

ON PHRASES NOT SHARED BY THE
MAHĀBHĀRATA AND *RĀMĀYAṆA*

The two great epics of India, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, are often contrasted with each other. First of all, as is regularly noted, they differ in size: the *Mahābhārata* being composed of approximately 100.000 verses, while the *Rāmāyaṇa* is a quarter of that size, or, about 24.000 verses¹. The geographical data are different: place names in the *Mahābhārata* such as Hastināpura and Indraprastha are located in north-west India, whereas those in the *Rāmāyaṇa* like Ayodhyā and island of Laṅkā are found in the east and south. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* the element of the animal story (*Tiersage*) is evident, and monkeys play an important role, whereas in the *Mahābhārata* these roles are not attributed to any particular animal. On the other hand, the *Mahābhārata* contains philosophical portions like the *Bhagavadgītā*, *Anugītā*, and *Mokṣadharma*, but such portions are totally absent from the *Rāmāyaṇa*. This absence of a philosophical portion is responsible for the production of philosophical additions in

* I would like to express my thanks to Dr. John L. Brockington of the University of Edinburgh, whose series of important studies over many years has encouraged me to undertake *Rāmāyaṇa* studies. It is due to his kind encouragement that I was able to write this article. Thanks are also due to Dr. J. Silk and C. Bielefeldt who took the trouble to correct my English.

1. Cf. VRā. 1.196* (*catur-viṃśat-sahasrāṇi ślokānam uktavān ṛṣiḥ*)

2. Cf. H. VON GLASENAPP, *Die Zwei philosophische Rāmāyaṇa*, Wiesbaden, 1951.

later times, such as the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*- and *Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa*, the so-called *Zwei philosophische Rāmāyāṇas*². Different *avatāras* of the god Viṣṇu play important roles in the two epics, Kṛṣṇa in the *Mahābhārata* and Rāma in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Not only the *dramatis personae* and the contents but also the literary genres to which these two epics belong are different from each other. The *Mahābhārata* is called *ākhyāna* (story), *pañcama veda* (the fifth Veda), *itihāsa* (legend), and even sometimes *dharma-saṃhitā* (law-code), while the *Rāmāyaṇa* is principally called *ādi-kāvya*, the first poem in India. The author of this *ādi-kāvya* is the well-known Vālmīki, the first poet, or *ādi-kavi*, while the authorship of the *Mahābhārata* is attributed to Vyāsa, a legendary figure; the word *vyāsa* as a common noun means simply "compiler". It is generally thought that Vālmīki, the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and Rāma, its hero, were contemporary, but the connection of Vyāsa with the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas is obscure³. One could be able to multiply in this way the points of contrast between the two epics.

As early as the beginning of this century, in 1901, E. W. Hopkins collected some 337 parallel phrases in the two epics and published them in Appendix (A) to his *The Great Epic of India*⁴. Prior to this, Hopkins had also published the article "Proverbs and Tales Common to the Two Sanskrit Epics"⁵. The tradition of philological studies of this sort, particularly with regard to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, has been continued by J. L. Brockington, who published "Stereotyped Expressions in the *Rāmāyaṇa*"⁶ and later "Vālmīki's Proverbs"⁷. He also listed some 96 instances of long compounds found in identical form in both the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*⁸. In the domain of figures of speech (particularly similes), Brockington contributed to a comparative study

3. Cf. A. BLOCH, "Vālmīki und die Ikṣvākuiden", IJ 7 (1963-64), pp. 81 ff.

4. Cf. HOPKINS, 1901, pp. 403-445.

5. Cf. HOPKINS, 1899, pp. 22-39.

6. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1970 (2), pp. 210-227 (especially 223-225).

7. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1980, pp. 139-150.

8. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1970 (1), pp. 401-402 (*agni-śikhopama*, *alātacakraprati-*
ma, *aśru-pūrṇa-mukha*, *kamala-patrākṣa*, *kālopahata-cetana*, *kopa-saṃrakta-locana*,
etc). Cf. also BROCKINGTON, 1982 (2), pp. 21-30, especially p. 26.

and remarked that «there exists in fact a large stock of similes common to the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*»⁹.

With reference to the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Rāmopākhyāna*, which is incorporated in the *Mahābhārata*, intensive study of this sort was carried out in the course of determining the historical priority of the epic and epitome. In this connection we must mention the contributions by such scholars as V.S. Sukthankar, H. Jacobi, N. Sen and J.L. Brockington¹⁰.

With the publication of *The Pratīka Index of the Mahābhārata* by P. L. Vaidya (1967-1972) in Poona, we are now in a much better position than Hopkins to undertake a comparative study of this sort, although admittedly it is still a great desideratum to have a similar Pratīka Index of the critical edition of the *Rāmāyaṇa* published from Baroda. At the present moment, we are forced to depend upon the *Pāda-Index of Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa* in two volumes, published in the *Gaekwad's Oriental Series*, Nos. 129 (1961) and 153 (1966), which is based upon the Bombay vulgate edition and is unfortunately not always accurate. When a Pratīka-index of the Baroda critical edition of the *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa* is published according to the same principles used by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, scholars will be able to start a more comprehensive and systematic study on a solid text-critical basis.

Side by side with the expressions common to the two epics that Hopkins and others tried to gather in the afore-mentioned works, we have expressions peculiar to each. That is to say, some phrases, especially so-called stereotyped expressions, appear in the *Mahābhārata* but never in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and vice versa.

While the *study of phrases shared* by the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa* revealed a common stock that characterizes the literary genre of the epic in the history of Indian literature, the approach proposed here – that is, a *study of phrases not shared* by the two epics, which, as it were, tends in the opposite direction from that of Hopkins – will reveal the peculiarities of phraseology of the two epics and thus serve to differentiate them. In other words, the study of phrases not

9. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1977, pp. 441-459, especially p. 459.

10. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1978, pp. 79-111.

shared by the epics may eventually enable us to detect peculiarities of each that reflect different historical factors in the formation of epic phrases¹¹: peculiarities of the historical and cultural backgrounds in which they were composed, differing backgrounds of the techniques used by "the singers of tales" in the course of their oral transmission, their idiosyncrasies of style, and so forth¹².

In the course of reading through the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*, the present writer became aware of differences of phraseology in the two epics. This is particularly true in the formulation of so-called formulaic expressions. Despite the difficulties involved in undertaking this sort of comparative study of the two epics, which if pursued systematically would require immense time and space, the present writer presents here some such phrases that have come to his notice. Though far from being complete and systematic, some results of his studies of a rather random nature are presented below, these discovered while he was engaged in pursuing some particular topics, such as studies on ancient Indian asceticism, the *Kṣatra-dharma*, and so on.

I

(1) *tapasā dagdha-kilbiṣa*.

(1-1) While the present writer was investigating some aspects of ancient Indian asceticism as revealed in the Epic literature, he noticed the phrase *tapasā dagdha-kilbiṣa* (having burnt defilement by means of *tapas*) appearing only in the *Mahābhārata* and never used in the other epic. The occurrences of the phrase in the *Mahābhārata* are as follows:

tapasā dagdha-kilbiṣaḥ : MBh. 3.81.61, 3.107.4, 12.139.91, 15.26.9, 15.27.12.

11. It goes without saying that alliterations containing the name of heroes of the particular epic are peculiar to that epic; for example, *rāma ... abhirāma* (*rāmasya loka-rāmasya, rāmo lokābhirāma*), *rāvaṇo loka-rāvaṇa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

12. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1985, p. 78.

tapasā dagdha-kilbiṣāḥ : MBh. 3.32.35, 12.210.25, 13.129.42,
14.27.23, 15.27.14.
tapasā dagdha-kilbiṣam : MBh. 1.66.2, 3.156.1.

It is remarkable that the phrase appears only in *Mahābhārata* books 1, 3, 12-15, and never in the so-called war books.

(1-2) One may well wonder then what sorts of phrases are used in the *Rāmāyaṇa* in order to express the same idea, because the *Rāmāyaṇa* is also replete with descriptions of asceticism and ascetic practice. In this regard, we may note the following passages:

tapasā vīta-kalmaṣāḥ : VRā. 4.43.32 (Bombay Vulgate), which
reads *tāpasā vīta-kalmaṣāḥ* (Baroda crit.
ed. 4.42.32).

tapo-nirdhūta-kalmaṣān : VRā. 7.36.57 (Bombay Vulgate).

Curiously enough, these two phrases never appear in the *Mahābhārata*.

(1-3). If we ask what phrase then is fairly common in the *Rāmāyaṇa* in connection with the Sanskrit word *tapas*, the answer might be *tapasā-dyotita-prabha*.

tapasā dyotita-prabhaḥ : VRā. 1.17.35, 1.50.2, 7.2.13, 7.2.20.

tapasā dyotita-prabhām : VRā. 1.48.13.

cf. also:

tapasā bhāskara-prabhaḥ: VRā. 7.103.4 (Bombay). Baroda 7.93.5
has instead *tapasvī bhāskara-prabhaḥ*.

It is to be noted that in the *Rāmāyaṇa* this phrase appears only in books 1 and 7, which are usually considered later additions. The same phrase occurs in the *Mahābhārata* only once:

tapasā dyotita-prabhaḥ : MBh. 3.247.26.

In the *Mahābhārata*, however, the opening portion, *tapasā dyotita*, is construed not only with *prabhā* but also with other words.

tapasā dyotitātmānam : MBh. 1.46.6.
(lopāmudrām...) *tapasā dyotitām* : MBh. 3.95.13.

Here we notice that the phrase *tapasā dyotita* is construed only with *prabhā* in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, while in the *Mahābhārata* it is also construed with *ātman*. It may also be noted here that not *dyotita-* but *dīpta-(tejas)* is a favorite word in the *Rāmāyaṇa*¹³.

(1-4) More than twenty years ago, the present writer had occasion to investigate compounds in the two epics that have *-nitya* as the last member of a (locative) *tatpuruṣa* compound¹⁴. A result of a modest gleaning of this type of compound from the *Mahābhārata* was published from India¹⁵, but the problem in the *Rāmāyaṇa* was not dealt with. Their occurrence in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is as follows¹⁶:

satām ca dharma-nityānām kṛta-śobhi ca rāghava. : VRā.2.4.27.
sa kaccid brāhmaṇo vidvān dharma-nityo mahā-dyutiḥ : VRā.2.94.5.
sajapāś ca tapo-nityās tathā pañca-tapo- 'nvitāḥ : VRā. 3.5.5.
dharma-nityais tapo-dāntair viśikhair iva pāvakaiḥ : VRā. 3.7.7.
mad-vidhaṃ yo 'timanyeta dharma-nityaṃ jitendriyam : VRā.3.41.43.

According to the Pāda-index, *dharma-nitya* appears also in VRā. 7.37.8 and 7.54.14, and *śoka-saṃtāpa-nitya* (*śoka-saṃtāpa-nityena kāmena kaluṣīkṛtaḥ*) in VRā. 6.12.18 (Bombay). As is evident from the above, in this rather peculiar compound the word *nitya* is construed only four times with *dharma* and once with *tapas*. This compound, however, is fairly common in the *Mahābhārata*. In addition to *dharma* and *tapas*, *nitya* is construed with such ethico-religious concepts as *dāna*, *satya*, *svādhyāya*, *jñāna*, *adhyātman*, *adhyātma-jñāna*, *dhyāna*, *adhyayana*, *śuśrūṣā*, *cāra*, *ārjava*, *dama*, *japya*, *kṣamā*, *śama*, *saṃyama*, *vṛtti* and *yoga*. Apart from ethico-religious concepts, even such concrete objects as *vana*, *parvata*, *śāstra*, *śāstra*, *araṇya*, *parvata-vāsa* and *jāhnavī-tīra* appear before *nitya*.

13. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1970 (2), p. 216.

14. Cf. M. HARA, 1959.

15. Cf. M. HARA, 1969.

16. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1970 (1), p. 383.

To take as an example *tapo-nitya*, the occurrences of this compound as the opening of a *pāda* in the *Mahābhārata* are as follows: MBh. 3.111.6, 3.122.15, 3.203.48, 3.228.8, 5.173.13, 7.57.34, 8.24.48, 9.38.24, 9.39.11, 9.47.31, 12.111.11, 12.182.14, 12.230.9, 12.316.22, 13.153.48, 14.10.8. Other occurrences in the middle of *pāda* are 3.110.16, 10.7.7, 12.125.32, 12.125.34.

(2) *mṛtyuṃ kṛtvā nivartanam*.

While the present writer was working on the concept of *kṣatradharma*, the guiding principle to be followed by the warrior-caste, he noticed that in the so-called war-books of the *Mahābhārata* (6-9) there appears a recurring phrase, *mṛtyaṃ kṛtvā nivartanam* (making death the place of retreat), which indicates the resolute decision of warriors who are about to depart to the front.

(a) *mṛtyuṃ kṛtvā nivartanam* : MBh. 6.53.2, 7.127.20, 8.26.32, 8.32.9, 8.41.7, 8.55.73, 8.56.47, 9.7.5, 9.9.7, 9.9.57, 9.10.8, 9.20.4, 9.27.21.

(b) *kṛtvā mṛtyuṃ nivartanam* : MBh. 7.17.31, 7.171.39.

It is remarkable that, while the majority of the occurrences of type (a) are centred in books 8 and 9, type (b) appears only in book 7. But this phrase never occurs in the *Rāmāyaṇa* despite the fact that this epic contains so many descriptions of battle scenes. This is strange because both epics are never laconic in describing the dauntless warrior (*anivartin*), and they share with each other phrases about this type of warrior¹⁷:

saṃyugeśv anivartin- : VRā. 5.14.17; MBh. 6.86.66.
saṃgrāmeśv anivartin- : VRā. 2.58.35, 4.35.16, 5.21.11, 6.110.5;
 MBh. 3.79.3, 5.163.14, 6.89.18, 9.4.34,
 9.15.8, 12.221.24, 13.2.13.

17. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1985, p. 85.

samareśv anivartin- : VRā. 3.21.8, 4.16.3, 4.19.21, 7.22.14,
7.27.28, 7.27.36; MBh. 1.213.47,
5.172.11, 7.106.6, 7.131.61, 9.23.6,
9.32.42, 9.53.25.

(3) *palāyana-parāyaṇa*.

Similarly, in descriptions of soldiers' fleeing from the battle-field, the *Mahābhārata* abounds in the following expressions with the intention of using alliteration:

palāyana-parāyaṇam : MBh. 6.103.3, 7.36.23.
palāyana-parāyaṇaḥ : MBh. 7.98.8, 12.136.106.
palāyana-parāyaṇān : MBh. 7.98.14.
palāyana-parāyaṇāḥ : MBh. 7.21.15, 7.165.66.

Cf. also,

palāyana-para : MBh. 3.255.32, 6.71.32, 13.31.22.
palāyana-kṛta-kṣaṇa : MBh. 7.65.3, 7.165.89, 14.85.13.
palāyana-kṛtotsāha : MBh. 3.255.56, 7.35.43, 7.45.4, 7.165.55.
palāyane kṛtotsāha : MBh. 7.89.32, 7.91.51, 7.128.16.

Strangely enough, these phrases never appear in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, though it is full of descriptions of battle-scenes. I have come across an exception in Gorresio's edition (5.33.31)¹⁸, which was however not adopted in the Baroda critical edition (766*, p. 253).

(4) *paśu-māram amārayat*.

In the description of a fearful battle, where a dauntless warrior mercilessly kills his adversary as if slaughtering animals, this phrase is repeated in the *Mahābhārata*:

18. Cf. HOPKINS, 1901, p. 423, no. 161.

tasya tad vacanaṃ śrutvā bhīmaseno 'tyamarṣaṇaḥ
niṣpiṣyainaṃ balād bhūmau paśu-māram amārayat (MBh.1.142.28)
taṃ viśīdantaṃ ājñāya rākṣasaṃ pāṇḍava-nandanaḥ
pragrhya tarasā dorbhyāḥ paśu-māram amārayat (MBh.3.12.63)
taṃ ākrāmya padī rājan kaṇṭhe corasi cobhayoḥ
nadantaṃ visphurantaṃ ca paśu-māram amārayat (MBh.10.8.18)
mayā ca pāpakarmāsau dhṛṣṭadyumno mahīpate
praviśya śibiraṃ rātrau paśu-māreṇa mārिताḥ (MBh.10.9.51)
taṃ hanyuḥ kāṣṭha-loṣṭair vā daheyur vā kaṭāgninā
paśuvan māreyeyur vā kṣatriyā ye syur īdrśāḥ (MBh.12.98.22)¹⁹

However, this phrase indicating a disgraceful way for an honourable warrior to be killed is never used in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

(5) *prāhinod yama-sādanam* and others.

As an euphemism for dying and killing in battle, there appears either the compound *yama-sādana*, or *yama-kṣaya* (Yama's abode). Usually, it is construed with the verbs *nī-* (lead), *gam-* (go) or its causative form, *gamaya-* (let go). Thus, both the epics share the phrases *nayāmi* (*neṣyāmi*) *yama-sādanam* (VRā. 3.21.4, 5.56.103, thrice in the Bombay *Yuddha-Kāṇḍa* and MBh. 2.68.18, 3.40.10, 3.40.32), *netāsmi yama-sādanam*, (MBh. 2.68.18); *gamiṣyāmi yama-kṣayam* (VRā. 2.53.22, 2.54.3 and Bombay 6.71.54), *gamayiṣye yama-kṣayam* (MBh. 3.15.12)²⁰.

In addition to these, the *Mahābhārata* has a similar expression that contains the verb *pra-hi-* (send).

19. Cf. *nirvāṇaṃ nādhigaccheyur jīveyuḥ paśu-jīvikāṃ*
vighātenaiva yujeyur na cārthaṃ kiṃcid āpnuyuḥ (MBh. 3.32.24)
 (Cf. SEN, 1965, p. 359).

Cf. also MBh. 2.14.17 (*paśūnāṃ iva kā prītir jīvite bharatarṣabha*)
hanyatāṃ durmatir bhīṣmaḥ paśuvat sādhu ayaṃ nṛpaiḥ (MBh. 2.41.28)
paśuvad ghātanaṃ vā me dahanāṃ vā kaṭāgninā (MBh. 2.41.31)
kathaṃ ca nihataḥ pāpāḥ pāñcālāḥ paśuvan mayā (MBh. 10.5.34)
paśuvat tathaivainaṃ amārayat (MBh. 10.8.35)
spurato vepamānāṃś ca śamiteva paśūn makhe (MBh. 10.8.36)

20. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1970 (2), p. 220; 1976, p. 112; and 1985, pp. 79, 84.

- prāhiṇod yama-sādanam* : MBh. 3.234.7, 4.22.25, 6.50.69,
6.99.17, 6.100.3, 7.7.21, 7.104.27,
8.38.40.
- prāhiṇvan yama-sādanam* : MBh. 3.169.17, 3.168.29.

The verb-form *prāhiṇot* is not only construed with *yama-sādanam* (accusative) but also with *mṛtyu-lokāya* (dative). The occurrences are as follows:

- prāhiṇon mṛtyu-lokāya* : MBh. 6.50.74, 6.84.22, 6.109.13,
7.27.30, 7.29.6, 7.68.50, 7.132.23,
7.132.25, 7.136.3, 7.136.5, 8.58.2,
10.8.74.

This phraseology seems to be peculiar to the *Mahābhārata*; the construction never appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

(6) *yama-rāṣṭra-vivardhana*.

In the description of a fierce battle where merciless slaughter takes place the following is the favorite phrase of the war-books of the *Mahābhārata* singers *yuddha**yama-rāṣṭra vivardhana*, «a fierce battle, which increases (the population of) the kingdom of Yama»²¹. The occurrences are as follows:

- yama-rāṣṭra-vivardhanaḥ* : MBh. 6.79.8, 6.85.26, 8.16.8,
8.42.2, 9.22.13.
- yama-rāṣṭra-vivardhanam* : MBh. 6.75.55, 6.91.24, 6.99.16,
6.104.17, 7.31.72, 7.143.42, 9.9.58,
9.13.43.
- yama-rāṣṭra-vivardhini* : MBh. 6.99.36, 8.36.31.
- yama-rāṣṭra-vivardhane* : MBh. 9.10.5.
- yama-rāṣṭra-vivṛddhaye* : MBh. 7.54.6.

21. Cf. HOPKINS, 1899, p. 37.

Since this phrase never appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, it is apparently peculiar to the *Mahābhārata*.

(7) *kalām nārhati ṣoḍaśīm*.

As has been studied by J. Gonda²², the number sixteen is indicative of totality in ancient Indian literature. In association with a moon-digit (1/16 of the moon's diametre), the expression "the one sixteenth (1/16)", or *kalā*, makes its appearance already in Vedic texts. Later, in Hindu and Buddhist literature²³, we often meet the expression *kalām nārhati ṣoḍaśīm* (that does not worth even to the one sixteenth). In the *Mahābhārata* this expression occurs fairly commonly, but, strangely enough, it never appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa*:

kalām nārhati ṣoḍaśīm : MBh. 2.38.26.

kalām nārhati ṣoḍaśīm : MBh. 1.94.60, 3.171.3, 7.86.29, 8.11.28.

kalām arhati ṣoḍaśīm : MBh. 3.89.19, 3.243.3, 7.35.6.

Cf. MBh. 7.168.16 (*yah kalām ṣoḍaśīm pūrṇaṁ dhanamjaya na te 'rhati*), 12.168.36, 12.171.51, 12.268.6 (*nārhatāḥ ṣoḍaśīm kalām*).

The only occurrence of *kalā* in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, as far as I know, is met in VRā. 5.14.14, where Hanumān speaks to himself while watching Sītā in confinement:

rājyaṁ vā triṣu lokeṣu sītā vā janakātmajā
trailokṇya-rājyaṁ sakalaṁ sītāyā nāpnuyāt kalām (VRā. 5.14.14)

(8) *trṇaiḥ kūpa ivāvṛtaḥ*.

J. Brockington twice refers to the simile of a well covered over by grasses as an illustration of a hidden place of danger into which one may easily fall, or of a dangerous person in disguise²⁴. The *Rāmāyaṇa* text reads as follows:

22. Cf. J. GONDA, 1965.

23. Cf. *Dhammapada* 70, *Manusmṛti* 2.86. Cf. also HOPKINS, 1901 p: 428, and GONDA, 1965, pp. 127 ff.

24. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1977, p. 447, and 1980, p. 146.

sa pāpo bhavya-rūpeṇa tṛṇaiḥ kūpa ivāvṛttaḥ
atiṣṭhat prekṣya vaidehīm rāma-patnīm yaśasvinīm (VRā. 3.44.10)
na tvām vinihaatmānaṃ dharma-dhvajam adhārmikam
jāne pāpa-samācaraṃ tṛṇaiḥ kūpam ivāvṛtaṃ (VRā. 4.17.18)
sa bāla-bhāvād yudhi vīrya-darpiṭaḥ
pravṛddha-manyuḥ kṣatajopamekṣaṇaḥ
samāsasādāpratimaṃ raṇe kaṇiṃ
gajo mahā-kūpam ivāvṛtaṃ tṛṇaiḥ (VRā. 5.45.20)

Brockington considered that the *Mahābhārata* singers borrowed the simile from the *Rāmāyaṇa*²⁵, and he quoted the following passage from the *Mahābhārata*, which R.K. Sharma failed to list in his work (*Elements of Poetry in the Mahābhārata*, California, 1964, pp. 54-55):

pāpānāṃ viddhy adhiṣṭhānaṃ lobham eva dvijottama
lubdhāḥ pāpaṃ vyavasyanti narā nātibahu-śrutāḥ
adharmā dharma-rūpeṇa tṛṇaiḥ kūpā ivāvṛtāḥ (MBh. 3.198.54)

A similar verse can be quoted from the 13th book of the *Mahābhārata*:

adharmā dharma-rūpeṇa tṛṇaiḥ kūpā ivāvṛtāḥ
tatas tair bhidyate vṛttaṃ śṛṇu caiva yudhiṣṭhira (MBh.13.147.11)²⁶

However, the same simile is used in the *Mahābhārata* with a different adjective, *channa*, instead of *āvṛta*.

durbuddhim akṛta-prajñam channaṃ kūpaṃ tṛṇair iva
vivarjayīta medhāvī tasmin maitrī praṇaśyati (MBh. 5.39.35=IS.2870)
dveṣa-krodha-prasaktāś ca śiṣṭācāra-bahiṣkṛtāḥ
antaḥkṣurā vān-madhurāḥ kūpās channās tṛṇair iva
dharma-vaitaṃsikāḥ kṣudrā muṣṇanti dhvajino jagat
 (MBh. 12.152.16)

25. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1977, p. 447.

26. Cf. *kūpe vīrut-tṛṇāvṛtte* (MBh. 1.73.18, 9.35.29), *mahākūpas tṛṇa-vīrut-samāvṛtaḥ* (MBh. 13.69.2), (J. BROCKINGTON, 1985-6, p. 19).

*vidyan teṣāṃ sāhasikā guṇās teṣāṃ atīva hi
kūpā iva tṛṇa-cchannā viśuddhā dyaur ivāpare* (MBh. 13.33.9)

While *tṛṇair...ivāvṛta* is peculiar to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the simile with *channa* seems to be peculiar to the *Mahābhārata*; the simile with *channa* never appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which has only *āvṛta*.

In this connection, one may note that Kālidāsa used the simile with *channa* in his *Śakuntalā* 5.22.2-3 in the tradition of the *Mahābhārata* but not the *Rāmāyaṇa*:

*ko ṇāma aṇṇo dhamma-kañcua-vavadesiṇo taṇa-channa-kūvova-
massa tuha aṇukārī bhavissadi* (R. Pischel ed., HOS 16, 1922, p. 66).

One may also refer to the expression *tṛṇa-pihita-kūpe nipatanam* in *Cāṇakya-rāja-nīti-śāstra* 5.43.

(9) *hrī-niṣedha*.

Similarly, in the description of the honourable warrior, we often meet the phrase *hrī-niṣedha*, which occurs fairly often in the *Mahābhārata*. The occurrences are as follows:

MBh. 4.18.29., 4.32.35, 5.25.5, 5.47.26, 5.88.34, 5.124.3, 7.169.1, 8.4.101, 9.9.54, 11.26.15, 12.84.1, 12.220.50, 12.221.34.

In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, however, this phrase occurs only once, in the third book in the description of Bharata by Lakṣmaṇa.

*padma-patrekṣaṇaḥ śyāmaḥ śrīmān nirudaro mahān
dharmajñāḥ satyavādī ca hrī-niṣedho jitendriyaḥ* (VRā. 3.15.29)

Despite thirteen occurrences of the phrase in the *Mahābhārata* as enumerated above, many of which are followed by such compounds as *yata-vrata*, the construction of the phrase with *jitendriya* as we have it here in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (*hrī-niṣedho jitendriyaḥ*) never appears in the *Mahābhārata*.

(10) *nātibhāra*....

Since both epics are replete with fatalistic notions, it is no wonder that such well-known phrases as the following are shared by both the epics.

daivam eva paraṃ manye pauraṣaṃ tu nirarthakam

(VRā. 1.57.21 = MBh. 2.43.32)²⁷

kālo hi duratikramaḥ

(VRā. 3.64.21, 5.14.3; MBh. six times)²⁸.

In addition to these well-known phrases, we have expressions of similar purport that contain the word *atibhāra* (over-burden). The term appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa* only once, although the GOS Index does not list it.

nātibhāro 'sti daivasya (VRā. 3.65.29 = MBh. 11.25.30)

However, in the *Mahābhārata*, we have its further variations.

nātibhāraḥ kṛtāntasya : MBh. 7, App.14.11.

na daivasyātibhāro 'sti : MBh. 4.19.6, 10.9.10.

(Cf. also, *nātibhāro hi pārthasya* : MBh. 1.55.36).

These variations, however, do not appear in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Instead, the *Rāmāyaṇa* has its construction with *kāla*.

na kālasyātibhāro 'sti : VRā. 6.38.19.

This, in its turn, never appears in the *Mahābhārata*.

(11) *svaireṣv api*.

In the statement of a resolute promise, an oath or curse, and also in the formulation of the act of truth (*satya-kriyā* or *satya-vacana*), we often meet in the *Mahābhārata* the phrase *svaireṣv api* (even with

27. Cf. HOPKINS, 1899, p. 26, and BROCKINGTON, 1980, p. 142.

28. Cf. HOPKINS, 1899, p. 26, and BROCKINGTON, 1976, p. 125.

regard to indifferent matters, in wantonness), which is often construed with such phrases as *nokta-pūrvam anṛtam ... kadā cana* (I have never spoken untruth). The occurrence of this phrase in the *Mahābhārata* is listed below:

MBh. 1.38.2, 1.44.11, 1.49.19, 1.57.10, 1.107.17, 3.46.5, 3.71.13, 3.194.23, 3.281.97.12.49.24, 13.51.17, 14.56.10, 14.68.19, 17.2.20.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* also abounds in this sort of oath and curse. A few examples may suffice to illustrate the situation. First of all, the following expression is repeated three times:

*anṛtaṃ nokta-pūrvam me na ca vakṣye kadā cana
kṛcchreṣv api gataḥ saumya kṣatra-dharmaṇa te śape*

(VRā. 1.57.18)

etat te pratijānāmi satyenaiva śapāmi te

(VRā. 4.7.21cd)

cāritra-sukha-śīlatvāt praviṣṭāsi mano mama

(VRā. 6.38.29cd)

Other examples of similar purport are as follows:

anṛtaṃ nokta-pūrvam me vīra kṛcchre 'pi tiṣṭhatā

dharma-lobha-parītena na ca vakṣye kathaṃ cana (VRā. 4.14.13)

pracetaso 'haṃ daśamaḥ putro rāghava-nandana

na smarāmy anṛtaṃ vākyam tathemaṃ tava putrakau (VRā. 7.87.17)

na smarāmy anṛtaṃ hy uktam na ca hīṃsāṃ smarāmy aham

(VRā. 7.64.7ab)

Despite this oft-recurring expression of resolute statement, we never meet this construction with *svaireṣv api*.

One may compare *kṛcchreṣv api gataḥ* (VRā. 1.57.18) and *ciraṃ kṛcchre 'pi tiṣṭhatā* (VRā. 4.14.13) to *svaireṣv api* of the *Mahābhārata*, but these phrases of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, curiously enough, never appear in the *Mahābhārata*.

(12) *kiṃ-śīla and kathaṃ-śīla*.

Brockington lists examples of *bahuvrīhi* compounds with interrogatives as the first member in the *Rāmāyaṇa* such as *kiṃ-rūpa* (3.32.2), *kiṃ-vīrya* (1.19.12), *kiṃ-karman* (3.64.7), *kiṃ-nimitta* (3.64.5), *kiṃ-parākrama* (3.32.2), *kathaṃ-rūpa* (3.64.7), *kathaṃ-vīrya* (3.32.2 and 64.7) and *kathaṃ-pramāṇa* (1.19.12). He also quotes two examples where these forms are used together:

kaś ca rāmaḥ kathaṃ-vīryaḥ kiṃ-rūpaḥ kiṃ-parākramaḥ
(VRā. 3.32.2)

kathaṃ-vīryaḥ kathaṃ-rūpaḥ kiṃ-karmā sa ca rākṣasaḥ
(VRā. 3.64.7)

He compares them with *kiṃ-vīryaḥ kiṃ-parākramaḥ* in MBh. 2.16.10²⁹. In the *Mahābhārata*, we have similar compounds with the word *-śīla* (*kiṃ-śīla* and *yac-chīla*).

kiṃ-śīlāḥ kiṃ-samācāraḥ kiṃ-vidyaḥ kiṃ-parāyaṇaḥ
prāpnoti brahmaṇaḥ sthānaṃ yat paraṃ prakṛter dhruvam
(MBh. 12.222.1)

For *kiṃ-śīlāḥ kiṃ-samācāraḥ*, cf. 12.81.2, 12.269.1; *kiṃ-śīlāḥ kiṃ-samācārāḥ*, 13.133.1; *kiṃ-śīlāḥ kiṃ-samutthānāḥ*, 12.102.1; *evaṃ-śīla-samācāraḥ*, 13.133.34 and 40.

dur-yodhano hi yat-senaḥ sarvathā viditas tava
yac-cchīlo yat-svabhāvaś ca yad-balo yat-parākramaḥ (MBh. 5.72.8)
Cf. *yac-cchīlam anujāyate* 3.9.11.

However, these compounds with *-śīla* never appear in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

II

Though not classified into the category of the phrases not shared by both the epics, the following is an example that shows a difference

29. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1982 (1), p. 345.

between the two epics of the contextual atmosphere around a particular word – in this case, the compound *yuddha-śraddhā*, which is found in both the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*. The present writer recently had occasion to discuss the Sanskrit word *śraddhā* used in the sense of desire³⁰. H.W. Köhler carefully studied the word in question as used in Vedic and early Buddhist literature and attributed to the word the meaning *Freigebigkeit* or *Spendefreudigkeit*, instead of the usual *Glaube*. It was, then, my task to investigate the use of the word in the sense of desire still exemplified in the epic literature.

The most remarkable usage in the *Mahābhārata* is its appearance in the *avyayībhāva*- compound, *yathā-śraddham* (as you like). However, this compound apparently never occurs in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, according to Brockington's list³¹.

Among ordinary *tatpuruṣa*-compounds, *yuddha-śraddhā* (desire, or eagerness to fight) stands out conspicuously. However, while the present writer was collecting all the occurrences of this compound in both the epics, he noticed the contextual difference between the two.

This compound, *yuddha-śraddhā*, occurs in the *Mahābhārata* without exception in proclamations of war, where it is governed by forms of either the verb *vi-nī-*, in either the present or future tenses, or of the verb *chid-*, but only in the present tense. Among the occurrences with *vineṣyāmi*, we can distinguish the following three types:

tiṣṭha tiṣṭha na me jīvan droṇaputra gamiṣyasi
yuddha-śraddhām ahaṃ te adya vineṣyāmi raṇājire (MBh. 7.131.62)

(Ghaṭotkaca said,) «Wait, wait, o son of Droṇa, you shall not go (escaping) from me with your life. I shall today dispel your eagerness for fighting on the battlefield».

kiṃ katthitena bahudhā yudhyasvādya mayā saha
adya te 'haṃ vineṣyāmi yuddha-śraddhām vṛkodara (MBh. 9.32.46)

30. Cf. M. HARA, "Śraddhā in the sense of desire", to be published in *J. May Felicitation Volume*.

31. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1970 (1), p. 393.

(Duryodhana said,) «What need is there to boast multifariously. Fight now with me! Today, I shall beat out of you your desire for fighting, O Vṛkodara».

*sarva-śaṣṭrāṇi cādatsva yojayasva ca vāhinīm
ahaṃ hi te vineśyāmi yuddha-śraddhāṃ itaḥ param* (MBh. 5.94.24)

(Nara said,) «Take up all your weapons and array your army. I shall relieve you of your desire for battle for evermore».

In place of the future form, the present form of the same verb appears in the following passage:

*yāvad asya śitair bāṇaiḥ saṃrambhaṃ vinayāmy ahaṃ
yuddha-śraddhāṃ ca kaunteya jīvitasya ca saṃyuge* (MBh. 7.169.56)

(Sahadeva said,) «(Let him come to me....) until, with my sharp arrows, O son of Kuntī, I remove his arrogance (*saṃrambha*), quench his desire for battle and crush his hope of life on the battle field».

The verbal root *chid-* appears in the same context:

*na hy ahaṃ nādya vikramya sthaviro 'pi śiśos tava
yuddha-śraddhāṃ raṇe chindyāṃ jīvitasya ca sūtaja* (MBh. 5.166.3)

(Bhīṣma said,) «For certainly today, though I am old and you are young in age, showing prowess, I will quell your desire for battle and crush your hope of life, O son of Sūta».

However, if we turn our attention to the other epic, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the syntactic outlook around the compound *yuddha-śraddhā* changes completely because of its different phraseology. Here we do not meet any more constructions with the verb *vi-nī-* and *chid-*. Let us examine the examples, all found in the last *Kāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa*:

*yuddha-śraddhātha vā te 'sti śaṅkha-cakra-gadādhara
ahaṃ sthito 'smi paśyāmi balaṃ darśaya yat tava* (VRā. 7.8.5)

(Mālyavat said,) «Or, if ever you have a desire to fight, O holder of the conch, discus and mace, here I stand; show your prowess that I may see it».

*kṣāmasvādya daśagrīva uṣyatām rajanī tvayā
yuddha-śraddhā tu yady asti śvas tāta samare 'rjunam* (VRā. 7.32.29)

«O Daśagrīva, would you please wait until tomorrow. If you still have the desire to fight, then (challenge) Arjuna (Haihaya) tomorrow, O dear friend».

*evam uktās tu śakreṇa devāḥ śakra-samā yudhi
saṃnahyanta mahāsattvā yuddha-śraddhā-samanvitāḥ* (VRā. 7.27.5)

«Having been thus addressed by Indra, the great-spirited gods, who were equal to Indra in battle, armed themselves, being fully endowed with the eagerness for fight».

Thus, in the phraseology around the compound *yuddha-śraddhā*, we note a distinct difference of usage between the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*.

III

Lastly, we shall have a look into the problem of how the most frequent phrase in the *Mahābhārata* is treated in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The phrase here dealt with ordinarily takes the following form:

atrāpy udāharantīmam itihāsaṃ purāṭanam (on this point people cite as an illustration this old legend).

This phrase introduces a dialogue (*saṃvāda*), or proverb (*gīta*, or *prokta*), or a story that happened in the past (*yad... vṛttam*), with the intention of illustrating the point of discussion. It is to be noted that this phrase never introduces so-called episodes (*upākhyāna*) such as the stories of Nala and Sāvitrī. Hence the phrase abounds in book 12, which contains it more than seventy times (72 times), in contrast to book 1 (only twice, 1.54.23, 1.201.1) and book 3, the so-called book of episodes (five times only).

Occasionally, the particle *api* is replaced by *eva*, and then the opening portion takes this form:

atraivodāharantīmam (5.33.84, 5.36.1, 12.11.1, 12.21.1, 12.29.12, 12.171.57, 12.219.1, 12.220.6, 12.267.1, 12.275.2, 13.9.7, 13.95.1).

Other variations are:

atra te vartayiṣyāmi (12.263.2, 12.277.2)
atra te vartayiṣye 'ham (12.224.6, 12.291.7, 12.298.3)
atra te varṇayiṣye 'ham (12.146.2)
hanta te vartayiṣye 'ham (12.162.28)

We also have the openings *śṛṇu me vistareṇemam* (1.201.1), *śṛṇu rājan purā vṛttam* (5.9.3), and *śṛṇu pārtha yathā-vṛttam* (12.149.1).

This same phrase as a whole – *atrāpy (or eva) udāharantīmam itihāsam purātanam* – never appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Only its last portion, *itihāsam purātanam*, is twice found in the sixth book of the Bombay edition, but these verses are excluded in the Baroda critical edition³².

imam āṛṣa-stavaṃ divyam itihāsam purātanam
ye narāḥ kīrtayiṣyanti nāsti teṣāṃ parābhava (VRā.6.117.32, Bombay)
striyo rajasvalāḥ śrutvā putrān sūyur anuttamān
pūjayamś ca paṭhamś itihāsam purātanam (VRā.6.128.114, Bombay)

We note here that even this fractional portion of the phrase *itihāsam purātanam* in the *Rāmāyaṇa* does not serve to introduce a dialogue (*saṃvāda*) or other episodes, as in the case of the *Mahābhārata*. Rather, these two occurrences in the Bombay Vulgate Edition, if we scrutinize them carefully, are located in the midst of the context of the so-called *śravaṇa-phala*.

Furthermore, the preceeding portion that modifies our phrase – that is, *imam āṛṣa-stavaṃ divyam* (VRā. 6.117.32) – never appears in the *Mahābhārata*.

32. Cf. BROCKINGTON, 1985, p. 86.

Though there still remain many problems to be investigated, particularly with regard to phrases that speak of the *śravaṇa-phala* both in the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*, here we only note that the most popular phrase in the *Mahābhārata* (*atrāpy udāharantīmam itihāsaṃ purātam*) does not occur in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and even its fractional portion is used in the Vulgate Edition with a different contextual atmosphere, namely that of *śravaṇa-phala*³³.

Abbreviations

- AJPh : *American Journal of Philology* (Baltimore)
 BDCPL : *Bulletin of the Department of Comparative Philology and Linguistics* (Calcutta University)
 GOS : *Gaekwad's Oriental Series* (Baroda)
 HOS : *Harvard Oriental Series* (Cambridge, Mass.)
 IJ : *Indo-iranian Journal* (The Hague)
 IL : *Indian Linguistics* (Poona)
 IT : *Indologica Taurinensia* (Torino)
 JAOS : *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (Baltimore)
 JOI : *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda)
 JRAS : *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London)
 MBh. : *The Mahābhārata* (Poona Critical Edition)
 ṚTAM : *Journal of Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad* (Lucknow)
 VRā. : *The Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* (Baroda Critical Edition) unless otherwise indicated.

33. Other phrases peculiar to the *Rāmāyaṇa* that have come to my notice are as follows:

jagatyāṃ jagatī-nātha (-pati).
aśru-pūrita-locana.
bāṣpa-paryākula (-mukha, -jana, -īkṣaṇa).
bāṣpa-pragranthitākṣara.
bāṣpa-saṃruddha-kaṇṭha.

Bibliography

BROCKINGTON, J.L.

- 1969 : "The Verbal System of the *Rāmāyaṇa*", JOI 19, Nos. 1-2, pp. 1-34.
 1970(1) : "The Nominal System of the *Rāmāyaṇa*", JOI 19, No. 4, pp. 369-415.
 1970(2) : "Stereotyped Expressions in the *Rāmāyaṇa*", JAOS 90, pp. 210-227.
 1976 : "Religious Attitudes in *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa*", JRAS, pp. 108-129.
 1977 : "Figures of Speech in the *Rāmāyaṇa*", JAOS 97, pp. 414-459.
 1978 : "Sanskrit Epic Tradition I. Epic and Epitome (*Rāmāyaṇa* and *Rāmopākhyāna*)", IT 6, pp. 79-111.
 1980 : "Vālmiki's Proverbs", IT 7, pp. 139-150.
 1982(1) : "The Syntax of the *Rāmāyaṇa*", JOI 31, No. 4, pp. 340-354.
 1982(2) : "The Language of the *Rāmāyaṇa*", BDCPL 7, pp. 21-30.
 1985 : "Sanskrit Epic Tradition (III. Fashions in Formulae)", in *Proceedings of the Fifth World Sanskrit Conference*, New Delhi, pp. 77-90.
 1985-86 : "Guarded by Grass, A *Rāmāyaṇa* Motif and some western Parallels", IT 13, pp. 15-28.
 1989-90 : "The Text of the *Rāmāyaṇa*", IT 15-16, pp. 79-90.

GONDA, J.

- 1965 : "The Number Sixteen", in his *Change and Continuity in Indian Religion*, 's-Gravenhage, pp. 115-130.

HARA, M.

- 1959 : "A Note on the Sanskrit word *ni-tya*", JAOS 79, pp. 90-96.
 1969 : "A Note on the Sanskrit word *ni-tya*", RTAM 1, pp. 41-50.

HOPKINS, E.W.

- 1899 : "Proverbs and Tales common to the two Sanskrit Epics", AJPh 20, pp. 22-39.
 1901 : *The Great Epic of India*, New Haven.

SEN, S.

- 1965 : "Historical Syntax of Middle-Indo-Aryan", IL 13. Reprint edition cf. volume 1-15, volume III, comprising vols. 9-15 (1944-1950). Poona, pp. 355-473.