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ARTICLE I.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE VEDA;*

BY MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

PROFESSOR IN JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE, MD.

Presented to the Society April, 1892.

I. THE LEGEND OF SOMA AND THE EAGLE.

The legend of the rape of the heavenly drink, the Soma, is one of the most valued themes of the Vedic poets and the story-tellers of the Brāhmaṇas. The event is constantly alluded to, and not infrequently narrated in full. The earliest version of the legend in mantra-form is given at RV. iv. 26 and 27, and the interpretation of these two hymns has engaged the interest of Vedic scholars from very early times. Especially iv. 27 contains evidently the most complete and rounded statement of the event in question, and many are the attempts which have been made to elucidate this difficult hymn. The correct interpretation of the hymn seems to have been lost among the Hindus themselves at a very early time, since the AA. ii. 5. 13 ff. places the first stanza in the mouth of its reputed author, Vāmadeva, who thus becomes himself the eagle, and is supposed to have discovered all the races of the gods. This view of the hymn is adopted from the AA. by Siyama, and he therefore has nothing to offer which we may employ in establishing the general character of the myth. Adalbert Kuhn, in his famous book, Die Herabkunft des Feuers und des Göttertrankes, p. 146, supposes that Indra, having been confined in the bosom of the clouds, assumes the form of an eagle, and brings the Soma to mortals, after having overcome Tvaṣṭar, or some other hostile divinity. Ludwig, in his translation, ii. 592 ff., and in his commentary, v. 467 ff., does not present a systematic interpretation of the hymn from

*This is the fifth of the series bearing this title: as to the first three, see this Journal, vol. xv., pp. 143 ff.; the fourth appeared in the Amer. Journ. Philol. xii. 414-443.
the point of view of its mythological character. On p. 468 of
the commentary, he considers Soma as the speaker in the first
stanzas of iv. 27, and this characterizes his conception of the
situation. Grassmann, in his translation, i. 134 ff., correctly puts
the first stanza into the mouth of the eagle, the succeeding
stanzas being spoken by Soma. While this is correct, Grassmann
does not make any attempt to state who the eagle really was,
and how the eagle and the Soma came into such close relation as to
justify a dialogue between them. By dint of emending nir
adiyam in st. 1 to nir adiyat, as well as by certain other changes
in the text, Roth has reconstructed and translated the hymn in
Z.D.M.G. xxxvi. 353 ff.* In his opinion, Soma in a monologue
describes how the eagle came to carry him away, and how he
succeeded in performing this undertaking. Roth also does not
attempt to explain the myth. His method of dealing with the
hymn was criticised by Bergaigne, Religion Védique, iii. 322 ff.
The latter regards Soma as the speaker in stanza 1, and thinks
that Soma himself, taking the form of an eagle, flies forth (cf.
especially p. 325). Another explanation, too complicated for dis-
cussion in this connection, is that of Koulikovski in the Revue
de Linguistique, xviii. 1 ff. Both Bergaigne’s and Koulikovski’s
views are criticized by Eggeling in the introduction to the second
volume of his translation of the Çatapatha-Brahmana, Sacred
Books of the East, xxvi., p. xx ff. Pischel, in Pischel and Geldner’s
Vedische Studien, i. 206 ff., has advanced an explanation of the
hymn which introduces Indra, the eagle, and Soma as the
dramatis personae, without attempting any naturalistic explana-
tion of the eagle. According to Pischel, the first half of st.
1 is spoken by Indra; the second half by the eagle; the first
half of st. 2 by Soma; the remainder of the hymn is nar-
rated by the poet. Certain points in Pischel’s exposition of the
hymn have been criticized by Ludwig in his essay l’ber Methode
bei Interpretation des Rig-Veda, pp. 30, 66; he does not, how-
ever, substitute any distinct view of the hymn in the place of
his own former translation, or of the interpretation advanced by
his predecessors. Further, Hillebrandt in his recent book,
Vedische Mythologie (Erster Band), Soma und verwandte Gö-
ter, pp. 277 ff., has defended anew Roth’s emendation, and has
added points of view in support of his interpretation. He, how-
ever, also fails to show who the eagle is, and wherein is to be
found the naturalistic basis for the entire myth. Finally, Reg-
naud in a still more recent volume, entitled Le Rig-Veda et les
origines de la mythologie indo-européenne, pp. 298 ff., has sub-
jected many of his predecessors to a most radical criticism,
dominated by his own peculiar views, and he has not failed to
add his own translation of RV. iv. 26 and 27.

* Hillebrandt, in his Veda chrestomathy, p. 25, adopts most of Roth’s
suggestions, and accordingly he has taken nir adiyat into the text,
instead of nir adiyam of the MSS.
My own treatment of the legend, undertaken somewhat shame-facedly after so many painstaking efforts on the part of my predecessors, is justified by a greater sympathy for the versions of the story, and the allusions made to it, in the entire literature, as far as it was accessible to me. Certainly all former attempts are deficient on the very face of them, because they do not pay due regard to the later forms of the legend. They do not endeavor to show how the versions of the Brāhmaṇas, which in the most familiar manner substitute the gāyatrī-metre in the place of the eagle, could have arisen upon the basis of the form of the legend in the mantras. I shall endeavor to show that the gāyatrī is the mystic sacerdotal name of Agni, the heavenly Agni (the lightning), who is the eagle. The legend contains the description of the flight forth of the lightning from the womb of the cloud; as the lightning shoots from the cloud, the heavenly fluid, the Soma, streams down upon the earth. The individual points of the myth will appear in greater detail in the course of this exposition.

He who undertakes to interpret the three stanzas which make up AV. vi. 48 must certainly grope in the dark without a knowledge of the ritualistic literature. The case is somewhat similar to that of AV. vi. 80:* practices and legends are at the back of the stanzas; they are in fact not proper Atharvan-verses, but evidently belong to the same class as a host of formulas in the Yajus-saṁhitās, and their employment as such in the Atharvan ritual will appear very clearly. The stanzas are:

1. gyanō ‘si gāyatrāchandā ānu tvā rabhe: svastī mā sīṁ vahā ‘syā yajnasya d’ci sūkha. 2. rḥūr asī jāyacchandā ānu tvā rabhe: svastī etc. 3. vṛ’ṣi ‘si trīṣṭīpchanḍā ānu tvā rabhe: svastī etc.

The passage may be translated: 1. ‘Thou art the eagle, thy metre is the gāyatrī, thee I take hold of; carry me prosperously to the completion of this sacrifice. 2. Thou art a R̄bhu, thy metre is the jagatī, thee I take hold of, etc. 3. Thou art a bull, thy metre is the tristubh, thee I take hold of, etc.’

The style of the passage and the expression yajñasya udeśc (cf. VS. iv. 9, 10; ČB. iii. 1. 1. 12; xiv. 1. 1. 4; AČS. iv. 2. 8) point to the grānta-ceremonial for its explanation. Accordingly passages which correspond more or less closely occur extensively in the grānta-literature. Thus, at TS. iii. 2. 1. 1. we have: gyanō ‘si gāyatrāchandā ānu tvā”rabhe svastī mā sīṁ pāraya; suparṇō ‘si trīṣṭīpchanḍā ānu, etc.; sūkhā ‘si jāyagatīchandā ānu, etc. The passage is quoted with the words gyanō ‘si gāyatrāchandāḥ in Ap. Čr. xii. 17. 15. At ČB. xii. 3. 4. 3–5; KČS. xiii. 1. 11, we have the same formulas with the variant rḥūr asī for sūkha ‘si in the third. At GB. i. 5. 12–14 the same formulas with samrāḍ asī for suparṇo ‘si, and svaro ‘si gayo ‘si (like PB. below) for

sughū 'si. At ÇÇS. vi. 8, 10–12, we have: cyeno 'si patvū gāya-
trachandā anu tvā "rābe svasti mā sam pīrayā 'sya yajñase
'dream; suparno 'si patvū trīṣṭupchandāḥ; sakāh 'si patvū
jagachandāḥ. At PB. i. 3, 8; 5, 12, 15 we have: cyeno 'si
gāyatrachandā anu tvā "rābe, etc.; vṛṣako 'si trīṣṭupchandā,
etc.; svaro 'si gāyo 'si jagachandāḥ, etc.: cf. also LCS. i. 12, 13;
ii. 1, 5; 5, 5.* All these texts, excepting the TS., state dis-
tinctly that the three formulas were employed respectively at,
the three daily pressures of the Soma; and accordingly the Atharvan
hymn in question (vi. 48) is employed in the Vāït. Sū. 17, 10;
21, 7 on the same occasions: stanza 1 at the prūṭah-savana;
st. 3 at the mādhyaṇāna; st. 2 at the trīṣṭiya-savana. This
accords perfectly with ÇB. iv. 2, 5, 20: gāyatri vī prūṭah-sava-
nana vahati, trīṣṭum mādhyaṇānaṁ savanam, jagati trīṣṭiya-
savanam. Very much the same statements occur at TS. ii. 2, 9,
5, 6; TB. i. 8, 8, 3; ÇB. iv. 3, 3, 9; AB. iii. 12, 3–5; PB. vi. 3,
11; Vāït. 19, 16, 17; ÇÇS. xiii. 5, 4–6; xiv. 33, 7, 10, 18; KÇS.
xxv. 14, 14, 17; Chand. Up. iii. 16, 1, 3, 5; Sūyana to RV. i.
164, 23; Agnivāmin to LCS. ii. 5, 5, and elsewhere.† Further-
more, this distribution of the metres among the soma-pres-
sures is the fundamental and prevailing one in the hymns of the RV.,
as was shown by Bergaigne in his posthumous Recherches sur l’histoire de la liturgie Védique, printed in vol. xiii. (1889)
of the Journal Asiatique: see especially chapter iv., p. 166 ff.

The second stanza of our hymn, which is employed at the
trīṣṭiya-savana, is addressed to the Rbhus, who are sharers in it
with Indra at all periods of early ritualistic practice.‡ Thus the
scholiast at KÇS. xxii. 6, 4: ārbhavam iti trīṣṭiya-savanapavanā-
nam ucyate 'the pavanām stotra at the third pressure is said
to belong to the Rbhus.' Similarly the scholiast at ÇB. x. 1, 2, 7:

* The connection of the eagle and the gāyatri-metre appears also at
VS. xii. 4: suṇarvā 'śī garutmaṇām triṣṭe te vrio gāyatrîn caṅkṣaḥ, etc.
† The employment of the entire hymn at Kāṇç. 56, 4: 59, 27 is more
secondary: it is recited at the initiation of the brahmaçārin and at the
. dikṣitasya ved bhramacaśi no vi dāyapradānam. This employment is
probably due to the occurrence in the hymn of designations of metres,
in whose protection the person about to be consecrated is placed. At
the rājesīghi, also a ceremony of consecration, the king is commended
the care of the metres: see TS. i. 8, 18, 1; VS. x. 10–14; ÇB. v. 4,
1, 3 ff.
‡ I would not pass without notice the frequent connection in the
ritual of the Ādityas and Sūrya with the evening pressure: see e.g.
ÇB. xii. 3, 4, 1; ÔB. i. 4, 7, 8; 5, 11; Ap. Çr. xiii. 11, 1; ÇÇS. xiv.
14: AB. ii. 32, 1; Nirukta vii. 10: cf. Bergaigne, l. c. p. 171. The
jagni metre elsewhere also is associated with the Ādityas and the sun :
e. g. ÇB. x. 3, 3, 6; TA. iv. 6, 1. At PB. i. 5, 15, where the formula is
svaro 'śī gāyo 'śī jagachandāḥ, etc., the commentator also ascribes
the ceremony to Sūrya: he ārbhavapavanāṇām śrīya śrīya śrīya śrīya\
trīṣṭiya jagachandāḥ. Similarly the Rudras, Indra’s companions, are
frequently associated with the noon pressure and the trīṣṭiya, e. g. Ap.
Çr. xii. 2, 8; xiv. 30, 7.
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trīyasavane saptadvastra triyātmakah ārbhavah pavanānāh. Cf. also AÇŚ. v. 17. 1 ff.; GB. ii. 2. 22. This is represented in the RV. by passages like RV. iv. 35. 7, prītāh sūtān apībo haryaya vādhyānīnāṁ sīvānāṁ kēvānāṁ teḥ: sām rūbhhiḥ pībavā raṇuṛdhebhīḥ sākhiḥ yān indra cakṛṣe sukṛtyā́ in the morning you drank the pressed drink, O you with the bay steeds; the noon-tide pressing is exclusively yours; drink (in the evening) with the Rbhus, the bestowers of treasure, whom you have made your friends because of their skilful deeds;† RV. iv. 34. 4, pībata vājū rbara vada vo māhi trīyaṁ sīvānam mādāya; RV. iv. 33. 11, tē nūmān asmē rbara vāsānī trīyē asmēn sīvane dādhīta. So also RV. iv. 34. 5; TS. iii. 1. 9. 2 : cf. Ludwieg, Rīg Veda, iii. 384; Bergaigne l. c. pp. 11 and 108. We have therefore for the second stanza of the hymn the following obvious conditions: it is recited at the trīyasavana, it is addressed to the Rbhus, and the Rbhus are connected with the jagati-metre because the jagati-metre is the prominent metre of the evening-pressures (cf. GB. ii. 4. 16, 18).‡ The third stanza of AV. vi. 48 is employed at the noon-tide pressure, the mādhyānīnda. This, as is distinctly stated at RV. iv. 35. 7 (see above), belongs to Indra especially: see also iii. 32. 1; v. 40. 4; vi. 47. 6; viii. 13. 13; 37. 1; x. 179. 3; VS. xix. 26. The Brāhmaṇas and Śūtras frequently present the same statement: e. g. ÇB. ii. 4. 4. 12; AB. ii. 32. 1; GB. ii. 2. 21. The appearance of the Rudras at the mādhyānīnda, e. g. ÇB. x. 3. 4. 1; GB. i. 4. 7, 8; 5. 11; ÇŚ. xiv. 33. 11 (cf. VS. xxiii. 8), is founded upon early conceptions which assume their companionship with Indra: see e. g. in RV. iii. 32. 3, mādhyānīne sīvane vajrahasta pīṭh ruddhebhīḥ sāganah suṣṭra. That the trīstubh is the metre of Indra is stated distinctly at RV. x. 130. 5; TS. i. 8. 13. 1; vii. 1. 1. 4; 2. 6. 3; VS. viii. 47; ix. 33; xxiv. 60; MS. iii. 7. 3; Kāth. xxiii. 10; ÇB. ix. 4. 3. 7; 5. 1. 33; x. 3. 2. 5; TA. iv. 6. 1; KB. iii. 2. Moreover, at TS. vi. 1. 6. 2; ÇB. iv. 3. 2. 8 we have the explicit statement that the trīstubh is the metre of the noon-pressure, and at Nir. vii. 10 Indra is mentioned along with these.

* Cf. ÇB. iv. 3. 3. 6.
‡ Or along with their good deeds?"

† It is of no mean interest to find the stanza AV. vi. 48. 2, which deals with the trīyasavana, in the middle between those of the prātāsavana and the mādhyānīnda. The Vāit. (17. 10) refuses to take them in this order, and the parallel versions cited on pp. 3. 4 present the stanza which contains the divinity of the jagati-metre in the third, not in the second place. I make no doubt that the fault is with the diskenasts of the Cāunaka-version of the AV.: the critical Atharvān edition of the future will follow the manifestly sensible arrangement of the stanzas as given in the Vāit., TS., etc. The case is especially calculated to prove that independent criticism may be brought to bear on the traditional arrangement of stanzas in Vedic hymns: it shows also once more the inseparable relation between the hymns and the ritual, and the futility of carrying on the study of either without the aid of the other. In this instance, certainly, the ritualistic tradition is better, and reaches behind that of the Sūhhitā.
The third stanza of our hymn thus presents the following conditions: it is recited at the noon-tide pressure, it is addressed to Indra under the thin disguise of his epithet \( vrṣān \) *‘bull,’ and it is connected with the \( trīṣṭubh \), the prevailing metre of the mid-day pressure: cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.* viii. 52 ff.; Bergaigne, l. c. p. 166 ff., 196.

We have thus shown that stanzas 2 and 3 are invocations respectively to the Rbhus at the evening pressure, and to Indra at the mid-day pressure. In order to render clear the divinity which is invoked in stanza 1 by the name of \( cyena \) ‘eagle,’ we must go further afield. In the Brāhmaṇas the legend of Soma and the eagle appears very consistently in a version which substitutes the \( gāyatrī \) for the eagle. The story is told or alluded to innumerable times in texts of this sort. Thus, it is treated at AB, iii. 25–27 as follows:

‘King Soma, you know, lived in yonder world (in heaven).
In reference to him the gods and the Rṣis deliberated: “How might this King Soma come to us?” They said to the metres:
“Do ye bring to us this king Soma.” “All right” (said they).
They, transforming themselves into birds, flew up. Because they, transforming themselves into birds (\( suparna \)), flew up, the knowers of legends designate (this event) as the bird-legend (\( śūparna \)). The metres then went to king Soma. . . The \( jayati \) . . . flew up first. In flying up, she became tired after having gone half way. . . . Then the \( trīṣṭubh \) flew up. In flying up, after having gone more than half way, she became tired. . . .
The gods said to the \( gāyatrī \): “Do you fetch king Soma.” “All right” (said she); “do ye pronounce over me the entire charm for procuring a safe journey.” “All right” (said they). She flew up. The gods recited over her the entire formula for procuring a safe journey: “\( pra, ca, ca \); in perfect safety he goes; in safety he comes back.” . . . She, flying, frightened the guardians of the Soma, and with her feet and bill seized king Soma. . . . Kṛṣṇu, a guardian of the Soma, discharging (an arrow) after her, cut off a talon of her left foot. . . . What (the \( gāyatrī \)) seized with her right foot, that became the morning pressure (\( prātahastāvahana \)). . . . What she seized with her left foot became the noon pressure (\( madhyāstādīvāna saṇavam \)). . . . What she seized became the third pressure (\( trīṇām saṇavam \)). . . .

This form of the legend is alluded to familiarly in various places, at times with distinct mention of the identity of the eagle (\( cyena \)) and the \( gāyatrī \). Thus, at CB. i. 8. 2. 10, \( tad vāi kuniśthānān chandah sad gāyatrī prathavān chandusāṃ yujyate tad vād viryena‘va yac chyena bhārāvā divah somam abharat . . .

Though the smallest metre, the \( gāyatrī \) is employed first of the

* \( Vṛṣaku \) at PB. i. 5. 12; LCS. ii. 1. 5. The commentator at PB. glosses the word by \( tādāraḥ \), as does also Śāyāṇa at AV. vi. 48. 3.
metres; and this on account of her strength, since, having transformed herself into an eagle, she brought the Soma from heaven;'

ÇB. iii. 4. 1. 12, çyenāya tvā somabhṛte viśnave tve 'ti,* tad gṛyātrīṃ anvādbhajati sā yad gṛyātri śyena bhūtvā divah somam āharat tena sā śyenāḥ somabhṛt 'In uttering the formula: "Thee for the Soma-bearing eagle! thee for Viṣṇu!" thereby he assigns to the gṛyātri her share. Because the gṛyātri, having become an eagle, carried off Soma from heaven, therefore she is the Soma-bearing eagle.' Similarly iii. 9. 4. 10, çyenāya tvā somabhṛta iti, tad gṛyātryāṃ minite 'gnahe tvā rayaspasada ity aqṇir vāi gṛyātri tad gṛyātryāṃ minite sā yad gṛyātri śyenāḥ bhūtvā divah somam āharat tena sā śyenāḥ somabhṛt '"Thee for the Soma-bearing eagle!" this he measures out for the gṛyātri. "Thee for Agni, the bestower of growth of wealth!" Now Agni is the gṛyātri; he measures this out for the gṛyātri. And since the gṛyātri, having turned eagle, fetched Soma from heaven, therefore she is the Soma-bearing eagle.' This passage is of especial interest as it mentions Agni distinctly as equal to the gṛyātri and the eagle; it contains in itself, as we shall see, the key to the entire legend. At ÇB. iv. 3. 2. 7 we have: 'In the beginning the metres consisted of four syllables. Then the jagati flew up for Soma, and came back leaving three syllables. Then the triśūḥbha flew up for Soma, and came back leaving behind one syllable. Then the gṛyātri flew up for Soma, and she came back bringing with her those syllables as well as Soma.' Very similar to the last is the allusion to the legend at PB. viii. 4. 1–4; ix. 5. 4. At ÇB. i. 7. 1. 1 we have: yatras vāi gṛyātri somam acaḥ 'patat tad asyā āharantya apūd asta 'bhṛtyatya parṇam praccheda gṛyātryāi vā somasya vā rīkṣas tat patiti parṇo 'bhavat 'When the gṛyātri flew towards Soma, a footless archer, aiming at her while she was carrying him off, severed one of the feathers (parṇa) either of the gṛyātri or of king Soma; this falling down became a parṇa-tree.' Cf. also Mahādhara to VS. i. 1. Very similar is TS. iii. 5. 7. 1 (cf. also TB. i. 1. 3. 10; 2. 1. 6; 4. 7. 5; iii. 2. 1. 1): tritiyayatam ito diśi soma āsit, tāṁ gṛyātry aḥ āharat, tasya parṇam acaḥiyata, tat parṇo 'bhavat 'In the third heaven from here dwelt Soma; him the gṛyātri stole. Of him a feather (parṇa) was cut off; that became a parṇa-tree.' And at ÇB. xi. 7. 2. 8, diśi vāi soma āsit tāṁ gṛyātri vayo bhūtvā āharat. Also PB. ix 5. 4 tells the story in a condensed form. And in Ap. Čr. i. 6. 8 we have the statement tritiyasyāi diśo gṛyātryāi soma āḥbrtaḥ.

The same ākhyaṇa within a different frame is told at TS. vi. 1. 6. 1 ff.: 'Kadrū and Suparnī fought for their own persons. Kadrū overcame Suparnī. She (Kadrū) said: "In the third heaven from here is Soma; steal him and ransom yourself with him." Kadrū is this (earth), Suparnī yonder (heaven); the

† Cf. also TS. i. 2. 10. 1: MS. i. 2. 6; 3. 3.
metres are the children of Suparnī. She (Suparnī) said (to the metres): “For this parents bring up children. Kadru has told me: ‘In the third heaven from here is Soma; steal him and ransom yourself with him.” The jagati, consisting of fourteen syllables, flew up; she returned without having obtained him; of her two syllables were wanting. . . The tristubh, consisting of thirteen syllables, flew up; she returned without having obtained him; of her two syllables were wanting. . . The gāyatrī, consisting of four syllables, flew up; . . . she took the Soma and the four syllables (lost by the others). She became octosyllabic.’ At MS. iii. 7, 3 there is another version of the same story: ‘Kadru is this (earth); Suparnī is Vāk (the voice); the metres gāyatrī, tristubh, and jagati are the children of Suparnī. Kadru conquered Suparnī, her person; she said: “Bring the Soma; with him ransom yourself.” She (Suparnī) sent the metres, saying: “Bring the Soma from yonder (heaven); with him ransom me.” Then the jagati flew up; she came with the cattle and the δικαί. . . Then the tristubh flew up; she came with the δακσινά and topas. . . Then the gāyatrī flew up; she brought the Soma.’ . . . A version which contains the leading features of the TS. and MS. occurs at Kāth. xxiii. 10 (cf. Kap. S. xxxvii. 1); it is reported by Weber, Ind. Stud. viii. 31 ff. Shorter versions of the story in this form occur also at ČB. iii. 6. 2. 2 ff. and ii. 2. 4. 1 ff. This version is at the base also of the later forms of the legend, as presented by the Suparnākhyāna, edited by E. Grube in the Ind. Stud. xiv. 1-31; Mahābhārata i. 1073 ff.; Rāmāyaṇa iii. 162 ff., etc.

That the identification of the gāyatrī with the eagle does not belong to the ephemeral clap-trap of the Brähmanas is very evident from the cumulative force of this testimony. There can be no doubt that we have here a version of the Suparnākhyāna which passed current in these texts because it was to all intents and purposes the original legend. To our knowledge there is in fact in the Brähmanas but one attempt—secondary on the very face of it—to substitute another personage for the eagle. It is the version of Kāth. xxxvii. 14, reported by Weber, Ind. Stud. iii. 466: ‘The gods and the Asuras were engaged in strife; the amṛta was at that time with the Asuras, with the demon Ćusna. Ćusna, namely, carried it in his mouth.’ Those of the gods who died, they remained just so; those of the Asuras (who died) Ćusna breathed upon with the amṛta; they revived. Indra perceived: “With the Asuras, with the demon Ćusna, is the amṛta.” He, having changed himself into a lump of honey, lay upon the way; this Ćusna swallowed, and Indra, changing into an eagle, snatched the amṛta from his mouth. Hence this one is the strongest of birds, for he is one form of Indra.” But the evidence of the mantras themselves does not admit of the identification of the eagle with Indra in the original version of our legend. For the eagle constantly brings the Soma to Indra; thus RV. iii. 43. 7, īndra pīda vṛṣadhitasya vṛṣaḥ ā yātī te
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The text is a passage discussing the legend of Soma and the eagle, referencing Sanskrit sources such as RV and MS. The passage delves into the identification of Agni as the eagle, the role of Soma, and the connection between the eagle and the Agni. It also touches on the metrical aspects of the legend, mentioning stanza 2 of AV vi. 48 and the use of different Sanskrit texts like CB, VS, and CB. iii. 2.

The passage also highlights the importance of understanding the context and the identification of Agni with the eagle, emphasizing the need for a detailed study of the sources. It concludes with a reference to the commentary on this passage, indicating further readings and scholarship.
leader is Agni, are connected with the gāyatrī at VS. xi. 58, 60; xxiii. 8; MS. i. 1. 10 (6. 6); i. 2. 8 (17. 9); i. 9. 2 (132. 5); ii. 7. 6 (80. 13); TS. iii. 3. 3. 1; TB. ii. 7. 15. 5; iii. 9. 4. 6; PB. vi. 6. 7; GB. ii. 2. 9; CÇS. xiv. 33. 8; Chând. Up. iii. 16. 1; Vāit. 15. 3; LÇS. iii. 12. 8; AGS. i. 24. 15; Ap. Çr. xii. 8. 1; 17. 4.

Further, Agni and the gāyatrī, or either of them, are the divinities regularly invoked at the prātahsavana. Thus RV. iii. 28. 1, ágnive jasava no havih purolpyâni játavedaḥ: prātah-svâné dhîyânaso; AV. vi. 47. 1 = TS. iii. 1. 9. 1 = MS. i. 3. 36, agnih prātahsvanâ pátv asmān; ÇB. ii. 4. 4. 12, āgneyân hi prātahsvanam; AB. ii. 32. 1, bhūr agnir jyotir jyotir agnir it prātahsvanany ca svasb. So also GB. ii. 3. 10, 11. The Vasus, who are identified with Agni in TB. ii. 1. 9. 3, or are regarded as the companions of Agni (cf. Ind. Stud. v. 240), are substituted at ÇB. xii. 3. 4. 1; TB. i. 5. 11. 3; GB. ii. 4. 7. 8; 5. 11; Ap. Çr. xiv. 20. 7; Nrâ. Tâp. Up. i. 2. 1. Both Agni (or the Vasus) and the gāyatrī are mentioned in connection with the prātahsavana at CÇS. xiv. 33. 7. 8; Chând. Up. iii. 16. 1; Nir. vii. 8. The gāyatrī by itself is correlated with the prātahsavana in AB. iii. 27. 1; PB. vii. 4. 6; viii. 4. 2; ÇB. iv. 3. 2. 8; CÇS. xxv. 14, 16; CÇS. xiii. 5. 4; cf. also Weber, Ind. Stud. viii. 24. 32 ff., and Bergaigneî. c. pp. 166, 166. All this, combined with the fact that the stanza AV. vi. 47. 1, agnih prātahsvanâ pátv asmān, is employed at Vâit. 21. 7 along with AV. vi. 48. 1 in the same invocation (to Agni), renders it certain that the cyena, the eagle, of the first stanza of our hymn is identical with Agni in the Atharvan and in the Yajus-saraühitas; and the question now arises whether this result is applicable to the legend of the eagle and the Soma in the mantras.

In RV. vii. 15. 4 = TB. ii. 4. 8. 1 we have the statement: navaññ hit stônam agneye divâh cyenya jûjanaṁ 'A new song of praise I have now produced for Agni, the eagle of heaven.' The expression divâh cyena occurs in addition only twice in the Rig-Veda, at vii. 56. 3 and x. 92. 6; it is applied both times to the Maruts, and needs no comment. But it fits the case of Agni also, if we conceive of him as the lightning, agnir vâidyutaḥ (TB. iii. 10. 5. 1), which shoots down from the cloud: cf. RV. vi. 16. 35, gârbe mûlûḥ pitûṣ pitâ vâidyutânâ aksarê. The gāyatrī also, which as we have seen is a personification of Agni, takes the epithet dâvidyutationi in PB. xii. 1. 2,* just as the verb dâvidyot is employed with vâidyut in RV. vi. 3. 8; x. 95. 10. At VS. xcviii. 18; TA. iv. 11. 1, the gāyatrī is endowed with divyâ śuk 'heavenly light.' Among the eight kâthakâinî which occur at the end of the first chapter of the kândâmukrama of the Åtreya-branch of the Black Yajur-Veda (see Ind. Stud. iii. 376,

*The commentator glosses: gāyatrī ca agnim añahotpatte tejoripatute dipyamânah bhavati, atâh cabâdasmâdhvya dâvidyutaśantabô gâyatrî eva pasthâpyate : cf. also PB. vi. 9. 25.
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452; xii. 352) occur certain īṣṭi designated as divaḥcyenetayat. They are the sixth of the list of eight, and are preceded by five methods of building the fire-altar (cīti). Cf. also the seventh ēlōka of the second chapter of the same anukrama. At TB. iii. 12. 1 and 2, the divaḥcyena īṣṭi is described, and the two opening mantras are addressed distinctly to Agni: tubhīyaṁ tā añgiras-tama (RV. viii. 43. 18; VS. xii. 116; TS. i. 3. 14. 3), and ap-yāna taṁ kūmān agne (RV. vi. 5. 7; VS. xviii. 74; TS. i. 3. 14. 3). There can therefore be little doubt that in the ritual also the expression divaḥ cyena is referred to Agni.

Agni is frequently spoken of as a bird: e. g. RV. i. 164. 52 (cf. TS. iii. 1. 11. 3; AV. vii. 39. 1), divyāṁ supaṁvāṁ viyāsām bhāntam āpāṁ gārbhaṁ dārcatām bādāhām; x. 114. 5, supaṁvāṁ vipāḥ kuvāyō vācōbhīr ēkaṁ sintam bāhudhā kalpayati: cf. also i. 58. 5; 141. 7; ii. 2. 4; vi. 3. 7; 4. 6; x. 8. 3. Thus the legend of the eagle and the Soma resolves itself into a poetic account of one of the very simplest natural phenomena; the descent of the lightning is viewed as the cause of the descent of the ambrosial fluid, the somā.* Soma is in the highest heaven, as is stated distinctly at RV. iii. 32. 10, paramē vyoḍan; at iv. 26. 6, divāḥ... uṭtarāḥ; at TS. vi. 1. 6. 1, trītyasyaṁ ītō divī sōmaḥ: cf. also TB. i. 1. 3. 10; ii. 3. 1. 1; Kṛṣṇa xxii. 10 (Ind. Stud. viii. 32), etc. In the Supānākhyāna 12. 1 we have the statement indrasya somaṁ nīhitaṁ ghuḥāyaṁ trītyāḥ prsthād rajaso vimūnīt: nīhataṁ rukṣaṁ tarasā pranādyā harisyāmi... indūm (cf. also 11. 1, 6; 21. 4; 29. 2). What real natural cause other than the lightning is it that could bring Indra's Soma, deposited in the hiding place (the cloud), after having crossed the space (rajas)? The heavy clouds immediately prior to the storm yield no fluid; but, when the storm has brewed long enough, the lightning rends the clouds, and with them come the torrents of water.† At Sup. 9. 5 it is stated that the eagle ca-  

denū sāu prsthivin divaṁ ca saṁdādavat eti nabhō dīcāḥ ca. 
The root naḍ is significant. Every summer we may watch this imposing natural drama, enacted by the cloud (garbha, guhā), the lightning (cyena), and the water of the cloud (soma). Hence doubtless Parjanya, the god of thunderstorms and rain (Muir, OSM. v. 142), is said to be the father of Soma: RV. ix. 82. 3; 113. 3.

At RV. i. 93. 6† (= TS. ii. 3. 14. 2), the two parallel mysteries, the descent of the fire and the descent of the Soma, are

* Cf. VS. vi. 84, somo rájā 'mrtaḥ sūtaḥ 'king Soma when pressed becomes amṛta; CB. ix. 5. 1. 8, tad yat tad amṛtaṁ somaḥ sah 'that which is amṛta, that is Soma.' The connection between soma and rain appears perhaps at TS. ii. 4. 9. 2, sūmyā khaṭu vā đhitor vṛśśin cyātāti.
† For the association of lightning and rain see RV. i. 39. 9; v. 84. 3; vii. 56. 13; x. 91. 5.
† It is of interest to note that this is the only hymn in the RV. which is addressed to Agni and Soma as a dvandra-devatā.
placed together: à 'nyāṁ dīvō mātariṇavā jahārā 'matnād anyām pāri cyenō ádrēḥ 'One (the fire) Mātariṣvan did bring from heaven, the other (the Soma) the eagle (the lightning) snatched from the cloud.' Similarly we have RV. vi. 20. 6, prā cyenō nā madirām aṇḍām asmāi ciro dāsāya nāmucar matbhāyan 'churning for him the head of the demon Namuci, as did the eagle the intoxicating plant (from the cloud, or the heavens)." The cloud is clearly enough implied, as may be seen from the closely parallel passage ix. 77. 2, sā pūrvyāh pava yānī dīvās pāri cyenō matbhāyad iṣitaś tirō rājāḥ 'He (the Soma) is the first to purify himself, whom the eagle, hurled across the ether, churned from the heavens.'

Before entering upon the discussion of RV. iv. 27, the principal version of the legend in the mantras, I would present a point which, though less transparent, seems also to support the explanation of the eagle as the lightning-fire. Colebrooke, Miscellaneous Essays, i. 319, mentions a performance called cyenayūga, without offering anything to explain it. The treatment of the word in the lexicons is based solely upon Colebrooke's report. At Kāuç. 43. 3 occurs according to the MSS. the following unintelligible text: ati dhavanī 'ty avasāmaniveśanānucaranānīnayaṇeyā. This has been emended in our edition by assuming haplography, so as to read... avasāna-nivesana-anucaranānīnayaṇeyā 'while reciting AV. vii. 41. 1, alighting (upon the spot where a house is to be built), sitting down upon it, and walking along it, one performs the sacrifice of pouring water upon the place.' By comparing the extracts given in the edition from Darila's commentary, the Atharva-paddhati, and Keśava's Paddhati, the basis of this translation may be easily recognized. Another emendation, avasāna-nivesana-anucaranānīnū nayaṇeyā, may do even better justice to the translation presented above. But all the commentaries agree in designating the performance as cyena-yūga or cyeneyā. Thus, e.g., most clearly the Atharva-paddhati: atha bṛhac-chūḍā-karma ucyate, ati dhavanī 'ty udāpitram abhinmanaṛya bhīmaṇu nīnayati, yatra grhain kariṣyati tatra viṣhnūṁ camayati, cyenadavatāpākayājañavidhi-nena 'jyabhāgantām kṛtvā... caruṁ jūhoti, bhāmāsthiṁe yatra grhaṁ kariṣyati, athavā nave grhe cyenayāgam kartavyaḥ. According to this, the ceremony is performed on the ground upon which a new house is to be built, or within the new house after its completion (cf. also Keśava on this point). Its purpose is to succeed in the erection of the house by removing untoward circumstances, or, according to Keśava, by purifying the ground. The ceremony consists in pouring water upon the ground, and offering a pot of rice porridge to the divinity cyena after the

* Grassmann translates very loosely "als ihm der adler zugeführt den rauchtrank, riss ab das haupt er namutschi des diämons." The misrendering of nd is especially apparent. Ludwig's translation (544) is by far a nearer approach to the meaning of the passage.
ājyatāntra customary in many ceremonies of the Kāuçika has been performed. It is striking that the text of the Kāuçika does not present the word gyena at all. If we regard the last syllables of the undoubtedly corrupt sūtra, namely neyū, the suspicion that the syllable gy has fallen out is hardly to be suppressed. Possibly then, once more, the sūtra was . . . anasūna-niveçana-anucarana-ninanamūnini gyeneyū, or something similar.

The text of the Atharvan-hymn, vii. 41, employed in this performance is undoubtedly related to the cycle of conceptions with which we are here dealing. Especially the first stanza exhibits unmistakable points of contact with RV. iv. 27. It reads: āti dhānavānī āty apīs tatārda gyenō nrcākṣā anasūnadāurā: tāran vīcuvāy āvarā rājānī sudrena sākhūyī cīvā d jagamyaā. 'He cut across the dry land and across the waters, the eagle, kind to men, looking for his goal; crossing all the lower atmospheric regions, may he with Indra his companion come here as a friendly one.' The second stanza does not add anything of material interest, except that the eagle is designated as divyāh suparnāh. But the epithet nrcākṣāh points distinctly towards Agni (cf. Contributions, third series, J.A.O.S. xv. 170), and cīvāh may also show us Agni on the way of development to the later Čiva. It would seem quite reasonable then to suppose that the entire cyenayāga is a charm against the dangers besetting a house, notably fire, and still more specifically, perhaps, fire due to lightning. In the hymn the lightning is implored to seek its goal, not as hostile destructive force, but as nrcākṣāh and cīvāh, and to bring property in its capacity as precursor of rain. Now all this would be purely hypothetical, in spite of its inherent probability, but for the fact that the two stanzas in the ritual elsewhere go by the name of samproksanyī (sc. rcīā): see Kāuç. 40. 9; 80. 42; 83. 17.* In 80. 42, the place of the funeral-fire is sprinkled while reciting the samproksanyī, doubtless to render Agni harmless (cīva). In 40. 9, a charm for producing the flow of water where previously there was none, the performer recites these stanzas while sprinkling water along the desired water-course. All this becomes intelligible upon the basis of the explanation of gyena as lightning, the companion of rain, and it seems difficult to imagine any other theory whatsoever.

If, now, we submit ourselves to the guidance of the facts assembled thus far, the hymn RV. iv. 27 resolves itself into a narrative of the legend undertaken by its two chief figures, Agni the lightning, and Soma. Agni begins the story in the first stanza: gihrē ni śūnā ānv esām avedam ahān devnāṁ jānimūni vīdvā: ātām mā pūra ḍasyār arakṣann dēha gyenō javāsāṁ nir adiyām.

* The hymn is rubricated also in the vāstu-gava, or vāstospatiyānī (sc. sūktānī) of the Gañamala, Ath. Parīç. 34. 5; cf. Kāuç. 8. 28, note. The second stanza is cited in Vāt. 22. 28, and in the Črāddhakalpa, Ath. Parīç. 46. 3, without contributing any valuable information.
Agni (the lightning) says: 'While yet in the (cloud-)womb I knew all the races of these gods here; a hundred brazen castles guarded me. Then as an eagle I flew forth swiftly.'

It is of interest to observe how our investigation, undertaken from the widest possible exoteric view of the legend in the entire Vedic literature, meets in a certain way the analysis of this stanza as made by Bergaigne, Religion Védique iii. 332 ff., from altogether internal criteria. Bergaigne's view of the stanza is, however, founded unnecessarily upon his theory of Vedic paradoxes; he recognizes, to be sure, that Agni does in some way enter into its make-up, but concludes nevertheless that Soma is speaking. After recognizing the presence of Agni in the wording of the passage, taken phrase by phrase, with a security of touch truly admirable, he says (p. 334): "Il est vrai qu'au vers iv. 27. 1 il s'agit, d'après ma propre interprétation, de Soma et non d'Agni. Mais quelle est celle des formules mythiques concernant Agni qui n'a pas été, au moins accidentellement, appliquée à Soma?" I confess that I cannot subscribe to such a view, either in general or in any particular instance. No one can deny that epithets, expressions, and general phrases are likely to be found applicable to more than one divinity and more than one situation, and that for the sake of their secondary application a point or two is occasionally strained. But it is certainly going too far to suppose that a continuous series of statements such as are contained in this stanza are primarily intended for Agni and then applied in cold blood to Soma. This view seems especially out of place in a hymn of such indubitable character as an ākhyāna. Here a story is told, and I would fain believe that any mysticism which appears in the final hermeneutic result is to be laid at the door of the interpreter, and not of the composer of the hymn.

The paradox would indeed here be overpowering, if it were real. Bergaigne's assumption would make the eagle and Soma identical; yet they are certainly two personages. Just as the Brāhmaṇaas sing the praises of the gāyatrī for bringing the Soma, just so do the hymns extol the eagle for the same feat. Thus RV. viii. 82. 9, 4. yām te cyenād padā "bharat tiro rájasya āśrīram: pibè'd asya tvām āciṣe 'Of the unconquerable Soma which the eagle brought with his foot across the ether, drink indeed of it; you own it.' Very similar is x. 144. 5, 4. yām te cyenāc ārṣram avrkām padā "bharad arunām mānām āndhaah, etc. Or ix. 68. 6, cyenō yid āndho ā bharat parāvāhā: cf. x. 144. 4. Again, iii. 43. 7, īndra pibā vr'sadhūtasya vr'sna ā yām te cyenā uciṣā jabhāra; iv. 18. 13, údhā me cyenō mādhyā jabhāra. In the Yajus-somāhitās and the Brāhmaṇaas the adjective somabhṛt 'he who brings the soma' is a standing epithet of the eagle. See the passages above, p. 7. Roth also (ZDMG. xxxvi. 354), though he advocates the serious emendation of nir udiṣyam to nir udiṣyaλ, does not lose sight of the separate individuality of the Soma and the eagle in his translation: 'da plötzlich schwelt auf mich (sc. Soma) herein der Adler.' Pischel indeed finds no
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less than three persons in the first stanza: Soma, Indra, and the eagle.

In our belief, as we have stated above, the speaker in the first stanza is Agni, the lightning, who here flies from the cloud-womb, just as he is spoken of in the *Suarakhyya* 3. 2 as *vidy[r̥]n meghākāhā* 'the lightning whose companion is the cloud,' or at AV. i. 12. 1 and 3 as *jarū[y]a* '(cloud-) placenta-born' and *abhr[ā]jā* 'cloud-born'? cf. *Seven Hymns of the Atharva-Veda,* Amer. Journ. Philol. vii. 470 (p. 5 of the reprint). At RV. vi. 16. 35, the following statement is addressed to Agni: *gārbhe mātāḥ pitāḥ pitar vīddiyutānō aksāre: sidhān rtāya yonīm å. The expressions *gārbhe mātāḥ*, *rtāya yonīm* and *vīddiyutānō* show again that the lightning breaking from the cloud is meant. Pischel's supposition (l. c. 215) that the first half of the stanza is spoken by Indra may be disproved on plain technical grounds: the locative *gārbhe* is never associated with Indra. On the contrary, the locative may be regarded as the peculiar property of Agni. The locative occurs nine times in the RV., the passages just discussed containing two of the occurrences. Of the remaining seven, three are plainly used in connection with Agni. Thus, at RV. i. 65. 4, *gārbhe* is applied to Agni in the expression *rtāya yonī gārbhe sujātim;* at RV. i. 148. 5, in *gārbhe sāntam (sc. aṁga)*; at RV. viii. 43. 9, in *agne gārbhe saṁ jāyane pūnāh.* The stanza RV. viii. 83. 8 is part of a hymn to the *vīce devāh,* and is addressed to the Maruts: *prā bhrātṛtvān suññānavō dīha dvitā samānyā; mātār gārbhe bharāmahe.* Ludwig (p. 233) translates: "unsere bruderschaft, o trefflich begabte, die vor alters bestandend gemeinsame, in der mutter leibe, die tragen wir hier vor." Grassmann translates: "wir tragen eure Bruderschaft gemeinsam, o schöngelende, an uns schon in der mutter Leib." The sense of both translations seems to be that the fraternal relation of the sacrificing mortals with the Maruts is (cf. RV. viii. 20. 22) from all time, even anterior to birth. This use of the combination *mātār gārbhe* seems to stand unsupported, and I do not see how the expression *prā bhrātṛtvān... mātār gārbhe bharāmahe* can be interpreted in this way. If we remember that the plants as well as the clouds and waters are the womb of Agni, the stanza may be imagined as liturgical, depicting the bringing on of fire, represented symbolically by firewood, which is then regarded as the mother in whose womb Agni lives (cf. RV. vi. 16. 35). We may then translate: 'then surely together do we carry forth (the means of) fraternal relation with you (the sacrificial fire) in the womb of the mother, O ye (Maruts) who confer good gifts.' Be this as it may—our suggestion is uncertain, and the stanza very obscure—there is no allusion to Indra in the passage. Of the other three RV. passages in which the locative *gārbhe* occurs, x. 53. 11 is a very obscure final stanza of an Agni-hymn; x. 177. 2 refers to the Gandharva in the waters: *sūrī (sc. vācaṁ) gandharnō vadvad gārbhe antāh;* x. 10. 5 deals with Yama and Yami. Thus the expressions containing the word *gārbhe* occur nowhere in any relation to Indra.
A striking confirmation of the identity of the lightning with agnir gärbe is afforded by CB. xii. 4. 4. 4, a prāyāścitta-performance of one who has been burned by lightning: yasya vāidyuta dahat kiṁ tatra karma ki prāyāścittir iti . . . yady u asya ṣṛdayam vy eva likheda agnaye 'paunate aṣṭakapālam puro- ḍaṣaṇi nirvapet (cf. Kātyā. Cṛ. xxv. 43) athāi te yājñyāntvāya: apsv agne sadhiṣā jaya-sā sudhāīr anurūdhyaśe: gärbe saṁ jāyase punar iti 'He whom the fire of the lightning burns, what performance shall he go through and what expiation? . . . If this burning annoys him, then let him offer a rice-cake in eight cups to Agni of the waters. Then these two formulas of invitation are recited: "In the waters, O Agni, is your goal, to the plants you are attached;" and "being in the [cloud-]womb you are born again." The stanza, quoted from VS. xii. 36, is identical with RV. viii. 43. 9, above, and its employment in such a ceremony shows clearly that lightning from the cloud-womb is meant in the expression agnir gärbe.

The expression āvane esām avedam ahāṁ devānāṁ jānimāni vīgvā is just as unequivocal evidence in favor of Agni's presence in the stanza. Pischel, l. c. p. 207, compares RV. viii. 78. 5, nākāṁ īntrapārānāṁ pariṣṭakāve: vīgvā ādīna pāryaśi, in support of this theory that Indra is the speaker in the first half of the stanza. But the parallelism in the two passages is too general, and cannot stand before the closer and more technical parallelism of the following passages, whose subject is Agni. To begin with the epithet jātāvedas, which is explained—it does not matter whether correctly or incorrectly—at RV. vi. 15. 13 by vīgvā veda jānimā, the very words which occur in iv. 27. 1, our passage: agnir . . . śa rījā vīgvā veda jānimā jātāvedāh. The very same statement occurs at iii. 4. 10, sā 'd (sc. agnī) u hōtā satyātaro yajāti yātā devānāṁ jānimāni veda 'may he indeed sacrifice as the more reliable hotar in accordance with his knowledge of the races of the gods.' Again, at RV. iv. 2. 18 = AV. xviii. 3. 23, (agnir) akhyad devenāṁ yāj jānimā (for jānimā according to the padapātha, 'Agni has seen the races of the gods;' at TS. iv. 7.

* Pischel, l. c., p. 94 contends with great earnestness that jātāvedas means 'having inborn knowledge,' in accordance with the common use of jāta- as the first member of compounds in the literature subsequent to the mantras. The utmost that may be conceded is that the mantras themselves, having lost sight of the true meaning of the word, deal with it in this sense by way of popular etymology. The word vedas never means 'knowledge.' In a compound of doubtful interpretation the only way is to hold to the proper sense of its members. Until vedas is found in the sense of 'knowledge,' we must assume that jātāvedas simply happened to lend itself to the interpretation given above, because there existed by its side the clearly marked conception that Agni knows the births, i. e. the true nature of gods, men, and things. As it is, the Veda explains jātāvedas by 'he who knows born things' (RV. vi. 15. 13), and not by 'he who has innate knowledge.' Cf. Whitney, A.J. Ph. iii. 409.
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15. 1 ; TB. iii. 9. 16. 4, agner manve prathamasya pracetusah. At AV. ii. 28. 2 we have tād agnir hōtā vayānāṃ vidvān viṣṇu devānāṃ jānīmāṃ vivakti 'then Agni the hotar who knows (his) work promulgates all the races of the gods.' The plain meaning of these expressions is that Agni, the messenger of man to the gods, is thoroughly acquainted with the latter and is capable of reaching them. At AV. xiii. 3. 21, by a slight shift of position, men who know Agni's birth say of themselves that they are acquainted with all the races of the gods, implying, no doubt, that they are thus gifted through their knowledge of Agni: vidvā te agne tredhā janātryan tredhā devānāṃ jānīmāṃ vidma; at AV. i. 8. 4, by still another simple modification, Agni is said to know the races of evil beings (yūdhaṇa, wizards), and to destroy them: yātrai 'stam agne jānīmām vēthā gāhā sudām arinān jātavedah: tēsā tvam . . . jahi. Thus the full meaning of the first half of RV. iv. 27. 1 is this: the heavenly fire, the lightning, in telling his part of the story announces himself by one of his chief characteristics, his special acquaintance with the gods, claiming its possession even yet in an embryonic state.

We turn now to the second half of RV. iv. 27. 1. Pischel (l.c. 207) lays considerable stress on the word javāsā, which he regards on account of its accent (javās, not javas) as a noun of agency rather than a noun of action. This, he thinks, supports his theory that Indra is the speaker in the first half-stanza. The second half-stanza, which he also puts into the mouth of the eagle, is then rendered by him as follows: "(Der Adler spricht:) Da flog ich der Adler mit dem schnellen (Indra) zusammen heraus."

We must, however, in this connection, consider the closely parallel passage RV. viii. 100. 8 = Sup. 31. 9, mūnojavā ayāmnā dyāsim akarat pīram, dīvaṁ suparnā yātvyā sōmān vārīna abharat 'going swift as the mind, the bird passed through the brazen castle; going to the sky, he brought the Soma to him of the thunderbolt.' Here the word mūnojavās evidently takes the place of javāsā at iv. 27. 1 (cf. also mūnojavās at iv. 26. 5); moreover, the expression abharat vārīna means 'he brought to Indra;' and there is therefore no possibility of Indra's having flown out together with the eagle. To clinch the point, we have at AV. vi. 92. 2 javās te arvam nihito gūhā yāh cyenē rāta uṣā yō 'carat pārītah: tēna tvāṁ . . . ajojī jaya 'with the swiftness, O steed, which has been secretly deposited in you, with (the swiftness) which moves in the eagle and in the wind, . . . with that win the race.' At VS. ix. 9 the passage occurs in this form: javā yēs te vājīn nihito gūhā yāh cyenē pārītah ācarac ca rite tēna no vājīn bālāvān bālēna vājaic ca bhava* . . . ; and Mahādhara unhesitatingly glosses: he vājīn aṣvapravah gūhā guhyāni ārdvāyaṇapradeṣe nihito 'vestīhipētah . . . cyenē cyenēkhye páksāni yo javāh parītah tvajāvī' va parīdat-

*Variants in the Kārṇa school x. 12 . . . parīto . . . vājaic cādi . . .

vol. xvi. 8
tahe sam acarat carati pravartate yaç ca te javah paridattah sun vute acarat vijyati carati, etc. There can be no doubt therefore that javäs, masculine, is employed as an abstract, just like jivas, neuter, e.g. in the expression cyenäya jivasä at RV. i.118.11; v. 78. 4. He whose grammatical conscience is affected by the undoubted fact that of oxytone and barytone couplets the former are regularly nouns of agency and the latter nouns of action (apäs 'active'; ápäs 'work'; ānandës 'feudos') may resort to a correction of the accent. But I question whether we are justified at present in imposing this grammatical theory, strongly supported by facts as it undoubtedly is, upon the tradition of the accented texts. These exhibit a considerable number of cases in which the accentual distribution does not hold good: see, for example, Whitney, Sk. Gr.* §1151 g; KZ. xxv. 602, and the dative infinitives like javäsät, döhäsät, etc. (Whitney, ib. §973 a).* The expression catäm mā pūra āyasir araksan may also be taken as an indication that Agni (the lightning) is the speaker in the first stanza. On this basis we can understand why Agni is frequently implied to act as a brazen castle for his worshiper, or to surround him with a brazen castle. At RV. viii. 15. 4, which is obviously an Agni hymn, we have nāvāni nā stōmam agnaye dīvāh cyenāya jijanam; this has been commented upon above. In stanza 14 of the same hymn we have the prayer addressed to Agni: āhū maḥi na āṣasy ... pāh bhava catābhujā 'then be thou for us a brazen castle with a hundred enclosures'; at vii. 16. 10, tāṁ ānhasah pipṛhi ... tvāṁ catām pūrbhiḥ; at vii. 3. 7, āgne ... catām pūrbhar āyasibhir ni pahi; at i. 58. 8, āgne gṛṇāntam ānhasa urusya ... pūrbhā āyasibhiḥ; at vi. 48. 8, catām pūrbhā yavistha pahi ānhasah, etc. It seems quite likely that these expressions convey an allusion to this important point in the life-history of Agni himself, namely his origin from the brazen castle in the sky, the clouds.

In the second stanza of iv. 27, the narrative is taken up by Soma: nā ghū sa mām āpa josain jabhūrā bhit'm uṣa tvākṣasā viryāna: īnā pārāśaḥ ajahād ārātir utā vōtan atarac chācuvasah 'Not indeed with ease did he carry me off; he was superior in strength and heroism. The liberal one left at a distance the Arātis (the demons of avarice); moreover he crossed the winds with mighty force.'

* Ludwig, Interpretation des Rüg-Veda, pp. 64, 67, suggests that cyenä javäsät be taken in the sense of cyenä-javäsät. But the types to which he refers by way of support involve generally a verb which has a value approaching the sense of the copula (e.g. krtvā in the sense of bhūtā: cf. the periphrastic perfect, and Delbrück, Syntaktische Forschungen, p. 108 ff.); and this very fact leads back to our translation 'as an eagle I swiftly flew forth.' Be this as it may, it does not change the value of the passage materially. Expressions such as are cited by Ludwig occur also in TB. iii. 8. 13; Ap. Čr. v. 2. 4 (ārpaṇa kṛpatā) and TB. iii. 7. 4. 8 (kṛṣṇo rūpaṇa kṛtva).

† Cf. Sup. 29. 6, ahām (sc. suparno) balena 'ty atarami sapatān.
In this translation the word īrmā is still uncertain. I cannot conclude with Pischel, l. c. p. 214, that it is equal to ātra in all its meanings, down to the very palest shades. He translates the passage by "da entging der Freiebigge (Indra) den Nachstel-lungen," da being the equivalent of īrmā. In this translation the word da has the faintest meaning possible in the case of ātra. That the parallel at RV. iv. 26. 7, ātra pūrāṇādhīr ajahūd ārūthā may be merely a seeming one is shown by Ludwig, Interpretation des Rig-Veda, pp. 30, 66. At RV. v. 73. 3 and viii. 22. 4, īrmā may well mean 'apart, at a distance.' At v. 62. 2 it is said to be a great achievement of Mitra and Varuna that īrmā taathūsīr (sc. dāca patā dhenāvāth) āhābhīr duduhre, which Pischel translates (p. 214) "dass die stehenden (Kūbe) Tag für Tag hierher Milch geben," hierher being the equivalent of īrmā. If the ten hundred cows stand apart, occupying as it were a large territory, their daily milking, which is the function of Mitra and Varuna, becomes a greater feat. At RV. x. 44. 6, it is said of the evil-disposed (kēpayāh) who are unable to ascend the ship of the sacrifice that īrmā 'vā tē ny āvīcanta. Ludwig ii. 248 translates "die sanken nieder verlassen,"* and this seems correct. It would be a very tame punishment for a Vedic Hindu to be compelled to continue to dwell upon the earth; they like nothing better than that. Hence the explanation of Yāska, Nir. 5. 25, ṛne hāī 'vā te nyāvīcanta 'smīnna eva loke simply propagates his belief in general that īrmā means 'here,' giving moreover an extreme theological bent to the entire passage. Bergaigne's supposition, iii. 328, that the parallelism of ātra in RV. iv. 26. 7 with īrmā in iv. 27. 2 has given rise to the traditional explanation of the word seems well worth further consideration. It is useless, however, to con-tend that the meaning of īrmā has been definitely settled; the intrinsic vagueness of the word is aggravated by the highly colored mythological character of the passages in which it occurs.

I have followed in my translation of pūrāṇādhī the general exposition of the word as laid down by Pischel in Vedicke Studien i. 202 ff.† In support of the abstract meaning of the word 'liberality,' which is in my opinion the primary meaning (cf. Zend pārāṇī), I would point especially to the intimate relation of pūrāṇādhī with sūn'rā; the latter has been recently well treated by Dr. Oertel in the P. A. O. S. for May 1891 (Journal, vol. xv., pp. xciv ff.), and he has arrived at the meaning 'liberality' for that word. At RV. i. 123. 6 we have ād īrātām sūn'rā āt pūrāṇādhī; at x. 39. 2, codāyataṁ sūn'rāṁ ... āt pūrāṇādhīr īrayatam. Cf. also i. 158. 2, jīgrāṁ asē revatīḥ pūrāṇādhī, At iii. 62. 11; vi. 49. 14; vii. 36. 8; x. 65. 14, we find pūrāṇādhī

* Quite different is Bergaigne's highly mythological explanation, ii. 502, note 8.
† For different views of the word see Hillebrandt, Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, iii. 188 ff., 259 ff., and Colinet, Babylonien and Oriental Record, ii. 245.
together with rāti. At RV. i. 5. 3; ii. 1. 3; iv. 34. 2; vii. 9. 6; 5. 32; ix. 93. 4, the word appears together with rājī ‘wealth.’ But I cannot accept Pischel’s reference of the word to Indra. Here, as well as at RV. iv. 26. 7, the expression pūramāthira ajahād ārātī refers to the eagle, and means that the eagle in bringing the Soma is liberal. For with the arrival of the Soma liberality, i.e. the liberality in sacrificing, gains its strongest expression. Therefore the Ārātis, the powers of avarice, who have kept the Soma in their power, are left behind. The words pūramāthi and ārātī are opposed to one another also at RV. iv. 50. 11; vii. 97. 9, without the implication that pūramāthi is Indra, though Indra here as well as at v. 35. 8; vii. 32. 20; viii. 81. 15 appears in company with pūramāthi. At RV. ix. 72. 4 we have pūramāthīvīn mānusyo yazāndāthānah ćācīr dhiyāh pavate sōma indra te ‘the bright Soma accompanied by Purāṇḍhi, forwarding the sacrifice of men, flows to you, O Indra, along with prayer.’ Cf. also the expression pāramāna... rāhāmānaḥ pūramāthyāh ‘Soma hastening along with Purāndhi,’ in RV. ix. 110. 3, and further iv. 34. 2; vii. 64. 5; also ix. 90. 4; 97. 36. From these passages we may gather that the pressure of the Soma by itself is a quite sufficient occasion for pūramāthi, and there is no need on account of its appearance at iv. 26. 7; 27. 2. 4 to assign to Indra an active part in bringing it down from the clouds. Cf. also Ludwig, l. e. p. 66. The only doubt left in my mind is whether it is not best to regard pūramāthi as the abstract, meaning ‘liberality,’ rather than the adjective qualifying cyenaḥ; the sense of the myth remains the same in either case.

With the discussion of the first two stanzas of RV. iv. 27 the special advantages derivable from our theory of the myth are at an end. The general features of the remainder of the story are clear, and there has been no serious difference of opinion as to its face value. As the eagle flies through space with the Soma, one of the guardians of the Soma, Kṛṣṇaṇu* by name, angered in his mind, hurls an arrow at him; this, however, injures the eagle only so far as to cause the loss of a feather from his plumage. He succeeds, nevertheless, in bringing the Soma down upon the earth, where it is pressed for Indra. Possibly this falling of the feather is the poetic expression of the simple observation that the lightning strikes the ground and is visible a moment before in its zig-zag (feather-like) form.† The story is told RV. iv. 27. 3-5, and I have nothing to add to the discussions of these stanzas

---

*For Kṛṣṇaṇu cf. Weber, Ind. Stud. ii. 318 ff.; Kuhn in K.Z. i. 523; Roth, Z.D.M.G. xxxvi. 359; Bergaigne, l. e. iii. 30 ff. The connection of the word with Zend Kreṣiṇi seems untenable, since J. Darmesteter, Zend Avesta, vol. i. p. lxxxvii, has recently identified the latter with Alexander the Great.

†The heavenly archer, nameless to be sure, discharges his arrow at Agni, which may be the heavenly Agni, the lightning, thus corroborating the explanation above.
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by the authorities mentioned in the introduction to this paper, excepting a remark on the word īndraṇvato in st. 4. The passage reads: *gīpyā* im īndraṇvato nā bhujyān ēyenó jahāra bhαtō ādhi snōh. Pischel applies here the doctrine that the literature and life of Sanskrit (classical) India must be referred to freely in the restoration of Vedic India. With this view I agree in principle, and I need but refer to my remarks in the Contributions, Third Series, J.A.O.S. xv. 145, to point out the manner in which, I believe, benefit may be derived from the classical literature. Pischel translates the passage thus (p. 215): "Da trug ihn (den Soma) der Adler eilig vom hohen Himmelsgewölbe, wie (die Vögel) den Bhujyu aus dem Himmel trugen." He regards īndraṇvāt as identical with later īndraloka (p. 213). The story is that Tugra, the wicked father, abandoned his son Bhujyu in the middle of the waters, and that he was saved from them, not without a good deal of effort, by the Aśvins, by means of their flying horses. The place in which Bhujyu was abandoned is described RV. i. 117. 14; 118. 6; viii. 5. 22; x. 143. 5 simply as the samudrāv; vii. 68. 7 as mādhya samudrē; i. 158. 3; 182. 7 as mādhya ārṇasah; in x. 39. 4 the Aśvins carry Bhujyu aḍbhyās pārī; in vi. 62. 6 they bring him out of the waters, the ocean, and the womb of the flood: aḍbhyāṣ samudrāt . . . ārṇasoh nir upāsthūtā; in i. 116. 4 they bring him to the sandy shore, the bank of the watery ocean: samudrāsya dhāṃvann ārdrasās pārī; in i. 182. 5 they carry him out of the great flood: kṣodasō mahāh; in i. 117. 14 they are said to have carried him ārṇasoh nīh samudrāt; in vii. 69. 7 they carry him out of the flood after he has been thrown down into the ocean: āvaviddham samudrād uḍ uṭathur ārṇasah; in i. 182. 6 Bhujyu is described as having been thrown down into the water, pushed into bottomless darkness: āvaviddham . . . aṣav āntir anārabhānāc tāmasi prāvaviddham; in i. 116. 5 the situation is described as 'the ocean without support and without hold': anāsthānā agraḥbānā samudrē; in x. 65. 12 Bhujyu is freed by the Aśvins from distress: āḥasah piprthō nīh. I am strongly inclined to see in all this primarily nothing more than the story of the wonderful saving of an abandoned man from the floods of a great water: cf. especially vii. 68. 7, uta tyām bhujyīm aśvinā sīkhyo mādhya jahur dvēvāsah samudrē 'O Aśvins, his evil-disposed companions abandoned Bhujyu in the middle of the ocean.' But there can be little doubt that the Vedic Rishis transplanted the event to heaven: in RV. i. 116. 3 they designate the place of Bhujyu's abandonment as udameghā, a ār.ākey., which seems to refer to the water-cloud;† in x. 143. 5 Bhujyu is carried by the Aśvins to the other side of the ether: a rājasah pārē. In i. 119. 4 the legend is alluded to as follows: yuvām bhujyīm bhurānāmān vimhīr gataṁ svāyuktibhir nivāhantā pitṛbhyā ṛ.

* For gīpyā cf. the valuable remarks of Fick, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch, p. 299.
† The Petersburg Lexicons render it "Wasserschauber."
Upon this passage especially Pischel rests his interpretation of īndrāvat. He translates pitṛbhya d ‘from the fathers’ and, inasmuch as the abode of the fathers is svargaloka, and that again is later īndraloka, he feels justified in establishing the equation īndrāvat = īndraloka for the passage under discussion.

But, if īndrāvat is equal to īndraloka, we must import into the Rig-Veda not only the word but the conception in all its bearings. And that is a preeminently joyous one. The notion of being saved from īndraloka is, from the point of view of a Hindu, just as inconceivable as salvation from paradise would be from the point of view of Judæo-Christian conceptions. On the other hand, the passages in which Bhujju’s troubles are narrated show distinctly that the conditions were indeed such as to require the help of the deus ex machina. Bearing in mind the expression īrajasah pārē in x. 143. 5, which states that the Aycins carried Bhujju to the other side of the ether, we may translate nisūhantā pitṛbhya d by ‘carrying him to the fathers’ rather than ‘from the fathers.’ Perhaps for that reason—though upon this I do not insist—the help which is afforded Bhujju by the Aycins is designated in RV. i. 119. 8 as svāvatār uṭhi ‘help resulting in svāt, i. e. paradise.*

Pischel regards the other occurrence of īndrāvat (with long ī) in the same light. At RV. x. 101. 1 we read didhi-krām āgnim uśasain ca devim īndrāvatō vasse ni huvye voḥ, which he would therefore translate by ‘I call you, Dadhikrā etc., down for help from īndraloka.’ I would see here in īndrāvato an expression which, to be sure, is illumined by classical usage, but in a different manner from the one assumed by Pischel. The word represents here the same usage as appears in the classical expression (Nala ii. 23) lokāpūlāḥ . . . sūgniḥkāḥ ‘the guardians of the world, Agni at their head.’ Or, still more precisely, it is the equivalent of īndrājyestḥāḥ, RV. iv. 51. 5; vii. 11. 5; viii. 63. 12; x. 70. 4; it expresses the prominence or leadership of Indra. I would translate ‘I call down to you for help Dadhikrā, Agni, and the goddess Usas, with Indra at their head.’

The word īndrāvataḥ in RV. iv. 27. 4 seems therefore untenable. Of the many suggestions which have been made by way of remedy, that offered by Ludwig, Interpretation des Rig-Veda, p. 66 (§ 37), a change to parāvātō, seems to me the most plausible,†

---

* The legend of Bhujju is one of those which will be profited by a systematic investigation from the point of view of the Vedic writings in general. In VS. xviii. 42 = TS. iii. 4. 7. 1 occurs the expression bhujyāḥ suparṇāḥ, and the MS. ii. 12. 2 has in its place bhujī suparṇāḥ. The treatment of the passage in CB. ix. 4. 1. 11 is futile. The Aycins themselves are called bhujī (dual) in TA. i. 10. 1, and, I believe, also in the latter part of the TB.—the passage is not at hand—and this again reminds us of the epithet bhujī applied to the same divinities in RV. vii. 8. 2.

† Grassmann’s translation, i. 134, “des Indra Schar,” presupposes the correction of īndrāvato to īndrāvanto (cf. his lexicon s. v. īndrāvat):
The Legend of Soma and the Eagle.  

and I would offer in support of it the following considerations. In iv. 26. 8, in the parallel passage, we have n’gypi eyenô diada-mano aśram parivâdah sakunô mandrîm miidûm. At ix. 68. 6; x. 144. 4, the eagle also brings the Soma from the distant height (parivâdah), just as Mâtrîgyan brings the fire from the same place at i. 128. 2; iii. 9. 5; vi. 8. 4. Soma is parâvâti at viii. 53. 3 (Vâl. 5. 3); 93. 6; ix. 39. 5; 65. 22. Now Bhujyu, according to i. 119. 8, was abandoned parâvâti, and was thence carried off by the Açvins. If, therefore, we read at iv. 27. 4 parivâto nà bhujyum, we have a comparison perfect in every detail. The change from parà to indrâ in a hymn whose final purpose was the worship of Indra (cf. st. 5) does not seem to lie out of the range of possibility.

The course which we have followed in our interpretation of the legend of Soma and the eagle may be briefly resumed as follows: At AV. vi. 48 there are three formulas, the second of which is addressed to the Rbhus at the evening pressure of the Soma, on which occasion hymns in the jayati-metre are employed. The third is addressed to Indra at the noon-tide pressure of the Soma; at that time hymns in the tristûbha-metre are prescribed. The first stanza is addressed to the eagle, whose metre is said to be the gîyâtri. This refers to the morning pressure, and in this function the formula is employed by the Vâîtâna-sûtra in connection with the stanza AV. vi. 47. 1, which is distinctly addressed to Agni. Now, inasmuch as Agni is the divinity of the morning-pressure, and the gîyâtri the metre of the hymns employed at the morning-pressure, there is no reason to doubt that the eagle of AV. vi. 48. 1 is Agni.

Further, the bizarre attitude of the Brûhmaṇas, which consistently relate that the gîyâtri brought down the Soma from heaven, becomes quite intelligible. There is at the basis of this a complete identification of Agni, the eagle, with his metre, the gîyâtri, which is perfectly natural from the point of view of these texts.

In approaching the hymns RV. iv. 26 and 27, the principal source of the legend in the mantras, we need but remember that the heavenly Agni, the lightning, is the eagle, and the entire legend resolves itself into the description of one of the most simple and salient natural phenomena. The Soma, the heavenly fluid, is supposed to be enclosed within the clouds, where the lightning also is hidden. When the summer-storm breaks out, the light-

it receives a certain amount of support from the reading indravâto for indra vâto at TB. ii. 6. 16. 2 (so also the commentary), and the occasional occurrence elsewhere of this solemism. A better emendation would be indrâvantâ, referring to the Açvins, who are designated as indrânamâ at RV. i. 182. 2. Ludwig ii. 598 and v. 468 suggests indrâvato; Roth, Z.D.M.G. xxxvi. 398, tr'âvato na bhûjyum ‘like a serpent from a marsh.’ Cf. also Bergaigne, i. c. iii. 399 ff.
ning, the eagle, breaks from the cloud, and with it comes the rush of the heavenly fluid upon the earth. Then it becomes available at the sacrifice, especially in behalf of Indra, who is the Soma-drinker by distinction.

The hymn RV. iv. 27 contains the narrative of this event, undertaken by the two principal performers in it. The first stanza is spoken by Agni, the lightning, and its wording is full of allusions to the technical features which characterize that divinity in distinction from all others. The next three stanzas are spoken by Soma, who describes Agni's achievements in his behalf. Soma narrates in addition that Kṛṣṇa, the heavenly archer, one of his guardians, shot an arrow at the eagle, which did not disturb him in his flight, but simply caused the loss of a single feather, that fell upon the earth. It seems quite likely that this describes the striking of the lightning into the ground, but possibly this last feature of the myth is not a part of the purely naturalistic phase of the legend, which may at that point have passed into the hands of the poet, who, in India as elsewhere, would draw upon the stores of his imagination for the extension and embellishment of myths of a primarily naturalistic character, combining in accordance with the dictates of his fancy any features from other legendary sources which seemed to him suitable to the taste of his hearers.*

II. ON THE GROUP OF VEDIC WORDS ENDING IN -pitā (sapitā,\[4pt\] prapitā, abhipitā, apapitā).†

There is scarcely a group of Vedic words which rests under a heavier cloud of misapprehension than that which furnishes the title of this article. The native exegetes started the interpretation of the words with false and inconsistent etymologies, and later the western interpreters have substituted others no better. The translations of the passages containing these words have

---

* Cf. for this my remarks in the third series of these contributions, J.A.O.S. xvi. 1892.
† This article was written during the winter of 1891-2, and was presented to the American Oriental Society at its annual meeting, April 1892: cf. the Proceedings of that meeting (Journal, vol. xv. p. ccccxx). The briefest possible abstract of the paper was printed in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars for 1892 (Nr. 99, p. 102). Since then Professor Geldner has printed an elaborate discussion of one of these words, prapitā, in the Védische Studien by Prof. Pischel and himself vol. ii., pp. 165-179. It is to be regretted that he did not at the same time undertake an investigation of all the words of the small category, especially abhipitā. As it is, our paths diverge hopelessly, and I have not been able to assimilate any part of his discussion, interesting, fresh, and bold as it is. I cannot repress the hope that he may now yield himself up to the seduction of my chief claim, namely that all these words contain the stem pita, and in a future article perhaps direct his ingenuity to the further elucidation of the difficulties which have remained on my hands even after this recognition.
Group of Vedic words in -pitrə.

produced some of the obscurest, vaguest, and most inconsistent results in the entire domain of Vedic interpretation. In Yāsaka’s Nāighāntavas, iii. 29, the word āprapitvə occurs by the side of abhikə, and Yāsaka, Nirukta iii. 20, explains both as āsannyaə, designations of nearness, vicinity. He adds the special translation praptə for āprapitvə, as though the word contained the root ṣp with the prepositional prefix pra. In the course of the 67th paragraph of Kautsavaya’s Nighāntavas, the two words are treated by themselves, as follows: prapitvə, abhikə: prāptasya—indicating obviously the same tradition. Śāyana repeats this interpretation, with direct reference to Yāsaka, at RV. i. 126. 3, saca (sc. prapitvaçabḍah) prapitvə abhike ity āsannyaə 'ti yāskena- oktatvəd āsannyaacananak. He operates with this rendering, e. g. at RV. i. 104. 1, prapitvə yāgakule prǎpte; i. 130. 9, asurānām prapitvə samipe ... prapitvə ity āsannyaəma; i. 180. 7, savanikita eva ki]; viii. 4. 3, prapitvə pripte sati; x. 73. 2, prapitvəd āsannya praaptv vṛtrv, etc. But other translations appear also. To i. 53. 24, where prapitvə occurs in antithesis to apa-pitvə, we have apaapitvam apaagamanam ... prapitvam pragamanam; to i. 16. 12, prapitvə ahnaḥ is explained by divasa-sya ... prakramā pārvitvə. We have therefore in the last two passages the idea of ‘advancing,’ which might on a stretch be derived from that of ‘nearness.’ But at vi. 31. 3 Śāyana comments prapitvə by prapatane yuddhe, i. e. prapitvə is assumed to mean ‘strife,’ and its derivation is now in Śāyana’s mind from the root pot and the preposition pra. At v. 31. 7, he presents both alternatives: prapitvam saṅgrāmaṇaḥ (battle) samipai (nearness) nā. The helplessness of the native tradition is especially observable at vii. 41. 4 = AV. iii. 16. 4 = VS. xxxiv. 37 = TB. ii. 8. 9. 8. Śāyana on the RV. says prapitvə ahnaḥ pārvitvə, i. e. ‘in the morning;’ Śāyana on the AV., prapitvə sāyān, i. e. ‘in the evening.’ And so Mahīdhara on the VS, prapitvə prapatana āsannyaə, and Mahīdhara on the TB. sāyānake. The first explanation of abhipitvə occurs at Nir. iii. 15; it is abhiprāpti ‘arrival,’ and so the word is explained by Śāyana at RV. i. 189. 7; iv. 16. 1; vii. 18. 9; viii. 4. 21; 27. 20; x. 40. 2. Similarly at RV. i. 186. 1 : abhipitvə ‘bhīgantawye yajnə; at RV. i. 186. 7 = VS. xxxiii. 34 Śāyana has abhipitvə ‘bhīpatane ‘maṇḍyajnə, while Mahīdhara has abhipatana āgamanakule. At i. 126. 3 Śāyana again exhibits his perplexity by making abhipitvə the direct equivalent of prapitvə: abhipitaçabda āgamanakale abhipitaçabda ittvat. And it would seem indeed that this perplexity drives him to extremes, since he translates abhipitvə at RV. v. 76. 2 by ‘evening’: ahnaḥ abhipitvə ‘bhīpatane saṃāptiə,

* In RV. iv. 16. 12 the words prapitvə and abhikə occur, but not in such connection as to suggest even the possibility of synonymous value.
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trīye savana ity arthah; in the same breath, as it were, the word is rendered by "forenoon" at RV. v. 76. 2, divābhīpitva dinasasyābhāpitavan prīthakale.

The stem sapitvā is a āṇ. āṇy., occurring only in the stanza RV. i. 109. 7 = TB. iii. 6. 11. 1. Madhava to TB. renders the word by sambandhitvam ‘relationship,’ and he may have in mind the more common word āpitvā, which the commentaries render in some such way quite regularly: thus, Sāyaṇā to RV. viii. 4. 3 glosses the latter by bandhutvam. On the other hand, Sāyaṇā explains sapitvam āsan at RV. i. 109. 7 by sahāprāptavaiśīn sthānam āsan brahma lokam agachan, having, therefore, again in mind the derivation from the root āp.*

Thus we see that the native tradition regards this series of words as derived from the root āp, or the root pat, and that it presses the exegesis of the words case by case into the service of these etymologies. Of western interpreters, Benfey, in his dictionary of the Sīma-Veda, treats the words in the same spirit. The p of -pitrā is in his view a reduced form of the root āp; prap-pi- in prapitvā is = Lat. prope; prapitvā means primarily ‘in the vicinity’ or ‘near.’ Similarly sāpi- in sapitvā is = Lat. sōpe, and also abhipitvā, apapitvā, and āpitvā have originated from the root āp. Essentially the same view is taken by Roth in the note on Yāṣka’s Nirukta iii. 20, and by Weber, Ind. Stud. xvii. 253. Grassmann, in his lexicon s. v. pītā, derives the stem from the root pat. It is needless to say that the translations made by these scholars are necessarily colored by their etymological views.

The Petersburg Lexicon assigns to prapitvā the meanings: 1. das Entgegengehen; 2. das Herbeikommen; Anbrechen des Tages; Frühe. In Böhtlingk’s lexicon the meanings are almost diametrically opposite, so much so as to raise the suspicion that some purely technical error is mischievously at play. The word is defined there as follows: 1. Weggang; 2. Flucht, Rückzug; 3. ein zurückgezogener Ort; 4. Rückgang des Tages, Abend. Ludwig translates prapitvām at RV. iii. 53. 24 (1003) and i. 104. 1 (469) by “nearness”; similarly prapitvām yāt at v. 37. 1 (532) by “zu leibe ihm gehend,” and prapitvā at vi. 31. 3 (554) “im nahkampf.” But at RV. x. 73. 2 (642) prapitvā is translated by “aus der ferne”; prapitvē at viii. 4. 3 (588) “in der ferne.” One is strongly tempted to exclaim “thou art so near and yet so far.” In addition he has at i. 189. 7 (293); vii. 41. 4 (92); iv. 16. 12 (517), where the genitive dhnām is either expressed or understood, the translation “annäherung der tage,” i. e. morning; but at viii. 1. 29 he translates prapitvē apiṣcarvare by “des nachtdunkels nahen.”

The Petersburg lexicons are agreed in translating abhipitvā by 1. Einkehr; 2. des Tages Einkehr, Abend. This places Böhtlingk’s lexicon in the position of assigning the same meanings to abhi-

---

* In the comment on the same passage Sāyaṇā mentions a still more obviously false derivation, from the root sap, namely saper bhāvak sapitvam.
pitvā and prapitvā, as can be seen by comparing the statements above. Ludwig also adopts the meaning “evening” or the like at RV. i. 186. 1, 6 (197); i. 189. 7 (293); iv. 34. 5 (166); viii. 27. 20 (229); v. 76. 2 (47); x. 40. 2 (70). But at i. 83. 6 (463), grīvā yātra vādati kārūr uktahād tarye ‘d indro abhipitvēsu ranyati, he translates “wo der stein singt als ukthakundiger preissänger, in disser nähe frent sich Indra.” Here then we have again the translation “nähe,” which Ludwig frequently ascribes to prapitvā; yet the words are evidently not the same, being employed in distinct antithesis at i. 189. 7. It would be possible to add much more of this sort to the arrainment by looking systematically through the literature of the translations. Enough has been presented to render it clear that a new theory in reference to the group of words is imperatively demanded.

We begin with the word sapitvā, which occurs in a single stanza, RV. i. 109. 7—TB. iii. 6. 11. 1; bharataṃ gītataṁ vaṣṭra pācaḥ āsmaḥ indrajñi avataṁ pācitoḥ: śmē nā tē raṃnayaḥ sīrṣaya yēbhī sapitvām pitāro na āsan* 1 Bring hither (property or wealth), render help, O you two gods who have the thunderbolt in your arms; help us, O Indra and Agni, with your might. These here (i.e. the sacrificers?) now are the rays of the sun with whom our fathers were in boon companionship.† According to CB. i. 9. 3. 10, the rays of the sun are the pious dead: ya esa tapati tasya ye raṃnayaḥ te sukṛtaḥ, just as at CB. vi. 5. 4. 8 the light of the stars: naksatram vāj janayo ye hi janāḥ panyakṛtaḥ dvargai lokān yami teṣām etāṁ jyotiṣi. Cf. also RV. x. 108. 1; CB. ii. 3. 3. 7; TS. v. 4. 1. 3; TA. i. 9. 3; i. 11. 2; and Mahīdhara to VS. xix. 69, where the fathers are also brought into relation to the rays of the sun, though, to be sure, in a quite different manner. Though the exact relation of the second half to the first half of the stanza is not quite clear, we may regard it as certain that the former contains the statement that the deceased ancestors of the sacrificer are in the company (sapitvām) of the blessed departed who have preceded. All translators are agreed as to the meaning of sapitvā. The Pet. Lexx. translate it by “(etwa) Gemeinschaft”; Grassmann, by “vereint”; Ludwig, by “im vereine.” No one, however, since Benfey has stated the reason why the word is to be so translated. The padāpiṣṭa divides it into sa + pitva, and that is quite correct. In pitva there is hidden the word pitu ‘sap, drink, nourishment;’† hence sapitvām is trans-

* TB. reads āyan.
† Grasmann’s translation of the second half is unintelligible: “Hier eben diese Sonnenzügel sind es, durch die mit euch vereint die Väter waren.” Śayana: sāpaśāna indraśa yēbhi raṃcitbhir yār arcbhir no sūmakaṃ pitarāḥ pūrvapuruṣāḥ sapitvāḥ sahaṣṭrātvaṃ añānan āsan, brahmaśokam agachan... yad vā, yēbhi raṃcitbhir sapitvāḥ saṃvaśaṣānaṃ adhyāṣan...”
‡ Yāṣkā’s Nīghantavas 2. 7, as well as Kāutsavāya 38, place the word among the annaṇānaṃ; at Yāṣkā’s Nirukta ix. 24, the derivation of the word is given as follows: pitur ity annaṇāma pātēr vā pibeter vā pādyater vā.
lated above by 'boon companionship.' Eating and drinking is the special occupation of the manes, as is stated times without end: e.g. RV. x. 15. 4 = AV. xviii. 1. 51 = VS. xix. 55 = TS. ii. 6. 12. 2; RV. x. 15. 8 = AV. xviii. 3. 46 = VS. xix. 51; also RV. x. 17. 8; VS. xix. 58–60, 66; TS. i. 8. 5. 2, etc. In RV. x. 15. 3 = AV. xviii. 1. 45 = VS. xix. 56 = TS. ii. 6. 12. 3, *pitā* is the name of the nourishment of which the manes partake: *bhūjanta pītvās tā iḥāgamisthūḥ.* In the hymn to the *pitā*, RV. i. 187, in stanza 11, the *pitā* is spoken of as the *sadhamād devānām* 'the feast-companion of the gods'; just so the manes are designated in RV. vii. 78. 4: *tā īd devānām sadhamādā īsān īrtvānāh kavāyāḥ pūrvyaśāh*; cf. also AV. xviii. 4. 10; TS. ii. 5. 5. 5; TB. iii. 1. 1. 8. At RV. x. 14. 10 = AV. xviii. 2. 11 = TA. vi. 3. 1, also at TS. i. 8. 5. 2, the manes are said to be the boon companions of Yama: *yāmēna yē sadhamādām mūdanti.* At AV. vi. 192. 4 'boon companionship' in the third heaven is asked for: *trītye nāke sadhamādāmadema.* The combined sense of all these passages is that the manes enjoy themselves in heaven with Yama and the gods, and the *pitā* is the exhilarating material which produces the effect. Hence *sa-pītvā* means 'the act of enjoying the *pitā* together.' It is a synonym of *sadhamād-ṛda,* and the substitution of the latter at RV. i. 108. 7 = TB. iii. 6. 11. 1 would yield just the same sense as the existing text: *yēbhīḥ sadhamādām pītāro na đan (āyan) = yēbhīḥ sapītvām pītāro na đan (āyan).*

My readers will now surmise that the following discussion is an attempt to find the stem *pītvā* also in the remaining words of the group. The number of stanzas containing these words is quite considerable, and many of them are unquestionably obscure up to the point of hopelessness. I shall therefore be content if I can show the way; certainly there will be a strong case made out; and, if it shall come to pass finally that my theory fails, the chapter of accidents, of specious verisimilitudes, will be enriched by one more striking instance.

I begin with RV. i. 83. 6, *grāvā yātra vádati kārūr ukthyas tāṣyā 'd īndro abhipittōṣu rāṇyati.* The Pet. Lex. cites this sentence under *abhipittō* 1. "Einkehr"; and it is difficult to recognize the precise conception in virtue of which it was placed there. Grassmann takes up the same idea, and renders: "bei wem der Stein als lieberreicher Sänger tönt, da einkehren ist des Indra Lust." But *tāṣya . . . abhipittōṣu* can naturally only mean 'bei seinen einkehrungen,' and not 'bei einkehren bei ihm.' Ludwig (403) translates: "wo der Stein singt als ukthakundiger preissänger, in dieser nähe freut sich Indra." But why the plural *abhipittōṣu* if the singular *abhipittō* means 'nearness'? And *tāṣya . . . abhipittōṣu* would again naturally mean 'bei seinen (des steines) nähen.' i.e., the supposed action of drawing near which underlies the word *abhipittōṣu* would have for its subject the press-stone. The notion of the press-stone coming near to Indra is not Vedic, and strikes me as faint and insipid. But this testimony in rebuttal is of secondary importance as compared
with the simple fact that ran is applied here to Indra. Now when Indra takes delight, it is always in the pressed drink, sutē, sutēsu, RV. i. 10. 5; vii. 12. 17; 13. 9; 31. 6; 93. 20; 96. 19; or in the soma-festivals, sāvanēsu, x. 43. 6; or, what is much the same, in the stoma, uktha, or pātra, the song of praise which accompanies the pressing of the soma, RV. iii. 4. 5; viii. 12. 18; 33. 16; 34. 11; 92. 12. There is no expression outside of these in which Indra figures as the subject of the root ran, and it seems therefore more than reasonable to suppose that abhipitvā means ‘the flow of the sap (pitū) of the soma-plant.’ Hence, in RV. i. 101. 1, the uktha, stotra, or pātra along with the soma which is pressed for Indra is designated as pitumād vācas. The pāda reads prā mandine pitumād arcata vācaḥ. In RV. i. 61. 7, Indra drinks pitū at the sāvanas: sāvanēsu . . . pitūm papivān. Further, in close parallelism with abhipitvāsu ranyati are the expressions RV. x. 64. 11, ranyāḥ sāndreyuḥ pitumāt iṣa kṣi- yah ‘delightful to behold like a home full of pitū’; RV. iv. 1. 8, ranyāḥ pitumāt iṣa samād ‘delightful like a feast rich in pitū.’ Regarding then the expression abhipitvāsu ranyati, as said of Indra, by itself, no one will be disposed to deny that our interpretation is almost self-evident in the light of these parallels.

We turn next to RV. x. 40. 2, kūha svīd dosā kūha vāstor açvinā kūhā ’bhikṣām karataḥ kūho ’ṣatuḥ. Ludwig (70) translates: ‘wo stellen sich die Açvīna am abend, wo beim auf- gange ein, wo ist ihre einkehren, wo übernachten sie?’ Grassmann’s translation differs only in the wording. In these translations the expression ‘wo ist ihre einkehren, wo übernachten sie’ is tautological. I am not aware that there is in the Veda any such expression as ‘einkehren, turn in,’ which savors rather of modern travel with inns and stations. The nearest approach to such an idea is expressed by the root sū+ ava, which means primarily ‘unhitch horses,’ and hence ‘halt.’ The common noun of action is avastira. But if we look at RV. i. 104. 1, yōnis ta indra niśṭaḥ akūri tām ā tī sīda svāna nā ’rūvā : viniṣṭaḥ vāyo vāsoṣṭya ’vā iṣa dosā vāstor vāhīyaḥ prapitvē, we see that something more salient and special is meant. For, if not, we should be compelled to assume that abhipitvām in x. 40. 2 and prapitvē in i. 104. 1 are exactly the same, and that would prove inconvenient in the sequel. And one may ask at once what it is that the Açvins or Indra really come for. Is it a polite visit? The third stanza of x. 40 takes up the questions asked in x. 40. 2 in the well known catenary manner, and, as might be expected, one of them is kṣaya . . . sāvanā ’va gachathāḥ ‘to whose soma-pressing do ye come down (O ye Açvins)?’ Now the second stanza expresses the same question in the phase kūhā ’bhikṣām karataḥ ‘where do you take your potations of pitū?’ And the expression vāhī- yasāḥ prapitvē at i. 104. 1 must mean ‘(the horses) which quickly carry you to the soma-drink,’ or ‘which bring you at the time of the soma-drink.’ All that is necessary in addition is to show
that abhipitvā and prapitvā are different kinds of soma-drink, and this we shall endeavor to do in the sequel.

Similarly, iv. 10. 1 is addressed to Indra: ā satyō yātu ma-
ghāvīṁ ṛṣiṁ drāvanto aṣya hāraya ēpa vah: tásmā id ādīnaḥ
susamū sudāksam iṁhā bhūpitvāṁ karate grāmanāṁ. Ludwig (517)
translates the second half "denn ihm haben wir saft (der) grosse
tüchtigkeit (verleih) gepreßt, besungen vollziehe er hier seine
ankunft." Grassmann essentially in the same way. Three words
in the stanza allude distinctly to the soma, namely ṛṣiṁ, āndhaḥ,
and susamū, * and yet, according to the translators, there is no
indication of the fact that Indra is to drink it. How feeble
would be the invocation to Indra in the fourth pāda merely to
'arrive,' after the first and second pādas have stated in good
Indra-language 'may the liberal one, to whom belong the pressed
soma-shoots, come hither, may his bay steeds run to us!' Taking
the stanza by itself, it is a veritable egg of Columbus to claim
that the fourth pāda is to be translated 'may he, while songs of
praise are singing for him, take here his potation of soma (pītu).'

Again, RV. i. 186. 1 = VS. xxxiii. 34, ā na tādāhir vidūthe
susāsti vicvīnavaḥ saviṭā denā eva tu: āpi yāthu yuvino mātsathū
no vicvain jāgad abhipitvā manuśaḥ. Ludwig (197) translates
the second half thus: "dass auch ihr, o jugendliche, trinket all
unser lebendes bei der einkehr." And Grassmann very much
the same way. We need but glance at those instances in which the
root mad is used transitively to find ourselves again, almost
invariably in words designating the soma. Thus
RV. ix. 107. 2, sutē cit tvā . . . madāmo āndhasi; i. 80. 2, sā
tvā madad vṛṣi mādaḥ sōmaḥ; i. 53. 6, tē tvā mādaḥ amadān .
tē sōmāsaḥ; iv. 42. 6, yān mā sōmīśo mamāndan; likewise ii.
22. 1; iii. 51. 11; vii. 22. 2; 26. 1, 2; ix. 90. 5; 94. 5; 96. 21; x.
116. 3, et al. I would therefore put the words of RV. i. 186. 1,
mātsathū vicvain jāgad abhipitvā upon the same plane with
madāmah tvā sutē in RV. ix. 107. 2, and translate 'do ye inspire
the whole world at the soma-drink.'

In the same hymn, RV. i. 186. 1, we have utā na īm tvāstā
ganto denā smātā sārībhīr abhipitvā sajōśah: ā vṛtakhe nārāy
carṣaṇipūrda tvīstamā narāṇā na iṁhā gamyāṁ. Both Ludwig
(197) and Grassmann translate abhipitvā by "zur einkehr."
Again the invitation extended to Indra and Tvaṣṭar foreshadows
the soma; and there is positively no reason for not translating
abhipitvā 'to the soma-drink.'

In RV. viii. 4. 21, the last one of the three stanzas of a dūna-
stuti, we have again the expression abhipitvā arāraṇaḥ, parallel
with abhipitvāsu ranyati in i. 83. 6, and more remotely with i.
186. 1: vṛksaṁ cem ne abhipitvā arāraṇur gām bhajanta melinā

* Note also the words sāvane and ukthām in the stanza immediately following.
† For the relation of Tvaṣṭar to the soma see now Hillebrandt, Soma.
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śvam bhajanta mehānā. Grassmann translates "die Bäume selbst erfreuten sich bei meinem Nahn," Ludwig (588), "selbst die bäume brausten bei meinem (Indra's) nahe." There is, so far as can be seen, no reason why the root ṛm employed with abhipitvā should be translated otherwise than by 'rejoice' here, any more than at i. 83. 6. The hymn is addressed to Indra, but it is very unlikely that Indra is the speaker in the dinastuti. It seems to me that the priest or the yajamāna is speaking: 'Even the trees* have rejoiced at my soma-feast.' In the third stanza of the same hymn occur the words prapitvē and āpitvē; the connection in which they appear is again almost conclusively in favor of our view of the word abhipitvē. They will be treated next in order. Before continuing with our discussion of abhipitvē, it will be of advantage to turn to those cases of the remaining words which support our view with special clearness.

We consider first RV. viii. 4. 3 = SV. i. 152; ii. 1071 (Nirukta iii. 20), the passage just alluded to: yathā gāurā apā kṛtām tṝṣyān ēty avē ṛrīnam: āpitvē nāḥ prapitvē tāyam ā gahi kānvesu sī sāca ṁīhu. Grassmann translates: "Gleich wie der Büffel dürstend hin zur wasserreichnen Quelle eilt, so komme Abends Morgends eilend her zu uns, und trinke bei den Kanvas gern." Ludwig: "wie der wilde stier, wenn er dürstet, zu dem mit wasser versehenen salzaumpf kommt, ob in der nähe ob in der ferne komm schnell heran, trink viel bei den Kanvas." As was indicated in our introductory statement, this translation of prapitvē is diametrically opposed to that given by the same scholar at i. 104. 1, where he translates vahīyasaḥ prapitvē "die in die nähe führen." Without attempting any further criticism, we may point to the theoretical conclusion to the comparison: Like a bull to the pond do you come—to what ? It is altogether unlikely that the comparison is left unfinished in mid-air; either āpitvē or prapitvē are certain to contain some word connected with soma-drinking. We may translate ... prapitvē tāyam ā gahi kānvesu sī sāca ṁīhu 'do you come here to the soma-drink (prapitvē). Do you bravely drink with the Kanvas.' Or, if the locative designates time, then we must render 'Like a bull to the pond, do you come at the time of the soma-pressure designated by the term prapitvē: i. e., according to our assumption below (p. 39), the prātahsavāna. Then this stanza is on the same level with RV. i. 104. 1, where the horses are said to convey Indra prapitvē, either to the soma-drink, or at the time of the prapitvā, the prātahsavāna. I have not been able to make out whether āpitvē (nāḥ) is another designation of some kind of soma-drink, or whether it simply means 'in friendship (to us)' as a secondary derivative from āpi 'companion,' being employed here in alliteration with prapitvē. The latter sense seems to be

*The wooden utensils of the soma-pressure? Cf. RV. ix. 37. 3, soma rīnēra, and the many wooden instruments and vessels for its preparation: cumasa, cumū, drosa, kalaça, etc.
required at RV. viii. 20. 22; 21. 13. Ludwig’s inconsistency has been pointed out. Grassmann renders āpiṭvā in the same way as he frequently does abhipīṭvā, namely “in the evening.” By what right? As regards prapitvā, he finds himself in straits not much less severe than Ludwig’s; he translates, at i. 104. 1, dosāt vāstor viṭhyasah prapitvā “die trefflich fahren früh, am Tag, am Abend.” The phrase dosāt vāstor means ‘by night and by day’; what use is there in adding anew after viṭhyasaḥ an expression for ‘in the morning’ (früh)? This alone shows that prapitvā means something more than a mere designation of time. The perplexity of both translators, and the probability of the solution, are equally striking.

We consider next RV. v. 31. 7, āśnasya cit pārī māyā agrbhnāḥ prapitvāṁ yāṁ āpa dāsyuṁ āśadhaḥ. Grassmann translates the last pāda “und vorwärtsdringend triebst du weg die Feinde.” Even the most unbounded faith in the transition of meanings will be staggered at the suggestion that one and the same word shall mean ‘vorwärts’ (v. 31. 7), and ‘morgends’ (viii. 4. 3), in addition to other values. Ludwig (532) translates: “auch des Čuṣṇa zauber hast du gefangen genommen, zu leibe ihm gehend triebst du hinweg den Dasyu.” And yet, as we have seen, at viii. 4. 3 he renders prapitvā by “in der ferne.” That prapitvāṁ yāṁ means ‘going to the soma-feast’ may be gathered from RV. vi. 20. 4, in a manner which I am strongly tempted to designate as unmistakable. The statement there, in a hymn to Indra, is satār apadraṇa...vadhaḥ (sc. āśnasya) āśnasyaḥ ‘caśnasya māyāḥ pitvā na’rīrecit kīṁ canā pri ‘By a hundred bolts (of Indra) the wiles of voracious Čuṣṇa came to naught. He (Indra) had not left anything of the soma-drink.’ That is to say, Indra, having imbibed deeply of the soma, destroyed the demon—the old story. Can the parallel occurrence of prapitvā and pitā in two otherwise identical passages be due to accident? In RV. i. 187. 1 we have pitāṁ nā stōṣan...yāṁ trītāḥ nyājāvā virāvān viparvan ardayaḥ ‘Let me now praise the pitā... by whose might Trita tore Vṛtra joint from joint.’ The passage is quoted Nir. ix. 25, and Roth remarks very fittingly in his commentary that, as it stands, it would suit Indra as well as Trita. Now is it not obvious that Indra avails himself of the force of the pitā by prapitvāṁ yāṁ, RV. v. 37. 7? The same statement in more general terms is made also in RV. x. 55. 8, where Indra is likewise urged to destroy the Dasyus: pitāḥ sōmasya divā ā vṛdhāṁ dāro nīr yudhāḥ ’dhamud dāsyuṁ. At any rate, we may assert confidently that the expression prapitvāṁ yāṁ means neither “vorwärtsdringend” (Grasm.) nor “zu leibe gehend” (Ludw.), since in RV. iv. 16. 12 the expression prapitvā āśadha is employed to indicate the condition under which Indra slays demons and Dasyus. Here prapitvā āśadha must be a designation of time, or of some special situation.

* So also hesitatingly Böhtlingk, in his lexicon. The Pet. Lex. translates it by “friendship,” just as in viii. 20. 22.
This brings us to a point in our investigation which renders it necessary to distinguish between the various compounds of *pitā*. Hitherto we have simply endeavored to show that both abhipitāvā and prapitā contain the word *pitā*, and refer to soma-drink. We now advance another step: it seems equally clear that prapitā is the designation of the morning-pressure, the prāṭahsavana or prāṭahśūna;* on the other hand, abhipitāvā is the designation of the triyasa-savana, the evening pressure. The paraphrase of prapitāvā is contained in RV. i. 124. 12 = vi. 64, 6, nāraḥ ca ye pituhājo vyuṣaṭau ‘the heroes who drink *pitā* in the morning.’ Let us first return to prapitāvā yān at RV. v. 31. 7. According to our view, prapitāvām yānā apā dāṣyādīr aṣedāhaḥ is to be translated ‘while going to the morning-pressing (of soma) you drove away the Dasyus.’ A very good parallel, which shows that the special divisions of the sacrificial day are made salient in appeals to the gods to destroy the evil one, appears at RV. iv. 28. 3, dhann āndro adadah agnir indo purā dāṣyān madhyāndinād abhike ... purā sahāśra pūrvā nā bharit. Ludwig translates: “Indra schlug, Agni brannte, o Indu, die Dasyus vor dem mittag noch im kampfe ... warf viele tausende mit dem pfeife nieder.” Grassmann also renders purā madhyāndinād by “vor der Mittagszeit.” This is correct, and I would merely add that the expression refers by implication to the mid-day pressure. The time of the mid-day pressure, the niskevalya, is by distinction the time in which the demons are slain: etad vā indrasya niskevalyān savanān yan madhyāmanān savanān, tena vṛtrāṃ ajīghāṇat tena vyajīghanata (CB. iv. 3. 3. 6). This puts it upon the same plane with prapitāvā yān: i.e., Indra, having strengthened himself at his breakfast of soma, as it were, is able to despatch all hostile creatures before the noonday-pressure, which is peculiarly his own.† And, as has been indicated above, the same thing is expressed in prapitāvē āṇah at RV. iv. 16. 12, kūtiśya čūṣanam aṣṭiṣanā nā bharitā prapitāvē āṇah kīśvānān sahāṛaḥ: sadya dāṣyān prā mṛṇā kūtiśaya prā sūrāḥ cakrān vṛhatād abhike. Ludwig (517) translates: “den Kutsa warfst du den Čuṇa den gefräßigen nider, beim nahen des tages, den verächter des getreides mit tausenden, mit dem Kutsa freundlichen tötetest du also gleich die Dasyus: ‘er rolle des Śūra rad heran,’ so dachte Kutsa.” Grassmann similarly renders prapitāvē āṇah by “früh am Morgen.” In our view it means literally ‘at the morning-pressure of the day:’ that is, ‘at the daily morning-pressure.’

* RV. viii. 3. 7; x. 112. 1, it is designated as pūrvapīṭi. Yasna 10. 2 ff., the first of the two daily Mazdaysnian pressures is designated as the havanem fratarem, contrasted with the havanem uparem. Cf. also (in what way) rapithva and its derivatives rapithvāna and rapithvakara; arṇapīṭha. Yasna 44, 5 (cf. Nerossegh), and frapithvā, Vd. 3. 10; further Fick† p. 80.

† Cf. RV. vi. 47. 21, dīvē-divē ... kṛṇā aṣedāha dpa sidmāno jāh.

‡ RV. iv. 35. 7, prāṭhāḥ sutām apībo haryyava madhyāmānām savanān kēvalām te.
Hence the expression, from the sacerdotal point of view, means much the same as 'in the morning.'

In connection with the last passage, we must place before our readers the difficult, but obviously parallel, passage RV. vi. 31. 3, tvāṁ kūṣṇaṁ iḥ śrīnaṁ indrā áçāraṁ yudhyā kāyam qavyān gavistau: dáçu pravātē ādiha śrīnaṁyā puṣṭamāc okārām áviver ápānāt.** Ludwig (554) translates the second half: "du bistest ihn im nahkampf, und raubtest des Sūrya rad, und tilgtest die schäden." That is, here pravātē is translated by "im nahkampf," but in the parallel passage iv. 16. 12 pravātē áhun̄h is rendered "beim nahen des tages." Grassmann more consistently translates: "am Morgen zehn Daemonen (schlugst du), nahmst hinweg dann der Sonne Rad und tilgtest aus die Schäden." Aufrecht in Kuhn's Zeitschrift xxv. 601 boldly substitutes áhun̄h for dáçu, and translates "auch hast du in der Frühe des Morgens der Sonne ihr Rad geraubt und grosse Thaten ausgeführt." I cannot illuminate the suspicious word dáçu, which Śāyaṇa derives from the root duie 'bite.' But, leaving it out of the question, there is again no difficulty in translating pravātē 'when drinking the soma of the morning-pressure,' or 'at the time of the morning-pressure.'

The mention of the morning-pressure in connection with Indra's destruction of the hostile forces, alluded to in both the two passages, iv. 16. 12 and vi. 31. 3, is the same as that contained in RV. x. 112. 1, indrā pūrā pratikāṃda sitāya pratikāmān tāvā hi pārvātāḥ : hármaṁ hāntave puru gātrān, etc. The difficult passage RV. i. 130. 9 is related to iv. 16. 12 and vi. 31. 3, sāraç okārām prá vṛn̄j jātā jātā pravātē vdcam ariṇā musāyati "cāna dh musāyati : upāṇā yad purānā Śṛgum utāye kave, etc. Ludwig (472) translates: "des Śūra (Svar) rad rollte er in gewaltigkeit sich zeigend hervor; rothflammend entlockt er die stimme (oder: raubt er den donnerkeil?); diss vermögend entlockt er sie, als, o Uçanā Kavi, aus der ferne du zur Hilfe kamst," etc. I do not see that the word pravātē is translated here at all, unless it is represented by the word "hervor" in the first clause, the division of the pādas notwithstanding. In the commentary on the passage, Ludwig gives up his translation and suggests an extremely hypothetical view, one feature of which is that vdcam as an absolute from a root vuc 'rollen.' Grassmann translates: "geboren kaum trieb kräftig er der Sonne Rad, bei Tages Anbruch nimmt er flam mend sich das Lied; er reisst es an sich mit Gewalt." Bergaigne, ii. 339, takes essentially Grassmann's view, adding that vdcam is "le prototype céleste de la prière humaine." The passage is one of the countless ones which allude to legends so well known that the poets do not take the trouble to narrate them in full. There is, to begin with, no hindrance in the way of regarding pravātē as 'at the matutinal soma.' The mention of Uçanās Kavi (or Kūrya) in connection with Indra also suggests the soma. Thus,
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at i. 51. 11, mándiṣṭa yād uṣine kāvyey sācānih īndraḥ, and compare Bergaigne ii. 340 (middle of the page) ff. Is arunā in our stanza really an epithet of Indra, as all who have dealt with the passage assume, and as is claimed explicitly by Ludwig v. 39, bottom? I am, for my part, not acquainted with any passage in which this is the case, unless we except TB. ii. 7. 16. 6, where Indra is designated as ārunā vrkā, which does not prove that he might also be designated as plain ārunā. Soma is āruna,* and in the light of Indra’s well-known achievements in the matter of drunkenness (cf. v. 29. 7; viii. 66. 4; x. 116. 4; x. 119, and our Story of Indra and Namuci, J.A.O.S. xv. 143 ff.) pāda b may perhaps be translated ‘at the matutinal drink the bright (soma) steals (Indra’s) speech.’ In pāda c, ā musāiyāni means perhaps ‘steals it back, gets it back’ (cf. ā + ā and āi; ā + haṛ and haṛ; ā + dṛu and dṛu; ā + mu and muc); and iṣānā may be Indra: ‘but he, the mighty (Indra), obtains it back.’ Be this as it may, it seems quite certain that prāpitvē here again appears in connection with soma-practices, and there seems no reason, from any point of view hitherto suggested, to deny it the translation which we advocate for the word throughout.

The two following occurrences of prāpitvē, taken by themselves, are again so clear as to offer well-nigh conclusive proof of the truth of our interpretation. RV, viii. 1. 29 reads: māma tvā sāna uditā māma madhyāndine divāḥ: māma prāpitvē aṇiparāvā evaḥ ā stōmāsau avṛttata. The Pet. Lex. translates apiṣparāva by “an die Nacht angrenzend, am Ende der Nacht befindlich,” i.e. ‘matutinal.’ The diametrically opposite translation in the abridged lexicon, by “in die Nacht reichend, nächlich” marks again most interestingly the havoc which has been wrought in all translations of the passages which contain the words ending in -pitvā. Grassmann in his concordance has followed the larger Pet. lexicon, but in his translation he has again become confused: “bei Sonnenaufgang, Indra, sind mir meine Lieder zugerollt, und in des Tages Mitte und am Abend dir, und in der Dämmerung der Nacht.” That is, he takes prāpitvē apiṣparāvā asyndetically for two designations of time; he translates prāpitvē “am Abend” in the teeth of his own rendering of the word by “in the morning” at RV. viii. 4. 3; i. 104 1, and especially at vii. 41. 4, which is in closest parallelism with our stanza. Ludwig (585) translates: “meine stoma sind bei der sonne aufgang, in des tages mittäglicher zeit, bei des nachtdunkels nahen, Vasu, dir entgegengekommen.” He too is compelled, however, to render prāpitvē “in the morning” (“bei der annährung... der tage”) at viii. 41. 4. The latter reads as follows: uti’dōnām bhāgavatān syāmo tvatprāpitvā udā mādhya dōnām utot eva’dōnā mṛgahān sāryuṣya vajāni devānām smudāā m syāma.

There can be no question that the translators are correct in agreeing that uditā sāryuṣya here means ‘at sunset,’ just as it

*See Grassmann’s lexicon, and Hillebrandt, Soma, p. 18 ff.
unquestionably does at RV. v. 69. 3, prātār devīm āditiṁ joharvinī madhyāndīna ādītā śrṣyasya; or at v. 76. 3, utā yataṁ saṅgaṇe prātār āhno madhyāndīna ādītā śrṣyasya. Hence prāpītē at viii. 41. 4 must mean ‘in the morning,’* or, as we construe it, ‘at the matutinal soma.’ At viii. 1. 29 the three divisions of the day are stated inversely† (sārā uḍite means ‘at sunset’), and prāpītē apītavurē is the more explicit version of prāpītē: it means ‘at the matutinal soma in the period of the day next to the night;’ i. e. ‘at the dawn’;‡ cf. pituhājā vyāstāṁ at RV. i. 124. 12 = vi. 64. 6. The mention of the stoma in viii. 1. 29 shows distinctly that the secular divisions of the day are not so much in the mind of the poet as the sacredotal divisions, into prātah-sasanam, madhyāndīnām, and triyāna-sasanam. The expression prāpītē apītavurē is equivalent to prātah-sasanam, or prātah-sāvē.

The word apītavurē occurs once more in RV. iii. 9. 7, tād bhadrāṁ tāva duśoṇāṁ pākāya cī chudayati: tvām yād agne pācāvah saṁdānta saṁdādhām apītavurē. Sāyana glosses guva-rūvaṁkhe agnvihāruṁkale, and Ludwig (309) translates the second half of the stanza “wenn dicht, o Agni, die herdentiere umlagern, den entzündeten bei begin der nacht.” A good picture this, the cattle lying about the fire kindled at night, and it may be supported by such statements as TB. iii. 2. 1. 5; CB. iii. 9. 1. 3: tvāmāḥ sāyama pācana upasamānaṁtvante ‘therefore do the cattle return (from the pasture) in the evening.’ Yet it appears from a simple investigation of the root iḥā with suṁ that it is not in place here. Nowhere do the Vedic poets speak of the fire lighted in the evening; on the other hand, it is stated in numerous instances that the fire is lighted in the morning, and more specifically at dawn.

Thus RV. v. 28. 1, saṁdādhī agnir divi cocīr apret pratyānān usām vrīyaḥ ci bhūti; RV. iv. 39. 3, saṁdādhī agnā udāso vyāstāṁ; RV. vii. 8. 1, d gyāna dgra usām āsoci; RV. iii. 10. 9 (cf. also i. 22. 21), tām tvā viprā vipanyakājā śaṅkalāḥ śiṁ indhate; RV. i. 44. 7. 8, sām hi tvā viprā indhate, sā d vahā puruḥūti prācetas ‘gne devaṁ iḥā ... vyāstāṁ kṣapaḥ (cf. also stanza 4); RV. x. 101. 1, tād bhudhāḥvāṁ sāmanāḥ sākhyāḥ śiṁ agnīm indhām; vii. 78. 2, prātāṁ sūm agnir jirute saṁdādhāḥ ... vāt yāti jyotiḥ śādhamāṁa vīpā vāmāṁi, etc. Hence usr-būdhā ‘awakening.

*So Sāyana to RV.: prāpītē ‘hāṁ prāpte pūrvāhā. But Sāyana to the corresponding passage AV. iii. 16. 4: prāpītē sādyāhne aḥnaṁ; Mahāhara to VS. xxxiv. 37: prāpītē prapalane astamaye; Mādhava to TB. ii. 8. 9. 8: sāyamkāte.
† Cf. Roth, Vāyase’s Nirukta, Erläuterungen, p. 84.
‡ Here Sāyana offers a correspondence antipodal to that given by himself at RV. vii. 41. 4: prāpītē prāpte divam anyā ‘vāsamāne.
§ This word offers a good example of what might be called the inflated translations of Vedic passages. The connection in which we have placed the passage shows conclusively that śaṅkalāḥ means simply ‘having awakened (in the morning).’ The Pāt. Lex. explains it as ‘munter, eifrīg, unermüdlich;’ Grassmann, ‘die wachsam sind;’ Ludwig (310), ‘die liederkundigen brähmana-sänger, die wachen.’
in the morning’ is a standing epithet of Agni (RV. i. 65. 10; 127. 10; iii. 2. 14; vi. 4. 2; 15. 1). The expression expressed at RV. iii. 9. 7 in the words tvāṁ yād agne puruṣāṁ samāsate samiddhām apiṣvarāre is therefore rather that which is epitomized in the word sanjuṇā at RV. v. 76. 3 = SV. ii. 1104, a stanza addressed to the Agvis: utā yātān sanjavā prātār āhno madhyāmadīnā udītā śārgaya; dīvā niḥkramāvānā pāntameta, etc. The expression sanjavā prātār āhnaḥ is described graphically by Śāyana on the SV, as the time of the morning when the cattle come home from grazing in the forest to be milked: sanjavachante gavo doḥabhūmāṃ yasmin kāle, rātrūparakāle hi gavo vane kīmātāni bhūvaniyātvā dohāya sanjavā pratiṁśvaraṇante. In Hir. GŚ. i. 19. 3 the day is divided into five divisions: prātaḥ sanjavā madhyāmadīne āparāhne śāyana. Here, to be sure, the sanjavā is in the second place, still, however, early in the morning; and at any rate not too much value must be attached to sporadic systematizations of this sort. Cf. also TB. i. 5. 3. 1; Ap. Čr. ix. 7. 3; xv. 18. 13, and scholia. That apiṣvarāre is not to be regarded with Śāyana (to RV. iii. 9. 7) and Ludwig as the beginning, but rather as the end of the night follows also from the passage AB. iv. 5: apiṣvarāri vāvam anam ty abhravam, apiṣvarairi khalu vā etāni Chandāṇi ty tu smā zā*zā hái tvāni hi indrān rātres tumasó upṣyābhyātram atyāpāyayātvā, tud apiṣvarairi vām apiṣvarairatam ‘They (the metres) said: “We endure the (entire) night.” He (the sage Aitareya) therefore called these metres apiṣvarāra. For they safely carried beyond the darkness of night, that is death, Indra who was afraid of it (the night). That is the apiṣvarāra-character of the apiṣvarāra-metre.’ Cf. also GB. ii. 5. 1, 3; Ap. Čr. xiv. 3. 11. We may conclude by saying that the juxtaposition of propitve with apiṣvarāre at RV. viii. 1. 29 is the most explicit statement which determines the time of the propitve ‘the matutinal soma.’ It takes place at dawn, the time of the first activity, when the fire is kindled, when the divinities of the morning are invoked, when the cattle assemble to be milked.

It is easily conceivable that the word propitve should have assumed the general value of a division of time. Thus propitve may perhaps in one or the other instance have arrived at the faded meaning ‘in the morning,’ just as abhipitve (see below) may have assumed the value ‘in the evening.’ In RV. i. 189. 7, tvāṁ tu āgna abhipitve vā viduta vēśi propitve mānasù yajatra: abhipitve mānave śāyay bhūh etc., it is not easy to say whether the primary or secondary value is to be assumed: ‘O Agni, you partake of (the sacrifice) at the matutinal soma,’ or ‘in the morning.’* In either case Agni is doubtless imagined as a partaker of the soma; the passage is absolutely otiose.

*Cf. the formula agne ver hotram, Kāty. Čr. xxiii. 3. 1; Śāyana, propitve samihita erā kāle... abhipitve bhāpāptakāle bhigamana-vatī yaśe vā. For the translation see Ludwig (293) and Grassmann; also Geldner’s criticism, Ved. Stud. ii. 158 ff.
I do not venture to translate RV. x. 73. 2, abhivarte 'va tā mahā-
padēna dhvāntē propitoḍd id uranta gārabbah. Grassmann speaks of the hymn as partly unintelligible, and then proceeds to make his assertion more than good by translating "ungeben gleichsam waren diese (Orte, etwa die Wolken in denen die Wasser eingeschlossen waren) von dem weitschreitenden (Indra, oder Vīsu?); aus der dunklen Tagesfrühe erhoben sich die neugebo-
renen (Wasser?)." Ludwig (642) renders "das war gleichsam
umhüllt vom grossen orte, aus dem dunkel, der ferne kamen
sie als kinder hervor (die Marut)." The chief interest of this
version lies in the translation of propitoḍd by "aus der ferne," since the same interpreter renders propitoḍ at vi. 31. 3 (554) by
"nahkampf," propitoḍ at i. 104. 1 (469) by "in die nähe," and
propitoḍum at v. 31. 7 (532) by "zu leibe." In his commentary
Ludwig translates propitoḍd by "in der nähe." Does dhvāntē
propitoḍd mean 'from the dawning morning,' i. e. from the
morning when still dark with twilight? cf. propitoḍ apigaruṇe above.

There is but one additional occurrence of the word propitoḍ, with apīpitā, at RV. iii. 53. 24 ; of this we shall speak below.

We return now to the remaining cases of abhipītā. Here
again there seems reason to believe that the word was not merely
a general designation for the act of soma-drinking, but that it
refers to the draughts of soma at the evening-pressure, the
trīyānā svānam. RV. iv. 34. 5 is addressed to the Rbhū : "saḥ
piṭito abhipītā āhām imā uṣṭāṃ marvāṣa iha guman. Ludwig
(166) : "Zu euch bei des tages einkehr* sind die tränke wie zur
wohnung die kühe, die erst gekalbt, gekommen." Grassmann
also renders abhipītā āhām "bei der Tage Einkehr." I would
translate 'To you the drinks have come at the daily evening
pressure etc.' This, as a matter of fact, is always said of the
Rbhūs : RV. i. 161. 8 ; iii. 53. 6 ; iv. 33. 11 ; 35. 9. AV. vi. 47. 3 ;
i. 1. 13.† The phrase parallel to abhipītā āhām in these pas-
sages does not contain some general statement of time, but the
technical terms trīyānā svānam and abhipītā designate the
same occasion, not precisely from the point of view of the
pressure of the soma, but from the subsequent one of drinking
the draughts of soma. The addition of the word āhām or ānhā,
which is found with both abhipītā and propitoḍ (i. 126. 3 ; iv.
16. 12), is the same as in the phrase īḍā ānhā 'at this time of
the day' at iv. 33. 11 ; just as the word ānhā is preceded here
by a designation of time, īḍā, so abhipītā and propitoḍ taken by
themselves are secondarily employed as designations of time.
The notion of the 'turning in of the day' is poetic, but not Vedic.

The passage RV. iv. 35. 6 is also addressed to the Rbhūs, and
is explained by the preceding : yā vaḥ sūnyatā abhipītā āhām
torām vaiṣṇoh svānam madāya. Here also abhipītā svānam

* But at RV. i. 126. 3 Ludwig (1001) translates the same expression, abhipītā āhām, by 'als die tage gekommen.' This cannot be under-
stood to mean 'evening' in any sense. Is it at all likely that the ex-
pression should have passed under two such widely different values?
† Cf. also the preceding article, pp. 4, 5.
Group of Vedic words in -pita.

is secondarily the equivalent of śrīyān śūvanam. Here again the word sāvana accentuates the steady adherence of the group of words under discussion to the soma-sacrifice.

Once more the special restriction of the word abhipitā to the enjoyment of the soma pressed in the evening appears at RV. iv. 16.1. The stanza has been discussed above. I would here draw attention anew to the word ḍīṣṭ in the expression ṝṇyā yātu maṅgāvān ṝṣṭ . . . ṝṇā hhipiṭāṁ karate ṝṣanāḥ. The word is a secondary derivative from ḍīṣṭā, which means 'the previously pressed soma-shrubs.' That is, the soma-plant after it has been pressed for the morning and noon libations is employed anew at the third or evening libation. The use of the ḍīṣṭ ā is described at KÇŚ. x. 3. 12 ff.; 9. 1 ff.; Ap. Čr. xiii. 10. 5 ff.; 20. 8 ff.; it belongs regularly to Indra and the Maruts. The situation implied therefore by the two words ḍīṣṭ and abhipitāṁ is simply this: Indra is called to make his soma-potations in the evening from the ḍīṣṭā, the previously pressed soma-shoots. Cf. on ḍīṣṭ ā and ḍīṣṭān Hillebrandt's recent discussion, Somā, p. 235 ff.

The more general meaning 'in the evening' may have arisen out of the primary one 'at the evening soma.' Thus, in RV. viii. 27. 20 (Ludwig 229), the word occurs imbedded in designations of time. It is preceded in stanza 19 by śṛṇu udvati, niṁrači, prabhū, and madhyaśādīṃ dīvāḥ; it is followed in stanza 21 by sātra śānte, madhyāṇādī, and ātāci. There seems no special reason for associating the word here with any feature of the soma-cult; but on the other hand it is also possible that all these designations of time are made with reference to the sacrificia day, and that the three sāvana are in the mind of the poet. He may be eclectic in the choice of his designations, employing the ordinary astronomical names in most cases, and the sacerdotal name for evening in the case of abhipitā. Nothing is more natural in the Rig-Veda, which may be designated not only by the name of sacrificial poetry, but by a more salient and specifically Hindu title, the poetry of the sacrifice. It is for the most part unquestionably in the bonds of sacrificial institutions. Similarly in RV. v. 76. 2 (addressed to the Aṃśins), dīvāḥ 'hipitāv 'vānnd gmrñātā práty āvartinī dātiṣe gūmbhovisthaḥ, 'hipitāv may mean 'in the evening.' Ludwig (47) translates "am tage am abend mit gunst bereitwilligst kommend," etc. In the next stanza occur other designations of time: saṅguvā, prātār āhrnā, madhyāṇādī, and udātā śṛṇyasya; the presence of the word saṅguvā as a designation of time (see above, p. 37) illustrates well the possibility of the poetical grouping together of astronomical designations of time with such as are derived secondarily from other important circumstances of Vedic life. In the dānastuti, RV. 1. 126. 3, āpa mā . . . dāpa rīthār āshrhaḥ: saṃśāc sahāram dān gāyeše ṛgāt sānat kāṅśvān abhipitē āhāvān, it is again impossible and unnecessary to decide whether abhipitē āhāvān means 'at the evening soma' or secondarily and poetically 'in the evening.' Ludwig (1011) translates "zu mir sind gekommen
zehn wagen etc. ... als die tage gekommen empfieng sie Kakṣi-vān." The expression "als die tage gekommen" has a poetic or even biblical flavor, but it does not really mean much here, and it does not accord with the same scholar's rendering of the expression at RV. iv. 34. 5 (cf. above). Grassmann more consistently translates "Kakṣīvat empfieng sie bei des Tages Einkehr (d. h. am Abend)." Śāyaṇa, abhipitvaśabda uṣmakañamācī.

There is one more occurrence of the word abhipitvā, in RV. vii. 18. 9, a stanza clear enough in outline, but obscure in a number of details. The text is as follows: iyār ārthān nad nyarthām pāresmām āpiś caṇid abhipitvām jagāma; sudāṣa indraḥ suta-kāh aukrān ārāṇiḥhāyam mānose vādhrivācah. The stanza pictures enemies of Sudās who seem to cross the river Paruṣi in order to attack him, or in order to escape after an unsuccessful attack. Roth, Zur Literatur und Geschichte des Weda, p. 96, translates "Zu einem Erfolge, nicht ohne Erfolg, gingen sie in die Paruṣi, und schnell (wie ein Pferd) schoss sie sich wieder zusammen (abhipitvām jāgāma)." Roth regards the first statement as an ironical description of the failure of the enemies of Sudās to reach him. Ludwig (1005) renders "wie zu dem ihnen bestimmten ziele sind zu ihrer vernichtung sie an die Paruṣi gegangen, selbst der rasche kam nicht heim." Grassmann, "Ihr Ziel, der Strom, ward ihnen zum Verderben; der schnellste selbst fand dort die Ruhestätte." All three translators resort to renderings of abhipitvā which cannot be employed in any other passage in which the word occurs.* Possibly the translation is 'They went as if to a goal [or as if after property (ārthān nā)], into destruction, into the Paruṣi; even the swift one did not come to the evening-soma.' The last statement in the mouth of a Brahmanical worshipper would be equivalent to saying "he did not reach his home and earth." Or, if we take caṇid positively instead of negatively, we may translate 'the swift one alone came to the evening soma, i. e. reached home.' (Cf. Hopkins in this Journal, xv. 262, note 2.) But these translations are no more certain than the preceding ones.

We turn now to the cār. nīc v. apamitvā, which occurs in connection with prapatvā in RV. iii. 53. 24, imā indra bharañimā

putrā apamitvān cikitur nā prapatvān: hinvynty āpvan arañil

ná tāgañ jyārāja nā pāri nayunti jyānam. Roth, Zur Literatur etc., p. 111, translates "these Söhne Bharata's kennen (feindliches) abwenden, nicht (freundliches) hinwenden. Sie spornen† ihr Ross; wie einen ewigen Feind tragen sie den starken Bogen (spähend) umher in der Schlacht." Ludwig (1005) translates "O Indra, disse Bharata denken nicht an nähe und nicht an ferne; sie treiben das ross wie einen nie versagenden helfer, als hätte es der bogenknecht kraft fuhren sie es in den wettkampf." Grassmann translates "O Indra, diese Söhne des Bharata halten das ferne im

* Ludwig in his commentary, "in die nähe" for "heim."
† On p. 106 he reads pūrvānti for hinvynti.
Auge nicht das nahe etc." It is evident that the words under discussion are one of the chief causes of the obscurity of the translations. By what road Ludwig arrives at the rendering "nāhe" for *apāpiṭvā* and "ferne" for *prapīṭvā* it seems impossible to discover. But for the fact that he renders *prapīṭvā* at RV. x. 73. 2 (542) by "aus der ferne," one might assume that he has merely transposed the two words in his translation, intending indeed that *apāpiṭvā* shall have the value of "ferne."

In the explanation of the stanza I believe we must bear in mind the traditional hostility of Vyāmītra and the Bharatas against Vasiṣṭha and the Tṛṣus. Śiṇa in explanation of our stanza *api ca suṁgrīme sahaṁ arañam arin īva vasiṣṭhān prayā apavam prerayanti, tataḥ ca bahūm dhanum parinayanti, vasiṣṭhin kantiṁ caurasanidūnena caranti. Śiṇa doubtless has in mind the stanza RV. vii. 33. 6, which to him speaks in plain language of a defeat of the Bharatas by the Tṛṣus: *daṇḍī īvěd godaṁśaṁ viṇā pāriśinīṁ bharatā arbhakṣaḥ: ābbhaṁca puratet vasiṣṭhā dū ṣū trṣūṇāṁ viṇo aprathanta Like staves used for driving cattle, the insignificant Bharatas were broken. And Vasiṣṭha became the leader; then indeed did the clans of the Tṛṣus spread themselves out." The stanza has been interpreted variously (cf. Hillebrandt, *Soma*, p. 110), but there seems to me no way of avoiding one conclusion. It states that the Bharatas were either for a time or altogether hostile, or without the services of Vasiṣṭha: cf. PB. xv. 5. 24. Either it contains an account of a contest between the Bharatas, the followers of Vyāmītra, and the Tṛṣus, the followers of Vasiṣṭha, in which the Bharatas were worsted—or, if the Bharatas and the Tṛṣus are identical, as has been assumed by Ludwig, *Rig- Veda*, iii. 175, and Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 413 ff., then the stanza states that the Bharatas (Tṛṣus) were powerless until Vasiṣṭha became their priest. Or, again, if we favor Hillebrandt's assumption that the Bharatas were defeated until the Tṛṣus with Vasiṣṭha at their head came to their assistance, it is again the presence of Vasiṣṭha, the representative of the Brahmanical principle, which is contrasted with the condition of hostility or strangeness to Brahmanical life on the part of the Bharatas.* I am, for my part, inclined to adhere to the simplest construction of the stanza, that which would see in it the account of a battle between the Bharatas (śvāriya) and the Tṛṣus with Vasiṣṭha (brahmaṇ), the latter being representatives of brahmanical orthodoxy. In the course of the *rījasūya*-ceremony, at TS. i. 8. 10. 2; TB. i. 7. 4. 2; 6. 7, we find the formula *esa vo bharatā rījā, soma śmikam brahmaṇāṁ vīnā rījā 'This person here, O Bharatas, is your king; Soma is king of us, the Brahmans.' The TB. adds *tasmāt soma- rījino brahmaṇāḥ. In VS. ix. 40; x. 18, the same formula

*Oldenberg's after-thought (Z. D. M. G. xlii. 307 ff., based upon Bergaigne, *Religion Védique*, ii. 362), that the Tṛṣus are identical with the Vasiṣṭhas, both being the priests of the Bharatas, seems to me the least probable of all that have been suggested.
occurs in the version esa vo 'mī rājā, etc., and Sāyāna at CB v. 3. 3. 12 remarks that Bāudhāyana reads esa vo bharatā etc., but that Apastamba presents the option of any of the following ethnic designations: bharatāh, kuruvaḥ, paṇcālaḥ, kurupāṇcālaḥ, or the indefinite janāḥ.* Correspondingly, in the Kāṇva school of the VS. xi. 11 and 27, the formula occurs in the version esa vah kuravo rājāii 'sa vah paṇcāla rājā. It would seem as though the obvious prominence of the name bharata in the formula again accentuates the, so to speak, secular character of this clan: the Bharatas etc. with their ksatriya-king on the one side; the Brahmans with king Soma on the other. And we must not fail to remember in this connection that the Vasishthas are the typical Brahmans, as is stated explicitly e. g. at Ts. iii. 5. 2. 1, tasmād nūsīṣṭho brahmā kāryaḥ. Upon the basis of this we would conjecture a possible literal translation of RV. iii. 53. 24: 'These sons of Bharata, O Indra, know separation [or separate feasts], not the (brahmanical) soma-feast.' The expression cikitur na prapitvām may mean 'they know not (or, they regard not) the matutinal soma-drink,' in the sense of 'they do not participate in brahmanical sacrifices,' on the other hand, apapitvām cikitur may mean either 'they know (or regard) separate feasting (or separation'), apapitvām being the opposite of sapitvām. The warlike, non-brahmanical character of the Bharatas is also clearly expressed in the second half of the stanza: 'they drive the foreign, not the native horse; they lead about in the battle the prize gained by the bow-string.'

We have thus concluded our course through the passages containing this group of words. There can be no illusion as to the degree of certainty which attaches to some of our interpretations; they are at times quite doubtful. But the majority of the passages with which we have dealt are fairly clear, and in some cases the denial of the presence of the stem pītū would seem to us to amount to mystification. We would emphasize once more that the relation of these words to the soma-practices runs like a red thread through a large number of the stanzas in which they occur. We may hope at least to have established our fundamental point, the connection of the words with pītū. The criticism in detail of the prevailing translations—if we may indeed speak of prevailing translations in the midst of so much unsettledness—will also arrest attention, and suggest to some one else the key to the renderings of some of the passages which our essay has not placed in the right light.

* Cf. MS. ii. 6. 9 (69. 7), esa te janate rājā etc.
† The horse not bred at home, but obtained in predatory expeditions? Perhaps 'they drive their horses against their own people as though they were enemies,' thus again indicating the turbulence of the Bharatas.
ARTICLE II.

THE STORY OF EL-'ABBÁS IBN EL-AḤNÁF AND HIS FORTUNATE VERSES.
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Presented to the Society April, 1893.

A very interesting, though little known, Arabic handbook of Polite Literature (ادب) is the work entitled The Rising-places of the Full-moons (كتب مطالع البدور في منازل السرور), written by 'Alá Ḍūl-Dīn el-Ghozáli* of Damascus, who died in the Mohammedan year 815 (beg. Apr. 13, 1412 A. D.). It is composed on a very original plan, which cannot be described here, and gives a birds-eye view of Arab life and customs and literature in a good many different phases. Ḥāfiz Ḥalifa (v. 598) mentions it, citing the opening words; and it is quite fully described by Flügel, in his Catalogue of the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish MSS. in the Royal Library at Vienna, i. 376 ff. The book was first printed at Cairo, in the year 1882.† Manuscript copies are scarce; very few, at least, have found their way to Western lands.‡ One came into the possession of the Library of the University of Strasburg§ in the winter of 1893–91, and at that time I was able to learn of only one other copy in Europe, namely that at Vienna. I have quite recently learned that the firm E. J. Brill, in Leyden, also possesses a copy.¶ Of these manuscripts I shall have more to say later.

*The full name is علاء الدين علي بن عبد الله اليهاتي الفزول الدمشقي.

†Brill, Catalogue périodique. No. 272 (38).
‡In the colophon of the Cairo edition, the editor says that he knows of only a very few MSS. of the work.
§This MS., which was brought, with a number of others, from Zanzibar, appears to be of Egyptian origin.
¶Catalogue d'une Collection de Manuscrits Arabes et Turcs. M. Th. Houëma, Dr.; 1889; No. 143. It is very much to be wished that some library in this country would purchase this important collection, which is for sale.
The 20th chapter of this "كتاب مطالع البدور" is entitled "Story-Telling by Night, in High Life (مُسامرة أُهل النعيم).* The chapter is divided into 7 "Night's" (not 6, as Flügel states), each Night containing a single narrative. These narratives vary considerably in length, and are in no way connected with one another. They have, for the most part, a distinct historical flavor. Authorities are generally cited, sometimes with considerable care. The whole chapter occupies about 27 large octavo pages in the Cairo edition.†

Soon after the above-mentioned manuscript was brought to Strasburg, Professor Nöldeke called my attention to the fact that, of the seven narratives of this 20th chapter, four at least are to be found in the Thousand and One Nights.‡ Upon making the comparison, I found that the correspondence is very close. Story No. 1 is a well-known tale of the Young Man of Baghdad, who lost his fortune, and was obliged to sell his favorite singing-girl.§ No. 3 is the adventure of Ibrāhīm ibn el-Mahdi at the house of the rich merchant, where he saw the beautiful hand at an upper window, and obtained entrance by playing the parasite.|| The Prologue to this tale, the narrative of the Parable of the Basra, appears in the 1001 Nights as the Story of the Barber.¶ No. 5 is the historical anecdote of the reconciliation of Ibrāhīm ibn el-Mahdi with the Caliph el-Ma'mūn, with the episode of the barber-surgeon.** No. 6 is the story of the Man

*There is of course no necessary connection between this title and the "1001 Nights." Few Arab customs are older or more characteristic than the مسامرة.

† Whole number of pages, 608.
‡ It is not only in this 20th chapter of Ghzūlī that parallels with the 1001 Nights are to be found. The story of Ibrāhīm el-Maṣūfī and the Devil is told in Gh. i. 241 almost exactly as in the Nights. (In the latter, a similar anecdote is told also of Ibrāhīm's son Ishākh.) The story of Ishāk el-Maṣūfī and the Basket is another example, though in Gh. (i. 243) the form of the narrative differs somewhat from that in the Nights, and the hero of the story is again Ibrāhīm.
|| Boul. ii. 236 (847th N.): Hab. vii. 392 (606th N.): Mac. ii. 298 (346th N.); Lane ii. 506 (cf. i. 2251); Burton iv. 278. Also Maṣûdī (ed. Barbier de Meynard), vii. 12; el-Ikk el-Farīd (3d ed.), iii. 334. The story is a favorite. I have found it, more or less altered, in other places besides those here mentioned.
¶ Boul. i. (30th N.): Hab. ii. 253; Mac. i. 219. In all editions and translations.
** Boul. ii. 128 (273d N.): Hab. vii. 159 (536th N.): Mac. ii. 189 (273d N.): Lane ii. 516; Burton iv. 103. Also Maṣûdī vii. 63-4, 67-72; Aghâfī ix. 60 ff. and, more or less abridged, in a number of other places. Ghzūlī cites as his authority Wâkidī, who heard the story from Ibrāhīm himself.
of Upper Egypt and his Frankish Wife, who had come to Palestine with the crusaders.* In each of these cases, the form of the narrative as told by el-Ghözûlî is identical with that found in the 1001 Nights; in fact, the correspondence is to a great extent verbal.† Story No. 2 also has points of connection with the Nights, as we shall see presently, though the relationship is far less apparent. Only Nos. 4 and 7 seem to have no such affinities.‡

I made a copy of the whole chapter, from the Strasbourg MS. (S), in the early spring of 1891. This MS. is dated 1064,§ and is, on the whole, quite well written, though the writer omitted the diacritical points by the wholesale.¶ Soon after, through the kindness and courtesy of the Library-Directors at Strasbourg and Vienna, I was able to collate the Vienna MS. (V). This is dated 965,¶ and is beautifully written, in a very distinct and even hand. The diacritical points are almost always present. I also obtained a copy of the Cairo edition (C), and made a collation of this chapter. The edition seems to be based on a single manuscript. The text it presents is not so good as that of the Vienna manuscript.

The collation of this portion of the Brill Codex (B), which arrived after most of this article was already in print, shows that the manuscript stands on the same footing with the others. It presents a very good text, most nearly resembling that of S, but on the whole superior to it. My thanks are due to the members

---

* Bäl. iv. 200 (894th N.); Hab. x. 421 (863d N.); Mac. iv. 353 (894th N.); Burton ix. 19.

† The supposition is by no means unreasonable that Ghozûlî was used directly as a source by a compiler of the Nights. There is the alternative of a common source (or sources), however. Of course the question cannot be touched upon here. One thing is certain: if there is direct dependence, the order is from Ghozûlî to the Nights, not the reverse.

‡ No. 4 is a characteristic Bedouin tale of two separated lovers and their trusty friend; short, but well told. As for No. 7, it was certainly never included in the 1001 N. It is the story of the Caliph Mo‘āwia, his son Yezid, and the wife of ‘Abd-Allah ibn Salâm, mentioned by Landberg, Proverbs, i. 155. Ghozûlî borrowed it directly from Ibn Badrûn. It is long-winded and tiresome, and nobody but a دمتعه would have found it sufficiently interesting to be included here. The same version, slightly abridged, is given in Humbert’s Analecta Arabica (Paris, 1838), pp. 72 ff.

§ Beg. Nov. 22, 1853.

¶ In this MS. constant use is made of the not uncommon system of diacritical signs according to which a small v-shaped mark written over ص, س, ض, ص, and ض, indicates that they are to be read un-pointed, while the same is indicated in the case of ض and ظ by a dot underneath. I learn from a description of the Brill MS., kindly sent me by Dr. Herzsbohn, of Leyden, that the same device is employed there also. S. abridges the narrative somewhat in the 6th and 7th Nights by omitting clauses from time to time.

† Beg. Oct. 24, 1597.
of the firm E. J. Brill for their kindness in allowing me the use of their manuscript, and to Dr. Herzsohn for his very careful copy.*

So much by way of introduction. My present purpose is to furnish the text of Narrative No. 2 of this series, according to the available manuscripts and the printed edition, with a translation and some added comments; and further to demonstrate, if possible, another point of connection, besides those already mentioned, between the 1001 Nights and el-Ghazâlî; with the added hope of throwing some light on the origin of the particular narratives under discussion.

The second Night (الليلة الثانية) in el-Ghazâlî's 20th chapter is a very good example of the semi-historical narratives already alluded to. Its hero is the poet el-'Abbâs ibn el-Alma'âf (†192 ?),† and the scene is laid in Bagdad. The omnipresent Caliph Hârûn er-Rasîd and his Vezîr Yahyâ ibn Hâlid play an important part. The whole is told in a remarkably simple and matter-of-fact way, however, and on no less an authority than that of the celebrated writer el-Mubarrad. I do not know that the story in this form is to be found anywhere else.

The Arabic text given here, while containing readings from any of the sources, as they seemed preferable, will be found generally to represent the Vienna MS., which is beyond question the best of all. I have restored hemza (in the MSS. written as usual ٢ instead of ٢ etc., and omitted altogether when in the line), and teṣdîd in most cases. I have also added vowels here and there, according to my own judgment. The four versions present no important variations, only such as ordinarily arise in process of transcribing. I have given them all here. The restored text has still some traces of copyist's blunders, common to all of the versions, as will be seen. Accordingly, all are to be traced

---

* Besides making a pretty careful comparison of these four Nights (1, 3, 5, and 6) in Ghazâlî with the standard eds. of the 1001 N., and with the other sources mentioned above, I have compared the version of story No. 5 given in the very interesting Reinhardt Codex of the 1001 N., owned by the Strasburg library. This MS. and the Macnaghten ed. correspond here much more closely with Ghazâlî than do any of the others. Passages of some length entirely wanting in the Breslau and Bülâk editions are supplied by Codex R. and Macn. together, one furnishing a part and the other the rest.

† The full name is ش. الفضل العباس بن الاحتف الكنفîي (ibn al-‘Abbâs al-Khânîfî). This poet seems to have been personally a great favorite among the men of his time. His verses were generally in an amatory vein. According to Ibn Hallîkân, not a single laudatory poem (مديح) is to be found in his divân.

‡ So Ibn Hallîkân. Ibn el-Athîr, Chron. vi. 180, gives the date as 193, and adds that some authorities give 198.
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to a single copy, or else the autograph itself was faulty in these places.* V. must have stood close to the original, and none of the others can be far removed. In this story of el-Abbás, the restored text is not wholly free from difficulties. In several places, especially toward the end of the narrative, it has evidently been abridged, generally at the cost of clearness. In translating, I have tried to follow the original closely, without sacrificing English idiom.

 حدث أبو العباس مصعب بن يزيد النهجري المعروف بالبيرد قال حدثنا محمد بن عمار الحنفي وكان من سادات بكر بن وائل وادركته شيخنا كبيرا مملاقا وكان إذا افاده على إملائه شيئًا جادًا به وكان قد ولد نديما شرطة البصرة فقد ذكرني هذا الحديث الذي ذكير ووقع إلى من غير ناحيته ولا اذكر ما بينهما من زيادة والنقصان إلا ان معاني الحديث مجموعة فيما اذكر لك حكي: ان فتيانا كانوا مجتمعين في نظام واحد كلهم ابن نعمة شرد عن اهله وقع باصحته فذكر ذكر منهم قال كنا قد اكتربنا

*From the character of some of the blunders, the former would seem to have been the case.

1 Om. V. and C. • C. وقع. B. لى.
2 • C. ذكر. كبير القامة.
3 • C. فاض. كلهم.
4 • C. حاذ. ابناء، and inserts (sic) after the next word.
5 • C. فقد كان. V. قدما. B. om. (sic).
دارا شاعرًا على حد الطريق ببغداد المعمورة بالناس وكما
نفسه احيانا ونوسر احيانا على مقدار ما يمكن الواحد
من اهله وكما لا نستكرك أن تقع مُوقتنا على واحد منا
إذا امكنه ويبقي الواحد منا لا يقدر على شيء فيقوم به
اصحابه الدهر الأطول وكما إذا ايسرتنا اكملنا ودعنا الملهيتيين
والملهيّات وكما في أسفل الدار فإذا عدمنا الطرق نجيبنا
حُرّفُنا لنا تتسع منها بالنظر إلى الناس وكما لا نظلوا
من نبيذ في عسر ولا يسر إننا كذلك يروما وإذا13 بفتي يستادن
علينا فقلنا له امددنا فإذا رجل نظيف11 إنّما الوجه سرى
الهمة تنبي زوياه10 إنه من ابناء11 النوع فاتبعل علينا فقال

1 C. مشروفة, and omits حـد. In B. follows ببغداد.
2 C. فكنا.
3 V. نفس, and (with S. and B.) omits ونوسر احيانا. The reading of V. may be the original, after all.
4 بيلق.
5 V. نستكر. B. نستكر. expresly marked صم! 
6 C. موكنا.
7 S. وبقيا. B. S. is especially apt to confound the two forms of final a.
8 S. inserts another الواحد.
9 C. الملهيد.
10 Om. B.
11 So V. and S. S. rarely writes final ـ in any other way; thus even نحيل لو. B. has here ذوا لا.
12 S. omits.
13 C. omits. B. يفت.
14 B. نصي. B. شريف.
15 S. B. شريف. B. ربيته. يظهر عليه.
16 B. اهيل.
17 C. B. وقال.
انى سمعت باجتماعكم، وألتكم وحسن منادتمكم حتى كنت أدرككم ادرجتم جميعاً في قلب واحد، فاحببت أن أكون واحداً منكم فلا تعتذروني! قال فصادر ذلك مني إفتخاراً من القرط وكثرة من النبيذ وقد كان نال لغلمانه أول ما يذمنوا لى أن أكون أحبهم هاتماً ما عندك فغاب عنها غير كثير ثم أن هؤلاء قد اتى بصلة خيرون وفيها طعام المطبح من جذل وفواج ورفاق وأشنان ومخلب وأخيلة فأصبنا من ذلك ثم اصبنا من شرابنا وانبسط الرجل وإذا هو أجحب خلق الله إذا حدث واحسنهم استماعاً إذا حدث وامسكهم عن ملاحات إذا خولف ثم أ قضنا في شرابنا وانبسط الرجل فإذا هو أجحب خلق الله خلقاً وخلقنا كتنا ربيماً استمتعنا

1 C. ادخلتم. B. transposes with the following.
2 C. قالب.
3 So B. and apparently S.; C. تخصصتمني.
4 V. اكتئاراً (sic).
5 B. ياذرون.
6 S. B. فقات.
7 C. إذا، كذا; S. B. قد.
8 S. B. add من B. omitting.
9 C. مطبوع.
10 S. وملعبل.
11 C. داخله.
12 C. ا قضنا في.
13 C. حياً; S. ا قضي.
14 S. B. ملاحات; C. ملاحات.
Read الباحة؟
15 S. C. ا قضنا في من.
16 S. inserts after this word احسن خلق الله.
17 This whole clause from ثم on is hardly more than a mere repetition of the preceding, and probably had its origin in a copyist's blunder. I have omitted it in the translation.
18 I. e., أمستعنا.
ان ندعو الى الشيء الذي نعلم انه يكرهه فيظهر لنا انه لا يريد غير وحده ورش ذكرها في إشراق وجهه وكتابنا نغنا به عن حسن المعنى وندارس اخباره وإذا به شغنا ذلك عن تعرف وجهه ونسبه فلم يسكن منا غير معرفة الكلية فانا سألناه عنها فقال أبو الفضل فقال لنا يوما بعد اتصال الامس الا اخبركم كيف غرفتم تلنا إنا لنصرف ذلك قال احببت في جواركم جارية وكانت سيدتها ذات حجاب و كنت اجلس لها في الطريق ألقبها اجتازها فأراها حتى اختلفني المس بالمس على الطريق ورأيت غرفتم هذه فسألت عن

1. C. بأن.
2. ان لا تريد.
3. C. ونرا.
4. B. I. e., of course, نقفي فشغناه وآدابه.
5. B. I find, really has the point under the د.
6. This and all that precede, beginning with وقتنا, is omitted in C., the double occurrence of the word وجهنا being the occasion of the blunder.
7. Read فلم يسكن منه؟ S. B. have and omit معنیة.
8. S. B. لنا.
9. S. B. فبينا نحن معه يوما.
10. B. فقال (اذ قال) B. المن.
11. C. فما.
12. B. بجواركم.
13. S. (sio), otherwise as in the text. C. has وكان وكن سيدها ذو عرائهما. The feminine is undoubtedly correct, and appears again below. See the translation.
14. B. على.
15. C. فارها حتى.
16. S. وايتي.
17. Om. S.
خبرها فأخبرتُكم عن إثنتينكم ومساعدة بعضكم بعضًا فكان
الدخول فيما انتُهي فيه آخر عندي من التجارة فسألت عنها
فغضبنا قلقناً له ما نحنُبَعَدُ عنها لك حتى نظفر بها
فقال يا إخْرَتي! أنتُ والله على ما ترون منى من شدة
الحبّة لها، والكلف بها ما تقدر فيها حرامًا قد وما
تقديري إلا مطالبها وصبرتها إلى أن يبن الله بقرة
فأشترهما واقام معنا شهرًا ونصف على غاية الاعتقاب
بقره والسرو بصحبته فتم احتلس منا فنالنا من فراقه كل
مصنف ولم تعرف له من ألا نلتسم منه فكدير
علينا من العيش ما كان طاب لنا به قبُّم عندنا ما كان

1 C. and S. فتحبرت. B. فتحبرت على.
2 Read إني. B. فكان.
3 C. لبضع. B. فتلقنا.
4 C. قبلنا، and omits له.
5 For يأهلاً، as usual.
6 S. B. have the consonants all unpointed, V. apparently نحبر، though the point might belong to the.
7 C. نفطر. B. نفطر، and omits نفطر.
8 V. يأخونى. B. has V. بعد الله. B. FECAL.
حسن بقربه وجعلنا لا نرى سرورا ولا غنا إلا ذكرنا أصلان
الناس والسرور بحضورة والغم بفargarته
فكتا فيه كما قال القائل:

كُل خير رأيتهم

ويرى مما أنفِك منهم على ذكرى

فغاب عنا رحاء عشرين يوما ثم بينا نحن مكتارون يوما
من الرraphicة. إذا به قد طلع في مركب نبيل ورشي جليل
فحيح سار بصرنا انحشت عن دابته وانحشت غلابانه ثم قال
يا اختِيتَا ما هنَا. عيش بعدكم ولست امالكم بغيبري إلى
النزل ولكن ميلنا بنا إلى المسجد فلنا معاً فقال أعرَفكم
أول نفسي أنا العياس بن الأحنف وكان من خبرى بعدكم
انى خرجت إلى منزل من عندكم فذا السودة محيطة

1. B. نر.
2. C. إلا إذا.
3. B. الشاعر. The metre is Tawli.
4. S. نذكرنِهِم.
5. Om. S.
6. S. and V. ذكر.
7. B. أيامَا مقدارها عشرون.
8. C. الرصاصة. B. om. الرصاصة (preceding).
9. C. بصرينا به.
من فُصِّلّى ذِي الْجَمِيلِ الْمَفَازِي، فَصُصَّتْ إِلَى يَعْقِيِّ بِنْ حَلَّٰلَ، فَقَالَ لِهَا: "وَيَعْقِيُّ، يَا عَبْسَ اِنْتَفِخْ اِنْتُسِرْ، مِنْ ظَرْفِهِنَّ، شَجَّرَ لِقَرْبِهِ مَأْخُذَكَ وَحِسَنَ تَأْنِيْكَ، أَنَّ الَّذِي قَدْ نُذِبْتَهُ، مِنْ شَأْنِكَ وَقَدْ عَرَفْتَ حَصْرَاتِ الْخَفَافِ، وَإِنِّي أَخْبَرْكَ اِنْ مَارَدَةً هَيْ الْغَالِبَةً عَلَى اِمْرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ الْيَوْمُ وَقَدْ جَرَى بَيْنِهَا عَظِبُ فَهُيَّ بَدْلَةً الْمُعَشُّرِ، تَأْنِيْكَ اِنْ تَعْتُذرْ وَهُوْ بَعْرُ الْخَلَافَةِ وَشَرِفُ الْمُلُكِ يَأْتِي ذُلَّكَ وَقَدْ رَمَّ الْأَمْرُ مِنْ قَبْلِهَا، فَأَعْيَانَى وَهُوْ اِحْرَىٰ، اِنْ يَسْتَفْرَى إِلَى الصِّبْأَةِ فَقُلْ شُعْرُ تِسْهَلُ، عَلَيْهَا هَذِهِ السِّبْلُ فَقَصِّيِّ كِلَامٌ مَّثِ دُعَاهُ اِمْرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ فَصَارَ الْيَهُ وَأَعْطِيُّ دِراًٰثَ، وَقَرَطُبَا فَاعْتِرَانِي الرَّمْعُ وَأَذْهَبُ.

---

1 Om. S. B.
2 صِبْأَةً.
3 V. S. B.
4 أَنْيَكَ، infin. of "أَنْيَكَ" (V.).
5 C. مَأْئُونَ.
6 اِذْبِتْهُ لَكَ (sic).
7 V. S. B. الغَالِبَةَ.
8 C. وَأَنْهُ.
9 C. بِبِلَالَانَ، S. بِبِلَالَةً (un-doubtedly for بِبِلَالِ with the usual diacritical point under the D). B. بِبِلَالِ.

---

8 S. وَهُمْ.
9 C. يُزِمْ (sic).
10 C. مِنْ قَبْلِهَا.
11 C. اِحْرَىٰ.
12 I. e., يُسْتَفْرَى. But C. تِسْهَلُ, the s being regarded as suffix.
13 C. يُسْتَفْرَى. B. inserts & after عليه.
14 B. دُعاً.
15 V. Dُرَاًٰثَ.
علي كل قانية ثم انفتح لي شيء والرسل تنزروا فنهاجنا
اربعه أبيات رضي بها وقعت صحيحة المعني سهيلة اللفظ ملائمة لما طلبت مئ بكل الرسول أبلغ الوزير أن
قد قلت أربعه أبيات فان فيها مقنع وجهت بها فرجع الى الرسول بأن هانها ففي اقل منها مقنع وفي ذهاب الرسول وجوعه قلت بيتين من غير ذلك الروى فكتبت أربعه أبيات في صدر الرثة وعقبت بالبيتين فكتبت
عاشقا كيلاهما متعين
كلها متوهج متفصب
صدت مغاصبة وصد مغاصبة
فكلها مبا يعلم متعب
راجع أحبتك الذين هجرتهم
إن المتيم قل ما يئجب

---

1 B. تترا. The words seem to be a serio-comic adaptation from the Koran (Sūr. xxiii. 46). C. has instead.
2 C. كتبت.
3 C. S. B. الأربعة الابيات.
4 Om. V.; S. B. add شعراء.
5 Om. B. متخصص.
6 S. In B. the second and fourth half-verses have exchanged places.
ان التتجنب اين تطاول مكما
دَبَّ السُّلَوُّ له فعَّر السَّلَبُ

وكتب تحى ذلك

لا بَن للعاشقين من وفَّيَة
تكون بين الصَّدَّ و السَّرَّم
حتى إذا الهجر تماشي به
راجع من يَهْلَو ٌ على رَّمَم

فلما سمعها أمير المسلمين قال والله لكأنى قصدت به
فقال له يحيى فتأتى والله يقصده به هذا يقول العباس

1 C. تطول
2 B. دَبَّ
3 All the texts have the slūla (except B., which leaves the s unpointed), but a glance at the metre is sufficient to show the true reading. The suffix in لى refers of course to التتجنب
4 The metre is Kāmil.
5 Metre, Sarf. B. adds شعرا للعشاق
6 B. وفقة
7 C. يكون
8 C. إذا ما
9 C. S. تهري. In B. the first consonant is unpointed, and the final letter is أ
10 S. رم, one of the very few places where a vowel is given.
11 C. ثم وجهت بالكتاب الى يحيى بن خالد فرنه يحيى الى الرشيد فقال والله ما رأيت شعرا اشبه بما نحن فيه من هذا والله لكأنى قصدت به فقال..... يقول العباس بن الاحتف في هذه القصة فلما قرأ الحب والله لا أنت البصرود به B.
بن الاحنف فقال ما رأيت شعرًا أشبه به لا نحن فيه من هذا فلما قرأ البيتين رفضي إلى قوله راجع من يهوى على رغب استغرب ضاحكاً حتى سمعت ضحكه ثم قال إن وله أراجع على رغم يا غلام هات البغل فنهض وذله السرار عن ان يأمر لي بشيء ندعيي يحيى فقال لي إن شعرك قد وقع بغاية الموافقة والاذه امير المرميين السرار عن ان يأمر لي بشيء قد تلقى لكن هذا الطبر ما وقع مني بمواقفة ثم جاء [رسول 11 فاسرة 15] فنهض رثبت مكانه ثم نهضت بنهوضه فقال لي يا عباسي آمسنت أمل الناس آتدرى ما سأزين به هذا الرسول قلت لا قال قد ذكر لي أن ماردة

1 V. B. ابن .
2 S. مم .
3 S. B. ترى .
4 B. واقصى the marked with the مهلة .
5 S. C. نهوي .
6 C. النعل .
7 S. رنهض .
8 B. فاذى اله .
9 S. B. وقال .
10 B. شعري .
11 V. لى .
12 Something of the kind has fallen out here and must be supplied, as the context shows plainly. It is an interesting fact that all the texts show the same gap.
13 C. فصاررة .
14 C. أملي .
15 C. آتدرى .
16 C. سارنزي .
17 C. أن ذكرني .
18 B. om. قد .
تلقت أخبار أمير المومنين لثأر علت بيكية فقلت يا أمير المومنين كيف هذا فاعطانا الشعر وقال هذا اتيني بيك قال النفس يقلت ثم قال العباس بن الاحتف قال ما فعلت؟ معه قال ما فعلت شيا بعد قالت إذا والله لا اجلس حتى يكافئن قال نامير المومنين قائم لقيامها وان تأتم لقيام أمير المومنين وهما يتظارعان في سلتك فهذا كله لك قلت ما لي من هذا كله الإصلة... ثم قال هذا أحسن من شعرك فأمر لي أمير المومنين بالكثير وامرة ماردة بمال دونه وأمر الوزير بمال دون ما أمر به وحملت على ما تروون من الظهر ثم قال الوزير من تمام اليد قبلك أن لا تخرج من الدار حتى يروي لك بهذا.

1. بلغت.
2. بيكية.
3. يامير.
4. C. B. به، but corrected in B.
5. قاله.
6. S. omits the four following words, the double occurrence of being the occasion of the blunder.
7. V. B. اذن.
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8. C. يكافئ.
9. S. يكافئ.
10. Om. B.
11. It is evident that something is missing here. Perhaps فضحكك؟
12. Om. C. B.
13. S. inserts ل.
14. B. om. مال and بيه.
15. C. من هذا ترجع الدار.
16. B. مثل هذا.
المال صياغا فاشترته لضياع بعشرين ألف دينار ودفون إلى بقية المال لذا الخضر الذي عانقى عنكم فهملتموا حتى فاتكم الضياع واتفق فيكم المال فقلنا له هتاك الله بمالك وكلنا راجع إلى نعة من الله فاتسم واتسمنا قال فآمروا بنا إلى التجاربة حتى نشتريها فشينا إلى صاحبتها وكانت جارية جميلة حلوة لا تخسُّن! شياً أكثر ما فيها ظرف اللسان وتأدية الرسائل وكانت تُسأرُ علي وجهها ماتئة وخمسين دينارا فلما رأينا مولاها استامنا فيها خمسمائة دينار فأجبنا بالعجب فخط مائاثم حط

1 S. B. مالك.
2 C. حطراء.
3 Om. B. 

3 The ordinary form of expression would be فاتسم علينا واتسمنا عليه: cf. e.g. Aghâni vii. 125. 11. After these words we should expect at least ثم before ثال.

4 Om. B. S. لماشتريها.

4 C. B. الصحابها. the same divergence from V. and S. as that noted above in the case of سيدتها. There is no further mention of this 'mistress,' and in the negotiations that follow only the actual owner of the girl (مولاها) appears. الْدَارِ صاحبتهَا would have been less ambiguous.

6 B. تشوري (sic).

7 V. C. B. رانى. B. has صاحبها.

7 V. B. اسمنى. C. استمنى.

9 V. B. فارقينها.

10 S. B. دينار. V. S. B. omit the three following words.
مائة وقال: العباس يا قتيلان اني والله! أحتشم بعد ما تلتم ولدكها حاجة في نفسك بها. يتم سروري فإن ساعدتم فعلت قلنا له تقل تال هذه التجارة أنا اعائنها. منذ دهر واريد أيثار نفس⸱ها. يتم سروري فإن ساعدتم فأكره أن تنظير الي بعين من قد ماكس في ثينها. ... أعطيته، فيها خمسين دينار كلا سأل قلنا فانه قد حط مائتين. قال:

وام فعال فدنا من مولاها رجلًا حرًا فأخذ ثلاث مائة وجعلها بالنائبين. فما زال لنا محبًا الي ان نقر المروت بيننا.

---

1 V. S. B. قال.
2 C. adds أقسم بها.
3 S. (sic).
4 C. عاينتها.
5 C. بها. There is evidently a dittograph here. The second V. S. B. said, at any rate, is to be canceled, and it is perhaps best to read here, and strike out the following words as far as V. S. B. فاكه.

6 Here, where فاكه is really needed, it is wanting!

7 S. B. قال.
8 B. adds له, and omits.
9 S. مائتين.
10 B. فصادتنا مولاها.
11 C. ثلثين دينار. B. فأخذناها بثلاثية.
12 S. B. بالائنين.

13 The narrative in these last lines is so condensed as to be obscure.
Translation of the Story of El-'Abbās Ibn El-Ahwaf and his Fortunate Verses.

Narrated by Abu 'I-l-'Abbās Mohammed ibn Yezīd, the grammarian, generally known as el-Mubarrad.*

I heard the story (he says) from Mohammed ibn 'Amir el-Hanafi,† one of the chiefs of the tribe Bekr ibn Wā'il. At the time of my acquaintance with him he was a very old man, living in straitened circumstances; but he was one who, whenever he found anything left over from his scanty means, was generous with it. He had been formerly prefect of the police of el-Brāra, and he told me this story, which I repeat. I have happened to hear it from another source, and I do not remember now what particulars were added or omitted in either of the two versions; I am only sure that all the essential points of the narrative are contained in that which I relate.

The story goes that there were certain young men who had joined themselves together into one band, each of them a member of the wealthy class of society, who had withdrawn from his own people, and was content with the society of his comrades. One of their number recounts as follows: We had hired a house looking out upon the most frequented street of Bagdad. We were sometimes poor and sometimes rich, according to what one or another of us could get out of his people, and we were not unwilling that the burden of providing for us should fall upon some one of our number, if he was equal to it, or that one and another of us should be left without a copper, in which case his comrades would stand by him for any length of time. In times of prosperity we used to feast, and call in the musicians and singing-girls. We occupied the lower part of the house; so, when we were in want of diversion, our place of resort was a certain balcony, where we could amuse ourselves with looking at the passers-by.‡ At all times, whatever the state of our funds, we kept a supply of nebidh§ on hand.

One day, while we were occupied in the manner just described, a young man, a stranger, asked to be admitted to our presence. We replied: "Come up!" So there appeared a well-dressed man, with a pleasant face, of noble disposition,† one whose appearance indicated that he was a man of condition. Approaching us, he

---

* Born 207, died 285 A. H.
† I. e., a member of the family Hanifa, who was the son of Lugaim ibn Sa'b ibn 'Ali ibn Bekr ibn Wā'il. He thus belonged to the same family as el-'Abbās himself.
‡ This feature of the Bagdad club has a very modern sound!
§ The well-known substitute for wine.
† This part of the description is a little premature, evidently. The enthusiasm of the narrator may excuse him.
said: "I have been told of your social life together, and your admirable good-fellowship, which is such that you have come by degrees to have one heart in common, as it were. And I had a strong desire to become one of you; so do not treat me ceremoniously, as an intruder." It happened that just then our stock of provisions was very low, while nebūdūh was abundant. Now the man had said to his servant: "As soon as they grant me permission to become one of them, produce what you have brought!" So he (the slave) disappeared for a moment, and then reappeared with a bamboo basket filled with dainties fresh from the bake-shop, kid’s flesh and young fowls, and thin cakes; also uṣānūn, and maḥlab, and tooth-sticks.* So we applied ourselves to these, and then to our nebūdūh, and the man relaxed, and we found him the liveliest of Allah’s creatures when he was telling stories, and the best possible listener while another was narrating; and most admirable in refraining from contention when there was difference of opinion. We used often to test him by proposing to him that which we were sure he would dislike, but he always showed us that it was just what he wished, and we could see this in the lighting-up of his face. While he was with us, we never lacked for bright and witty conversation, and we used to read over his anecdotes together; and, as it happened, that occupied us so completely that we failed to find out about the man himself or his lineage. In fact, we got possession of nothing more than his kunyā;† for we asked him what it was, and he said: "Abu’l-Faql." One day, soon after we had received him as our comrade, he said to us: "Shall I tell you how I came to know about you?" We replied: "We shall be very glad to hear." So he said "I have fallen in love with a certain girl here whose mistress has charge of singing-girls,§ and

* Uṣānūn is alkali for washing the hands; maḥlab, an aromatic grain used for perfuming. It was generally mixed with the alkali. It may seem strange that our hero should have seen fit to furnish his newly-made acquaintances with toothpicks and toilet-soap, in addition to the eatables; but it was quite in keeping with Bagdad etiquette that he should do so. Such accessories as these were indispensable to every meal in high life, and it was evidently good form to be particular about them. Ghozūlī himself devotes nearly a whole chapter-division (ii. 64 ff.) to the preparation and use of

† Dozy (Suppl.) gives a single example (Kosegarten, Chrestom. 147. 11) of this use of kunyā, which he renders "götter." I find it also in Ghorūfī i. 285. 14; 248. 17.

‡ The nickname, which every Arab had. As we might say that we had learned only the first name of a new acquaintance.

§ It was at this time the regular thing, particularly in Bagdad and the neighboring cities, for numbers of especially promising slave-girls to be educated together in establishments under competent management. (Cf. Kremer, Kulturgeschichte des Orients, ii. 108 ff.) Such houses as these often play an interesting part in stories of the 1001 N. The girls were carefully trained in music and poetry, and it was almost always the case that a few in each establishment were celebrated far
I used to sit by the street waiting for her to pass by, that I might see her. But at last, when I was worn out from sitting beside the street, I saw this balcony of yours; so I asked about it, and was told of your good-fellowship and how you help one another. Then the wish to become one of your number grew hardly less strong* within me than the passion for the girl." So we asked him about her, and he informed us. Then we said to him: "We will leave no effort untried until we have enabled you to get possession of her!" But he replied: "O my brothers, you see in what a state of passionate love for her I am, and yet I have never been able to use unlawful means. I can only wait for her, with all possible patience, until Allah shall graciously bestow riches upon me, and then I will buy her."

So he remained with us two months, and we were in the highest state of delight at having him among us as our comrade. Then he suddenly disappeared from us, and his absence caused us the greatest sorrow and distress; moreover, we knew of no dwelling-place of his, where we might seek him. So everything in our existence became gloomy which had been gay, and we found those things hateful that had been beautiful in his society. It began to be the case that we experienced no joy or sorrow without calling to mind how we had been united with him in friendship, and our joy in his presence, and our grief at his absence. Our condition was that described in the words of the poet:

Whatever good or ill I experience reminds me of them;
And yet how far removed I am from them, in spite of the remembrance!

So he was absent from us for about twenty days. Then, one day, as we were coming from er-Ruṣāfa,† all of a sudden he appeared, attended by a stately cavalcade, and himself in gorgeous array. The moment he saw us, he dismounted from his beast, and his servants dismounted also. Then he said: "O my brothers, life has been of no use to me since I have been deprived of you! I will not make you wait for my story until we come to the house, but turn aside, and come along with us now to the mosque." So we went with him, and he said: "I will tell you first of all who I am. I am el-ʿAbbās ibn el-Ahnaf; and this is

and wide for beauty and for skill in song. Visitors were of course welcome, as possible purchasers, and it is easy to understand how these houses became the most popular gathering-places for rich young men of taste. Our hero, being low in funds, was reduced to straits. makes here the impression of a phrase in common use. It is one with which I am not familiar, however.

* Reading فكان.
† The name of a quarter in the eastern part of Bagdad, especially known as the burial-place of the Abbaside Caliphs. Ibn Athir, vii. 135, speaks of a قصر الرصافة.
The Story of El-'Abbās Ibn El-Aḥnaf.

what happened to me after I left you. I went to my dwelling, and lo and behold, a guard from the palace appeared and took me in charge. So I was taken to the royal residence, and upon my arrival there was brought into the presence of Yahyā ibn Ḥālid, who cried out to me: "O ‘Abbās! I have selected you from among the makers of elegant verses, because of the aptness of your improvising, and your painstaking deliberation, and also because the matter to which I have summoned you is something in which you will be interested. You know the whims of the Caliphate. I must tell you that the girl Māridāf is just now in power with His Highness, but the two have quarreled; so now she, in the presumption of a favored mistress, refuses to seek for forgiveness; and he, in the majesty of the Caliphate and his royal dignity, also holds back. I have sought to bring about the reconciliation from her direction, but the task has proved too much for me. Now he is the more inclined of the two to rekindle the affection; so do you compose some verses by way of making this easy for him." Then, just as he had finished speaking, the Caliph summoned him, and he went into his presence. I was given ink and paper, but consternation had seized me, and taken every rhyme out of my head. Then I had a sudden inspiration (for inspiration is sent only at intervals),§ and there came to me four verses that just suited me—verses of the necessary point, of smooth diction, and exactly corresponding to what was required of me. So I said to one of the messengers:

"Tell the Vezīr that I have composed four verses, and, if they will suffice, I will send them in." The messenger came back to me with the answer: "Let us have them; the smallest one of them will suffice!" Now, while the messenger was going and coming, I had composed two more verses, with a different rhyme-letter;¶ so I wrote the four verses on the upper part of the sheet, and followed them with the two.

The first strophe was as follows:

The two lovers have quarreled:
Each feels aggrieved, each nurses anger.

*المسرح, lit. 'wearing the black' (the Abbaside color), came to be the technical designation for those in the employ of the Caliph.
† A slave-girl of foreign parentage, and an especial favorite with er-Raṣīd. She was the mother of the Caliph el-Mo'taṣīm. Mas'ūdī vii. 108 and Ibn Athīr vi. 374 give the names of her parents.
‡ The word in the text means to train (horses) well, to bring into lively condition.
§ A punning reference to the Koran, Sur. xxiii. 46.
¶ The lines of an Arabic poem must all rhyme with each other, and are so written that the terminal letter (which is the same throughout) is repeated in unbroken succession down the page, forming a perpendicular row as regular as an embroidery pattern and called the "fringe." A change in the rhyme-letter means accordingly a new poem (or strophe).
She has turned away in wrath from him, and he from her;
Each is weary of whatever might bring healing.

Return to the loved-ones you have renounced;
The enslaved one,* truly, should not stand long aloof.

When the estrangement between you has lasted long,
Then indifference creeps in, and the reconciliation sought is hard to reach!

And I had written below this:

To every lover the time is sure to come
For him to stand 'twixt strife and dissension sore;

Until, when he feels the quarrel too long drawn out,
He returns, in spite of himself, to his love once more!†

When the Caliph heard these verses, he said: "Really, it sounds as though I myself were the one aimed at here!" Yahya replied: "Sure enough, you are the one intended; this was written by el-Abbas ibn el-Ahnaf, to fit this very case." The Caliph said: "I have never seen verses that describe our present circumstances more exactly than these." Then, as he read the lines, and came to the words: "He returns, in spite of himself, to his love once more," he caught the humor of the situation, and burst out laughing, so that I heard him. Then he said: "Very well, I will 'return in spite of myself.' Here, boy, fetch the mule!"‡ So he rose up to go, and his joy made him forget to reward me. So Yahya called me, and said: "Your verses made a magnificent hit, but joy caused the Amr to forget to reward you." I replied: "Very well; only I can't say that these tidings make much of a 'hit' with me!" But

---

*I. e. enslaved by Love; an expression often occurring in Arabic poetry.
†I had been struck by a certain resemblance between the last line of this couplet and that of the graceful verses quoted by Ghozul in another place (i. 380):

ущеб عظيم الذنب مسن تحميه
فان كنت مظلوما نقل اننا ظالم
فانك ان لم تتحمل الذنب يا فتى
بفارتك من تهرى وانفك راغم

I notice now that Mas'udi (vii. 246) in citing a portion of the latter, ascribes it to el-Abbas ibn el-Ahnaf.
‡I should have been inclined to read with C. نعل ("shoes," or "sandals,"), if I had not happened to come across a passage in Aghani (ix. 90) telling how the Caliph er-Rasid kept a little black donkey for the purpose of riding about from one apartment to another in his palace.

 فقال هاتوا حباء فاني بصحار كان له أسود يركبه في القصر
The Story of 'Abbás Ibn El-Aḥnaf.

soon a messenger* came, and spoke with him aside. Then he (Yahyā) sprang up, and I, who had remained where I was, now sprang up too. "'Abbás," he said, "you are bound at last to become the richest of men. Do you know what private message this man has brought me?" I answered: "No." He said: "He told me that Mārida came to meet the Caliph, when she heard of his approach, and said to him: 'O Commander of the Faithful, how has this happened?' He handed her the poem, saying: 'This has brought me to you.' 'Who is its author?' she asked; and he replied: 'El-'Abbás ibn el-Aḥnaf.' 'And what have you done for him?' 'I have done nothing yet.' 'Then,' said she, 'I vow I will not sit down until he is rewarded.' So the Amīr puts himself at her bidding,† and I put myself at his; and they are waiting now with rival eagerness for your coming. So all this is for you." I answered: "What am I to get from 'all this,' as you call it, except the visit with them?" He laughed, and said: "You are more humorous now than you were in your verses!"

So the Caliph ordered a great sum of money to be given me,‡ and Mārida and the Vezīr followed his example, and I was raised to all this state of magnificence which you see. The Vezīr said, moreover: "One thing more is needed to make your fortune complete, and that is that you should not leave this palace until you have provided yourself with an estate for part of this money." So an estate was bought for me, for twenty thousand dinārs, and the rest of the money was paid over to me. And this is the adventure which kept me from you. So now come, and I will divide the money and the estates with you." We said to him: "We wish you all joy of this property of yours! As for us, we are all back again in Allah's own prosperity."§ He insisted, but we would not hear of it. Then he said: "Come with us now to where the girl is, and we will buy her." So we went to the dwelling of her mistress, and found her a beautiful girl, with a charming face, one whose excellence was unsurpassed in elegance of speech and aptness of expression. || She was valued at 150

* The word is wanting in the text.
† In جلس لقيامها there is a punning reference to the of the preceding sentence. For the ordinary use of the expression cf. e. g. 1001 N. (Macnaghten) iii. 418. 13.
‡ It is characteristic of the manner of this narrative that the most interesting scene of the entrance of the fortunate poet into the presence of the Caliph and Mārida and his reception by them is wholly passed over.
§ I. e., we are more than satisfied in having you with us again.

In the story of Ibrāhīm el-Maṣūfīl and the Basket, as told by Ghozūlī, the hero tells his charming acquaintances, the slave-girls, not to show themselves next day when he brings his companion, nor to let their voices be heard from behind the curtain except 'in such songs and recitations (?) as they may select' ما تحتبرنها من الغنا (أو تقلنها من قول مراسلة): i. 244, 18.
dinârs; but, when her owner saw us, he demanded of us 500 dinârs for her. We expressed our astonishment at this, so he came down one hundred in the price, then one hundred more. But el-Abbâs said: “O my friends, I am really ashamed, after what you have said,* but she is a necessity to me, and the one thing needful to complete my happiness; so, if you approve, I will do what I intend.” We answered: “Say on.” He said: “I have had my eye upon this girl for some time past, and purpose now to bestow upon myself this crowning gift. And I am unwilling that she should look upon me as haggling over her price. If you agree, I will give him 500 dinârs for her, as he has demanded.” “But,” we said, “he has already come down two hundred in the price.” “Even that fact shall make no difference,” he answered. But her master proved to be a generous-minded man, for he kept three hundred dinârs, and gave her the remaining two hundred for her outfit.†

And el-Abbâs remained with us, in close friendship, until death separated us.

Correspondences and Comments.

Professor Nöldeke directed my attention to the fact of a certain resemblance between this story and that of Abu 'l-Hasan of Horâsân, narrated in the 1001 Nights.‡ (Found in the Bâlâk and Calcutta [Macnaghten] editions,§ but wanting in the Breslau ed. Lane’s trans. omits it, as do the English translations generally. Burton, ix, 229 ff., has it.) Its main features are as follows: A certain rich young merchant of Bagdad falls desperately in love with one of the favorite slave-girls of the Caliph el-Mutawekkil. He manages, at the risk of his life, to enter the palace, disguised in the Caliph’s own clothes. After once or twice barely escaping discovery, he accidentally meets the sister of his charmer, who at first takes him for a robber, but finally brings about a meeting of the two lovers. Just as they are rushing into each other's arms in the approved fashion, a messenger appears at the chamber door and announces the approach of the Caliph. It is a moment of desperation, but the girl thrusts her lover into the refrigerator,|| and shuts the cover after him. So the Caliph enters. He is in trouble, for he has had a quarrel with the girl

---

*I. e., after you have taken the trouble to beat the man down in his price.
†I. e., the ġahâz, or bridal furnishings.
‡Concerning the nature of the resemblance intended by him I can only conjecture, as I neglected to ask. I did not at that time expect to make a special study of this 2nd Night.
§Bâl. iv., (59th N.); Macn. iv., 597 ff.
||سرداب, generally a small underground chamber, where provisions, wine, etc., could be kept cool. Burton remarks that almost every house in Bagdad has one, though it is unknown in Cairo. The word is Persian.
el-Benغا, his favorite of all the harĩf, and wishes our heroine, who is the most skilful of the singing-girls, to comfort him with her music. She takes a lute, and improvises some verses calculated to soften his heart. The singer surpasses herself. The Caliph is enraptured, and the young man, listening from the depths of the refrigerator, is so excited that, as he himself expresses it, "had it not been for the grace of Allah Almighty, I should have shouted for joy, and thereby brought destruction on myself and my friends." After listening to a few more verses of the same sort, His Majesty trots off to make peace with his favorite, first rewarding the singing-girl by releasing her from slavery and making her a free woman. So the young man is brought forth from his narrow quarters, and measures are at once taken to get him out of this dangerous place, the palace. He is disguised as a woman, and attempts to pass out unobserved, but is discovered, and brought before el-Mutawekkil. He regards himself as a dead man, and in sheer desperation tells the exact truth. But the Caliph, instead of ordering his head to be cut off, pardons him, and marries him to the girl; and the two live together in happiness and luxury to the end of their days.

Here is the genuine flavor of the "Arabian Nights." The story is told with all the bright coloring and splendor of circumstance with which we are familiar, full of striking situations and hair-breadth escapes. It makes a far more dazzling and exciting tale than this "Second Night" of ours, which seems bare and commonplace in comparison. Moreover, we receive the impression of two entirely distinct stories, standing in most respects far apart. But it is quite possible, after all, that the two are closely related to each other.

There is one point, manifestly, at which they cross: namely, the fact that in each a Caliph is reconciled to his mistress by the influence of an opportune verse of poetry. In both el-Ghözûlî and the 1001 Nights this is the hinge on which the whole story turns. The narrative at this point, moreover, exhibits a certain verbal correspondence in the two versions. In the story of

---

* So named in all the editions, and further defined as the mother of (the Caliph) el-Motazz. But the name is incorrect, and the result of a scribal error for Kabîha. Cf. Mas'ûdî vii. 270, 372; Ibn Athîr vii. 135. The latter adds that el-Mutawekkil gave her this name ("Ugly-face") because of her extreme beauty: لحسنها وجمالها كما يسمى الأسود كافرون. which latter comparison reminds one of how in our Southern States, in slavery times, "Snowball" was a name frequently given to particularly black darky babies.

† This verse are quite different, however, from those in el-Ghözûlî.
Abu 'l-Hasan, the incident is introduced in the following words:
“Now the Caliph was devoted to a certain girl named el-Bengā* (she who was the mother of el-Mo'tazz), but a quarrel had parted the two; so now she, for the might of her beauty and her charms, will not seek to be reconciled with him; and he, for the majesty of the Caliphate and the royal throne, will not seek reconciliation with her."† This coincidence in form of expression with el-Ghozūlī may be explained, of course, on general grounds; but it is more natural to suppose either direct dependence of some sort, or that these words are a characteristic survival from an oft-repeated popular anecdote.

A few months ago, I happened to be looking into Kosegarten's Chrestomathy,‡ for another purpose, and noticed this same story of Abu'l-Hasan of Horāsān, edited from a MS. of the 1001 Nights in the library at Gotha. The text given here varies little from that of the other editions, except in the case of the verses which the singing-girl recites to the Caliph. Among these I was surprised to find the identical couplet ascribed by Ghozūlī to el-'Abbās ibn el-Ahnaf in this narrative. The first half-verse has been lost, and its place supplied from the second verse; there is no other change of importance:

حتى إذا الهجر تبادي به
يكون بين الهجر والصرم
حتى إذا الهجر تبادي به
واصل من يهوى على رغم

This, it seemed to me, furnished an additional link in the chain of connection between the two stories.

At about the same time, I came across two more of the verses of our Ghozūlī narrative, namely the two that form the basis of the first strophe. They are cited by Ibn Hallikān in his article on Ibrāhīm el-Maṣūfī. After speaking in general terms of Ibrāhīm's fame as a musician, the author continues:§ “It is related that the Caliph Ḥārūn er-Raṣūl was passionately fond of a fair slave named Mārida, but they quarreled, and their mutual displeasure continued for some time. This induced Ga'far the Barmekide to order el-'Abbās ibn el-Ahnaf to compose something applicable to the circumstance, and the following verses were written by him in consequence (here follow the two verses

---

* Read "Kabīha," according to preceding note.
† The Arabic text is the same in all the editions. The form of words used is generally different from that in Ghozūlī.
‡ Chrestomathia Arabica, Leipzig, 1828.
§ Slane's Translation, i. 21.
† The well-known Vezir, son of the Yahyā of our narrative.
beginning 'Return to the loved ones you have renounced' etc., given in the same form as in el-Ghozâlî). In pursuance to Ga'far's orders, Ibrâhîm* sung these verses to er-Râsîd, who immediately hastened to Mâridâ, and got reconciled to her. She then asked him what brought about this event; and, being informed of what had passed, ordered to Ibrâhîm and el-'Abbâs a present of 10,000 dirhems each; and er-Râsîd, on her request, recompensed them with a reward of 40,000 dirhems." From this it would appear that the same story of the poet el-'Abbâs, with some slight variations, and with the same verses (at least in part), was widely known and credited in literary circles in the early centuries of Islâm.

That the story told by Ghozâlî is considerably older than that in the 1001 Nights is of course certain, if it really comes from el-Mubarrad; and this I see no good reason for doubting.† He was a contemporary of el-Mutawekkil,‡ and any such stories concerning this ruler must have arisen after his time. His cautious statement concerning the "two sources" from which he had heard the story may mean much or little; but at any rate it is plain enough that what we have in el-Ghozâlî is not a story made up out of whole cloth, nor one that has been much "worked over." What facts lie back of it is another question. The verses—certainly the two cited by Ibn Hallikân, and probably the others also§—are genuine compositions of the poet el-'Abbâs, and were much quoted. Possibly they gave rise to the whole story, though the incident of the reconciliation may have had some foundation in fact. That any other than er-Râsîd was the original of the story seems unlikely.|| In any case, this is one of the oldest tales of this class that we have concerning that monarch.

The relative age of this version would appear to be attested also by the episode of the young men's "club" in Bagdad (which certainly did not originate from the story of the verses), and the very tame incident of the purchase of the slave-girl, together with the somewhat loose way in which both are connected with the adventure in the palace.

The addition of Ibrâhîm el-Maušîlî, as found in Ibn Hallikân, is evidently a later improvement.

* He was perhaps the most celebrated musician of all Arab history. His son Ishâk was hardly less gifted, and the two are the heroes of many anecdotes.
† Ghozâlî generally makes the impression of using his sources carefully.
‡ Reigned from 232 to 247 A. H. (847-861 A. D.).
§ The first two verses of the first strophe are decidedly commonplace, not to say awkward. If our poet wrote them, they are at least no credit to him.
|| The tendency to substitute his name on all possible occasions is well known.
As for the tale of Abu'l Hasan of Horasân, it is an admirable specimen of the work of the professional story-teller. Its chief incident, that of the verses, was furnished by the older anecdote of the poet el-Abbâs. I am inclined to think that in the above-mentioned appearance of the el-Ghozûf couplet in the Gotha MS. of the 1001 Nights, edited by Kosegarten, may be seen a survival from the original borrowing, though it may be a later transfer. Of course, the substitution of el-Mutawekkil for Harûn er-Rasîd followed necessarily, in view of the fact that the anecdote of the reconciliation of the latter with Mârida was already well known.* Concerning the growth of the remainder of the story of Abu'l-Hasan, and whether some other already existing tale was utilized, one can only conjecture.

A story quite similar in many respects is that of the Young Merchant who Ate the Garlic (Habicht ii. 165, Macn. i. 217, Bulâk i. 27th N. In all the well-known translations). In this case, the young lover is brought into the palace concealed in a dry-goods box. The girl hides him in a closet, to avoid the Caliph. There is no mention of a royal quarrel, and no verses are recited. The Caliph is er-Rasîd. This tale appears to have belonged to the oldest redaction of the Arabic "Nights" of which we have any certain knowledge.† Very possibly an older variation of it may have furnished the framework for the story of Abu 'l-Hasan of Horasân.‡ Still, the exciting incident of a young man falling in love with one of the famous beauties of the royal harem, and daring to effect a meeting with her, almost before the very face and eyes of the Caliph, is a theme that would most naturally suggest itself to story-tellers of the days of the Caliphate. One may well be cautious in drawing conclusions here.

---

* Of course there is no significance in the apparent "coincidence" that Mârida and Kabih, both foreign slave-girls, were mothers of succeeding lines of Caliphs. During this period of the Abbaside rule, a Caliph whose mother was not a foreign slave was the exception. Not so in the days of the Omayyads!

† Cf. Zottenberg's Aladdîn, 7, 88; Burton x. 93 ff.; August Müller in the Deutsche Rundschau for July '87, p. 83 etc.

‡ Since the above was in print, a copy of Professor De Goeje's interesting and valuable paper "De arabische Nachtvertellingen" (published in "De Gids," 1886) has come into my hands. It throws additional light from another side on the question of the origin of these two tales from the "Nights" (p. 12 ff.), and I am glad to find my conjecture of a relationship between them thus confirmed. With the incident of the verses, and the story of el-Abbâs, De Goeje's essay is not concerned.
ARTICLE III.

A CYLINDER OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

BY DR. ALFRED B. MOLDENKE,
\ OF NEW YORK CITY.

Presented to the Society April, 1893.

The cylinder published in the following pages was purchased in 1878 by Gen. C. P. di Cesnola for the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York City from the British Museum. Although it has been in New York for so long a period, and several attempts at decipherment were made, it has never, as far as I am aware, been published. It is still in a splendid state of preservation, and forms one of the principal attractions of the Museum's collection of Babylonian antiquities. The individual signs are blurred in some parts (especially II. 6); but the outlines can still be traced. The cylinder is 5 inches high, and $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches in diameter at the thickest part.

The text is divided into two columns. These columns are, however, separated only by a slight ridge-like elevation of clay, and not, as we generally find it, by straight lines. The latter, on the other hand, are employed to divide the individual text lines. A small space marks the beginning of the text. The lines of columns I. and II. meet each other in the middle of the cylinder, and really form one long line. The only exceptions are: I. 16 = II. 16, 17; I. 22 = II. 23, 24; and I. 25 = II. 27, 28. Hence column II. contains three lines more than column I.

The text treats of a wall that Nebuchadnezzar had built in order to strengthen the defenses of Babylon and its cherished temple Esagila. This wall he built even further away from Babylon than its already strong and famous wall Imgur-Bel. Both are to protect the eastern part of the city against an enemy. Each forms a defense by itself; the walls are not connected in any way. The new wall is strengthened also by the digging of a ditch on the outer side. It is built "like a mountain," out of pitch and glazed bricks, and it forms an addition to the wall that Nabopolassar had built, called Gatnushi. Nebuchadnezzar's work, however, is superior to that of his father. For the wall built by the latter had to be made higher in order to be in harmony with
the one built by his son. The work is done thoroughly, the foundation being placed even below the level of the water. The document, perhaps also this cylinder, finds its place on the level of the sea, so low as to be out of the reach of inimical hands, but still high enough to be safe from the destructive power of water. The side of the wall, the one toward the enemy, is particularly strengthened against the ravages of the battering ram. The wall is then adorned with a large gate, undoubtedly of the most beautiful architecture, which shall remain an eternal monument of the fame of Nebuchadnezzar. But Babylon was a land of religion, and the king knows that he can only succeed with the help of the gods. Hence the inscription ends with a prayer to Marduk, the tutelary deity of Esagila, which sanctuary Nebuchadnezzar is thus eager to defend from defiling hands.

Through the kindness of Prof. Hall of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, who placed the cylinder at my disposal, I am enabled to publish it here in full.

First Column.

Transliteration.

| 1. Na-bi-un-ku-du-ur-ri-ṣu-ur | Nebuchadnezzar,  
2. šar Ba-bi-lam  
3. zau-ni-in  
4. mār  
5. šar Ba-bi-lam  
6. aš-su-um ma-as-sa-ar-ti  

Translation.

| 1. Nebuchadnezzar,  
2. King of Babylon,  
3. adorner of Esagila and Ezida,  
4. son of Nabopolassar,  
5. King of Babylon, am I.  
6. In order to (7) strengthen (6) the defense of Esagila,
TRANSLITERATION.

7. du-un-nu-nim
8. li-im-nim u ša-ak-gi-šum
9. a-na Ba-bi-lam īrsītu lā su-na-ki
10. ga-an ta-ḥa-zī a-na Im-gur-Bil
11. dār Ba-bi-lam īrsītu lā da-ḥi-šu
12. ša ma-na-ama šar ma-ah-ri lā i-ṣu-šu
13. in ka-ma-at Ba-bi-lam īrsītu
14. dītu dānu ba-la-ri šit Šamši
15. Ba-bi-lam īrsītu u-ša-aḫ-ḫi-ir
16. bi-ri-su aḫ-ri-imā

TRANSLATION.

(that) an enemy and a destroyer against Babylon might not press the storm of battle, in addition to Ḫur-Bel, a wall of Babylon not touching it, which no king before had done, on the outer line of Babylon a strong wall, in the region of the east, I let surround Babylon.

Its canal I dug;
Transliteration.

17. šu-pu-ul mi-i ak-šu-ud
18. ap-pa-li-is-ma
19. ka-ar a-bi-im ik-zu-ur-ru
20. Ga-at-nu-ši in-situ in-šu
21. dāru dannu ša ki-ma sa-tu-um
22. lā ut-ta-āš-šu
23. in kupri u agurri
24. ab-ni-ma
25. it-ti ka-ar a-bi ik-zu-ur-ru
26. i-si-ni-ik-ma
27. i-ši-su in i-ra-at ki-gal-ši

Translation.

the level of the water I reached and I saw.
The wall (that) my father had erected
(namely) Gatnushi, I raised:
(a strong wall, like a mountain
(which) cannot be moved,
of pitch and glazed bricks
I built,
and with the wall (that my)
father had erected
I joined.
Its foundation on the breast of
the lower world
II. 1. u-ša-ar-ši-id-ma
2. ri-ši-hu sa-da-ni-š
3. u-za-ak-ki-ir
4. i-ta-at dúri a-na du-un-nu-nim
5. u-ša-al-bi(?)-iš-ma
6. in du a-šur-ra-a-ra ti-a-am
7. iš-di dúri a-gur-ri i-mi-id-ma
8. in i-ra-at ap-si-i
9. u-ša-ar-ši-id ti-mi-in-su
10. ma-aš-ša-ar-ti Ėsag-ila
11. u Ba-bi-lam iriştu u-da-an-ni-mi-ma

TRANSLITERATION.

TRANSLATION.

I placed; its top mountain-high
I raised.
The side of the wall for strength
I fitted (clothed).
On the outside a beautiful (?)
sea,
at the foundation of the wall,
with glazed bricks I built;
on the level of the sea
I established its document.
The defense of Esagila
and of Babylon I strengthened.
An eternal gate of my majesty I made.

O Marduk, lord of the gods, god, my creator, before thee let my works appear; let become old to eternity (my) life for distant days.

Enjoyment of the fullness of life, permanence of throne, and long duration of reign,
TRANSLITERATION.

23. a-na ši-ri-i-k-tum šu-ur-kam
24. lu-ri-si-tu kul-[lat napšat]-ia
25. in Marduk at-ta-a-ma
26. in ki-bi-ti-ka ki-it-ti
27. ka là na-ka-ri
28. lu-ti-ru lu-za-aš-tu
29. ka-ak-ku-u-a
30. ka-ak na-ki-ri li-mi-i-su

TRANSLATION.

for a present may he present and
may he help (me) all my life.

O Marduk, thou,
According to thy just commands,
which do not change,
may go out, may wound
my weapons; (and)
the weapons of (my) enemies
may they lay low.

NOTES.

I. 16. “Its” canal: that is, the canal that was considered a necessary adjunct to each wall.

II. 5. The fourth sign in this line, usually read li, is to be read bi here, and the word is to be taken from labāku.

II. 6. a-šu-ra-a-ra I would, for lack of a better explanation, connect with šarāru ‘beauty, splendor.’ kima šī arṣī unammar ša-ru-ra-šu (VH. 64, col. II. line 28) ‘Like the rising of the moon I made its “beauty” shine.’

The sense of lines 6 and 7 of column II. is that Nebuchadnezzar lined the sides of the lake he constructed with glazed bricks, thus giv-
ing him the right to call the lake "beautiful," and also to use the word "build."

This Babylonian dialect, found on nearly all the building inscriptions of Nabopolassar, Nebuchadnezzar, and Nabonidus, has many marked peculiarities. A few of those that occur in this text are:

The use of ʃ for createView('atlas'); I. 16, ḫi-ri-su for ḫi-ri-šu; I. 27, i-ši-su for i-ši-šu. This, however, is often met with also in Assyrian texts. Then in I. 21 we have sa-tu-um for ša-du-um; II. 3, sa-da-ni-š for ša-da-ni-š.

Also the use of k for ʃ: I. 9, sa-na-ki for sa-na-ki from sandku 'press with hostile intent.' Also in is used for ina: I. 18, 23, 27, II. 6, 20, 26. In I. 8 we have ša-ak-gi-šum for ša-ak-ki-šum; and in II. 8 ū-za-ak-ki-ir for ū-za-ak-ki-ir.

I would conclude from this, either that the use of incorrect signs was due to the carelessness of the Babylonian scribe, or that these signs had already obtained the required value in Babylonia.
ARTICLE IV.
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INTRODUCTION.

The text of the Brāhmaṇa, as here published, is founded on manuscript material sent by A. C. Burnell* in 1881 to Professor Whitney (see Proc. A.O.S. for May, 1883; Journ. vol. xi., p. cxxlvi), as follows:

A., according to Burnell's note on the cover, copied "from a Malabar MS." in 1878; at the end he has added: "Date of original, Kullam 1040 = 1864 A.D. From a MS. at Palghat"; B., from "a MS. on talipot leaves, written about 300 years ago, and got from Tinnevelly, but which was originally brought from near Alleppey;" of this only the various readings are given, interlined in red ink on A.;

C., a transliterated text in Burnell's own hand, breaking off after the beginning of i. 59, apparently because the copying was carried no further.

The text of A. and the variants from B. are in the Grantha character, on European paper. They were copied in transliteration by Professor John Avery, and the copy was compared with its originals by Professor Whitney, who also added the readings of C.; from this copy was prepared the text given below. The originals are now in the Library of the India Office, London.

The attempt has been made to obtain new materials, but without success. Professor G. Oppert, in his List of Sanskrit

*Burnell's discovery of the existence of the Jāminīya Brāhmaṇa was announced by him in the London Academy of Sept. 29th, 1877, and his acquisition of the MSS. in the same paper for Feb. 8th, 1879.
**MSS. in Private Libraries of Southern India** (Madras, 1880), mentions three Jáimini or Talavakāra Brāhmaṇas (i. 416, No. 5045; ii. 22,462, Nos. 385, 7876); and, at my request, he kindly promised to examine them, in order to ascertain whether they were Burnell's originals or independent copies; but as, after a year, no information has come, I infer that his endeavor to procure it has been in vain, and that nothing would be gained by further delay of publication.

Burnell's MSS. of the Jáiminiya-Brāhmaṇa proper are altogether insufficient to found a complete edition upon; extracts from it have been published, by Burnell* and by myself (see this Journal, vol. xiv., p. 233 ff.); and I may perhaps hereafter undertake further work in the same direction; the text is in great part very corrupt. The Upaniśad-Brāhmaṇa is less unmanageable, though the manuscripts go back to a faulty archetype, and present in common considerable corruptions. They are also carelessly written as regards punctuation, orthography, and *sānāthi*; and these points I have taken the liberty of regulating; in all cases not purely orthographical I have given at the foot of the page the various readings of the manuscripts. For convenience of reference, I have numbered the sections (*khaṇḍa*) in each book (*adhyāya*) successively, disregarding the useless *anuvāka* division, and have added a division of the sections into paragraphs by inconspicuous but readily discoverable figures; this last has no manuscript authority.

The translation is literal, and purely philological. I have sometimes been compelled to force a translation of an obscure passage; attention is called to this in the notes, lest it might appear that the translation pretended to offer a solution of the difficulty.

In the notes at the end will be found chiefly parallel passages from the Jáiminiya Brāhmaṇa proper and elsewhere, which may help to throw light on certain passages, to support emendations, and to show, to some extent, the relation of our text to the kindred literature; but regarding the last point an exhaustive collection has not been aimed at.

At the close I have added an index of proper names, of quotations, of the *āraṇī eṣāṃśva* and rare words, and of some grammatical points of interest.

Professor Whitney has placed me under deep obligation by his kind assistance throughout this work.

---

*Namely, *A Legend, etc.* (Journal, xiv. 338, note), and *The Jáiminiya Text of the Arṣeya Brāhmaṇa of the Śāma-Veda*, Mangalore, 1878.

There should also be mentioned Professor Whitney’s translation of the story of Cyavana in the Proceedings for May, 1888 (Journ., vol. xi.).
I. 1.1. Prajapati verily conquered this [universe] by means of the threefold knowledge (Veda): that [namely] which was conquered of him. 2. He considered: "If the other gods shall sacrifice thus by means of this knowledge (Veda), verily they will conquer this conquest which is mine here. Come now, let me take the sap of the threefold knowledge (Veda)." 3. Saying bhūṣ, he took the sap of the Rigveda. That became this earth. The sap of it which streamed forth became Agni (fire), the sap of the sap. 4. Saying bhūvas, he took the sap of the Yajurveda. That became this atmosphere. The sap of it which streamed forth became Vāyu (wind), the sap of the sap. 5. Saying svar, he took the sap of the Śāmaveda. That became yonder sky. The sap of it which streamed forth became Āditya (sun), the sap of the sap. 6. Now of one syllable he was not able to take the sap: of om, just of that. 7. That became this speech. This [speech] is namely om. Of it breath is the sap. 8. These same are eight. Of eight syllables is the gāyatrī. The sāman is in the gāyatrī-metre and the gāyatrī is the brahman; and thus it becomes the brahman. Eight hoofed are the domestic animals, and therefore it belongs to the domestic animals.

1. A. veda. 2. A. vājayat. 3. A. padena. 4. hantā. 5. A.B. insert da. 6. repetition and confusion in C. 7. sā. [Note: This text seems to be a continuation from a previous page and contains no new content, possibly indicating a misalignment or misinterpretation of the text.]
I. 2. 1. sa yad om iti so 'gnir väg iti prthivy om iti väyur väg ity antarikşam\(^1\) om ity adityo väg iti dyûar om iti prâno väg ity eva väk. 2. sa ya evam viðvân udgâyaty om ity eva 'gnir adîya prthivyâm prâtiṣṭhâpayaty om ity eva väyum adîyâ 'nîrâkse prâtiṣṭhâpayaty om ity eva\(^2\) 'dîyam adîya divi prâtiṣṭhâpayaty om ity eva prânam adîya vac\(^i\) prâtiṣṭhâpayati. 3. tad dhîû 'tac châilânâ\(^4\) gâyatrîm gîvanty ovâše ovâše hum bhâ ovâ iti. 4. tad u ha tat parân evâ 'nâyusyam eva. tad väyog ca 'pûm ca 'nu vartma geya. 5. yad väi väyuḥ parân\(^e\) eva pâveta kṣiyeta [sa]. sa purastaû vâti sa dukṣिनata sa paçcût sa uttaratas sa upaṇíṣt\(^5\) sa sarvâ dîgo 'nusainvîtii. 6. tad etad âhur idânîm vâ ayam ito 'vâsî\(^d\) athe tthad vâti 'tii. sa yad râsmânam janamâno nîveṣṭamâno vâti kṣâyad eva bibhyat. 7. yad u ha vá evâ 'âpâh parâcîr eva prastûs syanderan kṣiyérains tâh. yad\(^d\) ânkûhâ\(^c\) kurvûnâ nîveṣṭamânâ viârtân srjamanâ yanti kṣayâd eva bibhyathi. tad etad väyog cai 'vâ 'pûm ca 'nu vartma geya. 2.

prathame 'nuvâke dviśtâh khaṣâṭh.

---

I. 2. 1. Om is Agni (fire), speech is the earth; om is Vâyu (wind), speech is the atmosphere; om is Aditya (sun), speech is the sky; om is breath, speech is just speech. 2. He who knowing thus sings the udgîthâ saying om, he takes Agni (fire) and causes him to stand firm on the earth; saying om, he takes Vâyu (wind) and causes him to stand firm in the atmosphere; saying om, he takes Aditya (sun) and causes him to stand firm in the sky; saying om, he takes breath and causes it to stand firm in speech. 3. Now the Châilanas sing the gîyatrâ (-sâman) thus: ovâše ovâše ovâše hum bhâ ovâ. 4. Truly, this is thrown away (parân), as it were; not productive of long life, as it were. It should be sung in accordance with the course of wind and waters. 5. Truly, if the wind should blow only straight away (parân), it would be exhausted. It blows from the front (east), from the right (south), from the back (west), from the left (north), from above, it blows from all quarters together. 6. This they say: “At this very moment it hath blown in this direction, now it bloweth thus.” When it blows begetting a whirlwind, winding itself in [it does so] just fearing exhaustion. 7. And if the waters should flow streaming straight away (parâcîr) only, they would be exhausted. When they proceed making bends, winding themselves in, producing eddies, [they do so] just fearing exhaustion. 8. Therefore that [sâman] should be sung according to the course of the wind and waters.

---

\(^1\) C. antarîkṣa. \(^2\) B. āpā. \(^3\) vâcî. \(^4\) B. chek-. C. chîl-. \(^5\) ca. \(^6\) A.B. parâkâ; C. purâd. \(^7\) B.C. -rîññhâ. \(^8\) C. sit. \(^9\) A. gajamâno, the ya correction; B.C. jamâno. \(^10\) C. vam. \(^11\) A. dayad, da struck out in B.; C. yad. \(^12\) ânkûhâ.
I. 3. 1. ovā ovā hum bhū ovā iti karotya eva. 2. etābhyaṁ sānam āyur eti. 3. sa yathā vṛksaṁ ākramāṇītāṁ ākramaṁśāṁ iṣyaṁ evam evāṁ te āve-āve devate saṁdhāye 'māṁ lokāṁ rohann eti.' 4. eka u eva mṛtyur anvetya açanayāṁ 'eva. 5. atha hiṁkaroti. candramāṁ vāi hiṁkāro 'nānam u vāi candramāṁ. annena 'çanayāṁ ghnanti. 6. tāṁ-tāṁ açanayāṁ annena hatvo 'ṁ ity etam evā 'dityain samayā 'timucyate. etad eva divaç chidram. 7. yathā khaṁ vā 'nasas' syād rathasya vāi 'vam etad divaç chidram. tad rāpaṁbhīs saṁchannāṁ' dpjyate. 8. yad gāyatraśyo 'rāhvaṁ hiṁkārūt tad amṛtam. tad oṁnāṁ da-dhyād ato yajamanam. atha yad itarata śāmo 'rāhvaṁ tasya pratihūrāt. 9. sa yathā 'dabhir āpas saṁsijyeraṁ' yathā 'gñinā 'gniś saṁsijyeta yathā kśire kṣīram āsicyāṁ evam evāṁ tād akṣa-ram etābhīr devatābhīs samsijyante. 3. prathame 'nuvāke trīyaś khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 4. 1. taṁ vā etam hiṁkāraṁ him bhū iti hiṁkurunti. přor vāi bhūḥ. asāu vā ādityo bhū iti. 2. etam ha vā etam nayaṅgam anu garbhāḥ iti. yad bhū iti striṇām' prajanaṁ niṅgacchati

I. 3. 1. He utters ovā ovā ovā hum bhū ovā. By means of these two [divinities] he arrives at complete age. 2. As one would keep 'climbing' up a tree by steps, even so uniting these divinities pairwise he keeps ascending these worlds. 3. Death alone goes after, viz. hunger. 4. Then he utters him. The hiṁkāra is the moon, and the moon is food. Through food they slay. 5. Having slain through food this hunger and that, saying om, he escapes through the midst of this sun. That is the fissure of the sky. 6. As is the [axle-] hole of a cart or of a chariot, even so is this fissure of the sky. That appears all covered by rays. 7. What of the gāyatra [-sāman] is beyond the hiṁkāra, that is immortal. There he should place himself as well as the sacrificer. And the rest of the sāman is beyond its pratikāra. 8. As waters might be united with waters, as fire might be united with fire, as one would pour milk into milk, even so this syllable is united with these divinities.

I. 4. 1. They utter this same hiṁkāra as him bhū. Fortune is bhūs (splendor); yonder sun is bhūs. 2. According to this same sign is [the word] garbhā (fetus). In that he, saying bhā, ap-

tasmāt tato brāhmaṇa ṛṣikalpo jāyate ‘tīvyādhi’ rājanyāc pūrṇah. 1. etain ha vā etain nayaṃgam anu vrṣabha iti. yad bhā iti nigacchati tasmāt tataḥ punyo baliwardo duhānā dhenur ukṣā ducavājī jāyante. 4. etain ha vā etain nayaṃgam anu gourdabha iti. yad bhā iti nigacchati tasmāt sa pāṇīyān chreyaisitu civaṇā tasmād asya pāṇīyan āśreyo jāyante ‘cvatara vā ‘cvatari vā. 5. etain ha vā etain nayaṃgam anu kubhāra iti. yad bhā iti nigacchati tasmāt so ‘nāyas’ sann api rājanāh prāṇoṇi. 6. taṃ hā’ tam eke hiṅkāraṃ hiṃ bhū ovā iti bahirde ‘va hiṅkuvaṇṭi. bahirde ‘va vā cīriḥ. cīrī vāi sāmna hiṅkāra iti. 7. sa ya enam tatra brūyād bahirdhā svā ayaṇa śrīyam adhita pāṇīyan bhāviṣyati.11

so yadā vāi mriyate ‘thā ‘gnāu prāsta bhavati:
ksire bata marisaty atnāv enam prāśisantī
tī tathā hā’ va syāt. 8. tasmād u hā’ tam hiṅkāram hiṃ wo ity antar ivī’ vā ‘tman arjayaey. tathā ha na bahirde śrīyam kurute sarvam āyur eti. 4.

prathame ‘nāva ca turthah khaṇḍah.

proaches the secret parts of women, therefore thence is born a Brāhmaṇ like a rṣi, a piercing kingly hero. 1. According to this same sign is [the word] vrṣabha (bull). In that he approaches saying bhā, therefore thence a [sacrificially] pure bull, a milking cow, an ox possessing tenfold strength (?) are born. 4. According to this same sign is [the word] gourdabha (ass). In that he approaches saying bhā, therefore he (the ass) being inferior covers those [mares] which are superior; therefore of this inferior one something better is born, either a mule or a she-mule. 6. According to this same sign is [the word] kubhā. In that he approaches saying bhū, therefore he, even though he be not an Ārya, obtains kings (?). 8. This same hiṅkāra some utter hiṃ bhū ovā—outside as it were. Truly outside is fortune; fortune indeed is the syllable hiṃ of the sūman. 7. If upon this one should say of him: "Truly he hath now put fortune outside, he will become worse; Truly, when he dies, he is thrown into the fire; quickly, alas, he will die, they will throw him into the fire—" even so it would come to pass. 8. And therefore one should put that hiṅkāra, viz. hiṃ vo, inside of one's self, as it were. Thus, indeed, he does not put fortune outside, he attains complete age.

5. 1. sā hāi 'sā khalā devata 'pasedhanti' tiṣṭhati. idaṁ vāi tvam atra pápam akar ne 'hāi "syasi. yo vái punyakrt syaḥ sa ihe 'yād iti. 2. sa brūyad apaṣya vái tvam tad yad ahaṁ tad' akaravāṁ tad vái mā tvam nā 'kārayisya tvam vái tasya kartā 'sū ti. 3. sā' ha veda satyam mā "he" ti. satyam hāi 'sā devata. sā' ha tasya ne "ge yad enam apasedhet satyam upāi 'va hvayate. 4. atha ho 'vāci 'kṣavko' vá vāraṇo 'nuvakā vá sātyakīrta' utāi 'sā' khalā devata 'paseddhām eva dhiryate' 'syāi dicāḥ. 5. [tad] divo 'ntuḥ. tad ime dhyāṇprthīvi samālayataḥ. yāvat vāi vediś tavati 'yam prthihi. tad yatrāi 'tac cātvātām khūtāṁ tat samprati sa diva ākāśaḥ. 6. tad bāhispañamāne stāyamāne manaso 'dṛshnīyāt. 7. sa yatho 'cchāyaṃ pratiyasya' propūdyetāṁ 'vam evāi 'tayā' devataye 'dam āṁśatam abhiparyaṇī yatrā 'yam idaṁ tapatī 'ti. 8. atha ho 'vāca— 5. prathame 'nuvāke pañcamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

6. 1. —gobalo vārṣṇaḥ ka etam ādityam arhati samayāi 'tum. dārīd vā esa etat tapati nyāṁ. tena vāi etam pūrveṇa sāmapathas tad eva manasa "hṛtyo 'pariṣṭād ētasyāi 'tusmin āṁre nida-
dhyād iti. 2. tad u ho 'vāca cātyāvanī samayāī 'vāi 'tad enāṁ kus tad vedā, yady etā āpo vā abhiho yad vāyuṁ vā esa upanhaye raçaṁ vā esa tad' etasmā vṛihāti 'ti. 3. athā ho 'vāco 'lukyo jūnakruteyo yattra vā esa etā tapaty etad evā 'mṛtam, etac cēd vāi prāpnoti tato mṛtyunā pāpamā vyāvartate. 4. kas tad vedā yat parenā 'dityam antarikṣam idam anālayanam avaraṇa. 5. athāi 'tad evā 'mṛtam, etad eva māṁ yāyum prāpaysyaṭha." etad evā 'harī nā 'timanya iti. 6. tāny etānī asṭāu. asṭākṣaraṇa gāyatrī, gāyatrīnī sūma brahma u gāyatrī. tad u brahmaḥ bhisampadyate. asṭācaphāḥ paccavas teno paccayam. 6.

prathame 'nuvāke 'saṅkaḥ khaṅdaḥ.

I. 7. 1. tā etā asṭāu devatāḥ. etāvad idāṁ sarvan. te [ . . . . . ]

kuroti. 2. sa nāī 'su lokesi pāpamane bhūtryayā 'vākāṣaṁ kuryat, manasaī 'naṁ nirbhajet. 3. tad etad ṛcā 'bhyanucyeate.
catvāri vāk parimitā padāni
tāni vidur brahmaṇā ye maniśinoḥ:

guhā trini nīhiṁ ne 'nīgayante

turyāṇī vāco manayaḥ vādanāti

'ti. 4. tad yāni tāni guhā trini nīhiṁ ne 'nīgayante [ 'ti] 'ma

one in this immortality. 2. Further Cātyāvanī said: "'Thus through the midst of him,' who knows that? Truly when he either calls upon these waters round about, or when upon the wind, he then parts the rays for him." 3. Further Ulukya Jūnakruteya said: "'Truly, where this one burns thus, there is this immortality. If one obtains this, he thereupon separates himself from death, from evil. 4. Who knows that which is beyond the sun, beneath this abodeless atmosphere? 5. And just this is immortality. This you will cause me to obtain. This I do not despise."

I. 7. 1. These are these eight divinities. So great is the universe. They [ . . . . . ] does. 2. He should not give an opportunity in these worlds to his hateful rival. He should exclude him with his mind. 3. That same is referred to in a ṛc: "Speech is four measured quarters; Brahmans who are wise know these; three, deposited in secret, do not stir; one quarter of speech men speak." 4. Now these 'three [quarters] deposited in secret which
do not stir, they are these worlds. 5. ‘One quarter of speech men speak.’ A fourth part indeed is this quarter of speech. Of him who knows thus it (?) is done by all speech, by all these worlds, by the all. 6. As a cloud of earth colliding with a stone as target breaks to pieces, even so he breaks to pieces who speaks ill of one knowing thus.

I. 8. 1-2 = I. 1. 1-2. 8. Come now, I will press this threefold knowledge (Veda).’ 4. He pressed this threefold knowledge (Veda). Pressing, he could not press one syllable of it, viz. om. 5. And that, indeed, is full of sap. Full of sap is the threefold knowledge of him who knows thus. 6. He, having pressed this sap, putting it aside, ran upward. 7. Him running four of the gods looked after, Indra, Candra, Rudra, Samudra. Therefore these are the best of the gods. For they looked after him. 8. What this sap was, that became penance (tapas). 9. These gods looked after this sap. They became aware: ‘Verily this [sap] hath become penance.’ 10. They, feeling this threefold knowledge (Veda) all over, found in it that same unpressed syllable, viz. om. 11. And that, indeed, is full of sap. They mixed it
trayaṁ vedam marimścitvā tasmān etad eva 'ksaram apītītaṁ' avindam om iti yad etat. 11. esa u ha vánaḥ sarasaḥ. tenāi 'nam praṇvyan. 12. yathā madhunā lajān prayuyād' evam. 12. te 'bhutaprayanta. tasmān tapyamānānām āpyayāta vedaḥ. te 'nena' ca tapası "pīnena ca vedena tūm u eva jītmin ajayate." yām prajavatir ajayet. 11. te ete sarva eva prajāpatimātrā ayāmāya ayaṁ iti. 12. tasmāt tapyamānasya bhūyāsī kirtir bhavati bhūyo yāpah. sa ya etad evaṁ vedan eva "pīnena vedena jaye." yado yājasty evam eva "pīnena" vedena yājayati. 14. tasya hūṁ 'tasya vāi 'eva kā canā "rtir asta" ya evaṁ veda. sa ya evaṁ 'nam uparadvatā' sa ārtmin pochati. 13. 8.

dvitiye 'nurvike prathamah khayāḥ.

I. 9. 1. tad āhur yad ovā ovā iti gīyate kvā 'tra ṛgḥ' bhavati kva śāme 'tī. 2. om iti vāi sāma vāg ity śk. om iti mano vāg iti vāk. om iti prīno vāg ity eva vāk. om iti 'ndro vāg iti sarve derāḥ. tad etad indram eva sarve devā anuyanti. 2. om ity etad eva 'ksaram. etena vāi sāmaṁ parasye 'ndraṁ vṛjita.' etena ha vāi tad bako dālbhya ajakeśināṁ indrāṁ vavarāja. 6.

with that, just so as one might mix beans with honey. 12. They brooded over [it] (did penance). Of them brooding over [it] knowledge (the Veda) was filled up. And by means of this heat (penance) and the filled up Veda they conquered that conquest which Prajāpati [had] conquered. All these are just commensurate with Prajāpati, [of whom one may doubt:] "Is it this one? Is it this one?" 13. Therefore greater becomes the renown, greater the glory of one who does penance. He who knows this thus sacrifices for himself by means of the filled-up Veda; and when he sacrifices for anyone else he thus sacrifices for him by means of the filled-up Veda. 14. For him who knows thus there is no misfortune at all. He who speaks ill of him, he meets with misfortune.

I. 9. 1. This they say: "If one sings ovā ovā, what becomes of the ṛg; what of the śāman?" 2. Om is the śāman, speech is the ṛg; om is the mind, speech is speech; om is breath, speech is just speech; om is Indra, speech is all the gods. Thus all the gods go after Indra. 3. Om is this syllable; by it at a simultaneous soma-sacrifice one would force Indra away from his rival.


9. 1 B. eva. 1 A. ovāta (=ovā ṛ) . 3 ṛg. 4 aṁṝj. 1 A.B. -cīn-. 4 C. cīn-. 4 vavrajā.
om ity etenai’vā”nināya.’ 4. tāny etāny aṣṭāu. aṣṭākṣarā gāyatri. gāyatrīṁ sāma brahma u gāyatri. taḍ u brahmā bhisampad-yāte. aṣṭāṇāṁ paṣcākṣa tāṇa pačavyam. 5. tasyai tānā nāmāṁ ‘ndrāḥ karmā ‘ksitir amṛtaṁ vyoṁanto vācaḥ. bahur’ bhūyas sarvāṁ sarvaṁśad uttaraṁ jyotiḥ. taṁ satyam vijnā- naṁ” vivācanam apratīväcyam.11 pūrvam sarvāṁ sarvā vāk. sarvām idam api dhenuḥ, pinvate parāg arvāk. 9.

dviṣye ‘nvāke dviṣyāḥ khaḍāḥ.

I. 10. 1. sā’ prthivaksalaiṁ kāmadugākṣiti prānasamhitam caksuṣṭrotraṁ vākprabhiṁ marasā vyāptaṁ hrdayāgramm brāhmaṇabhaktam’ annaśubham varṣapavitraṁ gobhagam prthiviyuparaṁ tapastau varuṇapariyatanam’ indraśreyah sahasrākṣaram ayutadhāram amṛtaḥ duḥāṁ sarvām imāṁ lokān abhivikṣaraɪ ti. 2. tad etat satyam akṣaram yaṅ om iti. tasminn āpoh pratiṣṭhitā apsū prthivi prthiviyāṁ ime lokāḥ. 3. yathā śucyā palācāṇi saṁśrṇāṁi syur evam etenai’ksareṇe ‘me lokāṁ saṁśrṇāḥ. 4. tad idam imāṁ atividadya daṇḍāḥ

Truly by means of it Baka Dālbhya forced Indra away from the Ajakeṇis; just by means of this om he led [him] to himself. 4 = I. 1. 4. 5. These are its names: Indra, action, imperishable- ness, the immortal, end of the firmament of speech (?); the manifold, the numerous, the all, the light higher than the all; righteousness, truth, distinction, decision which is not to be contra- dicted; the ancient all, all speech. This all also, [like] a cow, fattens thitherward, hitherward.

I. 10. 1. She that milks immortality possessing individual oceans (?), possessing wish-granting imperishableness, connected with breath, possessing sight and hearing, superior by speech, permeated by the mind, having the heart as its point, apportioned to the Brāhmaṇa, pleasant through food, having the rain as means of purification (?), cow-protecting, higher than the earth, having penance as a body, having Varuṇa as an enclosure, having Indra as leader, possessing a thousand syllables, possessing ten thousand streams, flows in all directions unto all these worlds. 2. Om is this same true syllable. In it the waters are firmly set, in the waters the earth, in the earth these worlds. 3. As leaves might be stuck together with a pin, so these worlds are stuck together by this syllable. 4. That same having pierced them flows tenfold, hun-

9. 11vā”nināya. 13-i; C. ‘ksiti. 13-hir. 18vijjaḥ. 11C. ‘ah. 10. 1aś. 2caksuṣṭrotra. 3hrdayāgram. 4A. bhraṅg. 5B. bhraṅg; C. bhraṅg. 6paryāyā. 7āh. 8C. om. 11. 9A.B. ‘puḥ. 10A.B. ‘dm; C. leaves space between idam and daṇḍāḥ.
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kṣarati pata dhā sahasradhā 'yutadhā pratyutadhā [niyutadhā] 'rbudadhā nyarbudadhā" nikhvadhāi padnam akṣīrī vyomāntāḥ. 1. yathāu 'gho visyandamānāḥ" parah-parovariyān bhavaty evam evāi 'tad akṣaram parah-parovariyān bhavati. 2. te hāi 'te" lokā urdhvā eva ārtīh. ima evam trayodasaṃmātāḥ. 3. sa ya evai vidyaṃ udgāyati sa evam evai 'tān lokān ativahati. om ity etenā 'ksareṇā 'mum 'ādityam mukham udbhate. esa ha va etad akṣaram. 4. tasyā sarvam āptam bhavati sarvam jītān na ha 'sya kaś canā" kāmo 'nāpto bhavati ya evam veda. 5. tad dha prthu vānyo" dinvaṃ vrātyaṃ papraccha.

sthānāṁ divastambhāniṁ sūryam āhur
antarikṣe sūryah prthivipratiṣṭhāḥ:
apu bhūmiṣa' ściyire' bhūribhūrāḥ
kim svim mahār adhitīṣṭhanty āpa

iti. 10. te ha pratyaṁcā

sthānāṁ eva divastambhāniṁ sūryam āhur
antarikṣe sūryah prthivipratiṣṭhāḥ:
apu bhūmiṣa' ściyire' bhūribhūrā
satyaṁ mahār adhitīṣṭhanty" āpa

iti. 11. om ity etad eva 'ksaraṁ satyaṁ. tad etad āpo 'dhitīṣṭhanti. 10.

dvitiye 'nuvāke tṛṣīyah khanḍaṁ. dvitiyo 'nuvākas samāptaṁ.

dredfold, thousandfold, ten thousandfold, hundred thousandfold, millionfold, ten millionfold, hundred millionfold, billionfold, ten billionfold, hundred billionfold, thousand billionfold. 8. As a flood flowing in different directions [proceeding] farther and farther becomes broader, even so this syllable [proceeding] farther and farther becomes broader. 9. These same worlds are lying [piled] upward [one above the other]. They thus are of thirteen months. 10. He who knowing thus sings the udgītha; he carries [the sacrificer] beyond these worlds. By means of this syllable om he places yonder sun in his mouth. Verily it (the sun) is this syllable. 11. Whoso knows thus, by him all is obtained, all conquered, of him no desire whatsoever is unfulfilled. 12. Now Pṛthu Vānīya asked the divine mendicants: "They call the sun (sūrya) a sky-supporting post; in the atmosphere is the sun having the earth as a support; in the waters the much-bearing earths lie; on what, pray, do the great waters rest?" 10. They answered: "They do call the sun a sky-supporting post; in the atmosphere is the sun having the earth as a support; in the waters the much-bearing earths lie; on truth the great waters rest." 11. This syllable om is truth. Thereon, then, the waters rest.

I. 11. 1. prajāpatiḥ prajā asrjata. tā enam srṣṭā annakāpinir
abhītas somantam paryaviṇ. 2. tā abraviḥ kūṁkūṁs svaṅ ti
annādyakāmā ity abhrvan. 3. so ‘bravīd evaṁ vāi vebr̄
annādyam asrksi sāmā ṣva. tuva vah prayačchati ti. tan
nāḥ prayačche ṣty abhrvan. 4. so ‘bravīd imān vāi pācūn
bhavīṣhathan upajivāmāh. ebhāh prathamat pradāyāmi ti
1. tebhīyo hiṅkāram prāyacchat. tasmāt pācūu hiṅkarikrato
vijñāsāmānī iha caranti. 6. prastāvam manuṣyebhyāh. tas-
mād u te suvata ihe ’ṣdram me bhavīṣyaty adhi me bhavīṣyati
1. 7. udīm vayobbhyāh. tasmāt tūny ādāmānī upāpātām
iha caranti. 8. udgīthām deśebbhyo ‘mītam. tasmāt te ‘mītāh.
9. pratiḥāram aravāyēbhāh pācūbhāh. tasmāt te pratihīṣtā
tantasyamānī iha caranti. 11.

11. tṛṣiye ‘nūvāke prathamah khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 12. 1. upadrayam gandharvāpsarobhyaḥ. tasmāt tu upa-
dram ām gṛhṇaṇa iha caranti. 2. nidhānam pītṛbhyaḥ. tasmād
u te nidhānāmsūṣṭhāḥ. 3. tuv yad ebhīyas tat sāmā prāyacchaṇ
etam evāt bhīyas tuv udītyaṃ prāyacchat. 4. sa yaud anudita
sa hiṅkāro ‘dhiroḍhāḥ’ prastāvaṇa uṣāṅgavan ādir mād-

I. 11. 1. prajāpati created creatures. They being created be-
leaguered him completely on all sides, yearning for food (?) . 2. He
said to them: "What is your desire?" "We are desirous of
food-eating," they said. 3. He said: "Truly, one Veda have I
created for food-eating, viz. the sūman; that I will furnish to
you." They said: "Furnish that to us." 4. He said: "We live
mostly on these domestic animals. To them I will give first."
5. He gave them the hiṅkāra. Therefore domestic animals go
about continually uttering him, desirous of knowing [each other],
as it were. 6. The prastāva [he gave] to men. And therefore
they praise themselves (ṣdv, as it were, [saying]: "This will
be mine, that will be mine." 7. The ādī [he gave] to the birds.
Therefore they move about taking (ṣdvādī, flying up and
down, as it were. 8. The udgīthā [he gave] to the gods,
being immortal. Therefore they are immortal. 9. The pratiḥāra
[he gave] to the beasts of the forest. Therefore they, being
kept back, move shaking (?) as it were.

I. 12. 1. The upadraya [he gave] to the Gandharvas and Ap-
sarases. Therefore they move taking hold as it were of the
upadraya (?). 2. The nidhāna [he gave] to the Fathers. And
therefore they are resting on the nidhāna. 3. In that he gave
them this sūman, thereby he gave them this sun. 4. When it is

11. 1. vā. 2. C. sūm. 3. pṛya. 4. kṛtā. 2. B.C. suvateva. 4. pratiḥās. 1. A.B. tātpratidalayamāṇ; C. tāṭāsidyamāṇ.
12. 1. C. -apsarobh. 4. C. arthodit. 5. udītyaḥ.
yandina udgitho 'paruhnaḥ pratiḥāro yad upāstamayaṁ lokī-
tāyati sa upadravo 'stānita eva nidhanam. 1. sa esa sarvair lokaiḥ samah. tad yad esa sarvair lokaiḥ samas tasmād esa eva sāma. sa ha vai sāmavita su sāma veda yat evam veda. 2. te 'bruvan dōra vai idam asmat. tatra 'daiṁ kuru yatro 'pajivāme 'ti.' 3. tad ṛṇān abhyatyanayat. sa visantam eva hiṅkāram akaroḍa graṁam prastavaiṁ varsām udgithaṁ garadamo prati-
thāram hemanain nidhanam. māsārdayasvai eva saptaṁ eva akarot. 4. te 'bruvan nemiya navai 'tarhi. tatrī 'va kuru yatro 'pajivāme 'ti.' 5. tat parjanya abhyatyanayat. sa purvaṁ eva hiṅkāram akaroṭ. 12.

trīye 'nvāke dvitiyaṁ hanaṁ.

I. 13. 1. jimūtaṁ prastavaiṁ stanaṁ udgithaṁ vidyut-
tam pratiḥāram vrśtin' nidhanam. yad vrśut prajoc cāu 'sadhyac ca jāyante te saptämiva akarot. 2. te 'bruvan nemiya navai 'tarhi. tatrī 'va kuru yatro 'pajivāme 'ti.' 3. tad yajnām abhyatyanayat. sa yajñasya eva hiṅkāram akaroḍa rcaḥ prastavaiṁ sāmāṇy udgithaṁ stonam pratiḥāram chando

not yet risen it is the hiṅkāra; when half risen it is the pras-
ťava; at the time when the cows are driven together it is the
ādi ; noon is the udgītha ; the afternoon is the pratiḥāra; when it
turns red toward sunset it is the upadrava; having gone to set-
ting it is the nidhana. 4. This (sun) is the same (sama) with all the
worlds, therefore it is the sāman. Truly he is sāman-knowing,
he knows the sāman, who knows thus. 5. They said: "Verily,
this is far away from us; make it there where we may live on
[it]." 6. Then he transferred it to the seasons. He made the
spring the hiṅkāra, the summer the prastava, the rainy season the
udgītha, the fall the pratiḥāra, the winter the nidhana. Both
months and half-months he made as sixth and seventh. 7. They
said: "Verily, it is nearer now; [but] make it there where we
may live on [it]." 8. Then he transferred it to Parjanya. He
made the preceding wind the hiṅkāra,—

I. 13. 1. The thunder-clouds the prastava, the thunder the
udgītha, the lightning the pratiḥāra, the rain the nidhana;
what creatures and herbs are born from rain, those he made as
sixth and seventh. 2. They said: "Verily, it is nearer now,[but]
make it there where we may live on [it]." 3. Then he transferred
it to the sacrifice. He made the yajuses the hiṅkara, the re's the
prastavas, the sāmans the udgītha, the stoma the pratiḥāras, the

12. 4C. repeats sa sāma veda. 1-ma iti. 4kar-. 1prastāvaḥ, varṣa udgīthāḥ; B.C. garat pratiḥāraḥ; A. om. garatam pratiḥāram.
13. 1A. prastārā'vam. 1-tir. 1A. sapatam-. 4-ma iti.
Jāminīya-Upaṇiṣad-Brāhmaṇa.
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nidhanam, svāhākāravasaṭkārav eva saptamāv akarot. 1. te 'bruvan nedīyo nañvai 'tarhi. tatāui 'va kuru yantra 'pajivāme 'tī.' 2. tat puruṣam abhyatyanayat. sa manu eva hīnārum akarod vuccam prastāvan prāṇam udgitham caksuḥ pratihāram prat- trayā niidhanam. reṣā cāi 'va prajāna ca saptamāv akarot. 3. te 'bruvanu utra 'va enat tad ukar yantra 'pajivisyāma iti. 4. sa vidyād aham eva sāmā 'smi mavya etā devatā iti. 18. 

tṛtiye 'nūvāke tṛtiyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 14. 1. na ha dūrerdevatas' syāt. yāvaḥ dhu 'vā utmanā devān upāste tāvād asmāi deva bhavanti. 2. athu ya etad evaṁ vedā 'ham eva sāmā 'smi mavya etās sarvā devata ity evam' hā 'smīnna etās sarvā devatā bhavanti. 3. tad etad devaṇṛta sāma. sarvā ha vāi devatā pr regulated evaniṣṭam punyāya sā- 

dhave. tā enam punyam eva sādhu kārayanti. 4. sa ha smā'ha suciṣṭaṇā pāliano' yo yajñakāmo mām eva sa vrṇitām. tata evāi 'naṁ yajña upanāṇiṣyati. evaniṣṭam hy udganyatām sarvā devatā anuvajitpyanti. tā asmāi tṛptaḥ tathā karisyanti yathāi 'naṁ yajña upanāṇiṣyati 'ti. 14. 

tṛtiye 'nūvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍāḥ. tṛtiyo 'nūvākas saṁpātaḥ.

chandaḥ the nidhāna; the exclamations svāhā and vaṣṭa he made as sixth and seventh. 4. They said: “Verily, it is nearer now, [but] make it there where we may live on [it].” 5. He transferred it to man. He made the mind the hīnārāya, speak the prastāva, breath the udgitha, sight the pratihāra, hearing the nidhāna; seed and offspring he made as sixth and seventh. 6. They said: “Now thou hast made it here, where we shall live on [it].” 7. He should know: “I am the sāman, in me are these divinities.”

I. 14. 1. He should not be one having the divinities far away. Truly to what extent he worships the gods with the self, to that extent the gods exist for him. 2. And who knows this thus: “I am the sāman, in me are all these divinities,” truly thus in him all these divinities exist. 3. That is the devaṇṛtā sāman; for all the divinities give ear to one knowing thus for what is pure, for what is good. They make him do what is pure, what is good.

4. Now Śucitta Čāilan used to say: “Whoso wisheth to sacrifice, let him choose me; then the sacrifice will become his. For with one who knowing thus singeth the udgitha all the divinities are pleased together. They being pleased will so act for him that the sacrifice shall become his.”

18. 'A. abhyatyanāt-

14. 'A.B. devata. 'A. om. 'B. esma. 'A. devaṇṛt; B. deva- 

vrūt; C. evaṇṛt. 'B. -nam.
I. 15. 1. devā vāi svargaṁ lokam āipsan. taṁ na śayanā nā "śīnā na tisthanto' na dhāvanto nā ti'va kena cāna karmanā" pnvn. 2. te devāḥ prajāpatim upādhāvanā svargaṁ vāi lokam āipsima. taṁ na śayanā nā "śīnā na tisthanto na dhāvanto nā ti'va kena cāna karmanā" pāma. tathā no 'nupādhi yathā svargaṁ lokam āpnyāme" ̣tī. 3. tān abravi śāmā 'nreyena svargaṁ lokam prāyate" ̣tī. te śāmā 'nreyena svargaṁ lokam prāyan. 4. pra vā ime śāmā 'gur iti. tasmāt praśīma tasmād u praśāmy annam aṭṭi. 5. devā vāi svargaṁ lokam āyan. 6. ta etān ākrapadāni carīrāṇi dhanānta āyan. te' svargaṁ lokam aṭāyan. 7. tānā ā divah prakīrnāṇy aĉeran. athe 'māni prajāpatir ākrapadāni carīrāṇi saṁcityā 'bhayaĉat. ya'd' abhyaĉat tāeva reo 'bhavan. 15.

caturthe 'nuyāke prathamaḥ khaṇḍah.

I. 16. 1. sāi 'va rg abhavaḍ āyam eva prih. ato devā abhavan. 2. athāi 'śām imām asūrač' gṛiṇam avindanta. tadb eva 'suraṁ

I. 15. 1. The gods desired to obtain the heavenly world. Neither lying nor sitting nor standing nor running nor by any [other] action whatsoever did they obtain it. 2. These gods ran unto Prajāpati [saying]: "We have desired to obtain the heavenly world. Neither lying nor sitting nor standing nor running nor by any [other] action whatsoever have we obtained it. Instruct us so that we may obtain the heavenly world." 3. He said to them: "Approach the heavenly world by means of a re-less śāman." They approached the heavenly world by means of a re-less śāman. 4. "Truly, these have gone forth (pra) by means of the śāman." Hence [the word] praśīma, and hence one eats food imperfectly (? praśāmi). 5. Verily, the gods went to the heavenly world. They kept shaking off their bodies, the re-parts. They conquered the heavenly world. 6. These [bodies] lay strewn up to the sky. Then Prajāpati, collecting these bodies, the re-parts, honored (√re) them. Because he honored them, they became re's.

I. 16. 1. That one became the re, this one [became] fortune. Hence the gods prevailed. 2. Now the Asuras acquired for...

15. 1A. "čin-. 2A. -ntyo. 3A. upāya-. 4C. prayāme. 4A. prayāte; B. pradhāme; C. prayāme. 6lokāhmaprayāt. 7After this there is confusion and repetition in the MSS. Before 6, all insert: ta etān ākrapadāni carīrāṇi dhanānta āyāna (A. rthayatan). te svargaṁ lokam ājāyaṇ (A. -at). athe 'māni prajāpatir .... tāeva reo bhavan. 5A. yat. 7MSS. om. te svargaṁ .... ajāyaṇ; inserted here from repetition above 7. 11C. om. yad .... 11A.B. om. tāeva .... 16. 1B. de-.
abhavat. 3. te' deva' abravun yu vai naç grir abhûd avidanta' tâm asurâh. kathânu na eşüm inâin priyam punar eva' jayene 'ti. 4. te 'bruvan' rey eva sama' gâyane 'ti. te punah pratyâdrutya' reî sâmâ 'gâyûn. tena 'smâl lokâd asurîn anu-
danta. 1. tad vâi mãdhyaundine ca savane triyasaeva' ca na reco 'purâho' 'stî. sa yat te reî' gâyati tena 'smâl lokâd divi-
santam bhûtreyany nudate. atha yad anûte' devatâsu prayas-
savânavâ' gâyati tena svarga'n lokâm eti. 6. prajâpatir vâi
sûnne'mâm jîtim ajayad yu 'sye 'yair jîtis tâm.' 7. sa svarga'n
lokâm úrohat. 7. te devâh prajâpatim upetya 'bruvann as-
abhâyam api 'dâin sâmâ prayâcche 'ti. tatke 'ti. tad ebhyas
sâmâ prayâcchat. 8. tad enâm idân sâmâ svarga'n lokâm nà
'kâmâyate' vôdham. 9. te devâh prajâpatim upetya 'bruvan
yu'd vâi nas sâmâ prâdâ idâm vâi nas tat svarga'n lokâm na
kâmâyate' vôdham iti. 10. tad vâi pîpmanà samârsîte 'ti. ko
'sya pîpne 'ti. rg iti. tad reî samârsîna. 11. tad idâm prajâ-
pater gahayamânâm athishad idâm vâi nà tat pîpmanà sam-
asrâksûn' iti. so 'bravid yas tvâi 'tena vyâvartayûd vy eva sa

themselves this fortune of theirs. Thereupon the cause of the
Asuras prevailed. 2. These gods said: "Truly, what hath been
our fortune, that the Asuras have acquired for themselves. How
then may we win back this fortune of theirs?" 4. They said:
"Let us sing the sîman in the re." They in turn, running up
toward [the Asuras], sang the sîman in the re. Thereby they
pushed the Asuras from this world. 5. Thus indeed at the noon-
libation and at the evening-libation there is no offense from the
re. He who sings these two [libations] in the re thereby pushes
his hostile rival away from this world. Moreover, in that he
sings the [chant of the] morning-libation in immortality, in the
divinities, thereby he goes to the heavenly world. 6. Verily by
means of the sîman Prajâpati conquered this conquest, viz. what
conquest there is of him. He ascended to the heavenly world. 7.
These gods coming unto Prajâpati said: "Furnish this sîman to
us also." [Saying] "Yes," he furnished this sîman to them.
8. This same sîman did not wish to carry them to the heavenly
world. 9. These gods coming unto Prajâpati said: "Verily, that
sîman which thou hast given to us, that does not wish to carry
us to the heavenly world." 10. "Mix it with evil." "What is its
evil?" "The re." They mixed it with the re. 11. That same
[sîman] stood upbraiding Prajâpati: "Verily, they thus have
mixed me with evil." He (P.) said: "Whoso shall separate the
pāpmanā vartātā iti. 18. sa ya etad rcā prātassavana vyāvar-tayati vy evaṁ" so pāpmanā vartate. 16.
caturthe 'nuvāke dvitiyaḥ khanḍaḥ.

I. 17. 1. tad āhur yaḍ ovā ovā iti giyate kvā 'tra rg bhavati
tva sāme 'ti. 2. prastuvann eva 'ṣṭābhir aksarāṭāḥ prastāuti. aṣṭākṣarā yāyātri. aksaram-aksarain tryaksaram. tac caturvī-
chatis sampadyante. caturvīṣatyaaksarā yāyātri. 3. tāṃ etām
prastāvena' ream āptvā yaḥ śir yā 'pacitir yas svargo' loko yaḍ
yaḍ yaḥ annādyaiā tāny āgāyamāna āste. 17.
caturthe 'nuvāke tritiyaḥ khanḍaḥ.

I. 18. 1. prajāpatir devān asṛjata. tāṃ nṛtyaḥ pāpmaṇā 'nva-
srijata. 2. te dvā prajāpatirīm upetyā 'brahman kasmād' u no
'sṛṣṭā' nṛtyaṁ cen nāḥ pāpmaṇām anvavaraakṣayann' āsīthe
'ti. 3. tāṃ abhavic chandaṇā sambhara. tāṇi yathāyatanam
praipata' tato nṛtyaṇā pāpmaṇā vyāparyatayate 'ti. 4. vasavo
yāyātriṁ samabharaṇ. tāṁ te prāviṇan. tāṁ sā 'cchādayat. 5.
rudrās triṣṭībhamaṇ samabharaṇ. tāṁ te prāviṇan. tāṁ sā 'cchā-
dayat.' 6. ādityā jagatiṁ samabharaṇ. tāṁ te prāviṇan. tāṁ sā

from this [evil], he shall separate himself from evil." 12. He who
at the morning-libation separates it from the rc, he thus separates
himself from evil.

I. 17. 1. This they say: "If there be sung ovā ovā, what be-
comes of the rc, what of the sāman." 2. When he sings the
prastāva, he sings the prastāva with eight syllables. Of eight
syllables is the yāyātri; each syllable is a triple syllable. Thus
they amount to twenty-four. The yāyātri has twenty-four syllables.
3. Having obtained this same rc by means of the prastāva,
he sits singing into his possession what fortune [there is], what
reverence, what heavenly world, what glory, what food-eating.

I. 18. 1. Prajāpati created the gods. After them death, evil
was created. 2. These gods coming unto Prajāpati said: "Why,
pray, hast thou created us, if thou wast going to create death,
evil, after us?" 3. He said to them: "Bring together the metres;
enter these each one at his proper place, then you will be sepa-
rated from death, evil. 4. The Vasus brought the yāyātri to-
gether. They entered it. It concealed them. 5. The Rudras
brought the triṣṭībh together. They entered it. It concealed

-vaksy-.; C. -vatsy-.; "A. cchād-.
'cohādayat. 7. viṣve deva anuṣṭubhāṁ samabhāran. tāṁ te prāvaṇan. tāṁ su 'cohādayat. 8. tāṁ asyām rey avarāyāṁ 'nṛtyur nirajāṇūd yathā maṃśāu manisātram paripayo 'deva. 9. te svaram prāvaṇan. tāṁ svare satō na' nirajāṇūt. svaramaṣa tu ghoṣeṇā 'nvāt. 10. ta om ity etad evā 'kṣaraṁ samārohaṇ. etad evā 'kṣaraṁ trayaṇi vidāya. yod ado 'nṛtaṁ tapati tat ārpaṇa tato 'nṛtyunā pāpmanā vyāvartanta. 11. evam evāi 'vam vidvān om ity etad evā 'kṣaraṁ samārohaṇa yaad ado 'nṛtaṁ tapati tat ārpaṇa tato 'nṛtyunā pāpmanā vyāvartate 'tho yasyai 'vam vidvān udgāyatī. 18.

caturthe 'nuvāke caturthah khaṇḍah. caturtho 'nuvākas samāptah.

I. 19. 1. athāi 'tad ekaviṣṇunā śūna. 2. tasya trayyē eva vidyā hīṅkāraḥ. 'agnir vāyuḥ asūv āditya esa prastāvah. ima eva lokā 'ādiḥ. teṣu hi 'dari lokesu sarvam āhitam. praddhā yajño dukṣinaḥ esa udgīthaḥ. dīgo 'vāntaradiğa akāśa esa pratihāraḥ. ājñā praśū oṣadhyā esa upadravaḥ. candrāmā naksātraṇi pīṭara etan niḥhanam. 3. tad etad ekaviṣṇunā śūna. sat evam etad ekaviṣṇunā śūna vedāi 'tena hā 'syu sarvano 'dīg-

them. 4. The Ādityas brought the jagatai together. They entered it. It concealed them. 7. All the gods brought the anuṣṭubh together. They entered it. It concealed them. 8. Death became aware of them in this tune-(tune)-less rc, just as one might discover the jewel-string within a jewel. 9. They entered tone. Them, being in tone, he did not become aware of. But he went after them by the noise of tone. 10. They climbed together upon that syllable om. That same syllable is the threefold knowledge (Veda). Resorting unto that immortality which burns yonder, they then separated themselves from death, evil. 11. Even so one knowing thus, climbing upon that syllable om, resorting unto that immortality which burns yonder, then separates himself from death, evil, and likewise he for whom one knowing thus sings the udgītha.

I. 19. 1. Now this is the twenty-onefold sūman. 2. Of it the threefold knowledge is the hīṅkāra; Agni, Vāyu, yonder sun, those are the prastāvā; these worlds the ādi—for this all is placed (√dhā + ā) in these worlds; faith, sacrifice, sacrificial gifts, those are the udgītha; the quarters, the intermediate quarters, space, those are the pratihāra; the waters, creatures, herbes, those are the upadrava; the moon, the asterisms, the Fathers, those are the niḥhanā. 3. This is the twenty-onefold sūman. He who thus knows this twenty-onefold sūman, of him

18. *A.B. -yām. 9 A.B. -yādi. 8 A.C. om. 10 C. o. 11 A. -ped-. 12 A.B. edo; C. o.
19. *A. trāi. 1 B. vāvāyur. 2 yesu. 4 C. jād. VOL. XVI. 14
tam bhavaty etasmād v eva' sarvasmād āvṛcyate' ya evaṁ vid-
vāsam upavudati. 19.

paścamo 'nuvākas samāptah.

I. 20. 1. idam eva' dam agre 'antarikṣam' āsit. tad v eva 'py etarhi. 2. tad yad etad antarikṣam' ya eva' 'yam' pavata etad eva 'antarikṣam.' esa ha va antarikṣanāma.' 3. esa u evai 'esa
vitatah. tad yathā kāṣṭhena palāpe viskabde syütām akṣena va
cakrāv evam' etene 'māu lokāu viskabdhau. 4. tasmin idam sarvam antah. tad' yad asmin idam sarvam antas tasmād an-
taryakṣam, antaryakṣam' ha vai nāma' tat. tad antarikṣam' iti
daroṣam 'aakṣate. 5. tad yathā mātaḥ prabaddhāh' prā-
lambarann evam hai 'tasmin sarve lokah prabaddhāḥ pralamb-
te. 6. tasyāt tasya sāmanā' tīra ṣāgās' trīṇi āgītīṇi sōd
vibhātya)n ca tatasr pratiṣṭhā daça prāgās sapta saṁsthā dvā
stobhav ekam rūpam. 7. tad yās tīra ṣāgā ima eva te' lokah.
8. atha yāni [trīṇy] āgītīṇy agnir vāyur asāv udādy etān
āgītīṇy. na ha vai kām cana pṛiyam aparādhnīti ya evam
veda. 20.

yaśthe 'nuvāke prathamah khaṇḍaḥ.

the udgītha is sung by this all; and from this same universe he is
cut off who speaks ill of one knowing thus.

I. 20. 1. This [all] in the beginning was this atmosphere here;
and that is so even now. 2. As for this atmosphere—he who
cleanses here is this atmosphere. For he is atmosphere by
name. 3. That same is stretched apart. As two leaves might
be propped apart by means of a peg, or two wheels by means
of an axle, so these [two] worlds are propped apart by means
of this [atmosphere]. 4. This all is within it. Because this all
is within (antas) it, therefore [it is called] antarāyakṣa. Anta-
rayakṣa verily is its name. It is called antarikṣa in an occult
way. 5. As baskets bound [to one another] would hang down,
so in it all the worlds bound [to one another] hang down.
6. Of this same sāman there are three āgās, three āgītās, six
vibhūtis, four pratiṣṭhās, ten prāgās, seven saṁsthās, two
stobhas, one form. 7. Now the three āgās, they are these
worlds. 8. Further, the [three] āgītās, Agni (fire), Vāyu (wind),
yonder sun are these āgītās. He misses no fortune whatever
who knows thus.

---

19. 'A.B. -as. 'C. āvṛcyote.
20. '1C. riṣeṣ. 'C. inserts esa ha va antarikṣam. 'C. evam. 'C. om.
1-ksṇā. 'B. navam. 'A. eteṣṇa. 'A. om. tad. . . . antas. 'C.
om. '1B. -band. 'B. -ṁaka. 'B. agamāḥ. 'A. ekarātīpa; B.C.
ekārupam. 'A. to.
I. 21. 1. atha yāṣ śaḍ vizhūtaya ṛtavas te. 2. atha yāṣ cata-
sraḥ pratiṣṭhā imeva eva tāṣ ca catasro diṣṭaḥ. 3. atha ye daṣa praṣa
ima eva te deṣa pranāh. 4. atha yāṣ saptaś saṁsthā yā evai
’tīṣ saptaḥ’ horāṭrāḥ prācīr vaṣaṭkurvanti tā eva tāḥ. 5. atha
yāṃ dvāu stobbhāv ahorātre eva te. 6. atha yād ekam rūpaṁ
carmā āva tat. karmanā hī ‘daṁ sarvaṁ vikriyate. 7. tasyāi
’tāṣa sāmno deva’ ājīṁ āyan. sa praṣṭāpar horasā hīṅkāram
udajayud agnis tejās prastāvam’ rūpeṇa bhāsapatīr udgītham
svadhāyā pitarāḥ’ pratiḥārāṁ vīryeṇe ‘ndro niḥdam. 8. athe
’tare deva antaritā iva’ san. ta indram abhuvan tava no vayam
smo ‘nu na etasmin sāmam ābhāje ’ti. 9. tebhyaṣa suvarṇam’ prā-
yacchaḥ. tam praṣṭāpar abhravī kathe ’ttham akāḥ. sarvaṁ vā
abhyaṁ sāma prādāh. etval vaiva sāma yāvān svarāh. 10. yā
eva te saṁrād bhavati’ ’ti. 11. so ‘bhravīt punar vā aham esāṁ’
etai rasam udāśya iti. tān abhravid yuṣī mā gūyata. abhi mū
svarate ’ti. tathā ’ti. 12. tam upūgyāyan. tam abhyaśvaran. teṣāṁ
punā rasam udātta.” 21.

Saṣṭhe ‘nunāke dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 21. 1. Further, the six vizhūtīs, they are the seasons. 2. Further, the four pratiṣṭhās, they are these four quarters. 3. Further, the ten praṣṭās, they are these ten breaths. 4. Further, the seven saṁsthās, they are those seven successive (?) days and nights that they utter vaṣaṭ (?) . 5. Further, the two stobbhas, they are day and night. 6. Further, the one form, that is action. For by action this all is developed. 7. About this same sāmaṇa the gods ran a race. Prajāpatī by a grasp conquered the hīṅkāra, Agni by splendor the prastāva, by form Bhraspati the udgītha, by the svadhā the Fathers the pratiḥāra, by heroism Indra the niḥdana. 8. Now the other gods were excluded, as it were. They said to Indra: “Verily, thine we are; let us also have a share in this sāmaṇa.” 9. He gave them the tone. Prajāpatī said to him: “Why hast thou acted thus? Verily, the whole sāmaṇa thou hast given to them. Truly, as great as the tone is, so great is the sāmaṇa. Verily, without tone it becomes re. 10. He (I.) said: “I will take back again this sap of them.” He said to them: “Join in my song, intone with me!” “Yes.” 11. They joined in the song, they intoned with him. Of them he took the sap back again.
I. 22. 1. sa yathā madhudhāne' madhunāśibhir madhv uṣṭacād
evam eva tatu sima pura' rasam uṣṭacāt. 2. tasmād u ha no'
pagāyet. indra esa yad udgātā. sa yathā 'sāv amīśāni' rasam
ādatta evam esa teśāṁ rasam ādatta. 3. kūmaṁ ha tā yajamāṇa
upagāyed yajamāṇanaya hi tad bhavaty atho brahmacāryā ucā-
ryoktaḥ. 4. tad u nā ūhur upāi 'va gāyet. dīpo hy upūgāyan'
dīpām' evam' salokatāṁ jayaṭi 'ti. 5. te ya eva 'me' mukhyāh
prūna ete eva 'dgyārač co 'pajgāṭārač ca. ime ha traya udgāṭāra
inga u caturā uṣṭacāra uṣṭacāra. 6. tasmād u catura eva 'pagāṭīn'
kurvita. tasmād u ho 'pagāṭīn' pratyabhīṁcet dīcchas sthā pro-
tram me mā hīnaśe 'ti. 1. sa yas sa rasa āsid ya eva 'yam
pavana esa eva sa rasaḥ. 2. sa yathā madhūvalopan adyād iti
ha smā 'ha sucittā īśūlana evam etasya rasaṅyā 'tmānam
pūrayeta. sa eva 'dgyātā 'tmānai ca yajamāṇain ca 'mrītavain
gamayati 'ti. 22.

ṣaṣe ṣe 'numāke triyah khāṇḍah. ṣaṣe ṣe 'numākas samāptaḥ.

I. 23. 1. ayaṁ eva 'dham agra ākūpa uṣit. sa u evā 'py etarhi.
2. sa yas su ākūpa vāg eva sū. tasmād ākūpa vāg vadati.

I. 22. 1. As one might pour honey into a honey-vessel by
means of the honey-cells, even so he then poured the sap again
into the simān. 2. And therefore one should not join in the song
[of the udgāṭar]. This udgāṭar is Indra. As he then took the
sap of those, even so he now takes the sap of these. 3. But
the sacrificer may join in the song [of the udgāṭar] at will—for
that is the sacrificer's—and also a Vedic student directed by
the teacher. 4. Verily, they also say this: "One should join in
the song. For the quarters joined in the song. He thus wins the
same world with the quarters." 5. These breaths in the mouth,
they are the udgāṭars and upagāṭars. For these three are the
udgāṭars and these four are the upagāṭars. 6. And therefore
one should appoint four upagāṭars. And therefore he should
touch the upagāṭars respectively [saying]: "Ye are the quarters,
do not injure my hearing." 7. As to what this sap was, he who
cleanses here, he is that sap. 8. "As one might eat a bite of
honey," Sucitta Īśūlana used to say, "so one should fill himself
with this sap. This same udgāṭar causeth himself and the sac-
crifice to attain immortality."

I. 23. 1. This [universe] in the beginning was this space here,
and that is so even now. 2. What this space is, that is speech.

va. 'dgdā-; A.B. -ṛn. -ṛn.
saptame 'nukale prathamah khaḍhā.

Therefore speech speaks from space. 1. This same speech Prājāpati pressed. Of it being pressed the sap streamed forth. That became these worlds. 4. He pressed these worlds. Of them being pressed the sap streamed forth. That became these deities: Agni, Vāyu, yonder sun. 5. He pressed these deities. Of them being pressed the sap streamed forth. That became the threefold knowledge. 6. He pressed the threefold knowledge. Of it being pressed the sap streamed forth. That became these sacred utterances: bṛis, bhuvas, svar. 7. He pressed these sacred utterances. Of them being pressed the sap streamed forth. That became that syllable, viz. om. 8. He pressed that syllable. Of it being pressed the sap streamed forth.

I. 24. 1. That flowed. Because it flowed (aksara), therefore it is aksara (syllable). 2. And because, being aksara, it was not exhausted (√kṣa), therefore it is aksaya. Verily, aksaya is its name. It is called aksara in an occult way. 3. Now some sing this as om. Let one not sing it thus. He is liable to hide it by this sap. So also there come to be two, as it were, viz. o-m. And some sing o. And that is also not sung thus. Let him not sing it thus either. Let him sing om. Thus he combines it with

26. ³ A. etā u. ³ C. rasam. ³C. inserts vs. ³sa trayīm . . . . . . rasam
(l) prāmedat. ⁴ A.B. om. ⁴ A.B. -ṇ. ⁴ C. om. sa trayīm . . . . . . prāmedat. ⁴ -ṇ.

saptame ‘nuvāke dvitiyāḥ khaṇḍaḥ. saptamo ‘nuvākas samāptāḥ.


that sap. 4. He thus causes this sap to rejoice. The sap, rejoiced, causes the syllable to rejoice. The syllable, rejoiced, causes the sacred utterances to rejoice. The sacred utterances, rejoiced, cause the Vedas to rejoice. The Vedas, rejoiced, cause the divinities to rejoice. The divinities, rejoiced, cause the worlds to rejoice. The worlds, rejoiced, cause the syllable to rejoice. The syllable, rejoiced, causes speech to rejoice. Speech, rejoiced, causes space to rejoice. Space, rejoiced, causes the creatures to rejoice. He rejoices in offspring and cattle who knows this thus, and also he for whom one knowing thus sings the udgātha.

I. 25. 1. This [universe] was in the beginning this space here; and that is so even now. 2. What this space is, that is the sun. For when he has risen this all is visible. 3. Verily its limits of the mortal and immortal are the ocean. What is encompassed by the ocean, that is obtained by death, and what is beyond, that is immortal. 4. As for this ocean—he who cleanses here is this ocean. For after him running together (√dru + sam) all created beings run together. 5. Heaven and earth are its two banks. As beakers or pails abandoned in a river would be, so is this earthly ocean of his. 6. This one rises at the shore of the ocean.

24. 6 A. om. ‘aksaraṁ . . . . vācāṁ tarpayati. 10 B.C. -yanti. 11 A.B. vākās. 11 C. gāyati. 25. 1 A.B. ‘dām (!). 4 sudite. 2 B. ‘vārca. 4 taraṇi. 1 A.B. ‘gruḥ-. 4 B. ‘dr-. 1 C. ‘anudr-. 8 B.C. ‘yā. 4 -yām. 10 ‘kasāṇi. 11 ‘praḥiṇāhini. 11 A.B. insert ‘zas; C. sa.
Rising he ascends on the back of the wind. He rises from the immortal. He goes about after the immortal. He stands firm in the immortal. 7. That threefold form of him which is not obtained by death is white, black, person. 8. What is white, that is the form of speech, of the rc, of Agni (fire), of death. What this speech is, that is the rc; and what Agni is, that is death. 9. Further, what is black, that is the form of the waters, of food, of mind, of the yajus. What these waters are, that is food; and what the mind is, that is the yajus. 10. Further, what this person is, that is breath, that is the sāman, that is the brahman, that is the immortal. What breath is, that is the sāman; and what the brahman is, that is the immortal.

I. 26. 1. Now with regard to the self. This eye here is threefold: white, black, person. 2-4 = I. 25. 5-10. 5. This is the on-going of the brahman. And from there is the on-going (¿)? 6. This ascending is the lightning. The reddish-white form which is of the lightning as it lightens, that is the form of speech, of the rc, of Agni (fire), of death. 7. And the dark-blue


daśama 'nuvāke dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 27. 1. sa hāi 'so 'mytena parivaḥtha mṛtyum adhyāste 'naivy kṛtvā. 2. atiha 'sa esa puruṣo yo 'yai ca kṣaṇi; ya āditye' so 'tipurasah. yo vidyati sa paramapuruṣah. 3. ete ha vaca trayah puruṣah. a ha 'syai te jayante. 4. sa yo 'yai ca kṣaṇy esa 'nurūpo nāma. anvaiḥ hy esa sarvani rūpāni. tam anurūpa ity upāśita. anvaiḥhi hāi 'nai sarvani rūpāni bhavanti. 5. ya āditye sa pratirūpaḥ. pratyaḥ hy esa sarvani rūpāni. tam pratirūpa ity upāśita. pratyaḥhāi hāi 'nai sarvani rūpāni bhavanti. 6. yo vidyati sa saccārūpaḥ sarvāni hy etusmin rūpāni. tain sarvārūpa ity upāśita. sarvāni hā 'smin rūpāni bhavanti. 7. ete ha vaca trayah puruṣah. a hā 'syai te jayante ya etad evam ṛvedi 'tho yasyai 'vaiṇ vidvān udgāyati. 27.

daśama 'nuvāke tṛtiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. daśama 'nuvākasamāptaḥ.

form which is of the lightning as it runs together, that is the form of the waters, of food, of mind, of the yajue. 8. And that person which is in the lightning, that is breath, that is the sāman, that is the brahman, that is the immortal. What breath is, that is the sāman; and what the brahman is, that is the immortal.

I. 27. 1. This same one, fortified by the immortal, having made food, sits upon death. 2. Now he is this person who is in the eye here. He who is in the sun is the superior-person. He who is in the lightning is the supreme-person. 3. These are the three persons; to him indeed they are born. 4. He who is here in the eye is conformable (anurūpa) by name. For he follows after all forms. One should worship him as conformable. Verily all forms [will] follow after him. 5. He who is in the sun is of corresponding form (pratirūpa). For he is corresponding to all forms. One should worship him as of corresponding form. Verily all forms [will] correspond to him. 6. He who is in the lightning is of all forms. For all forms are in him. One should worship him as of all forms. Verily all forms [will] be in him. 7. Verily these are the three persons. They are born to him who knows this thus, and to him for whom one knowing thus, sings the udgīthu.

I. 28. 1. This [universe] here in the beginning was space, and that is so even now. 2. This space is Indra. What this Indra is, that is he who burns here. That same one is seven-rayed, virile, powerful. 3. Of him the ray consisting of speech stands firm in front (east). That speech is Agni (fire). It becomes tenfold, hundredfold, thousandfold, ten thousandfold, hundred thousandfold, millionfold, ten millionfold, hundred millionfold, billionfold, ten billionfold, a hundred billionfold, a thousand billionfold.

4. This ray of him becoming speech is located respectively in all these creatures. Whosoever speaks, he speaks by the ray of him. 5. Now [the ray] consisting of mind stands firm at the right (south). That mind is the moon. That becomes tenfold. 6. That ray of him becoming mind is located respectively in all these creatures. Whosoever thinks, he thinks by the ray of him. 7. Now [the ray] consisting of sight stands firm in the rear (west). That sight is the sun. That becomes tenfold. 8. That ray of him becoming sight is located respectively in all these creatures. Whosoever sees, he sees by the ray of him. 9. Now [the ray] consisting of hearing stands firm upward (north). That hearing is the quarters. That becomes tenfold. 10. That ray of him becoming hearing is located respectively in all these creatures. Whosoever hears, he hears by the ray of him.

28. 1 A. om. 2 A.B. ur. 3 A.B. nikharvadah. 4 A.B. -ti. 5 ta; B. ssom. 6 B. pacyati. 7 B.C. pacyati. 8 C. om. 9 daksyad. 10 A.B. man. 11 A.B. caIru. 12 C. -ya. 13 C. vashitaI. 14 A.B. ta; C. om. 15 C. pratyavasthitah.

VOL. XVI. 15
I. 29. 1. atha prānāmayā ārdhvaḥ pratiṣṭhitah. 1 sa yas sa prāno vāyus suḥ. sa 2 daḍadhā bhavati. 2. sa esa etasya raṃmih prāno bhūtvā sarvāsv āsu prajāsu pratyavasthitah. sa yah kaś ca prāṇīty etasyāī 'va raṃmaīnā prāṇīti. 3. athā 'sumayaś tir-yāṇ pratiṣṭhitah. sa ha su 4 icāno nāma sa daḍadhā bhavati. 4. sa esa etasya raṃmih asūr bhūtvā sarvāsv āsu prajāsu pratyavasthitah. sa yah kaś ca 'sumān etasyāī 'va raṃmaīnā 'sumān. 5. athā 'nmaṇayo 'svaḥ pratiṣṭhitah. tad yat tād annam 5 āpasa tāḥ. 6. sa daḍadhā bhavati catadāḥ sahasradāḥ 'yutadāḥ pratyadādāḥ niyutadāḥ 'rbudadhā nyarbudadhā nikharvadāḥ padmān akṣitir vyomāntaḥ. 7. sa esa etasya raṃmih annam bhūtvā sarvāsv āsu prajāsu pratyavasthitah. sa yah kaś ca 'cānty etasyāī 'va raṃmaīnā 'cānti. 8. sa esa saptaraṃmih vrṣadhas tūvismān. tad 9 etad rūṇaḥ bhyanaucayate

yas saptaraṃmih vrṣadhas tūvismān

avāsaj tetave sapta sindhān :

yo rāūhinām 10 aepurud vajrabāhur 11
dyām ārohanti 11 sa jānasa indra

iti. 8. yas saptaraṃmih iti. sapta hy eta ādityasya raṃmayaḥ.

I. 29. 1. Now [the ray] consisting of breath stands firm aloft. That breath is Vāyu (wind). It becomes tenfold. 3. That ray of him becoming breath is located respectively in all these creatures. Whosoever breathes, he breathes by the ray of him. 1. Now [the ray] consisting of the vital spirit stands firm crosswise. That same is Lord by name. That becomes tenfold. 4. That ray of him becoming the vital spirit is located respectively in all these creatures. Whosoever possesses the vital spirit, he possesses the vital spirit by the ray of him. 5. Now [the ray] consisting of food stands firm bitherward. That food is the waters. That becomes tenfold, hundredfold, thousandfold, ten thousandfold, hundred thousandfold, millionfold, ten millionfold, hundred millionfold, billionfold, ten billionfold, a hundred billionfold, a thousand billionfold. 6. That ray of him becoming food is located respectively in all these creatures. Whosoever eats, he eats by the ray of him. 7. That same in one is seven-rayed, virile, powerful. That same is spoken of in a rc: "Who seven-rayed, virile, powerful, let loose to run the seven streams; who with the thunderbolt in his arm smote Rāūhaṇa ascending the sky—he, ye people, is Indra." 8. 'Who seven-rayed,' for these

---

1 C. -sth. 2 C. om. 3 C. space for sa i. 4 A.-vati. 5 C. after yat reads tat trudaḥ nāma, omitting tad annam. . . . . sa. 6 A. ahdannam. 7 A. tādā; B. sta. 8 A.B. nikharvācam; C. nikharvādāca. 9 A. voma-. 10 B. sāmāv. 11 C. om. tad etad, . . . . vrṣadhas tūvismān. 12 A. roh-. 13 -hu. 14 -ta.
I. 30. 1. "As paths might lead together up a mountain," Cātyāyani used to say, "even so these rays of the sun go from all sides to that sun." Verily one knowing thus who starts with om approaches this sun from all sides by means of these rays of him. 2. That same is the unobstructed (anīṣedha) sūman having doors on all sides. Some, indeed, worship it as having doors on both sides, cloud-going. Let them know differently from that. 3. And he who knows it thus, he knows the unobstructed sūman having doors on all sides. 4. That same is this lightning. What flies around this whole disk, that is the sūman; and what shines across, beyond, that is the sap of good action. Unto that he is released. 5. That same is the rivalless sūman. For Indra
I. 31. 1. ayam eve 'dun agra akāça āsūt, sa u evā 'py etarhi, sa yas sa akāça indra eva saḥ. sa yas sa indras sūmā 'va tat. 2. tasyāi 'tasya sūmā iyan eva prūci dig' ghiṅkāra iyan prastāva iyan ādīr iyan udgītho 'sāu pratihāro 'ntarīkṣam' upadrava iyan eva nidhanam. 3. tad etat' saptavidham sūmā, sa ya evam etat saptavidham sūmā veda yat kinn ca prūcyōm digi ya devata ye manasyā ye paçavo yudd annaďyān tat sarvām' hiṅkārēnū 'pnoti. 4. atha yad dakṣipiyāna digi tat sarvam prastāvēnū 'pnoti. 5. atha yat' pratihāryāni digi tat sarvām udīnā 'pnoti. 6. atha yad udīcyōm digi tat sarvām udgītenā 'pnoti. 7. atha yad' annasyāni digi tat sarvam pratihārenū 'pnoti. 8. atha yudd antarkiśa' tat sarvam upadrēnā 'pnoti. 9. atha yudd asyāni digi yudd devata ye manasyā ye paçavo yudd annaďyān tat sarvām nidhanenū 'pnoti.

indeed sees no rival whatever. As Indra sees no rival whatever, even so he sees no rival whatever who knows this thus and likewise he for whom one knowing thus sings the udgītha.

81. 1 A.B. dīr. 2 C. ēky-. 3 A. et. 4 insert manasyā. 5 A.B. -vī. 6 B.C. insert here vs. 4, with pratihāreṇa for prastāvena. 7 B. inserts avyāt. 8 A. inserts dakṣipiyānā digi, struck out in red.
that he obtains by means of the nidhana. 10. Verily everything is obtained of him, everything conquered, no wish whatever is unfulfilled of him who knows thus. 11. Whatever one knowing thus does in these worlds, that is his, he does it by himself. That same is referred to by a ye:

I. 32. 1. "If, O Indra, there were a hundred skies and a hundred earths for thee, not a thousand suns, O thou possessing the thunderbolt, unto thee when born, attained, nor Rodasi." 2. 'If, O Indra, there were a hundred skies and a hundred earths for thee,' what hundred skies there might be and hundred earths, this space is superior to them. 3. 'Not a thousand suns, O thou possessing the thunderbolt, unto thee,' for not at all [do] a thousand suns [attain] unto him. 4. 'When born attained, nor Rodasi,' for they do not bewail (vrud) him when born. Verily as to these two worlds (rodasi), this space is superior to them both. For both are within it. 5. What this space is, that is Indra; what this Indra is, that is he who burns here. 6. He keeps liberating himself from the clouds. As he keeps liberating himself from the clouds, even so does he keep liberating himself from all evil who knows thus, and he for whom one knowing thus sings the udgīthā.
I. 33. 1. triśtā sūma catuspāt, brahma triśīyam' indras triśīyam' prajāpatis triśīyam' annam eva caturthāh pādaḥ. 2. tad yad vai brahma sa prāṇo 'tha ya indras sū vāg atha yaḥ prajāpatis tan mano 'nnam eva caturthāh pādaḥ. 3. mana eva hiṅkūro vāk prastāvah prāṇa udgītho 'nnam eva caturthāh pādaḥ. 4. karoty eva vācā nayati prāṇena gamayati manasā, tad etan niruddhaṁ yan manah. tena yatra kāmayate tad ātmānaṁ ca yajamānaṁ ca dadhāi. 5. athā 'dhiśiivatam.' candramā eva hiṅkūro 'gniḥ prastāvā udītya udgītho āpa eva caturthāḥ pādaḥ, tad dhī pratyakṣam annam. 6. tā vā 'etā devatā amāvāsyaṁ rātrīṁ saṁyanti. candramā amāvāsyāṁ rātrīṁ udītyam praviṣṭyā udītyo 'gniṁ. 7. tad yat saṁyanti tasmāt sūma. sa ha vai sānavit sa sāma veda ya evaṁ veda. 8. tāśāṁ vā etāśāṁ devatānām ekāi 'kāi'va devatā sūma bhavati. 9. esa eva 'dīyās triśvṛc catuspād rāmapayo maṇḍalam puruṣā, rāmapaya eva hiṅkūrā, tasmāt te prathamata eva 'dīyātas tāyante. maṇḍalam prastāvah puruṣa udgītho yāḥ etā 'þpa 'natas sa eva caturthāḥ pādaḥ. 10. evam eva candramāso rāmapayo maṇḍalam puruṣā, rāmapaya eva hiṅkūro maṇḍalam prastāvah puruṣa udgītho yā etā 'þpa

I. 33. 1. Threefold is the sāman, fourfooted. The brahma is a third, Indra is a third, Prajāpati is a third, food is the fourth foot (quarter). 2. What the brahma is, that is breath; and what Indra is, that is speech; and what Prajāpati is, that is mind; food is the fourth foot (quarter). 3. Mind is the hiṅkūra, speech is the prastāvā, breath is the udgīthā, food is the fourth foot (quarter). 4. One acts with speech, one leads with breath, one causes to go with the mind. That same is shut up, viz. the mind. By means of it he thus places himself and the sacrificer where he wishes. 5. Now regarding the divinities. The moon is the hiṅkūra, Agni is the prastāvā, the sun is the udgīthā, the waters are the fourth foot (quarter). For they are manifestly food. 6. These same divinities come together on the night of the new moon. The moon, on the night of the new moon, enters the sun, the sun [enters] Agni. 7. Because they come together (yā + sam), hence [the word] sāman. He is sāman-knowing, he knows the sāman, who knows thus. 8. Of these same divinities each one divinity is a sāman. 9. This sun is threefold, fourfooted: rays, disk, person. The rays are the hiṅkūra. Therefore they are extended when it first rises. The disk is the prastāvā. The person is the udgīthā. The waters within are the fourth foot (quarter). 10. Likewise of the moon [there are] rays, disk, person. The rays are the hiṅkūra. The disk is the prastāvā. The person is the udgīthā. The waters within are
the fourth foot (quarter). 11. Four are the one, four the others.

I. 34. 1. Now with regard to the self. This eye is threefold, fourfooted: white, black, person. The white is the hiṅkāra, the black is the prastāva, the person is the udāgha, the waters within are the fourth foot (quarter). 2. This is the course of the sun, this [the course] of the moon. Four are these, four these. = I. 1. 3. 4. He who cleanses here, that same one is Prajāpati. That is also the sūman. Its god is this person in the eye. That same, contempting the offering, [has] gone up (?). A. And these two, moon and sun, which are seen here in the waters, these two are the gods of these two. 5. Truly when they say "the gods of the gods," it is these [that they mean]. These same, contempting the offering, [have] gone up (?). 6. Now Prthu Vāśya asked the divine mendicants thus: "The gods by whom impelled the wind blows forth, who give the five converging quarters, who contempted the offerings, the leaders of the waters
iti. 7. te ha prayūcūr
imām esām prthiṣṭiṃ vastu ekō
"nārīkṣaṃ" pary eko babhūva:
divam eko dadate yo vidhartā"
viśuṣā ācāḥ pratirakṣaṇty anyā
iti. 8. imām esām prthiṣṭiṃ vasta eko ity āgnir ha saḥ. 9. antarīkṣaṃ pary eko babhūve ti vāyur ha saḥ. 10. divam eko dadate yo vidhartē" ti ādityo ha saḥ. 11. viśuṣā ācāḥ pratirakṣaṇty anya iti. etā ha vāi devatā viśuṣā ācāḥ pratirakṣaṇti caudramū nakṣatṛṇī ti. tu etās sāmāi va satyo vyuḥho annādyāya. 34.

ekāḍače 'nuvāke dvitiyaḥ khayḍaḥ. ekāḍače 'nuvākas sanāptāḥ.

I. 35. 1. athā 'tat sāma. tad āhūs saṁvatsara eva sāme 'ti. 2. tasya vasanta eva hiṃkūraḥ. tasmāt paścāno vasantā hiṃka-rikratas samudāyanti. 3. grīṣmāḥ prastāvah. anirukto vāi prastāvo 'nirukta pānāṁ grīṣmāḥ. 4. varṣāḥ udgīthāḥ. uḥ iva vāi varṣāṁ gāyati. 5. ṣatāḥ pratiḥūraḥ. ṣatāhi kha khu vāi bhūyijhāḥ oṣadhaḥ pacyante. 6. hemanāto nīhanam. nīhanakṛtā iva vāi heman prájā bhasanti. 7. tān etāv antāv sanāptāḥ.

—which are they?" 7. They answered: "One of them dons this earth here, one hath encompassed the atmosphere, one, who is the disposer, gives the sky, others severally protect all regions."
8. "One dons this earth here," that is Agni. 9. "One hath encompassed the atmosphere," that is Vāyu. 10. "One, who is the disposer, gives the sky," that is the sun. 11. "Others severally protect all regions," these divinities indeed severally protect all regions, viz. moon and asterisms. These are true, extended kindness (?) for food-eating.

I. 35. 1. Now this is the sāmaṇ. This they say: The sāmaṇ is in the year. 2. Of it spring is the hiṃkūra. Therefore animals come together in the spring, continually uttering kim. 3. The summer is the prastāva. The prastāvā is indistinct; the summer is indistinct among the seasons. 4. The rainy season (varṣāḥ) is the udgītha. One sings the udgīthā through the year (varṣa), as it were. 5. The autumn is the pratiḥūra. Verily in the autumn most herbs ripen. 6. The winter is the nīhanuma. In the winter creatures are put to an end (nīhanakṛtā), as it were. 7. These two ends combine together; consequently the year is

34. 11C. -īkṛ.- 13-dhātā. 13C. any. 14A.B. vidhartā; C. vidhatte. 15A.B. ann.; C. 'mn-; all MSS. -yāyā. 35. 1A.B. -karikutas; C. -karikṛtas.
dhattaḥ. etad anu' antasya vā cā dhemantac ca vasantaḥ ca. etad anu grāmasyā'蚂蚁 sametaḥ. etad anu niskusyā'蚂蚁 sametaḥ. etad anu akhir bhogā yāryaḥ nyayaḥ. 3. etad etat sa νāma samā sankalpaḥ abhimanyakā' evam anantaṁ sāma. sa ya evam etad anantaṁ sāma vedā 'nantaṁ' eva jayati. 35.

dvīdaçe 'nudake prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 36. 1. athāi 'tāt parjanye sāma. tasya purovāta eva hiṅkāraḥ. athā yaḥ abhrāṇi samplāvayati sa prastūvaḥ. athā yaḥ stavanayi sa udgīṭah. athā yaḥ vidyotate sa prathihāraḥ. athā yaḥ varṣati tan nīdhanaṁ. 2. tadh etat parjanye sāma. sa ya evam etat parjanye sāma veda varṣukoh hā' sūna parjanyo bhanati. 3. athāi 'tāt purūse' sāma. tasyā' yam eva hiṅkāraḥ 'yam prastūvaḥ 'yam udgīṭho 'yam prathihāra idam nīdhanaṁ. 4. tad etat purūse sāma. sa ya evam etat purūse sāma veda 'rdhva eva prajaya' paṣubhir ārohān eti. 5. sa ya u enat' pratyag veda ye pratyāṅco lokās tāṁ jayati. tasyā' yam eva hiṅkāraḥ 'yam prastūva 'yam udgīṭho 'yam prathihāra idam nīdhanaṁ. ye pratyāṅco lokās tāṁ jayati. 6. sa ya u enat' tiryag veda ye tiryāṅco' endless. Its two ends are winter and spring. In accordance with this the two ends of a village join together. In accordance with this the two ends of a necklace join together. In accordance with this a snake lies taking its coils about it. 7. Truly, as a necklace bent all around the neck, so is the endless sūman. He who knows this endless sūman thus conquers endlessness.

I. 36. 1. Now this is the sūman in Parjanya. The wind which precedes is its hiṅkāraḥ; when it causes the clouds to float together, that is the prastūvaḥ; when it thunders, that is the udgīṭaḥ; when it lightens, that is the prathihāraḥ; when it rains, that is the nīdhanaḥ. 2. That is the sūman in Parjanya. He who thus knows the sūman in Parjanya, truly to him Parjanya sends rain. 3. Now this is the sūman in man. Of it this is the hiṅkāraḥ, this the prastūvaḥ, this the udgīṭhaḥ, this the prathihāraḥ, this the nīdhanaḥ. 4. That is the sūman in man. He who thus knows the sūman in man, he keeps ascending upward by progeny and by cattle. 5. And he who knows it in reversed direction conquers those worlds which are reversed. Of it this is the hiṅkāraḥ, this the prastūvaḥ, this the udgīṭhaḥ, this the prathihāraḥ, this the nīdhanaḥ. The worlds which are reversed, those he conquers. 6. And he who knows it crosswise conquers those worlds which

133 1 C. om. 2 A.B. -tal. 3 A.B. savat-. 4 -cī-. 5 A. -yattah. 6 C. namāṁ. 36 1 C. -pak-. 2 po. 3 prajā-. -nath. 5 C. om. 3 A.B. eva ; C. enam. A.B. -guñañ ; A.B. insert ma.
lokāṁ tāṁ jayati. tasya lomāṁ 'na hiṅkāras tvak prastāvo maṁ-
sam udgītho 'sthi prathihāro majjā nīdhanaṁ. 1. tasya trīṁ
āvir gāyati prastāvakram prathihāramśa nīdhanaṁ. tasmāḥ purusa-
sya trīṁ asthīṁ āvir dantāṁ ca dvayāṁ ca nakkhaṁ. ye tīryaṅco
lokāṁ tāṁ jayati. 2. ya u enat saṁyoga veda ye saṁyago lokāṁ
tāṁ jayati. tasya mana eva hiṅkāro vāk prastāvaṁ prāṇa udga-
thaḥ cakṣuḥ prathihāraḥ ca nīdhanaṁ. ye saṁyago lokāṁ
tāṁ jayati. 3. athāṁ tud devataṁ sāma, tasya vāyur eva hiṅkāro
'gniḥ prastāvaṁ uditya udgīthāḥ candrāṇaḥ prathihāraḥ dīpa eva
nīdhanaṁ. 4. tud etad devataṁ sāma, sa ya evam etad de-
vaṁ sāma vedā devataṁ eva saḷokatāṁ jayati. 36.

dvādeśe mūvake dvitiyaṁ khaṇḍhaṁ.

I. 37. 1. tasyāṁ 'tās tisraṁ āgūṁ agneyy ekāṁ "nāryā ekā vaicva-
devy ekā. 2. sā yā muntāra sā "gneyā, tapu prātaśawasanto
'dgeyam. āgneyas tu prātaśawasanām agneyo 'yāṁ lokāṁ,
saṁyā "gaya prātaśawasanto 'dgayaṁ yāhīnāl ti maniṁ lokam.
3. athāṁ yā ghośiny upadānāṁśi "nāryā "nāryā madhyamānān-
sya savanasto 'dgeyam, āindīṁ vāṁ madhyamānān savanam

are crosswise. Of the hair of the head is the hiṅkāra, the
skin the prastāva, the flesh the udgītha, the bone the prathihāra,
the marrow the nīdhana. 7. Of it he sings three openly, viz. the
prastāva, the prathihāra, the nīdhana. Therefore three bones of
man lie open, viz. the teeth and the two kinds of nails. The
worlds which are crosswise, those he conquers. 8. And he who
knows it converging conquers those worlds which are converging.
Of it mind is the hiṅkāra, speech the prastāva, breath the
udgītha, sight the prathihāra, hearing the nīdhana. The worlds
which are converging, those he conquers. 10. And this is the
sāman in the divinities. Of it Vāyu is the hiṅkāra, Agni the
prastāva, the sun the udgītha, the moon the prathihāra, the
quarters the nīdhana. 11. That is the sāman in the divinities.
He who knows thus this sāman in the divinities, he conquers a
share in the same world with the divinities.

I. 37. 1. Of it there are these three āgūs: one belonging to
Agni, one belonging to Indra, one belonging to all the gods.
2. That which is low, that belongs to Agni. With it the udgītha
of the morning-libation should be sung. Verily the morning-
libation belongs to Agni, this world belongs to Agni. He [then]
sings the udgītha of the morning-libation with his (Agni's) own
āgū, he enjoys this world. 3. And that which is loud [and]
oi noisy, that belongs to Indra. With it the udgītha of the noon-

---

36. 8 A. lik-. 8 C. hiṅkāram.
37. 1 C. āsk-. 3 A.B. 'nār-. 8 C. om. sā . . . . 'd. 4 B. mānadhī. 5 A.
om. athā . . . . lokam. 8 C. space for -aṁr-. 2 C. -niṁa.
libation should be sung. Verily the noon-libation belongs to Indra, yonder world belongs to Indra. He [then] sings the udgītha of the noon-libation with his (Indra's) own agā, he enjoys yonder world. 4. And [the agā] which he sings shaking, as it were (tremolo), spreading it, as it were, that belongs to all the gods. With it the udgītha of the evening-libation should be sung. Verily the evening-libation belongs to all the gods, this intermediate world belongs to all the gods. He [then] sings the udgītha of the evening-libation with their own agā, he enjoys this intermediate world. 5. Now above (?) they say: “The udgītha should be sung with one agā only, viz. [with that] which is the middle (mean) of his voice.” The voice with which he sings the udgītha expanding it apart, that is the middle (mean) of his voice. By means of this same voice he attains unto all voices. He who knows thus enjoys fortune not poured out in different directions [but] closely united. 6. And that which is plover-like belongs to Brhaspati. He who may be desirous of prominence in sacred lore should sing the udgītha with it. Verily this brahman is Brhaspati. He thus enjoys prominence in sacred lore. He thus becomes prominent in sacred lore. 7. Now Caikitiñeya sings the agā of one sāman only, viz. of the gāyatra-sāman. That should be sung without taking breath. That [part] of the sāman unto the parathāra should be sung without taking breath. Thus breath is the gāyatra-sāman. Verily he thus enjoys breath. He thus attains complete life.

37. aś checking. 9yā; A. inserts gosīyā. 10-yanti, 11-tāyā. 18B. s; C. om. 13 insert vāi gāyatrām from below. 14B. inserts sāmnas.
I. 38. 1. *atha ha brahmadattaṁ cāṅkitāneyam udgāyaṁaṁ kurava upodur udāhikī* sūna dālbhya ṭi. 2. 2. sa ha ṭrūṭyamano niṭtarāṁ jagnu. taviho "evah kim upodyamano niṭtarāṁ agāsīr īti. 3. 3. sa ha 'vace 'daṁ vāi lome' 'ty etad evāi 'tāt pratyupappr- maṁ. tasmād u ye na etad upāvādīṣur lomacānī 'va teṣāṁ śnapānīṁi bhavitaṁ. atha vayam ud eva gātāras śma īti.

4. 4. atha ha rājā jāivalīr gātunāsam 'arkṣākāyaṁanī pāmula- parṇābhāyām utthitaṁ pūrabhaṁ ruci 'gātā' gātāvātāḥ śaṁmaś īti. 5. 5. nāi 'va rājann rci 'ti ho 'vīca na śaṁme 'ti. tad yuyāṁ yārhi sarva eva paṇāyaṁ bhaviyatha ya evam īdvānso 'gāyate 'ti. 6. 6. atha yad dhā 'vakṣyaṁ rci ca śaṁma ca "gāme" 'ti dhītena vāi tad yutayāṁma 'malākṣaṇaṇāḥ 'gāte 'ti hāi 'nuṁś tad avakṣyaṁ. tad dhā tad uvāca svarena ca 'va hiṁkāreṇa ca "gāme 'ti. 38. 2. dvādaśe 'nuvāke tṛṭiyāḥ khāyaṁ.

I. 39. 1. atha ha satyādhibhāca cāṅtrarathis satyāyajñam pālaṅkaitam uvāca prācinaṇyoge 'ti mama caev vāi trām śaṁma virodān śaṁma "ṛtvijanāḥ kariṣyasi nāi 'va tarhi punar dīkṣām abhīdhyītāśi 'ti. mukurṛiṣiṇi hy āsa. ' 2. 2. su ho 'vāca yo vāi

I. 38. 1. Now the Kurus reproached Brahmadatta Cāṅkitāneya when he was singing the *udgītha*, (saying): "Stop the śaṁma, O Dālbhya." 2. He being reproached sang so much the more(?) They said to him: "Why hast thou, being reproached, sung so much the more?" 1. 1. He said: "Verily this is the hair-(loma-) [śaṁma]; thus we make answer. And therefore the funeral-places of those who have thus reproached us will be hairy (lomaṇa), as it were. Now we shall only sing the *udgīthu*.

4. Now king Jāivali asked Gālanaśa Arkaśākiyana, who had stood up with a woolen shirt (?) and a leaf : "O Āḷāvata, wilt thou sing with the rc [or] with the śaṁma?" 5. 5. "Not with the rc," he said, "nor with the śaṁma." "Thus then all of you will become renowned, who sang knowing thus." 6. Now if he had said: "Let us sing both with the rc and with the śaṁma," truly he would have told them: "Sing with a sucked-out, used-up branch of the *amalā*-plant." Therefore he spoke thus: "Let us sing both with tone and with the *hiṁkāra*.

I. 39. 1. Now Satyādhibhāka Cāṅtrarathī said to Satyayajñā Pāḷuṣīta: "O Prācinaṇyoga, if thou, knowing the śaṁma, shalt perform the priestly office for me with the śaṁma, then thou wilt not think of a second consecration." For he was one who repeatedly consecrated. 2. He said: "He who knowing the for-
sāmnaḥ griyaṁ vidvān sāmnaḥ "ṛtvijyaṁ karoti prīmān eva bhavati. mano viva sāmnaḥ prīr iti. 3. yo vai sāmnaḥ pratiṣṭhāṁ vidvān sāmnaḥ "ṛtvijyaṁ karoti prāty eva tiṣṭhati, vāg vāva sāmnaḥ pratiṣṭhe 'ti. 4. yo vai sāmnas swarṇaṁ vidvān sāmnaḥ "ṛtvijyaṁ karoty adhy asya grhe' svarṇaṁ ganyate. praṇo vāva sāmnas swarṇam iti. 5. yo vai sāmmo 'pacitiṁ vīdvaṁ sāmnaḥ "ṛtvijyaṁ karoty apacitīṁ eva bhavati. cakṣur vāva sāmrno 'pacitir iti. 6. yo vai sāmnaḥ ārūtīṁ vīdvaṁ sāmnaḥ "ṛtvijyaṁ karotī ārūtīṁ eva bhavati. protoṁ vāva sāmnaṁ ārūtir iti. 39.

dvādaśe 'nūvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. dvādaśo 'nūvākas samāptaḥ.

I. 40. 1. catvāri vák parimittā padāni
tāni vidūr brāhmaṇā ye maniṣināḥ:
guhā' triṇi nihitā ne 'ṛgayānti
turiyaṁ váco manayān vadanti
'ti. 2. vāg eva sāmana, vācā hi sāma gāyati. vāg eva 'ktham,' vācā hy ukthaṁ gaṁsati. vāg eva yajuh. vācā' hi yajur anuvartate. 3. tad yat kṛitā cā 'rvācinam brahmaṇas tad vāg eva sarvan. atha yad anyatra brahma 'padiṣyate. nā∫ va hi tenā "ṛtvijyaṁ karotī. parokṣenā 'va tu' krtam bhavati. 4. tasyā
tune of the sāman performs the priestly office with the sāman, he becomes fortunate. Verily mind is the fortune of the sāman. 1. He who knowing the firm stand of the sāman performs the priestly office with the sāman, he stands firm. Verily speech is the firm stand of the sāman. 4. He who knowing the gold of the sāman performs the priestly office with the sāman, in his house gold is found. Verily breath is the gold of the sāman. 5. He who knowing the reverence of the sāman performs the priestly office with the sāman, he becomes revered. Verily sight is the reverence of the sāman. 6. He who knowing the renown of the sāman performs the priestly office with the sāman, he becomes renowned. Verily hearing is the renown of the sāman.

I. 40. 1. = I. 7. 5. 2. Speech is the sāman; for with speech one sings the sāman. Speech is the uktha; for with speech one chants the uktha. Speech is the yajus; for with speech he follows out (recites) the yajus. 3. Whatever is is this side of the brahma, all that is speech; and what is elsewhere is taught [to be] brahma. For not at all does one perform with it the priestly office, but it is performed in an occult manner. 4. Of

39. ¹C. -ha. 40. ¹B.C. -hāni. ¹C. -hitāni. ¹C. om. ¹-kī. ¹A.B. vācaṁ. ¹ne. ¹A. om.
etasyai vaco manah padaç caçruh padaç çrottram pada vág eva caturthah padaḥ. 6. tad yad vái manasā dhyāyat tad váci va-
dati. yac caçruh payati tad váci vádati. yac chrotrena çroñoti8
tad váci vádati. 7. tad yañci etat sarvañ vacam eva bhisa-
mayati11 tasmād vág eva sāma. sa hu vái sāmanvit sa sāma veda ya evam
veda. 8. tasya etasya vácaḥ prñā13 eva 'suh. eñu hi 'idam
sarvan asûte13 'ti. 40.

trayaço 'nuvāke prathamah khañdāḥ.

I. 41. 1. tenu hūi 'tenε 'sūnε deva 'jivanti pitaro jivanti ma-
nyaya 'jivanti puçavo jivanti gandharvāpārasa jivanti sarvam
idaṁ jivati. 2. tad uhur yad' osunε 'daṁ sarvam' jivati kus
sāmmo 'sur iti. prñā iti brayah. prño ha váva sāmmo 'suhi.
3. sa esa prño voci pratiññhito vág u prñe pratiññhitā. táv
etav evam anyo1 'nyasmin pratiññhiññu. pratiññhith' ya evam
veda. 4. tad etad rca 'bhyanñciyate
'ditir dyuñr aditir antarikṣam' 6
aditir' matā sa pitā sa putrañā:
viçve deva aditiḥ pañca15 janā
aditir jātam aditir janitvam

this same speech mind is a quarter, sight is a quarter, hearing is
a quarter, speech itself is the fourth quarter. 6. What he thinks
with the mind, that he speaks with speech. What he sees with
sight, that he speaks with speech. What he hears with hearing,
that he speaks with speech. 6. In that this all thus unites
(√i + sam) into speech, therefore speech is the sūman. Verily
he is sūman-knowing, he knows the sūman, who knows thus.
7. The breaths of this same speech are the vital air (asu). For
in them this all was born (√sū).

I. 41. 1. By this same vital air the gods live, the Fathers live,
mex live, beasts live, Gandharvas and Apsarases live, this all
lives. 2. This they say: "If this all lives by the vital air, what
is the vital air of the sūman?" Let him say: "Breath." Verily
breath is the vital air of the sūman. 3. This breath stands firm
in speech, and speech stands firm in breath. Thus these two
stand firm in each other. He stands firm who knows thus.
4. This same is spoken of in a ṛc: "Aditi is the heaven, Aditi is
the atmosphere, Aditi is the mother, she is the father, she is the
son; Aditi is all the gods, the five races; Aditi is what is born,
Aditi is what is to be born."  5. ‘Aditi is the heaven, Aditi is the atmosphere;’ verily she is the heaven, she is the atmosphere.  6. ‘Aditi is the mother, she is the father, she is the son;’ verily she is the mother, she is the father, she is the son.  7. ‘Aditi is all the gods, the five races;’ the gods who were before the Asuras—five races—yonder person which is in the sun, in the moon, in lightning, in the water, within the eye here, that is they, that is she.  8. ‘Aditi is what is born, Aditi is what is to be born;’ verily she is what is born, she is what is to be born.

I. 42. 1. Áruni went to Vāsiṣṭha Cāikitānyaya to serve his studentship. He (V.) said to him (Ā.): “Thou knowest, my dear Gāutama, that we Čāikitānyayas worship this sūman. What divinity dost thou worship?” “The sūman, reverend sirs,” he (Ā.) said. 2. He (Ā.) asked him (V.): “Dost thou know that which is in the fire?” “That is the brightness of that sūman which we worship.” 3. “Dost thou know that which is in the earth?” “That is the firm standing of that sūman which we worship.” 4. “Dost thou know that which is in the waters?” “That is the tranquillity of that sūman which we worship.” 5. “Dost thou know that which is in the atmosphere?” “That
I. 43. 1. "Dost thou know that which is in the sun?" "That is the splendor of that sūman which we worship." 2. "Dost thou know that which is in the moon?" "That is the light of that sūman which we worship." 3. "Dost thou know that which is in the asterrisms?" "That is the understanding of that sūman which we worship." 4. "Dost thou know that which is in food?" "That is the seed of that sūman which we worship." 5. "Dost thou know that which is in the domestic animals?" "That is the glory of that sūman which we worship." 6. "Dost thou know that which is in the yoga?" "That is the action of that sūman which we worship." 7. "Now what dost thou worship?" "The syllable. Which is that syllable?" "[That which flowing (√kṣāra) was..."
I. 44. 1. rūpai-rūpam pratirūpo babhūva
tad asya rūpam pracīkṣāṇāya:
indro māyābhīḥ pururūpaḥ iyate
yuktaḥ hy asya harayaḥ patā dāpe
'ti. 2. rūpai-rūpam pratirūpo babhūve 'ti. rūpai-rūpaṁ hy esa
pratirūpo babhūva. 3. tad asya rūpam pracīkṣāṇāye 'ti. pracīkṣāṇāya
hā 'ayī tu ṛu pām. 4. indro māyābhīḥ pururūpam iyate
iti. māyābhīḥ hy esa etat pururūpam iyate. 5. yuktaḥ hy
not exhausted (√ksa).” “Which is that which flowing was not
exhausted?” “Indra.” 9. “Who is this Indra?” “He who
rests in the eye.” “Who is he who rests in the eye?” “This
divinity,” he said. 10. That person which is in the eye, that
is Indra, that is Prajāpati. [He is] the same with the earth, the
same with space, the same with the sky, the same with all
existence. He shines beyond the sky. He it is who must beworshiped as ‘this all.’ 11. He who knows this thus becomes bright,
having a firm stand, tranquil, self-possessed, fortunate, pervading,
displayed, possessing splendor, possessing light, possessing understanding, possessing seed, glorious, possessing praise, active, possessing the syllable, possessing Indra’s power, possessing the sū-
man. 12. And this is also spoken of in a rc:

I. 44. 1. “He became corresponding in form to every form;
such is his form to look upon; Indra through magic moves about in
many forms, for his ten hundred bay steeds are yoked.”
2. “He became corresponding in form to every form,” for he
came corresponding in form to every form. 3. “Such is his
form to look upon,” verily to look upon his form is such.
4. “Indra through magic moves about in many forms,” for
through magic he thus moves about in many forms. 5. “For
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his ten hundred bay steeds are yoked,' verily these are the thousand rays of the sun; they are yoked for him, with them he takes this all. In that he takes (√/ṛ) with them this all, therefore they are called bay (hari). 6. "Into every form the bounteous one often changes, exercising magic around his own body, when thrice in a moment he hath come from the sky, through his own incantations drinking out of season, the holy one." 7. 'Into every form the bounteous one often changes,' for into every form this bounteous one does often change. s. 'Exercising magic around his own body,' for through magic he thus protects his own body. s. 'When he thrice in a moment hath come from the sky,' for thrice in this moment he goes completely around this earth surveying these people. 10. 'Through his own incantations drinking out of season, the holy one,' for he is thus drinking out of season, the holy one.

I. 45. 1. Now Pṛthu Vāniya inquired this of the divine medicants: "They call Indra uktha, rś, udgītha, brahma, sūman, breath, vīyāna, or they call [him] mind, eye, āpāna, ear; the learned speak [of him] in many ways." 2. They answered: "These hymn-
ṣaya ete mantrakṛṭaḥ purūjāḥ
punar ājāyante vedāṇāṁ guptyaṁ kam:
te vāi vidvāṇo vāiṁya tād vadanti
samāṇam purusam bahudhā nivṛṣṭam
iti. 1. imāṁ ha vā tād devatāṁ trayayāṁ viḍyayāṁ imāṁ
samāṇāṁ abhyāṁ eka ājāyanti nāi' ke. yo ha vāvāi 'tād evāṁ
veda sa evāṁ 'tāṁ devatāṁ sampratī veda. 4. sa eṣa indra
udgāṭhaḥ, sa yadā' sa indra udgāṭha āgaḥcchati nāi' vo 'dgā-
tuṣ co 'pāgarāṇāṁ' ca viṣyāyate. 6. ita evo 'rādhvas'1 svarī' udeti. 
sa upari mūrdhno lelāyati. 5. sa vidyād āgamad indro ne'ha
kaṁ cana pāmā nyanīgah parīṣekṣyata iti. tasmin ha na kaṁ
cana pāmā nyanīgah parīṣīṣya. 6. tad etad abhrātrvyam
sūna. sa ha vā indraḥ kaṁ cana bhṛātrvyam paṣyate. sa yathe
'ndro na kaṁ cana bhṛātrvyam paṣyata evam eva na kaṁ cana
bhṛātrvyam paṣyate ya etad evāṁ vedā 'tho yasyāi' voṁ vi-
vrīn udgāyati. 45.

caturdaśe 'nvāke caturthaḥ khvādaḥ. caturdaśo 'nvākas samāptāḥ.

I. 46. 1. prajāpatir vāveda āgra āśū. so 'kāmayata bahus
syāṁ prajāyeya bhūmānāṁ gṛccheyam iti. 2. sa śoḍaśadhā
"imāṁ tūnār vamukuruta bhadrāṁ ca samāptiḥ ca 'bhūti ca' sam-
composing sages of old are born hither again for the keeping
of the Vedas; verily they knowing [it], O Vāiṁya, say this, that
one and the same person is entered into many places." 2. So
some cause the attainment in the threefold knowledge of this
divinity, this same one, others do not. 4. Verily he who knows
this this, he thoroughly knows this divinity. 5. That same Indra
is the udgāṭha. When this same Indra comes as udgāṭha, he is
not distinguished both of the udgāṭar and the upagāṭars. He
rises upward from here to heaven; he twinkle above the head.
6. He should know: "Indra hath come; no evil whatever, [not
a] trace, will be left here;" truly in him no evil whatever, [not
a] trace, is left. 7. That is the rivalless sūman. Verily Indra
sees no rival whatever. As Indra sees no rival whatever, so he
also sees no rival whatever who knows this thus, and also he for
whom one knowing thus sings the udgāṭha.

I. 46. 1. Prajāpati in the beginning was the Veda. He de-

dired: "May I be many, may I beget progeny, may I attain
manifoldness." 2. He divided himself into sixteen parts: bliss

45. 1 A. trāṣya; B. trīṣya. 4 A.B. imāṁ. 4-nā. 4 C. ny. 7 A.B. ha
vi. 7 ya vai. 9 A.B. -tṛn-. 10 insert ti. 11 rādhva. 12 svara. 13 pariṣe-
46. 1 C. ce.
bhūtīc ca bhūtani ca sarvān ca rūpaṁ ca 'parimitan ca śrīc ca maṇe ca nāma ca 'prāṇaṁ ca saṣṭitaṁ ca pāyaṁ ca māhīyān ca rasaṁ ca. 1. tad yad bhadrān hṛdayam asya tat tattva saṁvatsaraṁ asṛjata. tad asya saṁvatsaro 'nāpatiṣṭhate. 2. saṁśiptih kāruṇa 'syā tat. kāruṇā hi saṁpratīti. tataḥ tūn asṛjate. tad asya rtavo 'nāpatiṣṭhante. 3. ubhūtār annam asyo 'tat. 4. [tac] caṭurāṇiḥ bhavati. tato mūśān ardhamaṁśān ahorātrīṁ usasō 'sejata. tad asya mūśā ardhamaṁśā ahorātrīṁ usasō 'nāpatiṣṭhante. 5. saṁbhūti reto 'syā tad. retaso hi saṁbhavati.

pañcaaduc e 'nāke prathamaṁ khaṇḍāṁ.

I. 47. 1. tattvā candramasam asṛjata. tad asya candramā 'nāpatiṣṭhate. tasmāt sa retasoḥ pratirūpaḥ. 2. bhūtani prāṇo 'syā sah. tato vāyūm asṛjata. tad asya vāyur 'nāpatiṣṭhate. 3. sarvam api 'syā sah. tataḥ praṇān asṛjate. tad asya praṇaṃ 'nāpatiṣṭhante. 4. rūpaṁ vṛūna 'syā sah. tataḥ praṇaḥ asṛjata. tad asya praṇaḥ 'nāpatiṣṭhante. tasmād asu praṇām rūpāṇy adhīgamante. 5. aparimitatī muni 'syā tat. tato diṣo 'sṛjate. and attainment and energy and growth and existence and the all and form and the infinite and fortune and glory and name and the summit and the fellows and milk and exaltation and sap. 2. What bliss is, that is his heart. Thence he created the year. That of him the year attends upon. 4. Attainment, that is his action. For by action one attains. Thence he created the seasons. That of him the seasons attend upon. 5. Energy, that is his food; that becomes four-fold. Thence he created months, half-months, nights and days, dawns. That of him months, half-months, nights and days, dawns attend upon. 6. Growth, that is his seed. For from seed one grows.

I. 47. 1. Thence he created the moon. That of him the moon attends upon. Therefore one corresponds to the seed. 2. Existence, that is his breath. Thence he created the wind. That of him the wind attends upon. 3. The all, that is his apāna. Thence he created the domestic animals. That of him the domestic animals attend upon. 4. Form, that is his vṛūna. Thence he created offspring. That of him offspring attends upon. Therefore among this offspring forms are found. 5. The infinite, that is his mind. Thence he created the quarters. That
of him the quarters attend upon. Therefore they are infinite; for infinite, as it were, is mind. 6. Fortune, that is his speech. Thence he created the ocean. That of him the ocean attends upon. 7. Glory, that is his heat (penance). Thence he created fire. That of him the fire attends upon. Therefore it is born from the churned, as it were, from the thoroughly heated, as it were. 8. Name, that is his eye.

I. 48. 1. Thence he created the sun. That of him the sun attends upon. 2. The summit, that is his head. Thence he created the sky. That of him the sky attends upon. 3. The fellows, those are his limbs. For with his limbs one is born. Thence he created the forest-trees. That of him the forest-trees attend upon. 4. Milk, that is the hair of his body. Thence he created the herbs. That of him the herbs attend upon. 5. Exaltation, that is his flesh. For with the flesh one is exalted (?). Thence he created the birds. That of him the birds attend upon. Therefore they fly forth. Forth-flying (elastic ?) as it were are the large [pieces of] flesh (?) 6. The sap, that is his marrow. Thence he created the earth. That of him the earth attends upon. 7. He thus having divided himself into sixteen parts came together. Because he came together (\(\sqrt{i+s+am}\),

"tmānāṁ viśvāya sārdhaṁ samāsit. tad yat sārdhaṁ samāsitat" tat sāmnas sāmnatravam. 9. sa evāḥ "sa hiraṃmayāḥ puruṣa ud-
atiṣṭhat prajānāṁ janītā."

pañcadaśe 'nvāke trtiyāh khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 49. 1. devāsūrā uśpādhaṇa. te devāḥ prajāpataṁ upāddā-
vāḥ jayāṁ 'surīṇ iti. 2. so 'brahīṁ na vai māṁ yūyam víthha
nā 'surīṛḥ. yod vai māṁ yūyam vidyātā tato vai yūyam eva
syāta paraḥ bhāvyena iti. 3. tad vai bṛhīḥ 'tya aubrvaun. so
'brahī puruṣaḥ prajāpata sāme 'ti mo 'pāddhram. tato vai yū-
yam eva bhavīṣyathā paraḥ 'surīḥ bhavīṣyaṁ 'ti. 4. tam puru-
ṣaḥ prajāpata sāme 'tya upāsata. tato vai devā aubhavan para
'surīḥ. sa yṛkai 'vaṁ vidūn puruṣaḥ prajāpata sāme 'tya upa-
ste bhavatī utmanā paraḥ 'aya devaṁ bhūtātābh bhavati. 49.
pañcadaśe 'nvāke caturthāh khaṇḍaḥ. pañcadaśe 'nvākas samāpāṭaḥ.

I. 50. 1. devā vai viṣṇīyāṁ aubrvaun doṭiyaṁ caravāmahāī. 
mā doṭiyām bhāme 'ti. te 'bravaun sāmī 'va doṭiyaṁ caravā-
mahāī. sāmī 'ra no doṭiyam astv iti. 2. ta ime dyāvāpṛthivi
aubhava sametāṁ sāma prajānayatam iti. 3. so 'sāv asyā abh-
hatata. so 'brahī bhūḥ rā etasyāṁ kiṁ ca kiṁ ca kūryanty

that is the reason why the sāman is called so. 8. That same
one arose, a golden person, a generator of offspring.

I. 49. 1. The gods and the Asuras contended. These gods
ran unto Prajāpataṁ [for help, saying]: "Let us overcome the
Asuras." 2. He said: "Verily you do not know me, neither do
the Asuras. Verily if you should know, then you would prevail,
the Asuras would perish." 3. "Tell that," they said. He said:
"Worship me [saying]: 'Puruṣa, Prajāpata, Sāman.' Verily
you will then prevail, the Asuras will perish." 4. They wor-
shiped him [saying]: "Puruṣa, Prajāpata, Sāman." Thereupon
the gods verily prevailed, the Asuras perished. He who know-
ing thus worships [saying]: "Puruṣa, Prajāpata, Sāman," pre-
vails himself, his hostile rival perishes.

I. 50. 1. The gods, having completely conquered, said: "Let
us make a second; let us not be without a second." They said:
"Let us make the sāman the second; let the sāman be our
second." 2. They said to this sky and earth: "Unite, bring
forth the sāman." Yonder [sky] strongly abhorred this [earth].
adhisthivancyādharicarantyadhyāsate. pūnita nva enam aparťā vā iti. 4. te gāthām abravan tvayā punāme 'ti. kī m tatus syād iti. gatasanisā syā iti. tathe 'ti. te gāthāyā 'punana. tasmād uta gāthāyā gatāmi sunoti. 5. te kumbyām abravan tvayā punāme 'ti. kī m tatus syād iti. gatasanisā syā iti. tathe 'ti. te kumbyāyā' 'punana. tasmād uta kumbyāyā gatāmi sunoti. 6. te nārāganvisām abravan tvayā punāme 'ti. kī m tatus syād iti. gatasanisā syā iti. tathe 'ti. te nārāganisyā 'punana. tasmād uta nārāganisyā gatāmi sunoti. 7. te rādhūmi abravan tvayā punāme 'ti. kī m tatur syād iti. gatasanisā syā iti. tathe 'ti. te rābhyā 'punana. tasmād uta rābhyā gatāmi sunoti. 8. se 'yam pātā. aṭhā 'mum abarid bahu vāi kī m ca kī m ca punaṇc carati. tvam' anvupu-nisve 'ti. 50.

śoṣaṇe 'nivāke prathamaḥ khanyataḥ.

I. 51. 1. sa ālabena' punita. pūtāmi ha va asya sāmāni pūtā rcaḥ pūtāmi yajūṣi pūtam anuktam pūtam survam bhavati ya

He said: "Verily they do much on her of this kind and of that, they spit on her, they go about on her, they sit on her. Cleanse her now; verily she is unclean." 8. They said to the gāthā: "With thee we will cleanse [her]." "What would be the consequence?" "Thou wouldst be gainer of a hundred." "Very well." They cleansed [her] with the gāthā. And therefore one obtains a hundred with the gāthā. 4. They said to the kumbyā: "With thee we will cleanse [her]." "What would be the consequence of it?" "Thou wouldst be gainer of a hundred." "Very well." They cleansed [her] with the kumbyā. And therefore one obtains a hundred with the kumbyā. 5. They said to the nārāgaṇisā: "With thee we will cleanse [her]." "What would be the consequence of it?" "Thou wouldst be gainer of a hundred." "Very well." They cleansed [her] with the nārāgaṇisā. And therefore one obtains a hundred with the nārāgaṇisā. 6. They said to the rābhi: "With thee we will cleanse [her]." "What would be the consequence of it?" "Thou wouldst be gainer of a hundred." "Very well." They cleansed [her] with the rābhi. And therefore one obtains a hundred with the rābhi. 7. This [earth] here [was] cleansed. Then she said to yonder [sky]: "Verily much does a man practice of this sort and of that; cleanse thyself also."

I. 51. 1. He cleansed himself with noise (?). Verily the sāmanas are cleansed, the re's are cleansed, the yajuses are

50. 1-gāhīm. 4-nī; C. -nī, and so all MSS. in 5, 6, and 7. 1 C. -bhīm.
A.B. repeat 5. 7 C. tena. 10 C. gatāni. 11-bhīm. 12 C. ta. 13 lam.
51. 1-lav.; B. ālāvānām. 2-vām.
evāṁ veda. 2. te satemya sāma prājanayatām. 3. tad yat sametya sāma prājanayatām tat sāmaṃ sāmaṃvar. 4. tad idam sāma vṛṣṭaṃ adā uktamya leśyaṃ atiśat. tasya sarve deva māmatvina āsan mama mumeś ti. 5. te 'bravian vi 'dam bhajāmaḥ iti. tasya vibhūge na samopūdīyaṃ. tān prajāpati abhavib apeta. mama va etat. aham eva vo vībhakṣyāmi ti. 6. so 'gnīm abravit tvam vai me jyeṣṭhaḥ pūruṣām asi. tvam prathamo vṛnīṣe ti. 7. so 'braviṃ mandraṁ sāmaṇo vṛṇe 'nādyan' iti. sa ya etad gūyād annāda eva so 'san mūm u sa devaḥnīm rechād ya evaṁ vidvīśaṃ etad gūyantaṃ upavadād iti. 8. atha 'trām abravit tvam anuvṛniṣe ti. 9. so 'braviūv rūpaṁ sāmaṇo vṛṇe priyaṁ iti. sa ya etad gūyāt priya eva sa kirtē priyaḥ caksuṇāḥ priyā cakṣusēva sam mūm u sa devaḥnīm rechād ya evaṁ vidvīśaṃ etad gūyantaṃ upavadād iti. 10. atha bhārapati abravit tvam" anuvṛniṣe" ti. 11. so 'braviḥ krāuḍe na sāmaṇo vṛṇe bhāmavacarasam iti.

cleansed, the unākta is cleansed, the all is cleansed of him who knows thus. 2. These two having united generated the sāman. Because they having united (√i+sam) generated the sāman, therefore the sāman is called so. 3. This same sāman, having been created, coming up there stood twinkling. All the gods were desirous of possessing it [saying]: "[It is] mine, [it is] mine." 4. They said: "Let us share it out among ourselves." They did not agree in its division. Prajāpati said to them: "Go away! Verily, this is mine. I will share it out among you." 5. He said to Agni: "Verily, thou art the eldest of my sons; choose thou first." 6. He (A.) said: "I choose the soft (piano) of the sāman, i.e. the food-eating. Whosoever shall sing this, may he be a food-eater; and may he encounter me of the gods who speaketh ill of one who knoweth thus, who singeth this." 7. Then he (P.) said to Indra: "Choose thou after [him]." 8. He (I.) said: "I choose the strong of the sāman, i.e. fortune. Whosoever shall sing this, may he be fortunate; and may he encounter me of the gods who speaketh ill of one who knoweth thus, who singeth this. 9. Then he said to Soma: "Choose thou after [him]." 10. He (S.) said: "I choose the pleasant of the sāman, i.e. the dear. Whosoever shall sing this, may he be dear to fame, dear to sight, dear to all, and may he encounter me of the gods who speaketh ill of one who knoweth thus, who singeth this. 11. Then he (P.) said

su ya etad gñáád brahmavacarsay eva so ‘tan mám u sa devánum \( \)rechád ya evam vidvá̄nsam etad gñáyantam upavadád iti. 51.

\( \)sodeçe ‘nudake devitāh khanḍaḥ.

I. 52. 1. atha vippán deváñ abrávid yúyam anuvñídhvan iti. 2. te ‘bryan viyúvadevaná sanño vñímahe prajñanam iti. sa ya etad gñáyátm prajánán eva so ‘sad’ asáman u devánum \( \)rechád ya evam vidvá̄̄nsam etad gñáyantam upavadád iti. 3. atha paçana abrávid yúyam anuvñídhvan iti. 4. te ‘bryan vñúyá vñúkam ipé. sa eva no varisya\( h\) iti. te vñúyác ca paçávac ca ‘bryan niruktañ sanño vñímahe paçávyan iti. sa ya etad gñáyat papaumán eva so ‘sad asáman u ca sa vñúyam ca devánum \( \)rechád ya evam vidvá̄̄nsam etad gñáyantam upavadád iti. 5. atha prajñapati abrávid aham anuvñíśya iti. 6. so ‘brávid aniruktañ sanño upe svargam iti. sa ya etad gñáyat svargaloka eva so ‘san’ mám u sa devánum \( \)rechád ya evam vidvá̄̄nsam etad gñáyantam upavadád iti. 7. atha varúnan abrávid tvam anuvñíśve ’ti. 8. so ‘brávid yad vo na kač cañá ’vrtu tad aham pāriha-

to Bṛhaspati: “Choose thou after [him].” He (B.) said: “I choose the plover-like of the sáman, i. e. excellence in sacred lore. Whosoever shall sing this, may he be excellent in sacred lore; and may he encounter me of the gods who speaketh ill of one who knoweth thus, who singeth this.”

I. 52. 1. Then he said to all the gods: “Choose ye after [him].” 2. They said: “We choose that of the sáman which belongs to all the gods, i. e. generation. Whosoever shall sing this, may he be rich in generation, and may he encounter us of the gods who speaketh ill of one who knoweth thus, who singeth this.” 3. Then he said to the domestic animals: “Choose ye after [them].” They said: “Váyu is our lord; he will choose for us.” 4. They, Váyu and the domestic animals, said: “We choose the distinct [part] of the sáman, i. e. that which belongs to the domestic animals. Whosoever shall sing this, may he be rich in domestic animals; and may he encounter us and Váyu of the gods who speaketh ill of one who knoweth thus, who singeth this.” 5. Then Prajñapati said: “I will choose after [them].” 6. He said: “I choose the indistinct [part] of the sáman, i. e. that which belongs to heaven. Whosoever shall sing this, may he be in possession of the heavenly world, and may he encounter me of the gods who speaketh ill of one who knoweth thus, who singeth this.” 7. Then he said to Varúna: “Choose thou after [me].” 8. He said:

\[52. 1\] B. inserts ma. 1 insert from below ca sa vñúyam. 2 C. varis̄ha. 3 antir-. 4 B. -ug. 4 A.B. omit the rest, to iti. 4 A.B. ti. 4 A.B. svargam. 4 B. samui.
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risya
ti. kim iti. apadhvántañi
sámno vrñe 'paçavyam iti. sa ya etad gáyád apaçur' eva so 'san mám u sa devánám
tchád' ya etad gáyád iti. t vú ná etúñ ašúñ gítágitá
sámañá. imáñ u ha váí sapta gítáñi. athe' yam eva váruny
ágá 'gítá. 10. sa yáñ ha káñ
cáí 'váñ vidván etáseñ sápta-
náñ ágáñáñ gáyáti gítam evá 'nya bhavaty etáñ u káñáñ
rádhno
eya etáñ káñáñ. athe 'máñ eva várunim ágáñ na
gáyet. 52.
soḍáçe 'núvike třiñañ khañçañ. soḍáço 'núvákañ samáptáñ.

I. 53. 1. dánvañá vavé 'dam ágra ásit sac cáí 'vá 'sac ev.
tayor yát sat tat sáma tan manas sa práñáñ. atha yád asat
sa raká sa vák so 'pínañá. 3. tád yán manañ ca pránañ ca tat
súmámañ. atá vá vák cá 'pánañ ca tat súmañam. ídám ágya-
nam manañ ca pránañ ca 'dam áyatanáná vák cá 'pánañ ca
sasmá t páman dákśinátá yośám upáçe. 4. se 'yam yā asmi
sámañ' mithámañ úccháta. tám apréchát ká trome aši 'tí. sá
'ham asmi 'ty ubrúvít. atha vá aham anam 'smí 'tí. 5. tád yát sá

"What no one of you hath chosen, with that I will gird myself (?)."
"What is it?" "I choose the ill-sounding [part] of the sáman,
i.e. that which does not belong to the domestic animals. Whoso-
ever shall sing this, may he be without domestic animals, and
may he encounter me of the gods who singeth this." 1. These
same then are eight [ágá] of the sáman, sung and unsung; and
verily these seven are sung, but this ágá belonging to Varuña
is not sung. 10. Whichever of these seven ágás any one know-
ing thus sings, of him [the sáman?] is sung, and he accomplishes
those wishes which are in these [ágá]. And this ágá belonging
to Varuña one should not sing.

I. 53. 1. Verily, this [all] was twofold in the beginning: the
existent and the non-existent. 2. Of these two the existent, that
is the sáman, the mind, breath; and the non-existent, that is the
re, speech, exhalation. That which is mind and breath, that is
the same; and that which is speech and exhalation, that is the
same. This resting-place is mind and breath; this resting-place
is speech and exhalation. Therefore a man lies by a woman at
the right side. 4. This re desired intercourse with this sáman.
He (the sáman) asked her (the re): "Who art thou?" She
answered: "I am she (sá)." "Verily, then, I am he (ama)."
5. What was she (sá) and he (ama), that became the sáman; that

52. 10. A.B. -hryyy; A.B. -yata. 11 A.B. apaddhamálam; C. apadhmá-
tam. 12 C. pác. 13 A. prim. m. rddhd. 14 B. -tha; C. katha. 15 A. -
16 A.B. kámá. 17 C. niruddhá; A.B. niruddháti.
53. 11. B. myak; after this A.B. insert asmy adadya bhavite 'ti; C. asy
ty (space) bhavite 'ti (a misplaced gloss?). 1-ná. 12 C. upáçete.
cā 'mać ca tat sāmā 'bhavat tat sāmanas sāmatvam. 1. tāv vāi
sambhāvāvē 'ti. ne 'ty abravīt svasā vāi manā tvam asy anyatra
mithunam icchauvē 'ti. 1. sā 'bravīt na vāi taṁ vīndāmi yena
sambhāveya' 'tvayā 'va sambhāvānī 'ti. sā vāi punisve 'ty
abravīt. aprītā vā asī 'ti. 2. sā 'punita yad īdāṁ viprā' vadiantī
tena. sā 'bravīt kve 'dam bhavisyatī 'ti. pratyuhe 'ty abravīt.
dhīr vā esā. prajānāṁ jīvanāṁ vā etad bhavisyatī 'ti. tathē 'ti.
tat pratyāuhat. tasmād esā dhīr eva prajānāṁ jīvanāṁ eva.
3. punisve 'ty abravīt. sā 'punīta gāthāyā sā 'punīta kumbhayā' 4
sā 'punīta nārāpaneyā sā 'punīta puruṣetihūṣena sā 'punīta yad
īdāṁ' ādāya nā' āgyantī tena. 10. sā 'bravīt kve 'dam bhavis-
yatī 'ti. pratyuhe 'ty abravīt. dhīr vā esā. prajānāṁ jīvanāṁ
vā etad bhavisyatī 'ti. tathē 'ti. tat pratyāuhat. tasmād esā dhīr
v eva prajānāṁ jīvanāṁ eva. 11. punisvai 've 'ty abravīt. 53.
saptadace 'nuvāke prathamāḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 54. 1. sā madhunā 'punīta.' tasmād uṭa brahmācārī madhū
nā 'cniyād vedasya patha dev. kāmāṁ ha tv ācāryadattam
acniyāt. 2. atha rk sāmā 'bravīd bahu vāi kīṁ ca kīṁ ca
is the reason why the sāman is called so. 6. “Let us two here
have intercourse.” “No,” he said, “verily thou art my sister;
desire intercourse elsewhere.” 7. She said: “Verily, I find no
one with whom I might have intercourse; let me have inter-
course with thee.” “Then cleanse thyself,” he said; “verily
thou art unclean.” 8. She cleansed herself with that which the
inspired bards say. She said: “What is to become of this?”
“Cast it back,” he said; “verily this is device; it will become
the living of people.” “Yes.” She cast it back. Therefore is this
device the living of people. 9. “Cleanse thyself,” he said. She
cleansed herself with the gāthā, she cleansed herself with the
kumbhā, she cleansed herself with the nārāpanē, she cleansed
herself with the puruṣa and itihāsa, she cleansed herself with
that which they do not sing here when starting (?). 10. She said:
“What is to become of it?” “Cast it back,” he said; “verily
this is device. It will become the living of people.” “Yes.”
She cast it back. Therefore this is both device and the living
of people. 11. “Cleanse thyself,” he said.

I. 54. 1. She cleansed herself with honey. And therefore a
Vedic student should not eat honey [saying]: “[It is] the husk
of the Veda.” But he may eat at pleasure what his teacher gives
him. 2. Now the rc said to the sāman: “Verily much does a
man practice of one sort and another; cleanse thyself also.” He cleansed himself with ...... = I. 51. 1. 1. They enclosed the sadas for their intercourse. Therefore in the night of the fast-day one should not lie in the sadas; for there, in the sadas, these two, re and sūman, have intercourse in the night of the fast-day. For, as one who spies upon a superior, even so he, apprehended, is altogether likely to perish. 4. Now they say: “In the mouth of the udgātār they have intercourse; one should not look at the mouth of the udgātār.” 5. But they also say this: “He may look at pleasure at the mouth of the udgātār. Only in this night of the fast-day he should not lie in the sadas; for there, in the sadas, these two, re and sūman, have intercourse in the night of the fast-day.” 6. When he was about to have intercourse with her, he said: “I am he, thou art she; thou art she, I am he; becoming obedient to me (my wife), let us generate offspring. Come! let us have intercourse.” 7. When he had intercourse with her, he exceeded. He said: “Verily, I am not adapted to thee. Having become the virāj let us two generate.” “Yes.” 8. They, having become the virāj, generated. [As] hiṃkāra and ōhāva and prastāvā and first [āgā?] and udgīthā and middle [āgā?] and pratiḥāra and last [āgā?] and nidhana

yatām," te amum ajanayatāṁ yo 'sāu tapati. te vyadravatāṁ." 54.

saptadaśe 'nuvāke dvitiyāḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 55. 1. mad adhy abhūṣn mad adhy abhūṣd iti, tasmād āhur madhuputraś iti. 2. tasmād nā traśrīyo madhu nā 'ṣantī putrāṁ idaṁ vrataṁ carūna iti vadantuḥ. 3. tad ayaṁ tṛco 'nūda- śrayata, iyam eṣa gāyatry antarikṣanāṁ triṣṭub asāu jagati. tasyāṁ 'tat tṛcoḥ. 4. sa upariṣṭāt sūmā 'dhyāhitāṁ tapati. sa 'dhrupa itā 'sid adeśyad itva. sa no 'rvhāv 'tapat. 5. sa devāṁ abravid unā mā gāyate 'tī. kiṁ tatas syād iti. gṛiyāṁ vah pra- yaccheyam. mām iha dṛṣhete 'tī. 6. tathē 'tī. tam udagāyan. tam etad atrā 'drāhan, te bhṛya gṛiyām prāyaçchat. sā 'sā devāṁ grīḥ. 7. tata etad ārdhvas tapati. sa nā 'rvnā atapat. 8. sa rāśīn abravid unā mā gāyate 'tī. kiṁ tatas syād iti. gṛiyāṁ vah prāyaçcheyam. mām iha dṛṣhete 'tī. 9. tathē 'tī. tam anragāyan. tam etad atrā 'drāhan. te bhṛya gṛiyām prāyaçchat. sā 'sā rāśīn grīḥ. 9. tata etad arvāṁ tapati. sa na tiryahā
d and vāsamāra—thus having become the virūj they brought forth. They generated him who burns yonder. They ran apart—

I. 55. 1.—[saying]: "Hath he originated from me (mad adhy abhūt)? Hath he originated from me?" Therefore they say "honey-son" (madhuputra). And therefore women do not eat honey, saying: "We perform this vow of sons." 2. Then this tripod rose up in consequence: this [earth] the gāyatṛi; the atmosphere the triṣṭubh; yonder [sky] the jagati. That is its tripod. 3. He (yonder sun) burns on high, a sūman set above. He was unstable, as it were; he twinkled, as it were. He did not burn upward. 4. He said to the gods: "Sing me the udgītha." "What would be the result?" "I would bestow fortune upon you. Make me firm here."
5. "Very well." They sang him the udgītha. They thus made him firm there. He bestowed fortune upon them. That is that fortune of the gods. 6. Hence he thus burns upwards. He did not burn hitherward. 7. He said to the sages (ṛṣi): "Sing. after me." "What would be the result of it?" "I would bestow fortune upon you. Make me firm here." "Very well." They sang after him. They thus made him firm there. He bestowed fortune upon them. That is that fortune of the sages. 8. Hence he thus burns hitherward.
atapat. 10. sa gandharvāpsarasas brahīd a mā gāyate ti. kim
tataśiṃ syād iti. gṛiṇāṁ vah prayaccheyam. mām iha dhṛhetē ti.
11. tatē ti. tam āgāyan. tam etad atrā dhṛhai. tebhyaś gṛiṇam
prāyaçchat. sū tiṣṭa gandharvāpsarasāṁ gṛih. 12. tata etat
tiryaṇaḥ tapati. 13. tāni vā etāni triṇī śānma udgatam anugitam
āgītam. tad yathe ‘daśi rayam āgāyō’’ āgāyaṃ etad udgatam.”
atha yat yathāgītaṃ tad anugitam. atha yat kim re ‘ti śānmas
tad āgītam. etāni hy eva triṇī śānnaḥ. 55.

saptadaśe ‘nūvēke tīryaṁ khaṇḍaḥ. saptadāśo ‘nūvākas samāptaḥ.

I. 56. 1. āpo vā idam agre mahat salilam āsīt. sa ārmim
ārmim askandat. 2. tato hiraṃmayaū kuksyāū samadhañataūn
te eva rksāne. 3. se ‘yaun ‘rg idaśī śānma ‘bhyaçplavata.’
tām aparato kā tvam āsī ‘ti. 4. sa ‘ham āsmai ‘ty abravit. atha vā ākam
amo ‘sūti. 5. tad yat ‘sū ca ‘maś ca tat śānmas śāmatam. 6. tāu
vāi sumbhavaṇa ‘ti. ne ‘ty abravit svāsī vāi māma tvam aśi.
anyatra mithunaṃ icchase ‘ti. 7. 8. parīplavata mithunaṃ
icchamāṇa. 9. 10. samās sahasraid saptatō pariplavata. 11. tād
ēsa ṣlokas

He did not burn crosswise. 10. He said to the Gandharvas
and Apsarasas: “Sing unto me.” “What would be the result of it?”
“I would bestow fortune upon you. Make me firm here.”
11. “Very well.” They sang unto him. They thus made him
firm there. He bestowed fortune upon them. That is that
fortune of the Gandharvas and Apsarasas. 12. Hence he thus burns
crosswise. 13. Verily these are the three of the śāman [viz.]:
what is sung as udgītha, what is sung after (anugīta), what is
sung unto (ūgīta). As we here having sung unto sing the udgītha,
that is what is sung as udgītha; and what is sung like the ūgīta,
that is which is sung after; and anything of the śāman
[that is sung], that is sung unto. For there are just these three
[parts] of the śāman.

I. 56. 1. This all was at first the waters, a great flood. One
wave mounted [the other] wave. Thence two golden wombs
came into being, these two [viz.]: re and śāman. 2. This same
re floated unto that same śāman. = I. 53. 3. = I. 53. 4.
4. She floated away desiring intercourse. She floated around a
thousand seventy of years. 5. Regarding this there is this

56. 1-da. 4-kṛṣṇa. 4-ṣeṇa. 4-rkkasā-. 5. A. hyaḷ-. 4.A.B. papaṟa-. 
strī smātī 'cā 'gre saṁcarati? 'cchanti' salile patim:
smās sahasraṁ saptāsis tato jāyata paśyata
ii. 6. asau ca ādityaḥ paśyataḥ, 6 esa eva tadā aśīyata. etena
hi paśyati. 7. sā 'citrā ī nyapārata. sā 3 brahmi na vai tāṁ
vindāmi yena sambheyaṁ, trāyai 3 ra saṃbhavaiṁ ti. 8. sā
vāi dvītīyām icchase 'tirabravina na vai māi ko 'dyāṁyaśaśi ti.'
sā dvītīyaṁ vitrā ī nyapārata. 9. [trīyām] icchavāt 'reī 'tī yabravin na vacā māī ōcī udyanāyaṁ iti. sā trītīyām
vitrā ī nyapārata. so 'bravē ātra vai mo 'dyāṁyaśaśe ti.'
v. 10. sa yad ekayā 'gre samavadatu tasmād ekvācī sāma. atha
yad ācē apāśedhit tasmād devor na kurcanti. atha yat ticē
bhiś 9 samapādaśat tasmād u tēe sāma. 11. tā abravin pūnī-
dhāraṁ na pūtā vai śhe 'ti. 56.

aśādaće 'nurāke prathaṁ khaṇḍah.

I. 57. 1. sā gaśvatī gāthayā 'punāta nārāśaśyāī trīśub rāi-
ḥya jagnā. bhīmam bataṁ malam apāravādita 'ti. tasmād
bhīmalē dhiyo vā etāḥ. dhiyo vā imā malam apāravāditaś 'ti.

pūkā: "In the beginning the woman used to go seeking [her] lord
in the flood, one thousand seventies of years; thence the bea-
teous one was born." 6. Yonder sun is the beauteous one (pa-
śyata); he was born then, for by him one sees (paśyati). 7. She,
not having found [anyone], floated in. She said: "Verily I find no
one with whom I might have intercourse. Let me have inter-
course with thee." 8. "Then seek a second one," he said; "verily
not alone wilt thou sustain me." She, having found a second
one, floated in. 9. "Seek a third one," he said; "verily ye two
will not sustain me." She, having found a third one, floated in.
He said: "Verily now you will sustain me." 10. Because he
talked first with one, therefore the sāma is in one re. And
because he refused two, therefore they do not do (sing) it in
two [re's]. And because he agreed with three, therefore the
sāma is in a triplet. 11. He said to them: "Cleanse yourselves,
verily you are not clean."

I. 57. 1. That gaśvatī cleansed itself with the gāthā, the trī-
śubh with the nārāśaśyā, the jagnā with the rāibhi. "Lo, they
have struck away fearful (bhīma) defilement (mañā)." Therefore
these devices are terrible (? bhīmata). "Verily, these de-
vice have struck away defilement." And therefore [they are]
terrible (? bhīmata). And therefore one should not eat [any-

58. 7 C. saṃfi. 6 -ti. 9 paśyāh. 8 tam. 11 pūtā. 12 A. om. sa ... 
nypārata. 11 C. -yam. 12 A. B. rāi. 13 C. rā. 14 C. leaves space: A. B.
dine. 15 C. abr. 16 B.C. -svarv. 17 C. -pad. 18 A. B. tīru-. 19 sāmpa.
57. 1 A. B. -syot. 1 A. ba. 2 C. -the.
tasmuḍ u bhūmalah. tasmuḍ u gāyntaṁ nā `pniyāt, mālana hy ete jīvantī. 2. atha rāk ṣaṁā ḍraśīva bāhu vīś kiṁ ca kiṁ ca puṁśaṁ carati. tvam annaṇumśye `tī. sa ārdhva-gaṇena `punita. 3. pūtāṁ ha vā aṣaṁ sāmāṁ pūtā caḥ pūtāṁ yajñāṇī pūtāṁ anūktam pūtaṁ sarvam bhavati ya evam veda. 4. tāḥhyaṁ diṣo mithunāya paryāhan. tāṁ saṁbhavīṣyaṁ aḥvaivyātī, `mo `ham asmi sū tvam sūtvam asy am in `ham iti. 5. tāṁ etad ubhayato vaćā tyarīcyate hiṇka-rena purastat stobhena madhyato nīdhaneno `pariśāt, ati tiṣo brāhmaṇa-yanīś sadṛṣī ricyate ya evam veda. 6. tāyor yus smabhavātor ārdhvac āśo drat [prānuś] te te prāṇa eva `rdhvā aḍravan. 7. so `sāv ʿadityas sa esava ud aṁira eva gī candramā eva tham. sāmāṇy eva ud rea eva gī yajñasya eva tham ity udhiyevan. 8. atha ʿdhyaṁ-tam. prāṇa eva ud vīg eva gī muna eva tham. sa eso ʿdhivevataṁ ca ʿdhyaṁ-tam co ʿdgīthāḥ. 9. so sarva eva evam eso adhiyevataṁ ca ʿdhyaṁ-tam ca ʿdgīthāṁ vediḥ ʿtenu hā ʿnya sarvevaj lo ʿdgītām bhavatī etasmuḍ u eva sarvamād ʿnye cyate ya evam vidvānas uvavatu vavat 57.

agādaṁce `nunāke dvitiyaḥ khanḍaḥ.

thing] of those singing; for they live on defilement (mula). 2. Then the re said to the sāman: “Verily, much does a man practice of this sort and of that. Cleanse thyself also.” He cleansed himself with the upper series (?). 3. = I. 51. 4. They enclosed the quarters for their intercourse. When he was about to have intercourse with her, he called out: “I am he, thou art she; thou art she, I am he.” 5. With speech he thus exceeded her on both sides, with the hiṅkāra in front, with the stobha in the middle, with the niḍhana in the rear. Three similar women of the Brahman caste exceeds he who knows thus. 6. The vital blast which when they had intercourse ran upward, that is the breaths. These breaths ran upward. 7. Yonder sun, that same is ud, Agni is gī, the moon is tham. The sāmūns are ud, the re’s are gī, the yajuses are tham. So with regard to the divinities. 8. Now with regard to the self. Breath is ud, speech is gī, mind is tham. That is this udgīthā with regard both to the divinities and to the self. 9. He who thus knows the udgīthā with regard both to the divinities and to the self, verily his udgīthā is sung by this all; and he is cut off from this all who speaks ill of one who knows thus.

57. 4-tā. 5 A. ṣiṁ. 5 A. Rkk. 6-tāni. 8 A. -tā. 8 A. nūk. 10-syaṇa. 11 A. aṣaṇya; B.C. aḥvaṇa. 11 A.B. sānu. 15 C. -cā. 15 A.B. tyarīcyate. 15 A.B. cū. 15 A.B. dra-. 17 A. -dha-. 15 C. gīth. 15 C. -gīth-. 20 A. bhavatye `tī; B. bhavanti.
I. 58. 1. tad yad idam ahuh ka udagasir iti ka etam adivyan agasir' iti ha va etat prachanta. 2. etam ho va etam tvraya' vidyayu ganyanty. yathā vināgāthino gāpayeyur evam. 3. sa esa hradā' kāmanyam purṇo yan manah. tasyā' 'śā kulyā' yad vikā. 4. tad yathā' va apo' hradāt kulyayo 'parām upa-nayanty' evam evai 'tan manaso 'dhi vāco 'dgūtā yajamānam' yaya kāmān prayacchati. 5. sa ya udgātārūnī daksinābhīrūruhayati' tan sū kulyo' padhāvati. ya u evam nū rādhāyati sa u tām aprīhanti. 6. atra va atā' pratīcī' caī 'va pratigrāhuć ca. tad dhūmam' iti vāi prādiyate. tad vācā yajamānāya pradeyam manasā 'tmane.' tathā ha sarvai na prayacchati. 7. tad yad idam sambhavato reto 'sicyata' tad asayati. yathā hirnyaam avikṛtau' lelayad evam. 8. tasya sarve devā mamati. tva anumāna mametī. te 'bruvan vi 'daim karavaṁmāhā iti. te 'bruvan chreyo' va idam asmat. utmahīr evaś 'nud vikaravaṁ- mahā iti. 9. tad utmahīr eva vyukurvata. teśāṁ vāyur eva hiśkāra asa 'gniḥ prastāva indra ādīs somabṛhaspati' udgitho 'gvinīṃ pratihāro vícve devā upadravāh prajāpati eva nidha-

I. 58. 1. When they say here: "As who hast thou sung the udgitha?" they ask this: "As who hast thou sung this sun?" 2. Verily they sing it with the threefold knowledge, just as lute-players might play. 3. Mind is this pool full of desires. Speech is the stream of it. 4. As they lead the water from a lake nearer by means of a stream, just so the udgītār [leads] that from the mind by means of speech unto the sacrificer whose wishes he fulfils. 5. Whoso by sacrificial gifts conciliates the udgītār, unto him this stream runs; and whoso does not conciliate him, he drives this [stream] away. 6. Now henceforth [about] giving and receiving. [A gift] is given [with the words]: "This is smoke." Thus it should be given to the sacrificer with speech, with the mind to one's self. Thus one does not bestow all. 7. That seed which was shed when they had intercourse, that lay there, just like undefiled sparkling gold. 8. Of it all the gods were desirous to be possessors [saying]: "It is mine, it is mine." They said: "Let us divide it among ourselves." They said: "Verily, it is superior to us. Let us divide it by our selves." 9. They divided it by their selves. Of them Vāyu was the hiśkāra, Agni the prastāva, Indra the ādi, Soma and Brhaspati the udgīthā, the two Aśvins the pratihāra, all the
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nam. 10. etā vāi sarvā devatā etā hīranyam. 44 asya sarvabhīr devatābhīs stutam bhavati ya evaṁ veda, etāḥhya u eva sarvabhīyo devatābhīya āvṛṣcyate ya evaṁ vidvānāṁ upavadati. 58.

aṣṭādače ‘nuvāke triyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 59. 1. atha ha brahmadatta cāikitānyeḥ kuruvic jagāmā 'bhīpratārināṁ' kākṣasenim. sa hūśmāi madhuparkaṁ yayāca. 2. atha hū 'syā vāi prapadya' purohito 'nte nīṣasāda pūnakaḥ. taṁ hū 'nāmantrya' madhuparkam papāu. 3. taṁ ho 'vueca kīṁ vidvān no dūlbhya 'nāmantrya madhuparkam pibasi ti. sāmadvāiryaṁ prapadye 'ti ho 'vueca. 4. taṁ ha tatrāti 'va papaṛcchha yaḥ viyān tad vetthāḥ iti. hiṃkāra vā asya sa iti. 5. yaḥ agnāu tad vetthāḥ iti. prastāva vā asya sa iti. 6. yaḥ indre tad vetthāḥ iti. ādir vā asya sa iti. 7. yat somabhāspatyosa tad vetthāḥ iti. udgitho vā asya sa iti. 8. yaḥ aprīnos tad vetthāḥ iti. pratihāro vā asya sa iti. 9. yaḥ vigvesha deveśu tad vetthāḥ iti. upadravο vā asya sa iti. 10. yat prajāpatāu tad vetthāḥ iti. niḥdhanaṁ vā asya tad iti ho 'vueca. ārṣeyau vā asya tad gods the upadrava, Prajāpati the niḥdhana. 10. Verily these are all the divinities; these are gold. Praised by all divinities it is of him who knows thus; and from all divinities he is cut off who speaks ill of one who knows thus.

I. 59. 1. Now Brahmadatta Cāikitāneya went to the Kuru Abhipratārin Kākṣaseni. He (A.) offered him a honey-potion (madhuparka). 2. Now his purohita Čāunaka, stepping forth, sat down near by. He (B.) drank the honey-potion without addressing him (Č.). 3. He (Č.) said to him (B.): "As knowing what, O Dūlbhya, dost thou drink the honey-potion without addressing [me]?" "Having recourse to that which belongs to the strength of the sāman (ｱ)?" he (B.) said. 4. He (Č.) asked him (B.) just there: "Dost thou know that which is in Vāyu?" "Verily, the hiṃkāra of it." 5. "Dost thou know that which is in Agni?" "Verily, the prastāva of it." 6. "Dost thou know that which is in Indra?" "Verily, the ādi of it." 7. "Dost thou know that which is in Soma and Bhaspati?" "Verily, the udgitha of it." 8. "Dost thou know that which is in the two Āgyins?" "Verily, the pratihāra of it." 9. Dost thou know that which is in all the gods?" "Verily, the upadrava of it." 10. "Dost thou know that which is in Prajāpati?" "Verily, the
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59.

aṣṭādaçe 'nuvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 60. 1. devāsuraḥ aspardoḥanta, 
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nīdhana of it," he said; "that of it belongs to the sages (rṣī); that is its connection." 11. He (Ś.) said: "Homage be to thee, reverend sir; with knowledge hast thou drunk the honey-potion." 12. Then the other one (A.) asked: "What divinities has that which belongs to the strength of the sūman (?) to which thou hast recourse?" "What divinities the [verses] have with which the praise (stotra) is sung," he (B.) said, "those it has as divinities." 13. "That was well answered; that is its accomplishment (??)," he said; "just talk." "Don't! We have done thee this honor," he said; "do not ask us too much." 14. He said: "I should have asked thee about the divinity, I should have asked thee about the divinities of the divinity. The sūman has speech as its divinity; mind is the divinity of speech, the domestic animals [are the divinity] of mind, the herbs [are the divinity] of the domestic animals, the waters [are the divinity] of the herbs. That same is the sūman born from the waters, standing firm in the waters."

I. 60. 1. The gods and the Asuras contended. The gods sang the udgītha with the mind. The Asuras, running against this [mind] of them, mixed it with evil. Therefore with the mind one thinks many a thing of one kind and another; both [what is] good one thinks with it and [what is] evil. 2. They sang the udgītha with speech. That [speech] they treated in just the

59. 10 A. arya. 11 A. -vāyā. 12 sāmavāiyād. 13 uttam. 14 bhyo.
60. 1 gāy. 2 -drakṣya or -dratyā. 3 -sraj. 4 va. 5 kūr. 6 -tya. 7 vāi.
II. 1. of the gods there were six udgáتora: viz., speech and mind and sight and hearing and exhalation and breath. They resolved: “Let us consecrate ourselves with that udgáтar by

svargam lokam iyume 'ti. 1. te 'brusan vaco 'dgatra diksamahit. te vaco 'dgatra diksanta. sa yad eva vaca vadati tad atmana agyad atha ya itare kamsas tan devebhyah. 5. tam' paamp 'nvasrjyata. sa yad eva vaca paampa vadati sa eva sa paam. 7. te 'brusan na vai no 'yam mrtuyum' na paampnam atyavaksit. manaso 'dgatra diksamahat iti. 6. te manaso 'dgatra 'dikshantu. sa yad eva manasa ahavyati tad atmana agyad atha ya itare kamsas tan devebhyah. 6. tat paampa 'nvasrjyata. sa yad eva manasa papaah ahavyati sa eva sa paampa. 8. te 'brusan no nhuva no 'yam mrtuyum' na paampnam atyavaksit. caksuso 'dgatra diksamahit iti. 9. te caksuso 'dgatra 'dikshanta. sa yad eva caksusah pacyati tad atmanah' agyad atha ya itare kamsas tan devebhyah. 10. tat paampa 'nvasrjyata. sa yad eva caksusah papaam pacyati [sa eva sa paampa]. 11. te 'brusan no nhuva no 'yam mrtuyum' na paampnam atyavaksit. crotreho 'dgatra diksamahat iti. 12. te crotreho 'dgatra 'dikshanta. sa yad eva crotrenah grnoti tad atmanah agyad atha ya itare kamsas tan devebhyah. 13. tat

whom, having smitten away death, having smitten away evil, we may go to the heavenly world.” 3. They said: “Let us consecrate ourselves with speech as udgatah.” They consecrated themselves with speech as udgatah. What one speaks with speech, that it sang to itself; and what the other desires are, those [it sang] to the gods. 4. Evil was created after it. What evil thing one speaks with speech, that is that evil. 5. They said: “Verily, this one hath not carried us beyond death, nor beyond evil. Let us consecrate ourselves with the mind as udgatah.” 6. They consecrated themselves with the mind as udgatah. What one thinks with the mind, that it sang to itself; and what the other desires are, those [it sang] to the gods. 7. Evil was created after it. What evil thing one thinks with the mind, that is that evil. 8. They said: “Verily, this one hath not carried us beyond death, nor beyond evil. Let us consecrate ourselves with sight as udgatah.” 9. They consecrated themselves with sight as udgatah. What one sees with sight, that it sang to itself; and what the other desires are, those [it sang] to the gods. 10. Evil was created after it. What evil thing one sees with sight [that is that evil]. 11. They said: “Verily, this one hath not carried us beyond death, nor beyond evil. Let us consecrate ourselves with hearing as udgatah.” 12. They consecrated themselves with hearing as udgatah. What one hears with hearing, that it sang to itself; and what the other desires are, those [it sang] to the gods. 13. Evil was created after it. What evil thing one hears

1. -ma. 2. -tyu. 3. A. bravin. 4. nva. 5. avatyav. 6. B. -man.
pāṃsā 'nvāshyata. sa yad eva prātreṇa pāpaṁ śṛṇoti sa eva sa pāṃsā. 11. te 'bruvan no nvāva no 'yam mṛtyuṁ na pāṃsānam atyavāksit. apānen 'dgātrā dīksāmahā iti. 12. te pāneno 'dgātrā dīksānta. sa yad eva pānenā pāniti tad ātmana āgāyaḥ atha ya itare kūmās tān devabhāyaḥ. 13. tam pāṃsā 'nvāshyata. sa yad eva pānena pāpaṁ gandham apāniti sa eva sa pāṃsā. 17. te 'bruvan no nvāva no 'yam mṛtyuṁ na pāṃsānam atyavāksit. prāneno 'dgātrā dīksāmahā iti. 18. te prāneno 'dgātrā dīksānta. sa yad eva prānena prāniti tad ātmana āgāyaḥ atha ya itare kūmās tān devabhāyaḥ. 19. tam pāṃsā nā 'nvāshyata. na hṛ ṇ ena pānena pāpaṁ vudati na pāpaṁ dhyāyati na pāpaṁ paṭiyati na pāpaṁ śṛṇoti na pāpaṁ gandham apānītī. 20. tenā 'paḥatyā mṛtyum apahatyā pāṃsānam svargaṁ lokam āyan. apahatyā hai 'va mṛtyum apahatyā pāṃsānam svargaṁ lokam ēti ya evaṁ veda. 61.

prathame 'nvāke prathamāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

II. 2. 1. sā yā sā vāg āsīt so 'gnir abhavat. 2. atha yat tān maṇa āsīt sa caṇḍramā abhavaḥ. 3. atha yat tāc caṅkṣur āsīt sa uḍītyo 'bhavat. 4. atha yat tāc chrotram āsīt tā imā diṣo 'bhavaḥ with hearing, that is that evil. 14. They said: “Verily, this one hath not carried us beyond death, nor beyond evil. Let us consecrate ourselves with exhalation as udgātār.” 15. They consecrated themselves with exhalation as udgātār. What one exhales with exhalation, that it sang to itself; and what the other desires are, those [it sang] to the gods. 16. Evil was created after it. What evil odor one exhales with exhalation, that is that evil. 17. They said: “Verily, this one hath not carried us beyond death, nor beyond evil. Let us consecrate ourselves with breath as udgātār.” 18. They consecrated themselves with breath as udgātār. What one breathes with breath, that it sang to itself; and what the other desires are, those [it sang] to the gods. 19. No evil was created after that. For with this breath one speaks no evil thing, thinks no evil thing, sees no evil thing, hears no evil thing, exhales no evil odor. 20. By it having smitten away death, having smitten away evil, they went to the heavenly world. Having smitten away death, having smitten away evil, he who knows thus goes to the heavenly world.

II. 2. 1. What this speech was, that became Agni. 2. And what this mind was, that became the moon. 3. And what this sight was, that became the sun. 4. And what this hearing was, that
van. tā u eva viçve devāh. s. atha yas so 'pāna āsit sa brhaspatir abhavat. yad asyāi vāco brhatyai patis tasmād brhaspatiḥ. 

s. atha yas sa prāṇa āsit sa prajāpatir abhavat. sa esa putri prajāvān udgītho yaḥ prāṇaḥ. tasya sevra eva prajāvān bhavati ya evaṁ veda. t. tam hāi 'tām ek pratyaksam eva āgyanti prāṇāḥ prāṇāḥ hum bhā ovā iti. s. tad u ho 'vāca śatyāyaniś tata etam arhati pratyaksān gātum. yad vāva vca karoti tad etad eva 'sya kṛtam bhavati 'ti. s. atha vā ataḥ āksāmno eva prajātīḥ. sa yad dhīnkaroty abhy eva tena krandati. atha yat prastavītui 'eva tena plavate. atha yad uādam ādattu reta eva tena śiṣṇati. atha yad udgāyati reta eva tena śiṣṭaṁ sambhāvayati. atha yat prathiharati reta eva tena sambhātāṁ pravardhayati. atha yad upadravati reta eva tena pravṛddhāṁ vikaroti. atha yan nīdhanam upūtītī reta eva tena vikṛtam prajānavati. sāi 'ṣa āksāmnho prajātīḥ. 10. sa ya evam etām āksāmnho prajātinī veda pra hāi 'nam āksāmāni janayatāḥ. 62.

prathame 'nuvāke dvitiyāh khanḍaḥ. prathamo 'nuvākas samāptah.

became these quarters; and these are all the gods. s. And what this exhalation was, that became Brhaspati. Because he is the husband (lord, patti) of this great (brhati) speech, therefore he is [called] Brhaspati. s. And what this breath was, that became Prajāpati. That same, viz. breath, is rich in sons, rich in offspring, the udgītha. Of it tone is the offspring. Rich in offspring becomes he who knows thus. 1. Some sing that [breath] openly: "Breath, breath, breath, hum, bhā, ovā." s. And Čātyāyani said regarding this: "Therefore it is possible to sing it directly. Verily, what he performs with speech, that same is performed of him." s. Now [about] the generation of the ṛc and the sāman. In that he utters the hīṅkāra, thereby he cries to [her]. In that he utters the prastāva, thereby he mounts. In that he utters the ādi, thereby he emits seed. In that he utters the udgītha, thereby he causes the emitted seed to come to life. In that he utters the pratiḥāra, thereby he causes the seed, come to life, to grow forth. In that he utters the upadraṇa, he develops the seed, having grown forth. In that he enters upon the nīdhana, thereby he causes the seed, being unfolded, to be born forth. That is the generation of the ṛc and of the sāman, him the ṛc and the sāman propagate.

2. 'A. yat. 'A. atam; B. atha. 'B. kurvati. 'e. 'hāv-; A. om. yati. atha yat prathiharati. 'A. sāmnoh; B. ksāmnoh.
II. 3. 1. This [universe] in the beginning was he who burns here. This same, taking the splendor, the grasp, the vitality, the virility of all beings, went upward. 2. He desired: “May we win the one sweet soft syllable of the gods.” 3. He performed penance. He having performed penance became the one syllable. 4. That gods and sages desired together to obtain. Then he created creature-slaying Asuras, in order to prevent evil from going after. 5. That they desired together to obtain by speech. They ascended speech together. He took possession of their speech. Therefore speech is taken possession of; for [what is] true one speaks with it and [what is] untrue. 6. That they desired together to obtain by mind. They ascended mind together. He took possession of their mind. Therefore mind is taken possession of; for [what is] good one thinks with it and [what is] evil. 7. That they desired together to obtain by sight. They ascended sight together. He took possession of their sight. Therefore sight is taken possession of; for [what is] seemly one sees with it and [what is] unseemly. 8. That they desired together to obtain by hearing. They ascended hearing together. He took possession of their hearing. Therefore hearing is taken possession of. For [what is] worth hearing one hears with it and [what is] not worth hearing. 9. That they desired together to obtain by exhalation. They ascended exhalation together. He took possession of their exhalation.

3. 1 B. sa. 2-sā. 3madu. 4om. 5eti. 6ávā. 7repeat from above udevānām. 8paryāttam. A. paryūṭta; B. paryāptam.
enena jighatii durgandhi ca. 10. tam prāṇeno 'pasamāipte
tam prāṇeno 'pasamāipte
vāvāman mohayisyāma iti manyananāh. 12. sa yathā 'pānām
rtva loṣṭho" vidhvaṃsetāī 'vam eva 'sūra vyadvhaṃsanta sa ese
'sūra "khano yat prāṇah. 13. sa yathā 'pānām 'ikhaṇam rtva
loṣṭho" vidhvaṃsata evam eva sa vidhvaṃsate ya evam vidvāṃsam
upavadati. 63.

āvīšye 'nuvāke prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

II. 4. 1. sa ese vaśi dipāgra udgītho yat prāṇah,1 esā hi 'daṃ
sarvam vaṣe kurute. 2. vaśī bhavati vaçe svān kurute ya evam
veda, asya hy asiv aprī dipayate amusya2 va saḥ. 3. tam hāi
'tam udgīthām pātasyānim ācaśe vaśī dipāgra iti. dipāgra ha
va asya kirtir bhavati ya evam veda. 4. 'ābhūtir iti kārīrāda-
yaḥ, prāṇām va anu prajāh pācava abhavanti. sa ya evam
etam 'ābhūtir3 ity upāsta aśe 'r uvā prāṇena prajayā paścāh bhav-
ati. 5. sahmūhīr4 iti sāityayaūnayāḥ, prāṇām va anu prajāh
pācavas saṃbhavanti. sa ya evam etam saṃbhūtir ity upāste
sam e[sa] prāṇena prajayā paścāh bhavati. 6. prabhūtir iti
cālūnāḥ,5 prāṇām va anu prajāh pācavah prabhavanti. sa
fore exhalation is taken possession of; for fragrance one smells
with it and bad odor. 10. That they desired together to obtain
by breath. That they obtained together by breath. 11. Then
the creature-slaying Āśuras ran unto [them], thinking: "We
will confound [them]." 12. = I. 60. 8, 13. = I. 60. 9.

II. 4. 1. That same, viz. breath, is the controlling flame-pointed
udgītha. For it gets this all into control. 2. He becomes con-
trolling, he gets his people into control who knows thus; for
does yonder one flame at this one's point or this one at yonder
one's? 3. That same udgītho Cātāyani calls 'the controlling
one, the flame-pointed one.' Verily flame-pointed becomes his
name who knows thus. 4. The Kāriṇīs [call it] 'existence'
,'ābhūtī). Verily, along with breath offspring and domestic
animals exist. Whoso thus worships it as existence, with breath,
with offspring, with domestic animals he exists. 5. The Sāitya-
jugis [call it] 'origination' (saṃbhūtī). Verily, along with breath
offspring and domestic animals originate. Whoso thus worships
it as origination, with breath, with offspring, with domestic
animals he originates. 6. The Čālanas [call it] 'prevalence' (pra-
bhātī). Verily, along with breath offspring and domestic ani-

8. 10 loṣṭo.
4. 1 insert esā ta hi 'daṃ sarvam vaṣe kurute. 1-9. 2'muṣ-. 4'atah.
3'bhūr. 4'ābhūtī.
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II. Oertel,

ya evam etam prabhūtir ity upūste prei 'va prāṇena' prajayā paṣubhir bhavati. 7. bhūtir iti bhūlabināh. 10 prāṇam vā anu prajāh paṣavo bhavanti. sa ya evam etam bhūtir ity upūste bhavaty eva prāṇena prajayā paṣubhiḥ. 8. aparodho 'naparuddha iti pārśṇac caīlanaḥ. esa hy anyam aparunuddhi' nāī 'tam anyaḥ. esa ha' vā 'syā dvīṣantam' bhrātyayam aparunuddhi ya evam vedā. 64.

dvitiye 'nūvāke dvitiyāḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

II. 5. 1. ekavirā ityā ārūṇeyah. 6 eko hy evāi 'sa viro yat prāṇah. ā hā 'syāi 'ko viro vīryavān ājyate ya evam vedā. 2. ekaputra iti caīkitānayaḥ. eko' hy evāi 'sa putro yat prāṇah. 3. sa u eva dviputra iti. dvānu hi prāṇāpanu. 4. sa u eva triputra iti. trayo hi prāṇo 'pāno vyānaha. 5. sa u eva catsuputra iti. catvāro hi prāṇa 'pāna vyānas samanāḥ. 6. sa u eva paścuiputra iti. panca hi prāṇa 'pāna vyānas samāno 'vānaḥ. 7. sa u eva saīputra iti. saīhi prāṇo 'pāna vyānas samāno 'vāna udānaḥ. 8. sa u eva saīputra iti. saīpa hi 'me ċīrānyaḥ prāṇah. 9. sa

mals prevail. Whoso thus worships it as prevalence, with breath, with offspring, with domestic animals he prevails. 7. The Bhālabins [call it] 'coming into being' (bhūti). Verily, along with breath offspring and domestic animals come into being. Whoso thus worships it as coming into being, with breath, with offspring, with domestic animals he comes into being. 8. Pārṇa Cāilana [calls it] 'the unexcluded exclusion.' For it excludes another, [but] another [does] not [exclude] it. Verily, it excludes the hateful rival of him who knows thus.

II. 5. 1. Ārūṇeyā [calls it] 'sole hero.' For that, viz. breath, is sole hero. Of him a sole hero, rich in heroism, is born who knows thus. 2. Caīkitānaya [calls it] 'having one son.' For that, viz. breath, is the only son. 3. It is also having two sons. For breath and exhalation are two. 4. It is also having three sons. For breath, exhalation, and vyāna are three. 5. It is also having four sons. For breath, exhalation, vyāna, [and] samāna are four. 6. It is also having five sons. For breath, exhalation, vyāna, samāna, [and] avāna are five. 7. It is also having six sons. For breath, exhalation, vyāna, samāna, avāna, [and] udāna are six. 8. It is also having seven sons. For these breaths in the head are seven. 9. It is also having nine sons.

4. B. inserts paśajā. 5 A. bhūr. 6 avardadhā. 7 A. -nadvī. 8 A. -se. 9 -ta. 10 B. -din.

5. 1-ru. 3-tv. 3-yay; for eko all MSS. ekd. 4 A. -e. 5 A. dvi-p. 6 B. -nā. 7 abhi.
II. 6. 1. If he should say: "Sing one unto me," knowing that breath is the udgitha, he should think one with his mind. For breath is one. Truly, one is born unto him. 2. If he should say: "Sing two unto me," knowing that breath is the udgitha, he should think two with his mind. For breath and exhalation are two. Truly, two are born unto him. 3. If he should say: "Sing three unto me," knowing that breath is the udgitha, he should think three with his mind. For breath, exhalation, [and] vyāna are three. Truly, three are born unto him. 4. If he should say: "Sing four unto me," knowing that breath is the udgitha, he should think four with his mind. For breath, exhalation, vyāna, [and] samāna are four. Truly, four are born unto him. 5. If he should say: "Sing five unto me," knowing that breath is the udgitha, he should think five with his mind. For breath,
prāṇo 'pāṇo vyānas samāno 'vānah. pañca hāi 'vā 'syā 'jāyante.  
1. sa yadi brāyāt saṇ ma āgāye 'ti prāṇa uḍgha ity eva vidvān saṇ maṇasaś āhyaṇet. saḍ dhi prāṇo 'pāṇo vyānas samāno 'vāna udānaḥ. saḍ dhiis 'vā 'syā 'jāyante.  
2. sa yadi brāyāt saṇta ma āgāye 'ti prāṇa uḍgha ity eva vidvān saṇta maṇasaś āhyaṇet. saṇta hī 'me cīrṣanyāḥ prāṇāḥ. saṇta hāi 'vā 'syā 'jāyante.  
3. sa yadi brāyān navā ma āgāye 'ti prāṇa uḍgha ity eva vidvān nava maṇasaś āhyaṇet. saṇta cīrṣanyāḥ prāṇā dvān avānacau. nava hāi 'vā 'syā 'jāyante.  
4. sa yadi brāyād daṇca ma āgāye 'ti prāṇa uḍgha ity eva vidvān daṇca maṇasaś āhyaṇet. saṇta cīrṣanyāḥ prāṇā dvān avānacau nābhīyān daṇcaṇaḥ. daṇca hāi 'vā 'syā 'jāyante.  
5. sa yadi brāyāt saḥasram ma āgāye 'ti prāṇa uḍgha ity eva vidvān saḥasram maṇasaś āhyaṇet. saḥasram hāi 'ta ādityaracmayaḥ. te 'syā putrāḥ. saḥasram hāi 'vā 'syā 'jāyante.  
6. evān hāi 'vāi 'tam uḍghaṁ para ātuṇāraḥ kākṣivāṁ trasadasyuṁ iti pūre mahārājaś pro-triyāṁ saḥasraputrām upaṇiśeduh. te ha sarvā eva saḥasraputrā āśuḥ.  
7. sa yaevāvān vedā saḥasram hāi 'vā 'syā putrā bhavanti.  

dvitiye 'nuvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. dviṣiyo 'nuvākas samāptah.

exhalation, vyāna, samāna, [and] avāna are five. Truly five are born unto him.  
5. If he should say: "Sing six unto me," knowing that breath is the uḍgha, he should think six with his mind. For breath, exhalation, vyāna, samāna, avāna, udāna are six. Truly, six are born unto him.  
6. If he should say: "Sing seven unto me," knowing that breath is the uḍgha, he should think seven with his mind. For these breaths in the head are seven. Truly, seven are born unto him.  
7. If he should say: "Sing nine unto me," knowing that breath is the uḍgha, he should think nine with his mind. There are seven breaths in the head [and] two downward ones. Truly, nine are born unto him.  
8. If he should say: "Sing ten unto me," knowing that breath is the uḍgha, he should think ten with his mind. There are seven breaths in the head, two downward ones, [and] the tenth in the navel. Truly, ten are born unto him.  
9. If he should say: "Sing a thousand for me," knowing that breath is the uḍgha, he should think a thousand with his mind. Truly, a thousand are the rays of the sun. They are its sons. Truly, a thousand are born unto him.  
10. Para Ātmāra, Kākṣiṇvant, Trasadasyu, great kings of old, scholars in sacred lore, thus studied this same uḍgha of a thousand sons. All of them had a thousand sons. He who knows thus, of him there come to be a thousand sons.
II. 7. 1. Çaryāto vā nāmāvah prācyāṁ sthalyāṁ ayajata. 2. taṁ ha bhūtāny udgīthē 'pitvam ēśire.' 3. taṁ devā bhṛhaspatino 'dhātā diksāmahā iti purastād ācacakhaṁ ayaṁ ta udgāyaty iti. bāmenā ājāviseda pitaro daksinato 'yāṁ ta udgāyaty ity upanāsā kāvänyā 'surāh paścātā 'ayāṁ ta udgāyaty ity ayaśnyā' 4. 'nychirasena manuṣyā uttarato 'yāṁ ta udgāyayitī. 5. sa he' 'kañcah cakre hantāi 'nān prachānti kiyātā' vā ēka ēka kiyāta ekāh kiyāta ēka iti. 6. sa ho 'vāca bhṛhaspataṁ' yān me tvam udgāyey kīṁ tatas syād iti. 7. sa ho 'vāca devesā eva 'pras syād devesā īpā svargam u tvām lokāṃ gamayeyām iti. 8. atha ho 'vāca bāmbam ājāviseda yan me tvam udgāyey kīṁ tatas syād iti. 9. sa ho 'vāca pitarś eva īpā svargam u tvām lokāṃ gamayeyām iti. 10. atha ho 'vācā 'canasaṁ kāvyaṁ yan' me' tvam udgāyey kīṁ tatas syād iti. 11. sa ho 'vācā 'suresv eva īpā svargam u tvām lokāṃ gamayeyām iti. 12. atha ho 'vācā 'yāsyam āṅgira-

II. 7. 1. Çaryāta Mānava made a sacrifice on the eastern site. With him created beings sought a share in the udgītha. 2. Unto him the gods came from the east (front) [saying]: "Let us consecrate ourselves with Bhṛaspati as udgātar." Let this one sing the udgīthā for thee." With Bamba Ājāvīsā the Fathers [came] from the south (right) [saying]: "Let this one sing the udgīthā for thee." With Ucānas Kāväya the Asuras [came] from the west (rear) [saying]: "Let this one sing the udgīthā for thee." With Āyāsya Āṅgirasā men [came] from the north (left) [saying]: "Let this one sing the udgīthā for thee." 3. He considered: "Come now, I will ask them how great the power of the one is, how great the power of the other is, how great the power of the other (third) is." 4. He said to Bhṛaspati: "If thou shouldst sing the udgīthā for me, what would be the result of it?" 5. He said: "Among the gods there would be fortune, among the gods dominion, and I should cause thee to go to the heavenly world." 6. Then he said to Bamba Ājāvīsā: "If thou shouldst sing the udgīthā for me, what would be the result of it?" 7. He said: "Among the Fathers there would be fortune, among the Fathers dominion, and I should cause thee to go to the heavenly world." 8. Then he said to Ucānas Kāväya: "If thou shouldst sing the udgīthā for me, what would be the result of it?" 9. He said: "Among the Asuras there would be fortune, among the Asuras dominion, and I should cause thee to go to the heavenly world." 10. Then he said to Āyāsya Āṅgirasā: "If thou shouldst sing
II. 8. 1. He (C.) said: "Sing thou, reverend sir, the udgītha for me, who art the glory of this all." 2. Of him Ayāṣya sang the udgītha. Therefore an udgātar, when chosen, should desire to take his resting-place in the north (left). For that resting-place which is in the north is not obstructed. 3. Having come from the north, Ayāṣya Āṅgirasa sang the udgītha of Čāryāta Mānava. By breath he placed the gods in the world of the gods, by exhalation men in the world of men, by the uṣāna the Fathers in the world of the Fathers, by the hiṅkāra [as] thunderbolt he pushed the Asuras away from this world. 4. He said to them: "Go ye afar." That is a world named 'afar.' They went to it. These same Asuras were irretrievably defeated. 5. By the metres, by speech, he caused Čāryāṭa Mānava to go to the heavenly world. 6. These Asuras said: "Come, let us know him who placed us thus." Thereupon they came. Having come, they saw him. 7. They said: "Verily he (ayam) is in the mouth (āṣya)." Because they said: "Verily he is in the mouth," there-

7. 18 A. 19 u. 20-dhyāt. 21-tān. 22-insert u. 8. 1-çaṣa. 2-tān. 3-asamhīṣyam- tāyā-. 4 A. ta. -chas.
II. 9. 1. He should say to him: “Go afar.” What world the Asuras went unto, unto that same one he goes. 2. With the metres, with speech, he causes the sacrificer to go to the heavenly world. 3. These are the sacred utterances: pra, á, vác, bhús bhuvás svar, [ud]. 4. What pra is, that is breath, that is this world, that gives a share of this world in this world. 5. Á, that is exhalation, that is yonder world, that gives a share of yonder world in yonder world. 6. Vác, that is the brahman, that is this atmosphere. 7. Bhús bhuvás svar, that is the threefold knowledge. 8. Ud, that is yonder sun. Inasmuch as it is ud, it causes to cling up (?
\[\sqrt{\text{udis} + \text{ud}}\), as it were. 9. Inasmuch as it forms a unit, therefore it is sole hero. But being one it becomes a hero possessing heroism. To him a sole hero possessing heroism is born who knows thus. 10. And Çátyâyani said this: “One should worship

II. 10. They say the gods and the Asuras strove together. Truly, the gods and the Asuras did not then strive together. Both Prajñapati and Death then strove together. Now the gods were near to this Prajñapati, [being his] dear sons. They resolved: "Let us consecrate ourselves with that udgatār by whom, having smitten away death, having smitten away evil, we may go to the heavenly world." They said: "Let us consecrate ourselves with speech as udgatār." They consecrated themselves with speech as udgatār. Speech sang to them that which one speaks here with speech, which one enjoys here with speech. Evil was created after it. Just what evil thing one speaks with speech, that is that evil. They said: "Verily, this one hath not carried us beyond death nor beyond evil. Let us consecrate ourselves with mind as udgatār." They consecrated themselves with mind as udgatār. Mind sang to them that which one thinks here with the mind, which one enjoys here with the mind. Evil was created after it. Just what evil thing one thinks with the mind, that is that evil. They said: "Verily, this one, too, hath not carried us beyond death, nor beyond evil.

9. aūdityasya. 10. B. -dyās. A. inserts no 'dgātrā dikṣāmahā iti, which is cancelled in red, between te and bhya. 1avati-. 

{saying}: ‘Possessing many sons is this udgītha.’ For many are these rays of the sun. They are its sons. Therefore one should worship {saying}: ‘Possessing many sons is this udgītha.’"
Let us consecrate ourselves with sight as udgātar.” 10. They consecrated themselves with sight as udgātar. Sight sang to them that which one sees here with sight, which one enjoys here with sight. 11. Evil was created after it. Just what evil thing one sees with sight, that is that evil. 12. They said: “Verily, this one, too, hath not carried us beyond death nor beyond evil. Let us consecrate ourselves with hearing as udgātar.” 13. They consecrated themselves with hearing as udgātar. Hearing sang to them that which one hears here with hearing, which one enjoys here with hearing. 14. Evil was created after it. Just what evil thing one hears with hearing, that is that evil. 15. They said: “Verily, this one, too, hath not carried us beyond death nor beyond evil. Let us consecrate ourselves with breath as udgātar.” 16. They consecrated themselves with breath as udgātar. Breath sang to them that which one breathes here with breath, which one enjoys here with breath. 17. Evil was created after it. Just what evil thing one breathes with breath, that is that evil. 18. They said: “Verily, this one, too, hath not carried us beyond death nor beyond evil. Let us consecrate ourselves with this breath of the mouth as udgātar.” 19. They consecrated themselves with this breath of the mouth as udgātar. 20. Death said: “This is that udgātar by whom they will go beyond death.” 21. For with this breath one speaks no evil thing, thinks no evil thing, sees no evil thing, hears no
II. Oertel,

gandham anāṇīti. 2 sa tenā 'pahatyam apahatyapāpāmānuśvargain lokam āyam.' apahatyah hūt 'na mṛtyum apahatyapāpāmānuśvargain lokam eti ya evuṁ vedā. 70.

caturthe 'nūvāke prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

II. 11. 1. sa yathā hatvā pāṁrṇḍyā 'tiyāū' evam evai 'tām mṛtyum aṭiyāya. 2. sa vaśam prathamām aṭiyāvahat. tām pārena mṛtyuṁ nyaddhāt. so 'gnīr abhavat. 3. aha mano 'tayāvahat. 4. tat pārena mṛtyuṁ nyaddhāt. sa candrāni abhavat. 5. aha cakṣur aṭiyāvahat. tat pārena mṛtyuṁ nyaddhāt. sa údityo 'bhavat. 6. aha pradram aṭiyāvahat. tat pārena mṛtyuṁ nyaddhāt. sa viyūr abhavat. 7. aha 4 'tūnane kevalam eva 'nūdayam āgāyata. 8. sa esa eva 'yāsyah, āyē rāmate tasmād aṭūnyah. yad v evai 4 'yāyām āyē rāmate tasmād eva 'yānyah.' 9. sa esa eva 'nūgirasaḥ. ato hi 'māny aṅgāni rasaiṁ labhante. tasmād aṅgirasaḥ.' 10. evai 'tūm aṅgānāṁ rasais tasmād eva 7 nūgirasaḥ. 11. tām deva abruvan kevalaiṁ vā ānmane 'nūdayam āgāsāḥ. anu na etasminn annūdaya abhaja.' etad āṣayā 'nūmayaṭvam.'

evil thing, exalhes no evil odor. 2. By him having smitten away death, having smitten away evil, they went to the heavenly world. Having smitten away death, having smitten away evil, he goes to the heavenly world who knows thus.

II. 11. 1. As one would pass beyond another, having smitten him, having crushed him, even so they passed beyond that death. 2. Speech he carried beyond it first. He deposited it beyond death. It became fire. 3. Then he carried mind beyond it. He deposited it beyond death. It became the moon. 4. Then he carried sight beyond it. He deposited it beyond death. It became the sun. 5. Then he carried hearing beyond it. He deposited it beyond death. It became these quarters; they are also all the gods. 6. Then he carried breath beyond it. He deposited it beyond death. It became wind. 7. Then he sang food-eating for himself only. 8. That same is Ayāsya. He (ayam) is placed in the mouth (āṣyā); therefore he is [called] Ayāsya. And as he rests in the mouth, therefore also he is [called] Ayāsya. 9. That same is Aṅgirasa. For from him these limbs (aṅga) take their sap (rasa); therefore he is [called] Aṅgirasa. And because he is the sap of these limbs, therefore also he is Aṅgirasa. 10. The gods said to him: "Only for thyself hast thou sung food-eating. Let us also have a share in this food-eating. That is his

10. 'gamayan.
11. 1 B. inserts sa; for aṭiyāyaṁ all-yat. 2 -yu. 3 -n. 4 dathā. 5 āē. 6 dhyati. 7 B. egd. 8 -yē. 9 'yāsyah. 10 āh. 11 āmayatvam.
caturthe 'nunāke dhītyah khaṇḍah.

II. 12. 1. Verily, wheresoever these divinities touch, there no evil whatever, [not a] trace, is left. 2. He should know: "No evil whatever, [not a] trace, will be left here; these divinities will burn down all evil." Truly it happens thus. 3. And whose encounters one knowing thus, as one having encountered these divinities would perish, even so he perishes. For he speaks ill of him who has resorted to these divinities, who dwells in them. 4. Verily, of one who knows thus there is no misfortune whatever; he who speaks ill of one knowing thus, he meets with misfortune. 5. If one should harm him, he should say, approaching these divinities: "This one hath harmed me. Let him go down unto this misfortune." He goes down unto that misfortune. 6. And as many
II. 13. 1. deva vai brahmano vatsena vacam adhuran. agnir
ha vai brahmano vatsah. 2. sa ya sa vag brahmii va tat. atha
yo 'gnir mrtyas tath. 3. tam etam vacam yath. dhenuh vatseno
pasarya pratta'in dhiitii 'vam eva deva vacam sarvan kiman
dadhuran. 4. duhe' ha vai vacam sarvan kiman ya evam veda.
sa hai 'so 'nairto vacam devim uddhre' vada vada vade 'ti.
5. tad yad iha purusasya papan ktram bhavati tad aviskaroti.

abodes as these breaths of him have in this world, so many
abodes these divinities of him come to have in yonder world.
7. Therefore one knowing thus should not be in fear of house-
lessness, nor of worldlessness [thinking]: "These divinities will
make houses for me in this world. They come to be in yonder
world; and therefore they will give me the world." 8. And there-
therefore one knowing thus should not be in fear of houselessness, nor
of worldlessness. "These divinities will make in this world
houses for me from [their] houses, from abodes of their own," he
should know; "these divinities will give a world in yonder
world." 9. And therefore one knowing thus should not be in
fear of houselessness, nor of worldlessness. Let him know :
"They will bring about both for me." Verily so it comes to pass.
II. 14. 1. Verily, he of the gods is to be next served, viz. Agni. 2. Him one should serve well. Whoso serves him well in this world, him he (A.) serves well in yonder world. And who does not care for him in this world, him he (A.) does not care for in yonder world. Verily, therefore one should serve Agni well. 3. Him one should not touch with the hands, nor with the feet, nor with a stick. 4. He touches him with the hands, when he washes himself in his neighborhood; and when he stretches himself out towards [him], then [he touches him] with the feet. 5. He, being touched, is liable to place him in discomfort. Therefore one serves Agni well. Truly, he places such a one in comfort.

II. 15. 1. And verily he of the gods is the most voracious one, viz. Agni. 2. Therefore he should not eat what belongs to a vow without having given [him]. Verily, if one eats while the voracious one does not eat, he is likely to fasten on him. Truly he would eat what is putrid, as it were. 3. So then, when the meal is announced, he should say: "Kindle the fire." As,
prokte 'cane gṛyeṣṇaṁ parivesṭavāi brūyāt tādṛk tat. 1. etād
u ha vāva sāma ya'd vāk. yo vā caksus sāma yatraṁ sāme 'ty
upāste na' ha tena karoti. 1. atha ya' adityas sāma candramās
sāme 'ty upāste na' hāi 'va tena karoti. 1. atha yo vāk sāme 'ty
upāste sa eva 'nusṭhya sāma veda. vācā hi sāmnā 'rtvijāṁ
kriyate. 1. sa yo vācaḥ suvaro jāyate so 'yanir vāg v eva vāk.
tad atrā' 'kadhā sāma bhavati. 1. sa ya eva etād ekadāḥ
sāma bhavād vedaḥ 'vaṁ hāi 'tad ekadāḥ sāma bhavati 'ty
ekadhe 'va 'cṛṣṭhas svānāṁ bhavati. 1. tasmod u hāi 'evāṁvi-
dam eva sāmnā 'rtvijāṁ kārayeta. sa ha vāva sāma veda ya
evāṁ veda. 75.

pañcamo 'nuvāke āṭṭhyāh khaṇḍah. pañcamo 'nuvākas samāptaḥ.

III. 1. 1. ekā ha vāva kṛṣṇā devatā 'ṛdhadevatā eva 'nyāh,
ayam eva yo 'yam ānapate. 2. esa eva sarvaśāṁ devānāṁ gra-
hoḥ. 2. sa hāi 'so 'staināṁ nāma. astam iti he 'ha pacho'd grahaṁ
ācakṣate. 4. sa ya'd adityo 'stam āgad iti grahaṁ āgad iti hāi
'tat. tena so 'sarvak. sa etam eva 'pyeti. 5. astam candramā
eti. tena so 'sarvak. sa etam eva 'pyeti. 6. astam naśatrāṇi

when the meal is announced, one would direct that one's superior
be served [first], even so is that. 4. And that is also the sāmaṁ,
viz. speech. Verily, he who worships [saying]: "Sight is the
sāmaṁ; hearing is the sāmaṁ," he does not thereby perform it.
4. And he who worships [saying]: "The sun is the sāmaṁ; the
moon is the sāmaṁ," he does not thereby perform it. 5. Now he
who worships [saying]: "Speech is the sāmaṁ," he at once knows
the sāmaṁ. For with speech as the sāmaṁ the priestly office
is performed. 7. The tone which is born from speech, that is
Agni, and speech is just speech. That becomes here one, the
sāmaṁ. 8. He who thus knows that which becomes one, the
sāmaṁ [saying]: "Verily that becomes one, the sāmaṁ,"
he becomes one, as it were, the best of his [people]. 9. And there-
fore one should cause one knowing thus to perform the priestly
office with the sāmaṁ. Verily he knows the sāmaṁ who knows
thus.

III. 1. 1. One entire deity there is; the others are half-deities.
[It is] this one namely who cleanses here (the wind). 2. He [rep-
resents] the seizers of all the gods. 3. He, indeed, is 'setting'
by name. 'Setting' they call here the seizers in the west. 4. In
that the sun has gone to setting, it has gone to the seizers.
Therefore it is not whole. It goes unto that [god]. 5. The
moon sets. Therefore it is not whole. It goes unto that [god].
6. The asterisms set. Therefore they are not whole. They go

15. 'B. tam. 18. 'nā. 19. 'yad. 20. 'etr.-
1. 'B. paṅca.
yanti. tena tāṇy asarvāṇī. tāṇy etam eva 'piyanti. 1. anv agnir guccatā. tena so 'survah. sa etam eva 'pyeti. 2. ety ahaḥ. eti rātrih.3 tena te asarve. te etam eva 'yūtah. 4. muhyaṇti diṣo na vāi tāt rātrim prajñāyante. tena tā asarvāṇā. tā etam eva 'piyanti. 5. varṣati ca parjanya uc ca grhāṇi. tena so 'survah. sa etam eva 'pyeti. 6. ksijanta āpa evam saūdhayā evam vañnapata-yah. tena tāṇy asarvāṇī. tāṇy etam eva 'piyanti. 7. tad yad etat sarvah nāyam eva 'pyeti tasmād nāyur eva sāma. 8. sa ha vāi sāmavīt sa [kṛṣṇāṇi] sāma veda ya evaṁ veda. 9. athā 'dhyātmam. na vāi svapan vācā vudati. sa 'yam' eva prāṇam upyeti. 10. na manasā dhyāyatī. tad idam eva prāṇam upyeti. 11. na caksurā paśyati. tad idam eva prāṇam upyeti. 12. na grotena gronti tad idam eva prāṇam apyeti. 13. tad yad etat sarvam prāṇam eva 'bhisaneti tasmāt prāṇa eva sāma. 14. sa ha vāi sāmavīt sa kṛṣṇāṇi sāma veda ya evaṁ veda. 15. tad yad idam āhur na batā 'dya vāi 'ti [sa] hāi 'tāt purūṣe 'ntar niramate sa pūrṇas* evamānā āste. 16. tad dha gūnakaṁ11 ca kāpeyam abhipratārinām ca [kākṣaseni] brāhmaṇāḥ pariveśyamānāṁ upāveśvraja.17 76.

prathame 'nūvike prathamah khaṇḍaḥ.

unto that [god]. 7. The fire goes out. Therefore it is not whole. It goes unto that [god]. 8. Day goes ; night goes. Therefore they are not whole. They go unto that [god]. 9. The quarters are confounded ; they are not known by night. Therefore they are not whole. They go unto that [god]. 10. Parjanya rains and holds up. Therefore he is not whole. He goes unto that [god]. 11. The waters are exhausted, even so the herbs, even so the forest-trees. Therefore they are not whole. They go unto that [god]. 12. So, as this all goes unto wind, therefore is wind the sāman. 13. He is sāman-knowing, he knows the [entire] sāman, who knows thus. 14. Now with regard to the self. One who sleeps speaks not with the voice. That same [voice] goes unto breath. 15. He thinks not with the mind. That same [mind] goes unto breath. 16. He sees not with sight. That same [sight] goes unto breath. 17. He hears not with hearing. That same [hearing] goes unto breath. 18. So, as this all goes together unto breath, therefore is breath the sāman. 19. He is sāman-knowing, he knows the entire sāman, who knows thus. 20. Now when they say: "Lo! it doth not blow to-day," it is then resting within man ; he sits full, sweating. 21. Now unto Čaṇaka Kāpeya and Abhiprātārin [Kākṣaseni], while they were being waited upon, a Brāhma came.
III. 2. 1. tāu ha bibhiṁe. tāṁ ha nā "dadrāte" ko vā ko ve 'ti manyamānāu. 2. tāu ho 'paṇgaṁ
mahātmānaṁ caturō deva ekāh
kas sa' jagārum bhuvanāṣya gopāh :
tavā kāpēya' na vijānumy eke
'bhiprātārīn bhūdhā nibiṣamā
tī. 3. su ho 'vācā 'bhiprātāri 'maṁ' vāvā prapādyā pratirūхи
'ti. tuvā' vā' agam pratyeyu' iti. 11. 4. tām ha pratyuvācā
"tāmā devānām uta mātyānām"
hiranyaṁvanto ruposu' na' sūnuh :
mahāntam asya mahināmanā śūr
anādyanāno yadu' adantāti' atti' 'ti.
5. mahātmānaḥ caturō [deva] eka iti. vág' vā' agnī. su mahātmā devah. sa yatra svapiti' tad vācam prāṇo girati.
6. manaḍ caḍramāsa mahātmā devah. sa yatra svapiti tan manah' prāṇo girati.
7. caks'u' udiṣṭas sa mahātmā devah. sa yatra svapiti tac caksuḥ prāṇo girati.
8. groṭramā śūru sa mahātmānaḥ devah. sa yatra svapiti tac chroṭam prāṇo girati.
9. tad yau mahātmānaḥ caturō deva eka ity etad dha tut. 10. kas' sa' jagāre' 'ti. prajāpatir vā kuk. sa hāi 'taj jagāra.

III. 2. 1. He begged [food] of them. They paid no attention to him, thinking: "Who or who is he?" 2. He sang unto them: "One [god]—who is he?—swallowed up four magnificent ones, being a keeper of creation; him, O Kāpēya, some do not know; him, O Abhiprātārīn, settled down in many places." 3. Said Abhiprātārīn: "Stepping forward, answer this man; by thee must this man be answered." 4. Him he answered: "The self of the gods and of mortals, with golden teeth, defective (?), not a son. Great they call his greatness, in that he, not being eaten, eats him who eats." 5. 'One [god] four magnificent ones:' speech verily is fire; that is a magnificent god. When one sleeps, then breath swallows up speech. 6. Mind [is] the moon; that is a magnificent god. When one sleeps, then breath swallows up mind. 7. Sight [is] the sun; that is a magnificent god. When one sleeps, then breath swallows up sight. 8. Hearing [is] the quarters; those are magnificent gods. When one sleeps, then breath swallows up hearing. 9. So, when [it is said]: 'One god four magnificent ones,' this is what that means. 10. 'Who (ka) is he who swallowed up?' Ka is Prajāpati. He swallowed this
III. 3. 1. tasyā‘i ‘sa ātīr utmā samudrādho’ yaś asāv udītyaḥ. tasmād gāyatrasya stotre nā ‘vāyūn nec chriyā avachidyāḥ iti. 2. sa esa eva ‘ktham, jat purastād aviniiti tad etad ukthasya cīro yaḥ daksināt sa daksināḥ pakṣo yaḥ uṭṭaratas sa’ uṭṭaraḥ pakṣo-yat paccat [tat] puccham. 3. ayam eva prāṇa ukthasyā “tmā, sa ya evam etam” ukthasyā ’tmānām utman pratiśthitān reḍa sa hā ‘muṣṭīni loke sūṇgas” satarṣus [sarvas] sambhatāti. 4. gacchad dha vā amuṣṭīni loke yaḥ idam puruṣasyāḥ” pādu cīpaḥ up. 11. ‘A keeper of creation’: he, indeed, is a keeper of creation. 12. ‘Him, O Kāpeya, some do not know’: for some do not know him. 13. ‘Him, O Abhiprātārīn, settled down in many places’: for this breath has settled down in many places. 14. ‘The self of the gods and of mortals:’ for he is the self of the gods and of mortals. 15. ‘With golden teeth, defective, not a son:’ for he is not a son; for he, having the form of a son, is not a son. 16. ‘Great they call his greatness:’ for they call his greatness great. 17. ‘In that he, not being eaten, eats him who eats:’ for he, not being eaten, eats him who eats.

III. 3. 1. Of it he is the fortune, the self completely risen (?), viz. yonder sun. Therefore one should not take breath in (during) the stotre of the gāyatr [-sūn] [saying]: “May I not be cut off from fortune.” 2. That same is the uktha. When one takes breath eastward, that is the head of the uktha; when southward, that is the right side (wing); when northward, that is the left side (wing); when westward, that is the tail. 3. This breath is the self of the uktha. Who thus knows this self of the uktha firmly established in the self, truly he comes into being in yonder world with limbs, with a body, [whole]. 4. Verily, that is certainly in yonder world, viz. a man’s two testicles, the penis,
karna nasike yath kim cah nastikarin na sambhavati. 8. atha
ya evam etam' ukthayai *manam utman pratiishedat veda sa
ha va 'mustiho loke sngas satanus sarvas sambhavati. 9. tad
etad vaivamitram uktham. tad annam va'i visvam prana
mitram. 10. tad dha visvamitrac sramena tapasu vratacaryena
'ndrasya priyam dhama 'pajagama. 11. tasmu ha'i tat pravocao
yad* idam manusyam agatam. 12. tad dha sa upanisaduda
jyotir etad uktham* iti. 13. jyotir iti dve aksare prana iti dve
annam iti dve. tad etad anna eva pratiishedat. 11. atha hai
'nami jamadagnir upanirsadu *yur* etad uktham iti. 12. ayr
iti dve aksare prana iti dve annam iti dve. tad etad anna eva
pratiishedat. 13. atha hai *'nami* vasistha upanisaduda gaur
etad uktham iti. tad etad* annam eva. annam hi gauh. 14. tad
akh ad asya pranasya prusa cariram atha kena 'nye* pran
rana cariravanto bhavanti ti. 15. sa bhuvid yad vasa vadati
tad vasa cariray yam nanasa dhayatyai tan nanasa cariray
yac caksus paapayati tae caksus carirau, yac chrotrena grioti
tae chrotren cariram. evam u hai 'nye pranaca cariravanto
bhavanti' ti. 78.

prathama 'nunake tritiyah kauaah.

the two ears, the two nostrils: whatever does not come into
being boneless. 1. Now whose thus knows this self of the
uktho firmly established in the self, truly he comes into being in
yonder world with limbs, with a body, whole. 2. That same is
the uktho belonging to Viyamitra. Verily, food is all (vipa),
breath is a friend (mitra). 7. Now Viyamitra through exertion,
through penance, through the performance of vows, went unto
the dear abode of Indra. 8. And he proclaimed to him that
which has come to men here. 8. Now he went for instruction
[to him] [saying]: "Light is this uktho." 9. "Light" has two
syllables, 'breath' has two, 'food' has two. That same is firmly
established in food. 11. Then Jamadagni went for instruction
to him [saying]: "Life is this uktho." 11. "Life" has two sylla-
bles, 'breath' two, 'food' two. That same is firmly established
in food. 13. Then Vasistha went for instruction to him [say-
ing]: "The cow is this uktho." That same is just food. For
the cow is food. 11. This they say: "If man be the body of this
breath, how then do the other breaths (senses) come to have
bodies?" 11. Let him say: "What he speaks with speech, that
is the body of speech. What he thinks with the mind, that is
the body of the mind. What he sees with sight, that is the
body of sight. What he hears with hearing, that is the body of
hearing. Thus the other breaths (senses) also come to have
bodies."

3. 7. A. -tad. 8. A. ukth-. 9. pr-. 10. tad. 11. utth-. 12. A. -sada) gaur; B.
III. 4. 1. That same uktha is sevenfold. Chanted is the stotriya (strophe), the anurūpa (antistrophe), the dhāyya (kindling verse), the prāgātha (tristich), the sūkta (hymn), the nīvid (notification), [and] the parīdhāniyā (closing verse). 2. This [earth] is the stotriya; Agni the anurūpa; Vāyu the dhāyyā; the atmosphere the prāgātha; the sky the sūkta; the sun the nīvid—therefore the Rig-veda scholars study the nīvid when [the sun] has risen; for the sun is the nīvid—the quarters the parīdhāniyā. Thus with regard to the divinities. 3. Now with regard to the self. The self itself is the stotriya; offspring the anurūpa; breath the dhāyya; mind the prāgātha; the head the sūkta; sight the nīvid; hearing the parīdhāniyā. 4. Now some recite its parīdhāniyā with a triṣṭubh, others with an anustubh. But let him recite the parīdhāniyā with a triṣṭubh. 5. That same some chant having uttered these sacred utterances: “He, the great one, united with her, the great one; the god united with the goddess; the brahman united with the brahmani. In that he united, he united.” 6. Therefore the bodies of men are now united respectively. For man is this uktha. 7. “He, the great one, united with her, the great one.” Verily Agni is he, the great one, this [earth] is she, the great one. 8. “The god united with the goddess.” Verily Vāyu is the god, the atmosphere is the goddess. 9. “The brahman united with the brahmani.” Verily the sun is the brahman, the sky is the brahmani. 10. Of these divinities each two divinities make up nine syllables respec-

taylor nava-nava 'ksarāṇi sampadyante. etad ime' lokās' tri-
navā bhavanti. 11. tad brahma vai triyṛt. tad brahmā 'bhīṣya-
hṛtya paścanti, esa u eva stomas so' ucaurah. 12. yad īmām āhūr ekstoma ity ayam eva yo 'yam pavaite. eso 'dhi-devatam.
prāṇo 'dhyātmanam. tasya cariram anurahah.' 13. tad yathā ha
vai maṅgū maṇiśūtraṁ samprotaṁ syuḥ— 79.

prathame 'nuvāke caturthah khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 5. 1. —' evaṁ hai 'tasmin survam idāṁ samprotaṁ gan-
dharvāpastruḥ paśavo manasyaḥ. 2. tad dha muñjasā sāma-
gravasah prayayā. tasmaiḥ ha gājaniṁ váśyāḥ preṇyāḥ.'
1. tasya hai nārīkṣāṁ patitvā navāntapiṁḍa usasi nipapātā.
tāṁ hai 'dāyā 'nudadhūnam. 1. tato hai 'vai stomas' dadarśā
tārākṣā vitatam bahu ūbhānmānam. tasyo ha yuktvā' dadarśā
tābhāpavanāṁ usadya śitaṁ śīvī prāṇaṁ iti kārṣyati śitaṁ
gṛhitraṁ apāṇya iti vícā. didṛkṣetāṁ 'vai kāśyāṁ ṣūriśātāṁ
'vai karṇāḥbhāyāṁ. svayam idāṁ manoyuktam. 2. tad yatram vā
iṣur atyagro bhavaṁ na vai su tato hinaśā' tad' u vā etain no
tively. Thus these worlds come to be thrice nine. 11. Verily that
brahman is threefold. Having uttered the sacred utterances they
chant unto this brahman. And this is also the stoma, this the
anucaura (sequel). 12. When they call him 'possessing one stoma,'
that is he who cleanses here. That [he is] with regard to the
divinities; breath [he is] with regard to the self. The anucaura
is its body. 13. As the thread of a jewel would be twined in
with the jewel,—

III. 5. 1. — Even so this all is twined in with it, viz. Gandhar-
vāsas, Apsarasas, domestic animals, [and] men. 2. Now Muñja
Śīmacarvassa went forth. Ėvaṁjani, a Vāyīya, went before him.
ś. Falling from the atmosphere, a lump of fresh butter fell down
on his breast. He, taking it, put it in addition [in the fire (?)].
3. Thereupon he saw the stoma spread out in the atmosphere,
greatly shining; he also saw its application (?). 4. Having set
himself about the bahāpavanāṁ, he should say śitaṁ śīvī prā-
ṇya; śītaṁ gṛhitraṁ apāṇya, with speech. He should wish to
see with the eyes, he should wish to hear with the ears. This is
of itself yoked to mind. Now when an arrow is too pointed,
verily it then does not hurt. Verily thus he would not attain it.

4. 18 B. āṁ. 16 B. -kān. 13 ū. 17 śā. 17-rāṇtam.
5. 1 A gloss, the second quotation in 5, is inserted at the begin-
bine before eva (B. eva). 9māri. 2sāha. 4 A. sec. m.; B. tamaśmā. 5
propāyā. 13. 1A. a. 2A. -i. śītra, the first letter may be an ī. 18
ghṛitṛa. 11 A. astī; B. hanaśī. 17 yad.
Jāiminiya-Upanisad-Brāhmaṇa. 165

'pāṇuṇyāt. pa ity eva 'pāṇyāt. tad yathā bimbena nygam ānuyed evam evāś 'nam etayā devatayā "nayati. sa yaktaḥ karoti. esa evā 'pi yuktāḥ." 80.

prathame 'nuvāke pañcamah khaṇḍah. prathamo 'nuvākas samāptah.

III. 6. 1. yo 'sāu sāmāḥ prattīn vedā pra hā 'smāi diyaṭe. 2. dādā' iti ha vā āyaṃ agnir diṣṭyate tathā 'ti vāyuḥ pavaṭe hante 'ti candramā om ity ādityāḥ. 3. esa ha vā sāmāḥ prattīḥ. 4. etāṁ ha vā sāmāḥ prattīn sudakṣiṇāḥ kyāmin vidāṁ ca kāraṇa. 5. tāṁ hāi tāṁ hotar vā "jye gāyena mātrāvarunasya vā tāṁ" dādā' tathāḥ hantāḥ him bhā oṣv iṭi. pra ha vā āsmāi diyaṭe. 6. [50] 'py anyāṁ bahūṁ uparyupariṁ' yu evam etāṁ sāmāḥ prattīn veda. 8. yu u ku vā ābhānāh11 bandhumat sāma veda yatra ha 'py evānāḥ na vidur yatra raṣanti yatra pari 'va caṅkṣate tad dāḥ 'pi prāṣṭhyam uḍḍhipatam annūdayām purodhānaṁ" paryeti. 9. aṅgir ha vā ābhānāh11 bandhumat sāma. kasmād vā hy evānāḥ dāroh kasmād vā paryavṛtya mantanti se prāṣṭhyayaṁ "dhipatayaṁ 'nādūdayaṁ purodhāyāṁ" jāyate. 10. sa yatra ha vā 'py evaśvidāṁ na vidur yatra ro-

Let him breathe out [saying] simply pu. As one would attract a deer by means of a mirror, even thus he attracts it (?) by means of this divinity. He (?) performs yoked, and he is yoked also.

III. 6. 1. That one yonder who knows the delivery of the sāmaṇ, verily unto him it is delivered. 2. [Uttering] dādā, this fire here shines; [uttering] tathā, the wind cleanses (blows); hantā the moon [utters], om the sun. 3. Verily this is the delivery of the sāmaṇ. Verily this delivery of the sāmaṇ Sudakaśina Kṣāmi knew. 4. One should sing that same in the ājya-chant of either the hotar or the mātrāvaruṇa-priest: dādā, tathā, hantā, him bhā onā. Verily it is delivered unto him. 5. He is much superior to even many others who thus knows this delivery of the sāmaṇ. 6. And whoso being without relatives knows the sāmaṇ rich in relatives, even where they do not know him, where they are angry at him, where they overlook him, as it were, he thus compasses excellence, supremacy, food-eating, [and] the office of a purohita. 7. Verily Agni, being without relatives, is the sāmaṇ rich in relatives. For in whatever way they churm him, from the wood, or by turning, he is born for excellence, for supremacy, for food-eating, [and] for the office of a purohita. 8. Verily even

5. 11-po. 14-tīḥ.
6. 1-prattī. 1A. tadān; B. dādān. 3A. prakṛtiḥ; B. pravṛtiḥ.
1A. tām. 2B. inserts hantāḥ. 1A. om. 5-apy. 12-hūny. 10A. -upā.
III. 7. 1. svayan u tatra yatrāi 'naṁ viduḥ. 2. sudakṣiṇo ha vāi kṣāmīṁḥ prācīna-cālīṁ ca jábālāu te ha sabrahmācārīna āsūḥ. 3. te he 'me bahu jāpyasya ca 'nyasya ca 'nucīre prācīna-cālīṁ ca jábālāu ca. 4. atha ha sma sudakṣiṇah kṣāmīr yaḍ eva yajñasya 'njo yat suviditam tud dhā smāi 'va prechati. 5. tāḥ hu vā apodītā vyākroṣamānāś cerucu gūḍro durunācāna iti ha sma sudakṣiṇam kṣāmim ākroṇantī prācīna-cālīṁ ca jábālāu ca. 6. sa ha smā'ha sudakṣiṇah kṣāmīr yatra bhūyīṣṭaḥ kuru-paṇḍalās samūgata bhuvitāras ten na esa saivūdo nā'nupradṛṣ gūḍrah iva saivauḍsyāmahun iti. 7. tā u ha vāi jábālāu dīkṣātīṁ cūkraḥ ca goṣṭro ca. tayor ha prācīna-cālīṁ vṛtta udgātā. 8. sa tad dhā sudakṣiṇo 'nububuṭhe jábālāu hā 'dīkṣātām iti. sa ha saivraghūṭārami uñca 'nyayeśā' re jábālāu hā 'dīkṣātām' tud gamisāyāva iti. 82.

dvitiye 'nuvāke dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

where they do not know one knowing thus, where they are angry at him, where they so to speak overlook him, he thus compasses excellence, supremacy, food-eating, [and] the office of a purohitā.

III. 7. 1. And [that happens] of itself where they know him. 2. Sudakṣiṇa Kṣāmī, Prācīna-cālī, the two Jábalas—they were fellow-students. 3. These, viz. Prācīna-cālī and the two Jábalas, recited much of what is to be muttered and of other [prayers]. 4. Then Sudakṣiṇa Kṣāmī used to ask [them] concerning that which is easy of the sacrifice, concerning that which is well known. 5. And they, being distracted, kept crying out: "Çudra, ignoramus!" Thus they, viz. Prācīna-cālī and the two Jábalas, used to cry out against Sudakṣiṇa Kṣāmī. 6. Then Sudakṣiṇa Kṣāmī used to say: "Where most of the Kuru-paṇḍalās shall be assembled together, there shall be this disputation of ours; we will not dispute without witnesses, like Çudras." 7. Now the two Jábalas, Çūkra and Goṣtru, consecrated themselves. Of them Prācīna-cālī [was] chosen udgātā. 8. Then Sudakṣiṇa became aware: "The two Jábalas have consecrated themselves." He said to his driver: "Sirrah, conduct [me thither]. The two Jábalas have consecrated themselves. Thither we will go."
III. 8. 1. tasya ha ūṭatiṣṭa agrunukhā īvā "sur anyantarāṁ vā ayam upāgād" iti. 2. atha ha sma vai yaḥ puruḥ brahmaiva-
dyain vadaty anyatarāṁ upāgād iti ha śmiṁ 'nam manyante. atho ha śmaṁ 'nam mṛtyum īvā 'vo 'pāsate. 3. taṁ ha samgra-
hūtō 'vācā 'tha yad bhagavan te tābhāyāṁ na kuśalam kathā'
'tham ātthe 'ti. 4. om iti ho 'vāca gantavyam ma ācāryaṁ
suryamāṁ amanyate 'ti. 5. sa ha ratam āsthāya pradhānavayāṁ
cakāra. taṁ ha sma pratiṣante. 6. kaṁ jānūle 'ti. sudakṣina
iti. na vai nānāṁ sa idam abhyaveyād iti. sa eva 'ti. 7. sa hu
sopānād evā 'ntarvedy avasthāyo 'vācā 'ṛgav itthaiṁ gṛhapatād
iti. taṁ ha nā 'nudatiśthasat. sa ho 'vācā 'nūthātā maś edhi.
krṣṇājina 'si [ti]. tad īme kurupaścālaṁ avidur anūthātāṁ 'va
tu iti ho "cuh. 8. taṁ ha kanīyān bhūto 'vācā' 'nūthātha'
bhavā udgātārām iti. vai ha 'nātunthāu. 9. sa ho 'vāca trir
vai gṛhapate puruṣa jayate. pitur evā 'gre 'dhi jayate 'tha mā-
tur atha yajñāt. 10. trir' vai evaṁ mriyataṁ iti. sa yad dhu vā
enam etu pitā yonyāṁ reto bhūtaṁ śiścati—83.

dvitiye 'nurvāke ṛtiyāh khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 8. 1. Now his relatives were tear-faced, as it were [saying]:
"This one hath gone unto one or the other." 2. Now whenever
one formerly engaged in a theological disputation, they used to
think of him: "He hath gone unto one or the other;" and they
used to wait on him as on one dead. 3. The driver said to him:
"Since, sir, thou art not on good terms with these two, why dost
thou speak thus?" 4. "Yes," he said, "I must go; the teacher
thought [them] easily governed." 5. He, mounting the chariot,
drove off. They catch sight of him. 6. "Do you know who
this is?" "Sudakṣina." 7. "May he not come down hither now.
"[It is] just he." 8. He, descending from the steps within the
sacred enclosure, said: "Verily now is it thus, O householder?"
He did not wish to attend upon him. He said: "Be thou attending
upon me; thou art [dressed] in the skin of a black antelope.
These Kurupaścālas knew this. "He is thy attendant," they
said. 9. His younger brother said to him: "Sir, attend upon the
udgāta." He attended upon him. 10. He said: "Verily thrice,
O householder, man is born. From his father he is born first,
then from his mother, then from the sacrifice. 11. And thrice he
likewise dieth. When his father emitteth him as seed thus into
the womb,——

8. 1B. -m. 2B. t. 3ādṛ-. 4sūy-. 5gṛha-. 6uddhā-. 7m. 8insert iti. 9A. grāto. 10A. vā. 11anūtiśtha. 12A. triv. 13A. a; B. ū.
14A. om. 15B. triyata.
III. 9. 1. — tat prathamam mriyate. 2. andham' iva vai tamo yonih. lohitastoko vai' vai sa tad abhavaty aparin va stoka'h. kiin hi sa' tad abhavati. 3. sa yas tair devatani veda yain ca sa' tato 'nusambhavati yu' cii' 'naih tam mrtyum ativahati sa udgatii mrtyum ativahati 'ti. 4. atha ya enam etad dikṣayanti' tad dvitiyaṃ mriyate. vapantri kepaṃgraṇi. niṃrntanti nakhi. pratyaji'ya aigani. pratyacaty' aiguli. apavyto' paveṣita' āste. na jukoti. na yojeti. na yośitan' cārati. anānusin vaciin vudati. mṛtyasya vavai' sa' tad vāpum bhavati. 5. sa yas tair devatani veda yain ca' sa tato 'nusambhavati yu' cii' 'naih tam mṛtyum ativahati sa udgatii mṛtyum ativahati 'ti. 6. atha ya enam etad asmāl lokāt pretaṇi citīyam adadhati tad trīyaṃ mriyate. 7. sa yas' tair devatani veda yain ca sa tato 'nusambhavati yu' cii' 'naih tam mṛtyum ativahati' sa udgatii mṛtyum ativahati 'ti. 8. etavyad dhāi'vo' 9. k̕�ī rattam āsthāya praddhāvayān cakāra. 9. tām ha jābālam praṇyan kanīyān bhrātō 'vūcā kāmī bhavaī 10. chiddaka vācān avāī 'ti. hastinī gūḍham āīṣir iti. 10. pra hāi 'vai 'naih tac chaṣaṣa yah katham avocad bhaga vā iti. yas trayānum mṛtyunāṃ sāmā 'tivāhān veda sa udgatii mṛtyum ativahati 'ti. 84. dvitiye 'nuvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 9. 1. "— Then he dies for the first time. 2. Blind darkness, as it were, is the womb. He thus becomes either a drop of blood or a drop of water. What, pray, does he thus become? 3. He who knows that divinity after which he thence comes into being and which carries him beyond this death—he as udgātā carries beyond death. 4. And when they thus consecrate him, then he dies for the second time. They cut [his] hair and [his] beard. They trim [his] nails. They anoint his several limbs. He bends his fingers. He sits uncovered, stripped off (?). He does not offer oblations, he does not sacrifice, he does not approach a woman, he speaks non-human speech. Verily he then has the form of one dead. 5. = 6. 6. And when they lay him, having departed from this world, upon the funeral-pyre, then he dies for the third time. 7. = 8. Having said this much, mounting the chariot, he drove off. 9. To this Jābala, having come back, [his] younger brother said: "Sir, what words hath the Čudra spoken? Thou hast sought a shallow with an elephant." He (the older Jābala) set that forth to him who [had said]: "How hath he spoken, sir?": "He who knows the carrying-over of the three deaths by means of the sāmā, he as udgātā carries beyond death."
III. 10. 1. He said: "Sir, verily, thy father thought him an udgātar; and the Prācīnaçālas know it, who of them was the chosen udgātar here." To him they did not assent (?). 2. They said: "Run after Kāndviya." They ran after him. They made Kāndviya the udgātar, [and] Prācīnaçāl the brahman-priest. 3. He looking down at him said: "Thus this Brähman was not averse to idle talk. He doth not strive after the subtile of the súman." He did this beyond him (?). 4. When the father thus emits him as seed into the womb, then the sun thus emits him as seed in the womb. He there lords over this death. 5. And when the father thus emits him as seed into the womb, verily he thence comes into existence after that [seed] and after breath. For when breath enters the emitted seed, then it comes into being. 6. And when they thus consecrate him, it is Agni who thus emits him as seed into the womb. He there lords over this death. 7. Now what vāisarjana-offering the adhvaryu offers, after that he thence comes into existence and after the metres. 8. And when they thus lay him, having departed from this world, on the funeral pyre, it is the moon who thus emits him as seed into the womb. He there lords over this death. 9. Now when they put him, having departed from this world,

H. Oertel,

dhaty atho ya evai 'tadv avoksaaniyav apas tA eva sa tato 'nuvamhavati" prAnam v eva. prAna hy apah. 10. taAm ha va evanvid udgAtA yajamanam om ity etenA 'ksarena "dityam mrityum ativahati vAgy ity agnihi hm iti vAgyum bhA iti candramasan. 11. tanu vA etAn mrityum samno 'dgAtA "tmAnAma ca yajamanam ca 'tivahaty om ity etenA 'ksarena prAvenA 'munA "dityena. 12. tasyaI 'sa sloka

utai 'sanI jyestha" uta va kanIshA

utai 'sanI putra uta va pitae 'san:

eko ha devo munasi praviitaA

pitroo ha jojne sa u garbhe 'ntar

iti. 13. tad yad eso 'bhvuktA" tinam eva purusAm yo 'yan uchanno31 'ntar om ity etenA 'vA 'ksareNA prAvenA 'vA 'munA 'vA "dityena [. . . . . .] 85.

dvitiye 'nuvAke paNcamaa khanDaA. dvitiyo 'nuvAkAs saMpaAtha.

III. 11. 1. trir ha32 vai puruso mriyate trir jAya te. 33. sa hAitE 'tad eva prathamam mriyate yad retas siktA samdbhutam 'bhavati. sa prA navA evA 'bhisaNbhavati. Apan abhijAya te. 34. athAitE 'tad dvitiyA mriyate yad diksAya te. sa chaMAnasy evA 'bhisa-
on the funeral pyre, now what the waters for sprinkling are, after those he thence comes into existence and after breath also. For breath is the waters. 10. Him sacrificing an udgAtar who knows thus carries beyond the sun, [i.e. beyond] death, by means of this syllable, viz. om; [saying] vac [he carries him] beyond Agni; [saying] hun, beyond Viyu; [saying] bhA, beyond the moon. 11. Verily beyond these same deaths an udgAtar carries himself and the sacrificer, by means of this syllable, viz. om, by means of breath, by means of yonder sun. 12. About this there is this sloka: "Is he the oldest of them or the youngest? Is he their son, or their father? Truly one god is entered in the mind; he was born of old and he is within the womb." 13. In that he is spoken of, this same man who is concealed within, by just that syllable om, by breath, by yonder sun [. . . . . .].

III. 11. 1. Verily, thrice man dies, thrice he is born. 2. Then he dies for the first time, when the seed, emitted, comes into being. He is converted into breath; he is born into space. 2. Then he dies for the second time, when he consecrates himself. He is converted into the metres; he is born unto the sacrificial

10. 'A. tA. 30. jAtIsA. 31. B. hyu-. 32. achAyaN.
11. 'A. he. 3. insert sa hAitE 'tad eva prathamam mriyate. trir jAya te.
33. sAhh-. 34. 'A. ova.
bhavati. daksinam abhijayate. 1. athai 'tat tryiyam mrityate yan' mrityate. sa graddham eva 'bhishambhavati. lokam abhijayate. 1. tad etat tryaivrd' gayatram gayati. 2. tasya prathamaya "vete 'nam eva lokam jayati yad u ca 'smiin loke. tad etena cai 'nam pragna samardhayati" yam abhisambhavaty etam cai 'smi u cacam" prayacchati yam abhijayate. 1. atha dvitiyaya "vete 'dam eva 'ntariksan m jayati yad u ca 'ntarikse. tad etaii caii 'naii chandobhis samardhayati" yam abhisambhavati. etam cai 'smaii daksinam prayacchati yam abhijayate. 1. atha tryayaya "vrit 'mun eva lokam jayati yad u ca 'muismi loke. tad etaya caii 'naiai graddhaya samardhayati" yaya e vaii 'nam etac chradhayah 'gnau" abhyadadhah sam ayam ito bhavisyati ti. etam cai 'smaii lokam" prayacchati yam abhijayate. 86.

III. 12. 1. etad vaii tirsbhir avribhir inaing ca lokaii jayaty etaii caii 'nam bhutaais samardhayati" yam abhisambhavati.

3. atha va aha hinkarsiyai 'va. tam ha' svarge loke santam mrtyur anvety apanayai. 1. grir vai esai praajapatih sampno yad dhinkuraa. tam id udgata priyai praajapatih hinkare na mr.

gift. 4. Then he dies for the third time, when he dies. He is converted into faith; he is born into [his] world. 5. Therefore he sings the gayatra [-chant] in three turns (avrita). By its first turn he conquers this world, and what there is in this world. Thus he causes him to thrive with that breath into which he is converted, and he gives him that space unto which he is born. 6. And by its second turn he conquers this atmosphere, and what there is in the atmosphere. Thus he causes him to thrive with those metres into which he is converted, and he gives him that sacrificial gift unto which he is born. 7. And with the third turn he conquers yonder world, and what there is in yonder world. Thus he causes him to thrive with that faith with which faith they lay him into the fire [saying]: "This one, from here, will come to life;" and he gives him that world unto which he is born.

III. 12. 1. Verily, thus with three turns he conquers these worlds, and he causes him to thrive with those things into which he is converted. 2. Now from here concerning the hinkara. After him, being in the heavenly world, death goes, hunger. 3. The hinkara is the fortune, Prajapati of the saram. That death the udgatar drives away by means of for-
tyum apasedhati. 4. hum mé 'ty áha mà 'tra nu' gá yatrú ' tad yajamána iti hāi 'tat. 5. sa yathá śreyasa śiddhāḥ pápiyän prativiyajta' evam" hāi 'nu 'smá́n mṛtyúḥ pápmá prativiyate.'

III. 13. 1. hum bhá iti brahmavaraśakāmasya. bháti 'va hi brahmavarcasam. 2. hum bo' iti paçukāmasya, bo iti ha paçaro vāpyante. 3. hum bag iti çrikāmasya. bag iti ha çriyam pañåyanti. 4. hum bhá ová ity etad evo 'pagitam. 5. mahád īvá 'bhuparivartayan gáyed iti ita smá 'ha níko mahágrúmo mahá

nivego bhavati 'ti. sa yathá sthá̄ṇum arpayivé 'tareṇa ve 'tareṇa và pariyáyät tádyāk tat. 6. tad u ho 'váca çāṭyāyaniḥ kasmá kámad stháṇum arpayet. ato 'pagitam evá 'tat. náî 'váî 'tad' ádiyete 'ti. 7. [iti] nu hiṅkáranám. atáh và ato

nidhamam eva. ová iíi aksare. anto váî sámmo nidhamam

tune, of Prajadi, of the hiṅkára. 4. He says hum mà; that is, "Do not now go thither, where the sacrificer now is." As, driven by a better one, a worse one trembles before him, even so death, evil, trembles before him. 6. As for his saying mà, mà is the moon, the month. Verily, this month is mà. Therefore he says mà; that is bhá, in an occult way, as it were. As to why he says mà—in that he says mà, there are these three [meanings]. Therefore he should say mà.

III. 13. 1. Hum bhá are [the utterances] of him who desires lustre in sacred lore. For lustre in sacred lore shines (√bhá), as it were. 2. Hum bo are [the utterances] of him who desires cattle. For cattle low bo. 3. Hum bag are [the utterances] of him who desires fortune. For saying bag they exalt fortune. 4. Hum bhá ová, that is sung in response. "Let him sing turning about unto something great, as it were," Náka used to say; "he becomes the owner of a great village, the owner of a great resting place." That is as if, having caused to run against a post, with another or another one should go about [it]. 6. [But] Çáṭyāyani said regarding this: "For what purpose should he cause to run against a post? Now that is sung in response. Let him pay no attention to that." 7. So much about the hiṅkáras. Henceforth regarding the nidhana. Ová is two syllables. Verily the ni-
The content of the image is a page from a Sanskrit text, possibly a religious or philosophical work. The text contains Sanskrit verses and explanations, with a focus on the concept of the universe and the heavens. The text is written in a traditional layout, with verses numbered and discussed point by point. The language and the structure suggest it is from a classical Sanskrit text, possibly one related to Hindu philosophy or religious literature, such as the Upanishads or similar works.

The text discusses the concept of the heavens and the role of the sacrificer (udgātā) in the process of ritual offerings, emphasizing the importance of understanding and performing the rituals correctly. The verses highlight the symbolic and metaphysical aspects of the heavens and the significance of the sacrificer in this context.

The text also includes a dialogue or narrative element, with questions and responses that elucidate the deeper meanings and implications of the rituals and the universe. The dialogue style and the use of personal pronouns indicate an interactive or didactic nature, aimed at teaching or conveying profound knowledge.

Overall, the text provides a rich tapestry of religious and philosophical thought, with a focus on the divine and the cosmic, encapsulated in the form of ritual and sacrifice.
obtain the world. 3. To him he should answer thus: “Who (ka) am I, heaven [art] thou. As such I have gone to thee, the heavenly heaven.” 4. Verily Prajāpati is who (ka), and he who knows thus is heaven-going; for he goes to heaven. 5. He says to him: “Who thou art, that one am I; who I am, that one art thou; come!” 6. He enters this sap of good deeds. And what men in this world sacrifice, what good [deeds] they do, that of them rises upward [as] food-eating; it enters yonder moon, the world of men. 7. This human-like egg of him comes into being within the belly. Of it the food-eating rises upward toward the two breasts. When he is born, then the mother offers her breast to him for food-eating. 8. Verily unborn is the man in so far as he does not sacrifice. It is through the sacrifice that he is born; just as an egg first burst. 9. Then the udgāta knowing thus causes him, the sacrificer, through this syllable, viz. om, to enter the sun, the world of the gods. By means of the next syllable, viz. vāc, he gives him the moon, food-eating, imperishableness. 10. But whose udgītha one not knowing thus sings, verily he does not cause him to enter the world of the gods, nor to thrive through food-eating. 11. As an egg would lie besmeared (?), not receiving any food, so he lies besmeared (?), not receiving
any food.  12. Therefore he should cause only one knowing thus to sing the udgītha. Only one knowing thus here being addressed with “O udgātar” should answer.

III. 15. 1. Indra said the uktha for Viṣvāmitra [with] vāc.
   That same the descendants of Viṣvāmitra worship, just speech.
   2. Manu declared to Vasiṣṭha brahman-hood. Therefore they say:
      “The brahman belongs to Vasiṣṭha.”  2. This they also say:
      “One knowing thus is the brahman-priest; and who is equal to a
      Vasiṣṭha knowing thus?”  4. Prajāpati was desirous to have
      progeny. He performed penance. He considered: “Come now,
      I will generate a firm footing. What offspring I shall generate
      thereafter, that will thus stand firm; it will not, moving about
      without firm foundation, fall (?)”. He generated this world, [also]
      the world of atmosphere [and] yonder world. Having generated
      these three worlds, he toiled upon [them].  5. He heated them
      together. From them being heated together three bright [bodies]
      went up: Agni from the earth, Vāyu from the atmosphere, the
      sun from the sky.  7. He again heated these bright [bodies]. From
      them being heated together three bright [bodies] went up:
      the Rigveda from Agni, the Yajurveda from Vāyu, the Śāma
      vedas from the sun.  9. He again heated these bright [bodies]. From

14. 11 -cruñ-.  
15. 1 dā. 2 uñh-. 1A. jāye : B. janaye. 3 rk-. 4 tām. 5 -mu-. 6 sam-
abhan. 7 ssa. 8 -n.
III. 16. 1. This sacrifice verily is he that cleanses here. Speech and mind are the two tracks of it. For thus it rolls along by speech and mind. 2. Of it ‘hotar,’ ‘avdhvaryu,’ ‘udgatar’ arrange the one [track] by speech. Therefore they officiate with speech. The brahman-priest [arranges] the other by the mind. Therefore he sits in silence. 3. If he should sit talking aloud, while the stotra or the pastra are being uttered, then he would arrange with voice the one track of it. 4. As a one-legged man, going, keeps on tumbling, or a one-wheeled chariot, rolling, even so the sacrifice then keeps on tumbling. 5. A Brāhmaṇ knowing this said this to a brahman-priest who, when the prātaranuvāka was begun, sat talking aloud: “These here then have excluded half of the sacrifice.” For half of the sacrifice they then did exclude. 6. Therefore the Brāhmaṇ-priest should sit in silence, when the

them being heated together three bright [bodies] went up: bhus from the Rgveda, bhuvas from the Yajurveda, svar from the Sāmadeva, just so. 9. That is the brightness of the threefold knowledge. So great is this all. Verily what the world is of him who knows the threefold knowledge, that becomes the world of him who knows thus.

15. 10-m. 16. 1.ān. 2. gr. 3. nām. 4. ta. 5. o. 6. B. repeats ās-. 7. n. 8. gu-rūr. 9. ntarirgūh.
III. 17. 1. If that sacrifice should go tumbling from the side of the rc, they say: "Tell it to the brahman-priest"; and if from the yajus, they say: "Tell it to the brahman-priest"; and if from the siman, they say: "Tell it to the brahman-priest"; and if from [a cause] not understood—[when they ask]: "Whence hath this arisen?"—they say: "Tell it to the brahman-priest."

2. That brahman-priest going up toward the east should offer the sacrificial butter with a ladle in the agnidhra, with these exclamations: bhūṣ, bhūvas, suvr. 3. For these exclamations expiate everything. As one would mend gold with salt, silver with gold, tin with silver, copper with tin, iron with copper, wood with iron, wood and leather with glue, even so one knowing thus cures everything.

4. This they say: "If with the words: 'He hath offered for me, he hath dipped the dippings for me,' they lead the sacrificial gifts to the adhvaryu; if with the words: 'He hath sung the castra for me, he hath uttered the vasat for me,' to the hotar; if with the words: 'He hath sung

16. 11-ā. 11-pād. 11-yad. 11-naḥ.
17. 11-ā. 11-so. 11-ratha. 4. A. prāṇā; B. prā. 8. B. vidadh-. 4-puḥ.
A. kām-. 4. A. gṛyāna (sandadhyāt)ṇa, parenthesis cancelled in red.
A. -pas. 10-akṛṣ. 11-may. 90 B. om. ev. 11-ādiṣāṣa.
VOL. XVI. 24
Ity udgīтра 'tha kim cakruse brahmane tuṣṇim āsināya smā-
vātir āve 'tarāyī' pūrghīr daksīṇā nayanā 'ti. 1. sa brūyād 
اردhabhāg' gha' nāī sa' yajnāsya 'rdham hy esa yajnāsya 
rahati 'ti. ardhā ha sma vāi purā brahmane daksīṇā nayanā 
'ti. ardhā utarabhya pūrghīryā. 2. tasyāī 'sa āloko 
mayī 'dam manye bhavanādī sacrān 
mayī lokā mayī diṣa catasraḥ : 
mayī' 'dam manye nimisad yād ējati 
mayy āpa oṣadhaya ca sacrā 
śī. 1. mayī 'dam manye bhavanādī sacrān ity evanvīdāṁ ha 
vāve 'dam sacrān bhavanam avāyattam. 2. mayī lokā mayī 
diṣa catasraḥ ity evanvīdā ha vāve lokā evanvīdī diṣa cat-
asraḥ. 3. mayī 'dam manye nimisad yād ējati mayy āpa oṣadhaya ca sacrā ity evanvīdā 
ha vāve 'daṁ sacrān bhavanam pratiṣṭhitam. 6. tasmād u hāi 'vanvīdām eva brahmāṁ 
kurvāta. sa ha vāva' brahmā ya evam vedo. 92. 
caturthe 'nuvāke tṛtiyāḥ khaugāḥ.

III. 18. 1. athu vā atas stomabhāgānum eva 'numantrāḥ. 
2. tud dāyī 'tad eke stomabhāgāir eva 'numantrayante. tat 
tathā na' kuryāt. 3. devena savitrā prasūtaḥ prastotar deva-
the udgītha for me,' to the udgītar—now then to the brahman 
having done what, while he sat in silence, do they lead just as 
large sacrificial gifts as to the other priests?’ 4. Let him say: 
“He, indeed, shareth in half of the sacrifice, for he carrieth 
half of the sacrifice.” Indeed they formerly used to lead half of 
the sacrificial gifts to the brahman-priest, half to the other priests. 
6. Of this there is the following sloka: “In me, I think, is this 
whole creation etc., in me the worlds, in me the four quarters; 
in me, I think, is that twinkling thing which stirs, in me the 
waters and all the herbs.” 7. “In me, I think, is the whole crea-
tion etc.: for on one knowing thus this whole creation is depen-
dent. 8. ‘In me the worlds, in me the four quarters:’ for in one 
knowing thus are the worlds, in one knowing thus the four 
quartes. 9. ‘In me that twinkling thing which stirs, in me the 
waters and all the herbs:’ for in one knowing thus this whole 
creation has its support. 10. And therefore one should make one 
knowing thus a brahman-priest. He indeed is a brahman-priest 
who knows thus.

III. 18. 1. Now from here [about] the after-verses of the sto-
mabhāgas. 2. Now some recite the after-verses just with the 
stomabhāgas. One should not do that. 8. And some recite the

17. 1 stomā-. 13 nu. 12 kurvā.
bhoyo vācam iṣye 'ty u hai 'ke 'numantrayante savitā vāi deva-
nām prasavītā savitrā' prasūtā idam anumantrayāmaha iti 
va dadanā, ta u tathā naś kuryāt. 4. bhūr bhuvas svār ity u 
hai 'ke 'numantrayanta esā vāi trayi' vidyā trayyāi' 've' 'dām 
vidyāyā' 'numantrayāmaha iti vadantah. ta u tathā no eva 
kuryāt. 4. om ity eva 'numantrayeta. 5. athāh 'sa vasiṣṭhāyāi 
kastombhāgānumantraḥ. tena hai 'tena vasiṣṭhāḥ praджākāma 
'numantrayāṁ cakre devena savitrā prasūtāḥ prastotar' 
devabhoyo 
vācam iṣya bhūr bhuvas svār om iti. tato vāi sa bahuḥ 
pra-jayā paśubhiḥ prajāyāt. 6. sa eva tena vasiṣṭhāyāi kastom-
bhāgānumantraṁ 7. 'numantrayeta bhūr eva praṇayā 
paśu-bhiḥ praṇayate. iyam ity eva 'numantrayeta. 83.
caturthe 'nuvāke caturthāṁ' khaṇḍāḥ.

III. 19. 1. athāh 'sa vācā vajram udgrhnāti. yad' āha somāh 
pavata iti vo 'pūvardadham iti vā vācāi 'va ta u vāco vajraṁ 
vighyate vācā satyena 'timheya. tasmāḥ om ity eva 'numa-
trayeta. 9. devā vā anayāḥ trayyā [vidyayā] sarasayo 'ṛdhnās 

after- verses [with this]: "Impelled by god Savitar, O prastotar, 
send [thy] speech to the gods," saying: "Savitar, verily, is the 
impeller of the gods; we recite this after-verse impelled by 
Savitā." One should not do that either. 4. And some recite 
the after-verse [with] bhūs, bhuvas, svār, saying: "Verily, 
this is the threefold knowledge; we now recite this after-verse 
with the threefold knowledge." One should not do that either. 
5. One should recite the after-verse [saying] only om. 6. Now 
this is Vasiṣṭha's only stomaḥbāga-after-verse. With this same 
Vasiṣṭha, desirous of offspring, recited the after-verses: "Im-
pelled by god Savitar, O prastotar, send [thy] speech to the 
gods; bhūs, bhuvas, svār, om." Thereby he was greatly propa-
gated through progeny [and] cattle. 7. Let him recite the after-
verse with this one stomaḥbāga-after-verse of Vasiṣṭha; he is 
greatly propagated through progeny [and] cattle. But this is 
the rule: let him recite the after-verse with om only.

III. 19. 1. Now with speech he takes up a thunderbolt. In 
that he says either "Soma cleanses itself" or "Turn ye hither," 
thereby with speech that thunderbolt of speech is taken apart (?) 
by the truth of speech he is released. Therefore he should 
recite the after-verse [saying] om only. 2. Verily the gods

18. 4 rā. 1 A. ne, e cancelled in red. 4-5. 1 trāyīye. 5 'va. 6 'yāyā. 
5 'ya. 6 'yā. 7 'vr. 8 'tastrām. 9-yēte. 10 'yā. 11 'B. pāṇcamaḥ. 
11 'stā. 
19. 1 ya. 1 2.
III. 20. 1. guhā 'si devo 'sy upavā 'sy upa taṁ vāyasva' yo 'smin doṣeti yain ca vayaṁ duśmaḥ. 2. mahinā 'si bahuḥ 'si bhātya aśi rohiny aśi apannā 'si. 3. sambhūre devo 'si sam aham bhūyāsam. abhūtir aśi abhūyāsam. bhūtir aśi bhūyāsam. 4. yās te praṇā upadīṣṭā nā 'ham tava tāḥ paryemi. upa te tā

with this threefold [knowledge] rich in sap ascended upwards to the heavenly world. They, being afraid lest men should come after [them], pressed the threefold knowledge (Veda). 2. Pressing it, they could not press one syllable of it; that was om. 4. Verily this is full of sap; full of sap becomes the threefold knowledge of one who knows thus. 5. Verily what victory one wins, what thrift one thrives with the threefold knowledge full of sap, he wins that victory, he thrives that thrift, who knows thus. 6. Verily this same syllable is the firm stand of the threefold knowledge. [Saying] om the hotar stands firm, [saying] om the adhvaryu, [saying] om the udgātā. 7. Verily this same syllable is the triple heaven (?) of the Vedas. The priests having placed the sacrificer in this syllable carry him up together into the heavenly world. Therefore he should recite the afterverse [saying] om only.

III. 20. 1. “Thou art in secret, thou art a god, thou art on-blowing; blow on him who hates us and whom we hate. 2. Thou art great, thou art abundant, thou art extended (brāhati), thou art ruddy, thou art not fallen. 3. Thou art a god coming into existence; may I come into existence. Thou art existence; may I exist. Thou art becoming; may I become. 4. What offspring of thee is declared, that [offspring] of thee

19. 1vib.- 1trāy.- 1pratiṣṭhā. 1-e. 20. 1devāsmi. 1'py. 1vāyasvi. 1mahikā. 1abhūtīr.
diśāmi. 1. nāma me garīram me pratiṣṭhā me. tan me tvayi tan me mo 'pahṛthā iti 'māṃ prthivim avocat. 2. tam iyam āgatam prthivio pratīnandaty ayaṁ te bhagavo lokah. saha' nāv ayaṁ loka iti. 7. yad vāva me tvayi 'ty āha tad vāva me punar dehitī. 8. kiṁ nu te mayī 'ti. nāma' me garīram me pratiṣṭhā me. tan me tvayi tan me punar dehitī. tad asmā" iyam prthivī punar daḍāti. 9. tām āha pra mā vahe 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. aṅgin iti. tam aṅgin abhipravahati." 10. so 'gnim āhā 'bhijīd asy" abhijayāsam." lokajīd asi lokāni jayyāsam. attir asy annam adyāsam. annaṅho bhavati yas tvāi 'vaṁ veda. 11. sambhūr devo 'si sam aham bhūyāsam. abhūtir asy abhūyāsam. bhūtir asi bhūyāsam. 12. yāś te praṇa upadistā nā 'haṁ tava taḥ paryemi. upa te tā diśāmi. 13. tapo me tejo me 'nnam me vāṁ me. tan me tvayi. tan me mo 'pahṛthā' ity aṅgin avocat. 14. tain tathā 'vā' āgatam aṅgin pratiṇandaty ayaṁ te bhagavo lokas saha nāv ayaṁ loka iti. 15. yad vāva me tvayi 'ty āha tad vāva me punar dehitī. 16. kiṁ nu te mayī 'ti. tapo me tejo me 'nnam me vāṁ me. tan me tvayi. tan me punar dehitī. [tad] asmā" aṅgin punar daḍāti. 17. tām āha pra mā vahe 'ti. 95.

pañcame 'nuvāke prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I do not comprehend (?). That [offspring] of thee I declare.

1. My name, my body, my foundation: that of me is in thee. Do not take that of me unto thee," thus he said to this earth.

2. Him having come this earth joyfully receives [saying]: "Thine, O reverend sir, is this world. This world is ours in common."

7. "Verily what of me is in thee," he says, "give that back to me." 2. "What now of thee is there in me?" 3. "My name, my body, my foundation. That of me is in thee; give that back to me." That this earth gives back to him. 9. He says to her: "Carry me forth." "To what?" "To Agni." She carries him forth to Agni. 10. He says to Agni: "Victorious art thou, may I be victorious; world-conquering art thou, may I conquer the world; eating art thou, may I eat food; food-eating becomes he who knoweth thee thus. 11. = 3. 12. = 4. 13. "My penance, my splendor, my food, my speech, that of me is in thee. That of me do not take unto thee," he says to Agni. 14. Him having come thus Agni joyfully receives [saying]: "Thine, O reverend sir, is this world. This world is ours in common." 15. = 7. 16. "What now of thee is there in me?" "My penance, my splendor, my food, my speech. That of me is in thee; give that back to me."

That Agni gives back to him. 17. He says to him: "Carry me forth."

20. 6 sa. 1 B. madhi. 8 A. ma. 8 B. -hanti. 10 B. repeats abhi-
21. 1 jaryy-. 11 thāy. 13 tasmā. 14 asmāy.
III. 21. 1. kim abhi 'ti. vāyum iti. tan vāyum abhipravahati. 2. sa vāyum āha yat purastād vāsi 'nād rājā bhūto vāsi. ya daksinato vāsi "pāno bhūto vāsi. yat paccaud vāsi varuno rājā bhūto vāsi. ya d uttarato vāsi sono rājā bhūto vāsi. ya d upari- sūd avarāsā praṇjapair bhūto 'navāsī. 1. vrātyo 'ny ekavrāto 'navuṣṭho devānām bilam apiyadhāh. 4. tava praṇjas tavīu sādhyas tavī "po vicalam anuvicalanti. 5. sambhūr devo 'si sam aham bhūyāsam. ābhātur aya bhūyāsam. bhūtur aṣī bhū- yāsam. 6. yās te praṇā upadištā nā 'haṁ tava tāh paryemi. 7. upa te tā diśami. 8. praṇāpānāu me ārutam me. tan me tvayi. 9. tan me mo 'pahṛthā itī vāyum avocat. 10. tan tathā 'ṛā "gataṁ vāyuḥ pratinandaty ayaṁ te bhagavo lokahl. saha nār ayaṁ loka iti. 11. yad nāva me tvayi 'ty āha taḍ vāva me punar dehi 'ti. 12. kiṁ vu te mayi 'ti. praṇāpānāu me ārutam me. tan me tvayi. 13. tan me punar dehi 'ti. taḍ asmi vāyuḥ punar daddāti. 14. tam āha pra ma vahe 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. antarikṣalokam iti. tam antarikṣalokam abhipravahati. 15. tam tathā 'vā "gatoṁ antarikṣalokah pratinandaty ayaṁ te bhagavo lokahl. saha nār ayaṁ loka iti. 16. yad nāva me tvayi 'ty āha taḍ vāva me

III. 21. 1. "To what?" "To Vāyu." He carries him forth to Vāyu. 2. He says to Vāyu: "In that thou blowest from the front, thou blowest as king Indra. In that thou blowest from the right, thou blowest as the Lord. In that thou blowest from behind, thou blowest as king Varuṇa. In that thou blowest from the left, thou blowest as king Soma. In that thou blowest down from above, thou blowest down as Prajapati. 3. Thou art the Vṛtya, the only Vṛtya, not released of the gods (2). Thou hast closed the opening. 4. The progeny, the herbs, the waters follow after thy departing. 5. My breath and exhalation, my learning, that of me is in thee. That of me do not take unto thyself," he said to Vāyu. 2. Him having come thus Vāyu joyfully receives [saying]: "Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common." 6. = 20. 7. 10. "What now of thee is there in me?" "My breath and exhalation, my learning. That of me is in thee. Give that back to me." That Vāyu gives back to him. 11. He says to him: "Carry me forth." "To what?" "To the world of the atmosphere." He carries him to the world of the atmosphere. 12. Him having come thus the world of the atmosphere joyfully receives [saying]: "Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world belongs to both of us in common." 13. = 20. 7. 14. "What now of thee is there in me?"
punar dehi 'ti. 10. kim nu te mayi 'ti. ayam ma akçaḥ. sa me tayi. tan me punar dehi 'ti. tam asmā ākçačam antarikṣalokah punar dadati. 11. tam āha pra mā vaihe 'ti. 96.

paścane 'nuvāke dvitiyaḥ khanyāḥ.

III. 22. 1. kim abhi 'ti. diça iti. tami' diço 'bhipravahati. 2. tam tathāi 'vā "gatasṁ āpah pratinandantasy' ayam te bhagavo lokah. saha no 'yan loka iti. 3. yad vāva me yuṣmāsv ity āha tad vāva me punar datte 'ti. 4. kim nu te 'smaśv iti. gotram iti. tad asmāī gotram diçaḥ punar dadati. 5. tā āha pra mā vahate 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. ahorātrayor lokam iti. tam ahorātrayor lokam abhipravahanti. 6. tam tathāi 'vā "gatasm ahorātre pratinandato 'yanm te bhagavo lokah. saha no 'yan loka iti. 7. yad vāva me yuwayor ity āha tad vāva me punar dattam iti. 8. kim nu ta āvayor iti. akṣitir iti. tām asmā aksitim ahorātre punar dattaḥ. 9. te āha pra mā vahatam iti. 97.

paścane 'nuvāke triiyaḥ khanyāḥ.

III. 23. 1. kim abhi 'ti. ardhamūsān iti. tam ardhamūsān abhipravahataḥ. 2. tam tathāi 'vā "gatasm ardhamūsāḥ pratinandanto' ayam te bhagavo lokah. saha no 'yan loka iti.

"This space of mine. That of me is in thee. Give that back to me." That space the world of the atmosphere gives back to him. 10. He says to it: "Carry me forth."

III. 22. 1. "To what?" "To the quarters." It carries him forth to the quarters. 2. Him having come thus the quarters joyfully receive [saying]: "Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common." 3. = 20. 7.* 4. "What now of thee is there in us?" "Hearing." That hearing the quarters give back to him. 5. He says to them: "Carry me forth." "To what?" "To the world of day and night." They carry him to the world of day and night. 6. Him having come thus day and night joyfully receive [saying]: "Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common." 7. = 22. 8. "What now of thee is there in us two?" "Imperishableness." That imperishableness day and night give back to him. 9. He says to them: "Carry me forth."

III. 23. 1. "To what?" "To the half-months." They carry him forth to the half-months. 2. Him having come thus the half-months joyfully receive [saying]: "Thine is this world,
II. Oertel.

1. yad vāva me yuṣmāsv ity āha tad vāva me punar datte 'ti.  
2. kiṁ nu te 'smāsv iti. imāni kṣudrāṇi parvāṇi. tāni me yuṣmās. tāni me pratisamādhate 'ti. tāny asyaṁ ṛāhumāsāḥ punaḥ pratisamanadhati. 3. tān āha pra mā vahate 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. māsān iti. tam māsān abhipravahanti. 4. tāṁ tathāī vā "gatam māsāḥ pratinandanty" ayaṁ te bhagavo lokaḥ. sāha no 'yāin loka iti. 5. yad vāva me yuṣmāsv ity āha tad vāva me punar datte 'ti. 6. kiṁ nu te 'smāsv iti. imāni sthālāṇi parvāṇi. tāni me yuṣmās. tāni me pratisamādhate 'ti. tāny asya māsāḥ punaḥ pratisamanadhati. 7. tān āha pra mā vahate 'ti. 98.

paścāme `nuvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.'

III. 24. 1. kim abhi 'ti. pūṭin iti. tam pūtin abhipravahanti.  
2. tam tathāī vā "gatam pūṭvah pratinandanty ayaṁ te bhagavo lokaḥ. sāha no 'yāin loka iti. 3. yad vāva me yuṣmāsv ity āha tad vāva me punar datte 'ti. 4. kiṁ nu te 'smāsv iti. imāni jñāyāṇi parvāṇi. tāni me yuṣmāsāḥ tāni me pratisamanadhatte 'ti. tāny asyaḥ pūṭvah punaḥ pratisamanadhati. 5. tān āha pra mā vahate 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. suñvatsaram iti. tam suñvatsaram abhipravahanti. 6. tam tathāī vā "gatam suñvatsa-

reverend sir. This world is ours in common.” 1. = 22. 2.  
3. “What now of thee is there in us?” “These petty joints. These of me are in you. These of me put together in their respective places.” These [joints] of his the half-months put respectively together. 4. He says to them: “Carry me forth.” “To what?” “To the months.” They carry him forth to the months. 5. Him having come thus the months joyfully receive [saying]: “Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common.” 7. = 22. 8. 6. “What now of thee is there in us?” “These gross joints. These of me are in you. These of me put together respectively.” These [joints] of his the months put respectively together. 7. He says to them: “Carry me forth.”

III. 24. 1. “To what?” “To the seasons.” They carry him forth to the seasons. 2. Him having come thus the seasons joyfully receive [saying]: “Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common.” 1. = 22. 4. 8. “What now of thee is there in us?” “These chief joints. These of me are in you. These of me put respectively together.” These [joints] of his the seasons respectively put together. 9. He says to them: “Carry me forth.” “To what?” “To the year.” They carry him forth to the year. 10. Him having come thus the year

III. 25. 1. “To what?” “To the heavenly Gandharvas.” It carries him to the heavenly Gandharvas. 2. Him having come thus the heavenly Gandharvas joyfully receive [saying]: “Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common.” 2. = 22. 1. 4. “What now of thee is there in us?” “My fragrance, my joy, my delight. That of me is in you. Give that back to me.” That the heavenly Gandharvas give back to him. 2. He says to them: “Carry me forth.” “To what?” “To the Apsaras.” They carry him forth to the Apsarasas. 3. Him having come thus the Apsarasas joyfully receive [saying]: “Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common.” 7. = 22. 3. 8. “What now of thee is there in us?” “My laughter, my play, my sexual pleasure. That of me is in you. Give that back to me.” That the Apsarasas give back to him. 2. He says to them: “Carry me forth.”
III. 26. 1. kim abhī ’ti. divam iti. tam divam abhipravahanti
2. tam tatha’i ’vā ’gataṁ dyāuh’ pratinandaty ayaṁ te bhagavo
lokaḥ. saha nāv ayam loka iti. 3. yad vāva me tvayi ’ty āha
tad vāva me punar dehi ’ti. 4. kim nu te mayi ’ti. tṛpti iti.
sakṛt tṛpte ’va hy esā. tām asmāi tṛptiṁ dyāuh punar
daditi. 5. tam āha pra mā vahe ’ti. kim abhi ’ti. devān iti. tam devān
abhipravahati. 6. ’tva tathāi ’vā ’gataṁ devāh pratinandanty
ayaṁ te bhagavo lokaḥ. saha no ’yaṁ loka iti. 7. yad vāva me
yusmāsv ity āha tād vāva me punar datte ’ti. 8. kim nu te
’smāsv iti. amṛtam iti. tad asmā amṛtam devāh punar

pañcamaṃ ‘nuvāke saśtamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 27. 1. kim abhī ’ti. udityam iti. tam udityam abhiprava-
hani. 2. sa ’udityam āha vibhāḥ purastāt sampat’ paścāt.
samyān’ tvam asi. saṃigo manuṣyān arisi’ rujatas ta riṣī
pāpmaṇaḥ hanti. apahatapāpmā bhavati yas tvāi ’vāṁ’ vedā.
3. sambhūr devo ’si sam aham bhāyāsam. ābhūtir aśy ābhūyā-
sam. bhūtir’ asi bhāyāsam. 4. yās te praśaj upadiṣṭā nā ’ham
tava taḥ paryemi. upa te tā diṣāmi. 5. ojo me balaṃ me kacuṃ
tan me tvayi tan me mo ’pahṛthā ity udityam avocat.

III. 26. 1. “To what?” “To the sky.” They carry him
forth to the sky. 2. Him having come thus the sky joyfully
receives [saying]: “Thine is this world, reverend sir. This
world is ours in common.” 3. = 20. 4. “What now of thee
is there in me?” “Satisfaction.” For that is satisfied once for
all, as it were. That satisfaction the sky gives back to him.
5. He says to it: “Carry me forth.” “To what?” “To the
gods.” It carries him forth to the gods. 6. Him having come
thus the gods joyfully receive [saying]: “Thine is this world,
reverend sir. This world is ours in common.” 7. = 22. 8.
“What now of thee is there in us?” “Immortality.” That
immortality the gods give back to him. 9. He says to them:
“Carry me forth.”

III. 27. 1. “To what?” “To the sun.” They carry him forth
to the sun.” 2. He says to the sun: “Extensive art thou in the
east, success (?) in the west. Thou art collective. Thou hast
been angry with collective men; of thee that art angry the sage
(ṛṣi) slays the evil. He hath his evil smitten away who knoweth
thee thus.” 3. = 20. 4. = 20. 4. “My power, my strength, my
sight: that of me is in thee. Do not take that of me unto thee,”
thus he said to the sun. 8. Him having come thus the sun joyfully receives [saying]: “Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common.” 7. = 20. 7. 8. “What now of thee is there in me?” “My power, my strength, my sight: that of me is in thee. Give that back to me.” That the sun gives back to him. 9. He says to it: “Carry me forth.” “To what?” “To the moon.” It carries him to the moon. 10. He says to the moon: “The path of truth forsaketh thee not; the path of immortality forsaketh thee not. 11. Anew and anew thou becomest, being born. Burden by name, a Brāhmaṇ, thou dost worship. Therefore the true, both gods and men, bring food for thee. Food-eating becometh he who knoweth thee thus.” 12. = 20. 1. 13. = 20. 4. 14. “My mind, my seed, my offsprings, my second birth: that of me is in thee. Do not take that of me unto thee,” thus he said to the moon. 15. Him having come thus the moon joyfully receives [saying]: “Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common.” 16. = 20. 7. 17. “What now of thee is there in me?” “My mind, my seed, my offsprings, my second birth: that of me is in thee. Give that back to me.” That the moon gives back to him. 18. He says to it: “Carry me forth.”
III. 28. 1. kim abhi 'ti. brahmaño lokam iti. tam ādityam abhipravahati. 2. sa ādityam āha pra mā vahe 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. brahmaño lokam iti. tam candramasam abhipravahati. 3. sa evam ete devate anuvahacarati. 4. eso 'nte 'taḥ paraḥ pravāho nā 'sti. yān u kān ca 'taḥ prāco lokān abhyyavādismo te sarva uśā bhavanti te jītās teṣu asya sarveṣu kāmācāro bhavati ya evam veda. 5. sa yadi kāmāyata punar ihā 'jāye 'te yāmin kule 'bhidhyāyed yadi brāhmanakule yadi rājakule tasminn ājāyate. sa etam eva lokam punah prajānam abhśyārohann eti. 6. tad u ho 'rāca cātyāyamir bahuvyāhito vā ayam bahuro lokah. etasya vāi kāmāya nā pruvate[vā] paṃyanti vā ka etat pruṣya punar ihe 'yād atrāi 'va syād iti. 103.

paṃcame 'nūvāke navamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. paṃcame 'nūvakas samāptaḥ.

III. 29. 1. uccāīḍravāḥ ha kāupayeyāḥ kāuravyo rājā 'sa. tasya ha keṣa dārbhyāḥ pāncalō rājā svasaśya 'āsa. tāvā 'na nyonyasya priyāv āsatuh. 2. sa ho 'uccāīḍravāḥ kāupayeyo 'smāl lokāt preyāya. tasmin ha prete keṣa dārbhyo 'ranye mṛga-

III. 28. 1. "To what?" "To the world of brahman." It carries him forth to the sun. 2. He says to the sun: "Carry me forth." "To what?" "To the world of brahman." It carries him forth to the moon. He thus wanders to and fro between these divinities. 3. This is the end. There is no carrying forth beyond this [limit]. And all the worlds beyond this [limit] of which we have spoken, they are all obtained, they are conquered, in all of them there is unrestricted movement for him who knows thus. 4. If he should wish: "May I be born here again," on whatever family he might fix his thoughts, be it a Brāhman-family, be it a royal family, into that he is born. He keeps on ascending to this world again fore-knowing. 5. And Čāṭyāyani said: "Ofttimes, indeed, this world here is very ill. Now for the sake of it they talk to each other or toil [saying]: 'Who having thrown that away would come here again? he would be only there.'"

III. 29. 1. Uccāīḍravas Kāupayeya was a king of the Kurus. Now Keśa Dārbhya, king of the Pāṇḍalas, was his sister's son. And they were dear to each other. 2. This Uccāīḍravas Kāupayeya departed from this world. When he had departed, Keśin

---

28. 1 B. pratham. 2 B. brāḥ. 3 A. -anti, n cancelled in red. 4 insert here eso tae abhipravahati. pra mā vahe 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. brahmaño lokam iti. . . . . devate anuvahacarati. 5 B. 'emt. 6 altered, red, to -diṣṭha. 7 teṣu. 8 insert va. 9 B. inserts bravate. 10 B. inserts ca.

29. 1 dīgcr. 2 kāwa. 3 B. keṣa; A. keṣa. 4 A. evasti-. 5 A. inserts ga, cancelled in red.
yām caçārā 'priyaṁ vininiṣamānaḥ. 1. sa ha tathāi 'va palya-

yamāno mrday prasarāṇām antareṇāi 'vo 'cāṛcçva rasanāi kāu-
payeṣyam adhijagāma. 4. taṁ ho 'vāca dhṛpyāmi swājī jānāmi
'ti. na ṛpṛyasi 'ti ho 'vāca jānāsi. sa evā 'smi yam mā manyasa
iti. 5. atha yad bhagava āhur iti ho 'vāca ya āvir bhavaty
unye 'sya lokan upayanti 'ty atha katham açako ma āvir bhavi-
tum iti. 6. om iti ho 'vāca yadā vāi tuṣya lokasya goptarāmy
avo te 'tas' ta āvir abhūwam apiyam cāi 'sya vinessāmy avu
caī 'naiṁ cāśīnāyati 'ti. 7. tathā bhagava iti ho'ī 'vāca. taṁ vāi
nu tvā pariṣvajā iti. taṁ ha sma pariṣvajānā yathā dhū-
man vā 'pi 'yād vāyām vāi" 'kāvaṇā 'vā 'gnvārcaṁ vāICH po vāi
vām ha små 'nānī vyeti. na ha små 'nam pariṣvāṇāyō 'palah-
bhate. 104.

ī. 30. 1. sa ho 'vāca' yad vāi te purū ṛpaṁ āsūt tat te
rūpaṁ. na tu tvā pariṣvāṇāyō 'palubha' iti. 2. om iti ho
'veca brahmano vāi me sāma vidvān sāmno 'dagāyat. sa me
'pāreṇa sāmṇa 'pārīṇyō adhūnot. taṇ ṣaṣya vāi kīla sāma

Dārbhya went hunting in the woods, wishing to remove his sad-
ness. 1. While he was thus roaming about, chasing deer, he
perceived just between [himself and the game] Uccāścgra vās
Kāupayeṣa. 4. He said to him: "Am I really crazy, [or] do I
know?" "Thou art not crazy," he (U.) said, "thou knowest. I
am he whom thou thinkest me to be." 5. "Now since they say,
reverend sir," he (K.) said, "if one becometh manifest, others
go to his world,' how then hast thou been able to become man-
ifest unto me?" 6. "Yes," he (U.) said; "when I have found
the keeper of that world, thereupon I have become manifest unto
thee [thinking]: 'I will remove his sadness and I will teach him.'"
7. "Even so, reverend sir," he (K.) said; "verily now let me
embrace thee." When he [tried to] embrace him, as if one were
to approach smoke, or wind, or space, or the gleam of fire, or
water, even thus he escaped him. He [could] not take hold of him
for an embrace.

III. 30. 1. He (K.) said: "Verily, what appearance thou hadst
formerly, that appearance thou hast [even now]; yet I [can] not
take hold of thee for an embrace." 2. "Yes," he (U.) said; "a
Brāhmaṇ who knew the sāman sang the udgītha for me with the
sāman. By means of the bodiless sāman he shook off my bodies.

29. 4 'prassar-. B. 'ccāc-. 30. 1. A. 'ce. 2. -goyo. 4 'palabhate, e cancelled in red. 11 'rāraṇy.
III. 31. 1. *vyūḍhacchandasā vái dvādaśahena yakṣayamāno‘
‘smi. sa yo‘ vas‘ tat sāma veda‘ yad aham veda sa eva ma udgā-
syati. mīmāṃsadhvatam iti. 2. tasmai ha mīmāṃsāmānānām ekā
cana [na] sampraty abhidadhāti. 3. sa ha tathāi‘ eva palyaya-
mānaç gmaṇe‘ vā‘ vane‘ vā‘ ‘ṛṣṭapuyam upādhāvayaṁ
cakāra. taṁ ha cāyamānāḥ praṣṭaḥu. 4. taṁ ho ‘vāca ko ‘eti
‘iti, brāhmaṇo ‘smi prāṭṛdo bhālla iti. 5. sa kīm vetthe ‘ti. sāme
‘ti. 6. om iti ho ‘vāca. vyūḍhacchandasā vái dvādaśahena

Verily, whose udgītha one who knoweth the sāman singeth with
the sāman, him he causeth to go to the same world with the
divinities.” 1. “Pataṅga Prājāpatya,” he said, “was a dear son of
Prājāpati. To him he told this sāman. With it he sang the
udgītha of (for) the sages (ṛṣī). [Thus] these same sages have
shaken off their bodies. 4. And with this sāman,” he said,
“Prājāpati sang the udgītha of (for) the gods. [Thus] these same
gods above have shaken off their bodies.” 5. In this he (U.)
instructed him (K.). Having instructed him, he said: “Whoever
shall know this sāman, let only him sing the udgītha for thee.”
6. He, being instructed, returned. He went about asking ques-
tions of the Brāhmans of the Kurus and Paṇcālas.

III. 31. 1. [He said:] “I am going to sacrifice with a twelve-
day sacrifice having its metres transposed. Who of you knoweth
that sāman which I know, he alone shall sing the udgītha for
me. Ponder!” 2. Of them pondering not one answered him
precisely. 3. He wandering about in the same way, drove up unto
one lying covered in a cemetery or a grove. Fearing him (P.)
started away. 4. He (K.) said to him: “Who art thou?” “I am
a Brāhman, Prāṭṛdo Bhālla.” 5. “As such what dost thou know?”
“The sāman.” 6. “Very well,” he (K.) said: “I am going to
yaksyamāno" "smi. sa yādi tvam tat sāma vettha yad aham veda" tvam eva ma udgāsyasi." mimāṁsāsaye "iti. 7. tasmāi ha mimāṁsamānas tad eva" sampraty abhidadhau. 8. taṁ ho 'vācā 'yam ma udgāsyati 'iti. 9. tasmāi ha kuruṇaścālānām" brāhmaṇā asāyanta" āhur eṣu ha vā ayaṁ kuleṣu" satsā 'daśasyati." kasmā ayaṁ alam" iti. 10. alam naṁ" mahyam iti ha smā "ha. sāi 'vā 'lam masya 'lam matāyāi 'tasya ha 'lam" evo" tjaṅgau. tasmād ālamanīlājodgāte 'ty ākhyāpayanti. 106.

yāṣṭhe 'nuvāke triyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 32. 1. tad dha sātyakirtā āhur yāṁ vayaṁ devatām upaś-maha ekam eva vayaṁ tasyaṁ devatāyāṁ rūpam gavyo adiścāma ekam vāhana ekam hasīṇy ekam purusa ekam sarveṣu bhūtesu. tasya eva 'davā devatāyāi sarvaṁ rūpam iti. 2. tad etad ekam eva rūpam prāṇa eva. yāvaḥ dhy eva prāṇaṁ prāṇiti tāvad rūpam bhavati tad rūpam bhavati. 3. tad aha yād prāṇa utkrāmatā ārya eva'va bhūte' nartāyāḥ pariṣṭiyate na kī rūpam. 4. tasya 'nārātmā tapaḥ. tasmāt tasyamānasayo 'nātaraṁ prāṇo bhavati. 5. tapas 'nārātmā 'yāniḥ. sa niruk-sacrifice with a twelve-day sacrifice having its metres transposed. If thou knowest that sāman which I know, thou shalt sing the udgītha for me. Ponder." 6. He, pondering, answered him that precisely. 7. He (K.) said to him: "This one here shall sing the udgītha for me." 8. Complaining of him the Brāhmans of the Kurus and Paṇcālas said: "While those here are of the family, shall he sing the udgītha? To whom is he acceptable?" 9. "Verily, he is acceptable (alam) to me," he (K.) said. . . . ; he sang his udgītha acceptably (alam). Therefore they call him the ālamanīlājau-dvāgar (?).

III. 32. 1. This the Sātyakirtas say: "As to the divinity which we worship, of that divinity we point out one form to be in the cow, one in a draught-animal, one in the elephant, one in man, one in all creatures. This is the complete form of this divinity." 2. That same one form is breath. For as long as one breathes with breath so long there is form; that is form. 3. And when breath departs he is left useless, having become just like a log, [and] no form whatever [is left]. 4. His inner self is heat (penance). Therefore the breath of one who is heated (who practices penance) becomes hotter. 5. The inner self of heat

31. 19-kram-. 11B. inserts yad aham vettha. 13A. corrected from -tī. 12B. inserts tī. 14 om. itī. 11B. -pāṇ-. 16ārā-. 11kuleṣu. 12'gā-. 18B. arṇam. 99A. nyāi, after this a ma is cancelled in A. 11insert ma. 22. 1. A. yad. 2yeo. 1-e. 4-thā. 48
III. 33. 1. sa yo vāyuḥ prāna eva saḥ. yo 'gnir vāg eva sā. 

yaḥ candramā mana eva tad. yo' udītyas svara eva saḥ. tasmād etam udītyam āhum svara eti 'ti. 2. sa yo ha vā amūr devatā upāste yā anūr adhīdevatām dūrūpā vā etā duranusamprāpyaś iha. kas tad veda yady etā anu vā samprāpnyān na vā. 3. atha ya enā adhyātmaṃ upāste sa ha 'nīteva bhavati. nirījyanti vā vā' ita etā. [t]asya vā etā śārīrasya saha prāṇena nirījyanti. 

ka u eva tad veda yady etā anu vā samprāpnyān na vā. 4. atha ya enā ubhayāś ekadhā bhavantir veda sa eva 'nusṭhyā (penance) is fire. That is distinct. Therefore it burns. 5. Now with regard to the divinities. He is this divinity who cleanses here. Within him are the waters. These are food. He is to be worshiped as soft. Because the waters are in him, therefore [he is] soft. 6. His inner self is heat. Therefore it blows hotter when [the sun] shines. 7. The inner self of heat is lightning. That is distinct. Therefore it also burns. 8. Verily these four [are] the sāman: breath, speech, mind, [and] tone. That same breath, having mind as its guide, acts through speech. Of it tone is the offspring. Rich in offspring becomes he who knows thus.

III. 33. 1. Vāyu is breath, Agni is speech, the moon is mind, the sun is tone. Therefore they say of this sun: "He goeth as tone." 2. If any one worships yonder divinities, namely those [that are defined] with regard to the divinities—verily, they are of evil form, hard to be completely attained, as it were. Who knows whether he will completely attain unto them or not? 3. Now if any one worships them [as defined] with regard to the self, he becomes one who is near the gods. They waste away, as it were, from here. Verily these [divinities] waste away along with the breath of his body. And who knows whether he will completely attain unto them or not? 4. Now he who knows both

32. A. daṭi. B. -dāi-. C. -p-. *B. repeats tānī vāsitavyo (!) yad asminn āpo 'ntas . . . . . . . tasmāt so 'pi dāhati.

sūma veda sa ātmānaṁ veda sa brahma veda. 5. tad āhū prādeṣaṁatrād vā ita etā ekam bhavanti. ato hy ayam prānah svarya' upary' upari vartata iti. 6. atha hā 'ka āhūc catur-aṅgulād' vā ita etā ekam bhavanti 'iti. ato hy evā 'yam prānah svarya' upary' upari vartata iti. 7. sa esa brahmaṇa' avartaḥ. sa ya evam etam brahmaṇa' avartaṁ veda 'bhy evam prajāḥ paçava āvartaṁ sarvam āyur eti. 8. sa yo hā 'vam vidvān prānena prāṇyā 'pāṇeṇā 'pāṇya maṇasā itā uḥhayīr devatā ātmasya etya mukha ādhatte tasya sarvam āpam bhavati sarvam āpitam. na hā 'syā kāṣa kāmo 'nāpto bhavati ya evam veda. 108.

Saṣṭhe 'nivāke pañcamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 34. 5. tad etan mithunam yad vāk ca prānaḥ ca. mithunaṁ rksāme. ācaturāṁ váva mithunam prajananam. 6. tad yatra 'da āha somaḥ pavaṇa iti vo 'pavartadhvan iti vā tā sahā 'va vācā maṇasā prāṇena svarena hiṅkurvanti. tad hiṅka- reṇa mithunam kriyate. 7. sahā 'va vācā maṇasā prāṇena svarena nīdhanam upayanti. tan nīdhanena mithunam kriyate. 8. tat saṃtāvidhānām sāmanāḥ. saṃtākṛtvā udgātā 'tmānaṁ ca these kinds [of divinities] as unified, he immediately knows the sāman, he knows the self, he knows the brahman. 9. This they say: “From the size of a span from here these [divinities] become one. For from here this breath turneth sounding upward and upward.” 10. And some say: “From [the size of] four fingers from here these [divinities] become one. For from here this breath turneth sounding upward and upward.” 11. That is the turn of the brahman. He who thus knows this turn of the brahman, unto him offspring [and] domestic animals turn; he goes to complete age. 12. He who, knowing thus, breathing with breath, exhaling with exhalation, coming into the self, puts these divinities of both kinds with the mind in the mouth, by him everything is obtained, everything conquered. No wish soever of him is unattained who knows thus.

III. 34. 1. Those are this couple, viz. speech and breath; a couple are re and sāman. Verily to the fourth [generation] a pair is generative. 2. Now where one says here either “Soma cleanses itself,” or “Turn ye hither,” they thus utter the hiṅkāra along with speech, with mind, with breath, with tone. With the hiṅkāra a couple is thus brought about. 3. They also perform the nīdhaṇa along with speech, with mind, with breath, with tone. With the nīdhaṇa a couple is thus brought about. 4. That is the sevenfold of the sāman. Seven times the udgātar

93. 1.a. 5 svaya. 6-ṛ (†). 10-lā id. 11 brahman.
34. 1.pāpa. 5-kāra. 1-d.
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yatamanaṁ ca çarīrāt prajanayati. 1. yādṛçasyo ha váśi reto bhavati tádwam saṁbhavati yádi váśi puruṣasya puruṣa eva yádi gor gaur eva yádi açau yáva eva yádi mṛga eva. yasyāi 'na reto bhavati tadh eva saṁbhavati. 6. tád yathā ha váśi suvarnaṁ hiranyam agrahau praysamanaṁ kalyānataram kalyānataram bhavyat evam eva kalyānatarenā kalyānatarenā 'tman u saṁbhavati ya evam veda. 7. tád etad prāt 'bhyanūcyate. 109.

III. 35. 1. patañgam aktaṁ asurasya máyayā āhrdā pacyantī manasā vipacitāh: samudre antah kavyāvo vi caksate

maricinām padam icchanti vedhasa

iti. 2. patañgam aktaṁ iti. prāṇo váśi patañgah. patann eva hy eva aṅgeṣv ati ratham udiṣkṣate. 3. patañga ity udiṣkṣate. 4. asurasya máyaye 'ti. mano' váśi uṣrayam. tád dhī asusu ramate. tasyāi 'sa máyayā 'ktah. 5. āhrdā pacyantī manasā vipacitāta iti. āhrdā 'va' hy eto pacyantī yan manasā vipacitato. 6. samudre antah kavyāvo vi caksata iti. puruṣo váśi samudra evāṁvīda u kavyāah. tā 'minm puruṣe 'ntar vācaṁ vicaksate. 7. marici-

causes himself and the sacrificer to be born from the body. 8. And verily of what kind [of being] the seed is, that kind [of being] arises: if it be of a man, a man; if of a cow, a cow; if of a horse, a horse; if of a deer, a deer. Of what [being] the seed is, just that being is born. 9. Now as gold of good color being cast into the fire becomes more and more beautiful, even so he comes into being with a more and more beautiful self who knows thus. 10. That same is referred to in a rc.

III. 35. 1. “The winged one, adorned with the magic of an Asura, with the heart the inspired [bards] see, with the mind. Within the sea the sages look about; the faithful seek the track of the rays.” 2. The winged one, adorned’: breath is the winged one. For flying (patan), as it were, in these limbs (aṅga), he looks up beyond the chariot (?). [Therefore] he is called winged one (patāṅga). 3. ‘With the magic of an Asura’: mind is asura[-like]. For it rests (√ram) in the vital airs (asu). He is adorned with its magic. 4. ‘With the heart, with the mind the inspired [bards] see’: for verily the inspired ones see with the heart as with the mind. 5. ‘Within the sea the sages look about’: verily man is the sea, and those who know thus are the sages. They look about for this speech within man. 6. ‘The
faithful seek the track of the rays': rays, as it were, are these divinities, viz. Agni, Vāyu, sun, [and] moon. 7. Verily, of those divinities there is no track. [For] by means of a track second death goes after. 8. That same is the sāman which is not gone after by second death. He crosses over second death who knows thus.

III. 36. 1. "The winged one beareth speech with the mind; that [speech] the Gandharva spoke within the womb; this brilliant sounding wisdom the poets guard in the place of [sacred] order." 2. 'The winged one beareth speech with the mind': verily, breath is the winged one; he bears this speech with the mind. 3. 'That [speech] the Gandharva spoke within the womb': verily breath is the Gandharva, and man is the womb. He speaks this speech within man. 4. 'This brilliant, sounding wisdom': for sounding is this wisdom, viz. speech. 5. 'The poets guard in the place of [sacred] order': verily, mind is the [sacred] order, and those who know thus are the poets; om, that syllable is the [sacred] order. In that they reflect with it on the rc, on the yujus, on the sāman, thereby they guard this [wisdom].

35. # A. ve.
III. 37. 1. *apaçyaṁ* gopām anipadyamānām ā ca parā ca pathibhiṣ ca carantam:
    sa sadhiricī sa viṣucīr vasāṇā ā varivarittī bhuvanēṣu antar
    iti. 2. *apaçyaṁ* gopām anipadyamānām iti. prāṇo vāi gopāḥ.
    sa hi 'dām sarvam anipadyamānō gopāyati. 1. ā ca parā ca pathibhiṣ ca carantam iti.
    tad ye ca ha vā ihe prāṇā amī ca raṣmaya etaihir ha vā esā etad ā ca parā ca pathibhiṣ ca caratī. 4. sa
    sadhiricī sa viṣucīr vasāṇā iti. sadhiricī ca ha esā etad viṣucī ca prajā vaste. 5. ā varivarittī bhuvanēṣu antar iti.
    esā hy evā śu bhuvanēṣu antar āvarivaritī. 6. sa esā indra udgīthāḥ. sa
    yaḍāi 'sa indra udgīthā āgaçchati nāi'vo 'dgātuc ca 'pāṭṝṇāṁ'
    ca viṣuṇayate. ita evo "rdhvas" svār udevi. sa upari mūrdhno
    leloṣyati. 1. sa vidyād āgamadā indic ne 'ha kaś ca na pāṃ
    nyāgarah paṭipāyata iti. tamśin ha na kaś ca na pāṃ
    nyāgarah paṭipāyate. 2. tad etad abhṛtvyaṁśa śaṁ. na ha vā
    indraḥ kaṁ ca na pāṃ abhṛtvyaṁ paṭiyate. sa yathe nādro na kaṁ
    ca na pāṃ abhṛtvyaṁ paṭiyata eva eva [na] kaṁ ca na pāṃ
    abhṛtvyaṁ paṭiyate ya etad evaṁ vedā 'oho yasyāṁ'vaiṁ vidvān udgāyati. 112.
    saṣṭhe 'nuvāke navamaśh khaydaḥ. saṣṭha 'nuvāka samāptah.

III. 38. 1. praṇāpatiṁ brahmā 'ṣṛjata. tam apācyam amuk-
    kham' aṣṛjata. 2. tam aprapacyamn amukham caṇyam brahmā
    "viṣat. purusyaṁś tat. prāṇo vāi brahma. prāṇo vāvai 'naṁ tad
    úviṣat. 3. sa udatiṣṭhat praṇāṁ jayayita. taṁ rakṣāṁśa' anva-

III. 37. 1. "I saw the keeper who doth not fall down moving to
    and fro by the paths. Clad in the converging and diverging
    ones, he oft turneth hither within created beings." 2. "I saw
    the keeper who doth not fall down": verily breath is the keeper.
    For he keeps this all without falling down. 3. 'Moving to and fro
    by the paths': now what these breaths here and yonder rays are,
    by them as paths he thus moves to and fro. 4. 'Clad in the
    converging and diverging ones': for he is thus clad in converging
    and diverging offsprings. 5. 'He oft turneth hither within created
    beings': for he often does turn hither within these created
    beings. 6-10 = I. 45. 4-9.

III. 38. 1. The brahman created Prajāpati. It created him
    not seeing, without mouth. 2. Him lying not looking, without
    mouth, the brahman entered. That [became?] human. Verily
    the brahman is breath. Breath, indeed, entered him thus. 3. He
    arose, a generator of progeny. Him the Rakṣasas fastened on.

37. 'Re-; at the beginning of this pada all MSS. insert atim. 2B.
saste. 'Frh.-. 'dhrva. 'adjād. 'paṭi-. 'eta. 'bhṛ-.
38. 'mukh-. 'aprav-. 'pash-. 'A. -asy.
sacanta. 1. tam etad eva sama gyanam utrayat. yad gyanam atrayata tad gatyatra gatyatvam. 2. trayata evam suras- smut pavmano mucyate ya evam vedah. 3. tam upa'smii gatyatara kara iti rc 'cravaniyena' pagyanam. 4. yad upa'smii gatyatara iti tena gatyatram abhavat. tasmad eav 'ra pratiyut karyat. 5. pavanamaye 'nadvii abhi devam iyaihum-dhak-saktu iti soadip 'ksaran abhyagayanta. 'soadapakalam' vai brahma. kalasa evai 'num tad brahnum 'nicat. 6. ta ta tac catuvinnatanyaksharam gatyatram. asatkasarah prastava. 'soadapaksaram gulan tac catuvinnatatis sampadyante. catuvinnatayardhamasii samvatsaras samvatsaras sama. 7. tu 'rcac charirena mrtyar anvaitat. tad yaac chariravat tan mrtyar apatam. atha yaac achariram tad amrtam. tasay 'charirena samna charirany adhunot. 118.

saptame nuvake prathamaah khandah.

III. 39. 1. ovade ovade ovade hum bhav iti soadip 'ksaran abhyagayata. soadapakala1 vai purushah. kalasa evai 'syu tae charirany adhunot. 2. sa eso 'pahapatypm dhutacharirah. tad ekkriyavrityudasangagayat o iti udasa. a iti avdyat. vag iti

4. Him one singing this same saman rescued. Because he singing (gayan) rescued (atrayata), that is the reason why the gatyatra [-saman] is called so. 1. One rescues him, from all evil he is delivered, who knows thus. 2. They sang unto him with the rc which belongs to the preliminary invocation: "Sing, ye men, unto this one." Inasmuch as [it runs]: "Sing (gaya), ye men, unto this one," hence it became the gatyatra (-saman). Therefore this is to be made the introductory verse. 3. "Unto Indu, who is being purified, who desires to sacrifice to the god," thus they sang sixteen syllables unto [him]. Verily sixteenfold is the brahman. Part by part the brahman thus entered him. 4. That same is the gatyatra [-saman] with twenty-four syllables. The prastava has eight syllables. The song (gata) has sixteen syllables. Thus twenty-four are obtained. Twenty-four half-months has the year; the year is the saman. 10. Because of the body death went after these rc's. What is possessed of a body, that is obtained by death; and what is bodiless, that is immortal. By means of the bodiless saman he shook off this one's bodies.

III. 39. 1. He sang unto [him] sixteen syllables: ovate, ovate, ovate, hum, bhava, ovate. Sixteenfold is man. Part by part he thus shook off his bodies. 2. That same one had evil smitten away, his body shaken off . . . . speech (ovate) is the brahman; that

38. anom. 4. gatyatranm. 1cravasiy. 5. poga. 10. B. -laam. 11. prast.-
39. 1. -a.
tad brahma, tad id antarikstam so 'yam vayuh pavate, hum iti candrasmah, bhah ity adityah. 1. etasya ha va idam aksarasya kratam bhadi tyacakate. 2. etasya ha va idam aksarasya kratam abhram ityacakate. 3. etasya ha va idam aksarasya kratam kubhram ityacakate. 4. etasya ha va idam aksarasya kratam subhram ityacakate. 5. etasya ha va idam aksarasya kratam vrasbha ityacakate. 6. etasya ha va idam aksarasya kratam darbha ityacakate. 7. etasya ha va idam aksarasya kratam yo bhadi tyacakate. 8. etasya ha va idam aksarasya kratam sambhavati tyacakate. 9. tad yat kriin ca bhasi iti ca bhasi iti ca tad etan mithunam guyatram, pramithunena jayate ya evam veda. 114.

saptame 'nusake dvityah khaudyah.

III. 40. 1. tad etad amrtam guyatram, etena vai prajapatir amrutam eva eva eva etena rshayah. 2. tad etad brahma prajapotaye 'bravit prajapatih parameshhine prajapatya parameshhi prajapatiyo devaiva savitre devas savitah gnaive gnam indrave 'ndrak kayapaya kayapa graagrigayu kayapaya graagrigah kayapaha devatarae gayasayanaya kayapaha devatara graayasanah kayapah grausa vahneyaya kayapaya grauso vahneyah kayapaha indrotaya davisapaya samna-atmosphere is Vayu who cleanses here; hum is the moon; bhah is the sun. 1. In virtue of this syllable they say of him: "He shinethe." 4. In virtue of this syllable they say of him abhra (cloud). 3. In virtue of this syllable they say of him kubhra. 1. In virtue of this syllable they say of him svastra (white). 2. In virtue of this syllable they say of him vrasbha (bull). 3. In virtue of this syllable they say of him darbha. 5. In virtue of this syllable they say of him "he who shinethe." 10. In virtue of this syllable they say of him "he comes into existence." 11. Whatsoever is bhah and bhasi, that is the couple, the gyantrah [-saman]. By copulation he is propagated who knows thus.

III. 40. 1. That is the immortal guyatra [-saman]. By means of it Prajapati went unto immortality, by means of it the gods, by means of it the sages (rshi). 2. That same the brahan told to Prajapati; Prajapati to Parameshtin Priyapati; Parameshtin Priyapatyah to god Savitar; god Savitar to Agni; Agni to Indra; Indra to Kasyapa; Kasyapa to Rasyargiga Kasyapa; Rasyargiga Kasyapa to Devatara Cuyasanah Kasyapa; Devatara Cuyasanah Kasyapa to Cusata Vahneya Kasyapa; Cusata Vahneya


kaye 'ndroto daivāpač' caunako drtaya aindrotaye caunakāya dṛtir aindroti śaunakaḥ puḷuṣāya prācīnayogāya puḷuṣāḥ prācīnayogas satyayajñāya puḷuṣāye prācīnayogāya satya-yajñāḥ puḷuṣāḥ prācīnayogas somaṃcāmaṃ sātavyajñāye prācīnayogāya somaṃcāmas sātavyajñāḥ prācīnayogyo hrīṣvayā yogā "lakṣeyāya" māhāvṛṣyā rājye hrīṣvayāyā allaheko mahāvṛṣo rājā janaçrutāya kāṇḍīyāya janaçrutāḥ kāṇḍīyās sātavya-kāya janaçruteyāya kāṇḍīvīyāya sāyako janaçruteyāh kāṇḍīvyo nagari janaçruteyāya kāṇḍīvīyāya nagari janaçruteyāh kāṇḍīvīc caṇḍīyaṃ satyayānayā āreṣayā caṇḍacy satyayānir āreṣo rāmāya krātuṣṭeyāya vāiyāghrapadyāya rāmāh krātuṣṭeyo vāiyāghrapadyāḥ— 116.

saptame 'nuvāke ṛṣṭyaḥ khanḍaḥ.

III. 41. 1. — paṅkhyāya bābhavāya caṇkho bābhavyo daksāya kātyāyanaṃ āreteṣayā daksāḥ kātyayānir āreṣayō kāṅsāya vārayākāya caṃso vārakīḥ prosthapadāya vārayākāya prosthapādo vārayākah kaṃsāyā vārayākāya kaṃso vārayo jayan-tāya vārayākāya jayanto vārayākah kuberāya vārayākāya kubero vārayākāya jayantāya vārayākāya jayanto vārayo janaçrutāya vārayākāya janaçruṣto vārayās sudattāyaṃ puruṣaryāya sudattāḥ

Kūcysapa to Indrota Dāivāpa Čaunaka; Indrota Dāivāpa Čaunaka to Dṛti Aindroti Čaunaka; Dṛti Aindroti Čaunaka to Puḷuṣa Prācīnayoga; Puḷuṣa Prācīnayoga to Satyayajñā Puḷuṣā Prācīnayoga; Satyayajñā Puḷuṣā Prācīnayoga to Somaṃcāsa Sātavyajñī Prācīnayoga; Somaṃcāsa Sātavyajñī Prācīnayoga to Hṛṣvīcāya Allakeya, the king of the Mahāvrṣas; Hṛṣvīcāya Allakeya, the king of the Mahāvrṣas, to Janaçrutā Kāṇḍīvyā; Janaçrutā Kāṇḍīvyā to Sāyaka Janaçruteyā Kāṇḍīvyā; Sāyaka Janaçruteyā Kāṇḍīvyā to Nāgarī Janaçruteyā Kāṇḍīvyā; Nāgarī Janaçruteyā Kāṇḍīvyā to Caṅga Caṭāṣṭyāni Ātreya; Caṅga Caṭāṣṭyāni Ātreya to Rāma Kṛātuṣṭeyā Vāiyāghrapadya; Rāma Kṛātuṣṭeyā Vāiyāghrapadya—

III. 41. 1. — to Caṅkha Bābhavāya; Caṅkha Bābhavāya to Daksā Kātyāyani Ātreyaḥ; Daksā Kātyāyani Ātreya to Kaṇṣa Vāraki; Kaṇṣa Vāraki to Prosthapāda Vārakaḥ; Prosthapāda Vārakaḥ to Kaṇṣa Vārakaḥ; Kaṇṣa Vārakaḥ to Ājanta Vārakaḥ; Ājanta Vārakaḥ to Kuberā Vārakaḥ; Kuberā Vārakaḥ to Ājanta Vārakaḥ; Ājanta Vārakaḥ to Janaçrutā Vārakaḥ; Janaçrutā Vārakaḥ to Sudatta Puruṣaryāḥ; Sudatta Puruṣaryāḥ to

pāraśāryo 'śūdhāyo 'uttarāya pāraśāryāyā 'śūdha uttarāḥ pāraśāryo vipācitive pakunimitrāya pāraśāryāya vipācīcīc chakunimitrāḥ pāraśārya jayantāya pāraśāryāya jayantāḥ pāraśāryaḥ— 116.
saptame 'nuvāke catuṛthāḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 42. 1. — ṣyatamayantāya lāuhityāya ṣyatamayanto lāuhityāḥ palliguptāya lāuhityāya palligupto lāuhityas satyaçravase lāuhityāya' satyaçaranā lāuhityāḥ krṣṇadṛhtaye sātyakayaye krṣṇadṛhtis sātyakīc śyāmasajjantāya lāuhityāya śyāmasajjantyo lāuhityāḥ krṣṇadattāya lāuhityāya krṣṇadatta lāuhityo mitrabhūtaye lāuhityāya mitrabhūtitī lāuhityaṃ ṣyatamayantāya lāuhityāya ṣyatamayanto lāuhityas trivedáya krṣṇorātīya lāuhityāya trivedaḥ krṣṇarātō lāuhityo yaçasvin jayantāya lāuhityāya' yaçasvi jayanto lāuhityo jayakāya lāuhityaṃ jayako lāuhityāḥ krṣṇarātāya lāuhityāya krṣṇarātō lāuhityo daksajjantāya lāuhityāya daksajjantyo vipācīcīcīc dṛḍhajayantāya lāuhityāya vipācīcīcīc dṛḍhajayanto lāuhityo vāipācīcīcīc dṛḍhajayantāya lāuhityāya vāipācīcīcīc dṛḍhajayantir dṛḍhajayanto lāuhityo vāipācīcīcīc dṛḍhajayantae gūptaya lāuhityāya. 2. tad etad amṛtam gāyatram aṣṭa yāṇy anyāni gūtāni kāmyāṇy eva tāni kāmyāṇy eva tāni. 117.
saptame 'nuvāke pañcamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. saptame 'nuvākas samāptaḥ.

Aṣṭāda Uttara Pāraśārya; Aṣṭāda Uttara Pāraśārya to Vipācīcīcīc Čakunimitra Pāraśārya; Vipācīcīcīc Čakunimitra 'Pāraśārya to Jayanta Pāraśārya; Jayanta Pāraśārya—

III. 42. 1. — to Čyāmajayanta Lāuhitya; Čyāmajayanta Lāuhitya to Palligupta Lāuhitya; Palligupta Lāuhitya to Satyaçravas Lāuhitya; Satyaçravas Lāuhitya to Krṣṇadṛhtī Sātyaki; Krṣṇadṛhtī Sātyaki to Čyāmasajjantāya Lāuhitya; Čyāmasajjantāya Lāuhitya to Krṣṇadattāya Lāuhitya; Krṣṇadattāya Lāuhitya to Mitrabhūtī Lāuhitya; Mitrabhūtī Lāuhitya to Čyāmajayanta Lāuhitya; Čyāmajayanta Lāuhitya to Triveda Krṣṇarātīya Lāuhitya; Triveda Krṣṇarātīya Lāuhitya to Yaçasvin Jayanta Lāuhitya; Yaçasvin Jayanta Lāuhitya to Jayaka Lāuhitya; Jayaka Lāuhitya to Krṣṇarātīya Lāuhitya; Krṣṇarātīya Lāuhitya to Daksajjantāya Lāuhitya; Daksajjantāya Lāuhitya to Vipācīcīcīcīcīc Dṛḍhajayantāya Lāuhitya; Vipācīcīcīcīcīcīc Dṛḍhajayanto Lāuhitya to Vāipācīcīcīcīcīc Dṛḍhajayantae Gūptaya Lāuhitya. 2. That is the immortal gāyatra[-saman]; and what other chants there are, they are optional only, they are optional only.

41. 4 A. sudattā; B. sudattatāya. 8 A. āś.- (I); B. āś.-
42. 1loha. 7 A. -ti. 3 insert ċyāmajayanto lāuhityāya. 4 vāivip. 5 -d.
IV. 1. 1. 1. *vaṭapayo ṭarṣata harinīlo 'si haritaspṛṣṇas samānubuddho mā hīniśī. na māṁ tvaṁ vettha pradrava. 2. yad abhayavacaranaḥ bhavāṇiśi svapantam puruṣaṁ akividam aṣṭamaṇyaṁ varmanā varuṇo 'ntar daḥhūtā mā. 3. yad abhayavacaranaḥ bhavāṇiśi svapantam puruṣaṁ akividam aṣṭamaṇyaṁ varmanā varuṇo 'ntar daḥhūtā mā. 4. yad abhayavacaranaḥ bhavāṇiśi svapantam puruṣaṁ akividam lohamayena varmanā varuṇo 'ntar daḥhūtā mā. 5. yad abhayavacaranaḥ bhavāṇiśi svapantam puruṣaṁ akividam rajatamayena varmanā varuṇo 'ntar daḥhūtā mā. 6. yad abhayavacaranaḥ bhavāṇiśi svapantam puruṣāṁ swarṇamayena varmanā varuṇo 'ntar daḥhūtā mā.

1. āyur mātā matiḥ pitaḥ namas ta āviśeṣaṇaḥ:
grafo nāṁā 'si viṣṇuṇa tasmāi te viṣṇuḥ namā
namas tāṁrāya namo varunāya namo jīghāṁso
yakṣaṁ rājana mā māṁ hīniśī. rājana yakṣaṁ mā hīniśī. lauṣas suhīvīda
nayos savam āyur ayāṁ' ahām. 118.
prathamo 'nandakas samāptaḥ.

IV. 2. 1. puruṣo vā yajñaḥ. 2. tasya yāni catuṛvinçatir varṣāṁ tat prātāsavunam. catuṛvinçatyaṅkhārā gāyatri. gāy-

IV. 1. 1. Possessing white horses, conspicuous, yellow-blue art thou, . . . . do not harm. Thou knowest me not; run away. 2. When moving down against [him] thou descendest against the sleeping man unknowing, let Varuṇa cover me with a stone armor. 3. When moving down against [him] thou descendest against the sleeping man unknowing, let Varuṇa cover me with a brass armor. 4. When moving down against [him] thou descendest against the sleeping man unknowing, let Varuṇa cover me with a copper armor. 5. When moving down against [him] thou descendest against the sleeping man unknowing, let Varuṇa cover me with a copper armor. 6. When moving down against [him] thou descendest against the sleeping man unknowing, let Varuṇa cover me with a silver arm. 7. When moving down against [him] thou descendest against the sleeping man unknowing, let Varuṇa cover me with a golden armor. 7. Life is the mother, thought the father. Homage to thee, O drying one. Thou art seizer by name, possessing all life. Unto thee then homage for ever. Homage to the copper-red one, homage to Varuṇa, homage to him who desires to slay. 8. Consumption king, do not hurt me. King consumption, do not hurt. These two being harmonious, may I go to complete life.

IV. 2. 1. Man is the sacrifice. 2. His [first] twenty-four years are the morning-libation. The gāyatri has twenty-four syllables.

1. 1-re. 2. B. ti manamayena. 4. in the following the MSS. abbreviate. 4. B. mātana. 4-vāhāya. 4. A. ruṣāya. 4-aḥ. 4
2. 1-re.
The morning-libation is connected with the gāyatī. 3. It belongs to the Vāsus. The breaths are the Vāsus; for the breaths take to themselves all this that is good (nasu). 4. If in that time an illness should attack him, he should say: "Ye breaths, ye Vāsus, continue this morning-libation of mine by the noon-libation." Verily he becomes well. 5. His [next] forty-four years are the noon-libation. The triṣṭubh has forty-four syllables. The noon-libation is connected with the triṣṭubh. 6. It belongs to the Rudras. The breaths are the Rudras; for the breaths cause the whole [universe] to wail (vrud). 7. If in that time an illness should attack him, he should say: "Ye breaths, ye Rudras, continue this noon-libation of mine by the evening-libation." Verily he becomes well. 8. Moreover his [next] forty-eight years are the evening-libation. The jagati has forty-eight syllables. The evening-libation is connected with the jagati. 9. It belongs to the Ādityas. The breaths are the Ādityas; for the breaths take to themselves (dā + ā) this all. 10. If in that time an illness should attack him, he should say: "Ye breaths, ye Ādityas, continue this my evening-libation by my life-time." Verily he becomes well. 11. Now the Brāhmaṇ Mahidāsa Āitareya, knowing this, said in [his] illness: "Why dost thou now attack me, who am not to die of this illness?" He lived a hundred and sixteen years. He lives on to a hundred and sixteen years, [his] breath does not leave him in the midst of his lifetime, who knows thus.
IV. 3. 1. tr̥yāyusam kartapastra jamadagnes tr̥yāyusam: 
tr̥iṇy āmrataya puspāni tr̥iṇyā yāyāsi me kṛṇoh.
2. sa no mayobhah pitaṇa avicaśva čaṅtiko yanəh tanuve syonaḥ.
3. ye 'gnayaḥ puriaḥāḥ praviṣṭāḥ prthivīm anu: 
tesāṁ tvam aṣy uttamaḥ praśno jivatave suva. 120. 
tr̥itīya 'nvākas samāptah.

IV. 4. 1. aranyasya vastra 'si vičvanāma vičvābhirakṣano 
pām pakvo 'si varaṇasya dūto 'ntardhināma.' 2. yathā tvam 
amrito martebyhō 'ntarhito 'sy evam tvam asmān aghāyubhyo 
ntor dhehi. antardhir asi stenebhyaḥ. 121.
caturtho 'nvākas samāptah.

IV. 5. 1. vyusi savitā bhavasy udesyaṃ viṣṇur udyan purusa 
udito bṛhaspatir abhirayan maṇḍheva 'ndro vāikunṭha mādhyan-
dine bhago 'parāhaṇa ugro devo lohitāyann astamite yamo 
bhavasi. 2. aṃcasu soma rāja niśāyāṃ pitrājās svapne manu-
ṣyāṃ praviṣasi payasā pāpā. 3. vīrātre bhavo bhavasy apararā-
tre 'nigirā agnihotravāyāṃ bhṛghu. 4. tasya taḍa etad eva man-

IV. 3. 1. The threefold life-time of Kaṭyāpa, of Jamadagni 
the threefold life-time, the three flowers of immortality, three 
life-times thou madest for me. 2. Enter into us, O thou bene-
ficent food, which, tranquillizing, art pleasing to the body. 3. What dirty fires are entered into the earth along, of them 
they art the highest; impel us unto life.

IV. 4. 1. Thou art the calf of the forest, possessing all names, 
all-defending; ripe of the waters art thou, Varuṇa's messenger, 
concealment by name. 2. As thou, immortal, art concealed from 
mortals, so do thou conceal us from the wicked. Thou art con-
celment from robbers.

IV. 5. 1. When it dawns, thou becomest Savitar; when about 
to rise, Viṣṇu; rising, Purusa; risen, Bṛhaspati; ascending, the 
bounteous one; at noon, Indra Vāikunṭha; in the afternoon, 
Bhaga; growing red, the formidable god; having set, thou 
becomest Yama. 2. In the stones king Śoma, in the night the 
king of the Fathers. In sleep thou enterest into men; with the 
milk, into cattle. 3. In the middle of night thou art Bhava; in 
the after-part of the night, Aṅgiras; at the time of the Agni-
hotra, Bhṛgu. 4. This disk is its udder, speech and breath are

3. triyā-. 4. trin. 5. āyuktri. 6. to. 7. caṃśhtokā. 8. ya. 9. on. 10. prā.
5. 1. o. 16. A. parāheya. 17. ja. 18. ta.
IV. 6. 1. Bhageratho hai "kṣvako rājā kāmaprena yaṭena yakṣyamāna āsa. 2. tad u ha kurupaṇcālānām brāhmaṇā ucie bhageratho ha vā ayam āikṣvako rājā kāmaprena yaṭena yakṣya-yamānaḥ. etena kathām vadyasya iti. 3. tāṁ hā 'bhṛeyuh. tebhyo hā 'bhṛytebhhyo 'pacitiḥ cakāra. 4. atha hāi 'ṣūṁ su bhāga āuvrajo 'pṛtā kesaṁpruṇī nakhatu nikṛtya 'jyeṇā 'bhṛjīya duṇḍopānāhah bīhṛut. 5. tāṁ ho 'vāca brāhmaṇā bhagavantaḥ katamo vas tad veda yathā "prāvitaprathyācra-vite devuṁ gacchata iti. 6. atha ho 'vāca katamo vas tad veda yendra uśāsā sudgatā suhotā svadhavyamānā saṁmūnauvidu niyāyata iti. 7. atha ho 'vāca katamo vas tad veda yuca chandāni pravjyante yat tāṁ sarvāṁ saṁstutāṁ abhisaṁpadavyantā iti. 8. atha ho 'vāca katamo vas tad veda yathā gāyatrīyā utte mantrāḥ.

these two teats. From them milk for me the lesson, Vedic studentship, offspring, domestic animals, the heavenly world, the prayer for supremacy over [my] fellows. 2. These wishes I wish. Bhūṣ, bhūvas, svar. When [the sun] hath risen, show brightness. I place that in [my]self.

IV. 6. 1. King Bhageratha Āikṣvāka was about to sacrifice with a wish-fulfilling sacrifice. 2. Then the Brāhmans of the Kurupaṇcālasaid: "Verily this king Bhageratha Āikṣvāka is about to sacrifice with a wish-fulfilling sacrifice. With him we will have a talk." 3. They went to him. To them having come to [him] he paid honors. 4. Now he came to their place having cut the hair of his head and his beard, having cut his nails, having anointed himself with sacrificial butter, bearing a staff and sandals. 5. To them he (Bhageratha) said: "Reverend Brāhmans, who of you knoweth this: how address and response go to the gods?" 6. Then he said: "Who of you knoweth what he knoweth (= must know) of whom a good udgātar, a good hotar, a good udhvyar, one who knoweth men well, is born?" 7. Then he said: "Who of you knoweth this: how the metres are applied, to what all of them when used in praise together are equivalent?" 8. Then he said: "Who of you knoweth this:

5. 5-yu. 6-āśa. 7-ādiṣa. 8-ādiṣa.
6. 1-B. -pāke-. 2-yaṣam-. 3-etatena. 4-insert bhū. 5-upatvā. 6-ju.
punar yaññam apigacchata iti. 9. atha ho 'vāca katamo vas tad 
veda yathā daksīṇāḥ pratigṛhitā na hiñsanti 'ti. 123.

śaṣṭhe 'nuvāke prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 7. 1. etān hāt ’nān pañca praṣnān papraccha. 2. teṣām 
ha kurupaṇca-lānām1 bako dālhyyo ‘nucāna āsu. 3. sa ho 'vāca 
yathā "prāvītapratyāçrāvite devān gacchatu iti prācyam̥" vai 
rōjan dīcy ācra-vītapratyāçrāvite devān gacchataḥ. tuṣm̥ti 
śaṣṭhan āçrāvayati prāñ tiṣṭhan pratyāçrāvayati 'ti. 4. atha 
ho 'vāca yañcviduṣas sūdgātā suhōta svadhāvūryaś sumūnusavid̥ 
ājāyata iti yo vai manusyaśya sambhūtir vede 'ti ho 'vāca tasya 
sūdgātā suhōta svadhāvūryaś sumūnusavid̥ ājāyata iti prāñ̥ u 
ha vāva rōjan manusyaśya sambhūtir ēve 'ti. 5. atha ho 'vāca 
yac chandānī prajñyante yat tāni sarvāni saranatūrya abhip 
sampadyanta iti gāyatrīm u ha vāva rōjan sarvāni chandānī 
sarantaubhās sampadyanta iti. 6. atha ho 'vāca yathā gāya- 
trīyā uuttame aksare punar yaññam apigacchata iti vaśakārenā 
hā vāva rōjan gāyatrīyā uuttame aksare punar yaññam apigac- 
chata iti. 7. atha ho 'vāca yathā daksīṇāḥ pratigṛhitā na 
hiñsanti 'ti—124.

śaṣṭhe 'nuvāke dvitiyā khaṇḍaḥ.

how the last two syllables of the gāyatrī go again unto the sacrifice?” 9. Then he said: “Who of you knoweth this: how the 
sacrificial fees, being received, do not injure?”

IV. 7. 1. These five questions he asked of them. 2. Of these 
Kurupaṇcasas Baka Dālhyaa was learned. 3. He said: “‘How 
address and response go to the gods?’—verily in the eastern 
quarter, O king, do address and response go to the gods. 
Therefore standing towards the east one maketh address, [and] standing 
towards the east one maketh response.” 4. Then he said: 
‘‘What he knoweth (=must know) of whom a good udgātar, a 
good hotar, a good adhāvuryu, one who knoweth men well, is 
born?’—verily he who knoweth the origination of man,” he said, 
“of him a good udgātar, a good hotar, a good adhāvuryu, one 
who knoweth men well, is born. And the breaths, indeed, O 
king, are the origination of man.” 5. Then he said: “‘How the 
metres are applied, to what all of them when used in praise 
together are equivalent?’—verily to the gāyatrī, O king, all the 
metres when used in praise together are equivalent.” 6. Then 
said: “‘How the last two syllables of the gāyatrī go again 
unto the sacrifice?’—verily by means of the vaśakāra, O king, 
the last two syllables of the gāyatrī go again unto the sacrifice.” 
7. Then he said: “‘How the sacrificial fees, being received, do 
ot injure?’—

7. 1 B. -pācē. 2 asm. 3 sam-. 4 A. sambhūtiddhara; B. sambhūtir 
ddhara. 5 hāi. 6 prācē.
IV. 8. 1. — yo vāi gāyatryāi mukhān vede 'ti ho 'vāca tām daksīnā pratigṛhhtā na hiṃsanī 'ti. 2. agnir ha vāva rājan gāyatrimukham. tasmād yad aṅgō' abhyādadhāti bhūyān' eva sa tēna bhavati vārdhate. evam evāti 'vān vidvān brāhmaṇaḥ pratigṛhṇan bhūyān eva bhavati vārdhata u eve 'ti. 1. sa ho 'vācā' guccano vāi kīlā 'yam brāhmaṇa āśā. tvām aham anena yajñenā 'mi 'ti. 4. tasya vāi te tatho 'dghyāmī 'ti ho 'vāca yathāi 'karād eva bhūtvā svargam lokam esyasi 'ti. 1. tasmā etena gāyatremo 'dghheno 'jagāu. sa hāi 'karād eva bhūtvā svargam lokam iyāya. tena' hāi 'tenai 'karād eva bhūtvā svargam lokam eti [ya evām veda]. 1. oṁ vā iti dve aksāre. oṁ vā iti caturthe. oṁ vā iti ṣaṭthe. hum bhā oṁ vāg ity āṣṭame. 1. tena hāi 'tena pratādaro' 'ṣya bhayadasya 'samātyasyo 'jagāu. 2. tathā ho 'vāca kim ta 'dghyāmī 'ti. sa ho 'vāca hari me devāpavāvāgaye 'ti. tatha 'ti. tāū hā 'smā 'ājagāu. tāū hāi 'nam 'ājagmatuḥ. 1. sa vā ee udgithāh kāminānī sampad oṁ vās oṁ vāc oṁ vāc hum bhā oṁ vāg vāi. sūng haī 'vāva sata-nur amṛtas sambhavati ya etad evān veda 'the yasāi 'vām vidvān udgāyati. 125.

ṣaṭthe 'nuvāke tṛtyāh khaṇḍaḥ. ṣaṭho 'nuvākas samāptāḥ.

IV. 8. 1. — Verily whoso knoweth the mouth of the gāyatric, he said, "him the sacrificial fees, being received, do not injure.

Verily Agni, O king, is the mouth of the gāyatric. Therefore in that one puta [things] in the fire, it thereby becometh greater, it increaseth; even so a Brāhmaṇa knowing thus, receiving [sacrificial fees], becometh greater [and] increaseth." 2. He (Bhage-ratha) said: "Verily this one was a learned Brāhmaṇa. I come to thee with this sacrifice." 4. "Verily, I will sing for thee its udgitha," he (B.) said, "in such wise that thou shalt go to the heavenly world having become sole king." 5. For him he sang the udgitha by means of the gāyatra-udgitha. He (Bhageratha) having become sole king went to the heavenly world. By means of this same [udgitha] he goes to the heavenly world, having become sole king, [who knows thus]. 6. Om vā are two syllables, om vā the third and fourth, om vā the fifth and sixth, hum bhā, om vāc the seventh and eighth. 7. With this same [udgitha] Pratīdarṣa sang the udgitha for this Bhayada Āsammāya. 1. He said to him: "What shall I sing into thy possession?" He said: "Sing for me the two bay steeds of the gods." "Yes," he said. He sang the two into his possession. They both came unto him.

This same udgitha is the success of wishes, viz. om vāc, om vāc, hum bhā, om vāc. Verily he comes to life with limbs, with a body, immortal, who knows this thus, and he for whom one knowing thus sings the udgitha.

8. 1 aṅ-. 2-yaṅ. 3 gāyatra so. 4 tonu. 5 A. -ce. 6 A. savad.
IV. 9. 1. puruso vai yajñaḥ puruso ho 'udgīthā. athāi 'ta eva mṛtyayo yad agnir vāyuḥ udītyaḥ candramāḥ. 2. te ha puruṣaṁ jāyamānam eva mṛtyupācārī abhidhādhi. tasya vācaṁ eva1 'gnir abhiyadhāti prāṇam vāyuḥ ca kṣuṇaḥ udītyaḥ crotres candramāḥ. 3. tad āhus sa vā udgātā yo yajamāṇasya' prāne bhayo 'dhi mṛtyupāṇān umuṇcati' ti. 4. tad yasyāi 'vain vidvān prastāuti ya eva 'sya vāci mṛtyupācās tam eva 'syo 'nuṇcati. 5. atha yasyāi 'vain vīdvān' udgāyati ya eva 'sya prāne mṛtyupācās tam eva 'syo 'nuṇcati. 6. atha yasyāi 'vain vīdvān pratihārati' ya eva 'sya caktras' mṛtyupācās tam eva 'syo 'nuṇcati. 7. atha yasyāi 'vain vīdvān nidhanam' upāiti ya eva 'sya cotre mṛtyupācās tam eva 'syo 'nuṇcati. 8. evain vā evaṁvid udgātā yajamāṇasya prānebhayo 'dhi mṛtyupāṇ umuṇcati. 9. tad āhus sa vā udgātā yo yajamāṇasya prānebhayo 'dhi mṛtyupāṇ umuṇeye 'thāi 'nāṁ sāngāṁ sātāṁ sarvaṁyās sprṇati 'ti. 126.

saptame 'nuvāke prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 10. 1. tad yasyāi 'vain vīdvān hiṅkaroṭi ya eva 'sya lomam mṛtyupācās tasmād evai 'nāṁ sprṇati. 2. atha yasyāi

IV. 9. 1. Verily the sacrifice is man, the udgīthā indeed is man. Now these are the deaths, viz. Agni, Vāyu, the sun, the moon. 2. They put upon man, when he is being born, the fetters of death. Agni puts [them] upon his speech, Vāyu upon his breath, the sun upon his sight, the moon upon his hearing. 3. This they say: “Verily it is the udgātā who releaseth the fetters of death from the breaths of the sacrificer.” 4. For whom one knowing thus sings the prastāva, for him he releases that fetter of death which is in his speech. 5. And for whom one knowing thus sings the udgīthā, for him he releases that fetter of death which is in his breath. 6. And for whom one knowing thus sings the pratihāra, for him he releases that fetter of death which is in his sight. 7. And for whom one knowing thus enters upon the nidhana, for him he releases that fetter of death which is in his hearing. 8. Thus an udgātār knowing thus releases the fetters of death from the breaths of the sacrificer. 9. This they say: “He is an udgātār who, having released the fetters of death from the breaths of the sacrificer, rescue him then with his limbs, with his body, from every death.”

IV. 10. 1. Now for whom one knowing thus utters the hiṅkāra, him be rescue from that fetter of death which is in his hairs. 2. And for whom one knowing thus sings the prastāva, him be
rescues from that fetter of death which is in his skin. 1. And for whom one knowing thus begins the ádi, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his flesh. 2. And for whom one knowing thus sings the udgátha, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his sinews. 3. And for whom one knowing thus sings the pratihára, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his limbs. 4. And for whom one knowing thus sings the upádrava, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his bones. 5. And for whom one knowing thus enters upon the nidhána, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his marrow. 6. = IV. 9. 9. 9. This they say: "Verily he is the udgátar who, having released the fetters of death from the breasts of the sacrificer, having then rescued him with his limbs, with his body, from every death, placeth him in seven parts in the heavenly world." 10. That same one, rising, is Indra Váimrđha; risen, Savitar; Mitra at the time when the cows are driven together; Indra Váikuntha at noon; when returning, Čarva; when it is becoming red, the formidable god; Prajápati when it has gone home to lie down. 11. Thus for whom one knowing thus utters the hínikára, what heavenly world there is of him rising, in that he thus places him. 12. And for whom one knowing thus sings the prastátra, what heavenly world there is of him when he has risen, in that he thus places him. 13. And for whom one know-
ādātta ya evā 'syā sāṅgavakāle śvarga lokas tasminn evāi 'naṁ
dadhāti. 14. atha yasyāi 'vāṁ vidvān udgāyati ya evā 'syā
madhyandine śvarga lokas tasminn evāi 'naṁ dadhāti. 15. atha
yasyāi 'vāṁ vidvān pratiharati ya evā 'syā 'parāhe śvarga
lokas tasminn evāi 'naṁ dadhāti. 16. atha yasyāi 'vāṁ vidvān
upadravati ya evā 'syā 'stamyatas śvarga lokas tasminn evāi
'naṁ dadhāti. 17. atha yasyāi 'vāṁ vidvān nidhanam upāṣti
ya evā 'syā 'stamite śvarga lokas tasminn evāi 'naṁ dadhāti.
18. evāṁ vā evavēvid udgātā yajamānasya prānebhyo 'dhi
mṛtyupāśān unmucya 'thāi 'naṁ sāṅgai satanum sarvamṛtyos
śrītvā śvarga loke saptadhā' dadhāti. 127.

saptame 'nuvāke devīyāh khaṇḍāh. saptamo 'nuvākas samāptaḥ.

IV. 11. 1. saṁ dāha vāi devatās svayambhuvo 'gnir vāyur
asūv ādityaṁ prāṇo 'nnaṁ vāk. 2. tūś caṛiśthye vyavādanta'
'haṁ śreṣṭāḥ' 'smī ahaṁ śreṣṭhāḥ 'smy maṁ śrīyam upādhvam
iti. 3. 'tā anyonyaśyāi śreṣṭhayāyā na 'tisthanta. 'tā abruvan
na vā anyonyaśyāi śreṣṭhayāyā 'tisthamaḥ' etā samprabavā-
maḥāi yathā śreṣṭhās' smā iti. 4. 'tā agnim abruvan kathām

ing thus begins the ādī, what heavenly world there is of him at
the time when the cows are driven together, in that he thus places
him. 14. And for whom one knowing thus sings the udgātha,
what heavenly world there is of him at noon, in that he thus
places him. 15. And for whom one knowing thus sings the pra-
tihāra, what heavenly world there is of him in the afternoon, in
that he thus places him. 16. And for whom one knowing thus
sings the upadrava, what heavenly world there is of him going
home (setting), in that he thus places him. 17. And for whom
one knowing thus enters upon the nidhana, what heavenly world
there is of him when he has set, in that he thus places him.
18. Even so an udgātar knowing thus, having released the fetters
of death from the breaths of the sacrificer, having then rescued
him with his limbs, with his body, from every death, places him
in seven parts in the heavenly world.

IV. 11. 1. Verily there are six self-existing divinities, viz.
Agni, Vāyu, yonder sun, breath, food, speech. 2. These disputed
regarding their prāṇiṁcē [saying]: "I am the best, I am the
best; worship me as excellence." 3. They did not recognize
each the other's prāṇiṁcē. They said: "Verily we do not
recognize each the other's prāṇiṁcē. Let us therefore explain
together how we are best." 4. They said to Agni: "How art
IV. 12. 1. athā"dityam abravan katham u tvāṁ gṛṣṭho 'śi 'ti. 2. so 'bravid aham eva 'dyann ahar bhavāmy aham astaṁyaṁ rātriḥ. mayā cakṣuṣaṁ karmanī kriyante. sa yad aham na syāṁ naiṣ 'vā 'has' syān na rātriḥ. na karmanī kriyān. 3. tata idāṁ sarvam parāhvat tato na kīṁ cana pariśiyete 'ti. 4. evam eva 'ti ho 'cur nāi 've 'ha kīṁ cana pariśiyeta yat tvāṁ na syā āti. 5. aha prāṇam abravan katham u tvāṁ gṛṣṭho 'śi 'ti. 6. so 'bravid prāṇo bhūtvā 'gnir dīpyate. prāṇo bhūtvā thon the best?" 7. He said : "I am the mouth of the gods, I of the other creatures; by me offerings are offered; I transform the food of the gods, I [that] of men. 8. If I were not, the gods would be mouthless, mouthless the other creatures; no offerings would be offered. Neither the food of the gods would be transformed nor [that] of men. 9. Thence this all would perish; thence nothing at all would be left." 10. "Just so," they said; "nothing at all would be left if thou wert not." 11. Then they said to Vāyu : "And how art thou the best?" 12. He said : "I am the breath of the gods, I of the other creatures. From whom I go out, he then drifts away." 11. = 7. 12. = 8.

IV. 12. 1. Then they said to the sun : "And how art thou the best?" 2. He said : "I, rising, become the day; I, setting, the night. By me as sight deeds are done. If I were not, there would be no day, no night; no deeds would be done." 3. = 11. 4. = 11. 5. Then they said to breath : "And how art thou the best?" 6. He said : "As breath, Agni shineth; as breath, Vāyu
vāyur ākāśam' anubhavati. prāno bhūtvā "ditya udeśi. prānād annam prānād vāk. 7. sa yaḥ ahaṁ na syāṁ tata' idam' sarvam parābhavet tato na kiṁ cana pariṣīyete 'ti. 8. evam eva 'ti ho "cur nāi 've 'ha kiṁ cana pariṣīyeta yat tvāṁ na syāṁ iti. 9. athā 'nnam abruvan katham u' tvāṁ gṛṣṭham asi 'ti. 10. tad abravin mayi pratiṣṭhāyā 'gnir dīpyate. mayi pratiṣṭhāyā vāyur ākāśam anubhavati. mayi pratiṣṭhāyā "ditya udeśi. mad eva prāno mad vāk. 11. sa yaḥ ahaṁ na syāṁ tata' idam' sarvam parābhavet tato na kiṁ cana pariṣīyete 'ti. 12. evam eva 'ti ho "cur nāi 've 'ha kiṁ cana pariṣīyeta yat tvāṁ na syāṁ iti. 13. athā vācām abruvan katham u' tvāṁ gṛṣṭham 'sī 'ti. 14. sā 'bravin mayāi 've 'daṁ vijnāyate mayāi 'daḥ. sa yaḥ ahaṁ na syāṁ nāi 've 'daṁ vijnāyeta nā 'daḥ. 15. tata' idam' sarvam parābhavend nāi 've 'ha kiṁ cana pariṣīyeta' 'ti. 16. evam eva 'ti ho "cur nāi 've 'ha kiṁ cana pariṣīyeta yat tvāṁ na syāṁ iti. 17. 189.

aṣṭame 'nuvāke dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 13. 1. tā abruvann etā vāi kilu survā devatāḥ. ekāi 'kām evāi 'nu smrthī. sa yan nu nos survāsāṁ devatānāṁ ekā cana na syāt tata' idam' sarvam parābhavet tato na kiṁ cana pariṣīyeta. hanti sārdhām sametāyā yac chṛṣṭham tuḥ aṣṭame 'ti. 2. tā etasmin prāṇa' okāre vācyā akāre samāyan. tad yat samāyan tat sāmnas sāmatvam. 3. tā abruvan yāni no martānyā anaśa-v

permeateth space; as breath, the sun riseth; from breath [cometh] food, from breath speech. 7. If I were not, then this all would perish, then nothing at all would be left.” 8. 9. Then they said to food: “And how art thou the best?” 10. It said: “In me standing firm, Agni shineth; in me standing firm, Vāyu permeateth space in various directions; in me standing firm, the sun riseth; from me [cometh] breath, from me food.” 11. 12. 13. 14. They said to speech: “And how art thou the best?” 15. It said: “By me this is distinguished, by me that. If I were not, neither would this be distinguished nor that.” 16. 17. 18. 19.
"Removing those syllables of us which are mortal, whose evil is not smitted away, let us sing a gāyatra in the syllables [which are] immortal, having evil smitten away, pure: in Agni, in Vāyu, in the sun, in breath, in food, in speech. Thereby having smitten away death, having smitten away evil, may we go to the heavenly world."

4. A is the syllable of Agni [which is] immortal, having evil smitten away, pure; gnis is his syllable [which is] mortal, not having evil smitten away. 6. Vā is the syllable of Vāyu [which is] immortal, having evil smitten away, pure; yus is his syllable [which is] mortal, not having evil smitten away. 6. A is the syllable of the sun [which is] immortal, having evil smitten away, pure; tya is his syllable [which is] mortal, not having evil smitten away. 7. Prā is the syllable of breath [which is] immortal, having evil smitten away, pure; na is his syllable [which is] mortal, not having evil smitten away. 8. A is the syllable of food [which is] immortal, having evil smitten away, pure; nam is its syllable [which is] mortal, not having evil smitten away. 9. Vā is the syllable of speech [which is] immortal, having evil smitten away, pure; c is its syllable [which is] mortal, not having evil smitten away. 10. They, removing those syllables [which are] mortal, not having evil smitten away, sang the gāyatra in the syllables [which are] immortal, having evil smitten away, pure: in Agni, in Vāyu,

18. 1tyā. 6am-(-l). 7yena. 8-ço. 9-na. 10 tya ity. 11 A. adds vedivado mṛta, cancelled in red. 12 ya ity. 11-māsu.
11. apahatya mṛtyum apahatya pūmānaṁ svargaṁ lokam eti ya evaṁ veda. 130.

aṣṭame 'nuvāke trīyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 14. 1. tā brahmā 'bruvan tvayi pratiśṭhāyai 'taman udyac-chāme 'ti. tā brahmā 'bravid āṣyena' prāṇena yuṣmān' āṣyena prāṇena mām upāprnavāthe 'ti. 2. tā etena prāṇena u 'kareṇa vācy akāram abhinimesyanto' hiṅkārād bhakāram okāreṇa vācam anuvaran’tya uḥbhibhyām prāṇāḥbhīyām gāyatram a-gāyann ovāsc ovāsc ovāsc hum bhā vo va iti. 3. sa yatho 'bhayā-padi pratiśṭhāyai' evam eva svargo loke pratyatiśhan. prati svargo loke tiśhati ya evaṁ veda. 4. ya u ha va evānvid asmāl lokāt prāti sa praṇa eva bhūtvā vāyum apyeti vāyor adhy abhrāṇy abhrēbhya 'dhi varṣiṁ' varṣyai 've'maṁ lokam anuvā- bhavati. 5. ṛṣayo ha satramā' āsāṁ cakire. te punah-punar bahuḥbir-bahuḥbhī pratiṇābhis svargasya lokasya dvāravāṁ nā 'nu canā bhubdhīre. 6. ta u āramaṇa tapasā vratacaryene'nādram avarurudhīre. 7. tām ha 'cus svargaṁ vāi lokam ápipsīma.' te punah-punar bahuḥbir-bahuḥbhī pratiṇābhis svargasya lokasya dvāravāṁ nā 'nu canā 'bhūtsmāhi.' tathā no 'nuvādhi yathā in the sun, in breath, in food, in speech. Thereby having smitten away death, having smitten away evil, they went to the heavenly world. 11. Having smitten away death, having smitten away evil, he goes to the heavenly world who knows thus.

IV. 14. 1. They said to the brahma: "Standing firm in thee we will hold this one up." To them the brahma said: "With the breath in the mouth ye shall obtain yourselves, with the breath in the mouth me." 2. They, by this breath, the o-sound, being about to settle the a-sound in speech, and by the o-sound sounding the bhā-sound as speech after the hiṅkāra, sang the gāyatra with both these breaths: ovāsc ovāsc ovāsc hum bhā vo va. 3. As one with both feet stands firm, even so they stood firm in the heavenly world. He stands firm in the heavenly world who knows thus. 4. And he who knowing thus departs from this world, he, having become breath, goes unto Vāyu, from Vāyu unto the clouds, from the clouds unto rain. With rain he extends over this world. 5. The sages (ṛṣi) sat a session (sattra). They again and again with many, many introductory stanzas did in no way perceive the door of the heavenly world. 6. And they with exertion, with penance, with the performance of vows, got possession of Indra. 7. They said to him: "We have desired to obtain the heavenly world; yet again and again with many, many introductory stanzas have we in no way perceived the door of the

14. 1 āṣyeūśena. 2 A. -ā; B. -āṁ. 3-at. 4-p. 5-tr-. 6 A. āṭpīśīlu. 7 B. inserts bahuḥbir. 8 bhūt-. 9meṣant-. 
H. Oertel,

svargasya lokasya dvāram anuprajñāyā 'nārtas svastī saṁvatsarasayo 'dramaṁ gatvā svargaṁ lokam iyāme ṭi. 8. tān ho 'vūca ko vas sthāviratama iti.' 131.

aṣṭame 'nūvāke caturthaḥ khanḍaḥ.

IV. 15. 1. aham ity agastyaḥ. 2. sa vā cāh īty ho 'vūca tasmāi vāi te 'ham tad vākyāmi? yad vidvāṁsas svargasya lokasya
dvāram anuprajñāyā 'nārtas svastī saṁvatsarasasyo 'dramaṁ gatvā svargaṁ lokam esyathe 'ti. 3. tasmā ēvaṁ gatvāryaso 'dgitham upaṇiśadad amṛtam udvāc 'gnāu vāyūn ' āditye prāne 'nne vācī. 4. tato vāi te svargasya lokasya dvāram anuprajñāyā 'nārtas svastī saṁvatsarasasyo 'dramaṁ gatvā svargaṁ lokam āyan. 5. ēvaṁ evāi 'vaṁ vidvān svargasya lokasya dvāram anupra-
jñāyā 'nārtas svastī saṁvatsarasasyo 'dramaṁ gatvā svargaṁ lokam ēti. 132.

aṣṭame 'nūvāke paṁcamaḥ khanḍaḥ. aṣṭama 'nūvākas samāptaḥ.

IV. 16. 1. evāṁ vā ēvaṁ gatvāryaso 'dgitham' upaṇiśadad amṛtam indro 'gastyaḥ' 'vūca 'gastya isāya gyāvāspaaya iśa
gyāvāspir gauṣūktaye gauṣūktir jvaīyaṇaya jvaīyaṇanac gati-
yanaye gatiyāni rāmaṇa vṛatujāteya vāyāghrapadya vāyāghrapadya rāmaḥ vṛatujāteya vāyāghrapadya— 133.

navame 'nūvāke prathamaḥ khanḍaḥ.

heavenly world. Teach us so that we, perceiving the door of the heavenly world, unharmed, having gone successfully to the end of the year, may go to the heavenly world.” 6. He said to them:

“Who of you is the oldest?”

IV. 15. 1. “‘I,” said Agastya. 2. “Then come,” he said; “I will tell thee that which knowing ye, perceiving the door of the heavenly world, unharmed, having gone successfully to the end of the year, shall go to the heavenly world.” 3. To him he told this udgītha of the gāyatra [-sāman], the upaṇiśad, the immortal, in Agni, in Vāyu, in the sun, in breath, in food, in speech. 4. Verily they then, perceiving the door of the heavenly world, unharmed, having gone successfully to the end of the year, went to the heavenly world. 5. Even so one knowing thus, perceiving the gate of the heavenly world, unharmed, having gone successfully to the end of the year, goes to the heavenly world.

IV. 16. 1. Verily thus Indra told this udgītha of the gāyatra [-sāman], the upaṇiśad, the immortal, to Agastya, Agastya to Iṣa Īṣā, Iṣa Īṣā to Gauṣūkti, Gauṣūkti to Jvalāya, Jvalāya to Catiya, Catiya to Rama Kratujāteya Vai-

yāghrapadya, Rama Kratujāteya Vāyāghrapadya—

15. 1A. om. 1-kṛṣām. 2B. inserts dvāram and 'vāma. 'vāy.
16. 1-dīt. 1-dvā. 2B. dvā. 'dāye. 'vāyā.
IV. 17. 1. — çaṅkhāya bāḥravyāya caṅkho bāḥravyo daḳṣaṇāya kātyāyayanayo'ātreyaṇa daḳṣaṇ kātyāyani aṭreyaṇ kāṇṣaṇāya vārakṣaṇāya kaṃso vārakṣyas suyaṇāya pāṇḍīloya suyaṇaṃ pāṇḍīloṃ 'gnidattaya pāṇḍīloṃ y gnidattas pāṇḍīloṣyas suyaṇaṃ pāṇḍīloṣya suyaṇaṃ pāṇḍīloṣya jayantaya vārakṣyas jayant vārakṣya janaṅrūṭaya vārakṣyas janaṅrūtasa vārakṣyasā sudattāya pāṛṣaṇya. 2. sāi 'sāi gāyatrasyo 'paniṣad evam upāsitavyā. 134.

nvāme 'nvāke dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. navamo 'nvākas samāptaḥ.

IV. 18. 1. kene 'ṣitam patati preśitam manah
kena prāṇah prathamah prāti yuktaḥ:
kena 'ṣitam vacam imam vadanti
cakṣuṣaḥ prostram ka u devo yanakti.

2. prostrasya prostram manaso mano yad
vāco ha vacam sa u prāṇasya prāṇah:
cakṣuṣas cakṣur atimucya dhirāḥ
pratyā 'smāl lokād amṛtā bhavanti.

3. na tatra cakṣur gacchati na vāg gacchati na munah:
na vidmaḥ na vijānimo yathā 'tad anuṣṭikyati.'

4. anya eva tathā viditād atho aviditād adhi:
iti 'cuṣṭrama' pūrveśāṃ ye nas tathā vācaṣṭikāre.

IV. 17. 1. — to Čaṅkha Bābhavya, Čaṅka Bābhavya to Dākṣa Kātyāyani Ātreya, Dākṣa Kātyāyani Ātreya to Kāṇṣa Vārakṣya, Kāṇṣa Vārakṣya to Suyaṇa Pāṇḍīloṣya, Suyaṇa Pāṇḍīloṣya to Jayaṇta Vārakṣya, Jayaṇta Vārakṣya to Janaṅrūṭa Vārakṣya, Janaṅrūṭa Vārakṣya to Sudatta Pāṛṣaṇya. That same upaniṣad of the gāyatra [-sāman] of Cātyāyanī is to be worshiped thus.

IV. 18. 1. Sent by whom does the mind, sent forth, fly? Yoked by whom does the first breath come forth? By whom is this speech sent which they speak? And which god yokes sight [and] hearing? 2. Released from the hearing of the hearing, from the mind of the mind, from the speech of speech—and that is also the breath of the breath—from the sight of the sight, the wise departing from this world become immortal. 3. Sight does not go there, speech does not go there, neither [does] mind. We do not know, we do not distinguish, how one might teach that. 4. “It is different from the known and likewise from the unknown;”

17. 'āya. 'p. 'o, and insert janaṅrūṭaḥ vārakṣyaḥ janaṅrūte (I) vārakṣyas. 'a-o.
18. 'vidu. 'a. 1 B. inserts 'vāi. 'cīṁ-. 'cru-. 
Thus we heard from those of old, who explained it to us. 5. That which is not declared by speech, that by which speech is declared, only that know thou as brahman, not that which they worship here. 6. That which one does not think with the mind, that by which they say the mind is thought, only that know thou as brahman, not that which they worship here. 7. That which one does not see with sight, that by which one sees sights, only that know thou as brahman, not that which they worship here. 8. That which one does not hear with hearing, that by which this hearing is heard, only that know thou as brahman, not that which they worship here. 9. That which one does not breathe with breath, that by which breath is led forth, only that know thou as brahman, not that which they worship here.

IV. 19. 1. If thou thinkest: “I know [it] well,” little dost thou even then know the form of the brahman, what of it thou [art?], what of it [is] among the gods. Now then I think what is unknown is to be pondered upon by thee. 2. I do not think: “I know [it] well,” neither do I know: “I know [it] not.” He of us who knows this knows it (the brahman), and he does not know: “I know [it] not.” 3. Of whom it is not thought, of him it is thought; of whom it is thought, he knows it not. Not understood [is it] of those who understand; [it is] understood
Jātmīnīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.

4. pratibodhīdītam matam anṛtavām hi vindate:
   uṭmanuś vindate viryaṁ vidyāyā vindate 'nṛtavām.
1. iha ced avedid atha satyam asti. na ced iha 'redin mahatī
   vinvāśī. bhūtesu-bhūtesu vivicya dhirāḥ pretyā 'smāl lokād
   anṛtā bhavanti. 130.

dacāte 'nuvāke dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 20. 1. brahma ha devebhya vijîgye. tasya ha brahmano vi-
   jaya devā amahiyanta. ta āikṣaṇā 'śmākam eva 'yaṁ vijīyah.
   asmākam eva 'yaṁ mahīm 'ti. 2. tād dhāśāṁ vijāṇāu. tebhya
   ha prādūr bhavāva. tan na vyajāṇanta' kim idāṁ yakṣam iti.
   3. te 'guhim abhavāṁ jātaveda etad vijāṇihi kim etad yakṣam iti.
   4. tathē 'ti. 5. tād abhyadravañ. tam abhyavatad ko 'śi 'ti. agnir
   vā ahām' así ty abhavij jātavedā vā 'ahām asmi 'ti. 6. tas-
   miṁs tvayi kiṁ viryam iti. api 'daṁ sarvau duḥhyam yad idam
   prthiviyan iti. 7. tasmāi trpaṁ niṣaṁhva etad dhāṁ 'ti. tad
   upapreyāya sarvañjavana. tan na caṣāka dvākapam. sa tata eva
   nivārye nāṁ vijñānum yad etad yakṣam iti. 8. atha
   viṇyam abravan viṇyam etad vijāṇihi kim etad yakṣam iti. tathē
   'ti. 9. tād abhyadravat. tam abhyavatad ko 'śi 'ti. vāyur vā

of those who do not understand. 4. It is thought to be known
in awakening (?), for one finds immortality; by the self one
finds strength, by knowledge one finds immortality. 5. If one
has known [it] here, then it is true; and if one has not known
[it] here, [there is] great loss. The wise, having separated [it]
in the several beings, departing from this world become immor-

IV. 20. 1. The brahman won a complete victory for the gods.
By the complete victory of this brahman the gods were exalted.
They considered: "Ours is this complete victory, ours is this
greatness." 2. Now it (the brahman) became aware of this
[thought] of them. It manifested itself to them. They did not
recognized it [saying]: "What is this spectre?" 3. They said to
Agni: "O Jātavedas, find that out, what spectre this is." 4.
"Yes." 5. He ran to it. It said unto him: "Who art thou?"
"I am Agni," he said; "I am Jātavedas." 6. "What strength
then is in thee?" "I could burn even everything which is here
on earth." 7. It put down before him a blade of grass [saying]:
"Burn this." Approaching it with all his might he could not
burn it. Thereupon he returned [saying]: "I could not find
out what spectre this is." 8. Then they said to Viśnu: "O Viśnu,
find that out, what spectre this is." "Yes." 9. He ran to it. It

19. ^A. -vif-.
20. ^ata.
21. ^ham.
2B. -m.

vol. xvi.
29
IV. 21. 1. "The brahman," she said; "through the brahman’s complete victory ye are exalted.” Then he knew: “[It is] the brahman.” 2. Therefore indeed these gods—viz. Agni, Vayu, Indra—are as it were greatly above the other gods. For they touched it nearest; for he first knew it to be the brahman. 3. Therefore indeed Indra is as it were greatly above the other gods. For he touched it nearest; for he first knew it to be the brahman. 4. Regarding it [there is] this direction: “What of the lightning hath lightened: ah! hath winked: ah!” Thus with regard to the deities. 5. Now with regard to the self. That which both goes as mind, as it were, and through it (mind)
imagination continually remembers it (the brahman). 6. Verily it is tadvana by name. As tadvana it is to be worshiped. Who knows this thus, unto him all beings desire together. 7. "Sir, tell the upanisad." "The upanisad has been told thee. Verily, we told thee the upanisad of the brahman." 8. Penance, restraint, action are its foundation, the Vedas all its limbs, truth its abode. 9. Verily he who knows this [upanisad] thus, having smitten away evil, stands firm in the endless heavenly world that is not to be injured.

IV. 22. 1. Verily this was in the beginning space, being about to become. It became. It became the waters. 2. They performed penance. Having performed penance [uttering] huss, they breathed forth forward. That became breath. 3. Having breathed forth, they breathed out. That became exhalation. 4. Having breathed out, they breathed asunder. That became the vyāna. 5. Having breathed asunder, they breathed together. That became the samāna. 6. Having breathed together, they breathed up. That became the udāna. 7. This [all] was one, associated, not distinguished. 8. He made name and form. Thereby he distinguished it. Distinguished from evil is he who knows thus. 9. Verily yonder sun is breath, Agni is exhalation, the waters are the vyāna, the quarters are the samāna, the moon

21. 1. A. suk. 2. samvānkaṃanti. 3. 11-e. 22. 1. repeat 2c vi. 2. yed. 3. apāna. 4. p. 5. mādam. 6. raipam. 7. vinot. 8. A. -im. 9. A. upā.
H. Oertel,

dīpas samānaç cundramā udānah. 10. tad vā etad ekam abha-
vat prāṇa eva. sa ya evam etad ekam bhavaat vedai 'vain ānī 
'tad ekudhā bhavati 'ty ekudhāi 'va preśhhas svānām' bhavati. 11. 
tad agnir vāi prāṇo vāg itī prthivi vāyur vāi prāṇo vāg ity 
antarikṣam adityo vāi prāṇo vāg itī dyāur dīco vāi prāṇo vāg 
itī ātraiv candramā vāi prāṇo vāg itī manāḥ pumān vāi 
prāṇo vāg itī strī. 12. tasye 'dañ sṛṣṭam ājīthilam bhavanam 
āsād āpuryāptam. 13. su manorūpam akuruta. tena tat puryāp-
not. dṛdhañ ha vā asye 'dañ sṛṣṭam ājīthilam bhavanam 
puryāptam bhavati ya evān veda. 139.

ekādače 'nsvāke prathamāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

IV. 23. 1. sāi 'sā' catudhā vihitā* prīr udgūthas sāmā 'rkyān 
jyeṣṭhābhramanam. 2. prāṇo vāno 'd vāg gi' sa udgūthah. 
1. prāṇo vāvā 'mo vāk sāt sāma. 4. prāṇo vāva ko vāg 'k 
tad arkyam. 8. prāṇo vāva jyeṣṭho vāg brāhmaṇain taj 
jyeṣṭhābhramanam. 6. upaniṣadām bhī brāhī 'ti. uktā ta upaniṣad 
yaya te dhātava uktāḥ. 3 tridāhu visu vāva ta upaniṣadām*
abrūme 'ti. 7. etac chuklam krṣṇāṁ tāmrāṁ sāmavāru itī ha 
smā "ha yadāi 'va' guklakṛṣṇe tāmro varno bhyavāti sa vai te

is the udāna. 10. Verily that became one, viz. breath. He who 
thus knows this as becoming one [saying]: "Verily this thus 
becometh onefold," he becomes at once the first among his own 
people. 11. Verily now Agni is breath, speech is the earth; 
Vāyu is breath, speech is the atmosphere; the sun is breath, 
speech is the sky; the quarters are breath, speech is hearing; 
the moon is breath, speech is mind; man is breath, speech is 
woman. 12. That creation of his, when created, was unsteady, 
not fully completed. 13. He made the form of mind. By it he 
completed it. Verily stable becomes this creation which was 
created, not unsteady, completed, for him who knows thus.

IV. 23. 1. This is the fortune divided into four parts, viz. the 
udgūtha, the sāman, the arkyā, the chief brāhmaṇa. 2. Verily 
breath is ud, speech is gi; that is the udgūtha. 3. Verily breath 
is he (ama), speech is she (sā); that is the sāman. 4. Verily 
breath is ka, speech is rk; that is the arkyā. 5. Verily breath 
is the highest, speech is the brāhmaṇa; that is the highest 
brāhmaṇa. 6. "Sir, tell the upaniṣad." "The upaniṣad has 
been told thee, since the elements have been told thee. With 
three elements separately (?) verily we told thee the upaniṣad." 
7. "That white, black, copper-red is the color of the sāman," he 
used to say; "when the copper-red color descendeth into the
Jāminīya-Úpaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.
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vrūte* daçama* mānusam iti tridhātu. sa úiksata kva nu ma uttānāya11 gayānaye 'mā devatā balīṁ hareyur iti. 140. ekādaśe 'nuvāke dvitiyāh khaḍah.

IV. 24. 1. sa puruṣam eva prapūdanāya 'vrūta.' 2. tam purastāt pratyānocam prāvişat. tasmā urur abhavati, tad uruṣi ursvravam. 3. tasmā utrasa eva devatā balīṁ haranti. 4. vácam anuharantam agnim asmāi balīṁ harati. 5. mano 'nūharec candrāma' asmāi balīṁ harati. 6. cakṣur anuharad ādityo 'smāi balīṁ harati. 7. grōtram anuharad dipo 'smāi balīṁ haranti. 8. prāṇam anuharantaṁ váyur asmāi balīṁ harati. 9. tasyāś 'te niskhātah' pabhā balīvāhanāḥ ime prāṇāḥ. evam hāi 'tvim niskhātah pabhā balīvāhanās sarvato 'piyantı prāṇa ya evam veda, 10. sā hāi 'sa brahmāsandām ārūdhā, ā hā 'smāi brahmāsandāṁ haranty adhi ha brahmāsandāṁ rohati ya evam veda. 11. tad etad brahmayaçaç griyā parivṛdhah. brahma ha tu san yacati griyā parivṛdo bhavati ya evam veda. 12. tasyāś 'su śeṣo' yo 'yaṁ dakṣine 'kham antāh. tasya yev chaklam tad Çćain rūpeḥ yat kṛṣṇam tat sāṁvāt tat sāṁvātiva eva tāmām iva bahhrur* ieva tad yajusām.' 13. ya eva 'yaṁ cakṣesi purusa eṣa white and black, it snatcheth these two unto itself . . . ."

He considered: "Where now may these divinities bring tribute to me lying supine?"

IV. 24. 1. He chose man for a resort. 2. He entered him from the front (east), turned toward him. For him he became wide (uras). Therefore the breast (uras) is called so. 3. To him sitting there these divinities bring tribute. 4. Agni brings to him as tribute speech bringing after. 5. The moon brings to him as tribute mind bringing after. 6. The sun brings to him as tribute sight bringing after. 7. The quarters bring to him as tribute hearing bringing after. 8. Vāyu brings to him as tribute breath bringing after. 9. These are his dug-out paths, carrying tribute, [viz.] these breaths. Thus dug-out paths, carrying tribute, approach from all sides him who knows thus. 10. That [divinity] is seated on the brahmañ-throne. Unto him they bring the brahmañ-throne, he mounts the brahmañ-throne, who knows thus. 11. That same brahmañ-glory is encompassed by fortune. But being the brahmañ he is encompassed by glory [and] by fortune who knows thus. 12. Regarding it [there is] this direction which is here in the right eye. What of it is white, that is the form of the re's; what is black, that is the form of the sāmanas; what is copper-red, as it were, brownish, as it were, that is the form of the yajuses. 13. What this per-

23. *A.-ta. 10 daç; before the ç an illegible letter, perhaps crossed out. 11 uktañça.
indra eṣu pra-jā-patiṣa sanaḥ prathivā yama ṛkṣena samo dīva saṁuṣa sasvena bhūtena. eṣa paro dīya-nete. eṣa eva daṁ suvaṁ ity upaśityan. 141.

ekādaśe nāvīke trītyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 25. 1. na ca 'suc ca 'suc ca suc ca vāk ca manaḥ ca [manaḥ ca] vāk ca caksuṣ ca ārotram ca ārotram ca caksuṣ ca śraddhā ca tapas ca tapas ca śraddhā ca tāni śoḍaṇaḥ. 2. śoḍaṇakalam brahma. sa yu evam etat śoḍaṇakalam brahma veda īam evai 'tat śoḍaṇakalam brahma ṛjety. 3. vedo brahma tasya satyaṁ āyatanāṁ saṁaḥ pratiśthāṁ damaḥ ca. 4. tad yathā śvaḥ prāśyaṁ pāpāt karmano jugupsetā 'vam eva 'har-airāḥ pāpāt karmano jugupsetā''kālāt. 5. aṭhāi 'sūṁ āṇapadi viśrāt. 6. daṇḍa puruṣas svarga-narakaṇāṁ. tān evaṁ svargaṁ gatāṁ gatāṁ gamaṇantā narakaṁ gatāṁ narakaṁ gamaṇantā. 142.

ekādaśe nāvīke catuṛthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 26. 1. mano narako vāṁ narakaḥ prāṇo narakaḥ caksur narakaḥ ārotram narakaḥ ārotram narakaḥ gudāṁ narakaḥ gudāṁ narakaḥ pādāṁ narakaḥ. 2. manasaḥ parikṣa-yaṇī vede 'ti veda. 3. vācu rasāṁ vede 'ti veda. 4. prāṇena

son in the eye is, that is Indra, that is Prājāpati, the same with the earth, the same with space, the same with the sky, the same with all existence; he shines beyond the sky. One should worship him [saying]: “He is this all.”

IV. 25. 1. Being and non-being, non-being and being, speech and mind, [mind and] speech, sight and hearing, hearing and sight, faith and penance, penance and faith: these are sixteen. 2. Sixteenfold is the brahmaṇ. He who thus knows this sixteenfold brahmaṇ, him this sixteenfold brahmaṇ comes unto. 3. The Veda is the brahmaṇ, truth is its abode, tranquillity and restraint its foundation. 4. As one about to decease the next day would guard himself against an evil action, even so he should day by day guard against an evil action, until the time. 5. Now of these the virāj is ten-footed. 6. There are ten heavens and hells in man. They, having gone to heaven, cause him to go to heaven; having gone to hell, they cause him to go to hell.

IV. 26. 1. Mind is a hell, speech is a hell, breath is a hell, sight is a hell, hearing is a hell, the skin is a hell, both hands are a hell, the rectum is a hell, the penis is a hell, both feet are a hell. 2. He knows: “With the mind I know those things which are to be examined.” 3. He knows: “With speech I know savors.” 4. He knows: “With breath I know odors.”

gandhān vede 'ti veda. 6. cakruṣā rūpāni vede 'ti veda. 6. ātyāna ṣaṅgapārṇa vede 'ti veda. 6. haṭādhīyāṁ karmāṇi vede 'ti veda. 6. udārenā 'caṇayāṁ vede 'ti veda. 7. gīpṇena rāmān vede 'ti veda. 7. pādādhīyāṁ adhvano vede 'ti veda. 10. plakṣasya prāśraṇaṇasya pradeṣa-mātrād udak tat prthivyāi maṭhyam. atha yatrāī 'te sapta rṣayas tad dav maṭhyam. 11. atha yatrāī 'ta uṣās tat prthivyāi hṛdayam. atha yad etat kṛṣṇaṁ candramasi tad divo hṛdayam. 11. sa ya eva eva dāyavṛtthivyor maṭhyo ca hṛdaya ca veda nā' 'kāmo' 'sūrt lokāt prāti. 12. namo 'tisāmāyāi 'turtaye' hṛtasa-stāya pārthucravaśiṣya ye ca prānavi rakṣanti te mā rakṣantu. svasti. karme 'ti gārhaṇyatāc śama' ity āhavanīyo duma ity anvāhāryapacaṇaḥ. 143.

ekādaśe 'nuvāke paścamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. ekādaśe 'nuvākas samāptaḥ.

IV. 27. 1. kas savitā. kā sāvitrī. agnir eva savitā. prthivī sāvitrī. 2. sa yatrā 'gnaś tat prthivī yatra vā prthivī tad agniḥ. te ṭe yoni. tad ekam śīthunam. 3. kas savitā. kā sāvitrī. varuṇa eva savitā. ṣaṇa sāvitrī. 4. sa yatra varuṇas tad āpo

1. He knows: "With sight I know forms." 2. He knows: "With hearing I know sounds." 3. He knows: "With the skin I know contacts." 4. He knows: "With both hands I know works." 5. He knows: "With the belly I know hunger." 6. He knows: "With the penis I know delights." 11. He knows: "With both feet I know roads." 12. Just one span to the north of the Plakṣa Prāśravāna is the middle of the earth. And where these seven sages (Ursa major) are, that is the middle of the sky. 13. And where these salts are, that is the heart of the earth. And what is black in the moon, that is the heart of the sky. 14. He who thus knows the two centers and the two hearts of the sky and the earth departs not unwilling from this world. 15. Homage to Atisāma Etureta (?), to Dhrtaśrāta, to Pārthucravasa, and let those who protect breath protect me. Hail. 'Action' is the householder's fire; 'tranquillity' is the āhavanīya fire; 'self-restraint' is the anvāhāryapacāna fire.

IV. 27. 1. What is Savitar? What is Sāvitrī? Agni is Savitar, earth Sāvitrī. 2. Where Agni is, there is earth; or where earth is, there is Agni. These are two wombs. This is one couple. 3. What is Savitar? What is Sāvitrī? Varuna is Savitar, the waters are Sāvitrī. 4. Where Varuṇa is, there the waters

26. kono. 4A. -sāmaya; B. -sāmāya. 3 etur-. 4 corrected from pārījučr- 1. may.
yatra và "pus tad varuṇah. te dve yoni. [tad ekam mithunam.]
5. kasya savitā. kā sāvitrī. vāyu eva savitā. akūcas sāvitrī.
6. sa yatra vāyu taś akāpo yatra và "kācas taś vāyuḥ. te dve yoni. tad ekam mithunam. 1. kasya savitā. kā sāvitrī. yajña eva savitā. chandāṇi sāvitrī.
8. sa yatra yajña tace chandāṇi yatra và chandāṇi tad yajña. te dve yoni. tad ekam mithunam. 9. kasya savitā. kā sāvitrī. stanayitvam eva savitā. vidyut sāvitrī.
10. sa yatra stanayitvam tad vidyūḍa yatra và vidyūḍa tat stanayitvam. te dve yoni. tad ekam mithunam. 11. kasya savitā. kā sāvitrī. aditya eva savitā. dyauḥ sāvitrī.
12. sa yatrā "adityas tad dyauḥ yatra và dyauḥ tad adityāḥ. te dve yoni. tad ekam mithunam. 13. kasya savitā. kā sāvitrī. candrā eva savitā. nakṣatrami sāvitrī.
14. sa yatra candras tat nakṣatrami yatra và nakṣatrami tad candraḥ. te dve yoni. tad ekam mithunam. 15. kasya savitā. kā sāvitrī. mana eva savitā. vāk sāvitrī.

dvādaśe ‘nuvāke prathamah khaṇḍaḥ.

are; or where the waters are, there is Varuna. These are two wombs. [This is one couple.] 5. What is Savitar? What is Sāvitrī? Vāyu is Savitar, space Sāvitrī. 6. Where Vāyu is, there is space; or where space is, there is Vāyu. These are two wombs. This is one couple. 7. What is Savitar? What is Sāvitrī? The sacrifice is Savitar, the metres are Sāvitrī. 8. Where the sacrifice is, there the metres are; or where the metres are, there is the sacrifice. These are two wombs. This is one couple. 9. What is Savitar? What is Sāvitrī? Thunder is Savitar, lightning Sāvitrī. 10. Where thunder is, there is lightning; or where lightning is, there is thunder. These are two wombs. This is one couple. 11. What is Savitar? What is Sāvitrī? The sun is Savitar, the sky Sāvitrī. 12. Where the sun is, there is the sky; or where the sky is, there is the sun. These are two wombs. This is one couple. 13. What is Savitar? What is Sāvitrī? The moon is Savitar, the asterisms are Sāvitrī. 14. Where the moon is, there the asterisms are; or where the asterisms are, there is the moon. These are two wombs. This is one couple. 15. What is Savitar? What is Sāvitrī? Mind is Savitar, speech is Sāvitrī. 16. Where mind is, there is speech; or where speech is, there is mind. These are two wombs. This is one couple. 17. What is Savitar? What is Sāvitrī? Man is Savitar, woman Sāvitrī. Where man is, there is woman; or where woman is, there is man. These are two wombs. This is one couple.
IV. 28. 1. tasyā eṣa prathamaḥ padaḥ bhūs tat savitur vareṇyam iti. agnir vai vareṇyam, āpo vai vareṇyam. candramā vai vareṇyam.

2. tasyā eṣa dvitiyā padaḥ bharganayo bhovo bhargo devasya dhīmahī 'ti. agnir vai bhargagah, ādityo vai bhargagah. candramā vai bhargagah.

3. tasyā eṣa tṛtiyā padaś svas dhiyo yo naḥ pracoḍayūḍ iti. yajño vai pracoḍayati. stri ca vai puruṣaḥ ca prajānayataḥ.

4. bhūr bhuvas tat savitur vareṇyam bhargo devasya dhīmahī 'ti. agnir vai bhargagah, ādityo vai bhargagah. candramā vai bhargagah.

5. svar dhiyo yo naḥ pracoḍayūḍ iti. yajño vai pracoḍayati. stri ca vai puruṣaḥ ca prajānayataḥ.

6. bhūr bhuvas svas tat savitur vareṇyam bhargo devasya dhīmahī dhiyo yo naḥ pracoḍayūḍ iti. yō vai etāṁ saviṭrīṁ evam vedā 'pa punarmṛtyuṁ tarati sāvitrīyā eva salokatāṁ jayati sāvitrīyā eva salokatāṁ jayati. 145.

dvādaśe 'nvāke dvitiyā khaṇḍaḥ. dvādaśo 'nvākas samāptah.

ity upaniṣadbrāhmaṇam samāptam.

IV. 28. 1. This is its first pada: "Bhūs; that desirable [splendor] of Savitar." Fire indeed is what is desirable. Waters indeed is what is desirable. The moon indeed is what is desirable. 2. This is its second pada, made up of splendor: "Bhūvas; may we obtain the god's splendor." Fire indeed is splendor. The sun indeed is splendor. The moon indeed is splendor. 3. This is its third pada: "Svar; who may impel our devotion." The sacrifice indeed impels. Woman and man propagate. 4. "Bhūs, bhuvas; may we obtain that desirable splendor of god Savitar." Agni is splendor. The Sun is splendor. The Moon is splendor. 5. "Svar; who shall impel our devotion." The sacrifice impels. Woman and man propagate. 6. "Bhūs, bhuvas, svar; may we obtain that desirable splendor of god Savitar, who may impel our devotion." He who knows this Sāvitrī thus overcomes second death, he wins the same world with the Sāvitrī itself; he wins the same world with the Sāvitrī itself.

23. 1-sah. 'insert yajño vai pracoḍayati. stri ca vai puruṣaḥ ca prajānayataḥ.'
NOTES.

The MSS. have this heading: *talavakārabrāhmaṇe (I) upaṇiṣadbrāhmaṇam.*

In the numbering of the paragraphs the MSS. are careless and inconsistent. A. omits the *anuvāka* and *khaṇḍa* divisions, but numbers successively the paragraphs of each book. I have not thought it worth while to record simple omissions or inaccuracies of B. and C. in the *anuvāka* and *khaṇḍa* divisions, or of all three MSS. in the paragraph-numbers. With book ii. I. A. and B. begin a new set of numbers (at the end of the paragraphs), omitting however the first three paragraphs (ii. 1–3), and numbering ii. 4 as 3; but after this regularly ii. 5 = 5, etc., to the end of book iii., iii. 42 = 57. There are remnants of a still different system of numbering in B., where the first three paragraphs of book iii., in addition to the other figures, are numbered as 56, 57, and 58 respectively; iii. 18. has in B. the additional number 70; iii. 22. has 73; iii. 93. has 79. The numbering of these last three chapters is clearly at variance with that of the first three of the book, and also with the order of the paragraphs in our text.

I. 1. 1 ff. Cf. 8. 1 ff.

I. 1. s. Cf. GB. i. 6, sa (praṇāpatiḥ) khalu prthiviḥ eva 'gniḥ niraminationā'ntarikkād vāyuḥ āvā ādityam. The rest is different. — praṇedat: cf. JB. i. 354, tasya (ī. e. yojñasya) yo rasaḥ praṇedat...


I. 1. 4. tāṇy . . . aṣṭāu: i.e. prthivi, agni; antarikṣa, vāyu; dyu, āditya; vāc, prāya. — The whole paragraph is repeated at i. 6. 6; and, omitting ātāṇy, i. 33. 11; 34. 2. — aṣṭācaḥphas paçavas: cf. JB. iii. 241, 247, aṣṭākaśikā vā gāyatrī. aṣṭācaḥphas paçavas; TMB. iii. 8. 3 (CB. vi. 2. 2. 15). Elsewhere—e. g. TS. vi. 1. 6. 2; iii. 2. 9. 4; AB. iii. 21. 15; 28. 11—the jāgati is connected with the domestic animals.

I. 2. 2. ovāc. . . . ovā: cf. iii. 39. 1 (i. 3. 1).

I. 2. 4. parāḥ: here 'to no purpose,' as AB. iii. 46. 2, 3, 4. In paragraphs 5 and 6 it has its ordinary meaning. The -āḥ for -āk also in nṛyān i. 6. 1: cf. Kāṭh. U. ii. 4. 1 (and Böhltingk's note); Āit. U. iii. 3; Māit. U. vi. 17 (avānī); but parāk and arvāk at i. 9. 5.

I. 2. 1. sa sarvā . . . 'nusadhvāti: cf. CB. ii. 3. 9. 6, sarvā diço 'nusadhvāti; iii. 10. 4. 2, sarvā diço 'nusadhvāhi.

I. 3. 1. etābhdyām: scil. devatābhdyām: cf. below, 8, etābhir devatābhhir. 

I. 3. 3. sa etābh: . . . : cf. CB. xiv. 6. 1. 8 (=BAU. iii. 1. 8); ix. 3. 3. 6; JB. ii. 418, sa yathā vṛkṣam akramaṇāīr akramamāṇa iyād evam eva . . . svargam lokah rohanto yanti (AB. iii. 19. 6–7).

I. 3. 2. mṛtyu is also identified with açānādī BAU. i. 2. 1, and below iii. 12. 2. The peculiar ǣ is supported by 4; iii. 12. 2; iv. 24. 9; and JB. i. 188 (three times); but açānāyantiḥ and açānāgyuḥ JB. i. 117.
I. 3. 4. annam...candramāh: cf. KBU. iv. 2, candramasya annam; Māit. U. vi. 5.
I. 3. 4. s. Cf. JB. i. 196, annena 'caanyāṁ ghunnti. tāṁ-tāṁ açana-
yalan annena hatāva svargan lokam ārohan.
I. 3. s. The emendation rathasya is made certain by RV. viii. 91 (80).
7, 'khe rathasya 'khe 'nasāh.
I. 3. 7. The meaning of atha yad...pratihārāt is obscure.
I. 3. s. yathā 'yginā...satvajyeta: cf. JB. i. 81 (twice) yathā 'gnāv
agnī abhisamāmdhāyāt tādyāk tat. The procative āśīyaṁ (AÇS. ii. 3. 5,
āśīcyād) among these optatives is very surprising, and calls perhaps
for an emendation (āśīved ?).
I. 4. 1 ff. Cf. iii. 39. 3 ff.
I. 4. 4. atiyadhi...gūrah: a Vedic reminiscence: cf. VS. xxii. 22,
rājanyāḥ gūra īṣavyō 'tīvyādihi; TS. vii. 5. 18, rājanyā īṣavyāḥ gūro
mahārathō jāyatām; ČB. xiii. 1. 9. 2, rājanyāḥ gūra īṣavyō 'tīvyādihi
mahārathō jāyatām.
I. 4. 4. daçanañjī: perhaps of tenfold strength.'
I. 4. 4. On the inferiority of the ass to the horse cf. TS. v. 1. 3. 2 ff.:
ČB. vi. 4. 4. 7.
I. 4. 4. kuhra occurs again at iii. 39. 5. Neither this nor MS. ii. 5. 3
(p. 50. 16. 18) cast light on the exact meaning of the word. — anāryas:
the emendation is doubtful, but a change from ryy to rthy would be
easy in Devanāgari MS. Instead of rāyīḥa, rājayam would be ex-
pected: cf. TS. ii. 6. 6. 5, ya evam veda pra rājayam annadāyam ānopoti;
ČB. ii. 4. 4. 6, rājayam iha vā prāpnoti ya... 
I. 4. 4. hīna vo: hīma bhā would be expected, as in 1.
I. 5. 1. ye: read so with the MSS.; as below iii. 3. 1; 14. 8, -nir-
bhīṇa; iv. 3. 3; 21. 8, sarvāṅgāy; iv. 1. 8 MSS. ayāy; AB. i. 13. 4;
30. 5; cf. Tāit. Prāt. vii. 4.
I. 5. s. satyaṁ: the emendation is doubtful, the whole chapter ob-
scure.
I. 5. s. yāvati...prthivī: cf. TS. ii. 6. 4. 3; 5. 2, etc.
I. 5. s. ṣrpūṣud of the lifting up of a cup, as AB. vii. 38. 2, tān
(i. e. camaśaṇa) yatro 'dṛṣṭaḥ tāt evam upodṛṣṭiḥ. — manasa: i.
e. 'in silence,' opposed to vācā, as i. 58. 6, etc.
I. 6. 1. tena vā etam...nidadhyād iti: the text as it stands is un-
intelligible, the chapter obscure throughout.
I. 6. 2. raçmin...vyūhati: cf. Icla. U. 16, yama sûrya prājāpatyā
vyūha raçmin... 
I. 6. 4. anālayanam: formed from ālaya as anālaya (Tāit. U. ii. 7)
from nīlaya, and meaning the same.
I. 7. 1. There is no indication of a lacuna between te and karoti in
any of the MSS.
I. 7. 3. catvāri vak...vadanti = RV. i. 164 45; repeated below, at
i. 40. 1.
I. 7. 4. sa yathā 'cmānām...: the same comparison occurs again
below at i. 60. 8 and ii. 3. 13-18; in all three passages read lōṣo (for
lōṣha): cf. Chând. U. i. 2. 7, 8, yathā 'cmānam akhaṇam rīvā (Böhtlingk
inserts mṛtipiṣṭo) vidhvaṁsata evāṁ hāi 'va sa vidhvaṁsate ya...
II. Oertel,

BAU. i. 3. 8. sa yathā 'cānānām rītvā loṣo vidhvaṅsētāi 'evaḥ hāti 'ca vidhvaṅsamanāṃ vidhvaṅco vīneṣu.

At the end B. and C. have iti svarakhaṇḍaḥ.


I. 8. 4, s = iii. 19. 3, 4.

I. 8. 7, dravantam: it is barely possible to support the reading of the MSS. dravam by RV. iv. 40. 2 b.

I. 8. 10, marīṇṛcitvā: the exact meaning is as doubtful here as it is ČB. iv. 5. 1. 10: cf. Eggeling’s note, SBE. xxvi. 388.

I. 8. 11, tenāḥ 'nam . . . : cf. JB. i. 822, sa yathā madhunā lājān prayaṇām evam evāt 'tenā 'kṣaraṇaṃ sāmān (!) rasaḥ dasāhāti; and ii. 77, yathā madhy āṣīya lājān ānāpet tad anyathā 'va syāt tādṛk tāt.

I. 8. 12, ayāṁ: the clause is so much abbreviated as to be obscure. The peculiar position of the pluti-mark in the MSS., though repeated twice, is very probably due to a mistake. Cf. Schroeder, MS., i., introduction, p. xxx, and ZDMG. xxxiii. 187.

I. 9. 2, vāg ĩy āk: cf. Chând. U. i. 3. 4; 7. 1: BAU. i. 5. 5.

I. 9. 4, aṣṭāv: those enumerated in 2. — bahuḥ bhūyas: cf. RV. i. 188. 5, bahūṇic ca bhūyasyaḥ ca.

I. 9. 5, vyomânta vācaḥ: I have taken vyomântaḥ here in its primary sense; see below, note to i. 10. 4.

I. 10. 4, yathā sūcāya . . . : cf. JB. ii. 10, yathā sūcāya palačāni saṁśṛṇānām sūr evam etenā 'kṣareṇa 'me lokās saṁśṛṇāḥ ; Chând. U. ii. 23. 4, tathā yathā ca kūndavā sarvāni parvānān saṁśṛṇānān evam onkāreṇa sarvā vāk saṁśṛṇāḥ. These parallel passages show that čaknu in the Chând. U. may be taken in its ordinary meaning of ‘pin’ (AB. iii. 18. 6).

I. 10. 4, daṇḍadāḥ . . . : the same series of numerals is repeated at i. 28. 8 and 29. 5. Cf. Weber, ZDMG. xv. 132 ff. The series at TMB. xvii. 14. 2 is very similar to this; the chief difference is badva (cf. AB. viii. 22. 4) for padma; vyomânta occurs nowhere else, and the meaning given to it is purely conjectural. It occurred above, i. 9. 5, in its ordinary sense.

I. 10. 5. Cf. KB. viii. 9, tā parovarīyasīr abhyupayāt. trīn agra stāṭān atha dāvā athāh 'kam paraspara eva tāt lokān variyasāḥ ku-rute: AB. i. 25. 6, parovarīyaḥsā va ime lokā arvag anhitānāḥ.

I. 10. 10, satyam . . . āpa: cf. RV. x. 85. 1, satyena 'tābhītāh bhūmih.

I. 11. 1, annakācitir: it would be easy to emend to -kāñkṣāvir or -kāminār, were it not for the fact that the word occurs twice again, without any variants, in a similar story, JB. i. 88, praṣṭapatiḥ praṣṭā asṛjata. tānaḥ saṣṭā annakācitir abhitas samantam paryaśivān. tābhya hiṁkārāṇā 'nādyām asṛjata . . . tam etat praṣṭā annakācitar abhitas samantam pariśivānti. tābhya hiṁkāreṇā 'va 'nādyām sṛjate: also JB. ii. 148, tā nam annakācitir praṣṭā abhyupavāvardhuh; and at JB. ii. 149, tā nam annakācitir (MSS. -cin-) praṣṭā abhyupavartante.—The same tautological expression tam . . . sarve devā abhitas samantam paryaśivaḥ occurs at JB. ii. 142.

I. 11. 4, 12, 1-2, 4. Cf. Chând. U. ii. 9. 2-8, where however the pratidhāra is connected with the embryo, and the upadrava with the forest-animals.
I. 11. s. Cf. JB. iii. 218, prajñapatiḥ paçun asprjata. te ‘smañ (MSS. -n) śṛṣṭā asamāñanā apākraman (MSS. -krā-). so ‘kāmayataḥ ‘bhi mā paçvanas sanjāniran, na mad apākrameyur iti. sa etat sāmā ‘paçvat tena ‘stuta. tato vai tam paçavo bhīsamājñata (MSS. -samañj-) tato ‘smañ anapakramiño ‘bhavan. tud u (MSS. vi) hiñkāram bhavati, hum iti vai paçvanas sanjānate hum iti mātā putram abhyeti hum iti putro mātaran.

I. 11. s. tansayamānā : the emendation is doubtful.

I. 12. 1. upadravasah grhyanta : the pun here is not quite clear to me: perhaps upadrava is to be taken as ‘mishap,’ and reference is made to the harmful nature of the Gandharvas: cf. AV. viii. 6. 19; Fischel, Ved. Stud. i. 80.


I. 12. 7. Cf. Chānd. U. ii. 5. 1 ; 16. 1 ; SB. ii. 1; below i. 35. 2 ff.

I. 12-18. 1. Cf. Chānd. U. ii. 3. 1-2 ; 15. 1 ; CB. i. 5. 2. 18 ; ii. 2. 3. 8.

I. 13. 1. yad vṛṣṭāt . . . : cf. CB. ii. 6. 3. 7, vṛṣṭād osadhaya jāyaṁ.

I. 13. s. Cf. Chānd. U. ii. 7. 1; below, 38. 8.

I. 15. s. añceena sāmnā : cf. A. C. Burnell’s Arṣeyabrāhmaṇa (Mangalore, 1876). Introduction, p. xi ff., “by a sāman was intended a melody or chant, independent of the words; . . . the earliest records that we have make a distinction between the chant and the words, and treat the first as of more importance.” To the references there given may be added AQS, ix. 9. 9 (see Weber, Ind. Stud. x. 156, and Sitzungsb. d. Berliner A. d. W. (1892), p. 807), and below i. 18. 8 and 21. 9.

I. 15. 4. prasāma, prasāmī: the former is not found elsewhere, the latter occurs in the likewise obscure passage CB. iii. 9. 1. 9, vāg vāy saravaty annah somas tasmād yo vācā prasāmy annādō hāti ‘va bhavati, from which it would seem that prasāmī might mean ‘abundantly,’ rather than ‘imperfectly’ (PW., pw., Eggeling): cf. Chānd. U. ii. 8. 8.

I. 16. 4. ruci sāma gāyāma : i. e. ‘sing a ruci to a sāman-melody’: cf. Burnell’s Arṣeyabrāhmaṇa, Introd. p. xii, “A sāman is sung (gā) on (or, as we should say, to) a ruci (rci). This idiom is an old one, for it occurs in the Brāhmaṇas repeatedly; if the ruci (or words) really formed part of the sāman, this idiom would be impossible.”

I. 16. s. te: i. e. the chants of the noon and evening libations.

I. 16. s. The present kāmayate of all MSS. has certainly crept in from 9.


ran (sambh-). tāṁ te prāvičan. tāṁ sā (sa) 'oḥḍaẏayat. viśve devā anu-
śubhāṁ samabhāran. tāṁ te prāvičan. tāṁ sā 'oḥḍaẏayat (-n). maruṣaḥ
paṇkiṁ samabhāran. tāṁ te prāvičan. tāṁ sā 'oḥḍaẏayat. sādhyāc ca
"ptyaḥ ca 'tīcchandasaṁ (C. -daṁsaṁ) samabhāran. tāṁ te prāvičan.
tāṁ sā 'oḥḍaẏayat (C. -n). 344. savaṇy eva 'nārāṇī anuprāvičatām.
tato vai tāṁ (tā) mṛtyuḥ pāpma na nirājanāt. kuto hi tasya mṛtyuḥ
pāpme "ciṣyate yam na nirājanāt. na hái 'nam mṛtyuḥ pāpma 'nunin-
dati ya evam veda. chandaṁsi vāva tāṁ mṛtyuḥ pāpmano 'oḥḍaẏayam
(C. -dāy-). tad yad enān (-nā) chandaṁsi mṛtyoḥ pāpmano 'oḥḍaẏayams
tac chandaṁsi chandaśtvam. chandaśtvanti evāi 'nāṁ chandaṁsi mṛtyoḥ
pāpmano ya evam veda.

I. 18. s-ı. Cf. Chāṇḍ. U. i. 4. 2, devā vai mṛtyor bibhyatas trayīṁ
vīyāṁ prāvičan. te chandobhir acchādāyan. yad ebhir acchādāyams
tac chandaṁsi chandaśtvam.

I. 18. s. rey asvarāyām : cf. i. 21. 9, etāvad vāva sāma yāvān
svaraḥ. ṛg vā eṣa re satrād bhavaṁ, whence it appears that a re without
melody (sāmaṁ = svara) is meant : see above, i. 15. 3 ; 16. 4.

I. 18. s. The Chāṇḍ. U. i. 4. 4 identifies svara and om.

I. 19. s. etena há 'ṣya sarvena 'dgita : ... : cf. i. 57. 9 ; 58. 10. The
construction of ṛvraṣe + ā with the ablative (of dat. or loc.)
is noteworthy.

I. 20. s. tad yathā : ... : cf. J.B. i. 144, yathā vā akṣeṇa cakrāv
viśkabdhāv evam etene 'māu lokāu viśkabdhāv : RV. vii. 99. 8.

6. The three ṣāṅs are described below, i. 57. 1. — The precise
technical meaning of ṣāṅa, vibhūti, pratiśṭhā, and prāgā is obscure.

I. 21. s. The paragraph is not clear to me ; ahoratrā femininem is
very irregular ; prācīr I have taken in the sense of parācīr (into which
it should perhaps be corrected) 'successive,' as AB. vi. 18. 6 ff.

I. 21. s. ṛg vā : ... : cf. above, i. 18. 8.

I. 22. s. Cf. Ts. vi. 3. 1. 4-5, nā 'dhvariḥ upaṇgaṇa. vāgūryo vā
adhaṇvariḥ, yad adhaṇvariḥ upaṇgaṇed udgātre vácaṁ samprayacched
upaṇāya 'ṣya vāk śyāt.

I. 23. s. tasya 'bhūlīśitaṣya : ... : this is a clear contradiction of i. 1. 6.

I. 24. s. The same play between aksara and ṣeṣa in Amṛtanāda U.
24, yad aksaraṁ na kṣarate kaḍācit (Ind. St. ix. 93) : cf. also Ç. vi. 1.
3. 6.

I. 24. s. The same play between aksara and ṣeṣa is repeated below,
i. 43. 8.

I. 25. s. atha yathā : ... : i.e. as insignificant as a pail in comparison
with a river.

I. 25. s. Cf. J.B. i. 324, trāṣṭubho vā asāv adityaṁ caklaṁ krṣṇam
puṟuṣaṁ.

I. 25. s. yo 'gnir mṛtyus saḥ : cf. Ç. ii. 4. 7, 9, agner mṛtyor
ātmānam atrāyata ; J.B. i. 12, devā vā mṛtyunā samagatanta. sa yo ha
sa mṛtyur agnir eva saḥ. — Chāṇḍ. U. iii. 1-4 and vi. 4. 3 are quite
different from this paragraph.

I. 25. s. On the puṛuṣa of the sun cf. K.BU. iv. 3 ; Chāṇḍ. U. i. 6. 6 ;
vii. 11. 1 ; BAU. ii. 1. 2 ; iii. 9. 12.

I. 26. s. Cf. J.B. i. 324, trīṣeṇa cakṣuḥ caklaṁ krṣṇam kaniniṇā ; 324,
Jāmininīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.
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tṛdiśubham idam caṅcuṣa cūklaṁ kṛṣṇam puruṣaḥ; CB. xii. 8. 2. 26, trieṛāḥ vā idam caṅcṛāḥ cūklaṁ kṛṣṇam kanākaḥ; below i. 34. 1.
I. 26. s. tad yas tā āpo . . . : cf. i. 29. 5 ; 38. 5 ; CB. ii. 1. 1. 3 : cf. AA. iii. 2. 2–4.
I. 26. 4. On the puruṣa of the eye cf. KBU. iv. 18, 19; Chāṇḍ. U. i. 7. 5 ; iv. 15. 1 ; BAU. ii. 3. 5 ; iv. 2. 2 ; v. 5. 2, 4, etc.
I. 26. s. The paragraph is obscure.
I. 26. s. On the puruṣa in lightning cf. KBU. iv. 5 ; Chāṇḍ. U. iv. 18. 1 ; BAU. ii. 1. 4 : 5. 9.
I. 27. 1. adhyāṣṭe: very likely in the sense of 'prevails,' which PW. assumes for it in RV. i. 25. 9. — anānas kṛtvā: because death is hunger: above i. 8. 3 ; BAU. i. 2. 1. 4.
I. 28. s. sa esa saptrāṅgir vṝṣabha tuviṃsān; the last three words are quoted from the rc below, 29. 7 (RV. ii. 12. 12a).
I. 28. s. s. On these numerals see above, i. 10. 4.
I. 29. v. The rc is RV. ii. 12. 12.
I. 29. s. esa hy eva . . .ṝṣabhaḥ: cf. JB. ii. 97, īndro vā akāmatayata ṝṣabhaḥ sārvasāṁ prajānāṁ syām ṝṣabhatāṁ gaccheyam iti. sa etāṁ yajiṁ apacyat tam āharaṇa tenā yajyata. tato vā sa ṝṣabhaḥ sarvasāṁ prajānāṁ abhavaṇ ṝṣabhatāṁ agacchat. — mahīyā here and below (46. 2 ; 48. 5) was certainly connected with mahanā rather than with yamaḥ: cf. PW. s. v. yamaḥ; the commentator of TS. vii. 5. 10 explains it by pājī.
I. 30. s. anīṣedhaṁ sāma: nīṣedha is the epithet of several sāmans.
I. 30. s. = i. 45. 6. —AB. iv. 2. 3. states that the nāṇdanaṁ sāha (SV. ii. 659) is abhrātṛvyam and bhrātṛvyahā: cf. also Ind. Stud. iii. 203, 208. I. 31. s. Very differently on the sevenfold sāmaṇ, Chāṇḍ. U. ii. 8 ff. — yā devatāḥ: on the divinities of the different quarters see BAU. iii. 9. 20 ff.
I. 32. 1. The rc is RV. viii. 70 (59). 5.
I. 33. s. tad yad vāt brahma sa prāṇaḥ : this is the doctrine of Kauśikatī and Pāṇgīya (KBU. ii 1 ; 2.), of the sacrificial fires as revealed to Upakośala Kāmalīyana (Chāṇḍ. U. iv. 10. 5), and of one of the explanations of Varuṇa to Bhīṣu (Tāt. U. iii. 3. 1). The same was taught by Udaṇka Cāulībāyana (BAU. iv. 1. 2). For a refutation of it see BAU. v. 18. 1.
I. 33. 4. karotya eva vāca : cf. below ii. 2. 8 ; iii. 32. 9, sa esa prāva vāca kariṭi ; CB. iv. 6. 7. 5, sā yatre 'yam vāṁ āṣit sarvam eva tatrā kriyata sarvam prajñāyatā 'the yatra mana āsīn nāī 'na tatra kih canā kriyata na prajñāyatā no hi manasā dhyāyatā kaç canā "jñāti; Mahānār. U. iv. 7, vāca kṛtan karma kṛtam ; VS. xii. 58 and comment on it, CB. viii. 1. 2. 9. — gamayati manasā : cf. Chāṇḍ. U. v. 10. 2 (= iv. 15. 6), tat puruṣo manasā āna brahma gamayatī. — tad etan . . . manaḥ : cf. Māt. U. vii. 34, tāvan mana nirodhāvaham hṛdi yevat kṛṣṇam gatiṁ.
2. 33. s. The same etymology recurs below, 40. 6; 48. 7; 51. 2; iv. 13. 2.
3. 33. s. For the identification of sun and moon with the sāman cf. Chānd. U. i. 6. 3, 4.
5. 34. 2. sa eṣa āhitum atimatyā and ta āhitum atimatyā in 5 refer to pāda c of the ṛc quoted in 6.
6. 34. 4. The stanza is AV. x. 8. 35, which reads sadhrīcīḥ for sāmīcīḥ in b, and āhitum in c. In b dadante (manuscript reading: see Whitney, Index Verb.) should be restored for dadate of the edition. For dipaṃ sāmīcīḥ cf. CB. vii. 3. 1. 24.
7. 34. 7. The stanza is AV. x. 8. 36, which has esāṃ for eko in c, and eke for anye in d.
8. 34. 11. tā etās... annādyāya: obscure and probably corrupt.
9. 35. 1. satvatsara: 36. 1, parjanye, 4, puruṣe, and 10, devatāsu, prove it to be locative.
10. 35. s ff. Cf. above, i. 13. 7.
11. 35. 4. A similar play on vṛṣaḥ and vṛṣaḥ CB. ii. 2. 3. 7.
12. 35. s. nidhanakṛta: nidhanikṛta would be expected, but cf. the similar passage SB. iii. 1, which ends hemanto nidhanam. tasmād dhemantam praṇā nidhanakṛta ivā "sate nidhanarūpaṃ ivā 'tārhi.
13. 36. 1. Cf. Chānd. U. ii. 3. 1 and 18. 1; similarly TS. i. 6. 11. 3-4; CB. i. 5. 2. 18.
14. 36. s. pratyag: contrasted with ārthvā in 4, as Kāth. U. i. 5. 3, ārthvam prāṣam unnaṇayat apānam pratyag asyati (cf. Chānd. U. iii. 13. 3, yo 'ṣya pratyayuṣuḥ so 'pānāḥ. 5, yo 'ṣya "ārthvahuṣuḥ sa udānāḥ). It corresponds to āṭṭita in Chānd. U. ii. 2. 2, lokā ārthavāc ca "vṛttā ca.
18. 37. s ff. On this distribution of the savanas among the different divinities see Eggeling’s note, SBE. xii., p. xviii.
19. 37. s. On the manner in which the castraś of the three savanas should be sung cf. AB. iii. 44. 5. Also below i. 51. 6 ff.—The term mandra is frequently connected with Agni in the RV. Differently Chānd. U. ii. 22. 1, where the vinārdī sāṃnah is regarded as Agni’s udgīthā. — pāṇoti with accusative, like yāpūṣ.
20. 37. s. ghoṣini, upābdimati: these two adjectives are also combined JB. i. 253, yasmād etad ghoṣi ‘vo ‘pabdīmad iva giyate tasmād ghoṣi ‘vo ‘pabdīmad iva garbhā jāyante: cf. AB. iv. 9. 3, aṣparatēn ‘ndra ‘ājīm adhāvat. tasmād sa uccārghaṇa upābdīman kṣatrasya rūpaṃ. āndro hi saḥ. The Chānd. U. assigns to Indra the kākeṣam balavat sāṃnaḥ.
21. 37. s. uccā: i. e. ‘further on’: cf. below 7.
22. 37. s. The Chānd. U. also attributes the krāuṣcanāṃ sāṃnah to Bhāspati, while in TS. ii. 5. 11. 1 it is assigned to the Asuras: yat krāuṣcanam anvādāḥ "suraṃ tād yan mandraṃ mānaṃ tāt. As to its char-
acter, cf. comment. on TS. v. 5. 12. 1, krāuṣio dāruṇasvanā pañti-
viṣeṣaḥ.
I. 38. s. nitārām may mean ‘in a low tone.’ The rest of the chapter
is obscure and partly corrupt.
I. 38. s. A loma sāman is mentioned TMB. xiii. 11. 11. The point of
the pun between loma [sāman] and lomaṇāni (perhaps ‘covered with
herbs’) cmaṇāṇāni is not clear.
I. 38. s. galāṇasa: the exact form of the name is not quite certain;
at J.B. i. 316, A.B.C. read galāna, D. galāna. — cāmulaparṇābhyaṁ:
probably corrupt; but I have not corrected the อำเภอ into อำเภอ, because cāmila
is only found as adjective, ‘made of cāmila-wood.’
I. 39. s. Pāluṣita is probably the same person as Pāluṣi, Chānd. U.
v. 11. 1 (CB. x. 6. 1. 1), who is (Chānd. U. v. 18. 1) also addressed as
Pracīnayogya.
I. 39. s. sāmaḥ pratiṣṭhā: cf. BAU. i. 3. 29, tasya hāi tasya sāmna
yaḥ pratiṣṭhān veda prati ha tiṣṭhāti. tasya vāg eva pratiṣṭhā etc.;
Śāmacīdh. B. i. 12, yo ha vāi sāmaḥ pratiṣṭhān veda prati ha tiṣṭhāy
asmiḥ ca leke ‘muṣṭiṇiḥ ca. vāg vāva sāmaḥ pratiṣṭhā. yad v etad
vāg īty gvedah saḥ. rei sāma pratiṣṭhitam.
I. 39. s. sāmaṇas suvarṇam: cf. BAU. i. 3. 28, tasya hāi tasya sāmaṇa
yaḥ suvarṇam veda bhavati ha ‘ṣya suvarṇam. tasya vāi svara (1) eva
suvarṇam etc.; Śāmacīdh. B. i. 11, yo ha vāi sāmaṇaḥ svaḥ yaḥ suvar-
ṇam veda svaḥ ca ha vāi sāmaṇaḥ suvarṇam ca bhavati. svara (1) vāva
sāmaṇaḥ svaḥ tad eva suvarṇam.
I. 40. s. The verse is RV. i. 164. 45.
I. 40. s. vāg eva sāmaḥ: cf. BAU. i. 3. 24, vāg vāi sāma.
I. 40. s. The meaning of this paragraph is not quite clear.
I. 40. s ff. Cf. KB. ii. 8.
I. 40. s. prāṇā eva ‘ṣuḥ: cf. CB. vi. 6. 2. 6, prāṇo va asuḥ.
I. 41. s. The re is RV. i. 89. 10.
I. 41. s. The same five puruṣas are mentioned BAU. ii. 1. 2 (sun), 3
(moon), 4 (lightning), 5 (waters) ; 3. 9 (eye); KBU. iv. 8 (sun), 4 (moon),
5 (lightning), 10 (waters), 17 and 18 (eyes). Slightly different Chānd.
U. iv. 11. 1 (sun); 12. 1 (moon); 18. 1 (lightning); 15. 1 (eye), 6 (mind).
I. 48. s. yat pascu . . . : cf. Tāt. U. iii. 10. 8 ; TB. iii. 8. 7. 2.
I. 43. s. Cf. Māit. U. vii. 11, puruṣaḥ cakṣuso yo ‘yaṁ daśkine ‘kviny
avasthītaḥ | indro ‘yam . . .
I. 48. 10 = iv. 24. 3.
I. 43. 11. The list of adjectives, with the exception of jyotiṣmān, cor-
responds to the qualities enumerated above, 42. 3 ff.
I. 44. s. The re is RV. vi. 47. 18.
I. 44. s. haraṇaḥ = adityasya račmaṇaḥ: cf. Nirukt. vii. 24, adī-
tasya haraṇaḥ suvarṇā haraṇā adityaraṇaṇaś ye. — For the etymol-
ogy cf. SB. i. 1. 18, pārakṣāparakṣādu vā indraśya hari tābhyaṁ
hi dāh suvarṇa harati.
I. 44. s. The stanza is RV. iii. 58. 8.
I. 44. s. imāḥ . . . sankacārasyaḥ: cf. RV. vi. 58. 2.
I. 45. 1. The metre of the verses in 1 and 2 is defective. The
thought of the first cloka is similar to RV. i. 164. 46 (AV. ix. 10. 28).
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pāda c of which ends like pāda d here. For the end of pāda d of the second stanza, cf. below, iii. 2. 1.

I. 45. 1. to the end is repeated verbatim at iii. 87. 6 ff., which has been used in emending the MSS. reading here. — lelāyati: in the verb, in the same sense, is repeated below at 51. 3; 55. 3; 58. 7; also JB. i. 299, pra-jāpatīr yasīmaḥ yoneḥ praṇā arṣjata so ‘lelāyad eva sa dīpyamāno bhū-jamāno ।śīṣṭat; MS. i. 8. 6 (p. 133. 12.), yad aṅgāreṣu nyuvaṇcāntesu lelāya vi 'va bhātī tad devānām āśyam : cf. ApāśS. vi. 9. 2.

I. 45. 2. pāmā nṛyāṇaḥ: pāpmanyāṇaḥ would be expected, but cf. below ii. 12. 1, and JB. i. 10, tad yathā 'hir . . . (MSS. anvyedhānte) na kaś caṇa nṛyāṇaḥ pāmā paricīṣyata evam hāti 'vā 'aṁśān na kaś caṇa nṛyāṇaḥ pāmā paricīṣyata ya evam vidvān agnihatram juhoti.

I. 46. 2. On sajāta, see Eggeling's note on ČB. v. 4. 4. 19. — mahīyā: cf. above, i. 28. 8.

I. 46. 3. caturdhā: the conjecture is uncertain; perhaps the reading was paścadhā.

I. 48. 2. The paragraph is not clear.

I. 48. 3. samātāt: it would be easy to regard this form and anvātāt (iii. 38. 10) as due to dittography of the following tat, were it not for AV. xviii. 3. 40, anvātāt, which is protected by the metre.

I. 48. 4. janītā: so emended after Chāṇḍ. iv. 3. 7. Perhaps it would be better to correct it into janayitā: cf. below, iii. 38. 3, and JB. ii. 386, praṇāpatiḥ praṇānām praṇyanayitā.


I. 50. 4. suṇotī is the MSS. reading throughout, although one would rather expect sanotī. But cf. AB. iv. 17. 3, where asanvan (so all MSS. and Aufrechte; P. W. emends to asanvan) corresponds to asīdēṣayastus in 2.

I. 51. 1. ādābena: I emend so hesitatingly after AV. vi 16. 3 etc.

I. 51. 2. Cf. below, i. 58. 8.

I. 51. 3. Cf. above, i. 87. 1 ff.

I. 52. 2. apadhvāntam: emended after Chāṇḍ. U. ii. 22. 1, apadhvāntam varunāyasya.

I. 53. 1. At Chāṇḍ. U. vi. 2, Čyetaetu's father strongly maintains that in the beginning there existed the sat only, without a second: cf. also Chāṇḍ. U. iii. 19. 1 (identity of sat and asat). The Tālīt. U., on the other hand, holds (ii. 7. 1) that the sat was produced from the asat, a doctrine which Čyetaetu's father mentions and refutes.

I. 53. 2. tasmāt . . . : the logical connection of the two sentences is obscure. For the second one, cf. ČB. i. 1. 1. 20 = ii. 5. 2. 17, evam hi mithunah kiptam utterato hi strī pumānams upaçete; vi. 3. 1. 30 = vii. 5. 1. 6, daksinato vās vrṣā yosām upaçete. The reason is very probably the desire for male offspring: cf. Bhāt S. lxxviii. 34. daksinapārce pururo vāme nāri yamān ubhayasahsthanāv.

I. 58. 4 ff. On the superiority of the sāman over the rc and its chronological bearing see K. T. Telang's introduction to the Bhāgavad-gītā, SBE. viii. 19. — sāman is loosely treated as male and masculine (amaḥ; 54. 2, sa): cf. ČB. iv. 6. 7. 11, tad vā etat vrṣā sāma yosām reah sadasya adhyeti; i. 4. 4. 3, varṣā hi manaḥ; AB. i. 28. 16, where vāc is taken as masculine.
I. 53. s. For the etymology, cf. e. g. BAU. i. 3. 24; Chãnd. U. i. 6. 1; AB. iii. 28. 1.
I. 53. s. viprâ: the emendation is doubtful.
I. 53. s. ādāya na...: text and translation are doubtful.
I. 54. i. tasmâd...: cf. ApDhS. i. 1. 2. 23; GãutDHs. ii. 18. — kâ-mam...: cf. ApDhS. i. 1. 3. 32. From ApDhS. i. 1. 4. 5 ff. it would seem that students were at times offered forbidden food by their teachers; see Buhler’s note.
I. 54. s. bharanâdaksdépêna: correct form and meaning are unknown.
I. 54. s. On the intercourse of sàman and ōc in the sàdas and the prohibition of witnessing it (except through the door), see Cb. iv. 6. 7. 9 ff.
I. 54. s. amo ‘ham...: different versions of the formula Form. xiv. 2. 71; CB. xiv. 8. 4. 19 (= BAU. vi. 4. 20); AB. viii. 27. 4 (for appointing a purohita); TB. iii. 7. 1. 9; GB. ii. 8. 20; ApCS. ix. 2. 3; Ka. xxxv. 18; ÇGS. i. 18. 4; AGS. i. 7. 6; PGS. i. 6. 3; MânGS. i. 10; BãudhGS. i. 12; BhâradGS. i. 19; HGS. i. 20. 2.
I. 54. s. sambhavann atåriyâta: the emendation after i. 57. 5.
I. 54. s. hiñkâraç ca...: cf. AB. iii. 23. 4, te vâi pàścä ‘nyad bhûtvā pàścä ‘nyad bhûtvā ‘kalpetâm áhâvaç (? Aufr.-râç) ca hiñkåraç ca prasêvaç ca prathamaç ca tâ ngîthaç ca madhyamä ca prathihâraç ca ‘tumä ca nîdhanah ca vaśaâkâraç ca. — vyadrvatām, the emendation after CB. iv. 6. 7. 10, tasmâd gady api jâyâpati mithunam carantâu pagânti vy eva dravata ãga eva kuryate.
I. 54. s. tad yathe...: text and meaning of the clause are uncertain.
I. 56. s. Cf. AB. iii. 23; GB. viii. 20 ff., and Haug’s note, AB. ii. 197.
I. 57. s. gâyâtâm: for this pregnant use of the genitive see Weber, Ind. Stud. ix. 247.
I. 57. s. Cf. Chând. U. i. 3. 6–7; BAU. i. 3. 25.
I. 57. s. Cf. above, i. 51. 3.
I. 58. s. Because the udgîtha (ud) is the sun: cf. above, 57. 7.
I. 58. s. gâpayury: with the same meaning which the causative of vad usually has.
I. 58. s. pratiç: the MSS. read here and iii. 6. 1, 3 pratiç, as do five MSS. of TS. v. 4. 7. 2. — manaâ ‘in silence,’ as above, i. 5. 6.
I. 58. s. hiranyam avikrtam: cf. JB. iii. 1, sa (Prajâpati) idâm sarvam vyakarat. yathâ ha vâi hiranyam vikrtam evam.
I. 58. s. Cf. i. 51. 3.
I. 59. s. sâmavâryam: the meaning is uncertain. According to JB. i. 219, the nîdhanâ is the vîrya of the sâman: tad u ho ‘veca jñâna-cruto-teyocio vîryaḥ ca etat sâmano yan nîdhanam.
I. 59. s. Cf. the distribution of what follows among the several speakers is not clear; tad etat sâdhv... brûhy eva probably belongs to Çûnaka, who approves of Brahmadatta’s answer and urges him to continue. After this it seems as if Brahmadatta’s reply was lost, in which he proposes to turn the tables and ask Çûnaka and Abhipràtârin. To this either Çûnaka or Abhipratârin object with me ‘dâh te
namo 'karma (with reference to 11) . . . atiṣṭākiṣṭ. And in 14 Brahmadatta gives the questions which he proposed to ask them, together with the answers. As the text stands, however, it would seem that me 'dam . . . atiṣṭākiṣṭ is spoken by Brahmadatta, although what he refers to by idam namas is not clear. The text is not above suspicion, especially the absolute mà = 'don't,' for which BAU. v. 13. 2, sa (Prāṭyā's father) ha små "ha pāṇīnā mà prāṭyā seems to be the only parallel case.

I. 60. Cf. below, ii. 1 and 10; Čhand. U. i. 2; BAU. i. 8 (ČB. xiv. 4. 1): cf. also JB. i. 289, manaśa suhārdaśaṁ ca durhārdaśaṁ ca vijānāti prāṇena surabhi ca 'surabhi ca vijānāti caksurā darčanīyaṁ ca 'darčanīyaṁ ca vijānāti pratyena cṛvanīyaṁ ca 'cṛvanīyaṁ ca vijānāti vācy svādu ca 'svādu ca vijānāti.

I. 60. s. apānena jīghtati: this peculiar conception occurs also at BAU. iii. 2. 2, so 'pānēnā 'tīghraṇaḥ gṛhitā. apānena hi gandhān jīghtati. In the latter passage Böhtlingk has changed the reading, though supported by both recensions, into sa gandhena and prāṇena respectively. It is possible that the confusion (for which, however, I am inclined to hold the authors themselves responsible) came about through passages like ii. 1. 16, apānena pāpar gandhaṁ apāniti, which, occurring in connection with 'perceiving by sight,' 'hearing with hearing,' etc., was thought to be equal to 'smelling bad odor,' instead of 'exhaling' it.

I. 60. v. Cf. above, i. 7. 6.

After chapter 60 the MSS. have this very corrupt colophon: gaṇābhi-dhānopanīśadāṁ calam śaṣṭikāryākanāṁ nīyogadīnavā (B. -cā) dāhyāṁ cāṣṭiṣṭaṁ (B. -ṣṭrī) likhat (B. -n). mudāgīrīvan hi samudra-kānavaṣṭanti rudrākṣipesānaṁ ṣuṇā. kūca-karṇacaritaṁ (B. -karṇa-kacaritāṁ) ṣūrācaṣṭati gaṅgādāhva guṇāṁ gajesavaḥ.

II. 1. Cf. i. 60 and ii. 10.

II. 2. s. vācī bhṛtyāt pātis: bhṛti as a name for vāc and the same etymology of Bhṛṣpati also Čhand. U. i. 2. 11; BAU. i. 3. 29.

II. 2. s. tasya ... pṛajāḥ: cf. below, iii. 32. 9.

II. 2. s. yad vāva: ...: cf. i. 83. 4.

II. 3. s. svādu ... vanāme 'tī: the emendations are not quite certain.

II. 3. s. The change from paryāدتta in 5 and 6 to paryāдутta in 7, 8, and 9 (cf. below, ii. 13. 3) is noteworthy.

II. 3. s. ff. Cf. above, i. 7. 6.

II. 4. s. astaḥ hy ... vā saḥ: unclear.

II. 6. 10. sahasraṁ ... putráḥ: cf. ii. 9. 10.

II. 6. 11. Cf. TS. v. 6. 5. 3, etāṁ vā para āṭuṛāḥ kakṣivān āuṣcjo vihitavah āuṣyasas trasadasyah pūrūsusayah prajākāmaḥ acinvat a. tato vāi te sahasraṁ-sahasram putrān avindaṁ; TMB. xxv. 16. 3, para āṭyāras trasadasyah pūrūrusayoh vihitavah āuṣyasas kakṣivān āuṣjas te etat prajātikāmaḥ satrāyaṇam upāyaṁ te sahasraṁ-sahasram putrān apṣuṇam evam vāva te sahasraṁ-sahasram putrān pūrṇanti ya etad upāyanti.

II. 7. 1. The emendation of sthālyāṁ to sthalyāṁ after JB. iii. 128 (transl. Proceedings for May, 1888, p. x), atha ha cyavano bhāṛavaḥ punar yuvā bhūtvā 'ga[echae] charyātam manavam. tam prācyāṁ sthal-
yā́m ayā́yata. In the AB. the name of the sage is Čāryāta Mānava, in the ČB. the a is short, as in our text.

II. 7. 2. For the different quarters assigned to gods, Fathers, etc., cf. e. g. ČB. iii. 1. 1. 2., 6. 7. — bambaṇa is the correct reading : cf. below, 6, and TS. vi. 6. 8. 4.


II. 8. 7. The same etymology below, ii. 11. 8 ff., and BAU. i. 3. 9, 22 ; Chānd. U. i. 2. 12.

II. 9. 2. Five vyāḥrtis are also mentioned at JB. ii. 354, pāñcaśahīr vā́i vyāḥrtibhir idān devā ājayan.—For pra and u, cf. Chand. U. ii. 8. 1, and Eggeling, SBE. xiii. 101, note. — ud must be supplied : see 8.

II. 9. 4. The identification of pra with praṇa (but of ā with udāna) is also found ČB. i. 4. 1. 5 ; differently Chānd. U. ii. 8. 1.

II. 9. 4. ud īti so śāv ādityaḥ : cf. Chānd. U. i. 3. 7, āditya evo 't. The meaning of the following clause is obscure.

II. 10. Cf. above, i. 60.

II. 10. 2. taśya . . . ā́śuḥ : the same phrase is repeated below, iii. 30. 8 : cf. JB. iii. 190, atha ha vā́i vaiśkānam ity ṛṣikā īnдраśya priyā ā́śuḥ.

II. 10. 4. bhunjate : on account of the preceding vadati I have taken it as 3d singular.

II. 11. Cf. BAU. i. 3. 12 ff.

II. 11. 9. Cf. above, ii. 8. 7.

II. 11. 3. For the etymology cf. BAU. i. 3. 9, 21.

II. 11. 10. anā́mayatvam : the reading is probably corrupt.

II. 12. 1. pā́pam naṣṣṭaḥ : see above, i. 45. 5.

II. 12. 2. alokātāyaḥ = alokayatayai, BAU. i. 3. 88.

II. 13. 2. yathā dhenum . . . : cf. TS. ii. 3. 6. 3, yathā vatsena prat-tān gā́h duha exam eve 'māh lokān pratān kāmam annaṇyān duhe.

II. 14. 1. nedīṣṭham : cf. Aufrecht on AB. 1. 1 ; and ČB. i. 6. 3. 11.

II. 14. 4. atha yad . . . pāḍābhyaṃ : cf. ČB. iii. 1. 1. 7, tasmād u ha na pratiṇcāṇirāḥ caiva. ne 'd devān abhiprasārāya caiva īti.

At the end of the chapter there is the following colophon :

cahāñkalakāśyayāḥ ċaṛaḥyāyāṃ alālikhat.

III. 1. For this and the following chapter, cf. Chānd. U. iv. 8. 1. On the grahas see Eggeling on ČB. iv. 6. 5. 1 ; Vāyu is similarly contrasted with the other divinities at BAU. i. 5. 33, sa yathāś yā́m prāyānaṃ madhyamāḥ prāya exam etāsāṁ devatānāṁ vā́yuḥ. mlocanti hy anyā devatā na vāyuḥ, sāi 'ya 'nastamātā devatā yad vāyuḥ. (Somewhat similar is AB. viii. 28. 2 ff.). But at ČB. iii. 9. 2. 5 we read sarvā́ṃ vā idam anyad uśayati yad idān kīmaḥ 'p īśo 'yam pavate 'thāi 'tā (the waters) eva ne 'layanti.

III. 1. 4. Cf. JB. ii. 48, yadā "dītyo 'stam eti vāyu (MSS. -r) eva pyetī.

III. 1. 7. Cf. JB. ii. 48, yadā vā agnir uśayati vāyu eva 'pyetī.


III. 1. 14. Cf. JB. ii. 49, yadā vā́i tuśyim āste prāṇam eva vāg apyeti ; KBU. iii. 3.
III. 1. 16. Cf. JB. ii. 49, yadā svapitī prāyam eva cakepur appeti.

III. 1. 20. Vāyu enters man, ÇB. i. 1. 8. 2; v. 2. 4. 10.

III. 1. 21. In the corresponding story of Chānd. U. iv. 3, the beggar is a brahmaçārin.

III. 2. 2. The Chānd. U. version in c reads t. k. nā 'bhipaçyanti mar-
tyāḥ; and, at the end of d, nasantam (b of the ploka at JB. ii. 28 ends ba-
hudā nivīṣān); in b the MSS. of the Chānd. U., as ours, read so for sa.

III. 2. 3. The Chānd. U. version in a has janitā prajānām for uta m.; in b, hiranyadañjñuro babhase 'nasūriḥ; in d, anannam for adantam.
— rapasa (from rapas, as rabhasa from rabhas) is uncertain, and so is also the reading of the next two words.

III. 3. 1. na : see note on 1. 5. 1.

III. 3. 2. Breath is identified with the uktha in BAU. v. 14. 1.

III. 3. 4. gacṣad : Eggeling now takes the word to mean 'probably' in the Brāhmaṇas : note on ÇB. v. 4. 3. 2.—The end of this paragraph is not clear to me; perhaps the na should be thrown out.

III. 3. 5. Cf. a similar etymology of the name in AB. vi. 20. 8. 4.

III. 4. 1. triṣūdā paridadhati : cf. AB. vi. 15. 5.

III. 4. 10. nava-nandı 'karāṇi sampadyante : this statement is correct for agni + prthivi + mahant + mahi, and āditya + dyu + brahma + brāhmaṇ; but not for vāyu + antarika + deva + devi, which make ten syllables, unless vāyu is read for vāyu.

III. 4. 12. For the comparison, cf. JB. ii. 248, gathā (MSS. çaha) vai maṇḍu maṇjisthām otaṁ syād evam eṣu lokeṣu trirātra otaḥ (MSS. odah); ÇB. xii. 3. 4. 2; TMB. xx. 16. 6.

III. 5. 2. mūḍas : corrected after SB. iv. 1. The rest of the chapter is obscure, the readings, especially the quotations in 5, doubtful.

III. 5. 3. The quotations are given as they appear in the MSS., without saunḍhi at the end.—manoyuktam : it is uncertain whether this should be taken as a compound, or as two separate words.

III. 5. 4. bimbena : possibly 'by means of the fruit of the Momordica monadelpha.'

III. 6. 4. hotur vā 'jye . . . māitrāvaruṇasya vā : see Eggeling's note on ÇB. iv. 3. 2. 1 (SBE. xxvi. 825).

III. 6. x. 7. The correction of abandhu (neuter) to the masculine -dhur seems necessary to bring out the contrast : cf. RV. viii. 21. 4, vayaḥ hi tvā bandhumantam abandhavo viprāṣa indra yemima.—

kasmād vā . . . manthanti : these words are not quite clear to me.

III. 8. 2. anyatarām upāgād : I take this to be a euphemistic expression, similar to ÇB. v. 1. 8. 18, sa kva tataḥ syāt. The actual bodily danger incurred by entering into a disputation with a superior is well known (e. g. Chānd. U. i. 10. 9–11. 9; ÇB. ix. 6. 3; BAU. iii. 9; JB. ii. 76, 77, etc.).

III. 8. 4. The construction of the clause as it stands is harsh, no matter whether ma be taken as dative or as genitive : see Delbrück, Syntax. 399 (end).—suyamān : the word is very appropriate in talking to a driver.

III. 8. 7. In the following this much is clear, that Sudākṣira Kṣāiṃi by his unexpected arrival within the sacred enclosure succeeds in out-
witting Prācīnaçāli (iii. 7. 7) and making himself the udgātar; he particulars are not clear to me.

III. 8. 10. Possibly here and in the following paragraphs retobhūta should be taken as a cpd.: cf. havirbhūta, MS. iii. 4. 7 (p. 58. 18).

III. 9. 1 This paragraph is obscure. It must be inferred that the younger Jābala was not able to hear Sudakṣiṣā's discourse, iii. 8. 9–9. 7, the substance of which is told him by his older brother in iii. 9. 10, yas tryāṇam . . . atiḥvahīti. — The transitive use of avādi is very remarkable. It is probable that avādi 'ti should be corrected into avādit, which would at the same time remove the superfluous iti.

III. 9. 10. enaḥ . . . yaḥ katham avocad bhagava iti = the younger Jābala.

III. 10. 1–3 are obscure. It is uncertain who is the subject of uvāca in 1 and 3; also who is reproached in 3.


III. 10. 2. The stanza is AV. x. 8. 28, where however b reads utāi 'pām pito 'ta va putra ēdām, and precedes a; in c AV. reads prathamо jātaḥ s. u. g. antāh.

III. 10. 2. The readings of this paragraph are doubtful. Though the MSS. have no indication of a lacuna, it is certainly defective, and lacks the verb on which inam puruṣam depends.


III. 11. 2. imaḥ ca lokān: cf. CB. xii. 1. 7. 2, tryāṃ价ta ime lokāḥ.

III. 11. 2. açanayā: see note on i. 3. 3.

III. 11. 3. panyañianti: so far only found in Pān. iii. 1. 28: cf. above, i. 38. 5, panyañyāḥ.

III. 11. 3. Nāka Māudgalya (CB. etc.). — The bearing of yathā . . . tādyā ti tat on what precedes is not clear. The clause is so much abbreviated as to be obscure. It is probable that ratham should be supplied as object to the causatives arpaṭiyā and arpaṭet (6) viz. 'as one having caused one chariot to collide with a post (obstruction) would drive around the obstruction with the next chariot': cf. AV. x. 4. 1, ratha śēnunum ārat.

III. 11. 4. The iti should perhaps be placed after arpaṭet.

III. 11. 4. 1. braddhasya viṣṭapam: this phrase occurs frequently in the JB: tad braddhasya viṣṭapam gacchanti (ii. 387, 344, 351, 353, parallel passages); atha yāc caśtras tad eva braddhasya viṣṭapam. tasminn etad devis sarvān kāmān duhre (iii. 328); tad etat svargyam sāmā 'ṣunte svargaḥ lokāḥ ya evaḥ veda. tad yathā ha vai braddhasya viṣṭapāny evam etāni viṣṭālasya viṣṭapāni svargasya lokasya samsātīyā prā sargaḥ lokam āpnoti ya evaḥ veda (iii. 219); samudrasya (MSS. -ā) viṣṭape occurs JB. iii. 213: cf. below, iii. 19. 7, triviṣṭam.

III. 11. 4. 1. This is repeated, almost verbatim, JB. i. 18, where however the text is unfortunately even more corrupt than here: viz. tath hā 'gataṃ prechati kas tvam (C. tasyam) asi 'ti (C. om. iti). sa (C. -e) yo ha nāmā vā (A. B. om. vā) gotreṣa vā prabṛtī (B. -bṛtī) tath hā "ha yas te 'yam mayy (C. for hā "ha . . . mayy has bhā bhā ye su; for mayy
B. reads marryy, A. may) ātmā 'bhūd (B.C. ṣḍṛ) eva te su (C. st) iti. tasmān āhā "tman pratipat (C. pratīvat) tām (B.C. tā) tāvas (A. tāvas) sampaḷāyapad (so A. and B.; C. sampaḷāryya) gṛhitam apakārṣaṇī. Then, with only a few orthographical differences, to the end of 5 (all MSS. read svuvas, svargyam, svār, svuvaṇ, svuvar in 3 and 4). After this, sa etam eva suktarasaṃ (so C.; A.B. sahrk-) api eti tasya putrā dāyam upayantī pitāras sādhukṛtyāṃ. — In the text the division pratipat. ta is purely conjectural, the MSS. reading pratipatā, which might be an ablative depending on apakārṣaṇī, but it seems not improbable that a past pple is hidden in the word. For sampaḷāyapad I have been unable to find an acceptable emendation.

III. 14. sa yathā . . . eva: cf. JB. ii. 12, yathā ha va idam anāgā (MSS. -ān) nīrbhidyārann evam evā śaṃśa adhaḥ nirbhidyante; Āit. U. i. 1. 4, tasyāh bhītaptasya mukham nirbhidyatā yathā "ṣatam (cf. also RV. i. 104. 8, anāgā mā no . . . nir bhet). — The ṣū in nirbhṛyaṃ is noteworthy: see above, note to I. 5. 1.

III. 15. Cf. SB. i. 5. 1 ff., indro ha va evā śvāmātiṣṭhā yathā svāmātiṣṭhā brahma. vāg ity evā śvāmātiṣṭhā mano brahma svāmātiṣṭhā. 2. tad va etad vāśiṣṭham brahma; also TMB. xv. 5. 24. Hence a Vāśiṣṭha should be chosen as bhrahman-priest, TS. iii. 5. 2. 1: vāśīṣṭha brahma kārṇaḥ; cf. SB. i. 5. 3.

III. 15. 4 ff. Cf. AB. v. 32; CB. xi. 5. 8; GB. i. 6; Chānd. U. iv. 17.

III. 16. 1 ff. Strikingly (at times verbatim) similar is AB. v. 33. 2: cf. also GB. iii. 2; Chānd. U. iv. 16; KB. vi. 11: SB. i. 5. 4 ff.

III. 16. 1. udbhayāpād, udbhayācakro: cf. iv. 14. 3, udbhayāpadi (also udbhayādant); the AB. has udbhayātāḥpāl udbhayātaḍakrā.

III. 17. 1. Cf. Chānd. U. iv. 17. 4 ff.; AB. v. 32. 5 ff.; CB. xi. 5. 8. 5 ff.; SB. i. 5. 8; JB. i. 358, yam nu no 'dyā 'yass tvar bhīṣayam iyāt (MSS. iy-) kenā 'nam bhīṣajyāme 'ti tān prajāpāṭar abuvid yad va clasaya tātasya vedasya teja indriyāṁ viryaṁ rasa āsid ādam va āhām tad va (MSS. vam) udāyacakam (MSS. insert ity), etā vyāḥṛtiḥ prāya-cchām. etābhīr enam bhīṣajyāthe 'ti. sa yadi yajīśaḥ kṛto bhīṣam iyād (MSS. i) bhās svāhā 'ti gārhapate jahavāthā. sāi 'va tatra prāya-cchātī, atha yadi yajūṣo bhūvas svāhā 'tya aṃdihe jahavāthā. sāi 'va t. pr. atha yadi sāmatas svas svāhā 'tya āhavaniye jahavāthā. sāi 'va t. pr. atha yadi yajīśaḥ pādaḥ viśeṣaḥ dārayapāraṇāsāyor va bhūvas svāhā 'tya anāhāryapacane jahavāthā. sāi 'va t. pr. atha yadi anupasmiṣṭā kuta idam ajanī 'ti bhūr bhūvas svas svāhā 'tya āhavaniye jahavāthā. sāi 'va tasya sarvasya prāya-cchātī.

III. 17. 7. tad yathā . . . : very similar is Chānd. U. iv. 17. 7.; the comparisons in AB. v. 32. 6 and CB. xi. 5. 8. 6 differ, especially in the latter: cf. also comm. on KB. (Bibl. Ind. p. 4, line 4 ff.), baddhva kīṣṭhane 'va kāṣṭhāṁ niṣasāndhivandhanāṁ jatārjavijalodāhībhiḥ.

III. 17. 4. tad āhur . . . : almost verbatim as AB. v. 34. 1 ff.; GB. iii. 3.


III. 18. 1. somaḥ pavate and upātartadhram: cf. below, iii. 34. 2 CB. iv. 3. 5. 7. 8. and Eggeling's notes, SBE. xxvi. 307, 308.

III. 19. 3, 4 = I. 8. 4, 5.
III. 20. 1. yo 'emān ... dvīṣmaḥ = KBU. ii. 8 (Mahānār. U. iv. 18); the phrase (without the ca after yaḥ) is very frequent in AV., e. g. ii. 11. 8; 19. 1–28. 5.

III. 20. 2. apanāṇa : cf. BAU. v. 15. 10 (CB. xiv. 8. 15. 10), apad asi na hi padyase, in an invocation of gāyatri.

III. 21. 1. Text and translation are uncertain; the last two words are emended after AV. vii. 35. 2 b, aham ... bilam apyadhām.

III. 25. 4. modo ... pramodo : as in Tāt. U. ii. 5. 1, modo daksīṇaḥ pākṣaḥ pramoda uttaraḥ pākṣaḥ (of the ātmā 'nandamayāḥ').

III. 27. 11. navo-navo ... jāyamāno : a Vedic reminiscence, RV. x. 85. 19. navo-navo bhavati jāyamāno ... (= AV.; TS.; TB).

III. 28. 1 ff. Similar, but differing considerably in detail, are BAU. v. 12 and KBU. i. 1. 2 ff.

III. 28. 2. atra = loke 'cokāntare 'hime (BAU. v. 12. 1).

III. 29. 9. There seems to be no other passage in Vedic literature where a dead man temporarily returns of his own accord to comfort and instruct a friend. Somewhat similar are the stories of Bhṛgu (CB. xi. 6. 1. 1 ff.; JB. i. 42–44, JAOS. xv. 284 ff.) and Naciketas (TB. iii. 11. 8. 1 ff.; Kāth. U. i. 1), and, in later literature, that of Kādambari calling her lover back to life by her embrace (Weber, ZDMG. vii. 588 = Ind. Streif. i. 367). Cf. also the Jāina-story of ajj 'Āsātha, Ind. Stud. xvii. 109.


III. 30. 3. praṇāpratī ... āsā : the same phrase occurred above, ii. 10. 2. — praṇām is perhaps to be taken with sa, and devāṇām in 4 with praṇāpatī.

III. 31. 1. Cf. JB. iii. 7. praṇāpatī jāyamāna eva saka pāpmanā jāyata. so 'kāmayaṇā 'pa pāpmanah haniye 'ti. sa etath vyūḍhachandasaḥ dvādaśāhan yojaṁ tam apacayat. tam āharat. tenā yojaṇa. tena viṣṇuṣu caṇ pāpmināḥ vyūḍhata. sa yaḥ pāmāgrhita eva manyeta sa etena vyūḍhachandasaḥ dvādaśāhena yojaṇa. viṣṇuṣu caṇ hāt 'eva pāpmaṇaḥ vyūḍhate.

III. 31. 3. The emendations of this corrupt passage are tentative only.

III. 31. 10. I have not been able to restore a satisfactory text.

III. 32. 3. tad atha yadā ... : cf. CB. iii. 8. 3. 15 = 4. 5, yadā 'smāt praṇo 'pākramati dāvo eva tari bhiṣo 'nartyah ṣeṭe; KBU. ii. 14, asmā charirād uccakramus tad dharā 'praṇat śuṣkaṁ dārubhūtah śiṣye.

III. 32. 1. sa ... sa : as is seen from 8, they refer to antarātmā.

III. 32. 2. vācā karoti : see above, i. 89. 4.—taṣaṇa svarā ... praṇāḥ : cf. above, ii. 2. 6; in Chāṇḍ. U. i. 18. 2, svarā and praṇā are identified.

III. 33. 1. For the identification of agni and vāc cf. Chāṇḍ. U. iii. 18. 8, sā vāc so 'gihī. — ādītāya svarā ... : cf. Chāṇḍ. U. i. 3. 2, samāna u eva yasā ca 'sātu ca. uṣṇo 'yama uṣṇo 'sātu. svarā iti 'mani ākṣāyate praṇāyāya svarā iti 'amun ; i. 5. 1, ity asāu vādītāya udgāthā eva praṇāvah. om iti hy ita svarān eti : cf. i. 8. 1, ya eva 'sātu tāpati tam udgātham upāsita. udgān vā eva praṇābhya udgāyati.

VOL. XVI.
III. 38. 1. brahmaña avartaḥ: cf. Chānd. U. iv. 15. 6, mānasam avartam.

III. 34. 1. tad etan...ṣrāme: cf. Chānd. U. i. 1. 5. — acetaram: to the passages from MS., XB., and Kāṭh., quoted by Böhlingk (on Pāṇini viii. 1. 16) and Schroeder (Monatsberichte d. Berl. Akad., July 24, 1879, p. 688), must be added JB. ii. 276, acetaram ha khalu vai mithunam prajanamas; iii. 43, acetaram (MSS. acetūn) mithunam prajananam; iii. 87, acetaram vāva m. p.

III. 34. 2. somaḥ pavate and upāvartaḥvam: see above, iii. 19. 1.

III. 34. 2. Cf. ÇB. vi. 6. 1. 6, yādṛg vā yondu retaḥ sicṣate tādṛg jāyate; vii. 4. 1. 1, yādṛgad vā jāyate tādṛgad eva bhavati; Bhī. Sāmī. lxxv. 2.

III. 35. 1. The verse is RV. x. 177. 1.—On maricīnām in d see Weber, Ind. Stud. ix. 9, note.

III. 35. 2. ati ratham udikṣate: these words are doubtless corrupt.

III. 35. 3. maricīyaḥ I have left unchanged, regarding it as one of the frequent instances of confusion of i-stems and i-stems.

III. 36. 1. The verse is RV. x. 177. 2.

III. 37. 1. The verse is RV. x. 177. 3 (=L 164. 81).

III. 38. 1. prajānāṁ janaṅgatā: cf. i. 48. 8.

III. 38. 4. A similar etymology of gāyatra is given at BAU. v. 15. 7.

III. 38. 4. upā ṣmādi...naraḥ: the first pāda of SV. ii. 1 and 113 (= RV. ix. 11. 1 etc.). The final of gāyatā is protracted also in SV. and RV. The second and third pādas are given in 8, with the var. lect. devam for devān (SV. RV.). They also differ from SV. and RV. in the protraction of the final of indave to -vā, and of the last three vowels of iyakṣate (iyākṣatā), and by the insertion of hum-ḥa between the second and third syllable of the latter. The Bibl. Ind. gives the verse, yajñāyaṅañiṁ, thus: upā ṣmādi | gāyaṭā nārāḥ | pāvāmdānā | yādha | humāyā | dāvāyā | abhi devān iyākṣatā || te.

III. 38. 9. soḍaṇākalam vā brahmaḥ: cf. below, iv. 25. 2.

III. 38. 10. avādāt: cf. note on i. 48. 7.


III. 39. 2. tad...avrūḍyāt: I have not been able to restore a readable text. From what follows it would appear that parts of oṣaṁc, as ṣ and o. are commented upon and mystically explained.

III. 39. 3. ff. are similar to i. 4. 2 ff.

III. 40. ff. Only very few of these names occur in the Vaiṣṇavabrahmaṇa; a number of names are repeated in the vaṅga at iv. 18 ff.

After III. 42. the MSS. have this colophon:

bahaḥtād dhāraṇaḥaktā vismaranty alpapadhyayaḥ:
yam aham trīṇad adhyayam alikhām tam bhragaṇam.

IV. 1. 1. haritasūrasaṃānabuddho: the correctness of the MSS. reading is doubtful, the meaning obscure.

IV. 2. 1. ff. Cf. Chānd. U. iii. 18. The correspondence is very close, even to the misreading caturvikaṭcaturvaka in 2.

IV. 2. 2. sarvaṁ vasu ādadate: Chānd. U. sarvaṁ vāsyaṁni (cf. ÇB.
Jāminīyā-Upaniṣad-Bṛhmaṇa.

xi. 6. 3. 6; BAU iii. 9. 4.) ; cf. BAU. iii. 9. 4, eten hi 'dān vau sarvam hitam (= JB. ii. 77, JAOŚ. xv. 240).

IV. 2. 4. For the etymology cf. JB. ii. 77; CB. xi. 6. 3. 7.

IV. 3. 7. For the etymology cf. JB. ii. 77, idam sarvam 'adādānā yanti = CB. xi. 6. 3. 8; i. 1. 2. 18 (of the sun), tasmād ādityo nāma yad ādān āryaṁ kṣatram ādatta.

IV. 3. 8. The AV. v. 28. 7 reads: tṛṇyāymam jamadagnē vyāpana tṛṇyāyam jātā mārtasya okaṇeṣu tṛṇy āyāśe te 'karam; pādās a and b, of the AV. version are also found VS. iii. 62.

IV. 3. 9. Cf. RV. i. 187. 1, upa naḥ pitaṁ deca . . . mayobhur . . .

IV. 3. 10. = TS. v. 5. 7. 5; also VS. xviii. 67, with these var. lect.: in a, pāncakaṛyā for purīṇaḥ; in b, asyām pṛthivyam abhi; in c, asi tvam. — purīṇaḥ: see Eggeling's note to CB. vi. 3. 1. 38. — yo: cf. above, i. 5. 1.

IV. 5. 1. ff. Cf. below, 10. 10 ff.

IV. 5. 2. virātra, not so much "the end of the night" (PW., pw.) as the second half, or after-part of the night: cf. vyaḍha. — anīhotra-velādyām = after sunrise (AB. v. 31).”

IV. 6. 1. Tallies with the description given of a Vedic student returning after he has completed his studentship, ČQS. iii. 1; PGS. ii. 6; GGS. iii. 4; dāṇḍopānāhām occurs also GGS. iii. 1. 18.

IV. 6. 2. sūdgātā . . . : cf. TS. vii. 1. 8. 1, d'ṛya catvāro virā jāyante snahotā sūdgātā saadhiyuvān suśabheyaḥ.

IV. 6. 3. Cf. BAU. v. 15. 13.

IV. 6. 4. For Pratidārca Ābhāvata, see CB. xii. 8. 2. 3.

IV. 9. 1. 1 see the nā-class only here and below, 10. 1-8: cf. e. g. stabhndati; stabhnoti; sināti, sinot (JB. iii. 210 ter); skabhndati, skabhnuvant; lunāti, lunoit; kṣīndati, kṣīnopi; strūndati, strūpi, etc.

IV. 10. 5. saṇṭadhā: i. e. by means of the seven vibhaktis of the sūman enumerated in 1-7; cf. below, 18.

IV. 10. 6. Cf. above, 5. 1.

IV. 11. 10. cf. BAU. v. 39. 5.

IV. 18. 2. Chānd. U. viii. 8. 5; KBU. i. 6; BAU. ii. 3. 1 similarly divide satyam into an immortal (sat) and mortal (ti) syllable.

IV. 14. 1. The paragraph is obscure.

IV. 14. 2. ubhayāpadiḥ: scil. devatā.

IV. 14. 3. It seems very probable that a negative should be supplied in the relative clause, in order to contrast this paragraph with the preceding one. It would then correspond to KBU. i. 2. ye vāi ke cāḥ 'smāl lokāt pranyanti candramasam eva te sarve gacchanti . . . etad vāi svargasya lokasya dvārasah yac candramāḥ. tath yaḥ pratyāhāram atisparjyate. atha yaṁ eva na pratyāhānaṁ tāṁ tāṁ vṛṣṭir bhūtāṁ vāsati. sa iha . . . teṣu teṣu sthāneṣu pratyājyante (Bōhiting, Ber. d. Sāches. G. d. W. 1889, p. 301 ff.).

IV. 16 ff. Some of the names occurred above, iii. 40 ff.

IV. 18-21. The Kena-Upanisad. In Čākāra's recension it formed the ninth adhyāya. One of Burnett's MSS. of a fragment of JB. (i. 1-178) contains a commentary on this Upanisad, with the title Kṣudravi- varṇa.
IV. 18. 2. Röer compares Kāṭh. U. ii. 6. 12 ; Tāt. U. ii. 2. 4 (=9): 
Munḍ. U. iii. 1. 8.
IV. 18. 4. Both the Bombay ed. and the ed. of Röer count paragraphs 8 and 4 as one. — The second half-stanza of 4 occurs also Icša U. 
10, 18 ; see also Weber, Ind. Stud. ii. 183.
IV. 18. 6. mano matam : this was also the reading of the author of the 
Kṣudravivaraṇa.
IV. 18. 9. praṇiyate : for a similar pun between praṇa and । ni + 
pra see Prā. U. iv. 8, yād gārhapatyāt praṇiyate praṇayanād dhava-
niṣṇāḥ praṇāḥ ; also CB. vii. 5. 1. 21.
IV. 19. 1. dahram : both edd. and the Kṣudravivaraṇa read dabh-
ram. The AV. recension reads daharam (Ind. Stud. ii. 182). — Both Ç. 
and the Kṣ. place a period after eva te and take mange viditam (so, 
without avagraha, all edd.) as a remark of the student, which is harsh 
and unnecessary ; by reading aviditam we obtain a fit transition to what 
follows. The AV. recension differs considerably here, and begins the 
second paragraph with viditam.
IV. 19. 4. vidyayā ... mṛtam : cf. Icša U. ii. vidyayā mṛtam açnyate 
= Māṭ. U. viii. 9.
IV. 19. 6. viveçya : Röer vicintya, Bombay ed. and the Kṣ. vicitya ; 
but the latter explains dhārābh by vivekinaḥ : cf. Kāṭh. U. i. 2. 2, tāu 
samparītya virinakti dhiraḥ.
IV. 20. 4. tād : both MSS. here tam ; in 8, A. tād, B. tam ; in 11, both 
m (i) ; the AV. recension has tam throughout. — vac aham : the faulty 
reading of the MSS. va ham (here and once below, in 8) is found also 
in Chamb. 187 throughout (Ind. Stud. ii. 182).
IV. 20. 6. nāi nad açakam : the edd. here, and below in 10, ' tād for 
'nad.'
IV. 20. 8. ādadiya : the edd. and Ç. ādadiyam.
IV. 21. 1. The edd. insert aā before brahme 'ti. — For mahiyadhva the 
edd. have -dham.
IV. 21. 5. pasparīças : the edd. have the faulty form pasparīca. — sa : 
our MSS. and the edd. te, but it is obvious that this reading is due to 
the te of the following paragraph, and should be changed to sa, with 
Chamb. 187 (Ind. Stud. ii. 182). It is probable that the whole clause is 
a gloss.
IV. 21. 4. vyadyutad aś iti nyamisad aś : Röer, vyadyutad āś iti 'ti 
nyamisadal ; the Bombay ed. vyadyutād āś iti 'ti nyamisadal. The 
author of the Kṣ. read nyamisadal. The a after the verb is 
surprising ; both commentaries explain it as having the force of com-
parison (Kṣ. ā āve 'ty upamārtha açabdaḥ). After nyamisad an iti 
seems to be wanting.
IV. 21. 2. yad enad ... cāi 'nad : the edd. twice etad.
IV. 21. 5. sarvāṅgāyi : the edd. -ni : see note to i. 5. 1.
= mahati sarvamahati ; both explanations are impossible). But there
can be no doubt that the true reading is 'jyeya, as suggested by Müller. Here ends the Kena-Upaniṣad.

IV. 22. 11. agnir vāi ... vāg iti: the change from vāi to iti throughout this paragraph is noteworthy. In the similar passage i. 6. 2, iti vāi and iti are used for vāi.

IV. 23. 1. arkyam: the same form is repeated below, 4. As the form occurs repeatedly in ČB. along with arka (see PW.), I have not corrected it to arkam, which would better fit the etymology here given.

IV. 23. 2. prāpo vāvo 'd: cf. Chānd. U. i. 3. 6; BAU. i. 3. 25.—vāg gi: cf. Chand. i. 3. 6; BAU. i. 3. 25 identifies vāc with gīthā.

IV. 23. 3. Cf. Chānd. U. i. 7. 1; BAU. i. 3. 22 differs.

IV. 23. 4. BAU. i. 2. 1 derives arkyā (so MSS.) from jre 'honour' and ka 'joy.'

IV. 23. 5. Cf. above, 31. 7. The second half of this and the first half of the next paragraph are corrupt. The translation is purely tentative. —vāśu as independent word is unsupported, and calls for emendation.

IV. 23. 7. The cūkam, kṛṣṇam, and tāmram are the three dātus. The rest of the paragraph is obscure, and I have not succeeded in restoring a satisfactory text. In da(space)ṣa of the MSS. perhaps damaç ṭama are hidden.

IV. 24. 1. = i. 48. 10.

IV. 24. 12. Cf. note to i. 26. 1. —In i. 25. 8, cūkam rūpam is also assigned to the ar, but 9 connects kṛṣṇam rūpam with the yajas.


IV. 25. 2. Cf. above, iii. 88. 8.

IV. 26. 1 ff. Similar are KBU. iii. 6 and BAU. i. 3. —. KBU. manasā sarvāṇi dhyānānya āpnoti; BAU. manasā hi kāmān kāmāyate.

IV. 26. 2. vācā: i.e. jihvāyā, as KBU. (jihvāyā sarvān annarasan āpnoti) and BAU. (jihvāyā hi rasān vijñānā) read: cf. ČB. viii. 5. 4. 1, sarveṣāṁ aṅgānāṁ vācā ānaśyan rasasaḥ vijñānāt; x. 5. 2. 15, na vācā nāya rasasaḥ vijñānāt. See further, TMB. xx. 14. 8 (PW.), and JB. i. 260, quoted in the note to i. 60.

IV. 26. 7, 8. There are no corresponding passages in KBU.; BAU. has tavāc hi sparṣān vedāyate; for 9–11 there are no corresponding passages in BAU.

IV. 26. 10. KBU. upasthenā 'nandah ratim praṭātām āpnoti.

IV. 26. 11. KBU. pāddbhyaṁ sarvā ityā āpnoti.

IV. 26. 13. aṭisāmayāṅ 'tretāya: the text seems to be corrupt. —dhāttarāṣṭra and prthuṛcvasa are mentioned together at TMB. xxv. 15. 3; AV. viii. 10. 39 reads dhāttarāṣṭra, and Kauç. 9. 10 and 17. 27 pārtahā-

IV. 28. The sāvitrī is here given (as directed e.g. by ApGS. iv. 11. 10) pāda by pāda, hemistic by hemistic, and as a whole.

IV. 28. 2. apa ... tarati: I have not corrected to ava ... tarati on account of AV. vi. 6. 3 (RV. x. 188. 5 reads ava ... tīra in this verse).
INDEX.

I. Contains the śīraś eṣṭīṇa and rarer words, together with such words and references as for one reason or another seemed noteworthy. An * indicates that the word, form, or meaning to which it is prefixed is wanting in the minor Pet. lex. A v. after a reference indicates that it is to a vaṅga.

II. Gives a list of the etymological explanations.

III. Gives a collection of the more important grammatical points.
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akoviḍa, iv. 1. 2, 3, 4. 5.  
akṣaya, i. 24. 2 (bis).  
akṣaram-akṣaram, i. 17. 2.  
*akṣara-vat, i. 48. 11.  
akṣiti, i. 9. 5 ; 10. 4 ; iii. 14. 9 ; 29. 8 ; * (numeral) i. 28. 3 ; 29. 5.  
aqada, iv. 2. 4. 7, 10.  
Agastya, iv. 15. 1 ; 18. 1 v.  
*aṅgita, i. 53. 9. Cf. gītāgīta.  
*aṅghatā, ii. 12. 7, 8, 9.  
aṅghoṭrailvā, iv. 5. 3.  
aṅgīrī, iii. 29. 7.  
aṅgīrī, iv. 4. 2.  
vač + *abhī-parī, i. 35. 8.  
aṅjaś (*"easy"), iii. 7. 4.  
aṅja (sāmāh), iii. 10. 3.  
aṅjīruṣa, i. 27. 3.  
aṅvād-dhin (quot.), i. 4. 2.  
*Atiśāma *Etuḍa (? a demon), iv. 26. 15.  
*aṅtṛagra, iii. 5. 6.  
aṅtrṣad, iv. 24. 8.  
adhrvā, i. 55. 3.  
adhvāryu, iii. 10. 7 ; 16. 2 ; 17. 4 ; 19. 6.  
anantatā, i. 35. 8.  
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aṅvāṅgama, i. 35. 8.  
aṅvāṅgama, ii. 3. 4.  
aṅvāṅgama, i. 35. 8.
anāda, i. 51. 6.
*anyatodvāra, i. 30. 2.
*anvāgama, iii. 19. 2. Cf. anavāgama.
anvāhāryapacana, iv. 26. 15.
apakṣa, iii. 14. 9.
apacittī, i. 39. 5; (plur. with ी/क्र) iv. 6. 3.
apacitimatī, i. 39. 5.
apanna, iii. 20. 2.
aparardhra, iv. 5. 3.
aparādha, i. 16. 5.
aparāña, iv. 5. 1; 10. 15.
aparamitā, i. 46. 2; 47. 5.
aparodha (‘independent word’), ii. 4. 8.
aparidyāpta, iv. 22. 12.
apacca, iii. 38. 1.
apanhatapāman, iii. 27. 2; 39. 2; iv. 13. 3-10.
apīṭa, ii. 7. 1.
apīṭita, i. 8. 10.
apūta, i. 50. 3; 58. 7.
aprātiṇācaya, i. 9. 5.
apratiṣṭhā, iii. 15. 4.
*aprapacca, iii. 38. 2.
Abhayada *āsamaṇya, iv. 8. 7.
Abhipratārīṇa, iii. 1. 21; 2. 2. 3. 13.
Abhipratārīṇa Kākṣaseni, i. 59. 1: iii. 1. 21.
*akhrānda, i. 30. 2.
abhīdritya (‘-ah sāma’), i. 30. 5: 45. 6; iii. 37. 8.
am, i. 53. 4; 6(bis); 54. 6(bis); 56. 2(bis); 57. 4(bis); iv. 28. 3.
*ānalaṅkaṇa, i. 38. 6.
amāna, iii. 9. 4.
amārāya (‘ārātri’), i. 38. 6(bis).
amukha, iii. 38. 1. 2; iv. 11. 6.
aṇa, i. 34. 2.
*aṣamaṇya, ii. 8. 7(bis).
*aṣamaṇya, iv. 1. 8.
Ayāsa, ii. 8. 7; 8; 11. 8 (ter).
Ayāsa Āṅgirasa, ii. 7. 2; 6; 8. 3.
*ayutadhā, i. 10. 4; 28. 3; 29. 5.
*ayutadhāra, i. 10. 1.
arūka, iii. 32. 6(bis).
arka, iv. 28. 3.
*arhadhavedatā, iii. 1. 1.
ar ṣabhāj, iii. 17. 5.
ar ṣādha, i. 12. 4.
*arbusadhā, i. 10. 4; 28. 3; 29. 5.
alabhamāna, iii. 14. 1(bis).
alam, iii. 31. 9; 10 (quater).
*alokatā, i. 12. 7; 8, 9.
avakoṭa (‘-ah kr with dat.’), i. 7. 2.
avīrī, i. 58. 7.
avoṣṣaṇīya, iii. 10. 9.
avyāṣikta, i. 37. 6.
acan, iv. 5. 2.
*aṣanayā, i. 3. 3, 4; 5; iii. 12. 2.
acīthīla, iv. 23. 13.
acīmanaya, iv. 1. 2.
*aṇrumukha, iii. 8. 1.
Āṣāḍha Uttara Pārācarya, iii. 41. 1 v.
āṣṭacatātukadakṣara, iv. 2. 8.
āṣṭacaptha, i. 1. 8; 6. 6; 9. 4; 38. 11; 34. 2.
1 ्/as + anu, iv. 18. 1.
asambhāyaṃ (adv.), ii. 8. 4.
asidhārā, iii. 18. 9.
aṣumaya, i. 29. 3.
vaññī, iii. 31. 9.
asara (‘without melody.’ sāman) i. 18. 8.
ahorātra (dual), i. 28. 5; (neut. plur.)i. 46. 5; (‘fem. plur.’), i. 21. 4.
ā (one of the five vṛddhis), ii. 9. 8; 5; (exclamation, ‘after the verb’)
iv. 21. 4(bis).
ākramaṇa, i. 8. 2.
ākrānti, i. 28. 6.
ākkhaya, i. 7. 6; 60. 8; iii. 3. 12. 18.
āga, i. 20. 6; 7; 37. 1, 2, 8, 4, 5, 7; 53. 9, 10 (bis).
āgīta, i. 20. 6, 8 (bis); 55. 13 (bis).
āgniśtra, iii. 17. 2.
Āṅgirasa, ii. 11. 9 (ter): see Ayāasya Ā.
ācataram, iii. 34. 1.
*ācāryadatta, i. 54. 1.
*ācāryakta, i. 22. 3.
*Ajakeṣa (plur.), i. 9. 3.
*Ajadviṣa, see Bamba Ā.
*āhya, iii. 6. 4.
Aṣṭā, see Pāra Ā.
adaitavanta, i. 48. 11.

Ātreya, see Dakṣa Kātyāyani Ā.,
Cāṇḍa Čātyāyani Ā.
ādi. i. 11. 7; 12. 4; 19. 2; 31. 2, 5;
58. 9; 59. 6; (ādīn dā + ā), ii. 2.
9; iv. 10. 3, 18.
*ādityarācāmī, ii. 6. 10.
ādhipatya, iii. 6. 6, 8.
vāp + *upa-sam, ii. 3. 4–10.
āpīṇa, i. 8. 12, 13 (bis).
ādhūti, i. 46. 2, 5; ii. 4. 4 (bis); iii.
20. 3, 11; 21. 12; 27. 8, 12.
āyatana, i. 58. 3 (bis); ii. 12. 8.
Āruṣi, i. 42. 1.
Āṛṣeṣa, ii. 5. 1.
*Ārkaḍāyana, see Galūnasa Ā.
ārseya, i. 59. 10.
ālamyādalagāt (?), iii. 81. 10.
ālopa, see madhuvālopa.
*Ālakṣa, see Hṛtvaḍāḍyā Ā.
āvarta, iii. 83. 7 (bis).
āvīcōṣaṇa, iv. 1. 7.
āvṛt, iii. 11. 5. 6, 7; 12. 1.
*āvṛtīgacāma, iii. 31. 3.
ādṛśvaca (ā ṛç), iii. 38. 6.
*ādṛśvapratyādṛśvita (duita), iv. 6.
5; 7. 3 (bis).
vāś + adhi, i. 27. 1.
āṣaḥgvaṇam (adv.), i. 12. 4.
Āsāmāṭya, see Abhayā Ā.
āvona, i. 16. 2.
ābhavaniya, iv. 26. 15.
ābhava, i. 54. 8.
v + obhi-pra (of the sun), iv. 5. 1.
v + pari, iii. 20. 4, 12; 21. 6.
v + pali, iii. 29. 9; 31. 3.
v + *sam-ud-a, i. 85. 2.
ithāsa, see purāṇetiṭhāsa.
vidh + *ud (conjunct.), ii. 18. 4.
indriyavānt, i. 49. 11.
indracṛṣṭha, i. 10. 1.
Indrota Dāvāpita Čānuka, iii. 40.
1 v.
Iṣa ṣṭuṛāvāvī, iv. 16. 1 v.
vābh + *vī, i. 37. 4.
uktha, i. 40. 2 (bis): 45. 1 (quot.);
iii. 3. 2; 6 (adīvāṃitra u.), 9 ff.;
4. 1.
ugra (-aṃ śāmνhaḥ), i. 51. 8; (-o
devaḥ), iv. 5. 1; 10. 10.
Uccāsāravas Čārupayēya, iii. 29. 1,
2, 3.
ucchāra, i. 5. 7.
u (one of the five vyāhrtis), ii.
9. 3, 8.
uṭkrantī, i. 26. 5.
Uttara, see Apāhaya U. Pārācara.
udṛṛ, iv. 14. 7; 15. 4, 5.
uđgātṛ, i. 2. 3, 5, 8; 45. 5; 54. 4,
5; 58. 4, 5; ii. 1. 1 ff.; 10. 2 ff.;
iii. 7. 7; 8. 8; 9. 3, 9; 10. 1, 2;
12. 8; 18. 8, 10, 13; 14. 9; 17. 4;
19. 6; 34. 4; iv. 9. 3, 9; 10. 9, 18.
uṇḍīla, i. 55. 13 (bis).
uṇḍitha, i. 11. 8; 12. 4, 7; 18. 1, 3,
5; 19. 2; 21. 7; 31. 2, 6; 33. 3,
5, 9, 10; 84. 1; 85. 4; 86. 1, 3, 5,
6, 8, 9; 54. 8; 58. 9; 59. 7; ii. 4,
1, 8; 5. 12; 6. 1. 3 ff.; 7. 1, 9,
10; iv. 8. 5; 9. 1.
upagātṛ, i. 22. 5, 6; 45. 5; ii. 8. 2.
upatapant (noun), iv. 2. 11.
upadrava, i. 12. 1, 4; 19. 2; 31. 2,
8; 58. 9; 59. 9.
upadraṣṭṛ, i. 54. 8.
upastiṣad, iv. 15. 8; 21. 7; 28. 6.
upadbimant, i. 37. 3.
upardām (adv.), i. 58. 8.
upary-upari, iii. 6. 5; 88. 5, 6.
uprasaṭṭhiya, i. 54. 8 (bis), 5 (bis).
upavā, iii. 20. 1.
upāstamaṇam (adv.), i. 12. 4.
*ubhayacākra, iii. 16. 7.
*ubhayādīpad, iii. 16. 7; iv. 14. 3.
Uma Hāmavati, iv. 20. 11.
*Utukṣa (? Jānaçruteya, i. 6. 3.
Ucānaś Kātyā, ii. 7. 2, 6.
*ürdhvaṇgaṇa, i. 57. 2.
ūrmi, i. 56. 1 (bis).
vāḥ + *sam-ud, iii. 19. 7.
vṛ (caus.), iii. 18. 5, 6.
vrkta, iii. 17. 1.
*ṛkparo, i. 15. 5, 6.
ṛksāna, i. 54. 3, 5; 56. 1.
ṛksaṣaṇa, ii. 2. 9 (bis), 10.
ṛgena, i. 1. 3; iii. 7. 8.
Ṛṣyaṣṭiḥa Kāyopa, ii. 40. 1 v.
ṛṣikāla, i. 4. 2.
ekacakra, iii. 16. 5.
ekapad, iiii. 16. 5.
ekaputra, iii. 5. 2.
ekaraj, iv. 8. 4. 15.
ekaiviha (′anu sama), i. 19. 1, 3
(bis).
ekaivira, iiii. 5. 1.
ekaivrtya, iiii. 21. 3.
ekastha, i. 37. 5.
′ekastomahāgaṇumanta, iiii. 18.
6. 7.
′ey, iiii. 17. 6. 9.
′elavadāvasa, iiii. 19. 6.
′etureta (?), see Atisama E.
Āṅkṣaṅka, see Bhageratha A.
Āṅkṣaṅka Vīrā, i. 5. 4.
Ātareya, see Mahādāsa.
Āndrothi, see Dṛthī A. Čāyūkā.
āilaba, i. 51. 1.
on vā, iv. 8. 6 (ter).
on vā vā on vā vāc on vāc hum bhā
on vāc, iv. 8. 9.
oāra, iv. 19. 2 ; 14. 2 (bis).
om, i. 1. 6. 7 ; 2. 1 (quater), 2 (quater) ; 3. 5 ; 9. 2 (quater), 3 (bis) ;
10. 2. 7. 11 ; 18. 10. 11 ; 23. 7 ;
24. 1 (bis) ; 30. 1 ; iiii. 6. 2 ; 10. 10.
11. 13. 8. 10, 12, 13 ; 14. 9 ; 18. 5,
7 ; 19. 1, 6. 7. Rule as to its
pronunciation, i. 24. 3. — (′yes′) iii.
8. 5 ; 29. 6 ; 30. 2 ; 31. 6.
oāvāvā, i. 9. 1 ; 17. 1.
oāvāvāvā hum bhā oāvā, i. 3. 1.
oāvāvāvāvāc hum bhā oāvā, i.
2. 3 ; iii. 39. 1.
oāvāvāvāvāc hum bhā ro vā,
iv. 14. 2.
kaiva (neuter I), i. 25. 5.
Kāwa Vārākā, iiii. 41. 1 v.
Kāwa Vārāka, iiii. 41. 1 v ;
iv. 17. 1. v.
Kuṣaivanta, i. 5. 11.
kathā, iv. 6. 2.
kum (particle), i. 45. 2.
karmavānt (′active′), i. 48. 11.
kālāças, iiii. 38. 8 ; 39. 1.
kalyāna (comparat.), iiii. 34. 6
(quater).
Kāvyapa, iv. 3. 1.
Kākṣaseni, see Abhiratārin K.
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Kāṇḍivīya, iiii. 10. 2 (bis).
see Janaṇṛta K., Nagarīn
Janaṇṛteya K., Šayaka
Janaṇṛteya K.
Kātyāyani, see Daksya K. Ātreyā.
Kāpeya, iiii. 2. 6, 12.
see Čāyūkā K.
kāma (adv. accus.), i. 54. 1, 5.
kāmaeir (noun), iiii. 28. 3.
kāmadhūghākṣiti, i. 10. 1.
kāmagra, iv. 6. 1, 2.
kāmāgāyīn, i. 5. 12.
kārirādī (plur.) ii. 4. 4.
kārṣṣyāsa, iiii. 17. 8 (bis).
Kāwa, see Ucchāsas K.
Kāvyapa, iiii. 40. 3 v.
see Rṣyaṣṭhīga K., Devatara
(′vāvasīyana K., ′rūṣa
Vāhneya K.
kiṅkāma, i. 11. 2.
kiṁdevatya, i. 59. 12.
kukpi, i. 56. 1.
Kubera Vārāka, iiii. 41. 1 v.
kubhira, i. 4. 5 ; iii. 39. 5.
kumbja, i. 50. 5 (ter) ; 53. 9.
Kuru (sing.), i. 59. 1 (plur.) i. 38.
1 : see kāva.<kura.
Kurupačāla (plur.), iiii. 7. 6 ; 8. 7 ;
30. 6, 9 ; iv. 6. 2 ; 7. 2.
kučala (with dat.), iii. 8. 3.
† w + vi, i. 2. 9.
Kṛṣṇadaṭṭha Lāḥūtīya, iiii. 42. 1 v.
Kṛṣṇadhrītī Śāyāki, iiii. 43. 1 v.
Kṛṣṇaraṭṭa Lāḥūtīya, iiii. 42. 1 v.
see Triveda K. Lāḥūtīya.
Kṛṣṇājina (′poss. cpd.), iii. 5. 8. 7.
Kṛṣṇaṣṭara (′plur.), iii. 4. 9 ; iv. 6. 4.
Kṛṣṇa Dārbya, iiii. 39. 1, 2.
Kāpaṛeya, see Uccāsīgravas.
kuṅava, i. 29. 1.
kuṭa, iiii. 39. 3-10.
† w + abhi, ii. 2. 9.
Kṛṣṭuṭijāyana, see Rāma K. Vāiyya-
ghrapadaya.
krulā, iii. 25. 8.
krūvica, i. 37. 6 ; 51. 12.
† w + abhi-vi, i. 10. 1.
Kṣāmīni, see Sudakṣīṭa K.
Kṣudra, iiii. 28. 4.
kṣuradhāra, iii. 13. 9.
khala (= devata), i. 5. 1, 4.
"Galānas "Arkaśākyaṇa, i. 38. 4.
Gandharvāpsaras (plur.), i. 41. 1;
55. 10, 11; iii. 5. 1.
vyam + anu (of the fire), iii. 1. 7.
vgyam + adhi (pass.), i. 39. 4; 47. 4.
vgarh (with genit.), i. 16. 11.
vga (caus. "play"), i. 58. 2.
vga + ud, i. 2. 2; 10. 7; 14. 4; 18.
11; 24. 4; 27. 7; 30. 5; 32. 6; 38.
1, 3; 45. 7; 54. 4, 5, 13; 57. 9; 58.
1, 60. 1 ff.; ii. 7. 2, 4 ff.; 8. 3, 9;
iii. 17. 4; 30. 2–5; 31. 1, 6 ff.; iv.
8. 7, 9; 9. 5.
vga + upa ("address"?), iii. 2. 2.
gatā, i. 50. 4 (ter); 53. 9; 57. 1.
gādha, iii. 9. 9.
gāyatra, i. 1. 8; 2. 8; 8. 7; 37. 7; iii.
11. 5; 38. 4, 7, 9; iv. 8. 5; 18. 8;
10; 14. 2; 15. 8; 16. 1.
gāyatrī, i. 1. 8; 17. 2; 18. 4; 55. 2;
57. 1; iv. 2. 2; 6. 8; 7. 6; 8.
1, 2.
"gāyatrīmukha, iv. 8. 2.
gārhapatya, iv. 26. 15.
gitāgītā (plur.), i. 52. 9.
Gupta, see Vaiśeṣika Dārśhana-
yanta G. Lāukītya.
vygra + ud, i. 5. 6.
vygra + prati, iv. 6. 9; 7. 7; 8. 1, 2.
vygra + vi, iii. 19. 1.
gotra, iii. 14. 1.
gopṭr, iii. 29. 6.
Gobala Vāraṇaṇa, i. 6. 1.
gobhaga, i. 10. 1.
"Gocra (a Jābaḍa), iii. 7. 7.
Gānutama (patron. of Āruṇi), ii. 42. 1.
Gāṇuṣkīti, iv. 16. 1 v.
vgra (with dat.), iii. 10. 3.
caksuṁṇaṇa, i. 28. 7.
"caksucṛ śrotra (poss. cpd.), i. 10. 1.
caturaṅgula, iii. 38. 6.
caturviniyacatyaṅkara, iii. 38. 9; iv.
2. 2.
caturviniyacatyardhamāsa, iii. 38. 9.
catuspatra, ii. 5. 5.
catuṣṭavāṅcaṅcadakṣara, iv. 2. 5.
vya (with pple.), iii. 7. 5.
vya + anu-sam, iii. 28. 2.
vya + abhi-ava, iv. 1. 2 ff.
vya + anu-vi, iii. 21. 4.
vya + vi, iii. 21. 4.
cātavāla, i. 5. 5.
vda (conj.), iii. 31. 3.
-citṛ, iii. 10. 8, 9.
Cākitāṇeya, i. 37. 7; ii. 5. 2;
(plur.) i. 41. 1.
see Brahmadatta C., Vāsa-
ṛtha C.
Cātvarathi, see Satyādīvaka C.
jagatī, i. 18. 6; 55. 2; 57. 1; iv.
2. 8.
jan + abhi (with accus.), iii. 11.
2–7.
Janaṇrata Kāṇḍviya, i. 40. 2 v.
Janaṇrata *Vārakya, iii. 41. 1 v:
iv. 17. 1 v.
japti, iii. 7. 3.
Jamadagni, iii. 3. 11; iv. 3. 1.
Jayaka Lāukītya, iii. 42. 1 v.
Jayanta, see Yaçasvin J. Lāukī-
tyā.
Jayanta Pārācarya, iii. 41. 1 v.
Jayanta *Vārakya, iii. 41. 1 v
(two persons of this name): iv.
17. 1 v.
Janaṇrata, see Nagarīn J. Kā-
ḍviya.
Janaṇruteya, see Ulukya J., Sā-
yaka J. Kāṇḍviya.
Jābala, iii. 9. 9; (dual) iii. 7. 2, 3.
5, 7, 8 (bis).
see Goḍr, ("ukra.
fīvana, i. 58. 8 ff.
vya + nis ("prim. conj."), iii. 33. 3.
Jāvali, i. 38. 4.
"jyeṣṭhabrāhmaṇa, iv. 23. 1. 5.
jyotismant, i. 48. 11.
"Jvālāyana, iv. 16. 1 v.
tathā (exclam.), iii. 6. 2; 4.
taddevata, i. 59. 12.
tadvāna, iv. 21. 6.
vyan + anu-sam, iv. 2. 4, 7, 10.
vya + dv (adv. locat. of pple.), iii.
32. 7.
vya + upa, iv. 2. 4, 7, 10. 11 (bis).
tapastanu, i. 10. 1.
Dr̥ti Āndroti (āunaka, iii. 40. 2 v.

Dvipa, iv. 8. 8.

Dvīpa, see Indrota D. (āunaka.

dvīpaśrīvī, i. 50. 1.

dvēra, iv. 8. 8.

dvēra + i. 5. 4.

dvēra + uṣa ('sing the upadraṇa'),

Dvīputra, iii. 5. 3.

dvīpura, i. 5. 3.

dvīpura, i. 1. 1.

dvādaśā, iii. 31. 1. 6.

dvādaśā, iii. 5. 4.

dvādaśā, iii. 1. 9.

dvādaśā, iii. 9. 7.

dvādaśā, iii. 31. 1. 6.

dvādaśā, iii. 5. 4.

dvādaśā, iii. 1. 9.

dvādaśā, iii. 9. 7.

dvādaśā, iii. 31. 1. 6.

dvādaśā, iii. 5. 4.

dvādaśā, iii. 1. 9.

dvādaśā, iii. 9. 7.

dvādaśā, iii. 31. 1. 6.

dvādaśā, iii. 5. 4.

dvādaśā, iii. 1. 9.

dvādaśā, iii. 9. 7.

dvādaśā, iii. 31. 1. 6.

dvādaśā, iii. 5. 4.
prastāva, i. 11. 6 ; 12. 4, 7 ; 13. 1, 8, 5 ; 17. 3 ; 19. 2 ; 21. 7 ; 21. 2, 4 ; 33. 3, 5, 9, 10 ; 24. 1 ; 35. 3 ; 38. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 ; 54. 8 ; 58. 9 ; 59. 5 ; iiii. 38. 9.

prastotṛ, iiii. 18. 3, 6.

Prācinayoga, i. 39. 1.

see Puṣaṇa P., Satyaṣayiṇa
Pauṣuṣi P., Somaṇaṃsa Sātyayajya P.

Prācinacāla (plur.), iii. 10. 1.

Prācinacādi, iiii. 7. 2, 3, 5, 7 ; 10. 2.

Prājāpatya, see Parameṣṭhin P.

prāṅ ("successive"?), i. 21. 4.

prāṇamaya, i. 29. 1.

prāṇasāvahita, i. 10. 1.

prāṇāpāṇa (dual), ii. 5. 3 ; 6. 2 ;

iii. 21. 7, 10.

prātaranuvāka, iii. 16. 5, 6.

prātassayana, i. 16. 5, 12 ; 37. 1

(t) ; iv. 2. 2 (bis), 4.

Prāṛṭa Bāllā, iii. 31. 4.

prādeṣamātra, iii. 33. 5.

Prāśraya, see Plakṣa P.

Prapūṛṣa-pāda *Vāraṣyā, iiii. 41. 1 e.

vyādā (causat.), i. 8. 12.


plu + ā, ii. 2. 9.

plu + ni, i. 56. 7-9.

plu + parā, i. 56. 4.

plu + pra, iv. 11. 10.

plu + sam (cause.), i. 36. 1.

Baka Dābhvya, i. 9. 3 ; iv. 7. 2.

bandhūtā, i. 59. 10.

Bamba *Ajadeśa, i. 7. 2, 6.

baivāhana, iv. 24. 9 (bis).

baivardā, i. 4. 3.

bahigpavamāna, i. 5. 6 ; iii. 5. 5.

bahuṇputra, ii. 5. 11 ; 9. 10.

bahuṇa, iii. 20. 2.

bahuṇca, i. 4. 2.

Bābhravaya, see Ārikka B.

bimba, iii. 5. 6.

bila, ii. 21. 3.

bhyant (līm. -hauti), ii. 2. 5.

braḍhina, i. 13. 7.

brahmaṭa, i. 15. 2.

Brahmadatta Cākṣitāneya, i. 38. 1 ; 59. 1.

brahmā, i. 1. 8 ; 25. 10 ; 26. 8 ; 38.

2 ; 40. 3 ; ii. 18. 1, 2 ; ii. 4. 5, 9 ;

15. 2, 3 ; 16. 5, 6 ; 17. 1 ff. ; 28. 1.

2 ; 33. 4, 7 ; 38. 1, 2 ; iv. 14. 1 ;

18. 5 ff. ; 19. 1 ; 20. 1, 2 ; 21. 1

ff. ; 24. 11 ; 25. 1 ff.

brahmacyacas, iv. 24. 11.

brahmavacarabāka, i. 37. 6.

brahmaśandī, iv. 24. 10 (ter).

brahmanakula, iii. 38. 4.

brahmāyabhatta, i. 10. 1.

brahmaṇi, iii. 4. 5, 9 ; 21. 7 (b.

upaniṣad).

bha (exclam.) i. 4. 2 ff.

bhakāra, iv. 14. 2.

Bhagärtha Aṇēkārva, iv. 6. 1, 2.

bhadrā, i. 46. 2, 3.

bhandunānt (mat sāma), iii. 6. 6.

bhara (epith. of the moon), iii. 27.

bhara (epith. of the moon), iii. 27.

11.

bharayākiṣṇa (?), i. 54. 2.

bhāṣ bhāś, iii. 39. 1.

bhā, iii. 10. 10 (or bhāś ?).

Bhāalla, see Prāṛṭa B.

Bhāllabī (plur.), iv. 4. 7.

bhāvant, i. 43. 11.

bhīma, i. 57. 1.

bhīma, i. 57. 1 (bis).

bhīvaṇādi, iii. 17. 6, 7.

bhūvas, i. 1. 4 ; 28. 6 ; iv. 28. 2.

bhū+ anu, i. 54. 7 ; iv. 12. 6.

bhū + anu-vi, iv. 12. 10 ; 14. 4.

bhū + adhi, i. 55. 1 (bis).

bhūtochar, ii. 3. 4, 11.

bhūti, ii. 4. 7 (bis) ; iii. 20. 8, 11 ; 21.

5 : 27. 3, 12.

bhūman, i. 46. 1.

bhūr bhūvas, iv. 28. 4.

bhūr bhūvas svar, ii. 9. 3, 7 ; iii. 17.

2 ; 18. 4 ; iv. 5. 5 ; 28. 6.

bhūrihāra, i. 10. 9, 10.

bhūs, i. 1. 8 ; 28. 6 ; iv. 28. 1.

bhūga, i. 35. 7.

bhūrya, iii. 16. 5 (bis) ; 17. 1.

bhṛṣṭa, iii. 16. 7 (bis).

madhūdhāna, i. 22. 1.

madhūndā, i. 32. 1.

madhuparka, i. 59. 1-3, 11.

madhuputra, i. 55. 1.
moda, iii. 25. 4.

yakṣma (rājan), iv. 1. 8.

yajurveda, i. 1. 4 ; iii. 15. 7, 8.

yajuveśas, iii. 17. 1.

yajñākāma, i. 14. 4.

yathāgīta, i. 55. 18.

yathāyatanam (adv.), i. 18. 3.

yaddevatya, i. 59. 12.

yadvidvānās, iv. 6. 6 ; 7. 4.

yam + vi-ā, i. 37. 5.

yaśasvin, i. 48. 11.

Yaśasvin Jayanta Lauhitya, iii. 42. 1 v.

yajas + ‘pratij (conject.), i. 5. 7.

yātayaman, i. 38. 6.

yāvadāvāsa, ii. 12. 6.

yāyu + pra, i. 8. 11 (bis).

yukti, iii. 5. 4.

yūj + pra, iv. 6. 7 ; 7. 5.

rajatamaya, iv. 1. 5.

‘rāpasu (?), iii. 2. 4, 15.

rahasi (adv.), ii. 13. 5.

rajakula, ii. 38. 4.

Rāma ‘Krītijñāteya Vaiyāghrapad-ya, iii. 40. 2 v ; iv. 16. 1 v.

yṛṣu, iii. 27. 2 (bis).

yṛu + ‘sam-ud, iii. 3. 1.

retasvin, i. 43. 11.

reśman, i. 2. 6.

raśthi, i. 50. 7 ; 57. 1.

roḍhasi, i. 25. 5.

Rāupya, a demon (quot.), i. 29. 7, 10.

vlabh + ina, iii. 29. 7 ; 30. 1.

loji, i. 8. 11.

śī, i. 45. 4 ; 51. 3 : 54. 3 ; 58. 7 ;

iii. 37. 6.

lokajit, iii. 20. 10.

loma [-saman ?], i. 38. 3.

lomāca, i. 38. 3.

loṭa, i. 7. 6 ; 60. 8 ; ii. 3. 12, 13.

loθamaya, iv. 1. 4.

lōhāyasa, iii. 17. 3 (bis).

lohitastoka, iii. 9. 2.

lohitāyā, i. 12. 4 ; iv. 5. 1 : 10. 10.

Lauhitya, see Kṛṣṇadatta L., Kṛṣ- narāta L., Jayaka L., Triveda

Kṛṣṇarāta L., Dakṣajayanta L.,

Palligupta L., Mitrabhūti L.,
Yācasaṁ Jayanta L., Vīpācaṁit Dṛḍhajayanta L., Vāipācaṁit Dārśhajayanti Gupta L., Vāi-
pačita Dārśhajayanti Dṛḍha-
jayanta L., ČyāmaJayanta L., Čyāmaṣajayanta L., Satyaca-
ra Vas L.

vad (intens.), iii. 16. 3, 5.

vad + apa, iii. 7. 5.
vana (conjct.), iii. 31. 3.

vānuṣapariṣatana, i. 10. 1.

vartani, iii. 16. 1-3.

vānapariṣitra, i. 10. 1.
vārṣuka, i. 36. 2.
vāga, i. 51. 10.
vāga (ke rp), ii. 4. 1, 2.

vāṣṭ, iii. 17. 4; vāṣṭkāra, i. 54. 8.

vēras + vi (adv. locat. of pple), iv. 5. 1.

vāsanta (adv.), i. 35. 2.

Vāsiṁtha, iii. 2. 13; 15. 2; 18. 6 (bis), 7. Cfr. vāsiṁtha.

vāda + aha, iii. 21. 2 (bis).

vākprabhūta, i. 10. 1.

vāgdevatya, i. 59. 14.

vāsimaya, i. 28. 3.

vāc (one of the five vyārthis), ii. 9. 3, 6 (exclam.), iii. 10. 10; 14. 9.

vācanyama, iii. 18. 6.

Vārāki, see Kaṁsa V.

Vāraka, see Kāṁsa V., Kubera V.,

Janavatsa V., Jayanta V., Pras-
thaṇḍa V.

Vāraṇa, see Aikaraṇa V., Gobala V.

vāsiṁtha, ii. 15. 2.

Vāsiṁtha Čaikītanaya, i. 42. 1.

Vāhneya, see āvasa V. Kācyapa.

vij + prati (conjct.), i. 10. 5 (bis).

vīda + anu ("asent."); iii. 10. 1.

Vīpācaṁit Dṛḍhajayanta Lāhūtya, i. 42. 1 v.

Vīpācaṁit ākunimita Pārāçarya, i. 41. 1 v.

vīpra (conjct.), i. 53. 8.

vīhā, iii. 27. 2.

vīhāti, i. 20. 6; 21. 1; 42. 8.

vīhūtimant, i. 43. 11.
čatavant, i. 50. 4–7.
Čaśva, iv. 10. 10.
Čaryāta Mānava, ii. 7. 1 ; 8. 3. 5.
Čāṅgavani, i. 6. 2 ; 30. 1 ; ii. 2. 8 ;
4. 8 ; 9. 10 ; iii. 18. 6 ; 28. 5 ; iv.
16. 1 v ; 17. 1 v.

see Čaṇḍa Č. Ātreya.

(Śaṅkīṇā, see Śuyoja Č. Čaṇḍācī, iv. 3. 2.

cañćitam, i. 48. 11.

cāmāḷapariya (dual), i. 38. 4.

Śālāvāya, i. 38. 4.

ciṭhula, iv. 22. 13.

cukra, iii. 15. 6, 7 (bis). 8 (bis), 9.

(ukra (a Jābála), iii. 7. 7.

vṛṣa + ’ud- (pple.) iv. 1. 7.

vāraka (”dimin.”), iii. 9. 9.

guṇa, i. 57. 6.

(āśāna (plur.), i. 2. 3 ; ii. 4. 6.

see Pāṛṣaya Č., Śucita Č.

(Śaḍānaka, i. 59. 2.

see Indrata Č. Dvārāpa Č.

Drīti Āndroti Č.

(Śaḍānaka Kāpoja, iii. i. 21.

śmati, i. 38. 8 ; (conject.), iii.
31. 8.

*Śāyaṇajayanta Lāhuhiya (two per-
sons of this name), iii. 42. 1 v.

*Śāyaṇasajayanta Lāhuhiya, iii. 42.
1 v.

*Śāyaṇavājana, see Devataras Č.

Kācārya.

(Śāyaṇa, see Īśa Č.

cīrīmanta, i. 48. 11.

vṛṣa + ’ud (causat.), iv. 7. 3.

vṛṣa + ūrī- (causat.), iv. 7. 3.

vṛṣa + ūrī-upa, i. 38. 3.

(Šuṣa Vāhneya Kācārya, iii. 40.
1 v.

ciraśhāta, iv. 11. 3.

crotamāya, i. 28. 9.

vṛṣiš + ’ud, ii. 9. 8.

ciśman, iii. 17. 3.

(vajani (a Vāciya), iii. 5. 2.

cvetācya, iv. 1. 1.

*sahapatra, ii. 5. 7.

śoḍaṇapata, iv. 2. 11 (bis).

vṛṣaṇiv + ’adhi, i. 50. 3.

*sahgarakāla, iv. 10. 10, 13.

sahgrahīta, iii. 7. 8 ; 8. 8.

sahveca, iv. 10. 10.

sahacca, ii. 11. 18, 14.

sahava, i. 9. 3.

sahāthā, i. 20. 6 ; 21. 4.

sahapanca, iv. 26. 7.

sajāta, i. 46. 2 ; 48. 3.

sajñātavanasya, iv. 5. 4.

vṛṣaṇi + ’adhi, ii. 15. 2.

satanu, iv. 8. 9 ; 9. 9 ; 10. 8, 9.

Śatayajñī Pāṇaśita, i. 39. 1.

Śatayajñī Pāṇula Prāciṇavagya, 
iii. 40. 1 v.

Śatayogavas Lāhuhiya, iii. 42. 1 v.

*Śatayohita Kārttvarathi, i. 39. 1.

vṛṣi + ’ud, iii. 14. 6.

sadas, i. 54. 3 (ter), 5 (bis).

saptakṛtvas, iii. 34. 4.

saptapantra, ii. 5. 8.

saptarāṣṭri (quot.), i. 28. 2.

saptavādyā (asamāma), i. 31. 3 (bis):

iii. 34. 4.

sabhā, ii. 11. 13, 14.

*samānabhuddha (?), iv. 1. 1.

samapati, i. 46. 2, 4.

sampat, iii. 27. 2 ; iv. 8, 9.

sampratī, i. 5. 5 : 45. 3 ; iii. 31. 2.

sambūhi, iii. 20. 3, 11 ; 21. 5 ; 27. 3,
12.

sambhūti, i. 46. 3, 6 ; ii. 4. 5 (bis):

iv. 7. 4 (bis).

sarvas, i. 25. 5.

sarvaśāva, iv. 20. 6, 10.

sarvatodvāra (asamāma), i. 30. 2, 3.

sarvaçāryačītta, i. 17. 3.

saranārtya, iv. 9. 9 ; 10. 8, 9, 18.

saranārtha, i. 27. 6 (bis).

*sahasrapatra, ii. 6. 11 (bis).

sahrasaka, i. 10. 1.

śaṅga, iii. 3. 8, 5 ; iv. 8, 9 ; 9. 9 :

10. 8, 9, 13.

Śātyaki, see Kṛṣṇadhrīti S.

Śātyokara (plur.), iii. 32. 1.

see Anuvakti S.

Śātyajñī (plur.), ii. 4. 5.

see Somaçāma S. Prācina-

vyagya.

śāmasa, iii. 17. 1.
sāman, see ananvita, anisēdha,
abhrātrya, ekavāka, devaçrut
bandhumant, loma, saptavidhab
sarvatodvāra.

3. sāman (masc.), i. 34. 11.
sāmanvin, i. 48. 11.
sāmapatha, i. 6. 1.
sānaveda, i. 1. 5; iii. 15. 7, 8.
sānavāiṇya, i. 59. 3, 12.
Śaṅcarvasana, see Muñja S.
sāmi (with genit.), iv. 2. 11.
Śāyaka Jānaçruteya Kāṇḍīviya, iii.
   40. 2 v.
* sic + 'vi-ā, see avyāskta.
* sukṛtarasa, iii. 14. 6.
* Sucitā Čaitāna, i. 14. 4.
Śudakṣiṇa, iii. 7. 8; 8. 6 (see Śudakṣiṇa Kaṭāmī).
Śudakṣiṇa Kaṭāmī, iii. 6. 3; 7. 1,
   4, 5, 6 (see Śudakṣiṇa).
Śuddatta Pārāçarya, iv. 41. 1 v;
   iv. 17. 1 v.
śudhā, i. 14. 6.
* sūmanÇayavid, iv. 6. 6; 7. 4 (bis).
Suyājña (āyajña, iv. 17. 1.
śugama, iii. 8. 4.
śvārā, iii. 14. 3, 4.
śuvargā, iii. 14. 4.
śuvargā (epith. of hiraya), iii.
   34. 6.
śuvarṣamaya, iv. 1. 6.
śukotr, iv. 6. 6; 7. 4 (bis).
śukti, iii. 4. 1-3.
śuci, i. 10. 3.
śūgdātṛ, iv. 6. 6; 7. 4 (bis).
*sūñurūpa (?), iii. 2. 15.
śr + abhi-pra ('ind. of causat.,
   ii. 14. 4.
śr + pra ('approach'), iii. 29. 3.
sopāna, iii. 8. 7.
*Somañavrāṣtpati (dual), i. 58. 9.
Somaçūṣma Śatāyajñī Prācina-
yogya, iii. 40. 2 v.
stana, iii. 14. 7.
śtvu ('sing the stotra'), i. 59. 12.
śtva pra, i. 17. 2; ii. 2. 9; iv. 9.
   4; 10. 2, 12.
śtvu + sam, iv. 6. 7; 7. 5 (bis).
* stutacāstra (plur.), iii. 16. 6.
stotra, iii. 3. 1.
stotriya, iii. 4. 1-3.
stobha, i. 20. 6; 31. 5; 57. 5.
stoma, i. 13. 3; iii. 4. 11; 5. 4.
stomabhāga, iii. 8. 1, 2.
*stomavat, i. 43. 11.
sthali, ii. 7. 1.
śvēḥ + 'anu-ṛpa, i. 46. 3-5; 47.
   1-7; 48. 1-6.
sthāyu, i. 18. 5, 6.
sthiti, iii. 18. 7.
śvṛ, śṛṝāti, iv. 9. 9; 10. 1-8.
śvṛṛ + ni, ii. 12. 1.
śvyand + vi, i. 10. 5.
śvaj + part, iii. 29. 7.
svadhavyu, iv. 6. 6; 7. 4 (bis).
svayambhā, iv. 11. 2.
svair, i. 1. 5; 23. 6; iv. 28. 5.
śvair + anu, iv. 14. 2.
śvair + abhī, i. 31. 10, 11.
*svarapakṣa, iii. 13. 10.
*svaragnaraka (plur.), iv. 25. 5.
svarya, iii. 33. 5, 6.
svaśriya, iii. 29. 1.
*svarākāravasākāra (dual), i. 13. 3.
śvan (desid. pple.), iv. 1. 7.
hantā (exclam.), iii. 6. 1, 4.
haras, i. 21. 7; ii. 3. 1.
*harihastṛpa (?), iv. 1. 1.
*harinīlā, iv. 1. 1.
*hasa, iii. 25. 8.
śvā ṛ + pra, iii. 31. 3; (pple.), i.
   25. 5.
hiṅkāra, 1. 3. 7; 4. 1. 6, 8; 11. 5;
   12. 4, 7, 9; 13. 8, 5; 19. 2; 21. 7;
   31. 2, 3; 39. 3, 5, 9, 10; 84. 1;
   35. 3; 36. 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9; 38. 6;
   54. 8; 57. 5; 58. 9; 59. 4; iii. 12.
   2, 3; 34. 2.
*hiṅkar, i. 3. 4; 4. 1, 6; ii. 2. 9; iii.
   34. 2; iv. 10. 1, 11; (intens. pple.),
   i. 11. 5; 35. 2.
him bha, i. 4. 1.
him bhā ord, i. 4. 6.
him vo, i. 4. 8.
*hirunyadanta, iii. 2. 4, 15.
hum, iii. 10. 10.
hum bāg, iii. 10. 8.
II. Oertel,

Etymologies, etc.

aksara: vêk̪ar, i. 34. 1; 48. 8.
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)k̪i, i. 24. 2; 48. 8.
antarikṣa: antaḥ, antaryāka, i.
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)nta, 20. 4.
Aṣṭaka: ayam + āṣya, ii. 8. 7;
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)ṣya, 11. 8.
arkya: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)r + ka, iv. 23. 4.
asa: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)sa, 40. 7.
asa: asu + 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)ram, iii. 35. 8.
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)nigirasa: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)ṅga + 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)ra, ii. 11. 9.
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)di: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)dd + ā, i. 11. 7.
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)d̥ha + ā, i. 19. 2.
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)d̥tya: \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)d̥t + ā, iv. 2. 9.
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)avarta: \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)vṛt + ā, iii. 33. 7.
uras: uru, iv. 24. 2.
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)c: \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)c, i. 15. 6.
gāyatra: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)gâyam 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)tr̥yata, iii. 38. 4.
devaśrut: devatā̄ + 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)cru, i. 14. 3.
pataṅga: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)pa + 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)nga, iii. 35. 2.
pacṣāta: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)pac, i. 56. 6.
pratiśāra: \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)ṛh + prati, i. 11. 9.
pradāma, pradāmi: prā + 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)ṣman, i. 15. 4.
prastāva: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)stu, i. 11. 6.
Bṛhaspati: (vāco) bṛhatādī pati, ii. 2. 5.
bhimala: bhima + mala, i. 57. 1.
madhuputra: mad adhyabhūt, i. 55. 1.
mahiyā: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)māhi, i. 48. 5.
Rudra: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)rud, iv. 2. 6.
rodasi: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)rud, i. 82. 4.
Vasū: Vasi, iv. 2. 8.
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)vācyāmitra: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)vīc + mitra, iii. 3. 6.
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)tatasani: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)lam + 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)snu, i. 50. 4 ff.
sajāta: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)jan + 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)saha, i. 48. 3.
samudra: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)dru + 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)sam, i. 25. 4.
sāmāna: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)i + sām, i. 33. 7; 40. 6;
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)sama, i. 12. 5.
sā + 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)ama, i. 53. 5; 56. 2; 28. 3.
sindhu: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)st, i. 29. 2.
suvarga: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)var + 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)gam, iii. 14. 4.
hari: 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)ṛ, i. 44. 5.

III.

Grammatical.

The Grantha characters are liable to confuse ps and va, tlu and kta, 
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)ra and ra, \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)th and \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)dh, \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)dh and \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)y, also long and short vowels, especially \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)u and \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)a. There is no distinction made between mma and mma. No 
avagraha is used.

Linguual \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)n for \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)n: see note to i. 1. 5.
Confusion of i-stems and i-stems:

uv, v, tanuve, iv. 3. 2 (verse); suwar,
Locat. of stems in -an without end-
in; as sāman, i. 21. 8; 58. 4:
\(\text{\textit{ā}}\)ka, i. 41. 7; 48. 9.

Numerals: see note on i. 10. 4;
sahasraḥ saptatī = 70000.

Verbs: \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)pr, pres. \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)prati, see note
on iv. 9. 9; \(\text{\textit{ā}}\)dhūj according to
a-conjugation, ii. 10. 4 ff.; 'yāt, irregular imperfecta samātāt, i. 48. 7 (see note) and anvātāt, iii. 38. 10; 'yātī, precative āsciyāt, i. 3. 8 (see note); 'yātā + pari-ā, past pple paryādatta and paryātta side by side, ii. 8; 'yātī, 8d. sing. pres. 'yaye, i. 35. 7; periphrastic future with plural of pple: śaṁcānāni bhavitāraḥ, gāṝāraṁ smaḥ, i. 38. 8; transitive use of passive sorist in -ṛ (ʔ), iii. 9. 9 (see note); adverbal gerund, upāpapatām, i. 11. 7.

Composition: niḥkṣaṇa-kṛta for -niḥkṛta, i. 35. 6 (see note); apposition instead of composition: pāpaṁ naṁyaṅgah, i. 45. 5; ii. 12. 1, 2; iii. 37. 7 (bis).

Syntax: Superfluous u: teno, i. 1. 8; 6. 6; 9. 4; 33. 11; 34. 2, etc.; genit. of time, i. 44. 9; dative of the infinitive after 'yātrā, ii. 15. 8; kām after dat. infin., i. 45. 2 (verse); 'yāṛā with accusative, i. 37. 8 ff.; 'yvraç + a with ablative, i. 19. 3; i. 37. 9; 58. 10; locat. absolute of pple: ādapati, iii. 32. 7; upatapati, iv. 2. 11; tvuṣṭ, iv. 5. 1; verb in plural after caturvīnちょっと, i. 17. 2; iii. 38. 9.

IV.

1. Verses.

[patañgam aktaṁ, iii. 35. 1: RV. x. 177. 1, etc.]

[patan̄ga vácam manuṣāṁ, iii. 36. 2: RV. x. 177. 2, etc.]

[mai 'dāṁ manye bhūvanādi, iii. 17. 6.]

[mahātmānaṁ caturu devaṁ, iii. 2. 2: cf. Chānd. U. iv. 3. 6.]

[yad dyāva indra te caṁtam, i. 32. 1: RV. viii. 70. 5 (SV. i. 378; ii. 212.), etc.]

[yas saptaṁ śaṁyaṁ tvābhass, i. 29. 7: RV. ii. 12. 12, etc.]

[ye ṣamalya paṁpitchā, iv. 3. 3: TS. v. 5. 7. 4. 5; VS. xviii. 67.]

[ye bhūṁ viṁśata, i. 34. 6: AV. x. 8. 35.]

[rūpaṁ-rūpaṁ pratirūpo, i. 44. 1: RV. vi. 47. 18.]

[rūpaṁ-rūpaṁ mahātvam, i. 44. 6: RV. iii. 58. 8.]

[sa no mayābhū, iv. 3. 2.]

[sa yuddā vaṁ miṇyate, i. 4. 7.]

[strī 'smāra 'yā 'gre, i. 56. 5.]

[sthitā dīvastambhanī, i. 10. 9, repeated in 10, but different in d.]

[navo-navaṁ bhavaṁ jāyamānaṁ, i. 27. 11, Vedic allusion: see note.]
2. YAJUSES, ETC.

abhijid asy abhijayyāsam, iii. 20. prāṇās prāṇās prāṇās hum bhā ovo, ii. 2. 7.
amo 'ham asmi (longer version), i. mahān mahād samadhatta, iii. 4. 5.
54. 6; (abbreviated), 57. 4. yat purastād vāsi 'ndro, iii. 21. 1.
aranyasya vatsa 'si, iv. 4. 1. vibhūḥ purastāt sampat pačāt,
udvartadham, iii. 19. 1; 34. 2. iii. 27. 2.
guha 'si devo 'si, iii. 20. 1.
dīgas stha çotram, i. 22. 6.
devana sauvirā pranūtāḥ, iii. 18. 3, 6.
puruṣah prajāpatis sāma, i. 49. 3, svetāvo dārçalo harinilo 'si, iv.
4 (bis).

CORRECTIONS.

P. 81. (Text) i. 1. 8, read aśṭaçaphāḥ for aśṭaçāphāḥ.
P. 85. (Text) i. 5. 1, read akar ne for akar ne.
   (Translation) i. 5. 7, add "after burns.
P. 86. (Translation) i. 6. 1, add "after immortality.
P. 87. (Text) i. 7. 6, read losṭo for losṭha, and cancel note '.
P. 115. (Translation) i. 57. 5, read further on for above (?)
P. 123. (Notes) 44, read rūpam-rūpam for rūpam-rūpam.
P. 182. (Translation) i. 54. 8, read three times [rc] for [ágá ñ]
P. 140. (Text) i. 60. 8, read losṭo for losṭha, and cancel note 16.
P. 145. (Text) ii. 63. 12, 13, read losṭo for losṭha, and cancel note 30.
P. 148. (Translation) ii. 66 (end), insert 14 before He who.
P. 154. (Notes) 11, read -āh for aḥ.
P. 164. (Translation) iii. 5, line 6, read + instead of s.
P. 166. (Text) iii. 6, line 4, read + instead of s.
P. 168. (Notes) 94, read -yaj- for yaj-.
P. 176. (Translation), iii. 16. 6, read brahmaṇ-priest for Brāhmaṇ priest.
P. 187. (Translation), iii. 27. 11, read Bearer for Burden.
P. 188. (Text) iii. 28. 5, read bahu vyāhito for bahuvyāhito.
   (Notes) 29, read -āɪɛr for āɪɛr.
P. 201. (Translation) iv. 2. 2, read gāyatṛi for gāyatri.
   (Notes) 14, supply ayāny.
P. 216. (Text) iv. 19. 2, read su for sv.
P. 227. line 13, read ativyādhi for ativiyadhi.
P. 237. line 43, read kiṃcā 'pi yo for kiṃcā 'p iyo.
P. 248. col. 1, line 42 and col. 2, line 47, read 2 v for 1 v.
ARTICLE V.

IBRAHIM OF MOSUL: A STUDY IN ARABIC LITERARY TRADITION.

BY FRANK DYER CHESTER, Ph.D.,
ASSISTANT IN SEMITIC LANGUAGES IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Presented to the Society March, 1894.

One of the most fascinating characters in the history of the Bagdad caliphate is Ibrahim of Mosul (Ibrāhīm al-Mausull), the foremost singer and composer in the reign of that celebrated despot, Hārūn ar-Rashīd. As a boon companion and prime favorite, he became the repository of confidence both for the caliph and for his erstwhile Barmecide viziers. Hence the importance and interest attaching to traditions which relate to him and his affairs, and have been handed down through his family line or the schools of music and literature. They still lie numerously imbedded in the various histories, in the Kitāb al-Agānī—a work which I class by its contents as a musico-biographical encyclopaedia and from which Ibn Hallikān derived much of his memoiristic information—and in the host of anthological productions still extant.

The outward details of his life have been summed up very briefly by Kosegarten; at greater length, and from several sources, by Hammer-Purgstall,† who made good use of the Gotha epitome known as the Moṭṭār al-Agānī; also by Ahlwartdt,‡ who paid more attention than the former to the inner historical and artistic development of the period; and finally by Caussin de Perceval,§ entirely on the basis of the unabridged "Book of Songs" as contained in the Paris MS. But these scholars merely cited the traditions which they found, or translated them, sometimes literally, sometimes freely, according to

---

† Literaturgesch. der Araber, iii. 769 ff.
‡ Vorwort to his Divān des Abu Novās, p. 18.
§ Journal Asiatique (1878), 7e série, ii. 546, in an article posthumously published.
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taste, as if an examination of their correlation and interdependence were uncalled for, or even unnecessary. Therefore, in the following study of a couple of coincident traditions found in two or more of the sources, a stricter critical treatment will be attempted, in the hope of thereby bringing out new facts respecting the sources themselves.∗

A good opportunity for comparative work offers itself in the three versions (I am informed that there is at least one other) of the story of Ibrahim and the Devil, a conspectus of two of which is appended below. This tradition is reported by the Kitāb al-Aghānī in Ibrahim’s own words, as they purport to have been repeated to his son Ishāk, by him to his son Ḥammād, and by the latter to Mūḥammad ibn Māzyad,† who passed it on to Al-Īsbaḥānī, the author of the Aghānī.‡ Yet it is identical with the anecdote in the Thousand and One Nights, entitled “Story of Abu Ishāk an-Nadīm Ibrahim al-Mausulī (and his adventure) with Abu Mūrra.”§ Burton, of course, translates the latter form of the story, and in a note he criticises his predecessor, Lane, for failing to perceive its existence in the body of the Nights, and giving only an abstract of it from another source.|| But Burton himself mistook in supposing that that source could have been Al-Maṣʿūdī (“French translation, vol. vi., p. 340”); for the passage cited relates the appearance of the Devil to Ishāk, his son (also known as Al-Mausulī), in the palace of the caliph, not in his own home.¶ Hence the footnotes in which Burton calls attention to its differing characteristics help little in the study of the story of Ibrahim and the Devil. His alternative, that Lane borrowed from the Ḥalba(t) al-Kumeit, is of course the correct one.**

This anthology was written by Shams ad-Dīn an-Nawwāb (d. 1455 A. D.). Although I have had no access to its text, I perceive from Lane’s abstract, which is often literal, that its version stands midway between that of the Aghānī and that of the Nights. Its description of the Devil’s disguise agrees with the details given in the former, while its use of the appellative Abu Murra in speaking of the Devil accords with the latter. There are also other agreements with the Aghānī account. The story, however, received an addition or two: e. g. the statement that Ar-Rashīd, after appointing Saturday for the “day off,” gave Ibrahim two thousand dinārs.

∗ Cf. some remarks by Derenbourg in the Revue Critique (1888), no. 15.
† Also known by his surname Ibn Abi-l-Azhar (cf. Aghānī, v. 96 below middle; at the conclusion of this story, v. 98, incorrectly Ibn al-Azhar).
§ So Macnaghten. But Cairo ed. (1802 A. H.) iii. p. 163 has Iblis for Abu Murra.
¶ Perhaps the index to Al-Maṣʿūdī (vol. vi.) misled him. It makes the same blunder.
** Cf. Lane, i. c., i. 224, footnote *.
But the version in the Thousand and One Nights is considerably shortened from the original form of the story, and toned down to a mere tale. This is shown by the numerous blanks in the right hand column of the parallel translations below.*

The first point of difference in the Nights as regards subject-matter is the entire absence of the slave-girls from the first part of the story. Then again Ibrahim has a plurality of doorkeepers, but no chamberlains. Harun makes no pithy remarks, either at the beginning or at the end (the wish excepted). The unwelcome sheikh wears one tunic and white garments instead of two tunics and short boots. The style of his cap varies, but the species of his perfumery is unnoticed. He is less discourteous, and by no means sarcastic, in his first request for a song. The insult contained in his compliment is less distinctly emphasized, so much less that the name Ibrahim is actually not employed.† Abu Ishāk sings only twice; and no allusion is made to his great care in singing to the caliph, † perhaps the most delicate touch of the story. The first two of the Devil's songs vary slightly in vocabulary, probably on account of bad copying; but the third song has received an additional couplet, as well as a rearrangement of lines.† The musical technicality or reference to the māḥārī metre of the third song is dropped, showing that the design of this narrative, which was originally to explain how Ibrahim became famous for the use of that metre, had been exchanged for the mere desire to relate a sensational anecdote. Ibrahim's reflections on his way to inform the caliph of his experience are also omitted; and his present, instead of being delivered for him, is taken by him.

Now all these differences in the trend and wording of the story go to show that the version in the Thousand and One Nights is a free borrowing from some written biographical source. That it is not a form corrupted by the repetitions of story-tellers is evident, I think, from the remarkably long verbal agreements with the text of the Ağānî, a work which belongs back in the tenth century. Yet it must be later than the version in the Halba(t) al-Kumeit (used by Lane), for reasons already given, and therefore subsequent to 1450 A.D. The minor differences of vocabulary and turns of phrase are probably due to the careless copying of the Nights during the three or four centuries of its history.

---

* In my translations, when the words or constructions differ in the originals, the English renderings vary to correspond.
† So Macnaghten and Cairo eds. Ṣalḥānī (Beirut, 5 vols.), however, "Ibrahim."
‡ In one case (اذًا ذي أنانًا), the Nights has a more apposite reading. But the Bulak text of the Ağānî may be at fault. It would be interesting to collate all the MSS. on this passage (v. 38, top).
§ Particularly its disagreement in the details of the Devil's disguise.
The question now arises, what reason is there for the existence of this anecdote in the Nights? It must be answered that, so far as it is concerned, Lane seems to be correct in his surmise that, just as the old groundwork of the Thousand and One Nights (the Persian work entitled the "Thousand Nights") became by the addition of tales of Arab origin—*the least portion of the collection, so the anecdotes—especially the thirteen extending from the 680th to the 698th night,† of which "Ibrahim of Mosul and the Devil" is the seventh—were borrowed from older books, more classical in style, modernized, and inserted to supply lost portions or augment the original series of stories.† It is Lane’s opinion, however, that the borrowing was by means of oral communication for a number of years before the written work, the Thousand and One Nights, appeared. It seems more probable, from what has been said up to this point, that the borrowing was made through a chain of written sources. Furthermore, though this story of Ibrahim was shortened, most of the other twelve anecdotes were probably lengthened and developed, as it were, from sober tradition into the freer form of fiction. At least one of them, the fourth in order, entitled "Story of Yûnus the Scribe (and his adventure) with Al-Walid ibn Sahîl," exhibits such a history. For the basis of it is to be found in the Kitâb al-Âgâni, in the biography of Yûnus. Likewise the “Story of Jamîl ibn Ma’mar (told) to Hârûn ar-Rashîd,” the eighth of these anecdotes, describes a scene, though not the incidents, of one of the traditions adduced on authority in the biography of Jamîl.§ The story of Ibrahim and the Devil, having many parallels in the ana of other Arab singers who endeavored to mystify their patrons respecting their sources of musical inspiration, requires little comment here upon its unhistorical nature as a story. There are two accounts of an appearance of the Devil to his son Ishâk; the one in the Nights (the eleventh anecdote of the thirteen), where a young woman plays an important part in the proceedings; and the other in Al-Mas’ûdi’s Murâtâd-Dahab, so unhappily referred to by Burton. There are also in the Âgâni two accounts of the Devil’s visitation to Ibrahim ibn

---

*Such was the judgment of Hammer-Purgstall: cf. Lane, l. c., iii. 741 middle.
†Cf. Lane, l. c., iii 238 middle.
‡Cf. Lane, l. c., iii. 744 middle; and Burton in his Terminal Essay, ed. Lady B., vi. 285, where, for the words “They end in (two long detective stories),” should be read “They are followed by, etc.”
§Other anecdotes in the Nights are equally traceable to a written source such as the Âgâni. The story of “Isaac of Mosul and the Merchant” (ed. Lady B., iii. 288) should be carefully compared with the version in the Âgâni (v. 126). The Basket-story of Ishâk is, on the other hand, a freer adaptation, doubtless transmitted through an intervening anthology or two, of the story formerly told of his father Ibrahim (see Âgâni, v. 41-2).
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al-Mahdi,* a story of Ibn Jâmi', who was not of Persian but of good Kôreishite birth, inspired by a ḥijāra,f and a story of Môhâriq, Ibrahim al-Masulî's favorite pupil, surprised by a vision of Iblis in the form of an old sheikh.† Under the same category of weird stories come the traditions, also found in the Agânî, that one of Ishâk's most famous melodies was learned from cackling geese,§ and that his father Ibrahim one night, in a grotto belonging to his estate, enjoyed a secret opportunity to plagiarize on the efforts of two miauling cats.‖ It must not be supposed, however, that educated persons of the tenth century, among whom one would certainly class the author of the Agânî, believed in the truth of these narratives. With acumen Al-Iṣbahâni says, at the close of the account of Ibrahim and the Devil: "Thus am I informed of this story by Ibn al-Azhâr (Ibn Abî-l-Azhâr). I do not know what to say about it. Perhaps Ibrahim made up this tale to gain esteem by it; or it was made up and told about him, though a foundation for the story is (afforded by the following), which is more like the truth of it." Thereupon he details a tradition, according to which Ibrahim dreamed that a man met him and opportunely suggested that he set some words of the poet Dâr-Rimma (= "the of the withered limb," not Dâr-Runma), to the amazingly fine new melody which he had just composed in the mûhârî metre. But, though the idea that Ibrahim had a dream is more natural than that an apparition came to him in broad daylight, it should be noted that in the latter event he was taught a mûhârî tune, apparently the first one of the kind known to him, while in the former he is inspired with words for that tune. The stories therefore do not hang together, and in so far both must be pronounced fictitious. The possibility suggests itself merely that Harûn was minded to play Ibrahim a trick some day when he had let him off from court functions; and whether he initiated him in the mûhârî metre or not matters little, the point of interest being that he once upon a time showed himself a well-disguised, witty, and artistic Devil.

Another tradition worthy of study occurs in Al-Iṣbahâni's biography of Ibrahim. It concerns an event which happened at a time in Ibrahim's life earlier than that in which the one just treated is supposed to have occurred.

At the death of Harûn's father, the caliph Al-Mahdi, in the year 785 A. D., Ibrahim, then forty or more years of age, was beginning to leave behind his older competitors in the art of singing, among whom were Yahyâ ibn Mârzûk (al-Makkî) and Ibn

---

† Cf. Caussin de Perceval, l. c., p. 542, and Agânî vi. 71 top.
‡ See Brûnnow's vol. xxxi. of the Agânî, p. 282.
§ Agânî, v. 99 middle.
‖ Agânî, v. 20 bottom.
Jâmiʿ, and to stand forth conspicuously in his profession. His old master Siyâṭ had just died. Meanwhile, Fuleh ibn al-ʿAurâ was ranked of the old school of composers, Ḥakam al-Wâdî was only mediocre in his rendering, Mohammed ar-Raft (az-Zaff ?) was unoriginal, and Moḥârik, ʿAlâwiyya, and Ishâk were yet young and of the new generation. Ibrahim ibn al-Mahdî, the half-brother of Harun, was also but a youth of sixteen, and, according to the orthodox ideas of the Moslems, so hampered by his royal birth as to be incapable of rising higher than the position of a dilettante. The consequence was that Ibrahim al-Mausûlî stepped to the front, and enjoyed a much-coveted familiarity with the ruling monarch, winning through his favor great fame and large rewards for his marked musical powers. Sometimes, however, he must have overstepped the bounds, as a realization of his unique position filled his mind. Accordingly a certain degree of credence may be given to the following account of a musical scéance under the caliph Al-Hâdi. In the "Taʿrîkh ar-Rusul wa-l-Mulâk" of At-Ṭabarî it reads thus:

One day [Ibrahim speaks] we were with Mûsâ [i. e. Al-Hâdi], and Ibn Jâmiʿ and Moʿâd ibn at-Tobeib† were with him (too). It was the first day that Moʿâd had come in to our presence, and Moʿâd was excellent in (singing) songs and well acquainted with some of the old ones. (Al-Hâdi) said: "Whoever of you pleases me (with a song) shall have his choice (of reward)."‡ So Ibn Jâmiʿ sang him a song; but it did not move him. (Now) I understood his desire in songs. So, (when) he said, "Come now, Ibrahim!" I sang to him:

"Suleimâ sometimes holds reunions;
But where are her sweetmeats? where, Oh?"

He was so pleased that he arose from his seat and raised his voice and said "Repeat." So I repeated. Then he said "This is what I like;§ make (your) choice." I said "Commander of the Faithful, the garden of 'Abd al-Malik and its gushing fountain." Then his eyes revolved in his head till they were like two coals and he said: "(You) son of an uncircumcised woman, you desire that the vulgar may hear that you pleased me, and that I gave you your choice and presented you with a fief. By Allah, if your foolishness which conquers your soundness of sense were not (due to) haste, I should strike off that (thing) your tear-fountains¶ are in!" He was silent a while, and I saw the Angel

---

* Series iii. 1, p. 595. ed. Houtsma and Guyard.
† The Agâñî seems to offer nothing respecting this person.
‡ Literally, "Whoever of you pleases me, his choice (shall be) to him." The exact sense of طرب is to tickle the fancy of a person.
§ Literally, "This is my taste."
of Death between me and him, awaiting his command. Then he
called to Ibrahim al-Harrānī and said: “Take this fool by the
hand and lead him into the treasury, and let him take from it
what he will.” So Al-Harrānī took me into the treasury and said
“How much will you take?” I said “One hundred badra.”* He
said “Wait till I consult him.” I said “Then eighty.” He
said “Till I consult him!” Then I knew what he meant, and I
said “Seventy badra for me and thirty for you.” He said
“Now you have it right: go ahead.” So I went away with
seven hundred thousand (dirhams), and the Angel of Death went
away from me.†

That such an incident as this took place in the life of Ibrahim
is made clear by the occurrence of an equally interesting and
ingenuous account in the Agānī.‡ It appears, however, to have
descended (from Ishāk) through a different channel of tradition.
Although agreeing verbally in parts, it varies considerably con-
cerning the circumstances of the occasion. At-Tabari states that
his narrative was told (in his day?) on the authority of Ishāk
“or someone else,” on the authority of Ibrahim, as if it made
little difference to his readers from whom he got hold of it. But
Al-Jabahānī gives a chain of evidence, according to his custom:
“Yaḥyā ibn ‘Alī from his father (‘Alī ibn Yaḥyā), from Ishāk.”
For the benefit of comparison the version in the Agānī is here
translated. After describing the morose and sour-tempered
Al-Hādī, Ishāk is reported to have said:

My father was singing songs to him one day, and he said:
“Sing me the kind of song I like and am pleased with, and you
shall have your choice (of reward).” He said: “Commander of
the Faithful, if Saturn were not in opposition to me with his
cold, I should hope to attain to what is in your mind.” (Ibrahim
said) For I never used to see him give ear to any of the songs.
His attention was (always) to its genealogy and its subtlety (of
expression); and the school of Ibn Sūrejī he praised more highly
than the school of Ma'bad. So I sang to him (this) piece of his:

“Surely a weariness overtakes me at the remembrance of thee;
As the sparrow shakes himself free when the rain-drops moisten
him.”

Thereupon he thrust his hand into the opening of his cuirass and
lowered it an arm-length.§ Then he said: “Well done, by
Allah! (Sing me) more.” So I sang:

“O love for her! increase in me ardor every night;
O carelessness of the days! thy meeting-place is the Judgment Day!”

---

* There is ostensibly a play on this word بَدْرَة ( = haste)
above.
† Literally “from my face.”
‡ Ed. Bulāk v. 16.
§ In his excitement.
Then he thrust his hand into his cuirass and lowered it another arm-length or near it, and said: "(Sing me) more. You villain, well done, by Allah! You must have your choice, Ibrahim." (But) I sang:

"I renounced thee so that 'twas said 'He knows not love.'
And I visited thee so that 'twas said 'He has no patience.'"

Then he raised his voice and said "Well done, my fine fellow! Come, what will you?" I said "My master, the fountain of Marwân in Medina." Then his eyes revolved in his head till they were like two coals, and he said "(You) son of an uncircumcised woman, you desire to publish me in this assembly, so that people may say 'He pleased him and he gave him his choice'; and (you wish) to make me (subject to) talk and report. Ibrahim al-Harrânî, take this fool by the hand, when you go, and lead him into the private treasury. If he take everything in it, let him have it." So I entered and took fifty thousand dinârs.

There is a manifest value in comparing these two narratives of the same remarkable event in Ibrahim's life, aside from the differences which appear in their subject matter. The status of secular tradition in the time of the historian At-Tabarî was evidently that of floating hearsay and inexact testimony, even for the period preceding him by only from a hundred to a hundred and fifty years. On the other hand, the good authority for the account in the Âgânî happens to be very well known in this particular case. The Kitâb al-Fihrist, a bibliography proved from at least four passages within it to have been written in the year 987 A. D., states that 'All ibn Yahyâ (see chain of authorities above) was a contemporary and pupil of Ishâk, and that he wrote a book entitled "History of Ishâk ibn Ibrahim." It also informs us that he died hardly forty years later than Ishâk, and that his son Yahyâ lived until 912 A. D., at which time the author of the Âgânî was a youth of fifteen.† It may be said, therefore, with all probability, that Yahyâ put into Al-Islughânî's hands papers in his possession which contained this story of Ibrahim and Al-Hâdî, if he did not copy it directly from his father's book into his own; for the Fihrist informs us that he also composed a history of Ishâk, a statement which is corroborated in the Âgânî in the biography of Ishâk.‡ Of course it is probable that Yahyâ's father merely heard the story from his celebrated teacher, and may not have written it out entirely as it was told to him. But in any case it was transmitted through a direct line of well-known traditionists to the author of the "Book of Songs."

* Ar. أَخَصَّسَتْ لِلَّيْلِ أَبْوَانَ.
† See ed. Flügel, p. 148. Ibn Hallîkân closely follows the Fihrist in his articles on 'All and his son Yahyâ.
‡ See v. 102 bottom.
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That Aṭ-Ṭabarî, however, gives his little anecdotes on less good authority, there is an indication in his tradition from a certain Al-Karmâni, who related that Al-Ḥâfîd despatched Yaḥyâ ibn Ḥâlid with a ring as token of good-will to Ibrahim al-Muṣûlî for the purpose of bringing him back to court. For, in the later years of Al-Mahdî, Ibrahim had been forced to seek a hiding-place through having violated his oath that he would not associate with his two sons, Mûsâ and Hârûn. But, according to the family tradition, known to Al-Iṣbâhânî directly from Ḥâmmâd, who wrote a history of his grandfather Ibrahim, it was not the Barmecide vizier but the family relatives who brought back the great singer into Al-Ḥâfîd’s presence, where he announced in touching lines of his own composition the sad news of his favorite wife’s decease. Had Ḥâmmâd known that Yaḥyâ the Barmecide was sent after his grandfather on that memorable occasion, he would surely have mentioned the fact with great emphasis; for his family pride—and his father’s, too—was enormous.

In the light of the foregoing remarks it is certainly fair to conclude that the traditionists upon whom Aṭ-Ṭabarî depends were in many cases “outsiders,” speaking from hearsay only, and that they are to be graded below the professional men of music and letters whose schools of tradition preserved authoritative testimony to the history of persons who had formerly been connected with them.

CONSPECTUS.

AGÂNÎ.

I asked Ar-Rashîd that he would give me a day in the week in which he would not send for me for any cause or pretext, that I might be alone therein with my maidsens and my friends.

He granted me Saturday, saying “It is a day I find burdensome, so amuse yourself however you wish.”

So I remained Saturday at home, and ordered the preparation of my meat and drink and whatever I needed, and ordered my doorkeeper, and he shut the doors, and I instructed him not to let anyone in to me.

1001 NIGHTS.

I asked permission of Ar-Rashîd that there might be given me some day for being private with my household and my friends.

He granted me Saturday.

And I went home and began to prepare my meat and drink and whatever was needed, and ordered the doorkeepers to shut the doors and not to permit anyone to come in to me.

*Cf. Agânî, v. 6.
1 So Lane (from Ḥalba(t) al-Kumeit version).
1 Lane here agrees with the Agânî.
1 Lane adds “and he gave me two thousand dinârs.”
4 Ahlwardt (1. c.) freely: “auf den Tag gebe ich nicht viel.”
But while I was in my sitting-room with the women around me and maidens in line before me, behold I was visited by a sheikh of comely and reverend (aspect), clad in white garments and a fine shirt, a kalansura on his head and in his hand a silverhooked staff, and wafting musk until the house and court were filled (with it).

Great annoyance penetrated me at his coming in to me in the face of what I had ordered, (annoyance) such as had never before penetrated me; and I thought to turn away my doorkeeper and chamberlains on his account. But he saluted me in the best fashion, and I returned it and bade him be seated.

So he sat down. Then he began some stories of people and Arab battles and stories and verses, until my anger was gone, and me-thought my servants had sought to please me by admitting one of such good breeding and elegance. Then I said "Are you (inclined) for meat?" He said "I have no want of it." I said "Are you (inclined) for drink?" He said "That is as you wish." So I drank a pint and poured him out the like.

Then he said to me: "Abu Išāk, are you (inclined) to sing us something of your art whereby you have good custom from high and

But while I was in my sitting-room with the harem around me, behold (there appeared) a sheikh of comely and reverend (aspect), clad in white garments and a fine shirt, a teilasān on his head and in his hand a staff with silver handle, and wafting perfume until the court and porch were filled (with it).

Annoyance penetrated me at his coming in to me and I thought to turn away the doorkeepers. But he saluted me in the best fashion, and I returned it and bade him be seated.

So he sat down and began telling me stories of the Arabs and their verses, until my anger left me and methought my servants had sought to please me by admitting one of such good breeding and culture. Then I said "Are you (inclined) for meat?" He said "I have no want of it." I said "And for drink?" He said "That is as you wish." So I drank a pint, and poured him out the like.

Thereupon he said to me: "Abu Išāk, are you (inclined) to sing us something so we may hear of your art wherein you excel high and

For "women," the Āgānī has with masc. pl. verb, the 1001 Nights with fem. pl. verb (all eds.).

1 Burton for teilasān "a doctor’s turban." Lane does not know the form of the kalansura.
3 Lane adds "from his clothes."
4 Lane has "chamberlain" here and at the opening of the story. Ahlwardt refers the "turning off" to the visitor. This may be supported by the reading of the Gotha epitome, which he used.
6 Likewise Lane, "tales of war."
6 Lane "Ibrahim."
8 So Lane.
low?" His speech angered me, but I showed it indifference, took the lute, tried it, then played and sang. He said "Well done, Ibrahim!"

Then my anger increased, and I said: "He is not satisfied with coming in to me without permission and making demands upon me, but must call me by name instead of by surname and addressing me respectfully." Then he said "Will you go on (singing) to us?" I received the insult, took the lute and sang. He said, "Well done, Abu Ishāk! Finish, that we may repay you and sing to you." I took the lute and sang and took pains and completely rose up in what I sang to him, as I had never taken pains and arisen before the caliph or anyone else, because he said to me "I will repay you." He was delighted and said "Well done, my master!"

Then he said "Will you give your servant leave to sing?" I said "As you like," doubting his sense to sing in my presence after what he had heard from me. But he took the lute, tried it, tightened it—and, by Allah, I fancied it was speaking in the Arabic tongue for the beauty of its voice as I heard it. Thereupon he sang:

"I have a wounded heart; who will sell me
For it a heart having no wound (at all)?"

Then he said, "Will you give me leave to sing?" I said "As you like," doubting his sense to sing in my presence after what he had heard from me. But he took the lute, tried it, and, by Allah, I should have fancied the lute was speaking in the pure Arabic tongue, with a sweet murmuring voice. And he began to sing these couplets:

"I have a wounded heart; who will sell me
For it a heart having no wound (at all)?"

1 Salhānī (Beirut, 5 vols.) corrects to "Ibrahim," in accordance with the context.

2 Salhānī (Beirut, 5 vols.) omits عَلِيٌّ.

3 Lane has "proves himself unworthy of my conversation" (a mis-translation?).

4 The story is here divided by the customary formulas and part repetition of the foregoing words, to introduce the 688th night.

5 Lane has "my master, Ibrahim."

6 Similarly Lane, "your slave."

7 لَقَدْ prefixed to the verb-form.
"The people refuse me it; they will not sell it.
"Who would buy damaged (goods) for sound?
"I groan for the pining which is in my sides
"With the groans of a choked one, wounded by drink."

And, by Allah, I thought the walls and doors and all that was in the house answered him and sang with him, for the beauty of the song, so that I fancied I and my limbs and clothes answered him. I abode amazed, unable to speak or answer or move, for the trouble of my heart. Then he sang:

"Culvers of Liwa! (to your nests) return;¹
"Your mournful voices thrill this heart of mine.²
"Returned they; as they flew, they well nigh took
"My life, and made me tell my secret pine.
"With cooing call they repeatedly, as though
"Their breasts were maddened with the rage of wine;³
"Ne'er did mine eyes their like for culvers see
"Who weep, yet teardrops never dye their eyne."²

(I do not know any air to these couplets traceable to Ibrahim. That which I do know to them is by Mo-

¹ Or "piece"
² Following Burton's translation. Ahlwardt, "Culvers of the hedge, back hither return."
³ Ahlwardt, "Euch girren hören ist mein einzig Glück."
⁴ Agânf; 1001 Nights. The translation of this line is too free to be faithful. Lit. "(as though) they had drunk wine or madness were in them."
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Then he sang:

"O Zephyr of Najd, when from Najd thou blowest,
Thy voyage heaps only on me new woe!
I moan with the moaning of love-sick grief,
Into grief doth all check and all effort blow.
Bespoke me the turtle in bloom of morn,
From frail plant-twig and the willow (bough);
They say lover wearies of love when far,
And is cured of love an afar he go;
I tried every cure, which ne'er cured my love;
But that nearness is better than farness I know."

Then he sang also these couplets:

"O Zephyr of Najd, when from Najd thou blowest,
Thy voyage heaps only on me new woe!
The turtle bespake me in bloom of morn
From the cassia-twig and the willow (bough).
She moaned with the moaning of love-sick youth,
And exposed love-secret I ne'er would show;
They say lover wearies of love when near,
And is cured of love an afar he go;
I tried either(?) cure, which ne'er cured my love;
But that nearness is better than farness I know.
Yet the nearness of love shall no vantage prove,
An whose thou lovest deny thee of love."

Then he said: "Ibrahim, this song is madhārī. Take it and keep to it in your singing, and teach it to your maidens." I said "Repeat it to me!"; but he said: "There is no need to repeat it. You have learned it and have it all." Thereupon he vanished from before me. I was amazed, rose for my sword, before me. I was astonished, rose for my sword, drew it, then hastened to the door of the harem and found them closed. I

---

1 This musical note is very interesting (Moḥ. ibn al-Harīt was slightly younger and outlived Ibrahim, to the reign of Al-Maʾmūn). Of course it has no place in the Nights.

2 As Burton notes, this song occurs without the last two hemistichs in Al-Masʿūdī (Fr. transl. vii. 318); a good proof that the compiler of the Nights has made an addition, or copied it in from another.
said to the maidens "What have you heard in my room?" They said "We have heard the finest singing ever heard." I went out astounded to the house-door, found it closed, and asked the doorkeeper about the old man. He said: "What old man? By Allah, no one has come in to you to-day." So I went back to think over my adventure.

But lo, he called me from one of the corners of the house, and said: "No harm to you, Abu Ishâk! I am Ibilis, who have been your guest and companion to-day, so trouble not." Then I rode off to Ar-Rashld, and said "May I never (again) present him with news like this." I entered his presence and told him the story. He said "Reflect upon the couplets, whether you learned them." I took the lute, tried them, and behold! they were so firm in my breast as not to have vanished. Ar-Rashld was delighted and sat drinking, though he was not resolute in drinking, and ordered me a present and its delivery, and said "The sheikh was most wise in saying to you that you had learned them completely. Would he might some day favor us with his company, as he favored you!"

But lo, he called me from one corner of the building, and said "No harm to you, Abu Ishâk! I am only Abu Murra, who have been your companion to-day, so fear not." Then I rode off to Ar-Rashld and told him the story. He said "Repeat the pieces which you have learned from him." I took the lute and played, and behold! they were firm in my breast. Ar-Rashld was delighted with them and began to drink to them, though he was not confirmed in drinking, and said "Would he might some day favor us with his company, as he favored you!" Then he ordered me a present; and I took it, and departed.
ARTICLE VI.

NUMERICAL FORMULÆ IN THE VEDA AND THEIR BEARING ON VEDIC CRITICISM.

BY EDWARD WASHBURN HOPKINS,
PROFESSOR IN BRYN MAWR COLLEGE, BRYN MAWR, PA.

Presented to the Society, March, 1894.

In view of the conflicting opinions that are current respecting the age of the eighth book of the Rig-Veda, every additional means of historical criticism becomes of value. Of possible bases of criticism two have attracted my attention. In reading the Kāṇva book, I have been struck by the noteworthy similarity in vocabulary and in numerical formulæ between the eighth book and those books which I may call "General Books," (i., ix., x.) in distinction from the other received "Family Books" (ii.–vii.; the fourth book is perhaps the latest of the Family Books). The material for comparison from both points of view I have now collected; but, as the examples of the vocabulary are not yet arranged, I offer at present only the coincidences in numbers found in the Kāṇva Book and General Books. The results from this point of view alone are of course not such as to be conclusive in any way; yet they furnish strong corroborative evidence of the view that sees in the Kāṇva-book a literary production which, in so far as we are enabled to discriminate in the matter of time, belongs rather to the later than to the earlier Vedic period. There are hymns in either division of the books when the latter are arranged in groups, that belong to the other division. This is a va sans dire of Vedic criticism. Yet the general character of the two groups is not such as to indicate that the body of hymns of one group in their present form is synchronous with with that of the other.

In respect of numerical formulæ, the evidence given by their use easily may be overestimated; but, not less easily, this may be unjustly depreciated. For a numerical complex, when once received, naturally tends to assume a sacrosanct character, and perpetuates itself in the religious consciousness. Not that a holy number remains intact. Other factors come into play. Exaggerated laudation leads to multiplication in majorem glorialem.
Nevertheless, coincidences of numerical formulæ are to a certain extent indicative of a contemporary way of looking at things, and as such deserve to be reckoned as a factor in determining the age of a literary production. It is, for instance, possibly a mere coincidence that “the far distance” is spoken of in one group of books and that only in the other (later) group are found “the three far distances.” The underlying idea of three spaces may be older than the expression that here conveys it; but it certainly is significant that in the formulaic expression the Kaiyana book coincides with the later group; while the significance is heightened by finding similar coincidences to be not unusual, but rather, considering how few are the fixed formulæ, the norm. While, therefore, I would not lay too much weight upon the following examples, I consider them provisionally as indicative of a close connection between the General Books and that attributed to the Kaiyana.

The first example is the one already cited. In x. 95. 14 we find a plurality of “far distances” implied in paramā parāvāt; in i. 34. 7 and in the Atharva-Veda vi. 75. 3, the number is known as “three far distances.” Elsewhere in the Rig-Veda this formula is unknown save in the Kaiyana-book, and there it occurs twice (viii. 5. 8; 32. 22).

This three is of course a number peculiarly holy. Accordingly it is here that we find most of the coincidences. Thus, the gods are grouped in threes in a certain expression that is used but twice, once in the first, once in the eighth book (trīṣu d rocanē dīvās, i. 105. 5; viii. 69 (58). 3); the mystical “three dawns” are known only in viii. 41. 8; x. 67. 4; and nīrṣṭī, used all through the Veda in the singular, occurs in the plural only in viii. 24. 24, and x. 114. 2 (here specified as three in number).

Again, the fixed expression trīṣrjc̄ē, occurring quite a number of times, is found in the Atharvan, but in RV. only in the Kaiyana and General Books: thus, i. 34. 9, 12; 47. 2; 118. 2; 140. 2; viii. 72 (61). 8; 85 (74). 8; ix. 86. 32; x. 52. 4; 114. 1; 124. 1; and in four or five hymns of the Atharva-Veda. This is a very good example, because trīṣc̄ē is a word thoroughly Brahmanic and classical, so that its history, if sketched in literature, would read “used as a common word in epic literature and legal smrtīs; often employed in the Brahmanic period; not rare in the AV.; found in RV. in the General Books and Kaiyana, but not traced so far back as the other Family Books.”

The following examples of “three” may point to a closer connection with a late period. The expression trisadasthē barhīṣi in i. 47. 4 is paralleled only by the similar tridhātu barhīṣ of viii. 102 (91). 14; and by tribarhīṣa sādasi also in the first book, i. 181. 8. Indra’s bolt is represented as a trident only in i. 121. 4* and viii. 72 (61). 8. It is only in viii. 2. 21 that Indra receives the laud which is elsewhere ascribed to Agni, that he is “born in three

* Trīkakūbh (Indra) in sense refers to three-forked lightning.
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places." Cases of magic where "three" is employed in a mysterious occult manner, common in the Atharvan (e. g. AV. iv. 3. 1; 9. 8, etc.), occur in RV. only in the eighth and tenth books (viii. 91 (80). 5-7; x. 87. 10 ff.). The same growth in appreciation of esoteric wisdom, especially affected in the Brāhmaṇas, may perhaps be traced in the fact that "concealed" paddāni are spoken of only in i. 164. 45; viii. 8. 23; x. 13. 3 (=AV. xviii. 3. 40, v. l.). The "three ages past" appear to be known in viii. 101 (90). 14=AV. x. 8. 3, and not elsewhere in the Rig-Veda.

Turning to the next holiest number, it is only in the eighth book of the Rig-Veda that saptāpada occurs, withal in its late meaning, just as it is found in the Atharva-Veda (RV. viii. 72 (61). 16; AV. v. 11. 10); it is only in the eighth book that the "seven bottomed sea" is known, viii. 40. 5. Again, the "seven raçaṇdāyas of the sun" are spoken of only in i. 105. 9 and viii. 72 (61). 16, although synonyms of raçaṇdāyas are often found elsewhere, and Indra's seven raçaṇdāyas are common. Ludwig, indeed, will not accept Śāyaṇa on i. 105. 9, when the latter says saptasamikhyākā raçaṇdāyas sūryasya to explain anī yē saptā raçaṇdāyas tātā me nābhīr dītata; but, with the remark "es ist uns jedoch von dergleichen nichts erinnerlich," refers the rays to Agni as the only possibility (v. 444); a subjective impression that is contradicted by sūryasya saptā raçaṇmibhis in viii. 72 (61). 16.

A very striking example of the differences between the Family and the General Books may be noticed in the number of hotars. These priests are of course mentioned a great many times. In distinction from the "seven seers," who by the way are late, the seven viprās, and the kauṇdāyas, the hotars, when expressly counted, are reckoned either as five or as seven. In iii. 29. 14 we have a passage which on entirely different grounds is reckoned late, and here we find seven hotars. There is only one more passage in the Family Books, and this in the same third book, where the hotars are reckoned as seven, viz.: iii. 10. 4. On the other hand, they are elsewhere counted as five in the Family Books, while in books eight and ten, and possibly in the first book, they are counted as seven. The count of the Atharva-Veda also makes them seven. Thus, in RV. ii. 34. 14; v. 42. 1 we have distinctly only five hotars; but, as in AV. iv. 24. 3, so in RV. i. 58. 7 (?) viii. 60 (49). 16; ix. 10. 7; 114. 3; x. 35. 10; 61. 1; 63. 7, there are as plainly seven hotars, and probably we should add to these viii. 72 (61). 7; ix. 10. 3; and x. 122. 4.* With this latter group goes the late iii. 29. 14 (the language alone of this hymn shows its lateness; compare Lanman, Noun-infection, p. 578).

I reckon as late, not early, coincidences with cis-Indic data, referable to Persian or Babylonian influence,† and among them

* Ludwig, iii. 228, includes iii. 7. 7 (late?) as hotars, but these are viprās, not expressly hotars. I think AV. never mentions five hotars.
† On this topic, more in the next paper.
the name of the land as “Seven Rivers.” The seven rivers are often referred to; but, as an equivalent of hapta hendu, this designation occurs only in viii. 24. 27, where it stands on a par with the one mention of Babylon’s mintage, the “mand of gold” of viii. 78 (67). 2. It is, again, only in the eighth book that we find designated fractions other than a half. In viii. 47. 17 sapāḥ is ½ and kālā is ⅕. So AV. vi. 46. 3; xix. 57. 1.

Before leaving the province of seven, I may add the fact that saptāmāṇuṣya occurs only in viii. 39. 8, in respect of which I venture proleptically the following suggestion. Agni “of the seven peoples” may be meant, since it is difficult to see how māṇuṣa can stand here for “priest.” We may accept the explanation that seven means “many” (P.W.), but another explanation is also possible. In a preceding paper I have attempted to show that the “five tribes” cannot be the Puru-Yadu group with which the five are arbitrarily identified. I think the “five” refers to the five tribes whose respective family- or tribe-collections make the first Rig-Veda. Each tribe is identified with one special family of singers. Their output is represented by books ii.–iii., v.–vii. There were new tribes absorbed into the whole body of older Aryans. They too had each its priestly family. The first new one was the tribe represented in the collection by the hymns of the Gautamas, the fourth book. The next to come in were the Kanvas, who for a long time are regarded as more or less aliens. Apart from these distinctly family or tribal collections, containing some spontaneous and some ritualistic poetry, were the hymns not claimed by any family as exclusively theirs. Such were the few really old hymns of Soma, of death (with the Yama hymns), and of marriage. But such hymns were not numerous, and the later books consist chiefly of the new hymnology that belonged to a united people, settled in about the same region which they are to occupy for centuries. The “seven singers” (śayās), as fathers of the clan-priests, belong only to this later period (iv. 42. 8; ix. 92. 2; x. 82. 2; 114. 7; 130. 7). There were, then, before the Rik collection finally closed, seven families or tribes, each with its ancestral ṛgī, and to this division refers the “Agni of the seven tribes” (saptāmāṇuṣya) of the eighth book. The old nomenclature continues, however, just as the “seven rivers,” after they become twenty-one, are still called “the seven,” and even in the later period “the five families” (jāna, māṇuṣa, etc.) are retained.

The cardinal points, known in the Atharvan as ten, appear as ten in the Rik only in viii. 101 (90). 13, and, possibly, i. 164. 14. In regard to two of the most significant numerical formulae, I have elsewhere compared the use of the General Books with that of the Kanvas (“The Holy Numbers of the Rig-Veda,” in the Oriental Studies of the Philadelphia Oriental Club). The facts, briefly stated, are as follows. Several stereotyped groups of

* In vii. 18. 15 prakalāvid is not technical. † J.A.O.S. xv. 360.
seven, such as "seven gifts," "seven rivers," are raised by trebling to twenty-one; just as, conversely, in the Atharvan the three bonds of Varuna are multiplied into the other sacred number and become twenty-one. There are in the Rik, outside of the group i, viii, ix, x, but two cases where is found this later multiplication of objects that were before holy enough without such aid; and both of these exceptions refer to the same point, and are full of esoteric mystery: "they observed the first name of the cow; they found the thrice-seven highest names of the mother" (iv. 1. 16); and "Varuna declared unto me, the wise one, that the not-to-be-slain one (viz., the cow) bears thrice seven names" (vii. 87. 4). There are "seven names of the cows" in i. 164. 3; and in each of these cases we have to do with the raising of the number from seven to thrice seven, for these cows were once identical with the other Indic sevens (the Maruts, the beams, etc.).

The further cases are as follows:

Seven is raised to thrice seven in i. 20. 7, where the gifts begged for as seven in the Family Books (v. 1. 5; vi. 74. 1)* are now twenty-one. The "seven secret places" (padd) of Agni are in i. 72. 6 raised to thrice seven; and in a mystic hymn of the same book, i. 191. 12–14, we find mentioned "the three times seven vispuliṅgakās, and thrice seven peaks (Maruts)." In all the Family Books (with the exceptions just mentioned) there are no mystic thrice sevens. But in viii. 69 (68). 7 the Maruts appear again as thrice seven; and in viii. 96 (85). 2 Indra's seven strongholds, familiar from other parts of the work, suddenly appear as "thrice seven mountain-tops" destroyed by Indra.†

Other instances are all from books nine and ten: "Thrice seven cows milk for him," in ix. 70. 1; and again "thrice seven cows" are opposed to "seven cows" (streams) in ix. 86. 21, 25. In the tenth book are "the thrice seven streams" and "thrice seven wood-piles," x. 64. 8; 90. 15.

Moreover, a certain increase, even of the old method of multiplying holiness, may be observed in the trīḥ saptā saptatīndam (3×7×70) of viii. 46. 26; while in viii. 19. 37 we find "three seventies." Once more, it is to be noticed that it is only in viii. 96 (85). 8 that the Maruts are raised to "thrice sixty."‡ The Atharvan use of "thrice seven beings" is found in the Rik only at i. 133. 6 and Vāl. 11. 5, a Kāṇva verse.

* Compare v. 52. 17; saptā me saptā - - ēkaṃ-ekā cattā dādus in a gift-laund.
† Bergaigne, La Religion Védique, ii. 123, takes viii. 96. 2 and i. 72. 6 as referring to "worlds." But these are thrice seven only in still later literature. Compare viii. 7. 84 for sense. So later the seven hells become twenty-one. In iv. 19. 3 and ix. 54. 2, the saptā pravādas may be hils. Seven fortresses are mentioned in vi. 90. 10; vii. 18. 18 (Family Books).
‡ Not "sixty-three" (trīḥ saptās).
Not less interesting is the raising of the number of the original ten gods (as I think I have shown their original number to be, l. c.) to thrice eleven.* In Val. 9. 2 and ix. 92. 4, as in the late passage i. 34. 11, all the gods are included in this number. In iii. 6. 9 we find the only exception to the rule that the thrice eleven are confined to Kaṇva and General Books. For the Kaṇva book compare viii. 28. 1; 30. 2; 35. 3; 39. 9. In i. 139. 11 (compare x. 65. 9) the three elevens are distributed over heaven, earth, and waters. Without division they are mentioned in i. 34. 11; 45. 2. The exception in iii. 6. 9 may possibly be only a further example of the case in hand: that is, a late verse; for here the gods are mentioned *pāṃrāvantaś ‘accompanied with their wives,’ an expression which occurs in regard to gods only here and i. 72. 5; iv. 56. 4; viii. 28. 2; 93 (82). 22. But the fourth book is almost as late as the eighth.

Characteristic also of the eighth book is the fact that only here is there found a Dwita invented to go with the ancient Tīta (as later still Ekata goes with both), viii. 47. 16. We have in all this the same later raising of gods as that which we see again in AV. xi. 5. 2 (thousands of Gandharvas); and TS. v. 2. 5 ff. where the old Vasus are raised to 333; or, better still, ib. i. 4. 11. 1, where the eleven Rudras are made thirty-three.†

I might add to these a rather remarkable fact in connection with Schmidt’s theory of the duodecimal system: viz., that sixty, alone or in composition, occurs in Family Books only in the 60,000 men slain by Indra at vi. 26. 6, and in the Battle of the Ten Kings, vii. 18. 14. But it is not infrequent in the other group. In viii. 96 (85). 8 we have 3×60 (above); in i. 53. 9 there are 60099 slain by Indra; in i. 126. 3, we find 60,000 kine; in viii. 4. 20, the same; ib. 46. 29, the same; ib. 22, 60,000 horses; all these passages being gift-lauds; and in ix. 97. 53 there are 60,000 good things.

A few more cases remain. Only in iv. 26. 7 and in the eighth book have we *ayūta=10,000 (viii. 1. 5; 34. 15; and gift-lauds, ib. 3. 41; 21. 18; 46. 22). In the eighth and tenth books appears generally the greatest extravagance in gift-lauds (e. g. viii. 5. 37; 46. 22; 2. 41; x. 62. 8). But in vi. 63. 10 hundreds and thousands of horses are acknowledged as baksheeesh!

The “double one,” *dvauṛ, is found only in viii. 18. 14, 15; i. 104. 6; 105. 6; *dvipā, ‘island,’ only in i. 189. 3; viii. 20. 4. The old “pair” of horses is replaced by a spike-team: i. e. horses with a leader (*pratīṣṭha + prāṭīṣṭha), only in i. 39. 6; 100. 17; viii. 7. 28, and a gift-laud in vi. 47. 24. The later “four names” of Indra occur in the Rik only in x. 54. 4 and viii. 80 (89). 9. Elsewhere the four are unknown, although familiar to the Brahmanic

* That is, at first, “ten with one added” as ekacatam=100, loc. cit., p. 139. Compare RV. x. 85. 45.
† The 8899 gods of iii. 9. 9 really belong only in x. 53. 6. The still later group of thirty-five gods has been discussed by me, loc. cit., p. 159. It is found i. 162. 19 and x. 27. 15. 18.
age (see Ludwig’s citations). In viii. 80. 9 the fourth name is taken as a matter of course. Compare the Kaṇva verse Vāl. 4. 7, where Indra is the fourth Āditya, another late idea.

These numerical coincidences will be found to be paralleled by the vocabulary of the poets of the General Books and Kaṇvas respectively, in regard to which I hope to read a paper at the next meeting.*

* For previous estimates of the age of the Kaṇva book, see Zimmer, Altindisches Leben, p. 865; Lanman, J.A.O.S., X. 580; Brunnhofer, KZ., 1880; Iran und Turan, Preface.
كتاب المطر لأبي زيد سعيد بن وايس الانصاري رواية
إبى عبد الله حمّد بن العباس بن حمّد بن ابي حمّد يحيى بن
المبارک البيرديري من عفيّه أبي جعفر احمد بن حمّد عن
إبى زيد رجّه الله

قال أبو زيد الانصاري قال القينسيون أول المطر الوسيئ:
وإنّا أهلاً الفروخان الموجّراتان من الدّلو ثم السّرط ثم الثيرن والبيس كل نجسيّ نصر من خمس عشرة ليلة ثم السّرط
بعد الوسيئ وأذوازة الجبراء ثم الذّراقان وتشتّهُما ثم الجبهة
وهما اجتر السّرط وأول البديء وأذوازة اجتر الجبهة والغراء ثم
الصّرفة وهي فصل بين الدّنياء والصبّ في الصّيف وأذوازة
السماك الأول والأخير والآخر الركيب وما بين السماكين صيف وهو نحو من أربعين ليلة ثم المبين وهو نحو من عشرين ليلة إلى خمس عشرة عند طلوع الدنيران وهو بين الصيف والخريف وليس له نوء ثم المريج وانواه النسراء ثم الأخضر ثم غطوتان الدنير الأولتان وكل مطر من الوسيئ إلى الدنيا (fol. 2a) ربيع وانها هذه الأذواء في غيبوبة وغيبوب هذه النجوم الأول القيط طلوع ثنيا وآخره طلوع سهيل وأول الصيفي طلوع سهيل وأخرها طلوع السماك وقيل الصغرية ارتبكون ليلة يختليف حرا وبردها المعتدلات ثم الأول الشتاء السماك وآخره ونوع الجبهة وآخر الذبري ونوع الجبهة وآخر الصغرية وأول القيط السماك الآخر وهو الأول وآخر الصيف السماك الآخر الذي يقال له الركيب وبينهما اربعون ليلة أو نحو ذلك يقال اسماء السماك القيط وهو أسماء السماء فهي مقطعة وأردت فهي مركبة إضافًا ومنه الطاش وهو فوق القطع والردان يقال طاش السماك (fol. 2b) يقال نجوم تبصص والغيثا فوق البعش وكذلك الخيلة والنجمة يقال أعتب فهي مفيدة إضاءة وحلبة تحت حلبًا
"والديك تُجْحِدُ الحَبَّادَا وهو فريق البَغْمَةَ ومنه الحَفْشَةُ وهي
مثل الغَرْبِيَة يقال حَفْشَب السماء حَفْشَب حَفْشَا والحَشْكة مثلها
يقال حَفْشَت تَحْمِلُ حَشْفاً ومن السما الهَمْشَة وهو السما
الذَّايم الذي ليس فيه رَغْد ولا تَرْقَ اثْنِها تَلْدُ المَهْل أو تَلْدُ
الليل واكثرها ما بَلْغَت من المَهْلِ والتهَمَّان نحو الديبة تَلَال

"الرَّاحِزُ يَا حْبَادا تَحْمِلُ بالسُّفايِ كانَهُ تَهْمَان يَوْمٌ مَّاصٍ
ومن الديبة الهْمَش والهَمْش يقال هَمْشَب تَهْمِلِهَ هَمْشَا
وهمَشَت تَهْمِل حَطَّل يدلُّم قَعْلَانَا قَالَ الشَّاعِر
بلَى الرَّمِيم من ذَائِب الٍمَعَرَّف أَدْجَنَت
علَينِها ذَهَاب الصَّيْف تَهْمِلِهَا هَمْشَا
"(fol. 8a)
(الهِمْشَب الأَمْتُار المَمْعِيظة والشَّيْدَة وينقال سَحْبَة
دَجِينه ومُدْجِينه وقد ادْجَنَت إِدْجَانًا ودَجَنَت تَدْجَن دَجْنا
ودَجَنَا، والدَّجُنَة من الْغَيْم المَطْبَق تَطْبِيقًا للرَجُل المُطْبِلُ
الذي ليس فيها مَثَر يقال يَوْم دَجَن وَيَوْم دَجْنَا وكذلِك
تَلَلِية على الرَّجِدِيَّي بالرَّضْف وإِضْنَاء الدَّاجِنَة السَّبأَرِيَّة
الْمَطْبَقَة نحو الديبة ودَجَن السما الديبة الكُتُب ومن الديبة الرَّضِفَة
وهي ادْجَن رَقِّصا من الديبة وَسُرَع ذَهَابًا يقال قد أَدْجَنَت
Kitāb Al-Maṭar.

السماء فهي مَرَضَّدة وجامعها الرَّحم والرَّحم ومنها الهُفْأة واخذتها هُفْأة وهي نصر الرَّحم وتال العَتِبَيْيَيْن أَنَّهَا رَأِيَّةً ومنها الدَّمْها وهي البَطَّرَة الخَيْفَة والهُدْمَة مثلها وجامعها الهُدْمْ والهِدْمُ والذَّات والذَّات وِقَال أَرْض مُدَّهُودة ومُهَدْوَرة والرَّطْقَاء البَديعة السَّمَح (fol. 3b) الخَيْفَة ان طال مُطْرُها او قَصَر ومنه القُطْر وهو في كل البَطَّر ضَمَيْفَة وشَدِيّة ومنه الذَّهَاب وهو اسم للبَطَّر كله ضَمَيْفَة وشَدِيّة والرَّش القَطْر الحَيْف القَلِيل البَلْدَة تُلْبَيْدَا ارْتَش السَّمَاء رَشَّ إِرْشَاشًا وجمَاع الرَّش الرَّشَاَان وَمِنْهُ الْوَلِد وهو امْرُ البَطَّر واعْطُنْهُ قَطْرًا يَقَال وَبُلَّي الْأَرْض وِئَلُّها فِي مَمْوَلَة وَالرَّجُلُ مِن البَطَّر الكَثِير الْقَعَام وَهَيْ في كَلَّ رَمَنَى قَال الشَّاعِر

أَنَا الجَرْدُ بَن جُوْدَ بْن سَيْبَان كَيْمِيَّنَا جَادَ وَإِن جَادَوا وَبُتَّ وَقَال العَتِبَيْيَيْن ان دَوْمُوا جَادَ وَالبَيّْارُ وَالدَّيْرُ فِي كَلِّ الْإِمْتَار وَهُوَ الَّذِي يَتَيَّبَع بَعْضًا وَجَيْشَ النُّورُ الْحَرُّر والرَّك د مِن البَطَّر ضَعْفُ الَّذِي لا يَنْفِعُ آلَا ان تكون له قَبُّة وَالْبَعْضُ البَطَّر بعد البَطَّر يَقَال ارْض مُرْكَبَة تَرْكِيْنَا وجمَاع الْرَّزق الْرُكَان ويقال وأَدْل (هَهْ يِل) سَحَابَيْنَ وسَحَابَيْنَ وَأَدْل وَهُوَ البَطَّر الذي يَيْخَرُ ما أَوْلِيَّه عِينَيْن يَسْمِي به ويقال ارْض مَكْحُوَّة وَهَيْ şi؟ قَالَ XE 67
يا حذّها البحر المجدّ، فلا يزال بها حتّى تقفّلت ثبّتتّها وتقّلّعت من اضراله وتقّلّبّّ ظهّره الأرض لبطّلها سجّرّه الأرض حُكْرًا ويقال للبحر الذي لا يدّعع شياء إلاّ أساله جارٍ الصّبيع وذلك أنه يَّكثُرُ سيّلته حتّى يدّخل في جّهّ الصّبيع يفخّرها منه والمختلّى

البحر المّدّارك والسبح مثله غيرّ أنّ السّعّ ومنّا لم يتبّينّ قثّره والمنهارّ مثله والرّدّق السّعّ والقرّّ والصّفرّ البحر السّعّي والدهان مثل ذلك واحدّها ذاتيّ يقال دخّنها ونّلّها مّذهّونة

والصوّرة التي تروّى الأرض والسميّة من البحر الذي يندّى

جّهّ الأرض ويسّكّن التّراب والثّبيّّا البحر الكثيم والأهَاضيب واحدها هضّاب وواحد الهَضّاب (fol. 4b) هضّاب وهى حِلبّاء القّطر بعد القّطر والإدّان والهّمّل أولّ البحر والمنّهارّ والصّفرّ السّيبل الكثيم والزّلّيّ البحر بعد البحر في كل حيّي والتأعدّ البحر الأول وجماهّها العّياد يقال إّرض مّعهّدة إذا عّمّ مطرها

الرض المّعهّدة عّهدت تفهّيدا التي تصبّبها النّصة من البحر والّنّصة المبّرة التي تصبّب الّقَطّعة من الّرض وقّصّيّ الّقّطّعة يقال إّرض منّصة تّنفّيضا والّشُوبّيّ البحر يّصبّ البكاان وقُصّيّ الآخر وجّامهّة الشّأنيّب وملّه النّجّو وجّامهه
الجَاهِلَةِ والارض المَنْصُوحَةُ هي الْمُجَرَّدةُ صَدَحَتْ تَضَعُّها وَالْقُيَّى
اسم للْمَطْرِ كَلِمَةً وَجَمَاعَةُ الْعَيْنُ وَيَقَالُ ارْضُ مَيْتَةً وَمَفْيُورَةً
ويقال استَهْلَكَ السَّمَاءُ وَذَلِكَ فِي ارْضِ السَّمَاءِ وَالْاسمُ الْهَدْلُ
واسْبَلَ السَّمَاءِ إِسْبَالًا وَالْاسمُ السَّبُلُ وَهوَ المَطْرُ بِهِنَّ الحَقَابِ
والارض حين يَخُرُجُ من الحَقَابِ (fol. 5a) وَلَكِن يَصِلُّ إلى الْارض
ويقال للمَطْرِ الْقَلَيلِ الْعَرْضُ سَحَابَةً إِنْ قَلَى قُطْرَةً أَوْ كَثُرُوهُ مَثْلُ
الْقَعُورِ وَمَثْلُ ذَكَرْ السَّبِيلِ العُقَانَيْنِ وَهوَ المَطْرُ بِهِنَّ الحَقَابِ
والارض واحْذِرْهَا غَنْوُنً وَيَقَالُ هُوَ الضَّرِّبُ وَالْصَغِيعُ والْجَلَيدُ
وَالْخَلْجُ فَتْحًا الضَّرِّبِ والصَغِيعِ والْجَلَيدِ فَانَّهُ لا يَكُنُّ الْأَلَامَ
بَالْلَيْلِ والْخَلْجِ باللَيْلِ والْنَهَارِ فِي الْقُدُمِ وَهُنَّ لا يَكُنُّ الْأَخَرُ
فِي الْقُدُمِ وَيَقَالُ ارْضُ ضَرِّبًّا إِذَا أَصَابَهَا الجَلَيدُ فَتُحْرِقُ نَبَاتَهَا
وَقِدْ ضَرِّبَتْ ضَرِّبًّا وَاصْبَبَهَا الضَّرِّبُ إِضْرَابًا وَصَمَعَتْ الْأَرْضُ إِذَا
اِحْرَقَتْ الصَغِيعُ نَبَاتَهَا وَتُلْجَحَتْ فَهِيَ مَنْدُوَّةًْ
والطلَّ آثِرُ النَّدِي فِي الْارض مِن الْمَطْرِ أو الجَلَيدِ والصَغِيعِ أو الضَّرِّبِ وَيَقَالُ اِيْسَانُ لَنْدِي الَّذِي تُحْرِقُهُ عُرُفُ النَّجْرِ إِلَى
غُصُونِهَا طَلْبًاْ
والصَغِيعُ والضَّرِّبِ والجَلَيدُ والسَقَيْطُ نَدِي يَخُرُجُ مِن جُرْدِهِ
السَّمَاءِ (fol. 5b) وَيَقَالُ السَّمَاءُ جُرْدًا إِذَا لم يَكُنَّ عَلَيْهَا عَيْمٌ
وقد جَرَّت السماء جَرًَّا إذا لم يَكُن عليها عِينٌ والاسم الجَرَّة
ويقال: تَصِلْقُب السماء [كَصْلُّقًا] إذا انقطع عَيْنَهُا ثم تَجِيرُ
بعد ذلك حين يَدْهِب الْقَبْيْم كَلِه وَقَالُوا أَقْضَى المَطْر وَاقْطَع إِصْتَرَارٍ وَإِنَّي لَا أَقْضَيْ الدُّمَّ دَمَّ، فَهُمْ مَطْلُولون، إِنْ أَسْبَحْهُم المَطْر وَقَالُوا طَلَّ كَمْ فَلَّيْنا إِذَا غَرَّف قَايِلُهُ قَفِّطُ وَدَهْبَ دَمَّ، فَهُمْ مَطْلُول وَأَطْلُقُ عَلَى بَلَادِيهِ إِطْلَاءًا وَذَلِك ان لَا نَتَّرَأ مُؤُدِّيًا لِه وَقَالُ هَدِر دَمَّ يَهْدُر هَدْرًا إِذَا غَرَّف قَايِلُهُ فَاَبْطَلُهُ السَّلَطَانُ

وَدَهْبَ دَمَّ، هَدْرًا وَأَهْدَرُهُ السَّلَطَانُ إِنْهَارًا

ومن المَطْر الْرَّبْثَان وَيَجْفِف وَهَيْ القَطْرَة المَتْنَابِعَة يَفْسُدُ بَيْنَهُنَّ
سَكَوْنُ (١٠١) أَكْرَم ما بَيْنَهُنَّ سَاعَةٌ وَأَكْرِم ما بَيْنَهُنَّ بِيْنَهُنَّ وَلِبَلْهُ
وَقَالَ أرْض مِرْطُبَةٍ تَرْتَبُّهَا وَوَاحِدَ القَطْرَة قَطْرٍ وَالْرَّهْمٍ وَالْعُبْدَ وَالْقُطْرِبِ وَالْقَطْرِبِ بِاللُّهِ وَالنَّهَار يَقَال أَرْحَبَ الْأَرْض إِرْهَابًا وَأَقْصَب إِسْبَابًا

وَقَتَنَّ تَقْسِيمُ فَتْحُ مِنْ الرُّهْم السَّيِّف وهو السَّمَحُ الذِّي
تَسْرُقُ الْبَيْنَه وليس فيه مَاءٌ وَالْأَفْضَانُ المَطْر الدَّايم الذِّي
لَيْس فِيهُ مَرْجَة يَدَوْمِ الْبِيوَم وَاللُّهِيَة وَأَكْرِمٌ مِن ذلِك
اِسْمَاء الرُّهْمُ وَجِمَاعَة الرُّغْمُ يَقَال رَعَدُّ الرُّهْمُ
فَهَى تَرْعَدُ رَعَدًا وَأَرْحَبَ الْقُرْم ارْعَدًا إِذَا اسْتَبَى الْرُّهْمُ وَقَى
الرعد الإعرام وهو صوت الرعدぁٌٍٍ الشديد من يقال ارزم
الرعد إِعْرَامًا وَفِيهِ الْتَهْرِمٍ وَهُوَ اشْتِصَّت صوت الرعد شديدة وضعيفة
وهو الهميم (fol. 6b) ويقال تهْرِم الرعد تَهْرِمًا وَتَهْرِمْ أَنْهُرَامًا
وهي القفاعة وهو تتتابع صوت الرعد في شدة وجماعها الفعاعع
وهي الْعِمْش والمَّسِنان وهو صوت الرعد الثقيل رَجَسَ الرَّعد
وَرَجَسَ السَّماةُ رَجَسًا رَجَسًا وَرَجَسًا وَقُلْهَا الْصَّعِيقَةَ وَجُمَاعَهَا
الصواعق وهي نار تسقط من السماء في رعد شديد ويقال
اصقة على السماة إضعا عنا ويه الهميم وهو صوت الرعد
تَشْعَفُهُ مِن بَعْضٍ والرِّز الصوت مثل الهميم يقال أن الرعد يَمْرَ
آَرَآ يَأْرَآيرةَ وَرَزَّ الزَّمَانَ تَرْزَ رَزَّ قال الراجز

قَارْئُنَا مِن زَاِبِلَ أَلَا أَسَلَّى
الأسلامى أسقيت صوب الديم
صَوْبَ رِبيعٍ بَاكِرًٍ لَم يَنْتَمَ
يُرِزَّ ذَرَأً مِن دِرَآءَ الأَكْمَ
رَذَّ الْرَّذَآيَا بِالمَرَآدِ المَعْصِمَ

ويقال جَالِل الرَّعدُ جَالِلًا وهو الصوت (fol. 7a) يتقلب في
جَنُوب الْعَلَّامٍ وتَهْرِمٍ الرَّعدُ تَهْرِمًا وهو مثل الجَالِلُ وَرَكْمَ
ويقال فيصلون في السماء [كتشبها] إذا انقطع غيابها ثم تجبرت بعد ذلك حين يذهب الغيوم كلها ويقال أثب السماء اتجهت
باسم الحفر وقُلوا أقصر المطر واقت قصرا وإيقافا إذا انقطع ويقال: طل قوهم مظلولون إذا اصابهم الطلق ويقال طل دم فلكل إذا غرب قائه نبئ الله دُرمت نفور مظلول واتلَّنت عليه بالبذرة إطلاعا وذلك ان لا تزال مضربا له ويقال: قدَّر دمه يهددُ هُددا إذا غرب قائه فابطل الله السلطان
وذهب دمه عددا واعتبر السلطان إدبارا

ومن المطر الرجال ويَجَفف وهي القطر المتتابعة يَفْصِل بينهين سكونا (101). اقل ما بينهن ساعه وأكثر ما بينهن يوم وليلة وينقال ارض تريثة تزينى ووحيد القطر وقطر الرحم والثريج والعبار والغشام بالليل والنهار يقال ازجيَت الأرض إزجاجا وأضبى إضبابا

وقتنت تقييم قطعا ومن الرحم السيف وهو السحاب الذي تسوق الرحم وليس فيه ماء والإعجان المطر الدائم الذي ليس فيه فرج وقوجة يدوم اليوم والليلة وأكثر من ذلك

إسماء الرعد * الرعد وجماعة الرعده يقال رعدة السماء فهي ترعده ثم ترعد الشردا وأرعد القوم ارعدا إذا أصابهم الرعد وفي
الرعد الإزرع وهو صوت الرعد غيَّر الشديد، منه يقال ارْزُ
الرعد إزراعًا وفيه القُفْعَة وهو اشد صوت الرعد شديدًا وضيقه
وهو الهزيم (fol. 6b) وينسق تهزيم الرعد تهَزُّما وانهزم انْهِزْما
وفيه القُفْعَة وهو يتنازع صوت الرعد في شدة جماعها القعقاع
وفيه الرَّجُل والرَّجُلُ وهو صوت الرعد الثقيل رَجَّس الرعد
ورجست السماة تَرْجَس رُجُسًا ورَجُسًا وفيه الصاعقة جماعها
الصاعقة وهي نار تُشْفَط من السماء في رعد شديد وينسق
اسققت عليه السماة إضاقًا وفيه الرَّجُل وهو صوت الرعد
تُشْفَط من ثُبيث والرِّض الصوت مثل الأَدْرَز يقال ان الرعد يَبْثُر
آذًا وآذًا وآذًا السماة تَرْبُر رَبُر قال الراجرز

جارتنا من رايل آلا أسلم
الأسلمى استقى صوب الدَّيم
صوت بريق باكر لم يَنْبِن
يرُبُر رَبُر من ذُروة الأَدْرَز
رَبُر الآدنى بالرَّجُس المُغْصِب

وينسق جَلِّب الرعد جَلِّبًا وهو الصوت (fol. 7a) يقلل في
جَنُوب السحاب وتَهَزْرُج الرعد تُهْزِرُجة وهو مثل العَجَّاله وَجَرَّم
البرق يومًا وهو أحسن صوتًا واثنتين مطرفًا ومقال أرنب السماء
ارنانًا وهو صوت الرعد الذي لا ينقطع

асماه البرق* البرق وجمعه البروُق وقيل طرف السماء

* كسره بعرًا وأبرق القوم ابراقًا إذا اصابهم البرق وتَكَشَفَ البرق

تكَشَفُ وهو إضاحه في السماء واستقطار البرق استطارة وهو مثل

التكتشف ونبع البرق يلمع لبعًا ومعانًا وهي البَرَقَة ثم الآخرَى

البرق بعد البَرَقة ونبع البرق يلمع لبعًا ومعانًا وهو مثل

البرق حين اللمع لا يكون إلا من بعيد وتَبَسَّمَ البرق

* تبسُّمًا وهو مثل التكَشَف واستطارة البرق استطيفة وهو تذكار

لا يَسْكُنُ

(ولوم يبرق إيشمًا وهو أول البرق حين يبرق (fol. 7b
والاستطارة والتكَشَف البرقة تنبأ السماء والسَّلسلةُ بَرَق

النهار وبرق النحاس والبرق نبأ السماء الدقيقة قال الراجز

تَرَبَّقَتِ والذَّمارُ عَنْهَا غَافِلُ

آتَارَ أُحْرَى بَرَقَة سَلِمٌ

ويقال هذا تَرَقَ القلُب وَتَرَقَ حَلْب وَبرَق حَلْب وهو الذي

ليس فيه مطر وقيل حَفَقَ البرق حَفَقُ حَفَقًا وَحَفَقًا وَهو

*
كتاب المطر.

تتابعنا وتحفا البرق يخفوا خفيفًا وهو أن تراه من بعيد خفيفًا وهو انخفى ما يرى من البرق وراء مصبه البرق إنما هو الريح.

وهو الضعيف من البرق ويقال هو سنا البرق وهو ضوء البرق تراه من غير أن ترى البرق أو ترى صدرًا في موضعه إنما يكون السنا بالليل دون النهار وربما كان ذلك في غياب وربما كان ذلك بغيم جامع والسماء مصغية (fol. 8a) وضوء البرق مثل سماً وتشقق البرق تشققًا وذلك أن تبير البرقة فتصيب في الشيء وتألف البرق تآلفًا وهو مثل التشقيق وتشكيل البرق تشكلًا وهو ذو ماء البرق وتتابعنا في السماء البيضاء وتكاثر البرق تكاثرًا وهو السريع في السماء السريع وهما سوًا وهو السريع السريع الفائق والريح البرق إلهامًا وإلهامًا سرعة.

رُجُعُوه وتداركه وليس بين البرقين فرحة والعراش البرق الذي يلمع لا يفطر نحو النبسم عرض السماء يفرغ عرضًا إذا دم عبرتها ونبالت السماء غرامًا وبرء البرق تفرى قريًا وهو تكاثروه ودروهم في السماء.

أسماء الكحاب سحابة وجماعها (fol. 8b) الكحاب ومنها الغيم.

وجماعة الغيم وهو يكون في قليل الكحاب وكثيره الغائم.
واحدتُها عمامة وهي الفرَاء البيضاء من السُوداء وجماعة الفرَاء الْفَرِيق
والمرْيِن من السُوداء وواحدتُها مُرَتَّة ومنه المَحَاة وهي
النَحْبَة السُوداء ومنه السَيف وهو كل ما طرَّدت الربيع وافترته
من السُوداء إن كان فيه ماء أو لم يكن واحْلَف من السُوداء
كل سَمَان يَرْجُى أن يكون فيها مطر وواحدتُها حَلْقة وصَمْيَن
من السُوداء الذي كَرَاه مُتْرَاحَكَبًا أعنافا في تُذَايهم وجماعته
الصَبْر والسَّد من السُوداء النَشْه الأسود يَنْشأ منه أي

انتظار السباه ناشئ قال الشاعر
تبَصَرُ هَل ترى ألْوَاح تُرْبِ؟ أو ابْلُع على الأَنْفتا قُود
قُعدت لَه رِضْيِنِي رُجَال وقُدْكَرْنُ المِنْطَكَل والمَسْتَرْدُ
والْعِقَارُض الحَكِيَّة تراها في ناحية السباه وهم مثل
المِلْبِض إلا أن المِلْبِض أَبْعد زَمَيف من العاص وجَار
الأبيض والمِلْبِض أكثر ما يكون في السُوداء وف الجُفْن
وهو مثل الصَبْر وجماعته الأنفاذ والمَركَم الذي قد تَراَاُك
بعضه على بعض مثل النَسَد ومنه الرِبِّاب وواحدته ربَاة وهم
النَحْبَة الرَّتِيِقة السُوداء تكون دون الغَيْم في المطر ولا يقال
لها ربَاة إلا في مطر
ومنه الريح وهو أول الحساب المُنفر والكَنزُّر الحساب
الانْضْحَام البِيض وفيقال غَمَامة كَنْعَورة ومَغِيم كَنْعُورة وْجَلَّب كَنْعُورة
ومنه الطَّخَاء وهو الحساب الْرِّقَاء واحدته طَخَاثَة ومنه
الْقَرْع وهو الصِفْر البَقْرِي ووحدته قَرْعَة ومنه السَّمْرة وهو
القَيْم الذي ترى في خلِّمِه يَقَاطَة ووحدته (fol. 9b) نَقْطَة
ومن جماعة النَّمْر ومثله المجُف وهم كل سَحاب سَابِقة الربيع قد صُبَّ
مأه واجْهَام مثل المجف ووحدته جِهَامة قال ابو زيد سَيَعِت
رَبْكَة يَقْرَأُ فَاذا الرَّبْكَة يَقْرَأُ جَفَالا قال يَمِطُّه الرَّبْكَة
ونمنه الْضُرَّاء ووحداته ضَرَّاة وهو مثل المجف ومثله الرَّبْكَة من
القَيْم

ومنه السَّيْف والحَيْي وهم الغيم في عُرْض السماء القريب
الخَسْن

ومنه الخَسْن وهو الغيم يَنْبِع مع المطر فيِّيْخَالْ في السماء ومنه
بِنَايَ خَيْل وهم سَخَابْ يَخْرَجُون في البحر بين الخريف والربيع
طَرَوا عَلَى مَشْبَعَات ومنه الزِّرْج وهو مثل الرَّكَحِم والسَّيْف
ونمنه الغَمَاء وهو شَبْه الدَّخَان يَركِب رُؤوس الدمَال ومنه الصَّبَاب
وهو شَبْه الدَّخان والندى يَطْلِع السماء ووحدته ضَبَاءة
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يقال قد أصبِب السماة فهى مُضبِّبة ومنه الطَّلَّل وهى اول سماحة يُطيل و منه الطَّلَّل وتُرِيح واحدها طَّخْرُور وهو السماح الصفر والغيث السعودية ظل السماحة وقال بعض العرب بل هي السماحة وقال بعضهم غياثا وقال كثير غزوة كمساء إلى ظل الغياثا يثبتى ملبلبٍ فليما أن آناها استحلَّت ومن لفظ الكلاسيبيين امضحلَّة

والكَفَّار السماح السماح والركاب و يقال عجاح مكَفَّرة وظرة الغيم ابعد ما دُرِى من الغيم و يقال ترده الكلا وترده الغف وحليه ناحيتهما ومنه النَّشَاط وهو الطوال من السماح والواحدة النُّشاقَة وهى الطريقة البيضاء أكثر ما ينشاء من قيَّاب العين وعين كل سماح يبَدّدوا من قيَّاب القبلة

(fol. 10b) اسماء البيضاء النَّهْر والنَّهْر وجماعة الانهار وهو ذهِر ان ضَفْر أو عظيم ومنه الجتُّكول وهو ما شف من الانهار ليسكى المرى والكفل ومنه الأفخار وحدها فتى يقال هذا فتى وهو جَرَى العين في جدُول في بطن الأرض ولا يقال له فتى حتى يَعُبَّى تَفْقِيَةٍ اى يَعْفَى تفتيَةٍ و قال بعضهم نسأة وجماعة الغبي والجَدُول كل سُريَ لم يَعَثَى والمخلد من الجدُول ونُمْتُه أُحْدَه
وكذلك الجمع وينقل للماء قتامة وجمال وحداداً إلى جرى فيهم
الماء أو لم يجري ومنها الكمر وهو الجمسي وجهامه الأطرار
والكرة قال والكمر المحبذ الذي يجعده الإنسان في وسطه ويعطد
به الخصلة.

ويقال للماء الذي يذمده الناس ماء عيوب والعذم الماء
القديم من كل شيء وجهامه العذامل.

والخصلة من الماء ما لم يعجب الكمر ومثله المخصص
(fol. 11a)
والرقائق وينقل الماء ينحول ذلك إذا قال...
والبروض الماء القليل يستحيله برغم الجمسي يبروض بروضاً
والبروض الاستقاف وينقال للكدان إذا أنبط فيه الماء مساعدة
الماء وينقال للماء الماجع هَرْشَم قال الراجز

هرشم في جعله هرشم
تبدل للخثار ولا بن الفم
والجذور المدفوع السلم.

والمشرج كذان الأرض واحتله حشرجة وقال بعضهم المشجر
المائي الحسب وينقال رش الماء أول النطاق ينشف رشماً ونشم
السقاء والأرض والإهانة وهو النشف نشف ينشف نشفًا وينقال.
للركيزة طُمّت تطْنُو طُمسًا وهو كثرة الماء والبائقة البَیْضَاة ماء
وهي الطَّالمٌة ويقال ذلك في كل نهر وثَّقَّمّ اف طاف بثَّقْ (fol. 11b)
بُثُّوقًا وبِضَيْعِينُ الماء القليل يَرْسُحُ من الأرض ومن
السقاية بثُّق يَبْعَثُ بثُّقًا وثَّقَّمّ السكاكٍ الذي يَسْبِعُ الماء والإِضِهَةُ
الغيّر في القَافِ والسبيل، البَيْضَاة من الماء حيث ما كانت وجماعها
السُّمَّال والبائقة جماعها البَيْضَاة والبائقة وهي ما جاز
الناس فيها مُشَاة ورُبّيذانًا.
والجَرْدُونَ الجُدُّوِلِ لا يقال لها جُدُّوٌ إلا وفيها ماء وجماعها
المَدْحُورُ ومثلها المُغْلَبُ وقيل للجُدُّوِلِ في السَّمَّال المُفَلَّح وجماعه
الأَفْلَاعُ والسبيل ما جَرَّ من نَهْرٍ أو عين سااح الماء يَسْبِعُ
سيّدًا وسَيِّدًا وهو الذي تَسْبَعُ مَهِ جُدُّوِلُ المَحْرِيرٍ و المجْلِ
قال الرايٍز

*يَنْحَكَن من وَثَّقَّى قَلِبِي سَكَا
تَطْنُو إذا الولد عليّها التّةَ
*البّيّكا كع ارحةَاء والسكَ الركّيزة الضيقة من فَلْحِيّهَا
والسَّمَّالِقِيةٌ الركّيزة الكثيرة (fol. 12a)
الماء والخَبِيطُ من الماء الرَّفْعٌ وهو
ما بين الثلاثة الى النَّصّ مِن السقَاة والمَحْرِيرِ والغيّر، والإِناهُ
وَيُقال له أيضًا حَبْيَّة قال الرايِز
Kitāb Al-Maṭār.

إن تَسْلِيمُ الدَّفْنَاةَ والضَّرْوطُ
يَصِيمُ لها في حَوْضِها حُبُّبُ

وُنِمَ الماء الأَجِنُ وهو المُحِبُّ البِتَرِيَّرُ الطَّمْمُ ومنه المَعْرَضُ
والطَّمْكِينُ وَهُمْ واحِدُ وهو الأَخْفُصُ الَّذِي يَخرجُ من أسفل
الماء حتى يكون فوق الماء والرَّكْيَةُ المُوسِنَةُ التي يَعيِّسُنَّ فيها
الإنسان رِسَالًا وهذا قولُ عَامِّةٌ الكِلاْبِينِ وهو غَشَّى يَخْدُمُ
الإنسان من كَنُوٍّ رُجَي ماء الرَّكْيَة وَقَالُ بعَضِم آمِنَ الماء
يَأْسَسُ آمِنًا فَهْمُ والماء المُطرَق وهو الْطَرَقُ وهو ماء السماء
الذَّي يَتَنُّوُّ فيه الإلََّى وَتَبَعُّرُ فَذَالِكُ الطَّرَقُ والمُطرَوقُ
والرَّجَعُ اصْفَرُ من الْنَّهُي وَحُوْدُ وَجَمَاعَهُ الرَّجَعَانُ وَالْيَهَا وَهَى
جُلْدَانُ في الْأَرْضِ وَكَوْكَبُ (fol. 12b) الماء حَسُفُ في الرَّكْيَة وَحَسُفُها
صَفَرُ عَينِها وَيَعَالُ لِلرَّكْيَة الَّتِي تَهْدَمُتْ فَنَقَصَ مَارُها وَنْفَتْ
عُزْراَنُ وَتَرِيَّة وَيَعَالُ لأَوْلُ النَّبْطُ قَرَنُوا وَتَنْتَلِجُ الرَّكْيَة أتْلاجًا حين يَدُمُ
النَّبْطُ يَنْدَدُ التَّرَابِ والانْتَلاجُ قَبْلَ التَّرَحِيمُ وهو حَيْن يَنْدَدُ
النَّبْطُ التَّرَحِيمُ قَبْلَ النَّبْطُ والماء السَّاكِنُ السَّاكنُ الَّذِي لا يَدْرُؤُ
يَقَالُ سَكْرُ الماء يَسْكُنُ سَكْرًا
ويقال الفطَاء غطاء الركَّبة والأنف وكل شيء غطيت به تغطيته وكذلك إذا جعلت على رأس الركبة جحرة غطيت التغطيه أو عَجَرًا إذا غطيت فيه رأسها والغبار التراب الذي جعله فوق الفطاء حتى توارده وإذا لم يجلع على رأس الركبة جحرة ولا عَجَرًا ثم صبَّ فيها التراب فذلئك الدفن وكذلك كل حفرة مفرغة

(fol. 18a)

اركبت جعلت على رأسها شيء يغطيها به ثم دفت رأسها بالنذاب فذلئك التغطيه وإذا دفنتها بالترااب ولا شئ على رأسها فذلئك الدفن والتعريج وغطيت الأداء ليس فيه غُمُّ التغطيه والرَّكَّب من الماء القليل المخضوع بالطين والكدر مثلا يقال

كُدر الماء يُكَّدرُ [كَتَرُ] ويقال نضب الماء ينصب نصبًا مثل النَّفَّاش وبَض الماء يُضِمّ يُضيفًا وهو ان يُسْتَحْمَاء الماء كيَجتمع واجتماعه نضيفه ونض الماء يضِمّ نضيفًا وهو مثل البضيض ويقال ماء غلب وبعثة غذاب وتد عذب الماء عذوبة ومنه الزَّول وهو أشت الماء عذوبة واطبيه طفا ومنه النفق وهو مثل الزول ومنه الغراث وهو العذب ومنه الشَّم وهم البئر

عذبًا كان أو يلتح بالقرص الباء من كل شراب فرس يقيس قرسًا وفرَّوسًا (fol. 18b)

ومنه البئر وهو الذي لا يشرب منه وهو الرطاق وهو أشياء ملؤه وهو الذي لا يُطَمْعُ
Kitāb Al-Maṭār.
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ومنه المَحْضِرُ وهو الشرب من الماء ويقال له مَحْضِرُ;

ومنه المَعْلَمُ وهو أشد الماء مَحْضِرًا ومنه المَلِيمُ وهو المَحْضِرُ,

ومنه الفَجْلُ وهو أشد المَلِيمَة مَلِيمًا وأَخْبَنُهُ وملعنته الأِجْجُ قال الراجِز

يَشْرَبُنَّ مَاء سَبِحًا اجِجًا

لَوْ يَلَغَ الذِّبْحُ يِمَّا عَفَاجًا

لا يَتَعْيِّنُنَّ الأِجْجَ المَلِيمًا

قال ويقال وَلَغِ الكَلْبُ شَراَبِيًا وَقَ شَراَبِيًا وَقَ شَراَبِيًا وَقَ الشُّبُ.

فَالْمَاء الابْدَانُ الْبَلَح الشدِيد المَلِيمَة ومنه الصرى وهو

الأَجْجُ ومنه الرَّوَائِنُ وهو الدَّاَبُّ الْمَعْيِينُ الذي لا يَذْهَب وَرَثُ

الْمَاء يَتْمِن وَرَثُ وَرَثُ ومنه النُّزُورُ وهو الغَلِيلُ من الماء ومن كل

شِيئه ومنه الزَّوَاء وهو الكَثِيرُ (fol. 148a) من كلّ مَاء ويقال لِلْمِلْيُ."}

الْمَتَوَّكِىّ حِينِ تَأْجُّنَّ اجْجُ وَسَلَامٌ وَجِمَاعَهُ السَّدَامِ وَيَقَال لِلْمِلْيُة

اللَّتِي قد تَتَهْدَمَت وَتَحَرَّكَ عُرْوًا وَكَذَاكَ الجَمِيعُ.

وقالوا الأَّنْهَارُ كَلَّها بِحَارٍ وَالْنُّهْرُ بِحَرٍ وَيَقَال لِلْمَاء إِذَا غَنِّطُ

بعد عَدْرَةٍ قد أَسْتَتَحْرَر وَأَسْتَسْتَأْنَى بِيَزْرُمَ إذا غَنِّطَ مَارَهَا وَيَقَال

مَاء طَيِّبٌ وَهُوَ أَشْدَ حَفْرًا مِن الْكِكَرِ طَيِّبُ المَاء طَيِّبًا وَحَفْرًا.
السَّوَادَاءُ المُتَغَفِّرَةُ الرَّيحُ حَبِيبٌ الرَّكِيَّةُ حَمَامٌ حَمَامٌ والفَرْقُينُ
الطين الذي يَقْبَلُ السَّيْلُ فَبَقَىٰ على وجه الأرض رطَبًا كان
او يَايَاٰ#
ثم الكتاب والمَحَدِّل لله على نعيم رصل على نبيه سيّدنا
صلى.
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230 فحص، يفحص، فحول
154 ضرب أصرت ضرية
71 ضرب
91 ضريب
158 ضوء
244 إضاعة
100 سكين
274 سكر، يسكر، سكور
168 سيلبنة
12 سيماك
245 سلسلة
150 سنا
6 ساح يسبح سلم
260 سجقان
175، 200 سيف
82 شورب شاحيب
90 شهم
8 شتوي
99 شجاعة أمجد يشجع
7 شرط
180 تشتقق
177 صيبي ضمير
104 غمر أتعشى إفخاخ
159 مكعبة
مطر الحذب

عطاء

معقتم

ططعر، ططبارم

ضحاية ططعا

طرة 214

طرن طترن ق

ططن يطيط ططش

طل 99، 106

غين

طل ططل ططل ططلاء 107

غلبا

طيب

طيب طاميط

طبر يطبر طبر طامية

استطارت 148، 141

غرين

غثحن غثحيين 91

إغسان

غثاء

غلب علب علب علب عذاب 5

عرض يعرض عرض عراشة

غماهة غام 171

غنيبة غنيبالة

غيب غيبوبة 17

معرنص 281
عَبْرَاتُ ِقُرْءَاءٍ
وَمُعَلَّمٍ مَّفْيَوَةٍ
عِبَّمٌ غَيْبُمُ
نَّمَيْمَ أَنْلَأْجُ
فُرُّاتُ
مُؤَا يَقِرُّرُ قُرْءٍ
قُرْءَمَ يَقِمْ قُرْمُم
c. 271
قُرْمُم يَقِرْحُ قُرْحَ
c. 148
قُرْحُ قُرْسَ قُرْس
قُرْسَ قَارِسٍ
c. 291
قَرَعَةٌ قَرَع
c. 193
أَقْصَرُ إِقْصَارٍ
قُنْطُر قَطَارٍ
c. 113
قَطَّعَةُ قَطَّعَةٍ
قَطَّعَةُ مُقَطَّعَةٍ
c. 24
قَطَّعَةُ تَعَكَّدُمُ
c. 128
قَعَاعٌ
c. 200
أَلْهَبَ إِلَهَابٍ

فَخْرَةً مَّمْرَةً

مَسَالٍ

مُشَاشَةً

مَعْصِعٍ يَصُمُ مَصْعً

نَحْلٍ

نَجْوِيٍّ نِيَّةً

نَدْى

نَزْرٍ

نَسْرَانٍ

نَشْ، يُنِشَأ نَشْأٍ

نَشْحُ

نَشَامَةٌ نَشامَةٍ

نَشْفْ يُنَشَفُ نُشْف

نَشْف
NOTES.

6. Cf. Fleischer, ZDMG. vi. 390; Flügel, Die Grammatischen Schulen der Araber, p. 5; Yāḥīḥ, i. 369, 3; Zamaḥšari, al-Muṣafal, 189, 8; 162, 3. On the influence of the stars upon rain, see Wellhausen, Skizzen, iii. p. 173, and the passages cited there.


Lisān, s. v. "rain," has the whole passage from line 6 to line 18, but in the name of Abū Manṣūr. I note the following variants: 7

The two roots are similar in meaning. For a similar confusion, see De Goeje, Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum, iv. p. 363; 10

which is perhaps the better reading, cf. Ideler, Untersuchungen, p. 158.

The term "rain" is used to refer to various phenomena; cf. De Goeje, Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum, iv. p. 363; 10

The term "rain" is used to refer to various phenomena; cf. De Goeje, Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum, iv. p. 363; 10
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قال ابن منصور وهما من الفرع القادم. 

7. الشرطين = الشرط (β and γ of Aries?) Kazwinî, i. p. 42; Ideler, Untersuchungen, pp. 184, 287.

10. We ought to read الدَّينَّين, as in the authorities cited above; cf. also Lisân, i. 70; Muhîf, p. 331.

12. The passage is usually made up of السماك السماك الاعزل and السكان الراضم, Ideler, Untersuchungen, p. 51; Lisân, xiii. 469 [ZDMG., xlix. 116]. In we seem to have a more general name, "a star which watches (is opposite to) another star." Lane, p. 1134. See line 22.

17. هما لغنات. The passage is quoted Lisân, 172, but without غيرب.

18. MS. النقطة; Muhîf, s. v. and Lisân, ix. 339 تيظفت on the marg. of the MS. some one has made the correction النقطة.

19. MS. has distinctly صرارة, with ksr; but see Lane and Muhîf, s. v.; and Lisân, vi. 134, where our passage is quoted.

20. حاشية الصراب المعلّملا بذاش مُعَجّبة، which is incorrect; but see Thorbecke, Al-Ḥarîrî's Durrat-al-Ǧauwâd (Leipzig, 1871), p. 35; Lane, pp. 1975, 1989. Lisân, vi. 184, cites this passage, with dâl.


25. So the MS. Read وَأَرَّعْتُ.

26. So the MS. Lane, p. 937 دَيْمَة; Muhîf, p. 699.

28. Marg. حاشية رواها الزيدّي مَعَجّبة, and يرى تَحَمّلَ بالحَجّ.

Lisân, xvii. 321, cites the verse with the variant reading يَا حَبَّادًا تَحَمّلَ.

32. Read الرَّضَب.

59. The verse is cited by Lane, p. 936, and by Lisân, xv. 109, with in place of السَّكَرَى Ana the السَّكَرَى, which is an evident mistake.) On Al-Sukkarî, see Flügel, loc. cit., p. 89. Hammer-Purgstall, Literaturgesch., i. p. 396.
But in spite of this, see the remark of Lane, *loc. cit.*

83. Read *šābīb*. *Lisān*, i. 463, quoting ʿAbū Zayd, reads *wādī*.

85. On *mūjīb*. see Wright, *Grammar*, i. 185.

91. Marg.

On Abū Ḥātim al-Sajastānī (d. 248 or 255 A. H.) see Flügel, *Die Grammatischen Schulen*, p. 87; Yākūt, iii. 44; and Wüstenfeld's note, *ad loc.* On Abu-l-faḍl ibn al-Faraj al-Riyāšī, see Flügel, *Grammat. Schulen*, p. 85; and the authorities cited by Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften*, iii. 474. (d. 257 A. H.)

103. I have added *تصلعاصم*. Marg.


109. Read *yāḥiḏr.*

111. Marg.

Both in the text and on the margin *Muḥiṭ*, p. 703 and Freytag; *Rāhān*; so also the *Lisān*, s. v.; but the *Tāj* says:
118. Cf. Beidawi, i. p. 80, 8. Marg. اخبرنا ابن عبيد عن الحسن قال الرعد ملك موكَل بالحكم وتسبيعه صرته الذي تسمعون في كتاب السكركي تزرزولابو حاتم تزرز

119. Marg. The text in line 131 is not clear; we must evidently read the verse:

الا عسيلي أسقيبي صر البحث

I am indebted for this to Prof. Ignaz Goldziher of Buda-Pesth. A close scrutiny of the MS. seems to bear out this reading.

130. cf. Yākūt, ii. 941.

131. Ms. استطارة; but it must be read with ط; see line 141.

132. Brīq al-tahkab rather substantiates the reading of the Kāmūs (Lane, p. 1897, a. v. سلسلة), and not فعالة اف فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة فعالة Future; Wright, i. p. 10; ZDMG., xxx. 207; Nöldeke, Geschichte des Korans, p. 257; Fleischer, Kleinere Schriften, i. 29. But I doubt if it was ever used with the singular.

133. MS. has بيرق, evidently a mistake for the feminine.

134. MS. has وتداركة, and above the end of the word some letters which I read as معا, which may perhaps be معا referring to the possibility of either punctuation.

135. Read والخاف.

136. Read لسان, citing this passage, reads السد.

137. Read نشأ.

138. MS. has الغيم الغيم الاتخاب الأبيض أو الاتخاب الذي تراه دون الاتخاب الأعلي ويكون أبيض أو أسود.

The same mistake is found in line 194, where I have made the correction in the text.

139. Marg. غيَّرُ البَيْثةَ.
HASHISHA'AH 'UN 'ABI 'ABDUL-AL-'Ajam 'An

195. Marg. HASHISHA'AH 'UN 'ABI 'ABDUL-AL-'Ajam.


197. Marg. HASHISHA'AH 'UN 'ABI 'ABDUL-AL-'Ajam.

200. MS. Read نَطَّلَ and correct lines 206 and 207 accordingly.

201. Muḥīf, pp. 1254 and 1985, gives both forms. Read also the al-kalābīs, against the MS.

202. MS. seems to read أَخْدَهَةً, but the correct reading is أَخْدَهَةً; cf. *Lisān*, iv. p. 140.

203. *Lisān*, xvi. 90, cites the first two lines, with والَابنْ نَطَّلَ and both of which readings must be accepted. Before this our author is cited. قال ابْرَاهِيم: يقال للجَبِيل اللَّهِ الصَّلَّمُ عَلَيْهِ.

204. Marg. HASHISHA'AH 'UN 'ABI 'ABDUL-AL-'Ajam.

205. So in the MS. Read طَمَّرَ.

206. Read ْبُضَا.

207. Read ْبِنَاءً.

208. In the Ṭaj, vii. 174 and *Lisān*, iii. 474; xii. 332 the reading of the first word is يَرْتَخَى. Dr. Torrey has been kind enough to examine the MS. again, and finds the correct reading to be يَرْتَخَى. On the margin of the Ṭaj is the remark وَرَتَخَى هَيِّ اسْمُ بِتْمَر. The same remark is made in *Lisān. loc. cit.*; cf. also Yākūt, iv. 929, l. 22.

209. In MS. with مَعَ written above. Does this again refer to a double pronunciation?

210. I have inserted ـَكَذِّرْتُا. Marg. ـَكَذِّرْتُا مَعًا.
INTRODUCTION.

Al-Anṣārī was one of the most renowned of the early Baṣra grammarians. His full name was Abū Zaid Sa'īd, and his genealogy is given by Ibn Ḥallīkān as: ibn Aus ibn Thābit ibn Zaid ibn Ḫāṣ ibn Zaid ibn al-No'mān ibn Mālik ibn Tha'labī ibn Ka'b. He belonged to the noblest family of the Ḥazraj. His grandfather Thābit is said to have been one of the six who collected the Kurʾān while the prophet was still alive. Ibn Ḥallīkān says of him: “He held the first rank among the literary men of that time, and devoted his attention principally to the study of the philology of the Arabic language, its simpler terms and rare expressions.” Al-Nadîm gives us the following estimate upon the authority of al-Mubarrad: “Abū Zaid was well learned in grammar, though he did not come up to Ḥallī and Sibawaih. Yūnus was looked upon by Abū Zaid as untrustworthy in matters of lexicography, but was more learned than Abū Zaid in grammar. Still, Abū Zaid was held in higher estimation than either al-ʿAṣmaʿI or Abū ʿUbeidah in grammar. For this reason he is called Abū Zaid al-Naḥawi (the grammarian).” Nawāwī calls him “the Imām” in matters of philology. Simply as “Abū Zaid” he is cited by many authors, e.g. Yākūt, Jauhari, the editors of the Tūj al-ʿArūs and Lisān al-ʿArab, etc.

In the strife which divided the Baṣra from the Kūfa school, al-Anṣārī seems to have been catholic in his choice of authorities. Abū Sa'īd says of him: “I do not know any of the Baṣri philologists who have come to Kūfa to study the speech of the Beduin Arabs except Abū Zaid; for he relates traditions coming from al-Muḥājīl al-Ḍabbī.” According to Abū ʿAmr al-Māzīnī, traditions going back to Abū Zaid have been handed down by Abū ʿUbeid al-Ḥāṣim, Muḥammad ibn Sa'īd, Abū Ḥāṯim al-Ṣajastānī, Abū Zaid ʿOmar ibn Shabbah, Abū Ḥāṯim al-Rāzī, etc., etc. Our author is generally praised for his great knowl-

---

1 Biographical Dictionary, Tr. of Slane, i. p. 570; other authorities call Thābit: ibn Bashir ibn Abū Zaid. To this ibn Ḥallīkān wisely remarks: “and God knows which of the two is correct.” See also, Hammer-Purgstall, Literaturgeschichte der Araber, i. 308.
2 Flügel, Kitāb al-Fihrist, i. p. 54. 20.
3 Flügel, Die Grammatischen Schulen der Araber, Leipzig 1862, p. 71; Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Ḫūhammad, iii. 259; Nöldeke, Geschichte des Korans, p. 189.
4 Flügel, Kitāb al-Fihrist, loc. cit.
5 Biographical Dictionary of Illustrious Men, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, p. 721.
6 See e. g. Flügel, Schulen, passim; Košut, Fünf Streitfragen der Bauern und Küfensker, Wien, 1878.
7 Flügel, Schulen, p. 143.
8 Nawāwī, loc. cit.
edge of tradition. Al-Thauri says, quoting Ibn Munadir: "Al-Ashma' has the best-stocked memory of them all; Abū 'Ubeidah surpasses them in general information; and Abū Zaid al-Ašqārī is the surest authority in traditional knowledge." Even Al-Ashma' himself was not slow to recognize his worth. There is a tradition, the authority for which rests with Uthman al-Mazini, that he (Uthman) was once present when Al-Ashma' went up to Abū Zaid, who was then surrounded by his pupils, and after kissing him on the head sat down among them and said: "Thou hast been our lord and master for the last fifty years." While they were there, Ḥalaf al-Ahmar came, kissed him and sat down and said: "This one has been our teacher for twenty years."

Upon the authority of both Al-Ashma' and Abū 'Ubeidah, Abū Zaid is said to have been abstemious, God-fearing and religious. In philosophical thought, Ibn Ḥallikān says he belonged to the sect of the Kadrites—the upholders of the doctrine of free-will, who afterwards received the name of Mu'tazilites.

Of his life we know nothing other than that he came to Bagdad about the year 158 A.H., when al-Mahdi Muḥammad had ascended the throne of the Caliphate. The date of his death is also uncertain. It is variously given as 214, 215 or 216 A.H.—about 830 A.D. But all authorities agree that he attained a great age (98, 95 or 96). He died at Basra.

Abū Zaid was quite a prolific writer, nearly always upon lexicographical and grammatical subjects. The canon of his works varies in the different authorities. As many as twenty-five seem to be current and are mentioned by more than one author. But few of these were large works. They deserve rather the title "tract" than "book." In the case of most of the early Muhammadan writers, very few of their works have come down to us; those of Abū Zaid are among the rarest. His philological works are:

1. كتاب الأبل والشاه. On the words used in Arabic for camel and sheep. Fī, Ḥal., Fl.; H. H. v. 30 simply كتاب الأبل.


1 Ibn Ḥallikān, loc. cit.
2 Nawāwī, who also relates the story, says thirty years.
3 This is added by Nawāwī. On Ḥalaf al-Aḥmar see Ahlwardt, Chalif Elahmar's Qisside, p. 17.
4 Al-Führst, loc. cit.
7 Flügel, Schulen, loc. cit.
8 Suyūṭi, Al-Muzhir, ii, p. 231.
9 In the following list I have been careful to give my authorities. Fī = Führst; Ḥal. = Ibn Ḥallikān; H. H. = Hāfiz Ḥalifah, ed. Flügel; Fl. = Flügel, Gramm. Schulen: Su. = Suyūṭi, as cited by Flügel.
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4. كتاب خلق الإنسان. On words used in regard to the human body. Fi., Ḥal., Fi., H. H. iii. 173.¹
5. كتاب اللغات. On the different Arabic dialects. Fi., Ḥal., Fl.
6. كتاب قراءة أبي عمرو. On the Kur'ān recension of Abū 'Amr. Fi., Fl.³
7. كتاب النوادر. On uncommon expressions. Fi., Ḥal., Fl., H. H. vi. 387.³
9. كتاب القوس والترس. On the words used for bow and shield. Ḥal., H. H. v. 188; Su. gives these as two separate tracts.
10. كتاب الهمرة وتحريفها. On the lightening of the Hamza.⁴ There is another reading تحيت “On the full pronunciation, etc.” Ḥal., Fi., Fl.
12. كتاب النم. On the words used for the date. Fi., Ḥal.
13. كتاب البياء. On the words used for different kinds of water. Fi., Ḥal., Su., H. H. v. 161. Though mentioned here as a separate treatise, it will be found as a part of the كتاب المطر printed above.
14. كتاب المنصبيب. Ḥal., H. H. v. 137. Fi. has كتاب المنصوب.
15. كتاب الوجوح. On the expressions used in regard to animals. Fi., Ḥal.
16. كتاب الفرق. On the difference (between the parts of the human body and those of animals). Fi., Ḥal., Fl.

¹ For other works upon this subject, see the list in Ahlwardt's Catalogue of the Arabic MSS. in the Berlin Library, vol. vi. p. 293.
² For similar compilations of Kur'ān readings, see Ahlwardt, ibid. i. p. 247.
³ Extracts from a MS. of this work were sent in 1854 by Dr. Eli Smith to Professor Fleischer, and published by the latter, ZDMG., xii. p. 57. [See, also, Kleineere Schriften, iii. 471 sq.] The whole has lately been published by the Catholic press of Beirut and under the superintendence of Sa'id al-Ḥurī al-Sharti. To this is attached a tract on "Faults of Speech"; which, however, must have originally belonged to the book. It is not mentioned in any of the lists of Abu Zaid's works. [Cf. Nöldeke, ZDMG., xlix. p. 320.]
⁴ Cf. Fleischer, Kleineere Schriften, pp. 35 and 47.
R. J. H. Gottheil,


23. كتاب القرایب. On the combination of letters (?). Mentioned only by Fl.

24. كتاب في اللامات. On words commencing with lām; only in Fl.

25. كتاب الواحد. On the singular; only in Fi.

26. كتاب نبت المشافهات. Fi.

27. كتاب نبت الندل. Description of the 'Anam tree (see Führst, ii. p. 84). Fi.


29. كتاب [١٠] المعدن. On transitive verbs?? Fi.


In addition to these, Al-Nadīm mentions a number of other works which are given in none of the other authorities; and the subject matter of which can only be guessed at:

31. كتاب أيحان عثمان. On the religious belief of 'Uthmān?

32. كتاب حيلة وحكيلة. On mechanics and the secret arts??

33. كتاب الهوش واللذوش. On the expressions used for battle and war?

34. كتاب الجلسة. Dozy, Suppl., i. 207. "Droit d'occupation"??

35. كتاب نابة ونبيع. In his Catalogue of the Arabic MSS. in the Berlin Library (vol. vi. 299) Ahlwardt speaks of a كتاب السيف by our author. It may perhaps be a part of No. 2.

1 Ibn Dureid also wrote on this subject; Flögel, Gramm. Schulen, p. 108. Ibn al-Qttiyya, Il libro dei Verbi, pp. 10, seq.

1 Ibn Hallikān: I have seen a fine work of his, a treatise on plants, which contained a number of curious passages.
The little tract published here gets its title from the first subject of which it treats. But in addition to discussing the names of the different kinds of rain and the expressions used in speaking of rain, it treats in the same manner of the following subjects: رعد (thunder), دَرَق (lightning), مِيَار (mist) and سَكَاب (waters). This last seems to have existed — as I said above — as a separate treatise. Most of the material collected in these earlier tracts has found its way into the large lexica: Jawhari, Tāj, Līsān, etc. But they are important in studying the history of Arabic lexicography, and in determining the value of the work done by these first masters of a science which has been so greatly developed in the Muhammadan Schools.

I have been able to use only one MS.: and this has made the editing at once difficult and risky. But I know of no other in a European library. The MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris is numbered No. 4231 (old no., Ancien fonds No. 1928), written in the year 631 A. H. (see fol. 22a) = 1233 A. D. The handwriting is good and clear, and the punctuation is given very fully. But in the course of time, the writing, especially of the vowels, has become dulled, so that one is left at times in great doubt. Nor is the MS. itself free from faults. As this is the only MS., I have adhered closely to the original, making changes only where there were evident faults; even then, I have in every case called attention to the change. In order to insure accuracy, I have twice compared my copy with the manuscript; and through the kindness of Prof. H. Deroenbourg the proof was once more compared (by Mr. Conzelmann) with the original. It was Prof. Deroenbourg who first drew my attention to this tract of Abū Zaid, and who urged upon me the desirability of publishing it.

The MS. contains also:

كتاب غلط الصفاء من الفقهاء لأبي دَرْقِ
مكوسرة ابن دريد الازدي بشرح ابن خالويه
خطا العوام للجويقي
كتاب الملاحم

1 Ibn Dureid also wrote a work upon this subject. See W. Wright, Opuscula Arabica, Leyden, 1859, pp. 15, seq.; Berlin Catalogue of Arabic MSS., vi. p. 295. Ibn Dureid treats of a number of words mentioned in our tract; but I have not thought it necessary to cite each case.
2 I have been able to control a number of readings by the citations from another MS. in the Lisān al-ʿArab. It would have taken months of work to hunt up every citation; I have done so only when the text was suspicious.
3 On Ibn Hālawayh, see Deroenbourg, Hebraica, 1894.
4 Published from this MS. by H. Deroenbourg, Le livre des locutions vicieuses, in Morgenländische Forschungen, Leipzig, 1875, pp. 107, seq.
5 Published from a MS. in Gotha by H. Thorbecke, Ibn Duraid’s Kitāb al-Malāḥīn, Heidelberg, 1892.
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PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,

AT ITS

MEETING IN BOSTON AND CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

April 6th, 7th, and 8th, 1893.

The Society assembled at Cambridge, in the Room of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University, University Hall, on Thursday, April 6th, and was called to order by the President, Rev. Dr. William Hayes Ward, at 3.15 P. M.

The following members were in attendance at the sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Babbitt</th>
<th>Ferguson</th>
<th>Jenks</th>
<th>Moore, G. F.</th>
<th>Thayer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berle</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Kellner</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Torrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bierwirth</td>
<td>Gilman</td>
<td>Lanman</td>
<td>Mullan</td>
<td>Ward, W. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channing, Miss</td>
<td>Goodwin, C. J.</td>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>Oertel</td>
<td>Warren, H. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Harper, W. B.</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Orne</td>
<td>Warren, W. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Miss</td>
<td>Haupt</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Reisner</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahl</td>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td>Ropes</td>
<td>Wright, T. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dike</td>
<td>Higginson</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elwell</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Moore, C. H.</td>
<td>Taylor, J. R.</td>
<td>[44]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minutes of the Washington meeting were read by the Recording Secretary, Prof. Lyon, of Harvard University, and accepted by the Society. The report of the Committee of Arrangements was submitted in the form of a printed program and accepted.

The Chair appointed as a Committee to audit the Treasurer’s report Rev. Mr. Berle and Prof. Kellner; and, as a Committee to prepare a list of nominations for office for the ensuing year, Prof. J. Henry Thayer, Prof. George F. Moore, and Prof. Elwell.

The reports of the retiring officers were now in order.

The Treasurer, Mr. Henry C. Warren, of Cambridge, Mass., presented his accounts and statement to the Society; and they
were referred, with book and vouchers and the evidences of the
property, to the above named Committee of Audit. The Com-
mittee reported that the accounts were in due order, and that the
funds called for by the balances were in the possession of the
Treasurer. The usual analytical summary of the General
Account follows:

RECEIPTS.

Balance from old account, April 21, 1892.............. $432.84
Assessments (155) paid in for 1892-93.................. $775.00
Assessments (88) for other years....................... 190.00
Sales of publications................................ 188.30
Interest on Publication Fund.......................... 101.17
Interest on balances of General Account............... 14.96

Total income of the year.............................. 1,264.43

Total receipts for the year........................... $1,697.27

EXPENDITURES.

Journal, xv. 2 (remainder), and distribution........ $231.68
Proceedings, April, 1892.............................. 326.19
Authors' extras from Journal and Proceedings........ 96.00
Job printing........................................ 16.00
Postage, express, brokerage, etc..................... 41.44

Total disbursements for the year...................... $651.31
Credit balance on Gen'l Account, April 6, 1893...... 1,045.96

$1,697.27

One life-membership fee has also been received during the
year, and is, in accordance with action taken last year, retained
as capital. The anonymous gift of $1,000 to the Publication
Fund reported last year has been invested in eight shares of the
State National Bank, Boston (bought at 126; the extra $8 is
included in the item of "brokerage" in the above account), and
is earning at present a trifle over 6 per cent.

The state of the funds is as follows:

1892, Jan. 1, Amount of the Bradley Type-fund........ $1,316.70
Interest one year.................................... 53.18

1893, Jan. 1, Amount of the Bradley Type-fund........ $1,369.88
Amount of Publication-fund.......................... 2,008.00

1892, July 7, Amount of Life-membership-fund......... 75.00
Interest to Oct. 12, 1892............................ .75

1892, Oct. 12, Amount of Life-membership-fund........ $75.75

1893, April 6, Balance of General Account............. $1,045.96

The bills for Journal xv. 8 have not yet been presented.
The report of the Librarian, Mr. Van Name, for the year 1892–3, is as follows: The accessions to the Society’s library for the past year have been 37 volumes, 78 parts of volumes, 99 pamphlets, and 9 manuscripts (Sanskrit). The titles of all these works are included in the list appended to volume xv. of the Journal, just completed. The number of titles of printed works now in the library is 4,595; of manuscripts, 186.

The Committee of Publication reported that since the last meeting they had published and distributed the following: Journal, volume xv., number 2 (= pages 143–383), issued June 22, 1892; Proceedings of the Washington meeting of April 21–23, 1892 (= vol. xv., pages cxli–ccxx), issued Nov. 28, 1892; and finally, Journal, vol. xv., number 3 (= pages 283–322 and ccxxx–ccxlvii and i–v), issued April 3, 1893; in all, 292 pages.

Professor Lanman observed that a plan to publish the Journal as a quarterly had been strenuously advocated by one or two members. He believed that the Committee of Publication were very strongly of the opinion that promptness and frequency of issue were in the highest degree desirable; but that, on the other hand (aside from the consideration of expense), the quality of the material offered for publication should be the sole determinate of the question whether any given paper should be printed; that the needlessly created necessity of issuing a number upon each quarter-day might make quantity a co-determinant, a result for which parallels are not far to seek, and which would be most sincerely to be deprecated.

Moreover, there are indications—all of the greatest hope and promise—that material of the most worthy character is already forthcoming with increasing abundance, and that the laboriously gathered items of the Society’s income are likely to allow of a somewhat extended scale of expenditure for printing.

Finally, it was noted that the German Oriental Society is only a little younger than our own; that it has between four and five hundred contributors to its treasury, or about twice as many as have we; that—what is much more to the point—the professed Orientalists among its members are far more numerous than ours, and that this disparity, through most of the past history of our Society, has been much greater than it is even now; and that, as compared with their splendid achievements—Journal, “Abhandlungen,” and miscellaneous works, some seventy-five volumes in all—our fifteen volumes of Journal and Proceedings is a showing by no means discreditable.

The Directors reported by their Scribe, Prof. Lanman, as follows:

1. They had appointed the next regular business meeting of the Society to be held on the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of next Easter week, March 29, 30, and 31, 1894, or on some one or more of those three days, and that they would determine and announce the place of meeting in due course.

2. They had re-appointed, as Committee of Publication for 1893–94, Messrs. Hall, Lanman, G. F. Moore, Peters, and W. D. Whitney.

3. On recommendation of the Librarian they had voted a standing annual appropriation of $25 for the binding of books.

4. They had voted to present the report of the Committee on Joint Meetings to the Society, with a recommendation that the resolutions proposed by that report be adopted. (See below.)

5. They had voted to recommend to the Society for election to membership the following persons:

As Corporate Members:

Rev. J. L. Amerman, New York, N. Y.;
Mr. Nageeb J. Arbeely, New York, N. Y.;
Mr. Joseph F. Berg, New Brunswick, N. J.;
Dr. Heinrich C. Bierwirth, Cambridge, Mass.;
Dr. I. M. Casanowicz, Washington, D. C.;
Dr. Charles H. S. Davis, Meriden, Conn.;
Mr. Wm. W. Hastings, Haverford, Penn.;
Rev. Willis Hatfield Hazard, Cambridge, Mass.;
Rev. Arthur Lloyd, Port Hope, Ontario;
Mr. Percival Lowell, Boston, Mass.;
Prof. Duncan Macdonald, Hartford, Conn.;
Mr. George L. Meyers, New York, N. Y.;
Prof. Clifford H. Moore, Andover, Mass.;
Mr. Paul Elmer More, St. Louis, Mo.;
Mr. Murray Anthony Potter, San Francisco, Cal.;
Mr. James Hardy Ropes, Andover, Mass.;
Mr. William A. Rosenzweig, New York, N. Y.;
Rev. W. Scott Watson, Jr., Guttenberg, N. J.;
Prof. Theodore F. Wright, Cambridge, Mass.

As Corresponding Members:

Mr. George A. Grierson, Bengal Civil Service, Howrah, Bengal
Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, Madrassah, Calcutta, Bengal;
Rev. W. A. Shedd, Missionary at Oroomiah, Persia;
Dr. John C. Sundberg, U. S. Consul at Baghdad, Turkey.

And as Honorary Members:

Prof. Edward B. Cowell, Cambridge, England;
Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch, Leipzig, Germany;
Prof. Ignazio Guidi, Rome, Italy;
Prof. Hendrik Kern, Leyden, Netherlands;
Prof. Jules Oppert, Paris, France;
Dr. Reinhold Rost, London, England;
The report of the Directors being thus finished, the Society proceeded to the election of new members; and, ballot being had, the above named gentlemen were duly elected.

Mr. Talcott Williams, Chairman of the Committee appointed to confer with several Societies for the purpose of agreeing upon a common time and place of meeting, presented a written report embodying the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Directors of this Society be requested to make arrangements with any of the following Societies, to wit:

The American Philological Association;
The Archæological Institute of America;
The Anthropological Society of Washington:
The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis;
The Modern Language Association of America;
The American Folklore Society;
The American Dialect Society—
or any other Societies of a similar purpose, for a joint meeting in connection with the next annual meeting of this Society.

Resolved, That the Directors have authority* to appoint a meeting of this Society either in the Christmas vacation of 1893–94, the Easter vacation of 1894, or the Christmas vacation of 1894–5, if an alteration from the usual date be necessary in order to secure a joint meeting.

The resolutions were adopted, and the Committee, Messrs. Williams, Haupt, and Lanman, continued over for another year. The following names of recently deceased members of the Society were reported:

Dr. Thomas Chase, of Providence, R. I.;
Brinton Coxe, Esq., of Philadelphia, Penn.;
Mr. George E. Eby, of Philadelphia, Penn.;
Dr. Andrew F. Peabody, of Cambridge, Mass.

On Friday morning, Professors Elwell, G. F. Moore, and Thayer, as the Committee on the nomination of Officers, reported. Dr. Ward having intimated his desire not to stand for re-election, on account of the pressure of his other duties, which made it impracticable for him to give to the position such time and care as he felt that it demanded, the Committee nominated as President of the Society, Pres. D. C. Gilman; as Vice-President, in Mr. Gilman's place, Dr. Ward; and as Vice-President, in place of the late Dr. Peabody, Prof. Toy; and for the remaining offices, the incumbents of the preceding year. The gentlemen so nominated were elected. The Board for 1893–94 is accordingly as follows:

---

* In accordance with the palpable intention of this resolution, it should read "Directors be requested to appoint," etc.

President—Pres. D. C. Gilman, of Baltimore.
Vice-Presidents—Dr. William Hayes Ward, of New York; Prof. C. H. Toy, of Cambridge; Prof. Isaac H. Hall, of New York.
Corresponding Secretary—Prof. C. R. Lanman, of Cambridge.
Recording Secretary—Prof. D. G. Lyon, of Cambridge.
Treasurer—Mr. Henry C. Warren, of Cambridge.
Librarian—Mr. Addison Van Name, of New Haven.

Directors—The officers above named; and, Professors Bloomfield and Haupt, of Baltimore; Mr. Talcott Williams, of Philadelphia; Prof. E. W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr; Prof. A. L. Frothingham, of Princeton; Prof. R. Gottheil, of New York; Prof. George F. Moore, of Andover.

The session of Thursday afternoon was held at the Room of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University. Soon after assembling, the Society took a brief recess, while tea was served in the office of the Dean of Harvard College. Upon adjournment, some of the members went to the house of Prof. Toy and others to the house of Prof. Lanman, for supper and an informal evening gathering.

The session of Friday morning was held in the house of the Treasurer, Mr. Warren. This is the same house in which the Society used to assemble in the days of Professor Beck, who formerly lived in it. At the close of the morning session, upon the invitation of Mr. Warren, the members of the Society took their luncheon at his house.

The session of Friday afternoon (April 7) was held in the Library of the American Academy, in Boston. This meeting was on the precise fiftieth anniversary of the first meeting of the incorporated Society, which was called to meet at the house of Mr. John J. Dixwell, No. 5 Allston street, Boston, at three o'clock, Friday afternoon, April 7, 1843. The anniversary meeting was devoted to reminiscences of the founders and of the history of the Society, contributed by Dr. Ward, Prof. Lanman, Prof. Thayer, Rev. Henry L. Jenks, Prof. G. F. Moore, and Prof. Lyon.

Twenty-one members of the Society dined and spent the evening together at the Parker House.

Saturday morning's session was held in Claflin Hall of Boston University, Somerset street, Pres. W. F. Warren of Boston University acting as Chairman. During the session, Col. T. W. Higginson gave some very interesting reminiscences of Theodore Parker and Charles Beck. On motion, there were passed votes of thanks to Harvard University, the American Academy, and Boston University, as also to Messrs. Lanman, Toy, and Warren, for the various kind offices which had contributed to make the meeting a pleasant and successful one. At the close of the final session, twenty-six persons were present, all being members of the Society. The Society adjourned at quarter before one o'clock.
The following communications were presented:


The first part of the new edition of The Sacred Books of the Old Testament contains the Hebrew text of the Book of Job, with notes by Professor Siegfried of the University of Jena. The Hebrew text fills 27 pages, and the Critical Notes 21. With the exception of the portions written in prose, namely the prologue (chapters 1–2) and the epilogue (42. 7–17), as well as the introductory verses prefixed to the discourses of Elihu (c. 32. 1–6), the text is printed στρομόν, in double columns. The composite structure of the Book of Job is illustrated by the use of three different colors. The original portions of the poem are printed in black without any additional coloring, while subsequent additions are placed in blocks of different colors, namely blue, red, or green: blue indicating parallel compositions; red, corrective interpolations conforming the speeches of Job to the spirit of the orthodox doctrine of retribution; and green indicating polemical interpolations directed against the tendency of the poem. The Elihu speeches (chapters 32–37) are given in a special appendix printed in green. Later interpolations and glosses are relegated from the text and appear in the foot-notes.

The traditional order has often been changed to restore the proper sequence. After c. 13. 1–27 there follows for instance c. 14. 4, 3, 6, 18, 15, 16, 17, 1, 3; 13. 38; 14. 5, 7–12, 14, 18–22, etc. In order to facilitate references to verses appearing out of the traditional order, there has been appended a Concordance, giving the received arrangement of the verses and the corresponding pages and verses of the new edition. For the sake of clearness, the whole text has been divided into paragraphs wherever the change of subject seemed to require it.

The emendations adopted (ca. 600) are not given in the notes, as in Graetz's† posthumous work, but appear in the text. They are all carefully indicated by special diacritical marks, showing in every case where the Qere has been adopted instead of the Kethib; whether the new reading involves merely a departure from the Masoretic points or a different division of the consonantal text, whether it is conjectural or based on the authority of the ancient Versions. Doubtful words are marked with notes of interrogation, lacunae are indicated by † † † † † † † †, and hopelessly corrupt passages by . . . . : the received text in such

---


cases being given in the notes appended. The Hebrew text has been left unpointed except in ambiguous cases.

The Notes contain brief philological justifications of the emendations adopted, with constant references to the ancient Versions as well as to modern critics. Above all, Merx's well-known book* is cited throughout the Notes. It has not been deemed necessary to classify all the divergences exhibited by the ancient Versions. As a rule, there have been recorded only those variations on the authority of which an emendation has been adopted by the editor of the book. The Hebrew text is cited in the Notes according to the pages and lines of the new edition. But it is proposed to add in the subsequent parts, in the outer margin, the number of the chapters and verses, in order to facilitate references as much as possible. The English translation of the Notes has been most carefully prepared by Professor R. E. Brünnow, of the University of Heidelberg.

The chief aim of the new edition of the Hebrew text is to furnish the philological foundation for our new translation of the Bible now in course of preparation. The edition of the Hebrew text exhibits the reconstructed text on the basis of which the new translation has been prepared by the contributors. At the same time, it is hoped that the edition will prove useful for the class-room. It will save the instructor much time in giving in a brief and distinct form the critical analysis of the book in question. It will moreover have a most wholesome effect on the student, in forcing him to read unpointed Hebrew,† a practice which, unfortunately, is too much neglected in most of our Universities and Theological Seminaries. But, above all, I hope our new edition will become an indispensable help for all Hebraists who study the Old Testament from a critical point of view. It will show the student at a glance whether the received text is unquestionably correct, whether a passage is original or a subsequent addition. Thus it will, I think, place not only the historical but also the grammatical and lexicographical study of the Old Testament on a new basis.‡ A good deal of space is taken up in our Hebrew grammars and dictionaries with the explanation of unusual forms and words.§ Most of these will be found eliminated in our edition.

The munificence of Jacob H. Schiff, Esq., of New York, to whom Harvard University is indebted for the new Semitic museum, has enabled us to place the new edition within the reach of all students. Though the work is perhaps the most sumptuously gotten up Hebrew book ever published, the parts will be sold, in handsome covers, at the nominal price of about $1.00. Bibliophiles will be glad to learn that

† We must remember that a pointed Semitic text prejudices the reader. The adding of the vowels is a semi-interpretation.
‡ Cf. the remarks of Paul de Lagarde prefixed to the second part of his Orientalia, Göttingen, 1880.
there will be an édition de luxe, limited to 100 copies, printed on the
most costly hand-made Dutch paper, in a beautiful ornamental binding
specially designed for the work by Professor Stroehl, of Vienna, who
also has designed the new ornamental headings and tail-pieces for the
Hebrew text.

In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about an objection
that will most likely be raised against our new edition. Some people
will say, I presume, that the critical analysis is more or less subjective,
that there is not a general consensus of opinion concerning the depart-
ures from the received text, even among the most competent Biblical
scholars; perhaps none save the editor of the book in question will
believe in his reconstruction of the text. Now it is undoubtedly true
that in a great many cases we cannot as yet give the final dictum of
science. Like all progressive research, Biblical criticism is in a state
of fluctuation. A student who uses our new edition must rely on his
own judgment. We cannot expect to find the final solution of all diffi-
culties at once. We must be satisfied to recognize the difficulties as
such, to realize that the received text and the traditional order is not
intact. If we do not always hit the mark in reconstructing the text,
we may find some comfort in the maxim, which I at least adhere to,
that the probably right is preferable to the undoubtedly wrong. Ultra-
conservatism bars all progress. A man who is afraid of making a mis-
take had better not write on the Bible—or, for that matter, on any
scientific subject at all. Nor do I think that honest work can do any
harm to the cause of religion. It is a pity to think that faith and rea-
son should be incompatible. Reason is a divine gift. Let us exercise
it, but (as I stated in the first programme of our work)† with the vere-
cundia due to the venerable documents which form the basis of our
faith.

2. On a modern reproduction of the eleventh tablet of the
Babylonian Nimrod Epic and a new fragment of the Chaldean
account of the Deluge; by Professor Haupt.

The Johns Hopkins Press has now on sale a few plaster casts of
a modern reproduction of the Chaldean Flood Tablet, i.e. the eleventh
tablet of the so-called Izdubar or Gilgamesh Legends, commonly
known under the name of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic. The casts
have been most carefully made by one of the modelers of the U. S.

* Cf. the conclusion of B. Duhm's preface to his commentary on Isaiah
(Göttingen, 1892), p. iv.
† See Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 98 (May, 1892), p. 89, § 15.
‡ For the name Gilgames = Γιλγαμής (Al. n. an. xii. 21), cf. Dr. Casanowicz's
note in No. 98 of the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, p. 91. Mark Litzbarski
(ZA. vii. 110: cf. ibid. 327) suggests that the name of Nimrod's ancestor Ζισανοθρος
i.e. Xasigatra or Atrazasis, may be identical with the Arabic خضر، who lives
at the confluence of the two great rivers (مکیم بن بحور: cf. Koran,
Sura 18, v. 59 ff.). For the name Atrazasis see Beiträge zur Assyriologie, ii. 401.
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National Museum, Washington, D. C., from a clay tablet which I caused to be prepared some months ago by Rev. Dr. Rudolf Zehnpfund, of Rossslau, near Dessau, Germany. The plaster has been colored throughout so as to give the casts the appearance of real baked cuneiform clay tablets. The color is about the same as in the two fragments of the first column of the Flood Tablet (R = 2, II. 390 and 388) which I discovered in 1882,* or in the fragment of the Daily Telegraph Collection (D. T. 42), containing a different recension of the account of the Deluge.†

Our tablet has the size of the largest Deluge fragment known in the Kouyunjik collection of the British Museum as K 2353. A diagram showing the dimensions of this fragment is given on p. 122 of my edition. This fragment, which I refer to as Deluge Tablet A, has been pieced together out of about 20 small pieces. The reverse, for instance, is composed of 15 different pieces.‡ The text engraved on our modern Flood Tablet is the same as the one given on plates 134–149 of my edition. It is based on the fragments of 18 different copies§ of the Deluge Tablet now preserved in the British Museum. With the help of these duplicates the text can be almost completely restored. The only passages where we have rather extensive lacunae now are in the lower part of the first column, and in the lines describing the building of the vessel in the upper part of the second column, as well as the lines describing the coming of the Flood in the lower parts of the second column; the beginnings of some lines in the fifth column, and the ends of some lines in the first paragraph of the sixth column. Unless we recover some new fragments, we shall never be able to complete the text.

I have reason to believe that there are still a number of unknown Deluge fragments in the collection of the British Museum. Mr. Theo. G. Pinches, than whom there is none more familiar with the treasures of the Assyrian collections in the British Museum, was kind enough to send me some time ago a new fragment of the Flood Tablet, which he discovered on August 12th, 1891. It bears the number 81. 2–4, 460. The collection 81. 2–4 (i.e. received at the British Museum April 2d, 1881) seems to have come from the same place as the tablets of the Kouyunjik collection.¶ Mr. Pinches wrote me that he had not been able to find out whether the new piece joined any of the other Deluge fragments. I am inclined to think that it belongs to No. 84 on p. 128 of my edition, i.e. 81, 2–4, 296; but of course, this can only be settled after an inspection of the two fragments.

* See my Akkadische Sprache (Berlin, 1883), p. xlii.
† Cf. Schrader's Kat 57, n. 2; Delitzsch, Assy. Wörterbuch, p. 143, n. 12.
‡ See the engraving in Geo. Smith's Chaldean Account of Genesis (London, 1886), p. 9 (German ed. p. 10), or Kaulen's Assyrien und Babylonien (Freiburg, 1891), p. 169. A new piece of the reverse, which was found a few years ago, is published on p. 124 of my edition.
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The new fragment, though very small (ca. 14 x 7 in.), contains 5 variants to ll. 189-145 of my edition: *viz., *tiš instead of *ti-is in *appatal *I beheld,' l. 189; the upright wedge for the preposition a-na at the beginning of l. 141; in l. 143, the phonetic complement *α is omitted after the number 2 (≡ *šand); in l. 145, we have the accusative *xashšu (character GAR) instead of *xashšu 'fifth.'* If 81. 2-4, 400 joins 81. 2-4, 296, the plural *kibrāti 'regions' would be written defective in l. 189, just as the infinitive *kisdī 'arrival' is written defective in l. 130 on 81. 3-4, 296. Lines 143 and 144, as well as ll. 145 and 146, form but one line each on the new fragment, as well as on the Deluge Tablets A and C* (and D).*†

These graphic variations are not of much consequence, but in l. 140 we read on the new fragment, instead of *ana 12 ta-a-an štēlā *nagū 'after 12 double hours* there appeared an island *§, ana 14 ta-a-an etc., i. e. 'after 14 double hours there appeared an island.' The number 12 is only preserved on Deluge Tablet B, i. e. K 3875 (p. 109, l. 81 of my edition). This variation is not surprising; fragment I exhibits a number of peculiar readings: *e. g. ina nārub nisādīti in l. 126, and šabba šāptā-sumu instead of katmā; rādu after šāru in l. 129;' and in l. 189 A-AB-BA = tāmdum* follows immediately after kibrāti.

I give here a reproduction of the new fragment, based on the copy kindly sent me by Mr. Pinches.

* Cf. IV* 5, 22; *xashšu stands for *xanšu (IV* 9, additions ad pl. 56, l. 5) = *xamšu, just as *kumšu 'his name' occasionally appears as *šamšu (IV* 12, rev. 32, n. 20).
† Cf. p. 133 of my edition.
‡ See *Jensen in his review of Tallquist's Sprache der Contracte Nabund'id's, ZA. vi. 348.
† Deluge Tablet B has in l. 133 *appalsā- ma tāmāti 'I beheld the sea.' A and I, however, read *tam-ma instead of ta-ma-ta, and this *tam-ma cannot be explained as a masculine form of *tamdu (Beitr. zu Assyr. i. 135). I think it should be read *ud- ma = ḫdānī: 'land.' It is possible that we should also read *udmu instead of *šmu in l. 119, *udmu *ušša *nuš iš-itār- *ma, although the frequent occurrence of *šmu *ušši etc. (Delitzsch, AWR 449) seems to be in favor of the reading *šmu.
Our reproduction of the Flood Tablet is intended especially for use in academic classes, to enable students who have not access to original tablets to study the cuneiform writing. An accompanying statement gives explicit directions for the making and engraving of clay tablets, based on various experiments made by Dr. Zehnpfund, who is undoubtedly the most skilful modern cuneiform scribe. He engraved, for instance, the cuneiform congratulatory tablet which the contributors of our Assyriologische Bibliothek presented to the head of the firm of J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig, at the centennial anniversary of the firm.* He also engraved the text of the legend of the demon KATER printed in the famous menu of the Stockholm Congress of Orientalists.† A photograph of this tablet will be published in the Transactions of the Congress.‡ A copy of the Stockholm Congress tablet is exhibited in the museum of the University of Pennsylvania, as well as in the U. S. National Museum. Some notes on the subject are published in the Report on the Section of Oriental Antiquities in the U. S. National Museum, printed in the Smithsonian Reports for 1890, p. 189.

[Postscript. A note from Mr. Pinches, just received, informs me that my conjecture regarding the new Deluge fragment is right; 81, 2-4, 460 joins 81, 2-4, 296. Ana 14 ta-a-an in l. 140 is also perfectly clear.]

3. On recent studies in Hindu grammar; by Professor W. D. Whitney, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

An abstract of this paper, which will appear in full elsewhere (in the Amer. Journal of Philology, vol. xiv.), is as follows:

In May, 1884, I read before the Society a paper entitled "On the study of Hindu grammar and the study of Sanskrit" (it was published in abstract in the Proceedings, and in full in the Amer. Journ. Philol., vol. v.), intended to point out the true place and value of the grammatical division of the Sanskrit literature. Since then have appeared a number of contributions to knowledge in that department, by two younger scholars, at that time unknown, and these it is proposed to examine briefly.

The first, published in Bezenberger's Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, vols. x. and xi., 1885 and 1886, has for title "the case-system of the Hindu grammarians compared with the use of the cases in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa," and is a doctorate-dissertation by B. Liebich (now privat-docent at Breslau). Its first part was a digest of Pāṇini's rules as to the case-uses, and was very welcome, as a contribution to the easier understanding of his treatment of one important subject. In the second part, the author arranges under the Paninean scheme all the facts of case-use in the Brāhmaṇa mentioned: a careful

* Cf. Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 98, May, 1892, p. 92.
† Menu du diner offert au VIIIe Congrès International des Orientalistes, Stockholm, le 7 Sept. 1889.
‡ I have seen the photograph, but I do not know when the Transactions of the Semitic Section 1st will be published. I understand that the first volume of the Transactions of the Stockholm Congress, containing the papers of the Islamic Section 1st, has just been issued.
and creditable piece of work. The results of the comparison are precisely what we, knowing well the relation of the Brāhmaṇa language to the classical language, should expect to find them; there is general agreement, with plenty of special differences. Nothing indicates in the slightest degree any particular relation between Pāṇinī's system and this text. The general conclusion is that the native case-syntax, in spite of its striking defects of theory, is a fairly good practical scheme; the great grammarian comes out of the trial with credit. The author, however, mistakenly adds to his work the secondary title "a contribution to the syntax of the Sanskrit language," and this it plainly is not; we see here another example of the too common misapprehension that what illustrates Pāṇinī casts light upon Sanskrit. Of the author's own summary of results, the only item to be approved, as really following from the investigation, is that "the doctrine of Pāṇinī repose upon a careful and acute observation of the actual language:" and this ought not to have required proof. Better, also, "of an actual language," since Pāṇinī's care and acuteness are less in question than the character of the tongue he represents. That that tongue was especially a book-language, as the author's further remarks seem to indicate that he regards it, is doubtless an untenable view.

Four years later, in the same Journal (Bezzanberger's Beiträge etc., vol. xvi., 1890), a kindred subject is taken up by Dr. R. Otto Franke (now privat-dozent at Berlin), in a paper entitled "the case-system of Pāṇinī compared with the use of the cases in Pāli and in the Aṣokaka inscriptions." The author builds upon Liebich's foundation, looking in the later dialects mentioned for agreement with the Paninian scheme as drawn out by the latter, and finding as much as was reasonably to be expected, besides, in other departments of syntax, a curious coincidence or two which were beyond expectation. As the ground is less worked over, his harvest of new facts is fuller than that of Liebich. His general views as to Pāṇinī and his Sanskrit seem open to criticism. He greatly exaggerates the importance of Liebich's articles, and writes as if it were possible for any reasonable persons to imagine that the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, or the Pāli and the inscriptions, were the exclusive, or the principal, basis of Pāṇinī’s rules; or that Pāṇinī may have "collected the phenomena of very diverse dialects, and fused them together into an integral whole."

But the question as to what Pāṇinī's language really was is approached again by Dr. Franke under the heading "what is Sanskrit?" in Bezzanberger's Beiträge, vol. xvii. (1891; but the article is dated at the end Nov., 1889). The first half of the discussion turns on the question what Pāṇinī means by bhāṣā, and reaches the very plausible conclusion that it is no Prākrit, but unapproved Sanskrit. Of the second half the result is that "Pāṇinī’s Sanskrit is accordingly in the main bhāṣā. And yet, on the other hand, it is neither bhāṣā nor a living language:" which is not very clear. It is quite unaccountable that these authors take no notice of the dramas, which set before us a state of things, unquestionably at one time a real one, when educated people talk
Sanskrit and uneducated Pāṇīki. That is precisely the present character of Sanskrit, the spoken and written tongue of the educated class; that has been its character for over 3000 years; and that must have been its character at the beginning, when the distinction of Sanskrit and Pāṇīki first arose. That it was originally a vernacular is a matter of course, though one soon stiffened and made somewhat unnatural by grammatical handling; it was the tongue which Pāṇini and his like themselves spoke, and which they thought alone worthy to be spoken by others—of which, therefore, they tried to lay down the laws. In his prospectus of the views of various scholars upon the subject, Franke quotes a very old statement of Weber's, to the effect that "the development of Sanskrit and of the Pāṇīki dialects out of their common source, the Indo-Aryan mother-tongue, went on with absolute contemporaneousness (vollständig gleichzeitig)." But this seems scientifically untenable. It would imply, for example, that āttā (or appā) and ātmā, that pakkhiitā and prakṣipta, that hodu and bhavatu, and their like, are contemporaneous developments, while it is clear that the former in each case is the altered representative of the latter, than which nothing older and more original is attainable even by linguistic inference on Indian soil. The great mass of Pāṇīki words, forms, constructions imply the corresponding Sanskrit ones as a stage through which they have themselves passed. That here and there exceptions are met with, altered items of which the original is not found in Sanskrit, or is found in Vedic Sanskrit, is without any significance whatever against the mass. The history of dialects shows no dialect descended en bloc from an older one, and such exceptions might equally be relied on to prove Italian and French "absolutely contemporaneous" with Latin.

In the same year (1891), Dr. Liebich published a valuable collection of studies entitled "Pāṇini: a contribution to the knowledge of Sanskrit literature and grammar" (5vo., 164 pp.). The first study, or chapter, deals with Pāṇini's period, reviewing briefly the opinions of scholars, and, without bringing forward new evidence, arriving at the date "after Buddha and before Christ" as a merely probable conclusion. The second treats of Pāṇini's chief successors and commentators, as to whom much the same chronological uncertainty prevails. The third is an attempt to find his place in the literature, by a new method, a statistical one: the author counts off a thousand successive personal verb-forms in four works, the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, the Brhad-Araṇyaka, two Gṛhya-Sūtras, and the Bhagavad-Gītā, and applies to them the rules of the native grammar, to see how many and what of them are against rule. The test is made with creditable learning and industry, and the results are interesting, but really illustrative only, as bringing to light nothing that was not well known before. The matter is one to which the statistical method is not very well suited; this is decidedly more in place in the secondary inquiries raised in chapters six and seven, where it is cleverly shown that the last chapters of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa are of later origin than the rest (as already
believed, on other grounds), while the whole substance of the Brhad-
Araṇyaka is fairly homogeneous. It is much to be regretted that,
instead of the acknowledgedly late Bhagavat-Gītā, the author did not
select as example of the epic language some part of the Mahābhārata
which could plausibly be regarded as belonging to its original nucleus.
The fourth chapter, headed "Pāṇini's relation to the language of India,"
is chiefly made up of a review of the opinions of other scholars as to
the position of Pāṇini's Sanskrit among the dialects of India, the
author adding a statement of the results of his statistical examination
as his own view; and he closes with a new and wholly unacceptable
general classification of the entire body of dialects. He makes three
principal divisions: pre-classical, classical, and post-classical. To the
first he assigns only the language of the Vedic saṃhitās, the mantra-
dialect; the second he makes include the Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra lan-
guage (which he had elsewhere shown to be notably older than Pāṇini),
together with "the doctrine of Pāṇini;" and in the third he puts,
along with the epic or extra-Paninean, all the literature which we
have been accustomed to call "classical," by Kālidāsa and the rest!
Liebich's classical "doctrine of Pāṇini" can only include, besides
Pāṇini's grammar itself, what in my former paper I called "the non-
existent grammarians' dialect," because nothing had ever been written
in it; Liebich now acknowledges that this and the real language of the
literature even belong to different primary periods of the history of
Indian language—which is more than I had ever ventured to claim!

Just half of Dr. Liebich's volume is occupied by two so-called Appen-
dixes, containing digests of the teachings of the native grammar in
regard to the voice-inflection of the verbal roots (as active or middle or
both), and to the formation of feminine declensional stems. These are,
in my opinion, the substantially valuable part of the work, exemplify-
ing what needs to be done for all the various subjects included in the
grammar; and the next step must be to compare the schemes with the
facts of the literary language, in order to see what are the differences
and to infer their reason.

There is left for notice only the fifth chapter, in which the author
attempts to answer the objections of my former paper to thrusting the
grammarians' Sanskrit on our attention in place of the real Sanskrit of
the literature. The first point, that of the twelve hundred ungentimate
roots in the dhatupātha, he, after the manner of the students of the
native grammar in general, slips lightly over, with the suggestion of
possible interpolations since Pāṇini's time—as if that relieved of respon-
sibility the native grammatical system as it lies before us, or as if
interpolation could explain the increase of eight or nine hundred roots
to over two thousand! Till this increase is accounted for (if it ever
can be), it becomes the admirers of the Hindu grammar to speak in
humble tones. It is equally difficult to suppose that Pāṇini should
have accepted the whole list and that any one should have thrust in
the false roots, undetected and unhindered, since his period.

As to the middle periphrastic perfect and the middle precative, Dr.
Liebich says nothing that changes at all their aspect as stated by me:
that they are formations "sporadic in the early language, and really extinct in the later, but erected by the grammarians into a regular part of every verb-system." And the same is true in its way of the secondary passives. How much shadow of excuse Pāṇini may have had for giving them the value he does is a secondary question. Prayoktāse at Ts. ii. 6.2 is, in my opinion, shown to be 1st sing., and not 2d, by the occurrence of te in the sentence with it; the isolated and wholly anomalous yasṭāhe of TA. i. 11. 4 may be conjectured to be a corrupt reading, and the sole foundation of the grammarians' 1st singular.

In excuse of Pāṇini's two rules (viii. 8. 78, 79) defining when dham and dhve are to be used in 2d pl. mid., the author first suggests, without carrying out and either accepting or rejecting, the theory of a misinterpretation by the later grammarians: the sign in has two very different possible meanings; and it is uncertain what elements of the first rule are carried over by implication into the second. These ambiguities are to the discredit of the grammar; especially the second, which is a pervading one: in numberless cases we know not what a Paninean rule means until we know from the literature what it ought to mean, and then interpret it accordingly. Next it is pointed out that, after all, dh and dh are very little different, and perhaps Pāṇini's ear failed sometimes to distinguish them properly! This virtually gives away the whole case, making Pāṇini's word worthless not only here but in every other question of euphony; even I have never charged him with anything so bad as that. Finally, Liebich doubts of the connection of cause and effect in matters of language; we might properly expect to find dh sometimes without any reason for it. The utter futility of the whole reply is palpable. Pāṇini lays down a distinct statement as to when dh and when dh is to be used; and he makes the difference depend upon a circumstance which evidently can have no bearing upon it; and all the (few) facts of the literature are against him. As for his inclusion of the perfect ending dhve in the same rule, that could have reason only if the original and proper form of the endings were adhvan and adhve; and, if that were so, we should find dh in forms of the present-system also.

Passing over certain topics in my paper (the most important of them being the grammarians' derivation of the reduplicated aorist from the causative stem instead of from the root), Dr. Liebich takes up finally the defense of Pāṇini's classification of compounds, and especially of the so-called avyayābhāva class of adverbial compounds, regarded as primary, and coördinate with copulative, determinative, and possessive. According to him, the true fundamental principle of classification is furnished by the syntactical relation of the two members of the compound to one another: in the determinatives, the former member is dependent on the latter; in the copulatives, both are coördinate; in the possessives, both are alike dependent on a word outside the compound, which they qualify adjectively; then, finally, in the adverbial (e.g. atimātram 'excessively,' from ati 'beyond' and mātrā 'measure'), the latter member is dependent on the former. Calling the dependent
element minus and the other plus, we thus have the scheme minus-
plus, plus-plus, minus-minus, and plus-minus, which is plainly exhaus-
tive: no more are possible; no fewer are consistent with complete-
ness. The scheme is thus drawn out by some of the later grammarians,
though not expressly by Pāṇini himself; but Liebich is confident that
the latter knew and acknowledged it, being hindered from its full
adoption by considerations of brevity: brevity, it may be added, being
in his text-book well known to be the leading consideration, to which
everything else is to be sacrificed—to us hardly a recommendation of
the work. But it has never been found, I believe, that the facts of
language could be successfully treated mathematically; and so it seems
to be here. There is no such thing as a plus-minus class of compounds,
and perhaps Pāṇini was acuter than his successors (including our
author) in seeing that this is the case. Not that there is no plus-minus
relation between the elements of ati-mātram; but so there is a minus-
plus relation between those of the possessive mahābhāhu ‘having great
arms.’ As the conversion of the latter to adjective value overrides
the internal relation and makes the whole minus-minus, so does also
the conversion of the former to adverb value. Calling the adjective-
making influence a, and the adverb-making b, then, if \((\text{minus-plus})^a =
\text{minus-minus}\), certainly \((\text{plus-minus})^b = \text{minus-minus}\) as well. In very
fact, however, atimātram is the adverbially used accus. neut. of the
adjective atimātra ‘excessive’; and so, I confidently hold, are by
origin all its fellows; and the avyayibhāva stands at a double remove
from plus-minus value. The asserted primary class is not even a sub-
class, but only one group in a list of utterly heterogeneous character.

At the close of his chapter, Dr. Liebich, conceiving himself to have
refuted me everywhere, compassionates me for not having made a
happier selection of points for objection. I, on the contrary, feel quite
satisfied with them, as having withstood undamaged all his attacks;
but I am willing to add one more, which, indeed, he urges on my atten-
tion. He, namely, lifts up hands of horror (p. 81) at me for pronounc-
ing (in my Skt. Gr.) something “barbarous” which Pāṇini teaches.
The matter alluded to is the formation of comparative and superlative
predications by adverbial endings: thus, dādāti ‘he gives,’ dādātitaraṁ
‘he gives more,’ dādātitamāṁ ‘he gives most’—precisely as if one
were to say in Greek ἀλλοτριός, ἀλλοτριότος. It may be maintained,
without fear of successful contradiction, that such formations, no
matter who authorizes them, are horrible barbarisms, offenses against
the proprieties of universal Indo-European speech. The total absence of
anything even suggesting their possibility in the pre-Paninean language,
and their great rarity later, among writers to whom a rule of Pāṇini
is as the oracle of a god, shows sufficiently that they are not real.
Doubtless they were jocose or highly slangy modes of expression, which
some unexplainable freak led Pāṇini to sanction.

Liebich’s Pāṇini is reviewed by Dr. Franke at considerable length in
the Gött. Gel. Anzeigen for 1891 (pp. 951 ff.), though less in the way
of a detailed examination and criticism of its statements and opin-
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ions than of an independent discussion of some of the points involved. Many pages, however, are expended upon Pāṇini's classification of the compounds; and here the critic by no means supports Liebich's views, but rather takes my side, and helps to expose the superficialities and incongruities of Pāṇini's treatment of the subject. In other respects the notice is a laudatory one, going so far as to "thoroughly approve," as "very successful," Liebich's special pleadings respecting the ending dhvam—including, we must suppose, the suggestion of Pāṇini's defective ear, and the denial of a connection between cause and effect in Sanskrit euphony. It even adds a further argument of a like character: that in Prākrit ḍh sometimes takes the place of dh, and that Prakritic changes sometimes work their way into Sanskrit. So in Prākrit, and on a very large scale, n becomes ň; but that would hardly support a Hindu grammarian who should teach that a r altered the next following ň to ŏ only when itself preceded by certain specified sounds. The question of the twelve hundred false roots Franke passes over with the same cautious carelessness as Liebich, as if it were a matter of no real account.

The last publication we have to notice is again by Liebich, a small volume (8vo, pp. xi, 80, Breslau, 1899), entitled "Two chapters of the Kāṭikā." It contains a simple translation of the exposition given by that esteemed and authoritative commentary for the rules of Pāṇini that concern compounds; and there is prefixed an ample introduction, in which the absolute four-fold classification, spoken of above, is drawn out, illustrated, and defended much more fully than in the same author's Pāṇini. This introduction, though dated later, must probably have been prepared and printed earlier than Franke’s criticism of the Pāṇini, for the author could otherwise hardly have so ignored the rejection of the theory by his fellow partizan of the Hindu grammar. The volume is valuable as smoothing the way a little to the comprehension of Pāṇini for those who shall approach it hereafter: but its method is a narrowly restricted one; it refrains from all attempts at independent explanation, and yet more from all criticism. It is content, for example, to report without a word of comment the two discordant interpretations which are offered by the Kāṭikā for the extremely difficult introductory rule, and which plainly indicate that it did not itself quite know what the rule was meant to say. No one can well fail to be repelled by the fantastic obscurity with which the subject of compounds is presented in these chapters; and we have seen above that the underlying theory is a very defective one: how absurd, then, to require that students of Sanskrit should derive from such sources their knowledge of Sanskrit composition!

I would by no means say anything to discourage the study of Pāṇini; it is highly important and extremely interesting, and might well absorb more of the labor of the present generation of scholars than is given to it. But I would have it followed in a different spirit and a different method. It should be completely abandoned as the means by which we are to learn Sanskrit. For what the literature contains the liter-
ature itself suffices; we can understand and present it vastly better than Pāṇini could. It is the residuum of peculiar material involved in his grammar that we shall value, and the attempt must be to separate that from the rest of the mass. And the study should be made a truly progressive one, part after part of the native system being worked out to the last possible degree and the results recorded, so that it shall not be necessary for each generation to begin anew the tedious and unrewarding task.

4. Announcement of an edition of the Jaǐminiya or Talavakāra Upanishad-Brāhmaṇa; by Dr. Hanns Oertel, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Dr. Oertel gave a brief account of Burnell's discovery in Southern India of Gramhan manuscripts of the Jaǐminiya or Talavakāra Brāhmaṇa (of which the Upanishad-Brāhmaṇa forms the fourth or concluding book), and of his sending them to Professor Whitney, by whom, with the help of other scholars, they were copied and collated (see Proceedings for May, 1888, Journal, vol. xi., p. cxliv). The fifteen years since elapsed have failed to bring to light any new material. Under these circumstances, it does not seem premature to make public that part of the Brāhmaṇa whose text is least corrupt—the only part of the extensive work which admits of being edited in full, namely the Upanishad-Brāhmaṇa. All the manuscripts are very inaccurate, and they also evidently go back to the same faulty archetype, so that in many passages they present the same corrupt and unintelligible text. Such passages are most numerous in the first chapter (adhyāya). It may be hoped that, the text being made accessible, difficulties which must now be left unsolved will be at least in part removed by further comparison with other texts and by skilled conjecture.

The work is divided into four chapters. Each of the first three has a colophon, and the last three sections (khāḍā) of the third are a vaikuṇṭha. The last chapter is made up of heterogeneous material. It opens with three sections of mantra. The last two sections of the ninth division (anuvāka) are again a vaikuṇṭha. Then follows the Kena-Upanishad, in four sections, one division; and two more divisions end the chapter and the work proper: the ārṣeya-brāhmaṇa, published as a separate work by Burnell, comes after and ends the manuscript.

In general, the contents of the Upanishad-Brāhmaṇa are of one class with those of other similar works. Of most interest to us, perhaps, is the legendary material. For more than a dozen legends corresponding ones are found in other texts already published, with more or less of resemblance and divergence. Of others, to which no parallels have been discovered elsewhere, perhaps the most notable is the story of Uccāśīqgravevas Kāupayeya, king of the Kurus, and his friend Keçin Dārbhya: "They were dear to each other, and then Uccāśīqgravevas Dārbhya departed from this world. When he had departed, Keçin Dārbhya went hunting in order to get rid of his gloomy thoughts. While he was roaming about, Uccāśīqgravevas stood before him. 'Am I
crazy, or do I know thee,' said Keçin to him. He answered: 'Thou art not crazy; thou knowest me: I am he whom thou thinkest me to be.' And he goes on to explain that he has come back to comfort and instruct his friend. 'Keçin said: 'Reverend sir, let me now embrace thee;' but, when he tried to embrace him, he escaped him, as if one were to approach smoke, or wind, or space, or the gleam of fire, or water; he could not take hold of him for an embrace. He said: 'Truly, what appearance thou hast formerly, that appearance thou hast even now; yet I cannot take hold of thee for an embrace.' And then the king informs him that he has shaken off his corporeal body because a Brahman knowing the sūman which Prajāpati revealed to his dear son Patanga sang for him the udgītha. Thereupon Keçin seeks in vain among the Brahman-priests of the Kurus and Pañcharas for a knower of this sūman, till at length he meets Prātyrda Bhālla, who answers his questions correctly, and whom he chooses as udgātar for his twelve-day sacrifice.

Bhrigu and Naciketas visit the other world; but no further example is known in Vedic literature of an inhabitant of the other world who returns to this in order to comfort and instruct a friend.

The edition will comprise: 1. The transliterated text, with full list of various readings; 2. a purely philological, literal translation; 3. notes, chiefly references to parallel passages; 4. indexes of names, quotations, and the more important grammatical and lexical points.

5. The influences of Hindu thought on Manicheaism; by Mr. Paul Elmer More, of St. Louis, Mo.

The Manichean religion, which was promulgated by Mānî, a Persian, in the third century of our era, and which spread rapidly from Babylon to the east as far as China and westward with the Roman Empire, is an admirable example of the syncretic method of thought of that age. It is the deliberate attempt of a religious reformer to fuse into one homogeneous system Zoroastrianism and Christianity, the two religions then struggling for supremacy on the borderland of the Persian Empire. Probably the Zoroastrianism which forms the background of his syncretism is tinged with the Semitic superstitions prevalent in Assyria; certainly the Christian elements adopted are gnostic rather than orthodox. Baur and several of the later historians have endeavored—unsuccessfully, as I think—to show that the Christian elements are not an integral part of Manicheaism, but rather nominal additions to an ethnic religion already complete in itself. Such a view appears to me altogether to miss the true spirit of Mānî's purpose, and of the manner of thought of his age. However, it remains conceded by all that in one way or another Manicheaism is put together out of Persian and Christian elements.

The influence of Hindu thought, and of Buddhism in particular, on this religion is more a matter of dispute. The great historians have expressed different views on the subject. Geyer, in his dissertation Der Manicheismus und sein Verhältniss zum Buddhismus, merely enum-
erates a number of detached correspondences in details of faith and practice. Unfortunately, the publication by Flügel of the portion of the *Führst of Muḥammad ben Ishāk* bearing on Manicheism naturally fosters such a method of comparison. The Arabian encyclopedist adds a number of details to our knowledge of the more extravagant side of the heresy, but in a manner which tends to draw the student away from the more philosophical presentation by St. Augustin, on whom Baur and the earlier historians had mainly to depend. What I wish to establish is briefly this: First, that Mānī was influenced not by Buddhism alone, but by that whole movement of Hindu thought of which Buddhism is a single part; and, secondly, that this influence is seen not so much in the addition of new rites and dogmas borrowed from Buddhism as in the subtle spirit of India thoroughly permeating those already adopted from Persian and Christian sources.

In approaching this question, two avenues of information must be considered: to wit, historical tradition and internal evidence. As might be expected, historical statements on such a subject are suggestive but extremely vague. It is recorded however in the *Führst* that Mānī traveled for forty years, visiting the Hindus, the Chinese, and the inhabitants of Chorasan. Some tradition also of the Buddhist sources from which he drew seems to have lingered in the minds of the early chroniclers; and, as so often happens, these abstract ideas became personified, and figure with fabulous names among the followers of the reformer. It is not my intention here to discuss this side of the question. The following brief quotation from Renan's *Histoire des Langues Sémitiques* sums up the matter admirably: "Buddhas figure tantôt comme maître, tantôt comme disciple de Manès; Scythianus (Çakya?), le propagateur du Manichéisme en Occident, voyage dans l’Inde; enfin les auteurs arabes désignent tous comme fondateur du Sabisme un personnage du nom de Buda ou Budasf. Il n’est pas impossible que l’Évangile de Manès, ou l’Évangile selon Saint Thomas, ne fût quelque soutra bouddhique, le nom de Gotama étant devenu κατά Θουάν."  

On the other hand, internal evidence, drawn from a study of the religious themselves, justifies a more positive view of their relationship. It has been remarked that Hindu thought moves in cycles. Certainly, during the centuries just before and after our era, we see such a wave of thought sweep over India, changing the whole religious and intellectual life of the people. The Sāṃkhya philosophy, Buddhism, Jainism, and the Krishna cult apparently arose and developed side by side, being the various aspects of one great revolution. Their points of contact are numerous and essential; and doubtless, if the complete literature of the time were at our command, their origin and growth would show still more striking phases of resemblance. Now details of belief and worship may be detected in Manicheism which appear to be borrowed from one and another of these cults; but beyond this there is yet a deeper influence clearly perceptible. Mānī, we must believe, spent a number of years in northern India, traveling far and wide. We know,
too, from the Führst that the conception of his religious reform was already in his mind when he set forth from Assyria. Accordingly, we should expect to find traces of Hindu thought not so much in the framework of his system and in the details of construction as in the general tone and coloring of the whole. It is scarcely possible to believe that an earnest searcher after the truth should have been for years under the influence of this tremendous moral and intellectual ferment without bearing away just such traces of it in his mind. In the same way the philosophical student even of to-day who reaches this old Hindu life through the dust of dictionaries, although his intellectual credo is not altered by the study, finds perhaps that a peculiar spell is laid over his whole manner of thought.

An examination of the doctrines of Mânî makes this conjecture a certainty. The influence of Hindu thought is seen to be secondary and yet very profound. Dogmas already received are given a deeper meaning, and forms already adopted take on a new and wider significance. Thus Manicheism starts with the Zoroastrian conception of two co-eternal and hostile powers, of good and of evil, of light and of darkness. Now, in the Persian books, Ahriman opposes the god of light at every point, to be sure; yet creation was originally good, and the evil works of Ahriman are a later corruption. In the Bundahish (xv. 6), we are even told that Mashya and Mashyôl first believed that the world was created by Ormazd, and that afterwards they believed Ahriman to be the creator. From this falsehood Ahriman received his first joy. By this falsehood they both became darçands, and their souls shall remain in hell even unto the resurrection. Aji Dahāka, the great dragon, was expressly created by Ahriman to destroy the handiwork of the god of light. The material world is primarily righteous; and it is the first duty of man to support asha, the existing order of things, against the assaults of the demons. Here the influence of Hindu conceptions on Manicheism is evident. The struggle between Mânî's god of light and Eblis, the prince of darkness, becomes more intimate and far-reaching. The contest is no longer carried on in a neutral region between the two opposing powers, like two armies in battle array, but is waged in every particle of matter between the two natures contained within it.

The contest comes about in this way: The regnum lucis is threatened with invasion by the principes tenetarum, who from the dark abyss behold its glory and are enamored of it. An emanation of God, called the Primus Homo, descends into the depths to combat them. The five gross material elements belong to the regnum tenetarum; and to oppose these he first arms himself with a panoply of the five finer elements representing the spiritual counterpart of these—an idea probably suggested by the Sânkhyan theory of the five tattvāstras and the five mahābhūtas. He is for the time overwhelmed by Eblis, or Sâclus, as the demon is sometimes called; part of his panoply is rent away from him, and out of the union of these finer elements, or soul, with the gross matter of the regnum tenetarum springs the existing order of things, the soul being held by force in the bonds of matter, and giving it
form and life. Creation is then essentially a work of evil; matter as in all the phases of the Hindu cycle of thought, is altogether base; and the great struggle now waging is the effort of the imprisoned soul, or emanation of light, to free itself from the bondage of the world. It is to be noticed however that Mani's conception of evil, although deepened and spiritualized by Indian mysticism, remains primarily Persian. Evil for him is an actual and active principle, eternal in its nature, and far removed from maya, or mere illusion.

The process of redemption is the point of contact with Christianity, and from now on our heresy will be found Christian rather than Persian. In other words, Mani's system may be divided into two great periods, one of involution, or mingling of spirit and matter, adopted from Zoroastrian sources; and the second of evolution, or the separation of spirit and matter, borrowed chiefly from the Christian faith. This division is not, of course, a hard-and-fast one, but in the main makes evident the nature of the syncretism. In this second part of the system, Christian ideas are modified by Hindu thought in a manner precisely similar to the process already described. The Christian terminology and ritual are maintained, but the mission of the Christos is deepened and extended. The labor of salvation is no longer confined to the action of a man or god-man living his life in Palestine, but becomes the cosmic struggle of the Weltgeist striving upward toward deliverance. It is the Buddhist or Jaina conception of the progress toward release aided onward by the appearance of the Enlightener. St. Paul's mystical utterance, "The whole creation groaneth and travailleth in pain together," makes it easy to understand how such Hindu notions could be involved in Christian terminology; and the conclusion of this same passage, "until now . . . waiting for the adoption, to wit the redemption of our body," shows at the same time how far-reaching was the change wrought by the influence of India. A brief survey of the Manichaean Christology will make the subject plainer.

Mani distinguishes between the Christos and Jesus. The general name of the emanation from the kingdom of light is the Primus Homo; this is regarded in two ways, as a passive principle (δύναμις παθητική) suffering the bondage of the world, and as an active principle (δύναμις δημιουργική) effecting its own deliverance. Now the former is called the Jesus patibilis, while the latter is the Christos. When the world was created out of the union of the spiritual Primus Homo and the material regnum tenibrarum, the purest portion of the mixture, that containing the most light, was placed in the sky as the sun and moon. Their light, together with the atmosphere (which is the Holy Ghost), acting on the earth, produces life; life is the struggle of the imprisoned soul upwards toward reabsorption into the kingdom of light. In this process the sun and moon, the life-giving light (called also the Primus Homo, the Son of God), are the Christos; the spirit dormant in the earth and awakened by their touch is the Jesus patibilis. Every tree that expands its leaves in the warm breath of heaven, every flower that paints its blossoms with the colors of the sky, is only an expression of
the upward striving of the weary Weltgeist. So the agony of the
crucifixion became symbolical of the universal passion, and Jesus was
said to be omni suspensus ex ligno. The feeling which inspired this
conception of the suffering Jesus is beautifully told in that stanza of
Omar Khayyám:

Now the New Year reviving old Desires,
The thoughtful Soul to Solitude retires,
Where the White Hand of Moses on the Bough
Puts out, and Jesus from the Ground suspires.

Now when the demons of evil see that the light which they possess is
thus gradually withdrawn from them, they are thrown into despair.
They conspire among themselves, and, by a curious process of procreating
and then devoured their offspring, produce man, who contains the
quintessence of all the spiritual light remaining to them. Adam is
be
gotten by Saca
eas and Nebrod, their leaders, in the likeness of the Pr
imus Homo.
He is given the glory of the world, is made the microcosm or
counterpart of the universe, that by the excellence of his nature, as by a
bait, the Soul may be allured to remain in the body. He is created by
the lust of the demons; his own fall consists in succumbing to the
seductions of the flesh; and through the process of generation the spirit
is still held a bond-slave in the world, passing from father to son. As
the Christos acting in the sun awakens the inanimate earth, so too he
appears as a man among men, as Jesus of Nazareth, teaching the way
of salvation. Release comes only with the cessation of desire, and this
again is brought about only through the true knowledge, or Gnosis,
imported by the Savior. In all this we see strong traces of the Zoroas
trian sun-worship, as might be expected. The Christos represented as
distentus per solem lunamque points at once to Mithra, the sun-god and
mediator. But the significant modification comes rather from India.
The whole conception of Christ’s mission is changed; and the labor of
his life is to proclaim the way of release to the spirit already groping
upward, rather than to act as mediator between man and God. His
incarnation is only one brief event in the long struggle of Jesus and the
Christos. In accordance with this, the doctrine of Docetism was im
ported from India, either directly or through the earlier Gnostic sects.
Docetism is a transparent adaptation of the Hindu Mâyâ which plays so
important a rôle in Indian philosophy, in later Buddhism, and in the
Krishna cult. A single quotation from the Bhágavata Puráña or the
Lotus of the True Law would show the close resemblance of these doc
tines—and might at the same time throw light on the vexed question of
borrowing between Christianity and the Krishna cult; for surely no
one would care to maintain that Mâyâ is a western conception, origin
ating in Gnostic Docetism. For instance, we read in the Bhágavata
Puráña (iii. 13. 5, cited by Senart) “It is through his Mâyâ, by means
of Mâyâ, that Bhagavant has taken on himself a body:’’ and in the
Lotus of the True Law (chap. xvi., SBE. xxi. 362) it is written: ‘‘The
Tathágata who so long ago was perfectly enlightened is unlimited in
the duration of his life; he is everlasting. Without being extinct, the Tathāgata makes a show of extinction, on behalf of those who have to be educated." Precisely the same words might be used to express the Gnostic and Manichean doctrine of the Christ.

So too the dogma of sin as consisting in desire instead of disobedience, and, in accordance with this, the resulting system of ethics, are distinctly Hindu. The chief duty of man is to abstain from satisfaction of the desires of whatever sort, that he may not plunge the soul still deeper in the slough of sense. Marriage was abhorred as evil above all things, in flagrant contradiction of Persian and orthodox Christian views. In the constitution of the Manichean church we see the same principles at work. This was divided into two bodies, the electi (or ṛṣaṇas) and the auditores, in imitation of the orthodox church, the auditores taking the place of the catechumens. At first one might be tempted to consider the word auditor as a direct translation of the Buddhist āryakata; but the latter in his duties corresponds perfectly to the electus and not to the auditor. Furthermore, the adoption of Christian sacraments shows that the church was organized after western models rather than Indian; and yet the essential meaning of the organization leads us at once to the great Hindu religions of the time. The chief duty of the elect, besides chastity, was ahīnā, carried almost to the extremities found among the Jainas. The whole purport of their life, not to go into details, reminds us more of the Bhikṣus and Nirgranthas than of anything in Western manners. Furthermore, the principal duty of the auditors is precisely that of the Buddhist Upāsakas. Their connection with the elect consisted mainly in providing the latter with food, in order that these might be saved the awful sin of destroying even vegetable life. Like the Upāsakas, too, the auditors were allowed to marry and mingle with the world. At death the souls of the elect were transported up to the kingdom of light, into a state of being not unlike the Nirvāṇa of the Jainas, and possibly of the Buddhists. The auditors passed through a long series of transmigrations, while the wicked were cast into hell. Metempsychosis plays a comparatively subordinate part in the Manichean faith, but shows nevertheless how profound was the influence of India on the whole system.

Certain of the Christian sacraments, as has been mentioned, were accepted by the Manicheans. Of their manner of baptism we know little; but the Eucharist received among them the same curious modification. As the Jesus patibulis was said to be crucified in every plant, so the faithful were supposed to partake of the body and blood of Jesus at every meal, for they ate only vegetable food.—But it is not my purpose here to go into the details of the Manichean syncretism, or to institute any such minute comparison. Sufficient has been said, I hope, to indicate how the real influence of Hindu thought on Manicheism is to be found in the extension and modification of the whole body of dogmas and rites brought together from Persian and Christian sources.

VOL. XVI. D
6. The plural with pronominal suffixes in Assyrian and Hebrew; by Mr. George A. Reisner, of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

In the inscriptions of the time of Hammu-rabi there are traces of a duplote declension of the plural: viz., nom. u (♀) and gen. i (♀). The plural in u occurs four times, as follows: Biling. Insc. H. Col. ii., line 9, ni-šu ra-ap-ša-tum li-ši-ti-mi-ga-kum; Cyl. Insc. H. Col. i., line 7, and also Col. ii., line 4, šarru ša ip-ša-tu-šu a-na ši-tr Sh. u M. ša-ba; Samsu-iluna, Col. iii., line 1, nu-šar-di-u šar-ru-li-ya. The first three are plainly nominatives; and the last one, I think, is as plainly a nominative-absolute, such as occurs often in Assyrian.

It is true that this evidence is meager; but it is uniform, and it is supported in a measure by the contract tablets: cf. Meissner, B. z. Altbab. Privatrecht, No. 48, line 25, ši-bu-tum pa-nu-tum, ša Mar-ilu-Mar-tu i-na bab šu Nin-mar-ki Ilu-ba-ni lu u ma-ru a-na-ku u-ša-mu ik-ši-u-ma, kiram u bitam a-na Ilu-ba-ni u-ši-ru; No. 78, lines 4-7, a-na ta-az-ki-im da-a-a-ni ik-šu-du-ša ma a-na bit šu Šamaš i-ru-bn-u ma i-na bit Šamaš da-a-a-nu di-nam u-ša-ši-zu-šu nu-ti-ma. Several times also a plural in u seems to be used as a nominative absolute. Cf. No. 77, line 1, 5 GAN ešlim bi-ri-a-tum; and No. 24, line 1, 140 ŠE na-aš-pa-ku-tum, where a sentence intervenes before the rest of the tablet.

The evidence is confirmed by the Tel-el-Amarna Tablets, which contain the following examples: Berlin VA. Th. 152 (Winckler, No. 8), line 11, um-ma-a ki-i ab-bu-ni it-ti a-ša-mi-iš ni-i-nu lu (a-ša-nu, 'Saying, as our fathers (were) with one another, we, let us be friendly; line 13, t-na-an-na damkar-pl-u-a, ša itii Aḫu-ša-ša-ša ti-šu-u, i-na matu Ki-na-ḫi a-na ši-ma-a-ti it-ta-li-u; Berlin VA. Th. 151 (Winckler, No. 6), back, line 4, šum-ma la-bi-ru-tum ya-a-nu iš-šu-ti li-il- . . . , 'If there are no old ones, let [them take?] new ones' (acc.); Berlin, unnumbered (Winckler, No. 8), line 14, aššatu-pl ba-na-tum i-ba-ša-ša; and line 24, binatu-pl-u-u i-ba-aḫša-ša; Bulaq 28179 (Winckler, No. 9), back, line 10, ma-ta-tum ru-ša-tum ni-i-nu, 'Distant countries (are) we (ours). These are all apparently nominatives. Once, in (London 81) P.S.B.A. vol. x., p. 562, front, line 19, the word gab-bi-šu-nu occurs as a plural nominative agreeing with Ku-ša-a-u. Besides these examples, there are no other nominative plurals in these tablets. Once also, Winckler, No. 7, line 37, the phrase šarr-na-ši ma-ab-ra-nu-ma is a genitive. Everywhere else, the genitive and accusative end in i. Cf. also Agum-kakrimi, col. vii., line 19, āp-bi-tu.

To sum up, then, I conclude that, in the time of Hammu-rabi and for some time after that, the plural in Assyrian was declined after the duplote scheme, like the Arabic sound-plurals. Later, however, the distinction between the u and the i case was lost.

Further, with the pronominal suffixes, these terminations u and i are retained—see the examples above. So, later, when the distinction between the u case and the i case was lost, i + the pronominal suffix is found in all cases with both feminine and masculine. Now, comparing
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this with the Hebrew, we find that there too the plural, whether feminine or masculine, with pronominal suffixes, ends in $t$. And I wish to suggest a similar process of development in Hebrew to that which has taken place in Assyrian. First, then, whether the feminine in $u$-$t$ is originally made simply by analogy from the masculine or not, the Hebrew feminine $\text{יִמּוֹל}$ — with pronominal suffixes goes back to a real usage of this full form without the pronominal suffixes. Second, this full form $\text{יִמּוֹל}$ — is descended from a diptote declension of the plural (masculine and feminine) in $u$-$t$. And, finally, this makes probable a general Semitic diptote declension in the plural at a somewhat early stage in the development of the language.

7. On the so-called Chain of Causation of the Buddhists; by Mr. Henry C. Warren, of Cambridge, Mass.

"Chain of Causation" is the title given by Occidental students to the formula which embodies the Buddha’s effort to account for the origin of evil. The formula itself is as follows: "On Ignorance depend the saṃkhāra; on the saṃkhāra depends Consciousness; on Consciousness depends Name-and-Form; on Name-and-Form depend the Six Organs of Sense; on the Six Organs of Sense depends Contact; on Contact depends Sensation; on Sensation depends Desire; on Desire depends Attachment; on Attachment depends Existence; on Existence depends Birth; on Birth depend Old Age and Death, Sorrow, Lamentation, Misery, Grief, and Despair."

Chain of Causation is an unfortunate title, inasmuch as it involves the use of Occidental categories of an exacting kind into which to fit, as into a Procrustean bed, Oriental methods of thought. As a natural consequence, this same Chain of Causation has proved a stumbling-stone and rock of offense to some of the best European scholars. Oldenberg, for example, in his Buddha (Hoey’s translation, pp. 226–7), says: "The attempt is here made by the use of brief pithy phrases to trace back the suffering of all earthly existence to its most remote roots. The answer is as confused as the question was bold. It is utterly impossible for anyone who seeks to find out its meaning to trace from beginning to end a connected meaning in this formula. Most of the links of the chain, taken separately, admit of a passable interpretation; many arrange themselves also in groups together, and their articulation may be said to be not incomprehensible; but between these groups there remain contradictions and impossibilities in the consecutive arrangement of priority and sequence, which an exact exegesis has not the power, and is not permitted, to clear up." R. S. Cotleston, Bishop of Colombo and President of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, in his book Buddhism, which has just appeared, also gives up the problem in despair, saying (p. 122) "Who will attack a metaphysical puzzle which he [Prof. Oldenberg] declares insoluble?"

Now a great deal of the difficulty experienced by these scholars appears to me to arise from the too strict way in which they use the
word "cause," and from the idea which they labor under that Time plays an important part here, whereas it would appear to have but a secondary rôle.

The term "cause" should be used in a very loose and flexible way, and in different senses, in discussing different members of this series. The native phrase of which Chain of Causation is supposed to be a translation is pañcika-samuppāda. Pañcika is a gerund, equivalent to the Sanskrit pratitya, from the verbal root i 'go,' with the prefix pruti 'back;' and samuppāda stands for the Sanskrit samutpāda, meaning 'a springing up.' Therefore the whole phrase means 'a springing up [into existence] with reference to something else,' or, as I would render it, ‘origination by dependence.’ The word "chain" is a gratuitous addition, the Buddhist calling it a wheel, and making Ignorance depend on Old Age etc. Now it is to be noted that, if a thing springs up—that is to say, comes into being—with reference to something else, or in dependence on something else, that dependence by no means needs to be a causal one. In the Pāli, each of these members of the so-called Chain of Causation is said to be the paccaya of the one next following, and paccaya is rendered 'cause.' But Buddhaghosa, in the Visuddhi-Magga, enumerates twenty-four different kinds of paccaya, and, in discussing each member of the pañcika-samuppāda, states in which of these senses it is a paccaya of the succeeding one.

The Pāli texts very well express the general relation meant to be conveyed by the word paccaya when they say "If this one [member of the series] is not, then this [next following] one is not."

I will now run over the Chain of Causation, member by member, in reverse order, giving my own explanation of the relation of each member to the one before it, and show how comprehensible become the relations of the different members to each other if the term "cause" be used in a more flexible manner, and if Time be considered as only incidentally involved. I begin, then, with the bottom of the series.

Old Age etc. are said to depend on Birth. The relation here between Birth and Old Age etc. is that which we should express by the term "antecedent condition." The fact that I am born as a man or human being does not make me necessarily arrive at Old Age; yet, as the natives say, if there were no Birth, there would be no Old Age etc.

Birth is then said to depend on Existence. Now by Existence is meant existence in general, not this or that particular existence, but all existence whatsoever to which transmigration renders us liable. The relation, therefore, of Birth to Existence is simply that of a particular instance to a general category.

Next, Existence is said to be dependent on Attachment, and Attachment in its turn on Desire. I group together these two members of the series, as they mean much the same thing, Desire being the more general term, and the four divisions of Attachment are four classes of

* See R. C. Childers, Pāli Dictionary, p. 359; the same, in Colebrooke's Essays, i. 453; Böhtlingk and Roth, vii. 723, and the references to Burnouf there given.
Desire considered in the light of tendencies. Existence, therefore, is said to depend on Desire. Of this Desire it is said: "Where anything is delightful and agreeable to men, there Desire springs up and grows, there it settles and takes root:" that is to say, all pleasurable objects to which we cling become so much food to create and perpetuate our being. It may seem strange to put Desire and Attachment before Existence, but the existence here meant is sentient existence, and the assertion is that, wherever Desire and Attachment develop themselves, there ipso facto we have sentient existence. The relation, therefore, of Existence and Desire or Attachment is that of effect to cause, and that of Attachment to Desire is identity.

The statement that Desire depends on Sensation hardly requires any special elucidation. In order that we should have Desire, there must be objects of Desire—that is to say, pleasurable sensations. Thus Sensation is the necessary antecedent or condition of Desire.

Sensation is said to depend on Contact. Contact means the contact of the organ of sense with the object of sense. The Buddhist explanation of vision, for instance, is that the eye and the form or object seen come into collision, and that from this contact results the sensation of sight. The relation, therefore, of Contact and Sensation is that of cause and effect.

Contact is said to depend on the Organs of Sense. This statement hardly requires any comment, for, of course, if there were no eye, there would be no eye-contact and resultant vision. The Organs of Sense are, therefore, the necessary antecedent conditions of contact.

The Organs of Sense are said to depend on Name-and-Form. By Form is meant the body, and by Name certain mental constituents of being. It is therefore perfectly natural to say that the Organs of Sense depend on Name-and-Form, for the organs of the five senses are, of course, part of the body; and, as the Buddhists hold that there is a sixth sense, namely the mind, having ideas for its objects, this is naturally dependent on Name. Name-and-Form are therefore the material cause of the Organs of Sense. (I connect Name-and-Form with hyphens, as in Pāli they are usually compounded into one word, and declined in the singular.)

Name-and-Form depend on Consciousness, or better, perhaps, on the Consciousnesses. There are many different Consciousnesses: those belonging to the organs of sense, the eye-consciousness or sight, the ear-consciousness or hearing, etc., and many more besides, such as the Consciousness connected with the Trances. Now these Consciousnesses and Name-and-Form constitute the entire human being. Without these consciousnesses Name-and-Form would be lifeless; and, again, without Name-and-Form the Consciousnesses would not be possible. Therefore the Consciousnesses and Name-and-Form are interdependent, neither of them being able to exist independently—that is to say, in the case of the human being.

The Consciousnesses depend on the saṁkhāras or karma. Saṁkhāra and karma are much the same thing; karma is from the root kar, and
means 'deed' or 'act'; and sāṅkhāra is from the same root, and means 'doing' or 'action.' This karma may be good, bad, or indifferent, and performed by the body, voice, or mind; but Buddaghosa says they can all, in the last analysis, be reduced to thoughts or mental activity. Any dwelling of the mind on an object is a sāṅkhāra, and the Consciousnesses result from such sāṅkhāras. All the sāṅkhāras are really also consciousnesses, but some thirty-two are marked off as the results of the others, and called vipāka-viśādāyas 'resultant consciousnesses.' Thus the relation of these thirty-two consciousnesses to the others called sāṅkhāras is that of effect to cause.

The sāṅkhāras are said to depend on Ignorance, and by Ignorance is meant the want of knowledge of the evil nature of all things. So long as we remain ignorant of the unsatisfactoriness of all objects of sense, we continue to occupy our mind with them—that is to say, we continue to perform karma. Ignorance, then, is the antecedent condition of the sāṅkhāras.

I have thus gone over the Chain of Causation, and shown how variously the members of the series depend on each other, and that only in three instances was this dependence efficient cause.

My readers will also please notice that I have not assigned one part of the series to one point of time, say to one existence, and then the subsequent part to the following existence—the reason being that I consider the accounting for re-birth only a special application of this formula. For instance, some of the Consciousnesses may depend on the sāṅkhāras of a former birth; others (e. g., those of the Trances), on sāṅkhāras of the present one; also the Existence which depends on Desire and Attachment may be a renewed existence, or it may be such an existence as is given temporarily by the Trances (i. e., existence in the realm of Form by the four lower Trances, or in the realm of Formlessness by the four next above).

The Chain of Causation would thus appear in some sort to repeat itself, the assertion that Existence depends on Desire and Attachment being the more general statement of how all existence originates; while the description of the Consciousnesses evolving from the sāṅkhāras, and, in the case of re-birth, embodying themselves in Name-and-Form, is the specific one of how the human being comes about.

8. The Pariṣīṭas of the Aṭhārva-veda; by Dr. Edwin W. Fay, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Dr. Fay has at present the use of the two manuscripts, A and B, described by Dr. Magoun, Asūrī-Kalpa, in the Am. Journal of Philology, 1889, x. 165 ff. Codex A is a clean MS. of 217 leaves, or of 434 pages, each of nine lines. Twelve Pariṣīṭas, covering thirty-five pages, or about a twelfth part of this material, have been already copied and collated by Dr. Fay. The text and translation of the first six have been completed, and the text has been settled for several Pariṣīṭas more. It is believed that a tolerably complete and satisfactory text can be arrived at from the two MSS. now in hand, even without other manu-
script material. Many repetitions of details occur within the compass already surveyed. The separate Pariṣṭas are wont to present two treatments of the same ceremonial, one in prose, the other in ṣlokas. For this reason, it will often be possible to get the general sense of a passage, even when the determination of the precise text-reading offers insuperable difficulties.

After all, it is only the general sense of the Pariṣṭas that may fairly claim the attention of Orientalists. They present very little of linguistic interest, apart from occasional new words, and the authentication of words marked by Boehltingk as not quotable. But it should be added that, for students of folk-lore, ready access to this large collection of ritualistic and witchcraft practices is highly desirable.

Dr. Fay thinks that within the next two years he can finish the work of editing all these Pariṣṭas, as aforesaid. It is, nevertheless, very much to be wished that additional MSS. might be put at his disposal. And he would accordingly ask the Sanskritists of India and Europe to inform him (through the Secretary of the American Oriental Society, Cambridge, Massachusetts), of any such MSS. as might be entrusted to the Society for his use.


In the third Tārāṅga of the Kathā-sarit-sūgara, three brothers (verse 6) marry Bhojika's three daughters (10). A famine arises and the husbands flee (11). The sisters dwell with Bhojika's friend, Yajñadatta (13), and the second sister bears a son, Putraka, who, as protégé of Čiva, attains in time to fabulous wealth and to kingship (24). On the advice of Yajñadatta (35), Putraka bestows unprecedented largesse; on hearing the news of which, his father and uncles return, and (36) are most handsomely treated. Then comes (37) one of the frequently interjected sententious reflections of Somadeva:

\[ \text{ācaryam aparityājyo dṛṣṭanaśṭapādām api} \\
\text{avivekāṇḍhabuddhānāṁ svānubhāvo durātmanām.} \]

In course of time, continues the poet (39), they lusted for royal power and strove to slay Putraka, etc. etc.

In the edition of Brockhaus (1889), the couplet reads as I give it; and so in the edition of Durgāprasad and Parab (Bombay, 1889). Brockhaus, in his translation, p. 9, ignores the couplet entirely. In 1853, Boehltingk and Roth set up for anubhāva the meaning "8. Gesinnung, Denkungsart (7)," but merely for the sake of this one passage. Thus svā-anubhāva (svā = 'own') would amount to nearly the same thing as svā-bhāva. And so Tawney appears to take it in his translation, i. 13.

In 1875, however, Boehltingk and Roth, again for the sake of this sole passage, insert in the Lexicon the compound svā-anubhāva, and render it by "Genuss an Besitz (sva), Sinn für Besitz," and direct the reader to cancel the meaning and the citation under anubhāva 3. And in 1879 Boehltingk gives the same view in the minor Lexicon. Accord-
ingly, we should translate: 'Strange to say, wicked men, even after they have got into misfortune and out again, cannot (so blind are their minds for lack of judgment) give up their enjoyment of property (or taste for property, or interest in property).’ This, although not entirely inapposite, is not very pat.

I suspect that Somadeva wrote the line as follows:

\[\text{avivekāndhabuddhānāṃ svabhāvabh sukundātmānāṃ}.\]

Copyist A left out \textit{su-}; he, or his corrector, placed \textit{su-} in the margin; copyist B put it back from the margin into the text, but in the wrong place, thus, \textit{sua-su-bhāvo durātmānāṃ}; for the senseless \textit{sudsu-}, copyist C substituted what in nāgarī letters looks very nearly like it, namely \textit{svānu-}. Thus arose the corruption.

The reading \textit{svabhāvabh}, 'own nature,' yields just the sense we want, and fits the metre. For the combination \textit{sudur-}, compare \textit{duḥ-sparṣa} (opposite of \textit{su-sparṣa}) with \textit{su-duḥsparṣa}, and the like.

10. On the \textit{āornings. ley. rujānāḥ}, RV. i. 32. 6, with a note on haplogy; by Prof. M. Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

The hymn containing the word \textit{rujānāḥ} is one of the most prominent of the large class which describe the conflict of Indra and the demon of the cloud, \textit{Vṛtra}. The passage in question, RV. i. 32. 6 c, d, reads:

\[\text{nā tārīḍ asya sāṃptiḥ vadhānapānāḥ sāṁ rujānāḥ pāpīṣa indraṇāttraḥ}.\]

'(\textit{Vṛtra}) has not survived the blow of his (\textit{Indra’s}) weapons, etc.' The fourth \textit{pāda} is rendered by Grassmann: "im Sturz zerbrach der Indrafeind die Klöße;" Ludwig translates "die gebrochenen burgen zermalmt er (selber noch im sturze) des feind gott Indra." Both translators ignore the native treatment of the word. In Yāska’s Nāighantaṭuka i. 13 = Kāutsavaya 30,* it occurs in a list of words for 'river,' and in Yāska’s Nirukta vi. 4 we have, more explicitly, \textit{rujānā nādyo bhavantri rujanti kūlanīt} 'the rujānā are rivers; they break (ruj) the banks.' This purely etymological rendering is adopted by Sāyaṇa: \textit{indreṇa hato nādiṣu patiṇaḥ san... vr̥tradhaṣya pātena nādināḥ kūlāni tatraviṣyāṇādikāh cūrṇābhirām.} Even at the time of the present arrangement of the \textit{nāighantaṭuka} there must have been some perplexity, for the word occurs a second time in Nāgī. iv. 3, in one of those lists which even in Yāska’s time stood in need of especial elucidation.

And Mādava, in explaining the parallel passage at TB. ii. 5. 4. 4, renders quite differently: \textit{bhaṅgaḥ prāpnuvantih svakiyā eva senāḥ... vajreṇa hato bhūmnau patan san samapavrāntāh sarvān guṇān āvṛṇānāt prīṭhiṇānāt Śrīkara ‘his own armies while they are perishing. all the heroes standing near, (\textit{Vṛtra}) slain by the bolt, falling upon the ground, has

† Cf. under Pāṇini ii. 3. 54: \textit{nādi kūlaṇi rujati}.}
ground to pieces;' here rujâdh is explained by bhaṅgam pṛāpnuvantiḥ ... senḍh, in a manner totally different from the Nirukta. But all these translations are certainly incorrect, because they make rujâdh an accusative dependent upon sām pīpiṣe, which is thus forced to assume the function of a middle with active value. Every occurrence of the word in the Rig-Veda and the Atharva-Veda, and, so far as is known, every Vedic occurrence of the word, goes to show that the middle does not occur with active value; only the active occurs: see especially Grasmann's Lexicon and Whitney's Index Verborum. Thus sām pīpiṣa indraçatruḥ cannot mean anything else but 'he who had Indra as his enemy was crushed.' This grammatical consideration is supported to perfection by the facts otherwise known in the case: Vṛtra never crushes anything; on the other hand, sām pīṣ is used especially of Indra, and most frequently when he crushes cloud-demons: e.g. RV. iii. 18. 9, piṛo dāsasya sām piṣak; iii. 30. 8, ahaṣṭām indra sām piṣak kūpārum; iv. 80. 13, pūro yād asyā (sc. cūṇasaya) sam-piṣak; vi. 17. 10, yena nāvāntam dhiṅ sam-piṣak; vii. 1. 28, tuṁ pūrah ... cūṇasaya sām piṣak. One may say that but for the presence of rujâdh in the pāda no one would have ever thought of regarding sām pīpiṣe as an active. We are thus constrained to search in rujâdh for a nom. sg. in agreement with the subject of the sentence.

Another point strongly claims recognition. The root ruj, simple as well as with various prepositions, figures very prominently in descriptions of the injuries which Indra inflicts upon demons, and it seems very natural to suppose that the word rujâdh here states that such injury was inflicted upon Vṛtra by Indra. Thus RV. x. 89. 6, 7, (indrah) ṣrṇāti viḍu rujāti sthirāvi ... jaghāṇa vṛtrāḥ ... rur̥jāḥ pūraḥ: cf. also i. 6. 5; 51. 5; iv. 92. 10; vi. 32. 3; ix. 48. 2. Very similar are RV. vii. 6. 13, vi vṛtrāṃ parvaṇo rujāṇ; i. 59. 6, vi vṛtrāṣya ... paṇḍā 'rujāḥ; x. 152. 3 = AV. i. 21. 3 = RV. ii. 1217; also TS. i. 6. 12. 5. vi vṛtrāṣya hānā rujā. Elsewhere Vála is treated in the same way: e.g. RV. iv. 50. 5, vaṇah roṣaṇa; RV. vi. 89. 2, rujād ... vi dāsas āśānam; AV. xix. 28. 3, ṣr̥dahr̥ saṇḍānāṃ bhindhi 'nāra iva virujān valām. At RV. x. 49. 6, sām ... dāsaḥ vṛtrahā 'rujām, and AV. iv. 24. 2, ṣr̥ (sc. indra) dānāvstām balam āruṣā, the same theme is treated. At RV. vi. 22. 6, the words rujō vi dṛṣṭāḥ express essentially the same thing, the cleaving of the clouds: cf. also vii. 75. 7; viii. 45. 13; ix. 34. 1. At RV. vi. 32. 2 we have rujād ādṛim (cf. i. 72. 2); at RV. vi. 61. 2, arujat ānu giriṇām. Again, of Indra it is said at RV. x. 84. 3, rujān ... cātrāṇ; at RV. i. 102. 4 = AV. vii. 50. 4, prā cātrāṇam maṇḍhavan vṛṣṇya rujā. Every additional example strengthens the impression that rujādh originally stood in agreement with indraṣatruḥ, the subject of the sentence, and we are at once led to the emendation rujādh 'broken' in the sense of a passive: cf. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 284. But why should the correctly accented and easily intelligible rujādh have given way to this discordant lectio difficilior with anomalous accent? The sense, too, is tautological in the extreme: 'Vṛtra having been broken was crushed.'

VOL. XVI. E
The suggestion which we have to offer is uncertain, and, but for the fact that its rejection does not deprive the negative analysis of the passage of its value, it might perhaps not have been offered in print. The root ruṣ is employed very frequently in connection with parts of the body. Thus we have above the expressions vi vṛtrasya hānā ruṣa; vi vṛtrāṃ paraṇo ruṣāṇā; ruṣād... vi vālasya śālam. In a different connection we have AV, ix. 8. 12, figuratively, yāḥ simānau virujantī mūrdhānam praty arṣayīḥ 'the pains which break the crown of the head and the head;' AV. ix. 8. 18, yāḥ... pṛāṇasya virujantī; CB. iv. 5. 2. 3, virujya čroṣī. At Rām. iii. 72. 20 we have pakṣapañca-nakāḥ... gātrāyā ārujatā; at Har. 5694, stānān ārujya. With this we are related the very common expressions like mūkha-ruṣ 'pain in the mouth,' Varāh. Br. S. 5. 82; āṛg-ruṣ, ibid. 104. 5; aksi-ruṣ, ibid. 51. 11; 104. 16; netra-ruṣ, AK. iii. 4. 36. 208, 'pain in the eyes;' pārca-ruṣ, Suśr. i. 165. 9, 'pain in the side;' lalāçe ca ruṣā jāfne, Rām. iii. 29. 15; cīro-ruṣ, Varāh. Br. S. 53. 111; cīro-ruṣā, MBh. iii. 16899; cīravo ruṣā, ibid. 16816.

My suggestion, now, is that ruṣānāḥ is a compound of a derivative of the root ruṣ with some designation of a part of the body. It might be ruṣānād + dā 'having a broken mouth;' but it seems to me more likely to be ruṣānād + nās 'nose,' which would yield ruṣānānda, changed by dissimilation (haplology) to ruṣānās. The word would then mean 'with a broken nose.' In stanza 7 of the same hymn the statement is made that Vṛtra was broken into many small pieces: puratrd vṛtrā açyatād vyāstāh; which augurs that his nose was not exempt from the general catastrophe. This, at any rate, yields good sense, and accounts for the anomalous (bahuviṇa) accentuation. The stem nās 'nose' does not occur out of composition, but it seems to be fairly certain in anās, RV. v. 29. 10: anāso dasyuḥ aṁrṇo vadhena. The padapātha divides an-āso, and both the Petersburg lexicons and Grassmann follow, translating the word by 'without face or mouth.' Ludw. Rig-Veda ii. 109, translates 'with your weapon you slew the noseless Dasyu,' having in mind the flat-nosed aborigines. Cf. also his remarks in the notes, vol. v., p. 95. The same interpretation was advanced previously by Max Müller: see Ad. Kuhn, Die Herabkunft des Feuers, p. 59, note. Especially on the second assumption (ruṣānāḥ = ruṣānānāḥ) it is easy to understand how the composite character of the word might have been forgotten, and the earliest interpreters driven to propositions entirely out of accord with the rest of the sentence and with reasonable sense.

Note on Haplology.

Cases of haplology are by no means so rare in the older language as would appear from the very few instances which are usually reported.

*See the note on haplology at the end of this article. A bahuviṇa with a participle in -na as the first member we have in daṝṇā-pavi, yuyuṇa-sāpti (Whitney, Sk. Gr. § 1299c): cf. also uttānā-hasta, uttānā-pad. The participle ruṣānā is to be regarded as belonging to the root-aorist: cf. ib. 840, 6.
Whitney, Sk. Gr. 3 §1021b, mentions *irādhyāi for *iradh-ādhyāi, and this is the sole example in illustration of the process mentioned by Brugmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik, i. 484. Other examples, in addition to ulokā for *ulu-loka from uru-lokā (see below), are: madhūga 'sweet-wood, licorice,' for *madhu-dugha, *madhugha, with loss of aspiration, both intermediate forms being found occasionally in the MSS.: see e.g. Kāuṣ. 85. 21, note 9; trēc and trica for *try-ṛca ‘a group of three stanzas’ (so already Yāṣka, Nir. iii. 1); hiraṇmaya for *hiraṇya-maya ‘golden,’ where the loss of the first ya by dissimilation operates across the syllable ma; āsma for *āsma-maya, Ts. ii. 2. 12. 4, ‘fiery,’ which the Petersburg lexicon erroneously regards as the corruption of a theoretical *āṣmya; cēvṛda for *peva-vṛda ‘kindly, friendly’ (Grassmann); sādas-pāti for *sādasas-pāti ‘protector of home’: compounds with pāti having two accents regularly exhibit a genitive as the first member: cubhās-pāti, byḥas-pāti, brāhmaṇas-pāti, and by imitation vānas-pāti, jās-pāti, rāthas-pāti; cīrṣakti ‘head-ache’ may stand for cīrṣa-sakti ‘affection of the head’ from root sac in the sense of ‘fasten upon’: cf. A.V. i. 12. 3, where cīrṣakti and sac occur together alliteratively. The last example is by no means certain. There is correlation, surely, between this phenomenon and the gliding over of causatives like kṣayayāmi, etc., to the p-type: kṣapayāmi etc.: cf. also the change of rohāyāmi of the mantras to rupāyāmi in the Brāhmaṇas.

11. The etymology of ulokā; by Professor Bloomfield.

The various essays on this expression are instructive alike for the keen philological insight and the inadequate grammatical propositions of their authors. The expression is distinctively an archaism in the literature. In the first eight mapūdalas of the RV., the word lokā occurs only twice without the u preceding: vi. 47. 8; viii. 100. 12.* With antecedent u, the occurrences are i. 93. 6; ii. 90. 6; iii. 2. 9; 29. 8; 37. 11; iv. 17. 17; v. 1. 6; 4. 11; vi. 23. 3; 73. 2; vii. 20. 2; 35. 5; 60. 9; 84. 2; 99. 4; viii. 15. 4 (here u loka-kṛtnām). In the ninth book, there are two occurrences of simple lokā, ix. 113. 7, 9; and three of u lokā, ix. 2. 8 (u lokakṛtnām); 96. 21 (u lokakṛt); 92. 5 (u lokām). In the tenth book, there are six occurrences of u lokā: x. 18. 2; 16. 4; 30. 7; 104. 10; 133. 1 (u lokakṛt); 180. 8; and three occurrences of simple lokā; x. 14. 9; 85. 27; 90. 14. In addition, the tenth book, and that alone, begins to produce compounds in which lokā is the final member: urulokām, in x. 128. 2; ānolanām, in x. 18. 8; and patilokām, in x. 85. 48. This shows on the whole a perceptible growth of lokā at the expense of u lokā in the ninth and tenth books; and the A.V. continues boldly in

---

* Correct accordingly Bollensen in ZDMG. xxiii. 607, who claims that there is no occurrence of lokā without preceding u in the first eight books; and Max Müller, *Veithic Hymns* (SBF. xxxii), p. lxxv, who notes only viii. 100. 12.
the same direction. Here loki occurs so often as to render a count useless, but u loki occurs only three times, in one hymn of the Yama-book, xvii. 4. 11, 44, 71, in the obviously archaizing phrase sukṛtām u lokiṃ. I do not count three other occurrences which coincide with the RV., namely vii. 84. 2=RV. x. 180. 3; xviii. 3. 8=RV. x. 16. 4; xviii. 3. 80=RV. x. 18. 2. The AV. abounds also in compounds in which loki forms the second member; see Index Verborum, p. 267a. In the Yajus-texts, both u loki and lokī occur; but we have no means of controlling their frequency or proportion. We have surabhih u loki in VS. xii. 85=TS. iv. 2. 8. 2=MS. ii. 7. 10; sukṛtām u lokiṃ in VS. xviii. 52=TS. iv. 7. 18. 1=MS. ii. 13. 3; and in VS. xviii. 58. The parallel of VS. xviii. 58 in TS. v. 7. 7. 1 has sukṛtasya lokīṃ instead of sukṛtām u lokīṃ. That is precisely the favorite manner in which the AV. manages to circumvent the archaism: see e.g. iv. 11. 6; 14. 6; vi. 119. 1; 130. 1; 121. 1, 2; vii. 88. 4; xi. 1. 8, 87, etc. In VS. xi. 23=MS. ii. 7. 2 occurs the pāda dēkhaḥ sū lokāh sukṛtam prthivyām, which is varied in TS. iv. 1. 2. 4 to dēkhaḥ u lokāh sukṛtam prthivyāḥ. Both sū and sā are modern variants of u; and they testify that the combination u loki had become perplexing. It is to be noted also that the compound lokakṛt, which is preceded by u in the two sole occurrences in the RV. (ix. 86. 31; x. 188. 1), occurs in other texts always without u: AV. xviii. 3. 25; TS. i. 1. 12. 1; TB. iii. 1. 2. 10; AQS. iv. 18. 5.

Most Vedic scholars have recognized the unusual character of u before loki. In many cases it makes no sense; and in RV. ii. 3. 9; 87. 11; v. 4. 11; viii. 15. 4; ix. 2. 8, it stands at the beginning of a pāda, in defiance of the rule that enclitics cannot stand at the beginning of any verse-line.† There is no connection from which u loki, regarded as two words, could have been propagated secondarily;‡ hence all the interpreters have agreed in assuming uloki as a single word, misunderstood by the padapātha and the Prātiṣṭākyya of the RV., owing to the occurrence of lokī in the same text.

Adalbert Kuhn, in Ind. Stud. i. 350 ff., after comparing loki with Lith. and Old Pruss. lawaks, Lettish lawko, all meaning 'open space, field,' Low Germ. louch, lŏch 'village,' derives the words from Skt. ura, epsilon, and sees in the u a trace of the fuller form of the stem, which was lost for reasons not stated. The Pet. Lex. suggests that the word is a derivative from the root roc 'shine,' preceded by a preposition u, a reduced form of ava. Bollensen, ZDMG. xviii. 607 ff., xxii. 580, derives it from an adjective *urva-asca, through the weak stem *urva-ac, extended into an a-stem *urvaka, *uroka. Ascoli, Corsi di glottologia,

* The same expression occurs in RV. v. 1. 6.

† Hence the RV. Prātiṣṭākyya (978), which, like the padapātha, regards u in these cases as the particle, is led to insert a special provision exempting u from the law of enclitics; anudatatah tu pādaśc u novarjānā vidyate padam, 'no unaccented word is found at the beginning of a pāda except u.'

‡ A somewhat mechanical propagation of the particle u must be assumed for its persistent occurrence after infinitives in -tād'ī (-tād' u).
Bloomfield, Etymology of uloká.

p. 286 (German translation p. 195), Fick, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch (all editions), and Joh. Schmidt, Vocalismus, ii. 220, assume a phonetic development of u out of the initial i. Grassmann modifies the view of the Pet. Lex. by assuming a reduplicated stem *ruroka which lost the r of the reduplicating syllable.

The germ of what seems to me the true explanation is contained in Kuhn's view: there is some connection between uloká and the word urú. I assume a simple stem loká, and a descriptive compound uruloká, changed by assimilation of the linguals to *ululoká and by haplography to uloká. Naturally, after the loss of one of the syllables, the origin of the word was forgotten, and the padakara, perplexed by the existence of the simple word loká, construed u as the particle.

The Vedic poets themselves had lost all knowledge of the composite character of the word; but the expression uloká clearly betrays its elective affinity for the word urú, which frequently occurs as its predicate: e.g. RV. i. 93. 6; vi. 23. 7; vii. 33. 5; 60. 9; 84. 2; 99. 4; x. 180. 3. The case is therefore one of the unconscious doubling of equivalent linguistic elements; the first urú having been exhausted by its phonetic fate, a second urú is put into requisition; its fitness as a predicate of loká (uloká) has not passed by.‡ But there appears to be a certain shyness in putting urú near uloká; in all cases where the two occur together, urú stands at the beginning and uloká at the end of the pāda: e.g. i. 93. 6, urúh yajñāya cakrathur u lokáṃ. So also vi. 23. 7; vii. 35. 5; 60. 9; 84. 2; 99. 4; x. 180. 3.

The occurrence of the ár. p. uruloka in RV. x. 128. 2 = AV. v. 3. 3 = TS. iv. 7. 14. 1, does not stand in the way of the assumed phonetic process. In the first place, the word occurs in the tenth book, and we may assume that the phonetic law had ceased to operate. Further, the cases are not the same: *uruloka changed to uloká is a karmadhāraya, and accordingly oxytone; uruloka is a bahuvrhi in both function and accentuation. It is quite likely that the identical grave intonation of the two similar first syllables in uruloká favored a process of dissimilation uncalled for by the two initial syllables of urulokam, contrasted as they were by accent and perhaps also by syllabification (ur-ul-o-ká, but u-rú-lo-ka). But there seems to be also a chronological difference;

‡ Cf. Bechtel, Uber gegenseitige Asimilation und Dissimilation der beiden Zitterlauten, pp. 45 ff. Aufrecht's essentially similar view, ZDMG. xlii. 152, did not come to my notice until the present article was in type. Perhaps the totally independent arrival of both of us at the same result may impart an element of security to the construction.

‡ Cf. cases like Vedic pritisu, 'in battles,' with double loc. plur. ending su. This is rendered natural by a compound like pritusúr, where pritus may have been felt as a stem-form. Similarly patus-tás, 'at the feet,' and patusutah-qi, 'lying at the feet,' comparatives and superlatives like crṣṭhatama, nādiṣ- thatama; Pāli abhiruyhita for *abhīryuhita = Skt. abhiruyha, ogayhīrī for *ogayha = aṣṭādhya, etc. See F. Kuhn, Pali-grammatik, p. 120.

since the A.V., though it does not directly compound urú and lokí, places them closely together, e.g. ix. 2. 11, urúm lokím akaram mah-yam edhatum; xii. 1. 1, urúm lokím prthiváh nab karatu; see also xiv. 1. 58; xviii. 2. 20. The RV., as indicated above, avoids this, and exhibits in its place six occurrences of the type urúm...ulokím, e.g. vii. 84. 2, urúm na indraḥ kṛṣṇavrud u lokím. Each expression is typical for the text from which it is quoted.

12. The doctrine of the resurrection among the Ancient Persians; by Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College, New York City.

This paper was presented in abstract. The main points of its discussion, however, may briefly be given; and the most important passages from which citations were drawn are perhaps worth recording for future reference, if the paper be printed elsewhere in full.

Attention was first called to various likenesses and resemblances in general between the religion of Ancient Iran, as modified by Zoroaster, and the doctrines of Christianity. The most striking among these parallels are those to be found in the views relating to eschatology and the doctrine of a future life. It is the optimistic hope of a regeneration of the world and of a general resurrection of the dead that most markedly characterizes the religion of Persia from the earliest times. The pious expectation of a new order of things is the chord upon which Zoroaster himself rings constant changes in the Gāthās or 'Psalms.' A mighty crisis is impending (Ya. xxx. 2, mazé ydōkhō); each man should choose the best, and seek for the ideal state; mankind shall then become perfect, and the world renovated (frašem ahūm, frašōtema: cf. frašōkereti, etc.). This will be the establishment of the power and dominion of good over evil, the beginning of the true rule and sovereignty, "the good kingdom, the wished-for kingdom" (vohu khātha, khātha vairya). It is then that the resurrection of the dead will take place. It will be followed by a general judgment, accompanied by the flood of molten metal in which the wicked shall be punished, the righteous cleansed, and evil banished from the world (cf. also A.O.S. Proceedings for Oct. 1890, Journal, vol. xv. p. lviiii).

After this general introduction, various classical passages in Greek authors touching upon the ancient Persian belief were examined in the light of the Avesta. The citations were drawn from Theopompos, quoted by Diogenes Laertes, Procmium p. 2, ed. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum i. 289, and again by Æneas of Gaza, Dial. de animi immortal. p. 77, both cited by Windischmann, Zoroastri¢nche Studien p. 283. The allusion in Plutarch (Is. et Os. 47) was discussed, and the interesting passage Herodotus 3. 62 was reconsidered. All these classical passages were found to be quite in keeping with the general results won from the Avesta.

A more detailed investigation of the Avesta and the Pahlavi books now followed in regard to the doctrine of a millenium, the coming of the Saoshyant 'Saviour,' the destruction of evil, the establishment of
the kingdom and sovereignty of good, and the renovation of the universe, all which are directly associated with the doctrine of the resurrection.

In connection with the idea of a coming millennium, a final change and regeneration of the world—a belief parallel in a measure with ideas found in the Revelation—such passages were discussed as Ys. xxx. 2; xxxiii. 5; xxxvi. 2; lviii. 7; li. 6; xliii. 5, 6; xxx. 9; xlv. 19; l. 11: cf. Yt. xix. 11; Vd. xviii. 51; Ys. lxii. 3; Yt. xiiii. 58, 128; and Ys. li. 9; xxx. 7; Vsp. xx. 1; Yt. 17. 20; together with numerous allusions in the later Pahlavi books, such as Bundahish i. 25; xxx. 1 ff.; xxxix. 8, et al. Some of the classical passages were again used in comparison.

A treatment of the doctrine of the idea of a Saviour, as directly connected with the resurrection belief, was next briefly given; certain parallels with the Messianic ideas of Judaism were drawn. Quotations used for discussion upon this point were made from Ys. xlv. 3; xlviii. 9; Ys. xiv. 1; ix. 2; Yt. xiiii. 128; xix. 89; Bund. xxx. 2 ff.; B YT. iii. 61; Dd. ii. 13, et al., and a passage in a Syriac MS. commentary on the N. T. by 'Isaḥ-dād, as well as Apocryphal N. T., Infancy, iii. 1-10.

Finally, the resurrection passages Yt. xiiii. 128; xix. 89-96; Fragm. iv. 1-3 were translated in full and commented upon. The latter fragment (iv. 1-3) appears in the Dinkart ix. 48. 1-5 as taken from the Varashtmānsar Nāsk (cf. West, Pahlavi Texts transl. S. B. E. xxxvii. 302). A number of Pahlavi allusions were then instanced, occurrences of Ḩf. tanū-i pāsīn ‘the body hereafter’ were treated, and an extended discussion was given of the well-known Bundahish passage xxx. 1-82, and of its relation to the ancient Dāmdāt Nāsk. Statements bearing upon the resurrection were also cited from the accounts given in the Dinkart and the Persian Rīvāyats, of the contents of the original Avestan Nāsk or ‘books,’ to show that this doctrine must have been often referred to or discussed, and that it was evidently a prominent article of faith.

Having given a summary, and shown the perfect uniformity and accord between the Avesta, the Pahlavi Books, the old accounts of the original Nāskas, and the early allusions in the classics, the paper came to the conclusion that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is one of the oldest in the religion of Persia; that it may have been developed or even modified at different times; but that it was characteristic of Mazdaism in all its periods, so far as we can judge, and was a tenet undoubtedly inculcated by Zoroaster some centuries before the Christian era.

13. Sanskrit-Avestan Notes; by Professor Jackson.

1. Skt. gambhirā, gabhīrā, Av. gufra.

In American Journal of Philology xi. 89, 90, P. Horn of Strassburg has drawn attention to the possible existence of an occasional Avestan a or ā which answers to an a, or is the representative of the nasalis sonans. Dr. Horn has since somewhat questioned the correctness of his own suggestion; I think much may be said, however, in its favor.
The examples which Horn originally brought forward to support his theory were, it is true, by no means all sure; but a comparison with the Sanskrit seems to make, on this principle, the Avestan word *gūfra* 'deep' quite clear. Presumably, Av. *gūfra* stands for *gmy-ra*; cf. Av. *jaf-ra*. This can be none other than Skt. *gambh-ī-ṛd, gambh-ī-ṛd*. On -ī- see also Bartholomae, *Studien z. indog. Sprachgeschichte* ii. 170, 179. A proportion may thus be constructed:


We have thus an Av. *u* representing a, m.

The writing *u* in Av. may indeed not be truly orthographic: the variants at Yt. xv. 38 for the similar word *guf-ya, gaf-ya* would seem to show that fact; but that such a *u* does occur in Av. for m, a, seems unquestionable, and an acceptance of Horn's suggestion may perhaps clear up other words.


In the Avesta, Ya. lvii. 27, the divine horses of Sraosha are thus described:

- gayathro auruvañño
- auruṣa raokhina frādāresra
- speñta vidhvoṇhō ā s a y a
- māṇivaśaṁhō vazeñhi

'Four white steeds, bright, shining, sacred, knowing, and . . . . , bear Sraosha through the heavenly space.'

The epithet *asaya*, left untranslated, is obscure. Dr. E. W. West, under date Dec. 5, 1888, wrote me that the Pahlavi version of the word seems to contain *sidyako*, with which he compared Mod. Pers. *sidyak*, 'shadow.' The hint was an excellent one; *asaya* might well mean 'not casting a shadow.'

Turning now to the Sanskrit, we find a precise parallel in the word *a-čhāyā* 'shadowless' in a passage of the Rig-Veda, x. 37. 14: *brāhma a čhāya ो apaldāpō dveda*. The meaning at once becomes clear, and the forms match exactly. For the phonetic changes (Skt. *d* = Av. *d*; Skt. *ch* = Av. *s*), see my *Avesta Grammar*, §§ 17, 142.

With reference, moreover, to the force of the attribute 'shadowless' Professor Geldner has happily suggested a parallel in the familiar epithet *chāyādvitiya* 'accompanied by a shadow,' the characteristic mark distinguishing Nala from the gods in the well-known episode MBh. iii. 57. 25. A further support, I think, may also be brought in from a passage in the classics. Plutarch, in *Is. et Os.* 47, describes the millennium which the Zoroastrian religion pictures as coming upon earth at the end of the world; in this connection he notes as one of the characteristics of men beatified that they shall no longer 'cast a shadow': *αὐτοπότις ἀναμμενης ἀτομεύει, μήτε τρόφις δεμοίνυς μήτε σώμαν ῥοδόνειαν.* See also Windischmann, *Zur. Studien*, p. 294.

The epithets Skt. *achāyā*, Av. *asaya* are therefore quite parallel in signification; and the wonderful coursers of Sraosha, besides all their
other divine attributes, become 'shadowless' as they dart through the sky.*

3. Data for Zoroaster's Life.

In P.A.O.S. for April, 1892 (Journal, vol. xv., p. clxxx), attention was called to the Zartusht-Nāmah as possibly furnishing a number of old traditional facts connected with the actual life of Zoroaster. Mention was made, for example, of Zoroaster's reputed teacher Barzin- karūs. Possibly that name may rest upon some good foundation. Allusion to a spiritual teacher (aēthrapaiti) of Zoroaster is at any rate now quotable from an ancient Avesta fragment of the Hādhōkht Nask, cited in Sad Dar xl. 4; see also Dinkart viii. 45. 9. The Avesta text (emended) is thus given in West, Pahlavi Texts transl., S. B. E. xxiv. 302; xxxvii. 488:

mā āzārayōkī, Zarathuštra! mā Pournāspem mā Dughdhovām, mā aēthrapaitīk;

which may be rendered: 'Mayest thou, O Zoroaster, not anger thy father, Pouroshasp, nor thy mother, Dughdhowa, nor thy spiritual teacher.' Might Barzinkarūs be the very aēthrapaitī here alluded to? According to the Zartusht-Nāmah, Zoroaster was given into a learned teacher's charge at the age of seven years.

The passage cited is also especially interesting as it gives us an actual occurrence of the name of Zoroaster's mother in an Avesta text. Her name had previously been quotable only in Pahlavi and Persian writings. See, for instance, Bd. xxxii. 10; Sl. x. 4; xii. 11, and the reference in A.O.S. Journal xv. 228.

Items like this have their value as contributing something toward our knowledge of Zoroaster's life and the facts connected with him as a historical personage. It is for just such points as this that we must look to Pahlavi scholars to provide us with new material and data.

14. The independent particle stū in the Rig-veda; by Prof. Herbert C. Tolman, of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

As an inseparable prefix, the particle stū is used, in all periods of the Sanskrit language, with the familiar meanings which flow naturally from its primary signification 'well.' On the other hand, as is well known, the Veda furnishes many examples of stū used as an independent word.

The German translators either omit the word entirely, believing it to be used simply as a metrical expletive, or else they render it by schon, which is a good German reproduction of the padding of the original, if padding it be. They also render it by gut, recht, sehr, ja, recht bald

* Since the above was written, I am interested in finding that Darmesteter, in his new translation, Le Zend-Avesta, vol. i. 366, assigns precisely the same meaning to asayta, 'sans faire d'ombre.' To have the support also of such authority is gratifying.

VOL. XVI.
(Ludwig), sogleich; and mā u śū is rendered by nimmer: thus, for example, in RV. i. 88. 6, mō śū nāḥ... nīrīṭṣir durḥāṇa vadhāt. But is not the meaning rather 'Kindly (i.e. please), O Maruts, let not destruction (and) disaster slay us?'

The particle śū occurs as a word in the first book of the Rig-veda in some forty-one passages, counting the refrain of i. 112. 1-23 as one. If we examine these passages, we shall find that the renderings 'kindly,' 'please,' 'be so good as to,' fit in all but eight. In these eight we can insist either a. on the simple adverbial meaning of the particle, or else b. that its force consists in representing the action of the verb as desirable.

Thus, as an example under a. may be cited i. 37. 14, tātṛō śū māda-yādhvāi, 'so enjoy yourselves as their (the Kaṇvas': tātra = kāṇvesu) guests, well or thoroughly: i.e. have a rousing good time with them.' And, as examples under b.: i. 188. 1, ṗṛd śū jyēṣṭhaṁ nicīrāḥbhīyām bhāṁ nāmo... bharatā, 'proffer well (i.e. acceptably or so that it may be most acceptable) as your best offering to the two needful (gods) exalted homage;' i. 164. 26, abhīdṛḍho gharmāṁ tāt u śū ṗṛd vocam, 'the kettle is hot and I announce it (to you) acceptably: i.e. you'll be glad to hear me say so.'*

But it is the meaning 'please' which I desire especially to emphasize, and which, I think, is the most appropriate in no less than twenty-three of the forty-one passages. In each case I render by 'be so good as to.' Thus, i. 9. 6, asmān śū... codaye 'ndra rāyé, 'be so good, O Indra, as to help us on to prosperity;' i. 17. 7, asmān śū jīgīṣwas kṛtam, 'be ye two so good as to make us victorious;' i. 26. 5, imā u śū śruḍhā gīrāḥ, 'and be so good as to hear these (our) songs;' and similarly in the others, in which the verb is an imperative or its equivalent. And not essentially different is i. 118. 10, tā vāṁ narā sū drase... hāvāmahe, 'therefore we call on you two, O heroes, to be so good as to help us.'

It seems to follow that the meaning 'please' or 'I pray' must be conceded for the detached śū. The logical development of the meanings presents no difficulty: thus, 'well, acceptably, kindly, we pray.' Moreover, there is in various languages a tendency to tone down the harshness of a direct command. In this way the Roman noli facere and ne feceris took the place of ne fac. And the use of quominus with verbs of hindering and so on was developed under the same tendency. In late Greek, παρακαλέω was attached for a like purpose to the imperative, so that to-day in Athens it is the regular word for 'please.'†

The functions of the detached śū in the Rig-veda I hold to be: 1. to soften a command ('please'); 2. to make acceptable a wish ('I pray');

* The other five passages are i. 135. 9; 184. 2; 52. 1; 53. 1: 139. 8. But it may be noted that in all these eight examples, save one, it is quite possible to apply the rendering 'please.'
† Δις μοι, παρακαλέω τις ἵλιαις, 'Please hand me the olives.' Compare the Latin bene in nunc te opsecro ut me bene tures. Mostell. iv. 3. 11.
and 3, to modify the verb as a simple adverb ('well, agreeably'). Of the last use there are somewhat less than a dozen instances.

The particle, then, has a definite significance in every case of its occurrence, and ought not to be slighted by the translator. In most of the instances where the German versions attempt to render it, its sense is quite different from that of *schen*, *sogleich*, *wohl* etc.

15. On early Moslem promissory notes; by Mr. Frank D. Chester, Assistant in Arabic in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

In the *Kitâb al-Agâni* (ed. Bulak, I, p. 17, l. 16), first-rate evidence is to be found that the Arabs of the time of Moâwiya, the first Damascus calif, had already excellent financial arrangements in private business transactions, particularly the custom of giving what we now call a "promise to pay" for money lent on specified terms. A tradition there reported from Mos'ab ibn 'Ammâr, a descendant of the famous Ibn az-Zubeir of Medina, relates that Sa'id, grandson of Umayya, before his death had instructed his son 'Amru to make over certain property to his cousin Moâwiya, in order to pay off the debts that had accumulated upon him during his lifetime. For it was the custom that near relatives should take upon themselves all indebtedness of the deceased. In this case, Sa'id desired that 'Amru should be able to offer the calif something that he might sell to advantage and incur no debt. Accordingly, Moâwiya accepted his relative's offer with the words "What has he made over to me?" 'Amru replied "His castle in Al-'Arâq." He said "I take it for his debt." He answered "It is yours on condition that you have the amount transported to Medina and converted into *wâifa*." He said "Ay," and had it transferred to Medina and divided among his creditors. "And the greater part," says the tradition, "consisted of promises to pay (كُانَ أَكَثَّرُهَا وَعَدَاتٌ)."

The Arabic word *عِدَة* here used appears to have a technical sense, an illustration of which is afforded by the conclusion of Mos'ab's story, which runs thus:

A young man of the Koreish came to him (viz. 'Amru, on his return to Medina) with a document (صَكِ) to the amount of twenty thousand dirhams with Sa'id's own signature and the signature of a freedman of his upon it. He sent for the freedman, and made him read the document. When he had read it, he wept and said "Ay, this is his writing, and this is my signature upon it." Then 'Amru said to him "How

*Read فَأَعْرَضَ (عَلَيْهِ), which makes little sense: cf. 'Amru's reply.
comes there to be twenty thousand dirhams for this youth upon it? Why, he is the poorest of the poor of the Koreish!” He said “I will tell you about it. Sa’id was passing along after his loss of office, and this youth happened on him, and journeyed with him till he arrived at his home. There he stopped and said ‘Do you wish anything?’ (The youth) said ‘No, except that I found you traveling alone and desired to come to your protection.’ Then he said to me ‘Bring me a sheet of paper,’ and I brought him this. He wrote out this debt himself, and said ‘You shall not suffer anything at my hands; take this, and, when anything comes in to me, you come to me.’” ‘Amru said ‘By Allah, he surely shall not receive it except in ʿalifas. Give it to him.” And the twenty thousand dirhams were weighed out to him in ʿalifas.\footnote{Ar. ʿalifas. (= in ʿalif kind). The ʿalif was then equivalent to the silver dirham, about 20 cents. There would be no point to the end of this story if it were translated by ‘in full.’ Cf. ‘Amru’s request above. How improper to have asked Moawiya to pay in full!}

The legal point of this story is that Sa’id’s great generosity led him to incur money obligations when he had no means to fulfil them. This fact really invalidated his note, at least according to the Mohamadan law of the present day; and so also did the fact that he specified no time of payment.

One is naturally led to inquire whether the word ʿalif, which was here used of the transaction with the impoverished youth (l. 24), had acquired the technical and limited usage that it now possesses, to signify the simple ‘loan-obligation.’ The Moslem law-books of the present time provide for two sorts of legal obligations to pay, the ʿalif and the ʿalif, treating them under the same category with contracts of sale. Thus the creditor is looked upon as buyer to the amount of the obligation, and the debtor as vender of the same, so that the Moslem manages to evade the Koranic prohibition of usury. Such legal squinting, it may be said, is characteristic of the Orientals, and has its parallels elsewhere in their institutions. Accordingly, in the second species of contract, the debtor promises to deliver goods or money to a stipulated amount over that actually borrowed, and the creditor contrives to get his interest. The ʿalif, however, which more concerns us here, is a promise to restore merely the amount lent, at the end of a specified term. In case the debtor fails to keep his agreement, the Hanafite and the unorthodox Shi’ite sects insist still further that the creditor may claim no interest; but the Shafi’ites more rationally permit him to convert the contract immediately into the ʿalif. Ordinarily, a written contract is made out, with the signatures of sev-
eral witnesses, in whose presence the loan must be made. Yet the contract is valid if oral only, provided the creditor pronounces the word قِيلَتُ 'I lend,' and the debtor أَقَرَّتُ 'I receive.'

To return to our story of Sa‘īd and the time of Mo‘awiya (7th cent. A.D.): we can say this much, that دَيْنُ was then used of a ‘promise to pay,’ though it connoted in fact much more than عَدَة (cf. loc. cit. lines 11, 16, 24); that one witness, at least, was required, though probably more, this being a peculiar case; that the custom of writing out عَدَات was very common, especially when rich men had fees to pay; finally that, as another tradition, adduced (loc. cit.) to show that Sa‘īd was generous to a fault, also indicates, local if not inter-territorial systems of credit prevailed. Sa‘īd ordered a freedman, it is said, to ‘take what he liked on his security (أَمَانُة),’ in order to marry off one of his young servants.

But now let us pass from Mo‘awiya to Mohammed, half a century earlier. Have we proof that there existed in his time such financial facilities as are above suggested? Or is it correct to draw the usual picture of a system of barter, in which the precious metals had a value not as a circulating medium, but as natural products, for ornamental purposes? The testimony of the Koran (ii. 282–284) would tend to dis-establish this latter view: “O ye who believe!” it reads, “if ye engage in debt for a stated time, then write it down, and let a scribe write it down between you faithfully; . . . unless, indeed, it be a ready-money transaction between you, which ye arrange between yourselves; . . . but bring witnesses to what ye sell one to another; . . . but if ye be upon a journey and ye cannot find a scribe, then let a pledge be taken.”

It looks as if in Mohammed’s time at Medina, where these words were said to have been uttered, and at Mecca, there was a class, not necessarily a school of men, who, knowing how to write, had fallen into the custom of recording transactions for their neighbors, and acted as scribes to the merchants passing in and out of the city. Mohammed thus favors their employment, as calculated to assure the systematic recording of business acts, and to prevent unfair dealing.

With this evidence we may compare that of the traditions of the Ṣaḥīḥ of Al-Bokhārī, in his chapter on “Borrowing, Payment of Debts, Cheating, and Failure” (ed. Krehl, ii. § 44). Here is reported Mohammed’s behavior in matters of trade. The first two traditions represent him as paying his creditors promptly or else giving security (e. g., an iron cuirass for some food obtained from a Jew), while the fourth states that he was in the habit of keeping by him one dinār, no more, with which to meet any obligation. Somewhat discrepantly, we find here no use of scribe or witness, but only pledge-giving, which grew out of simple barter, or holding of ready money as a medium of
exchange. Probably Mohammed's own social and commercial relations expanded in proportion as he and his religion advanced into greater popularity.

On the other hand, we have good reason to believe that the advent of the Prophet gave one forcible turn to the commercial life as well as to the religious cult of the Arabs. In his day, the Bedawin flowing in from the desert to the cities were confounded, and too often thrown into great straits, by the class of men who swarmed the market-places and acted as money-changers. Fortunately, there are extant lines from old poets, a couple of them perhaps pre-Mohammedan, which depict this condition of things in the Arabian business world (see Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur Poesie der alten Araber*, pp. 183-193)*. Each fragment or piece of poetry expresses the great joy of a man who, in a very wily manner, has been able to foil his creditor. In all these lines the word دين has only the general sense of 'debt,' usually referring to a simple bill of sale. It is interesting to notice the word ضريبة, which was used in the story of Sa'îd to signify the 'sheet of paper' on which the دين was recorded. The Koranic prohibition of usury, however, is our best evidence of the fact that money-changing was a widespread practice in Mohammed's time, along with some sort of banking and account-keeping (ii. 276-279). The policy of that revelation was to protect the poorer classes of his converts against the fraudulent extortions of those quasi-brokers. With the new era, therefore, the purely financial side of trade fell into the hands of Jews and other foreigners alone, with whom it largely remains at the present time.

The last purpose of this inquiry is to ask whether the Arabs were borrowers of these financial arrangements, especially the use of documents and witnesses. Until the sixth century, when some homage was paid to the kings of Hira and Ghassan, and appeal was made to their jurisdiction, they had never seen political union; under tribe or clan rule there was no recognized authoritative opinion. Some exception to this must be taken from the fact that certain highly respected families, like the Koreish at Mekka, rose early to a controlling influence in the cities. But more and more, particularly in the sixth century, the Arabs came into living contact with Egypt, Syria, and Persia, whose inhabitants were well advanced in their organization of private as well as political rights and regulations. Through the Christians then settled in Arabia, and especially the Ghassanite Arabs in the north of the peninsula, the Bedawin were confronted with Greek civilization, and borrowed much of Byzantine culture as time went on. But, if in Mohammed's time such documents were used, it must have been through the influence of the caravan-trades to the north and east that

---

* For this reference I am indebted to Pr. C. C. Torrey, of Andover.
the usage was introduced, though even at that early period the Jews
and Christians might have disseminated European habits of business
from Alexandria and other important commercial centres. Never-
theless, it is equally probable that the Arabs, no less than the Babylo-
nians, from whom we have all kinds of contract-tablets reaching far
back into antiquity, were original in this particular; that they were
early led to require written testimony to business transactions: and
that their increasing commerce with the outside world developed in
their best representatives the sense of justice; so that under Moham-
med, who was himself a keen trader, they easily adopted a regular
requirement of documentary evidence in the undertaking of business
obligations.

16. A palm-leaf column from Ahnas; by Rev. W. C. Winslow,
of Boston.

This column, now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, was one of
six belonging to a vestibule of a temple that once stood at Ha-Khen-
ensu, referred to in Assyrian texts as Hininsi, afterwards named
Heracleopolis by the Greeks, and called by the natives at present
Ahnas, sometimes Henassieh; it is referred to in Isaiah xxx. 4, as
Hanes. Henassieh may be a corruption of Hanes, the eh being a com-
mon terminative. As to the age of the site, Brugach (Dictionnaire
Géographique, i. 604) quotes a text stating that here Ra, the second
king of the initial divine dynasties, began his earthly reign. Dr.
Naville, the explorer of the Egypt Exploration Fund, searched in vain
for inscriptions of the IXth and Xth Dynasties, whose seat of govern-
ment was here; but among his disclosures were the columns of a side
entrance to a temple undoubtedly dedicated to Arsaphes, a form of
Osiris, usually represented with a ram’s head. For the large text on
the basement declares: “The living Horus, the mighty Bull who loves
Ma, the lord of praises like his father Pthah, King Rameses, erected
this house to his father Hershefi (Arsaphes), the Lord of Two Lands.”
The great Harris Papyrus (British Museum) states that Rameses III.
presented slaves to “the temple of Hershefi, the king of the Two
Lands”: the peculiar designation of the god thus occurring in both
cases. The six shafts, 17 feet in height, were probably taken by
Rameses II. from an edifice of Usertesen II. of the XIIth Dynasty, as
the architraves bear the cartouches of that king: but they can be abso-
lutely dated only from the reign of Rameses.

The royal inscriptions, clearly emblazoned, run from the bending palm-
leaf to the base, on this wise: Emblems of the shoot of a plant and a
bee (wasp form), verbally suten cheb; the six-worded cartouche, Ra
user ma Sotepe Ra; si Ra; the cartouche, Ramesu mer Amon; the
symbol Crux ansata, or tau of the Nile: the plant and bee repeated;
Neb Taui; the six-worded cartouche repeated; Si (or Se) Ra; Neb
khau; the smaller cartouche repeated; the symbol of life repeated;
Neb Taui; the larger cartouche repeated; Neb Khau; and the smaller
cartouche. On the column’s right, with the same or equivalent titles,
Rameses is offering to Horus (figures 3 feet 9 inches in height): on the left a replica of the right, and, on the rear, of the front. The column from Ahnas in the museum of the University of Pennsylvania is without its capital: the Boston shaft is unrivalled by any other monumental work in this country from Egypt for its peculiar grace and beauty.

17. Professor D. G. Lyon, of Harvard University, gave an account of a collection of Phœnician glass-ware recently acquired by the Harvard Semitic Museum. The objects are said to have been found in tombs in the vicinity of Tyre, and they are believed to belong to the period between Alexander and the beginning of our era. There are forty-eight specimens, consisting of vases, tea bottles, kohl holders, bowls, goblets, and pitchers. They are well preserved, and several of the specimens are of unusually fine workmanship.
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PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
AT ITS
MEETING IN NEW YORK, N. Y.,
March 29th, 30th, and 31st, 1894.

The Society assembled at New York, in the Room of the
Trustees of Columbia College, on Thursday of Easter Week,
March 29th, at 3 p. m., and was called to order by its President,
Professor Daniel Coit Gilman of the Johns Hopkins University.
Professor Henry Drisler welcomed the Society to New York and
to the hospitalities of Columbia College.

The following members were in attendance at one or more
of the sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adler</th>
<th>Dickerman</th>
<th>Jackson</th>
<th>Rudolph, Miss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbeely</td>
<td>Driiger</td>
<td>Jastrow, Jr., M.</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, W. R.</td>
<td>Elwell</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Smyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbitt</td>
<td>Fay</td>
<td>Lanman</td>
<td>Steele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Leivas</td>
<td>Torrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binney</td>
<td>Frothingham</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Toy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td>Gilman</td>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td>Ward, W. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradner</td>
<td>Goodwin, C. J.</td>
<td>McConnell, Mrs.</td>
<td>Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td>Myer</td>
<td>Webb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinton</td>
<td>Grieve, Miss</td>
<td>Oertel</td>
<td>Werren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Hall, I. H.</td>
<td>Olcott</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casanovicz</td>
<td>Haupt</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collitz</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Ragozin, Mrs.</td>
<td>Wright, T. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahl</td>
<td>Hyvernat</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Yohannan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minutes of the last meeting, at Boston and Cambridge,
were read by the Recording Secretary, Professor Lyon of Har-
Harvard University, and accepted by the Society. The report of the Committee of Arrangements was presented by Professor Jackson, of Columbia College. It was in the form of a printed program, with a cyclostyle supplement, and was accepted.

The reports of outgoing officers were now in order.

The Corresponding Secretary, Professor Lanman, of Harvard University, presented some of the correspondence of the year.

This included letters of regret from the Right Rev. C. R. Hale, of Cairo, Ill., from Prof. G. F. Moore, of Andover, Mr. Orne, of Cambridge, and Prof. Hilprecht, of Philadelphia. The last report part 2 of volume I. of The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania as well under way, and that he hopes to have it in the printer’s hands before leaving for Constantinople and the Hittite region in May, 1894.

The Secretary called the attention of the Society to the valuable and interesting volumes of transactions of the International Congress of Orientalists held in London in 1892. Application for them may be made to E. Delmar Morgan, Esq., care of the Royal Asiatic Society, 22 Albermarle st., London.

Messrs. Wijayaratna and Co. write from Maradana, Colombo, Ceylon, offering various works in Pali, Sanskrit, and Singalese, and declaring their readiness to procure similar books for those concerned with these studies.

Dr. John C. Sundberg, recently appointed United States Consul at Bagdad, writes from Bagdad under date of April 27, 1893. He gives an interesting account of his journey from San Francisco to Bagdad, by way of Hong Kong, the Straits Settlements, Calcutta, Bombay, Bandar Abbas on the Strait of Hormuz, Bushire on the Persian Gulf, the Schatt-el-Arab, and the Tigris. He says: "Owing undoubtedly to the very filthy habits of the poor, there is a great amount of eye-disease here, and I treat from sixty to eighty patients (poor) gratis every day. I have also a few rich patients, and among them the Nakib, the most influential man in Bagdad, the Wali not excepted. I have made a few short excursions into the desert, but shall postpone my visit to Babylon, perhaps till next fall. There are sold here a great many antiquities of modern make; in fact, there are several Assyrian antiquity factories in Bagdad, and spurious seals and cylinders as well as coins are sold in the bazaars to gullible tourists."

Rev. George N. Thomesen, of the American Baptist Mission, Kurnool, Madras Presidency, India, writes under date of September 28, 1893, concerning the Vadayalai and Tengalai sects of Vaishnavas in that region: "In India great religious revivals occasionally occur. At such times a wave of deepfelt enthusiasm sweeps over the land, and sometimes the effects of it can be traced after many centuries have elapsed. About 1000 years ago the great Vedanta philosopher and Brahman revivalist, Sankaracharya lived. We have few facts of his life—all we know is that he lived as a celibate in Sringeri, Mysore. Among the Hindus, or rather among the Vaishnavites among the Hindus, he is
called the Adiguru, the first priest. His enthusiastic teaching of
the Vedas with his own philosophical interpretation soon won for him
disciples in all parts of India. Finding that he had not sufficient
strength to look after all his adherents, he founded monasteries in
convenient centers, and appointed his most prominent disciples to be his
representatives. One of the centers selected was Ahobalam, in the
mountains of the Kurnool District of the Madras Presidency, a place
about 200 miles north-west of Madras. The madham or monastery is
in the mountain-range known as the Eastern Ghauts. It is a lonesome
place, where tigers and the wild beasts of India have their haunts.
There are two temples, one near the foot of the mountains, where the
Pujari or worshiper (a man paid by grant of land and presents from
pilgrims) lives; and about 2 miles distant, in a very retired part, is the
most sacred temple, in a cave.

"The god worshiped at Ahobalam is called Ugraha-Nara-Simham,
the austere man-lion. Nara-simham is the name of the fourth avatar
or incarnation of Vishnu. In this avatar Vishnu is said to have sprung
out of a stone pillar as a man-lion, and to have in this shape destroyed
the Asura or demon Hiranyak. When Vishnu is represented as the
avenger, destroying the man-lion, he is called Ugraha, the austere, the
awful one; on the other hand, when he is represented as the pacified
man-lion, quieted by the slokas chanted by Hiranyak's son Prachladen,
he is called Lakshmi-Nara-Simham, the merciful man-lion. Before this
severe idol the high-priest and the disciples of the Vadagalais are to
worship, but at the present day the idol is very much neglected. It is
questionable whether the present high-priest living in Tiruvellur near
Madras has ever taken the trouble to go to Ahobalam, and hence many
of his followers do not believe in him. He carries about with him a
small gold idol representing Ugraha-Nara-Simham, and this his disciples
worship. He is, like most of the other prominent priests of the
Hindus, a wealthy man, and goes where he can get the most money
with the least trouble—so a prominent Hindu says. Ahobalam is still
considered a very holy place, and annually many pilgrims go there from
all parts of India. The reason why this of all other centers is so sacred
is that after the death of the Adiguru Sankaracharya each one of his
principal disciples, in their respective centers, claimed to be the holiest
and that their monasteries or madhams were the most sacred, and so
tried to gain the greatest possible influence. All the different centers
in the course of time became Tengalai centers, except Ahobalam, which
became the great Vadagalai center.

"Teng means south and Vada north, and Galai means mark; hence
the great difference between the two sects consists in the mark they
wear on their forehead. These marks cause great dissensions at the
great annual feasts, and even the courts are often called upon to settle
the disputes. In the temples both sects claim the right of placing the
mark of their sect on the forehead of the idol. The Tengalais claim
that this mark represents both feet of Vishnu, resting on a lotus throne;
hence the mark, looking like a trident, is to extend down to the bridge
of the nose. Some of the very orthodox Brahmans, in order to make
this very plain, even put five toes to each slanting line representing a foot. On the other hand, the Vadagalais claim that the mark represents only the right foot of Vishnu, from which the holy river, the Ganges, sprang; and hence there is to be no throne, or mark half way down the nose. The center line is said to represent Lakshmi, Vishnu’s wife, since, according to the allegorical interpretation, as God has no wife, this represents the mercy of God which Lakshmi personifies. Formerly the great disputes were about more spiritual things, but, as both parties have become materialistic, their great disputes now are about these little caste-marks. Of course there are even now spiritually minded men in both sects, and these still keep up the quarrel about man’s relation to God. Both parties have their own theories, which they defend with all the obstinacy of the proverbial Scotchman who is open to conviction, but who would like to see the man that could convince him.

"The question raised at these discussions is: ‘Is a man a free agent or not?’ To this the Tengalais reply: ‘He is not! All of man’s actions are controlled by God. Man has no will of his own, and can do nothing aside from God. He is as dependent on God as the kitten is on the cat!’ Hence the theory of the Tengalais is called the Marjalaapattu, or cat-hold theory. On the other hand, the Vadagalais say: ‘Man is a free agent; he can do as he wills to do. He has a will of his own, and is not under the sole control of God. Man’s relation to God is that of the young monkey to its mother!’ For this reason this theory is called the Markattapattu or monkey-hold theory. Of course there are still many other differences, differences in ritual, in regard to priority at worship, in regard to mantras or sacred incantations; but these would be too wearisome to enumerate. The Tengalais are the most numerous among the Vaishnavites, and also seem to be the most materialistic, while the Vadagalais still seem to retain a trace in their character of the severity of the god they worship."

A letter from the Geographical Society of the Pacific invites us to take part in their "Geographical Day," May 4th. Mr. W. E. Coleman was subsequently appointed to represent the Oriental Society on that occasion.

Mr. Edward Naville writes inviting our Society to take part in the International Congress of Orientalists to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, September 3-12, 1894. Messrs. Brinton, Gotthell, Haupt, and Jackson were appointed Delegates to represent the Society.

The Secretary announced the death of the Corporate Member—Mr. Alexander Isaac Cotheal, of New York, N. Y.

Mr. Cotheal was born in New York City, November 5, 1804, the eldest son of Henry Cotheal, and grandson of Isaac Cotheal of Revolutionary times. At the age of twenty-one he entered the house of his father and uncle, Henry and David Cotheal, a well-known shipping-firm trading to Central America, especially the Mosquito Coast, to San Blas, and to California. In 1840, Mr. Cotheal was a frequent visitor to the ship
Sultanee, then in port at New York, and became greatly interested in the Arabic language. In 1851, he embarked for the east coast of Africa, Zanzibar and Mozambique. Later he visited Nicaragua; and he was Consul General for Nicaragua from 1871 until his death. He also traveled in Europe, particularly in Spain. It was of his personal experiences there that he liked especially to talk, and he seems to have had warm friends there.

He retired from business early in life and devoted himself to congenial literary pursuits. He was one of the founders of the American Geological Society and President of the American Ethnological Society. He filled various offices in the St. Nicholas Society, of which, at his death, he was the oldest member. He was a life-long member of Trinity Parish. He was the author of a "Sketch of the language of the Mosquito Indians," which was published in the "Transactions of the American Ethnological Society." Of Oriental tongues, besides Arabic, he studied Turkish, Persian, Hindustani, and Gujaratti.

His Arabic was chiefly learned at home, by hard study, and by constant teaching from natives whom he chanced to find in New York and who would come to his house and read with him. At the request of the late Sir Richard F. Burton, Mr. Cotheal translated the rare Arabic text of "Atiappa, the Generous." This is published in the sixth volume of Sir Richard's "Supplemental Nights."

He was elected a member of the American Oriental Society September 30, 1846, and came to be the oldest living member of the Society. His presence was to be counted on at the New Haven and New York meetings, and he more than once entertained the Society at his residence. He was a Director of the Society for over a quarter of a century, from 1865 to 1891. In 1890, he made what was the first gift to it by way of endowment of a publication fund: to wit, one thousand dollars. This was reported in the Proceedings for May, 1890, as "intended by the donor as a nucleus of a Publication Fund, and prescribed by him to be invested, that its interest may be used to help in defraying the costs of the Journal and Proceedings."

Mr. Cotheal was unmarried. He passed away February 25, 1894, at his residence in New York. His nephew, Mr. Henry Cotheal Swords of New York, writes: "He died, as he had always lived, at peace with all the world; and I trust that our last end may be like his."

The Treasurer, Mr. Henry C. Warren, of Cambridge, Mass., presented to the Society his accounts and statement for the year April 6, 1893 to March 29, 1894, and suggested the desirability of annually appointing an Auditing Committee to examine the securities of the Society at the place where such securities may be stored. The Chair appointed gentlemen residing in the neighborhood of Boston: to wit, Professors Toy and Lyon of Cambridge. To them the Treasurer's accounts, with book and vouchers, and with report on the state of the funds, were referred. The Committee reported to the Society and certified that the accounts were in
due order and properly vouched, and that the funds called for by the balances were in the possession of the Treasurer. The usual analytical summary of the General Account follows:

**Receipts.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance from old account, April 6, 1893</td>
<td>$1,045.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments (168) for 1893-4</td>
<td>$840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments (34) for other years</td>
<td>170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of publications</td>
<td>114.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income of investments, so far as collected</td>
<td>36.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on balances of General Account</td>
<td>30.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement to anonymous gift of $1,000</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total collected income of the year</strong></td>
<td>1,199.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total receipts for the year</strong></td>
<td>$2,245.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal, xv. 8, and distribution</td>
<td>$212.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal, xvi. 1 (part)</td>
<td>154.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings, April, 1893</td>
<td>188.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors' extras from Journal and Proceedings</td>
<td>31.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>105.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job printing</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, express, etc.</td>
<td>33.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total disbursements for the year</strong></td>
<td>696.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit balance on Gen'l Account, March 29, 1894</td>
<td>1,548.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,245.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The supplementary gift of $8 was intended to offset the excess over $1,000 of the cost of the eight shares of bank-stock (at 128) in which the original gift was invested.

The interest of the Bradley Type-fund is regularly passed to the credit of that fund for further accumulation.

Exclusive of that interest, the amount of the interest, collected and uncollected, for the year is $110.40, and belongs to the credit of the General Account.

The state of the funds is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1893, Jan. 1</td>
<td>Amount of the Bradley Type-fund</td>
<td>$1,369.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest for one year</td>
<td>55.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894, Jan. 1</td>
<td>Amount of the Bradley Type-fund</td>
<td>$1,423.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894, March 29</td>
<td>Amount of Publication-fund</td>
<td>$2,137.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894, March 29</td>
<td>Balance of General Account</td>
<td>$1,548.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of funds in possession of the Society</strong></td>
<td>$5,100.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bills for Journal xvi. 1 have not yet been all presented.
The Librarian, Mr. Addison Van Name, of New Haven, presented the following report for the year 1893-94.

The additions to the Society's Library for the year now closing have been 90 volumes, 87 parts of volumes, 118 pamphlets, and a plaster cast of the Chaldean Deluge tablet. The number of titles is now 4,648.

No sales having been reported by the Paris agency* for ten years past, orders were sent for the return of the volumes of the Journal on hand, except vols. ii.–v., of which the Society already had a more than sufficient supply. In accordance with the instructions given, ten sets of these four volumes were distributed to certain designated libraries and institutions. From one of these, the Musée Guimet, we have just received an unexpectedly large return, no less than fifty volumes of its publications, including twenty-three quarto volumes of the Annales and twenty volumes of the Revue de l'histoire des religions. The Society will no doubt authorize the sending of the volumes of the Journal needed to complete the Museum's set.

The Imperial Russian Archæological Society has invited an exchange of publications by sending the latest volumes of three separate series of its issues, an invitation which should be promptly accepted.

The standing appropriation of $35 a year for binding voted at the last meeting has not been expended. There will be a certain advantage if two years' appropriations may be combined so that $50 may be available every second year.

During the past summer a much needed rearrangement of the Society's library was completed by Dr. Oertel, with the aid of Dr. Haskell, a service for which the thanks of the Society are due to them.

For the Committee of Publication, Professor Lanman reported as follows: The Proceedings of the Society at Boston and Cambridge, April 6–8, 1893, were issued, as a pamphlet of xlviii pages and as a part of volume xvi. of the Journal, on the 1st of June, 1893. The printing of the first half of volume xvi. of the Journal (280 pages) is so nearly completed that the part can be issued a few days after the meeting.

The Directors reported by their Scribe, Professor Lanman, as follows:

1. They had appointed the next meeting of the Society to be held at Philadelphia at some time during the Christmas week of 1894, in case the American Philological Association or any of the other Societies addressed by us upon the subject should finally determine to unite with us in a joint meeting at that time

* The stocks of publications of the Society long held by Messrs. Trübner and Co. of London, and by the firm F. A. Brockhaus of Leipzig, have now been returned; and likewise those held by Prof. Lanman. The Society has therefore now no scattered agencies whatever for the sale of its publications, and the entire stock thereof, along with its library, is gratuitously stored and cared for by the Yale University Library.
and place. The Committee on Joint Meeting was continued over. As eventual Committee of Arrangements had been appointed the Corresponding Secretary, and Professors Haupt, Hopkins, and M. Jastrow, Jr. [The next annual business meeting will be held in the week beginning with Easter (April 14), 1895.]

2. They had appointed, as Committee of Publication for 1894–95, Professors I. H. Hall, Haupt, Lanman, G. F. Moore, and W. D. Whitney.

3. They had appointed Mr. W. E. Coleman to represent the Society at the meeting of the Geographical Society, and Messrs. Brinton, Gottheil, Haupt, and Jackson as delegates to the Geneva Congress: all as noted above, page lii.

4. They had authorized the exchanges suggested in the Report of the Librarian, and the biennial combination of the annual Appropriations for book-binding.

5. The Directors voted to recommend to the Society that an invitation be extended to the International Congress of Orientalists convening at Geneva in 1894, to meet in this country in 1897, under the auspices of the American Oriental Society. The Directors were careful to refrain from committing themselves to any question of details as to the place of meeting and the Committee of Arrangements; and not to commit the Society to the expenditure of money.

6. They had voted to recommend to the Society for election to membership the following persons:

As Corporate Members:

Mrs. Emma J. Arnold, Providence, R. I.;
Rev. E. E. Atkinson, Belmont, Mass.;
Hon. Truxton Beale, Washington, D. C.;
Dr. William Sturgis Bigelow, Boston, Mass.;
Prof. G. R. Carpenter, New York, N. Y.;
Rev. Camden M. Cobern, Ann Arbor, Mich.;
Mr. Ephraim Deinard, Kearny, N. J.;
Mr. Joseph H. Durkee, New York, N. Y.;
Prof. Ernest F. Fenollosa, Boston, Mass.;
Miss Lucia G. Grieve, New York, N. Y.;
Rev. J. B. Grossmann, Philadelphia, Pa.;
Prof. Joshua A. Joffé, New York, N. Y.;
Mr. Nobuta Kishimoto, Okayama, Japan;
Mr. Robert Lilley, New York, N. Y.;
Prof. Samuel A. Martin, Lincoln University, Pa.;
Prof. Edward S. Morse, Salem, Mass.;
Mr. George W. Osborn, Westfield, N. J.;
Rev. Ismar J. Peritz, Mattapan, Mass.;
Mr. Edward Robinson, Boston, Mass.;
Mr. Sanford L. Rotter, New York, N. Y.;
Miss Adelaide Rudolph, New York, N. Y.
Election of Officers.

Mr. Macy M. Skinner, Cambridge, Mass.;
Mr. A. W. Stratton, Toronto, Canada;
Miss Cornelia Warren, Boston, Mass.;
Rev. J. E. Werren, Abington, Mass.;
Prof. John H. Wigmore, Evanston, Illinois;
Rev. A. Yohannan, New York, N. Y. [28.]

The recommendation contained in the fifth paragraph of the report of the Directors was unanimously adopted by the Society. And the persons recommended for election to membership, after ballot duly had, were formally elected.

On Saturday morning, Rev. Dr. Ward, and Professors Toy and Hopkins, as Committee on the Nomination of Officers, reported. The Corresponding Secretary, Professor Lanman, who was elected to that office first in 1884, and had performed the somewhat similar duties of Secretary of the American Philological Association from 1879 to 1884, having expressed a wish, after fifteen years of such service, to be relieved, the Committee nominated in his stead Professor Edward Delavan Perry of Columbia College, New York; and, for the remaining offices, the incumbents of the foregoing year. The gentlemen so nominated were duly elected by the Society. For convenience of reference, the names of the Board for 1894–95 may here be given:

President—Pres. D. C. Gilman, of Baltimore.
Vice-Presidents—Dr. William Hayes Ward, of New York; Prof. C. H. Toy, of Cambridge; Prof. Isaac H. Hall, of New York.
Corresponding Secretary—Prof. E. D. Perry, of New York.
Recording Secretary—Prof. D. G. Lyon, of Cambridge.
Treasurer—Mr. Henry C. Warren, of Cambridge.
Librarian—Mr. Addison Van Name, of New Haven.

Directors—The officers above named: and Professors Bloomfield and Haupt, of Baltimore; Mr. Talcott Williams, of Philadelphia; Prof. E. W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr; Prof. A. L. Frothingham, of Princeton; Prof. R. Gottheil, of New York; Prof. George F. Moore, of Andover.

In taking the Chair on Friday afternoon, the President of the Society made a brief address, in which he expressed his grateful appreciation of the honor that the Society had conferred upon him.

In assuming the office, in order to be quite familiar with the policy that had been pursued, he had made it his duty to read with attention the minutes of the Directors as well as of the Society, during the past half century; and he spoke particularly of its new birth in 1897. At that time, the question had arisen as to the possible enlargement of resources and membership, and an elaborate report, drawn up by Professor Whitney and approved by an able committee, was presented and
adopted.* This report is still worth consideration. It lays stress upon the importance of publishing contributions to Oriental learning, as the chief condition of usefulness and honor. The long series of learned papers that bear the Society's imprint shows how steadily this principle has been observed. There are no indications that the standard will be lowered. On the contrary, the increasing number of scholars in this country devoted to Oriental learning gives assurance that the Journal and the Proceedings will continue to publish important contributions to Oriental science. Thus the highest object of the Society has been and will be attained.

In respect to the scope which should be given to Oriental studies, the report of the Committee makes these remarks, which, in view of the tendency of the Society toward philological studies, are worth repeating:

"We believe that Oriental studies have a high and positive value for all who are studying the history of the human race; that natural history, that geography, that ethnology, that linguistics, that the history of religions, of philosophy, of political institutions, of commerce cannot be pursued without the most constant reference to the Orient. * * *

"We need not fear * * * to welcome into our number any person who has enlightenment and culture enough to take an interest in our objects and to be willing to contribute to their furtherance. * * *

"We do not regard Oriental scholarship as a requisite for admission to the Society, but only that liberal culture which inspires an appreciation of our objects and a willingness to join heartily in promoting them. * * *"

After other introductory words, the Chairman called attention to the fact that in a very few days, on the twelfth of April, it will be a hundred years since the birth of the distinguished geographer, Edward Robinson, who held the office of President of the American Oriental Society for a period of seventeen years, from 1846 to 1863. But few of the actual members of this association knew him personally. There are some, however, who remember how constantly he attended the meetings, which were then held semi-annually, as a general rule in Boston and New Haven; how dignified and courteous he was as a presiding officer; and how much lustre was derived from his acquisitions as a scholar and his fame as an explorer. The published memorials of his life are brief, consisting chiefly of the discourses delivered soon after his death by his colleagues in the Union Theological Seminary of New York, Professors Henry B. Smith and Roswell D. Hitchcock; but this brevity is not a reason for serious regrets, because his writings constitute his memoirs, and because the outward incidents of his career were not of extraordinary interest. He belongs to the class of men who confer great benefits upon their generation, and acquire corresponding renown, by accurate, patient, prolonged, and unostentatious researches, the results of which are important contributions to human knowledge. Although he was a minister of the Presbyterian church, it is not as a minister that he is remembered. He secured the reverence of his

* The Committee included Dr. Edward Robinson, President Woolney, Professor C. C. Felton, Professor Hadley, and Professor Whitney.
Address of the President.

pupils, but not so much by the inspiring qualities which were characteristic of his own biblical teacher, Moses Stuart of Andover, as by the thoroughness of his scholarship and the reputation of his works. As a grammarian and lexicographer he won distinction, especially in the early part of his career; but his lasting reputation is due to the thorough explorations which he made in the peninsula of Sinai, in the Desert, and in Palestine. Part of his fame may perhaps be attributed to the fact that in this modern epoch of scientific researches he was a pioneer in the field of Biblical geography; but far more depends upon his accuracy and thoroughness, as an observer, a recorder, and an interpreter. He would himself award the heartiest praise to his companion in travel, Rev. Eli Smith, whose name is associated with Robinson's upon the title page of the Biblical Researches. To his extraordinary preparations for the journey the most ample references are made, both in the preface and in the earliest chapter of the narrative, which is based upon the diaries of both the travelers.

In the archives of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (the speaker continued) I have recently read the letters which were addressed by Eli Smith to Dr. Rufus Anderson, one of the Secretaries in Boston. I cannot say that they throw much light upon the well-known Researches in Palestine, but it is more than possible that they will interest those members of the Society who regard the journey of Robinson and Smith as an epoch-making expedition. Some extracts from this correspondence I therefore present to the Society, in commemoration of the life which began one hundred years since.

Here is added also the substance of President W. Hayes Ward's address at the meeting in Boston last year (April 7th, 1893: see the Proceedings of that meeting, p. vi).

A few gentlemen held an informal meeting, fifty years ago last August [1842], in the office of John Pickering, of Boston, to consider the practicability of organizing an American Oriental Society. They appointed a Committee to draft a constitution. They met again in the same place on the 7th of September, when the draft was reported, amended, and adopted. Again they adjourned till October 18th, when the organization was perfected by the election of John Pickering as President; William Jenks, Moses Stuart, and Edward Robinson as Vice-Presidents; William W. Greenough as Corresponding Secretary; Francis Gardner as Recording Secretary and Librarian; and John James Dixwell as Treasurer. The incorporators were John Pickering, William Jenks, and John J. Dixwell. The first Directors were Rufus Anderson, Barnas Sears, C. C. Felton, Sidney Willard, and Bela B. Edwards, and the object of the Society was stated to be the cultivation of learning in the Asiatic, African, and Polynesian languages.

I ask you now to stop for a moment and look at those names. You will notice, in the first place, that they do not represent particularly either Harvard College or Yale College. Professor Felton's name is a famous one in the history of Harvard, but he was a Grecian, and his
own studies were not especially in the line of those of the Society of
which he was made one of the original Directors. Yale was not rep-
resented at all. It was inevitable that John Pickering should be
selected first President of the American Oriental Society. It was to his
initiative and that of Rev. Dr. Jenks* that its organization was due.
He was for the first two or three years of its existence its life and soul.
Mr. Pickering was—more, perhaps, than any other man we have ever
had—our admirable Crichton, or Mezzofanti. He was, according to
Charles Sumner, "familiar with the English, French, Portuguese,
Italian, Spanish, German, Romain, Greek, and Latin languages; less
familiar, but acquainted, with Dutch, Swedish, Danish, and Hebrew;
and he had explored, with various degrees of care, Arabic, Turkish,
Syriac, Persian, Coptic, Sanskrit, Chinese, Cochin-Chinese, Russian,
Egyptian hieroglyphics, Malay in several dialects, and particularly the
Indian languages of America and the Polynesian islands."

He was invited by Harvard College to the chair of Hebrew, and
afterward of Greek, and declined both. He was pioneer in the study
of the languages and antiquities of our American Indians. He wrote
numerous books and papers, of which the one which will now be best
remembered is his dictionary of the Greek language. Pickering's
Lexicon succeeded Hedericus and Schrevelius in the use of our schools
in the first half of the century, and did not lose its currency even down
to the time when Liddell and Scott took and possessed the field. He
was also a lawyer in full practice, City Solicitor for Boston, State Sen-
ator, and reviser and editor of the Statutes of Massachusetts. Such
a man was a whole Oriental Society in himself, and his decease so
soon after its organization seemed at first to be fatal to its survival.

The two oldest foreign Missionary Societies were very definitely rep-
resented in the two directors Rufus Anderson and Barnas Sears. It
was more than anything else to provide a place where the grammatical,
geographical, and historical studies of missionaries could be received
and published, that the American Oriental Society was founded.

Rufus Anderson was the most distinguished director of missionary
work that this country has ever seen. He was a tall, smooth-shaven,
very dignified and very positive man, and made one great mistake in
the conduct of the mission work under his charge. He undervalued
the direct and indirect work of education, and to this day the injury
is felt which resulted from his suppressing certain advanced schools
after his visit to India. While he was not a contributor himself of
articles to be read at the meetings of the Society, his hearty coopera-
tion was of great value, as encouraging the missionaries under his
care to prepare and send valuable contributions.

Barnas Sears, Professor in Newton Theological Seminary, was closely
related to the second foreign Missionary Society organized in this coun-
try, and which found its field in what was then the almost utterly un-
known land of Burmah. But to the public Barnas Sears was known as

* See Proceedings for May, 1875, p. iii (Journal, vol. x., p. cix).
one of the very foremost representatives of education in this country, not simply as connected with seminary or college, but by his activity in all matters which concerned public education. He was no more of an Orientalist than Dr. Rufus Anderson, but his sympathy was genuine and his help hearty.

An entirely different class of men was represented by Moses Stuart, Edward Robinson, and Bela B. Edwards. These men were scholars such as we cannot easily equal, the men who first introduced our youth to German learning. Moses Stuart was the pioneer of Hebrew studies in America, Professor of Hebrew at Andover Seminary, a man of free, open, and honest mind, thoroughly devoted to the truth, the author of excellent Hebrew grammars and Christomathies, and of numerous able commentaries and learned discussions and excursuses. If any man in this country was the morning star of Oriental learning, it was Moses Stuart, a man far in advance of his day. I never saw him, although I learned as a boy to believe him the chief of American scholars, and I went to Andover Academy in time to hear, ten years after the organization of the Society, the commemorative funeral discourse preached at the opening of the term following his death. As might be expected, he was a theologian as well as an Orientalist; but his singularly candid mind always put him in advance of the conservatives of his day, although I remember that it did not prevent him from defending the paternal institution of African slavery against the intemperate attacks of the troublesome Abolitionists.

Edward Robinson was a younger man, who lived for a while in Professor Stuart’s family, and was induced by him to devote himself to Oriental studies. He was then in the prime of his power, and had the year before published his famous “Biblical Researches” in Germany and the United States. His edition of Gesenius’ Hebrew Lexicon had not yet appeared, nor his Hebrew grammar. The young Hebrew students of the day still used Stuart’s Grammar and Christomathy, and Gibbes’s Lexicon. I well remember Edward Robinson, and indeed I recited to him a few times while he was still teaching in Union Theological Seminary, but in feeble health, in 1857. He was a bluff, somewhat gruff man, strongbodied and large, with a kind heart under a rough exterior. I recall a recitation in the Harmony of the Gospels—for at this time he had ceased to teach the Old Testament—in which, when he had mentioned Good Friday, one of the junior theological students from Puritan New England asked him in perfect innocence, and with an ignorance that did not all surprise me, “What part of the year does Good Friday come on?” “Are you,” was his severe reply, “from Connecticut, and don’t you know that Fast Day always comes on Good Friday?” We all of us knew the annual Fast Day, if we did not know Good Friday. Moses Stuart and Edward Robinson were the fathers of a real school of Hebrew students, and he created an enthusiasm in Semitic studies which might have borne much more fruit if the time had been ripe for it, as it was ripe when men of our own day created a new interest in the same studies. But then little advance seemed possible. There was no key to the Semitic problems. Scholars seemed able to
go only round and round in the same circle, and so enthusiasm was soon dampened. Besides, the key to Aryan languages was then found in the new study of Sanskrit, which attracted all the attention of our ambitious young men. And yet Moses Stuart and Edward Robinson were pioneers to whom we cannot give too much credit. Even the best methods of modern teaching were not unfamiliar to them. The Seminary method, of which we make so much, was familiar to them, if I may judge from a single specimen of their labors which I found a day or two ago in looking over some pamphlets belonging to my father, who was one of Moses Stuart's pupils, and a member of the class which prepared this pamphlet. It is a collection of all the quotations in the New Testament, arranged in parallel columns, giving the Hebrew and Septuagint forms from the Old Testament, with the quotations as they stand in the New Testament, and prepared by the junior class of Andover Theological Seminary, under the superintendence of Moses Stuart, and published in 1827. The texts of both Greek and Hebrew are the latest and best available, the Septuagint being taken from that of the Vatican manuscript.

Bela B. Edwards, another of Moses Stuart's pupils, was a yet younger man, and a very brilliant scholar; but he died at an earlier age. I will not stop to recount his career and character, but I have mentioned these men as the typical Oriental scholars of their time. All that the schools of the day could do for Oriental studies was to teach Hebrew to theological students, with a little Syriac to those who wanted it.

It is at first surprising that, with so many theological seminaries, every one of which had a professor of Hebrew, there was so little done worth recording. It was only a very few enterprising men like Moses Stuart and Edward Robinson that attempted anything new and creditable; the rest simply taught the dry rules of grammar, as the grammar gave it, to their pupils. There was not a professor of any Semitic language in any of our colleges or universities, with the sole remarkable exception, soon to be mentioned, of Edward E. Salisbury in Yale College. Indeed, there was no professor of Arabic in Harvard, our oldest University, until, not many years ago, our own Professor Toy was called to the chair of Semitics. The reason is clear—the time was not ripe for any unifying principles which should give basis for comparative study. Among the Aryan languages, Comparative Grammar was in its infancy; and outside of that family, where the key had been found in Sanskrit, it was unknown.

I have said that the organization of the American Oriental Society was perfected at the October meeting in 1842 by the election of the first board of officers. At the next May meeting, in 1843, the President read an admirable introductory address, in which he outlined the purposes of the Society and the advantages which it possessed, and then gave a general view of the progress of Oriental studies up to that time. One who now observes that our country is full of young and ambitious scholars devoted to these studies in our institutions of learning will be surprised to see that it was not to such men that our first President looked for the learned papers which should justify the existence of the
Society, but chiefly to the missionaries in foreign lands. It was they only, or travelers like Edward Robinson, that seemed to have any opportunity to make original researches. We must look, he said, to the "intelligent and energetic American missionaries and scholars who are now spread over some of the most interesting regions of the civilized East and of uncivilized Polynesia." There are, he added, "more American missionaries masters of these languages than of any other nation on the globe." On these men he depended; but he pointed with special pride to the monumental work of Edward Robinson, issued the year before. Then he cast his eye over the entire globe, but stopped a moment in Egypt, where, he said, it is now proved that history goes back as far as the nineteenth century before Christ, in Carthage, Phenicia, Asia Minor, in the Nestorian country of Persia, where Justin Perkins had honorable mention, and in Mesopotamia, whose records were yet unexcavated.

It is interesting, now that Cuneiform literature holds so prominent a place in our studies, to hear President Pickering speak thus of the few cuneiform inscriptions then known, mostly from Persia: "The eminent Dr. Grotefend, of Frankfort, has recently applied himself to the task of deciphering them, and his success thus far does the greatest credit to his learning and sagacity." Only the Persepolitan was known, and the angular style of the writing shows, said he, that the cuneiform characters were used "exclusively for the purpose of engraving on stone, and were never intended for the ordinary purposes of writing." It is evident that libraries of cuneiform writing to be unburied in every ancient city were then unimagined. Not yet were the names of Rawlinson, Oppert, Hincks, and Norris known to the world.

After going the circuit of the East and of Polynesia, attracted to the latter region by the labors of the missionaries in the Sandwich Islands, President Pickering makes one observation which was a prophecy, and which anticipated what proved to be almost a complete revolution in the work of the Society and in the linguistic scholarship of the country. These words deserve to be quoted. He says (JAOS. i. 48):

"It is a high gratification to every American, who values the reputation of his native land, to know, that some of our young countrymen are now residing in Germany—that genial soil of profound learning—with a view to the acquisition of the Sanscrit language; and that we shall one day have the fruits of their learning among us."

To this was appended the following note:

"Since this Address was delivered, one of our countrymen has returned from Germany, with a rich collection of Oriental manuscripts (formerly in De Sacy's library), and a valuable body of works in Sanscrit literature; which, it is said, are to accompany him to the ancient and respectable College at New Haven."

That young man was Edward E. Salisbury, who had gone to Yale College to take the chair of the Sanskrit and Arabic languages, and also was destined to become very soon after this the Corresponding Secretary, and to take on his willing and capable shoulders the burden of the Society, to prepare or secure its papers, and to pay the expense of their
publication. That chief burden he bore until, in 1857, he succeeded in shifting the responsibility of the office upon William D. Whitney, the most distinguished scholar among all the names on our records.

Such was the origin of the American Oriental Society in 1842, just twenty years after the organization of the Asiatic Society of France, and nineteen years after the organization of the Royal Asiatic Society of England. The German Oriental Society, it may surprise us to recall, was organized in Dresden in 1844, two years after the American Oriental Society, and the first number of its Zeitschrift, issued in 1846, has an article on Oriental studies in America, prepared, I think, by Bela B. Edwards, in which a very handsome tribute is paid to the excellent work of Edward Robinson, Eli Smith, and others, and mention is made of the publications of this Society and of the excellent introductory address of Mr. Pickering, whose death is lamented, as he was the life of the Society, and it had seemed to be in a state of suspended animation since his decease.

The first article in the first issue of the Journal of the American Oriental Society, following the President's address, is on Buddhism, and is by Edward E. Salisbury. Every other article in this volume—and the same is very nearly true of the second—is by some American missionary. One of these, on the Zulu language, is by Lewis Grout, and it is a remarkable fact that he offers an article for this meeting on a kindred topic. In vol. iv. there are twelve articles, ten by missionaries, one by Edward E. Salisbury, and one by William D. Whitney. Professor Whitney's first contribution to our Journal is in the Second Part of vol. iii. and is on "the Main Results of the Later Vedic Researches in Germany."

Such was, in brief, the condition of Oriental studies in the United States during the first four years after the organization of the American Oriental Society. Then followed immediately what we may call our Sanskrit era. From this time the two men who carried the Oriental Society on their shoulders, and who gave it its fame and glory, were Edward E. Salisbury, the elder scholar, and his distinguished pupil, William D. Whitney. Philology had found its key. The great school of American philologists found their teacher and master at "the ancient and respectable College at New Haven." The generous expenditure of time, labor, and money by these two men in behalf of this Society is beyond all praise.

During the session of Saturday morning, a telegram was received from Professor Theodore F. Wright, who had meantime returned to Cambridge, to the effect that permission had been granted by Government to the authorities of the Palestine Exploration Fund to conduct excavations for two years in Jerusalem.

Mr. Talcott Williams, a member of the Executive Committee on the Babylonian Section of the Archaeological Association of the University of Pennsylvania, announced that explorations had been resumed at Niffer by Mr. John Henry Haynes, who had prosecuted the work with great success during the past year, and would be kept in the field for a year to come.
Rev. Dr. Ward presented the following minute, and added some fitting words showing how great have been the services of Professor Salisbury to the Society. By vote of the Society, the minute was adopted for record and for transmission to Professor Salisbury.

The American Oriental Society, at its annual meeting in New York, this the thirtieth day of March, 1894, remembering with gratitude the eminent services rendered for many years to it, and through it to American scholarship, by its oldest living member and most efficient founder, Edward Elbridge Salisbury of New Haven, Connecticut, desires heartily to congratulate him on occasion of his eightieth birthday, now almost attained, and to express its fervent wish that he may long continue to encourage and aid it with his interest and his counsels.

In the program for the meeting, the Corresponding Secretary had ventured to insert the following paragraph:

The plan of the sessions allows about nine hours for the presentation of communications. It is evident that, in fairness to all, no one speaker has a right to more than fifteen minutes for the presentation of any one single communication. It is, moreover, palpably inappropriate to read a long or a highly technical paper before persons of so varied interests as are they who now compose the Society. It is therefore suggested that in case of such papers no attempt be made to read the manuscript; but that a résumé of the paper be given, along with a brief account of the methods employed in reaching the conclusions. It is believed that the results of an enforcement of such a rule on the part of the presiding officer would commend the rule to the hearty approval of the Society.

The suggestion was in fact adopted as a rule, and was enforced with all desirable strictness by the Chair, and with excellent effect. If a continuance of this rule should also prove effectual, for a time at least, in staving off what is proposed as an otherwise inevitable division of the Society into Aryan and Semitic sections for the reading of papers, no one can doubt that we should all be the gainers.

The suggestion was made that all papers be handed in some weeks prior to the meeting and distributed in print to the members before they leave their homes, so that the time now devoted to reading might be free for discussion; but such a course would appear for the present hardly feasible.

The Society held four formal sessions, all in the Room of the Trustees of Columbia College. The afternoon sessions of Thursday and Friday began at about three o'clock; and the morning sessions of Friday and Saturday, at about half-past nine. To break the continuity of the sessions, several recesses of five minutes were taken. Between the morning and afternoon sessions of Friday, certain New York members entertained the
Society at luncheon at No. 54 East Forty-ninth Street, opposite the College. On Friday evening, at about seven o'clock, some thirty-five members dined together at Hotel Wellington. Both on Thursday evening, and also on Friday evening after the dinner, a very considerable number of the members met informally in a pleasant hall, and spent several hours in agreeable social intercourse.

It was voted that the thanks of the Society be sent to the authorities of Columbia College for their hospitality, and to the Committee of Arrangements for their work, which accomplished much for the comfort and pleasure of the members and for the success of the meeting.

Final adjournment was had on Saturday at 12.35 P.M.

The following communications were presented:


Several years ago I began to make translations from the Buddhist Scriptures as contained in the Pāli language. My plan was by a series of translations to present Buddhist doctrine in Buddhist phraseology, so to speak. The work has proved very pleasant. The thoughts, the dialectic, the point of view, the whole mental and moral atmosphere in which one is immersed, in the study of native Buddhist texts, are each and all so different from anything to which we Occidentals are accustomed, and so much that seemed important truth rewarded my search, that, though the work has grown but slowly, my interest has never flagged.

In order the better to carry out my plan of giving a consistent view of Buddhist teaching, it was necessary to consult and, if possible, master Buddhaghosa's Visuddhi-Magga. Buddhaghosa was a Buddhist convert who flourished in the fourth century of our era. He wrote in Pāli, and his masterpiece is, no doubt, this same Visuddhi-Magga, which, being interpreted, is 'The Way of Purity,' or 'The Way of Salvation.' This Visuddhi-Magga is a treasure-house of Buddhist doctrine, and elaborates in an orderly, systematic manner the Buddhist plan of salvation.

As the Visuddhi-Magga, however, is only to be had in native manuscript, I had recourse to one owned by Prof. T. W. Rhys Davids, Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, and began to transcribe. It seems almost impossible to understand a Pāli work written on palm-leaves until it has first been transcribed. The natives do not divide the words, and they make use of almost no devices to help the eye, so that it becomes a question of spelling one's way along letter by letter, and it is hardly possible to read currently. Accordingly I was obliged to copy, and to copy not once but a number of times, and thus I found myself editing the Visuddhi. In order to better the readings of the passages I wanted to translate, I obtained from Rev. Richard Morris, of England, another palm-leaf manuscript, written like the first one, in the Singhalese character. As these two manuscripts, however,
were very similar, and repeated each other's mistakes, and as I now felt myself fairly embarked on the task of editing the Visuddhi, I borrowed the copy belonging to the India Office Library of London, England. This is a very correct manuscript in large Burmese characters, and on it I rely as much as on both the others put together. Lastly, a fourth manuscript has just been received, written like the India Office Library copy in the Burmese character, and, so far as I have yet had opportunity to judge, with very similar readings.

Thus the volume of translations and the editing of the Visuddhi have gone on hand in hand; but the volume of translations, as having been first undertaken, I am intending to publish first. In fact, the first chapter is being printed, and the electroplates made; but the next three chapters occasion me more difficulty, and are still in a backward condition. As they are largely of a philosophical character, and contain with the fifth and last chapter what will make some seventy-five printed pages of translations from the Visuddhi; and as, moreover, there is much of a technical nature in the Visuddhi which must be mastered in order to understand the thought, my progress in my volume of translations is conditioned by my comprehension of the Visuddhi; and, per contra, in order to edit properly I must understand what I am editing, and to that end translation is greatly helpful. Thus I do not find it advantageous to let one undertaking far outrun the other, and hence also it seems impossible at present to fix the date when either one will be finished. However, two complete typeset copies of the Visuddhi have been made, and about a third of another one. My design is to have this third copy be the last, for there would appear to be no need of a fourth complete revision. Therefore I am in hopes that, when this third copy is finished and the various readings have been affixed, it will be fit to send to the printers.

2. On the Sacrifices בֵּלֶל and בֵּלֶל הַשִּׁלֹם in the Marseilles Inscription; by Professor George A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

It will be remembered that in the Marseilles inscription mention is made of three different kinds of sacrifices, which are respectively called בֵּלֶל הַשִּׁלֹם, בֵּלֶל, and בֵּלֶל הַשִּׁלֹם. Of these, the first is sufficiently explained in the Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum. The exact meaning of the other two is, however, much debated.

As to בֵּלֶל, Vogüé and Blau think this word an adjective descriptive of the בֵּלֶל, corresponding to the Hebrew פָּרֹעַ. The following uses of the word in Hebrew may be urged in support of this opinion: פָּרֹעַ וּפָּרֹעַ בֵּלֶל, 'thy beauty for it was perfect,' Eze. xvi. 14; פָּרֹעַ וּפָּרֹעַ בֵּלֶל, 'perfect in beauty,' Eze. xxvii. 3. This view is, however, shown to be incorrect by the inscription itself; for we have in l. 3. בֵּלֶל, in the case of a בֵּלֶל, where בֵּלֶל is evidently the name of a sacrifice. Saulcy, Munk, Schroder, Meier, Halévy, and the editors of the Corpus are therefore in the right when they maintain that there are three sac-
rifices, and not two only, mentioned here. The Corpus translates 'holocaust,' and in this follows the Hebrew usage. Cf. Lev. vi. 15, "it shall be to Yahwe a holocaust, burned as incense;" Lev. vi. 16, 'every minkhath of the priest shall be a holocaust; it shall not be eaten;' Deut. xiii. 17, 'and its spoil thou shalt gather together unto the midst of the street, and thou shalt burn the city with fire; it is a holocaust to Yahwe;" 1 Sam. vii. 9, 'and Samuel took a fat lamb, and offered it as a burnt offering, a holocaust to Yahwe.'

From these examples it is clear that קול means 'holocaust' in Hebrew, and there are no Hebrew examples to be adduced on the other side. It does not, however, follow from this that it had the same meaning in Phoenician. Indeed, our present inscription abundantly proves that it did not have that meaning. It prescribes that in the case of an ox as a קול the priest should have three hundred shekels of flesh,* and that in the case of a calf as a קול he should have one hundred and fifty shekels of flesh. Whence was the flesh to come, if not from the victim? Moreover, the hide, the viscera, the feet, and the rest of the flesh went to the owner of the sacrifice. Whether the owner offered all this as a burnt offering, or retained a portion for himself, does not appear. It may be supposed that he offered it, but this cannot be proved. When the victims were smaller animals, as rams, lambs, kids, and birds, the priest received a money-payment only. Were these then real holocausts? It is uncertain; for in some cases, as when the victim was a lamb or a kid, the hide etc. went to the worshiper.

When the victim was an ox or a calf, therefore, we are sure that the offering was not a holocaust; and we cannot be sure that it was so in all the other cases.

It appears, therefore, that the קול did not signify a holocaust, but was a technical name for a sacrifice the exact nature of which is not yet known.

Is the nature of the קול clear? In this phrase the קול appears to have been the name of the sacrifice, and the קול an adjective describing it. If so, the adjective meant 'complete' or 'whole,' if we may reason from Hebrew analogy.

The root-meaning of קול was 'be whole.' If etymology were, therefore, to have any weight, we should conclude that this sacrifice was designed to renew the bond of union between the worshiper and

* It is true that this statement rests on an emended passage of the text, but of the correctness of the emendation there can be no doubt. The reasons for it are patent to all, and in it all agree.
his god. Among the Hebrews the etymological meaning is supported by several statements of the literature. For example, Deut. xxvii. 7, "sacrifice, and eat there, and rejoice before Yahwe thy God." Here is a survival of the old communal idea of sacrifice. Lev. xix. 5 reads 'when ye offer sacrifices of שָלֵּם to Yahwe, ye shall offer them that ye may be accepted.' From Lev. iii. 8, vii. 31, etc., we learn that the fat of the הִלָּה was burned on the altar, and the inwards without the camp, and that the flesh was eaten. Lev. vii. 11-21 divides the שָלֵּם into thank-offerings and vow-offerings: cf. Prov. vii. 14. Whether a similar ritual existed, and similar distinctions held, in Phoenicia, we have no means of knowing. The analogy of כַּלָּל as a sacrifice would lead us to think not. The term שָלֵּם has disappeared from the Cartage tablet. We have also no means of determining the exact force of כַּלָּל in the compound expression. It may have applied either to the victim, implying that the whole was a שָלֵּם, or to the idea of the root שָלֵּם, implying that it effected a complete wholeness between the god and the worshiper. The former supposition is more in accordance with the analogies of primitive thought, and is to be preferred.

3. Description of the Semitic manuscripts in the library of the Hartford Theological Seminary; by Professor Duncan B. Macdonald, of Hartford, Conn.

I. SYRIAC.

Four fragments of lectionaries (Peshittā and Harqelians text), all in very similar hands, closely resembling Plate VII. in the facsimiles given in Wright’s Cat. of the Syr. Mss. in the Brit. Mus., but more regular and angular. They resemble, also, but by no means so closely, Plate XIV., being much finer in outline and not so clumsy.

A. A double leaf of vellum, not the inner leaf of a gathering; double cols.; 43 × 31.* written part 26 × 20, between cols. 2.5; a full line averages 11 letters; single point punctuation and colored ornaments: Harq. text.

F. 1a.—John xv. 26-xvi. 3; then מִמְסָרָה מִמָּסָר (colored ornament across page).

b.—Colored ornament across page, then קָנָה מִמָּסָר מִמָּסָר מִמָּסָר.


B. A fragment cut out apparently for the sake of a painting of Christ raising the dead, which fills one side. On the other, in double cols., Luke xxiv. 4-6, 9-10. Breadth of written portion 21, between cols. 2.5;

* All measurements are given in centimetres.

a full line averages 11 letters; single point punctuation; small ornaments between verses 4 and 5, 9 and 10. Ḥarq. text.

C. A single vellum leaf, much shriveled and damaged by fire; double cols.; written portion 28 × 19, between cols. 1; a full line averages 11 letters; single point punctuation; rubrics in red and gold; ʿAḥšatā text.

a.—[?] [فَارْضُ | وَمَعَ عَصْرَهُ | عِنْدمَا | ِّيَصَٰمَ | حَمَّلٰهُ]. John xii. 12-17.

b.—John xii. 17-23; at foot of col. 2 a rubric of 8 lines, but much damaged.

D. A single vellum leaf; double cols.; 48 × 32, written portion 30 × 21, between cols. 2.5; a full line averages 10 letters; single point punctuation; rubrics and colored ornaments: Ḥarq. text.


b.—Luke xiii. 28-30; then, in a small hand, [ْسَيَّ صَمَّامَ | ْمَعَ ِّيَصَٰمَ | ِّيَصَٰمَ] (along margin ʿAḥšatā). Then, in a larger hand, [ْسَيَّ صَمَّامَ | ْمَعَ ِّيَصَٰمَ | ِّيَصَٰمَ] then, at head of col. 2, John iv. 46-50.


[It may, perhaps, serve as an explanation of so elaborate a description of such small fragments, that they are to be regarded as specimens from an as yet untouched collection in Kurdistān. So far as the evidence goes, we may have here a new find of 8th Century MSS.: and, as efforts are being made to get at them, further information may be looked for.]

II. Arabic.

1. Kūfī Qurʾān fragment.

One very large oblong vellum leaf, written on both sides but mounted in such a manner that only the writing on one side is accessible; size of leaf as it remains, 54.5 × 49, of written part 48 × 45.5; 23 lines; a rounded regular hand, sloped slightly backwards, and with much closer resemblances to Plate LIX. in the Palæographical Society's Facsimiles (dated by Wright in the 8th century) than to any other Kūfī text I have seen; but it is firmer and more rounded, and the slope backwards is not so marked; it is absolutely different from the usual stiff artificial Kūfī; words divided between lines; at the end of line 13 there is a little stroke to fill out the line, thus — ʿ, and the rest of the word, ʿyḵm, comes in the next line; no vowels; diacritical points sparingly given, in the shape of short slanting lines; and divisions of verses are similarly marked (except end of verse 93, where there is no mark); but all these are apparently later additions, for the ink is much blacker and fresher; terminal ornament to l. 14 (end of v. 92)—this certainly by original hand, and just before it stand three slanting lines belonging to
the later verse divisions; the page that is accessible contains Süra xi., v. 96, وَلَأَنفَخْسَاكُمَا النَّاسَ, to v. 98; there is no ruling visible.

There are the following differences of orthography from the Qur'ân text as given in Flügel and in Fleischer's Baidâwi (compare generally Nolden, *Geschichte des Korâns*, pp. 248 ff.): The alif of prolongation is omitted in l. 5, l. 8, l. 9, صَلِّي الْإِضْلاَحُ ْاِسْمَالْعَا, l. 12, جَاثِيٰينَ l. 16, ْمِكَاتَينِكُمْ, ْلِرَجُنْناَ l. 20, كَذَّبَ l. 21, Nöld. p. 254); in l. 8 and in l. 16 are written for ْلِرَجُنْناَ أنَّهَا ْكُمْ ْنَشُّاشَةٌ, accepting the later diacritical points) is read for نَشُّاشَةٌ in Baidâwi's text, but he gives نَشُّاشَةٌ as a various reading (compare also Nöld., p. 258); but in the text given with the Calcutta edition of az-Zamakhshari's *Kashâf* several of these words are written as in this fragment—

أَنْهَيُكُمْ أَرْبَعُ، ْلِرَجُنْناَ ْقِلَّيْنِ, ْصَلِّي, ْنَشُّاشَا لَفَرِيدَ

and in all the cases of the vocative يا, viz. l. 3, 6, 10, 15, 17, 19; the alif with hamza is omitted in l. 6 (Nöld., p. 254); in l. 8 نَشُّاشَةٌ and in l. 16 are written for نَشُّاشَةٌ in Baidâwi's text, but he gives نَشُّاشَةٌ as a various reading (compare also Nöld., p. 258); but in the text given with the Calcutta edition of az-Zamakhshari's *Kashâf* several of these words are written as in this fragment—

أَنْهَيُكُمْ أَرْبَعُ، ْلِرَجُنْناَ ْقِلَّيْنِ, ْصَلِّي, ْنَشُّاشَا لَفَرِيدَ

and in all the cases of the vocative; in the Qur'ân lithographed by Drugulin in 1890 from a MS. of A. H. 1094 I find the first three of these, and the first two are in the Qur'ân MS. of A. H. 978 in the Seminary library. I give these details as an addition to the growing proof of our need of a reliable Qur'ân text. No one could describe Flügel's edition as reliable, and Fleischer edited Baidâwi, not the Qur'ân. The following extracts from p. 167 of the

غِيْطَ النَّفْعُ فِي الْقَرَائِاتِ السَّمِيعٍ لِسَبِيدِ عَلَى الْنَّورِيُّ الصَّفِئِيُّ (on the margin of Ibn al-Qâshî's Commentary on the Shâfi'î *Biyâ, Cairo, A. H. 1304) may be of interest as to two of the above readings:

(نشاَرِ اَنَّكَ) قَرَأَ الْحَرِمِيُّ وَبَصَرَ بِإِبَادَال ثَانِيَةٍ وَأَوَّاَ

وعنهم أَيْضاً تَسُهِّلُها بِبِهِنِ وَالْبِانِوَنَ بَالْحَقِيقَ وَمَرَابِيِّمُ فِي الْمَدَّ لَا تَخْفَى وَرَسُمُ نِشَاّرِ هَنَا بَالْبَوْلاَ. On p. 18 in the

«أَعِنَى الْحَرِمِيُّينَ إِمَامِ طِيَّبَةٍ» he explains: مَضْطَلَعَ الْكُتَّابِ ْعَلَّمَةٌ أَبَا زَايِمْ نَافِعًا وَأَبَا مُعَبَّدٍ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بِنَ كَتِبٍ
2. Qurʾān of A. H. 978.
Carefully written on Oriental glazed paper; fully pointed and, generally, with the waqf signs (Kosegarten, Gramm. arab., p. 88; Diction-
ary of the technical terms used in the sciences of the Muslims, pp.
1498–1500; as-Suyūṭī, Ḥqāʾin, Calc. edit., pp. 195 ff.; Cairo edit. of A. H.
1306, pp. 87 ff.; Nöld., Gesch., pp. 353 ff.). Consists at present of 329
leaves, but one is missing between F. 326 and F. 327 (contained Sūras
xciii.–xcvi.): gatherings @ 5, but so many leaves have been mounted that
the later gatherings cannot be distinguished; size of page, 20.5 × 15;
of written parts, 13.5 × 7.5; 13 ll. to the page; catchwords to leaves; no ruling
visible; Sūra titles, sections, and pausal signs in red; has been carefully collated, with corrections on margin; on b of
last leaf came last words of Sūra al-nāṣ, and an Arabic-Turkish
colophon:
من الجِنية وأَلْتَتْ تَمَّ بِعَرْنِ اللَّه
المَلك الْبَنَان كَتبَ انْقُرَ الفَقْرَاء وَخَادِمٌ آلِصَالَا البِـحتِاج
بالَـيْحَةِ الَّذِي تَعَالَى اِضْعَفَ الْعَبِيد
الْقَتْرُ الْبَرَّيِّ ابِرْهَيمُ سَرْدُ
بَـلْ إِسْتَنَاءَ بَابِهِمُوبَنَ دِرَالْسَلَـطِتْنَا جْرِيْ ذَلِكَ وَحَـرَى
أَوْاىْ رَبِّيْنَا مَنْ شَهْرِ سَبْتِ ثِـنَانِ سِبْعِينِ وَتَسْعَ مَائَة
Stamped oriental leather binding; bookplate with D. G. IOHANNES
WILHELMUS D. S. I. C. M. A. & W. | EX BIBLIOTHECA SERENIS-
SIMÆ DOMUS | SAXO-ISENACENSIS.

3. Al-Ghazzālī (Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad b. M. b. M.) as-Sāsi′ī—
Minhāj al-ʿAbīdīn, and three books of the Ḥyāʾa al-ʿUṯmān. A. H. 850.
Written in a legible hand on Oriental glazed paper, without vowels,
but with many diacritical points; rulings with dry point (the مَـسْتَرَب؟
). as also slanting on the margin for notes; many marginal notes and
corrections; catchwords to leaves; section-titles and divisions in red:
174 leaves; 17 gatherings @ 5 + 1 @ 3(?); the second leaves of the first
and last gatherings are lost; leaves 1a and b, 109b, and 138–4a and b
are blank; 27 ll. to page; size of page 27 × 18, of written part 17 × 12.
Contains, on leaves 3–109, §§ 37–40 of إِحَيَاء عِلْمِ الْدُّنِىَّة
(رَبَع الْبَنِيَّات) and last quarter of the
work: compare Goeche, pp. 254 ff. The titles of the sections are:
كتاب التفكّر (89); كتاب المحاسبة والدرة الأوقية (88); كتاب النية (87);
كتاب ذكر الموت وما بعده (40); ما نحن في الكتاب المذكور وما عقبه.
فيما كتب ردّه عليه مورس. فلرغم ذلك إننا تناولنا في هذا الكتاب منهج العبادين.
عليهما وان يعپه [sic] في آخرهم. انهم جميعًا وذللك في يوم الاثنين المحادي والعشرين من شهر شوال سنة خمسين وثمانية مائة.

On the margin there comes in the same hand:

بلغ بحمد الله مقابلته على ذكر عددية فقح ان شاء الله تعالى بتأريخ حادي عشره من شهر ذي القعدة سنة خمسين وثمانية مائة والجديد لله رب العاليمين.

On the blank pages there are several notes scribbled in very illegible hands, of which the following may be of some interest:

المحمد لله رب العاليمين ولد البراند المبارك محمد عبد ربه. / الدين بن الشيخ الصالح زين الدين عم... هذل... المبارك وهي سنة اجرأ [?] في آخر ليلة يفصر صاحبها عن يوم الاثنين الثاني عشره من شهر سبتمبر، من شهر سنة احده وستين وثمانية مائة انتحاة الله نسوا صالحا بينه.

كرمة وجميلة الله إله. المحمد لله رب العاليمين بتاريخ خامس عشره من شهر رمضان، سنة خمسين وثمانية مائة اندرج بالوفاة إلى رحمة الله تعالى الفقير إلى الله...
This volume has apparently been a Waqf at one time; for on leaf 1a stands On the same page: Ex bibliotheca ducali Hilpertohusana. Stamped oriental leather binding; book-plate as No. 2.
The collator was Rev. George Cecil Renouard, and in the second volume the date 18 Aug., 1838, is given. At the end of the first volume is the following note: Extraits du traité de géographie d'Edrisi d'après les deux exemplaires de la bibliothèque d'Oxford, et collation de quelques passages des deux manuscrits, par le révérend George Cecil Renouard, qui avait entrepris une édition du texte arabe avec une version anglaise. C'est ici le premier volume. Les deux volumes m'ont été offerts par M. Renouard le 30 Juin, 1834, dans une lettre datée de Swanscombe, Dartford, Kent. Reinaud.
The collation extends over Climate I., parts 1–10, II. 1–7, III. 1–5, and IV. 1. Of the Oxford MSS. there have already been used by Dozy and de Goeje in the Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, Climates I. 1–5, II. 1–4, III. 1–4, and IV. 1.; by Gildemeister, in Idrisî Palestina et Syria (Bonn, 1888: compare, too, Rosenmüller, Analecta arabica III.); III. 5 and IV. 5 (extracts); by Schiaparelli and Amari, in L'Italia descritta nel 'Libro del re Ruggero' (Rome, 1889), IV. 2 and 3, V. 2 and 3; by Amari, in Biblioteca Arabo-Sicula (Leipzig, 1857), IV. 2. This leaves a comparatively small unpublished part for which this collation is available. In view of Gildemeister's note on p. 38, it may be worth mentioning that Renouard read the date of Pococke 375 as A. H. 960, in opposition to Gagnier's 906 and Uri's 906. Dozy read it as 860.
From a notice prefixed to Lee's translation of Ibn Baṭûta (London, 1829) it would appear that this was a preparation for a translation to be published by the Oriental Translation Committee.
Az-Zamakhshârî (Jâr Allâh 'Abû-l-Qâsim Maḥmûd b. 'Umar)—Kitâb as-Sawûbîgh ft sharîf an-nawâbîgh.
A carefully written manuscript in a European hand (Schultens'), with few vowels. It begins—
قصيدة ابن دريدخمسة برس مخانف ملادا السلطان
الملك البشتي اعز الله نصرة
[the space of a line blank]
مقصورة
ابي بكر بن محمد بن الحسن بن دريد الأزدي
Thus it is a commentary that follows, and not a تَّخْبِيس: at the end is the following colophon: 

تم بعوت الله وحسن ترقيقه وفرغ من تحریر العبد المذنب الخاتم إلى رحمه الله مسعود بن محمد القرنوي الكاذب. في الثامن عشر من رجب سنة

أَنتَين وسبعين وستمائة

The date and the name of the transcriber are the same as those of Cod. 1072 Warn. (Cat. Bibl. Lugd., Vol. ii., pp. 49 ff.) and this may be from that MS.: then the Nawābigh begin:

اللهِمّ إن مَا منحتني من النَّفَم السواى

اللهِم هذه الكلام النباه

النَّفَم هو من تولِهم الله الخير الهماء أي القاه في

روعة اللَّغ"}

It appears to be a copy of Cod. 814 (8) Warn., leaves 219-243 (Cat. Bibl. Lugd., Vol. i. [2d edit.], p. 219); and contains the text with extracts from at-Taftāzānī's Comm. up to p. 108 of Schultens' edit. (Lugd. Bat., 1772); there it breaks off abruptly, and there follows immediately: Explicit MS. Cl. Schultensii manu descrip- tum nullo finiti operis addito indicio. There are interlinear and marginal glosses in Latin.


With a commentary. Written in at least two generally legible hands, on oriental glazed paper, without vowels, but with diacritical points; some marginal corrections; catchwords to leaves: text sometimes underlined in red, sometimes in black, but both irregularly; 105 leaves; gatherings @ 5 but very irregular; 11 lines to page; size of page 14.75 × 10.5, of written part 9.5 × 6.5.

The commentary is anonymous, and in the manuscript catalogues accessible to me I can find traces of two other copies only, also anonym- ous, and both in the Escorial: see Derenbourg, Les manuscrits arabes de l'Escurial, Vol. i., pp. 108-4; Casiri, Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana Es- curialenis, Vol. i., p. 40. Casiri gives name of author as Khālid b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abī Bakr al-Anṣārī, but apparently through confusion with another work in the same volume. It begins after the basmala—
The remainder is missing, with the colophon.


A copy of the Vienna MS. Mxt. 190 (IL 380 No. 1164 in Flügel's Cat.), apparently made for Müller by Hassan and Langer. It consists of 843 large leaves, in 9 fasciculi. On the value of the MS. see Müller's edit., Vol. ii., p. xviii. Further description of this transcript is unnecessary.

4. Non-Jewish religious ceremonies in the Talmud; by Dr. I. M. Casanowicz, of Washington, D. C.

The Talmud is not only the storehouse of the Jewish religious and mental life for more than seven centuries, but also a panopticon, as it were, of the whole ancient world. For just the time which this encyclopaedia of the Jewish mental history encompasses, namely from the 4th century before to the 4th after Christ, was the period in which the Jewish nation was drawn into the circle of the pagan world, not only in political life but also in the domain of culture and civilization. Long before Palestine was brought under the supremacy of Rome, it came into close contact and conflict with that phase of Greek culture and civilization which is called Hellenism, and it might be expected that the mental life of the prominent nations of that period, which, moreover, was characterized by its cosmopolitanism and syncretism, will be found in some way reflected and mirrored in the Talmud.

Limiting ourselves to the representation of the religious ceremonies of the nations that came under the observation of the authors of the Talmud, we give in the following pages a specimen of the material which the Talmud contains for a study of the religious practices of the ancient world, as found in the tract Aboda Zarah.

This section of the Talmud, as its name indicates, cultus alienus sive extraneus, which in the talmudical and rabbinical usage of language means 'idolatry,' contains the laws relating to idolatry and the enticers or seducers to it, and treats in eight chapters of: 1. The
festivals of idolaters; 2. The social and commercial intercourse with them; 3. Images and other objects of pagan worship; 4. Matters pertaining to idolatry.

The treatise is written with the object of protecting and guarding Judaism against the encroachments of Paganism.

We arrange the statements of the Talmud, adding the parallels from the classical writers where there are such, under the following headings: 1. Seasons; 2. Places; 3. Objects; 4. Offerings and mode of worship; 5. Witchcraft.

1. Seasons of Worship.

"It is forbidden to enter into any transactions with idolaters three days before their festivals. . . . And these are the festivals of the idolaters: the Calendae, Saturnalia, Cratesim, the day of the Genesis of the kings, the days of birth and death. These are the words of Rabbi Mefr.* The (other) wise men say: the death at which a (public) cremation takes place is connected with idolatry, otherwise not; while in case of shaving the beard and front-lock, of returning from a sea-voyage, of release from prison, or of giving a festival to a son, it is forbidden to have converse with this single man and on this single day only." (i. 1. 1a; 3. 8a.)

"Rab Chanin† says the Calendae takes place eight days after the solstice (of Tebeth=December), the Saturnalia eight days before the same solstice." (i. 1. 6a.)

Calendae means properly the day of summoning, from calare 'summon.' Macrobius‡ and Varro§ mention that it was the duty of one of the pontifices to watch for the first appearance of the new moon, and, as soon as he descried it, to carry word to the rex sacrorum, who then summoned the people and offered a sacrifice. The Calendae, i. e. the first day of each month, were consecrated to Juno. Also to the Lares gifts were offered on the Calendae.¶ The Calendae of January, which are alluded to in our passage, were celebrated with special solemnity, and were called the Calendae par excellence.¶

The Saturnalia were celebrated in December, at first only for one day, on the nineteenth,** later for several days, beginning on the seventeenth,†† in honor of Saturnus (Cronus), with sacrifices in open air, and were accompanied by great merriment.††

The meaning of the word genesis (yevesia) is discussed 10a, and decided to mean the assuming of the reign by the king, while that of cratesim (sparianus) is said to be the obtaining of the supremacy of Rome, 8b. The Latin equivalent of yevesia, natalis, was also employed in a wider sense. Thus Spartanus, Vita Adrian i 4, says: "quando

* Lived in the second century A. D.  ** Grünbaum in ZDMG. xxxi. 277.
† Lived 299-352 A. D., in Machuza.  § Livy ii. 21. 2.
‡ Saturn i. 15.  §§ De re rustica i. 37.
¶ Preller, Römische Mythologie, p. 490.  ¶¶ Macrobius, 1. c., i. 7, 8, 10, etc.
et natalem adoptionis celebrari jussit. Tertio Iduum earundem quando et natalem imperii instituit celebrandum;" to which Cassaubon remarks: "Antiqui vocarunt natales omnes dies propter aliquam lectionem in signem sibi solemnnes; inde in historis principis ejusdem tot natales." The Jerusalem Talmud, i. 89c, takes γενεθλίον in the meaning of birthday, and καραθέως of the installation of the king in his office.

That these days of the Roman emperors were religiously celebrated is attested by Roman writers.* So were also offerings made to the Lares on the birthday, at the entering of a son on the age of maturity, on the happy return from a voyage, etc., of private persons.†

Funerals, with the Greeks as well as with the Romans, were accompanied by a sacrifice and a funeral repast, especially on the ninth day after burial.‡

"These (viz. those named above) are the festivals of the Romans. Which are those of the Persians? The Motredi, Turiski, Moharneki, and Moharin. These are of the Romans and Persians; and which are of the Babylonians? The Moharneki, the Arquenithi, and the tenth of Adar (March–April)." (11b.)

2. Places of Worship.

Rab§ said there were five principal (established) places of idolatry: the house of Bel in Babylon, the house of Nebo in Cursi, Taratha in Maphog, Carepa in Askalon, Nishra (eagle) in Arabia." (11b.)

The temple of Bel, i. e. of Bel-Merodach, in the city of Babylon, of which he was the tutelar deity, was quite celebrated in antiquity. The principal seat of worship of Nebo was, according to the cuneiform inscriptions, Borsippa, the sister-city of Babylon. Under Carepa of Askalon probably Serapis is to be understood.† According to Hai Gaon,¶ there was in a mosque of Arabia a stone with an eagle engraved on it, to which religious homage was paid,** and it is very likely that in pre-Islamic times such an object existed as the Ka‘aba in Mecca.

"It is allowed to assist in the building of platforms and bath-houses; but when the cupola is reached where idols are placed, it is forbidden." (16a.)

"Proclus the philosopher asked of Rabban Gamaliel,†† while he was in the bath of Aphrodite at Acco (Ptolemais), why he was bathing in a bath where an idol is set up? Gamaliel answered: She (i. e. Aphrodite) came into our (territory), not we into hers; the bath was not

* Sueton. Vespasian 6; Tiberius 53; Tacit. Histor. ii. 79; Pliny, Panegyricus 53.
† Preller, l. c., p. 491.
‡ Juvenal v. 84; Augustine, Confessions vi. 2. 2.
§ Principal of the Academy of Sora, died A. D. 241.
¶ Living Wörterbuch iv. 222.
¶¶ Lived 969–1038 in Pumbeditha.
** Levy, ib. iii. 455.
†† Gamaliel II, President of the Academy and Synhedrion of Jabne (Jamnia) at the end of the first and beginning of the second century A. D.
made for Aphrodite, but Aphrodite for the bath (i.e. to decorate it).”
(iii. 5. 44b.)

Baths equipped with halls, libraries, etc., and decorated with statues, are often spoken of in the ancient authors.*

In another passage (iv. 6. 58b) “platforms (θημα) of kings” are mentioned, which Rashi explains to have been stone structures erected on the road where the king had to pass. On these were placed idols, that the king may worship them in passing.

“Rabbi Meir says it is forbidden to visit the theaters and circuses, because they deliberate there on the affairs of idolatry.” (18b.)

3. Objects of worship.

“Rabbi Ishmael† says: three stones, arranged one at the side of the other, make out a Mercury, and are forbidden to make use of; but two are allowed.” (iv. 1. 48b.) Another authority defines a Mercury thus: “two stones on each side and a third one placed upon them.” (50a.) It was the old primitive form of worship, and represented not the Roman Mercury, but the Greek Hermes, with whom, however, Mercury was in later time identified. Hermes was originally considered a deity of crops, flocks, and roads, and particularly as Hermes ἵδος, i.e. the omnipresent protector of roads; pillars of stone were raised in his honor at cross-roads, to which every passer-by used to add a stone. As early as Homer these ἱερα or ἱεροῦ λόφοι were known.‡ But it is a well-known fact that the crude primitive representations of the deities, like the Χοάνες etc., were through the whole period of classical antiquity most devoutly reverenced in Greece and Italy, and survived down to the centuries of the Christian era. The Hermes, in particular, not only were seen by Strabo in Egypt§ and Pausanias in Greece, but have also been found by recent travelers in Greece and other countries.¶ It is therefore probable that the Greek settlers also introduced them into Palestine and Syria.

“Rabbi Judah** adds (to that which is to be considered as an idol and therefore forbidden to make use of) the representation of a sucking woman and Serapis . . . , but this only when he has a modius and she a sucking child.” (43a.)

Serapis or Sarapis, Egyptian Asarhapi=Osiris-Apis, was the Egyptian Osiris in the character of a god of the lower world, his corresponding incarnation as a god of the upper world being the bull Apis. Under the Ptolemies, Osiris and his sister-wife Isis were amalgamated with Greek divinities. As Serapis he included the Egyptian Osiris, Pluto,

---

* Cf. especially Vitruvius v. 10 ff.; Seneca Ep. ii. 2.
† Died as martyr under Hadrian about 134 A. D.
‡ Cf. Odys. xvi. 471.
§ Cf. xvii. 818.
¶ Cf. iv. 33. 3.
|| Cf. Ross, Reisen durch Griechenland, i. 18, 174.
** Disciple of Akiba, 100-160 A. D. (?)
AEsculapius, and Zeus. His temple at Alexandria, the Serapeion, was one of the most famous buildings in antiquity. This new worship rapidly spread from Egypt to Greece.* In Rome the Egyptian cults make their appearance in the second century B. C., and in 48 B. C. a temple was erected in honor of Serapis and Isis by the Triumvirs. Their worship, favored by the emperors, spread especially in the Roman provinces. The worship of Serapis in Palestine is, moreover, attested by coins of Cassarea, Ptolemais (Acco), Neapolis (Shechem), and AElia Capitolina (Jerusalem).† Serapis as Zeus-Serapis was represented—as may be seen from the surviving colossal bust in the Vatican—with a modius, or corn-measure, upon his head. The suckling woman with infant may have been a representation of Isis, who was often conceived as having her son Horus on her lap; or of Juno, who, as goddess of childbirth (Juno Lucina), was represented on her festival, the Matronalia, with an infant in swaddling clothes; or also of Aphrodite-Ashtarte.

"Rabbi Meir says: all kinds of images are forbidden, because they are worshiped once a year; but the wise men say it is not forbidden unless the hand holds a staff, or a bird, or a globe—which shows, as Rashi explains, that great importance was attributed to the image." (iii. 1. 40b.)

There are still extant numerous statues with the objects named above attached to them, as for instance a scepter or staff to those of Zeus, Hera (Juno), Hermes (Mercury), AEsculapius; and a bird to those of Apollo and Aphrodite (Venus).

"Fragments of images are allowed, but the representation of a hand or foot is forbidden, for these things are worshiped." (iii. 2. 41a.)

"When one finds vessels with a representation of the sun, the moon, a serpent (dragon), upon them, he shall carry them to the Dead Sea (i. e. destroy them)." Another authority says: "All representations are allowed except that of a serpent." (iii. 3. 42a.)

The representation of divinities and mythological scenes on vases, lekythas, etc., is still extant in numerous specimens. That these vessels were objects of religious homage is not known from any other source. The serpent particularly was the attribute of many divinities. It was also the symbol of AEsculapius, who was brought from Epidaurus to Rome in the shape of a snake when his worship was introduced into that city 288 B. C. It was also the popular representation of the Genii.‡

"Idolaters who worship mountains and hills—they themselves (i. e. the mountains and hills) are allowed, but what is upon them (trees) is forbidden" (iii. 6. 45a.)

Sacred groves and trees are often mentioned in the classical writers.§

---

† Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, i. 546, 586; ii. 15 ff.
‡ Preller, Römische Mythologie, pp. 76, 566; Vergil, AEne. v. 95.
§ Cf. e. g. Vergil, Georg. iii. 332; AEne. i. 165 ff.; see also Preller, l. c., p. 297.
Particular trees were sacred to individual divinities: so, for instance, the oak to Zeus, the laurel to Apollo, the myrtle to Aphrodite. The worship on elevated places is also often referred to in the Old Testament.

"It is forbidden to put the mouth to the statues which pour out water, in order to drink, because it might give the appearance of kissing the idol." (12a.)

"With regard to the statues of kings the opinions are divided. According to Rabbah,* all agree that those of cities are allowed to be made use of, because they are made for the sake of ornament [not with a view to religious worship]." (41a.)

It is well known that since Augustus the provinces especially were zealous in the cult of the emperors. It was with them an expression of loyalty to Rome. Caligula demanded divine worship even from the Jews, and only his timely death prevented the temple at Jerusalem from being defiled by his statue.

4. Offerings and Mode of Worship.

"It is forbidden to sell to idolaters pineapples, cembrinuts, figs, frankincense, and the white cock. Rabbi Judah says it is allowed to sell a white cock among other cocks, and in the case of a single white cock it may be sold when one of its toes is cut off, for they do not offer a defective victim. . . . Rabbi Meir says it is also forbidden to sell to idolaters dates and palms." (i. 5. 13b.)

The cock was offered to Æsculapius, the god of healing. The specification of a white cock is found only here.

"When one finds upon the head of (a statue or pillar of) Mercury money, garlands, or vessels, they are allowed for use; but vines, garlands of ears, wine, oil, flour, and similar things that are offered upon the altar are forbidden." (iv. 3. 51b.)

"The following objects of non-Israelites are forbidden for any use whatever: wine, vinegar that was originally wine, and skins with a hole in the region of the heart. Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel† says that if the opening (of the skin) is round it is forbidden, if oblong it is allowed." (ii. 3. 29b.)

The use of wine for libations is well known. The opening of the skins in the region of the heart may refer to the inspection of the entrails of the victims by the haruspices.

"It is forbidden to make ornaments for idols, as chains, earrings, and rings." (19b.)

"A city where there is an idol and where there are booths with garlands and without garlands—the former are forbidden (to enter and make purchases in), the latter are allowed." (i. 4. 12b.)

The distinction is made because the booths decorated with garlands were used in the interest of the cult.

---

* Died 300 A.D., as principal of the Academy of Pumbeditha.
† President of the Synhedron at the time of the Judeo-Roman war.
"Rabbi Nathan* says that on the day when taxes are remitted they use to proclaim and make known: 'whosoever shall put a wreath upon his head and that of his animal in honor of the idol, to him the taxes will be remitted.’" (18a.)

"Rab Judah said that Rab was teaching concerning an idol that was worshiped with a stick (Rashi: a stick was swung in front of it); that if one broke a stick in front of it he was guilty (of an act of idolatry), but if he merely threw it he was free." (50b.)

5. Witchcraft and Superstition.

"Said Rabba bar Rab Isaac to Rab Judah: 'there is an idolatrous house in our place, where, when the world is in need of rain, a dream says to them: slaughter a man for me and rain will come. And they slaughter a man and rain comes.’" (55a.)

"Said Zonan to Rabbi Akiba:† 'both of us know that there is no reality in idolatry, and yet we see people going to the temples broken down (as cripples) and returning restored.'" (55a.) The answer of Akiba is to the effect that God does not overrule the pre-ordained destinies of men on account of their foolishness.

"When one goes to the stadia and circuses and sees there the snakes, the conjurors, the flute-players, the clowns (?), the muledrivers (?), the ventriloquists (?), the hierodules (?), and the sigillaria (?), so is this sitting in the seat of the scornful (Psalm i. 1)." (18b.)

These are the references to the religious beliefs and practices of the nations who came under the observation of the Jews about the time of the beginning of the Christian era, derived from a single treatise of the Talmud. Many of the customs recorded are also found in the Greek and Roman writers; some are met with only in this treatise. Altogether, it would seem that the Talmud is not entirely to be disdained as a source of instruction respecting the civilization and religions of the ancient world.

5. On a recent attempt, by Jacobi and Tilak, to determine on astronomical evidence the date of the earliest Vedic period as 4000 B. C.; by Professor W. D. Whitney, of Yale University, New Haven.

At a meeting of the Society in this city nearly nine years ago (Oct. '85), I criticised and condemned Ludwig's attempt to fix the date of the Rig-Veda by alleged eclipses. The distinguished French Indianist, Bergaigne, passed the same judgment upon it at nearly the same time, (Journ. Asiat. '86). Although the two criticisms provoked from Ludwig a violent and most uncourteous retort (see his Rig-Veda, vol. vi.,

* Lived about 140-200 A. D.
† Died as a martyr under Hadrian.
Within the past year, a similar attempt has been made, independently of one another, by two scholars, one German (Prof. Jacobi, of Bonn, in the Festgruss an Roth, 1893, pp. 68-74) and one Hindu (Bál Gangādhār Tilak, The Orion, or researches into the antiquity of the Vedas, Bombay, 1893, pp. ix, 229, 16mo.), working along the same general line, and coming to an accordant conclusion: namely, that the oldest period called Vedic goes back to or into the fifth millennium before Christ—an antiquity as remote as that long recognized for Egyptian civilization, and recently claimed, on good grounds, for that of Mesopotamia also. This is a startling novelty; as such, however, we have no right to reject it offhand; but we are justified in demanding pretty distinct and unequivocal evidence in its favor, before we yield it our credence.

The general argument may be very briefly stated thus: The Hindus (as also the Chinese, the Persians, and the Arabs) had a lunar zodiac of 27 (or 28) asterisms, rudely marking the successive days of the moon's circuit of the heavens. Since the establishment of the Hindu science of astronomy, under Greek influence and instruction, in the first centuries of our era, the series of asterisms has been made to begin with Ācyvīni (in the head of Aries), for the acknowledged reason that that group was nearest the vernal equinox at the time. But earlier, in the Brāhmaṇas etc., the series always began with Kṛttikā (Pleiades), presumably because, owing to the precession, that group had been nearest to the equinox: and this was the case some two thousand and more years before Christ. Some two thousand and more years yet earlier, the equinox was near to Mrgaśīras, or the head of Orion; if, therefore, it can be made to appear that the Hindus once began their asterismal system with Mrgaśīras, and because of the latter's coincidence with the equinox, we shall conclude that they must have done so more than four thousand years before Christ. But the same sum can be worked in terms of months. The Hindu months are lunar, and are named sidereally, each from the asterism in or adjacent to which the moon is full in the given month; but the seasons follow the equinoxes and solstices; hence the rainy season, for example, began about a month earlier when Acvīni (Aries) was at the equinox than when Kṛttikā (Pleiades) was there, and about two months earlier than when Mrgaśīras (Orion) was there; and if it can be shown that the year always commenced with a fixed season, and has twice changed its initial month, Mrgaśīras (Orion).

* His language is as follows: "Anything more completely the opposite (Wider- sprü) of criticism than the judgment which our, in all points well-considered, discussion of the subject has met with at the hands of Whitney and Bergaigne is not to be conceived. It [the discussion] is refuted in no single point; the judges do not stand upon the ground of criticism, but upon that of personal and wholly unjustified opposition." Perhaps nothing different from this was to be expected from one who could propose such a theory: finding nothing to say in its defense, he was obliged to abuse his critics and impute to them personal motives.
will thus also be proved to have been at the equinox at a recorded or remembered period in Hindu history. And this, in one of the two alternative methods, or in both combined, is what our two authors attempt to demonstrate.

Professor Jacobi sets out by finding in the Rig-Veda the beginning of the year to be determined by that of the rainy season. And first he quotes a verse from the humorous hymn to the frogs, RV. vii. 103. 9, usually rendered thus: "they keep the divine ordering of the twelve-fold one (i. e. of the year); those fellows do not infringe the season, when in the year the early rain has come"; that is to say, the wise frogs, after reposing through the long dry season, begin their activity again as regularly as the rains come. Jacobi objects that dūḍḍāqā, rendered "twelve-fold," means strictly "twelfth," and ought to be taken here in this its more natural sense; and he translates: "they keep the divine ordinance: those fellows do not infringe the season of the twelfth [month];" inferring that then the downright rains mark the first month of the new year. But dūḍḍāqā does not in fact mean "twelfth" any more naturally than "twelve-fold;" its ordinal value, though commoner, especially in later time, is not one whit more original and proper than the other, or than yet others; and the proposed change, partly as agreeing less with the metrical division of the verse, is, in my opinion, no improvement, but rather the contrary; and no conclusion as to the beginning of the year can be drawn from it with any fair degree of confidence. This first datum, then, is too indefinite and doubtful to be worth anything.

Next our attention is directed to a verse (13) in the doubtless very late sūryā-hymn in the tenth book (x. 85), where, for the sole and only time in the Rig-Veda, mention appears to be made of two out of the series of asterisms, the Atharva-Veda being brought in to help establish the fact. The subject is the wedding of the sun-bride, and the verse reads thus: "The bridal-car (vahatā) of Sūryā hath gone forth, which Savitar sent off; in the Maghā (RV. Aghā)’s are slain the kine (i. e., apparently, for the wedding-feast); in the Phalgunī’s (RV. Arjunī’s) is the carrying-off (RV. carrying-about: vīvāha ‘carrying-off’ is the regular name for wedding)." The Maghā’s and the Phalgunī’s are successive asterisms, in Leo, Maghā being the Sickle, with α Leonis, Regulus, as principal star; and the Phalgunī’s (reckoned as two asterisms, "former" and "latter" Phalgunī’s) are the square in the Lion’s tail, or β, δ, ε, and γ Leonis. Now, as Professor Jacobi points out, the transfer of the sun-bride to a new home would seem plausibly interpretable as the change of the sun from the old year to a new one: and hence the beginning of the rainy season, nearly determined as it is by the summer solstice, would be with the sun in the Phalgunī’s; and this would imply the vernal equinox at Mṛgaçiras (Orion), and the period 4000 B. C. or earlier.

There is evidently a certain degree of plausibility in this argument. But it is also beset with many difficulties. The whole myth in question is a strange and problematic one. That the moon should be viewed as
the husband of the asterisms, whom he (all the names for "moon" are masculine) visits in succession on his round of the sky, is natural enough; but that the infinitely superior sun, made feminine for the nonce (सूर्यā instead of सूर्यa), while always masculine else, should be the moon's bride, is very startling; nor, indeed, is it anywhere distinctly stated that the moon (सोमa) is the bridegroom, though this is inferable with tolerable confidence from intimations given. Sūryā is repeatedly said to go (वस. 7d) or go forth (वस. 12d) to her husband (and only vs. 88 to be "carried about;" but for Agni, not Soma), or to go (वस. 10d) to her house; while any people who had gone so far in observation of the heavens as to establish a system of asterisms, and to determine the position of the sun in it at a given time (no easy matter, but one requiring great skill in observing and inferring), must have seen that it is the moon who "goes forth" in the zodiac to the sun. The astronomical puzzle-headedness involved in the myth is hardly reconcilable with the accuracy which should make its details reliable data for important and far-reaching conclusions. The kine for the feast, too, it would seem, must be killed where the bride is, or when the sun is in Maghā; then if the wedding-train starts when sun and moon are together in the Phalguna, which would be ten to fifteen days later, how do we know that they do not go and settle down in some other asterism, further on? And are we to suppose that the couple move and start their new life in the rains? That is certainly the least auspicious time for such an undertaking, and no safe model for the earthly weddings of which it is supposed to be the prototype. On all accounts, there is here no foundation on which to build important conclusions.

Nor shall we be able to find anything more solid in Professor Jacobi's next plea, which is derived from the prescriptions of the Gṛhya-Sūtras as to the time when a Vedic student is to be received by his teacher, and to commence study. Cāṅkāyana sets this at the season when the plants appear: that is to say, at the beginning of the rains; and it is pointed out that the Buddhists also fix their season of study and preaching in the same part of the year. But Pāraskara puts the initiation of the student at the full moon of the month Črāvaṇa, which (Crudana being β, α, γ Aquilæ) would have been first month of the rains in the second millennium before Christ; while Gobhila sets it, alternatively, in the month Bhādrapada, which would have occupied the same position more than two thousand years earlier, or when the vernal equinox was at Orion. The author further points out that the Rāmāyaṇa (a comparatively very late authority) designates Bhādrapada as the month for devoting one's self to sacred study; and that the Jains (whom one would think likely to be quite independent of Brahmanic tradition) do the same. The reason for fixing on this particular season Professor Jacobi takes to be the fact that "the rainy months, during which all out-of-doors occupation ceases, are the natural time of study;" and then he makes the momentous assumption that the designations of Čravaṇa and Bhādrapada can be due only to traditions from older periods, when those months began the rainy season respectively. On this point cautious critics will be little likely to agree with him. If the
systematic study (memorization) of Vedic lore began as early as 4000 B. C., and could be carried on only in-doors, and so was attached closely to the in-doors rainy season, we should expect to find it attached throughout to the season, and not to the month, and especially in the case of the Jains; that these also abandoned the rains is one indication that the consideration was never a constraining one. And the orthodox Vedic student did not go to school for a limited time in each year, but for a series of years of uninterrupted labor; and on what date the beginning should be made was a matter of indifference, to be variously determined, according to the suggestions of locality and climate, or other convenience—or to the chronicle of schools, which might seek after something distinctive. I cannot possibly attribute the smallest value to this part of our author's argumentation.

We are next referred by him to the connection established by several of the Brähmaṇas between the Phalguni's (β. δ, etc. Leonis; and the beginning and end of the year. The Tāṭātirīya-Saṁhitā (vii. 4. 8) and the Pancaviśa-Brähmaṇa (v. 9. 8) say simply that "the full-moon in Phalguni is the mouth (mukha, i. e. 'beginning') of the year;" this would imply a position of the sun near the western of the two Bhādra-padaś (a Pegasus etc.), and determine the Phālguna month, beginning 14 days earlier, as first month. The Kāṇḍitakī-Brähmaṇa (v. 1) makes an almost identical statement, but adds to it the following: "the latter (eastern) Phalgu's are the mouth, the former (western) are the tail;" and the Tāṭātirīya-Brähmaṇa (i. 6. 28) virtually comments on this, saying that "the former Phalguni's are the last night of the year, and the latter Phalguni's are the first night of the year." The Çatapatha-Brähmaṇa (vi. 2. 2. 18) puts it still a little differently: "the full moon of Phalguni is the first night of the year—namely, the latter one; the former one is the last [night]." All this, it seems, can only mean that, of two successive (nearly) full-moon nights in Phalguni, the former, when the moon is nearer the former Phalguni, is the last night of one year, and the other the first night of the next year; and the only conclusion to be properly drawn from it is that the full-moon of the month Phālguna divides the two years. But Professor Jacobi, by a procedure which is to me quite unaccountable, takes the two parts of the statement as if they were two separate and independent statements, inferring from the one that Phālguna was recognized by the Brähmaṇas as a first month, and from the other that the summer solstice was determined by them to lie between the former and latter Phalguṇi's—as if the sun in the Phalguṇi's entered into the question at all, and as if the Brähmaṇas ever made any pretense to such astronomical exactness as would be implied in their drawing the solstitial colure between the former and the latter Phalguṇi's! What they have really done is bad and blundering enough, but quite of a piece with their general treatment of matters involving astronomical observation. For it is senseless to talk, in connection with the full moon in Phālguna, of a year-limit between the two Phalguni's; if the definition would fit the circumstances in a given year, it could not possibly do so in the year following, nor in the year after that, nor ever in two years in succe-
sion. All that we have any right to infer from these Brähmaṇa passages is that they recognize a reckoning of the year (among others) that makes it begin in Phālguna; and this might be for one of a great many reasons besides the occurrence of the solstice near that group of stars four thousand years before Christ. In fact, all inferences drawn from varying beginnings of the year, in one and another and another month, seem to me helplessly weak supports for any important theory. With their customary looseness in regard to such matters, the ancient Hindus reckoned three, or five, or six, or seven seasons (ṛtū) in the year; and there was no controlling reason why any of these might not have been given the first place—the vacillating relations of the lunar months to the actual seasons adding their share to the confusion. Of course, any given month being taken as first, the ancient four-month sacrifices, of primary importance, would be arranged accordingly.

Professor Jacobi even tries (though with becoming absence of dogmatism) to derive a little support from the names of the two asterisms which, with the vernal equinox at Mrīgačiras (Orion’s head), would enclose the autumnal equinox, namely Jyeṣṭhā ‘oldest’ before the equinox, and Mūla ‘root’ after it: the former, he thinks, might designate the “old” year, and the latter be that out of which the new series springs and grows. But how should jyeṣṭha, ‘oldest’ or ‘chief,’ ever come to be so applied? The superlative is plainly and entirely unsuited to the use; and an asterism does not suggest a year, but only a month; and the asterism and month just left behind would properly be styled rather the “youngest,” the most recent, of its series. If we are to determine the relations of the asterisms on such fanciful etymological grounds (after the manner of the Brähmaṇas), I would repeat my suggestion, made in the notes to the Sūrya-Siddhānta, that Mūla (tail of the Scorpion) is ‘root’ as being the lowest or southernmost of the whole series; that Jyeṣṭhā (Antares etc.) is its “oldest” branch, while in Viśākhā ‘divaricate’ (α and β Libræ) it branches apart toward Svātī (Arcturus) and Cindrā (Spica); this is at least much more plausible than our author’s interpretation.

Finally, after claiming that these various evidences “point unmistakably” (untrüglich) to the asserted position of the equinox at Orion in the oldest Vedic period, Professor Jacobi goes on as follows: ‘The later Vedic period has applied a correction, consisting in the transfer of the initial point to Kṛttikā (the Pleiades); and this very circumstance gives their determination a real significance; it must have been nearly right at the time of the correction.” Here he seems to me to be wanting in due candor; I cannot see that he has any right to make such a statement without at least adding a caveat: “Provided the system of asterisms was really of Hindu origin and modification,” or something else equivalent to this. Doubtless he cannot be ignorant of the discussions and discordance of opinion on this subject, nor unaware that at least some of those who have studied it most deeply hold views which would deprive his statement of all value. If the asterismal system were limited to India, there would be much less reason for regarding it as introduced there from abroad—and yet, even in that case, some would
doubtless have been acute enough to suspect a foreign origin. But it is found (as was pointed out above) over a large part of Asia; and the only question is whether it was brought into India or carried out of India. What possible grounds has Professor Jacobi for regarding its Indian origin as so certain that the opposing view has no claim even to be referred to? The eminent French astronomer Biot thought that he had proved it primitively Chinese, by an array of correspondences and historical evidences alongside of which our author's proofs of a remote antiquity for the Veda make no show at all. Other scholars—e. g. Sédillot—have been as confident that the system had its birth in Arabia. Weber and I, on whatever other points we may have been discordant, agreed entirely, some thirty-five years ago, that it must have been introduced into India, probably out of Mesopotamia; nor, I believe, has either of us seen any reason for changing his conviction since. And I know of no modern scholar whose opinion is of any value that holds and has endeavored to show the contrary. Nothing in the Rig-Veda nor in the Brāhmaṇas, and nothing in the later Sanskrit literature, tends in any degree to give us the impression that the ancient Hindus were observers, recorders, and interpreters of astronomical phenomena. On the contrary, their treatment of such facts (we have already seen an instance or two above) shows the same looseness and heedlessness that is characteristic of the Hindu genius everywhere in its relation to objective truths, to successive historical occurrences. That no hint of the existence of a planet can be found in the Rig-Veda is enough by itself to show that the Hindus of that period had not devised an asterismal system. A late hymn or two, and passages in the Brāhmaṇas, show the recognition of a year of 360 days, divided into 12 months of 30 days each, beside a system of lunar months, which would give a year of only 354 days: what their relation to one another, how their differences were reconciled, and by what method either reckoning was kept in unison with the true year, no one knows. The earliest so-called "Vedic" astronomical manual (vedāṅga), the Jyotisha, whose first object, seemingly, it ought to be to give rules on such points, is mostly filled with unintelligible rubbish, and leaves us quite in the lurch as regards valuable information. And when, not long after the beginning of our era, the Hindus had borrowed from Greece a true astronomical science, the product of long-continued and accurate observation, they at once proceeded to cast it into an artificial form, founded on assumed and consciously false data, adapting it to purely closet use, with exclusion of further observation: taking in as part of the data a grossly inaccurate determination of the positions of certain selected "junction-stars" (yogatārd) of the asterisms, which positions they called dhruva 'fixed,' thus virtually denying the precession. That such observers and reasoners as these should have been capable, some four or five thousand years before Christ, of determining, or believing themselves to have determined, the position of the summer solstice as between β and δ Leonis lacks to my mind any semblance of plausibility. Instead of shifting the beginning of the asterismal series from Mr̥gaśiras (Orion's head) to Kr̥ttikā (Pleiades) in the later Vedic period, I hold it as alone
probable that they received the system from abroad with Krūttikā at its head, and would probably have retained it in that form until the present day but for the revolution wrought in their science by Greek teaching. When the beginning was shifted from Krūttikā to Ācvinī (Aries), it was for good reason, and owing to the change of position of the equinox; but the credit of this belongs to the Greeks, and not to the Hindus.

If Professor Jacobi’s main argument is thus wholly destitute of convincing force, neither can we attribute any greater value to the supporting evidence which he would fain derive from the mention of a polar star (dhrūva, lit’ly ‘fixed’) by the Gṛhya-Sūtras, solely and alone as something which a bride is to be taken out and made to look at on the evening of her wedding-day. For such observers, and for such a trifling purpose, any star not too far from the pole would have satisfied both the newly-wedded woman and the exhibitor; there is no need of assuming that the custom is one handed down from the remote period when a Draconis was really very close to the pole, across an interval of two or three thousand years, during which there is no mention of a pole-star, either in Veda or in Brāhmaṇa.

The success of the author of the other work here considered in establishing his kindred thesis is, as will readily be inferred, no better. Mr. Tilak is not by profession a student of Indian antiquity, nor of astronomy, but a lawyer—a pleader and lecturer on law in Poona. He was, as he states, led to his investigation by coming upon Krishna’s claim in the Bhagavat-Gītā “I am Mārgaṇija among the months,” ascribing to it an importance and authority which, considering the late date and secondary origin of that episode of the Mahābhārata, Western scholars would be far from endorsing. The investigation is carried on in an excellent spirit, with much and various learning, and with commendable ingenuity; it assembles many interesting facts, and makes some curious and attractive combinations; but, as appears to me, its arguments are in general strained, its premises questionable, and its conclusions lacking in solidity. A book larger than his own would be needed to discuss fully all that the author brings forward: nothing more can be attempted here than to excerpt and comment upon leading points, in such a way as to give a fair impression of his strength and his weakness.

Mr. Tilak’s main object is, as already intimated, to establish that the asterism Mārgaṇija (lit’ly ‘deer’s head’) with its surroundings, or the constellation Orion with its neighbors, was a great center of observation and myth-making in the earliest time, even back to the period of Indo-European or Aryan unity—and this, not only because of its conspicuous beauty as a constellation, but also, and principally, for its position close to the vernal equinox in the fifth millennium before Christ: somewhat, it may be added, as the equal or superior prominence of the Great Bear is due in part to its character as a constellation, and in part to its place near the pole.

To this central point of the value of Orion we are conducted by a well-managed succession of stages. After a general introductory chap-
ter, on which we need not dwell, the second is entitled "Sacrifice aliud the Year;" and in it begin to appear the misapprehensions to which reference has been made above. That there is a close relation between natural periods of time and the sacrifices is a matter of course: the morning and evening oblations depend upon the day; the new-moon and full-moon ceremonies, upon the natural month; the four-month or seasonal sacrifices, upon the recognized seasons; and so, when the round of the year had made itself plain, there were established rites to mark its recurrence. But Mr. Tilak appears to hold that the year was fixed and maintained by and for the sake of the great sattra ("session") or protracted sacrifice that lasts a whole year. Unmindful of the fact that every ceremony of more than twelve days is called a sattra, and so that there are sattras of a great variety of lengths, even year-sattras for variously measured years, and (at least theoretically) for series of two or more years; failing also to see that they are, all of them, the very superfetation of a highly elaborated sacrificial system, implying orders of priests, accumulated wealth, and, one may even say, regulated city life—he views (pp. 13-14) the year-sattra as a primitive Indo-European institution, the necessary auxiliary to a calendar. "Without a yearly sattra regularly kept up, a Vedic Rishi could hardly have been able to ascertain and measure the time in the way he did. . . . The idea of a sacrifice extending over the whole year may be safely supposed to have originated in the oldest days of the history of the Aryan race." Then, in order to trace back into the Rig-Veda a recognition of the two ayanas ("courses") or halves of the year, the northern and the southern—those, namely, in which the sun moves respectively northward and southward, from solstice to solstice, or else (for the word has both varieties of application) on the north and on the south of the equator, from equinox to equinox—he determines that meaning to belong to the Vedic terms devayāna and pītṛyāna: and this is an utter and palpable mistake; the words have no such value; devayāna occurs a dozen times, usually as adjective with some noun meaning 'roads,' and never signifies anything but the paths that go to the gods, or that the gods go upon, between their heaven and this world, to which they come in order to enjoy the offerings of their worshipers; and pītṛyāna, occurring only once, designates in like manner the road traveled by the Fathers or manes, to arrive at their abode. There is, in fact, nothing yet brought to light in the Rig-Veda to indicate, or even intimate, that in its time such things as ayanas and equinoxes and solstices, regarded as distances and points in the heavens, had ever been thought of; everything of the kind that the author of Orion thinks to find there is projected into the oldest Veda out of the records of a much later period. And these two fundamental errors are enough of themselves to vitiate his whole argument.

The next chapter (III.) is entitled "The Krittikās." Over its main thesis—namely, that in the earlier time the asterismal system began with Kṛttikā (Pleiades) instead of Açvin (Aries)—we need not linger: that is conceded by everyone, and has been sufficiently set forth above: together with, it is believed, its true explanation. The (as concerns
this point) crucial question respecting the origin of the system Mr. Tilak barely mentions in his Introduction (p. 6 ff.), declining to enter into any discussion of it: and, from his point of view, not without reason; for if he is in a position, as he claims, to prove that India had a yet earlier system beginning with Mrigaçiras (Orion), he has demonstrated the Hindu origin, in spite of all that has been said and can be said against it. A considerable part of the chapter is taken up with a full quotation, accompanied by translation and discussion, of two parallel passages from the Tāttirīya and the Kāushitaki Brāhmaṇas, respecting the times of consecration for the year-sattra. Four different times are prescribed in succession: the last quarter in the month Māgha, the full-moon of the following month Phālguna, the full-moon of the next succeeding month Kātra, and four days before the full-moon (i. e., doubtless, of Kātra; but some native authorities regard Māgha as intended: see Weber, Nakshatras, ii. 343); objections are raised to the convenience of the first two, and the others (virtually one) are approved as acceptable. If, now, this sattra were, as Mr. Tilak assumes and fully believes, a counterpart of the year, established in primeval times, on competent astronomical knowledge, for the purpose of keeping the calendar straight, and accordingly adapted precisely to the movements of the sun; and if its vishuvant or central day (with 180 days of ceremonies in a certain order preceding it, and 180 days of the same in a reverse order following it) were attached necessarily to an equinox, because the word vishuvant implies an equal division of the day between light and darkness: and then if there were no way of explaining the series of alternative beginnings excepting by recognizing two of them as conservative traditions from times that fitted these astronomical conditions—then, and only then, we could use them as sufficient data, inferring from them the positions of the equinox, and hence the epochs, at which they were successively established. But all these necessary conditions appear to be wanting. Weber, in his essays on the Nakshatras (ii. 341 ff.), quotes and expounds the same Brāhmaṇa passages in full. He demonstrates yet other allowed seasons for beginning the year-sattra, out of the Kāushitaki-Brāhmaṇa itself and out of the Sūtras. So far as any preference is shown in connection with the incidence of the vishuvant-day, it is for the solstice instead of the equinox. And the texts which set forth the different dates side by side are plainly unaware of any deeper reason for the choice of one instead of another. In short, there is nothing to be fairly inferred from these quoted passages except that considerable diversity prevailed in practice, and was allowed, as regards the time for commencing the sattra, and that the element of astronomical exactness did not enter into the case at all. How, indeed, should it do so, when the date was attached to any one of the constantly shifting lunar months? no fixation expressed in such terms could ever be accurate two years in succession. If there had been among the primitive Indo-Europeans, or among the earliest Hindus, science enough to establish such a rite by a certain sidereal position of the sun, there would have been enough to keep it there, without transference to an ever-oscillating date.
The next chapter is called "Agrahāyaṇa," and is devoted to a learned and ingenious argument to prove that, as the word agrahāyaṇa means 'beginning of the year,' and is recognized as a name for the month Mārgaśirsha (with the moon full near Orion), that month must have been at one time regarded as first of the twelve (or thirteen). This may be freely granted, without at all implying that the asterism Mrgačiras (Orion's head) was ever first of the asterismal series, and for the reason that it lay nearest to the vernal equinox. The extended and intricate discussions into which Mr. Tilak enters as to the relation of agrahāyaṇa and its derivatives, agrahāyaṇi etc., as laid down and defended by various native lexicographers and grammarians, are rather lost upon us, who value far more highly a few instances of actual and natural use in older works than the learned and artificial lucubrations of comparatively modern Hindu savants; that agrahāyaṇa itself designates the asterism Mrgačiras, and so proves it to have been first asterism of a series beginning and ending with the year, is by no means to be credited, in the absence of any passages exhibiting such use, and against the evidence of all the analogies of asterismal nomenclature.

In the following chapter, "the Antelope's Head," we come to the very center of our author's position. By the name antelope's or deer's head (mrğaciras) has been generally understood the little group of inconspicuous stars in the head of Orion, constituting one of the series of asterisms, while the brilliant star α in his right shoulder constitutes another, called Ārdra ('wet'); the whole constellation of Orion has been viewed as the antelope (mrğa); and, correspondingly, the neighboring Sirius is named mrğavajāda 'deer-hunter,' while the three stars of Orion's belt, which point just in the direction of Sirius, are the "three-jointed arrow" (īsus trikāṇḍā) shot by the hunter. Mrgačiras, as so understood, is in itself an insignificant group, and we have some reason for wondering why the bright γ, Orion's left shoulder, was not selected instead; but the general constellation is so conspicuous that anything standing in a clearly definable relation to it might well be regarded as sufficiently marked; and, at any rate, the identity of this group as the asterism is established beyond all reasonable question by the circumstance that it is accepted as such in the two other systems, the Chinese and the Arab. Mr. Tilak, however—under what inducement, it seems difficult to understand—desires to change all this, and to turn the entire constellation of Orion into a head, with what we call the "belt" running across the forehead at the base of the horns. By so doing he cuts loose altogether from the traditional asterismal systems, makes up an unacceptable constellation with some of the brightest stars omitted, and regards the deer as shot through the top of the skull with the arrow, as if this had been a rifle-bullet. All this, though our author values it so highly as to make his frontispiece of it, is to be summarily rejected. If the Hindus of the Brāhmaṇa period saw, as they plainly did, a deer (mrğa) in Orion, it should be enough for us that the asterismal system adopts its head as one member; the establishment of the deer itself might be as much older as there is evidence to prove it. Mr. Tilak tries to find something relating to it in the Rig-Veda, by point-
ing out that the dragon slain by Indra is more than once spoken of there as a "wild beast" (mṛga: this is the original, and in ancient times the only, meaning of the word); and that, as he claims, Indra cuts off the head of his foe the dragon; but here, as nearly everywhere that he appeals to the Rig-Veda, his exegesis is faulty; two of his three passages speak of "splitting" (bhid) the head, and the other of "crushing" (sam-pis) it; no cutting off is alluded to; and all attempts to find in the earliest Veda a severed head of a mṛga, in whatever sense of the word, are vain. If, as he asserts, there are Hindus at the present time who point out the belt of Orion as the asterism Mṛgaçiras, that can be nothing more than a popular error, substituting for one group of three stars another and brighter one in its vicinity, and easily explainable of a people who have long been notoriously careless as to the real identity of their asterisms.

Then the author goes on to find in the Milky Way, near by, the river that separates this and the other world, and in Canis Major and Canis Minor the two dogs that guard it on either side, and the two dogs of Yama, and the dog of the Avesta, and Saramá, and Cerberus, and the dog whom (RV. i. 181. 18: see below) the he-goat accused of waking up the Ribhus—all very ingenious and entertaining, but of a nature only to adorn and illustrate a thesis already proved by evidence possessing a quite other degree of preciseness and cogency. We are taught to regard the deer, the hunter, and the dogs as originally Indo-European, the dogs having been later lost (from the sky) by Hindu tradition, and the hunter (as distinguished from the deer) by Greek tradition. Throughout the discussion, the treatment and application of Rig-Veda passages is far from being such as Western scholarship can approve; and the same is the case with the final conclusion of the chapter, that "the three principal deities in the Hindu mythology can be traced to and located in this part of the heavens"—the trio being Vishnu, Rudra, and Prajāpati.

The sixth chapter, "Orion and his Belt," continues the same argument, and with evidences to which we must take equal exception. Ağrahāyaṇa and its derivatives are again brought forward for explanation, and its hāyaṇa is made out to come probably from ayana, with an indifferent ā prefixed (for which various supporting facts are adduced, as hiṇav and īnv) and the vowel lengthened; and thus ağrahāyaṇi is identified with āgrayaṇi, the sacrifice of first fruits, while the latter is further on identified with the name Orion. The number of the planets is found to be "fixed at nine" (with anticipation, it is to be inferred, of the discovery of Uranus and Neptune), since there are nine grahas or 'dips' of liquid oblation at the sacrifice (the common name of a planet being also graha). The sacred thread of the Brahmins comes from Orion's belt as its prototype; and the belt, staff, and antelope's skin of the Brahmanic pupil commencing his Vedic study go back equally to Orion's trappings. The chapter has no direct bearing upon the main question of the work, and these details are quoted only as illustrating the degree of the author's prepossession in favor of his theory of the immense importance of Orion. And the first part of
chapter VII. "Ribhus and Vrishākapi," is of the same character. It is suggested that the means—turiyena bhramayā (RV. v. 40. 6), 'by the fourth prayer'—which the sage Atri employed successfully in bringing the eclipsed sun back into the sky, was perhaps a quadrant or some similar instrument. Planets are recognized in bhaspati, in ākra and mānthin, and in vena, both vena and ākra (= cypris) being names of Venus—and so on. Then the principal part of the chapter is devoted to the discussion of a couple of obscure legends from the Rig-Veda. At i. 181. 13 we read thus: "Having slept, ye Ribhus, ye asked: 'Who, O Agohya, hath awakened us?' The he-goat declares the dog to be the awakener; in a year thus to-day have ye looked out (i.e. opened your eyes);" and iv. 38. 7 says that the Ribhus slept twelve days as guests with Agohya. If, now (as has been suggested also by others), the Ribhus are the divinities of the seasons (which is reconcilable with some of their described attributes, though by no means with all): and if Agohya, lit'ly 'the unconcealable one,' is the sun; and if the twelve days of recreation are the twelve that must be added to the lunar year to fill it out to a solar one (one, unfortunately, of 366 days, which neither Vedic tradition nor astronomy sanctions): and if "in a year" (sāvat-sare) means distinctly 'at the end of the year' (which might be if the sleep had been of a year's length, but is far less probable, if not impossible, supposing it to have been of twelve days only)—then the dog that roused them (or, at least, was accused of having done so by the he-goat, whom Mr. Tilak this time interprets to be the sun), presumably in order to recommence their duties at the beginning of a new year, may have been Canis Major (although this is nowhere called a dog in Hindu tradition, the Hindus, as we saw above, having lost that feature of the original Indo-European legend); and this would imply the sun's start upon his yearly round from a vernal equinox in the neighborhood of Orion, at four to five thousand years before Christ. Doubtless it will be generally held that a conclusion depending on so many uncertainties and impossibilities is no conclusion at all. If it were already proved by sound evidence that the Hindus began their year, at the period named, from an observed equinox at that point in the heavens, then the interpretation of the legend offered by our author might be viewed as an ingenious and somewhat plausible one; but such an interpretation of such a legend is far too weak a foundation to build any belief upon.

As for the Vrishākapi hymn (RV. x. 86), the use made of it in the chapter seems utterly fanciful and unwarranted. Of all who have attempted to bring sense out of that strange and obscure passage of the Rig-Veda, no one is less to be congratulated on his success than Mr. Tilak. His discussion of it is only to be paralleled with the endeavor to extract sunbeams from cucumbers, and does not in the least call for examination or criticism in detail. Nor need we spend any words upon the final chapter, "Conclusions," in which the theories and suggestions of the work are gathered and presented anew, without added evidences, in their naked implausibility. Our own conclusion must be that the argument is wholly unacceptable, and that nothing has been brought forward, either by him or by Jacobi, that has force to change the hitherto current views of Hindu antiquity.
6. On the third volume of Eggeling’s translation of the Catapatha-Brähmana, with remarks on “soma = the moon”; by Professor Whitney.

Having presented to the Society (see Proceedings for October, 1882, and for October, 1888: Journal, vol. xi., p. cxxxi.; and vol. xiv., p. vii) criticisms on the first and second volumes of Eggeling’s translation, I feel called upon not to let the third pass without a few words of notice. It brings us to the middle of the Brähmana, and counts as vol. xii. of the Sacred Books of the East. When that series comes to an end (if it ever does), it is to be hoped that some provision will be made for the completion of this extremely important work; that it should be left a fragment would be the greatest pity, and little to the credit of those who are responsible for the planning and carrying out of the enterprise.

The volume contains three of the fourteen books constituting the Brähmana. Book v. concludes the exposition of the regular soma-sacrifices, being chiefly occupied with the vijapeya and rījasūya ceremonies, and, at the end, with the sāutrāmaṇḍi; on these, Weber has lately published important monographs.* Then books vi. and vii. give the first part of the interminable discussion of the agnicayana, or building-up of a fire-altar out of specially prepared bricks and other objects: something quite apart from the general order of Vedic rites, and apparently of comparatively modern origin; and, as Weber points out in his detailed description of the ceremony in the Indische Studien (xiii. 217 ff.), the language of the Brähmana here takes on certain peculiarities, as if this part were from another hand or another school than that which produced the preceding books.

That the volume is, upon the whole, an industrious and instructive piece of work, a trustworthy representative of its original, and supported by notes generally valuable and helpful, is a matter of course. It is, as ought to be the case, perceptibly superior to its predecessors; the occasional striking misapprehensions of meaning which had to be pointed out in them are here hardly to be found—whether from absence of occasion of their occurrence, or because the translator has learned much by experience; for it does not appear that he has been willing now, any more than hitherto, to submit his version to a careful and searching revision. The lack of this is indicated by the not very rare omissions of words or phrases or sentences of the original (toward fifty such cases have been noted): sometimes (as in v. 3. 3. 10; vi. 2. 1. 7; 3. 3. 14; 6. 2. 7; 7. 2. 2; vii. 1. 1. 7; 3. 2. 10; 5. 2. 38) he skips from one occurrence of a word to a later one, losing what intervenes, to the extent even of a line or more; but usually only a word or two is let slip (examples are: mahate twice, v. 3. 3. 12, and repeated at v. 4. 2. 8; cīras, v. 4. 1. 9; itare, v. 4. 2. 1; yuṣmās, vi. 4. 4. 16; vittam, vi. 6. 2. 4; rikta, vii. 1. 2. 9; saṁvatsares, vii. 1. 2. 11), or even a part of a word.

(as -stomam, v. 1. 3. 1; a-, v. 5. 4. 38, turning the negative statement into a positive). The same carelessness is shown in certain uncorrected errata: e. g., shed for sheds (du.), v. 2. 1. 28; lord for lords, v. 3. 8. 11; hip for hips (du.) vii. 5. 1. 35; seed once (vi. 4. 3. 2) for seat and once (vii. 3. 1. 36) for sand; head (vi. 5. 4. 16) for heat; substance for sustenance (ūrj; vi. 7. 3. 8); saline salt for saline soil, vii. 1. 1. 7; worship for worshiper (dāvāhā; vii. 3. 1. 29).

That the translator takes rather lightly his task of turning the Brāhmaṇa into English may be instructively shown by a notable example out of his second volume. There is a certain combination of a root with prefixes, mad with upa- + ni, which occurs (as far as known) only three times in the language, all in the third and fourth books of this Brāhmaṇa; and upon their interpretation depends in no small degree the important question whether a second root mad requires to be recognized. On turning to see what are the views of Professor Eggeling upon this point, we find that once (iii. 7. 3. 11) he renders the verb in question by “quiet them” (impr.), once again (iv. 3. 2. 4) by “he quickens,” and the last time (iv. 6. 9. 6) by “he encourages”—in each case, plainly without any apprehension of the points involved, or any consciousness of the other two cases; and also without any reference to the Petersburg Lexicon, whose interpretation is quite different. After making this experience, one feels that he cannot regard the author’s translation of any critical word or phrase as expressing his deliberate opinion of its meaning, because one cannot be certain that it attracted his serious attention.

So, further, when we find a word rendered in a great variety of different ways, it is presumably because the translator did not think it worth while to take the trouble to be consistent. A fair degree of consistency in such matters appears to me to be demanded in order to represent faithfully such a text; the Brāhmaṇa is not so much a literary monument as a technical treatise, of which the accords and differences of expression have their decided value. For example, in books vi. and vii. the verb upa-dhā, lit’lly ‘put to,’ is in constant use to signify the addition or laying on or putting in of the bricks etc. that compose the fire-altar. As such it ought, in my opinion, to have a constant representative, departed from only under stress, and with notification of the departure. But the translator, for no discoverable reason more serious than the attainment of a pleasing variety of expression, renders it with a great number of discordant phrases: for example (for doubtless some have escaped my notice), pile up, build up, fill up, put on, place on, lay on, put in, put down, lay down, set down; and also bestow (e. g. p. 383), give (396), endow (380): these last being fairly to be called mistranslations, as they import into the term some thing which it does not itself contain. So, again, at v. 3. 4. 3 ff., the verb groh is used formally, nineteen times in succession, of the ‘taking’ or ‘dipping’ of various kinds of water as ingredients of a compound; in the majority of cases it is rendered “take,” but in several also “catch,” “catch up,” “draw.” For further examples we may quote: djya sometimes “butter,” sometimes “clarified butter,” some-
times "ghee" (and ghṛta, which is the word ghee, then on the same page, 79, rendered "clarified butter"); ud-yam, repeated in two successive lines (p. 189), "aim" and "raise"; nir-math "churn out" and "kindle" (217); açman "rock" (147), "pebble" (148), and "stone" as distinguished from pebble (158); rasa "sap, essence, vital sap, vital essence"; abhi-sic "anoint" and "sprinkle," and declared (88 n.) to mean lit. "sprinkle," which is an error, since it signifies 'pour on' —and so on, in numberless cases of greater or less importance, many of them trivial in themselves, and worthy of notice only as they illustrate the loose habit of the translator, and his unwillingness to be governed by anything but the suggestion of the moment.

Certain minor errors, also mainly attributable to carelessness in revision, may be pointed out: Pṛthīn instead of Pṛthī (p. 81); Cūnāh-çepha instead of Çepa (95 n.); "Indra" for āindrā (129), and "Varunā" for vārūṇa (405); "half-month" instead of 'half-year' for ayaña (394); "lay on the ground" instead of 'fell' for açiyyanta (880); "erect" for rohāti, as if it were causative (22, and similarly 278), and prati-thā also as causative (55); "over" instead of 'under' for antara (81–32); "may we obtain" for the aorist āpāma (100); anupāvaṃ rendered as if anurāpaṃ (166); "bearded" for tūpara (178); "innocuous" for anacanāya (305); "primeval" for tāvya (306); "skin" for vāpā (947); "foam" for abhra (419)—and so on; the examples might be multiplied; nor is it possible to distinguish accurately between such cases and more serious misunderstandings; of the latter class are more distinctly "prosper" for klīp (90, 107–8), "favor" for anu-sac (392), and so on. Then there are such unhappy selections of equivalents as "slaughter" for ā-laḥ (162 et al.), "rend saunder" for ava-dr (84 et al.), "cart" for ratha (188), "prayer" for yaņus (155 et al.). On p. 348 (vii. 3. 1. 23) he fails to notice that the root is as well as the adjective mahant goes to make up the artificial etymology of mahīṣa; and on p. 392 (vii. 2. 1. 11) it seems to escape him altogether that the forms of nir-arpay and nir-ṛch which are used are for the purpose of a play of words upon nṛṛtī. A somewhat similar case is at vii. 5. 1. 21, where he three times gives to prāṇayat the impossible meaning "breathed," not perceiving that only a pun is intended between it and prāṇa, and that it signifies 'he led forth' the breaths: the same pun is found also elsewhere (Pṛac. Up. iv. 3; JUB. iv. 18. 9). In a few instances the connection of the parts of a sentence seems to me wrongly apprehended: for example, at vi. 3. 1. 42, read rather "thereby it [is] gold; gold is immortal; the waters are immortal"; at vii. 1. 2. 19, rather "that is the ḍhavaniya, that the sky, that the head . . . that is the gārhapatya, that the foundation, this world"; at vi. 1. 1. 9, "whosoever there was here" belongs with "everything here"; at vii. 5. 1. 9, sukṛtasya qualifies loke: 'in the world of the well-done.'

A very notable oversight is committed at vi. 2. 2. 28, where, after speaking of the new moon, the text goes on to tell of what happens 'during the half-month of (her) increase' āpāryamāṇapakṣe, and the translator renders it "when his (Agni's second) wing is covered (with

---
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loose soil)"! And the true sense of the antithesis between adhidevatam and adhyātman (239, 248, 270) seems to be misconceived by him. After identifying certain things or certain parts of things with sundry divinities (the grounds being usually as obscure as those for the identification of soma with the moon), the Brāhmaṇa says: "to this effect as regards the divinities; now as regards one's self (or, the self);" and then follows a similar (and similarly obscure) identification of them with members or faculties or operations of human beings; such is plainly the sense in each of the three passages cited here, as it is elsewhere; and the translator is quite mistaken in conjecturing and suggesting (in parenthesis) a connection of adhyātman with Agni's "self" or body. I think him also plainly in error in translating the present passive participle as if it were perfect: antayoḥ satkṣriyamāṇyaḥ "after the two ends have been completed" (vii. 1. 2. 23 : cf. also p. 314, note 2); it should be while the two ends are being completed." At vi. 2. 3. 1 and several similar passages later, we are doubtless not to infer from his rendering teṣāṁ cetayamānām by whilst they were meditating" that he regards the expression as a genitive absolute; he is only giving a convenient and perfectly proper paraphrase of the literal meaning: 'of them, as they were meditating, Prajāpati' did so and so.

The translator still insists on viewing the pronoun ayaṁ when applied to the wind as the equivalent of asāṁ and requiring to be represented by yonder "the wind that blows yonder". So, too, as in the preceding volume we have read of the sacrificer's "lady" (patni), we now again, as result of a like spasmodic attempt to lift the style of the Brāhmaṇa up to a level with that of modern Society, meet with the "ladies" (gū́sā : vi. 5. 4. 7) of those elegant gentlemen the gods; and the mahiṣi (lit.'ly 'she-buffalo,' but applied also to a chief wife) appears in the grandiloquent disguise of a "consecrated consort" (vi. 5. 3. 1 et al.)!

When the Brāhmaṇa gives only the first words (pratikā) of a quoted verse, or those severally of a series of verses, the translator once (p. 218) adds in a note the version of them complete; but in a considerable number of cases (pp. 75, 259, 279, 382, etc. etc.) he fills out the verse or verses in his text, without even intimating by brackets that he is making additions: surely the former was the better way, and should have been followed throughout; in such a work we have the right to know just what the Brāhmaṇa gives and what it does not give. Per contra, although he usually has the utmost patience with its interminable repetitions, reproducing them faithfully, there are a few passages (pp. 80 bis, 85, 198, 398) where he abbreviates, putting in a representative pronoun instead of the detail of his original—by a weakness that is to be regretted, for the reason just pleaded above.

It is, of course, not impossible that, in one and another of the points here brought to notice, the translator may be working upon a text different from that which the published edition of the Brāhmaṇa lays before us. But that cannot be regarded as relieving him of responsibility with regard to these very points. That he should report differ-
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ences of reading, correcting the printed text where it requires correction, is what we have the right to expect of him. Weber’s text is very carefully edited, and unusually accurate, and it will unquestionably be very long before we have another to put in its place; and no one has such an opportunity as a translator, equipped with additional manuscripts and with commentaries, to test every word in it. To my mind, it is the bounden duty of the translator, under such circumstances, to note and make known every error that he detects in the published text. Doubtless it is an added burden to do so; but it is one that counts for almost nothing in the sum of what he has undertaken, and also in comparison with what it would cost another if undertaken separately; and to leave it wholly untouched is little better than shirking.

At the end of his Introduction, the translator steps aside, as it were, to add the weight of his full approval and acceptance to Hillebrandt’s recently published* views as to the relation between soma and the moon. It might have been more in place to mention Weber’s comprehensive essays, referred to above (though that on the rājasūya was perhaps published too recently for such mention), on account of their direct bearing upon the contents of the volume. And Hillebrandt might himself have been more gratified if the translator, who had now been dealing with soma and soma-sacrifices through sundry hundreds of pages, had, instead of merely pronouncing a general formal approval, brought forward at least a single item to support the asserted relation, showing where it seemed to have been in the mind of the authors of the Brāhmaṇa, and where its recognition would aid our comprehension of their rules and expositions. Are we not perhaps justified in assuming that he would have been much puzzled to do so? and, in that case, what is the value to him of the new truth? Without some support of this kind, his recommendation is only an idle form.

But, even as form, it is open to serious objection. Professor Hillebrandt, it says, has “fully established . . . the identity of Soma with the Moon in early Vedic mythology.” It is doubtless by an error of expression that Professor Eggeling seems to say here more and other than he means—or than Hillebrandt himself would claim. What he intends is rather that soma has been identified with the moon: which is a very different matter. If two things are identical, they are interchangeable without any (at least, considerable or essential) change of sense. On the other hand, objects that are very different may have had an identical origin; and objects originally very different may come to be a greater or less extent identified. And the Vedic Hindus have a perfect rage for identifications of things the most diverse; the volume before us, for example, teems with them, on almost every page. I open it at a venture, and I read: “[Agni] Vāiśvānara truly is the year, and Prajāpati is the year” (p. 57); and every student of the Brāhmaṇas

knows how it is elsewhere insisted on, with endless iteration, that Prajāpati and the year and the sacrifice are all one; accordingly, as the translator, to be consistent, would have to maintain, "this fully establishes the identity of Agni Vāiçvāna and Prajāpati and the year and the sacrifice in early Vedic mythology." Yet we know that they are four quite independent and discordant entities, and that to replace one of them by any one of the others in a given passage would be a very dangerous proceeding, justifiable only by a careful examination and convincing exposition of the reasons for it in the particular case. Is it otherwise than this with soma and the moon? Soma is, as all acknowledge, a derivative from the root su 'press out,' and means literally 'extract,' and all its primary uses are in accordance with this: a certain juicy plant is gathered on the mountains, and—at the time of the Brāhmaṇas, with infinite ceremony; earlier, doubtless quite simply—pounded and pressed, and the exuding liquid caught and filtered, mixed with certain added ingredients, and then drunk; and sometimes, when one drinks too much of it, the result is unfortunate; it comes out of him again by vomiting and purging, and the unhappy drinker has to submit to remedial or expiatory treatment. All this, now, according to the letter of Professor Eggeling's attestation, is true likewise of the moon! The absurdity of such an allegation is apparent to the dimmest eyes. But the hypothesis of original identity and later differentiation is equally excluded by the circumstances of the case. There remains as a possibility only the theory of secondary identification; and, in spite of our experience that the Hindus are ready, without apparent justification, to identify almost anything with almost anything else, we should regard this as incredible if it were not also incontestable; as every Sanskrit scholar knows, it is not buried in theosophical treatises only; it has spread into general usage, so that soma has come to be frequent among the many moon-names, and the two things have various appellations in common; although none of the really distinctive names of the moon, like candramāsa, is made a title of the drink soma.

Such being the condition of things, its investigation has two parts: first, what is the basis of the identification? what likeness or analogy suggested it at the beginning, and what others supported and maintained it, giving it finally such general acceptance? and, second, how early is it, and how pervading, and of what degree of importance in determining the view and treatment of the two things identified, in different writings and classes of writings? As for the first of these two divisions of the subject, Hillebrandt does not deem it worthy of the smallest attention; for all that he says about it, he might himself be a Hindu, and regard as quite natural and to be expected that a mild intoxicant and the queen of night should become mixed up with one another, to the partial loss of their separate identity. Herein lies, in my opinion, the weakness of Hillebrandt's work: the question of basis is not one of curious historical interest only; its answer must have an important practical bearing upon those involved in the other division. The latter are essentially questions of more and less; possibly, Sanskrit scholars in general have not recognized enough of the element of
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lunacy in the ecstatic soma-hymns; but also its presence in the measure claimed for it seems far from likely to be demonstrated. A considerable part of the author's reasoning seems to me to be underlain by this argument: it is very strange that the moon makes so small a figure in Hindu mythology and ceremony; on the other hand, it is strange that the drink soma should have been raised to such prominence as a divinity; hence, by a union of soma and the moon, the two unexplainables may be made in a manner to explain one another. I am not at all satisfied that their combination is an admissible one, or that the exaltation of soma is not sufficiently accounted for by its own merits; but I should reserve a confident opinion on such points till after a more thorough examination and consideration, on my own part and on that of others. Meanwhile, I cannot regard any facile endorsement like that of Professor Eggeling as contributing perceptibly to the decision of the question.

7. Transitive and intransitive verbs in Semitic; by Professor Paul Haupt, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

The following is an abstract of this paper, which will be published in full in the American Journal of Philology.

The difference between the so-called transitive and intransitive verbs in Semitic is not that the first class requires an object to complete the sense while the verbs of the second class express an action or state that is limited to the agent or subject; the distinctive features of the two groups are rather that the so-called transitive verbs express an action dependent upon the will of the subject, while the so-called intransitive verbs originally express an action or state not dependent upon the will of the subject, but beyond the control of the individual in question. Consequently it would be better to call them intentional and unintentional verbs: or, if a Latin term be preferred, verba voluntaria et involuntaria.

French entendre 'hear' (Arabic ʿamīda) would be in Semitic an unintentional verb; you often hear things which you do not want to hear. If you hear a paper, for instance, on transitive and intransitive verbs in Semitic, hear is a verbum voluntarium. The corresponding verbum voluntarium is écouter, 'listen,' Heb. hīqēḇh, or ḫʾāzīn, or hīqēḇ ʿazēn—all causative stems meaning 'give ear.' The same difference exists between Assyrian amāru 'see' and dagālu 'look at.' I see in Semitic really means 'my eyes were struck with the sight;' the Arabic ʿādā 'see' has therefore the characteristic semipassive vowel a in the imperfect, while the corresponding verbum voluntarium 'look at' is again expressed by causative stems in Hebrew: hībḥ, or hīqīf.

After this explanation, the involuntary or semipassive nature of the verbs hate, love, fear will be apparent. If to ride a horse is treated as a verbum involuntarium, it would seem as if the equestrian skill of the primitive Semites could not have been very great. Any one who has seen a man without any experience in horsemanship on the back of
a spirited steed will appreciate the semipassive vowel ə in ērub ‘he rides.’ It is interesting to note in this connection that the Hebrew expression for he dismounted is ‘he fell from the horse.’ ērub ‘he rides’ means simply ‘he was carried;’ the verb ēmūmītārāmīt would be ‘he manages a horse as an equestrian’ (אֵֽעְרֻב). īmūd ‘he learns’ means really ‘he is taught a lesson;’ the lesson is hammered into him. It is characteristic that the nominal derivative of īmūd ‘he learns,’ the noun malāḏīb, with prefixed m instrumentale, means not exactly ‘instrument of learning,’ but ‘ox-goad.’

8. The Origin of the Pentateuch; by Professor Haupt.

An abstract of this paper, which will appear in full elsewhere, is as follows:

The question has never been raised ‘why is the Hexateuch a composite structure? why did not the final editor re-write the whole matter in his own language? why were the older sources quoted in full with all their phraseological peculiarities as well as internal contradictions and incongruities, different accounts of one and the same event which mutually exclude one another?’

The only satisfactory theory explaining the origin of the Pentateuch, it seems to me, is that the pre-existing documents were incorporated because they could not be suppressed. The only thing the priestly editors could do in certain cases was to give objectionable traditional stories a parenetic setting emphasizing the spiritual lessons deducible from them. The church followed a similar policy in dealing with the heathen festivals of our Germanic ancestors: as the Christian priests found it impossible to abolish the ancient pagan rites, they endeavored to infuse Christian ideas into them.

The church has always connived at certain things, making concessions to popular prejudices; and this has been a wise policy. A compromise is always better than a revolution or radical reformation. The failure of Ezra’s first attempt at reformation immediately after his arrival in Jerusalem was probably due to the fact that he hoped to make the abstract system of P,* without the popular JED,* the canonical book of the post-exilic congregation. The law which Ezra brought from Babylonia in 438 was P (including H);* but the Torah which was proclaimed 14 years later, at the great public meeting convened by Nehemiah in 444, must have been P+JED combined: that is, practically our present Hexateuch (excepting later strata of P). It is not impossible that the combination of JED and P was effected under the influence of Nehemiah, who, being a courtier and a diplomat, was probably more in touch with the feelings of the people than the school

* For the explanation of these symbols consult the index to Driver’s Introduction to the Literature of the O. T.
of priests who had systematized the legal precepts of P in Babylonia* about 500 B.C. The haggadic elements of JE were necessary to clothe the halachic skeleton of P with flesh and blood. The prosaic legal framework of P, without the picturesque narratives of JE, was not adapted to the common people, and the combination of JED with P was the best way to counteract the effect of JE, which was too popular to be suppressed.

The Book of Joshua must have been cut off from the Hexateuch after the Torah had been proclaimed as the standard of the restored community in 444; and this separation was evidently made with the aim to emphasize the Mosaic origin of the Law. Certain elements of JE were no doubt eliminated, especially those that were at variance with P, but this process was most probably a gradual one: objectionable passages were pruned away or modified in the course of time; on the other hand, it became necessary subsequently to re-insert certain sections which had originally been excluded from the Deuteronomistic redaction of the historical books.

9. The Rivers of Paradise; by Professor Haupt.

The full text of this paper will be published elsewhere; the following is a brief abstract.

Gen. ii. 10-14 represents a subsequent insertion, written about 640 B.C. To expect an accurate geographical description of a distant region at such a date would be as unreasonable as the attempt to harmonize the account of creation given in the beginning of the Bible with the latest results of modern science.

The fourth and the third of the rivers mentioned are perfectly clear: the Euphrates and the Hiddekel, or Tigris, which flows east of Mesopotamia. The second, Gihon, must be a river originating from the same source as the Euphrates and Tigris, and afterwards flowing around the whole country of Cush, or Ethiopia. Of course, there is no such river; but if we remember that Alexander the Great thought at first that the sources of the Nile were in northwestern India (Arrian iv. 1; Strabo, § 696), there can be no doubt that the Hebrew narrator intended the Gihon for the imaginary upper course of the Nile in the Asiatic region east of the Tigris, as well as in the supposed eastern projection of Africa† joining eastern Asia.

The first river, the Pison,‡ is in the extreme east, most distant from

* P is influenced by Babylonian institutions; we can trace the Babylonian prototypes not only for certain Jewish rites, but also for certain technical terms of the Levitic priestly language. The term qor bōn 'gift' or 'offering' is a Babylonian loan-word; the euphemism "clean place" for "dumping ground" (Lev. iv. 12; vi. 11) is also found in the cuneiform incantations (iv. R². 8, 43; 14, no. 2, rev. 2).

† See e.g. the maps illustrating the growth of our geographical knowledge in W. Sievers' Aesten (Leipzig und Berlin, 1892), p. 5.

‡ For the form pibōn instead of *pibōn, see Barth's Nominalbildung, i. (Leipzig, 1889), p. xxix below.
the Palestinian writer. It is, therefore, mentioned first, and described more minutely. Not only the district around which it flows is mentioned, but also the products of that region: pure gold, bdellium,* and shoham stones, or pearls (Assyr. sānu,† properly the 'gray gem'). Ḥavlāh, i.e. the 'sandy region,' is the old Hebrew name for the Arabian peninsula (with the exception of northern Arabia); and the Pison, i.e. 'the broad stream,' flowing around Ḥavlāh, can be nothing but the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. The Hebrew narrator thought that the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea formed one 'broad river,' flowing around Arabia,§ but originating from the same source as the Euphrates and Tigris.

We may safely assume that the Palestinian writer fancied the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea to be much narrower than they are, and he may have believed that the yām-sūf or 'Weedy Sea,' i.e. the Gulf of Suez (and the Gulf of Akaba), was much larger. It would not be surprising if he had looked upon the yām-sūf, or Weedy Sea, as the sea into which the Pison, i.e. the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, emptied. A study of medieval maps will show that such an idea is by no means impossible. Besides, we must remember that the Assyrians called the Persian Gulf nāru marratu 'the bitter, or salt-water river.' The name is also applied to the universal sea, imagined as a broad circular stream surrounding Babylonia,|| just as Homer called the ocean encircling the disc of the earth ḫaraq. There is no sharp distinction between river and sea in Semitic; and maps on which the various rivers and seas appear in their proper proportions are quite modern.

---

* This is the gum resin of the balsamodendron mukul, which is often found mixed with myrrh. It is not impossible that Heb. bēḏēlah is an older name for myrrh, as suggested by Delitzsch (Paradies, p. 132). We may find a cuneiform name bidallūzu or bitallūzu some day: the d is probably due to a partial assimilation of the infixed t to the initial b.

† See Meissner-Rost, Bauinschriften Sanherib's (Leipzig, 1893), p. 25, 30; sā'ādāniš (Sarg. Cyl. 21) means 'like a pearl-diver' (عَذْرَص).

‡ Cf. H. Winckler, Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen (Leipzig, 1892), p. 146, n. 2.

§ If the Gihon is the Nile, and the Pison the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, then the upper course of the Gihon would naturally be further east than the Pison, unless we are ready to admit that the Hebrew narrator fancied that Ḥavlāh, which is washed by both the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, was situated west of the Nile. In a diagram exhibiting the vague geographical notions of the Hebrew narrator, it will be best to make the Pison the second river. This confusion does not surprise me at all. I have come across several students of Assyriology who did not know exactly whether the east river of Mesopotamia was the Euphrates or the Tigris. If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry? Besides, we must bear in mind that the lower course of the Pison, i.e. the Red Sea, is east of the lower course of the Gihon, i.e. the Nile.

|| See the Babylonian map published ZA. iv. 369: cf. vi. 175.
Of the mouth of the Euphrates and Tigris the Palestinian writer evidently had no accurate knowledge.* He certainly did not think that they emptied into the Persian Gulf, which he considered a part of the Pison. If he troubled himself at all about the question, he may have fancied that they disappeared in the swamps of southern Babylonia, just as the great Arabic geographers, who had a much better knowledge of the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris, believed that the Euphrates emptied into the swamps (قصب في البطانة) southwest of Babylon.†

10. On two passages of the Chaldean Flood-tablet; by Professor Haupt.

The goddess Ištar exclaims in ll. 123 and 124 of the Chaldean Flood-tablet: anākū-um aullada nišāl-đ-ma ki māre ṃune unmālā tāmtā-um.‡ I translated the passage in 1881 (sic)!, in my commentary on the cuneiform account of the Deluge printed in the second edition of Professor E. Schrader’s Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament (KAT.† 63. 15): ‘I do not bear my people that they should fill the sea like fish-spawn.’§ Delitzsch, in his great Assyrian Dictionary (p. 329 below), adopted my translation; but Professor Peter Jensen, of Marburg, in his Cosmology of the Babylonians (Strassburg, 1890), p. 419, remarks: “it is true, d may mean ‘not,’ but only in prohibitive clauses, and not at the end of such sentences” (against Delitzsch, Assyrr. Gramm., p. 215).

---

* Delitzsch (Paradies, p. 177) says: Ich gehe wohl nicht zu weit wenn ich behaupte, dass sich nur die Wenigsten bisher ein klares Bild vom Mündunggebiete des Euphrat und Tigris gemacht haben.

† See the map of the ‘Irāq in the Gotha MS. (written 1173 A. D.) of el-Iṣṭakhri (c. 950), reproduced in Aug. Müller’s Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland (Berlin, 1885), i. 576; and compare Reinaud’s Géographie d’Aboufïéda (Paris, 1848), ii. 1: pp. 54, n. 1; 65, n. 1. Also on the Babylonian map mentioned above the Euphrates empties into the apparu, or swamp (Z.A., iv. 367). Pliny (v. 26, sec. 90) says: Scinditur Euphrates a Zeugmate DLXXXIII millibus passuum circa vicem Massicen, et parte leva in Mesopotamiam vadit per ipsam Seleuciam, circa eam praefluentii infusus Tigrī; dextero autem alveo Babylonem quondam Chaldeae caput petit, mediumque permeans, item quam Mothrin vocant, distrahitur in paludes.

‡ I stated in my paper On a modern reproduction of the eleventh tablet of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic, printed in these Proceedings for April, 1893, p. xi. note †, that we seemed to have a masculine form tamma instead of tāmtu or tāmdu ‘sea’ in l. 133 of the Deluge text; but that I thought it should be read udma=Heb. ʿadāmāh ‘land.’ Some Assyriologists may feel inclined to combine tamma with the Arabic ʿṭma ‘sea.’

§ Ich aber gebäre die Menschen nicht dazu dass sie wie Fischbrut das Meer füllen.
This strange statement is characteristic of certain polemical remarks of Jensen's aimed at Delitzsch and myself: in order to be able to correct what he imagines to be our mistakes, he is obliged to distort the facts, and impune to us a blunder we never dreamed of. That is, of course, highly flattering for both Delitzsch and myself. Neither of us ever thought of combining ד-מה (cf. Heb. dl-nd) with the preceding clause. In my commentary of 1881, as well as in Delitzsch's lexicon, it is evident that we connect the negative particle with the following line. The position of the د at the end of the preceding line would be the same as in the last line of the Esarhaddon cylinder, i. R. 47, 56: i.e. Esarh. vi. 56 (=KB. ii. 150: cf. Abel Winckler, Keilschrifttexte, Berlin, 1890, p. 24 below).

Now I do not any longer believe that my former translation of the passage is correct, although it has been followed by so great an Assyriologist as Delitzsch (I shall state presently how the lines must be explained); but my interpretation proposed in 1881 is certainly better than Jensen's rendering (Cosmol., 429): "what I bore—where is it?" A beginner could tell Professor Jensen that this would be in Assyrian 𒃏 𒀭𒃏₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃�
Haupt, On two passages of the Chaldean Flood-tablet.

Strack in Herzog's Realencyklopädie, ix. 888, and cf. König, Einleitung in das A. T. (Bonn, 1899), p. 88. The ὁταξ λέγομεν ως γιμμάζεται, Num. xxxi. 5, means ‘they were sent forth.’ Assyry. muššuru is a synonym of Heb. šullāh (cf. Lev. xiv. 7, 58; Deut. xxii. 7; and II. 147, 150, 158 of the Flood-tablet). The Nifal nimsdr has the same meaning as the Pual šullāh, Prov. xvii. 11.

Hopkins University, by Mr. Edgar P. Allen, of the Johns Hopkins University (A. O. S. Proc. at Baltimore, Oct. 1887, p. ccxvii), one year before Dr. Muss-Arnolt became a member of the Assyrian Seminary of that University:

Chicago, 1894.

Um jedoch die Auffindung solcher Derivate, namentlich von schwachen Stämmen, zu erleichtern, sind alle Wörter auch in alphabetischer Ordnung mit Angabe des Verbalstammes, zu dem sie gehören, verzeichnet.


Die Stämme sind in der Regel in hebräischen Buchstaben gegeben. Hebräische und syrische Wörter sind in hebräischer Schrift citiert, . . . . äthiopische . . . . in lateinischer Transcription.

Die Anordnung der Konsonanten ist die von Haupt und Delitzsch in ihren Werken befolgte. Alle Anfangsgutturales werden unter K behandelt . . . . e. g. abu, . . . alaku ‘geben,’ aitbu ‘süße Milch,’ aqrabu ‘Skorpion,’ artbu ‘Rabe’ . . .

But, in order to facilitate the finding of words, especially of derivatives from feeble stems, all words . . . . . will be cited also in alphabetical order, with appended references to their stems.

This arrangement has two advantages: a survey will thereby be obtained of classes of words formed by the same prefix, and also an idea of the relative frequency of certain formations; it will, besides, be especially convenient for words whose stems are a matter of doubt.

The stems will be expressed in Hebrew letters. . . . Hebrew and Syriac words cited will be written in Hebrew. . . . while . . . Ethiopic . . . will be transliterated in Roman characters.

The arrangement of consonants will be according to the system first indicated by Professor Haupt, and followed by Delitzsch in his Dictionary: that is, all initial gutturals will be cited under K . . . for example abu ‘father,’ aldu ‘go,’ aitbu ‘milk,’ aqrabu ‘scorpion,’ and dritbu ‘raven.’

I deem it unnecessary to add a word of comment. As soon as Dr. W. Muss-Arnolt’s glossary is published, I shall review it in a special paper, in which I shall also discuss the history of the work and Dr. Muss-Arnolt’s card-catalogue or rather collection of slips.
The correct rendering of the two lines 128 and 124 of the Deluge-text is: "I will raise my people again, though they fill the sea like fishspawn." Dr. Muss-Arnolt has published my explanation in what he calls a revised translation of the Chaldean account of the Deluge (l. 116), published in the Chicago Biblical World (Chicago, 1894), iii. 109-118. Dr. Muss-Arnolt, however, appears to have misunderstood my philological reasons for this translation; he seems to think that the *ki* at the beginning of the second line (NE. 108. 15; 128. 1) is a concessive conjunction, like the Heb. *ki* in such passages as Eccl. iv. 14, כֵּ֥לֵי מִשְׁמַּאֲדֵי הָאָבִ֑רְדֵּי כִּ֖י נָ֑כִּים בֵּֽלָֽאֲרָה לְאֵֽלָּֽלִּ֖ד "though he may come from a family of outcasts," paraphrased by the following explanatory gloss:* כִּֽי נָכִֿים בֵּֽלָֽאֲרָה לְאֵֽלָּֽלִּד "though he may have been poor in (what subsequently became) his kingdom." *ki*, of course, in *ki māre nāne* can only be the kaph similitudinis. Dr. Muss-Arnolt's rendering of *ki māre nāne*, "although like the spawn of the fishes," would be on a par with Jules Oppert's translation of the fourth line of the Flood-tablet: u atta ul šandāta,† "the number of thy years does not change," where šandāta is made to express both years and change (see Johns Hopkins University Circulars, Feb. 1889, No. 69, p. 17s.). *ki māre nāne umālā tāmtā-ma* is a concessive circumstantial clause (Gesenius-Kautzsch (25), §160), introduced by the enclitic -*ma* 'and' appended to nīšā'd: cf. Heb. qē- in passages like Gen. xviii. 27; xxvi. 27; Is. xxxii. 1; Jer. xiv. 15; †† xlv. 18: l. 17, etc.). In an accurate rendering of the Deluge-text the concessive particle "although" must appear at the end of l. 123, not as the beginning of l. 124.

Now this question arises: can we take nīšā'd-mā as the noun nīšu with the suffix of the first person followed by the enclitic -*ma*? George Smith understood it so (Records of the Past, vii. 199, 14), and this interpretation is certainly favored by the fact that there is no space between nīšu and -*ma* on the original (cf. Beitr. z. Assyrr. i. 132, n.; † NE. 108, n. 7). The form nīšā'd is not exceptional; it is a form like abā'd 'my father,' šepā'd 'my foot,' etc. The singular nīšu is used because the godhead speaks of the post-diluvian race: nīšu'a means 'my race,' the plural nīšu'a would mean 'my races,' which would be less appropriate in this connection. It took some time, of course, before the post-diluvian race could develop into nīšu or different races.

The length of the a-vowel of the suffix is preserved under the influence of the enclitic -*ma*. The original form of the possessive suffix of

---

* Cf. the abstract of my paper On the Book of Ecclesiastes, in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 90 (June, 1891), p. 115 a below, note *.

† The overlapping -a is found especially in the permissive forms of the verba tertiae infirmae. The language tries to strengthen these forms as much as possible: cf. the feminine termination in the forms of the infinite construct in the verba tertiae in Hebrew, etc.

†† My remark, Beitr. z. Assyrr. i. 132, was known to Jensen, and should have prevented him from reading ullahani ši'a iama.
the first person sing. was -ydā, with a long final vowel: cf. Arabic pause forms, as ‘abdiyād (عبديا or عبديد) ‘my servant’ (Kosegarten, §1016, p. 444; Ewald, Gramm. arab. §387; Caspari-Müller, §36, note d).* We find the same lengthening in l. 41 of the Deluge (NE. 136): ina qaqqar Bel uš aššušu reššā-ma (or pānt’a) ‘on the ground of Bel (that is, terra firma) I cannot resist (the Flood).’ The passage has been very incorrectly translated. Dr. Muss-Arnolt (l. c., l. 38) renders: ‘On Bel’s earth I dare not live securely,’ following Jensen’s and Jeremias’s erroneous interpretation: ‘will auf Bel’s Ort mein Haupt nicht mehr niederlegen.’ Dr. Meissner, perhaps the ablest representative of the younger German school of Assyriology, translated (ZA. iii. 418; cf. BA. i. 390, ad p. 128): ‘nicht werde ich meinen Geist auf Bel’s Erde richten.’ Ṣakduša ša reššī, however, means nothing but ‘resist,’ † literally ‘make head,’ like our English idiom. Parnell, for example, said in his manifesto to the Irish people of America (March 18, ’91): “without your aid Ireland could not for one moment have made head against her oppressors.” We find the same phrase in NE. 51. 17: šališi šanna di ʿUrḫ lamū nakru, Ḩt sar ana nakrišu uš iššu qaqshaša ‘three years was the enemy besieging the city of Erech; the goddess Ḩt could no longer resist its (Erech’s) enemies.’

Another form like reššā-ma ‘my head’ is ɡuwrššā-ma ‘my youth,’ in l. 399 of the eleventh tablet of the Gilgamesh legends (NE. 147): anāku šakūl-ma ṣatna ana ša šu ɡuwrššā-ma ‘I will eat it$ and become again as I was in my youth.’

For the long -ā before the enclitic -ma cf. also Delitzsch’s Assyrian Grammar, p. 128; Jäger’s inaugural dissertation, p. 12, n.* =Beitr. z. Assyr. i. 453. We find the long -ā also without the -ma: Professor Bezold gives a number of passages in his transliteration of the El-Amarna texts in the British Museum, published under the misleading title Oriental Diplomacy (London, 1888, pp. 68, 70, sub abu ‘father’ and aḫu ‘brother’); and Professor Zimmern has some in his translation of the cuneiform letters from Jerusalem (ZA. v. 150, 7, 11; 152, 22, 5, etc.). Professor Bezold’s reading, abā‘u, is certainly wrong (cf. Bezold’s remarks, l. c. §3). Nor do I believe (with Jensen, ZA. v. 100) that a-bu-u-a-a was pronounced abāya.

* Compare the abstract of my paper on the possessive suffix of the first person singular in Assyrian, in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, May, 1894.
‡ For the use of the relative pronoun ša in this connection cf. Dr. Kretzschmar’s paper in Beitr. z. Assyr. i. 358 below.
Cases where the enclitic -ma is appended to the suffix of the first person without scriptio plena of the preceding final a-vowel of the possessive suffix of the first person sing. are quite common; we find several instances in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser I. (cf. Lotz, 118), in the annals of Assurnasirpal (cf. Ernst Müller, Z. A. i. 869), and in the el-Amarna texts (cf. Z. A. v. 166, 18), etc.

There are several points in Jensen’s translation of the Deluge-text which I do not approve of, and I hope to find the time to discuss some of them. It is undoubtedly true that the interpretation of the Deluge-text has been much advanced since I published my commentary thirteen years ago, chiefly through the works of Delitzsch and Zimmerm;* but several of Jensen’s remarks criticizing my translation† of 1881 are just as gratuitous as the specimens quoted above.

Let me give one additional exemplification. I said in 1881 that the cuneiform epithet of the Babylonian Noah, Atra-xastis or Xaslu-astra, i.e. ξασουρας,‡ had about the same meaning as the Hebrew יְגַל יְנָרָם יִשְׂרָאֵל 'a just and perfect man,' as Noah is called in the priestly narrative of the Biblical Flood. I stated that Xaslu-astra meant ‘wise and reverential, God-fearing.’ Now Jensen remarks (Cosmol.,

* Cf. e. g. Zimmerm, Buss-psalmen: 28. 1 (Pir-napištem); 118. 1 (attari, Delitzsch); 47 (dipārītī); 55. 1 (kazarratu); 17 (naplusu); 20. 10 (letu);—Delitzsch, Wörterbuch: 67 below (Ubara); 205 (Ubara-Tutu); 168. 1 (Adar); 185 (māraku ‘length!’); 139, below (šar); 248 (ezub); 127 (dē esibīsu); 126. 4 (āšu); 135 (addnu); 143 (iqrīdā); 133 (ait ‘along with’); 321 (kukkēt); 274 (ṭubat rigma); 314 (iqrīti); 238. 3 (vi. urra, vii. mākātī); 288, below (marī); 237 (urru imlāquat); 210 (ana nāši ul iddīn); 129. 3 (adagur); 222 (aban kididī); 262 (xastes); 250 (iṭēsis); 168. 2 (Atraxastis: cf. Beltr. z. Assyri., ii. 401), etc., etc.

† On p. 367 of his Cosmology, Jensen speaks of my Uebersetzungsversuche:

‡ As I stated in my note on Gilgamesḥ=Eīyāmaṣ (A. O. S. Proc. for April, 1893, p. ix, n. †). Mark Lidzbarski suggested that ξασουρας might be the prototype of the Arabic el-Khdhr, living at the confluence of the two great rivers (Koran, sura 18. 59 ff.), who is identified with the prophet Elijah, St. George, and the prime minister of Alexander the Great: ɣlukkas; and, of course, the Greek sea-god Γαῖαμος (Πάντιμος) is the same mythical personage (Z. A. vii. 320). Professor Bezdolt ought to have added (Z. A. vii. 109. 2, 320) that Lidzbarski’s and Dyroff’s remarks had been anticipated by Lenormant, Les Origines de l’histoire (Paris, 1882), ii. 13 (“L’analoge est si frappante qu’il est inutile d’insister davantage. J’ajouterai seulement que le mot Khidr lui-même n’est rien autre que la contraction de la forme grecque Xisathros, ou de la forme babylonienne ‘Hasis-Adra, transmise directement aux Arabes sans passer par le grec’). It would also have been well if Professor Bezdolt, before printing Lidzbarski’s and Dyroff’s articles in his Zeitschrift, had called their attention to Clermont-Ganneau’s paper Hors et Saint Georges, published in the Revue archéologique, nouvelle série, xxxii. 388–397, and cited by Lenormant, l. c. Compare also Lidzbarski’s reply to Dyroff in Parts 3 and 4 (issued Jan., 1894) of Bezdolt’s Zeitschrift, vol. viii.
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p. 385): “Warum an Xisuthros das Moment der Furcht besonders her-vorgehoben werden soll, versteht man nicht recht.” He fails to see why a word implying fear should be used as an epithet of the Babylonian Noah, who braved the terrors of the Deluge. Professor Jensen evidently considers this a very clever remark, otherwise he would not have distorted the facts in order to be able to bring it in. He knows, of course, as well as I do, that there is a difference between ehrfurch-tig, gottesfurchtig, and furchtbar, feige. When Bismarck made his famous remark in the Reichstag: “Wir Deutschen fürchten Gott und sonst nichts in der Welt,” he did not mean to emphasize “das Moment der Furcht.”* I have often noticed that certain men would rather make an inaccurate statement than sacrifice an aperçu which they consider “smart.” But indeed Xasis-atra or Atra-xasla after all means ‘most reverential or God-fearing, just and perfect,’ like the Hebrew שְׂמַּחַ וַתִּירְךָ. Atra stands, as Professor Jensen rightly pointed out, for ‘watra : it is a prefix which has about the same meaning as our prefixed arch-, or arrant, and is evidently identical with the Aramaic מְצִיר,† while Assyr. xasla has about the same meaning as Syriac סַּמָּךְ, i.e. ‘exceedingly wise.’ But wisdom according to Semitic ideas is religion,§ and ungodliness is folly; the fool says in his heart there is no God; and in Job xxviii. 38 (a polemical interpolation directed against the tendency of the poem) we read: “Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.” I recommend the last statement to Professor Jensen’s special consideration.

I need hardly add that the above remarks do not affect my appreciation of Professor Jensen’s wide reading and untiring industry, and of the breadth and originality of his views. I would only suggest in the most amicable manner that he select another corpus vile when he desires to practice himself in the facetious style of polemics.

* A similar rather “juvenilo” remark is Jensen’s statement, Cosmol., p. 384: “šamas-napištim könnte nur bedeuten ’Lebenssone.’ So bezeichnen zwar bei uns Verliebte einander [I], und ein solcher Ausdruck wäre für einen König eine vielleicht auch im Munde eines Babyloniers passende Bezeichnung; aber warum Xisuthros Lebenssone genannt werden konnte will mir nicht einfallen.” The fact that the reason for a certain name does not occur to Jensen hardly proves that the name is impossible.

† Cf. e. g. Dan. vii. 7, מִידִּים מְזוּבִּים (‘exceedingly strong,’ or vii. 19, מִידִּים מְזוּבִּים ‘exceedingly dreadful.’

‡ As Nöldeke, §§ 245, states, סָמַךְ may precede or follow the adjective to which it belongs. In Assyrian the adverbial accusative atra seems to have been prefixed in the older period of the language (Atra-xasla), and afterwards to have been affixed (Σιουoδροχύ = Xasis-atra).


This paper will merely glance at some of the features which distinguish the Hindu system of music from our own.

In editing a book of Christian lyrics for our converts in the year 1838,* it became necessary to study the principles of their musical science. My way was immediately blocked by the discovery that there were no treatises on the subject in the Tamil, the vernacular of that part of India. There was a brief one in Canarese, and others in Sanskrit, of which I could make little use till I should spend valuable time on those languages. I was further hindered by the jealousy of the native musicians whom I employed. All I got through them was by strategy; for they used every artifice to keep the arcana of their science shut up from my approach.

More than one hundred years ago, Sir William Jones, in Bengal, encountered the same difficulties. His articles on the "Musical Modes of the Hindus" were prepared by the aid of Pundits, employees of the court in which he was presiding judge. With every profession of frankness, these men either misinformed him or concealed the clues to some of the fundamental facts. The articles have been freely used in all encyclopedic notices of this subject. They develop many valuable facts, but contain also not a few errors.

Roman Catholic missionaries have always encouraged the use of native tunes and metres in the public and social worship of their converts. But Protestant missionaries, fearing their influence from association with idol worship in the temples and elsewhere, long opposed their use. Psalms and Hymns in English metres and set to English tunes were provided for them. These continued in general use through all our India missions for nearly half a century.

It is easy to see that these foreign forms would have no attraction, and would prove to be utterly impracticable, for a people who justly boasted a prosody of far greater elaboration than our own, and a musical science hoary with antiquity, which has remained essentially unchanged for unnumbered centuries, being in common daily use among all the nationalities of India, and to which even the most illiterate are passionately attached.

The philosophical works of the Hindus—all, as they claim, divinely inspired—classify the arts and sciences under sixty-four heads. Five of these treat of music. One, the twenty-second, regulates the modulation of sounds. The other four give rules for instrumental music. One is on the lute, another on the flute—the wind and the stringed instruments; the third and fourth treat of the tambourine and cymbals, which furnish time, measure, and rhythm for the tune. Music and tune are designated by the word rāka (Skt. rāga), signifying ‘love, emotion, passion'; for they regard this art as the God-given organ to express and impress emotion.

---

* Mr. Webb was for many years a missionary at Dindigal, in the Madura district, Southern India.
The octave or diatonic scale is, of necessity perhaps, the basis of their musical system, as of our own. Like ours, it has eight notes, the first and the eighth being in unison, with a ratio of one to two. It has also seven divisions or steps, five of which may be termed major and two minor, corresponding to the number of our tones and semi-tones. But here the correspondence ends; for, in their fractional proportions and mathematical ratios, tones and semi-tones differ radically throughout from the European gamut. Each of these seven notes has its name. The first is called Sakshma, the second Rishaba, and so on. Each is also designated by a single syllable, as with us. The syllable used for this purpose is the first of its name; thus, Sa for Sakshma, Ri for Rishaba, and the rest, Sa, Ri, Ga, Ma, Pa, Tha, Ni, for our do, re, mi, etc.; and they answer the purpose in practice quite as well. Two of the tones, the first and the fifth, Sa and Ga, are called Pirakruthi 'unchanged,' because they admit of no modification by division. The others—that is, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, or Ri, Ga, Ma, Tha and Ni—are variously subdivided. The fourth, or Ma, is divided but once. The other four have each two divisions. There are therefore found in the Hindu scale seven principal and nine subordinate notes, sixteen in all. As the principal, so also the subordinate notes have each its distinctive name, and with these names the musical experts are perfectly familiar. But they all acknowledge that in actual practice one subdivision only is admissible, so that four of the nine are simply theoretical. The American Encyclopedia says that the Hindu gamut is divided into twenty-two fractional tones; but this is an error. Theoretically they have sixteen, practically but twelve, as in our chromatic scale.

Many of their tunes find their most distinctive characteristic and attractive expression in the construction of the descending scale, which, in many of their modes, differs from the ascending both in the order of its tones and sub tones and in their mathematical ratio, somewhat as in our minor mode.

Hindu musicians claim that, though their system knows nothing of the intricate harmonies highly admired by Europeans, its attraction and excellence are far superior to ours, both for expression and impression: 1. Because of the scientific and artistic construction of their scales; 2. Because of the charming character and expression developed by them in their system of intervals; 3. Because of the scientific combination and succession which their system accords to these intervals; 4. Because of the skillful application of the variations developed in the descending scales.

The pitch or key of a tune, as well as the intensity and the timbre or quality of the tone, with the time and rhythm of the movement, are applied by us together with the scale in the construction of the tune. All these the Hindus treat with great elaboration as quite distinct though supplementary sciences, under the general term of Thāla. The marvelous ingenuity and infinite detail in the construction of the Thāla appear in the class-books used in the training of the dancing-girls in the temples. On one occasion I examined these books with some care. I
found them full of mathematical tables for the fractional division of
time in their movements. Their practice with these tables extends
through a period of eight or ten years of daily exercises. Once I was
present when a class of these girls carried on simultaneously five dis-
tinct rhythmical movements: one with the right hand; another, and
quite diverse, with the left; a third and fourth with each foot; and still
another with graceful movements of the head, all the time advancing
and receding with instrumental and vocal accompaniment. This was
an exhibition of consummate skill under the rules of their Thāla.

I have spoken of the scales and their subdivisions, also of their rules
for time, measure, and rhythm. I must now refer to the tunes which
are constructed of the scales. They are thirty-two in number, enu-
erated and described in their shastras. These thirty-two are treated as
classical genera, on the basis of which a multitude of others may be
and have been composed. Each one of these latter is related to its
theme as a species to its genus. Several of these original Vedic tunes
are adapted to the several forms of classic verse—one for Veppā, the
best or sacerdotal verse; another for Akavetpā, the heroic; another for
Kalipā, the mercantile; the fourth for Vanjippā, the agricultural.
Several are called tunes of place, supposed to express or awaken emo-
tions suggested by localities, as maritime, mountainous, or agricultural.
Some are appropriated to the seasons, as to spring and autumn; others
to the different parts of the day—to morning, noon, or evening. They
gravely object to singing or playing a morning tune in the evening
hour, when, as they say, the physical and mental condition is relaxed
and demands the soothing and rest which the intervals of the evening
minor modes suggest and promote. Other adaptations and modes or
arrangements of the scales are used for popular songs in religious wor-
ship. These last they call Patha Keerttina or Lyrics. Several of the
original thirty-two arrangements of the scale are intended for use on
special occasions: one to express joy, another sorrow; some for wed-
dings or for funerals, for felicitation or for condolence, for festive
scenes, for dancing or for martial inspiration.

Their skilful musicians are very quick not only to detect dissonance
or imperfect vocalization, but to criticise severely the admission of in-
tervals that are foreign to the mode or tune announced. After hearing
three or four intervals, they will announce the name of the tune, as
their scientific classification of tunes is largely determined by the char-
acter of the intervals and their order. For this reason they scorn our
European music. They despise it. They say it shows gross ignorance
of the first principles of the science. I have heard them say that while
in many of the arts and sciences, and in the amenities of our social life,
we greatly excel, in music and religion we are inferior, shallow, and
far in the rear. For with their religion, as with their music, they are
intensely conceited. They refer with infinite pride to their amazing
chronology as contrasted with the biblical—to their Brahma-Kalpa
of one hundred days in the life of the god, each of which numbers
4,320,000,000 years—over against our paltry 6,000 years.
The question is often asked how such delicate and intricate modes and melodies are preserved, and how they have been transmitted unchanged, as is claimed, from generation to generation through so many centuries? How have their identity and individuality been protected, with no musical staff or other device by which to make permanent record of the tones and intervals that distinguish them—to say nothing of the time, measure, pitch, and rhythm? To this they reply: 1. These modes and tunes were originally communicated to men by Brahma himself, who carefully guards them, as he does all his gifts; 2. They are all constructed in accordance with natural laws and principles that can suffer no change or variation; 3. By divine provision they were from the first permanently recorded on the lute. This instrument was invented, as they claim, under instruction from Brahma, by Nared, his own son. In the twenty-third of the sixty-four inspired treatises on the arts and sciences it is minutely described, with its seven strings and its key-board for frets, and very specific rules are given for its use; 4. Although they have no device like the European staff on which to record the scales, each of the twelve notes and subnotes, the three key-tones and the seven Thálas, or modes of time, positive and relative, with every prescribed variation of feet, measures, and rhythm, have their own specific name or designation announced in the shastras, and used there in their description, and well-known to every educated Hindu. By these means the preservation and accurate transmission of all the tunes of their elaborate musical system have been perfectly secured, as they claim, through all past ages, and are safe for all coming time.

12. On a Greek Inscription; by Prof. Isaac H. Hall, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y.

This inscription occurs on a bronze object shaped like the head-end of a tenpenny cut nail, with the upper part of the head convex and having rounded corners. Upon the head is a figure now obscure, but apparently the representation of an equestrian soldier. The dimensions of the object are as follows: extreme length, 3.7 centimeters; head, 1.3 centimeters in diameter, .04 thick. Width of sides, .04 at small end, .07 next to head. A hole passes through it from side to side, 2.8 centimeters from long end. The inscription occupies the four sides of the object, two sides having one line each, and two having two lines each. The inscription appears to be of the Byzantine period. The object was found near Tyre, somewhere in the Lebanon. The inscription is as follows, the numbers denoting the sides of the object:

1. ΑΠΙΩΚ ΚΤΙΡΩΚ
2. ΙΟΥΑΙΑΝΩ
3. a. ΤΩ ΔΟΥΛΟΥΟΥ Κ
   b. ΟΥΤΩΝΟΡΟΗΤΙ
4. a. ΟΚΑΤΟΙΚΩΚΩΝ ΒΟΡΩΗΙΑ
   b. ΤΑΥΤΙΤΙΤΩΒΟΡΗΙ

The hole mentioned above passes through from the end of 1. to the end of 3. On 1., beyond the hole, is an engraved figure which appears to be a circle about a cross, the strokes forming the latter being double, and a stray stroke from the circle making the whole figure, in its present condition, look like a lion. The letters on 1. and 2. are about twice as large as those on 3. and 4. The lines on 1. and 3. stop at the hole, while those on 2. and 4. run to the head. Or, if close measurement is required, the line on 1. is 2.1 centimeters long; that on 2. is 2.5 c. long; those on 3. are 2.1 c. long; those on 4. are 2.85 long. Height of letters on 1., 0.3 c.; on 2., 0.35 c.; on 3., 0.15 to 0.2 c.; on 4., 0.125 to 0.2 c.

Putting it into modern type and separating the words:

*Aνιος Κέρως | Ιουλιανός | τύραννος σου τῷ φοροτι | ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν βοσθίᾳ | τῷ ἱφιστῶς βοσθί.

Perhaps the inscription should be taken as beginning with 2., but the sense would be the same. The chief difficulty is the word at the end of 3 b. I find no example of it elsewhere, and can only conjecture its meaning as something akin to ‘supporter’ or ‘farther.’ Another difficulty is that of determining the exact meaning of the phrase τῷ ἱφιστῶς; but I incline to take it as a dative of manner or degree. The itacisms in the last word of 4 a and 4 b give no trouble; nor the nominative with the (apparent) 2d pers. imperative.

“Holy Lord, who dwellest in help, help most loftily Julianus the supporter (?) of thy servant.”

For what purpose the object was made or used, or what more nearly was the purport of the inscription, I cannot determine.

13. The casts of sculptures and inscriptions at Persepolis; by Dr. Cyrus Adler, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

The following is a brief note from Dr. Adler’s paper*: In the winter of 1891 a private expedition was sent out from England, with the assistance of Lord Saville, for the purpose of securing moulds of the sculptures and inscriptions at Persepolis. The expedition was in charge of Mr. Herbert Weld Blundell, the modeling being done by Mr. Giuntini. As a result, all the important sculptures and inscriptions at Persepolis have been successfully produced in London. Twenty sets have been made from the moulds; and they are offered for sale, for about $1500 a set, by Mr. Cecil H. Smith, 8, The Avenue, Fulham Road, London, S. W.

Hon. Truxton Beale, who was during this period U. S. Minister to Persia, visited Persepolis during the progress of the work, and received from Mr. Blundell for the U. S. National Museum two paper moulds, which he transmitted to Washington. Plaster casts have been successfully made from these moulds. The one is an inscription of Artaxerxes III. (Ochus), who reigned 358–344 B. C., or, according to some, 359–388 B. C.; the other is the figure of a warrior, probably one of the “Immortal Guard.”

14. On a catalogue of the Sanskrit part of the Society's library;
by Dr. Hanns Oertel, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The Librarian's Reports of Additions to the Society's Library form,
when taken together, a pretty complete catalogue of the library. There
are nineteen of these lists, and one or two of them are given in each of
the first fifteen volumes of the Journal except volumes xii. and xiv.
Especially notable are the first list of volume vii. (the Bradley books)
and the first list of volume xi. (the Thompson books). Since these
lists are available as a catalogue only to those who have at hand a full
set of the Journal, and since they are, by nature of their arrangement,
not convenient for ready use, it cannot be doubted that an alphabetic
catalogue of authors and subjects would considerably increase the use-
fulness of the Society's collection.

To make and print such a catalogue, on the other hand, would
involve an expense of labor and money quite disproportionate to the use
likely to be made of it: this, partly because of the great number of
languages represented, and partly because the collection, as made by
donations, is not systematically complete in any subject.* Moreover,
growth of the library would necessitate frequent supplementary
lists, so that we should soon be again confronted with the inconvenience
already alluded to.

A manuscript card-catalogue is obviously the only solution of the
difficulty; this could be sent, part after part, as finished, to such institu-
tions of learning as desired to have it copied. The copying might
perhaps be done by members of the regular library staff or by some
interested graduate students. Far the best and easiest way would be,
in departments where partly complete printed bibliographies exist (and
in Sanskrit such is the case: see Haas and Bendall), to run through
the book with the cards, and enter the initials "A. O. S." on the margin
opposite the titles of works owned by the Society. This would be
satisfactory; and, if competent volunteers for the really important
departments of the library can be found, all that it is desirable to
accomplish can be done, and without expense to the Society.

I propose to prepare such a catalogue for the Sanskrit part of the
Society's library, and have ready now the first part of it, containing the
titles of Catalogues of Sanskrit Manuscripts. Of these there are several
not mentioned in Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum. The titles are
alphabetized according to the name of the author; and the names of
the places where the manuscripts are deposited are entered as cross-

---

* It is in place here to quote an extract from Prof. W. D. Whitney's open letter
to the Members of the American Oriental Society, of April, 1891, page 5:

"The library has become, after a life of nearly fifty years, one of noteworthy
extent and value, especially on account of the long series of publications of learned
societies which it contains; apart from those, it has the miscellaneous and scram-
bly character which belongs to a collection made by donation only, and in no
department completed by purchase."
references. To the titles are added also references to Aufrecht's Catalogus and Haas-Bendall's Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Pali Books in the British Museum. This first part is to be followed by a Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prakrit texts. I should be very happy to receive suggestions regarding the work.


Under this title was given a translation and criticism of a scene in the third book of the Mahābhārata (29–36). The different religious systems of the Epic were spoken of, and the passage under consideration was shown to be early for various reasons. The doctrine taught was analyzed. It is the converse of that teaching which first crops out in the late Upanishads that the prasāda or special grace of the Lord suffices to save—being therefore a sort of parallel to the Calvinistic doctrine of salvation by special privilege. The chief disputant is a woman, who claims that if the Lord saves by grace he damnns by cruelty, and: "Man is led about by the Creator like a bull by the nose or a bird by the string. In obtaining good and evil God's will, not man's work, is paramount. Each one is sent to heaven or to hell by the Lord at the Lord's pleasure, not because he deserves it," etc. (īyantarītta, iii. 30. 28). The queen is then refuted by her husband. He tells her that what she says is heresy (nāstikyam), and lays down the admirable principle that works should be disinterested, i. e. without expectation of heavenly reward. "There is no virtue in trying to milk virtue." (Compare Schiller, Einem ist sie eine Kuh, etc.) All this is interesting as a preliminary sketch of the Divine Song, the principles of which are here enunciated without the later Krishnaism. The duel of words concludes characteristically. The king says, and this is his only real argument, that the religious doctrine contradicted by the queen must be true, for "people would not have been good for so many ages if there had not been some reward attached to goodness," thereby contradicting himself in true Epic style. "But," he adds, "all this is after all a mystery; the gods are full of illusion. Do not blame the Lord Creator; it is through his grace that the mortal who believes attains to immortality." Then, just as the sage woman in the Upanishads is debarred from too penetrating inquiry by the word "ask no more, or your head will fall off," so the queen here suddenly recants all that she says. At the end of the recantation, which is apparently a later working over of the text, the queen asseverates that she has learned this "wisdom of Brhaspati" as a child in her father's house. It is questionable whether this tag did not originally belong at the end of the first argument. For Brhaspati is a seer not over-orthodox in the Epic, and there seems to be less ridi-

* To the title of the paper as well as to any parallelism between Calvinism and this phase of Hinduism exception having been taken in the meeting, it may be well to state that no real Calvinism was seen in the Hindu Epic, only something that reminded the writer very strongly of Calvinism.
The legend alluded to in AV. vi. 112–13 is stated as follows in MS. iv. 1. 9 (p. 12, l. 2 ff.): ‘The gods did not find a person upon whom they might be able to wipe off (mārksyāmahe) from themselves the bloody part of the sacrifice (that is any one upon whom they might transfer their guilt). Then Agni spake: ‘I will create for you him upon whom ye shall wipe off from yourselves the bloody part of the sacrifice.’ He threw a coal upon the waters; from that Ekata was born. (He threw) a second one (dvitīyam); from that Dvita (was born). (He threw) a third one (tritiyam); from that Trita (was born) . . . The gods came wiping themselves upon (Ekata, Dvita, and Trita); they (in turn) wiped themselves upon one who was overtaken by the rising sun, i.e. one over whom the sun rises while he is asleep; this one (wiped himself) upon one who was overtaken (asleep) by the setting sun; he upon one afflicted with brown teeth; he upon one with diseased nails; he upon one who had married a younger sister before the older one was married; he upon one whose younger brother had married before himself; he upon one who had married before his older brother; he upon one who had slain a man; he upon one who had committed an abortion. Beyond him who has committed an abortion the sin does not pass.’

In TB. iii. 2. 8. 9 ff. the same story is told with variants, the chief difference being that the culminating sin is the slaying of a Brahman: ‘Beyond the slayer of a Brahman the sin does not pass.’ Still other versions occur in the Kāṭh. S. xxxi. 7; Kap. S. xlvi. 7 (cf. also ČB. i. 2. 2. 8; KCS. ii. 5. 26; Mahādhara to VS. i. 23; Āp ČS. i. 25. 15); and similar lists of sinful personages are to be quoted from a variety of Śūtras and later Śmārtas-texts; they have been assembled by Professor Delbrück in his monograph ‘Die indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen,’ Transactions of the Royal Saxon Society, vol. xi., nr. v, pp. 578 ff. (200 ff. of the reprint); cf. also Zimmer, Altindisches Leben, p. 315. All those mentioned in the lists are obviously regarded as burdened with guilt (ēnas); and the legend clearly marks them as persons upon whom, therefore, the guilt of others may be unloaded.

Another legend, which reads like a remote echo of the one stated above, occurs at ČB. i. 2. 3. 1 ff. (cf. SBE. xiii. 47 ff.). Its essence is that Agni, after his three older brothers had worn themselves out in the service of the gods—a story upon which the Brāhmaṇas are constantly ringing the changes—fled into the waters, lest he should succumb to the same fate. But the gods discovered him there, and Agni spat upon the waters because they had not proved a safe refuge. Thence sprang
the Āptya (cf. ápya in the account of the Tāit. Br. above) deities, Trīta, Dvīta, and Ekāta.

"They roamed about with Indra, even as nowadays a Brāhmaṇa follows in the train of a king. When he slew Viṣṇu, the three-headed son of Tvāṣṭar, they also knew of his going to be killed; and straightway Trīta slew him. Indra, assuredly, was free from that (sin), for he is a god.

"And the people thereupon said: 'Let those be guilty of the sin who knew about his going to be killed!' 'How?' they asked. 'The sacrifice shall wipe it off upon (shall transfer it to) them,' they said" (Professor Eggeling's translation). The Āptyas, then, loaded with the guilt (or impurity) of the sacrifice, determine to pass this guilt on, and they pick out as their victim him who performs a sacrifice without conferring the daksīṇā upon the officiating priest. Further, the impure rinsing-water is poured out for the Āptyas with the formulas, "'For Trīta thee! For Dvīta thee! For Ekāta thee!'" (cf. VS. i. 28, and Mahiśhara's comment thereon).

Similarly Sāyaṇa to RV. i. 52. 5 describes the relation of Trīta and the rest of the Āptyas: cf. also his introduction to RV. i. 105.

The human beings upon whom Trīta and the other Āptyas wipe off the guilt of the gods deposited in themselves are sinners or outcasts without exception. Aside from the testimony of the legends above, VS. xxx. presents a fictitious, schematic list of human beings, fit to be sacrificed at the puruṣamedha, the human sacrifice, and, in verse 9, the parivṛtta, the parivвидāṇa, and the edīḍhiṣṭपati (!) are sacrificed respectively to the female personifications of evil, Nirṣṭi, Arāddhi, and Niśkiṭti. In ApŚS. ix. 12. 11 an expiatory rite is performed for a still larger part of these lists, and in Vasishtha's Dharmacāstra they are designated as enāsvini 'loaded with guilt (ēnas)." It follows that Trīta must also have committed some crime which fitted him in his turn for the position of scape-goat of the gods. The nature of this crime is, in our judgment, indicated in part in the version of the legend in ČB. above. Indra's drastic performances upon the great variety of demons whom he slays, coupled as they are at times with wiles and treachery, have not failed to arouse the compunctions of a certain school of Vedic moralists, who contemplate his exploits with mingled sorrow and fear for Indra's position as a righteous god. So e. g. in TB. i. 7. 1. 7. 8; PB. xii. 6. 8; and MS. iv. 3. 4, Indra is blamed for having betrayed and slain his quondam friend Naṃuci, and is compelled to perform purificatory rites; see our "Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda." Third Series, J.A.O.S. xv. 160. Similarly, Viṣṇu is betrayed in TS. vi. 5. 1. 1–3; MS. iv. 5. 6; PB. xx. 15. 6 ff. Especially the death of Viṣṇu, Tvāṣṭar's son, is treated by certain texts with a naïve affectation of horror, and accounted as amounting to Brahman-murder, the crime upon which TB. iii. 2. 8. 11 (and other texts quoted by Professor Delbrück above) remarks: 'Beyond the slayer of a Brahman the sin does not pass.' Thus, in TS. ii. 5. 1. 2, the beings (bhūtāni) cry to Indra: "thou art the slayer of a Brahman": see also the Cāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata (xii. 18210 ff.), and the Rig-vidhāna iii. 5. 4.
Since, now, Indra's misdeeds on account of their prominence are likely to have given rise to the notion of misdeeds on the part of the gods (*devānasad, A.V. vi. iii. 3; x. 1. 12*), it was natural that some personage closely associated with Indra—a personage, moreover, who could be construed as subservient, or at least ancillary to him—should be picked out for the unenviable position. For this Trita seems fitted in an eminent degree. Trita is in general the double of Indra in his struggle with the demons. A passage like RV. i. 187. 1, *pituvā nā stōsam . . . yāsya trītō vṛṣṇi vṛtrām viparvam ardāyati, 'Let me now praise the drink by whose might Trita tore Vṛtra joint from joint,' suits Indra as well as Trita.* In RV. i. 52. 5; v. 86. 1; viii. 7. 24 he appears as Indra's coadjutor, and, in the first one of these passages, as Indra's predecessor and model in the fights against the dragons. In x. 48. 2 Indra gets the cows for Trita from the dragon, and in i. 163. 2 Trita in his turn appears as Indra's servitor, harnessing the horse which Indra rides. Especially RV. x. 8. 8, 'Trita Āptya, knowing (the nature of) his weapons, derived from the Fathers, and impelled by Indra, fought against the three-headed and seven-rayed (monster), and, slaying him, freed the cows of the son of Tvaṣṭar.' Compare also ii. 11. 19.

Whether, now, we regard Trita as the faded predecessor of Indra in the rôle of a demiurge, being, as it were, the Indo-Iranian Hercules (cf. the Avestan Thraetaona Athwya), supplanted in part in the land of the seven streams by Indra; whether we regard him, as would appear from some passages of the Rig-Veda, as Indra's lieutenant; or whether we follow Bergaigne, *Religion Védique*, pp. 326, 330, in viewing him as a divine sacrificer; in each case the moralizing fancy, which would whitewash the cruelties incidental upon Indra's valued services, naturally alights upon Trita, and makes him bear the burden of his superior's misdeeds. And this again has been generalized so that in A.V. vi. 113, the gods in general, without specification, are said to have wiped off their guilt upon Trita.

The rites within which A.V. vi. 113. 114 are embedded in the Kāuṣīṭka-sūtra (46. 26–29), in their turn, have for their object the removal of the sin of him whose younger brother marries first, as also of the prematurely married younger brother. Symbolically the sin is again removed, this time to a non-living object, being washed off upon reeds which are then placed upon foam in a river. As the foam vanishes, so does the sin.

The treatment of the Kāuṣīṭka embraces but one side of the hymn in employing it in connection with the expiatory performances of the *parivṛtta* and the *parivivīdāna*. It seems to me that this is too narrow, and that the hymns were constructed to cover all the crimes in the catalogues connected with the legend of Trita, as given above. This at least is in Keṣava's mind when, commenting upon Kāuṣ. 46. 26 ff., he says, "now the expiation is stated for him who marries, performs the rite of building the fire, and undergoes the consecration for the Soma-sacrifice,

* Cf. our 'Contributions,' Fifth series, J.A.O.S. xvi. p. 32, and Yāska's Nirukta ix. 25, where Indra is substituted outright.
while the older brother is alive.” Further, the text of both hymns (vi. 112. 3; 113. 2) states distinctly that the sins in question shall be wiped off upon the abortionist, the bhrūṇahān, whose crime figures as a most shocking one at the end of the lists.

This indicates that the entire list of sins is in the mind of the poet, even though he intends to direct his charm against some special part of them. Finally, the expression dvādaṣṭaḥd in vi. 113. 8, ‘Deposited in a dozen places is that which has been wiped off on Trita, namely the sins belonging to man,’ refers in my opinion again to the list of crimes, which are stated variously as from 9-11 in number, the use of the number 12 being due to its formulary and solemn character. From all this it seems to me that the hymns have in mind at least all the sins which arise from the inversion of the order of precedence as between the younger and older brothers, and probably the rest also.

The two hymns again present a marked instance of the close interlacing between the legendary material of the Brāhmaṇas and the Mantras.* I doubt whether the true purport of them would ever have become clear without the legends reported above, and their previous treatment owes a certain degree of vagueness to the absence of these legends from the apparatus of the translators.

The hymns have been translated by Ludwik, Rig-Veda iii. 469, 444; by Grill,† pp. 15, 171; Hardy, Die Vedisch-brāhmaṇische Periode, p. 201; cf. also Zimmer’s luminous allusion to vi. 113 in his Altindisches Leben, p. 315; and Ludwik (l. c., p. 469, 470). Grill treats both hymns rather too vaguely, under the caption “Krankheit” (pp. 8 ff.). The Anu-kramaṇi defines vi. 112 as agyeyam; vi. 113 as paḍasyam.

I add the translation of the two hymns, undertaken in the light of the preceding exposition:

vi. 112. 1. May this (younger brother) not slay the oldest one of them, O Agni; protect him so that he be not torn out by the root! Do thou here cunningly loosen the fetters of Grāhi (attack of disease); may all the gods give thee leave! 2. Free these three, O Agni, from the three fetters with which they have been shackled! Do thou here cunningly loosen the fetters of Grāhi; release them all, father, sons, and mother! 3. The fetters with which the older brother, whose younger brother has married before him, has been bound, with which he has been encumbered and shackled limb by limb, may they be loosened; since fit for loosening they are. Wipe off, O Puṣan, the misdeeds upon him who practices abortion!

vi. 113. 1. On Trita the gods wiped off this sin. Trita wiped it off on human beings; hence, if Grāhi has seized thee, may these gods remove her by means of their charm. 2. Enter into the rays into smoke. O sin: go into the vapors, and into the fog! Lose thyself with the foam of the river; wipe off. O Puṣan, the misdeeds upon him who practices abortion.

* Cf. my ‘Contributions.’ Third series J.A.O.S. xv. p. 163; Fifth series, ib. xvi. p. 3.
† That is, release the entire family from the consequences of the misdeeds of certain members (the sons).
abortion. 8. Deposited in twelve places is that which has been wiped off Trita, the sins belonging to humanity; hence, if Grāhi has seized thee, may these gods remove her by means of their charm!

17. On the group of Vedic words ending in -gua and -gvin; by Professor Bloomfield.*

In 1852, Professor Roth in his note on Nirukta xi. 19 (p. 149) said somewhat as follows: "The suffix -gua is to be found outside of navagva and its correspondent dasaqva only in etaqva and afithigva. An extension of it seems to be -gvin in catagvin. If we look for a unity of meaning for the suffix in all these formations, we must assume for it, as well as for the related suffix -gu, which occurs in a considerable number of compounds, a broad meaning, something like 'having the kind, form, number of.'" And further, "navagva and dasaqva könnte die 'Neuner, Zehner,' d. h. die Glieider einer sovielle Theile zählenden Gemeinschaft, etaqva ein bunstgearteter, catagvin hundertfach sein." The suggestion of a similar view may be found also in Benfey's glossary to the Śāma-Veda, s. v. etaqva and navagva. Ludwig's translations are along the same line: see, for instance, RV. i. 159. 5 (171); viii. 45. 11 (608). Grassmann in his concordance essays to lend etymological support to this kind of construction, by assuming a stem -gua 'coming,' from a root gva 'to come,' an "older" form of the root gā, having in mind doubtless the labialized forms of the root in baiw, venio, etc.: cf. his somewhat similar misconception of the interrogative stem ku (s. v.). It is, however, not worth while to discuss subtle phonological questions in this connection, since a correct philological interpretation of these suffixes obviates the necessity of stepping outside of ordinary grammatical experiences. The stems are -gva and -gvin; and gu is the well known weakest stem-form of go 'cow.'

The word catagvin speaks most plainly; it means 'possessing, or consisting of, a hundred cows,' and one needs but to present the five passages in which the word occurs to put the question as a whole upon a firm basis: RV. i. 159. 5, 'To us, O heaven and earth, give wealth in goods, containing a hundred cattle (catagvinam)'; iv. 49. 4, rayin catagvinam dvavantaḥ sahasriṇām. And again: viii. 45. 11, 'going easily, O thou to whom belongs the press-stone (Indra), rich in horses, having a hundred cows' (dvavantaḥ catagvinah); ix. 65. 17, catagvinah gavāṁ pūrṇam sāvyam; ix. 67. 6, catagvinah rayin gomantam acvīnam: cf. in general RV. ix. 62. 12.

The word catagvin does not differ in structure fundamentally from saptāgu in RV. x. 47. 6, 'to Bhāspati, who gives (or obtains) seven cows (saptāgum). The words saptāgu and rayīm in the relation of cause and effect are obviously parallel to catagvinam and rayim. And in Gāut. Dharmaç. xviii. 26, 27; Manu xi. 14; Mahābh. xiii. 8742, catagvan and sahasragaun are later representatives of such formation: cf.

* First read before the Johns Hopkins Philological Association, March 17, 1893; see Johns Hopkins University Circulars, vol. xii, no. 105, p. 90.
also ekagu, Vāt. Sū. 24. 20. But the additional suffix -in (cata-gu-in) does impart to the word a more general adjectival value, rendered with difficulty in English by "hundred-cow-like," and at any rate the word is on the road to a meaning like 'hundredfold' even in RV. ix. 65. 17, catagvinām rayān gomantam, where catagvinam is sufficiently 'faded' and generalized to admit of the additional gomantam. This is therefore not precisely tautological; the expression as it stands is to be rendered 'hundredfold wealth abounding in cattle.' And so the poet finds it possible in RV. viii. 1. 9 to address Indra thus: yē te sinti dacaṭarināh catino yē sahasrānāh . . . 'with thy horses in tens, hundreds, and thousands!'

The proper name atithīgva has, so far as is known, never been translated. Grassmann's 'goa' 'going' does not yield appreciable sense.

If we analyze structurally atithī-gu-d 'he who has or offers a cow for the guest, 'he who is hospitable,' we have a normal compound, normal sense, and a valuable glimpse of Vedic house-practices, known hitherto only in the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras. At the arghya-ceremony, which is performed on the arrival of an honored guest, the "preparation" of a cow is the central feature. The technical expression is gāh kurute: see CŚS. ii. 15. 1; AGS. i. 24. 30, 31; PGS. i. 3. 26, 80; Gobh. iv. 10. 1; ĀpGS. 13. 15; HGS. i. 18. 10; ApDhS. ii. 4. 8. 5. In TS. vi. 1. 10. 1 the ceremony goes by the name go-argha. There is no reason why this simple and natural practice should not be reflected by the hymns, and it comports with the character of Atithigva as a generous giver: cf. vi. 47. 22; x. 48. 8; i. 180. 7, also similar statements in reference to descendants of Atithigva (atithīgva) in viii. 68. 16, 17. The adjective atithīn is a śp. levy. in RV. x. 68. 8; it occurs in the expression atithīnār gāh and, whatever it may mean, it suggests forcibly the proper name in question. The rendering of atithī by 'wandering,' as given by the Petersburg lexicons and Grassmann, is based upon the supposed etymology (root at 'wander'), and reflects the vagueness usual with such interpretations. Ludwig's translation (973) "wie gäste kommend" is a compromise between the etymology and the ordinary

* The Homeric bahuvarthi-complexes τεσσαράς-bō(F)-ioς 'worth four steers,' and similarly ἐννα-, δώδεκα-, τεσσαρά-, ἐκατόμβιος, suggest, along with the Vedic words, that the I. E. word gōu was a prominent unit of count. The weak stem gu at the end of a possessive compound appears in ἐκατόμβιος, which almost reflects a possible Vedic *cata-gu-d 'a body of hundred cows or steers.' ἐκατόμβιος has undergone a somewhat similar fate with catagvin; it means originally 'a sacrifice of a hundred steers,' but the meaning of its component parts must have been thoroughly lost sight of before Peleus, ll. xiii. 146, could promise a hecatomb of fifty rams; cf. also the ταῖρων τε καὶ ἄρεων ἐκατόμβιος, Od. i. 25, and the ἐκατόμβιος ταῖρων ἥδις αἰγῶν, ll. ii. 315. In a different way the meaning has faded out of ἓοιν bovdolōs, so as to enable it to appear in the compound ἵπποβοδολός 'horse-herd.' Another type and use of numerals in composition with the stem gōu is exhibited in the Phrygian proper name ὅκτας (cf. saptāgo, and navāgva, dacoagvā, below); see Bezz. Beitr. x. 196; Indog. Anzeig. ii. 15.
Bloomfield, Vedic words in -gva and -gvin.

meaning of atithi. The passage in question reads: 'Brhaspati has divided out like barley from bushels the (rain-) cows propitious to the pious, fit for guests (atithi), strong, desirable, beautiful in color, faultless in form, after having conquered them from the clouds.' The proper name atithi-gv-ā means therefore precisely one who has atithinir gāh.

It seems scarcely possible to hesitate, after these considerations, when we come to analyze the words navagva and daçaugva. Whatever their precise meaning, they also are bahuvrhi-comounds, containing the stem gu- 'cow'; and the proof may be rendered on the severest technical grounds. As the outflow of Indra's supreme power to obtain the cows (waters) from the mountains (clouds), the same capacity appears delegated to Brhaspati, frequently with the qualifying attribute Ângiras or Ângirasa; next, to the Ângiras themselves; further, to the Navagvas and Daçaugvas, who are also frequently designated as Ângiras; and finally, to Saramā in the specific character as a messenger of Indra. Brhaspati Ângirasa is designated as saptâgâ in x. 46. 7 Indra, the Ângiras, Brhaspati, and Saramā appear in the same exploit in i. 62. 3: cf. in general the hymns x. 67 and 108. Statements of this sort which concern the Navagvas and Daçaugvas are found in RV. x. 62. 6. 7; v. 29. 12; 45. 7; and similarly x. 108. 8; iii. 39. 5. Note also the more general relation of návagva in ix. 108. 4 to gāh in st. 8; of návagrāh to gopdm in x. 61. 10 and of dáçaugrāh to gārṇasa in ii. 84. 12. In these passages the poet at any rate must be conscious of a relation between the element -gva and the stem go or its derivatives. Without entering here upon a complete discussion of all the mythological ideas involved (cf. Bergaigne, Religion Védique ii. 307 ff.), it seems to me that we must choose one of two interpretations of -gva in these two names. Either the Navagvas and Daçaugvas are heavenly assistants of Indra or Brhaspati, and distinguished themselves in these exploits by obtaining or freeing nine or ten of the cloud-cows; or, like the Ângiras, they are mythical sacrificers who, by giving nine or ten cows, strengthen Indra or Brhaspati in his attacks upon the cloud-cows. In fact, the name seems to carry a changeable force involving both aspects, just as the epithet saptâgâ applied to Brhaspati in x. 47. 6 clearly implies his participation in the heavenly exploit, and at the same time the generous bestowal of cattle upon the reverent sacrificer who praises him with songs. But even a future modification of this view cannot impair the fundamental fact that these words are possessive compounds with stem gu- as their second member.

The ending -gva occurs in one other word, étatçva. Grassmann, under the coercion of his theory that gva=gh 'go,' translates it by 'coming quickly, hurrying'; the Petersburg lexicons by 'bunt schimmernd'; Ludwig at i. 115. 8 (129) by 'schillernd,' but at vii. 70. 2 (54), and viii. 59. 7 (618) by Étagva, a makeshift clearly indicative of embarrassment. Sākyas's comments do not present anything tenable so far as -gva is concerned. The interpretation of gva becomes simple enough if we follow the lead of the other words of the group; it contains the stem gu 'cow' in the sense of 'ray'; étatçva means 'having bright rays,' and
so ‘shining brightly.’ In v. 80, 2-4 Ušas is spoken of as follows: brhad-
rathā . . . egh gōbbhīr arunēbhīr yujānā . . . vṛṇī bhavatī; the cows can scarcely refer to anything but rays, or sheets of light.

In conclusion, a few brief remarks, suggested by the preceding investigation: Another case of a word misunderstood as a suffix is contained in viṣṇu. This is explained by the lexicons as a derivative of root viṣ: I would propose to analyze it as viṣṇu ‘crossing the back (of the heavens)’; cf. the constant use of the root kram+vi in connection with Viṣṇu’s three steps. Conversely, a misunderstanding has given rise to a prefix iṣ with the root kr and with no other root in the sense ‘prepare.’ There is really no such prefix; it has been abstracted in this single connection from combinations like aniṣkṛta, which was misunderstood to be dn-iṣ-kṛta, but is in reality d-niṣ-kṛta. In this way arose the expression iṣkṛtāram aniṣkṛtam, RV. viii. 99. 8. That iṣ + kr is identical with niṣ + kr appears from a comparison of RV. x. 97. 9: iṣkṛtir nāma vo mātā, with TS. iv. 2. 6. 2: niṣkṛtir nāma vo mātā. Cf. English apron, from a napron, (felt to be an apron: cf. napkin), and a host of other examples collected by Mr. Charles P. G. Scott in the Trans. of the Am. Philol. Assoc. xxiii. 179 ff.

The difficult word adhrigu I shall hope on some other occasion to explain as d-adhrigu ‘not poor, rich, liberal,’ adhrigu=Zend drigu ‘poor.’ The word is employed as an epithet of both divine and human sacrificers: see especially RV. viii. 22. 11; 93. 11.

18. Notes on Zoroaster and the Avesta; by Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College, New York City.

I. ALLUSION TO ZOROASTER IN THE SNOURA EDDA PREFACE.

In the preface to the Younger Edda there is a passage relating to Zoroaster which is perhaps worth recording among the allusions to his name found in non-Oriental literature.* The preface to the Snorra Edda after giving a brief sketch of the history of the world down to the time of Noah and the Flood, proceeds to an account of the Tower of Babel and the dispersion of the races through the confusion of tongues. Foremost among the builders of the tower was Zoroaster; the text adds that he became king of the Assyrians, and that he was the first idolater. In consequence of the confusion of tongues he was known by many names, but chief among these was Baal or Bel.

The text Edda Snorra Slurlússonar, formáli 2, ed. Jónsson, p. 5, is here given for convenience of future reference: Ok så, er fremstr var, hét Zöröastes; hann hó, fyrr enn hann grét, er hann kom i veróldina: enn forsúmhir voru II ok LXX, ok svá margar tungur hafa sithan dreifst um veróldina, eptir thi sem risarnir skiptust sithan til landa, ok thjóðirnar fjölguthust. Í thesim sama stath var gjör ein hin úgatasta borg ok dregit af nafni stúpulsins, ok köllut Babílon. Ok sem tungna-

* My attention was first called to the passage by a passing mention in A. Wirth, Aus orientalischen Chroniken, p. xxiv, Frankfurt, 1894.
skiptit var orthit, þá fjöguthust svá nöfnin mannanna ok annara húta, ok sjá sami Zóroastres haftih mörg nöfn; ok þó at hann undir-stæthi, at hans ofsi væri legthr of sagthrí smith, þá færthi haan sik þó fram til veraldigs metnather, ok lét taka sik til konungs ýfr mörgum þjóðum Assiríorum. Af honum höfst skurthgoða villa; ok sem hann var blótathr, var hann kallathr Baal; thann köllum vær Bel; hann haftih ok mörg önnur nöfn. Enn sem nöfnin fjöguthust, þá tyndist meth thi sannleikrin.

5 (p. 7). Ok af thessu höfst önnur villa millum Kritarmanna ok Macedoniórum, svá sem hin fyrrí methal Assiríorum ok Kaldeis af Zóroastre.

This may be rendered:* 'He who was the foremost (builder of the tower) was called Zoroaster; he laughed before he cried when he came into the world. But there were (in all) seventy-two master-builders; and so many tongues have since spread throughout the world, according as the giants were scattered over the land and the nations multiplied. In this same place was built a most renowned town, and it derived its title from the name of the tower, and was called Babylon. And when the confusion of tongues had come to pass, then multiplied also the names of men and of other things; and this same Zoroaster had many names. And although he well understood that his pride was humbled by the said work, nevertheless he pushed his way on to worldly distinction, and got himself chosen king over many peoples of the Assyrians. From him arose the error of graven images (i. e. idolatry); and when he was sacrificed unto, he was called Baal; we call him Bel; he had also many other names. But, as the names multiplied, so was the truth lost withal.'

5. ' (From Saturn) there arose another heresy among the Cretans and Macedonians, just as the above mentioned error among the Assyrians and Chaldaeans arose from Zoroaster.'

This passage is interesting for several reasons.

First, it preserves the tradition elsewhere recorded regarding Zoroaster's having laughed instead of having cried when he was born into the world. This statement is found in Pliny N. H. vii. 16. 15: riaisse eodem die quo genus esset, unum hominem accepsimus, Zoroastrem. Again, in the Pahlavi Dinkart vii., pavan zarkhunishno bará khandīz 'he laughed at the time of his birth' (cf. Darab Peshotan Sanjana, Geiger's Eastern Iranians ii. 196 note and on p. 200 note, a similar quotation found in Solinus). The same tradition is preserved in the Zartusht Námah (cf. Wilson's Parsi Religion, p. 488) 'as he left the womb he laughed; the house was enlightened with his laughter.' In Shahrestâni likewise we read that Zoroaster "as he was born uttered a laugh" (see Gotthell's Semitic References to Zoroaster in the Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler). The same, moreover, is noted in the Persian Dabistan, Ch. i. Sect. 14, transl. Shea and Troyer, i. 218: "Zaradusht, *

* For some helpful suggestions in connection with the passage I am indebted to the kindness of my friend and colleague, Professor H. H. Boyesen, of Columbia College, and to Mr. E. H. Babbitt.
on issuing forth into the abode of existence, laughed aloud at the moment of his birth."  

Second, the two allusions here connecting Zoroaster with Assyria, Chaldea, and Babylon are to be added to other references which also connect his name with these places (e.g. consult Windischmann. Zor. Studien, p. 303 ff.); or again they are to be placed beside the statement of the Armenian Moses of Khorni, who makes Zoroaster a contemporary of Semiramis, and appointed by her to be ruler of Nineveh and Assyria. (See Spiegel, Erânische Alterthumskunde, 1. 683.)  

Third, in connection with the reputed multiplicity of names of Zoroaster, and the association of his name with Baal, Bel, attention might be called to the citation in the Syro-Arabic Lexicon of Bar 'Alf (ca. A.D. 888) s. v. Balaam, 'Balaam is Zardsht, the diviner of the Magians' (cf. Gottheil, References in the Driesler Classical Studies).

II. PLUTARCH'S ARTAXERXES, CH. III. 1-10.  

A passage in the above designated chapter of Plutarch is worth considering in the light of ancient Persian antiquities. The famous biographer's life of Artaxerxes Mnemon opens with an account of this ruler's succession to the throne of Darius in B. C. 404, and then describes some of the priestly ceremonies that accompanied the coronation.  

Shortly after the death of Darius, the new king went to Pasargadæ, according to Plutarch, to be installed in the kingly office by the Persian priests. The ceremonies were performed in the temple of a goddess whom he compares with the Grecian Athena. But as most of the rites were not public, Plutarch is able to give us only the following details:  

Eis tòtò de tòn têleímeon paralēthonta tòn mèn idian úpobóthai stolēn, únapla-bein ò ò Kíros ò palaios éphron pròn ò baxaleis genēthai, kai sîkwn palάðhs émpagánta terrnn thon kastatrophein kai pontîmwn ëkparon ðegnàlanstos. (Plutarchi Viteae parallelae, Artaxerxes, Ch. iii. p. 106, recogn. Sinentis).  

This may be rendered: 'After entering the temple, the one to be consecrated must take off his own robe and put on that which Cyrus the Elder had worn before he was king. And then, having partaken of a cake of figs, he must chew some turpentine and drink some acidulated milk.'  

A comparison with one or two elements in the sacrifice of the Avestan ritual may naturally be instituted.  

First, the suggestion at once presents itself that the "cake of figs," sîkwn palάðhs, answers to the Avestan draonah, Mod. Pers. darûn, which with the milk, butter, fruits, flowers, and small bit of meat, composes the nyazda or oblation. See Darmesteter, Zend-Avesta Traduction, i. p. lxvi; Spiegel, Avesta übersetzt, ii. p. xi: de Harlez, Avesta traduit, p. clxxviii; Haug, 'Some Parsi Ceremonies' in Essays on the Persis, 3 ed., pp. 896, 407.  

Second, the mention of the turpentine tree, ërrunfôs, naturally suggests the peculiar tasting haoma stalks which play so important a part in the Avestan ritual.
Third, the acidulated milk, curds, or whey, ḍēṭyaṭa, may not unreasonably be identified with the mixture of the haoma-juice and milk which was regularly used at the sacrifice: cf. Ys. x. 14:

Yase-tē būḍha haoma zāirē
gāva iristahē bakhāhē
'Whoso, golden Haoma, ever
Drinketh thee when mixed with milk.'

Again, Vd. xviii. 72 saothranām haomavaitinām gaomavaitinām . . .
hām-irista aḍṭayaṇa urvarayāṇo yā vaocē ḍadhāṇaṭāpāta ' libations accompanied by haoma-juice and meat, mixed also with the ḍadhāṇaṭāpāta-plant (benzoin).’ Consult also the renderings of Geldner, Studien i. 48, and de Harlez, Avesta Trad. pp. 289, c lxvi.

There is of course nothing certain in the above suggested identifications, but they seem plausible; and, if we assume that in Plutarch’s description there may be some reminiscence of ceremonies that were actually performed when the king was consecrated by the priests, these hints may help to throw some light on the classical passage.

19. On some Hittite seal cylinders; by Rev. Dr. William Hayes Ward, of New York, N. Y.

Two cylinders were presented for inspection bearing Hittite inscriptions. While many cylinders were known that could safely be ascribed to Hittite art, those having undoubted Hittite inscriptions had not been met with, until these two came to light. One of them is of copper plated with silver, and is said to have been brought, with a number of other antiquities, from Haifa in Syria. It is to the galvanic action of the silver on the copper that we are indebted for the excellent preservation of the outer layer of silver. The cylinder is made of a flat, rectangular piece of metal, bent around so as to bring the opposite edges into juxtaposition, thus forming a cylinder; but these two edges are not soldered together. The cylinder is 21 millimeters in length by 9 millimeters in diameter. At each end is a rope pattern, enclosed in border lines. On the body of the cylinder is a personage, with what appears to be a crowded and contracted solar disk over his head. He wears a long, loose, open robe, and holds one hand extended, and in the other what appears to be a lituus, with the lower end bent up, as is common in Hittite sculpture. Facing him, but separated by two columns of Hittite characters, is a figure in a close cap, a short robe, with one hand lifted, and the other holding a mace over his shoulder, the top of which is a circle divided in the middle by the handle of the mace. Back to the latter, and with a star between them, is a personage in a high Phrygian cap, a long robe, and with both hands extended in front. The toes of these figures are mostly turned up. Behind the principal figure surmounted by the winged disk are what appear to be hieroglyphs, a bird, and a triangle with a smaller one beside it; and behind him are two vertical lines of inscription, three characters in each column, unless one of them over the hand of the personage be an
object held in the hand. One of the characters is new, and is identical with the Babylonian character for Harran, and suggests the possibility that it may be the ideograph for that city. While it is of little use to try to read the characters, yet their presence distinctly defines the Hittite style of a considerable family of cylinders which for other reasons we have called Hittite. We have here the rope pattern, the tall Phrygian cap, the turned up toes. There is a considerable body of hematite cylinders of about this size and type which these written characters help us to designate more positively as Hittite, although it has often seemed doubtful whether they should not be called Syrian or Phenician. The shape and size of these cylinders are about the same as those of the hematite Babylonian cylinders of about 2000 B.C.; which inclines one to give them a considerable antiquity, especially as about 1500 B.C. a much larger cylinder came into use, with the advent of the Kassite dynasty, and similar large cylinders were in use in Assyria.

The other cylinder of which I speak is unfortunately in very poor condition. It is of black serpentine, and came from the region of Urfa, and is of unusual size, being 56 millimeters in length and 15 millimeters in diameter. Although considerably battered, it is easy to make out that there were on it five lines of Hittite characters, covering the whole surface; but no connected text can be restored. The characters are arranged in the way usual in Hittite inscriptions, two characters often appearing one over the other. One line is wrong side up as compared with the others.

Although of little value as a text, this cylinder is of much value because of its relationship in shape and material with a large class of these large, deeply cut, soft black serpentine cylinders which I have been in the habit, with others, of calling Assyrian, but with a good deal of doubt whether they are really so. These are the cylinders that introduce the winged disk and the sacred tree, elements unknown to early Babylonian art, and especially delight in the fight between Bel and the dragon. It is evident that in the time of the Assyrian empire the art of the country had somehow acquired important elements of mythology not familiar to the early Babylonian empire, and it was not easy to discover evidence whence they came, much as we might conjecture in certain particulars. If then, as this Hittite cylinder seems to indicate, we can refer these large cylinders, so peculiar in character, to a Hittite region, we are in the line of a connection with Egypt. We well know how close was the connection between the Egyptian and the Hittite kingdoms in the time of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties; and we may be certain that it was about this time that western Asia felt most markedly the influence of Egypt, the influence previously being chiefly Babylonian. I am inclined to think that the winged disk was brought into western Asia about the time of Thothmes II. or Rameses III., and came to represent the special god of Nahrina, by a sort of religious revolution which modified considerably the idea of the winged disk as it had been known in Egypt, and made of it the only supreme god, so that it was hardly to be recognized and identified.
with its Egyptian original, when the iconoclastic heretic king Khuenaten made it his sole divinity. From the Hittites and the Mesopotamian people the Assyrians accepted the disk and the sacred tree. This would not make this large cylinder and the kindred ones of an age as old as the silvered cylinder of which I have spoken. Indeed, if, as seems probable, this large type was introduced about the time of king Burnaburiash, then we might put these large serpentine cylinders as early as 1300 or 1200 B.C.; and from these large Hittite or Mesopotamian cylinders were copied the later characteristic cylinders of the Sargonide period which we know are Assyrian.

20. A royal cylinder of Burnaburiash; by Rev. Dr. W. H. Ward.

Menant, in his Les Pierres Gravées, i. 193, calls attention to two cylinders which bear the name of Kurigalzu, one of the kings of the Kassite dynasty of the old Babylonian empire. They belong to a marked type, larger than those that preceded them, and are characterized by long inscriptions of six or eight lines, generally prayers to a god, with or without the name of the owner. With the inscription there is generally one human figure standing, with one hand raised, and accompanied by symbolic emblems, the most characteristic of which are the Maltese cross, or labarum, and the lozenge. These are new elements in Babylonian art.

A third royal cylinder belonging to this same Kassite dynasty belonged to me but has now been transferred to the Metropolitan Museum. It bears the name of Kurigalzu's father, Burnaburiash, and it is distinctly stated that the owner of the seal, a servant of Burnaburiash, was himself a Kassite. This cylinder belongs to the same general type as those of Kurigalzu, and we may now consider that the Kassite type is pretty certainly fixed.

This cylinder is of a stone intermediate between chalcedony and sard, mainly bluish white, but clouded with a yellowish shade. It is 34 millimeters long by 15 millimeters in diameter, and is thus considerably larger than the Babylonian cylinders of 2000-2500 B.C., but of about the prevailing size and shape of the best cylinders of the period of the Assyrian empire, and of the second Babylonian empire, to both of which we may conclude that these Kassite cylinders gave the type. There is a single human figure in this cylinder of Burnaburiash, of the same type as on the cylinders of Kurigalzu. The entire remaining space is taken up with nine lines of inscription, which Mr. T. G. Pinches has kindly translated for me in part as follows:

1. Rimmon, supreme lord, judge,
2. Who rains, fertility,
3. . . . . . . .
4. . . . . . . .
5. . . . . . . .
6. Uzi-Sutaḥ.
7. Son of Kaššu (i. e. the Kassite),
8. Servant of Burnaburraš,
9. King of the world.

While Rimmon is a god widely worshipped, the last lines of the inscription are purely Kassite. Not only is the king Kassite, and the owner designated as a Kassite, but the name of a Kassite god enters into the name of its owner Uzi-Šutah. The length of the inscription leaves no room for any symbols, but in shape, size, the style of the human figure, and the length of the inscription, the cylinder is characteristically Kassite.

Of the two cylinders bearing the name of Kurigalzu, one belonged to his son, and one to Durulmas, the son of his servant. Yet another is figured in DeClercq's Collection, No. 257, of the same type, and belonged to Iriba-Bin, son of Durulmas, probably the same as the owner of the previous seal. Here we have the Kassite type fixed by a series of four cylinders, one of Burnaburraš, father of Kurigalzu, one of Kurigalzu's son, one of Kurigalzu's servant's son Durulmas, and one of the son of Durulmas, or Durulmas, thus giving us four generations. From one or more of these four cylinders we get the cross and the lozenge, and a bird like a dove or raven. A dozen other cylinders of this type could be mentioned, of which not less than half a dozen belong to the Metropolitan Museum.

A very interesting cylinder, now in the Metropolitan Museum, and figured by General di Cresnola, *Cyprus*, pl. xxxi. fig. 3, is of this same type. It is of the usual size and has eight lines of inscription, and the usual standing figure, above which, separated by a line, are two winged sphinxes face to face. This is a new and surprising emblem, and it is not strange that it has led M. Menant to decide that this cylinder must have been made as late as the time of the second Babylonian empire, under an archaizing influence, in imitation of the older cylinders. But it is not clear that such a cylinder, found in Cyprus, may not have been made there in the time of the Kassite dynasty, which was a very powerful one, and which must have extended its influence over the Syrian coast, and probably over Cyprus. In this case a Babylonian officer living in Cyprus might very well have had a seal made after the general style of his country, but the sphinxes would have been copied from the familiar Egyptian art which had spread all along the coast. Indeed, precisely this design of two sphinxes facing each other, is what we find in Phenician or Hittite cylinders, which probably go back earlier than this date. The two sphinxes have just the same relation to the figure under them as the two birds have in one of the Kassite cylinders. There would therefore be no reason for believing this to be a bit of archaizing work of the age of Nabonidus, were it not that it is made of a blue chalcedony, which, so far as we know, came into use even later than Nabonidus; and that the ends are convex, another sign of later execution.
21. On the classification of oriental cylinders; by Rev. Dr. W. H. Ward.

In this paper an attempt was made to classify the known cylinders according to their national origin and age, separating the different designs, and suggesting a flexible method of enumerating them in a Museum.


Of this paper a very brief abstract is as follows. The purpose of the paper is chiefly practical—to dissuade from the use, as signs of relationship between languages, of radicals between which and certain physiological processes correlations exist, in virtue of which a class of articulate sounds are strongly prompted by a class of functions. Imitative or onomatopoetic words are not here meant; such are the result, not of physiological correlation, but of conscious mimicry. They are words to which their signification is imparted by certain physiological processes, common to the race everywhere, and leading to the creation of the same signs with the same meaning in totally sundered linguistic stocks. These signs I would call "physonyms," and the process of their formation "physonymous."

One of the best known and simplest examples is that of the widespread designation of "mother" by such words as mama, nana, ana; and of "father" by such as papa, baba, tata. Its true explanation has been found to be that, in the infant's first attempt to utter articulate sounds, the consonants m, p, and t decidedly preponderate; and the natural vowel, a, associated with these, yields the child's first syllables. It repeats such sounds as ma-ma-ma or pa-pa-pa, without attaching any meaning to them; the parents apply these sounds to themselves, and thus impart to them their signification.

More curious and far-reaching is the correlation between the post-linguals (k and g) and words of direction and indication, as pointed out also by Winkler. His position could easily be strengthened by numerous further examples. K is at the basis of many roots that are local exponents; with o, u, and a, it is the characteristic element in demonstratives in all Dravidian, Malayan, Melanesian, and Polynesian tongues, in most Australian, and in many Ural-Altaic and American idioms. But the pre-linguals, t and d, very rarely in primitive tongues are main signifiers of indication from and toward.

Yet more remarkable are the contrary correlations of the nasals, n and m; they denote a condition of rest, repose, and inward connection. The contrast of the two classes appears especially in the personal pronouns. In very many diverse languages, n and m are associated with the first person; k, t, and d with the second; almost never the contrary. Thus, m and n appear in the first person in all Indo-European tongues, all Ural-Altaic, over twenty African, and I should say more...
than half the American; further, in the Hamitic and Semitic groups, and in Australian and Dravidian. And with similar frequency are k, t, and d found in the second person.

In various groups of unrelated languages, s is essentially demonstrative and locative; this is explained by its alternation with k and g.

In some American tongues we find significant phonetic elements—that is, certain simple sounds always attached to certain classes of perceptions (see my Essays of an Americanist, p. 394).

We are driven to assume for these identities a correlation with physiological function, though we have not yet the material for its definition. What we need for the proper solution of the problem is an exhaustive collation of these phynonymous radicals from all the languages of the world, an arrangement of them into classes, and then a study of the relations which each class bears to the physiological reactions of the sounds to which it corresponds.

23. On some causes of the Chinese anti-foreign riots of 1892–93; by Rev. Dr. J. T. Gracey, of Rochester, N. Y.

Dr. Gracey presented to the Library of the Society a copy of a Chinese book entitled Causes of the Riots etc., containing reproductions (reduced in size) of some of the anti-foreign placards which are pasted on walls and otherwise published or circulated in China, and which can be found on sale at the Government book-stalls all over the country.

The superstitious prejudices of the people render them an easy prey to designing leaders. The people in general are of a sufficiently literary turn to be open to literary influences. The literati themselves are the ruling class. In the course of centuries, they have become demagogues adept in inflaming the passions and directing the actions of the people by means of the printed sheet. The Honan province is a powerful center for these evil forces and for their administration. From that center, what we might call a “tract operation” is conducted, which circulates books, placards, etc. gratuitously, and which can at any time produce simultaneous inspiration over all the Yangtze valley and widely over China besides.

The volume is in itself an interesting specimen of the native art. It gives on the one page the placards, and on the opposite page descriptive letter-press in English, explaining the pictures, interpreting the legends inscribed on the various figures therein, and translating the other Chinese matter which the placards contain. All is thus rendered quite intelligible, and is a drastic exhibition of unprincipled scurrility and of a mendaciousness which is to us incredible. The pictures are rude, brightly colored, and often obscene; but their obscenity is of a kind calculated to arouse in the native the passion of hatred rather than lust, and to occasion in us feelings of simple disgust and indignation. Jesus is called the “Hog ancestor” and is pictured as a hog. Christianity is called the “Foreign devil religion” and the “Heavenly
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Hog religion.” The missionaries are represented as grossly licentious; and are accused of kidnapping the Chinese children, ostensibly to put them into the Christian schools, but in reality in order that the foreigners may pluck out the children’s eyes and hearts wherewith to concoct chemicals for making silver and gold. And so forth.

The introduction to the book gives a good explanation of the book itself and of its relation to national political movements. Closely allied therewith are a couple of matters upon which Dr. Gracey adds a few words.

1. The pensioned army. This is a deep and penetrating cause of ready disturbance and is a constant menace. The million or so of men who were pensioned at the close of the war of the Taiping rebellion were practically pauperized and supported in idleness. They became restless, and wandered over the country, lawless and violent. The opium den became the unit of their organized operations. Substitutes have been hypothecated on the death of the pensioners, and the government so corrupted that no administration has dared to arrest the outflow from the national exchequer to this idle, vicious, and turbulent organization.

2. The secret societies. One of these is the Kolao Hui, a military organization,—originally a benevolent one. It is recruited very extensively from among the soldiers of the war of the Taiping rebellion. In that army were a great many men from Honan, known as the Honan Braves. These men have been the important element in the organized conspiracy against foreigners, which domestically includes the reigning dynasty, who are opposed and hated as foreigners, being Tartar. The Government army is honeycombed with members of the secret society antagonistic to foreigners of all kinds. The Government may not know whether it can depend on the army in an emergency or not.


That Ancient India has no history is one of the most important general facts in the history of India, and one of those having the deepest significance. It means that the religious belief of the Hindu of antiquity—be he Pantheist, Buddhist, or what not—is so tinged with pessimism that the examples of public spirit and of faith in high endeavor which culminate, after generations, in a Cavour, a Bismarck, or a Lincoln, are almost grotesquely inconceivable. To comprehend fully the reasons why Ancient India is so barren of great personalities and of the noble records that should enshrine them for the memory of mankind—this is a first great step in the understanding of Hindu character.

And yet, as nineteenth century students of Indic antiquity, we cannot help wishing that there were something in it a little more personal and tangible. It is indeed hard to “draw nigh” to the pale gods of the Rig-Veda; and as for Brahma, his very essence precludes it. If we
can never become intimate with any ancient Hindus themselves, we should like at least to know some men who have known them well. And we want something that was intentionally written for a record. All the more welcome, therefore, are the books, albeit written by foreigners, which were really meant for records, to wit: first, the Greek and Latin accounts which rest on the observations of the generals and followers of Alexander the Great, and on the information that flowed later to the great mart of Alexandria in the Nile Delta: second, the records of the Buddhist pilgrims from China; and third, those of the learned Chorasamian, Albiruni. To test the statements of these foreign records on the touchstone of native evidence and of recent archaeological discovery has been one of the most fascinating and rewarding tasks of Indology of the last few years.

Of all the eminent ancient foreign visitors to India, the Chinese pilgrims seem to me to have the most peculiar claim to our sympathy and admiration. The Greeks came for gain and conquest. Not so the bold yet gentle followers of the great and gentle Buddha. Perhaps it will not tax your patience too severely, if I read you a few verses which were inspired by this feeling, and were written as a college exercise in English by one of my Pāli-students at Harvard University, Mr. Murray A. Potter, of San Francisco.

THE CHINESE BUDDHIST PILGRIMS.

Across the Gobi's plains of burning sand
They crept unmindful of the stifling air.
Until at length they saw the temples fair
And thronging marts of stately Samarcand.
Not there they stopped; but on their little band
Pursued its way o'er wind-swept passes bare
And Pamir's icy height; their only care,
To reach at last the long-sought promised land.

And now beneath the sacred Bo-tree's shade,
By fragrant winds of Magadha caressed,
They humbly bowed themselves, and ever prayed
That, like their noble teacher, Buddha blessed,
When death their bodies to oblivion laid,
They too might gain Nirvana's endless rest.

Before the close of the century that saw the life and works of Jesus, the importation of Buddhist books into China had already begun. Some of the converts were moved to undergo the great perils of a pilgrimage to India, in order to see the places sacred in Buddhist story, and especially the Bo-tree in Magadha. Of these pilgrims, the first to leave a record now accessible to us was Fā-hien. He started in the year 399 A. D. from Chang'an for India to procure complete copies of the Vinaya-piṭaka, and after an absence of fourteen years returned to Nan-kin, translated some of the books, and wrote the account of his travels.
These travels have been translated from Chinese into English by Professor Legge of Oxford (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1886); and to them he has prefixed a brief introduction, with details of the author's life culled from a Chinese work named Memoirs of eminent monks, compiled in 519 A.D. Some of these I quote:—

His surname, they tell us, was Kung, and he was a native of Wu-yang in Ping-yang, which is still the name of a large department in Shan-hai. He had three brothers older than himself: but, when they all died before shedding their first teeth, his father devoted him to the service of the Buddhist society, and had him entered as a Črāmaṇera (‘novice’), still keeping him at home in the family. The little fellow fell dangerously ill, and the father sent him to the monastery, where he soon got well, and refused to return to his parents.

When he was ten years old, his father died; and an uncle, considering the widowed solitariness and helplessness of the mother, urged him to renounce the monastic life, and return to her; but the boy replied: "I did not quit the family in compliance with my father's wishes, but because I wished to be far from the dust and vulgar ways of life. This is why I chose monkhood." The uncle approved of his words, and gave over urging him. When his mother also died, it appeared how great had been the affection for her of his fine nature; but after her burial he returned to the monastery.

On one occasion, he was cutting rice with a score or two of his fellow disciples, when some hungry thieves came upon them to take away their grain by force. The other Črāmaṇera's all fled, but our young hero stood his ground, and said to the thieves, "If you must have the grain, take what you please. But, sirs, it was your former neglect of charity that brought you to your present state of destitution; and now, again, you wish to rob others.* I am afraid that in the coming ages you will have still greater poverty and distress: I am sorry for you beforehand." With these words he followed his companions to the monastery, while the thieves left the grain and went away, all the monks, of whom there were several hundred, doing homage to his conduct and courage. So far Professor Legge's introduction.

Now there are several considerations which move me to give full credence to this little incident: first, the character of the eminent monk of whom it is related; second, the general nature of the tradition by which it is handed down to us; and third, the intrinsic genuineness and correctness of the Buddhist doctrine which Fā-hien propounds to the thieves. When tested on the touchstone of the Buddhist Sutta-piṭaka, this correctness is so striking that I am tempted to point out the precise book and chapter which may have suggested to Fā-hien his ready, appropriate, and courageous words.

* Precisely so the Bodhisat, for example, Jātaka, vol. i., p. 133**: especially, idāni puna pi pāpam eva karoti.
It is found in one of the Five Nikāyas, the Aṅguttara (iv. 197), and narrates how Mallikā, the queen of Kosala, was rich, and high in the social scale, but yet of a very ugly face and bad figure. She approaches the Buddha to inquire the reason of her unhappy fate. She puts her question in characteristically Buddhist fashion: namely, in a kind of tabular form. She makes four combinations of the two matters of most import to many women, and asks:

1. Why is a woman born ugly and poor?
2. " " " rich?
3. " " beautiful and poor?
4. " " " rich?

The passage has been translated for the third volume of the Harvard Oriental Series by Mr. H. C. Warren. From his version I read some parts:—

"'Reverend Sir, what is the reason, and what is the cause, when a woman is ugly, of a bad figure, and horrible to look at, and indigent, poor, needy, and low in the social scale?

'Reverend Sir, what is the reason, and what is the cause, when a woman is ugly, of a bad figure, and horrible to look at, and rich, wealthy, affluent, and high in the social scale?

'Reverend Sir, what is the reason, and what is the cause, when a woman is beautiful, attractive, pleasing, and possessed of surpassing loveliness, and indigent, poor, needy, and low in the social scale?

'Reverend Sir, what is the reason, and what is the cause, when a woman is beautiful, attractive, pleasing, and possessed of surpassing loveliness, and rich, wealthy, affluent, and high in the social scale?'"

[ Skipping to Buddha’s answer to the second question, which covers Mallika’s case.]

"'And, again, Mallika, when a woman has been irascible and violent, and at every little thing said against her has felt spiteful, angry, enragèd, and sulky, and manifested anger, hatred, and heartburning; but has given alms to monks and Brahmins, of food, drink, building-sites, carriages, garlands, scents, ointments, bedding, dwelling-houses, and lamps, and has not been of an envious disposition, nor felt envy at the gains, honor, reverence, respect, homage, and worship that came to others, nor been furious and envious thereat; then, when she leaves that existence and comes to this one, wherever she may be born, she is ugly, of a bad figure, and horrible to look at, and rich, wealthy, affluent, and high in the social scale.'" * * *

"'When he had thus spoken, Mallika the queen replied to The Blessed One as follows:"

"'Since now, Reverend Sir, in a former existence I was irascible and violent, and at every little thing said against me felt spiteful, angry, enragèd, and sulky, and manifested anger, hatred, and heartburning, therefore am I now ugly, of a bad figure, and horrible to look at. Since now, Reverend Sir, in a former existence I gave alms to monks and Brahmins, of food, drink, building-sites, carriages, garlands, scents, ointments, bedding, dwelling-houses, and lamps, therefore am I now rich, wealthy, and affluent. Since now, Reverend Sir, in a former existence I was not of an envious disposition, nor felt envy at the gains, honor, reverence, respect, homage, and worship that came to others, nor was furious and envious thereat, therefore am I now high in the social scale."

"'* * * From this day forth I will not be irascible or violent, and though much be said against me, I will not feel spiteful, angry, en
Haupt, Postscript.

raged, or sulky, nor manifest anger, hatred, and heartburning. I will give alms * * *. And I will not be of an envious disposition * * *.'"

It is hardly to be doubted that Fā-hien was well read in the Buddhist scriptures; and it is fairly presumable that he knew this very story. Nevertheless, there is a long way between proving that a thing may be and that it must be. Indeed, there are passages in Sanskrit which may be held to contain the key-note of the monk's warning. Thus, in Čārgadharā's Paddhati,* no. 274, page 48, ed. Peterson, we read:

*bodhayanti na yācante bhiksācārā gṛhe-gṛhe:
diyatāṁ diyatāṁ nityam adātuh phalam idṛçam.*

From house to house for alms they go.
They beg not. No! they simply warn:
An if thou givest not to me,
My lot of beggar thine shall be.

The indication of a not improbable source is the only point of my paper; and even that is not certain. But I hope I may not have asked your attention in vain.†

Postscript, dated June 1, 1894, to Prof. Haupt's article on the Flood-tablet, above p. cv.

I find that Prof. Sayce in his new book The "Higher Criticism" and the Verdict of the Monuments (London, 1894), p. 110, has adopted Prof. Jensen's translation, 'what I have borne, where is it?' Prof. Sayce has also retained the erroneous translation of kīма ārī mitzurat usallu, 'like the trunks of trees did the bodies float.' He also reads Aдра-khāsiś, with d, instead of Aдра-khāsiś, explaining the name to mean ' the reverently intelligent' (L. c. p. 109). Line 164 (cf. NE. 141, n. 13) is translated, ' the great goddess lifted up the mighty bow which Anu had made;' ετεκζ, line 172, 'stood still' (cf. Delitzsch's Wörterbuch, 250); line 178, ' who except Ea can devise a speech?' To the foot-note (p. cv) concerning Peiser's Babylonian map, add the reference: cf. also Alfred Jeremias, Izdubar-Nimrod (Leipzig, 1891), p. 87, note.

* Cf. Böhtlingk, Indische Sprüche,* no. 4489.
† Professor Legge, on page 59, note, observes in passing: "I am surprised it does not end with the statement that she [mother Vais'akha] is to become a Buddha." Some readers may be interested to know that it is a condition, sino qua non, for becoming a Buddha that the creature in question should be a human being and of the male sex. *Itikī-bhāvamī na gacchanti,* 'the Buddhists are never of the female sex,' says the Introduction to the Jātaka, i. 45.
Other papers were presented, as follows:

25. On Ibrahim of Mosul, a study in Arabic literary tradition; by Dr. F. D. Chester, of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. To be published in the Journal, xvi. 261 ff.


28. Influence of the Christian orient and of Byzantine civilization on Italy during the early middle age; by Professor A. L. Frothingham, Jr., of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.


32. On contact between the eastern coast of Asia and the western coast of America in pre-historic times; by Rev. S. D. Peck, of Good Hope, Illinois.

33. Notes on Die altpersischen Keilinschriften of Weissbach and Bang; by Professor H. C. Tolman, of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. Published in pamphlet form, as a supplement to his Old Persian Inscriptions.

34. On foreign words in the Koran; by Professor C. H. Toy, of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

35. On some points of Arabic Syntax; by Mr. W. Scott Watson, of Towerhill, N. J.
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
AT ITS
MEETING IN PHILADELPHIA, PENN.,
December 27th, 28th, and 29th, 1894.

The meeting of the American Oriental Society in Philadelphia, at the University of Pennsylvania, December 27, 28, 29, 1894, was held in accordance with a vote passed at the annual meeting in New York, March 29-31, 1894, which provided that a joint meeting should be held with various other associations. The committee to whom the arrangements for the joint meeting were entrusted having conferred with similar committees representing the other associations which intended to participate in the meeting, it was decided that such joint meeting should be made commemorative of the services of the late Professor William Dwight Whitney, who had passed away on June 7, 1894.

The following organizations took part in the joint meeting:

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS,
AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY,
SPELLING REFORM ASSOCIATION,
ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA.

These societies held three joint sessions.

On Thursday, December 27, at 12 m., the societies having assembled in the large hall of the library of the University of Pennsylvania, addresses were made by Mr. C. C. Harrison, Acting Provost of the University, by Professor A. Marshall Elliott of the Johns Hopkins University, President of the Modern Language Association and presiding officer of the session, and by Dr. Horace Howard Furness of Philadelphia.

VOL. XVI.
At the close of the opening joint session the Local Committee announced the places of meeting of the various societies; a luncheon to be served to all members by the University of Pennsylvania; a dinner at six o'clock P. M., at one dollar per person, in the Bullitt Building, to which all were invited; a reception by the Provost and Trustees in the Library Building of the University from eight to eleven o'clock P. M.; an invitation to attend the monthly reception of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, from eight to eleven o'clock P. M.; and for Friday, December 28, an invitation to the gentlemen to attend a reception of the Penn Club from half-past nine to half-past eleven P. M.

The second joint session was held in the same place on Friday, December 28, at 10 A. M., and was devoted to the reading of papers.

The third joint session was held in the same place on Friday, December 28, at 8 P. M. It was a Memorial Meeting in honor of William Dwight Whitney.

The programmes of the joint sessions, and of the separate meetings of the societies other than the American Oriental Society, will be found below. The papers commemorative of Professor Whitney will be published in a separate volume.

Three separate sessions were held by the American Oriental Society: on Thursday, December 27, at 3.00 P. M.; on Friday, December 28, at 2.30 P. M.; and on Saturday, December 29, at 10 A. M. It has been found impossible, owing to the fact that so many members of this Society are also members of other philosophical associations and attended the other separate sessions, to prepare a complete list of those present at our separate sessions. A partial list follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adler, Cyrus</th>
<th>Gilbert, H. L.</th>
<th>Lawler, T. B.</th>
<th>Steele, J. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barton, G. A.</td>
<td>Gilman, D. C.</td>
<td>Levis, C.</td>
<td>Stratton, A. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batten, L. W.</td>
<td>Gotthill, R. J. H.</td>
<td>Lyman, B. S.</td>
<td>Taylor, C. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binney, John</td>
<td>Grape, J.</td>
<td>Lyon, D. G.</td>
<td>Taylor, J. P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield, M.</td>
<td>Hall, I. H.</td>
<td>Macdonald, D. B.</td>
<td>Tyler, C. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs, C. A.</td>
<td>Harris, J. R.</td>
<td>Mead, C. M.</td>
<td>Van Name, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton, M. W.</td>
<td>Hilprecht, H. V.</td>
<td>Olcott, G. N.</td>
<td>White, J. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elwell, L. H.</td>
<td>Hopkins, E. W.</td>
<td>Paton, L. B.</td>
<td>Williams, T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay, E. W.</td>
<td>Jackson, A. V. W.</td>
<td>Perry, E. D.</td>
<td>Wright, T. F. [54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, H.</td>
<td>Jastrow, M., Jr.</td>
<td>Ramsay, F. P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frothingham, A. L., Jr.</td>
<td>Lauman, C. B.</td>
<td>Schmidt, Nathaniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minutes of the last meeting, at New York, were read by the Recording Secretary, Professor Lyon, of Harvard University, and accepted by the Society.

Reports of officers being now in order, the Corresponding Secretary, Professor Perry, of Columbia College, presented some of the correspondence of the year.
Professor E. E. Salisbury had written to thank the Society for the vote passed at its last meeting congratulating him on the near approach of his eightieth birthday.

Mr. W. E. Coleman had written in reference to the Geographical Congress, which was held in San Francisco on May 4, 1894, at which he was present as the representative of this Society. Mr. Coleman read at the Congress a paper on "Oriental Societies and Geographical Research," and he states that this paper is to be printed in one of the bulletins of the Congress.

The Corresponding Secretary read a copy of the letter which he had sent to the International Congress of Orientalists, held at Geneva, September 8-12, 1894, inviting that body to meet in this country in 1897.

He also read a letter from Prof. A. H. Edgren of the University of Nebraska, stating that he had inscribed to Prof. Whitney's memory his translation of Shakuntala, an advance copy of which he presents to the Society.

He also read a letter from the Honorary Philological Secretary of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, stating that he sends 20 copies of a fly-leaf exhibiting the system of transliteration which will in future be adhered to by the Asiatic Society of Bengal for all its publications.

Reports on the Geneva Congress of Orientalists being called for, Professors R. J. H. Gottheil and A. V. W. Jackson responded. The former stated that a provisional report was made at the Congress of Edward Glaser's most recent journey of discovery. Glaser brought home some 600 Sabean inscriptions and a collection of rare Arabic MSS. The American delegates presented the invitation extended by the American Oriental Society, but the Congress finally chose Paris for the next place of meeting. Professor Jackson stated that Professors Ascoli and Weber paid fitting tributes to the memory of Professor Whitney.

No reports were presented by the Treasurer, the Librarian, or the Committee of Publication, such being due only at the annual meeting in Easter Week.

The Directors reported by their Scribe, Professor Perry, as follows:

1. That they recommended for election to Corporate Membership the following persons:
   Professor L. W. Batten, Philadelphia, Penn.
   Mr. Samuel N. Deinard, Philadelphia, Penn.
   Mr. Harry Westbrook Dunning, New Haven, Conn.
   Mr. J. A. Kohut, New York, N. Y.
   Mr. Thomas B. Lawler, Worcester, Mass.
   Professor W. Max Müller, Philadelphia, Penn.
   Professor L. B. Paton, Hartford, Conn.
   Professor Nathaniel Schmidt, Hamilton, N. Y.
   Mr. M. Victor Staley, New Haven, Conn.
   Professor Charles Mellen Tyler, Ithaca, N. Y.
   Dr. Albrecht Wirth, Chicago, Ill. [11]

2. That they recommended that the next annual meeting be held at New Haven, on Thursday, April 18, 1895, and the following day, the Committee of Arrangements to consist of Messrs. Van Name, Salisbury, Oertel, and the Corresponding Secretary.

3. That they recommended that the report of deceased members be postponed until the April meeting.

4. That they recommended that the next issue of Proceedings shall follow the April meeting.

5. That the vacancy in the Publication Committee caused by the death of Professor Whitney had been filled by the appointment thereto of the Corresponding Secretary.

Ballot being had, the persons recommended for election to membership were declared formally elected; and the other recommendations contained in the above report were unanimously adopted by the Society.

On motion it was resolved that the minute passed at the last meeting in regard to the long and faithful services of Professor Lanman as Corresponding Secretary should be printed in the next issue of the Proceedings.

The minute is as follows:

VOTED:—That the American Oriental Society has heard with great regret that Professor Lanman feels himself obliged to decline re-election as Corresponding Secretary of this Society. With singular devotion and great faithfulness he has performed the difficult and engrossing duties of this office for the past ten years. During these years the conduct of the work of the Society has been committed especially to his hands, and to his indefatigable efficiency its success has been to a very great extent due. The Society hereby expresses its hearty thanks to him for his faithful and self-sacrificing services, and gratefully recognizes his worthy succession to the two distinguished scholars who preceded him in this office.

The Society passed a vote of thanks to the University of Pennsylvania for their hospitality, and to the Local Committee for their efficient services, which had added so greatly to the enjoyment of the members in attendance.

This vote was in the nature of an affirmation of the vote of thanks passed at the joint session of Friday, December 28, which was as follows:

The several Societies here assembled in the Congress of American Philologists, viz.:

THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,
THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS,
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
THE AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY,
THE SPELLING REFORM ASSOCIATION, and
THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA,
Hopkins, Notes on Dyāus, Viṣṇu, Varuṇa, and Rudra. cxlv

unite in expressing their hearty thanks to the Provost and Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania for their unstinted hospitality; to the Local Committee, with its efficient Chairman and Secretary, for the considerate provision made for the convenience of every guest; and also to Dr. Horace Howard Furness for his memorable words of welcome. They further desire to record their grateful recognition of the courtesies generously extended to them and their friends by

THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
THE PENN CLUB,
THE UNIVERSITY CLUB,
THE ART CLUB,
THE ACORN CLUB, and
THE NEW CENTURY CLUB.

Final adjournment was had on Saturday at 11.30 A.M.

The following communications were presented:

1. Notes on Dyāus, Viṣṇu, Varuṇa, and Rudra, by Professor E. W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Penn.

These notes we intended to present as the detailed verification of certain views set forth in more popular form in a volume (now in press) on Indic religions. The appearance of Oldenberg's Religion des Veda after we had sent the title of this paper to the committee has led us to modify the form in which the notes were first drawn up, and to extend the field which they cover to a review of the principles involved in interpretation.

First, as to Dyāus, we will simply state the grounds on which we have claimed that Dyāus was never a supreme god of the Aryan. The various Aryan families have each their own chief god, and there is no supreme Dyāus or etymologically equivalent supreme form in Teutonic* or Slavic mythology. In Rome there is a Mars-piter as well as a Ju-piter. In India itself pitā is said of Dyāus no more than of other gods. Moreover, the instances where Dyāus is called father make it evident that he is not regarded as a Supreme Father but as father paired with Mother Earth. Now there is no advanced Earth-cult in the Rig-Veda. At most, one has a poem to Earth, called Mother as a matter of course; but no worship of Earth as a great divinity over the gods is found. This is just the position taken by Dyāus. He is, as the visible sky, not the Father, but one of many 'father'-gods. That he fathers gods means nothing in the hyperbolic phraseology of the Rig-Veda. The Dawn and Aṁsvins are his sons; but dawn may be sired of sky without much praise.† Indra destroys Dyāus in v. 54. 2-4, though the latter is called his father, iv. 17. 4.‡ In invocations Dyāus is grouped as one.

* Compare Bremer, I. F., iii. 301.
† So x. 45. 8, sky begets fire.
‡ In x. 173. 6 Indra carries Dyāus as an ornament.

of many gods (i. 129. 3; 186. 6; iii. 51. 5; 54. 2; v. 48. 8; x. 63. 10, etc.), or more often as one of the pair 'sky and earth' (iv. 51. 11; v. 59. 1; vi. 70. 5-6; x. 10. 5; 38. 3; 58. 7-10), 'father and mother.' But the natural sex of Dyāus as an impregnating bull (Dyāūr vr̥ṣd, v. 86. 5) is not so strong but that heaven and earth are regarded also as two sisters (i. 185. 5; iii. 54. 10).† Dyāus in v. 47. 7 is mere place, the high seat, and so in other passages (iii. 6. 3; x. 8. 11). Dyāus, it is true, is called the great father, v. 71. 5 ('Fire brought great father Dyāus and rain,' rasa), just as it is said that 'great Dyāus' is the norm of Indra's strength (v. 57. 5. 'Dyāus Asura and earth' both bow to Indra, v. 181. 1). But how few and unimportant are the cases where Dyāus is father can be estimated only when one considers how large is the work in which the few cases occur, and how many other gods are also called 'father':

'Father Dyāus be sweetness to us,' i. 90. 7.  
'Dyāus is my father, my mother is the Earth,' i. 164. 33.  
'Dyāus is your father, Earth is your mother,' i. 191. 6.  
'Dyāus and Earth, father and mother,' v. 48. 2.  
'Father Dyāus, mother Earth, brother Fire, vi. 51. 5.  
'Wind, Earth, and father Dyāus grant us place,' i. 89. 4.  
'Father Dyāus give us treasure,' iv. 1. 10.

Often it is only in connection with nourishing Agni (fire) that Dyāus is lauded (viit. 7. 5; x. 8. 11; 88. 2, 8).

That to be father even of the gods is not to be a Supreme Father-God is evident from i. 69. 2: bhava devānām pīṭh putrāḥ sán, 'being the son thou becamest the father of the gods,' said of Agni. Other passages which show how lightly 'father' is used are as follows:

'(Agni) is our un-aging father,' v. 4. 2.  
'Thou, O Agni, art our Prometheus, our father,' i. 31. 10.§  
'Thou, O Indra, art our Prometheus, and like a father,' viit. 29. 4.

So Bṛhaspati is father; and Tvaṣṭar is father; and Wind is father; and Varuṇa is father; and Yama is father; and Soma is father; and Agni is father again in two or three passages; and Indra in another is father and mother both.

They that claim an original supreme Aryan Father Sky must point to him on early Aryan soil or in India. They cannot do this in either case.

* iv. 57. 3; i. 94. 16 (ix. 98. 58); iii. 54. 19 ('May sky, earth, waters, air, sun, stars, hear us'); vii. 34. 23 ('sky, earth, trees, and plants,' invoked for wealth); v. 41. 1, etc.

† Dyāus and Earth both 'wet the sacrifice,' and give food in i. 22. 13. Dyāus bellows (thunders) only in i. 31. 4 (verse 10 as 'father'); v. 58. 6; vi. 72. 3. The Maruta pour out 'the pail of Dyāus' in v. 59. 8.

‡ Scarce a touch of moral greatness exists in Dyāus. In iv. 3. 5 he is grouped with Varuṇa as a sin-regarding god, but the exception is marked.

§ Prometheus, Prāmatīs. In the two verses preceding, 'Dyāus and Earth' are the parents of Agni himself.

† i. 31. 10; ii. 5. 1; viii. 98=87. 11. For the other cases see the Lexicon.

Wind in x. 186. 2 is both father and brother.
There is then no evidence whatever that Dyāus in the Rig-Veda is a dec-  
enant Supreme. The testimony shows that while the Slav raised Bhaga,  
and the Teuton raised Wotan-Odin, the Greek raised Zeus out of a group  
of gods to be chief. To the Hindu Dyāus was never supreme, but only  
one of many ‘protectors’ (pitāras, fathers); whose ‘fatherhood’ is not  
more pronounced than is that of other gods. If Zeus-Jupiter is supreme  
in the Greco-Italic combination, this proves nothing for the Aryans in  
general. It is parallel to a supreme Slavic deity with Iranian and  
Indic representations who are not supreme, even as Dyāus is not supreme.  

Viṣṇu: Oldenberg claims that Viṣṇu's strides are atmospheric; that  
the god is a space-god. But Viṣṇu has not been regarded as a sun-god  
through predilection for sun-gods, but because what little is said of  
him answers only to that conception. It is the rule in the Rig-Veda  
that the spirits of the departed live in the top of the sky, and Viṣṇu is  
the first god to represent (what he continues to represent through later  
ages) the sun-home of souls.* Earth-souls, star-souls, moon-souls, plant-  
souls, these are oddities, rarities in the Rig-Veda. The sun-soul is, as  
it is later, the norm. Viṣṇu is the Herdsman, like Helios, and in the  
Rig-Veda, like Śūrya and like Fire, ‘the undeceived Herdsman’: viṣṇur  
gopā ddāḥhyas, i. 22. 18; (agnir) ddābho gopās, vi. 7. 7; (śūryo) jāgato  
gopās, vii. 60. 2. In ii. 1. 3 Viṣṇu of the wide steps' and Fire are one.  
The fastening of the world is ascribed in the first two passages to the  
Universal Agni and to Viṣṇu in almost the same words. In i. 155 his  
highest step is most clearly in the sky. In i. 154, the ‘highest pada’ of  
Viṣṇu can scarcely be other than the highest place in the top of the  
sky.†  

Oldenberg, chiefly on the strength of the one verse i. 154. 4, where  
Viṣṇu holds the three-fold world, is quite confident that this god is a  
space-god (p. 139). It is evident that this theory is built upon the  
ritualistic conception of Viṣṇu, rather than on that of the Rig-Veda.  
For vi-kram can scarcely mean anything else than step widely out;  

* i. 154. 1. 5.  
† Although Viṣṇu's name occurs about forty times in the family books, as a  
general thing he is lauded only in hymns to Indra, whose friendly subordinate he  
is (iv. 18. 11; viii. 106=89. 12). He appears inconspicuously in connection with  
the Maruts in v. 87; ii. 34 (v. 3. 3, interpolated); vii. 20 and 40; and is named  
in hymns to Indra in ii. 22; vi. 17, 20, 21; viii. 3, 5, 12, 15, 16, 66; otherwise  
only in a list of gods vii. 44 (as in lists of All-gods, iii. 54, 55; v. 46, 49, 50;  
vi. 48, 49, 50; vii. 35, 36, 39, 40; viii. 25, 27, 31, 72); in one hymn to Indra-Agni, vii. 93;  
in one hymn to Agni alone, iv. 3, with which deity he is identified (above); and  
in one hymn to the Aqvis, viii. 35, to whom he is joined (verse 14). In vii.  
29. 7 he is (not named) the wide-stepping god whose steps are where gods are. He  
is almost ignored in some families, notably in that of Viṣṇavāmitra (book iii).  
Among all he gets but two independent hymns, both in the collection of one  
family (vii. 99–100); and shares one hymn with Indra in another family book  
(vi. 69).
and the solar home of souls is too evidently connected with Viṣṇu to be thrust aside as of no account. To the translation of the unique, and in all probability late verse, i. 154. 4, which speaks of Viṣṇu ‘supporting the threefold world,’ whence Oldenberg concludes that the ritualistic idea is the normal conception of the Rig-Veda, he gives this significant note (p. 228): “Diese Vorstellung herrscht in den jüngeren Veden vor.” We say that this is significant because it indicates not only the author’s attitude, but a certain lack of historical sense, which detracts from the value of his work, and which we shall have occasion to notice again. Historically stated, the note should read: “This view is quite unique in the Rig-Veda, but prevails in later literature.” In accordance with this later view Oldenberg translates urugāy as ‘lord of wide spaces,’ instead of ‘wide-stepping,’ and ignores altogether those traits which make a solar deity of Viṣṇu. These traits, indeed, are not very pronounced, but the reason for this is the one given in our recent essay on Henotheism. Viṣṇu is no longer a natural phenomenon. He is a mystic god, the keeper of the souls of the dead, the first cover of real pantheism. Of his solar character remain the three steps, indicated by vi-krama, ‘step widely,’ one of which is located in the zenith, and the others cannot be downward or upward (which vi-kram would not express) but across from horizon to horizon.

Varuṇa: In the forthcoming book to which we referred above, we have directed ourselves chiefly against the interpretation of Varuṇa as a Sole Supreme, either in the Veda or at any other stage of Aryan belief. We should, therefore, be very ready to welcome any cogent interpretation of Varuṇa as nature-god more distinct than ‘covering heaven.’ But though we find such an interpretation in Hillebrandt and Oldenberg, we must ask what grounds make them identify Varuṇa with the moon and why, above all, should it be necessary to ‘regard Varuṇa as a Semite.’ The first question is answered shortly if not satisfactorily, because Sun and Moon make a natural pair, Mithra and Varuṇa. But so do heaven and sun, especially when one is informed that sun is the eye of heaven (Varuṇa). So that what little support is given to any nature-interpretation remains to uphold the Heaven-Varuṇa. But it is especially the assertion on p. 198 of Oldenberg’s Religion: ‘The Indo-European people has taken this (whole) circle of gods (Mithra, Varuṇa and the Ādityas) from elsewhere’ that must be examined. The first argument is that Varuṇa is not Aryan, not the same with Ouranos; an old doubt, which is based on phonetics, always uncertain in proper names, and not even then in this case fully justified. The next argument is that since Varuṇa is moon (a bare assumption), the Indo-Europeans would have two moon-gods and two sun-gods. To this the only answer necessary is that names are not things, and that the same natural phenomenon may diverge into two distinct gods. The ‘five planets’ as Ādityas have of course no support save the attraction of novelty. And then follows: “Is it then not probable that the Indo-Iranians have here borrowed something which they only half understood, from a neighboring people, which knew more about the starry
heaven, in all likelihood the Semites (or the Akkadians)?” Further:
“When one examines the gods of the Veda does one not receive the
impression that this closed circle of light-gods separates itself as some-
thing peculiar, strange, from the other gods of the Vedic Olympus?”

And so Oldenberg, by a further series of questions, states indirectly
that he regards Varuṇa as representative of an older higher culture,
witness of a lively intercourse with a people that “at that time” stood
before the threshold of India.

We have shown in our book that Mexico has as good and as natural
a Varuṇa as had ever the Akkadians, to whose moon-hymn Oldenberg
triumphantly refers as proof of his interrogations being an argument.
Something of this sort has been suggested by Brunnhofer (see our
paper The Dog in the Rig-Veda, A.J.P. xv. 158), who also wants to get
rid of Varuṇa (for a different reason), and so ascribes him to Iran.

Our last quotation from Oldenberg gives, however, the key of the
argument. Varuṇa is not like the other Vedic gods. Whether this be
reason enough for regarding him as an exotic we shall discuss below.
But first, in order to the elucidation of Varuṇa, some other divinities
must be discussed. What does Oldenberg make of Dawn and Aṣvin?

The chief question in regard to Dawn is why she is not allowed to
share in the soma. Oldenberg’s answer to this is that in the later
ritual she is given an hymn, but not soma; hence, etc. The answer
that the whole tone of the Dawn hymns separates them as sharply as
does those of the two great Varuṇa hymns from the later ritual is quite
overlooked.

As to the Aṣvin they are to Oldenberg the morning and the evening
stars. They had previously been identified with the Gemini by Weber
and with Venus by Bollensen. Why are they now taken to be two
disjunct stars? The proof for such a statement is offered solely in the
phraseology of i. 181. 4 and v. 73. 4; of which passages the first says
that the Aṣvins are ‘born here and there’ (tētha jātā), and the second
that they are nānā jātāu, which Oldenberg chooses to translate
“getrennt geboren,” though the first verse of the same hymn shows
that the words mean ‘in different places.’ Oldenberg himself warns
against taking sporadic phrases as expressive of normal Vedic ideas.
Let us see what is the normal tone of the Vedic poets in regard to their
twin gods. But first to review Oldenberg’s argument. 1. The Aṣvins
must be the (one) morning star, because only a morning star can be
spoken of as accompanying dawn and sun-rise. 2. “Only the duality
does not suit this idea.” But “a very little change will make this all
right,” and so, since “the idea of a morning star cannot be separated
from that of an evening star: this (evening star) is the second Aṣvin.”
3. As evidence: they are said to be ‘born here and there,’ etc. (as
above), and are praised at morn and eve.

We pause here to give a truer picture of the Aṣvins according to the
Rig-Veda:

i. 157. 1: “Agni is awake, the Sun rises, Dawn shines, the two
Aṣvins have yoked their car to go.”
i. 180. 1: “You two Aṣvins accompany Dawn.”

i. 188. 2: “You two Açvins accompany Dawn.”

viii, 5. 2: “You two Açvins accompany Dawn.”

And so on, in many cases, the Açvins as a pair accompany the morning light. Their united duality is a part of their being, no less pronounced than is their matutinality. But again, it is not twice, morn and eve, but thrice that they appear. In the first place they come to three soma-pressings (passim), and in the second they are represented as being in three different places. Compare viii. 8. 14: “If ye two Açvins are in the distance or in air;” 22, “in many places;” 28, “Three places of the Açvins there are now revealed, formerly secret.” Three-fold is the nature of the dual Açvins for this very reason (compare i. 84). ‘At eve and at morn,’ ‘in east or in west’ (x. 40. 2; viii. 10. 5), is merely part of their excursion ‘round earth and heaven’ (viii. 22. 5, and often); exactly as the expression ‘called at morn and eve’ (x. 89. 1; 40. 4, etc.) represents only a part of the three-fold calling (morn, noon, and night, v. 76. 8), ‘the sky, the mountain, and the waters’ are these three places (v. 76. 4). But above all they come always in union together (ékasmin yöge samāné vii. 67. 8).

On the basis of this simple juxtaposition of actual verses we are constrained to think that Oldenberg’s facile view is not in accordance with the extant texts. For we demand at least a little proof of the one star, a little evidence of the evening star. But what proof is offered? None other, besides what we have mentioned, save the ‘parallel’ of Mitra Varuṇa as sun and moon, where Varuṇa is not proved to be moon, and a further comparison of the Açvins’ intercourse with Śūryā as the equivalent of a Lithuanian folk-song, which must itself, in order to fit into Oldenberg’s interpretation of the Açvins, be ‘interpreted’ in a novel Oldenbergian way!

Rudra: But the best, and worst, example of Oldenberg’s method is found in his treatment of Rudra. The hymns in Rudra’s honor are very few. It is impossible that any one writing about them should overlook any significant statement. One of these statements is as plain as it is conclusive, vii. 46. 8: ‘May thy lightning which, hurled down from the sky, passes along the earth, avoid us.’ Now what has Oldenberg to say about this celestial lightning-hurler, who is (ii. 88. 1) the father of the rain-bejeweled (v. 57. 4) storm-gods, the Maruts? “Rudra is wont to be considered a tempest-god. He cannot at any rate have this meaning in the consciousness of the Vedic poets. The hymns to the Maruts show how in the Veda the tempestuous rush of the wind is described: the lightnings flash, the rain pours down.

[etc.] Nothing of this sort is found in the Rudra hymns.” Rudra in ii. 33. 3 is the god who “holds the vājra in his arms,” and this vājra can be no other than the didyāt ‘gleaming bolt’ (literally ‘lightning’) of vii. 46. 3, regarded also as an arrow of his bow (ii. 33. 10). And what should the leader of the rain-giving Maruts do? He does not pour the rain; he hurls the lightning. But when it is said (v. 58. 7): ‘the sons of Rudra make rain of their sweat,’ is not Rudra implicated, at least as an ethereal or atmospheric god? But, to pass this point and return to the verse: (Rudra’s) ·lightning hurled from the sky passes
along the earth.’ How does Oldenberg, who interprets Rudra as an Old Man of the Mountains without any celestial attributes, explain this? He does not even allude to it! He wanders off to Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras to explain the ‘mountain-nature’ and the medicines of this lightning-god of the sky, and to interpret his bolt as wind (pp. 217 ff.), till, after one page devoted to Rudra in the Rig-Veda, and six to the later Rudra, he comes to this result: ‘We have before us here, I think, a relation of those European types whose nature Mannhardt has developed in so masterly a way, Fauni and Silvani, wood-men, wild people. From the desert, from mountain and wood come the sickness-spirits or darts of sickness to human abodes. These are the hosts or the shafts of Rudra, who dwells in the mountains.’

We are far from denying the possibility of such an origin for much in Rudra’s later nature, for Rudra in the later age is Çiva, the folk-god. But where there are but four hymns to Rudra in the Rig-Veda, and one of them (vii. 46) represents him as a celestial god, not even mentioning mountains; another praises him as ‘bright as the sun, shining as gold,’ also without an allusion to mountains (i. 43; 5, like sun and gold); a third calls him ‘the boar of the sky’ and speaks of averting celestial wrath, also without an allusion to mountains; and the fourth calls him the god ‘that bears lightning in his arms’ (above), and speaks of the (jālīṣa) cure that ‘carries off the celestial hurt,’ and of Rudra’s storming like a wild bull, a warrior aloft upon his car (ii. 38. 7, 11), also without an allusion to mountains—in these circumstances we maintain that to represent Rudra as an original Old Man of the Mountains, portrayed in his primitive nature in later texts, and in a secondary nature in the Rig-Veda, is unhistorical.

But Oldenberg lays much stress on the ‘medicines’? This, however, proves nothing to the purpose, for to the Vedic seers the waters are medicines. Because Rudra as a Marut-leader is a water-causing god, therefore he is medicinally potent. What idea is connected with the word for medicine in the Rig-Veda? Compare i. 33. 20 “all medicines are in the waters” (apā antār viṣaptā bheṣajā). In i. 89. 4, Wind, Earth and Father Dyāus are besought for medicines, along with the Açvins. Of which gods are used the verbs ‘to heal with medicine’? With one exception only, the dewy Açvins.* Are these, therefore, mountain-gods as well as separated stars? If we do not err, only hyperbolic Soma, the waters, the Açvins, and Rudra are called ‘physicians.’ And if the last is ‘the best physician’ is it not because he is most responsible for “the waters which are the physicians” (vi. 50. 7)? Can, in any circumstances, this, the Rik view, be calmly shoved overboard and the “true interpretation” of Rudra be one based on later texts, where the earthly pest-gods of the un-Aryan peoples have crept in and coalesced with the Vedic celestial ‘pest and healing’ god? Does not Helios in Greece send pest and is he not a saviour too? Is it

* In viii. 79=68. 2 (compare viii. 72=61. 17: x. 115. 2) Soma as priest and poet heals (bhīṣajī; the other verbs bhīṣaji and bhīṣajī are used of the Açvins). In vi. 74. 3 Soma and Rudra have all medicines.
more scientific to be less historical? Let us see how the Vedic poet represents sickness and healing: "O Agni, keep off enemies, destroy sickness and demons, let out for us a quantity of water from the ocean of the sky" (x. 98. 12). For not only Rudra (Lightning) but the universal Agni, Fire, "sends down rain from the sky" (ib. 10); and this whole hymn shows that the medicines against sickness are the rains. Moreover, when Wind is besought to 'bring medicine' how is it done? "Wind blow medicine hither, blow away hurt, for thou hast all medicines, and goest as the messenger of the gods . . . and may the gods bring help hither and the hosts of Maruts" (x. 187. 8, 5), for "the waters are curative, the waters drive away sickness, the waters cure everything, may they bring thee cure" (ib. 6). And that this is the regular view of the Vedic seers shows another passage: "May we be with you, O Maruts, when the water streams down health and medicine" (v. 53. 14). In viii. 20. 25 medicine is in the Indus, in the Asikni, in the seas, and \textit{pravatag}, which, considering the preceding verse, "Maruts, bring us to your Marut-medicine," must be rather cloud than hill, and here the "Maruts, sons of Rudra," also bring cure (ib. 17. 26).

What says the poet directly? "From the sky come the medicines" (x. 59. 9, \textit{dirac caranti bhesag}). And it is only as dew-gods that the \textit{Açvins} are physicians in the eyes of the Vedic poets: "When ye two mount your car ye wet our realm with sweet \textit{ghee}—ye heal with your medicines" (i. 157. 2, 6). In a word, Rudra as lightning and medicine god remains a thunder-storm god in strict accordance with the dogmas of the Vedic poets. One may indulge in any speculation as to his pre-Vedic nature without affecting the Rig-Vedic conception of him; and one may interpret the later \textit{Carva-Bhava-Çiva} mixture as one chooses, but the Vedic Rudra is not this conglomerate.

Having thus obtained the key to Oldenberg's method, we are in a position to understand the interrogation in regard to Varuṇa. "Is he not a god quite different to the ritualistic gods, and consequently ought we not to condemn him as an alien, because he does not fit into our conception of the Rig-Veda?" This is what is intended. In answer we say: "Well, yes, Varuṇa in some hymns is not like the ritualistic gods, and Xenophases' God is not like the gods of Aristophanes; but that is no reason for supposing that Xenophases borrowed from the Akkadians."

Varuṇa has been more misrepresented than any god of the Rig-Veda. There are at least three Varuṇas, all distinct variations under the same name. The last of these is the pantheistic Varuṇa of the Atharva, who is quite other than the quasi-monotheistic god of the Rik.

The Rig-Veda contains two hymns to Varuṇa that are of exalted, almost monotheistic color. Other Varuṇa hymns represent him as a water-god chiefly, and do not give him a very lofty position. "He upsets a water-keg and makes heaven, air and earth stream with rain. The king of creation wets the ground . . . ," or "Varuṇa lets the streams flow"—such traits he shares with Parjanya, and in most of the hymns to him he does just what Rudra does in another fashion, sends rain which heals from hurts (sin), though the rainy side is vigorously
Hopkins, Notes on Dyāus, Viṣṇu, Varuṇa, and Rudra. cliii

suppressed by some admirers. There is quite enough of it, however, in
the Rig-Veda to show that Varuṇa is like the other gods, and to nullify
the force of the appeal that is meant to oust him. Varuṇa rises to a
great height, but he still drips water wherever he goes, and there is no
reason for making the Semites or the Akkadians responsible for him.

One last specimen of unhistorical interpretation may be given. In a
burial-hymn of the Rig-Veda the dead man is addressed thus: "Enter
now into Mother Earth, the earth wide and kindly. May she, a maid
soft as wool, guard thee from Destruction's lap Nirṛti ('going out,' like
Nirudda, 'blowing out'). Open, O Earth, harm him not, be easy of
access, easy of approach to this man. As a mother (covers) her son
with the hem of her garment, so enfold him (open for him), O Earth." Then the pillars and props of the grave are mentioned, and a clod of
earth is cast down by the speaker of the hymn. The later hymns to
the Manes (shown to be late by their content) have already knowledge
of cremation as well as burial; and in the later ritual-age cremation is
the only rite for adults. Now Oldenberg must needs equate the Rig-
Veda with the ritual, and on beginning his description of the Vedic
funeral, he says (p. 570): "Cremation was the customary form of
funeral though not the universal one"! In regard to the so clear allusion to burial given in the verses above he adds: "It can just as
well refer to cremation" (p. 571). It certainly can be forced to refer to
cremation, and that is what the later ritualists did with it in arranging
the ritual (Roth, Z.D.M.G. viii. 467), but it seems a pity to adopt now-
days their point of view.

We trust that the exception which we have taken to Oldenberg's
method, as exhibited in these instances, will not be accepted as a
general depreciation of the clever and learned work in which that
method is implicitly manifested. Especially in the latter part the book
is one of great value, fruitful in reasonable suggestions and com-
prehensive in its elucidation of the cult. Here there is by no means so
much to stickle at as in the first part, which aims at presenting the
Vedic religion as a whole, without due historical distinction between
the Brahmanic age and belief as these are known in extant literature
and the age and belief of the Rig-Veda. For it is one thing to say that
the Rig-Veda is the product of a Brahmanic age (to that we should
agree with some reservations), and another to say that this Brahmanic
age is the Brahmanic age of extant Brāhmaṇas. The extant Brāhma-
ṇas, and even the Atharva-Veda, represent a period so removed
from that of the Rig-Veda that the god who in the Rig-Veda is not yet
developed as chief god is in the Brāhmaṇas and Atharvan already an
antiquated figure-head with whom other newer ritualistic gods are
identified to ensure their respectability.

But, although the cult-part of Oldenberg's Religion des Veda (the
radical error lurks even in the title, for there is no one religion of the
Veda) is free from the grosser confusion of Brahmanic and Vedic views,
to which we have called attention, there are yet several points even
here which seem to demand a word of tentative criticism. For in-
stance, we are not sure that Oldenberg is wrong and that we are right
in this regard, but to us it seems as if too much stress had been laid upon totemism. On page 85, our learned author, who is perhaps too well read in modern anthropology, seems to give the absolute dictum that animal names of persons and clans imply totemism. This is no longer a new theory. On the contrary, taken in so universal an application it is a theory already on the wane, and it seems to us injudicious to apply it at random to the Rig-Veda. As a means of explanation it requires great circumspection, as is evinced by the practice of the American Indians, among whom it is a well-known fact that animal names not of totemistic origin are given, although many of the tribes do have totem-names. For example, in the Rig-Veda, Cucumber and Tortoise certainly appear to indicate totemism. But when we hear that Mr. Cucumber was so called because of his numerous family we must remain in doubt whether this was not the real reason. Such family events are apt to receive the mocking admiration of contemporaries. Again, Mr. Tortoise is the son of Gṛtsamada, a name smacking strongly of the sacrifice, a thoroughly priestly name, and it is not his ancestor but his son who is called Tortoise, very likely because he was slow. The descendants of this son will be called 'sons of the tortoise,' but there is no proof of totemism; on the contrary, there is here direct evidence that totemistic appearance may be found without totemism. We can scarcely believe that Gṛtsamada's ritualistically educated son ever worshipped the tortoise.

Clearly enough, it is in the later literature that one is brought into closest rapport with the anthropological data of other peoples. This is due to the fact that the more the Hindus penetrated into India the more they absorbed the cult of the un-Aryan nations, and it is from these rather than from the refined priestliness of the Rig-Vedic Aryans that one may get parallels to the conceptions of Cis-Indic barbarians. All the more reason is there for not confounding Rig-Veda and Bṛhmaṇas. A rough-and-ready jumbling of Rik and Sūtra will not, as it seems to us, be productive of any definitive results. Thus, to interpret (p. 328) the sacrifice as 'big medicine' (to use the corresponding phrase of the American Indians), is in our opinion as unwise and as opposed to the notions of the Rig-Veda as it is wise and legitimate in the presentation of Bṛhmaṇic theosophy.

The modern character of Oldenberg's work (we refer to the first part) will make it popular with anthropologists, and we may expect to hear it cited for a long time as authority for anti-solar mythologists. The more we study primitive religion, however, the more we are likely to learn that religion is not all from one seed, and that solar deities after all have existed and do exist. To convert the Vedic gods into giants and dwarfs, or cast them out of India because they refuse either to conform to the anthropological model or to adapt themselves to the Procrustean bed of the later ritual is equally unhistorical. It would be more conducive to a true view to go through the history of each god, pointing out how and where the striking differences arise, which may be seen in the earlier and later conceptions of his character.
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2. The Sanskrit Root *manth-*, *math-* in Avestan; by Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College, New York.

The Sanskrit root *manth-* *math-* ‘to shake, agitate, cause concussion, crush, bruise,’ has apparently heretofore not been quotable in the Avesta; its existence in Avestan, however, may now be shown from one of the fragments in the Farhang Zand-Pahlavi, p. 7, ll. 6–10 (Hosheenji and Haug, *Zand-Pahlavi Glossary*, pp. 7 and 48; Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta, traduction iii.* p. 14). The passage, though corrupt in its syntax, apparently alludes to certain penalties incurred by acts of assault and battery, or in consequence of injuries carelessly inflicted upon a corpse in moving it from the *kata* or receiving vault to the Tower of Silence. The latter suggestion is Geldner’s, after Dastur Hosheenji. The text runs

\[\begin{align*}
\text{nārē vaghṛhanem} \\
\text{astem āēvā mastravanām} \\
\text{vispaca yo mastraghnām a māstā} \\
\text{hvarō-cīthanām aēlēē anyē cikayutō.}
\end{align*}\]

With due allowance for the wretched syntax, aēvā and the uncertain aēlēē, this may be rendered:

‘(As for) the head of a man—
Whosoever has crushed a single bone of the skull,
And he that has crushed all (the bones) of the skull,
Shall pay (du,) the penalty of a wound as the others.’

Such at least is the sense one may gather from the Pahlavi version āē vanāskār vaghṛtān gubrā barā sūmbēnd . . . ast aēvak mastarg . . . zag hamāi zanīnā mūn mastarg dar sūft ‘if a sinner crush the head of a man—a single bone—every blow which pierces the skull.’ Compare also Darmesteter *loc. cit.*

Even though the sentence-structure be faulty, the general meaning is plain, and the verb *amāstā* in the third line of the Avestan fragment contains the looked-for root. The form is an aorist mid. 3 sg., either root-aorist *a-māth-ta*, or *s*-aorist *a-māth-s-ta*, cf. Skt. *dāṅdta* (*ṛtan* ‘to stretch,’) and *māṅsta*, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, 882 a. For the Avestan phonetic laws that come into consideration see Bartholomae, *Handbuch d. alteran. Dialekte*, 148 c, and Jackson, *Avesta Grammar*, I., 151, 46.

The newly-found Avestan root which here describes the injuring or crushing of the head is employed quite similarly in Sanskrit with regard to the demon Namuci slain by Indra: RV. v. 30. 8 *cīro dāśasya nāmucaer mathāyān* and RV. vi. 20. 6 *prā cyenō nā madirām aḥcūm aṣ-māi cīro dāśasya nāmucaer mathāyān*. Cf. also AV. vii. 50. 5, of a wolf shaking a sheep: *āvīm vṛko yātahā māthat.*

3. Two Problems in Sanskrit Grammar; by Professor Maurice Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

1. On the instrumentals in nā from stems in man (mahinā, varṣā, prathīṇā, bhūṇā, etc.).

This problem has been discussed very frequently, the previous treatments being recorded by Professor Collitz, Beszenberger's Beiträge, xviii. 231 ff. There is no occasion for reviewing these here, since the present essay approaches the subject from a point of view radically different from that of the preceding attempts.

We start from mahinā, by far the most common of these words; it occurs 85 times in the Rig-Veda. All the occurrences are restricted to two metrical types. First, in octosyllabic pādas the word occupies the fourth, fifth and sixth syllables. There are four cases of this kind, iii. 59. 7; viii. 12. 23; 68. 8; x. 119. 8, e. g., iii. 59. 7: abhi yā mahinā dvam.

Secondly, in the other 31 cases (for which see Grassmann) the word follows immediately upon the caesura of a triṣṭubh-jagati-pāda, no matter whether the caesura is after the fourth or fifth syllable. The following examples may illustrate the situation:

i. 173. 6: prā yād itthā | mahinā nṛbhyo āsti (tristubh).
ii. 17. 2: cīrāṃ ṣvāṃ | mahinā praty anuṣṭacata (jagati).
iii. 6. 2: divaḥ cīt āgme | mahinā pṛthivydh (tristubh).
vi. 68. 9: ayāṁ yā utvaḥ | mahinā māhivratāḥ (jagati).*

Both positions are, metrically speaking, critical. The second half of octosyllabic pādas is regularly iambic (see Oldenberg, Die Hymnen des Rig-Veda, p. 8); the caesura in triṣṭubh-jagati pādas is regularly followed by an anapaest (− − −) (ibid. p. 56). It is evident at once that the regular instrumental mahinā, a bacchius (− − −), could not, without violating the two general metrical laws, stand in these positions, and yet the facts show that there was a marked lexical and stylistic need for such a word in that very position.†

There is one other closely related word, equally unfit for these positions in the metrical line, namely mahinā, occurring 34 times in the RV. This is the true metrical complement of mahinā.‡ It occurs either at the end of triṣṭubh lines (7 times), where the final − is needed, e. g., RV. ii. 85. 2: apāṁ nāpād asurydyasya mahinā.§ or before the caesura in

* Of the three cases of mahinā in the RV. only one holds this position, i. 59. 7, vaivarnaḥ | mahinā viṣvākṣiṣṭāḥ; the remaining two appear before the caesura, where they are free to stand (vi. 61. 13; x. 88. 14).
† The AV., whose diction is less hieratic and in closer contact with popular speech, whose metres are far less trammelled, reads at iv. 30. 8 (var. of RV. x. 125. 8) cātatt | mahinām nāṁ bahūva.
‡ Cf. e. g. RV. vii. 50. 10, ākṣaraḥ cā mahinā mṛśāt nāḥ, with iii. 62. 17, mahinā ākṣarāḥ rūjathaḥ. Cf. also RV. v. 87. 2, prā yā jatāḥ | mahinā yā ca nā savyam, with the fourth pada of the same stanza, mahinā tāṁ caṃ dāhṛṣṭātāḥ nā 'droyaḥ.
§ The remaining passages of this sort are: RV. i. 174. 4; ii. 28. 1; vi. 66. 5; viii. 100. 4; x. 55. 7; 89. 1.
all of the remaining cases, except four (ii. 3. 2; iv. 2. 1; vi. 21. 2; x. 6. 7). It is unnecessary for our purpose here to define the relations of the spongaic mahñā to the types prevalent in the divisions before the caesura, since these are liberal enough to accommodate any group of two syllables no matter what their quantity may be (see Oldenberg's tables, ibid. pp. 14, 49 ff.).

Now the form mahñā is an isolated instrumental,* and we may at once permit ourselves to be struck with the peculiar fact that the 'dropping' of the m in mahimñā is also a matter which concerns the instrumental only. I assume that mahinā is a contaminated (blend) form of mahñā and mahimñā, instigated, or elevated to a position of prominence, by the obvious metrical and stylistic conventions briefly sketched above.

The word mahinā means 'with greatness.' The former considerations of the problem have failed to take note of the semantic character of the remaining words that are involved in the discussion: varīḍā means, 'with extent'; prathinā, 'with extent', and bhūndā, again, 'with greatness.' These are so obviously congeneri with mahinā as to suggest at once that they were patterned after it. This is shown strikingly by TS. iv. 7. 2. 1 = MS. ii. 11. 2 = VS. xiii. 4, where three of these four nouns succeed each other in a liturgical formula, and that, too, not in their instrumental form, but in the nominative singular, eliminating thus the suspicion that the peculiar form of the instrumental is the cause of their appearance in company. The passage reads, mahinā ca me varinā ca me prathinā ca me ... yajñēna kalpantām 'may greatness, and scope, and breadth ... form themselves for me with the sacrifice.'

The only remaining form, preñā, seems in every way out of agreement. The form occurs twice, and is taken as an instrumental from premān 'love.' It is permitted, of course, to assume that by this time instrumentals in nā from stems in mdn had asserted themselves unto freedom and independent initiative. But the meaning of the word is not at all certain, though Sāyaṇa at RV. x. 71. 1 explains it as equal to premā 'with Vedic loss of m' (makāralopaḥ chāndasak).

We may finally note as a curiosum that the form drāghmā, RV. x. 70. 4, which is usually discussed in this connection as an instrumental from drāghmān (Sāyaṇa, drāghimnā) is again lexically congeneric ('with length') with the group in nā; a corresponding nominative drāghmā (MS.), drāghimā (VS.), and drāghuyā (TS.) figures in the liturgical formula excerpted above along with the other designations of extent.

* We may perhaps assume that it represents an ancient heteroloctic declension, together with the stem mahas for the casus recti.

† See for this term and the linguistic principles involved our two essays On adaptation of suffixes in congeneric classes of substantives, Am. Journ. Phil., xii. 1 ff., and On the so-called root-determinatives in the Indo-European languages, Indogermanische Forschungen, iv. 66 ff.

VOL. XVI
2. On the relation of the vowel-groups ār and ur to īr and īr in Sanskrit.

De Saussure's theory of disyllabic roots (Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles, pp. 239 ff.) has yielded the result that the Sanskrit vowel-groups īr (before consonants) and īr (before vowels) are now generally, though not universally, regarded as the reduced, low-tone, forms, (I. E. ī) corresponding to Sk. drī (I. E. ēr). Thus the root-forms tir in tir-tvā, and īr in tir-dī are regarded as weak form of the disyllabic root tari in tari-tum, precisely as kr in kr-tvā is the weak form of kar in kār-tum. De Saussure, ibid. p. 244, has also hinted at the correct explanation of the groups ār and ur, and it is the object of these lines to present the subject in clearer outline, and to illustrate it by additional materials.

First of all we must eliminate one source of the groups ār and ur. The groups īr and īr never occur after labials when they represent I. E. ī: only ār and ur are found. Thus the desiderative which has for some reason generalized the long reduced vowels ā, ī, īr, and ār never exhibits īr after a labial. A root beginning with a non-labial may exhibit either īr or ār (titṝṣati and tātāṝṣati), a root beginning with a labial can have only ār, not īr (bubhāṛṣati from bhṛ 'carry'); cf. Joh. Schmidt, Vocalismus, ii. 229. The forms ār and ur, in roots beginning with labials are, therefore, otiose as far as their labial coloring is concerned; they may be = īr and īr, labialized by the initial consonant. On the other hand, the presence of the labial initial may be fortuitous, and the labial color of ār and ur may be organic, just as in roots that do not show the labial: each case must be judged by itself. Aside from labializing influences the Sk. groups ār and ur are the reduced vowel-forms (I. E. ēr), occurring respectively before consonants and vowels, of the strong forms Sk. drī (I. E. ēr). This may be stated in the following proportion:

\[ ār \text{ and } ur : drī = īr \text{ and } īr : drī. \]

* Perhaps also ēr; see the author in Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, xlviii. p. 578.

† One may suppose that this lingual vowel was accompanied by some rounding of the lips even in prothetic times.

‡ There is a marked difference between the strong types ār and īr. The former occurs before vowels in the form ārv; the type īr never occurs before vowels in the form āry; instead the monosyllabic ar appears. Thus the Avestan stem tarv-aya by the side of Sk. taru-te, but there is no tarv- anywhere to match tarī-tum, tart-lar, etc. The varying quantity of the ā of ār is interesting, because it shows that the long ā of ār is not of an origin radically different from that of the ā of ār, and is not the root-determinative ā (I. E. ā) which has crowded out ā (I. E. ā). Thus in reference to Brugmann, Grundriss ii, pp. 896, 931; cf. our remarks Z.D.M.G. xlviii. 578. From what source, or what style of root-determinative can tarv-ṝṣas (by the side of taru-ṝṣa), varu-ldr and varu-ṝṣa, jdr̄uṭha, etc., have derived their ā? Unless we assume purely metrical lengthening we are compelled to acknowledge both ār and ār as I. E. types, ēr and ēr. This is, of course equally true of anī (=I. E. anī), etc.
The history of these vocalic relations may be illustrated by the following list:

1. tārū-, tarv-: tūr, tur ‘pass.’

The base taru occurs in the verbal forms, Vedic taru-te, taru-ṣema, tāru-ṣante. This is the anteconsonantal form. The antevocalic form is tarv in Avestan ta-twvya ‘overcome’ (e.g. ta-twv-ayeni, Yasht xiv.4). Nominal forms are numerous: tāru-s, tāru-ṣa, taru-tar, tāru-tra, perhaps also, tāru-tāru-ṇa and tārū-ṇas. Further, tādru-, if the root tādr is a contamination of tar and sar, as I have assumed (Indogermanische Forschungen, iv. 72).* The reduced forms, ante-consonantal vića-tār(y), su-pra-tār(y), tār-ṭā, tār-ṇa, vića-tār-ṭi, -tār-ya, tā-tūr-ṣati, tār-ṇi; ante-vocalic tur-dī, tur-ṭe, tār-tūr-ṭa, (ap-) tār-ṇa, tūr-ṇa, tur-i, tā-tūr-i, tār-tār-u.

Cf. the disyllabic base in ī: -tār-ṭar, tār-ṇi, tār-ṭum with the reduced forms, anteconsonantal tir-ṇd, tir-ṭv, ti-tir-ṇa, and antevocalic tir-dī, ti-tir-u, tir-ṭa, tir-e, etc. The materials, of themselves, yield the proportion:

tar (tarv): tūr, tur = tār ī: tir, tir.

2. jārū, jaru: jūr, jur ‘waste, grow old.’

The Rig-Veda has jārū-tha ‘waste’, as the name of a personified force, destroyed by Agni (cf. his epithet a-jīrā ‘not wasting away’); see RV. vii. i. 7; 9. 6; 20. 8. The antevocalic strong form appears in Avestan sa-twv-a ‘old age’; cf. sru-am ‘time’.† The anteconsonantal weak form in jār-yaṭi, jūr-ṇd, jūr-ṇī, and amā-jār(y) ‘aging at home’. The antevocalic weak form in jur-dī, jd-gur-i, a-jūr-ṇam. Cf. with this jārā-māṇ: jūr-ṇd. The weak antevocalic form perhaps in a-jir-d (see above). Again we may state the proportion:

jārū: jūr, jur = jār ī: jīr, jir.

3. čdrū, čaru: čūr ‘crush.’

The strong anteconsonantal čdru-ṣ ‘missile’; antevocalic čarv-ḍ, Avestan sa-twv-a ‘god of destruction’. The weak anteconsonantal form čūr-ṭd (RV. i. 174. 6) ‘slain’. Cf. on the other hand the infinitive čdri-tos with čir-ṇd and čir-ṭd.

4. caru, carv: čūr ‘grind’.

This root presents the relation very clearly. Anteconsonantal strong čaru-ṣ ‘porridge’; antevocalic cdru-ṭati, carv-ayati ‘grind, chew’. The

* Cf. terw-aketai: νοσεί, φθίνει, τερ-ακετο - ἡτείπετο (Hesych).
† The word is ordinarily, but doubtfully, compared with Lat. agilis ‘agile’, and derived from the root aj ‘drive’.
‡ Cf. also Greek ἵαβ-ς (Attic), ἵαβ-ς (Ionic), ἵαβ-ς (poetic), as evidence of w in the second syllable.
weak form in cūr-ṇa ‘ground, flour’. The congeneric root bhāru, in bhāru-ṭi ‘chew’, Avestan aš-bōhv-ra ‘eating much’, is in some way related to this root, but no weak forms of the root occur.*

5. karu, karv: kūr, kūr ‘make’.

The strong forms of the verb karō-mī are built upon a base karō- which is in direct relation to kuru in karū-ṇa ‘deed’. The antevocalic strong form in kārv-ara ‘deed’. The weak anteconsontal form in turi-kūr-mī, -kūr-min ‘acting mightily’; the antevocalic perhaps in kuru ‘make thou’.† Vedic kṛ-n-ō-mī, kṛ-ṇ-u-tē also point to a disyllabic base ending in u.

6. paru, parv: pār, pur ‘fill’.

Whitney in his Roots of the Sanskrit Language, p. 100, treats under root 1 pr the words pāru-s and pāru-an ‘knot, joint’ (cf. pārva-ta, Avestan paōrva-ta, ‘mountain’). This etymology is none too certain, because Greek νείρας νεῖρας (pēr-ṇ-ōs), and áneiρων exhibit European r and the root for ‘fill’ has I. E. l. These words doubtless represent an I. E. base pēr-. But we have I. E. pēlu in Gothic filu which is related, along with its strong base filau (genitive filau-s) to Sk. purā, Greek πολύ, as Sk. karo (karu) with its strengthened base kar is to kuru. Avestan pōr-vu, Achemenian parōv may also be referred to I. E. pēlu (Goth. filu).§ The weak anteconsontal base in pār-, pā-, pār-, etc.; the weak antevocalic base in d-pā-pur-am, pd-pur-i, infinitive -pur-as, etc. But we must not fail to note that the disyllabic base with ordinary sh’va in pār-ṃaṇ may have a share in these weak forms, since the labial initial seems to prevent the occurrence of the weak stems *pīr, *pir.

7. varū (I. E. ywaću) : ār, ur ‘cover, protect’.

The strong stem in vārū-tar ‘protector’, vārū-tha ‘protection’, and perhaps vārū-na ‘covering sky’.† Further in Avestan vṓru ‘broad’, i. e. Aryan vārū (cf. vōhu = Sk. vasu). The form is very interesting in the light of the present discussion, since it manifests the same relation

---

* There seems to be a vein of lexical adaptation in the u of the second syllable in the direction of the meaning ‘destroy’. See all the preceding numbers, and cf. our article On the root-determinatives, in Indogermanische Forschungen, iv. 66 ff.
† I do not divide kūr-u, because the form is an especial weak manifestation of kāru. Perhaps originally barytone kāru: oxytone kūr: low tone kūr. We shall meet with this type again below.
‡ Cf. also par-ṇa ‘in the past year’, and paru-ṇa ‘pertaining to the past year’. The forms are reported by the grammarians, and are as yet not quotable. They are, however, not to be questioned, because of nīrōv (nētōv) ‘a year ago’.
§ Cf. our explanation of Avestan voṇru in the next number.
†† Greek Fēva-thai ‘protect’, Fēvu-ma ‘protection’ also exhibit the strong stem.
between itself (I. E. ýéru) and Sk. urú, as between Gothic flu, and perhaps also Avestan po'ru (I. E. pélu), and Sk. purú, Greek πόλις. The weak anteconsontantal stem in ūr-νοτι 'cover', ūr-νάd 'reservoir'; the weak antevocalic form, perhaps in ūr-as 'breast'. The type urú: vdrú =
kuru : kurú = puru : paru (Goth. flu), etc. The dissyllabic types with sh'va, varśman, varśum, etc., suggest the same caution as in the preceding group, because of the initial labial.

8. varu (I. E. ūelu): ūr, ur 'surround, turn'.

An apparently kindred I. E. root-word ūelu in the sense of 'surround, cover, turn' is bound up with Sk. varú, because the latter fails to differentiate r and l. Latin vél-0, Goth. val-0jan 'roll'; Greek Fctv in ἐλ-οτω (II. xxii. 989), ἐλ-οτις (Od. ix. 433) 'roll, compress', ἐλ-ρον 'cover'. It is obviously impossible to decide in each particular case of Sk. varú whether it represents I. e. ýeru or ūelu. So e. g. ūr-νοτι may be from either. But the anteconsontantal weak form ūr in ūr-νάd 'wool' belongs to ūelu, as is attested by the European words for 'wool'; the antevocalic weak type may be assumed in ūr-νάτα 'ram', and further údca (údca), Lat. vél-0 shows a base úlu- on a level with kuru, purú and urú (cf. also gurú).

9. dharu: dhúr, dhur 'hold.'

The strong type in dhárū-νa 'holding'; the weak anteconsontantal type in dhúr-γú, loc. plur. of dhur 'wagon-pole,' the antevocalic type in acc. sing. dhúr-am.

In addition to the types that show the presence of u treated above under táru, namely táru (tarv), túr, and tur, there are other types which have in some way arisen as modifications of the same original dissyllabic base. They are túrv in túrv-atī 'overcome' and tvar 'hasten.' Similarly járu 'consume' and jvar (jváh) 'burn.' Now there is a root in the sense of 'injure' which correspondingly exhibits the following types: dhúrv in dhúrv-atī, dhvār in dhúrv-atī, by the side of dhúr in dhúr-ta 'robber,' and dhvār-ā 'forcibly,' CB. x. 5. 2. 13 (quoted also by Whitney, Roots, etc., p. 87 top, from the MS.). These forms combined point forcibly to a dissyllabic mother-base dharu. We may best realize this by the following proportion:

táru (tarv): túr, tur : tvar = jurú (jarv): jūr, jūr : jvar = x:
dhúr, dhur : dhúrv : dhvār.

Here x is dharu, and we are thus led to a real etymon for the last series: dhúr, etc. must have meant originally 'to hold by force.' The etymologist should, moreover, not fail to take note of the congenic meaning of tåv, jårv, and dhúrv; the grammarian may well be appalled by
the protean variety of these types, and the apparently hopeless task of coordinating them.*

10. (saru): sūr 'move.'

The perf. pass. partic. a-sūr-ta 'untrodden, remote' occurs in this indubitable meaning at AV. x. 3. 9; cf. sūr-ta and a-sūr-ta, RV. x. 82. 4, and Pāṇini viii. 2. 61 (sūr-ta = śṛ-ṭa). Further sūr-mt 'water-pipe'; sūr-mya 'located in canals.' The dissyllabic stem sūr- is wanting (sara in sārī-man), but the root sru 'flow' is so evidently a modification of I. E. sēru (cf. dhru-ti, type 7 in the foot-note, above), as to justify us in speaking of sār-ta as a participle from the root *saru. The parallel root ḍru is equally an early development of I. E. kēlu; the full root is apparent in kele-o 'to make hear, to order,' which seems to stand on the same morphological plane with Sk. karō, except that it appears in a thematic form (cf. raṇo-o: Sk. tanu-tē).

11. maru: mūr, mur 'die.'

Nothing coercive in this number. The perf. pass. partic. mūr-ya 'crushed' goes with the secondary root mṛṇ, but its long vowel points to a dissyllabic strong stem. The antevocalic weak type in mūr-ya. Weber, Indische Studien iv. 399, and Whitney, Roots, etc., p. 24, derive maru 'desert' from the root mṛ 'die,' and this may represent the strong dissyllabic type. The secondary root mūr-ch 'thicken' which forms a participle mūr-ta and the abstract mūr-ti 'form' may possibly claim a place in this company, but its etymological relations are complicated and obscure.

The weak stems gūr, gur 'greet' in gūr-ta, gur-dte, etc. are wanting in any kind of a strong stem, directly connected with them.† Similarly the root hrṛ 'be crooked' exhibits the forms ju-hūr-thās, ju-hūr-anta, hūṛ-ate and hru-ti which suggest forcibly the proportion:

\[
\text{dhūṛ-ta}: \text{dhur-ā:dhvar-ati}: \text{dhru-ti} = \text{ju-hūr-thās}: \text{ju-hūr-anta}: \text{hūṛ-ate}: \text{hru-ti}.
\]

This points to an original type *haru (see No. 9, and the note there). Deficient in strong correlative types are also jūṛ-gūr-āya and jat-gul-ās: root gt 'swallow'; bhūṛ-dtu, bhūṛ-qi, and bhūṛ-āy (type xūr-, as in tūr-dn, ulv-d): root bhur 'quiver'; cf. Lat. fer-co. It is of interest to

---

* We may profitably resume here all the basic forms which seem to be descended from dissyllabic zarū, z being the varying initial consonant: 1. zarū (tār-ī, tār-īs, etc.). 2. zarū (tār-yā, zarū-a, zarū-d, etc.). 3. zarū (tār-ta, etc.). 4. zarū (tār-dī, etc.). 5. zarū (tār-a, pūrū, etc.). 6. zarū (ulv-a, tūr-dn, etc.). 7. tūr (tūr-an, dhrū-ti 'injury,' etc.). 8. tūr (dhrū-a 'form') 9. tūr (dhrū-ā, tār-ā, tār-āti). 10. tār (jūṛ-āti, tār-āti, tār-āti, dhrū-āti). I am tempted to pervert: 'he who reads may run.'—Avestan zar-ān may belong rather to type 8 (=zār-ān), than to type 7.

† Cf. perhaps Gr. γηπι-ω 'sing' in relation to jari-tār 'singer,' gtr-bhās 'with songs.'
glance over the list under the suffix *rawler Whitney, *Sk. Gr.* § 1170*. Seven examples are given, but five of them are *tuvu-zi*, *bihru-zi*, *dahru-zi* (<i>i</i>nu-i, *dahru-n-u-te*), *tu-tuvu-zi*, and *ju-guru-zi*. Nominal suffixes beginning with *v* makes a very feeble showing in the light of the theory of disyllabic types in *u*. Cf. also *dagh-u-an* : *dagh-n-u-yat*; *pru-su-d* : *pru-su-n-u-te*; *taku-an* : *taku*, etc. Conversely there need be little doubt that the disyllabic strong stem *aru* in *dru-ant*, *dru-an*, and Avestan *aru*-a is a type on the same morphological plane with the preceding, though the weak forms *ur*, *ur* do not happen to occur. The stem *aru*: *ru-ti = stem karu*; *kru-n-ti = stem *dahru* (<i>i</i>nu-i =*dahru*); *dahru-n-ti*, etc.

When the group *ur* is followed by a consonant the morphological antecedents of the types are generally wanting. Thus *murdhauan* (cf. Av. *ka-mereda*), *bhurja, sphragati*, *kurd-ati* (*gurd* : see J.A.O.S. *xi.*, p. *cxlvii*), *arj, urdhv*, etc.

The similar form *spurdhau* from *spradh* (cf. Avestan 6th class stem *spareda*) shows a labial before *ur*, as do several other of these, and is therefore of doubtful value. If we compare *cudja* ‘crest’ with *kprvo-do-zi* ‘crested lark’ we may assume for it the value *kuru-dd*. The ablaut relation of *cudja* : *kuru-lo* would then be parallel to that of *er-vo*: Sk. *svpad-nas*. Similarly von Brandke, *Kuhn’s Zeitschrift* xxxiv. 157, would explain Sk. *kud* (*kula-ti*) ‘without horns’ upon the basis *kdvu* in Lat. *calu-os* ‘bald’ (cf. Sk. *kula-a*).

4. Description of a Collection of Arabic, Coptic, and Carshooni MSS. belonging to Dr. Cyrus Adler; by Prof. Henri Hyvernat, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

The MSS. briefly described in the following list are the property of Dr. Cyrus Adler, of Washington, and were purchased by him in Egypt in 1891. They formed a single collection and were secured from the widow of a Coptic priest. All of them were written in Egypt for the use of the Coptic Church. While none of them is of great antiquity, several are careful and correct specimens of chirography, and would hold an honorable rank in the collections of Europe. Such is, for instance, No. I, a Bible in Arabic from Genesis to II Chronicles inclusive, written in the year 1276 of the Coptic era or 1580 A.D., as appears from an interesting note of the copyist. No. 6, containing the Acts and the Epistles, must be of the same date; it begins with a preface on the life and epistles of St. Paul and sums up the sections, chapters and verses, and also gives an index of quotations from the Old Testament in the Epistles of St. Paul. No. 18 is a very good MS., containing the lives of Barlaam and Josaphat; the date was not found, but I think it can be ascribed to the XIVth Century. It would be worth while to compare it with the other copies of that famous work in the libraries of Europe.

* For other noun-stems built up on the stem *keru*, *koru*, see Vanik*Griechisch-Lateinisches Wörterbuch*, p. 126; Persson, *Wurzelwörterung*, p. 222.
Among the Coptic MSS. may be named No. 15, containing the Gospel of St. Mark in the Memphitic or Bahiric dialect; although not much older than the XVth Century, it represents a good classical school from a palaeographical point of view, and also a good recension. On the last folio there is an interesting cryptographical note of the copyist, which I translate thus: For God's sake remember your servant Gabriel who wrote this second Gospel.

The catalogue contains 24 numbers. The 24th is not Christian. It is the first part of the work of Ibn Chalikkān, in Arabic from فی to فی.

I sincerely hope that the Oriental Society will not further delay in the compilation of a general catalogue of all the Oriental MSS. in the public or private libraries of America. I am very willing to do my share of the work, by cataloguing all the Coptic and Christian Arabic MSS. I have myself from 75 to 80 Oriental MSS., Arabic, Turkish, Persian, Syriac and Armenian, and will be glad to send them to whoever will volunteer to catalogue them.

The following is a list of the MSS.:  

No. 1. The Bible in Arabic. Genesis to II Chronicles inclusive. Two volumes in one; very good MS., neatly written and well preserved; contains interesting note of the copyist on the last folio of each volume, especially of the second volume; original binding 11½ inches long, 8½ inches wide. Folios, vol. i, 162; vol. ii, 193; 22 lines on page. Date 1276 Coptic era—1560 A. D.

No. 2. The Four Gospels in Arabic; complete. Pretty good MS., mutilated in places; supplemented by a recent rough hand; chapters marked in Coptic letters; 4½ inches long, 3½ inches wide. Folios not numbered regularly; by count 272; 9 to 15 lines on a page. 1508 Coptic era—1692 A. D. Date found at the end of St. Luke.

No. 3. St. Mark in Arabic. II–12 to XVI–14; inexperienced hand; careless in places; 5 inches long, 3 inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 96; 10 lines on a page. Date not found—recent.

No. 4. St. Luke in Arabic; complete. Different hand-writings; all of them poor and rough. 5½ inches long, 4½ inches wide; 9 to 12 lines on a page. Folios not numbered, by count 125. Date not found—recent.

No. 5. St. John in Arabic; complete except last verse; hand very ordinary but regular; chapters not numbered and not marked except last chapter; 5 inches long; 8½ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 79; 9 lines on a page. Date not found—recent.

No. 6. Epistles and Acts, in Arabic; complete except last 54 verses of Acts; good hand, regular; chapters not marked in text; supplemented in places at a rather early date; front page supplemented by another hand at a later period. Preface on the life and epistles of St. Paul, together with an index of sections, chapters, verses, and an index of quotations from the Old Testament in the Epistles of St. Paul; 10 inches long; 7¼ inches wide. Folios 181; 15 lines on a page; date not found, about XVI Century.

No. 7. Epistles and Acts, in Arabic; from XXV–21 to end of Acts wanting; fine broad hand; uniform; preface like in No. 6, but first
three folios wanting; 8½ inches long, 6 inches wide. Folios 259; 15 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVII Century.

No. 8. Epistles of St. Paul in Arabic; complete. Neat but rather awkward hand; chapters marked in full in text; sections in margin. In beginning, usual preface on the life and epistles of St. Paul, but first folios wanting; at end is index of sections, chapters, etc., and also of quotations from the Old Testament; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios 202, 15 lines on a page. Date not found; not earlier than XVIII Century.*

No. 9. Lessons from the Bible for Holy Week, in Arabic; complete. Hasty hand; bound; supplemented in places at a later period; 8½ inches long, 6 inches wide. Folio not numbered, by count 140; 17 lines on a page. Date not found, not older than XVIII Century. Compare Biblioth. Nat. No. 118.

No. 10. Portions of Psalms to be sung at morning and evening prayers or at Mass during the months of Thoth, Hathor, Koak, Taubeh, Emeshir, and on the fifth Sunday of the month when there is one—in Arabic. First seven months wanting. Very ordinary and unimportant; 6 inches long, 3⅛ inches wide. Folio not numbered, by count 44; 12 lines on a page. Date not found—quite recent.

No. 11. Hymns in honor of the Blessed Virgin and of Saints, in Arabic. Clear but hasty hand; text interspersed with illustrations of saints; somewhat worn; 6⅛ inches long, 4¾ inches wide. Folios 174, the first three wanting; 9 lines on a page. Date 1461 of Martyrdom—1745 A.D.

No. 12. Calendar or abridged Martyrology for Coptic Church, in Arabic. Neat hand; complete; 6⅛ inches long, 4¾ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 29; 12 lines on a page. Date not found—recent.

No. 13. Lives of Barlaam and Josaphat, in Arabic, complete. Neat regular hand but not elegant. Oriental binding, good MSS., 8½ inches long, 5½ inches wide. Folios 269; last three added at later period; 14 lines on a page. Date not found, XV Century or older.

No. 14. Portions of the Bible to be chanted in the office of Holy Week, in Coptic-Bahiric; complete. Pretty good hand for the time; title in Arabic; well preserved; 8½ inches long; 6¼ inches wide. Folios 42; 12 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVIII Century.

No. 15. St. Mark in Coptic-Bahiric. First five verses wanting; Arabic translation added on first few folios. Good, regular, classical hand, suffered much from usage. Chapters and sections marked in margin; at folio 147 a new hand of later date. On reverse of last folio, beside the title "Gospel by St. Mark" is a note of the scribe in cipher "For the sake of God remember your servant Gabriel who wrote this second Gospel;" 9¼ inches long, 6⅛ inches wide. Folios 158,—folios 1, 3, 48, 111 wanting. 15, 16, 17 lines on a page. Date not found, about XV Century.

* For these last three MSS. compare Biblioth. Nation. MSS. Arab., Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66.
No. 16. The Theotokia, in Coptic-Bahiric. Hymns, chiefly in honor of the Blessed Virgin, of the martyrs and of other saints. Folios 2, 3 and 4 wanting. Decadence, titles in Arabic; headings of chapters decorated with scrolls of flower and open twine, combined with most absurd figures of animals; binding wanting; 8½ inches long, 6¾ inches wide. Folios 155, numbered except last three; 17 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVII Century.

No. 17. Prayer Book, in Coptic-Bahiric, with Arabic translation. Two parts—1. The Angelic praise to be sung after the Gospel of St. John, at morning prayer. 3. Prayers of midnight. Complete. Uniform; at end is a subscription of the copyist, an inhabitant of Cairo; 6¼ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 34. Number of lines on a page varies. Date not found, XIX Century.

No. 18. Fragments of Gospel of St. John in Coptic-Memphitic, with Arabic translation; 10½ inches long, 7½ inches wide. Folios 2; about XVIII Century.

No. 19. Psalmody or collection of Acrostic Hymns and anthems in Coptic-Bahiric with Arabic translation. Complete; very rude hand, index in Arabic prefixed at later date; name of author in note, Razeck Joseph Reshide; worn; 8½ inches long, 6 inches wide. Folios 277, marked in Coptic letters; 15 lines on a page. Date in note by the copyist at the end, 1559 of Martyrs—1886 A.D.

No. 20. Fragment of a Diaconicum or book which contains the prayers to be recited at Mass by the deacon, in Arabic and Carabooni; 7½ inches long, 5½ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 8; 16 lines on a page. Date not found—recent.

No. 21. Fragment of Gospel in Arabic and Carabooni, Matt. XII—39—XIII—46; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios not numbered; by count 8; 16 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVIII Century.

No. 22. Fragment of Gospel, in Arabic and Carabooni, Matt. XII—82—XVI—4; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios 20; 16 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVIII Century.

No. 23. Fragment of Gospel in Arabic and Carabooni, Matt. I—1 to Mark II—7; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide; folios 140; 16 lines on a page. Date not found, XVII Century.

No. 24. Lives of famous men, by Ibn Chalikkan, in Arabic. From ض; clean, clear hand, not elegant; Oriental binding, 10½ inches long, 7½ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 166; 21 lines on a page. Date not found, XIII or XIV Century.

5. The Emphatic Particle ב in the Old Testament; by Dr. I. M. Casanowicz, of the U. S. National Museum, Washington, D. C.

It is a well-known fact that the prefix ב is used in some passages of the Old Testament to emphasize a noun; and that classical Hebrew likewise employsם ה in the meaning 'whether-or,' sive-sive or et-et; and ב, after a preceding series or enumeration, to sum up, ' every.
all.' In the past, ל in these cases has been commonly regarded by exegesists and grammarians as a variety of the preposition ל in its' meaning ‘as to,’ quod attinet ad, quoad. Professor Haupt, in a paper read before the American Oriental Society, April 22, 1899,* pointed out that we have here to do with a special emphatic particle in Hebrew, ל being the Hebrew equivalent of the Arabic lat† and Assyrian lā,‡ ‘verily’; ל = Assyrian lā-lā (lā-lā§, which is a compound of ל or ם, the Assyrian equivalent of Hebrew ל), and the emphatic ל; while ל in ל is a variety of the same emphatic particle ל. In illustration of this view Professor Haupt quoted the following passages: Gen. ix. 10, xxii. 10; Ex. xxvii. 8, 19; Josh. xvii. 16; Ezek. xliv. 9; Eccl. ix. 4; Exx. i. 11; II Chr. vii. 21.

In view of the importance of Professor Haupt's statement for Hebrew syntax, I prepared, after reading the Old Testament, the following list of the passages in which ל has apparently one of these three meanings:

I. ל, ‘verily.’

1. Ps. lxxxxix. 19. ‘כי לחרותי קבוצת ולקחורים ישכם מלוכל.’ for verily Jhvh is our shield, and the Holy One of Israel is our king.'§

2. Exx. ix. 4. ‘כי לכלוב ח' ה' חומת שמים,’ for verily a living dog is better than a dead lion.’**

3. II Chr. vii. 21. ‘רבי המלך יאשר רוחו על כל עליך עליי ו𝐲.’ and this house which was exalted, verily every one that passeth it will be appalled at it.'††

* An abstract of this paper has been published in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, vol. xiii, no. 114, p. 107ff, under the title, A New Hebrew Particle.
‡ Cf. Delitzsch, Assyrian Grammar, §78, p. 214; §93, p. 258; and §145, p. 363.
§ Cf. Delitzsch, l. c. §82, p. 230.
¶ In a good literary translation the emphatic particles would, of course, ordinarily be omitted, and the emphasis expressed by intonation; they are inserted here to bring out the point under discussion.

† The ל is commonly considered in this passage as the preposition of the possessor, and the verse rendered, ‘For Jhvh's is our shield, and to the Holy One of Israel belongs our king.’ But it is only in the succeeding part of the psalm that the human king is spoken of: in all the preceding verses Jhvh is the subject. Hitzig renders the second hemistich, 'und der Heilige Israel's (was den anlangt, der) ist unser König.'

** The ל here is authenticated by Symmachus's rendering, ενυι 'ον εκ θεον γινει δούλοι του δ η λέουν τευχαντήν.
†† Cf. the parallel passage in I Kings ix. 8, with Haupt's conjectural emendation of the text in both passages, in the Abstract mentioned above, p. 108.
4. Lev. vii. 26 (P).  
"...and ye shall eat no manner of blood, whether it be of fowl or of beast, in any of your dwellings."

5. Lev. xxii. 18 (P).  
"...whosoever of the house of Israel... offereth his oblation, whether it be any of their vows or of their freewill offerings."

"...these ye shall offer unto Jhvh in your feasts, beside your vows and your free-will offerings, (with regard to) your burnt offerings, and your meal offerings, and your poured-out offerings, and your peace offerings."

7. Josh. xvii. 16.  
"...and all the Canaanites that dwell in the land of the valley have iron chariots, both they who are of Beth-shean and her towns, and they who are of the valley of Jezreel."

8. I Kings vi. 30.  
"...and he overlaid the floor of the house with gold, both within and without."

9. I Kings x. 23.  
"...and King Solomon excelled all the kings of the earth, both in riches and in wisdom."

10. II Kings xvii. 24 (Is. xxxvi. 9).  
"...and thou hast put thy trust in Egypt, both for chariots and for horsemen."

11. Ezr. i. 11.  
"...all the vessels, both silver and gold."

12. II Chr. xxii. 8.  
"...and their father gave them great gifts, silver as well as gold and precious things."

13. Gen. ix. 9, 10 (P).  
"...all the men of violence that are with me have gathered together."

III. 'In short, every.'
Casanowicz, The Empathic Particle ל in the O. T. clxxix

‘and I, behold, I am establishing my covenant with you and with your offspring after you; and with every living being that is with you, the fowl, the cattle, and every beast of the earth with you; of all that come out of the ark, in short, every beast of the earth.’


יִתְנַן עַדְרֵיהֶם אֲלֵיהֶם בָּאָם, כְּנֶשֶׁד שֵׂעָר גֹּיוֹיָּה.

‘and Ephron the Hittite answered Abraham in the audience of the Hittites, of all those who entered the gate of his town.’†

15. Ex. xxvii. 8 (P).

טֹהֵט סֵינָהּ לְכָל עֵנֵי הַמַּחֲלָהָיָּהוּ, וּמִשָּׁלָהָיו לְכָל בֵּית עֵנֵי הַמַּחֲלָהָיָּהוּ.

‘and thou shalt make its pots to take away its ashes, and its shovels, and its sprinkling-basins, and its flesh-hooks, and its fire-pans, in short, all its vessels shalt thou make of brass.’

16. Ex. xxvii. 18, 19 (P).

וַאֲרוּנָהּ נַהֲשׁה: לְכָל כַּלְּבֵיהֶם.

בִּכְלֵי עַבְדֵיהֶם, כְּלֵי הַיָּדָרִים כְּלֵי הַיָּדָרִים נַהֲשׁוּ.

‘and their sockets shall be of brass. In short, all the instruments of the tabernacle in all its service, and all its pins, and the pins of the court, shall be of brass.’

17. Lev. xi. 42 (P).

כַּל הָוָּל עַל חַדְּלֵךְ כָּל הָוָּל עַל חַדְּלֵךְ.

עַר כָּל מַרְבַּת רַבִּים כָּל אֵשֶׁר עַל חַדְּלֵךְ לְכָל אָדָם לְכָל אָדָם לְכָל אָדָם.

‘whatsoever goeth on the belly, and whatsoever goeth upon all fours, and all that hath many feet, in short, all creeping things that creep upon the earth—them ye shall not eat.’ LXX. εἰς πᾶσα τοῖς ἐπιστρεφεῖς τοῖς ἐπιπονοοῦν κ. τ. ὁ=בְּכֵלָל.

* Delitzsch, ad loc. : ‘Erst ב of the Teile, in welchen das Ganze besteht, dann des genus ex quo d. i. des Allgemeinen, unter das das Einzelne sich subsumirt, hierauf ב des Gesamtbegriffs, wonach sich das darunter befasste Einzelne bestimmt.’ This explanation seems rather strained; לְכָל דְּתֵית דְּרָאָם is superfluous, and is probably a later addition; it is omitted by the LXX.

† Here ב could also be taken as an expository limitation of בְּכֵלָל לוכַל, ‘as many of them as used to enter the gate of his town,’ i.e. those who were his immediate neighbors. In vs. 18 ב is used in the same phrase, on which J. H. Michaelis in his edition (1720) observes: Pro בְּכֵלָל לוכַל 3. sed contra Mas. impressam ad v. 10.
18. Num. xvi. 8 (P). ‘and I, behold, I have given thee the charge of my heave offerings, even of all the hallowed things of the Israelites.’

19. Ezek. xlv. 5. ‘mark well, and behold with thine eyes, and hear with thine ears all that I say unto thee, in short, all the ordinances of the house and all the law thereof.’

20. Ezek. xlv. 9. ‘all unclean, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, shall come into my sanctuary, in short, no alien who is in the midst of Israel.’

21. Ezr. i. 5. ‘then rose up the heads of the houses of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests and Levites, in short, all whose spirit God had stirred up to return and to build the house of Jvh.’

22. Ezr. vii. 28. ‘and He hath extended mercy unto me before the king and his counsellors, in short, before all the mighty princes of the king.’

23. I Chr. vi. 84. ‘and Aaron and his sons were offering on the altar of the burnt offering, and on the altar of incense, in short, (they attended) to all the work of the most holy place.’

24. I Chr. xxviii. 21. ‘and, behold, there are the divisions of the priests and Levites for all the service of the house of God, indeed, there will be with thee in all kind of work every willing man that is skillful, and the princes and all the people will be entirely at thy command.’

25. II Chr. v. 19. ‘and the Levites who were singers, they all, namely Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun, and their sons and brethren, arrayed in byssus . . . ‘
APPENDIX.

Passages in which either corruption of the text may be suspected or the  י  admits a different explanation:—

Is. xxxii. 1.  י התו ה ת יול ימ רה וו ר ש הושי יי,’ ‘behold, a king will reign in righteousness, and princes will rule in judgment.’—Here י is rejected by most modern commentators as a mistake, though it is supported by Symmachus’s rendering, idv s\, s\, δικαστήνα παρατηρεῖ θεατής, and emphasis would be here quite in place.

In Ps. xvi. 8, יְלַרְשֵׁהוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ הָאָרֶץ הָרֶם, the י may be dependent on יְלַרְשֵׁהוּ in vs. 2; cf. Delitzsch in loc., and Haupt in the Abstract mentioned above.

In I Chr. iii. 2, יְלַרְשֵׁהוּ לַאֱשֶׁרִים בֶּן מְעָבָד, I Chr. vii. 1, יְלַרְשֵׁהוּ לַאֱשֶׁרִים מְעָבָד. יְלַרְשֵׁהוּ מְעָבָד, and I Chr. xxiv. 1, יְלַרְשֵׁהוּ מְעָבָד; יְלַרְשֵׁהוּ מְעָבָד, and the י is evidently due to a copyist’s error; see Haupt l. c.

In the following passages the י may be explained as introducing the accusative, a use which is common in Aramaic:—Job v. 2, יְלַאֲוִי, יְלַאֲוִי, ‘for vexation killeth the foolish man, and jealousy slayeth the silly man.’

I Chr. xvi. 87, יֹעֵבְךָ דָּוִדָא יְדִידָא יְלָעַדָא יְהִי יְנָאָדָא, ‘and he left there before the ark of the covenant of Jhvh, Asaph and his brethren.’

II Chr. xxxi. 2, יָנַעְמָר חַיָּוָא אֶת יוֹסֵפְהוּ הָכֹהָנִים, יָנַעְמָר חַיָּוָא אֶת יוֹסֵפְהוּ הָכֹהָנִים, ‘and Hezekiah installed the divisions of the priests and Levites in their divisions, every man according to his service, the priests and Levites, for burnt offerings and peace offerings.’

In II Chr. xxviii. 15, יִנָּבָלָם בָּעָרִים לֶלַעְבָד כֶּלֶשׁ, ‘and they carried them on asses, every one that was feeble,’ י is best explained as the exponent of the accusative.

Not counting the passages in which either the authenticity or the meaning of the י is doubtful, there have been found three cases of the emphatic particle י verily; nine cases of י ייער equivalent to enim enim; and thirteen cases of י in short.’ Of these twenty-five cases, twenty-one occur in post-exilic writers; the nine passages from the Pentateuch all occurring in portions assigned to the Priest’s Code (P). This is quite in keeping with what is generally observed in languages in their decline, viz., that they multiply external means of expressing emphasis.

I have suggested (Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc., 1884, p. xi) that one of the descriptions of Agni in the Vedas, *viz.* Apām nāpāt, ‘Waters’ son,’ is repeated in Lat. Nept-unus (<"ud-nos") ‘son of water,’ and, less literally, in Ἱδως (for *Ne-νορ-ιδως) ‘son of the ἰδᾶς, ἰδᾶ being interpreted as something like ‘kindlings,’ ‘fuel.’ I accounted for the apharesis in Greek by a complete personification in consequence of which there was a shift of conception from ‘son of the ἰδᾶς’ to ‘lord of the ἰδᾶς.’ I failed to explain *F* in Corinthian Ἱορθοὶ Ἀργοῦ; this, if not merely orthographic, may be explained as belonging to the suffix -von, Ἀργοὐ being interpreted as ‘possessing fuel.’ I do not claim cogency, however, for the supposition that Ἱορ- is for *Neνορ, nor does my interpretation of ‘ιδως reach probability.

We can, however, from other mythological sources largely augment the probability of my comparison.

1) *Nārā-piṇāsa.*

The epithet *Nārā-piṇāsa* is separable in the Rig Veda (x. 64. 3), though only the last part is inflected. In *Npēv* we have the dualic nom. in *ēu* (Sk. Nārā=Nārāu) converted into a stem and inflected. For the genesis of these dualic forms I refer to my Agglutination etc., (A.J.P. xv, 480). The only phonetic difficulty in identifying *Nārā* with *Npēv* is the variant quantity of the stem-vowel. All will admit, I take it, the probability that *Npēv* may have been originally but an epithet of Ἱδως.

Not only was the epithet *ndragāśa* separable, but there was a distinct divinity *Cāśa* in the Vedas. He was associated with Bhūga, and Bhūga with Pūṣan (cf. Grassmann, Wört. s. v.). The compound epithet *Nārāpāśa* is used of Pūṣan as well as of Agni, and we may infer that *Cāśa* is one of the forms of Agni-Pūṣan.

In Latin Consus, the phonetic equation with *Cāśa* is perfect, and the mythological sphere is the same, for Consus is, according to Livy (i. 9. 6), Neptunus Equester.

2) *Agni-Mātariṇ̄ca.*

The Rishis had etymologized on this epithet quite early; thus we read in RV. iii. 29. 114. mātariṇ̄ca yād amimīta māvīri vādāya sadrgo abhavat sārimani: ‘When Mātāriṇ̄ca roared in his mother he became a gust of wind, to howl.’ Here I have referred amimīta to *āvā ‘bellow,’ and defined sārimani after Sārasvatī ‘goddess of the voice’ (cf. Lat. sermo ‘speech’); amimīta has, however, been taken heretofore in the sense ‘was fashioned,’ and mātariṇ̄ca understood as *māvīri-pan ‘growing in his mother.’ The accent of the compound demands, however, a division mātāri-pan with its first member meaning ‘roaring’ or ‘mother.’ If the epithet belongs to Agni as lightning then it might mean something like ‘possessing a mother-īcva-’ or ‘with a roaring *īcva-’ and this *īcva- might have a sense like apām
in \textit{Apm} Nāpāt, that is to say ‘water’ or ‘cloud’; thus the compound would mean ‘possessing water as a mother’ or ‘having a roaring-cloud,’ either being quite apt epithets of the lightning.

No stem \*pqva- ‘water’ is extant in Sanskrit, and so, if this signification is to be justified, it will be necessary to have recourse to the kindred languages.

Because of the mythological association of the water-deities \textit{Apm} Nāpāt, Poseidon and Neptune with the creation of the horse, I suggested (Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc., 1894, p. xi) a primitive confusion of the kindred stems \textit{akwa-} ‘water’ and \textit{ekwe-} ‘horse,’ uniting in a still more primitive \*ak- (cf. A.J.P. xv, 423). Sibree in the Academy (Nos. 1018, 1052) had made the same suggestion, though this was quite unknown to me. Inasmuch as the vocalization of \textit{ippoc} ‘horse’ is abnormal in Greek, it is possible there was an \textit{ippeta} ‘water.’ Thus Sibree interprets ‘\textit{Aganippeta}’ as ‘green-spring,’ \textit{Melanippeta} as ‘little black-water’ and Euhippa as ‘fair-water.’ This seems to me more reasonable than an interpretation as ‘Great-horse’ etc. Homer offers, I believe, a quite certain case of \textit{ippeta} ‘water’ in \textit{A} 500: κε ἄρισθην νῆσις παρ’ \textit{ippetov} ἡλικονʹ. ‘He came to him from Abydos, from beside the swift waters,’ an interpretation far more cogent, in my opinion, than ‘from beside the swift mares.’

The sense of ‘water’ seems also to belong to Sk. \textit{dpva-}. Not to take account of Sibree’s Sanskrit and Avestan names of rivers, I cite RV. viii. 26. 24:

\begin{verbatim}
tvam hi supādrastomam nṛṣādanaśu hūmide grāvānmaḥ nāvapṛṣṭham maṁhāna
\end{verbatim}

Ludwig translates with forced literalness: “dich den überreichen an trefflicher nahrung, rufen zu der menschen sitzen wir, der wie ein stein von rossrückenbreite an reichlichkeit.” Grassmann renders the third pada “Dem steine gleich, der reichlich scharfen Soma tragt”—a translation got by correcting \textit{nāvapṛṣṭham} to \textit{nāvapṛṣṭham}. Grassmann’s translation seems to me absolutely correct, and we can reach it without a textual correction if the stem \textit{dpva} be taken to mean ‘fluid,’ This it does also in the name of the \textit{acvatthā} tree which was either regarded directly as a source of Soma (RV. I. 135. 8), or used for making a vat for the Soma. The \textit{acvatthā} (‘ficus religiosa’) was, like all the figs, rich in sap, and \textit{caoutchouc} is made from it in modern times (Encyc. Brit., s. v. fig). As to its formation, I would explain -ttha thus; -tta (ptc. of \textit{vāda}): \textit{vādā} = ttha: \textit{vāhā}, and so a\textit{cva-ttha} would mean ‘having water as its gift,’ i. e. ‘furnishing water.’ The accent is, however, the less usual one for appositional compounds, and so it may be best to take it as a \textit{tatpurusā}, ‘furnished with water.’

It seems to me that both in Sanskrit and Greek the words for ‘horse’ and ‘water’ have kept hand in hand, even to showing the same abnormal vocalization in Greek. So far as the stem \textit{ekwe-} ‘horse’ is concerned, the Greek abnormality may be stated as an interchange of \textit{e} and \textit{i}, and is to be ascribed, in my opinion, to an Aryan doublet \textit{ei}
3) Tānū-nāpāt.

This epithet of Agni is traditionally explained as ‘self-born.’ There is a difficulty with the accent, however, for tānū ‘self’ is oxytone. Further, the double accent suggests a dvandva. I interpret tānū as ‘thunder’ (tānū). It is not preserved in the Veda as simplex, but the suffix -u is found in tanayūnū, tanyatū, tanyū and stanaθu; the inferred *tānū- is warranted by Lat. tonus=tonitrus (Seneca, Q. N. ii. 56: antiqui autem tonitrurn dixerunt aut tonum), for this tonus can hardly be the borrowed ēδωρος, which has no such signification in Greek.

I interpret the compound as ‘thunder and lightning’; for nāpāt as short for apdm nāpāt I refer to RV. ii. 35. 14 and to x. 15. 8° (?).


The Vedic fire-god Agni, if not an actual derivative of ॐ ‘lead,’ was liable to such a popular association. Hence we can explain his epithet purōhita- ‘set before’ (RV. i. 1. 1); he is also known as prathama-jāt ‘first-born’ (RV. x. 5. 7; 61. 19), though not the exclusive possessor of this epithet. We may therefore infer that Πορώχος, which is a by-name of Poseidon, harks back to the primitive period for its meaning. In Latin Fortunus (suffix from Neptūnus), usually explained as ‘harbor-god,’ we have the self-same name.

We have further in the Veda a numeral divinity Triti Aptyā («*APT-YO: nāpāt ‘lightning’?) where Aptyā is usually interpreted as ‘son of the waters.’ Now Poseidon’s wife was ‘Αφτιότης and their son was Τηρω; in the battle of Zeus with the giants he rendered great service by blowing on a conch. This suggests identification with the ‘thunder’ which might very naturally be termed ‘son of lightning.’ In Τηριω we have, I believe, a reduplicated form of 唵 ‘thunder’ in reverse order to Lat. ton-ī-tr-u-. Its precise Aryan form cannot be constructed from the material surviving, for already in the Aryan period association with tri-tō ‘third’ had taken place, suggested doubtless by Agni as ‘first.’ In the Greek forms, i doubtless belonged to the original reduplicating syllable, cf. the Sk. intensive doublet vār-ī-rī | vārīrī. For the interchange of r and n in reduplication a good example is Grk. καρ-κιος by the side of Lat. can-cer ‘crab.’

In Sanskrit a Dviti- ‘second’ stands beside Triti- ‘third.’ In the Old Norse mythology Óðhin has the epithets Thridhi ‘third,’ and Tvegg ‘second.’ It is probable, therefore, that all this numeral toying took place in the primitive period.
7. A Description of the Būlāq Edition of the Jamhara Ash'ār al-'Arab, with an Examination into the Origin and Sources of the Collection; by Professor D. B. Macdonald, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Ct.*

It is some ten years since Hommel drew attention to the Jamhara Ash'ār al-'Arab in his Prolegomena to a new Arabic Lexicon, read before the Sixth Oriental Congress at Leyden. Previously, the book had been used and referred to by Nöldeke in his Beiträge, and by Ahlwardt in his Sīr Divans, besides descriptions, more or less incomplete, in various catalogues of manuscripts.

Hommel gave a description of the book and a careful list of the poems contained in it, and promised to publish it on the basis of all the European manuscripts. That promise has not yet been fulfilled, and the present Būlāq print is, therefore, the editio princeps. A description of this edition and a consideration of the origin and sources of the collection is the object of the present paper.

As the Transactions of the Leyden Oriental Congress, in which Hommel gave his list of the poems, are generally accessible, and the present recension agrees essentially with that list, it will not be necessary here to go into detail. I need only say that the book consists of forty-nine Qaḍīras, seven groups of seven each, the first group being what we now know as the Muʿallaqāt.

The Būlāq edition is a quarto of 4 + 196 pages, clearly printed on good paper. There are no vowels except on p. 57–96, gatherings 8–12, in which the verses are partly vowelised. Why these five sheets should be excepted, I cannot guess. The title-page is dated, The Amiriya Press, Būlāq, 1308; but the date in the colophon is the latter part of Safar, 1311. This difference will be explained immediately. The first page is blank; then come three pages of Fīhrist, the title-page, and a page with the Muqaddima of the editor. He names himself Saʿid Effendi b. 'Antūn 'Ammūn, and says that his attention had been called to the Jamhara by Count Carlo de Landberg, and that at his instance he had resolved to edit it. The preface is tolerably concise in style, but involved and obscure in expression. A wordy colophon by Mūhammad al-Ḥusaynī comes on p. 193–195. He explains that after the work had been interrupted by the death of the editor, it was taken up and finished by Iskandar 'Ammūn, his brother. No hint is given at what point the break in the editorship took place, or what manuscripts were used. He only complains of their farness and badness. As in the numerous marginal notes, a manuscript 'is spoken of, and another manuscript,' there were at least three; but they were apparently not all complete, and thus the number available at different points varied.

At one point there was only one, for the note occurs: "Thus in the

* This paper had finally left the author's hands before the appearance of Professor Nöldeke's notes on the Čamharat aš'ār al-'Arab in Z.D.M.G. xlix. 1896, p. 290–293. — Ed.
manuscript which is in our hands; but it is very corrupt (ṣaqima), so correct it.” But the manuscripts seem to have been used faithfully, for on p. 114, at the poem of ‘Urwa b. al-Ward, there is a note to the effect that in the Majmū‘ ad-Dawādırī there are two additional verses at that point. On the next page a various reading is noted, and the editors confess that the Jamhara reading which they print contradicts the lexicons accessible to them, but add: “And we seek refuge with God from falsifying.” Again, on p. 187 there is the remark: “‘Alqama stands here in the manuscripts; but according to the Qdmūṣ and the Aghānī and the rest it was ‘Alas.” There are many other notes, but these will indicate the tolerably reliable character of the editing. A curious misarrangement may be noticed. In the list of poets according to their classes which is given on p. 35, ‘Antara b. ‘Amr b. ash-Shaddād comes rightly second in the second class. But the poem itself stands immediately after that of Ṭarafa, and is treated as an eighth Mu’allagā, thus leaving only six poems in the second class. This is probably due to the manuscripts; the poem of ‘Antara in question became his Mu’allagā-poem when he was reckoned among the Mu’allagā-poets. As to the manuscripts which may have been used in this edition, I can give little information. In the Khedival Library in Cairo there are, apparently, two. In Qism i, Juz’ iv. of the Catalogue, p. 224, one is described very briefly, with name of another and beginning of text exactly as in this edition. There is added: “And of what is mentioned in this book are the forty-nine Mu’allagāt (1), divided into seven divisions, each division of seven poems, designated by a designation peculiar to them. A MS. in two vols. in an ancient hand.” The author is said to have died A. H. 170: but after the forty-nine Mu’allagāt we need not pay much attention to that, and the date will be shown later to be absolutely impossible. Then in Juz’ vii. p. 192, Majmū‘ 141, 1, there is another copy. In the beginning of the text quoted is a various reading علمنهم عن العرب for (p. 3, 1. 8 of the printed text.)

To return to the description of the book, pages 1-39 are taken up with a long introduction. It begins: “This is the Book of the Collection of the Poems of the Arabs in the time of the Ignorance and of al-Islām, according to whose tongue the Qur‘ān was revealed, and from whose words the Arabic language is derived, and from whose poems are taken the witnesses for the meanings of the Qur‘ān and the obscure usages of tradition, and to whom are referred wisdom and the polite sciences, composed by Abū Zayd Muḥammad b. Abī-l-Khaṭṭāb al-Qurashi. And since no one has been found of the poets after them who has not been driven to steal from the beauties of their expressions; and since a knowledge of them on that account suffices; and further, since they are the mighty ones of poetry, who wade its sea and whose ambition in it is far-reaching, and they made for it a Record (Diwan) in which the advantages derived from them are many,—and if it were not that the language is common to all, verily they would have appropriated it from all others,—therefore we took from their poems, since
they are the source, the most brilliant and most important of them. And we make mention in this our book of what the stories handed down and the poems preserved bring from them, and of what of their words agrees with the Qur'ān, and of what is handed down by tradition from the Prophet of God concerning poetry and poets, and of what comes from his Companions and from those who followed after them, and of what each one of them has praised, and who first spoke poetry, and what is preserved of the poetry of Jinn."

The programme sketched in the last lines is closely adhered to. The next seven pages are occupied with illustrations of the value of the poets as interpreters of the Qur'ān. Then comes a page or two on the question of the first poet, followed by several pages of anecdotes from the Prophet and his Companions, relating what they said and thought of poetry. Then (p. 16, foot) begins the perennial discussion concerning the most poetical of mankind, and the claims of Imr al-Qays are upheld. This passes into eerie stories of the Jinn; how they made poetry, appeared to human beings in the desert, and inspired the Arab poets with their verses. Then, in succession (p. 24–34), the claims of Zuhayr, an-Nāighbah adh-Dhubyānī, al-A'shā, Labīd, 'Amr b. Kulthūm, and Tarafa are set forth. At the foot of p. 34 begins a general consideration of the Classes (Tūbaqāt) of the poets, and statement of the arrangement of this particular selection. But this important part of the volume must be taken up from another side, and I would pass to it through an examination of the date of the compiler and the nature of his sources.

The name of the compiler of this collection, or its editor and annotator, as the case may be, is given in his preface as Abū Zayd Muḥammad b. Abī-l-Khaṭṭāb al-Qurashī. At the foot of p. 10, he seems to refer to himself with a qāla Muḥammadun. These are all the references that I can find in the book; and outside of the book there is not a trace of such a person to be found. Hommel's suggestion, that he may be the Muḥammad b. Ziyād al-Qurashī who is named in an Isnād in the Kīṭāb al-Aḥānī, can hardly be accepted, as his position in the Isnād would bring him much too early. For his date, then, and date of the collection we are driven to an examination of the Isnāds that occur in the book. But first, it may be noted that according to the British Museum Catalogue, the Jamhara is quoted by Ibn Rashīq al-Qayrawānī, who died A. H. 468; and that it is not mentioned in the Fihrist, which appears to reach down to A. H. 400. The first date gives a terminus ad quem, though, of course, we cannot say that the second gives the terminus a quo. Still, in a work professedly bibliographical, such as the Fihrist, the entire absence of any allusion to the Jamhara would be strange.

Among the names which stand last in the Isnāds, the four principal ones are Abū 'Ubayda Ma'mar b. al-Muṭṭāda (full name, p. 12; generally Abū 'Ubayda); Muḥammad b. 'Uthmān al-Jufarī; Abū-l-′Abbās al-Warrāq al-Kāṭib; and al-Mufaḍḍal. As to Abū 'Ubayda, there cannot be any doubt. He is the well known grammarian, who was
born A. H. 114, and died A. H. 208, 209, 210 or 211—traditions vary. The *Ismāds* which contain him are the following: p. 19, Sunayd (?), from Ḥizām b. Ārāḥ, from Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū Bakr al-Muzani; p. 25, Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū 'Abd ar-ʿArāḥmān al-Ghaṣṣānī, from Sharīk b. al-ʿAwṣad; p. 23, Abū 'Ubayda, from ash-Shaʿbī; but on the margin from another MS., Sunayd, from Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Jahmī, of Jahm b. Ḥudhayfa, from Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū-l-Mukhasṣhī (?) and Muqālid, from ash-Shaʿbī; p. 26, Abū 'Ubayda, from Qutayba b. Shābīb b. al-ʿAwwām b. Zuhayr; p. 29, al-Jahmī, from Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū 'Amr b. al-ʿAlā; p. 35, Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū 'Amr b. al-ʿAlā; pp. 24, 34, 35 are simple references to statements of Abū 'Ubayda, without *Ismāds*. It will be noticed that between Abū Zayd and Abū 'Ubayda two links come in twice. One of these, al-Jahmī, was a contemporary of the Khalīfa al-Mutawakkil, A. H. 232–247.

As to Muhammad b. 'Uthmān, I can only make one suggestion: he may be the Abū Jaʿfar b. 'Uthmān b. Abū Shayba al-Abṣī of the *Fihrist* (or *Fīhrīst*), who died A. H. 297. But in the *Jamāhara* the name is al-Jaʿfari; though that may be through confusion with his *Kunya*. Further, of his books, the *Fihrist* only mentions one, *Kitāb al-Sunan fi l-Fiqh*. His *Ismāds* are: from al-Ḥasan b. Dāʾūd al-Jaʿfari, from Ibn 'Āʾisha at-Taymi; p. 18, from 'Abd ar-ʿArāḥmān b. Muḥammad, from al-Haytham b. 'Adil, from Muqālid, from ash-Shaʿbī; p. 14, from Muṭṭarrīf al-Kinānī, from Ibn Dāʾūd, from Abū Līhīzim al-Anbarī, from ash-Shaʿbī; same p., from Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab; p. 15, from Ibn Isḥāq, from Abū Allāh b. ʿAbd-Ṭufayl, from his father, from his grandfather; p. 25, from Abū Misma, from Ibn Dāʾūd; p. 26, from Muṭṭarrīf al-Kinānī, from Ibn Dāʾūd; p. 37, from Abū 'Alqama, from Muḥājirīn (?), from Sulaymān, from Abī al-ʿAzīz b. Abū ar-ʿArāḥmān b. Zayd, from 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, from Ḥassān b. Thābit; pp. 32, from 'Ali b. Tāhir adh-Dhuhlī, from Ibn 'Āʾisha died A. H. 228 and al-Haytham in 209, and as Muṭṭarrīf was probably the Qāḍī of Ṣana', who died about 191 (the two intermediaries I cannot fix), it is evident that A. H. 297 is not an impossibly late date for our Muḥammad b. 'Uthmān.

Abū-l-ʿAbbās, also, is hard to fix. The *Kunya* is common and was borne, among others, by al-Mubarrad (d. 285), Thaʾlab, (d. 291), the elder al-Muṣafḍāl aṭ-Ṭābbī (d. 170). But he is further distinguished as al-Warrāq al-Kātib. The title al-Kātib is very common, but that of al-Warrāq is not. In Ibn Khallikān I can find only three to whom it is given: the well known author of the *Fihrist*, Abū-l-Ḥasan Muḥammad, without date, and an *Umar* contemporary with Abū Nuwās, who died A. H. 365 or 196. The *Kunya* of the last may have been Abū-l-ʿAbbās, and that is all we can say. But it was the *Kunya* of the grammarian al-ʿAḥwal; and in the *Fihrist* he is described as Nāṣirī (scribe), and by Ḥājī Khalīfa as Muḥarrīr (correct scribe or corrector). From the *Fihrist* we learn that he edited (ʿamalā) the poems of Dḥū-r-Rummā and Imr al-Qāys. Wāṣṭenfeld suggests that his date probably fell between the end of the second and the middle of the third centuries of the Flight.
In the 'Jamhara, Abū-l-'Abbās has the following Iṣnāds: p. 12, Abū Talḥa Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh al-Khuwāt, from Bakr b. Sulaymān, from Muḥammad b. Ishāq, from Hishām b. ʿUrwa, from his father, from 'Abd Allāh b. Zam'a b. al-Aswad b. al-Muṭṭalib; p. 13, from Abū Talḥa, from Bakr b. Sulaymān, going back to 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd; p. 16, from Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh, from Abū ʿUbayda; p. 17, in the text stands, “Ibn al-Marwazī said, There related to me my father”; but on the margin there is as the reading of some manuscripts: “And there related to us Abū-l-'Abbās al-Warrāq, from Abū Talḥa Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh az-Zarūdī; there related to me my father.” This last is almost certainly right; for it is a first-hand story of Bedawī life and of how the Jinn made poetry and inspired the Arab poets, and with such a ‘man of Merv’ could have nothing to do. Further, towards the end, occurs the phrase qāla az-Zarūdī, and in the middle of the story comes: “Then I became old and weak and remained in Zarūd”87. The strange nisba az-Zarūdī, which is not in as-Suyūṭī’s Lubb al-Lubāb, seems to have caused the difficulty88.

Last comes al-Mufaḍḍal. On page 3 he is named al-Mufaḍḍal b. Muḥammad aṣ-Ṣabbī; and on p. 10, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Mufaḍḍal b. 'Abd Allāh al-Muḥabbī. Elsewhere he is simply al-Mufaḍḍal. Nöldeke, who used the Berlin manuscript of the 'Jamhara’ (Cod. Sprenger 1215), seems to have understood al-Mufaḍḍal aṣ-Ṣabbī the elder, who died in 170. Hommel, who had access to all the European manuscripts, takes explicitly the same view. But if this edition is to count as evidence, there are insuperable difficulties in the way. In early Arabic literary history the two al-Mufaḍḍals are known. The one was Abū-l-'Abbās [or Abū 'Abd ar-Raḥmān, or Abū Muḥammad] al-Mufaḍḍal b. Muḥammad b. Ya'āq ib. 'Āmir b. Sālim b. ar-Rammād aṣ-Ṣabbī, of the stem Tha'labā b. as-Sīd b. Dabbī. He was the collector of the Mufaḍḍalīyāt, and died, as stated above, in A. H. 17089. The other was Abū Ṭālib al-Mufaḍḍal b. Salama b. Āṣim aṣ-Ṣabbī al-Kūfī, who died after 30090. It may be worth noticing that he wrote a Kitāb Jamāhīr al-Qabūdīl. But the two fuller indications in the 'Jamhara are inconsistent with one another, and only the first agrees with the elder al-Mufaḍḍal, while the question still remains, how we are to explain the indication on p. 10, and especially the strange nisba, al-Muḥabbī. On the margin of p. 3 there is given as the reading of one copy, al-Mufaḍḍal b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Muḥabbī b. Abū ar-Raḥmān b. 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. This agrees with the indication on p. 10, which seems to be the reading of all the manuscripts to which the Cairo editors had access: but does not agree with either of the two historically authenticated al-Mufaḍḍals. Further, there is a serious difficulty in the genealogical chain. Ibn Qutayba91 tells us that 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb had a son al-Mujabbār (or al-Mujabbīr) 'Abd ar-Raḥmān, and he again had a son whose name we learn from an-Nawawī92 was also al-Mujabbār (or Mujabbīr), but Ibn Qutayba adds expressly that there was no issue of this line. Have we an instance here of the genealogical ignorance remarked on in the preface to the Kitāb
al-Ma'drif\textsuperscript{12}, through which men traced up their origin to a distinguished name and did not notice lā 'aqda laha, 'he had no issue'? Still, whether some links in the chain are forged or not, I have little doubt that we have here the genealogy as Abū Zayd gave it, and a hitherto unknown al-Mufaḍḍal. The name would easily explain the confusion with one or the other of the great grammarians, and the changing of the genealogy to suit him; but it would be hard to explain the reverse process. Further, from the Ismāḍî it can be decisively proved that we have not here the elder al-Mufaḍḍal. On page 8 the tradition is said to go back to Ibn 'Abbās, but the margin gives the longer form, from his father, from his grandfather, from Abū Ẓabyan\textsuperscript{4}, from Ibn 'Abbās (it will be noticed that the first two links in this chain occur in almost all the Ismāḍîs); p. 10, he asked his father; p. 11, from his father, from his grandfather, from Muḥammad b. Ishāq (without doubt the Sāhib al-Maghāzī, d. 151), from Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh, from Abū Sa'id al-Khuza'ī, from Abū ẗ-Tufayl 'Āmīr b. Wāthila\textsuperscript{20}; p. 17, no Ismāḍî in the text but on margin as given on the margins of several copies: from his father, from his grandfather, from Abū 'Ubayda, from 'Attāb b. 'Umayr b. 'Abd al-Malik; p. 20, from his father, from his grandfather, from Ibn Ishāq, from Muḥājīd\textsuperscript{49}, from Ibn 'Abbās; p. 21, from his father, from his grandfather, from al-'Alā b-Maymūn al-Āmīdī, from his father; p. 29, from Alī b. Ṭāhir adh-Dhuḥailī, from Abū 'Ubayda, from al-Mujājīdī, from ash-Sha'bī; pp. 16, 34, 25, references, but no Ismāḍî. It will be noticed that twice in the above Abū 'Ubayda occurs, once with two links between himself and al-Mufaḍḍal, and once with one. But as Abū 'Ubayda died in 210 and the elder Mufaḍḍal in 170, we certainly here cannot have to do with the elder Mufaḍḍal. But have we then the younger, who died probably after 300? The names are quite different and offer no support to such an idea. I confess I can throw no light upon this matter, and must content myself with simply stating the difficulty and giving the facts as I have them.  

To complete the statement of the Ismāḍîs contained in the Jamhāra I must add the following: p. 15, Ibn Ishāq, from 'Abd Allāh b. ẗ-Tufayl, from his father, from his grandfather; p. 16, al-Maqna', from his father, from al-Asma\textsuperscript{10}; p. 18, Muṭarrif al-Kinānī, from Ibn Dāʾb; p. 31, ʿIsā b. ʿUmar; ibid., Abū 'Amr b. al-Ālā. Hommel cites from the copy that von Kremer had made from a Cairo MS., Sunayd b. Muḥammad al-Azdī, from Ibn al-Aʿrābī\textsuperscript{27}; but this I cannot find in the Būlāq text.

As a further dating-point it may be noticed that in the Commentary on 'Antara's Qāyīda (p. 98) a line is quoted from Abū Tammām, the compiler of the Hamāṣa, 172 or 188 or 190—228 or 231 or 232.

Taking the evidence that has now been presented, scanty and uncertain as it is. I feel inclined to date the present form of the Jamhāra in the latter part of the third or the beginning of the fourth centuries of the Flight; if anything, later rather than earlier.

From much of the above it will have become evident that the text of this edition varies markedly from those which Nöldeke, Alwardt
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and Hommel had before them. This is especially the case in the section describing the classes (tablāq) of the poets. There the text is quite different from the fragment quoted by Nöldeke from the Berlin manuscript, and since the passage is very important as throwing light, not only on the history of the Jamhāra, but also on that of the collecting of Arabic poems generally, I shall translate the whole of it.

It begins on p. 34: "The section making mention of the classes of those of whom we have named some. Abū Ībâyda said: The greatest poets are the people of the tents especially. They are Imr al-Qays, and Zuhayr, and an-Nābigha. But if any one say that Imr al-Qays is not of the people of Najd, then, verily, these abodes of which he has made mention in his poetry are the abodes of the Banū Asad b. Khuzayma. And in the second class are al-Ashâ, and Labîd, and Ṭarâfa. And it is said that al-Ṭaradāq said, Imr al-Qays is the greatest poet; and Jarîr said, an-Nâbigha; and al-Akhṭāl said, al-Asâr; and Ibn ʿAḥmar said Zuhayr; and Dhūr-Rumma said, Labîd; and Ibn Muğbil said, Ṭarâfa, and al-Kumayt said, 'Amr b. Kultaḥūm; but our opinion (apparently Abū Zayd's) is that of Abū 'Ubayda; that is, Imr al-Qays, then Zuhayr, and an-Nābigha, and al-Ashâ, and Labîd, and 'Amr (Abū 'Ubayda does not mention 'Amr above), and Ṭarâfa. Al-Mufaqḍāl said: These are the authors of the seven long poems which the Arabs call as-Sumūf [the strings of beads or pearls], and whoever says that there is the seven belongs to other than them has contradicted that in which the people of science and knowledge have united. And we have perceived the most of the people of science saying that after these came seven not inferior to them; and in truth their authors have followed the authors of the first, but have not fallen short of them. And these are the Mujamharat [collected] by Abū b. al-Abraq, and Antara b. Ḍūlār, and Adī b. Zayd, and Bishr b. Abī Khāzim, and Umayya b. Abī-Salūb, and Khadīgî b. Zuhayr, and an-Namr b. Tawlab. And as for the Muntaqayāt [chosen] of the Arabs, they are by Musayyab b. 'Alas, and al-Muraqqish, and al-Mutalmīs, and Urwa b. al-Ward, and Muḥalib b. Ṭabrî'a, and Durayd b. as-Simma, and al-Mutanakhkhîl b. 'Uwaymir. And as for the Mudhakhabah [gilded], they belong to [the tribes of] al-Aws and al-Khazraj specially, and are by Ḥaṣān b. Ṭhābit, and 'Abd Allâh b. Rawâḥa, and Mâlik b. al-'Ajjân, and Qays b. al-Khaṭîm, and Uḥaybîna b. al-Julâb, and Abû Qays b. al-Aslat, and 'Amr b. Imr al-Qays. And the most highly prized Marâthā [laments] are seven, by Abū Dhu‘ayb al-Hudhalî, and Ḍā‘l Qama b. Dī Jadan al-Ḥimyarî, and Muḥammad b. Ka‘b al-Ghânawî, and al-Asâr b. al-Bâhilî, and Abû Zayd at-Tâ‘î, and Mâlik b. ar-Rayyab an-Nahshâlî, and Mutamīm b. Nuwayra al-Yarbûl. And as for the Mashâ‘lāt [mixed] of the Arabs, they are those with which unbelief and al-Islâm mixed, and they are by Nâbigha bani Ja‘da, and Ka‘b b. Zuhayr, and al-Qutâmî, and al-Khuṭayyâ, and ash-Shâmmâkî, and 'Amr b. Ahmar, and Ibn Muğbil. And as for the seven Muhâmāt [well-joined], they are by al-Ṭaradâq, and Jarîr, and al-Akhṭâl, and 'Ubayd ar-Râ‘î, and Dhūr-Rumma, and al-Kumayt b. Zayd, and at-Ṭirīmmâh b. Ḥakîm. Al-
Mufaḍḍal said: These nine and forty Qasidas are the most highly prized of the poems of the Arabs in the period of the Ignorance and of al-Islām, and the soul of the poetry of each man of them. And Abū 'Ubayda mentioned in the third class of poets, al-Muraqqish and Ka'b b. Zuhayr, and al-Khuṭay'a and Khudāsh b. Zuhayr, and Durayd b. aṣ-Ṣimma, and 'Antara, and 'Urwa b. al-Ward, and an-Namr b. Tawlab, and aḥ-Shammākh b. Dirār, and 'Amr b. Āhmar. Al-Mufaḍḍal said: These are the mighty ones of the poets of the people of Najd, who blamed and praised, and pursued every kind of poetry. And as for the people of al-Hijāz, they were best in love poetry. And Abū 'Ubayda mentioned that men agreed that the greatest poets of the people of al-Islām were al-Farazdaq, and Jarir, and al-Akhfāl.

The relative merits of the three last-named poets are then discussed for about three pages. Then, from the middle of p. 38, various stories about Imr al-Qays are given from Ibn Da'b, derived from al-Farazdaq. The Mu'allaga of Imr al-Qays begins at the foot of p. 39.

Before going on to examine this passage it may be well to state shortly the views expressed by Nöldeke and Hommel, based upon the Berlin manuscript already referred to. Nöldeke notices first that according to Ibn an-Nabhān (d. 338), the seven Mu'allaga were selected by Ḥammād ar-Rāwiya (d. 167). His view then is that Abū 'Ubayda and al-Mufaḍḍal, whom he takes to be the elder, the collector of the Mufaḍḍaliyyāt, are represented as agreeing in this choice of Ḥammād's, and that this first class of seven Abū Zayd selected and added the other six classes. Without doubt this is the right interpretation of the passage as it stands in the Berlin manuscript. Hommel's final view is similar. He thinks that the whole collection had been known to Abū 'Ubayda and al-Mufaḍḍal, and that it was only the present recension, with its commentary and introduction, that was due to Abū Zayd.

But if we are to accept the Rūlāq text, those views must be essentially modified. First, as Hommel has already noticed, there is absolutely no mention in the Jamhara of Ḥammād ar-Rāwiya and the part he took in selecting and combining the seven Mu'allaga, or, as they are called here, Sumūṭ. But I do not feel that we can follow Hommel further and deduce from this that Abū Zayd did not know this tradition, and still less that the tradition is false. There was no necessity for him to mention it at this point, and his whole treatment of the subject shows that he is giving a highly compressed statement. Next, Abū 'Ubayda and al-Mufaḍḍal witness to two quite different things. Abū 'Ubayda has apparently no connection with the Jamhara arrangement of seven groups of seven poems each, and knows nothing of it. His arrangement is one into three Tubaqāt, the first two embracing the seven Mu'allaga-poets, and the third ten other poets. Whether he had yet more classes we are not told; but it is worth noticing that these three classes are limited to poets of Najd. His arrangement is not followed in the Jamhara, except in that his first two classes are put into one and made a first class, and that Imr al-Qays is regarded as the greatest poet. Whether he divided into two classes the poems
which Ḥammād had selected and made into one, or Ḥammād combined his two classes must remain unsettled. This would lead us to expect that he had written a book Ṭabaqāt Shuʿarāʾ Najd, or simply ash-Shuʿarāʾ, which Abū Zayd is here using; but the nearest I can find is a mention by the Fihrist of a book by him Kitāb ash-Shīr wasḥ-Shuʿarāʾ.

But al-Mufaḍḍal, whoever he was, evidently knew the Jamhara arrangement of seven groups of seven, whether it was due to him or not. Therefore, leaving the positive question of its authorship open, we may fix one thing, viz., that it is not to be ascribed to Abū Zayd. But is it not possible to push the origin further back, and say of some at least of the classes what we know of the first? Some of them are spoken of as well known as selections and under these names. In none of them is the grouping of the seven poems together said to have been coincident in time with the grouping of the seven classes together. Thus, we have the Munṭaqayāt al-ʿArab and the Masḥūbāt al-ʿArab, just exactly as we have the poems called as-Sumāt by the Arabs. So, too, we have the seven Muḥamāt. If we did not know of the Sumāt, or Muṭallaqāt (a term never used by Abū Zayd), separately, we could not draw any distinction between them and the others. Because the other six classes have not survived as separate entities, have we any right to say that they never were separate? After Ḥammād ar-Rākwiya or Abū Ubayda, as the case may be, had made his selection of seven, is it not probable that others would also form selections of seven in imitation? As the first selection was called the Sumāt or Muṭallaqāt, so the others might be called the Muyamharāt or the Masḥūbāt. We know of many that were formed but have now vanished—melted into the greater—as these into the Jamhara. The Fihrist tells us that Abū Tammām made different selections beside the Hamāsa. He had a Kitāb al-Ikhtiyār min Ashʿar al-Qabāṭīl, and we may notice that one of our seven classes is devoted to poets of the two tribes of al-Madīna, al-Aws and al-Khazraj. So, too, he had a Kitāb al-Fuḥūl. Further, the fact that the names of the selectors of the seven poems in each of the last six classes are not mentioned, agrees with the non-mention of Ḥammād, or Abū Ubayda, as the selector of the first class. All seven are, in this matter, on exactly the same footing.

If we are, then, to regard this as a compilation from previously separate groups, can we ascribe the choice of the name Jamhara to the title of the second group, al-Muyamharāt? Could a name not be derived from that of the first group, the Sumāt, because that was the oldest and best known, and confusion might arise? But the point is of no importance, and I may repeat again that we may regard it as certain that Abū Zayd was only the editor of this recension of the collection of seven groups of seven poems, and not its originator. To him we probably owe the introduction and the commentary, and it may be possible to draw from them some ideas of his character. I can only touch here upon one or two points, as a detailed statement would involve a more careful study of the book than my time has allowed.
He appears to have been a Muslim of pious tendencies and no special critical acumen. In his preface he tells us that the early poets are chiefly valuable because they assist us to understand the Qurʾān. So any scholar of his day would have said; but he takes it somewhat in earnest, and gives us seven pages of illustrations. The very first of these, a beautiful verse of Imr al-Qays only preserved here, will give an idea of his feeling for poetry. It runs:

قَفَّا فَنَسْأَلَ اِلْأَطْلَالٌ عِنْمَ أَمَّ مَا لِيُ # رَحِيلُ ثَانِيَةَ اِلْأَطْلَالِ عِنْمَ أَمَّ مَا لِيُ

'Stand and ask the ruins concerning Umm Mālik! But will ruins give any tidings save of falling to ruin?'

On which Abū Zayd remarks: He certainly knew that the ruins would not reply, and only meant, Ask the people of the ruins. Further, on p. 35 he has added to an opinion from Abū 'Ubayda that al-Farazdaq, Jarīf and al-Akhṭal are the greatest poets of the time of al-Islām, a remark that that is always excepting Ḥassān b. Thābit, for no one can be compared with the poet of the Prophet of God. Again, on the vexed question of the presence of foreign words in the Qurʾān, he takes up the stiffest and most orthodox position. The Qurʾān has been definitely said to be in perspicuous Arabic, and so Arabic only it can be. If we find words in it that are like Persian or Greek or Syriac words, what of it? Cannot the two languages have the same word for the same thing without there being a connection? So he and one school of Muslim Theologians cleared the difficulty.

From this will be evident what we are to expect of Abū Zayd acting independently; but there can be no question of the importance of the collection that has come down to us under his name. If some of the poems have been published elsewhere since Hommel drew up his list and noted that 1400 lines were new, yet he did not reckon with that number the poems which occur also in the Muṭaffādaliyyāt which Thorbecke was then editing. But Thorbecke's edition remains a fragment, and these poems are still unedited. On my part there has been no attempt to trace what is published and what not. That would be a work of much time, and I have only been able to gather up the more salient points throwing light on the date and origin of the book. Names which I have given up as hopeless will be traced by others, and my trust is that the complete collection of Isnāds may be of assistance in this. Those who have had anything to do with Arab biography know how perplexing and unsatisfying is the search through a jungle of Ḭaqabs, Kunyas, Nīṣbas and Ismās for some name that, in the end, we do not find. Such will be charitable towards the smallness of my results, and seeking that charity, I would close with the old jingle that has done duty so often:

ان تجد عيبا نسدا الخلل # جل مس لا عيب فيه وعلا
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NOTES.

1 *Actes du sixième Congrès international des Orientalistes, Deuxième partie, sect. i.* pp. 387-408.
2 *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber,* pp. xx, xxi.
3 Pp. xix, xx, xxvii, and 144.
5 The poem of *ʻAntara which stands second in the second class in Hommel’s list, stands first in the Būlāq text. Further, the Būlāq text is richer, in all, by about 67 lines.
6 See the review of this work by Prym and Socin, *Z.D.M.G.* xxxi, 667 ff.

ومهذا ذكر في هذا الكتاب المعلقات التسع والأربعون مقسمة إلى سبعة أقسام كل قسم سبع قصائد ملقيات بلقب خصوص بها ناحة في جلديين يفظم عادي

I have had to read here instead of تحول الشعراء تحول الشعراء. This seems necessary in order to get a noun to which the suffix in may refer but perhaps it may be possible to supply that from الشعراء. The text-reading is, of course, the common phrase.

Ahlwardt has on p. xix. of the “Six Divans,” *ʻalī elkhattab as the reading of the Berlin MS.;* but on p. 144 (the Arabic preface to the

ابن أبي الخطب (تعليقة.


Part ii., p. 481, note. I quote through Hommel, as this catalogue is inaccessible to me. It refers also to the *Muzhir* of as-Suyūtī. ʻAbd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī, in his list of books used in writing the *Khizāna al-Adab,* includes the *Jamhara,* but does not mention Abū Zayd.


*Fihrist,* p. 111.

Ibn Qut., p. 169; an-Nawawi, s. v.

Ibn Qut., p. 268.

P. 229, and references in note.


Ibn Qut., p. 267.


Ibn Qut., p. 267.
To these may be added a Muhammad b. Hasan al-Warrāq, who died in حدود الثلاثين ومائتين, and who wrote mostly religious and gnomic poetry (Fawāt al-Wafayāt, ii. 356); and an Abū-l-Abbās Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Kātib, who wrote a كتاب المراج, and died 270 (Hājī Khalīfa, v. 80).
Fihrist, pp. 79; 157, l. 18; and 158, l. 21. In the last passage simply under his Kūnyā. Hājī Khalīfa, iii. 150. Wüstenfeld, Gramm. Schulen, p. 198 f.

For Zarūd see Mardāsid, s. v., and Bibl. Geogr. Arab., vii., 143 and 113.
Was confusion produced by the Abūl-Abbās al-Marwāzī who died in 274 (Fihrist, p. 150)?
Wüstenfeld, Gramm. Schulen, p. 142 ff.
P. 92, 94.
Wüstenfeld, An-Nawawi, p. 335. The form of the name given in Ibn Qut. seems to be right, though it is left in doubt whether we have the form of the active or of the passive participle. On the other hand the بنكحārī of the Jamhāra appears to be quite false. In the Cairo reprint of Ibn Qutayba it has become

البنكحأر

An-Nawawi tells how it was gained:

قال ابن عبد البار وانما قيل له الماجّر لأنه وقع وهو غلام فتكسر فدحل إلى عينيه حقيقة أي الموميئين فقيل انظر إلى ابن أخيك الكسر فقالت ليس بالمكشر ولكن

Ibn Qut., p. 1 and 2.
Ibn Durayd, Kitāb al-Ishtiqāq, p. 289.
Ibn Qut., p. 173.
Ibn Qut., p. 540.
Ibn Qut., p. 370.

باب ذكر طبقات من سبنا منهم قال ابن عبيد الله أشعر

الناس أهل الروم خاصة . . . 

قال المفضل هزلاء أحكام السبم الطوال التي تسبيها العرب

السموت فمن قال أن السبم لعثرهم فقد خالف ما أجمع عليه
Macdonald, *A Description of the Bûlâq Edition, etc.* clxxxvii

أهله العلم والمعرفة وقد أدركنا أكثر أهله العلم يقولون أن
بعد هم سبعا ما هي بدنهم ولقن تلا أحكامهم أحكام
الأولئما فلما قصروا وَهُنَّ السِّنهُرات

It may be of use, perhaps, to reprint here the fragment from the
Berlin MS. given by Nöeldeke in the *Beiträge* (p. xx.):

قال المفصل : القول عندنا ما قاله أبو عبيدة في ترتيب طبقاتهم وهو أن أول
طبقاتهم أحكام السبع ممتهنات وهما امرؤ القيس وريهم والبابعة
والإياعي وليبيد وهم بن كلثوم وطرفة بن عبد قل البفصل
هَنَاكَاء أحكام السبع الطوال الذين تسيبها العرب بالسبوط ومن
زعم غير ذلك فقد خالف جمهور العلماء

The repetition of the mafāṣil shows that something is wrong
with the text, and comparison with the Bûlâq edition shows what it is.
Notice, too, the occurrence of the term **البحوثات**, which never appears
in the Bûlâq edition. The later form of tradition will be found in
as-Suyûtî's *Muzhir*, Naw' 49; ed. Cairo 1883, iii. 234.

Nöeldeke translates *die Berühmten*. I have followed Lane.

قال المفصل فهذة النسعة الأربعون قصيدة عيون أشعار
العرب في الجاهلية والإسلام ونفس شعر كل رجل منهم

I am not certain that I have caught the exact meaning of the last
phrase.

This tradition was only known to Nöeldeke through a note by
al-Khafäjî on the *Durra al-Ghawwâs* of al-Ḫârift, but see Appendix.

Father Lewis Cheikho, in *Les poètes arabes chrétiens*, p. 288,
284, gives the *Jamhara* poem of Umayya b. Ablî-Ṣalt, and remarks:

**هيّ قصيدة تعَد من جمهور العرب**. This may mean noth-
ing; but it may also mean that there is a separate MS. of the
*Mujam al-ʿArab* in the Jesuit Library at Bayrût. There are evidently
some MSS. there of high value, and a catalogue of the collection
would be of the greatest interest.

Compare with this as-Suyûtî's *Ikhân*. On p. 125 ff. (Uthmānîya ed.,
Cairo 1806) there is a long section on the subject, in which Ibn ʿAbbâs
is represented as saying: Poetry is the Record (*Divân*) of the Arabs.
Then, whenever anything in the Qur'an which God has revealed in the
tongue of the Arabs is obscure, we turn to their Record.

* In Ahlwardt's Six Divans, p. 199, this line is quoted from the Berlin
MS., but the second Miṣrī is different:

\[\text{'And has sought changed the ruins save falling to ruin?'}\]

* Compare al-Jawālīqi’s Kitāb al-Mu'arrab, p. 3-5 of Sachau's edition;
and as-Suyūtī's Itqān, p. 142 ff. Perhaps this is not so much a case of
orthodoxy as of Arab versus 'Ajami. Abū Zayd will not admit foreign
words to be in the Qur'an; it is pure Arabic. So, too, we are to inter-
pret it according to the Arab poets, not the theological ideas of non-
Arabs. This position would be highly intelligible in one of the tribe of
Quraysh.

APPENDIX.

In his Beiträge, p. xix, xx,* Nöldeke speaks as though an-Nahḥās
knew not only the story of the hanging on the Ka‘ba, but also the
name al-Mu‘allaqa as applied to the seven poems. That is certainly
the impression that al-Khafājī gives, but it appears to be incorrect.
Nöldeke cited the passage from a manuscript, but it has since been pub-
lished twice; once by Thorbecke in his edition of Harīfī’s Durra al-
Ghawwās (p. 47), and in the Constantinople edition (Press of Jawālīb,
A. H. 1399) of the Durra, with al-Khafājī’s shahr (p. 229). Compare
too, Wüstenfeld, Ibn Khallikān, No. 204, and Kosegarten, Mu‘allaqa
of 'Amr, p. 66—the last is an anonymous scholiast. Al-Khafājī, à
propos of a mention of Ḥamād in the Durra, says:

\[\text{ وهو الذي جمع السبع المعلقات وسببت ملاحظات لأنهم كانوا إذا أنشدروا شعراً}
\text{في جماعهم يقولوا كلهم عَلْيَّهم إِشارة إِلَى أنَّهُما يَنطِغُي أن يَحْفَظُ وَاٰمَ تَيِلِ من أَنْهَا جَلَّتْ نِبِيَّةَ الَّذِي أَصْلُهُ كَلياً}

[Constand. edit.]

But Frenkel in his edition of the Mu‘allaqa of Inm al-Qays with the
commentary of an-Nahḥās (Halle a/S, 1878), has given from the Berlin
MS. (Wetzstein i. 56) an-Nahḥās’s own words. The passage is worth
quoting at length; for it has several points of contact with the Jamhara,
and throws light upon the history of the term Mu‘allaqa. It comes at
the end of the commentary on ‘Amr b. Kulthūm, whose Qāṣīdā stands

—Ed.
قال أبو جعفر: فهذا آخر السمم المشهورات.
على ما رأيت أهل اللغة يذهبون إليه منهم أبو الحسن بن كيسان وليس لنا أن نعترض في هذا فانقول من الشعر ما هو أجزاء من هذه كما أنه ليس لنا أن نعترض في الألقاب وإنما نذكرها على ما نقلت إلى هنا نحو المصدر والحال والتنبيين وقد رأيت من يذهب إلى أن تقيمة الأعشى وقعت هُرَيْثة وتقيمة
النايفة وهي يا ذاك مئة من هذه القصائد وقد بَيَّننا أن هذا لا يُحَدَّ بقياس غير أن رأينا أكثر أهل اللغة يذهب إلى أن أشعار
الملاهي أمرَ الْقِيسٍ وَهُمَّر بن أبي سلمى والنايفة والأعشى فإن
أبا عبيدة قال: أشعار الملاهي ثلثاء أمرَ الْقِيسٍ وَهُمَّر
والنايفة أخذنا قول أكثر أهل اللغة على إملاء تقيمة الأعشى
وتصيدة النايفة لتقيدهم اياها وإن كانتا ليستا من القصائد
السمم عند أكثرهم واختلفوا في جمِّع هذه القصائد السمم وقيل
أن العرب كان أكثرهم يبتغي ببعضات ويتناشدون الشعر فإذا
استحسن الملك تقيمة قال: ُلْقَرَوا وأبْنَهَا في خ#, نفياً نفياً
قول من قال أنها مْلَقَت في الكعبة فلا يعرفه أحدٌ من الرواة
وأضْعَ ما قال في هذا أَن حماداً الراوية لِنْا رأى زَغْد الناس في
الشعر جمِّع هذه السمم وفحصهم عليها وقال لهم هذا هي
المشهورات فسبيت القصائد المشهورة لهذا ونبِّأ بتصيدة
الأعشى لأن أبا عبيدة قال لم يقل في الجاهلية على زُرُوْتِها مثلها

VOL. XVI. 8
Apparently Hommel, who wrote in 1884, did not know that this passage had been printed, for he only refers to Ahlwardt’s Bemerkung, p. 18, who, in turn, makes only a reference to the Berlin MS. Nor does Frenkel appear to have recognized the importance of the passage which he gives. One point that is clear from it is that an-Naḥḥās does not state as so definite a fact of knowledge as al-Khaṭāfi gives us to understand, that Hammād collected the seven poems. He simply gives it as the sounder opinion: ʾaṣḥaḥu mā qilā fi hādhā. Apparently, in his time (he died 338), there were many different reports, and he regarded this as the most trustworthy. Then, as to the plan on which his own collection was based, an-Naḥḥās tells us that he wished to give the seven poems that were called al-Mashhūrāt, the collecting of which he assigns to Hammād. As to which poems were included in this collection, he follows Abū-l-Hasan b. Kaysān without considering himself whether some other poems might not be better than these. This suggests that some in his time did consider that question, and therefore, the seven may have become confused. Further, his mention of Ibn Kaysān suggests that there were other traditions as to what poems belonged to the Mashhūrāt.

Further, some inserted among the seven the Qaṣīda of al-Aʾshā beginning, یا دَارُ مَيْةٍ رَدَّعُ عَرَقُهُ, and that of an-Nābigha beginning, [both in the Jamhara seven, but not with these poems]; but this was not based on a regular tradition, but simply because these two poets were reckoned among the four best poets of the time of Ignorance. Yet Abū ʿUbayda only reckoned three to the first class, omitting from it al-Aʾshā (see the Jamhara). An-Naḥḥās, therefore, determined to add these two poems, making up the number to nine. He then explains what difference of opinion there was as to how these seven came to be collected. Some held by the story of the fair of ʿUkāz, and that the best poems were selected and preserved there. Others affirmed that they were hung in the Kaʿbah; but an-Naḥḥās rejects this utterly,—“not one of the Rāwis knows anything of it.” He then gives his adherence to the story about Hammād, that having noticed the indifference of the people to poetry, he collected these seven and brought them to their notice, and told them that they were the most celebrated. Thence they had their name, al-Mashhūrāt, by which an-Naḥḥās apparently knew them. Then he remarks that of the two additional Qaṣīdas he puts that of al-Aʾshā first, because Abū ʿUbayda had said that there was no other poem of the Ignorance in the same rhyme-letter equal to it.

In all this the most striking point is that he does not seem to have known the seven under the name of the Muʿallaqāt. For them they were the Mashhūrāt. That is the name which he gives and explains here, as well as at the beginning of his commentary. So, too, at-Tibrīzī (d. 420), in his commentary on ten poems (the nine of an-Naḥḥās with the addition of the Bā Qaṣīda of Abīd b. al-Abraṣ edd. Lyall), who follows an-Naḥḥās closely, speaks only of ‘the seven Qaṣīdas.’
Similarly, az-Zawzanî (d. 496), so far as I can trace him, speaks only of 'the seven Qaṣidas,' and never uses the term Mu'allaqât. Ibn Khalilikân (d. 681) is the first whom I find using that term, and he speaks of 'the nine Mu'allaqât.' In Wüstenfeld's text there stands السبع، but the reading in Ibn Khallikân's autograph MS. in the British Museum is النسح. [It may be worth mentioning that August Müller carefully collated this MS. (Add. 25,785), covering three-quarters of the book, with his copy of Wüstenfeld’s edition, which is now in the Hartford Seminary Library.] With as-Suyûtî (d. 911) in the Muzhir, and al-Khafâji (d. 1089) we find the term in its modern use. Further, none of the Lexicons explains the term in this sense, not even the Qâmûs, in spite of Freytag's Kam.

But though an-Nahlûs does not use the term Mu'allaqât, yet he uses the verb عَلَق, apparently in the sense 'to select and preserve a poem.' Does this mean that Mu'allaqa may be said of any poem that is selected from others and preserved carefully, distinguished in any way? Was that its first usage, and was it not till later, much later, that it came to be applied to the seven which Ḥammâd had picked out and called al-Mashhûrât? Apparently it was still in the stage of being applicable to any selected poem when Ibn Khallikân wrote, as he speaks of the nine Mu'allaqât of an-Nahlûs. This would indicate that the story about the Ka'ba was not invented to explain the name; for the story existed long before the common noun had become a name. Another question that rises is this: Is there any connection, after all, between the first class of the Jamhara, i.e., the Sumûţ, and Ḥammâd's seven? Are they not, perhaps, quite distinct sevens? It is true that five names occur in both: Imr al-Qays, Zuhayr, Labîd, 'Amr and Ṭarafa. But neither 'Antara nor al-Ḥârith are in the Jamhara, nor are an-Nâbiyâ or al-'Ashâ in Ḥammâd's seven. The names are different: Ḥammâd's are called al-Mashhûrât; the Jamhara's, as-Sumûţ. The story of their origin and originator is different. The Jamhara seven, if connected with any one as originator, is connected with Abû 'Ubayda. I have already suggested that probably there were many more collections of seven than we have hitherto supposed or identified. At a later stage, they would become confused with one another or be swallowed up in the greater collections. Thus the name as-Sumûţ might come in time to be applied to Ḥammâd's seven as on the title page of Arnold's edition.

Finally, I would notice that in both the Sahâd and the Lisân، and سُئِطْ عَلَق: and we have in the Lisân والسُئِطْ خَيْطُ النَّظَرِ لَائِدَة يَعَلَقُ.

This paper will be published in full in the forthcoming number of Haupt and Delitzsch's Beiträge zur Assyriologie, Vol. III., Part 2. The fragment in question was obtained at Kouryunjik by the late Rev. W. F. Williams, at the time when Sir A. H. Layard was conducting his excavations at that place. Through the kindness of Mr. Talcott Williams, of Philadelphia, it was placed at the disposal of the writer. The fragment reveals the close of an episode in the "Etana"-legend. The eagle who has destroyed the serpent's nest dies a disgraceful death. The serpent is avenged, aided by Šamaš—the sun-god—who indicates the manner in which the death of the eagle can be brought about. In connection with the fragment, some general questions affecting the order of the episodes composing the "Etana"-legend were discussed; and the suggestion was also ventured that the mysterious Ethan (or Etan) mentioned in I Kings v. ii among the "wise" men of old may be a dimmed tradition of the Babylonian Etana. At all events, the names are identical. Ethan and Etana signify "the strong one," which was a favorite epithet of the Semitic gods and heroes.

9. Note on the Term Mušannitum; by Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.

The full text of this paper will be found in Hebraica, Vol. X., pp. 193-5. It offers an explanation for a word of frequent occurrence in the legal literature of the Babylonians. With the help of a comparison with a Talmudic term מֶשָּׁנִים, the conclusion was reached that the Babylonian word was used to designate the "embankment" that the climatic conditions of the Euphrates valley rendered necessary as a protection to fields during the rainy season. The word is derived from a stem מַשָּׁנ, meaning to be "pointed," and the form is contracted from μουσαννίττων = μουσαννίττων = μουσάννιτον. In the technical sense of "embankment," the Talmudic term was shown to be a loan-word from the Babylonian, the writing מִשְׁנִים instead of מִשְׁנִים being due to an adaptation of the borrowed word to one already existing in Aramaic, and used in a manner that favored a supposed connection with the foreign word. The term also occurs as a loan-word in Arabic, مُسَانُن. There appears also the form מַשְׁנִים, without the מ.

10. On the Language of the Sinjirli Inscriptions; by Professor R. J. H. Gottheil, of Columbia College, New York, N. Y.

In connection with the Sinjirli inscriptions, Professor Gottheil pointed out the close connection which existed between the older Aramaic (in the inscriptions and in the Bible) and the Hebrew. Many peculiarities common to both these dialects are found again in the Assyrian. It is
only in its later development that the Aramaic branched off so perceptibly from the Hebrew. This will also serve to explain how the Assyrian shows peculiarities in lexicon and grammatical structure which at times agree with the Hebrew, at times with the Aramaic dialects.

11. Notes; by Professor George A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Penn.*

1. On the Semitic Ishtar Cult.

Professor D. H. Müller's *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Abessinien* contains an inscription which gives evidence of the existence of the Ishtar Cult in Abyssinia. The writer had previously found traces of it in all the other countries of the Semitic area.

An inscription published by Derenbourg in the *Journal Asiatique* proves the theory of the late Professor W. R. Smith that Athtar was originally a mother goddess in Arabia, and then developed into a masculine deity, as it shows clearly the transition from the one to the other.

2. On the God Mut.

The writer had shown in a paper published elsewhere that there was a god Maut or Mut among the Hebrews. The discovery of traces of the worship of the Egyptian god Mut near Gaza in Palestine in the time of the El Amarna tablets suggests the possibility that the Hebrew god may have been borrowed from the Egyptians.

3. Was Ilu ever a Distinct Deity in Babylonia?

The object of this paper was to suggest the possibility of a different explanation of *Ilu*, as an element of proper names, from that followed by recent scholars. The analogy of other proper names and of the history of Ishtar suggest, though they do not clearly prove, that *Ilu* was once a distinct deity.


Hebrew poetry is not musical, but pictorial. It is not metrical in form. It has what may be called verses or lines, but the line has not a given number of accents, nor are the accents arranged in a given order. Each line presents a single complete picture. This picture is itself the blending together usually of two simpler pictures, each presented in a distinct phrase. The image or conception in a phrase is a unity of two elements, as, say, a subject and its action; but the phrase may have less or more than two words. Generally each line is one of a couplet, giving companion pictures.

The Psalm may be thus arranged, to illustrate the theory:

The other communications were presented as follows:

13. On some Hebrew MSS. from Egypt; by Dr. Cyrus Adler, of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

14. On the origin of games and divination in Eastern Asia; by Mr. Stewart Culin, of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.

15. On the Bharats and the Bharatas: by Professor E. W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Penn.

16. On a complete verbal index to the Fiqh-al-Luqha of Ath-tha' Alibi; by Professor D. B. Macdonald, of Hartford, Conn.

17. On the Agnihotra-section of the Jāminītya-brāhmaṇa; by Dr. Hanns Oertel, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn. To be published in the Journal.

18. An emendation of Śāyāṇa on S. B. i. 3. 2; by Dr. Oertel.

19. On some unpublished Arabic inscriptions in Morocco and elsewhere; by Mr. Talcott Williams, of Philadelphia, Penn.


21. Note on the Julian inscription described by Dr. I. H. Hall at the meeting of March, 1894; by Dr. Wright. Published in the Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund, April, 1895.

Papers by Professor M. Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University, and Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College, were read at the Second Joint Session, Friday, December 28th.
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JOINT SESSIONS.
Opening Session.

Thursday, December 27, at 12 M.

Address by Mr. C. C. Harrison, Acting Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, introducing the Presiding Officer of the Meeting, Professor A. Marshall Elliott, of the Johns Hopkins University, President of the Modern Language Association of America.

Address of Welcome by Dr. Horace Howard Furness, Philadelphia.
SECOND JOINT SESSION.

Friday, December 28, at 10 A. M.

Presiding Officer of the Meeting, Prof. John Henry Wright, of Harvard University, President of the American Philological Association.

1. Dr. J. P. Peters, New York, and Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, University of Philadelphia. The last results of the Babylonian expedition of the University of Pennsylvania.


5. Prof. Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College. Some Modern German etymologies.

6. Prof. Maurice Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University. On Prof. Streitberg's theory as to the origin of certain long Indo-European vowels.

7. Prof. Federico Halbherr, University of Rome. Explorations in Crete for the Archaeological Institute (read by Prof. Frothingham).


THIRD JOINT SESSION.

Friday, December 28, at 8 P. M.

MEMORIAL MEETING

IN HONOR OF

WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY.

Presiding Officer of the Meeting, President Daniel Coit Gilman, of Johns Hopkins University, President of the American Oriental Society.

1. Reading of letters from foreign scholars.
2. **MEMORIAL ADDRESS** by Prof. Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University.

3. Whitney's influence on the study of modern languages and on lexicography, by Prof. Francis A. March, Lafayette College.

4. Whitney's influence on students of classical philology, by Prof. Bernadotte Perrin, Yale University.

5. Address by Prof. J. Irving Manatt, Brown University.


7. Concluding address by President Daniel Coit Gilman.

---

**SPECIAL SESSIONS.**

**AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.**

(Organized 1869.)


2. Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College. The Delphian Hymns and the Pronunciation of the Greek Vowels.

3. Prof. Alfred Gudeman, University of Pennsylvania. Plutarch as a Philologist.

4. Prof. Edwin W. Fay, of Washington and Lee University. *ARYAN tṛ = GRK. πλ = LAT. cl̄, ARY. dṛ = βλ = LAT. gl̄*.

5. Prof. C. R. Lanman of Harvard University. Reflecting Meanings; a Point in Semantics.

6. Prof. Karl P. Harrington, of the University of North Carolina. Notes on the Diction of the *Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii*.

7. Prof. W. A. Lamberton, of the University of Pennsylvania. Notes on Thucydides.

8. Dr. Arthur Fairbanks, of Yale University. Local Cults in Homer.

9. Dr. Mitchell Carroll, of the Johns Hopkins University. Aristotle on the Faults of Poetry; or Poetics xxv. in the Light of the Homeric Scholia.


11. Prof. M. W. Easton, of the University of Pennsylvania. Remarks upon Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, chiefly with reference to the text.
15. Prof. E. G. Sihler, of the University of the City of New York. St. Paul and the Lex Iulia de vi.
18. Prof. John Williams White, of Harvard University. The pre-Themistoclean Wall at Athens.
24. Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College in the City of New York. Two ancient Persian Names in Greek, Ἀρταβάντς and Φάρσάμα.
27. Prof. Carl Darling Buck, of the University of Chicago. The Passive in Oscan-Umbrian.
28. Prof. W. J. Battle, of the University of Texas (read by title). Magical Curses written on Lead Tablets.
29. Dr. Charles Knapp, of Barnard College (read by title). Lexicographical Notes.
30. Prof. W. G. Hale, of the University of Chicago. On the Latin Subjunctive and the Greek Optative in Indirect Discourse.
31. Prof. M. Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University. On the Etymology of ἀδίκο.

Papers by Prof. W. W. Goodwin, of Harvard University, and Prof. Minton Warren, of the Johns Hopkins University, were read at the Second Joint Session, Friday, December 28th.

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS.

(Organized 1880.)


3. Prof. Lewis B. Paton, Hartford Theological Seminary. Did Amos approve the calf-worship at Bethel?


5. Prof. J. Henry Thayer, Harvard University. σὺ ἐίπας, σὺ λέγεις, Mat. xxvi. 64, John xviii. 37, etc.


8. Prof. Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University. On 2 Samuel i. 23.


10. Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, Colgate University. Μαραν ἀβα, I Cor. xvi. 22.


12. Prof. George F. Moore, Andover Theological Seminary. I Kings vii. 46 and the question of Succoth (read by Prof. Lyon).


Papers by Prof. J. P. Peters, New York, and Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, University of Pennsylvania, were read at the Second Joint Session, Friday, December 28.
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

(Organized 1883.)

1. Prof. W. T. Hewett, Cornell University. The life and works of Prof. Matthias de Vries.

2. Dr. K. Francke, Harvard University. The relation of early German romanticism to the classic ideal.


5. Prof. Frederic Spencer, University of North Wales, Bangor, Wales. On the reform of methods in teaching the Modern Languages, together with an experiment in the teaching of German.


7. Prof. Henry R. Lang, Yale University. The metres employed by the earliest Portuguese lyric school.

8. Dr. J. Hendren Gorrell, Wake Forest College, N. C. Indirect discourse in Anglo-Saxon.

9. Prof. O. F. Emerson, Cornell University. A parallel between the Middle English poem *Patience* and one of the pseudo-Tertullian poems.


11. Dr. C. C. Marden, Johns Hopkins University. The Spanish dialect of Mexico City.


13. Prof. James T. Hatfield, Northwestern University. The poetry of Wilhelm Müller.

14. Dr. L. E. Menger, Johns Hopkins University. Early Romanticists in Italy.

15. Dr. Edwin S. Lewis, Princeton University. On the development of inter-vocalic labials in the Romanic languages.


17. Mr. Alex. W. Herdler, Princeton University. On the Slavonic languages.
Program of the Congress of Philologists.


19. Prof. A. R. Hohlfeld, Vanderbilt University. Contributions to a bibliography of Racine (read by title).

A paper by Prof. Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, was read at the Second Joint Session, Friday, December 28.

——

AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY.

(Organized 1888.)

Prof. E. S. Sheldon, Harvard University, read a paper at the Second Joint Session, Friday, December 28.

——

SPELLING REFORM ASSOCIATION.

(Organized 1876.)

1. Opening remarks by President March: "The movement for spelling reform."


4. Remarks by Charles P. G. Scott, Ph.D., Editor of Worcester's Dictionary: "The attitude of philologists toward the spelling reform."


7. Remarks by Mrs. E. B. Burns, of New York.

——

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA.

(Organized 1879.)

1. Mrs. Sara Y. Stevenson, University of Pennsylvania. The antiquities from Koptos at the University of Pennsylvania.


4. Prof. Frank B. Tarbell, University of Chicago. Retrograde inscriptions on Attic vases.

5. Prof. John Williams White, Harvard University. History and work of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

6. Prof. William R. Ware, Columbia College, N. Y. The New American School of Architecture at Rome.


13. Prof. A. L. Frothingham, Jr., Princeton University. Byzantine influence upon Mediæval Italy.

14. The ivory throne at Ravenna.

15. Mr. William Rankin, Jr., Princeton University. Some early Italian pictures in American galleries.

16. Prof. Alfred Emerson, Cornell University. The archaeology of Athenian politics in the fifth century B.C.

A paper by Prof. Federico Halbherr, University of Rome, was read at the Second Joint Session, on Friday, December 28.
PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,

AT ITS

MEETING IN NEW HAVEN, CONN.,

April 18th and 19th, 1895.

The Society assembled at New Haven, in the Foreign Missions Library, East Divinity Hall, Yale University, on Thursday of Easter Week, April 18th, 1895, at 3 p.m., and was called to order by its President, President Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins University.

The following members were in attendance at one or more of the sessions:

Batten  Goodwin, C. J.  Martin, W. A. P.
Berg  Gottheil  Moore, G. F.
Binney  Grieve, Miss  Oertel
Blaustein  Haupt  Perry
Bradner  Hopkins  Staley
Chester  Jackson  Steele
Davis, J. D.  Jewett  Van Name
Dickerman  Lanman  Ward
Gilman  Macdonald  [26]

On opening the session, the President expressed the pleasure of the Society at being welcomed again at New Haven, where the associations connected with the Society's history are so many. He then spoke of the recent loss which Yale University, and the world of science, had suffered in the death, on April 14th, of Professor James Dwight Dana, the distinguished zoologist, geologist, and mineralogist. Dr. Gilman spoke with feeling, admiration, and respect concerning the life and work of the departed scholar, and called attention to the fact that, although not enrolled among Orientalists, Professor Dana had been an extensive traveller in the Orient, and by his writings on the Geology of the Pacific and
on Coral Islands had made important contributions to our knowledge of the physical and natural characteristics of the Eastern Hemisphere.

In the absence of the Recording Secretary, Professor Lyon, the Society chose Professor Jackson, of Columbia College, to discharge the duties of that officer during the session.

The minutes of the special meeting held at Philadelphia, December 27th, 28th and 29th, 1894, in connection with various other philological and archaeological societies of America, were read and approved. The report of the Committee of Arrangements for the present meeting was made by Dr. Oertel of Yale University. This report was in the form of a printed programme, and was accompanied by an invitation from President Dwight of Yale University, extending to the members of the Society the hospitality of his home during the evening. The report and the invitation were accepted with acknowledgments and thanks.

The reports of outgoing officers were now in order.

The Corresponding Secretary, Professor Perry, of Columbia College, presented some of the correspondence that had been received since the Christmas meeting.

Report was then made upon some letters which had been addressed to Professor Lanman of Harvard University on subjects touching the work of the Society.—Siddheçvara Mitter, formerly the Secretary of Protap Chunder Roy of Calcutta, writes from The Residency at Khatmandu, Nepal, that although many good manuscripts have been carried away, the country is still rich in them; and that he is ready to do what he can to secure any such as may be desired by Oriental students among us.*—Dr. Rost writes from London that a young Singalese gentleman, de Silva Wickremasingha, a pupil of Professor Kuhn and Dr. Franke, would be glad to collate Pāli manuscripts for any one who may wish to make use of his services.—In a letter to Mr. H. C. Warren of Cambridge, the Venerable W. Subhûti, Theró, P. N. M., a learned Buddhist High Priest, of Waskaduwa, Kalutara, in the Western Province of Ceylon, to whom various Pāli students in the Occident are already so greatly indebted, has increased the existing obligations by the tender of his kind offices in the matter of procuring transcripts of manuscripts.†—Dr. James Burgess of Edinburgh wrote to Prof. Lanman with regard to the “Magazine of Indian Photographs,” an interesting monthly started at Allahabad (Sept., 1894, yearly 30 Rupees, office at 5, Cutchery Road);

* At the meeting of April, 1893, Professor Lanman described a good copy of a MS. of the Lañkā-avatāra, just received by him from Nepal; but the description was not printed.

† Since his first letter, Subhûti has sent to Mr. Warren a complete and excellent transcript, on about 1700 pages, of the Paramattha Manjūsā, which is a commentary upon Buddhaghosa’s Visuddhi Magga, and was much desired by Mr. Warren in his work upon the Visuddhi Magga.
Corresponding Secretary's Report.

and also concerning the progress of his own labors upon the great work on the Archeology of India to be published by Griggs of London.—Professor James Legge of Oxford had also sent a most interesting letter to Professor Lanman, in the course of which he said, "Nor can I bring myself to think that his [Buddha's] teaching has been a great boon to the world, or even to the peoples by whom its records have been most generally and favorably received."

In this connection, Dr. William Hayes Ward drew the attention of the Society to recent discoveries of tablets at Tel-Lo, and read selections from a letter received from Mr. J. H. Haynes, in charge of the Philadelphia expedition at Niffer, in which Mr. Haynes gave account of fair success in the search for tablets which he had been pursuing.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the names of recently deceased members of the Society. The record is as follows:

**HONORARY MEMBERS:**

Professor Heinrich Brugsch-Pasha;
Professor August Dillmann;
Sir Brian Houghton Hodgson;
Sir Austen Henry Layard;
Raoi Sahib Shankar Pandurang Pandit;
Major-General Sir Henry Creswicke Rawlinson.

**CORRESPONDING MEMBERS:**

Hyde Clarke;
Professor Philippe Edouard Foucaux;
Dr. D. J. Macgowan.

**CORPORATE MEMBERS:**

Professor Edwin Cone Bissell;
Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut;
Professor William Dwight Whitney.

As is well known to our members, the obligations of the American Oriental Society to Professor Whitney are very exceptionally great. This meeting, the first annual legal meeting of the Society after his decease, would have been the natural time for taking some official notice of his death. That this was not done is due to the fact that that session of the First American Congress of Philologists which was held at Philadelphia, Friday evening, December 28, 1894, was made a memorial meeting, and "devoted to the expression, on the part of his colleagues and friends, of their appreciation of the character and public services of Mr. Whitney." The Proceedings of that session are to be published by the Congress in a volume entitled, "The Whitney Memorial Meeting." This is to be distributed to the members of the

VOL. XVI.
American Oriental Society, the American Philological Association, and the Modern Language Association of America. The volume is uniform or very nearly uniform in size with the publications of those Societies and may properly be treated as a part of their official publications.

The Treasurer, Mr. Henry C. Warren, of Cambridge, Mass., presented to the Society, by the hand of Professor Lanman, his accounts and statement for the year ending April, 1895. At the request of the Treasurer, the Chair appointed Professors Lanman and Lyon of Cambridge, as a Committee to examine the securities of the Society at the place where such securities may be stored; and they were requested to report on the same to the President of the Society. As an Auditing Committee to examine the Treasurer's accounts presented at the meeting, Professors Lanman and Gottheil were named. This Committee reported to the Society during the meeting, and certified that the accounts were in due order and properly vouched. The usual analytical summary of the General Account follows:

**Receipts.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance from old account, March 29, 1894</td>
<td>$1,548.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments (181) for 1894–5</td>
<td>$906.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments (81) for other years</td>
<td>155.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of publications</td>
<td>150.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income of investments, other than Bradley Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>195.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income of the year</strong></td>
<td>$1,406.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total receipts for the year</strong></td>
<td>$2,955.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal, xvi. 1 (part)</td>
<td>$932.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings, March, 1894</td>
<td>$109.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on $932.80 from June 30 to July 27, 1894</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of expenses of Joint Meeting at Philadelphia</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding (for two years)</td>
<td>49.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job printing</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, etc.</td>
<td>30.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total disbursements for the year</strong></td>
<td>1,376.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credit balance on Gen'l Account, Apr. 18, 1895: 1,376.61

**$2,955.00**

Upon these facts, the Treasurer remarks as follows: The expenses for the past fiscal year have been large, amounting to $1,376.61, by far the larger part of which was spent in printing Vol. xvi. of the Journal, and the Proceedings for 1894. The receipts from all sources have slightly exceeded the expenditures,
Treasurer's Report—Librarian's Report.

so that the total funds in the possession of the Society are some forty odd dollars in excess of what they were at the time of making the last report. It is to be noted that the continued hard times have lowered the rate of interest in the case of some of the investments of the Society. The total interest account, however, for this year is about thirty dollars larger than that of last year; this fact is in part due to the circumstance that the meeting this year is held later than it was last spring, so that April dividends have come in.

The state of the funds is as follows:

**A. Principal of Special Funds:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mar. 28, 1894:</th>
<th>Apr. 18, 1895:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1425.30</td>
<td>$1482.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Balances Belonging to General Account:**

| $1548.51     | $1498.38     |
| 40.40        | 71.84        |
| 3.79         | 8.17         |

| $5092.90     | $5136.15     |

The Librarian, Mr. Addison Van Name, of New Haven, presented the following report for 1894–5: "The additions to the library for the past year have been 256 volumes, 103 parts of volumes, and 130 pamphlets. Besides the usual exchanges from corresponding institutions, two important gifts have been received. One of them, a portion of the library of the late Professor Whitney, presented by his family, has naturally a double interest and value to the Society. It comprises 139 volumes and 38 pamphlets, and next to the gifts of the Hon. Charles William Bradley and the Rev. Joseph P. Thompson, is perhaps the most valuable the library has ever received. The other noteworthy gift* of the year is a Siamese edition of the sacred canon of the Southern Buddhists, the Tripitaka, in 39 volumes, 8vo., a present from His Majesty the King of Siam, in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his reign. The sum of fifty dollars, covered by the annual appropriation of twenty-five dollars for two years past, has been expended for binding. The number of titles in the

---

* For more detailed information concerning this gift, see communication no. 16 below, pp. cxcxlv ff.
Society's library is now 4828, an increase of nearly two hundred in the past year.

For the Committee on Publication, the Corresponding Secretary reported as follows: By authorization of the Society, given at its meeting of December last, the Committee had held an informal conference with the gentlemen empowered to represent the American Philological Association in the matter of publishing a volume commemorative of the late Prof. Whitney. It was the opinion of those present that such a volume should consist of the addresses delivered at the "Whitney Memorial Meeting," December 28, 1894, and of the letters received from foreign scholars concerning Mr. Whitney, extracts from which had been read at that meeting.

The Committee has under consideration the question of publishing an index to the publications of the Society.

As matter of record it may be added that the Proceedings of the Society at New York, March 29-31, 1894, were issued as a pamphlet of 92 pages and as a part of volume xvi. of the Journal, Sep. 24, 1894; and, further, that almost no progress had been made with the Journal; but that one Arabic and one Vedic article had been printed, covering in all about 14 forms.

On Friday morning, April 19, at 9.30, upon the close of the Directors' Meeting, the second session of the Society was begun.

The Directors reported by their scribe, Professor Perry, as follows:

1. They had appointed the next meeting of the Society to be held at Andover, Mass., during Easter Week, April 9th, 10th and 11th, 1896. (The Chair named as members of the Local Committee of Arrangements, to act with the Corresponding Secretary, Professors George F. Moore and John P. Taylor, of the Andover Theological Seminary.)

2. They had decided to recommend to the Society for adoption the suggestion embodied in the report of the Committee of Publication, that such committee shall hereafter consist of six members, one of whom shall be the Corresponding Secretary, and that he shall act as Chairman of that Committee.

3. They had named the following members to serve as the Committee of Publication: The Corresponding Secretary, Chairman, and Professors Isaac H. Hall, Paul Haupt, E. W. Hopkins, Maurice Bloomfield, and George F. Moore.

4. They had voted to recommend to the Society for election to membership the following persons:

As Corporate Members:

Miss Lutie Rebecca Corwin, Mt. Holyoke Seminary, South Hadley, Mass.

Dr. George S. Duncan, Harrisburg, Penn.

Dr. Charles P. G. Scott, Radnor, Penn.

Mr. Frederick Wells Williams, New Haven, Conn.

Mr. Ellis Robert Woodruff,* New York, N. Y.

* Mr. Woodruff died May, 1895.
The recommendation contained in the second paragraph of the report of the Directors was unanimously adopted by the Society. The persons recommended for election to membership, after ballot duly had, were declared elected.

Next in order of business was the report of the Committee on the Nomination of Officers, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Ward, Mr. Van Name, and Professor Haupt. The Corresponding Secretary, Professor Perry, owing to the duties which devolve upon him in consequence of his being transferred from the department of Sanskrit to the Professorship of Greek in Columbia College, requested to have a successor named for the office which he had held in the Society during the past year; and Professor Lannan, who had been Corresponding Secretary from 1884 to 1894, was nominated in his stead. Professor D. G. Lyon, who had served as Recording Secretary since his election to the office in 1886, likewise requested that he might be relieved of the duties of that position, and as his successor Professor George F. Moore of the Andover Theological Seminary was nominated. The gentlemen so nominated, and the other officers and Directors who had been the incumbents of the foregoing year, were duly elected by the Society. For convenience of reference the names of the Board for 1895–96 are here given:

President—Pres. D. C. Gilman, of Baltimore.
Vice-Presidents—Dr. William Hayes Ward, of New York; Prof. C. H. Toy, of Cambridge; Prof. Isaac H. Hall, of New York.
Corresponding Secretary—Prof. C. R. Lanman, of Cambridge.
Recording Secretary—Prof. G. F. Moore, of Andover.
Treasurer—Mr. Henry C. Warren, of Cambridge.
Librarian—Mr. Addison Van Name, of New Haven.

Directors—The officers above named: and Professors Bloomfield and Haupt, of Baltimore; Mr. Talcott Williams, of Philadelphia; Prof. E. W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr; Prof. A. L. Frothingham, of Princeton; Prof. R. Gottheil, of New York; Prof. George F. Moore, of Andover.

Upon motion of the Corresponding Secretary it was

Resolved, That the American Oriental Society hereby tenders its thanks to the authorities of Yale University, and in particular to President and Mrs. Dwight, and to the members of the Local Committee of Arrangements, Messrs. Salisbury, Van Name, and Oertel, for the hospitality extended to the Society on the occasion of its annual meeting in April, 1895, and for the excellent arrangements made for the comfort and convenience of the members attending.

Final adjournment was had on Friday, April 19th, at 11.15 A. M.

The following communications were presented:

Possessing a high degree of intellectual culture and a longer career of recorded experience than any other existing people, it might have been expected that the Chinese would make important discoveries in the arts and sciences. In the arts, their contribution to the common stock is specially notable—including silk, tea, porcelain, the mariner’s compass, and the art of printing.

In the sciences, their achievements have been less conspicuous—the free movement of the Chinese intellect having from an early period been restrained by a cast-iron orthodoxy. Yet there is good evidence that some of their leading thinkers hit on such broad generalizations as biological evolution, the unity of matter, the duality of matter and motion, the conservation of energy, the existence and properties of elemental ether, etc. This last topic was treated in the paper with special detail, and it will claim the whole of the remaining space allotted to this abstract.

Professor Oliver Lodge thus describes the modern theory of ether in a lecture before the Royal Institution. “The simplest conception of the universe that has yet occurred to the mind of man—one continuous substance filling all space; which can vibrate as light; which can be parted into positive and negative electricity; which in whirls or vortices constitutes matter, and which transmits by continuity (not by impact) every action and reaction of which matter is capable; this is the modern view of the ether and its functions.”

This conception, which he qualifies as ‘modern’ is by no means new to the philosophy of China. How early it appeared there it is not easy to affirm—perhaps ten centuries before our era, when the earliest speculations on the forces of nature were embodied in the Yihking or Book of Changes. It is found, however, as a full fledged doctrine in several writers of the eleventh century after Christ; who not only speak of an ethereal medium, but ascribe to it all the properties above enumerated except that of producing electricity. Those writers are known as the Sungju, or school of the Sung dynasty. A pleiad cluster of extraordinary brilliancy, its principal luminaries were five; who, as two of them were brothers, fall curiously enough under the four alliterative names of Cheo, Chang, Ch’eng, and Chu.

Cheo is author of a theory of the universe based on an exposition of the Book of Changes. Chang is best known by a small work called Cheng meng, ‘Right notions for the Young,’ in which, beginning as Chinese writers are prone to do, with the origin of the world, he sets forth what he considers as the correct view of the way in which it came into being. The two brothers Cheng adopted and expounded Chang’s views. Chu, the fifth and most illustrious in the series, was their disciple. I shall have to cite something from each in order to show that their conceptions of ether were substantially identical with those of our modern physicists.
Speaking of space, Chang says, "The immensity of space, though called the great void, is not a void. In fact, there is no such thing as vacuum." "It is filled with a subtile substance called Chi." That substance is, as we shall see, the ether of our modern science; though Chang and his compères were not able to enumerate as many of its properties as are known to the science of our day. The only property here asserted is its all-pervading presence. Even that might be left in doubt, but for a more explicit statement in another passage: "Heaven," he says, "in its external form appears to be an envelope for the earth, yet its Chi or substance in reality penetrates to the center of the earth."

It would hardly follow from this expression that he considers ether as present in all forms of matter. But here is a passage in which he introduces what we may call the dynamics of ether, showing that he did not regard it as saturating matter, like an inert fluid: but that it is in a state of intense activity at every point, and that the existence of matter is due to that activity. "This Chi," he says, "which fills all space, is in a state of perpetual ebb and flow—expanding and contracting without a moment's cessation. This is the source of motion and the origin of matter, whether soft or hard, gaseous or solid. Its combinations give rise to the transient forms of all things. Even the solid rocks are but grosser products of its action—like ashes from a furnace."

In another place he compares the transformation of ether into matter to the formation of ice in water, and, as might be expected, he finds in the melting of ice an image of the reversion of matter into its primordial element. His words are: "Within the immensity of space, matter is alternately concentrated and dissipated, as ice is congealed and dissolved in water." In the passages thus far quoted, we have only a reciprocal action or vibrations, no intimation of those whirls and eddies by which the ultimate particles are generated, or rather in which they consist. Professor Lodge states this as an article in an accepted creed; and we know something of those speculations as to the origin of the atom to which Lord Kelvin has lent the authority of his great name. With our Chinese thinkers the vortex-ring is a cardinal feature.

Ch'êo, the first of the five, in a diagram of cosmic forces, begins with a single ring or circle of uniform whiteness. This represents the primitive ether. Then follows a circle partly dark, which shows the original substance differentiated into two forms: Yin and Yang, the bright and the dark—the dual source of all things.

Says Chu, the last of the five, speaking of this diagram, "It shows how the primitive void was transformed into matter." "The two forces, mó'lai móchû, grind back and forth, or revolve like millstones in opposite directions. The detritus resulting from their friction is what we call matter." We may smile at the crudeness of this illustration; but have not Western philosophers described the particles of ether as cubes which in the course of evolution get their angles rubbed off and thus give birth to matter? His words are of value to us not for the light they throw on the process of creation, but as evidence that the Chinese had the idea of vortex motion.
Of this movement Chang says, "The immensity of space is filled with a pure fluid. Since it is pure (i.e. perfectly fluid) it offers no obstruction to motion." Here we have enunciated the principle of the perpetuity of vortex motion, viz. (in the language of modern physics) that, in a frictionless fluid, its original motion is maintained without alteration.

To summarize the points in which the ether of these Chinese thinkers agrees with that of our modern science:

1. It is a subtle fluid filling all space.
2. As a vehicle of force it is endowed with intense activity.
3. Its motions, which are in whirls or eddies, result in the production of matter.
4. This primordial substance, by its vibrations, is the source of light.

The occidental theory is confirmed by a magnificent array of scientific facts. The oriental theory, standing apart from experimental science, never emerged from the state of speculation—a speculation wonderfully acute and sublime; one in which the scientific imagination shows itself to the best advantage; divining as if by instinct great truths, which require for their confirmation the slower processes of patient investigation.

Practical as the Chinese mind confessedly is, it is not a little remarkable that Chinese philosophers in the study of nature have never made extensive use of the experimental method. That they have not been ignorant of it is evident from the following question and answer in the writings of the brothers Cheng. "One asked whether to arrive at a knowledge of nature it is needful to investigate each particular object, or may not some one thing be seized upon from which the knowledge of all things can be deduced?" "The Master replied: A comprehensive knowledge of nature is not so easily acquired. You must examine one thing to-day and one thing to-morrow; and, when you have accumulated a store of facts, your knowledge will burst its shell and come forth into fuller light, connecting all the particulars by general laws."

We should not forget that in the West the same theory existed in the state of a discarded speculation for at least two centuries before it received the seal of science. The first European to get a glimpse of the circumambient ocean was René Descartes. His mistake in referring the motions of the planets to whirlpools of ether brought discredit on his whole system; though he also held that small vortices were necessary to explain the constitution of matter. But what a glorious resurrection awaited it! In the first year of this century, touched literally by a sunbeam, it woke from its long slumber. Young found it necessary to his undulatory theory of light to which he was led by the interference of rays, and Fresnel resorted to it to explain the phenomena of polarization. So much is our knowledge of it extended, and so firmly is the conception established, that in some of our treatises on physics the three subjects of light, heat, and electricity are all ranged under the common rubric of "ether waves."

If anything more were required to complete the triumph of a neglected philosopher, would it not be to see his vortex theory employed to
explain the existence of matter? For what is the dynamic theory of
the molecule but a rehabilitation of the Cartesian vortex, which its
author represented not merely as bearing the planets on its bosom, but
as hugging each particle in its whirls or eddies?

But have the thinkers of China, who preceded Descartes by five cen-
turies, nothing to do with this triumph of the French philosopher? Is
it not probable that while he was at the Jesuit college of La Flèche he
fell in with fragments of Chinese philosophy in the writings of Jesuit
missionaries? If such were the case (and it is impossible to prove the
contrary), who can measure the obligations of the world to China for
the germ-thought deposited in the brain of the "Father of modern phi-
losophy?"

2. The Gods of Shirpurla; by Professor John D. Davis, of
Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.

The general principle on which the local pantheon at Shirpurla was
constructed has been stated by the lamented Amiaud. Speaking of
various temples of Babylonia, and including Shirpurla implicitly, he
says: "The cult rendered to these gods was offered by reason of their
being the mother, the brothers, or the sisters of the principal divinity"
(Records of the Past, New Series, i. 59). So thorough was the work of
this French scholar, and so keen his insight, that there is but scant
gleaning after him in this direction. Still there is some. A few facts
about the gods remain to be gathered from the inscriptions of the patesis,
which somewhat modify the picture that has been drawn of the local
pantheon.

These facts, as well as the others which play a part in the present
paper, are not all new. Not a few of them are familiar from gen-
eral, especially from the later, Babylonian and Assyrian literature.
But they are invariably derived from the records of the patesis them-
selves, and they stand as attestations of the faith of Shirpurla. They
make known the conceptions of the gods, not as entertained in diffe-
rent ages and at diverse places, but as held at a definite period, and by
a homogeneous people of the remote past. And in the history of Baby-
lonian religion this is a matter of importance. A fixed point is estab-
lished from which to view the development of religious thought.

A word as to the geography of Shirpurla. The place was apparently
a complex city, though not necessarily closely compacted together. It
is generally called country, but is also definitely named a city (DeC. pl.
14 col. i. 14, 15).* It afforded the titular designation of the reigning
prince (1 no. 2; 2 no. 2; et passim). It is not customarily mentioned in
the local records as the site of temples, the location of these being
specified by towns. Within the circuit which bore the designation of
Shirpurla, four towns or civic quarters were included; namely, first,
Girsu-ki, the royal quarter. It contained the palace of the patesi and the temple of Ningirsu, the patron deity of the royal house. Urkagina is called not only king of Shirpurla, but also king of Girsu-ki (32, A).

Second, Uru-azagga: perhaps the sacred quarter, as its name may denote. In it was the seat of worship of the goddess Gatumbug, the mother of Shirpurla, and of the goddess Bau, the local mistress of Uru-azagga. Third, Ninâ-ki; over which the goddess Ninâ presided: and fourth, Gishgalla-ki; of which the goddess Nanâ was the patron deity. The two last mentioned towns were probably burgher quarters.

This description of Shirpurla represents in its general features the theory advanced by Amiaud. Recently, however, Mr. C. J. Ball, in commenting on a bilingual text (IVR. 46), drew attention to the group of three signs gish-gal-la which stand as the equivalent of Babylon; and he suggested a comparison with the name commonly pronounced Gishgalla-ki (written with one sign and the determinative) in the texts of Shirpurla (PSBA. xv. 51 sq.). This suggestion has been taken up and pushed by Professor Hommel, who believes that in all places where we meet the latter ideogram "we have to read Gishgalla-ki, and to understand Babylon:" and he concludes that this great city was ruled by the patesis of Shirpurla (PSBA. xv. 108 sq.). It is to be remembered, however, that, first, the two names are written differently. Their possible similarity may indeed be due to the identity of the towns; but this is by no means certain, especially since the names as understood are mere appellations. Secondly, there are evident difficulties, though perhaps none that are insuperable, in believing that a patesi of Shirpurla could have built temples in Babylon, or would have spoken gratefully of Babylon's gods. Thirdly, the goddess Nanâ is prominent in Gishgalla-ki; so prominent, indeed, that she is best regarded as the tutelary deity of the place. Marduk was the patron of Babylon. To identify Gishgalla-ki with Babylon involves the assumption, it seems to me, of a religious revolution of which history has given no inkling.

In view, therefore, of the consequences of accepting this definition, the old view which regards Gishgalla-ki as a quarter or inferior town of Shirpurla, must be entertained until satisfactory historical proof be adduced that the goddess Nanâ was at one period the chief deity of Babylon. We have no great zeal in the matter. Whatever the outcome of the investigation, it remains true that the patesis of Shirpurla held sway over the four towns or the civic quarters known as Girsu, Uru-azagga, Ninâ, and Gishgalla.

The protectress of Shirpurla as a whole was the goddess Gatumbug. **"the mother of Shirpurla"** (5 no. 2, i. 2: 14 col. i. 2, et passim). She sat enthroned in the town of Uru-azagga (14 col. iii. 6). But each of the four civic centers had, as already indicated, its own patron deity.

The god Ningirsu was, as his title denotes, the lord of Girsu. The local divinity of Uru-azagga was the goddess Bau, child of Ana, heaven (8 col. iv. 5; 13 no. 2 col. i. 3; 13 no. 4 col. i. 9), the firstborn child of heaven (35 col. xx. 19). She occupied a great temple in Uru-azagga (8 col. iv. 6; 9 col. iii. 17; 13 no. 2 col. iii. 30 sq.), and was worshipped
as the mistress of this town (13 no. 2 col. i. 4, col. iii. 18, 19; 18 no. 4 col. i. 4). The goddess Bau is identified by Amiaud with Gatumudug, partly on the authority of a fragmentary text (IRR 59, 27 e, f, see Tableau comparé, no. 158), and partly on account of her being called a “daughter of Ana” (RP. n.s. i. 58, presumably having in mind 35 col. ii. 4–9 from bottom). Of the town Ninâ-ki, the goddess Ninâ was, of course, the patroness. It is called her favorite city, she is the titular deity, and she had a notable temple in the place (35 col. ii. 2, 18; 37 no. 8, 9–13; London inscription, PSBA. xiii. 62, no. ii. 9 sq.). Of the town of Gishgalla, one would expect Lugal-Gishgalla to be patron. But as already intimated, this position is occupied by Nanâ. She is the foremost deity of Gishgalla in these inscriptions. Her temple in Gishgalla is mentioned (8 col. iv. 8, 9).

This divine quaternion was not a loose aggregation of deities. As the several districts or towns formed one body politic, so three, at least, of the four local deities were members of the same family. This is not conjecture; nor is it derived from texts which might misrepresent the conception current in Shirpurla. The information is furnished by the patesis themselves. Foremost among these four divinities was Ningirsu. He was the husband of the goddess Bau, the mistress of Uru-azaggia (13 no. 3, col. ii. 3–6); and he was the brother of Ninâ, the protectress of Ninâ-ki (55 col. v. 17; see Zimmern, ZA. iii. 292 sq.). The goddess Nanâ was certainly, in the conception of the patesis, not identical with Ninâ, as Amiaud supposed that she was. They were children of different gods. She may have been regarded as Ningirsu’s mother or, to speak more exactly, as his father’s wife, being the goddess Ninchar sag under another name. It would be rash to assert that she was. The argument is direct (Nanâ = Ishtar = wife of Enlil, VR. 8, 92 and 10, 32 variant), but it is derived from other texts than those of the patesis. Still, Gudea most honorably associates her with Enlil (Ménant, Babylon et la Chaldée, p. 64), and he also bestows upon her a prominent title of the wife of Enlil (13 no. 1, col. ii. 2, etc.). At any rate, the four quarters of Shirpurla were presided over respectively by Ningirsu, his wife Bau, his sister Ninâ, and Nanâ, possibly his mother.

Each of these four deities was, in turn, the center or nucleus of a family. The writers of the tablets dwell upon the kinship. Ningirsu is stated to have been the son of Enlil (35 col. vii. 5, col. viii. 21), whose wife was Ninchar sag (cp. 18, last column bottom; 38 col. xiii. 1, 3); to have himself had to wife the goddess Bau; and to have been the father of the gods Galalim (36 col. vi. 4 and 5 from bottom) and Dushagga (29 no. 1. 1–3).

Bau, the mistress of Uru-azaggia, was, of course, the center of but a small group; for she is already included in the family of Ningirsu, and her husband and children are reckoned there. Still, she forms the nucleus of a group. She is the daughter of Ana, and is associated with Ningishzida, a son of Ana, in the temple at Uru-azaggia (18 no. 2 col. viii. 12, 13; and 36 col. xxi. 5 from bottom).

Ninâ, in some sense sister of Ningirsu, was the daughter of god Ea, king of Eridu (IVR* 1 col. ii. 38; OBI. i. pl. 30, col. i. 22). Like Ea’s son
Marduk (IVR* 4, col. iii. 23), so Ninâ is called a "child of Eridu" (35 col. xx. 16). Her consort was apparently the god Nindara, who shares an attribute with her (8 col. v. 2; 37 no. 4, 2; IR 5 no. xxiii. 1 with 2 col. v. 1; 29 no. 4, 2; IR 5 no. xxiii. 2). Her daughter was Ninmarki (8 col. v. 10; 19=col. viii. 67 sq. of inscription).

The goddess Nanâ is the center of another small group. The smallness, as well as the composition, of the group is at once explained, if the suggestion that Nanâ may have been regarded as Enlil’s wife be correct. Her kindred are then largely included in the family of Ningirsu. Still, Nanâ is the center of a group. Gudea states that she was the daughter of the moon-god Ensu (PSBA. xiii. 158–159, 1. 1, 2); and it is apparently a consort of her who is mentioned under the title of Lugal-Gishgalla (8 col. ii. 2).

It is probable that each of these four families was worshipped as a whole in the town of which its nucleus was the tutelary god. For such a custom prevailed in other towns. It can be demonstrated in the case of Girsu. It can be traced in the case of Uru-azagga; for the worship of one other member of the small family of Bau in addition to that of the goddess herself is attested; namely, the worship of Ningishzida. It can be discerned further in the case of Gishgalla; for there is explicit testimony that, side by side with the adoration paid by the patesi to the goddess Nanâ, homage was also rendered to Lugal-Gishgalla (Text of Entena cited by Hommel, PSBA. xv. 110).

With these disclosures in regard to three of the towns in evidence, it is a reasonable conjecture that a family group was worshipped in each of the four towns. But while this is conjectural, it is certain that all of these groups were worshipped in the town of Girsu. The patesi dwelt in Girsu; and, as already stated, worshipped Ningirsu and, in connection with him, his parents, his wife and his children. But the patesi who ruled in Girsu held sway over the three other towns or civic quarters as well. He must do as much for the patrons of the other towns as he did for the patron of his own city. And so it came about that in Girsu temples stood to the four tutelary deities and their families.

These four deities and their immediate kindred constitute the gods of Shiptura, properly so called. Not that they alone were known, nor that they alone were worshipped. Allusion is made to other gods. Shitlamtauddua, the king of the nether world, and the Anunnaki are mentioned. The sungod Bar and the dreaded Isum are invoked. Some of the gods who receive mention in the inscriptions were doubtless members of one or the other of these groups. Duziuab probably belonged to the group of Ninâ (IIR56, 38). From sources outside of the records of the patesi, it is known also that Shitlamtauddua had a temple in Girau and was regarded as a son of Enlil (IIR61, 18. 19 b; IIR38, 1–3a; IVR35, no. 2, 1–3). This lineage would make him, according to modern ideas, the brother of Ningirsu; and, for that matter, he may have been so regarded in Shiptura. But a principle of this kind, if carried out, would have required a temple to each member of the vast Babylonian
pantheon; for all the deities were interrelated according to the current
genealogies, and Girsu would have been taxed to contain the sanctu-
aries. But the god Shitlamuaddua need not have been worshipped
there by reason of his kinship to the tutelary deity. A sufficient expan-
ation of his worship there is that he was a great and terrible god, the
ruler in that realm to which every human soul sooner or later goes. The
gods of Shirpurla were four family groups. The members of these
families, even though in themselves obscure, are the prominent gods in
the records of the patesis. The other deities who occasionally figure at
Shirpurla were intruders into the local circle, gods of a wider cult
which peculiar emergencies, or unusual portents, or momentary dread
brought into prominence.

Of what has thus far been said, this is the sum: The gods of Shir-
purla are found to have been four family groups; consisting of the
tutelary deity of each of the four towns and his or her parents, consort,
and children. These four groups were further bound together by the
mutual kinship, in three cases at least, of their central member; by
the relationship which is emphasized of Ningirsu with Bau, his wife,
and Ninâ, his sister. The god Ningirsu is the center about which the
fourfold pantheon revolves.

These results may be applied with illuminating effect to the inscrip-
tions of the patesis. Take a record of building operations. Temples
of course do not fall into decay and require reparation in logical
sequence, yet there is always a logical order of enumeration. Uruk-
gina, one of the earliest of the patesis, tells of certain temples which
he erected (Collection de Clercq, tome ii. pl. viii). He does not once
mention relationships; but it is evident that he is constructing sanctu-
aries to the family of Ningirsu. No deity outside of this group is
honored with a house; and the members of the family are enumerated
in order; first, Ningirsu himself, then his two sons, his wife, and his
father. Or take Ur-Bau’s record of the temples which he fitted up (8
col. iii. 5 sq.). They chance to be in different quarters of Shirpurla.
Yet similar phenomena of orderly enumeration appear. The temples
erected are in Girsu two, namely, to Ningirsu and to his father’s wife,
Nincharsag; in Uru-azagga, one, to Bau; in Gishgalla, one, to Nanâ,
the center of the local group; and in Girsu again, four to the family of
Ninâ, namely, to her father, to her consort, to her father under a
second name (Ninagal, = Ea, IIR 58, 58a–c), and to her daughter.

Or instead of the records of building operations, take an enumera-
tion of benefits conferred by the gods. Gudea acknowledges his
indebtedness to heaven (9 col. i. 10 sq.). Again with a precision which
implies a logical basis for the sequence, although not a word is said of
kinship, the gods are grouped; and in this order: the father Enlil, the
son Ningirsu, then his sister, his wife, and one who is supposed to be
his wife under another name, then his two sons. With this may be
compared a very similar list, 16–19 col. ii. 9 sq.

Or take, finally, Gudea’s curse of the rebellious (16–19 col. viii. 44 sq.).
We cannot assert that he invokes only gods of the fourfold pantheon.
Why should he? But, still, note the order of thought as the hot words pour forth. First come the parents of the four tutelary gods, Ana, Enil and wife Nincharsag, Ea, and Ensu. Then follow the tutelary gods; Ningirsu of Giru, Ninâ and her consort of Ninâ-ki, Gatumdug of Shirpuría as a whole, Bau of Uru-azagga, Nanâ of Gishgalla. Then come the sun-god Bar and the murderous god Ishum. Why these two are enumerated here may be variously explained. Then, of Ningirsu's family, his sons; of Ninâ's family, her daughter and Duzizuab; and, finally, of Bau's separate family, Ningishzida.

Three general remarks may be made. The inscriptions from Telloh reveal, better perhaps than any other documents that are as yet accessible to the public, first, that the genealogy of the gods was established, and established even in many minute details, as early as the time of the patesis of Shirpuría. Second, that in this genealogy the order, Anu, Bel, and Ea, was fixed. A glimpse of this fact is afforded by other early records also. Third, that Anu, Bel, and Ea were clearly recognized as standing at or near the beginning of the genealogy. They are distinctly parent gods. These three matters are of importance in the history of religion.

3. On the syntax of the Assyrian preposition ina; by Professor J. Dynele Prince, of the University of the City of New York.

Few prepositions have the flexibility and extensive scope which is seen in the use of the Assyrian ina, and to a great extent also in that of its syntactical, if not etymological, equivalent, the ֻ of the other Semitic idioms. By what was probably a very gradual process, ina has developed certain functions somewhat different from those which seem naturally to belong to it. This fact, however, is not due to any poverty of prepositions peculiar to Semitic, because the varied application of ina does not appear to have restricted the force of other prepositions which co-exist synonymously in several usages.

A discussion of the syntax of the preposition ina should be divided into two heads; the first treating of those cases in which ina is used to denote local position (in, at, or on) and the corresponding motion towards, and the second, of the cases in which the preposition appears to have evolved secondary meanings which seem to be developments from the fundamental local signification.

It is highly probable that the original force of ina was position within a given place, implying that the subject was surrounded on all sides, a usage which still appears as one of the most common applications of the preposition: thus: ina ališu esiršu,* "I shut him up within his city"

* The verb eseršu is also used with ana; cf. ana iššen mazaxi—tu esiršuni (I. R. Tig. c. v. 71/8); ana ancīli esiršu, "I shut him up in prison" (f) (I. R. Senn. c. ii. 72).
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(I. R. Ašurn. c. iii. 46); and also in composition with ḫibbu and gīrbu: e.g., with ḫibbu, I. R. 37, No. 2, 87/8; with gīrbu, I. R. Ašurn. c. ii. 84.

It will readily be seen that a preposition denoting position within could very easily be applied to express direction into, and we accordingly find ina thus used with a number of verbs of motion; thus, with erēbu,* 'to enter,' I. R. Ašurn. c. ii. 19/20; 87/8, and with étēqu, 'to march,' I. R. Esarh. c. i. 53. This usage is of course found with ḫibbu and gīrbu: ina ḫibbu uṣerib, "I caused to enter therein" (II. R. 67, 11a); ina gīrbu Ninā ʿilikkamma, "came into Nineveh" (V. R. 1, 62).

Ina, 'within, into,' came to be used very naturally also in the sense of 'among'; cf. the familiar phrases, ina šarrāni maxrāti, "among the former kings"; ina puxur ilāni, "among all the gods," etc.; also frequently in composition with ḫibbu. Ina is employed similarly in composition with bīrit, to express 'between'; cf. I. R. Ašurn. c. i. 47, and passim.

It is hardly necessary to give examples to show that the preposition ב in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac is found in much the same senses as the Assyrian ina; namely, 'within, into, among.' The use of ina, 'in, into, among,' in composition with ḫibbu and gīrbu is exactly equivalent to that of the Hebrew ב with רוח and רוח. The Heb. ל, the cognate of ḫibbu, is found sometimes, though rarely, in the sense of "midst" (cf. ל, Exod. xv. 8; Ps. xlvi. 8; etc.). It is interesting to notice that the Ethiopic ba comparatively seldom denotes motion towards, but seems in its local meaning to be confined to the original idea of position in or at (cf. Dillmann, Ḡṭiop. Gramm., p. 306). On the other hand, the Ethiopic westa corresponds syntactically with ina in this sense better than does ba, as it is used in the same way to denote motion into. Furthermore, westa in composition with ba means 'among' (cf. Dillm. op. cit., p. 311/2).† In Arabic the separate prep. ب is employed to express both 'within' and 'into,' while ب is almost always confined to the meaning 'at' or 'near.'

The Assyrian ina from denoting 'in, into,' came to be employed to express proximity in much the same way as the Arabic ب and the Ethiopic ba. Such expressions as ina šep Labunana, ina šep Ialmān, "at the foot of Lebanon," etc., are of most common occurrence, and agree with such ordinary usages as the Hebrew ב and Arab. نابب القاهرة, "at the gate of Cairo." The familiar usage of ina denoting position at or near, in composition with battubatti, maxar, pān, pūt, gabal, šapal and tarṣu, must also be classified under this head.

* The prep. ana is also occasionally used in the sense of 'into'; cf. ana má naṣa, "whosoever casts it into the water," (IV. R. 39, rev. 19; I. R. Tig. c. viii. 65). The use of ʿin seen in Jon. i. 12, ʿin-šēr ʿin, should be compared in this connection. We also find erēbu with ana (I. R. Ašurn. c. i. 83).

† Westa from Ḥwasaṭa with t instead of ū, owing to the preceding sibilant, is probably cognate with Assyrian ḫibbu, 'from.'
It is interesting to notice that "ina" alone is used very seldom with verbs of motion with the meaning 'towards, unto,' which is the legitimate sense of "ana. Even in expressions like "ina ubandūt xurānī ardi-šunūtī, "I pursued them even unto (into) the tops of the mountains" (I. R. Senn. c. iii. 81), it is clear that the preposition has the force of 'into,' rather than of 'unto.' In such a sentence as "ina qatā ardānī tam-nuṣuma, 'she delivered him into (unto) the hands of his servants' (V. R. 3, 7), "ina" construed with "manū" might be regarded as the first step towards the meaning 'unto,' because "manū" is generally found construed with "ana" (cf. I. R. Tig. c. i. 83; c. iii. 9/10); sometimes, however, with no preposition at all (cf. I. R. Senn. c. iv. 50). "Ina" in composition with "eli," however, occasionally admits of the interpretation 'unto,' as "ša ina eli Aššur amru, "who looked towards (i. e. belonged to) A."" V. R. 3, 82.

The Hebrew ב also occurs in this sense, as רָאִישׁ בְּשֵׁמִים . Gen. xi. 4. Idioms like ב וּרְחֵם, ב הָאָנָה indicate, moreover, that in Hebrew the meaning of ב approached very closely the idea of motion at or unto. The Ethiopic "enta," which may be an etymological cognate of "ina," and is capable of almost as many shades of meaning, is used quite commonly in this sense to denote both position (Jud. i. 25) and direction towards (Matth. xii. 1). "Enta" denotes also motion through, as in John x. 1, 2, Matth. xii. 48. This is usually expressed in Heb. by ב יִלְךָ.

"Ina," "into," in the sense of 'against,' is quite common in Assyrian: thus: "ina adía ʿtxā, "they sinned against my ordinances" (V. R. 1, 118, 132, etc.). In this sense it is frequently found also in composition with "irtu; e. g., "ina irtia iliḵānima (Senn. Const. 45); and with "eli, as in ʾša ina eli Ašur šiṭa sillatu igpudu "who planned treason against A. my God" (V. R. 4, 67; II. R. 65, 4a). The meaning 'against' may be expressed by "eli" alone, to which the signification properly belongs, as well as by ʿciru, especially in the later inscriptions; cf. kakkia ša eli nakri aḵunu, "my weapons which I had aimed against the foe" (Sargon Nimroud. 18; I. R. Senn. c. iii. 21/2), and ʾcir gimir ummanāti, "against all the troops" (I. R. Senn. c. v. 61; V. R. 1, 60); etc. The idea of 'against,' which is the datīvus incommodo, is also expressed quite properly in Assyrian by "ana, which is essentially the preposition of the dative;† cf. ana ʾamīma šuṭu limḏāti ʾilleʿu, "whoever plans evil against this my image" (I. R. 27, no. 2, 87/8; I. R. Aššur. c. ii. 51; etc.).

The use of ב in both Hebrew and Aramaic in the sense of 'against' is well known; for example, in Isaia xix. 2, with the verb ב לֶאָל מָלָה,ُ

* "Eli" alone is not infrequently found synonymous with "ana; cf. eli Tarqū-unarratu rakhesu. V. R. 1, 123/4; etc.

† It is interesting to see that "ana, being the sign of the dative, is used with verbs of trust and confidence; ana Nabā naktīl, "trust thou in Nebo" (I. R. 35, no. 2. 12; Aššur. c. iii. 39; etc.), although the same idea is expressed in Heb. by ב נָבָא (cf. also Caspari, Arab. Gramm., p. 260; Dillmann, Ἱθιοπ. Gramm., p. 306).
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‘to fight against’;* also Gen. xvi. 12 בַּעֲלַי הָוֹד הַל בֵּן. Dillmann especially calls attention to the fact that the Ethiopic ba, although rarely used to denote motion towards, not infrequently means ‘against’ (Athiop. Gramm., p. 306).

In this connection we may note that ina in such sentences as ša ina mārišu ʾĀšur šar Igigi uttušu, which is translated by Abel, "whom ʾĀšur the king of the Igigi appointed during his childhood" (KB. i. 188. 2/3; 190, 1), is capable of the rendering ‘in spite of’; thus, ‘in spite of his youth. That this is also a possible, though not generally recognized interpretation of the Heb. ב, may be seen from Eccl. v. 18, יַעֲלֵנִי חֲלַר, "in spite of his sore travail"; Isaiah ix. 20, יַעֲלֵנִי חֲלַר, "in spite of all this"; etc. It is not impossible also to regard the use of ina in the Assyrian sentence just quoted as equivalent in force to the Hebrew adverbal ב, the so-called ב essential in such expressions as בַּחֹלֵךְ. Isaiah xl. 10. The Assyrian sentence could mean ‘whom A. appointed as or for his son.” This, however, would be properly expressed by ana; cf. ana dannitišnaššu ana širigti ʾirugâni.

As ina is essentially the preposition of position, it is natural to find it denoting also superposition, ‘on, over,’ and the corresponding motion. It is the regular preposition to express situation on a height; ina šad Panari (I. R. Tig. c. ii. 37, etc.). It is used of travelling “on foot,” ina šepia (I. R. Senn. c. i. 69); “on a horse,” ina sisi arkabma (l. c. 86/7); and “upon (or in) a ship,” ina elippi—irkab (I. R. Ašurn. c. iii. 38) (cf. Jon. i. 3). In this sense ina is used in composition with eli and muzzī, the force of which it seems to strengthen; thus, ina eli kigalli ša Sin šaṭirmâ, “it stood written on the tablets of Sin” (V. R. 3, 121); ša ina muzzī ʾušibū, “upon which they sat” (V. R. 6, 20). Although eli† alone has frequently the force of position on or over (cf. I. R. Tig. c. vii. 58), it is more usual to find it in this sense in composition with ina.

The use of ina to denote motion on or over is very common; cf. ina kussi ʾušibuma, “he took his seat upon the throne” (Sarg. Prunkinschr. 84), which should be carefully distinguished from ina kussi šarrāṭi rabūši ʾušibū, “I was seated with dignity upon my royal throne” (I. R. Ašurn. c. i. 44). Ina occurs in composition with eli† and muzzī in this sense; cf. bītu u madatta ina elišunu ʾaškun, “tribute and tax I laid upon them” (I. R. Tig. c. v. 80/1; etc.). Perhaps the most striking instance of the use of ina in this sense is seen in the construction of the preposition with šaṭiru, ‘to write upon.’ This is found constricted with ina alone, as ina nariya u temmenia ʾalṭur (I. R. Tig. c. viii. 48); with ina in composition with šibbu; ina šibbi ʾalṭur (I. R. Ašurn. c. i. 69); with

---

* In Assyrian the regular prep. with verbs meaning to fight is ʾitiš, ‘with’; cf. I. R. Tig. c. i. 51/5, with šāniššu, and with mazzū. Tig. c. iii. 55/6. הָשִׁית in Hebrew is also found with שֶׁאֲמַר as well as with יש.
† The prep. ʾiruš is also used to denote superposition; cf. III. R. 14, 10, ‘over.’
‡ Eli alone is also used thus: cf. I. R. Ašurn. c. iii. 54; c. ii. 106; ʾiruš alone; cf. ʾušša šurubša, I. R. Esarh. c. iii. 18; etc.
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muxxi; ina muxxi ašṭur (c. vi. 18/9); with qirbu; ina qirbīša ašṭur (Shalm. Obelisk, 72, and passim).*

The Hebrew-Aramaic בְּ like ina, is also used to denote position on a height; cf. דְּוָאֵל מַעְרָר בּ, 1 Kings viii. 9; Num. xiv. 10; Deut. xxxi. 15; בֵּלֶם, Isaiah lxvi. 20. The Heb. verb בָּהַר, 'to write' (upon), like the Assyrian šaṭāru, is used with ב (cf. Deut. xxviii. 61; 1 Kings xxxi. 11), especially in the sense of recording (cf. Exod. xvii. 14; Num. v. 23; etc.).†

It will be seen from the above cursory view that the variations of the fundamental conceptions of position and motion towards expressed by ina must be regarded as developments from the ina of position within. It may be shown likewise that the several secondary usages of the preposition about to be described were also developed from the same original idea. These usages may be classified as follows: 1. the ina of condition and manner; 2. the ina of time; 3. the ina of accomplishment; the ina, 4. of instrument; 5. of quality; 6. of cause; 7. the partitive ina, and its natural development, the ina of motion from or out of.

1. It is easy to see how from the idea of being in or at a place was developed the idea of being in a condition. An excellent illustration of both the local use and the use of ina to denote manner may be seen in the sentence: ina xidāti rīsdī erub ina bīt ridūti, 'in joy and gladness I entered into the harem' (V. R. 1, 28). Ina is very commonly applied in adverbial phrases like ina līti, 'victoriously' (I. R. Esarh. c. iv. 40); ina la meni, 'without number,' passim.‡ This latter expression is more usually found with ana; cf. ana la minam (Shalm. Monol. c. ii. 48; I. R. Senn. c. ii. 17; etc.). The use of the preposition ina līšan mēṣ Axarru, 'in the language of the Westland,' should also be classified under this head (Sarg. Prunkinschr. 161/2; also, I. R. Esarh. c. ii. 24–6).

We find in Hebrew a precisely cognate usage of ב in expressions like בְּ, Ps. lxxiii. 8; בְּ לֵ יַּ הֲ ה הֲ ר מ, Josh. xxv. 14, and in the many adverbial idioms like בְּfy, 'hastily' (cf. also the Aramaic נוֹרְבְּרָּה הֲרֵאשְׁנִי, 'finally'). A similar usage is found in Ethiopic with bu; cf. Matth. xxviii. 8.

2. A preposition denoting both position in or at and condition and manner could also be used to express, first, time when, and then, duration of time, 'while.' The inscriptions are full of such idioms as atta ina alākīka, 'when thou goest' (IV. R. 17, 45, a; 24, 34b; HT. 298, no. 49); and even more vividly in ina līšen ūmi, 'on one day,' ina šalalti ūmi, 'on the third day.' passim.§ Ina is used in this sense in compo-

---

* šaṭāru also occurs with eli and with qiru; Sarg. Prunkinschr. 53; I. R. Senn. c. ii. 6.
† In Heb. and Arabic superposition is generally expressed by בְּלִי. علي.
‡ Also ana šīšāti. 'anew'; ana pāt yimiḏušu, 'in their entirety.'
§ The preposition is not infrequently omitted; ūmi, 'then.'
sition with maxar and pān for 'before,' and with tarçu to denote a
definite point of time; cf. ina tarçī abīa, "at the time of my fathers," pasīm. The ina expressing duration of time ('while') is also of very
common occurrence; cf. ina kussī, "while on my throne" (I. R. Senn.
c. iii. 76); ina tārtīa, "during my return" (l. c., c. i. 40); ina mīṭīq
girriya, "during the progress of my march," etc. *
The familiar use of the Heb. ב, with the infin., to express 'when,
while, although, because,' as in בֵּיתָנוּ "when thou comest
hither," is an exact cognate of the Assyrian idiom seen in ina alākiya.
Expressions like בִּיוֹתֵךְ מְשִׁלֹתִי may be cited as parallel to ina īšīn
ūmī. Duration of time ('while') is usually expressed in Heb. by בָּעֲרֹוי;
e. g., Jer. xv. 9; Ps. cxlv. 2.
3. Examples of ina in the sense of 'within,' that is, 'among' have
already been quoted. From the idea of 'among,' it must be supposed
that ina came to be applied in the less usual sense in which it is found
in Beh. 8, i. e. 'in company with,' ina ḡāb e ḣātū. In this case it
appears to usurp the function of adī (I. R. Aṣurn. c. iii. 19), of itī
(I. R. Tig. c. viii. 59), and of gādū (Sarg. Prunkinschr. 28).
This construction of ina has an exact counterpart in the Heb. ב of
accompaniment in expressions like בֶּעָרֹוי, Gen. ix. 4; xv. 14;
etc., and in the common idiom בּאַעַל, 'come with,' i. e. 'bring' (cf.
Arabic بِنِتِي, 'come with, bring,' etc.).
The composition of ina with balu, to express 'without,' should also
be mentioned in this connection; cf. ša ina baluš, 'without whom,' pasīm. Cognate usages are the Hebrew בָּעֲרֹוי and the
Arabic بِنِتِي and بِلَأ.
4. The instrumental usage of ina is very common. There can be no
doubt that this usage is a development of the ina of time and accom-
apaniment just mentioned. To attack a city in company with an army
could very readily be transferred to mean by means of an army. Occa-
sionally the use of ina is so ambiguous as to leave the reader in doubt
whether the preposition was intended to denote position in, time when,
or instrument: thus: ina šutti ušašišūma, "in a dream I dreamed it"
(during, or by means of, a dream ?), V. R. 2, 97; ina ešpri išašišū, "who buries it in (or by means of) the dust" (I. R. 27, no. 2, 59); etc.
In such expressions as ina tukulli Ašur—allik, "by means of the aid of
Ashur (or 'along with' ?) I went," the instrumental force of ina is more
apparent. We find it still more vividly in ina kakki ramānīšu uqatā
napištis, "he destroyed his life with (by) his own weapon" (Sarg. Cyl. 27); ša ina Ašur bēšia aššišu, "which I had conquered by means of A.
my lord" (Tig. c. viii. 18); etc. It occasionally happens that the idea
of instrument is expressed by the noun alone, without any explanatory
preposition, as in atmux rītiya, "I seized with my hand" (I. R. Senn. c.
v. 60).

* Cf. also ana īšīn ūmī la uballīm, "for a single day he did not let him live";
III. R. No. 6, 13.
The instrumental use of the Hebrew and Aramaic בּ, as in קֵרְבּ, Isaiah lvi. 1; also, to strike with the sword, Josh. x. 11 (also Aramaic אֲנִי חֶרְבּ), is well known. The idiom בּ, נִשְׂבּעַת, 'to swear by' (1 Kings i. 17, 30) has its exact equivalent in šamū ina. The Arabic and Ethiopic ba is also used instrumentally; cf. قُتِلَ بِالسَّيْف, "he slew him with the sword," and in Ethiopic, Ps. xvi. 9, "cover me with thy wings." The idiom baeda, "in the hand, by means of," is the same as the Syriac ܐܢܐ (Nöldeke, Syr. Gramm., p. 171).

5. Very nearly allied with the ina of instrument is the use of the preposition to denote the material of which a thing is made; cf. ina agurri rācpu, "which were constructed of brick" (I. R. Tigr. vi. 11); ina agurri šupniat, "it was made of bricks" (V. R. 6. 28). This is cognate with the Heb. ב of material in 1 Kings vii. 14: Lev. xiii. 52; etc.*

6. The ina of cause, 'by reason of,' follows very closely on the ina of instrument, and is quite as frequently used; cf. ina qibti Ašur—ana Zamua aškunu dikātu, "by reason of the command of A.—I ordered an expedition against Z." (I. R. Aṣurn. c. ii. 55, passim).

In this connection it should be mentioned that ina is found in composition with elī, to strengthen the meaning closely connected with the idea of cause which is peculiar to that preposition, i.e. 'with regard to,' cf. ina elī ardi ša Amūse, "concerning the servant of A." (K. 486. 1, in BA. i., p. 187), and in the epistolary literature, passim. Eli sometimes occurs alone in this sense, as in elī annāti annāti, "concerning these things" (V. R. 4. 21), etc.

7. Finally, there can be little doubt that the frequent and natural use of ina in the sense of 'among' gave rise to the peculiar idiom seen in the contract tablets, where the preposition actually appears in a partitive sense; thus, ṣaw mane šipati ina pappasu Ululu, "20 m. of wool among (i. e. from) the revenue of the month Ululu" (Strm. Nbd. no. 41; BA. i., p. 494): GUN šādāt ina pappasu ša bit Anuṭum (Strm. Nbd. no. 109; BA. i., p. 495): still more vividly: ina ḥibbi ši manā, ši qit kaspi rēt, "from this (a sum before specified); he paid 4 m., 7 s. of silver" (Strm. Nbd. 262; BA. i., p. 510). A passage precisely parallel to this, and one illustrative of the full force of ina in this sense, is found in Strm. Nbd. 410 (BA. i. 522), where ultu is used instead of ina: ṣaw ṣaw šipati, ši qit ultu kaspi. This explains also the extraordinary application, so common, of ina in the sense of 'out of, away from,' although there can be no doubt that this usage is also closely connected in idea with the instrumental force of the preposition; cf. the prep. with akālu and šīṭu: ina ḥibbi ḫulu šiṭu, "they ate and drank therein" (V. R. 6. 21: IV. R. 13, 55/6); ina pēshu kabbi luṣamma, "from their exalted mouth (i.e., by means of) let it go forth"

* We occasionally find כ in this sense in Heb. as כ, Gen. ii. 19; cf. also the Arabic مأر, "of gold."
† Ultu is very probably a fem. formation from the same stem as elī.
Prince, On the Syntax of the Assyrian Preposition ina. ccxxv

(IV. R. 45, rev. 37/9). The most vivid use of ina, 'out of,' is seen in sentences like ina māti lūxalliqā, 'may they destroy (his family) from the land' (l. c. 85). The construction of verbs of fleeing and fearing with ina pān should also be mentioned here; so with palāzu, I. R. Tig. c. iii. 17/8; Ašurn. c. ii. 113; with ipparsidū, I. R. Tig. c. v. 55/6; ina is also used with eṭrū, napāzu, šuzubu, and other verbs. The fact that palāzu, for example, is construed with ūtu pān serves to illustrate the force of ina here as 'away from'; cf. Ašurn. c. ii. 61/3; 99.*

In agreement with the Assyrian usage, we find both in Hebrew and Aramaic the ב used idiomatically with ב ל and ה הנך, 'to eat or drink from a vessel,' cf. Ps. cxli. 4; Gen. xlii, 5; and in Aramaic, Dan. v. 2.

As to the derivation of ina, the last word has clearly not yet been said. The numerous attempts to derive both ana and ina from stems containing ע, such as עה (Hincks), עה (Sayce), עה (Bertin), are not very satisfactory; nor does it seem necessary with Lagarde to separate the two prepositions etymologically (GGN. 1881, p. 378). It is certainly strange also to derive ana, which denotes motion towards, from a stem עה , expressing motion from, as seen in the Arabic ع ; nor can the derivation of ina from this stem be admitted (in spite of Del., Prol. p. 132, n. 1), because the secondary meaning, 'out of, away from,' sometimes seen with ina, is probably, as shown above, a legitimate development from its original signification, 'among.' Schrader, whose opinion, as expressed in ZDMG. xxvi., p. 290, was so contemptuously passed over by Lagarde, was probably not far wrong in seeing in both ana and ina the same stem as that found in the Hebrew עה (ל) and Arabic עה . It is highly probable, as Kraetzschmar has pointed out, that the -na in both ina and ana is the demonstrative enclitic stem seen in sinatina, which is also evident in the verbal particle ni = nu (BA. i., p. 397/8). His explanation of the root-vowels i and a as being more or less arbitrary developments from an unknown stem ' + na is very satisfactory.

If this view be adopted, the striking syntactical similarity between ina and ב may be explained by supposing that, while the Assyrian was content merely to prefix the vowels i and a to the demonstrative root na,† it became necessary in the other Semitic idioms to add to these combinations the distinct prepositional elements ב and ב. Traces of this are seen in the Sabaean form ב = ב , י = ב . It must be supposed then that the final ר ultimately disappeared. It is decidedly not permissible to assume an aphaeresis of an original ב or ב in Assyrian;

* The verb palāzu is also construed with ana; V. R. 5, 96.
† Traces of the same demonstrative n are to be found in the cognate prepositions; the Ethiopic enta (e + n + ta), the Hebrew ע (Asyr. itti), and perhaps the Arabic עכ.
that is, that ina and ana were worn down from *bina and *lana respectively. The prepositional element ׃ is well known in Assyrian in the combination lapdn, 'before,' and there would probably remain some trace of its occurring with ana, had this ever been the case. It seems highly probable, therefore, that the Assyrian ina-ana may be said in a certain sense to be actually cognate with the ׃ and ׃ of the other Semitic dialects.


This theory, which was set forth in a paper read at the meeting in December, 1894 (see above p. cxciii), was further exemplified by an analysis of the poetical structure of Psalm xix.

5. Rev. Theodore F. Wright, of Cambridge, Mass., the United States Secretary of the Palestine Exploration Fund, gave a brief account of the progress of the work now being carried on in Jerusalem under the direction of Dr. Bliss.

6. On a dated Greek Inscription from Syria; by Professor Isaac H. Hall, of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.

Marble fragment of tombstone from Tripoli, Syria. Found in 1894. The stone is the property of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. It is broken in two in the middle from top to bottom, but not so as seriously to interfere with the reading, except in the last complete line. Size of fragment, 10 x 4 inches, nearly 1 inch thick. Seven lines present, and illegible parts of an eighth. How many more lines were present can only be conjectured. Letters from ¼ to ½ inch high: very peculiar: ἰ for Η; Δ and Δ for Α; γ for γ; Ζ, with the bottom stroke curved. Otherwise like later Greek; ε, ζ, θ (M), &c., being approximately the forms for these letters. No division of words. Lines run clear across. Reading:

Line 1. ἐτούς ηγής ΜΗΝΟΣ ΑΠΕΛΛΑΙΟΥ ΖΚ ΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ
   " 2. ΚΟΤΡΑ ΣΧΑΚΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΑ ΘΤΑΘΗΡ ΔΑΜΗ
   " 3. ΤΡΙΟΤ ΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΕΤΤΥΧΟΤ ΤΑΡΧΙΟΠΙΟΥΤ
   " 4. ΜΗΤΡΟΣ ΑΓΘΗΣ ΣΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΟΙ ΤΑΤ
   " 5. ΤΗΣ ΤΟΝΕΙΟ ΑΝΕΘΚΑΝ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ
   " 6. ΖΗΘΣΑΝ ΕΤΗΘ Θ ΜΕΤΑΛΛΑΞΑΣΑΝ ΔΙΑ
   " 7. ΤΟΥ ΖΗΤΟΥ [Μ]Η[(Ν)]ΩΚ ΑΠΕΛΛΑΙΟΥ Ε

The substance of it is that Sekagantigona, daughter of Dametrio and Socrates (here, as sometimes elsewhere, a feminine name), was born on the 27th of the month Apelleus in the year 438; that she departed this life at the age of 9 on the 5th day of the month Apelleus, in the
year 447; and her parents set up the stone to commemorate her. The exact construction of the phrase which means "the prosperous dealer in salt fish," and of the phrase that gives the name of the mother, deserve some discussion, which I have no time to go into now, and for that reason I withhold a translation. But we have two sentences complete (the first ending with the mother's name, the second with XAPIN), and one incomplete one.

The valuable thing about the inscription, however, is the dates. They are of the Seleucid era, which the Syriac writers call "the year of Alexander," and "the year of the Greeks," which begins October 1, B.C. 311. The dates here are written in a manner which reverses the ordinary Greek style: the units, tens and hundreds going from left to right, in each number here occurring. As the month is Apellaeus, answering to our December, we must subtract 312 from the number of the year in order to reduce it to the Christian era. Accordingly the date of the girl's birth falls in the year 438—312, or A.D. 136; that of her death in the year 447—312, or A.D. 135. The difference between the two is 9 years, as given on the stone: although, as she was born on the 27th and died on the 5th of the month Apellaeus, she lacked three weeks and one day of the full 9 years.

The date of the stone must, of course, be about the same as that of the death; probably early in the next (A.D.) year, or in the same Seleucid year 447; which would make the date of the inscription quite near the beginning of the year A.D. 136.

7. On the question of the date of Zoroaster; by Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College in the City of New York.

This communication, the details of which will be given in full in JAOS. xvii., presented in its various aspects the much mooted question as to the period in the world's history in which the Prophet of Iran appeared.

First were discussed those passages in the classics which assign to Zoroaster the fabulous antiquity of B.C. 6000 or 5000. Second, all the material was presented which connects Zoroaster's name with that of the uncertain Semiramis and Ninus. The present writer had formerly believed that the date of the prophet's activity was to be placed at least a thousand years before the Christian era; there seemed to be sufficient ground for abandoning such a view and rejecting the above numbers. Third, the old traditional date which assigns the prophetic career of Zoroaster to the sixth century before Christ was taken up and discussed at length.

Two passages in the Pahlavi scriptures, Arda-i Viraf i. 1—5 and Bundahish xxxiv. 7—8, including some similar references, were examined in the light of a large number of allusions to Zoroaster's date in Arabic writings and in some Syriac works. All of these, like Firdausi's Shāh Nāmah, consistently set the time of the appearance of the great relig-
ious teacher of Persia at about 300 years before Alexander's invasion. Other support for this view was given, and the paper came to the conclusion that, at least, with our present data, we may best assign the date of Zoroaster as falling between the latter half of the seventh century B. C. and the middle of the sixth century B. C.—a result which is of importance for the position of Zoroastrianism in the study of comparative religion.

8. The Sanskrit root *gānth in Avestan; by Professor A. V. Williams Jackson.

Our chief authority for the existence of the Sanskrit root *gānth 'cut, pierce, kill' in Avestan rests upon the noun *snatha- 'a blow, *snathīḥ- 'weapon' and upon the occurrence of the obscure form dōēsnathēḥti (is it dṛū snathēḥti?, cf. M 3) in Fragn. viii. 2 (Westergaard)—see Justi Handbuch der ZendSprache. The position of the root in Avestan, however, may perhaps be a little strengthened from the Av. fragment in the Pahlavi Vendidad iv. 52 seq. (Darmesteter, Le Zend-Avesta, traduction iii. 47), aēthaē thnasaf ḫišanaḥu 'he wounds through his malice.' In this event, thnasaf would stand for snathaf, an assumption which is perfectly permissible on phonetic grounds. The interchange of th and s implied in th [s] na [s] a† is not uncommon in later texts, cf. Jackson Av. Gram. I. 77 n 2, and consult Bartholomae Vorgeschichte § 33 n, in Geiger and Kuhn's Grundriss d. iran. Sprachen.


Under normal phonetic conditions hizva would correspond to Sk. *sīhvā, Indiranic *sīzhvā, but the actual Sk. word is jihṛā< Indiranic *sīzhvā. Did Indiranic have a pair *sīzhvā, *zīzhvā? were both or was only one of them normal? The Sk. doublet jihṛā, jihṛā 'tongue' doubtless belongs, esoterically considered, to root hū, hūva 'call,' and if Indiranic *sīzhvā be the abnormal term, there may have been before it a *suzhū. Now this term is found at VS. i. 30 in the sentence agnēr jihṛā 'si sūhār 'thou art Agni's tongue, the loud-calling,' where sūhār seems, barring a proper name, hapax legomenon. If the Indo-Iranians had *suzhū 'tongue,' and alongside of it *suzhū 'loud-calling' as its epithet, then not only *suzhū but also *sīzhvā were liable to a popular change to *suzhū, *sīzhvā.

Into exotic etymology I will not here go, but refer to Collitz, "The Aryan Name for the Tongue" in Oriental Studies of the Oriental Club of Philadelphia, and to myself in Mod. Lang. Notes. ix. 281 sq., for two different attempts to vindicate the relation of jihṛā* to γλῶσσα, Lat. lingua, etc.

* What I there say of Avest. hizva is a stupid oversight.
10. On Rig-Veda x. 73; by Professor Edwin W. Fay.

This hymn is fairly entitled to rank among the most obscure of the Rig-Veda. Grassmann's translation of the hymn is introduced by the words: "das Lied ist vielfach dunkel, zum Theil ganz unverständlich." In his notes on stanza 2, Ludwig says: "bietet ausserordentliche schwierigkeit;" and Bloomfield (JAOS. xvi. p. 88) declines to translate the same stanza. The difficulties seem to me to proceed from a misunderstanding of the reference of a single term in the first stanza, which I will now proceed to discuss: it reads,

Stz. 1. jāniśthā ugraḥ sāhase turāya
mandrā ḍjiṣṭho bahulābhimānaḥ
āvardham ināram marutāc cœd ātra
mātā yād virāṇād dadhānaḥ dhāniśthā

'Thou wast born strong for mighty advancing,
Jolly, most strong, of manifold pride.
[These] helped Indra, the Maruts, to wit, that time
When the mother o' the hero helped him, she the most-helpful.'

So much for a verbal translation in which the order of the thoughts is rendered rather than the grammatical construction; as to this last there can be scarcely any question among scholars. I differ, however, from the current and undisputed explanation of mātā as Indra's mother. Pāda immediately suggests the cloud-battle, and it is safe to say that if d were blotted out, scholarly emendation would fill the gap by a reference to Ahi-Vṛtra, Indra's arch-antagonist. I therefore refer virāṁ to Vṛtra, and mātā—dhāniśthā to his mother, Dānu, noting the assonances in the names, and asking whether dṛtra yād would as naturally be used of a relation of identity (=et-et, cum-tum) as of contrast.

We have warrant in RV. i. 32. 9 for marshalling Vṛtra and his mother against Indra:

nīdāvaya abhavad vṛtrāputrā
indro asyā āva vādhar jahbhāra
uttarā sār ādharaḥ putrā āśū
dānuḥ çaye sahāvatsa nā dhenāḥ

'Exhausted in strength became she that hath Vṛtra to her son;
Indra her weapon off-warded:
Above, the mother; underneath, the son was;
Dānu lies like a cow with her calf.'

Further, there is excuse for referring virāṁ to Vṛtra. Thus in RV. ii. 30. 4 Indra-Bṛhaṣpati is charged to slay virāṇ (demons), and here allusion to Vṛtra is indubitable; while at vii. 99. 5 Indra again slays virāṇ, where the allusion, though less definite, is certain too.
ccxxx American Oriental Society's Proceedings, April 1895.

On the other hand, not only is the reference of mātā and vīrām to Indra the more obvious, but it is not to be denied that Indra and his mother are thrice introduced. Thus in viii. 17. 1-3 Indra, at birth, jaśāndh, asks his mother to tell him kā ugrāḥ kē ha graivire 'who are mighty, who are famed;' she thereupon points out to him the demon ahiṣāna whom he forthwith slays; in viii. 45. 4-5, the same question from Indra is answered by his mother's likening any enemy of Indra's to mist on the mountains (?). In iv. 18. 11 the situation is somewhat different, for here the mother addresses her new-born son:

utā mātā mahīśān ānu avenad
amī tvā jahati putra devāh
āthā 'bravid vīrām indro haniṣyān
sākhe visno vitarāṁ vi kramasva

'And the mother unto her mighty [son] turned:
"Yon leave thee, son, yon gods,"
Then cried Indra, being about to slay Vṛtra,
"Friend Viṣṇu step a little further away."'

It was vain to deny that from these passages we might speak of Indra's mother—whenever she was—as his helper in battle, and moreover, in the first passage jātaḥ and ugrāḥ suggest jānisthāḥ and ugrāḥ of our stanza. But elsewhere the relations of Indra to his mother as his inciter to battle are expressed in the dialogue form which is lacking here.

As the result of argument on this point we must admit that the mātā and vīrām in question may be Dānu and Vṛtra; but 'may be' is a far cry from 'must be.' Does the hymn contribute further in our dilemma?

Stz. 2. dṛuhō nīṣattā pṛyānti cid ēvāih
purū gāṃsena vāyṛhūṣ tā indram
abhīvyte vu tā mahāpadēna
dhvāntā prapitrād ād aranta gārbbhāh

Here Ludwig takes pṛyānt as pṛṇis and corrects abhīvytā to abhīvy’tā, while he construes tā as inst. sg. (=ōna), remarking that "als neut. plur. ist es so gut wie sinnlos, da es sich nur um die garbhāḥ handelt."
His translation runs: "in der Dhruk weise sasaz Pṛyānt [die nacht od. Pṛṇi?], sie erhöhten mit vilem proise Indra; das war gleichsam um-hüllt vom groszen orte, ausz dem dunkel, der ferne kamen sie als kinder hervor [die Marut]." This is not very clear, to say the least of it. Grassmann's difficulties are evidenced by his translation: "Sich an ihn schmiegend sass sie da wie eine Rächerin; sie [die Maruta] stärkten den Indra vielfach durch Lobgesang; umgeben gleichsam waren diese [Orte, etwa die Wolken, in denen die Wasser eingeschlossen waren] von dem weitschreitenden [Indra oder Vischnu?]; aus der dunkeln Tagesfrühe erhob sich die neugeborenen [Wasser?]."
Fay, On Rig- Veda x. 73.

The kernel of the difficulty with this stanza lies in tā. Ludwig's note and Grassmann's rendering warn us off from the neut. plur., and there is no clearing-up to be got from Ludwig's version in his notes as inst. sg., a proceeding otherwise unjustified on the side of the form. Let us, assuming that mātā in stz. 1 referred to Vṛtra's mother, take tā as nom. dual and thus translate the stanza:

'In [her] witch's usual way she crouched clinging quite (ciḍ) close;  
With a loud song they (the Maruts) helped Indra:  
Covered-over-like were they two (Vṛtra and Dānu) by Long-Stride (i.e. Indra);  
Out from the dark prapitvā* flowed the [cloud-] children.'

To justify this translation I beg to note that the description of pāḍa a is closely parallel with i. 82. 9d: e.g., nisattā 'crouched' is parallel with caye lies; pṛṣantā 'close-clinging' is parallel with saḥdvedaṇ dā dhentāk 'like a cow with her calf.' I further call attention to the chiastic arrangement of cd of stz. 1, and ab of stz. 2: c (Indra and the Maruts) and d (Dānu and Vṛtra) make a chiasmus with a (Dānu and Vṛtra) and b (Indra and the Maruts). For my version of stz. 2 I make bold to claim a conspicuous clearness due to taking mātā and vīrām of stz. 1 for Dānu and Vṛtra.

Stz. 3. ṭṣvā te pāḍā ātā yāj jīgāśi  
    āvardhan vāṣa uṭā yē ciḍ ātra  
    tvāṁ indra sā́vṛkān sahāsram  
    āsān dadhise aćcivān vacvṛtyāh

'Swift are thy feet as thou stridest forward,  
Thou wast helped by thy steeds also that were there,  
Thou, O Indra, didst a thousand Śālā-wolves  
In thy mouth uptake; like to the Aćvins canst thou press onward.

Here I vary from the other translators in taking vāṣa as 'steeds,' thus carrying on the thought of a; and similarly at the end I take d of aćcivā in the sense of 'just like' (cf. Grassmann Wört. s. v.), and so describe Indra's speed again by likening him to the Aćvins in his advance.

---

* I am inclined to follow Bloomfield (l. c., p. 24 sq.) in referring *pitā to pitu 'drink,' taking prapitvā here in the approximate sense of 'cloud' as a source of water. The 'cloud-children' (gārbaḥ) are of course the rains. The semantic relation may be stated proportionally thus: gārba 'womb': gārba 'child' = gārba 'cloud-womb': gārba 'cloud-child.'

† I note the connection of Grk. γίγας with this word, comparing Ζήνωρος γίγας 'rushing wind' Aesch. Ag. 692. (See Am. Jr. Phil. xiii. 226.)
Stz. 4. samantā tūñir úpa yūsi yajñām
dā nasatyā sakhyāyā vakṣi
vasdvyaṁ indra dhārayah sahāsrā
cavānā çūra dudatur maghāni

'Not only dost thou come swiftly to the sacrifice,
[But] thou bringest the Nāsatya into alliance [with thee];
In thy store-house, O Indra, thou hast placed a thousand [gifts],
The Aśvins, O hero, have given thee [a thousand] gifts.'

Stz. 5. māndamāna rtād āḍhi prajyāi
sākhībhir indra iṣīrebhir ārtham
ābhir hi māyā úpa dāsyum āgān
mihāḥ prá tamāræ avapat tāmānai

'Rejoicing, forth from the rta hath he come unto mankind,
Indra, with his ready friends [hath come] to help [mankind];
For with these [viz.: clouds] he has come, his wiles against the
demon he has set,
Clouds darkling before [him] he (hath) sprinkled—a darkness.'

In a I construe āḍhi as a verb with agāt in c, and in c I recognize two
verbs ā [agāt], and later on úpa āgāt. Now as the roots i and gam
with ārtham mean 'go to work' (cf. Böhtlingk, Wört. s. v. ārtha), I con-
strue āḍhi + ā with ārtham, followed by the datīvus commodi pra-
jayāi. Against this construction the most pertinent objection rises
from the dissociation of āḍhi and rtād, of which combination we have
two other instances in RV. Still hi 'for' of c strongly implies a declara-
tive sentence before it, for which āḍhi [agāt] seems far the most nat-
ural verb. We must assume that the pada-kāra is in error in reading
ā-āgāt instead of ā-agāt.

So far as I can see, neither Ludwig nor Grassmann pay any attention
to the initial ā of c. This I take to be proleptic for the final āgāt with
úpa. I take ābhir as proleptic for mihāḥ, but am quite sensible of the
fact that there is some harshness in doing so. This seems to me less
violent than taking ābhir as referring to prajyāi and translating 'um
ihretwillen' with Grassmann. Ludwig construes ābhir with māyāḥ
(=māyāḥ),* which is not convincing on the side of the form. Less
violence is done to normal conditions if we take māyāḥ, at the last
resort, as a terminal acc. with the verb of motion, thus rendering c:

* If we could grant that māyāḥ is instrum., I would derive the form, not from
māyāḥ, but make it a plural of māyā inst. sg. (cf. the author, Am. Jr. Phil. xv-
428). I ask if the māyā of our text may not be inst. sg. with praṣṭha vowel? Such vowels are after a mere diacritic device, and thus nom. and inst.
in ā might be distinguished. I note the loc. in i to -i-stems (cf. Whitney¹, 138,
d, and 336, f). At any rate in x. 29. 3 minisā ā is written with a praṣṭha inst.
sg. in ā. If māyā can be taken as inst. sg., then it is in apposition with ābhir-
'through which as his trick.' In that case the pada text may be in error in taking
ābhir as ā + ābhir in place of the accentuated demonstrative (cf. Whitney², 502 b).
Fay, On Rig-Veda x. 73.

‘For by means of these (the clouds, to wit) he hath resorted to tricks, [to tricks] upon the demon he hath resorted.’

Stz. 6. sānāmānā cid dhvasayo ny āṃśā
   āvāhann īndra udāso yāthā ’nah
   ṛṣvādir agachaḥ sākhibhir nīkāmāḥ
   sākām pratiṣṭhā hṛ’dyā javhantha

‘The two of like names (Dasyu and Dānu?) thou didst sprinkle down here (asmāi),*’

Indra, thou brakest them asunder as [thou didst] the car of Uṣas.
With thy swift friends thou cam’st and strong,
   With their cordial support (pratiṣṭhā) thou slewest—’

In sānāmānā I find still another reference to Dasyu-Vṛtra and Dānu his mother. The occurrence of dāsyum in the half-stanza just preceding prepares for sānāmānā. Ludwig’s translation suggests Indra’s sorrels; but his notes suggest a pair of divinities always found in conjunction, say, Dhuni and Cumuri. Grassmann makes sānāmānā refer to mihas tamrāḥ and tāmānśi of the previous stanza. I note that by my explanation a mentions Indra’s enemies as c does his friends, in line with the chastic arrangement noted above. Neither Grassmann nor Ludwig read hṛ’dyā as it is given us by the text, but correct, the former to hṛ’dyāḥ acc. plur., the latter to hṛ’dyāḥ gen. sg. fem. of hṛd- (sic).

Stz. 7. tvāṁ jaghantha nāmucim makhasyūṁ
   dāsāṁ krṣṇinā śnaye vīmāyam
   tvāṁ cakartha mānave syonān
   pathō devatā ’njase’va yānān.

‘Thou slewest Namuci, the battle-lover,
   And Dāsa thou madest for the Rishi’s sake all-guileless;
   Thou madest for man easy
   Paths god-wards, passable as if [slick] with grease.’†

Stz. 8. tvāṁ etāni papriṣe vi nāma
   ṛpacā indra ādhiṣe gābhastāu
   ānu tvā devāḥ pāvasā madanti
   upāribudhnān vanināc cakartha.

‘Thou hast widely extended thy names;
   Masterly, O Indra, hast thou put them in thy hand;‡
   Unto thee the gods loudly cheer,
   The uprooting of the trees was thy doing.’

* Böhltingk defines āṃśā by “dieses alles, alles um uns her.” This comes very near to the first person; thus asmāi may be looked on as a quasi-singular to asmā. Cf. infra, stz. 9.
† I note the common phrase “like greased lightning.” [To Prof. Whitney also, ḍyācasā suggested the same phrase.—Ed]
‡ I take ṛ to mean that Indra has won the property-rights to all his names.
Stz. 9. cakrām yād asyā 'psv ḍ nisattam
    utō tád asmūi mádhv ĩc cachadyāt
prthivyām ātisītam yād udhāh
pāyo gōṣv ādadhā ḍṣadhīṣu.

'When his discus* has gone down into the water,
    Why then that will seem to this world (asmāi)† honey-sweet:
—Whenas [thou hast] released thy udder o'er the earth
    [And] hast put milk into the cows and herbs.'

In this rendering I take a as 3d person and cd as 2d person. While such a change of persons is harsh, it is not otherwise unknown in RV.
I have translated ādadhās in the aoristic sense (cf. Whitney 9296). As to construction I take the tád clause of b first with a, and again with cd, recognizing for the latter a slight anacoluthon. This rendering accounts for the accent of ādadhās, which Grassmann emends to adadhās, while Ludwig explains, with all too evident finesse, by assum-
ing gōṣv [adadhā] ādadhā ḍṣadhīṣu. I construe udhāh pāyo—ādadhās as a double accusative: 'thou hast rendered thy teat (into) milk.'

Stz. 10. ācād iyāyē 'ti yād vādanti
    ājāso jātām utā manya enam
manyor iyāya harnyēṣu tathāv
yātāḥ praṣujñā īndro asya veda.

"'From ācā he came'—when men say [this]—
    From ājās he was born—is what I think of him:
From manyā he came—in our houses took his place;
[But] whence he was born—Indra (alone) knows this.'

Here the balanced structure of each pāda is noticeable. In b the writer seems to pique himself on his cleverness in defining ācā by ājās.
I would therefore venture to suggest that we have here a sort of riddle or brahmodya, which Bloomfield (JAOS. xv. 172 sq.) explains as a sort of theological quiz. If this is true, we might expect to find unusual meanings here for ācā and ājās.

By prehistoric etymology ācā might mean 'cloud' or 'water' (cf. Sibree, Academy, No. 1018, and the author, Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc., 1894, p. xi). I have urged (PAOS., Dec., 1894, p. clxxiii) that ācā means 'liquid' at RV. viii. 26. 24. So, if Agni, the lightning, is apām napāt 'waters' son,' then it might be said of Indra, the lightning. ācād iyāya 'from water he came.' Along this line we may reconcile the statement of RV. ii. 35. 6a, ācāyāsā ḍtā jānina, 'the birth of ācā is in him' [sc. apām napāt]. with the statement of our present stanza 'he came from ācā': rain and lightning are contemporaneous phenom-

* Cakrām means 'wheel,' but was used in the Epic period preséminently of the discus employed by Viśṇu for his weapon. I propose to take it here of Indra's thunderbolt. In Vergil's description of Vulcan's labors (Aen. 8. 429), the thunderbolt of Jupiter was being provided with 'spokes' ('radīn).
† For asmāi as approximately a 1st person see above, stz. 6.
ena and so either may be regarded as the cause of the other, so that lightning may be said to be produced by the rain (clouds), or, per contra, to produce the rain. It was inevitable that the Vedic Hindus should confound ā́rva ‘rain’ with ā́rva ‘horse,’ and indeed both words proceeded doubtless from a common epithet ā́rva ‘the swift,’ which had come to be applied to the horse par excellence before the end of the primitive period. Thus we can more easily understand the mythological rôle of the horse in the Vedas, and the statement (Cat. Brāh. v. 1.4.5; vii. 5.2.18) that “lightning is a horse descended from the waters, or the clouds” (Bloomfield, l. c. 178, note).

In pāda b we can give to ījās also the meaning ‘water,’ not only by etymology (cf. Grk. ὕδας ‘wet’), but on the positive testimony of the Vedic lexicographers.*

In manyú I see the sense of ‘wrath,’ used to define ījās in its ordinary sense of ‘might’ more narrowly. Thus, by way of double entendre, ījās mediates between ā́rva and manyú. We might press manyú into the sense of ‘storm’ as a display of wrath and might. In RV. x. 83 the personified Manyu is called, among other things, Vārūṇa ‘sky’ (Grk. ὃσπαρας), he is provided with a thunderbolt (v. stz’s 1, 2, 6), and is identified also with Indra (stz. 2).

I take the content of abc to be that the lightning-god came from cloud, water, and sky, or, in one word, from storm, and became fire upon men’s hearths (harmyéu t fastháu). It even has been supposed that Agní † is the subject of the verbs in these pādas, but we have seen how lightning is a common aspect of Agni and Indra.

In d the poet turns helplessly away from these hard questions concerning Indra’s origin, and declares that this is known to the god alone. The literary tone here reminds one of the famous cosmogonic hymn, RV. x. 129, which ends with the following words:

só añgá veda yádi và ná veda

‘he (the supreme god) alone knows (the origin of the world)—or suppose he does not know?‘

Stz. 11. vúyáh suparna úpa sedur indrom
priyúmedha īsuyo náddhamúnuh
úpa dhvántám úryahi púrdhi cákṣur
mumugdhyān dśmánu nháhyéva baddhá.”

‘The strong-winged birds have drawn nigh to Indra,
The Priyamedha Rishi, begging for help:
Uncover the darkness, fill thy eye (= bring back the sun),
Release us, caught in a net as it were.’

* The Náighántukakágá, reported by Yáśuka, l. 12. This early Vedic commentator and lexicographer is surely as reliable in a matter of definition as Heaycith, say, in Greek.
† Have the etymologists noted that harmyá ‘house’ stands in the same semasic relation to the root ghr ‘be hot’ as Latin aedes ‘house’ to aetus ‘heat’?
‡ Cf. Bloomfield, l. c.
11. The real Indra of the Rig-Veda; by Professor Edward Washburn Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

It has been claimed by Oldenberg* that the common view in regard to Indra is incorrect; that this god was in the eyes of the poets a mountain-deity, not a storm-god† of the atmosphere.

The Rig-Veda speaks of Indra with no doubtful voice. Speculation may perhaps make out his prototype to be an earth-giant, an Old Man of the Mountains. But what says the Rig-Veda of Indra? \( \text{urdhvō' ṛ ādhy ādhy antāriksē ādhā vṛtrāya prā vadāhī jabhāra mīhauṃ vārāna āpi ātm ādudrot tīgmāyudho ajayac chātraṃ indraḥ.} \)

In this hymn Indra is represented as the battle-god of the people, but at the same time as the god that lets the streams flow forth. He does this in the usual way. There is nothing extraordinary in the scene which the poet paints. Indra smites the demon that keeps back the flood. The god “stood on high,” not on the mountain; for the poet, as if to guard expressly against any other interpretation, adds “on the inter-space” (between sky and earth). “He rushed down on him (the demon) with a sharp weapon (lightning)§ and enveloped in cloud.” A moment later the poet invokes Indra as Bṛhaspati, the lord of strength, and cries out āva kṣīpa dīvo dēmānam: “From (or of) the sky cast down the stone (wherewith thou didst slay thy enemies).” || This is the anthropomorphic Indra of the Rig-Veda, the only Indra whose single personality is deducible from the literary data; and hence the only Indra whose personality has any historical value. Nor need one do more than turn a page or two to find ample confirmation of this fact.

Indra’s host is of the sky alone: utā syā na īndro vīcācārṣanir dīvāḥ çārdhenā mārutenā sukṛdūḥ, etc.|| Not only does the god stand on the inter-space, but even the paramā rījānī, the “highest spaces” conceivable, are near to him. It is “out of the inter-space” that Indra sends sustenance (of rain).** Indra was born “in the highest heaven,” for there “he drank soma as soon as he was born.” ††

In view of so explicit passages as are these, it is evident that the Vedic poet has no such notion of Indra as would tend to equate the god

---

* Die Religion des Veda, pp. 141 ff.
† Oldenberg holds that the myth was originally a storm-myth, that Indra’s bolt was first lightning, and that Indra thus became “for the Vedic poets” a giant and mountain myth.
§ That Indra’s weapon is not wind but lightning is sufficiently shown by the use of acaṁ (below), the bolt itself, as well as of didyāt (below). Compare v. 31. 4: takṣgam tvāya vījānā Ṛgvedam.
|| ii. 30. 5. Compare i. 121. 9, “Thou didst hurl the stone of the sky.”
|| ii. 31. 3. The Maruts have Indra’s bolt, the lightning, didyāt, vii. 57. 4.
** iii. 30. 2, 11. Compare also viii. 71 = 82 4: 89 = 100. 5.
†† iii. 32. 10. Compare iv. 17. 4.
with a giant of earth.* It is, perhaps, legitimate to hazard a guess that Indra may have arisen from a mountainous prototype. But a view based on the reverse process cannot be accepted as an addition to Vedic exegesis. The ‘splitting of the mountains,’ whether of earth or of air, is but the manifestation of the great atmosphere-god’s power when he is already invested with the characteristics of a supreme deity. The fall of rain goes together with the rise of the rivers. Indra lets out the rivers, but that he does not do so as a mountain-giant is shown by the ethereal position assigned to him by the poets.†

The comparison with Parjanya, which Oldenberg institutes, is perfectly legitimate, but the points of difference appear to be unduly estimated. If we examine the phraseology of the Parjanya hymn (v. 88), we shall see on the contrary a rather striking similarity with that employed to describe Indra. Parjanya is jiridānus, an expression applied to the work of the atmospheric Maruts (i. 185. 15); to the ‘rain of the sky’ (ix. 97. 17); to Mitra and Varuṇa (v. 62. 3), in their capacity of heavenly rain-gods (frequently alluded to), and to Indra (viii. 51=62. 3). Then Parjanya is ‘a bellowing bull that puts his seed in the plants,’ an idea which is expressed with almost the same words in regard to Agni (i. 128. 3; x. 1. 2); to Soma (ix. 76. 5; ix. 5. 1, etc.) and to Indra, first in respect of the noise (i. 100. 13; 173. 3-4), then in respect of the bull (vi. 44. 21, and frequently), and finally in respect of the plants (ii. 18. 7). The ‘crash’ of Indra’s descent is noticed in viii. 1. 2. He and Parjanya alone have the epithet mahāvadha; he shares with Parjanya the ‘thunder’ expressed by standyan (vi. 44. 12; for the image here compare viii. 21. 18), and exactly as Parjanya here thunders and all quakes, so Indra thunders and all quakes (i. 80. 14; ii. 12. 1). He like Parjanya has a whip, kāḍa, as have also the rain-giving Ādvin and Maruts (viii. 33. 11; i. 22. 3; 87. 3; 157. 4; 168. 4); his regular epithet is ratheṣṭha, just as Parjanya in this hymn is ratheṣṭa. Parjanya smites demons. Indra smites or ‘burns’ them (with lightning). The distinction is significant.‡

The rain-pouring, both in the Parjanya hymn and in the hymns to Indra and the Maruts, is the business of the Maruts themselves,§

---

* It is scarcely necessary to state that the citations given are illustrative only. They might be increased to any extent. But the collective view is the one here represented.

† The snake is surely not a river-snake. This water-holder ‘stops the sky and water,’ R.V. ii. 11. 5. Where the snake is located are the waters, the streams, which Indra lets out of the sky; though this also affects the rivers: i. 57. 6; ii. 11. 7; 12. 3.

‡ iii. 30. 16 (with the thunderbolt). Compare vi. 18. 10: “Burn like fire (compare x. 87. 5) the dry wood with thy weapon; the demons also, like a thunderbolt.”

§ The Maruts ‘sowd rain’ (v. 55. 5; 58. 3, etc.); Mitra-Varuṇa send it (v. 62. 3, etc.); but chiefly Soma sends it (ix. 39. 2, etc.). Even Varuṇa sends rain (v. 85); while Agni does so too (vi. 13. 1; ii. 6. 5).
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'whose sweat is rain.' They alone are varśāntīrijas. In prayer, Indra-Bhṛaspati is clearly besought for rain, in x. 98. 4-9; and he himself says "I gave rain to mortals" (iv. 26. 2-3), adding that he led the waters, as if the swelling of the river-water were the result of the rain, as it is. In ii. 27. 14-15, "This one" also is Indra, apparently. The form of Indra's appearance is as a rain (x. 28. 4; compare viii. 13. 6).

Naturally, with the Maruts to pour the rain for him,* Indra's reputation, not being that of a mere Parjanya, rests more on his heroic act as a battle-leader; so that in the Rik there is perhaps all that could be expected of the rain-god. Yet in x. 98. 4 Indra sends rain (as Bhṛaspati). As for the letting out of the rivers, since the rivers are let out only when the storm bursts, it is clearly fair to attribute the act to Indra, who brings the storm which bursts the river. And Oldenberg has neglected to mention that in the praise of rivers it is Varūpa alone and not Indra who in x. 75. 2 is praised for letting out the whole band of rivers.† I utterly fail to see how it can be said of a god who 'sends rain,' who is full of 'drops,' who 'thunders day by day,'‡ who 'crashes down,' who is armed like Parjanya (mohāvadha), or more particularly, has the 'sharp gleaming' weapon 'of the sky' (lightning), peculiar to Agni and the Maruts (didyūt), or to Dyāus (acānī),§ who has the 'rain-bejeweled Maruts' as his constant companions, and like Parjanya makes all things grow,|| that "for the Vedic poets Indra's victory is not that of a tempest; but represents the breaking of the river-fOUNTS FROM THE DEPTHS OF THE MOUNTAIN." Oldenberg says that the rarity of such expressions prevents one from laying much weight upon them, and is inclined to attribute these characteristics anyway to the Vedic exaggeration which paints a god's form in uncanonical ways.¶ To me it seems as if this explanation were not sufficient. And there is a further difficulty. According to Oldenberg, Indra's prototype is a gewittergott. This storm-god then "for the Vedic poets" becomes a mountain-giant. He then suffers a reversion, and in his third stage becomes a gewittergott again (post-Rik).** Did the great Ram ever skip like this? I trow not.

The true explanation of Indra's unbounded greatness I have given, I think, in my Religions of India. He passes beyond the atmospheric storm-god, he becomes too great to be specifically described, he approaches the universality of Agni the three-fold. Hence his material attributes are sunk under vague grandiloquence. His storming through

---

* ud iṛayāthā maruṭaḥ samudratō yāyāṁ rṣṭiṁ varśayāthā purīśinah (v. 55. 5), etc.
† Compare vii. 87. 1. Oldenberg refers to the passages where Indra does this. In x. 124. 7-8 both gods have this function.
‡ x. 92. 8.
§ The acānī belongs to Dyāus, Agni, and Indra (iii. 30. 16, and below).
|| xi. 13. 7. Vṛtra is nadiṅgṛ̤́ṅ, but he is also svāṛṛ̤śīs, viii. 12. 26; i. 52. 2, 5.
¶ Oldenberg, loc. cit. p. 142.
** ib. pp. 142-143.
the sky is grand enough to be depicted in general terms. He is the
causa movens of rain-burst and river-flood. But except for an occa-
sional reference, the poet treats him no more as storm-god but as bat-
tle-god,* god of hosts. Still back of this may lie the dragon-slayer of
earth; but when the Rig-Veda permits us to see the form of his veiled
god ("clothed in cloud") he shows us not an Old Man of the Moun-
tains, but a god that rides upon the storm, whose weapon is the
'gleaming' bolt† sent down from the sky; whose rain is a source of
fruitfulness and thankfulness, who in his storming gives at once an
ideal of warriormship and a promise of rich gain: yaj puspīrīc ca pras-
vaḥ ca dharmayuddhī dāne vyāvīr adhārayaḥ; yaṁ cāsāmā ājana
dīyātō divā urīr urvāḥ abhītāḥ sāsy uktiyāḥ.‡

12. Theories of Sacrifice as applied to the Rig-Veda; by Pro-
fessor Hopkins.

This paper took up the different theories of sacrifice in the Rig-Veda
and pointed out that to understand the sacrifice as portrayed in this
work one must abide by the general tone and not by sporadic examples
found in contradiction to that tone. The Vedic poet's view of expia-
tion of sin, the object of his sacrifice, and his relations with his gods
were reviewed. Smith's theory of consanguinity is not found repre-
sented in Vedic hymns. Neither is the view that the gods are to be
cought or to be duped by magical medicinal power one that can be re-
ferred to the Hymns except in a few cases, which by their infrequency
show a marked contrast with the prevailing view. Desire and hope
and shrewd hospitality, to make the gods grant these hopeful desires,
are the foundation of the Vedic sacrifice. The hospitable gifts, how-
ever, must be sufficient to insure reward. No one knows precisely how
much the gods want. Therefore the poet thinks, lack of luck showing
lack of favor, that when the worshipper is unfortunate it is a sign that
the god is angry; from which anger with its consequences he begs to
be released, not knowing how or when he has sinned. But he argues
logically that he must have done so. This is the second class of sins for
which sacrifice must be made. The first class consists of sins that the

* "When the [i.e. thy] sharp thunderbolt falls... when battle rages, then be
our savior" (iv. 16. 17). The thunderbolt (açāni, the bolt which strikes a tree.
il. 14. 2) is Indra's, as in i. 54. 4, where Indra shakes "high heaven" and fights
with the açāni; cf. i. 80. 13, vii. 104. 20. It belongs also to Dyāus and Agni—
see above. Compare also ayān śrīve ādha jāyahūn utā ghnān (iv. 17. 10. His
special glory is victory and slaughter). So iv. 17. 12 ff.: 'rushing like a wind
with thundering clouds... he throws up the dust... like Dyāus with the thun-
derbolt smiting... he enriches the praiser.'

† Divī nā ketūr ādhi ḍhāyī haryatō vīyācad vajro hārito nā rā́ḥyā: tudād
ādhih hārīcīpīro yā āyastāh sahārasoka abhavad dharmabharāk (x. 96. 4); va-
vādhanā upa dūsire eṣa vajro droravīt (viii. 6. 40). Compare x. 138. 2.
‡ ii. 13. 7. Compare iv. 20. 7–9.
Aryan himself hates. But there is no case in the Vedic hymns of an Aryan admitting that he has committed a specific first-class sin. It is always his foes who sin thus. He himself makes sacrifice to atone for what he thinks he must have done, not for what he admits he has done. Examples were given to illustrate the paper, which was intended for the general public of the Society and contained no special study, except negatively, to show that ‘capturing’ a god, and ‘big medicine’ sacrifice must each be regarded not as the Rig-Vedic idea of sacrifice, but as an idea which sporadically appears in the Rig-Veda.

13. On the legend of Indra’s visit to Medhātithi, Sāyaṇa on RV. i. 51. 1; by Dr. Hanns Oertel, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The subrahmāṇyā-chant which the subrahmāṇyā-priest sings while the soma is conveyed on the soma-cart to the sacrificial enclosure is interesting because it contains allusions to a number of Indra-myths about which little is known from other sources. In it Indra is invoked (1) as Medhātither meṣa ‘ram of Medhātithi’; (2) as Vṛṣṇaṇḍaṣvaṣa Meṇa ‘Menā (wife?) of Vṛṣṇaṇḍa’; (3) as Ahalyāyā jāra ‘paramour of Ahalyā’; and (4) as Kāucika brahmanā Gāutama bruṇaṇa. I propose to say a few words with regard to the first allusion.

Sāyaṇa in his commentary on the Rig Veda mentions three times the legend of Indra’s visit to Medhātithi in the form of a ram. Twice (i. 51. 1 and viii. 2. 40) he quotes from the SB. (i. 1.): medhātithim hi kāṇvāyanim meṣo bhūtvā “jāhāra ‘for he (Indra) having become a ram, carried off Medhātithi the descendant of Kaśvya.”* Once he states practically the same in his own words (viii. 97. 12): indro meṣo bhūtvā medhātithim svargam anayat, ‘Indra, having become a ram, led Medhātithi to heaven.’

The mythological side of this legend has been discussed by A. Weber (Ind. Stud. ix. 38-40), who conjectures that it arose from a misreading of RV. viii. 2. 40 (meṣo bhūto ‘bhi yan nayaḥ for yan ayah of the satihūta) possibly under the influence of the Greek Ganymede-legend. Without entering into this question I pass on to the other statement which Sāyaṇa makes in connection with it (on RV. i. 51. 1): Kaṇvaṇḍa meṣa rajamāna indro meṣarupena gataś tadiyāḥ sōmaḥ papāu. sa rṣī tam meṣa ity avocat. ata idānim api meṣa iti ‘ndro ‘bhidiyate, for which he quotes the subrahmāṇyā-formula. Weber notes here, “This also is clearly only a misunderstanding of the figurative text (viii. 2. 40). For in reality the verse does not contain anything except the request that Indra may come to Medhātithi as a ram, i.e. with rich gifts.” Here, too, I refrain from discussing the mythological aspect and the possible origin of this version. All I propose to do is to show that this last passage does not at all originate with Sāyaṇa, but (1) that he repeats here a form of the legend current at the

* Cf. Sāy. on TA. i. 12.4.
time of the Brāhmaṇas, and (2) that, although he does not cite it, his source was the lost Cātyāyana-brāhmaṇa, from which he quotes freely in other parts of his commentary.

(1) The first proposition is easily proved by a reference to JB. ii. 79 (where the subrahmanya-formula is quoted and explained), medhātīther meṣeṭti. medhātīther ha meṣo bhūtvā rājānam papāu.

(2) The second proposition rests on these considerations:

(a) The Cātyāyana-brāhmaṇa was a Śāmaṇdya brāhmaṇa. A material and formal correspondence to the TMB. and the JB. is, therefore, a priori probable; and in the case of the Cātyāyana brāhmaṇa and the JB. it is proved by the almost verbatim correspondence of the legend of Apālā (already noted by Burnell), and others. A more detailed discussion of the relation of these two Brāhmaṇas, for which the material is partly collected, I must defer till some later time.

(b) In his commentary to RV. i. 51. 13 Sāyaṇa, in explaining menā of the subrahmanya-formula, quotes from the TMB. and the Cātyāyana brāhmaṇa. This last quotation is as follows: vṛṣasātvasa menā bhūtvā maghavā kula uvāsa. This occurs verbatim so in JB. ii. 79. This coincidence warrants, I think, the assumption that the legends of the subrahmanya-formula were related in similar phrasology in Cāṭ. B. and JB. (just as the story of Apālā).

Hence I conclude that the above indro meṣo bhūtvā somam papāu goes back to the Cāṭ. B.

14. On Klemm's edition of the Śaḍviṇgabrahmaṇa; by Dr. Hanns Oertel, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The Śaḍviṇgabrahmaṇa is one of the most barren of Brahmanical treatises, and Jībānanda Vidyāśāgara* has done his best to make its text unintelligible by countless misprints, wrong word-divisions, omissions of syllables or words. The announcement of a readable edition of its text accompanied by Sāyaṇa's Commentary and a translation is therefore heartily to be welcomed, and the specimen of the first book† offered to us here is a proof that its author is well qualified to undertake the task, the completion of which, it is to be hoped, will not be delayed too long.

In the following I offer a few notes to text and translation of the first prapāṭhaka.

i. 1. 1 f. (Trans. p. 50). Read Brahma and Subrahman for Brahma, Subrahma; and so in the following vas.

i. 1. 6. Read ‘pa for sha; in the translation (p. 51) insert ‘hier.’

i. 1. 8. (Trans. p. 51) ‘lockt’ for āha ‘addresses’ is too strong. The very similar passage ČB. iii. 2. 1. 19 f. uses upamantray and accounts for the fact that a woman does not yield until the third call.

* I have access only to the second (but hardly revised) edition, Calcutta, 1881.
A similar etymology of hari is found at JUB. i. 44. 5.
In the translation insert 'so' or 'dann' between 'ihm' and 'herbei.'
Read gārū ṣvaskandīna (cf. 28, gātama bruṇa). Read Kaṇčiko and Kaṇčikaḥ.
na utsahe is rather 'I cannot.' Read brahmāyas is 'brahman-priests.'
I should place a period after manuṣyaderah and translate 'Gods verily are the gods, and then also these human gods. Those who are Brahmans, learned, students, these are the human gods (read —devah).
The whole khaṇḍa has a very close parallel in JB. ii. 78 ff.
Read (10. line) brahmaṇaḥ.
Read eṣa.
The quotation trayo 'ṛvāṇco . . . . mūtrapuṛṣa is to be emended after AB. i. 20. 4. ta ime 'ṛvāṇco reṣaṇya mūtraḥ puṛṣya iti.
anubrāte rather 'learns,' Delbr. A.S. p. 246.
Rather 'For if one were to blow into a (bladder) full (of air), if (more air) were to go (= to be forced) into it, it would burst; if no (more air) were to go (= to be forced) into it, it would empty itself.'
For abhuyapaṇcraṇamāya Jībaṇanda and the MS. of the P. W. read abhuyapaṣṭ—.
Samārambhāya rather in its usual meaning 'for the beginning,' as contrasted with saṁśtatāyī 'for the continuance.'
10 ff. JB. i. 74 ff. offers a rather close parallel.
ṣhr + anu-ṛi, rather, as usual, 'curse.'
Rather '(Saying,) "Speech is the uktha," (he told it, i.e. the uktha) to Vīgāṁitra; (saying,) "Mind is the brahma," (he told it, i.e. the brahma) to Vasiṣṭha.' It would seem that an iti is wanting after mano brahma.
Read rgyvedaḥ.
Read 'Feuern' for 'Fällen.'
Read trīyam.
Read 'durchlaufen' for 'durchgehen.'
Read raṇṭhaṁ.

15. Emendations to the Jāminiya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa, sent in part by Böhtlingk and in part by Roth, to the Editor, Dr. Oertel.

Of the following emendations to the Jāminiya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa those of Böhtlingk were kindly sent to me in a letter dated December 23, 1894, and are the result of a cursory examination of part of the text; those of the late lamented Professor Roth had been intended for Professor Whitney, but were sent to me after the latter's untimely death, under date of June 12, 1894. They are published with the consent of their authors.
Counsellor Böhtlingk's emendations:
"i. 2. 6, hätte ich janayamāno lieber gesehen, und in diesem, sowie in kurvāṇaḥ in 7 das Medium hervorgehoben."
"i. 3. 7, lesen wir taditara (als Comp.) 'ein von diesem (gāyatra) verschiedenes rāman,' wird der Satz grammatisch correct."
"i. 3. 8, āśicyāt ist, wie auch Sie annehmen, verdorben. Ich nehme aber nicht nur am Precativ, sondern auch am Act. Anstoss. Man hätte āśicyeta erwartet. AÇS. ii. 3. 5 steht pratisācyāt, nicht āsi-, wie Sie angaben."
"i. 4. 5, ich möchte 'narthyas... rāyaḥ (von rās) lesen."
"iii. 19. 7, triviṣṭapam fehlerhaft für triviṣṭabāham; vgl. PW.1 unter triviṣṭapa 3) und PW.1 unter stabh mit vi. Dieses Wort passt hier vortrefflich."
"iv. 24. 8, atrasada gehört eher zu devatā."

Professor Roth's emendations:
"i. 4. 5, arājyaḥ sann api rājyaṃ prāṇoti."
"ii. 5. 7, pratyasya, 'wie er eine Höhe (dennoch) betritt, nachdem er (zunächst) Anstoss dabei gefunden'; AÇS. viii. 18. 14."
"i. 22. 8, dīopam, abs. 'bischen um bischen'."
"ii. 35. 3, vātaraṇi als Grenzfuss."
"i. 38. 4, cāmilapānabhyām, 'Holzstücke oder Zweige von cāmi u. parṇa'; Kāty. iv. 2. 1; Gobh. i. 17. 16."
"iii. 14. 2, tam ōtvas sumpalāyya padgrhitam apakārṣanti 'ihn entfiehrend (da er entspringen will) packen sie am Fuss und schleppen ihn weg'."
"iiii. 14. 11, halte ich viḍīgda für Gegensatz zu nīrbhīṇa 'verklebt', soviel als 'verschlossen'; vgl. Āpast. Čr. xv. 17. 8.'
"iii. 31. 10, sa | eva | alammasya | alammatā | yā | etasya | ha | alam | alam | eva, etc. u. etwa: 'alamja ailāg'a singet.' Tāṇḍya xiii. 10. 8, tad alammasyā 'lammatvam.'
"iv. 1. 1, sa mā na budho 'bemerke mich nicht."
"iv. 3. 2, caṁ tokāya tanuve."

I add a few corrections of my own:
i. 8. 12 read ayāṁ for ayaśm.
i. 45 (translation) dele 4. and read 4 for 5, 5 for 6, 6 for 7.
With i. 50. 3 compare CB. ii. 1. 1. 2.
i. 58. 8, dhiyā-dhiyā, cf. Whitney AJP. xi. 433.
With iii. 11. 1f. compare CB. xi. 9. 1.
i. 14. 11 read perhaps vyṛṭdham for viḍīgdam, cf. TS. vi. 5. 6. 1.
i. 25. 4. cf. BAU. iv. 3. 11, mudāḥ... pramudāḥ.
In the note to i. 45. 5 read JB. i. 10, tad yathā hiranye dhmatē ('when the gold is refined').
To note on iii. 29. 8 add reference to Ind. Stud. xiv. 120. To the note to iii. 35. 6 add that maricayah occurs at JB. i. 45. 8.
Pg. 288, add to the list of etymologies: ākāça: ʃkāç + ā, i. 25. 2.

It is perhaps not generally known to the present members of the Society that His Majesty, Pawarendr Ramesr, Second King of Siam, was an Honorary Member of the American Oriental Society. A letter from him, acknowledging and returning thanks for his election, was presented in October, 1865 (see Proceedings for that date, Journal, vol. viii., p. lxxxii), and contains the following passage: "It is gratifying to learn, through your Society's published works, of the interest taken in the United States in Oriental learning. Allow me to hope that this interest, as well as the benefit derived from such studies, may continue to increase and result in much good." One of the greatest benefactors of the Society, the Hon. Charles W. Bradley, of New Haven, was deeply interested in Siam. "In 1857, he returned home as bearer of the new treaty with Siam, and, on his outward passage to Ningpo, he took with him its ratification, being invested for the purpose with plenipotentiary powers" (Proceedings for May, 1865, Journal, vol. viii., p. lxi). In his paper On the Kings and the Kingdom of Siam (Proceedings for May, 1859, p. 7, not in the Journal), Mr. Bradley speaks "of the First and Second Kings, their character, their uncommon attainments in European languages and science, their knowledge of and interest in all that takes place in the political and intellectual world of the West, and their especially friendly feeling toward America and Americans." In this connection, attention may be called to the very interesting work of Mrs. A. H. Leonowens, The English Governess at the Siamese Court.

Mr. Lanman laid before the Society one volume of the King of Siam's edition of the Tipitaka, in 39 volumes, which had already been mentioned by the Librarian. The books are printed books, and are in the Pali language and in the Siamese alphabet. Affixed to the fly-leaf of the first volume is the following circular letter:

CONSULATE-GENERAL OF SIAM,
NEW YORK, March 20, 1895.

Sir:

I have forwarded to the address of your Institution, a Siamese edition of the sacred writings of the Southern Buddhists, the Tipitaka, sent as a present by His Majesty, Somdetch Phra Paramindr Maha Chulalonkorn Phra Chula Chom Kiao, King of Siam, in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of his reign.

It may be interesting to His Majesty to receive some account of your Institution, showing what has been accomplished in your quarter of the "New World" in the cause of letters and education during the last twenty-five years.

Will you therefore have the kindness to send a copy of your last Report by mail to His Royal Highness, Prince Devawongse Varaprakar, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Bangkok, Siam, and one copy, if you please, to me.

Will you also acknowledge receipt of the books to His Royal Highness, and send a duplicate receipt to me.

I have the honor to be, Sir, Faithfully yours,

ISAAC TOWNSEND SMITH, Consul-General of Siam,
1 East 59th St., New York.

To the Librarian of the ——.
The courtesy of the Consul-General has enabled me to give the following list of public libraries that were chosen to be the fortunate recipients of this royal gift. They are:

Cal., Berkeley, University of California.
      Palo Alto, Leland Stanford Junior University.
      San Francisco, Mercantile Library.
Conn., Hartford, Trinity College.
      New Haven, American Oriental Society.
      Yale University.
D. C., Washington, Catholic University of America.
      Library of Congress.
      Smithsonian Institution.
Ill., Chicago, Newberry Library.
      McCormick Theological Seminary.
      University of Chicago.
Ind., Evanston, Northwestern University.
      Bloomington, Indiana University.
Kans., Lawrence, University of Kansas.
La., New Orleans, Tulane University.
Me., Brunswick, Bowdoin College.
Md., Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University.
Mass., Amherst, Amherst College.
      Boston, Public Library.
      Boston University.
      Cambridge, Harvard University.
      Newton Center, Newton Theological Institution.
      Worcester, American Antiquarian Society.
Mich., Ann Arbor, University of Michigan.
      Detroit, Public Library.
Minn., Minneapolis, University of Minnesota.
Mo., Columbia, University of the State of Missouri.
      St. Louis, Public Library.
      Washington University.
      Springfield, Drury College.
N. H., Hanover, Dartmouth College.
N. J., Madison, Drew Theological Seminary.
      Princeton, College of New Jersey.
N. Y., Ithaca, Cornell University.
      New York, Astor Library.
      Columbia College.
      Union Theological Seminary.
      Ohio, Cincinnati, Public Library.
      Oberlin, Oberlin College.
Pa., Bryn Mawr, Bryn Mawr College.
      Haverford, Haverford College.
      Philadelphia, Mercantile Library.
      University of Pennsylvania.
R. I., Providence, Brown University.
Tenn., Nashville, Vanderbilt University.
      Sewanee, University of the South.
Va., Charlottesville, University of Virginia.
      Wis., Madison, University of Wisconsin.
      [Total, 49.]

These volumes of the Tiptiṭaka have no duplicate title-pages in English; and, in the absence of experts at many or most of the above-mentioned libraries, it is probable that the books will fail to be properly catalogued and will thus also fail to attract possible students and to be made known to those already interested. Accordingly, for the practi-
cal purpose of increasing the chances of usefulness of the widely distributed Siamese edition the following lists are given.

The Harvard copy of this work has already been of great use to Mr. Henry C. Warren of Cambridge, in the prosecution of his studies in Buddhism. He drew up a numbered list of the 89 volumes and wrote out in briefest form the contents of each volume. A similar service for the Library of the University of Edinburgh was rendered by Dr. James Burgess. Each of the volumes has a Kittana-patta or 'Table of Contents.' These it may be quite desirable to print in our Journal in extenso for the use of Pāli students; giving, for instance, the 153 suttas of the Majjhima-nikāya. For the present purpose, however, I have disregarded systematic completeness, and even consistency, and have given in general only so much as is desirable for the identification of the contents of the several volumes. But for the Mahā-niddesa, the Culla-niddesa, and the Paṭisambhidā-magga, I have given the tables in full. It will be seen, as Mr. Warren observes, that the Vīmāna-vattthu, Peta-vattthu, Therā-gāthā, Therī-gāthā, Jātaka, Apadāna, Buddhavaṃsa, and Cariyā-piṭaka, given by Childers in his Dictionary as belonging to the Khuddaka-nikāya and so forming part of the canon, are not included in the Siamese edition.

Reprints of this paper will be sent, first, to all the above-mentioned libraries. The cataloguers will thereby be enabled easily to identify or cause to be identified all the 89 volumes of the set; to note the contents of each volume on its fly-leaf; and thus to catalogue the work properly and make it accessible to students. Mr. H. C. Warren authorizes me to say that he is willing to identify each of the volumes of the set for any Library that will send the books to his address (12 Quincy st., Cambridge, Mass.). The Library concerned must pay the carriage both ways; but there will be no other expense.

Secondly, reprints of this paper will be sent, so long as the supply lasts, to any Pāli students who may ask for them. (Apply to C. R. L., 9 Farrar st., Cambridge, Mass.) They will thus be enabled to find out where copies of the Tipiṭaka may be consulted or borrowed.

I. Table showing the distribution of the main divisions of the Tipiṭaka over the 89 volumes of the Royal Siamese Edition.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 1.</td>
<td>Mahā-vibhaṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 2.</td>
<td>Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 3.</td>
<td>Mahā-vagga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 4.</td>
<td>Culla-vagga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 5.</td>
<td>Parivāra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. 1.</td>
<td>Dīgha-nikāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 2.</td>
<td>Majjhima-nikāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 3.</td>
<td>Sāhyutta-nikāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 4.</td>
<td>Aṅguttara-nikāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 5.</td>
<td>Khuddaka-nikāya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Abhidhamma-piṭaka (11 vol’s).—Volumes 29–39.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dhammasaṅgaṇi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Vibhaṅga-ppakaraṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kathāvatthu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dhammapaññatti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 34, 35</td>
<td>Puggalapaññatti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36, 37, 38, 39</td>
<td>Paṭṭhāna-ppakaraṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Table showing more particularly the contents of each of the 39 volumes.

#### A. Vinaya-piṭaka.

**Volume.**

1. **Mahā-vibhaṅga, Part i.:**
   1. (Verañja-) Pārājika-kaṇḍa;
   2. Terass-kaṇḍa (the “13” Saṅghādisesa rules);
   3. Aniyata-kaṇḍa;
2. **Mahā-vibhaṅga, Part ii.:**
   4. Nissaggiya-kaṇḍa;
   5. Pācittiya-kaṇḍa;
   6. Pāṭidesanīya-kaṇḍa;
   7. Sekhiya-kaṇḍa.
3. **Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga:**
   1. Pārājika-kaṇḍa;
   2. Sattarasa-kaṇḍa (the “17” Saṅghādisesa rules);
   3. Nissaggiya-kaṇḍa;
   4. Pācittiya-kaṇḍa;
   5. Pāṭidesanīya-kaṇḍa;
4. **Mahā-vagga, Part i.:**
   1. Mahā-khandhaka;
   2. Uposatha-kkhandhaka;
   3. Vassūpanāyika-kkhandhaka;
   4. Pavāraṇā-kkhandhaka;
5. **Mahā-vagga, Part ii.:**
   5. Camma-kkhandhaka;
   6. Bhesajja-kkhandhaka;
   7. Kaṭhina-kkhandhaka;
   8. Cīvara-kkhandhaka;
   9. Campeyya-kkhandhaka;
6. **Culla-vagga, Part i.:**
   1. Kamma-kkhandhaka;
   2. Pārivāsika-kkhandhaka;
   3. Samuccaya-kkhandhaka;
   4. Samatha-kkhandhaka;
Volume.
7. Culla-vagga, Part ii.:
   5. Khuddakavatthu-kkhandhaka;
   6. Senāsana-kkhandhaka;
   7. Saṃghabheda-kkhandhaka;
   8. Vatta-kkhandhaka;
   9. Pātimokkaṭṭhapana-kkhandhaka;
  10. Bhikkhuni-kkhandhaka;
  11. Pañcasati-ka-kkhandhaka;
8. Parivāra.

B.—Suttanta-piṭaka.

9. Dīgha-nikāya, Part i, Silakkhandha-vagga:
   1. Brahmacāla-sutta;
   2. Sāmaññaphala-sutta;
   3. Ambatthera-sutta;
   4. Sopadaṇḍa-sutta;
   5. Kuṭadanta-sutta;
   6. Mahāli-sutta;
   7. Jāliya-sutta;
   8. Mahā-sihanāda-sutta;
   9. Poṭṭhapāda-sutta;
  10. Subha-sutta;
  11. Kevaṭṭa-sutta;
  12. Lohicca-sutta;

10. Dīgha-nikāya, Part ii., Mahā-vagga:
   1. Mahāpadāna-sutta;
   2. Mahāniddāna-sutta;
   3. Mahāparinibbāna-sutta;
   4. Mahāsudassana-sutta;
   5. Janavasabha-sutta;
   6. Mahāgovinda-sutta;
   7. Mahāsamaya-sutta;
   8. Sakkapaṇḍa-sutta;
   9. Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna-sutta;

11. Dīgha-nikāya, Part iii., Pāṭika-vagga:
   1. Pāṭika-sutta;
   2. Udumbarika-sutta;
   3. Cakkavatti-sutta;
   4. Aggaṇṭha-sutta;
   5. Sampasādaniya-sutta;
   6. Pāṇḍika-sutta;
   7. Lakkhaṇa-sutta;
   8. Siṅgālaka-sutta;
   9. Āṭānāṭiya-sutta;
Volume.
10. Saṅgiti-sutta;
11. Dasuttara-sutta.
12. Majjhima-nikāya, Part i., Mūla-paṇṇāsaka:
   1. Mūlapariyāya-vagga;
   2. Sīhanāda-vagga;
   3. Opanna-vagga;
   4. Mahāyamaka-vagga;
   5. Cūlayamaka-vagga.
18. Majjhima-nikāya, Part ii., Majjhima-paṇṇāsaka:
   1. Gahapati-vagga;
   2. Bhikkhu-vagga;
   3. Paribbājaka-vagga;
   4. Rāja-vagga;
   5. Brāhmaṇa-vagga.
14. Majjhima-nikāya, Part iii., Upāri-paṇṇāsaka:
   1. Devadaha-vagga;
   2. Anupada-vagga;
   3. Suddhāta-vagga;
   4. Vibhaṅga-vagga;
   5. Saḷāyatana-vagga.
15. Saṁyutta-nikāya, Part i., Saṅgātha-vagga:
   1. Devatā-saṁyutta;
   2. Devaputta-saṁyutta;
   3. Kosala-saṁyutta;
   4. Māra-saṁyutta;
   5. Bhikkhuni-saṁyutta;
   6. Brahma-saṁyutta;
   7. Brāhmaṇa-saṁyutta;
   8. Vaṅgīsa-saṁyutta;
   9. Vana-saṁyutta;
10. Yakka-saṁyutta;
11. Sakka-saṁyutta.
16. Saṁyutta-nikāya, Part ii., Nīdāna-vagga:
   1. Abhisamaya-saṁyutta (Feer, 12 and 13);
   2. Dhattu-saṁyutta (14);
   3. Anamatagga-saṁyutta (15);
   4. Kassapa-saṁyutta (16);
   5. Lābhassakkā-saṁyutta (17);
   6. Rāhula-saṁyutta (18);
   7. Lakkhaṇa-saṁyutta (19);
   8. Opanna-saṁyutta (20);
17. Saṁyutta-nikāya, Part iii., Khandhavāra-vagga:
   1. Khandha-saṁyutta (22);*
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Volume.
2. Rādha-sāṁyutta (33);
3. Diṭṭhi-sāṁyutta (24);
4. Okkanta-sāṁyutta (25);
5. Uppāda-sāṁyutta (26);
6. Kilesa-sāṁyutta (27);
7. Sārīputta-sāṁyutta (28);
8. Nāga-sāṁyutta (29);
9. Supaṇṇa-sāṁyutta (30);
10. Gandhappakāya-sāṁyutta (31);
11. Valāhaka-sāṁyutta (32);
12. Vacchagotta-sāṁyutta (33);
13. Samādhi-sāṁyutta (34).

18. Sāṁyutta-nikāya, Part iv., Saḷāyatana-vagga:
1. Saḷāyatana-sāṁyutta (35);
2. Vedanā-sāṁyutta (36);
3. Mātugāma-sāṁyutta (37);
4. Jambukhādaka-sāṁyutta (38);
5. Sāmaṇḍaka-sāṁyutta (39);
6. Moggallāna-sāṁyutta (40);
7. Cittagaha-patipuccha-sāṁyutta (41);
8. Gāmani-sāṁyutta (42);
9. Asañkhata-sāṁyutta (43);
10. Abyākata-sāṁyutta (44).

19. Sāṁyutta-nikāya, Part v., Mahāvāra-vagga:
1. Magga-sāṁyutta;
2. Bojjhaṅga-sāṁyutta;
3. Satipaṭṭhāna-sāṁyutta;
4. Indriya-sāṁyutta;
5. Sammappadhāna-sāṁyutta;
6. Bala-sāṁyutta;
7. Iddhipāda-sāṁyutta;
8. Anuruddha-sāṁyutta;
9. Jhāna-sāṁyutta;
10. Ānāpāna-sāṁyutta;
11. Sotāpatti-sāṁyutta;
12. Saccā-sāṁyutta.

20. Aṅguttara-nikāya, Part i.:
1. Eka-nipāta;
2. Duka-nipāta;
3. Tika-nipāta;

21. Aṅguttara nikāya, Part ii.:
4. Catukka-nipāta;

22. Aṅguttara-nikāya, Part iii.:
5. Pañcaka-nipāta;
6. Chakkha-nipāta;

23. Aṅguttara-nikāya, Part iv.:
7. Sattaka-nipāta;
8. Aṭṭhaka-nipāta;
9. Navaka-nipāta;
Volume.

24. Aṅguttara-nikāya, Part v.:
   10. Dasa-nipāta;

25. Khuddaka-nikāya, Part i.:
   1. Khuddaka-pāṭha;
   2. Dhamma-pada;
   3. Udāna;
   4. Itivuttaka;
   5. Sutta-nipāta.

26. Khuddaka-nikāya, Part ii., Mahā-niddesa:
   Aṭṭhaka-vagga: *
      1. Kāma-sutta-niddesa;
      2. Guhaṭṭhaka-sutta-niddesa;
      3. Duṭṭhāṭṭhaka-sutta-niddesa;
      4. Suddhaṭṭhaka-sutta-niddesa;
      5. Paramaṭṭhaka-sutta-niddesa;
      6. Jarā-sutta-niddesa;
      7. Tissa-metteyya-sutta-niddesa;
      8. Pasūra-sutta-niddesa;
      9. Māgandiya-sutta-niddesa;
     10. Purābheda-sutta-niddesa;
     11. Kalaha-vivāda-sutta-niddesa;
     12. Cūla-viyūha-sutta-niddesa;
     13. Mahā-viyūha-sutta-niddesa;
     14. Tuvaṭṭhaka-sutta-niddesa;
     15. Atta-daṇḍa-sutta-niddesa;

27. Khuddaka-nikāya, Part iii., Cūla-niddesa:
   Pārāyana-vagga: †
      1. Vatthu-gāthā;
      2. Ajita-mañavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
      3. Tissametteyya-mañavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
      4. Puppaka-mañavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
      5. Mettagā-mañavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
      6. Dhotaka-mañavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
      7. Upasīva-mañavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
      8. Nanda-mañavaka-pañhū-niddesa;
      9. Hemaka-mañavaka-pañhā-niddesa;

* The Aṭṭhaka-vagga is the fourth book of the Sutta-nipāta, and has sixteen sutta's, which correspond in their titles and in their order to the sixteen niddesa's.

† The Pārāyana-vagga is the fifth book of the Sutta-nipāta. Besides the vatthu-gāthā, it has sixteen pucchā's, corresponding in the names and the order to the sixteen pañhā's whose niddesa's are here enumerated.—The ḳhagga-vasāṇa-sutta is the third of the first book of the Sutta-nipāta.
Volume.
10. Todeyya-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
11. Kappa-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
12. Jatukaṇḍī-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
13. Bhadravudha-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
14. Udaya-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
15. Posāla-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
16. Mogharāja-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
17. Pīṇgiya-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
28. Khuddaka-nikāya, Part iv., Paṭisambhidā-magga:
   Mahāvagga:
   1. Nāṇa-kathā;
   2. Diṭṭhi-kathā;
   3. Ānāpāna-kathā;
   4. Indriya-kathā;
   5. Vīmokkha-kathā;
   6. Gati-kathā;
   7. Kamma-kathā;
   8. Vipallāsa-kathā;
   9. Magga-kathā;
Yukanaddha-vagga:
   1. Yukanaddha-kathā;
   2. Sacca-kathā;
   3. Bojjhaṅga-kathā;
   4. Mettā-kathā;
   5. Virāga-kathā;
   6. Paṭisambhidā-kathā;
   7. Dhammacakka-kathā;
   8. Lokuttara-kathā;
   9. Bala-kathā;
  10. Sufña-kathā.
Pañhā-vagga:
   1. Mahāpañhā-kathā;
   2. Iddhi-kathā;
   3. Abhisamaya-kathā;
   4. Viveka-kathā;
   5. Cariyā-kathā;
   6. Pāṭihāriya-kathā;
   7. Samaśīsa-kathā;
   8. Satipaṭṭhāna-kathā;
   9. Vipassanā-kathā;
  10. Mātika-kathā.
C.—Abhidhamma-piṭaka.
29. Dhamma-saṅgaṇī.
30. Vibhaṅga-ppakaraṇa.
31. Kathā-vatthu.
Lanman, Harvard Copy of First Sanskrit Book, etc. ccilii

32. Dhātu-kāthā and Puggala-paññatti.

33. Yamaka, Part i.:
   1. Mūla-yamaka;
   2. Khandha-yamaka;
   3. Āyatana-yamaka;
   4. Dhātu-yamaka;
   5. Sacca-yamaka;
   6. Saṃkhāra-yamaka;

34. Yamaka, Part ii.:
   7. Anusaya-yamaka;

35. Yamaka, Part iii.:
   8. Citta-yamaka;
   9. Dhamma-yamaka;
   10. Indriya-yamaka.

36. Duka-paṭṭhāna, Part i.

37. Duka-paṭṭhāna, Part ii.

38. Tika-paṭṭhāna.


17. The Harvard copy of the first Sanskrit book ever printed; by Professor Lanman.

Mr. Lanman laid before the Society a book, given—together with many other valuable and valued proofs of his loyalty and affection—by Dr. Fitzedward Hall, of the Class of 1846, to the Library of Harvard, his Alma Mater. The volume is one of most noteworthy character and history. It is a copy of the first Sanskrit book ever printed. The title reads: ‘The Seasons: A Descriptive Poem, by Cālīdās, in the original Sanscrit. Calcutta: M.DCC.XCII.’ And the ‘Advertisement’ of twenty lines on page three begins with the words, ‘This book is the first ever printed in Sanscrit.’ Neither here nor on the title-page is there any mention of the editor’s name; but we know his name from the fact that the ‘Advertisement’ is reprinted (vol. xiii., p. 386, 8vo ed. of London, 1807) as a part of ‘The Works of Sir William Jones.’

The book is an octavo of 4+64 pages, printed in Bengali letters, on admirable paper of J. Whatman, with broad margins. As early as 1840, Von Bohlen, in his edition of the ‘Seasons,’ says of Jones’s edition: ‘...et primum omnino, id quod memoratu dignum est, opusculum fuit Sanskritum prolo subjectum. Europam vero hoc incunabulum, quod vel in ipsa India jam dudum prorsus evanuit, vix vidit; et ubi forte, veluti in Chambersiana codicum collectione [in the Royal Library at Berlin], invenitur, codicis manuscripti instar aestimandum est.’ There follows Jones’s ‘preface’ entire. And Gildemeister, in his ‘Bibliothecæ Sanscritæ Specimen’ (Bonn, 1847, p. 70), says: ‘Liber sanscritus omnium quæ typis exscripti sunt primus isque rarisimus.’

But this is not all. The title-page bears the name ‘Cha. Wilkins,’ presumably in his autograph. Now, in the ninth volume of the Jour-
nal of the American Oriental Society, p. lxxxviii (October, 1870), are extracts from "thirteen inedited letters from Sir William Jones to Mr. (afterwards Sir) Charles Wilkins," communicated by Prof. Fitzedward Hall, D.C.L. And in the tenth volume, pages 110–117, are given these letters in full. Several extracts may follow: "You are the first European that ever understood Sanscrit, and will, possibly, be the last" (October 6, 1787). "The ships of this season will carry home seven hundred copies of our first volume of Transactions; ... but unless the impression should be sold in London, Harington and Morris (who print the book at their hazard) will be losers, and we must dissolve the Society [The Asiatic Society of Bengal!]" (February 27, 1789). "I am so busy at this season, that I have only time to request your acceptance of a little Sanscrit poem, which Morris has printed [i.e. presumably Harington and Morris], and which you are the only man in Europe who can read and understand" (January 14, 1789).

As is evident from the date of the last extract, the "little poem" can be no other than the 'Seasons' of "Cálidás." The extract itself is a copy of the very words of the editor that were sent with the poem. And the volume itself, without doubt, is no other than the identical copy given by Sir William Jones to Sir Charles Wilkins. Illustrious owners! Homer tells of "the handing-down of the sceptre" (of Agamemnon). Here is a book whose handing-down ought to have for Oriental students no less interest than the story of the sceptre had for Thucydides. Dr. Hall's gift deserves to be held in honor.

18. The story of Yayáti; by Professor Lanman.

Read by title.
Additions to the Library.

Additions to the Library.

April, 1893—March, 1896.

From the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

From the American Antiquarian Society.

From the American Geographical Society.

From the American Philosophical Society.

From the Aschendorffsche Buchhandlung, Münster.

From the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
American Oriental Society.

Tul’wi Sat’sa. Fasc. 4.
Appendix to Pāg-Sam Thi S’in. Fasc. 4.
Sher Phyn. Vol. iii. 1.
Āin i Akbarī, translated. Vol. iii. 2-5.
Ma’āsir-ul-Umara. Vol. i. 10, 11, (index), iii. 11, 12, (index).
Abū Zakariyā Yahyā at-Tibrizī’s commentary on ten ancient Arabic poems. Fasc. 2.
Catalogue of the Persian books and MSS. in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Compiled by Maulavi Mirza Ashraf Ali. Fasc. 3. Calcutta, 1895. 4°

From the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.


From the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.


From the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.


From the Asiatic Society of Japan.


From the Asiatic Society of Paris.


From the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences.

Catalogus der ethnologische verzameling. 4. druk, supplement. Batavia, 1894. 8°.
Additions to the Library.

From the Royal Academy of Sciences, Berlin.


From the Royal Library, Berlin.

Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin:
Bd. xii. Verzeichniss der lateinischen Handschriften, von Valentin Rose.
   Bd. i. Berlin, 1893. 4°.

From Mr. C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh.


From R. G. Bhandarkar, Ph.D.

Bombay, 1894. 8°.

From His Highness the Maharaja of Bhavnagar.

Collection of Prakrit and Sanskrit inscriptions, published by the Bhavnagar Archaeological Department, under the auspices of His Highness Raol Shri Takhtsingji, Maharaja of Bhavnagar. Bhavnagar, n. d. 4°.

From the Society of Biblical Archeology.


From James L. Bowes, Esq.


From Prof. F. von Bradke.


From Prof. D. G. Brinton, M.D.

American Oriental Society.

From the Buddhist Text Society of India.
Brief summary of Do ka zang, the Sutra of the glorious age. By Sarat Chandra Das. Darjeeling, 1895. 8°.

From the Buffalo Historical Society.

From James Burgess, LL.D.
Six papers on oriental subjects, by James Burgess, LL.D. [Reprints from periodicals, 1890–95.] 8°.

From Mr. K. R. Cama.
The position of Zoroastrian women in remote antiquity as illustrated in the Avesta, the sacred books of the Parsees. By Darab Dastur Peeshotan Sanjana. Bombay, 1892. 8°.

From the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press.
The Jātaka; or, Stories of the Buddha’s former births. Translated from the Pāli by various hands under the editorship of Professor E. B. Cowell. Vol. i, ii. Cambridge, 1895. 8°.

Sacred Books of the East, edited by F. Max Müller:

From Mr. William E. Conzelman.
Additions to the Library.

From Prof. E. B. Cowell.


From Robert N. Cust, LL.D.

Essay on the ancient religions of the world before the great Anno Domini. Hertford, 1894. 8°.

From Mr. Ephraim Deinard.

Reise durch Europa. Von E. Deinard. Pressburg, 1886. 8°. [Hebrew.]
“War of the Lord against Amalek.” [Against the use of the Ethrog (orange) in the Feast of Tabernacles.] By E. Deinard. Newark, 1892. 16°. [Hebrew.]
[Future of Judaism.] By E. Deinard. Newark, 1895. 16°. [Hebrew.]

From Prof. August Dillmann.

Veteris Testamenti Aethiopici tomus quintus quo continenter libri apocryphi. Ad librorum MSS. fidem edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Dr. Augustus Dillmann. Berolini, 1894. 4°.

From Prof. A. H. Edgren.


From the Field Columbian Museum, Chicago.

Historical and descriptive account of the Field Columbian Museum. Chicago, 1894. 8°. (Pub. 1.)
Annual report of the director for the year 1894–95. Chicago, 1895. 8°. (Pub. 6.)

From Dr. H. Fritsche.


From the German Oriental Society.

American Oriental Society.

From the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.


The cause of the riots in the Yangtse valley: a "complete picture gallery" [containing a reproduction and translation of the Kin t'un sheng yü p'ah sie ts'üan hwa]. Hankow, 1891. 4°.

From Prof. Ignazio Guidi.

Proverbi, stoffe e racconti abissini, tradotti e pubblicati da Ignazio Guidi. Roma 1894. 8°.

From Prof. Ch. de Harlez.

Le livre des esprits et des immortels. Essai de mythologie Chinoise d'après les textes originaux, par Ch. de Harlez. Bruxelles, 1893. 4°.
La religion et les cérémonies impériales de la Chine moderne d’après le cérémonial et les décrets officiels, par Ch. de Harlez. Paris, 1894. 4°.

From the Rev. Henri Havret, S. J.


From Her Majesty’s Secretary of State for India.

Archaeological Survey of India:

The Moghul architecture of Fathpur-Sikri, described and illustrated by Edmund W. Smith. Pt. i. Allahabad, 1894. 4°.
List of architectural and archaeological remains in Coorg, compiled by Alex. Rea. Madras, 1894. 4°.
South Indian Buddhist antiquities; including the stūpas of Bhattiprōju Guḍi-vāḍa and Ghanṭāsālā. By Alex. Rea. Madras, 1894. 8°.
Progress report of the Archaeological Survey of Western India, May, 1893, to April, 1894. 1°.
Discovery of the exact site of Asoka’s classic capital of Pāṭaliputra, the Pālībothra of the Greeks, and description of the superficial remains. By L. A. Waddell-Calcutta, 1892. 4°.
Additions to the Library.

List of photographic negatives belonging to the India office. 1894. 1°.


Report on publications issued and registered in the several provinces of British India during 1892, 1893, 1894. Calcutta, 1893–95. 1°.

Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. existing in Oudh province for the year 1889, 1890. Allahabad, 1893. 8°.


From the Italian Asiatic Society.


From His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir.


From the Trustees of the Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy Translation Fund.


From Johns Hopkins University.

Plaster cast of the Chaldean flood tablet.

From Rev. Samuel H. Kellogg, D.D., LL.D.

American Oriental Society.

From the University of Kiel.


From Mr. George Alexander Kohut.


Tributes to the memory of Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut. Published by Congregation Ahawath Chesed. New York, 1894. 8°.


From Prof. E. Kahn.


From Prof. Charles R. Lanman.


India proof impression of the portrait of Prof. W. D. Whitney, engraved on wood by G. Kruell.


From Prof. Anton Marty.


From Mr. Jivanji Jamshedji Modi.

Modi, J. J. Astoldān, and recorded instances of children having been nourished by wolves and birds of prey. Bombay, 1889. 8°.


———The funeral ceremonies of the Parsees, their origin and explanation. Bombay, 1892. 8°.
Additions to the Library.


From Mr. Alfred B. Moldenke,


From Prof. F. Max Müller.

Rig-veda-saṁhitā: the sacred hymns of the Brâhmans, together with the commentary of Sāyaṇâkârîya. Edited by F. Max Müller. 2d ed. London, 1890. 4 v. 4°.
Address delivered at the opening of the ninth International Congress of Orientalists, London, Sept. 5, 1892, by Frederick Max Müller, President of the Congress. Oxford, 1892. 8°.
An offering of sincere gratitude to my many friends and fellow-labourers for their good wishes on the first of September, 1893, the fiftieth anniversary of my receiving the Doctor’s degree in the University of Leipzig. [Catalogue of the principal works published by Prof. F. Max Müller, etc.] Oxford. 8°.

From the Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, Munich.


From Prof. Eberhard Nestle.


From the Neuchatel Geographical Society.


From l’École des langues orientales vivantes, Paris.

American Oriental Society.

v. 9, Histoire du sultan Djelâl ed-dîn Mankobîti prince du Khâreszm par Moham-
Ouvrage traduit du chinois pour la première fois et annoté par Abel Des
v. 12, Cent-dix lettres grecques de François Filète publiées intégralement pour la
première fois d'après le Codex Trivulzianus 873 avec traduction, notes et com-
mentaires par Émile Legrand. Paris, 1892. 8°.
v. 13, Description topographique et historique de Boukhara par Mohammed Ner-
chakhy, suivie de textes relatifs à la Transoxiane. Texte persan publié par
v. 15, Les Français dans l'Inde, Dupleix et Labourdonnais. Extraits du journal
Paris, 1894. 8°.
v. 16, Zoubdat Kâchâl-Mamâlik. Tableau politique et administratif de l'Égypte,
de la Syrie et du Hîджîz sous la domination des sultans mamloûks du 13e au
15e siècle par Khalîl ed-Dîâhîry. Texte arabe publié par Paul Ravaisse. Paris,
1894. 8°.
v. 18, 19, Bibliographie coréenne. Tableau littéraire de la Corée, contenant la
nomenclature des ouvrages publiés dans ce pays jusqu'en 1890, ainsi que la
description et l'analyse détaillées des principaux d'entre ces ouvrages, par Ma-
Centenaire de l'École des langues orientales vivantes. 1795–1895. Recueil de

From the Musée Guimet, Paris.
94. 4°.
Catalogue du Musée Guimet. 1re partie: Inde, Chine et Japon. Par L. de
Milloué. nouv. éd. Lyon, 1883. 16°.
Introduction au catalogue du Musée Guimet. Aperçu sommaire de l'histoire des
Congrès provincial des orientalistes. Compte rendu de la 3e session, Lyon, 1878.
Lyon, 1880. 2v. 4°.

Arabic chrestomathy in Hebrew characters, with a glossary. Edited by Hartwig
Hirschfeld, Ph.D. London, 1892. 8°.

From the Wolf Peiser Verlag, Berlin.
Die Hethitischen Inschriften. Ein Versuch ihrer Entzifferung nebst einer das
weitere Studium vorbereitenden, methodisch geordneten Ausgabe. Von F. R.
Peiser. Berlin, 1892. sm. 4°.
Additions to the Library.

From Rev. S. D. Feet.
The American Antiquarian. Vol. xv. 2-6, xvi, xvii, xviii, 1. Chicago and Good Hope, Ill., 1893-95. 8°.

From the Peking Oriental Society.

From Mr. Jeejeebhoy Framjee Petit.
The Dinh-i-Mahno-l-Khrat; or, The religious decisions of the spirit of wisdom. The Pahlavi text, edited with an introduction, etc., by Darab Dastur Peahotan Sanjana. Bombay, 1895. 8°.

From the Oriental Club of Philadelphia.

From His Highness Prince Philip of Saxe Coburg and Gotha.

From Mr. P. L. Armand de Potter.
The Egyptian pantheon: an explanatory catalogue of Egyptian antiquities collected and classified with especial reference to the religion and funerary rites of ancient Egypt, by Armand de Potter. New York. 8°.

From Prof. Francesco L. Pullé.

From the Geographical Society of Quebec.

From the Geographische Verlagshandlung Dietrich Reimer, Berlin.

From the National Museum of Rio de Janeiro.
Archivos do Museu Nacional do Rio de Janeiro. Vol. viii. Rio de Janeiro, 1892. 4°
A scroll of the law, supposed to have been written by Maimonides. Explanations by Dr. S. Roubin. San Francisco, n. d. 8°.

From Pratápa Chandra Roy and Sundari Bala Roy.

From the Imperial Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg.

From the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society, St. Petersburg.

From Mr. Darab Dastur Peshoton Sanjana.
The Pahlavi text of the Ntrangistan, wanting in the Indian MSS. and found in the Iranian copy TD. By D. D. P. Sanjana. Bombay, 1894. 8°.

From the Royal Saxon Society of Sciences.
Abhandlungen der phrilogisch-historischen Classe der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Bd. xiii. 4-7, xiv, xv, xvii. 1. Leipzig, 1892-95. 4°.
Additions to the Library.

From His Majesty the King of Siam.

From the Smithsonian Institution.
Account of the Smithsonian Institution; its origin, history and achievements. Washington, 1895. 8°.
Exhibit of the Smithsonian Institution at the Cotton States Exposition, Atlanta, 1895. Washington, 1895. 8°.
List of the publications of the Bureau of Ethnology with index to authors and subjects. By F. W. Hodge. Washington, 1894. 8°.

From the Editor, Maj. Richard C. Temple.

From Prof. Vilhelm Thomsen.
American Oriental Society.

From the United States Geological Survey.


From the United States Bureau of Education.


From the Imperial Academy of Sciences, Vienna.

Register zu Bd. cxxi-cxxx. Wien, 1894. 8°.

From the Geographical Society, Vienna.


From Prof. Albrecht Weber.


From the Family of Prof. William Dwight Whitney.

Additions to the Library.


Bartholomae, C. Das altiranische Verbum in Formenlehre und Syntax. München, 1878. 8°.

—— Die Gādā’s und heiligen Gebete des altiranischen Volkes. (Metrum, Text, Grammatik und Wortverzeichniss.) Halle, 1879. 8°.

—— Studien zur indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte. Halle, 1891. 2 Heft. 8°.


—— Weitere Beiträge zur Erklärung des Zend. Göttingen, 1852-53. 16°.


—— Ein erster Versuch ueber den Accent im Sanskrit. St. Petersbourg, 1843. 4°. [Bound with the above.]

—— Die Upādī-Affixe. St. Petersbourg, 1844. 4°. [Bound with the above.]


Davids, A. L. A grammar of the Turkish language. London, 1832. 4°.

Introduction to the study of language. Leipzig, 1882. 8°. [Bibliothek
Indogermanischer Grammatiken, Band 4.]

Dīpavamṣa: an ancient Buddhist historical record. Edited and translated by H.
Oldenberg. London [Berlin], 1879. 8°.


Fick, August. Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen. 3.
Auflage. Göttingen, 1874–76. 4 v. in 3. 8°.


Appendice aux Rudimens... contenant... des lettres hindoustanî
goûnales, accompagnées d’une traduction et de fac-simile. Paris, 1833. 4°.

[Bound with the above.]


Über die Metrik des jüngeren Avesta. Tübingen, 1877. 8°.


—Scriptorum Arabum de rebus Indicis loci et opuscula inedita. Recensuit et

Green, William Henry, A grammar of the Hebrew language. 2d ed. New
York, 1861. 8°.

Hall, Fitzedward. A contribution towards an index to the bibliography of the
Indian philosophical systems. Calcutta, 1859. 8°.

Leipzig, 1874. 8°.

Hayden, F. V. Contributions to the ethnography and philology of the Indian
tribes of the Missouri valley. Philadelphia, 1862. 4°.

Hemacandra. Grammatik der Prákritsprachen. Herausgegeben, überarbeitet und

Hiltebrandt, Alfred. Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondopfer in seiner einfache-
sten Form. Jena, 1880. 8°.


Hitzopadesa. The 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th books: containing the Sanskrit text, with

Hoffmann, J. J. Japanese–English dictionary according to the annotations of J.
3 [B.] Leyden, 1892. 8°.

Strassburg, 1879. 8°.

—Grammatisches aus dem Mahābhārata. Leipzig, 1884. 8°. [Bibliothek
Indogermanischer Grammatiken, Band 2, Anhang 1.]


Īgwarā Krishna. The Sankhya Kārikā; or, Memorial verses on the Sānkhya
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