p. 38, note <sup>17</sup>, and other Andhra names.

Attention may also be drawn to p. 59, l. 11, where all the divergent readings are obviously attempts to Sanskritize one and the same original Pkt statement that was puzzling.

v. The fifth class of peculiarities is a very noticeable feature of these texts, namely, the copious use of particles as mere expletives, such as *tu*, *hi*, *ca*, *vai*, &c., and especially *tu*. The lines in which two such particles occur are too numerous to be mentioned, but three and even four are sometimes found in a single line, and the following lines are cited as most illustrative :—

bhavitā cāpi Sujyeṣṭhaḥ sapta varṣāni vai tataḥ <sup>3</sup>  
 Svātīś ca bhavitā rājā samās tv aṣṭādaśaiva tu <sup>4</sup>  
 Śivaśrīr vai Pulomā tu saptaiva bhavitā nṛpaḥ <sup>5</sup>  
 sapta Gardabhinaś cāpi tato 'tha daśa vai Śakāḥ <sup>6</sup>  
 trayodaśa Muruṇḍāś ca Maunā hy ekādaśaiva tu <sup>7</sup>  
 saptasaṣṭis tu varṣāni daś-Ābhīrās tathaiva ca <sup>8</sup>  
 śātāni trīṇy aśītim ca Śakā hy aṣṭādaśaiva tu <sup>9</sup>  
 Pulomās tu tath-Āndhrās tu Mahāpadmāntare punaḥ <sup>10</sup>.

One cannot imagine that these verses were composed originally either in Skt or in Pkt with so many expletives, when the authors could easily have improved their verses by employing appropriate words denoting 'reign' or 'exist' or 'relationship'. No one composing in Skt would mar his verse and proclaim his literary poverty by such shifts ; but these blemishes are readily intelligible, if the verses were originally in Pkt as chronicles of the past and were converted into Skt prophecies. Future tenses are longer than past tenses, and if they could not be fitted into the place of the past tenses, it would have been natural to substitute expletives. Thus it may be conjectured that the second, fifth, sixth, and seventh lines ended originally with a past verb corresponding to *abhavat* or *abhavan*. Again, Pkt forms are sometimes longer than their Skt equivalents, and the substitution of the latter would have been compensated for by adding an expletive ; thus in the third line *Śivaśrīr vai* no doubt stands for the Pkt *Sivasiri*, and in the eighth line *Pulomās tu tath-Āndhrās tu* probably mean the ablat. case and stood originally something like *Pulomādo tath-Āndhrādo*, or *Pulomamhā tath-Āndhrāmhā*.

It has been noticed above (pp. 78, 80) that the particle *tu* is used sometimes to compensate for the loss of the final syllable of *viṃśati* and *triṃśati*. When the full forms of these words vitiated the metre, they were reduced sometimes to *viṃśat*

<sup>1</sup> Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, § 439.

<sup>2</sup> P. 35, note <sup>29</sup>. Pischel, § 439.

<sup>3</sup> P. 31, l. 4, Vā and Bd.

<sup>4</sup> P. 40, l. 13, Mt.

<sup>5</sup> P. 42, l. 29, Mt and eVā.

<sup>6</sup> P. 45, note <sup>12</sup>, Vā and Bd.

<sup>7</sup> P. 46, l. 5, Vā and Bd.

<sup>8</sup> P. 46, l. 7, Mt.

<sup>9</sup> P. 46, l. 9, Mt.

<sup>10</sup> P. 58, l. 7, Mt.

or *viṃśa*, and *triṃśat* or *triṃśa* and the lost syllable was replaced by an expletive *tu*. This expedient is very common and many instances of it will be found in the notes. Indeed it is hardly too much to say that the occurrence of *tu* throughout the account, if not required by euphony (see next para.), almost certainly indicates a lost syllable, and in many cases *tu* in the Mt and *eVā* has been altered to *ca* in the Vā and Bḍ as an improvement. Other instances of compensatory expletives may be surmised in the notes, such as these—*Suseṇāś c-Āntarikṣāc ca* (p. 10, l. 13) is hardly explainable unless the second *ca* has replaced the lost syllable of the Pkt ablative; and *Dharmīnaḥ sa* (p. 11, l. 15) no doubt stands instead of the Pkt genitive *Dharmīnassa*.

The use of expletives was however carried beyond necessary requirements, and they are often inserted merely to prevent two vowels from coming together, as *tv* in the second of the above-cited lines, and *hy* in the fifth and seventh lines. Skt sandhi did not require this device, but it is intelligible in Pkt. This superfluity is found in the Bh also, where it has not condensed the older ślokas, as in *śūdra-prāyūś tv adhārmikūḥ* (p. 25, l. 3).

vi. The instances of irregular sandhi may be divided into two classes; *first*, those in which the form it takes resembles Pkt sandhi and is unnecessary, because regular Skt sandhi would have been proper and sufficient; and *secondly*, those in which it consists of double sandhi in order to contract the words for the metre.

Of the first class may be cited *varṣāni 'kārayat* instead of *varṣāny akārayat* (p. 15, note <sup>29</sup>); *trīni 'śibīś* for *trīny aśibīś* (p. 46, note <sup>48</sup>); *Daśarathāṣṭau* instead of *Daśaratho 'ṣṭau* (p. 28, note <sup>5</sup>); and *Agnimitrāṣṭau* for *Agnimitro 'ṣṭau* (p. 31, note <sup>10</sup>). Such sandhi can be explained through Pkt, and it is difficult to understand how any one composing in Skt could have adopted it; nor is it probable as a copyist's error.

The second class is commoner, and we find—*bhaviṣyāṣṭau* for *bhaviṣyāḥ aṣṭau* (p. 5, l. 10); *bhaviṣyodayanas* for *bhaviṣyāḥ Udayanas* (p. 7, l. 23); *Yavanāṣṭau* for *Yavanāḥ aṣṭau* (p. 45, l. 4; p. 47, l. 10); and *bhāvīyānyāḥ* for *bhāvīyāḥ anyāḥ* (p. 47, l. 13). Here ordinary sandhi would have given a superfluous syllable, and the double sandhi rectifies the metre; but the significance of it is that it was easily avoidable in Skt, because the first two phrases might have been written *bhāvino 'ṣṭau* and *bhavitṛḥ Udayanas*. The simplest explanation seems to be, that the conversion of the Pkt past tense into the Skt future was made perfunctorily, and overloaded the verse with a superfluous syllable which was adjusted by the double sandhi. The third phrase would have been *Yonā attha* in Pkt, and the Sanskritization of *Yonā* into *Yavanāḥ* produced the difficulty of the extra syllable. Attempts at improvement were made; see p. 45, note <sup>16</sup>. There are many similar instances, such as *tatōtsādyā* and *tatōtpātyā* (p. 34, notes <sup>3, 5</sup>); *atōdīhrtyā* and *tatōdīhrtyā* (p. 38, note <sup>4</sup>).

Crisis of this kind is ordinarily explained as *ūrṣa-sandhi*, but this explanation is manifestly untenable here <sup>1</sup>. All these irregularities are readily intelligible on the two suppositions, that Pkt words were converted into their Skt equivalents, and that past tenses were changed to futures, with the metrical difficulties that naturally ensued.

vii. All these peculiarities are found in the Mt, Vā, and Bḍ throughout, and show that their version must have been composed originally in Pkt ślokas and that the ślokas were Sanskritized for incorporation in the Bhaviṣya, from which the Mt

<sup>1</sup> In the Purāṇas what is called *ūrṣa-sandhi* is really Prakrit sandhi; see p. 20, note <sup>2</sup>.

and Vā confessedly, and the Bḍ impliedly, borrowed their accounts (see Introdn. §7). The Prakritisms which have been cited are not mere casual variations, for such might be due to the ignorance or carelessness of copyists, but have an important *raison d'être* in the verse in many cases. The same conclusion holds good for the Vṣ and Bh in the passages where they have preserved the old śloka form.

viii. The main part of the Viṣṇu account is in prose and, not being affected by the exigencies of metre, runs in ordinary Skt, and displays no verbal peculiarities. It contains the same matter found in the Vā and Bḍ but in a condensed shape, and closes its account where they end, so that it must have been composed directly in Skt from them or their original, the revised version in the Bhaviṣya, for it is not probable that its account was a new and independent compilation, when the compilations in those Purāṇas were available. A difference may be noticed in its account to this extent that the dynastic matter is generally narrated in curt sentences, often without regard for sandhi<sup>1</sup>, and that the subsequent matter of the evils of the Kali age is in ordinary good prose Skt with a predilection for compound phrases. Hence it would seem that the dynastic portion was an earlier and somewhat crude condensation, and that the latter portion was an addition made with regard to the canons of good prose.

ix. The Bhāgavata account, which is mainly a condensation, is evidently a later redaction. Peculiarities of the kinds noticed above do not appear therein, but it is in good Sanskrit, and phrases occur in it which indicate that it must have been composed directly in Skt. Two are especially significant. A śloka line ends with the words *ekādaśa kṣitim* (p. 48, note<sup>77</sup>), where the *śa* is long by position before *kṣ* as it should be, but would not have been long in Pkt in which *kṣ* would have become *kh*; so that this line must have been composed in Skt and not in Pkt. Similarly another line ends *iti śrutak* (p. 32, note<sup>45</sup>), where the second *i* is long by position in Skt but would not have been so in Pkt.

x. The Garuḍa has no Prakritisms except in some of the names, and these are too uncertain a basis on which to argue, for those Prakritisms might be original or might be due to the carelessness of copyists, yet one name certainly seems somewhat suggestive<sup>2</sup>. All that is clear is that its account is the last and concisest redaction, that it was probably composed afresh in Skt, and that it makes frequent use of the termination *ka* for the sake of the metre. Its treatment of the name Adhiśimakṛṣṇa suggests that it was composed from a bare list of kings, for it divides the name into two, *Adhiśīma + ka* (ending one line) and *Kṛṣṇa* (beginning the next line)<sup>3</sup>—which seems inexplicable unless it had only a prose list and chopped the names up into groups for each line.

<sup>1</sup> As in p. 18, note<sup>7</sup>; p. 30, note<sup>46</sup>; and in these curt sentences *tasyāpi Aśoka-wardhanaḥ, tataś ca Ariṣṭakarmā, and tasmāt Yajñaśrīḥ*.

<sup>2</sup> *Dṛḍhasenaka* appears as *Datḥasenaka* in

*abGr*, which may be a faulty Sanskritization of the Pkt *Dadhasena + ka*, though it might also be the form of that name in one kind of Pkt; see p. 16, note<sup>75</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 4, note<sup>10</sup>.

## APPENDIX II

### *The Oldest Scripts used in the Account.*

Mistakes are found in the MSS, which can, it seems, be only explained satisfactorily by supposing that they arose out of misreadings of the ancient scripts (see *Introdn.* § 26). Some mistakes are obviously mere clerical blunders, but others cannot be accounted for naturally in that way. Kharoṣṭhī being the oldest Indian script that we know of, mistakes that could be traced to misreadings of its letters would be most significant. Such instances may singly be open to some distrust, but collectively they would have cumulative force; and without pronouncing a positive opinion, it does yet seem to me that certain misreadings do point to Kharoṣṭhī as their source. Such mistakes may prevail in many MSS, if they passed undetected from the beginning; otherwise they may only occur in single MSS, having been corrected in all the others.

i. First may be cited an instance from the V<sub>§</sub>, because it affords the best illustration of a misreading that seems significant, though the V<sub>§</sub> does not contain the oldest version. It calls Aśoka generally Aśokavardhana, but *kV<sub>§</sub>* has *Ayośokavardhana* (p. 28, note <sup>28</sup>). Here *yo* is obviously a misreading of *śo*; the copyist read the *śo* as *yo* and wrote *yo*, then he (or some one else) perceived the mistake and wrote or inserted *śo* in the copy, but the *yo* was not cancelled and the erroneous name *Ayośoka* remained and was repeated till it appears in *kV<sub>§</sub>*. Now *śo* could not be mistakenly read as *yo* in any Indian script except Kharoṣṭhī, and in that *śo* and *yo* were often written so much alike, that it is very difficult at times to say merely from the shape which letter was meant. Hence it seems reasonably certain that this passage in the Viṣṇu must have been originally taken from a Kharoṣṭhī MS. Had this mistake occurred in verse, the extra syllable would probably have been detected and the error corrected, but there was no such check in the prose of the V<sub>§</sub>, and the mistake might have been followed in one copy (from which was descended *kV<sub>§</sub>*) though rectified in others.

Other misreadings of *ś* and *y* occur, namely—*Ayoda* for *Aśoka* in *lMt*<sup>1</sup>, where the second misreading of *k* as *ā* might have arisen later in the Gupta script<sup>2</sup>; *Māgadhēso* in *jMt*<sup>3</sup> where the more general readings are *Māgadhā ye*, *Māgadho yo* or *Māgadheya*; *Koyāla* in *cgV<sub>§</sub>*<sup>4</sup> for *Kośala*, where *yā* might easily be read for *śa* because Kharoṣṭhī often did not distinguish between long and short vowels; and *Sāliyūka* in *eVā* for *Sāliśūka*<sup>5</sup>; *Maurya dayo daśa* in *lV<sub>§</sub>*<sup>6</sup>, where *daśa* was probably first misread and written as *daya*, which was afterwards amended so as to read *Maury-ālayo* incorrectly.

ii. Some similar variations seem to point to the same conclusion. The *Mt*

<sup>1</sup> P. 27, note <sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> See Bühler's *Ind. Palaeog.*, Table IV, cols. xxi, xxiii, and Table V, cols. viii, ix.

<sup>3</sup> P. 14, note <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> P. 54, note <sup>20</sup>. *Koyāla* is an error in writing, different from *Koj'ala* which was

a variation of *Kausalya* in pronunciation; see *Actes du XIV<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Orientalistes*, Alger, 1905, p. 217.

<sup>5</sup> P. 29, note <sup>27</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> P. 30, note <sup>46</sup>.

reading, *Kāśeyās*, appears in *djMt* as *Kāleyās*; and the mistake of *l* for *ś* seems best explainable by their similarity in Kharoṣṭhī. The *Vā* and *Bḍ* read *Kālakās*, which is probably a similar misreading of the equivalent name *Kāsakās*<sup>1</sup>.

iii. Two other letters which might be confused in Kharoṣṭhī but not in any other script are *k* and *bh*, and there are some variations which seem to have so originated. The *Vā* generally, and the *Mt* sometimes, have *Tvūga* instead of *Svūga*<sup>2</sup>, a misreading the cause of which is not clear<sup>3</sup>, but the name *Svūgabhrtya* is generally corrupted to *Tvūgakrtya* in the *Vā*, while *eVā* alone among the *Vā* MSS has preserved it nearly right as *Svūgavrtya*<sup>4</sup>. Here it seems certain that *bh* was misread as *k* in a Kharoṣṭhī MS. The converse appears to be the cause of the faulty *Mt* reading in p. 41, line 22, where *saumyo bhaviṣyati*, with no mention of the length of the reign, seems to be a misreading of the *Vā* and *Bḍ* reading *so 'py eka-viṃśatiṃ*, for, while *saumyo* might be a later mistake and emendation for *so'pye*, *bhaviṣyati* could be a misreading of *ka-viṃśati* in Kharoṣṭhī only. The two forms would be *bhavissati* and *ka-viṣati* in Pali and probably also in literary Pkt, and these two would be almost identical in Kharoṣṭhī which generally wrote long and short vowels alike and doubled letters as single.

iv. As regards Brāhmī, I have not found any variations of importance which can be assigned definitely to misreadings of it, and there is not the same scope for detecting such errors, because there is more resemblance between Brāhmī and Gupta letters than between them and Kharoṣṭhī. All the mistakes that I have detected, which might be attributed to misreadings of Brāhmī letters, might equally well, or even better, be attributed to misreadings of Gupta letters. Hence it seems to me, speaking with diffidence, that no light is thrown by Brāhmī on the age of the account or the MSS, and that, so far as the negative argument is of weight, Brāhmī writing played no part in the early MSS of these dynastic accounts. If this be so, the accounts passed from Kharoṣṭhī into the Gupta script.

v. If these explanations of these variations be reasonable and not fanciful, it appears that the *Mt*, *Vā*, and *Vṣ* all betray the fact that their accounts were originally copied from MSS written in Kharoṣṭhī. This script was in use till A.D. 300, or perhaps even half a century later<sup>5</sup>. This conclusion would, as regards the *Mt* and *Vā*, agree with the period assigned to them<sup>6</sup>. There is no further indication regarding the date of the *Vṣ*, and as Kharoṣṭhī MSS would have lasted some centuries, the *Vṣ* account might well be later and yet have been extracted from such a MS. There has been no opportunity of testing the *Bḍ* account in this way, because I have not been able to collate any MS of it; and the printed edition betrays no misreadings of this kind; but it is so closely like the *Vā* that the same conclusion probably holds good for it.

vi. Nor have I found any variations in the Bhāgavata which point to misreadings of Kharoṣṭhī or even of Brāhmī. I have noticed only two peculiarities which may perhaps be significant.

In the list of Andhra kings Hāla was succeeded by a king whose name consisted of four syllables, the best supported forms of which are Mantalaka or

<sup>1</sup> P. 23, note<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> P. 32, note<sup>47</sup>; p. 33, note<sup>52</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps through the Pkt form *Svūga*; *s* carelessly made might be read as *t* in Kharoṣṭhī. The mistake is ancient as it is

found so widely.

<sup>4</sup> P. 34, note<sup>25</sup>; *vrtiya* might be a modern misreading of *krtya*.

<sup>5</sup> JRAS, 1907, pp. 184-5.

<sup>6</sup> See Introdn. §§ 21-24.

Pattalaka<sup>1</sup>. The Bh calls them *Hāleya* and *Talaka* respectively, *Hāleya* ending the first half of a line and *Talaka* beginning the second half, thus:—

Aniṣṭakarmā Hāleyas Talakas tasya cātmajaḥ.

These two names seem to be mistakes for *Hāla* and *Pattalaka*, the *pa* being misread as *ya*. If so, the wrong division of these two names in the middle of a line seems only explicable on the supposition that the Bh prepared this verse from a bare prose list of kings and divided the letters of the two names incorrectly. If this suggestion has any validity, it would appear that the Bh could not have been composed till after the time when *y* approximated to *p* in shape, that is, after the 7th century A.D.

The other instance is the name of the Andhra king *Āpilaka*, which appears in the Bh generally as *Civilaka*. The probable genesis of the changes in the name is suggested in p. 39, note<sup>46</sup>, and the fact that seems significant here is that the compiler of the Bh account apparently drew his information from a *Vṣ* account in which he misread the initial *d* as *c*. This mistake could arise only in the Gupta script and not very well before the 7th century A.D.<sup>2</sup>

## APPENDIX III

### *Janamejaya's Dispute with the Brahmans.*

The dispute between the Paurava king Janamejaya<sup>3</sup> and Vaiśampāyana and other brahmans is narrated in *AMt* 50, 57<sup>b</sup>-65 and *AVā* 99, 250-256 and gives us an instance of how the text was revised<sup>4</sup>. The *Mt* version, which is the oldest, says the king made a successful stand against them for some time, but afterwards gave in and, making his son king, departed to the forest (according to custom); but the *Vā* version has abridged the inconvenient verses, and says he perished and the brahmans made his son king. This alteration may have been made (1) either in the *Bhaviṣya* when it was revised, and so passed into the *Vāyu*<sup>5</sup>, or (2) in the *Vāyu* itself; but it is impossible to decide this point, because *eVā* and the *Bd*, which would have thrown much light on it, have unfortunately lost this passage in lacunae. What is clear is that a story of royal opposition to brahmanic claims was modified early in the 4th century A.D. to maintain brahmanic prestige.

As regards MSS, *bhḥpMt* omit l. 6, read l. 9 instead of it and omit l. 9 from its place; *efjḥnMt* omit l. 9; *kMt* ll. 9, 20; *lMt* ll. 6-9; *mMt* reads l. 9 instead of l. 6, as well as in its proper place; *a<sup>1</sup>dhVā* omit ll. 11-13; *ḷVā* ll. 11-13, 18-20; *ḷVā* ll. 14, 15; *lVā* ll. 16, 17; and *efjḥmVā* want the whole.

<sup>1</sup> P. 41, l. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See Bühler's *Ind. Pal.*, Table IV.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 4, l. 2.

<sup>4</sup> See *Introdn.* §§ 24, 30.

<sup>5</sup> See *Introdn.* § 23.

*Matsya.*

Janamejayaḥ Parīkṣitaḥ  
 putraḥ parama-dhārmikāḥ <sup>1</sup>  
 brahmānaṁ <sup>2</sup> kalpayāmāsa  
 sa vai <sup>3</sup> vājasaneyakam <sup>4</sup>  
 sa <sup>6</sup> Vaiśampāyanaenaiva <sup>7</sup>  
 śaptaḥ <sup>9</sup> kila <sup>10</sup> maharṣinā  
 na sthāsyatiḥa <sup>12</sup> durbuddhe <sup>13</sup>  
 tavaitad vacanam bhuvi  
 yāvat sthāsyasi tvaṁ loke <sup>14</sup>  
 tāvad eva <sup>16</sup> prapatsyati <sup>16</sup>  
 kṣatrasya vijayam jñātvā <sup>19</sup>  
 tataḥ prabhṛti sarvaśaḥ  
 abhigamya sthitāś <sup>20</sup> caiva <sup>21</sup>  
 nrpaṁ ca Janamejayam  
 tataḥ prabhṛti śūpena  
 kṣatriyasya tu yājinaḥ <sup>26</sup>  
 utsannā <sup>26</sup> yājino <sup>27</sup> yājñe <sup>28</sup>  
 tataḥ prabhṛti sarvaśaḥ  
 kṣatrasya <sup>29</sup> yājinaḥ <sup>30</sup> kecic <sup>31</sup>  
 chāpāt <sup>32</sup> tasya mahātmanaḥ

*Vāyu.*

Parikṣitas tu dāyādo  
 rājāsī Janamejayaḥ <sup>1</sup>  
 brāhmaṇān kalpayāmāsa  
 sa vai vājasaneyikān <sup>5</sup>  
 aśapat taṁ <sup>8</sup> tadāmarṣād  
 Vaiśampāyana <sup>11</sup> eva tu  
 na sthāsyatiḥa durbuddhe  
 tavaitad vacanam bhuvi  
 yāvat sthāsyāmy ahaṁ loke  
 tāvan naitat <sup>17</sup> praśasyate <sup>18</sup> 5

abhitāḥ <sup>22</sup> samsthitāś <sup>23</sup> cāpi  
 tataḥ sa <sup>24</sup> Janamejayaḥ

10

<sup>1</sup> This is l. 2 on p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> In *fhMt* brāhmaṇaṁ, *jMt* brah°.

<sup>3</sup> In *cnMt* makhe; *jMt* makhaṁ; *eMt* makha.

<sup>4</sup> In *efgMt* °yikam; *kMt* °yake.

<sup>5</sup> In *a°a°dhklVā* °yakān.

<sup>6</sup> In *hMt* taṁ.

<sup>7</sup> In *cejnMt* °yane caiva.

<sup>8</sup> So *a°a°bdghlVā*. *Ca°kVā* aśapatnaṁ.

<sup>9</sup> In *benMt* saptaḥ; *hMt* śaptaṁ; *lMt* sapuḥ.

<sup>10</sup> In *eMt* kali.

<sup>11</sup> So *Ca°iVā*: but *a°a°bdghkVā* °yanam.

<sup>12</sup> In *bdMt* °iti.

<sup>13</sup> In *jMt* durbuddheḥ.

<sup>14</sup> So *CGVa°a°Mt*: *lMt* vai loke; *enMt* loke tvaṁ; *a°a°kMt* loke 'smiṁ; *cMt* lokeṣu. But *bdfyhmpMt* sthāsyāmy ahaṁ loke, and *jMt* crply.

<sup>15</sup> In *hMt* etat.

<sup>16</sup> So *CGVa°a°Mt*; *mpMt* °paśyati; *eMt* °yaśyati; *dMt* °śatsyati; *jkMt* °vatsyati; *a°a°efyhMt* °vatsyati; *nMt* °vaśyati; *lMt* °vatsyasi.

<sup>17</sup> In *a°Vā* naiva.

<sup>18</sup> So *Ca°a°iVā*: but *a°a°gVā* prapatsyati; *bdhkVā* °paśyati.

<sup>19</sup> In *fyjMt* jñātuṁ: *bdhmpMt* substitute l. 9 for this line; see note <sup>26</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> In *bdcfyjmMt* sthitāś.

<sup>21</sup> *Caivam* in *cenMt*.

<sup>22</sup> In *bhVā* †pravṛ[ti]taḥ; *dVā* †pracittitaḥ.

<sup>23</sup> In *dhVā* sa sthitāś.

<sup>24</sup> In *hVā* †taka sa; *bVā* †takasaj; *dVā* †tak sa.

<sup>25</sup> In *cnMt* yājinaḥ; *bdfyjmpMt* vājinaḥ; *hMt* rājinaḥ.

<sup>26</sup> So *ACMt*: *bdhpMt* omit this line, see note <sup>19</sup>, but *mMt* has it here also. In *bdMt* uchannā; *mMt* trasyannā above, *utsannā* here; *hMt* utkalasya.

<sup>27</sup> In *bdmpMt* vājino; *hMt* rāj°.

<sup>28</sup> In *dhmpMt* jujñe.

<sup>29</sup> In *lMt* kṣatra[vy]aya.

<sup>30</sup> In *lMt* yājinaḥ, *fyjMt* vāj°: *bdjpmMt* vājinaḥ, *hMt* rāj°.

<sup>31</sup> In *cenMt* kaścit.

<sup>32</sup> In *djMt* chāpām.

*Matsya.*

paurṇamāseṇa<sup>33</sup> haviṣā  
 iṣṭvā tasmin<sup>34</sup> prajāpatim  
 sa<sup>35</sup> Vaiśampāyanenaiva  
 praviśan<sup>37</sup> vāritas<sup>38</sup> tataḥ<sup>39</sup>  
 Parikṣītaḥ suto 'sau vai<sup>42</sup>  
 Pauravo Janamejayaḥ  
 dvir aśvamedham āhṛtya<sup>43</sup>  
 mahā-vājasaneyakam<sup>44</sup>  
 pravartayitvā taṁ sarvam<sup>46</sup>  
 ṛṣir<sup>47</sup> vājasaneyakam<sup>48</sup>

vivāde<sup>55</sup> brāhmaṇaiḥ sārddham  
 abhiśapto vanam yayau  
 Janamejayāc Chatānikas  
 tasmāj jajñe sa vīryavān<sup>58</sup>  
 Janamejayaḥ<sup>59</sup> Śātānikam  
 putram rājye 'bhiṣiktavān<sup>61</sup>.

<sup>33</sup> In *dMt pūrṇa*°.

<sup>34</sup> In *fMt dṛṣṭvā*°; *eMt iṣṭvā te 'smin*;  
*dMt i tasmin*; *nMt iti 'smin*.

<sup>35</sup> In *a²a²ceknMt taṁ*; *jMt te*; *hMt tad*;  
*lMt tad[e]*.

<sup>36</sup> In *gVā °taḥ paśye* (for *paśyet*!).

<sup>37</sup> In *fMt °viśat*; *eMt °viśen*; *dMt °viśan*.

<sup>38</sup> In *hMt nāvitas*.

<sup>39</sup> In *mpMt tataḥ*.

<sup>40</sup> Sic: read *tadvad dhiṣṭaiḥ*?

<sup>41</sup> In *a³a⁴gVā mukhe*.  
<sup>42</sup> In *CbdfpMt so vai, cenMt yo*°: *hMt*  
*tataḥ śāpat*.

<sup>43</sup> In *jMt ākrtya*; *pMt āruhya*.

<sup>44</sup> So *CbđhlpMt*; *AefgknMt °yakaḥ, eMt*  
*°yikaḥ*.

<sup>45</sup> In *gVā °yikam*.

<sup>46</sup> In *chjMt tat*°; *fgMt tān sarvān*.

<sup>47</sup> So *bedefghlnpMt*: *ACmMt ṛṣin*; *jMt*  
*ṛṣer*: *hMt* reads this half line *svavarcā* (for  
*kharcā ca*!) *Janamejayaḥ*.

*Vāyu.*

paurṇamāsyena haviṣā  
 devam iṣṭvā prajāpatim  
 vijñāya samsthito 'paśyat<sup>36</sup>  
 tadvadhiṣṭān<sup>40</sup> vibhor makhe<sup>41</sup>  
 Parikṣit-tanayaś cāpi  
 Pauravo Janamejayaḥ  
 dvir aśvamedham āhṛtya  
 tato vājasaneyakam<sup>45</sup>  
 pravartayitvā tad brahma  
 trikharvī<sup>49</sup> Janamejayaḥ 15  
 kharvam<sup>50</sup> Aśvaka<sup>51</sup>-mukhyānān  
 kharvam<sup>52</sup> Aṅga-nivāsinām  
 kharvam<sup>53</sup> ca Madhyadeśānām  
 trikharvī<sup>54</sup> Janamejayaḥ  
 viśādād<sup>56</sup> brāhmaṇaiḥ sārddham  
 abhiśastah<sup>57</sup> kṣayaṁ yayau  
 tasya putraḥ Śātāniko  
 balavān satya-vikramaḥ  
 tataḥ sutaṁ<sup>60</sup> Śātānikam  
 viprās tam abhyaṣecayan<sup>62</sup>. 20

<sup>48</sup> In *cMt °yikam*; *efyjkIMt °yakaḥ*.

<sup>49</sup> So *C²a²bgVā*; *a¹Vā °khārvī*: with dia-  
 lectic variation of *kh* and *g*, *glVā °ṣarvī*,  
*a³Vā °ṣairvī*; *dVā °svarcā*; *hVā °svacī*.

<sup>50</sup> In *ghVā sarvam*.

<sup>51</sup> In *gVā* and one MS of *CVā Aśmaka*.

<sup>52</sup> In *gVā sarvam*.

<sup>53</sup> In *ghVā sarvam*.

<sup>54</sup> In *dVā °kharvā*; *hVā °khabī*; *gVā*  
*°ṣarvī*; *kVā °ṣadyī*.

<sup>55</sup> In *bdpMt °dam*; *jMt °do*.

<sup>56</sup> In *a³kVā viśādo*.

<sup>57</sup> In *hVā °śataḥ*.

<sup>58</sup> In *jMt su-v*°; after this line *jMt* inserts  
*Mt l. 6* on p. 4.

<sup>59</sup> In *nMt °jayā*; *hMt tatas te tu*.

<sup>60</sup> In *dVā taṁ tu*.

<sup>61</sup> In *hMt viprā rāj*°, altered to *putram*  
*tasyābhyāṣecayat*.

<sup>62</sup> In *dghVā tasyābhy*°. *CVā tam abhya-*  
*ṣecayat*.