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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 storytellers of the Brähmanas. 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 Sāyaṇa, 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 stanza 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 discussion 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 Catapatha-Brähmana, 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 persona, without attempting any naturalistic explanation 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 narrated by the poet. Certain points in Pischel's exposition of the hymn have been criticized by Ludwig in his essay Über Methode bei Interpretation des Rig-Veda, pp. 30, 60; he does not, however, 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 Götter, pp. 277 ff., has defended anew Roth's emendation, and has added points of view in support of his interpretation. He, however, also fails to show who the eagle is, and wherein is to be found the naturalistic basis for the entire myth. Finally, Regnaud in a still more recent volume, entitled Le Rig-Veda et les origines de la mythologie indo-européenne, pp. 298 ff., has subjected 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-faced 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. gyenō 'si gāyatrāchandō ānu tvā rabhe: svasti mā sāṁ vahā 'syā yajñasyo 'dṛ' ci svāhā. 2. rāhūr asī jāgucchandō ānu tvā rabhe: svasti etc. 3. vrśā 'si triṣṭāpchandō ānu tvā rabhe: svasti 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 Rbhu, thy metre is the jagatī, thee I take' hold of, etc. 3. Thou art a bull, thy metre is the triṣṭubh, thee I take hold of, etc.'

The style of the passage and the expression yajñasya uddy (cf. VS. iv. 9, 10; CB. iii. 1. 1. 12; xiv. 1. 1. 4; AQS. iv. 2. 8) point to the grāuta-ceremonial for its explanation. Accordingly passages which correspond more or less closely occur extensively in the grāuta-literature. Thus, at TS. iii. 2. 1. 1. we have: gyenō 'si gāyatrāchandō ānu tvā' rabhe svasti mā sāṁ pāraya; suparnō 'si triṣṭāpchandō ānu, etc.; sāghā 'si jāgucchandō anu, etc. The passage is quoted with the words gyno 'si gāyatrāchandāh in Ap. Čr. xii. 17. 15. At CB. xii. 3. 4. 3–5; KČS. xiii. 1. 11, we have the same formulas with the variant rāhūr asī for sāghā 'si in the third. At GB. i. 5. 12–14 the same formulas with samrād asī for suparnō 'si, and svaro 'si ganyo 'si (like PB. below) for

---

saghā 'si. At ČQS. vi. 8, 10–12, we have: āya

trachandā anvā tvā "rābhē svastī mā sam ār̥ṣa tvā 'syā yujñasyo'
dream; suparno 'si patōa tristupchandā' sakā 'si patōa

jagacchandā. At PB. i. 3, 5; 5. 12, 15 we have: āya 'si
gyātrachandā anvā tvā "rābhē, etc.; vṛṣaka 'si tristupchandā,' etc.;
svāro 'si gayō 'si jagacchandā, etc.: cf. also ČQS. i. 12
i. 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 question (vi. 48) is employed in the Vāit. Sū. 17, 10; 21.

As in the same occasions: stanzas 1 at the prātah-savāna;
st. 4 in the mādhyaśālā; st. 2 at the trīyā-savāna. This

avoids perfectly with ČB. iv. 2. 5, 20: gyātrā vā prātah-savā-

na; mādhāti, trīyā mādhyaśālānām savānām, jagaṭi trīyā-
savānām. Very much the same statements occur at TS. ii. 2. 9
5, 6; TB. i. 8, 8, 3; ČB. iv. 3. 2, 9; AB. iii. 12, 3–5; PB. vi. 3
11; Vāit. 19. 16, 17; ČQS. xiii. 5. 4–6; xiv. 33, 7, 10, 13; ČKS.
xxv. 14. 16, 17; Chānd. Up. iii. 16. 1, 3, 5; Sāyana to RV. i.
164. 23; Agniśāmin to ČQS. i. 5. 5, and elsewhere.‡

Furthermore, this distribution of the metres among the three 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

trīyā-savāna, is addressed to the Rbhus, who are sharers in it

and Indra at all periods of early ritualistic practice.† The

scholiast at ČKS. xii. 6. 4: ār̥ṣavatām iti trīyā-savānāpavamā-
nam ucyate 'the pavamāna stotra at the third pressure is said
to belong to the Rbhus.' Similarly the scholiast at ČB. x. 1. 2. 7:

* The connection of the eagle and the gyātrā-metre appears also at

VS. xii. 4: suparno 'si garūtmānas triyō te cīrō gyātrām ca sa kauy,
etc.

‡ The employment of the entire hymn at Kāuč. 56. 4; 59. 27 is more

secondary; it is recited at the initiation of the brahma-cārīn and at the

consecration for the Soma-sacrifice (dīkṣā). See especially 59. 27: ...

dīksitasya vā brahma-cārinā vā daṇḍapradānam. 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 rājasthāya, also a ceremony of consecration, the king is commended
to the care of the metres: see TS. i. 8. 13. 1; VS. x. 10–14; ČB. v. 4.
1. 3 ff.

† I would not pass without notice the frequent connection in the

ritual of the Ādīyas and Sūrya with the evening pressure; see e. g.

ČB. xii. 3. 4. 1; GB. i. 4. 7, 8; 5. 11; Āp. Čr. xii. 11. 1; ČQS. xiv. 33.
14; AB. ii. 32. 1; Nirukta vii. 10: cf. Bergaigne, l. c. p. 171. The

jagati metre elsewhere also is associated with the Ādīyas and the sun;
e. g. ČB. x. 3. 2, 6; TA. iv. 6. 1. At PB. i. 5. 15, where the formula is

svāro 'si gayō 'si jagacchandā, etc., the commentator also ascribes

the ceremony to Sūrya: he ār̥ṣavatā-pavamāna-bhimānānī śūrya tvaṁ

jagacchandā. Similarly the Rudras, Indra's companions, are

frequently associated with the noon pressure and the trīṣṭubh, e. g. Āp.
Čr. xiii. 2. 8; xiv. 20. 7.
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The tṛtiyasavaṇe saṃpadaćacotriyūtmakah ārabhavaḥ pavamānāh. Cf. also AQS. v. 17. 1 ff.; GB. ii. 2. 22. This is represented in the RV. by passages like RV. iv. 35. 7, prātah satām apibo haryacca mādhyamindānaṁ sīvanaṁ kēvalam teśa: sām yāḥbhīḥ pībasasvā ratnadhēbhīḥ sākhyār yān indra cakrix suktiryā '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. 35. 4, pibatu vajā rīhano dādevo māhi tṛtiyatī sīvanaṁ mian sīvana duṭhīta. So also RV. iv. 34. 5; TS. iii. 1. 9. 2; Ved. Wig., Rīg Veda, i. 384; Bergaigne i. c. pp. 11 and 188. We have therefore for the second stanza of the hymn the following obvious conditions: it is recited at the tṛtiyasavana, it is addressed to the Rbhus, and the Rbhus are connected with the jagāti-metre because the jagāti-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 mādhyamindāna. 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 Sūtras frequently present the same statement: e. g. CB. ii. 4. 4. 12; AB. ii. 32. 1; GB. ii. 2. 21. The appearance of the Rudras at the mādhyamindāna, e. g. CB. xii. 3. 4. 1; GB. i. 4. 7, 8; 5. 11; ČCS. 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, mādhyamindāne sīvanē vajrahastu pibā rudrēbhīḥ sīvanē suṣṭeṇa. That the tristubh 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; xxix. 60; MS. iii. 7. 3; Kāth. xxiii. 10; ČB. 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; ČB. iv. 3. 2. 8 we have the explicit statement that the tristubh is the metre of the noon-pressure, and at Nir. vii. 10 Indra is mentioned along with these.

* Cf. CB. 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 tṛtiyasavana, in the middle between those of the prātahsavana and the mādhyamindāna. 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 jagāti-metre in the third, not in the second place. I make no doubt that the fault is with the diakēhasts of the Čāuṇaka-version of the AV.: the critical Atharvan 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 Saṁhitā.
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 *vrśa*\(^*\) 'bull,' and it is connected with the *triṣṭuḥh*, the prevailing metre of the midday 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 midday 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 Brāhmaṇa the legend of Soma and the eagle appears very consistently in a version which substitutes the *gāyatīrī* 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 Rāis 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 (*swarna*), flew up, the knowers of legends designate (this event) as the bird-legend (*swarna*). 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 *triṣṭuḥh* flew up. In flying up, after having gone more than half way, she became tired. . . . The gods said to the *gāyatīrī*: "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. . . . Krṣānu, a guardian of the Soma, discharging (an arrow) after her, cut off a talon of her left foot. . . . What (the *gāyatīrī*) seized with her right foot, that became the morning pressure (*prātahāsavana*). . . . What she seized with her left foot became the noon pressure (*mādhyaśāvanā*). . . . What she seized became the third pressure (*triṣṭuḥ savanā*). . . .

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 *gāyatīrī*. Thus, at CB. i. 8. 2. 10, *tad vāi kariṣṭhauṁ chandah sad gāyatī prathamā chandasūṁ yujyate tad u tad viryentī\(^*\)ca yac chyono bhūtvā dīvah somāṁ áharaṅ

\(^*\) *Vṛṣaka* at PB. i. 5. 12; LŚS. ii. 1. 5. The commentator at PB. glosses the word by *indralḥ*, as does also Sāyana 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; CB. iii. 4. 1. 12, gyeṇīya tvā somabhṛte visnave tvā 'ti,* tad gāyatrīm anvābhajati sā yad gāyatrī gyeno bhūtvā dīvah somam āharat tena sā gyenaḥ somabhṛt 'In uttering the formula: “Thee for the Soma-bearing eagle! thee for Viṣṇu!” thereby he assigns to the gāyatrī her share. Because the gāyatrī, having become an eagle, carried off Soma from heaven, therefore she is the Soma-bearing eagle.' Similarly iii. 9. 4. 10, gyeṇīya tvā somabhṛta iva, tad gāyatrīyā māmīte 'gnaye tvā rayasposada ity agnir vāi gāyatrī tad gāyatrīyā māmīte sa yad gāyatrī gyeno bhūtvā dīvah somam āharat tena sā gyenaḥ somabhṛt ‘Thee for the Soma-bearing eagle!’ this he measures out for the gāyatrī. "Thee for Agni, the bestower of growth of wealth!” Now Agni is the gāyatrī; he measures this out for the gāyatrī. And since the gāyatrī, having turned eagle, fetched Soma from heaven, therefore she is the Soma-bearing eagle.' This passage is of special interest as it mentions Agni distinctly as equal to the gāyatrī and the eagle; it contains in itself, as we shall see, the key to the entire legend. At CB. iv. 3. 2. 7 we have: 'In the beginning the metres consisted of four syllables. Then the jāgati flew up for Soma, and came back leaving three syllables. Then the triśūbad flew up for Soma, and came back leaving behind one syllable. Then the gāyatrī 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 CB. i. 7. 1. 1 we have: yatra vāi gāyatrī somam achā ’patat tad asyā āharantyā apūd astaḥ bhūyāyatya parṇam prachiṣṭedā gāyatrīyā va somasya va rajñas tat putātvā parṇo bhavat ‘When the gāyatrī flew towards Soma, a footless archer, aiming at her while she was carrying him off, severed one of the feathers (parṇa) either of the gāyatrī or of king Soma; this falling down became a parṇa-tree.’ Cf. also Mahādharā 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): triyasyām iito divi soma aśit, tāv gāyatrī aḥharat, tasya parṇam achiḍaṭa, tat parṇo bhavat ‘In the third heaven from here dwelt Soma; him the gāyatrī stole. Of him a feather (parṇa) was cut off; that became a parṇa-tree.’ And at CB. xi. 7. 2. 8, divi vāi soma aśit tāv gāyatrī vayo bhūtvā ’harat. Also PB. ix. 5. 4 tells the story in a condensed form. And in Ap. Čr. i. 6. 8 we have the statement triyasyāī āviu gāyatriyā soma abhṛtaḥ.

The same ākhyāna 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. Kadrū has told me: ‘In the third heaven from here is Soma; steal him and ransom yourself with him.’” The ājāti, consisting of fourteen syllables, flew up; she returned without having obtained him; of her two syllables were wanting. . . . The tristūbh, consisting of thirteen syllables, flew up; she returned without having obtained him; of her two syllables were wanting . . . The gāyatri, 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: ‘Kadrū is this (earth); Suparnī is Vīk (the voice); the metres gāyati, tristūbh, and ājāti are the children of Suparnī. Kadrū conquered Suparnī, her person; she said: “Bring the Soma; with him ransom yourself.” She (Suparnī) sent the metres, saying: “Bring the Soma from yonnder (heaven); with him ransom me.” Then the ājāti flew up; she came with the cattle and the daksīna. . . . Then the tristūbh flew up; she came with the daksīna and tapas. . . . Then the gāyatri 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 CB. iii. 6. 2. 2 ff. and iii. 2. 4. 1 ff. This version is at the base also of the later forms of the legend, as presented by the Suparnakhyāna, 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 gāyatri with the eagle does not belong to the ephemeral clap-trap of the Brāhmaṇas is very evident from the cumulative force of this testimony. There can be no doubt that we have here a version of the Suparnakhyāna 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 Brāhmaṇas 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 Čuṣṇa. Čuṣṇa, namely, carried it in his mouth. Those of the gods who died, they remained just so; those of the Asuras (who died) Čuṣṇa breathed upon with the amṛta; they revived. Indra perceived: “With the Asuras, with the demon Čuṣṇa, is the amṛta.” He, having changed himself into a lump of honey, lay upon the way; this Čuṣṇa 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. 48. 7, Indra pibam vaṣadhitasya vaṣṇa a yāten te.
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Or RV. i. 80. 2, sā tvā mañad vy’sā madah somāh vyenabhīratah sutāh; yēna vytrāni nir adhyā yajñānta. At iv. 18. 13, Indra himself acknowledges that the eagle brought the Soma to him: ādha me vyenā mādhaḥ ā jahūraḥ: cf. also the passages below, p. 14. The last legend can therefore be nothing more than one of those secondary tentative starts of the story upon a new line of development which lie in the nature of these plastic materials; this frequently obscures the true view of a legend much more seriously than is the case in this instance. In this instance the close relation in general which exists between Indra and Soma, combined with the constantly vaunted warlike prowess of the former, renders it a priori likely that the honor of having captured the Soma—which he is constantly drinking—should also be ascribed to Indra. Thus may have resulted the sporadic identification of Indra also with the eagle which is perhaps faintly supported even in the RV. by such a passage as x. 90. 8: cf. Bergaigne, l. c. ii. 174. I have dwelt upon this form of the legend with some emphasis, because Kuhn, Herabkunft des Feuers, p. 146, bases upon it the entire interpretation of the myth, leaving out of sight the fact that in this story the amṛta and not the Soma is captured by Indra, there being no direct mention of Soma at all.

In stanza 2 of AV. vi. 48 we have the Rāhus, whose metre is the jagati, addressed at the evening-pressure; in st. 3, Indra, whose metre is the tristubh, addressed at the noon-pressure. Who then is the eagle or the gāyatrī addressed at the morning pressure? The texts themselves permit of no doubt. At CB. iii. 9. 4. 10 we have the distinct statement that Agni is the gāyatrī, and that the gāyatrī changed into the eagle. The identification of Agni and the gāyatrī extends through the entire mantra and brāhmaṇa literature. Thus the statement agner gāyatry abhavat occurs at RV. x. 130. 4; the expression gāyatrī vā agnih occurs at CB. i. 8. 2. 13; gāyatro vā agnih at KB. iii. 2; gāyatro gniḥ at MS. i. 6. 8 (99.4); i. 7. 4 (113.7); i. 9. 5 (136.4); VS. xxix. 60; CB. vi. 1. 3. 19; 2. 1. 22; ix. 4. 3. 6; TS. ii. 2. 5; iii. 5. 4. 4; vii. 5. 14. 1; TB. i. 1. 5. 3;* 6. 1. 11; LQS. iii. 12. 3; KB. i. 1; iii. 2; agnir vā gāyatrī at CB. iii. 4. 1. 9; the statement gāyatram agneḥ chandah, or something similar, at MS. i. 6. 10 (102. 3); ii. 8. 11 (115. 9); CB. ii. 2. 1. 17; AB. i. 1. 8; iv. 29. 1; ACS. iv. 12. 1; vi. 5. 2. 7. The gāyatrī is connected with fire directly or indirectly at TS. i. 8. 13. 1; vii. 1. 1. 4; VS. viii. 47; xxix. 60; GB. ii. 6. 6; PB. vii. 8. 4; viii. 8. 3; CB. i. 3. 4. 6; iv. 3. 2. 10; x. 3. 2. 1; ÇCS. vi. 4. 11; TA. iv. 6. 1; Māit. Up. vii. 1; Nir. vii. 8. Still more secondarily at RV. i. 164. 25 (cf. Sāyana), where its three pādas are compared with the samidh, the kindling-wood. Similarly the Vasus, whose

* The commentator on this passage says: agner mukhadatvena gāyatrisambandhitvam.
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 (50. 13); TS. iii. 3. 3. 1; TB. ii. 7. 15. 5; iii. 9. 4. 6; PB. vi. 6. 7; GB. ii. 2. 9; ČCS. xiv. 33. 8; Chând. Up. iii. 16. 1; Vāit. 15. 3; LČS. iii. 12. 8; AGS. i. 24. 15; Ap. Čr. xii. 8. 1; 17. 4.

Further, Agni and the gāyatrī, or either of them, are the divinities regularly invoked at the prātahsavāna. Thus RV. iii. 28. 1, āgne jūsava no hotaḥ purulåśau jātaveduh prātah-
śīve dhiyåvaso; AV. vi. 47. 1 = TS. iii. 1. 9. 1 = MS. i. 3. 36, agniḥ prātahsavānaḥ pītv avasat; ČB. ii. 4. 4. 12, ṛgneyam hi prātahsavānam; AB. ii. 32. 1, bhūr agnir jyotir jyotir ugniḥ it prātahsavānasya cakvān. So also GB. ii. 3. 10, 11. The Vasus, who are identified with Agni in TB. i. 9. 3, or are regarded as the companions of Agni (cf. Ind. Stud. v. 240), are substituted at ČB. xii. 3. 4. 1; TB. i. 5. 11. 3; GB. i. 4. 7. 8; 5. 11; Ap. Čr. xiv. 20. 7; Nṛṣ. Tāp. Up. i. 2. 1. Both Agni (or the Vasus) and the gāyatrī are mentioned in connection with the prātahsavānan at ČCS. xiv. 33. 7. 8; Chând. Up. iii. 16. 1; Nir. vii. 8. The gāyatrī by itself is correlated with the prātahsavāna in AB. iii. 27. 1; PB. vii. 4. 6; viii. 4. 2; ČB. iv. 3. 2. 8; ČCS. xxv. 14, 16; ČCS. xiii. 5. 4: cf. also Weber, Ind. Stud. viii. 24. 32 ff., and Bergaignel. c. pp. 166, 196. All this, combined with the fact that the stanza AV. vi. 47. 1, agnih prātahsavānāḥ pītv avasat, is employed at Vāit. 21. 7 along with AV. vi. 48. 1 in the same invocation (to Agni), renders it certain that the āyena, the eagle, of the first stanza of our hymn is identical with Agni in the Atharvan and in the Yajus-sāṁhitās; 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: nāvam niyām agnaye divāh āyena jñanam 'A new song of praise I have now produced for Agni, the eagle of heaven.' The expression divāh āyena 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 vāidyutah (TB. iii. 10. 5. 1), which shoots down from the cloud: cf. RV. vi. 16. 35, gārbe māṭāḥ pitarś pitarś vāidyutānāḥ aksarē. The gāyatrī also, which we have seen is a personification of Agni, takes the epithet vāidyutatā in PB. xii. 1. 2, just as the verb vāidyota is employed with vāidyut in RV. vi. 3. 8; x. 95. 10. At VS. xxxviii. 18; TA. iv. 11. 1, the gāyatrī is endowed with āyā śuk 'heavenly light.' Among the eight kāthakām which occur at the end of the first chapter of the kāṇḍānakrama of the Ātreya-branch of the Black Yajur-Veda (see Ind. Stud. iii. 376,

*The commentator glosses: gāyatrī ca agnīnā sahotpatte tejorupatvātipyamānā bhavati, ataḥ gābhasāmānyena vāidyutatīcābdena gāyatrī eva pasthayate; cf. also PB. vi. 9. 25.
452; xii. 352) occur certain īṣṭi designated as divahcyenestyayaḥ. They are the sixth of the list of eight, and are preceded by five methods of building the fire-altar (cītī). Cf. also the seventh ādīka of the second chapter of the same anukrama. At TB. iii. 12. 1 and 2, the divahcyena īṣṭi is described, and the two opening mantras are addressed distinctly to Agni: sūbhayaṁ tā aṅgiras-yaṁ (RV. viii. 43. 18; VS. xii. 116; TS. i. 3. 14. 3), and aṣ- yāma taṁ kūmaṁ 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), divaṁ suparnaṁ vayaṁ brhīn- tam apāṁ gārdhāṁ darçatam ṣaḍāṁ; x. 114. 5, suparnaṁ viprīṁ kavayaṁ vācōbhīr ēkāṁ sīntant bahudhā kalpayanti: 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 soma.* Soma is in the highest heaven, as is stated, distinctly at RV. iii. 32. 10, param āydmānaḥ; at iv. 26. 6, divaḥ . . . ātārāṇ; at TS. vi. 1. 6. 1, eṣṭiṣasyaṁ iti dīvi sōmaḥ: cf. also TB. i. 1. 3. 10; iii. 2. 1. 1; Kāṭh. xxiii. 10 (Ind. Stud. viii. 32), etc. In the Suparnākhyāna 12. 1 we have the statement indraṣya somaṁ nihitaṁ guhāyaṁ śrīyaṁ prīthiḥ rajasa vimuṇāt: nihataṁ rajasas taraṇa pramudyaḥ harisyanti . . . īndum (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 ēvaśeṣaṁ prīthiṁ dīraṁ ca saṁnādayann eti nabhō dhīṣa ca. The root nāḍ 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, OST. 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. 34, soma rājaṁ ṛtyaṁ sutalī, ‘king Soma when pressed becomes amṛta; CB. ix. 5. 1. 8, tād yat tad amṛtaṁ somaṁ saṁ ‘that which is amṛta, that is Soma.’ The connection between soma and rain appears perhaps at TS. ii. 4. 9. 2, sāmyā khalu vā āhutir vṛṣṭiṁ cyā- vayati.

† 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 dvandva-devatā.
placed together: à 'nyau diivō mātariyāvā juhārā 'mathnād anyām pāri cyenu udreh 'One (the fire) Mātariyāvan did bring from heaven, the other (the Soma) the eagle (the lightning) snatched from the cloud.' Similarly we have RV. vi. 20. 6, páh cyenu nā madirām aśiśām asmāi śīrō dāsīśya nāmīcēr mathāyān 'churning for him the head of the demon Nāmuci, 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 pāvate yēn dibis pāri cyenu mathāyād isītās tīrō rājāh '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 cyenayāga, without offering anything to explain it. The treatment of the word in the lexicons is based solely upon Colebrooke's report. At Kīng, 43. 3 occurs according to the MSS. the following unintelligible text: ati dhanvēnī ty avasāna nivēcana anicaraṇāni nayanejyā. This has been emended in our edition by assuming haplography, so as to read . . . avasāna nivēcana anicaraṇāni nivēcana nayanejyā '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 Dārila's commentary, the Atharva-paddhati, and Keśava's Paddhati, the basis of this translation may be easily recognized. Another emendation, avasāna nivēcana anicaraṇāni nivēcana nivēcana nivēcana nayanejyā, may do even better justice to the translation presented above. But all the commentaries agree in designating the performance as cyenayāga or cyenayāga. Thus, e. g., most clearly the Atharva-paddhati: atha bhāc-chālā-karma ucyate, ati dhanvēnī ty udāpātram abhimanytra bhūmāh nīnayati, yatra gṛhaḥ kariṣyati tatra vighnaṁ ṣamayati, cyenadevātāpākayājñāvaṁdūnena 'jyābhāgaṁtaṁ kṛtvā . . . caruṁ juhoti, bhūmiśṭhūne yatra gṛhaḥ kariṣyati, athavā nahe gṛhe cyenayāgaḥ kartavyah. 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 rauschtrank, riss ab das haupt er Namutschi des dämons." The mis-rendering of nā is especially apparent. Ludwig's translation (544) is by far a nearer approach to the meaning of the passage.
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ājyatantra customary in many ceremonies of the Kāuṭika has been performed. It is striking that the text of the Kāuṭika does not present the word çyeṇa at all. If we regard the last syllables of the undoubtedly corrupt sūtra, namely nejya, the suspicion that the syllable çye has fallen out is hardly to be suppressed. Possibly then, once more, the sūtra was ... anavaśāniveçana-anuvaraṇa-anivayanaṇaṇān çyeṇejya, 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 dhāvāny āty āpar tatarā çyenō nreksā avasinadarpāh: tāra naçivāna dvarā rājāniś ṛdhrenā sākhyā çivā ā jagnyātā. '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 āvetā suparnāḥ. But the epithet nreksāḥ points distinctly towards Agni (cf. Contributions, third series, J.A.O.S. xv. 170), and çivāḥ may also show us Agni on the way of development to the later Cīva. It would seem quite reasonable then to suppose that the entire çyenayāga 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 nreksāḥ and çivāḥ, 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 samproksanyāu (sc. rcīṇu): see Kāuṇ. 40. 9; 80. 42; 83. 17.* In 80. 42, the place of the funeral-fire is sprinkled while reciting the samproksanyāu, doubtless to render Agni harmless (civa). 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 çyenā 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 lighting, and Soma. Agni begins the story in the first stanza: gārbe na sān̄ na eva vaหมya na evānu ahūn devānām janimāṃ vīpū: ātām mā pūra ṣvaśīr arāksann ādha çyenō javāsā nir adīyaṃ.

*The hymn is rubricated also in the vāstu-gaṇa, or vāstospatīyānī (sc. sūktānī) of the Gaṇamālā, Ath. Pariç. 34. 5 : cf. Kāuṇ. 8. 23, note. The second stanza is cited in Vāit. 22. 23, and in the Črādhakalpa, Ath. Pariç. 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): "It 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 Brāhmans sing the praises of the āyātṛi for bringing the Soma, just so do the hymns extoll the eagle for the same feat. Thus RV. viii. 82. 9, 'yāṁ te āyenaḥ padā'ḥ bharat tirō réjānsy āśṛtam: pibā'd asya tvām īcise '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, yāṁ te āyenaḥ cārum avrōkām padā ḍharud arūmad mānām āndhasah, etc. Or ix. 68. 6, āyenaḥ yād āndho ā bharat parāvūtah: cf. x. 144. 4. Again, iii. 43. 7, 'indra pibā vrśadhūtasya vrśena ā yām te āyena ugaṭe jabhāra; iv. 18. 13, ādhā ma āyena mādho ā jabhāra. In the Yajus-savāṇhitas and the Brāhmans the adjective somadhṛt ‘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 aḍiyam to nir aḍiyat, does not lose sight of the separate individuality of the Soma and the eagle in his translation: ‘da plötzlich schwebt auf mich (sc. Soma) herein der Adler.’ Pischel indeed finds no
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 Sūparṇākhyāna 3. 2 as vidyān meghāsakha ‘the lightning whose companion is the cloud;’ or at AV i. 12. 1 and 3 as gāruṇyā ‘(cloud-) placenta-born’ and abhrūjā ‘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: gārbha mātāḥ pīṭāḥ pīṭā vididgyutinā aksāre: śidāṃ rāṣya yonīṃ ā.

The expressions gārbhe mātāḥ, rāṣya yonīṃ and vididgyutinā 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 expression 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 rāṣya yonī gārbhe sujātām; at RV i. 148. 5, in gārbhe sāntam (sc. agnīm); at RV viii. 43. 9, in agne . . . gārbhe sān jāyase pānāh. The stanza RV viii. 83. 8 is part of a hymn to the vīva devaḥ, and is addressed to the Maruts: prā bhrātrtvāṁ sudāmavō ‘dha dvātī samānyā: mātūr gārbhe bhavrūmahe. Ludwig (p. 233) translates: “unsere Bruderschaft, o trefflich begabte, die vor alters bestandene gemeinsamkeit, in der mutter leib, die tragen wir hier vor.” Grassmann translates: “wir tragen eure Bruderschaft gemeinsam, o schöngebende, 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 mātūr gārbhe seems to stand unsupported, and I do not see how the expression prā bhrātvāṁ . . . mātūr gārbhe bhavrūmahe 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: tāni (sc. vācain) gandharvō ‘caddad gārbhe antāḥ; 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 gārbhe is afforded by CB. xii. 4. 4. 4, a prāyaścittu-performance of one who has been burned by lightning: yasya vādhyuto daheh kim tatra karma kā prāyaścittir iti . . . yady u asya hrdayam vy eva likhchet ugnaye ’psunate astakapālam purṇaśaṁ niśārape (cf. Kûty. Cr. xxv. 4. 33) atathā ’te yājyaṁnīvākye: apsv agne sañhīs tava sitasādhir anuvadyase : gārbhe saññajyase 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 gārbhe.

The expression dve esām aśvau dhaṁ cāhāin devānāṁ jānimāṁ 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, nākīṁ indro nikartave nū pākrāṁ pāryakāvte: vīgvāṁ ērvōti pācyati, 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 . . . sa rājā vīgvā veda jānimā jātāvedah. The very same statement occurs at iii. 4. 10, sō d (sc. agnīh) u hōtā satyāuro yajāti yāthā devānāṁ jānimāṁ 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) akhyayā devānāṁ 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. 18), 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 prucetasah. At AV. ii. 28. 2 we have tād agnir hōtā vaṁśināṁ vidvān vipūvā devanāṁ jānīmāḥ viivakti ‘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: vidmā te agne tredāh janitram tredāh devanāṁ jānīmāṁ vidma; at AV. i. 8. 4, by still another simple modification, Agni is said to know the races of evil beings (yātudhāna, wizards), and to destroy them: yātriṣāṁ agne jānīmāṁ vēṭtha gūhā satām atrināṁ jētavedah: tāṁ svam... 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 while 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 javasā, which he regards on account of its accent (javas, not jávas) 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, mānojavā śayāmāna ṛyaśāṁ atarat pūram, ḍivāṁ supārṇō gatvāya sōmāṁ vajrīna abhārat ‘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 mānojavās evidently takes the place of javasā at iv. 27. 1 (cf. also mānojavas at iv. 26. 5); moreover, the expression abhārat vajrīne 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 javas te arvar niḥita gūhā yāḥ cyenē vīta utā yo ‘carat pārītah: tēna tvāṁ... ajen 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: javāḥ yāṁ te vājīn niḥita gūhā yāḥ cyenē pārītto ācaran ca vāte tēna no vājīn bāla vāla bāla vājaic ca bhava*... ; and Mahādhara unhesitatingly glosses: he vājīn āva yas te tava javo vegah gūhā gūhāyam hydayapradeчёт niḥita vasthāpitah... cyene cyenākkhe paksini yo jayāh parītah tvayāi ‘va paridat-

*Variants in the Kāṇva school x. 12... parīto... vājaic caśi-
dhi... VOL. XVI. 3
tah san acarat curati pravartate yug ca te jayah paridattah san vate acarat vinyan curati, etc. There can be no doubt therefore that javas, masculine, is employed as an abstract, just like javas, neuter, e. g. in the expression gyeñasya jivasā at RV. i. 118. 11; v. 78. 4. He whose grammatical conscience is afflicted by the undoubted fact that of oxytone and barytone complets the former are regularly nouns of agency and the latter nouns of action (apās 'active'; apas 'work'; svaroḥs : svaroṣ) may resort to a correction of the accent. But I question whether we are justified in 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 jayas, dohas, etc. (Whitney, ib. § 973 a).* The expression gatām nā pura ḍyasīr arakṣan 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 implored 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 nāmān nā stomaṁ agniye divōṁ gyeñasya jīvanam; this has been commented upon above. In stanza 14 of the same hymn we have the prayer addressed to Agni: ādhā mahi na ḍyasī ... phir bhavan gatābhayāḥ 'then be thou for us a brazen castle with a hundred enclosures; at vii. 16. 10, tāṁ ānhasah piṃkha ... tvāṁ gatām pūrbhīḥ; at vii. 3. 7, āgne ... gatāṁ pūrbhāryaśīhīr nī pāki; at i. 58. 8, āgne gṛnāntam ānhasa utyasa ... pūrbhār ḍyasābhīḥ; at vi. 48. 8, gatām pūrbhāryaśīhāha pākya 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 ghaśa māṁ āpa yosāṁ jahūrāḥ 'bhāṁ āsa tvākṣasā vīryena: śravā pūrṇāntā jahūāḥ árāṁ uta vatiṁ atarca chāgaśīnaḥ 'Not indeed with ease did he carry me off; he was superior in strength and heroism. The liberal one left at a distance the Arāṭis (the demons of avarice);† moreover he crossed the winds with mighty force.'

*Ludwig, Interpretation des Rig-Veda, pp. 64, 67, suggests that gyeńska javasā be taken in the sense of gyeṇa-jayasā. 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. kṛtvā in the sense of bhūtvā: cf. the periphrastic perfect, and Delbrück, Syntaxische Forschungen, p. 103 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. 12; Ap. Čr. v. 2. 4 (açvo rūpaṁ kṛtvā) and TB. iii. 7. 4. 8 (kṛṣṇo rūpaṁ kṛtvā).

† Cf. Sup. 29. 6, aham (sc. suparṣo) balena 'ty ataram saapatnān.
In this translation the word īrmā is still uncertain. I cannot conclude with Pischel, l. e. p. 214, that it is equal to āṭra in all its meanings, down to the very palest shades. He translates the passage by "da entging der Freiegebige (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 āṭra.

That the parallel at RV. iv. 26. 7, āṭra pāraṇdhīr ajahād āvāṭāh

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 tāsthvisr (sc.
dāca catā dhēnivā) āhūhāv āuūhre, which Pischel translates

(p. 214) "dass die stehenden (Kühe) Tag für Tag hierher Milch

geben," hierher being the equivalent of īrmā. If the 'ten hun-
dred 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 (kēpayāl) who are unable to ascend the ship of the

sacrifice that īrmā vā tē ny avicanta. 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

dinue to dwell upon the earth; they like nothing better than

that. Hence the explanation of Yāska, Nir. 5. 25, νε ἡ αἰ 'va te

nyavicaṭa 'sminn eva loke simply propagates his belief in gen-
eral that īrmā means 'here,' giving moreover an extreme theo-

logical bent to the entire passage. Bergaigne's supposition, iii.

328, that the parallelism of āṭra 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

intrinsinc 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 pāraṇdhī the general

exposition of the word as laid down by Pischel in Vedic

studien i. 202 ff.† In support of the abstract meaning of the

word 'liberality,' which is in my opinion the primary meaning
(cf. Zend pārendā), I would point especially to the intimate rela-
tion of pāraṇdhī with sūn'ītā; the latter has been recently well

treated by Dr. Oertel in the P. A. O. S. for May 1891 (Journal,

vol. xv., pp. xcv ff.), and he has arrived at the meaning 'liberality'

for that word. At RV. i. 123. 6 we have ud īrātān sūn'ītā uṭ

pāraṇdhīh; at x. 39. 2, codīyataṁ sūn'ītāh . . . uṭ pāraṇdhīr

īrayatam. Cf. also i. 158. 2, jīgītām aṣmē revāṭāh pāraṇdhīh.

At iii. 62. 11 ; vi. 48. 14 ; vii. 36. 8 ; x. 65. 14, we find pāraṇdhī

* 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, Baby-

lonian 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 rajī 'wealth.' But I cannot accept Pischel's reference of the word to Indra. Here, as well as at RV. iv. 26. 7, the expression pāramādhi or 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 Arātis, the powers of avarice, who have kept the Soma in their power, are left behind. The words pāramādhi and ārātī are opposed to one another also at RV. iv. 50. 11; vii. 97. 9, without the implication that pāramādhi is Indra, though Indra here as well as at v. 35. 8; vii. 32. 20; viii. 81. 15 appears in company with pāramādhi. At RV. ix. 72. 4 we have pāramādhivān mānuso yajñasādhanah cūcīr dhiyā pavata soma indra te 'the bright Soma accompanied by Purāndhi, forwarding the sacrifice of men, flows to you, O Indra, along with prayer.' Cf. also the expression pāvamāna ... rāhunānaḥ pāramādhyā 'Soma hastening along with Purāndhi,' in RV. ix. 110. 8, 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 pāramādhi, 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. c. p. 66. The only doubt left in my mind is whether it is not best to regard pāramādhi as the abstract, meaning 'liberality,' rather than the adjective qualifying genā; 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, Krēnū* 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 Krēnū cf. Weber, Ind. Stud. ii. 313 ff.; Kuhn in K.Z. i. 523; Roth, Z.D.M.G. xxxvi. 339; Bergaigne, l. c. iii. 30 ff. The connection of the word with Zend Keresānī 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.
by the authorities mentioned in the introduction to this paper, excepting a remark on the word *indrāvato* in st. 4. The passage reads: 

 fiyat* *ām *indrāvato nā bhujyāniṣ guṇe jahārā brahā ādhi snāh. 

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 *indrāvat* as identical with later *indrāloka* (p. 212). 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 Aeqvins, 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 samudrā; vii. 68. 7 as mādhye samudrā; i. 158. 3; 182. 7 as mādhye ārnasaḥ; in x. 39. 4 the Aeqvins carry Bhujyu adbhuya pāri; in vi. 62. 6 they bring him out of the waters, the ocean, and the womb of the flood: adbhuya samudrāt. . . ārnasa nir upāsthā; in i. 116. 4 they bring him to the sandy shore, the bank of the watery ocean: samudrāṣya dhanvanm ardṛṣya pāre; in i. 182. 5 they carry him out of the great flood: kṣodaso mahāḥ; in i. 117. 14 they are said to have carried him ārnasa nih samudrāt; in vii. 69. 7 they carry him out of the flood after he has been thrown down into the ocean: ānaviddhān samudrā ud uñathur ārnasaḥ; in i. 182. 6 Bhujyu is described as having been thrown down into the water, pushed into bottomless darkness: ānaviddhān . . . apsvāntir anuvambhanti tāmases prāviddham; in i. 116. 5 the situation is described as ‘the ocean without support and without hold’: anūsthānā agrabhāṅe samudrāḥ; in x. 65. 12 Bhujyu is freed by the Aeqvins from distress: ānāsaḥ pipṛtha nih. 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 bhujyām aeqvinā sākhāyo mādhye jahur dūrēvāsaḥ samudrāḥ ‘O Aeqvins, his evil-disposed companions abandoned Bhujyu in the middle of the ocean.’ But there can be little doubt that the Vedic Rishi transplanted the event to heaven: in RV. i. 116. 3 they designate the place of Bhujyu’s abandonment as udameghā, a āpi. lēya, which seems to refer to the water-cloud;† in x. 143. 5 Bhujyu is carried by the Aeqvins to the other side of the ether: ā rūjasah pāre. In i. 119. 4 the legend is alluded to as follows: āvām bhujyām bhurūmānaṁ vībhir gataṁ svayuktibhir nivāhantā pitrōbhya ā.

* For fiyat cf. the valuable remarks of Fick, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch, p. 399. 
† The Petersburg Lexicons render it “Wasserschauer.”
Upon this passage especially Pischel rests his interpretation of īndrāvāt. He translates pīṭṛbhyā dā 'from the fathers'; and, inasmuch as the abode of the fathers is svarga-loka, and that again is later indraloka, he feels justified in establishing the equation īndrāvāt = indraloka for the passage under discussion.

But, if īndrāvāt is equal to indraloka, 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 indraloka is, from the point of view of a Hindu, just as inconceivable as salvation from paradise would be from the point of view of Judeo-Christian conceptions. On the other hand, the passages in which Bhujyu'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 ā rājasūl pārā in x. 143. 5, which states that the Aevins carried Bhujyu to the other side of the ether, we may translate nivāhantā pīṭṛbhyā ā 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 Bhujyu by the Aevins is designated in RV. i. 119. 8 as svadāvatīrūṭhī 'help resulting in svadr, i.e. paradise.'*

Pischel regards the one other occurrence of īndrāvāt (with long ā) in the same light. At RV. x. 101. 1 we read dūdhi-kvām āgnim usāsān ca devim īndrāvātō 'vase ni hauye vaih, which he would therefore translate by 'I call you, Dadhikra etc., down for help from indraloka.' I would see here in īndrāvāt 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) lokapālāḥ . . . sū Gryikāḥ 'the guardians of the world, Agni at their head.' Or, still more precisely, it is the equivalent of īndrayesthūḥ, RV. iv. 54. 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 Dadhi-kra, Agni, and the goddess Uṣas, 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 parāvāto, seems to me the most plausible,†

---

*The legend of Bhujyu 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 bhujyuḥ suparṇaḥ, and the MS. ii. 12. 2 has in its place bhujī suparṇaḥ. The treatment of the passage in ĊB. ix. 4. 1. 11 is futile. The Aevins 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. viii. 8. 2.

† Grassmann's translation, i. 184, "des Indra Schar," presupposes the correction of īndrāvato to īndrāvanto (cf. his lexicon s. v. īndrāvat);
and I would offer in support of it the following considerations. In iv. 26. 6, in the parallel passage, we have ṛṣipṛṣipṛṣeṇo dāda-māno aṇiṣāṁ parāvātah cākunā mandrām mūdām. At ix. 68. 6; x. 144. 4, the eagle also brings the Soma from the distant height (parāvātah), just as Mātarīçvan brings the fire from the same place at i. 128. 2; iii. 9. 5; vi. 8. 4. Soma is parāvātī at viii. 53. 3 (Vāl. 5. 3); 93. 6; ix. 39. 5; 65. 22. Now Bhūjy, according to i. 119. 8, was abandoned parāvātī, and was thence carried off by the Aṃivins. If, therefore, we read at iv. 27. 4 parāvātā vā bhūjyām, we have a comparison perfect in every detail. The change from parā- to indrā- 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 Ῥbhus at the evening pressure of the Soma, on which occasion hymns in the jāyati-metre are employed. The third is addressed to Indra at the noon-tide pressure of the Soma; at that time hymns in the tristubh-metre are prescribed. The first stanza is addressed to the eagle, whose metre is said to be the gāyatrī. This refers to the morning pressure, and in this function the formula is employed by the Vātāna-sūtra in connection with the stanza AV. vi. 47. 1, which is distinctively addressed to Agni. Now, inasmuch as Agni is the divinity of the morning-pressure, and the gāyatrī the metre of the hymns employed at the morning-pressure, there is no room to doubt that the eagle of AV. vi. 48. 1 is Agni.

Further, the bizarre attitude of the Brāhmaṇas, which consistently relate that the gāyatrī 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 gāyatrī, 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 indravanto for indravantu at TB. ii. 6. 16. 2 (so also the commentary), and the occasional occurrence elsewhere of this solecism. A better emendation would be indravantu, referring to the Aṃivins, who are designated as indratamā at RV. i. 182. 2. Ludwig ii. 593 and v. 468 suggests indra-vatāḥ; Roth, Z.D.M.G. xxxvi. 358, ṛavato na bhūjyām ‘like a serpent from a marsh.’ Cf. also Bergaigne, i. c. iii. 380 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 Krṣṇa, 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 -pita (sapita, prapita, abhipita, upapita).†

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. xv. 185 ff.
† 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. cxxx). 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, prapita, in the Vedicke Studien by Prof. Pischel and himself vol. ii., pp. 155-179. 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 abhipita. 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.
produced some of the obscurest, vaguest, and most inconsistent results in the entire domain of Vedic interpretation. In Yāska’s Nāighanātavas, iii. 29, the word prāptivē occurs by the side of abhikē.* and Yāska, Nirukta iii. 20, explains both as āsannayya, designations of nearness, vicinity. He adds the special translation prāpte for prāpitve, as though the word contained the root āp with the prepositional prefix prā. In the course of the 67th paragraph of Kautsavya’s Nighañtavas,† the two words are treated by themselves, as follows: prāpitve, abhikē: prāptasya—indicating obviously the same tradition. Śāyaṇa repeats this interpretation, with direct reference to Yāska, at RV. i. 126. 3, sa ca (sc. prāpitvaçaabda) prāpitve bhikē ity āsannaye ‘ti yāṣken- oktatnūd āsannayacanaḥ. He operates with this rendering, e. g. at RV. i. 104. 1, prāpitve yāgakule prāpte; i. 130. 9, asurāṇām prāpitve samīpe . . . prāpitvā ity āsannāmā; i. 189. 7, saṁnihita eva kule; viii. 4. 3, prāpitve prāpte sati; x. 73. 2, prāpitvād āsannūd prāptūd vratāḥ, etc. But other translations appear also. To iii. 53. 24, where prāpitvē occurs in antithesis to apa- pitvā, we have apa-pitram apa-śamanam . . . prāpitvam praga- manam; to iv. 16. 12, prāpitve aṅkāḥ is explained by divasa- sya . . . prakrame pūrvāḥya. 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 Śāyaṇa comments prāpitvē by prapatane yuddhe, i. e. prāpitvē is assumed to mean ‘strife,’ and its derivation is now in Śāyaṇa’s mind from the root pat and the preposition pra. At v. 31. 7, he presents both alternatives: prāpitvām saṁgrāmaṁ (battle) saṁipāṁ (nearness) vā. 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. Śāyaṇa on the RV. says prāpitve aṅkām pūrvāḥya, i. e. ‘in the morning;’ Śāyaṇa on the AV., prāpitvē stiyūḥya, i. e. ‘in the evening.’ And so Mahīdhara on the VS, prāpitve prapatane astamāya, and Mādhava on the TB. sāyaṅkule.

The first explanation of abhipitvā occurs at Nir. iii. 15; it is abhiprāpti ‘arrival,’ and so the word is explained by Śāyaṇa 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: abhipitvē ‘bhigantavye yajñe;’ at RV. i. 186. 7 = VS. xxxiii. 34 Śāyaṇa has abhipitvē ‘bhupatanye’smadyajñe, while Mahīdhara has abhipatane āgamanakule. At i. 126. 3 Śāyaṇa again exhibits his perplexity by making abhipitvē the direct equivalent of prāpitvā: abhipitvaçaabda āsannakūlavā prāpitvaçaabda iti patvā. And it would seem indeed that this perplexity drives him to extremes, since he translates abhipitvā at RV. v. 76. 2 by ‘evening’: aṅkām abhipitvē ‘bhupatane samāptāu,
trīye savana ity arthaḥ; in the same breath, as it were, the word is rendered by “forenoon” at RV. v. 76. 2, divābhīpitvē divasyābhīpitatane prātahāḥ.

The stem sapītvā is a ā. ṭev. occurring only in the stanza RV. i. 109. 7 = TB. iii. 6. 11. 1. Madhava to TB. renders the word by sambandhītvam ‘relationship,’ and he may have in mind the more common word āpitvā, which the commentaries render in some such way quite regularly: thus, Sāyana to RV. viii. 4. 3 glosses the latter by bandhītvam. On the other hand, Sāyana explains sapītvām āsan at RV. i. 109. 7 by sakapīptavayān sthānam āsan brahma-lokam ajachan, 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 glossary of the Sāma-Veda, treats the words in the same spirit. The p of -pitvā is in his view a reduced form of the root āp; prapiti- in prapītvā is = Lat. prope; prapītvē means primarily ‘in the vicinity’ or ‘near.’ Similarly supi- in sapītvā is = Lat. saper, and also abhipiṭvā, upapīṭvā, and āpitvā have originated from the root āp. Essentially the same view is taken by Roth in the note on Yāska’s Nirukta iii. 20, and by Weber, Ind. Stud. xvii. 253. Grassmann, in his lexicón s. v. pītvā, 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 prapītvā the meanings: 1. das Entgegengehen; 2. das Herbeikomen; 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 prapītvām at RV. iii. 53. 24 (1003) and i. 104. 1 (469) by “nearness”; similarly prapītvān yān at v. 37. 1 (532) by “zu leibe ihm gehend,” and prapītvā at vi. 31. 3 (554) “im nahkampf.” But at RV. x. 73. 2 (642) prapītvāt is translated by “aus der ferne”; prapītvē 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 āhnām is either expressed or understood, the translation “anmahung der tage,” i. e. morning; but at viii. 1. 29 he translates prapītvē upicaruvarē by “des nachdunksels nahen.”

The Petersburg lexicons are agreed in translating abhipiṭvā 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 Sāyana mentions a still more obviously false derivation, from the root sap, namely saper bhāvah sapītvam.
pitojá and prapitojá, 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 (653), grinda yatra vádati káviri ukhyás táṣyé ‘d indro abhipitóšu ranyati, he translates “wo der stein singt als ukthakundiger preissinger, in dieser nähe freut sich Indra.” Here then we have again the translation “nähe,” which Ludwig frequently ascribes to prapitojá; 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 arraignment 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 sapitojá, which occurs in a single stanza, RV. i. 109. 7—TB. iii. 6. 11. 1, á Bharatau cikstau víjrabahú as-mán indragu avatáu vicibhih: imá ná te raçmáyáh śrhyasya yébhih sapitvám pitáro na ásan* ‘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 táṣya ye raçmáyas te suktaḥ, just as at CB. vi. 5. 4. 8 the light of the stars: naksatrává vái janaýo ye hi janaý punyakartáh svargaú lokáta yami tásam etámi jyotásti. Cf. also RV. x. 108. 1; CB. ii. 3. 3. 7; TS. v. 4. 1. 3; TA. i. 9. 3; 11. 2; and Mahádhara 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 (sapitvám) of the blessed departed who have preceded. All translators are agreed as to the meaning of sapitvá. 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 padapátha divides it into sa + pitva, and that is quite correct. In pitva there is hidden the word pítá ‘sap, drink, nourishment;’‡ hence sapitvám is trans-

---

* TB. reads áyan.
† Grassmann’s translation of the second half is unintelligible: “Hier eben diese Sonnenzügel sind es, durch die mit euch vereint die Väter waren.” Sáyána: sthýátmanta indrasya yebhi raçmibhir yáir arčibhir no ‘smákam pítáraḥ púrvaparùsháh sapitvám saharpútrapayán śhánam ásan, brahma lokam agachan . . . yad vá, yebhi raçmibhih sapitvám samavetavatam adhyagachan . . .
‡ Yáska’s Nighántvas 2. 7, as well as Káutsavaya 38, place the word among the annandáni; at Yáska’s Nirukta ix. 24, the derivation of the word is given as follows: pítur ity annandáma pátar và pibater và púdyater vá.
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. i. 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. i. 45 = VS. xix. 56 = TS. ii. 6. 12, 3, pitū is the name of the nourishment of which the manes partake: bhūjanta pitvās tā ihāgamisthiḥ. In the hymn to the pitū, RV. i. 187, in stanza 11, the pitū is spoken of as the saudhamādu devināṁ 'the feast-companion of the gods'; just so the manes are designated in RV. vii. 76. 4: tā id devināṁ saudhamādu āsann pitināḥ kanāyāḥ pūrvāyāḥ. 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: yamēna yē saudhamādam mādantī. At AV. vi. 122. 4 'boon companionship' in the third heaven is asked for: tṛtye nāde saudhamādum madoma. The combined sense of all these passages is that the manes enjoy themselves in heaven with Yama and the gods, and the pitū is the exhilarating material which produces the effect. Hence sa-pitvū means 'the act of enjoying the pitū together.' It is a synonym of saudha-mād-u, and the substitution of the latter at RV. i. 109. 7 = TB. iii. 6. 11. 1 would yield just the same sense as the existing text: yēbhīḥ saudhamādam pitūrō na āṣan (āṣan) = yēbhīḥ sapitvām pitūre na āṣan (āṣan).

My readers will now surmise that the following discussion is an attempt to find the stem pitū 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 vādati kārār ukthās tūśyā 'd ināro abhipitvōsu ranyati. The Pet. Lex. cites this sentence under abhipitvō 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 dem Stein als lieberreicher Sänger tont, da einzukehren ist des Indra Lust." But tūṣya ... abhipitvōsu can naturally only mean 'bei seinen einkehren,' and not 'beim einkehren bei ihm.' Ludwig (403) translates: "wo der Stein singt als ukthakundiger preissänger, in dieser nähe freut sich Indra." But why the plural abhipitvōsu if the singular abhipitvē means 'nearness'? And tūṣya ... abhipitvēsu would again naturally mean 'bei seinen (des steines) nähen.' i.e., the supposed action of drawing near which underlies the word abhipitvōsu 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, suté, sutésu, RV. i. 10. 5; viii. 12. 17; 13. 9; 31. 6; 93. 20; 96. 19; or in the soma-festivals, sávanésu, x. 43. 6; or, what is much the same, in the stoma, uktha, or gástra, 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 abhipitvá means 'the flow of the sap (píti) of the soma-plant.' Hence, in RV. i. 101. 1, the uktha, stotra, or gástra along with the soma which is pressed for Indra is designated as pitunád vácas. The pāda reads, prá manúne pitunád arcatá vácaḥ. In RV. i. 61. 7, Indra drinks píti at the sávanas: sávanésu...pitám pápín. Further, in close parallelism with abhipitvásu ranyati are the expressions RV. x. 64. 11, ranváh sánídrśtám pitunáh íva kásāyaḥ 'delightful to behold like a home full of píta'; RV. iv. 1. 8, ranváh pitumáti íva saṁsáta 'delightful like a feast rich in píti.' Regarding then the expression abhipitvásu 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, kúhá svád dosá kúhá vástor aśviná kúhá bhápitván karatáh kího 'satuh.' Ludwig (70) translates: 'wo stellen sich die Aśvinā am abend, wo beim aufgegangen, wo ist ihre einkehr, wo übernachten sie?' Grassmann's translation differs only in the wording. In these translations the expression 'wo ist ihre einkehr, 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 sá+ava, which means primarily 'unhitch horses,' and hence 'halt.' The common noun of action is avasána. But if we look at RV. i. 104. 1, yónis tā indra nīṣāde akári tām ā ní śida svainó ná 'rvā: vimihya vdyo 'vasādyā 'rvān dosá vástor váhyasāh 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 Aśvins 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 kāṣya...sāvaná 'ava gachathāh 'to whose soma-pressing do ye come down (O ye Aśvins)?' Now the second stanza expresses the same question in the phase kúhá bhápitván karatáh 'where do you take your potations of píti?' And the expression váhyasāh 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 *abhīpitvā* and *prapitvā* are different kinds of soma-drink, and this we shall endeavor to do in the sequel.

Similarly, iv. 16. 1 is addressed to Indra: *ā satyā yātu mu-
ghāvānī ṣūṣumā svā ṛṣi drāvanto asya hāraya īpa naḥ: tasmā uḥ āndhah
svā ṛṣi svā ṛṣi madumā svā ṛṣi.* Ludwig (517) translates the second half “denn ihm haben wir saft (der) grosse
tächsigkeit (verleiht) gepresst, besungen vollziehe er hier seine
ankunft.” Grassmann essentially in the same way. Three words
in the stanza allude distinctly to the soma, namely ṛṣi, āndhah,
and svā ṛṣi, 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 lither, 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 (pīṭa).’

Again, RV. i. 186. 1 = VS. xxxiii. 34, *ā na āūhāḥ niñāthe
śucati vícitiśārāḥ saviñī denā etu: api yāthā yuvāmo mūṣatathā
no vícvaṇā jāgad abhīpitve mānisatā.* Ludwig (197) translates the
second half thus: “dass auch ihr, o jugendliche, tränket 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 the midst of words designating the soma. Thus
RV. ix. 107. 2, *sute cīt tvā . . . madamāvī āndhāsāḥ; i. 80. 2, sā
tvā madūd vṛṣī su madāḥ sömah; i. 53. 6, tē tvā mādū amudān . . .
tē sömūsaḥ; iv. 42. 6, yām mā sömūsa mumīdan; 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,
mūṣatathā vícvaṇā jāgad abhīpitve upon the same plane with
madāmah tvā sute 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 ini tvāstā
gauḥ āchū sūhitāh abhīpitvā saisūsah: ā vrthahe ’nārač
carsaniprās tvāstīm tvāstīm na ini ganīyāḥ.* Both Ludwig
(197) and Grassmann translate *abhīpitve* by “zur einkehr.”
Again the invitation extended to Indra and Tvāṣṭar foreshadows
the soma,† and there is positively no reason for not translating
abhīpitve ‘to the soma-drink.’

In RV. viii. 4. 21, the last one of the three stanzas of a dāna-
strī, we have again the expression *abhīpitvē arārānah,* parallel
with *abhīpitvēn ranyati* in i. 83. 6, and more remotely with i.
186. 1: *vrkṣat cīn me abhīpitvē arārānur gāṃ bhajanta mehunā*

---

*Note also the words sāvane and ukhām in the stanza immediately following.
† For the relation of Tvāṣṭar to the soma see now Hillebrandt, Soma, 515.
Grassmann translates "die Bäume selbst erfreuten sich bei meinem Nahn." Ludwig (588), "selbst die bäume brausten bei meinem (Indra's) nahlen." There is, so far as can be seen, no reason why the root *van* employed with *abhípitvá* 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 *dánustuti*. 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 *abhípitvā*. They will be treated next in order. Before continuing with our discussion of *abhípitvā*, 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 (Niebuhr iii. 20), the passage just alluded to: *yāthā gāurā apā kr̥tdā tr̥yām ety ōvē riṇam: āpitvē nahi prapitvē tāyam ā gahi kānsva sū sācā pība.* Grassmann translates: "Gleich wie der Büßel dürftend hin zur wasserreichen Quelle eilt, so komme Abends Morgends eilend her zu uns, und trinke bei den Kanvas gern." Ludwig: "wie der wilde stier, wenn er dürftet, zu dem mit wasser versehenen salzsumpf 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 *vāhyasah 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 kānsva sū sācā pība* "do you come here to the soma-drink (prapitvā)." 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 *prapitvā* : i.e., according to our assumption below (p. 33), the *prātaḥsavana*. 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 *prātaḥsavana*. I have not been able to make out whether *āpitvē* (nahi) 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. 27. 3, *somo vanem', and the many wooden instruments and vessels for its preparation: *camasa, camū, drona, kulaça*, etc.
required at RV. viii. 20. 22; 31. 13. Ludwig's inconsistency has been pointed out. Grassmann renders ṣprītvē in the same way as he frequently does abhipiṭvē, namely "in the evening."²⁸ By what right? As regards prapītvē, he finds himself in straits not much less severe than Ludwig's; he translates, at i. 104. 1, dosā nāstor vālīyasaḥ prapītvē "die trefflich fahren früh, am Tag, am Abend." The phrase dosā nāstor means 'by night and by day'; what use is there in adding anew after vālīyasaḥ an expression for 'in the morning' (früh)? This alone shows that prapītvē 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, gāṣasya cāt pārī māyā upāh-nāḥ prapītvāṁ yānā ṣpurā dīṣyāṁ uṣedhāh. Grassmann translates the last pādā "und vorwärtsdringend trichtst 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 liebe ihm gehend trichtst du hinweg den Dasyu." And yet, as we have seen, at viii. 4. 3 he renders prapītvē by "in der ferne." That prapītvāṁ yān 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 gāṁūr aparvan... adhāh (sc. adhāsa) gāṣasya 'gāṣasya māyāḥ pītvā nāvā ṛirecāt kēu cau cau prā '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 prapītvā and pītvā in two otherwise identical passages be due to accident? In RV. i. 187. 1 we have pītvāṁ nā stosau... yāsaṛ trītvā vy ḍāsā ṛostra vīpaṛvan arāyāt 'Let me now praise the pītvā... by whose might Tīra tōre Tītra 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 Tītra. Now is it not obvious that Indra avails himself of the force of the pītvā by prapītvāṁ yān, 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: pītvāḥ sōmasṛ śīvā ṣeṣāḥ ē眬āh ērī nīr yudhā 'dhunad ēdyān. At any rate, we may assert confidently that the expression prapītvāṁ yān means neither "vorwärtsdringend" (Grassm.) nor "zu liebe gehend" (Ludw.), since in RV. iv. 16. 12 the expression prapītvē āhnāḥ is employed to indicate the condition under which Indra slays demons and Dasyus. Here prapītvē āhnāḥ 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 -pitvā. Hitherto we have simply endeavored to show that both abhipitvā and prapitvā contain the word pitā, and refer to soma-drink. We now advance another step: it seems equally clear that prapitvā is the designation of the morning-pressure, the prātaḥsavana or prātaḥśiva; on the other hand, abhipitvā is the designation of the tyāya-savāna, the evening pressure. The paraphrase of prapitvā is contained in RV. i. 124. 12 = vi. 64. 6, nāraḥ ca yē pitubhājo vyuṣṭānu ‘the heroes who drink pitā in the morning.’ Let us first return to prapitvāṁ yān at RV. v. 31. 7. According to our view, prapitvāṁ yānām āpa dāśiyāṁ uṣedhāḥ is to be translated ‘while going to the morning-pressing (of soma) you drove away the Dasysus.’ 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, āhānān indro ādahad agnir īndro purā dāśiyān madhyāṃdīmanād abhike ... purā sahāṛā puṇā nī bārhit. Ludwig translates: “Indra schlug, Agni brannte, o Indu, die Dasyu vor dem mittag noch im kamefe ... warf viele tausende mit dem pfeile nieder.” Grassmann also renders purā madhyāṃdīmanād 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 nīśkevalya, is by distinction the time in which the demons are slain: etad va indrasya nīśkevalyan śavāniyān yān madhyāṃdīmanān śavāniyān, tata vyartram ajīghāṃsat tata vyajīguṣata (CB. iv. 3. 3. 6). This puts it upon the same plane with prapitvāṁ 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 prapitvē āhnah at RV. iv. 16. 12, kūṭṣya ācaṣānām ni bārhit prapitvē āhnah kūyavan sahāṛā: sadyo dāśiyān prā mṛṇā kūṣṭyena prā śaṇā cakrān vyhatād abhike. Ludwig (517) translates: “den Kutsa warfst du den Čuṣna den gefräßigen nider, beim nahen des tages, den verächter des getreides mit tausenden, mit dem Kutsa freundlichen tötetest du also gleich die Dasyu: ‘er rolle des Sūra rad heran,’ so dachte Kutsa.” Grassmann similarly renders prapitvē āhnah 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 pūrvāpīṭi. Yāsna 10. 2 ff., the first of the two daily Mazdayasnián pressures is designated as the havanem fratāren, contrasted with the havanem āpāren. Cf. also (in what way) rapithvā and its derivatives rapithvina and rapithvihara; arēmpithvā, Yāsna 44. 5 (cf. Neriosengh), and frapitvē, Vd. 3. 10; further Fick, p. 80.

† Cf. RV. vi. 47. 21, divē-dive ... kṛṣṇa uṣedhā āpa śādmanto jāh.

‡ RV. iv. 35. 7, prātaḥ sutām apibō haryaṇa mādhyaṁdīṇah savānaḥ kēvalāṁ 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, tvān kūtyān ṛhi āśvānam āndra āṣārāvām yudhyāni kāyavāni gavīṣṭām: dācā prapitītē ādhū śāryasiṃ maṇiṣyāc cakrām deviṇām āpūṣtāt.* Ludwig (554) translates the second half: "du bisgest ihn im nahkampf, und raubtest des Sūrya rad, und tilgtest die schäden." That is, here prapitītē is translated by "im nahkampf," but in the parallel passage iv. 16. 12 prapitvē dāwuh 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 dāwuh for dācu, and translates "aneh hast du in der Frühe des Morgens der Sonne ihr Rad geraubt und grosse Thaten ausgeführt." I cannot illuminate the suspicious word dācu, which Śāyāna derives from the root dvāc 'bite.' But, leaving it out of the question, there is again no difficulty in translating prapitvē '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, āndra niḥā pratikāmānī sutāyu prāthāvānīś tānu hā pravāpiṭhe: hārṣisam hūntune sūra niṭrān, etc. The difficult passage RV. i. 130. 9 is related to iv. 16. 12 and vi. 31. 3, śrīṛ cakrām pra vyāj jātā dūṣā prapitvē nācam uruṇā maṇiṣyāti "cānā ā maṇiṣyāti: uśānā yāt purāvāto jagama niṣaya kave, etc. Ludwig (472) translates: "des Sūra (Svar) ṛad rollt er in gewaltigkeit sich zeitend hervor; rothflammend entlockt er die stimme (oder: raubt er den donnerkel ?); diss vornögend entlockt er sie, als, o Uṣanā Kavi, aus der ferne du zur hilfe kamst," etc. I do not see that the word prapitvē 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 vēcam as an absolutive from a root vac 'rollen.' Grassmann translates: "geboren kaum trieb kräftig er der Sonne Rad, bei Tages Anbruch nimmt er flammend sich das lied; er reisst es an sich mit gewalt." Bergaigne, ii. 339, takes essentially Grassmann's view, adding that vēcam 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 prapitvē as 'at the matutinal soma.' The mention of Uṣanās Kavi (or Kāya) in connection with Indra also suggests the soma. Thus,

* The padāpātha and the editions read dvāve rāpāṇi. The excellent emendation is that proposed by Aufrecht in Kühn's Zeitschrift, xxv. 601.
† This implies the emendation of vēcam in the text to vājram.
Group of Vedic words in -pitva.

at i. 51. 11, māndiśta yāt ucīne kuivyē sācān āndraḥ, 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 arunā vyāna, which does not prove that he might also be designated as plain arunā. Soma is aruna,* 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 masāyati means perhaps ‘steals it back, gets it back’ (cf. ā+dā and dā; ā+har and har; ā+dru and dru; ā+nuce and nuc); and iγānā may be Indra: ‘but he, the mighty (Indra), obtains it back.’ Be this as it may, it seems quite certain that prapitvē 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 prapitvē, 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 trā stra udītā māma mulhyāindine divāh: māman prapitvē apiatarvā vaso ā stōniso avratata. The Pet. Lex. translates apiatarvā 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, nächtlich” marks again most interestingly the havoc which has been wrought in all translations of the passages which contain the words ending in -pitva. Grassmann in his concordance has followed the larger Pet. lexicon, but in his translation he has again become confused: “bei Sonnenaufgang, Indra, sind dir meine Lieder zugerollt, und in des Tages Mitte und am Abend dir, und in der Dämmerung der Nacht.” That is, he takes prapitvē apiatarvā asyndetically for two designations of time; he translates prapitvē “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 mittaglicher zeit, bei des nachtdunkels nahen, Vasa, dir entgegengekommen.” He too is compelled, however, to render prapitvē “in the morning” (“bei der annährung... der tage”) at viii. 41. 4. The latter reads as follows: utē ’dānām bhā-gayantah syāmō ‘tā prapitvā utā mádhya āhnām: utō ’dītā mahāvan stīryasya vaṭām davānām sunataḥ syāmā.

There can be no question that the translators are correct in agreeing that udītā stīryasya 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 devīn ādītiṁ johā
vini madhyānādina ādīta śrīruya; or at v. 76. 3, udā yātrāṁ
svāguvā prātār āhno madhyānādina ādīta śrīruya. Hence
prāpito 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† (śrīra ādīte means ‘at
sunset’), and prāpito api-śrīruvārē is the more explicit version
of prāpito: it means ‘at the matutinal soma in the period of
the day next to the night,’ i.e. ‘at the dawn;‡ cf. pitubhadō
vruṣṭaṁ 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 sacerdotal divi-
sions, into prātāh-samam, madhānādinaṁ, and triyūn sam-
vam. The expression prāpito api-śrīruvāre is equivalent to
prātāh-samam, or prātāhāvē.

The word api-śrīruvāre occurs once more in RV. iii. 9. 7, tād
bhadrāṁ tāmav divīsamā pīkāya cie chudiyati: tvām yād uge
paţavaṁ samāpute samaśādina api-śrīruvāre. Sāyaṇa glosses
vruṣṭaṁ khe agniharanakāle, and Ludwig (309) translates the
second half of the stanza “wenn dich, o Agni, die herdentiere
umlagern, den entzündeten bei beginn der nacht.” A good pic-
ture this, the cattle lying about the fire kindled at night, and it
may be supported by such statements as TB. iii. 2. 1. 5; ČB. iii.
9. 1. 3: tuṁma sāyaṇa paţavā vṛṣṭimāvartante ‘therefore do
the cattle return (from the pasture) in the evening.’ Yet it ap-
ppears from a simple investigation of the root udh with sam 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 nu-
merous instances that the fire is lighted in the morning, and more
specifically at dawn.

Thus RV. v. 28. 1, sāmīdha agnir divi gocir ācēr pratyānām uṣa-
sūma uṣvīyā vi bhāti; RV. iv. 39. 3, sāmīdhe agnā uṣāso vṛṣṭuṁ;
RV. vii. 8. 1, a āgnir āgra uṣāsa ācērī; RV. iii. 10. 9 (cf. also
i. 22. 21), tām tvā viprā viprāyāvā jāgṛvānsah śām indhate; RV.
i. 44. 7, 8, saṁ hi tvā viça indhate, sā a vaḥa puruṣaṁ prācetasā
‘gne devāṁ ihā... vṛṣṭiśu ksāpaḥ’ (cf. also stanza 4); RV. x. 101.
1, uḍ budhyaśuṁ sāmanasah sākhāyāḥ śām agnīm indhvam;
vii. 78. 2, prātī śām agnir jūrāte sāmīdham... uṣā yāti jyōtiśa
bādikmānā vīcōvī tāmāṇi, etc. Hence uśr-bhūdh ‘awakening

---

*So Sāyaṇa to RV.: prāpito ‘hnāṁ prāpte pūrvaṁ. But Sāyaṇa
to the corresponding passage AV. iii. 16. 4: prāpito sāyāhne athāṁ;
Mahādhara to VS. xxxiv. 87: prāpito prapātana astamaye; Mādhava
to TB. ii. 8. 9. 8: sāyāṇikāle.
† Cf. Roth, Yāṣa’s Nirukta, Erläuterungen, p. 34.
‡ Here Sāyaṇa offers a translation antipodal to that given by himself
at RV. vii. 41. 4: prāpito prāpte dvām asya vāsāne.
§ This word offers a good example of what might be called the in-
flated translations of Vedic passages. The connection in which we
have placed the passage shows conclusively that jāgṛvānsah means
simply ‘having awakened (in the morning).’ The Pet. Lex. explains it
as “munter, eifrig, unermüdlich;” Grassmann, “die wachsam sind;”
Ludwig (310), “die liederkundigen brähmanasänger, 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 situation expressed at RV. iii. 9. 7 in the words tvām ād agraṁ samādosesam-
iddham apīcavaraṁ is therefore rather that which is epitomized in the word saṁgava at RV. v. 76. 3 = SV. ii. 1104, a stanza addressed to the Aevins: utā yātāṁ saṁgava prātār dhano ma-
dhyāntaṁ utātāṁ sārgasyaṁ; divā nāktam āsma vāntum, etc. The expression saṁgava prātār dhanaṁ is described graphically by Śaṅkara on the SV. as the time of the morning when the cattle come home from grazing in the forest to be milked: saṁgavan cetanta āvāmo dothābhāvāṁ yasmin kāle, vātryāvāye kāle hi gāno vane kīnaturāṁ bhakṣyāvitā dothāye saṁgavane pratinivartante. In Hir. GS. i. 10. 3 the day is divided into five divisions: prātāṁ saṁgavane madhyāntaṁ parāṁ kāle. Here, to be sure, the saṁgava is in the second place, still, however, early in the morn-
ing; 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 apīcavaraṁ is not to be regarded with Śaṅkara (to RV. iii. 9. 7) and Ludwig as the begin-
ning, but rather as the end of the night follows also from the passage AB. iv. 5: apīcavaraṁ amī samātī ty abhavaṁ, apīca-
varaṁ khatu vā atiṁ chandāṁśi ty ha snuṁ “haiṁ tāṁ hi nāvāṁ rātres tanaśo mūtyor bhīkyatam utyāpārayaṁ, tvā apīcavara-
ṛāṁ apīcavartaṁ ‘They (the metres) said: “We endure the (entire) night.” He (the sage Aitareya) therefore called these metres apīcavara. For they safely carried beyond the darkness of night, that is death, Indra who was afraid of it (the night). That is the apīcavara-character of the apīcavarta-
metre. Cf. also GB. ii. 5. 1; 3; Ap. Čr. xiv. 3. 11. We may conclude by saying that the juxtaposition of prapitõ with apī-
cavara at RV. viii. 1. 29 is the most explicit statement which determines the time of the prapitõ 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 prapitõ should have assumed the general value of a division of time. Thus prapitõ may perhaps in one or the other instance have arrived at the faded meaning ‘in the morning,’ just as abhipitõ (see below) may have assumed the value ‘in the evening.’ In RV. i. 189. 7, tvām tāṁ agraṁ udbhāyāṁ vi vidrītān vēśi prapitõ manūṣa yaṁbāta: abhipitõ manurē cārany bhūṁ 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 morn-
ing.’ In either case Agni is doubtless imagined as a partaker of the soma; the passage is absolutely otiose.

*Cf. the formula agraṁ ver hotram, Kāty. Čr. xxiii. 3. 1; Śaṅkara, prapitõ savimhita eva kāle... abhipitõ bhiprāptakaṁ bhigamanavati yaṁbāta. For the translation see Ludwig (203) and Grassmann; also Geldner’s criticism, Ved. Stud. ii. 156 ff.
I do not venture to translate RV. x. 73. 2, abhīpetvāta tā mahā-
padānā dhvāntāt prapitvād ud arantu gārbhāh. Grassmann
speaks of the hymn as partly unintelligible, and then proceeds
to make his assertion more than good by translating "ungebene
gleichsam waren diese (Orte, etwa die Wolken in denen die Wasser
eingeschlossen waren) von dem weitschreienden (Indra, oder
Vigra?); aus der dunklen Tagesfrüh 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 prapitvād by "aus der ferne,
since the same interpreter renders prapitvē at vi. 31. 3 (554) by
"nahkampf," prapitvē at i. 104. 1 (496) by "in die nahe," and
prapiñm at v. 31. 7 (532) by "zu leibe." In his commentary
Ludwig translates prapitvād by "in der nahe." Does dhvāntāt
prapitvād mean 'from the dawning morning,' i.e. from the morn-
ing when still dark with twilight? cf. prapitvē apiyāvā here above.

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

We return now to the remaining cases of abhipitvā. 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 somaun. RV. iv. 34. 5 is addressed to the Rbhu: ã mhi
pitāyā abhipitvē āhnām imā ānun saurasū ivu gumin. Ludwig
(166): "Zu euch bei des tages einkehr* sind die tränke wie zur
wohnung die kühe, die erst gekalbt, gekommen." Grassmann
also renders abhipitvē āhnām "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
Rbhus: RV. i. 161. 8; iii. 52. 6; iv. 33. 11; 35. 9. AV. vi. 47. 3;
ix. 1. 13. † The phrase parallel to abhipitvē āhnām in these pas-
gages does not contain some general statement of time, but the
technical terms trīyānā somaun and abhipitvē designate the
same occasion, not precisely from the point of view of the pres-
sure of the soma, but from the subsequent one of drinking the
draughts of soma. The addition of the word āhnām or āhnāh,
which is found with both abhipitvē and prapitvē (i. 126. 3; iv.
16. 12), is the same as in the phrase idā āhnāh 'at this time of
the day' at iv. 33. 11; just as the word āhnāh is preceded here
by a designation of time, idā, so abhipitvē and prapitvē taken by
themselves are secondarily employed as designations of time.
The notion of the 'turning in of the day' is poetick, but not Vedic.

The passage RV. iv. 35. 6 is also addressed to the Rbhus, and
is explained by the preceding: yō mhi soma abhipitvē āhnām
tīrām vajāsānā somaun mādāya. Here also abhipitvē āhnām

*But at RV. i. 126. 3 Ludwig (1001) translates the same expression,
abhipitvē āhnām, 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.
is secondarily the equivalent of triyam savarnm. Here again the word sāvam accentuates the steady adherence of the group of words under discussion to the soma-sacrifice.

Once more the special restriction of the word abhipitvā 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 rjist in the expression a sitvā yatn manhāvān rjist... dhā bhipitvām kartāte gṛṇānīh. The word is a secondary derivative from rjisā, 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 rjisā is described at KṣŚ. x. 3. 12 ff.; 9. 1 ff.; Āp. Ăr. xiii. 10. 5 ff.; 20. 8 ff.; it belongs regularly to Indra and the Maruts. The situation implied therefore by the two words rjist and abhipitvām is simply this: Indra is called to make his soma-potations in the evening from the rjisā, the previously pressed soma-shoots. Cf. on rjisā and rjisān Hillebrandt’s recent discussion, Somī, 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 śrīyuc udvā, nīmucī, prabudhī, and madhyāndine divāḥ; it is followed in stanza 21 by śrīsa udāte, madhyāndine, and dāúcī. 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 sacrificial day, and that the three sāvam 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 sacredotal name for evening in the case of abhipitvē. 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 Āsīns), divā bhipitvē ‘vastā yamāṭhī prāty āvartin dācīsa cīṃbhuvisthā, abhipitvē 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: saṅgavē, prādr ānūh, madhyāndine, and udāte śrīyasa; the presence of the word saṅgavē 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 rathūso astuhā; sastāh sahāsram ānu gāvyam āgat sānat kakṣivān abhipitvē ānūm, it is again impossible and unnecessary to decide whether abhipitvē ānūm means ‘at the evening soma’ or secondarily and poetically ‘in the evening.’ Ludwig (1011) translates “zu mir” sind gekommen.
zehn wagen etc... als die tagge gekommen empfng sie Kaksī-
vān." The expression "als die tagge 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 ex-
pression at RV. iv. 34. 5 (cf. above). Grassmann more consist-
ently translates "Kakschīvat empfng sie bei des Tages Einkehr
(d. h. am Abend)." Sāyaṇa, abhipitṛaṇabā āśemakālaevēći.

There is one more clear enough in outline, but obscure in a num-
ber of details. The text is as follows: īyār ārthān nā nyarthām
pāruṣāṅām āgyā canēd abhipitṛān jagāmā; sudā́sā indrān satī-
kāṁ amitraṁ āryadhyayā mānaye vādhrīvaśāh. The stanza
pictures enemies of Sudās who seem to cross the river Paruṣāṅ
in order to attack him, or in order to escape after an unsuccessful
attack. Roth, Zur Literatur und Geschichte des Veda, p. 96,
translates "Zu einem Erfolge, nicht ohne Erfolg, gingen sie in
die Paruṣāṅ, und schnell (wie ein Pferd) schloss sie sich wieder
zusammen (abhipitṛān jagāmā)." Roth regards the first state-
ment 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 Paruṣāṅ
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 render-
ings of abhipitṛā 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 Paruṣāṅ; even the swift one did not come
to the evening-soma.' The last statement in the mouth of a Bra-
manical worshiper would be equivalent to saying "he did not
reach his home and hearth." Or, if we take canēd positively in-
stead 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 ār. ley. apapitṛā, which occurs in con-
nection with prapitṛā in RV. iii. 53. 24, imā indrā bharatiya
pitra apapitṛān ekitur nā prapitṛān: hiṃvinty āśe man arāṇān
nā nityān jyēvyājaḥ pāri nayanā tyā ājū. Roth, Zur Literatur
etc., p. 111, translates "diese Söhne Bharata's kennen (feindliches)
abwenden, nicht (frändliches) hinwenden. Sie spornen ihr Ross;
wie einen ewigen Feind tragen sie den starken Bogen (spähend)
umher in der Schlacht." Ludwig (1003) translates "O Indra,
diese Bharata denken nicht an nähe und nicht an ferne; sie trei-
ben das Ross wie einen nie versagenden helfen, als hätte es der
bogensehne kraft führen 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 pīvanēti for hīvanēti.
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 “nähe” for apapitvá and “ferne” for prapitvá it seems impossible to discover. But for the fact that he renders prapitvá 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 apapitvá shall have the value of “ferne.”

In the explanation of the stanza I believe we must bear in mind the traditional hostility of Viṣṇavāmitra and the Bharatas against Vasishtha and the Trtsus. Sāyana says in explanation of our stanza api ca satīrāne sahaṣja arānaṃ arīm iva vasīṣṭhān praty aṣvam prerayanti, tatæ ca balaṁ dhanum parinayanti, vasīṣṭhān hantum parasamahānena caranti. Sāyana 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 Trtsus: dandā ivē ’d gojanāsa āsan pārichinnā bharatā arbhakādhā: abhavac ca puratā vasīṣṭha ād it tr’śūnāṁ viṣo apraṭhanta ‘Like staves used for driving cattle, the insignificant Bharatas were broken. And Vasīṣṭha became the leader; then indeed did the clans of the Trtsus 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 Vasīṣṭha: cf. PB. xv. 5. 24. Either it contains an account of a contest between the Bharatas, the followers of Viṣṇavāmitra, and the Trtsus, the followers of Vasīṣṭha, in which the Bharatas were worsted—or, if the Bharatas and the Trtsus are identical, as has been assumed by Ludwig; Rīg-Veda, iii. 175, and Oldenberg, Buddhā, p. 413 ff., then the stanza states that the Bharatas (Trtsus) were powerless until Vasīṣṭha became their priest. Or, again, if we favor Hillebrandt’s assumption that the Bharatas were defeated until the Trtsus with Vasīṣṭha at their head came to their assistance, it is again the presence of Vasīṣṭha, 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 (kṣatriya) and the Trtsus with Vasīṣṭha (brahman), the latter being representatives of brahmanical orthodoxy. In the course of the rājasūya-ceremony, at TS. i. 8. 10. 2; TB. i. 7. 4. 2; 6. 7, we find the formula esa vo bharatā rājā, somo śri⁰kam brahmanānāṁ rājā ‘This person here, O Bharatas, is your king; Soma is king of us, the Brahmans.’ The TB. adds tasmāt soma-paramāno brahmanāḥ. In VS. ix. 40; x. 18, the same formula.

*Oldenberg’s after-thought (Z.D.M.G. xliii. 207 ff., based upon Bergaigne, Religion Védique, ii. 802), that the Trtsus are identical with the Vasīṣṭhas, both being the priests of the Bharatas, seems to me the least probable of all that have been suggested.
occurs in the version eṣa vo ‘mīrājā, etc., and Śāvana at Qb v. 3. 3. 12 remarks that Bāṇdhāyana reads eṣa vo bharatā etc., but that Apastamba presents the option of any of the following ethnic designations: bharatāḥ, kuravaḥ, paṁcālāḥ, kurupaṁcālāḥ, or the indefinite janaḥ. Correspondingly, in the Kāṇya school of the VS. xi. 11 and 27, the formula occurs in the version eṣa vaḥ kuravo rājāi eṣa vaḥ paṁcālā 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 ksātriya-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 Vasiṣṭhas are the typical Brahmans, as is stated explicitly e. g. at Ts. iii. 5. 2. 1, tasmād vāsiṣṭho 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 (brahmical) soma-feast.’ The expression cikitur nā propitvām may mean ‘they know not (or, they regard not) the matutinal soma-drink,’ in the sense of ‘they do not participate in brahmical sacrifices;’ on the other hand, apurpiṭvām cikitur may mean either ‘they know (or regard) separate feasting (or separation),’ apurpiṭvām being the opposite of sopitvām. 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 pītā 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 pītā. 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), eṣa te janaṭe 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.
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A very interesting, though little known, Arabic handbook of Polite Literature (إداب) is the work entitled The Rising-places of the Full-moons (كتاب مطالع البدور في منازل السراور), written by 'Alâ 'd-Din el-Ghozâli* 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. Haǧr Halīfa (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 Strasbourg§ in the winter of 1890–91, 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 ʿAlâ-ud-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh al-Bihāṭī al-Ḥāzīlī al-Dimashqī.
† Brill, Catalogue périodique, No. 272 (25).
‡ 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 Egyption origin.
¶ Catalogue d'une Collection de Manuscrits Arabes et Turcs. M. Th. Houtema, Dr.; 1888; No. 148. 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 کتاب مطالع البدر is entitled Story-Telling by Night, in High Life (مساءمة أهل النعيم).* The chapter is divided into 7 "Nights" (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 Strasbourg, 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 the correspondence to be very close. Story No. 1 is the 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 İbrāhîm ibn el-Mahdī 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 Parasite of el-Basra, appears in the 1001 Nights as the Story of the Barber.¶ No. 5 is the historical anecdote of the reconciliation of İbrāhîm ibn el-Mahdī 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 مساءمة.

† Whole number of pages, 608.
‡ It is not only in this 20th chapter of Ghozûlî that parallels with the 1001 Nights are to be found. The story of İbrâhîm el-Maûsilî and the Devil is told in Gh. i. 244 almost exactly as in the Nights. (In the latter, a similar anecdote is told also of İbrâhîm's son İshâk.) The story of İshâk el-Maûsilî and the Basket is another example, though in Gh. i. 244 the form of the narrative differs somewhat from that in the Nights, and the hero of the story is again İbrâhîm.
§ 1001 N., 2d Bulak ed., iv. 258 ff. (896th Night); Habicht's ed., x. 450 ff. (844th N.); Macnaghten's ed., iv. 357 ff. (896th N.); Lane's trans. (1841), iii. 572 (cf. ii. 578); Burton's trans., ix. 24. Also Kosegarten, Chrest. 22 ff. (cf. especially Preface, pp. x, xii).
¶ Bul. i. 236 (847th N.); Hab. vii. 292 (606th N.); Mac. ii. 293 (846th N.); Lane ii. 506 (cf. i. 235); Burton iv. 278. Also Masûdî (ed. Barbier de Meynard), vii. 12; el-Ikd el-Fardî (2d ed.), iii. 334. The story is a great favorite. I have found it, more or less altered, in other places besides those here mentioned.
¶ Bul. i. (80th N.); Hab. ii. 253; Mac. i. 249. In all editions and translations.
** Bul. ii. 128 (378d N.); Hab. vii. 159 (538th N.); Mac. ii. 138 (378d N.); Lane ii. 336; Burton iv. 103. Also Masûdî vii. 63-4, 67-73; Aghãnt ix. 60 ff., and more or less abridged, in a number of other places. Ghozûlî cites as his authority Wâkidî, who heard the story from İbrâhîm 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-Ghazālī 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 Strasburg MS. (S), in the early spring of 1891. This MS. is dated 1084,§ 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 Strasburg 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

* Bûl. 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 Ghazālī 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 Ghazālī 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‘awiya, his son Yezid, and the wife of ‘Abd-Allah ibn Salām, mentioned by Landberg, Proverbs, i. 155. Ghazālī borrowed it directly from Ibn Badrīn. It is long-winded and tiresome, and nobody but a humble would have found it sufficiently interesting to be included here. The same version, slightly abridged, is given in Humbert’s Analecta Arabica (Paris, 1888), pp. 72 ff.
§ Beg. Nov. 23, 1656.
|| 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 ٠, ١, ٢, ٣, and ٤ indicates that they are to be read unpointed, while the same is indicated in the case of ٥ and ٦ by a dot underneath. I learn from a description of the Brill MS., kindly sent me by Dr. Herzsohn, 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.
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-Ghazüli; with the added hope of throwing some light on the origin of the particular narratives under discussion.

The second Night (الليلة الثانية) in el-Ghazüli's 20th chapter is a very good example of the semi-historical narratives already alluded to. Its hero is the poet el-'Abbás ibn el-Almá† (†192 ?), and the scene is laid in Bagdad. The omnipresent Caliph Hárün er-Rašīd and his Vezír Yāḥyá ibn Júlí 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 َ, etc., and omitted altogether when in the line), and teṣālīd 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 Ghazüli 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 Macnaghton ed. correspond here much more closely with Ghazüli than do any of the others. Passages of some length entirely wanting in the Breslau and Bûlāk editions are supplied by Codex R. and Macn. together, one furnishing a part and the other the rest.

† The full name is ابّر الفضل العبّاس بن الأحّنف الكنفّي الصّنكي (ibn Hallikân) in Hağ. Hal. iii. 243, vii. 1067, seems to be a mistake). 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 Hallikán, not a single laudatory poem (مديح) is to be found in his diwān.

‡ So Ibn Hallikân. Ibn el-Athîr, Chron. vi. 130, gives the date as 188, and adds that some authorities give 193.
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-Abbâs, 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 النخري المعروف بالبشرى قال حدثنا محمد بن عامر الحنفي وكان من سادات بكير بن وائل وادركته شيخًا كبيرًا مملقا وكان إذا اتفاد على إملائه شيئًا جادًا به وكان قدّ ولى تذكيرا شرطة البصرة فحدثني هذا الحديث الذي ذكره روعت إليه من غير ناحيته ولا ذكر ما بينهما من زيادة والنقصان إلا أن معاني الحديث مجمورة فيما ذكر لكي حكي أن فتى نا كانوا متجيدين في نظام واحد كلهم ابن نعمة شرد عن اهله ووقع باصحابه فذكر ذكر منهم قال كنت قد أدركتنا

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

1 Om. V. and C.  
2 C. كبير القامة.  
3 B. وقع.  
4 V. حاذ (sic).  
5 C. ذكر.  
6 C. لى.  
7 C. ذكر.  
8 C. كلهم, and inserts after the next word.  
9 C. ابنا, and inserts after the next word.
دارا شاعرةً على حدّ الطريق ببغداد المعمورة بالناس وكنتاً نُفلسُ احياناً ونُسر احياناً على مقدار ما يمكن الواحد من اهله وكنتا لا نستنكر أن تقع مرتين على واحد منا إذا امكننا ويبقى الواحدُ منا لا يقدر على شيء فيقوم به اصحابه الدهر الأطول وكنتا إذا ايسرونا اكلنا ودعوها البلهبيين والبلهبيات وكنتا في أسفل الدار فأذا عدمنا الطلب فضجسنا غرفة لنا نتمضّق منها بالنظير إلى الناس وكنتا لا نختلنا من ذبيح في عسر ولا يسر فانَا كذلك يومًا وإذا بفتى يستاذن علينا فقلنا له اصد فاذًا رجل نظيف حلم السوجه سريّ الهجة تنبيٰ ربياه التي من أبناء النعم فاتقبل علينا فقال

1 C. مشرفة. 
In B. follows شاعرةً ببغداد.
8 S. inserts another الواحد.
9 C. البلهبيين.
10 Om. B.
11 So V. and S. S. rarely writes final ََ in any other way; thus even ذوا! C. has here ذوا. نخلو. B.
12 B. S. omits لا.
13 C. omits و B. بفتا.
14 B. نصيف.
15 S. B. شريف.
16 C. رويته. يظهر عليه B. اهل.
17 B. وقال.
18 C. B. و
انتى سمعت باجتمعكم وألفتكم وحسن منادمتكم حتى كأنكم
ادرتتم جميعاً تتقلب واحد فصاحبتم أن أكون واحداً
منكم فلا تكتملني قال فاصدف ذلك منا إقتداراً من
القوت وكثرة من النبيذ وقد كان قال لغلامة أول ما يأتنا
لى أن أكون كأهدهم هاتاً مما عندك فناغ عننا غير كثير
ثم إن هو قد اتي بسلطة خيرزان وفيها طعام المطْبَع
من جَذْى ونراق ونزُاق وأشنان ومَلْحَبَة
11 فأضبنا من ذلك ثم أصبنا من 12 شرابنا وانبسط الرجل وإذا هو أحياناً
خلق الله إذا حدد واحسنهم استباعاً إذا حدد رامسهم
كَانِ مُلاحَةً إذا خلف ثم أضبنا في 15 شرابنا وانبسط الرجل
فذا هو 16 احسن النفس خَلْقاً وخلِّقاً 17 كَنَا ربّنا امتثالاء

1 C. ادخلتم. B. transposes with the following.
2 C. قال.
3 So B. and apparently S.; C. تكتملني.
4 V. (sic). أكتارا
5 B. ياذنون.
6 S. B. فهات.
7 C. إذا, and om. قد; S. B. ثم.
8 S. B. add من B. فيها, omitting
9 C. مطْبَع
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10 S. مَلْحَبَة.
11 C. داخلة.
12 C. أفضينا في.
13 C. حياً; S. أحبي.
14 S. B. ملاحات; C. البلاحات.
15 S. افضينا في; C. 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., امتثالاء.
أنا ندعو إلى الشيء الذي نعلم أنه يكره فيه ظهر لنا أنه لا يريد غيرة ونرى ذلك في إشراق وجهه وكنتا نغنا به عن حسن المعنى ونتدارس أخباره فإذا به شغلنا ذلك.

ومن تعرَّف وجهه ونمسي كلم يمكن منا غير معرفة الكنيسة فانا سألناه عنها فقال أبو الفضل فقال لنا يوما بعد اتصال الاياس ألا اخبركم كيف عرفتم تلنا إني لنحك ذلك قال احببت في جواركم جارية وكانت سيدها ذات حباث وكتبت اجلس لها في الطريق ألمس اجتيارها فأراها حتى اخلقتنا الجلوس على الطريق وزائت غيرفتم هذه فسألت عن

1 C. بأن.
2 C. ان لا نريد.
3 C. ونرا. B. داك.
4 I. e., of course. So B.
5 V. B. which would imply that the preceding was read وآداره. B., I find, really has the point under the د.

This and all that precedes, beginning with وكننا، is omitted in C., the double occurrence of the word وجهة being the occasion of the blunder.

Read كلم يمكنكنا منه؟ S. B. have لم نتعرف (نعرف) B. ومنه معرفة.

6 S. B. لنا.
7 S. B. فبينما نحن معه يوما.
8 S. B. فقال (اذ قال B. إلا الح.
9 C. داك.
10 B.
11 B.
12 S. وكان (sic), otherwise as in the text. C. has وكان سيدها ذو عراش. The feminine is undoubtedly correct, and appears again below. See the translation.
13 B.
14 C. على.
15 S. واريت.
16 B.
17 C. اخلقي. B.
18 S.
الخبارها فأخبرت عن ائتلافكم ومساعدة بعضكم بعضًا فكان الدخول فيها انتم فيه آخر عندى من التجارة فسالناه عنها فأخبرنا فقلنا له لما تحيد عنها لك حتى نظفر بها فقال يا إخوتي أنا والله على ما ترون منى من شدة الالبحة لها والكلف بها ما تدرت فيها حرماً قط وما تقديرى إلا مطالبتها ومصابرتها إلى أن يمن الله بثنية فأشترىها واتم معنا شهرين ونحن على غاية الاعتقاط بقربها والسروى بصحته ثم اختلص منا فناننا من قرائة كل مصحف ولعنة مولمة ولم نعرف له منزلا نلتنه منه فكاد علمنا من العيش ما كان طاب لنا به ونبع عندنا ما كان

1 C. and S. ~ B. ~ Fأخبرت على.
2 Read ~ B. لبعض ~不做
3 C. ~ جعلنا
4 For ~ لا ~ as usual.
5 S. B. have the consonants all unpuncted, V. apparently نخرج ~ though the point might belong to
the
6 C. ~ نفتر ~ S. نفتر ~ V. ~ فأخبرت ~ Fأخبرت ~ ـ والإله.
7 V. ~ as usual. ~ B. has
after
8 C. ~ أني.
9 Om. C.
10 C. ولا.
11 C. ~ بصحته (sic).
12 C. لفراته.
13 It is evident that something (perhaps محسن) has fallen out before this word محسن.
14 V. appears to have (sic f), though the three points are so placed that they might be distributed in almost any way.
15 V. ~ محسن.
حسُن بقرية وجعلنا لا نرى۱ سرورا ولا غنِما إلا ذكرنا اتصال
الانس والسرور بحضوره والغم بعرفته
فكنّا فيه كما قال القائل۲

یُذْکَرُنی‌هِم۳ كلّ خیر زایته

۴ وشر۵ فما اَنْفُک منهم على۶ ذکر۷
فغاب عنا زهاء عشرين۸ يومنا ثم بينا نحن معيتازون يوما من الرصة۹ اذا به قد طلع في موكب نبيل وزوی جليل
فمعيت بصر۱۰ بنا احتَظ عن دابیته وانحت غلمانه ثم قال۱۱ يا اخرتي۱۲ ما هنا عيش بعدكم ولست اماطلكم بخبرى الى
المنزل ولكن ميلوا بنا الى المسجد فنزلنا معه فقال أعرّفكم
۱۰۳ اولا بنفسي أنا العبّاس بن الأحنف وكان من خبرى بعدكم
۱۱۴ اني خرجت الى منزلی من عندكم فذا السورة۱۰ محيطة

۱ B. نر.
۲ C. الا اذا.
۳ B. الشاعر. The metre is Tawil.
۴ S. نذكرنی‌هم.
۵ Om. S.
۶ S. and V. ذكر.
۷ B. إياما مقدارها عشرون.
۸ C. الرصة. B. om. الرصة (preceding).
۹ C. بصرنا به.

۱۰ S. ياخرتي. V. اخواني. C. inserts after these words اني والله.
۱۱ After this word C. B. insert لي, S. بی.

12 ۱۲ C. حتی آتی.
۱۳ V. C. B. ابن.
۱۴ I. e., المسودة. V. السورة.
بي فُضّي إلى دار أمير المومنين، فصرى إلى يحيى بن خالد فقال لهٌ: اكتب يا عباس انما اخترتك من ظرفاء الشعر لقرب مأخذك وحسن تأنيك وأن الذي ندبتك له من شأنك وقد عرفت خطيرات الخلافة وإنى اخبرك أن ماردة هي الغالبة على أمير المومنين اليوم وقد جرى بينهما عتب فهى بدالة المعشر تأبي ان تعتذر وهو بشر الخلافة وشرف الملك يأبى ذلك وقد رمت الأمر من تبليها فأعُياني وهو أجرى أن يستفرز الصواب فلُعَّل شعرًا تسهل عليه هذا السبيل فقضى كلامه ثم دعاه أمير المومنين فصار إليه وأُعطيت دوارة وطرطاسا فاعترف الزمع وأذهب

1 Om. S. B.
2 C. اخبرتك.
3 V. S. B.قرب.
4 I. e., تأنيك, infin. of أين ماينك.
5 V. S. B. ندبتك لك.
6 C. الغالبة.
7 C. وأنت.
8 C. بلال, S. بدالة (undoubtedly for with the usual diacritical point under the د). B. بدالة.
9 S. وهي.
10 C. يعز (sic).
11 C. من تبليها.
12 C. أجري.
13 I. e., يَسُتَفْرِزُ. But C. تسجرة, the s being regarded as suffix.
14 C. يسهل.
15 C. هذه. B. inserts ب after
16 B. دعا.
17 V. دراء.
عنى كل قافية ثم انفتح لي شيء والرسل تتقرر فلا جائتنا 
اربعة ابيات رضيتهما وعند صميمها معينة سهلة الالفاظ 
ملائمة ليست طلبت منى فقلت لأحد الرسول أبلغ الوزير أني 
تد قلت أربعة ابيات فان كان فيها مقنع وجبت بها فرجع 
الرسول بان ابياتها فنفى انتل منها مقنع وفي ذهب 
الرسول ورجع العين قلت بتين من غير ذلك الروى فكنت 
الاربع ابيات في صدر الرقصة وعقبت ببنتين فكنتني

العاشقان كلاهما مستعنب

وكلاهما متوجين مستغصب

صدت مغاضبة وصد مغاضبا

فكلاهما مهما يعالج متعبد

راجع أحببتي الذين هكجتهم

إن المتيم كل ما يتتذيب

---

1 B. تقر أ. The words seem to be a serio-comic adaptation from the Koran (Sur. xxiii. 46). C. has instead.

2 C. س. ب. الاربعة ابيات.

3 C. V.; S. B. add شعرأ.

4 S. متعنيص. In B. the second and fourth half-verses have exchanged places.

5 B. البها.
لا بد للعاشقين من رغبة
تكون بعين الصد والصرم
حتى إذا الهجر تمادى به
راجع من يهوى على رغم
فلما سمعها أمير المؤمنين قال والله لكأنى قصدت به
فقال له يحيى فانت والله المقصود به هذا يقوله العباس

1. تطول.
2. ذب.

3. All the texts have the سلالة (except B., which leaves the س unpunctuated), but a glance at the metre is sufficient to show the true reading. The suffix in تطول refers of course to التجبب.

4. The metre is Kâmil.
5. Metre, Sarf. B. adds شعرنا للعشاق.
6. B. وفقة.
7. B. يكون.
8. C. اذا ما.

9. C. S. تهوى. In B. the first consonant is unpunctuated, and the final letter is ।.

10. B. رغم, one of the very few places where a vowel is given.

11. C. ثم وجهت بالكتاب إلى يحيى بن خالد فرفعه يحيى إلى الرشيد فقال والله ما رأيت شعرا اشبه بما نحن فيه من هذا والله لكأنى قصدت به فقال..... يقوله العباس ابن الاحتفان في هذه القصة فلما قرأ الح.

12. B. والله لا انت المقصود به.
بن الحنف فقال ما رأيت شعوا اشبه بما نحن فيه من هذا فلمّا قرأ البيتان وانتهى إلى قوله راجع من يتهوى على رغم استغرب ضاحكاً حتى سمعت ضحكة ثم قال إلهي والله أراجع على رغم يأ غلام هات البغل فنهض فذهله السرور عن ان يأتي لي بشيء فدعاني يحيى فقال لي إن شعرك تدق وقع بغاية الموافقة وأذهل أمير المومنين السرور عن ان يأتي لك بشيء قلت لكن هذا الخبر ما وقع مني بموافقة ثم جاء [رسوله] فسارما فنهض وثبت مكانى ثم نهضت بنهوضه فقال لي يا عباس أمسيت أمل الناس أندرني ما سارني به هذا الرسول قلت لا قال قد ذكر لي أن ماردة

1 V. B.
2 S. ما.
3 S. B. ترى.
4 B. اقتصى، the marked with the مهمة.
5 S. C. تهوى، تهوى.
6 C. النعل.
7 S. B. فناذهله.
8 B. وقال، and omit لي.
9 S. شعرى.
10 B. الأمير.
11 V. لي.
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. فشاره. V. فسارء.
14 C. أملي.
15 V. اتدري.
16 C. سارني.
17 C. ذكرني، and omits أن. B. om. قد.
تلقت امیر البومنين لما علمت بهجته. فقالت يا امیر البومنين كيف هذا فاعظاها الشعر وقال هذا انتي بي اللك قال فسنا يقوله قال العباس بن الاحنف فانتي ما فعلته معه قال ما فعلت شيا بعد قالت إما والله لا اجلس حتى يكفاك قال امیر البومنين قائم لقيامها وأنا قائم لقيام امیر البومنين وهم يتناظران في صلتك فهذا كله لك قلت ما لي من هذا كله إلا الصلة.... ثم قال هذا احسن من شعرك فأمر لي امیر البومنين بمال كثير وامرت ماردة بمال دونه وامر الوزير بمال دون ما امرت به وحملت على ما تروى من الظهر ثم قال الوزير من تمام اليد قبلك أن لا تخرج من الدار حتى يئتي لك بهذا

1 بلغت .
2 ببحبته .
3 يامير .
4 C. B. به , but corrected in B. to .
5 B. قالة .
6 S. omits the four following words, the double occurrence of being the occasion of the blunder.
7 V. B. اذن .
8 C. يكافى .
9 S. يكافى .
10 Om. B.
11 It is evident that something is missing here. Perhaps فضحك؟
12 Om. C. B. الامير .
13 S. inserts .
14 B. om. Mal and به .
15 C. من هذا . B. ترجع .
16 B. بئل هذا .
The malāf, a fāshir, lit. 'to throw back' between the parties to an agreement, and not only for the sake of the rest.

The ordinary form of expression would be: fāqisam 'aṣ'īna wa qasum 'aṣ'īna: cf. e.g. Aghānī vii. 128. 11. After these words we should expect at least 'tha' before the verb.:

The text is correct. S. yihkss (4th stem, passive), which is at least as good; in B. the first consonant is unpointed. C. Tbkss.

V. C. B. B. has Tshwr (sic).

V. B. C. B. Rānis. B. has Sāhihā.

V. B. C. C. Sāhīnā. C. B. Astamānī.

S. B. add Dīnār. V. S. B. omit the three following words.
مايأة وقال العباس يا فتى أنى والدة أحسنت بعد ما قلتم ولكتبها حاجة في نفسي بها يتم سروري فإن ساعدتم فعلت قلنا له قال قال هذه الحبارية أنا اعانتها منذ دهر وارين اثير نفسى بما يتم سروري فإن ساعدتم فأخبرهن أن تنظروا إلى بعض من قد ماكس في ثبها ... أعطية فإنه خسماتة دينار كي سأل قلنا قاتم قد حط مانين قال وان فعل صادفنا من مولاهما رجلا حرا فأخذ ثلاث مائة وجهزها بالمانين فها زال لنا ممکن أن اعبت الموت بيننا.

1 V. S. B. قال.
2 C. adds أقسم.
3 S. يها (sic).
4 C. عاينتها.
5 C. بها. There is evidently a ditto here. The second فان ساعدتم at any rate, is to be canceled, and it is perhaps best to read بها here, and strike out the following words as far as فاخره.
6 Here, where is really needed, it is wanting! Read فاعطية؟ C. has فاعطيته.
7 S. B. قال.
8 B. adds ل، and omits قد.
9 S. مانين.
10 B. صادفنا مولاهما.
11 C. ثلاث مائة دينار. B. فاخذناها بتلخاشية.
12 S. B. بالمانين.
13 The narrative in these last lines is so condensed as to be obscure.
Translation of the Story of El-Abbâs Ibn El-Ahnaf and his Fortunate Verses.

Narrated by Abu 'l-Abbâs Mohammed ibn Yezîd, the grammarian, generally known as el-Mubarrad.)*

I heard the story (he says) from Mohammed ibn 'Amir el-Hanafî,† one of the chiefs of the tribe Bekr ibn Wâ'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-Basra, 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 nebdâh§ 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 Wâ'il. He thus belonged to the same family as el-'Abbâs 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 nebūdh 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 usnān, and mahlab, and tooth-sticks.* So we applied ourselves to† these, and then to our nebūdh, 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 kunya;‡ for we asked him what it was, and he said: "Abūl-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

* Usnān is alkali for washing the hands; mahlab, 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 الخلل والنحلب والأشنان.

† Dozy (Suppl.) gives a single example (Kosegarten, Chrestom. 147. 11) of this use of اصاب من, which he renders "gosûter." I find it also in Ghozūlī i. 288. 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-Ruṣāfā,† 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.

ذات حباَتب makes here the impression of a phrase in common use. It is one with which I am not familiar, however.

* Reading ُنَفَمَانَ.
† The name of a quarter in the eastern part of Bagdad, especially known as the burial-place of the Abbaside Caliphs. Ibn Athîr, vii. 185, speaks of a ٓقصر الرصافة.
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 Yahyâ ibn Hâlid, who cried out to me: "O 'Abbâs! 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 Caliphs. I must tell you that the girl Mâridâf 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 Vezîr 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.

* المَسْتِدَةَ, 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-Raşîd. She was the mother of the Caliph el-Mo'tâsim. Mas'tûdi vii. 103 and Ibn Athîr 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!" Yahyâ replied: "Sure enough, you are the one intended; this was written by el-Abbâs ibn el-Ahñaf, 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 Yahyâ called me, and said: "Your verses made a magnificent hit, but joy caused the Amîr 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 Ghûzûlî in another place (i. 280):

تتحمل عظيم الذنب منك تحب
فان كنت مطلوحا فقل أنا ظالم
فانك إن لم تتحمل الذنب يا فتى
يفارتك من تهوى وانفك راغم

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

 فقال عاتى حمّار فاتى بحمار كان له أسود يركبة في القصر.
soon a messenger* came, and spoke with him aside. Then he (Yahyà) 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-Ahnaf.’ '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 قائم لقيامها there is a punning reference to 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.
‖ I am not sure just what accomplishment is intended by تأدية الرسائل. In the story of Ibrāhīm al-Ma’sīlī 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 تختترنه من الغناء أو تقلنه 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 Nöldéke directed my attention to the fact of a certain resemblance between this story and that of Abu 'l-Hasan of Horîsân, narrated in the 1001 Nights.†† (Found in the Bûlân 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 *jahâdz*, 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.
§Bûl. iv., (959th N.); Macn. iv., 557 ff.
‖سّرداب, 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-Bengâ,** his favorite of all the ħarîm, 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-Ghozûlî 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-Mo‘tazz. But the name is incorrect, and the result of a scribal error for Kabiha. Cf. Mas‘ûdî vii. 270, 372; Ibn Aṭîr vii. 185. The latter adds that el-Mutawekkil gave her this name (‘Ugly-face’)
because of her extreme beauty: وَكَانَ الْمِتَّرْكُلْ سَّاَهَا تُبَيِّنَكَهَا لِحَسَنَتِهَا وَجَمَالَهَا كَمَا يُسَمَّى الْآسُوَدُ كَافُّرًا

† The verses are quite different, however, from those in el-Ghozûlî.

‡ This, together with the point of agreement just mentioned, I suppose to have constituted the resemblance alluded to by Professor Nöldeke.
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-Ghozālī 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 Ḥorāsān, 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 Ghozālī to el-‘Abbās ibn el-‘Aḥnaf 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 تبادى به
يكون بين الهجر والصرم
حتى إذا الهجر تبادى 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 Ghozālī narrative, namely the two that form the basis of the first strophe. They are cited by Ibn Hallikān in his article on Ibrāhīm el-Mausilī. After speaking in general terms of Ibrāhīm’s fame as a musician, the author continues:§ “It is related that the Caliph Hārūn er-Rašīd 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-‘Aḥnaf 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 Ghozālī.
‡ Chrestomathia Arabica, Leipzig, 1888.
§ Slane’s Translation, i, 21.
∥ The well-known Vezīr, 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-Ghozûlî). In pursuance to Ġa'far's orders, İbrâhim* sung these verses to er-Râšîd, who immediately hastened to Mârida, and got reconciled to her. She then asked him what brought about this event; and, being informed of what had passed, ordered to İbrâhim and el-'Abbâs a present of 10,000 dirhems each; and er-Râšîd, on her request, reimbursed 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 İslâm.

That the story told by Ghozûlî 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-Ghozûlî 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-Râšîd 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 İbrâhim 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.
† Ghozûlî generally makes the impression of using his sources carefully.
‡ Reigned from 233 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 Ḥorāsān, 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-'Abbās. I am inclined to think that in the above-mentioned appearance of the el-Ghozālī 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 Hārūn er-Rašīd followed necessarily, in view of the fact that the anecdote of the reconciliation of the latter with Mārida was already well known.* Concerning the growth of the remainder of the story of Abu'l-Ḥasan, 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, Būlāq 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-Rašīd. 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-Ḥasan of Ḥorāsān.‡ 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 Mārida and Kabiḥa, 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. Zotenberg's *Aladdin*, 7, 38; Burton x. 93 ff.; August Müller in the *Deutsche Rundschau* for July '87, p. 88 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. 12ff.), 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-'Abbās, De Goeje's essay is not concerned.
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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 3/4 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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 1. ḫa Na-bi-um-ku-du-ur-ri-u-šu-ur</td>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. šar Bu-bi-lam ḫšitu</td>
<td>King of Babylon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. za-ni-in ḫ-sag-ila u ḫ-zi-du</td>
<td>adorer of Esagila and Ezida,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. mār ḫa Na-bi-um-apal-u-šu-ur</td>
<td>son of Nabopolassar,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. šar Bu-bi-lam ḫšitu a-na-ku</td>
<td>King of Babylon, am I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. aš-šum ma-āš-ša-ar-ti ḫ-sag-ila</td>
<td>In order to (7) strengthen (6) the defense of Esagila,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSLITERATION.
7. du-un-nu-nim
8. li-im-nim u ša-ak-gi-šum
9. a-na Ba-bi-lam ūṣītu lā ša-na-ki
10. ga-an ta-ḫa-zi a-na Im-gur-Bīl
11. dār Ba-bi-lam ūṣītu lā da-ḫi-šu
12. ša ma-na-a-ma šar ma-ab-ri lā i-pu-šu
13. in ka-ma-at Ba-bi-lam ūṣītu
14. dāru dannu ba-la-ri šit Šamši
15. Ba-bi-lam ūṣītu u-ša-aš-ši-ir
16. hirī-su ab-ri-i-ma

TRANSLATION.
(that) an enemy and a destroyer against Babylon might not press
the storm of battle, in addition to Imgur-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-š ak-šu-ud
18. ap-pa-li-is-ma
19. ka-ar a-bi-im ik-zu-ur-ru
20. Ga-at-nu-ši ur-šitu in-šu
21. dűru dannu šu ki-ma sa-tu-um
22. la ut-ta-aš-šu
23. in kūpri u aqurri
24. ab-ni-ma
25. it-ti ka-ar a-bi ik-zu-ur-ru
26. i-si-ni-ik-ma
27. i-si-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
A Cylinder of Nebuchadnezzar.

Second Column.

Transliteration.

II. 1. u-ša-ar-ši-id-ma
    2. ri-ši-šu sa-da-ni-š
    3. u-za-aš-ki-ir
    4. i-ta-at dūrī a-na du-un-nu-nim
    5. u-ša-al-bi(?)-iš-ma
    6. in ḍu a-šur-ra-a-ra ti-a-am
    7. iš-di dūrī a-gur-ri i-mi-id-ma
    8. in i-ra-at ap-si-i
    9. u-ša-ar-ši-id ti-mi-in-šu
   10. ma-ša-ar-ti Ša-a-giš-ša
   11. u Ba-bi-šam ša-a-giš-ša iššu u-da-an-ni-mi-ma

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 Ešagila
and of Babylon I strengthened.
12. ba-ba-am ēa-ir-a-am  |  An eternal gate
14. ȗs Marduk ȗs bil ilāni  |  O Marduk, lord of the gods,
15. i-lu ba-nu-u-a  |  god, my creator,
16. in ma-ash-ri-ka  |  before thee.
17. ȗp-ši-tu-u-a li-it-mi-ru  |  let my works appear;
18. lu-la-ab-bi-ir a-na da-ir-a-tim  |  let become old to eternity
19. ba-la-at um-mi-im ri-ik-su-tim  |  (my) life for distant days.
20. ša-bi-i li-it-tu-ti  |  Enjoyment of the fullness of life,
21. ku-un-nu ku-su-u  |  permanence of throne,
22. u la-ba-ri pa-li-i  |  and long duration of reign,
Transliteration.
23. ana ši-ri-ik-tum šu-ur-kam
24. lu-ri-ši-tu kul-[lat napšat]-ia
25. "Marduk atta-a-ma
26. in ki-bi-ti-ka ki-it-ti
27. ša lâ na-ka-ri
28. lu-šu-bi-šu lu-za-ak-tu
29. ka-ak ku-ru-a
30. ka-ak na-ki-ri li-mi-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 labâšu.
II. 6. ašur-ra-a-ra I would, for lack of a better explanation, connect with šarâru 'beauty, splendor.' kima šât arḫi unammûr ša-ru-ru-šu (VR. 64, col. II. line 23) '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 $s$ for $š$: in the suffix of the 3rd pers. sing., I. 16, $hi-ri-su$ for $hi-ri-šu$; 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. 2, $sa-da-ni-š$ for $ša-da-ni-š$.

Also the use of $k$ for $k$: I. 9, $sa-na-ki$ for $sa-na-ki$ from $sanakū 'press with hostile intent.' Also $in$ is used for $ina$: I. 13, 23, 27, II. 6, 20, 26. In I. 8 we have $ša-ak-šu$ for $ša-ak-šu$; and in II. 8 $u-za-ak-ki-ir$ for $u-za-ak-ki-ir$.

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.
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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. cxliv), 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 Alepppe;” 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 Jāiminiya 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 Jaimini or Talavakara Brhmañas (i. 416, No. 5048; 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 Jaiminiya-Brahmana 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 Upanishad-Brahmana 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 svadhe; 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 (khanda) in each book (adhyaya) successively, disregarding the useless anuvaka 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 Jaiminiya Brahmana 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 apa and apoav 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. 233, note), and The Jaiminiya Text of the Aryeya Brhma of the Sama-Veda, Mangalore, 1878. There should also be mentioned Professor Whitney's translation of the story of Cyavana in the Proceedings for May, 1883 (Journ., vol. xi.).
I. 1. 1. prajāpati vah idaṁ trayena vedenā 'jayad' yad asya ḍaṁ jītaṁ tat. 2. sa ākṣate 'tthan ced vā anye devā anena vedenā yakṣyanta imāṁ vāva te jītitaṁ āsyanti ye 'yam mama, hanta' trayasya vedasya rasam ādātā iti. 3. sa dhūr ity eva ṛgyedasya rasam ādatta. se 'yam pṛthivy abhavat. tasya yo rasah prānedat sa 'gnir abhavad rasasya rasah. 4. dhūva' ity eva yajurvedasya rasam ādatta. tad idam antarikṣaṁ abhavat. tasya yo rasah prānedat sa vāyur abhavad rasasya rasah. 5. svar ity eva sāmavedasya rasam ādatta. sa' 'sau dyāur abhavat. tasya yo rasah prānedat sa ādityo 'bhuvad rasasya rasah. 6. athā 'kasyāi vā 'kṣarasya rasain nā 'caknod ādātum om ity etasyāi 'va. 7. se 'yam vāy abhavat. om eva nāmāś 'sā. tasyā u prāna eva rasah. 8. tāny etāny āstāv. āstāksarā śāyati śāyati śātām śa brahma u śāyati. tad u brahmaḥ 'bhāsampadyate. āstāāpahā paścas eva sa eva paścycam. 1.

prathame 'nūvāke prathamaḥ khaṇḍah.

I. 1. 1. Prajāpati 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 bhūs, 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 śāyati. The sāman is in the śāyati-metre and the śāyati is the brahma; and thus it becomes the brahma. Eight-footed are the domestic animals, and therefore it belongs to the domestic animals.
I. 2. 1. Om is Agni (fire), speech is the earth; om is Vāyu (wind), speech is the atmosphere; om is Āditya (sun), speech is the sky: om is breath, speech is just speech. 2. He who knowing thus sings the udgitha saying om, he takes Agni (fire) and causes him to stand firm on the earth; saying om, he takes Vāyu (wind) and causes him to stand firm in the atmosphere; saying om, he takes Āditya (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 Čālana, sing the gāyatra (-sāman) thus: ovāśc ovāśc ovāśc hum bhā ovā.

2. Truly, this is thrown away (parān), as it were; not productive of long life, as it were. It should be sung in accordance with the course of wind and waters.

3. Truly, if the wind should blow only straight away (parācīr), 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. 4. 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. 5. And if the waters should flow streaming straight away (parācīr) only, they would be exhausted. When they proceed making bends, winding themselves in, producing eddies, [they do so] just fearing exhaustion. 6. Therefore that [sāman] should be sung according to the course of the wind and waters.

2. 1 C. antarikṣ-. 2 B. āpā. 3 vācī. 4 B. chel-; C. chīl-. 5 ā-ga. 6 A.B. parānd; C. purād. 7 B.C. -risṭhāt. 8 C. sit. 9 A. yajamāno, the ya correction; B.C. jamāno. 10 C. vam. 11 A. dayad, da struck out in B.; C. yad. 12 aṅkāsī.
I. 3. 1. ovā ovā ovā hum bhā ovā iti karoty eva. 2 etābhyaṁ sarvam āyur eti. 2. sa yathā vykṣam ākramaṇāṁś ākramaṁśa iyāṁ evam evāt 'te āve-dve devate saṇḍhaye 'manā lokān rohanā eti. 3. eka u eva mātyur anvety açanayāṁ 'va. 4. atha hiṁkaroti. candrāṁ vāi hiṁkāro 'nnam u vāi candrāmāḥ. annenā 'panayāṁ ghnti. 5. tāṁ-tāṁ açanayāṁ annena hatvo 'm ity etam evā 'dityaṁś samayā 'timucyate. etad eva divāc chiḍam. 6. yathā khaṁ vā 'nasas śyād rathasya vāi 'vam etad divāc chiḍam, tad raçmibhis svinchannāṁ śṛṣyate. 7. yad gāyatraśyo rādhvam hiṁkārāt tad amṛtam. tad 'atmānaṁ da-dhyād atho yo-jaṁnam. atha yaśā 7 itarat saṁo 'rādhvam tasya pratihārāt. 8. sa yathā 'dbhir āpas saṁśrijyetāḥ yathā 'gninā 'gnis saṁśrijyeta yathā kṣīre kṣiram āsicyād evam evāt 'tad aṣa-ram etābhir devatābhis saṁśrijyate. 3.

prathame 'nuvāke 'trīyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 4. 1. taṁ vā etam hiṁkārāṁ him bhā iti hiṁkurvanti. grīr vāi bhāḥ. asāu vāi 'ādityo bhā iti. 2. etam ha vā etam nyaṅgam anu garbhā iti. yad bha iti strīṇām prajananaṁ nigacchati

I. 3. 1. He utters ovā ovā ovā hum bhā 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 hunger. 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 pratiḥāra. 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 bhā. Fortune is bhās (splendor); yonder sun is bhās. 2. According to this same sign is [the word] garbhā (fetus). In that he, saying bha, ap-

8. 1 ovā, 2 A.B. div-. 3 A.B. akram-. 4 A. iti. 5 B. -tyāṁ; C. -tyo
  6 naso. 7 rasasya. 8 A.B. -ma. 9 A.B. tvad; C. tad (?). 10 B.-rān.
  11 A. om. 2 gāmbha. 3 A.B. strīn-.
tasmat tato brähmana ṭakalpo jayate ‘tivyādhi’ rājanyāc gūrah.

3. etam ha vā etam nāyaṅgam anu vṛṣabha iti. yaḥ bha iti nigacchati tasmat tataḥ punyo’ balivardo duhāna dhenur ukṣā daçavaijī jayante. 4. etam ha vā etam nāyaṅgam anu gardabha iti. yaḥ bha iti nigacchati tasmat sa pāpiyān chreyaśīru carati tasmaḍ asya pāpiyasaṅgreyo jayate ‘cavatavo vā ‘cavatari vā. 5. etam ha vā etam nāyaṅgam anu kubhra iti. yaḥ bha iti nigacchati tasmat so ‘nāyasa’ sann api rājñaḥ prāṇotī. 6. tam hāti tam eke hīṅkāraṁ him bhā ovā iti bahirdeśa‘va’ hīṅkurvanti. bahirdhe ‘va’ vā grīḥ. grīḥ vā śānno hīṅkāra iti. 7. sa ya enam tatra brūyadā bahirde śvā ayān śriyam adhita pāpiyān bhu- visyati.11

sa yadā vāṁ mriyate ‘thā’ ‘gnāu prāsto bhavati :

kṣīpre bata marisyatā ugnāv enam prāśīṣyantī ‘ti tathā hāi ‘va syāt. 8. tasmād u hāi ‘tam hīṅkāraṁ him vo ity antar śvā ‘va ‘tmann arjayet. tathā ha na bahirdhā śriyam kurute sarvam āyur eti. 4.

prathame ‘nūvāke eaturthāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

approaches the secret parts of women, therefore thence is born a Brähman like a rṣṭi, a piercing kingly hero. 3. According to this same sign is [the word] vṛṣabha (bull). In that he approaches saying bha, 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] gardabha (ass). In that he approaches saying bha, 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. 5. According to this same sign is [the word] kubhra. In that he approaches saying bha, therefore he, even though he be not an Ārya, obtains kings (?). 6. This same hīṅkāra some utter him bhā ovā—outside as it were. Truly outside is fortune; fortune indeed is the syllable him of the sāman. 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 hīṅkāra, viz. him vo, inside of one’s self, as it were. Thus, indeed, he does not put fortune outside, he attains complete age.

4.4 C. jayata itivyā... 5 A. yaṣat. 6-ya. 7 insert ‘ti. 8 A.B. nāk thyas; C. nārthyas. 9 C. om. bahirdhe’va ... tatra brūyad
bahirddhee, om. va. 11 yati ‘ti.
5. 1. sa haśa 'śā khalā devatā 'pasedhanti tiṣṭhati. idāṁ vāi tvam atra pāpam akar ne 'hāi ’śyasi. yo vāi punyakṛt syāt sa ihe ’yād iti. 2. sa brāyād apac̣yo vāi tvam tad yad aham tad akaravam tād vāi mā tvam nā ’kāryaśyas tvam vāi tasya kartā 'si 'ti. 3. sā ha veda satyam mā ’he ’ti. satyam hāi 'śā devatā. sā ha tasya ne ’če yad enam apasadhet satyam upāi ’va kavyate. 4. aha ho ’vācāi ’kṣāko ’vāi vārṣṇo ’nvaṅkātā vāi sātyakīrta utāi 'śā khalā devatā ’pasedhānum eva āhriyate 10 'syāi dīcaḥ. 5. [ta] dīvo ‘ntāh. tad ime dyāvāprthiśaḥ samoli̇s-yataḥ. yāvaśi vāi vedi śaviśi 'yam pṛthiśi. tad yatrāi ’tac cātvā- laiśi kūtaśi tat samprati sa diva ākāṣaḥ. 6. tad bāhispavamāne stāyāmāne manaso ’dṛṣṭhyāyā. 7. sa yatho ’cchryaḥ pratiyasaḥ 11 prapadyeti ’vam evāi ’tavā 12 devataye ’dam amṛtam abhiparyeti yatrā ’yam idāṁ tapati ’ti. 8. aha ho ’vācā— 5. prathame ’nvaṅkā pāṃcamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

6. 1. —gobalo vārṣṇaḥ ka etam udiṭyam arhati samayāi ’tum. dūrād vā esa etat tapati nvaṇ. tena vā etam pūreṇa śāmapathas tad eva manasaḥ ’hṛtyo ’pārisfād etasyāi ’tasminn amṛte nida-

I. 5. 1. This same base divinity stands driving away: “This evil thou hast done here; thou shalt not come here. Verily he who is doer of good deeds, he may come here.” 2. Let him say: “Thou sawest what I thus did; thou wouldst not make me do this; thou art doer of it.” 3. That [divinity] knows: “He tells me truth.” This divinity is truth. It is not competent to drive him away; he just calls upon truth. 4. Now either Āikṣvāka Vārṣṇa or Anuvaktar Śātyakīrta said: “And this base divinity begins to drive away from this quarter. 5. [There] is the end of the sky; there heaven and earth embrace. So great as the sacrificial hearth is, so great is this earth; and where that ditch (for the northern altar) is dug, precisely there is that space of the sky. 6. Thus, when the bāhispavamāna is being sung, he should take up [the cup] with the mind. 7. As one would approach an elevation, toiling toward [it], even thus by means of this divinity one compasses this immortality, where this one here burns. 8. Moreover —

I. 6. 1. — Gobala Vārṣṇa said: “Who is able to go through the midst of this sun? Verily from afar he thus burns downward. On that account, verily, the sāman-path is before him (?); seizing [him] thus with the mind he should place him above this

5, 1 insert ’ti. 2 B.C. tvad. 3 C. arka-. 4 sa-. 5 C. satyam māhe. 6 matam. 7 kašako. 8 B.C. sātyakīrta. 9 B. -ā. 10 dhṛy-. 11 pratyasya. 12 A.B. ’tatey-. 
H. Oertel,

dhyād iti. 2. tad u ho 'vāca cātyāyanis samayāi 'vai 'tad enam kas tad veda. yady etā āpo vā abhito yad vāyum1 vā esa upa-hvayate raśmīn vā esa tad2 etasmā3 vyūhati 'ti. 3. atha' ho 'vāco 'lukyo' jānaçrutya yatra vā esa etat tapaty etad eva 'mṛtam. etac ced vāi prāpnoti tato mṛtyunā pāpmanā vyāvar-tate. 4. kas tad veda yat parenā "dīyam antarikṣam idam anālamanā4 avareṇa. 5. athāi 'tad eva 'mṛtam. etad eva mām yāyam prāpayaśyathā.5 etad eva 'hām nā 'timanyā6 iti. 6. tānā etany aśtāu. aśṭākṣarā gāyatri. gāyatram sāma brahma u gāya-trī. tad u brahmā 'bhisampadyate. aśṭāçapadhā pacavan teno paçayvam. 6.

prathame 'nunāke fasṭhaḥ khanaḍaḥ.

I. 7. 1. tā etā aśtāu devatāḥ. etavaç idam sarvam. te [............] karoti. 2. sa nāi 'ṣu lokēsu pāpmane bhūtrayyā 'vakaçam kuryāt. manasāī 'nain nirbhajet. 3. tad etad roc ā 'bhayanocate. catvāri vāk parimitā padāni tānī vidur brāhmaṇā ye maṇiṣināḥ:

guhā trīṇi nihitā7 ne 'nigayanti8
turiyaṃ vācō manusya vadanti 'ti. 4. tad yāni tānī guhā trīṇi nihitā7 ne 'nigayanti [tā] 'ma one in this immortality. 2. Further Čātyāyanī 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 Jānaçruteya 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 immor-tality. This you will cause me to obtain. This I do not despise." 6. = i. 1. 8.

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 rc: "Speech is four measured quarters; Brāhmans 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

---

6. 1vā yām, 2A.B. tady; C. ta. 3C. syāi. 4C. atho. 5C. om. 6vāca (t) ulukyo A.C.; ulukyo B. 7B. yat. 8B. paro-. 9A. anvilay. 10-ta; A. prātip-. 11-yata. 7. 1B. tānī. 2A. no; C. om. 3C. gayanti. 4C. tānī. 5C. om.
eva te lokāḥ. 5. turīyaṃ vācō manusyā vadaṇṭī 'ti. caturbhāgo ha vai turīyaṃ vācaḥ. sarvayā 'syā vācā sarvār ebhir lokās sarvenā 'syā kṛtam bhavati ya evam veda. 6. sa yatāḥ 'ṛmnām ākhaṇam 'ṛtvā loṣṭho' vidhvāṇsata evam eva sa vidhvāṇsate ya evam vidvānasam upavadati. 7. 

prathame 'nuvāke saptamaḥ khaṇḍāḥ. prathamo 'nuvākas samāptah.

I. 8. 1. praṇāpatīr vā idām trayeṣa vedenā 'jayad yad asye 'dam jitaṁ tat. 2. sa ākṣate 'ṛtham caḥ vā anye devā anena vedenā yakṣyanta imāṁ vāva te jitiṁ jēṣyanti ye 'yam mama. 3. hante 'maṁ trayeṣa vedaṁ 'pilāyāni 'ti. 4. sa imāṁ trayeṣa vedaṁ apilayaṭ. tasya pilayān ekaṁ eva 'kṣaram nā 'caknot 'pilayānum om iti yad etat. 5. esa u ha vāva sarasaḥ, sarasaḥ ha vā evaṁvīdas trayi vidyā bhavaṭi. 6. sa imāṁ rasam pilayītvā 'panidhāyō'rdvho 'drvavat. 7. taṁ 'drvavantam catvāro devānām anvapacayān indraḥ candro rudras samudraḥ. tasmād ete āreṣṭhā devānām. ete 'hy 'enam' anvapacayān. 8. sa yo 'yam rasa āsīt tad eva tapo 'bhavaṭi. 9. ta imāṁ rasam 'devā anvākṣanta. ā te 'bhyaṇpacayant sa 'tapo vā abhūd iti. 10. imān u vāi 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 clod 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. 3. 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, Čandra, 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 maṁścitvā tasminn etad eva 'ksaram apiśitam'
avindann om iti yaḍ etat. 11. eṣa u ha vāvā sarasah. tenāi
'nam prāyvūna. 13 yathā madhumā lājān prāyvūd evam. 12. te
'bhyatapyaṁta. teśāṁ tapyamānānām āpyaṁta vedah. te 'nena ca
tapasā "pīnena ca vedena tām u eva jītim ajayaṁ" yām pra
jāpatir ajayaṁ. 17 te ete sarva eva praṇāpatimātṝā ayām' ayām
iti. 13. tasmāt tapyamānasya bhūyasī kirtir bhavati bhūya
yācaḥ. sa ya etad evam vedāi 'vam eva "pīnena vedena yajate."'
yado yājayaty evam eva "pīnena" vedena" yājayati. 14. tasya
hāi 'tasya nāi 'va kā cana "rtiṁ asti" ya evam veda. sa ya evaī
'nam upadatā" sa ārtim rochati. 32. 8.
dvitiye 'nunāke prathamāh khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 9. 1. tad āhūr yad ovā' ovā iti gīyate kvā 'tra rg bhavati
kva śāme 'ti. 2. om iti vai śūma vāg ity ṛk. om iti mano vāg
iti vāk. om iti prāṇo vāg ity eva vāk. om iti 'ndro vāg iti sarve
dēvāḥ. tad etad indram eva sarve devā anvanyanti. 3. om ity
etad eva 'ksaram. etena vai saṁsave parasye 'ndraṁ vṛṣāṇa.'
etena ha vai tad bako dālbhya ājakeśinām indram vavaraṅa. 5
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 commen-
surate 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 ṛc, what of the śāman?" 2. Om is the śāman, speech is
the ṛc; 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 simultane-
ous soma-sacrifice one would force Indra away from his rival.

8. 31 C. piśitam; B. -tā. 19 C. vā. 13 prāy-. 14 -yāyād. 15 C. tena; B. te ena; A. tenāna. 16 C. -yat. 17 A.B. -yan. 18 asyām. 19 C. om. yajate
yado .... vedena. 20 A.B. eva ēpī-. 21 A. asi. 22 A. upadati; C. upa-
dati. 23 A. achoati; B.C. ar-
9. 3 B. evā. 3 A. ovāta (=ovāś ṣ). 2 rg. 4 aṛvī-. 5 A.B. -pin-. C.
-πin-. 5 vavrajα.
om ity etenāi ’vā”niṣāya.” 4. tāny etāny āstāu. āstākṣarā gāyatrī. gāyatrīn śaṁa brahma u gāyatrī. tad u brahma ’bhisampad- yate. āstācaphāh paçavas teno paçavyam. 5. tasyāī ’tāni nā- mānā ’nārā harkā ’ksitir” amṛtaṁ vyomānto vācāḥ. bahur” bhūyas sarvāṁ sarvasmād uttaram jyotih. 6. taṁ satyaṁ vijnā- nām” vivācanam apratīvācyam.” 7. purvam sarvāṁ sarva vāk. sarvam idam api dhenuḥ pīnvate parāg arvāk. 8. dvitiye ‘nvāke dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍah.

I. 10. 1. saḥ prathaksātālān kāmadughākṣiti prānasamhitam caṣuṣyaṭram saukvaprāhātman manasaḥ vyuṭpān hṛdayāgrahm bhāmaṇabhaktam” annaçubhān āmrāpavitrān gobbhām prthivyuparam tapastanu varuṇaparīyatanam inindrārestham sahasrākṣaram ayutadhāram omṛtaṁ duhānā sarvān imān lokān abhivikṣarati ’ti. 2. tad etat satyaṁ aksaraṁ yath om iti. tasminna āpoḥ pratiṣṭhitā āpun prathiv pṛthivyāṁ ime lokāḥ. 3. yathā sūcyaḥ palaçānī samātyāṁ syur evam etenā ’ksareṇe ’me lokās samātyāṁ. 4. tad idam imān atiṣṭhyā daçadhā

Truly by means of it Baka Dālbhya forced Indra away from the Ājakeyins; just by means of this om he led [him] to himself. 4 = I. 1. 8. 5. These are its names: Indra, action, imperishable- ness, the immortal, end of the firmament of speech (?); the mani- fold, the numerous, the all, the light higher than the all; right- eousness, truth, distinction, decision which is not to be contra- dicted; the ancient all, all speech. This all also, [like] a cow, fattens thitherward, bitherward.

I. 10. 1. She that milks immortalitypossessing 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 Brāhmans, 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-
ksurati catadhā sahasradhā 'yutadhā prayutadhā [niyutadhā] 'rbudadhā nyarbudadhā10 nikhavadhā11 padam akṣitir vyo-
mántaḥ. 6. yathāu 'gro visyandamānaḥ12 paris-paroparīyaṃ bhavaty evam evāi 'tad aksaram paris-paroparīya13 bhavati. 6. te hā 'te14 lokā udvāva eva śūtāḥ. ima evam trayodaśamāsāḥ. 7. sa ya evām vidvān udgāyati sa evam evāi 'tān lokān ativahati. om ity etenā 'ksarenā 'num ādītyam mukha ādhatte. eṣa ha vā eta dhā aksaram. 8. tasya1 sarvam āptam bhavati sarvam jītaṁ na ha 'syā kaś cana16 kāmo 'nāpto bhavati ya evān vedā. 9. tad āha prthuṁ vāṁya17 divyān vratyaṁ paprcacha sthanāṁ divastambhanāṁ sūryam āhur antarikṣe sūryaḥ prthivipratisthaḥ: apsu bhūmig18 citirīre19 bhūribharāḥ kim svin mahīr adhisthanty āpa iti. 10. te ha pratyaccau sthanāṁ eva divastambhanāṁ sūryam āhur antarikṣe sūryaḥ prthivipratisthaḥ: apsu bhūmig18 citirīre19 bhūribhāras satyam mahīr adhisthanty20 āpa iti. 11. om ity etaṁ eva 'ksaram satyam. tad etaṁ āpo 'dhitiṣ-
thañtī. 10.

dvitiye 'nuvače tṛṭiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. dvitiyo 'nuvaκas saṃāpttaḥ.

dreadfold, thousandfold, ten thousandfold, hundred thousandfold, millionfold, ten millionfold, hundred millionfold, billionfold, ten billionfold, hundred billionfold, thousand billionfold. 5. As a flood flowing in different directions [proceeding] farther and farther becomes broader, even so this syllable [proceeding] farther and farther becomes broader. 6. These same worlds are lying [piled] upward [one above the other]. They thus are of thirteen months. 7. 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. 8. Whoso knows thus, by him all is obtained, all conquered, of him no desire whatsoever is unfulfilled. 9. Now Prthu Vāṁya 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 asṛjata. tā enāṁ srśā annakūcinir abhitas samantam paryavīcan. 2. tā abravit kimkāmā sthe 'ti. annādyakāmā ity abravan. 3. so 'brahīd ekān vāti vedam annādyam arśiśi sāmāti' 'va. tad vah prayacchāni 'ti. tan naḥ prayacche 'ty abravan. 4. so 'brahīd imān vāi paćūn bhūyishham upajwāmaḥ ebhyaḥ prathamam pradūṣyāmi 'ti. 5. tebhyo hiṁkāraṃ prayacchat. tasmāt paćavo hiṁkarikro vijitāsmanāṁ iva caranti. 6. prastāvam manusyebhyaḥ. tasmād u te stutata iva 'dam me bhavisyatī adi me bhavisyatī 'ti. 7. ādiṁ vayobbhyaḥ. tasmāt tāny ādādānāṁ upāpapātān iva caranti. 8. udgāthām devebhyo 'mytum. tasmāt te 'mytāh. 9. pratikāraṃ uranyebhyah paćubhyaḥ. tasmāt te pratihāraḥ tantasyamānāṁ iva caranti. 11. 

trīye 'nūva ke prathamah khanḍaḥ.

I. 12. 1. upadravāṁ gandharvaṁ apsarabhyah. tasmāt tu upadravāṁ grhnantā iva caranti. 2. nidhanam pitṛbhyaḥ. tasmād u te nidhanasamśthāḥ. 3. tad yad ebhyaḥ tat sāma pṛayacchod etam evāṁ bhyaḥ tad ādityam pṛayacchat. 4. sa yad anuditas sa hiṁkāro 'rdhitahā prastāva āsāṅgavam ādīr mādh-

I. 11. 1. Prajīpati created creatures. They being created beleaguered 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 sāman; 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 hiṁkāra. Therefore domestic animals go about continually uttering him, desirous of knowing [each other], as it were. 6. The prastāvā [he gave] to men. And therefore they praise themselves (√stu), as it were, [saying]: "This will be mine, that will be mine." 7. The ādi [he gave] to the birds. Therefore they move about taking themselves (√dā+ā), flying up and down, as it were. 8. The udgāthā [he gave] to the gods, being immortal. Therefore they are immortal. 9. The pratihāra [he gave] to the beasts of the forest. Therefore they, being kept back, move shaking (?) as it were.

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

11. ¹vā. ²C. sām.- ³prya.- ⁴krto. ⁵B.C. stuvateva. ⁶pratihātās. ⁷A.B. tātr(?)(s(?)yamānā; C. tātsyamānā. ¹²C. -apsarebh-. ¹³C. arthodit-. ¹⁴ādityaḥ.
wandana udgītho ‘parāhnaḥ pratihihro yaḥ upāstamayaṁ lokī-
tayati sa upadravo ‘stamita eva nidhanam. s. sa esa sarvāir
lokāḥ samaḥ. tad yaḥ esa sarvāir lokāḥ samaṁ tasmād esa eva
sama. sa ha vai samaṁvita sa sama veda ya evam veda. s. te
‘bruvan dāre va idam asmat. tatre ‘dāṁ kuru yatro ‘pajīvāme
‘ti.’ 7. tad ‘ṛtun abhyatyanayat. sa vasantam eva hiṅkāram
akaroṁ garīsinaṁ prastāvāṁ varṣāṁ udgīthāṁ caruḍām9
pratihihram henuntāṁ nidhanam. māsārdhamaśāv eva saptamāv
akaroṁ. 8. te ‘bruvan nediyo nvāvai ‘tarhi. tatrāi ‘va kuru
yatro ‘pajīvāme ‘ti.’ 9. tat parjanyam abhyatyanayat. sa pu-
rovātāṁ eva hiṅkāram akaroṁ. 10.

I. 13. 1. jīmūtāṁ prastāvān1 stanayitum udgīthāṁ vidyut-
am pratihihram vyṛṭini2 nidhanam. yaḥ vyṛṭit prajāc cau
‘sadhayac ca jāyante te saptamāv3 akaroṁ. 2. te ‘bruvan
tad yajñam abhyatyanayat. sa yajñasya eva hiṅkāram akaroṁ
raḥ prastāvāṁ sāmāṇy udgīthāṁ stomam pratihihram chando

not yet risen it is the hiṅkāra; when half risen it is the pra-
stāva; at the time when the cows are driven together it is the
ādi; noon is the udgīthā; the afternoon is the pratihihra; when
it turns red toward sunset it is the upadrava; having gone to set-
ting it is the nidhana. 5. 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. 6. They said: “Verily,
this is far away from us; make it there where we may live on
[it].” 7. Then he transferred it to the seasons. He made the
spring the hiṅkāra, the summer the prastāva, the rainy season the
udgīthā, the fall the pratihihara, the winter the nidhana. Both
months and half-months he made as sixth and seventh. 8. They
said: “Verily, it is nearer now; [but] make it there where we
may live on [it].” 9. Then he transferred it to Parjanya. He
made the preceding wind the hiṅkāra,—

I. 13. 1. The thunder-clouds the prastāva, the thunder the
udgīthā, the lightning the pratihihara, 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 yajñasya the hiṅkāra, the re’s the
prastāva, the sāmans the udgīthā, the stoma the pratihihara, the

12. 4C. repeats sa sama veda. 5-ma iti. 6-kara. 7-prastāvaḥ, varṣā
udgīthāḥ; B.C. caṛat pratihiharaḥ; A. om. caṛadām pratihiharam.
13. 1A. prastātrāi ‘vam. 2-tir. 3A. sapatam. 4-ma iti.
nidhanam. svāhākāravaṇaṭkārāv eva saptamāv akarot. 4. te
'bruvaṇa nedīya νvāvaiitarhi. tatrāv va kuru yatro 'pājīvāmē 'ti.'
s. tat purusam abhyatyanayat. sa mana eva hiṅkāraṃ akarot vācam prastāvam pṛāṇam udgāthāṃ caṅkṣuḥ pratīkāraṃ pro-
trāṇaṃ nidhanam. retaṃ cāv 'va prajām ca saptamāv akarot. 6.
te 'bruvaṇaḥ atra va enat tad akur yatro 'pājīvīṣyāma iti. 7. sa
vidaṇaḥ aham eva sāmā 'smi nayy etā devatā iti. 13.
trīyaḥ 'nūvāke trīyaḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 14. 1. na ha daṅredevaṣṭ syāt. yāvād dha va ātmanā
devān upāste tavaś asmāi devā bhavanti. 2. atha ya etad evam
vedā 'ham eva sāmā 'smi nayy etās sarvā ā devatā ity evam' hā 'sminn etās sarvā ā devatā bhavanti. 3. tad etad devaṇaṇt śāma. sarvā va vā devaṇaṇt gīvanta evaṁvādam punyāya sā-
ḍhāve. tā enam punyām eva sādhu kārayantī. 4. sa ha smā'ha
suciṭtac pāilano' yo yajñākāmā mām eva sa vṛṇiṭum. tata evāi
'nam yajña upanamsyati. evaṁvādam h y udgāyantām sarvā
devatā anusaṁtrpyanti. tā asmāi trītaḥ tathā kariṣṭanti yathāi
'nam yajña upanamsyati 'ti. 14.

triye 'nuvake catvarthah khandah. triye 'nuvakas samaptaḥ.

chandas the nidhana; the exclamations svāhā and vaṣaṭ 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 trans-
ferred it to man. He made the mind the hiṅkāra, speech the
prastāva, breath the udgātha, sight the pratiṣkāra, hearing the
nidhana; 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 devaṇaṇt 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 Sucitta Čāilana used to say: "Whoso wisheth to sacri-
fice, let him choose me; then the sacrifice will become his.
For with one who knowing thus singeth the udgātha all the divin-
ities are pleased together. They being pleased will so act for
him that the sacrifice shall become his."
I. 15. 1. deva vai svargaṁ lokam āipsan. tāṁ na āyānā nā "sinā' na tiṣṭhanto' na dhāvanto nā' va kena cana karmañṇa" pūrvan. 2. te devāḥ prajāpatim upādāvanā svargaṁ vai lokam āipsisna. tāṁ na āyānā nā "sinā' na tiṣṭhanto na dhāvanto nā' va kena cana karmañṇa" pāma. tathā na 'nugādi yathā svargaṁ lokam āpūryāme' ti. 3. tāṁ abhavīt śāṃna 'nṛcena svargaṁ lokam prayāte' ti. te śāṃna 'nṛcena svargaṁ lokam prāyan. 4. pra vā āhe śāṃna 'gur iti. tasmāt prasāna tasmād ut prasāmy annam atti. 5. deva vai svargaṁ lokam āyan. ta etāṁ yākpadāṇi ārāṇi dhāvanta āyan. te svargaṁ lokam ājayan.  

1. tāṁ a divāḥ prakāṛṇaṇy aṣeran. athe 'māṇī prajāpatir yākpadāṇi ārāṇi samācyā 'bhyaṛarca. yadā abhyarca tā eva roo bhavan. 16.

caturthe 'nuvāke prathamāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 16. 1. sāi'va ṛg abhavaṅ āyam eva ṛbh. ato deva abhavan. 2. athāi 'śām imāṁ asurāḥ' priyam avindanta. tad eva "suram

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 āraṇless sāmaṇ." They approached the heavenly world by means of a āraṇ-less sāmaṇ. 4. "Truly, these have gone forth (pra) by means of the sāmaṇ." Hence [the word] prasāma, and hence one eats food imperfectly (? prasāmi). 5. Verily, the gods went to the heavenly world. They kept shaking off their bodies, the āraṇ-parts. They conquered the heavenly world. 6. These [bodies] lay strewn up to the sky. Then Prajāpati, collecting these bodies, the āraṇ-parts, honored (√ro) them. Because he honored them, they became āraṇ's.

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

---

15. 1 A. "cīṁ-. 2 A. -ntyo. 3 A. upāya-. 4 C. prayāme. 5 A. prayāte; B. pradhāme; C. prayāme. 6 lokammaprayat. 7 After this there is confusion and repetition in the MSS. Before 5, all insert: ta etāṁ yākpadāṇi ārāṇi dhāvanta āyan (A. ṛṭhāyan). te svargaṁ lokam ajayan (A. -at). athe 'māṇī prajāpatir ... tā eva roo 'bhavan. 8 A. yat. 9 MSS. om. te svargaṁ .... ajayan; inserted here from repetition above 7. 10 C. om. yad .... 11 A.B. om. tā eva ....

16. 1 B. ās-. 
abhavat. 1. te2 deva3 abrwan yā vai naṣ prīr abhūt avindanta4 tām asūrāh. kathāṁ nu evāṁ īmāṁ āryam pṛun eva5 jayena6 'ti. 4. te 'brwann ārya eva sāma gāyāme7 'ti. te punaḥ pratyādrutya8 ṛci sāmā 'gāyan. tenā 'sāmā lokād asūrān anu-
danta. 5. tād vai mādhyandine ca savaṇe tṛṭiyasavane ca na rco 'parāhdo9 'stī. sa yat te 'ṛci gāyati tenā 'sāmā lokād dvī-
ṣantam bhṛṭrīvyaṃ nudate. atha yaḥ ānṛte10 devataśu prātasa-
savanaṁ gāyati tenu svargaṁ lokam eti. 11. prajāpatīr vai sārne māṁ jītim ajayaḥ yā 'syē 'yāṁ jītis tām.11 sa svargaṁ lokam ārohat.12 1. te devaḥ prajāpatim upetyā 'brwann as-
mbhyam api 'dān sāma prāyauche 'ti. tathe 'ti. tād ebhyaś
sāma prāyaacha. 2. tād ēnān idāṁ sāma svargaṁ lokam nā
'kāmayate13 vodhum. 3. te devaḥ prajāpatim upetyā 'brwann
yad vai nās sāma prādaī idāṁ vai nās nāt svargaṁ lokam nā
kāmayate14 vodhum iti. 4. tād vai pāpmanā sāmasrjate 'ti. ko
'sya pāpme 'ti. ṭg iti. tād 'ṛcā sāmasrjan. 11. tād idām prajā-
pater garhayāmāṇam atiśhād idāṁ vai ma tāt pāpmanā sam-
asrākṣaṁ15 iti. so 'bravid yaś tvāi 'tena vyāvartayād vy eva sa

themselves this fortune of theirs. Thereupon the cause of the
Asuras prevailed. 3. 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 sāman in the ṛc." They in turn, running up
toward [the Asuras], sang the sāman in the ṛc. 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
ṛc. He who sings these two [libations] in the ṛc 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 sāman Prajāpati conquered this conquest, viz. what
conquest there is of him. He ascended to the heavenly world. 7.
These gods coming unto Prajāpati said: "Furnish this sāman to
us also." [Saying] "Yes," he furnished this sāman to them.
8. This same sāman did not wish to carry them to the heavenly
world. 9. These gods coming unto Prajāpati said: "Verily, that
sāman 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 ṛc." They mixed it with the ṛc. 11. That same
[sāman] stood upbraiding Prajāpati: "Verily, they thus have
mixed me with evil." He (P.) said: "Whoso shall separate thee

16. 2A.B. tad. 2A.B. eva. 4śindanta. 5A. aya. 6B. -drucyaṇya. 
ṛtī. 8A. parāhdo. 9ro. 10ānṛte. 11C. tam. 15C. ar-. 11A.B. na
kāmayate: Č. na kāmayate. 14A. kāmāy-. B. sāmay. 15śāṃsr-.
pāpmanā vartātā iti. 12. sa ya etad rocā prātassavane vyāvar-tayati vy evaṁ" sa pāpmanā vartate. 16.
caturthe 'nūvāke dvitiyah khaṇḍah.

I. 17. 1. tād āhur yad ovā ovā iti giyate kvā 'tra rg bhavati kva sāme 'ti. 2. prastuvann evā 'ṣṭūbhir aksaraiḥ prastāuti. aśtāksarā giyatrī. aksaram-aksaram tryaksaram. tac caturvihn-patis sampadyante. caturvihnpatyaksarā giyatrī. 3. tām etam prastāvena' roam āptvā yā prīr yā 'pacitir yas svargo' loko yad yaço yad annādayān tāny āgyāyānāna āste. 17.
caturthe 'nūvāke tritiyah khaṇḍah.

I. 18. 1. prajāpati devān asriyata. tāṁ mṛtyuḥ pāpmaḥ 'nava-sriyata. 2. te devā prajāpatim upetyā 'bruvan kasmād' u no 'ṣṛṣṭhā' mṛtyuḥ cen naḥ pāpmaṇam anvavasrakṣayann āsihī 'ti. 3. tāṁ abhivi chaṇḍāśi sambharata. tāṁ yathāyatanam praviṣṣata tato mṛtyunā pāpmanā vyāvartvyathē 'ti. 4. vasavo giyatrīṃ samadharaṇa. tāṁ te prāviṣca tāṁ sa 'cchādayat. 5. rudrās tṛṣṭubham samadharana. tāṁ te prāviṣca. tāṁ sa 'cchādayat. 6. ādityā jagatiṃ samadharana. tāṁ te prāviṣca. tāṁ sa from this [evil], he shall separate himself from evil." 12. He who at the morning-libation separates it from the ro, he thus separates himself from evil.

I. 17. 1. This they say: "If there be sung ovā ovā, what becomes of the ro, what of the sāman." 2. When he sings the prastāva, he sings the prastāva with eight syllables. Of eight syllables is the giyatrī; each syllable is a triple syllable. Thus they amount to twenty-four. The giyatrī has twenty-four syllables. 3. Having obtained this same ro 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 separated from death, evil. 4. The Vasu brought the giyatrī together. They entered it. It concealed them. 5. The Rudras brought the tṛṣṭubh together. They entered it. It concealed

16.16 A. eva.
I. 19. 1. athāi 'tad ekaviñaṃ sāma. 2. tasya trayyā eva vidyā hinkārā; agnir vāyuṃ uṣāv āditya esa prasāvah, ima eva lokā aḍih. teṣu hi 'duṃ lokēsu sarvam āhitam. yuddhā yajno duksiṇā esa udgīthāḥ. diço 'vāntaraṇa diṛkṣa esa pratihāraḥ. āpah prajā oṣadhiyā esa upādāvaḥ. caṇḍamā naksattraṇī pitara etan nidhanam. 3. tad etad ekaviñaṃ sāma, sa ya evam etad ekaviñaṃ sāma vedāi 'tena ha 'sya sa ravo 'ḍyā.

them. 4. The Ādityas brought the jagati together. They entered it. It concealed them. 7. All the gods brought the anuśṭubh together. They entered it. It concealed them. 8. Death became aware of them in this tone-(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 sāman. 2. Of it the threefold knowledge is the hinkāra; Agni, Vāyu, yonder sun, those are the prastāva; these worlds the ādi—for this all is placed (√dā + ṣ) in these worlds; faith, sacrifice, sacrificial gifts, those are the udgītha; the quarters, the intermediate quarters, space, those are the pratihāra; the waters, creatures, herbs, those are the upādāva; the moon, the asterisms, the Fathers, those are the nidhana. 3. This is the twenty-onefold sāman. He who thus knows this twenty-onefold sāman, of him

18. 1 A.B. -yām. 6 A.B. -yāt. 6 A.C. om. 6 C. o. 6 A. -ped-. 6 A.B. edo; C. o.
19. 1 A. trā. 2 B. vāvāyur. 2 yesu. 4 C. -jā.
tam bhavaty etasmād v evaś sarvasmād āvṛṣcyate ya evāṃ vidvāṁsaṃ upavadati. 19.

pañcamo 'nūvākas samāptaḥ.

I. 20. 1. idam eva 'idan agre 'antarikṣam' āsūt. tathā v evā 'py etarhi. 2. tad yad etad antarikṣam" ya evā 'yam" pavata etad eva 'antarikṣam.' esa ha va antarikṣanāma.' 3. esa u evāi 'sa vitatah. tad yathā kūṣṭhena pālaçe vīskabdhe syātum akṣena va oacro v evam" etene' 'māu lokāu vīskabdhaū. 4. tasminn idam sarvam antah. tad" yad asminn idam sarvam antas tasmād an-
taryaksaṃ. antaryaksaṃ' ha vai nāmaī 'tat. tad antarikṣam' iti parokṣam ācakṣate. 5. tad yathā mūtabh prabhaddhāḥ" pralambhān evaṁ hūi tasmin sarve lokāḥ prabhaddhāḥ pralambhaṇe. 6. tasyāī 'tasya sūmnas' tisra āgās\" triṇy āgūtani sūd vībhūtyaça caturśaḥ pratiṣṭhā dāpa praṣgaṃ saṃsthaḥ dvāv stobhāv ekas̄aṃ rūpaṃ. 7. tad yās tisra. āgā ima eva te' lokāh. 8. atha yāni [triṇy] āgūtani agnir vāyur aśav uditya etān āgūtāni. na ha vai kāṁ cana śriyam aparādhnoti ya evam vedā. 20.

saṣṭhe 'nūvēke prathamaḥ khanḍaḥ.

the udgūtha 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] antaryaksa. Anta-
ryaksa 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 sūman there are three āgās, three āgūtas, six viḍhūtim, four pratiṣṭhās, ten praṣgaṃ, seven samsthās, two stobhas, one form. 7. Now the three āgās, they are these worlds. 8. Further, the [three] āgūtas, Agni (fire), Vāyu (wind), yonder sun are these āgūtas. He misses no fortune whatever who knows thus.

19. 5 A.B. -as. 6 C. avṛṣcyote.
20. 1 C. -rikṣa. 2 C. inserts esa ha va antarikṣam. 3 C. evam. 4 C. om. 5-kṣonā. 6 B. novam. 7 A. eṭhāna. 8 A. om. tathā . . . . . antas. 9 C. om. 10 B. -bandā. 11 B. -nams. 13 B. agamāḥ. 13 A. ekaraipam; B.C. ekartāpam. 14 A.B. to.
I. 21. 1. atha yās sañc vibhūtaya erta vac te. 2. atha yās catur-
srāh pratiṣṭhāh ima eva taç caturśro dañçah. 3. atha ye daça praça
ima eva te daça prañāh. 4. atha yās sañcā sañsthāh yā evāi
'nās' sañcā 'horātrāh prācīr vasaṭkurvanti' ta eva tañ. 5. atha
yāu dvāu stobhāv ahorātre eva te. 6. atha yañ' ekam rūpam
karmāi va tat. karnamā hī 'daññ sarvañ viññatyate. 7. tasāyā
'tasayā sūmnā devā aṁjān āyan. sa praṣṭāpati haraśā' hiṅkāram
udāyaud agnis tejasā prastāvānī rūpēnu hraspati udītham
svadhāya pitarañ pratiṣṭhām viryene 'ndro niñḥanam. 8. atha
'tare devā antartātā īvā 'san. ta indram abhrvān tava vāi vayañ
smo 'nu na etasmin sūmnā ābhaje 'ti. 9. tebhyañ svaranī prā-
yacchāt. tam praṣṭāpati abhrvāt kathē 'titham akah. sarvañ b
ēbhyañ sūma prādah. etavād vīva sūma yāvān svarah. ṛg vā
esa rte svarād bhavati 'ti. 10. so 'bravīt punar vā aham eñām
etāñ rasam ādāṣya iti. tān abhrvād āpu mā gāyata. abhi mā
svarate 'ti. tathē 'ti. 11. tam upāgāyan. tam abhyasvan. teṣām
punā rasam ādatta.'

sañcē 'nuñēke dvitiyāh khandañāh.
I. 22. 1. sa yathā madhuvāne madhumātibhir madhumātibhir evam evam eva tat sūman punā rasam āsīvaṇa. 2. tasmād u ha no ‘pagāyat. indra esa yad udgātā. sa yathā ‘svaś amīśām⁴ rasam ādattta evam esa teśām rasam ādattte. 3. kāmān ha tu yajamāna upagāyed yajamānasya hi tād bhavaty atho brahmācaryyā acāryoktaḥ. 4. tad u vē āhur upāi ‘vavāgyet. diśo hy upāgāyan⁴ diśann evam sałokatāni jayati ‘ti. 5. te ya eva ‘me’ mukhyah prāṇā esa evo ’dgātārca eva ‘pagātārca eva. ime ha traya udgātāra ima u catvāra upagātāraḥ. 6. tasmād u caturā eva ‘pagātān’ kurvita. tasmād u ho ‘pagātān’ pratyabhīmṛc ḍed diphas shu prο-tram me mā hiṁśate ‘ti. 7. su yas sa rasu āśūd ya eva ‘yam panata esa eva sa rasuḥ. 8. sa yathā madhvālom adyād iti ha smā “ha sucittā cāilana evam etasya rasasya “tmanam pūrayeta. sa evo ’dgātā “tmanāṁ ca yajamānāṁ ca ‘mṛtatvān gamayati ‘ti. 22.

sas̄the ‘nvāke ṛtīyaḥ khaṇḍāḥ. sas̄the ‘nvākasam sadāpataḥ.

I. 23. 1. ayam eva ‘dam agra ākāṣa āśīt. sa u eva ‘py etarhi. 2. sa yas sa ākāṣa vāg eva sa. tasmād ākāṣād 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 sūman. 2. And therefore one should not join in the song [of the udgātār]. This udgātār 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 udgātār] 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 udgātārs and upagātārs. For these three are the udgātārs and these four are the upagātārs. 6. And therefore one should appoint four upagātārs. And therefore he should touch the upagātārs 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 Cāilana used to say, “so one should fill himself with this sap. This same udgātār causeth himself and the sacrificer to attain immortality.”

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

3. tām etām1 vācam prajāpatir abhyapilayat. tasyā abhipīlitāyāi rasah3 prānedat.2 ta eve 'me lokā abhavan. 4. sa4 imān lokān abhyapilayat. teṣām abhipīlitānāṁ rasah prānedat. tā evī 'tā devatā abhavanām agnir vāyur asāv ādityā3 itī. 5. sa etā devatā abhyapilayat. tāsām abhipīlitānāṁ rasah prānedat. sa trayī vidyā 'bhavat. 6. sa trayīṁ vidyām abhyapilayat. tasyā abhipīlitāyāi rasah prānedat. tā evī 'tā vyāhṛtyaō bhavan bhūr bhuvas svar itī. 7. sa etā vyāhṛtyābhavyapilayat. tāsām abhipīlitānāṁ rasah prānedat. tad etad akṣaram abhavad om itī yad etad. 8. sa etad akṣaram abhyapilayat. tasyā 'bhipūlitasya' rasah prānedat.

23. saptame 'nūvāke prathamāḥ khaṇḍhāḥ.

I. 24. 1. tad akṣaraṇa eva. yad akṣaraṇa eva tasmād akṣaram. 2. yad eva 'ksarāṁ nā 'ksiyata tasmād akṣayaṃ. akṣayam ha vāi nāmāi 'tāt. tad akṣaram iti parokṣam ācakṣate. 3. tad dhāi 'tad eka om iti gāyanti. tat tathā na gāyet. īśvare hāī 'nadd etena rasena 'ntārdhātoh3. ato5 dve5 ivāī 'vam bhavata om iti. o ity u hāī ke gāyanti. tad u ha5 tan na5 gītam. nāī 'va' tathā gāyet. om5 ity eva gāyet. tad enaā etena rasena samādadhāti.

Therefore speech speaks from space. 3. This same speech Prajāpāti 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 divinities: Agni, Vāyu, yonder sun. 5. He pressed these divinities. 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: bhūs, 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 (akṣarat), therefore it is akṣara (syllable). 2. And because, being akṣara, it was not exhausted (√ksṛ), therefore it is akṣaya. Verily, akṣaya is its name. It is called akṣara 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

---

28. 1 A. etā vā. 2 C. rasam. 3 C. inserts vs. 6 sa trayīṁ . . . rasam (1) prānedat. 4 A.B. om. 5 A.B. -ā. 6 C. om. sa trayīṁ . . . prānedat. 7 -ā. 24. 1 A.B. -vā. 2 C. yā-. 3 B.C. -the. 4 C. ddhā; A.B. dvāī. 5 C. om. 6 A.B. ni-. 7 A.B. ne ēva. 8 o.
4. tad etait rasam tarpayati. rasas tryto 'ksaram tarpayati. aksaram trytaim vyahitys tarpayati. vyahiryas tryta vedainas tarpayanti. vedas tryta devatas tarpayanti. devatás tryta lokás tarpayanti. lokás tryta akaram tarpayanti. aksaram trytaim vacam tarpayati.19 vuk10 tryta 'kacan tarpayati. akacás trytah prajus tarpayati. tryyati prajayá paśubhir ya etait evam vedá 'tho yasyai 'van vidvan udgayati.11 24.

saptame 'niváke dvidyáh khaṇḍaḥ. saptamo 'nivākas samāptaḥ.

I. 25. 1. ayam eve 'dan1 agra ákuka ásīt sa u evá 'py etarhi. 2. sa yas sa ákuka áditya eva sa. etasmin [hy] udita2 sarvam idam ákupate. 3. tasya martyamtaor vá3 turi4 samudra eva. tad yat samudraiva paripphitam5 tan mtyor āptam atha yat param tad amṛtam. 4. sa yo ha sa samudra ya evá 'yan parvata esa eva sa samudraḥ. etait hi samudravantai sarvāni bhūtāny anusaṁdravanti7. 5. tasya8 dyāvapṛthivī eva rodhasi. atha yathā nadyam9 kañāni10 vă praśināni11 syus sarānsi vāi 'van asyā 'yan pārthivas12 samudraḥ. 6. sa esa pāra eva samudra-

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 (vādrue+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.

25. A.B. dvâ (!). 2 sudita. 3B. váirva. 4 tarañi. 5 A.B. -gruh-. 6 B. -dre-. 7 C. anud-. 8 B.C. -yá. 9 yám. 10 kasâni. 11 prahinâhini. 12 A.B. insert sas; 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. 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 रो, of Agni (fire), of death. What this speech is, that is the रो; 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 याजस. What these waters are, that is food; and what the mind is, that is the याजस. 10. Further, what this person is, that is breath, that is the सामन, that is the brahman, that is the immortal. What breath is, that is the सामन; 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. 8-10. 5. This is the up-going of the brahman. And from there is the on-going (?). 5. 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 रो, of Agni (fire), of death. 7. And the dark-blue
form which is of the lightning as it runs together, that is the
form of the waters, of food, of mind, of the yajus. 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 (anurāpa) 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 cor-
responding 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 udgītha.
I. 28. 1. ayam eve 'dam agra ākāṣa āsīt. sa u evā 'py etarhi. 2. sa yas sa ākāṣa indra eva sah. sa yas sa indra esa eva sa ya esa eva' tapati. sa esa saptaraṣmir vrṣabhas tuvismān. 3. tasya vāṁaya raṃhī prāṭiṣṭhitah. sā yā sā vāg agnis sah. sa daṣadhā bhavati gatadhā sahasradhā 'yutadhā prayutadhā niyutadhā 'rbudadhā nyurbudadhā nikharvadhā padmam aksiti4 vyomāntah. 4. sa esa etasya raṃhir vāg bhūtvā sarvāv āsu pratyavasthitah. sa yaḥ kač ca vaddati6 etasyāi 'va raṃhinā vadati. 5. atha6 manomayo daksīṇā pratiṣṭhitah. tad yat tan manav10 candramūs sah. sa daṣadhā bhavati. 6. sa esa etasya raṃhir mano bhūtvā sarvāv āsu prajāsu pratyavasthitah. sa yaḥ kač ca manita etasyāi 'va raṃhinā manute. 7. atha caikṣamayā11 pratyān12 pratiṣṭhitah. 13 tad yat taci14 caikṣ ādityas sah. sa daṣadhā bhavati. 8. sa esa etasya raṃhic caikṣ bhūtvā sarvāv āsu prajāsu pratyavasthitah. sa yaḥ kač ca pacyati etasyāi 'va raṃhinā pacyati. 9. atha pro-tramayā udā pratiṣṭhitah. 15 tad yat taci chrotram dipas tāh. sa daṣadhā bhavati. 10. sa esa etasya raṃhīc pro-tram bhūtvā sarvāv āsu prajāsu pratyavasthitah. sa yaḥ kač ca prajātī etasyāi 'va raṃhinā prajātī. 28.

navame 'nuvāke prathamah khaṇḍah.

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.
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I. 29. 1. atha prāṇamaya ārdhvāḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ. sa yaḥ sa prāṇo vāyus saḥ. sa2 daśadhāḥ bhavati. 2. sa eṣa etasya raṇmih prāṇo bhūtvā sarvāsvaḥ āsu prajitāḥ pratyavasthitāḥ. sa yaḥ kaç ca prāṇitya etasyāi 'va raṇmīna prāṇīti. 3. athā 'śumayās tir-yaḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ. sa hu sa3 iṣūna nāma. su daśadhā bhavati.4. sa eṣa etasya raṇmīra asur bhūtvā sarvāsvaḥ āsu prajitāḥ praty-avasthitāḥ. sa yaḥ kaç ca 'śumān etasyāi 'va raṇmīna 'śumān. 5. athā 'ṛnamayo 'rvan pratiṣṭhitāḥ. tad yat6 tad annam6 āpas tāḥ,7 sa daśadhā bhavati cātadhā suhasadhā 'yutadhā prayut-adhā niyutadhā 'rbudadhā nyarbuddadhā nikhavadhā8 padnam akṣitir vyomāntāḥ. 9. sa eṣa etasya raṇmīra annam bhūtvā sarvāsva9 āsu prajitāḥ pratyavasthitāḥ. sa yaḥ kaç ca 'ṛṇāty etasyāi 'va raṇmīna 'ṛṇāti. 7. sa eṣa saptaraṇmīr vṛṣabhas tuviṣmān. tad10 etad yāḥ bhyanācyate yas saptaraṇmīr vṛṣabhas tuviṣmān avāṣya cātavā saptā sindhān:
yo rāhuṇam11 asphurād vajrābhūr12
dyām ārohanta11 sa janāsa indra iti. 8. yas saptaraṇmīr iti. saptā hy eto ādityasya raṇmāyāḥ.

I. 29. 1. Now [the ray] consisting of breath stands firm aloft. That breath is Vāyu (wind). It becomes tenfold. 2. That ray of him becoming breath is located respectively in all these creatures. Whosoever breathes, he breathes by the ray of him. 3. 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 hitherward. 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 one is seven-rayed, virile, powerful. That same is spoken of in a ṛc: "Who seven-rayed, virile, powerful, let loose to run the seven streams; who with the thunderbolt in his arm smote Rāhuṇa ascending the sky—he, ye people, is Indra." 8. 'Who seven-rayed,' for these
rays of the sun are seven. 'Vīrile,' for he is the bull of these creatures. 'Powerful,' that is his exaltation. 9. 'Let loose to run the seven streams,' for these streams are seven; by them this all is bound. Because by them the all is bound (√ṣī), therefore they are [called] streams (śindhu). 10. 'Who with the thunderbolt in his arm smote Rāuhina,' for he with the thunderbolt in his arm did smite Rāuhina. 11. 'Ascending the sky, he, ye people, is Indra,' for he is Indra.

I. 30. 1. "As paths might lead together up a mountain," Čātyāyani 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 (aniśedha) sāman 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 sāman having doors on all sides. 4. That same is this lightning. What flies around this whole disk, that is the sāman; and what shines across, beyond, that is the sap of good action. Unto that he is released. 5. That same is the rivalless sāman. For Indra

29. 32 mahayā. 16 C. space for -han-; B. -hattam.
30. 1 B.C. evam, 2 B. tīpratīvīyanti, 3 anus-. A.C. om. 5 B. nata; A.C. ta. 6 om. 7 A.B. etāva; C. etā. 8 C. gam; leaves space for about four syllables. 9 eto. 10 viduḥ. 11 A.B. -tvim.
cana bhrātvyaṃ paçyata evam eva na kaṁ cana bhrātvyaṃ paçyate ya etad evam vedā 'tho yasyāi 'vamīn vidvān udgāyati. 30.

navame 'nvāke 'ṭīya ṣ khanḍaṇ. navamo 'nvākas samāptaḥ.

I. 31. 1. ayam eve 'dum agra ākāṣa āsūt. sa u eva 'py etarki. sa yas sa ākāṣa indra eva saḥ. sa yas sa indras sāmā 'va tat. 2. tasyāi 'tasya sāmana īyam eva prācī diig' ghiṅkāra īyam prastūva īyam ādīr īyam udgītho 'sāv pratiḥāra 'ntarīkṣam' upadrava īyam eva nidhanam. 3. tad etat' saptavidham sāma. sa ya evam etat saptavidham sāma veda yat kim ca prācyāṁ dii di yā devatā ye manuṣyā ye pāṇava yad annādyam tat sarvam' hīṅkārena "pnoti. 4. atha yad daksīṇāyaṃ dii tat sarvam prastūvanā "pnoti. 5. atha yat' prācīyāṁ dii tat sarvam ādīnā "pnoti. 6. atha yad udīcyāṁ dii tat sarvam udgīthenā "pnoti. 7. atha yad' manuṣyāṁ dii tat sarvam pratiḥārena "pnoti. 8. atha yad' antarīkṣa 'tat sarvam upadravanā "pnoti. 9. atha yad asyāni dii yā devatā ye manuṣyā ye pāṇava yad annādyam tat sarvam nidhanena "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.

I. 31. 1. This [all] here was in the beginning space. And that is so even now. What this space is, that is Indra. What this Indra is, that is the sāman. 2. Of this same sāman this eastern quarter is the hīṅkāra, this (i. e. the southern quarter) the prastūva, this (i. e. the western quarter) the ādī, this (i. e. the northern quarter) the udgītha, yonder [quarter] the pratiḥāra, the atmosphere the upadrava, this [quarter] the nidhana. 3. That is the sevenfold sāman. He who knows this thus sevenfold sāman, whatever there is in the eastern quarter, what divinities, what men, what domestic animals, what food, all that he obtains by means of the hīṅkāra. 4. And what there is in the southern quarter, all that he obtains by means of the prastūva. 5. And what there is in the western quarter, all that he obtains by means of the ādī. 6. And what there is in the northern quarter, all that he obtains by means of the udgītha. 7. And what there is in yonder quarter, all that he obtains by means of the pratiḥāra. 8. And what there is in the atmosphere, all that he obtains by means of the upadrava. 9. And what there is in this quarter, what divinities, what men, what domestic animals, what food, all

81. 1 A.B. dii. 2 C. -īkṣa-. 3 A. et. 4 insert manuṣyā. 5 A.B. -vā. 6 B.C. insert here vs. 4, with pratiḥāreṇa for prastūvena. 7 B. inserts avyāt. 8 A. inserts daksīṇāyaṃ dii, struck out in red.
10. sarvāṁ hāī 'va 'syā "ptam bhavati sarvāṁ jītaṁ na hā 'syā kaś ca na kāma kāmica vimaṁ vīdvān eṣu lokesu kurute svasya hāī 'va tat svataḥ kurute. tad etad roa 'bhyanācyate. 31.

daçaome 'nuvāke prathamah khaṇḍah.

I. 32. 1. yaḍ dyāva indra te caṇaṁ caṇatam bhūmīr uta syuḥ:
na tvā vajrīnt sahasraṁ sūryāṁ anu na jātam aṣṭa rodasī iti. 2. yaḍ dyāva indra te caṇaṁ caṇatam bhūmīr uta syur iti. yac chataṁ dyāvas suṣuḥ caṇatam bhūmyas tābhya eṣa eva "kāṇo jyāyān." 3. na tvā vajrīnt sahasraṁ sūryāṁ anu iti. na hī etau sahasraṁ caṇa sūryā anu. 4. na jātam aṣṭa rodasī iti. na hī etau jātam rodanti. ime ha vāva rodasī tābhīyam eṣa eva "kāṇo jyāyān. etasmin hy evai 'te antah. 5. sa yas sa akāpa indra eva saḥ. sa yas sa ināra eṣa eva sa ya eṣu tapati. 6. sa eso 'bhrāṇyā atimucyaṁāna eti. tad yathāī 'so 'bhrāṇyā atimucyaṁāna ety evam eva sa sarvamāt pāpmano 'timucyaṁāna eti ya evam vedā 'tho yasyāī 'vaṁ vīdvān udgāyati. 32.

daçaome 'nuvāke dvitiyāḥ khaṇḍah. daçaomo 'nuvākas samāptah.

that he obtains by means of the nīdhana. 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 r: 2.

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 Rodasī." 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 Rodasī,' for they do not bewail (∨rud) him when born. Verily as to these two worlds (rodasī), 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 udgītha.

32. 'om. 2B -yāṁ. 3C. om. 4yan. 5C. om. sa ... sa. 6C. space -y. 7C. -māṇayă. A.B. -yamāṇay.
I. 33. 1. trīṛt sāma catuspāt. brahma trīyam' indras trīyam' prajāpatis trīyam' annam eva caturthah pādah. 2. tad yad vai brahma sa prāṇa 'tha ya indras sā vāg atha yaḥ prajāpatis tan mano 'nam eva caturthah pādah. 3. mana eva hiṅkāro vāk prastāvah prāṇa udgītho 'nam eva caturthah pādah. 4. karoti eva vacā nayati prāṇena gamayati manasā. tad etan niruddhah yan manah. tena yatra kāmaya te tadātmānaś ca yajamānaś ca adhāti. 5. athā 'dhiḍāvatam' candramā eva hiṅkāro 'gniḥ prastāva uditya udgītho āpa eva caturthah pādah.' tad á dhi pratyakṣam annam. 6. tā vai etā devatā amāvāśyaṁ rātrim saṁyanti. candramā amāvāśyaṁ rātrim udityam praviṣṭi udityo 'gniṁ. 7. tad yat saṁyanti' tasmāt sāma. sa ha vai śāmatv sa sāma veda ya evam veda. 8. tāsūṁ vai etāsūṁ devatānāṁ ekā'kā' vai devatā sāma bhavati. 9. eva eva "dityas trīṛt catuspād raṃmayo maṇḍalam purusāḥ. raṃmaya eva hiṅkāraḥ. tasmāt te prathamata evo 'dyatas tāyante. maṇḍalam prastāvah purusā udgītho yā etā āpo 'ntas sa eva caturthah pādah. 10. evam eva candramasov raṃmayo maṇḍalam purusāḥ. raṃmaya eva hiṅkāro maṇḍalam prastāvah. purusā udgītho yā etā āpo

38. 1 trīṛt. 2 A. -devat-. 3 A. -am. 4 C. -ā. 5 A. say-.
'ntas' sa eva caturthaḥ pūdah. 11. catvāry anyāni catvāry anyāni. tany aṣṭau'. aṣṭākṣaraḥ gāyatrī. gāyatrīṁ śāma brahma u gāyatrī. tad u brahmaḥ 'bhisampadyate. aṣṭācaphāḥ paṇavas tene paṇavyam. 33.

ekāde 'nūvāke prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 34. 1. athā 'dhyātmam. idam eva caṅkuśa triveṇe catuspāc chuhlaṁ kṛṣṇam puruṣah. cuhlaṁ eva hiṅkūraḥ kṛṣṇam pravastavaḥ puruṣaḥ udgītho ya ēma āpo 'ntas sa eva caturthaḥ pūdah. 2. idam ādyiṣṭaḥ yānam idam candramasaḥ. catvāri 'māni catvāri 'māni. tān yaṣṭau'. aṣṭākṣaraḥ gāyatrī. gāyatrīṁ śāma brahma u gāyatrī. tad u brahmaḥ 'bhisampadyate. aṣṭācaphāḥ paṇavas tene paṇavyam. 3. sa yo 'yam paṇate sa ēsa eva praṇāpatiḥ. tad v eva śāma. tasyā 'yāṁ devo yo 'yāṁ caṅkuśi puruṣah. sa ēsa āḥutim atimatyō 'tkrāṇāḥ. 4. athā yaṅ eva candramāś ca "dhyāya ca yaṅ etau āpsu devṣe" etau etayor devau. 5. yaḥ dha vā idam āḥur devānuṁ devā ēīty ete ha te. ta eta āḥutim atimatyō 'tkrāṇāḥ. 6. tad dhaḥ prṛthu vāṁya divyaṁ divyaṁ vṛtyāṁḥ pārcacca ṣaṁcē: ye'dante paṇca digas saṁcē: ya āḥutē atyaman yāntaḥ devaḥ apāṁḥ saṁcē kartāme taṁ saṁann the fourth foot (quarter). 11. Four are the one, four the others. =I. 1. 8.

I. 34. 1. Now with regard to the self. This eye is threefold, fourfooted: white, black, person. The white is the hiṅkūra, the black is the prastāva, the person is the udgītha, 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. 8. 3. He who cleanses here, that same one is Prajāpati. That is also the sāman. Its god is this person in the eye. That same, contemplating the offering, [has] gone up (?). 4. 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, contemplating the offering, [have] gone up (?). 6. Now Prṛtu Vāṁya asked the divine mendicants thus: "The gods by whom impelled the wind blows forth, who give the five converging quarters, who contemplated the offerings, the leaders of the waters.

33. 1 A. -aṁ. 2 C. om. 3 B. ud. 4 A. -tṛ; B.C. -ṭrāṁ.
34. 1 A.B. -pāḍ- 2 A. om. 3 -yate. 4 etā u. 5 A. tān. 6 ebhir. 7 A.B. -aṇaḥ; C. daṇa. 8 C. -tṛ. 9 C. ātyam-. 10 B.C. parāṁ.
iti. 1. te ha prayāyucar
   imām eśam prthivīṁ vasta eko
   ‘ntarikṣam’ pary eko babhuva:
   divam eko dadate yo viḍhātā  
   viṣvā  ācāḥ pratirakṣanti anya’

iti. 2. imām eśam prthivīṁ vasta eka ity agnír ha saḥ. 3. ante-
   tarikṣam  pary eko babhūve ’ti váyur ha saḥ. 4. divam eko
dadate yo viḍhāte ’ty uddityo ha saḥ. 5. viṣvā  ācāḥ pratirak-
   ṣanty anya iti. etā ha vai devatā viṣvā  ācāḥ pratirakṣantī
candramā nakṣatṛāṇi ’ti. tā etās sāmāi ’va satyo vṛddho anu-
dyāya. 34.

ekādaçe ‘nurvāke dvitiyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ. ekādaço ‘nurvākas samāptāḥ.

I. 35. 1. athāi ’tat sūma. taḍ āhūs sarīvatsura eva sāme ’ti.
   2. tasya vasanta eva hiṅkāraḥ. tasmat pācavo vasantā hiṅka-
      rikratas’ samudāyanti. 3. grīṣmāḥ prastāvah. anirukto vai
drastavo ’nirukta rūnāṁ grīṣmāḥ. 4. varṣā udgīthāḥ. ud īva
   vai varṣāṁ gāyati. 5. parat pratiḥāraḥ. parādi ha khalī vai
   bhūyāśīḥ sādhaṇāḥ pacyante. 6. hemanto niḍhanam. niḍha-
   nakṛtā ēva vai hemān praʃā bhavanti. 7. tāv etāv antāv sam-

—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 en-
compessed 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 sāman. This they say: The sāman
is in the year. 2. Of it spring is the hiṅkāra. Therefore ani-
mals come together in the spring, continually uttering him. 3.
The summer is the prastāva. The prastāva is indistinct; the
summer is indistinct among the seasons. 4. The rainy season
(varṣāḥ) is the udgītha. One sings the udgītha through the year
(varṣā), as it were. 5. The autumn is the pratiḥāra. Verily in
the autumn most herbs ripen. 6. The winter is the niḍhana.
In the winter creatures are put to an end (niḍhanakṛtā), as it were.
7. These two ends combine together; consequently the year is

34. 11 C. -ks-. 12 -dhattā. 13 C. any. 14 A.B. viḍhartē; C. viḍhatte.
15 A.B. ann-; C. ‘nn-; all MSS. -yāyā.
35. 1 A.B. -karirkutās; C. -karikṛtas.
dhattaḥ. etad anvā anantasvā svayatsarah. tasyātvś āntāv yaddhemantaḥ ca vasantaḥ ca. etad anvā grāmasyāntāv sametaḥ. etad anvā nisakṣyāntāv sametaḥ. etad anvā dhanum pariyāturṣyā ca. s. tad yathā ha vai niskas samantaṁ grīvatvābhi-pariyaktavā evam anantaṁ sāmva. sa ya evam etad anantaṁ sāmva vedā 'nantaṁ' eva jayati. 35.
dvādeṣe 'nvāke prathamaṁ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 36. 1. athāiś tat parjanye sāma. tasyā purvośā eva hiṅkāraḥ. atha yad abhrūni samplūvayati sena prastāvaḥ. atha yad stanayati sa udgīthāḥ. atha yad vidyotate sa prathihaṇaḥ. atha yad varṣati tām nīdhanam. 2. tad etat parjanye sāma. sa ya evam etat parjanye sāma veda varṣuko ha śmaī parjanyo bhave. 3. athāiś 'tut puruṣā' sāma. tasyā yam eva hiṅkāro 'yam prastāva 'yam udgītho 'yam prathihaṇa idaṁ nīdhanaṁ. 4. tad etat puruṣā sāma. sa ya evam etat puruṣā sāma veda 'rāhva eva prajayā paçubhir ārohan eti. 5. ya u enat pratyag veda ye pratyāṅco lokas tāṁ jayati. tasyā yam eva hiṅkāro 'yam prastāva 'yam udgītho 'yam prathihaṇa idaṁ nīdhanaṁ. ye pratyāṅco lokas tāṁ jayati. 6. ya u enat tiryug 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. 2. Truly, as a necklace bent all around the neck, so is the endless sāman. He who knows this endless sāman thus conquers endlessness.

I. 36. 1. Now this is the sāman in Parjanya. The wind which precedes is its hiṅkāra; when it causes the clouds to float together, that is the prastāva; when it thunders, that is the udgīthā; when it lightens, that is the prathihaṇa; when it rains, that is the nīdhanā. 2. That is the sāman in Parjanya. He who thus knows the sāman in Parjanya, truly to him Parjanya sends rain. 3. Now this is the sāman in man. Of it this is the hiṅkāra, this the prastāva, this the udgīthā, this the prathihaṇa, this the nīdhanā. 4. That is the sāman in man. He who thus knows the sāman 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 hiṅkāra, this the prastāva, this the udgīthā, this the prathihaṇa, this the nīdhanā. The worlds which are reversed, those he conquers. 6. And he who knows it crosswise conquers those worlds which

36. ² C. -sak-. ² śo. ⁴ -prajā. ⁴ -nāṁ. ⁵ C. om. ⁴ A.B. ena; C. enam. ⁴ A.B. -punice; A.B. insert ma.
lokās tāṁ jayati. tasya lomāi 'eva hiṁkāras tvak prastāvo mān-
sam udgītho 'sthi pratiḥārao māṣā niḥāhanam. 7. tasya trīṇy
āvīr gāyati prastāvam pratiḥāram ś niḥāhanam. tvamīt puruṣa-
sya trīṇy asthīṇy āvīr dantāṇ ca dvayaṇ ca nukhāḥ. ye tiryāṇco
lokās tāṁ jayati. 8. ya u etat suṇyaṇg vedā ya suṇyaṇco lokās
tāṁ jayati. tasya mana eva hiṁkāro vāk prastāvaḥ prāṇa udgī-
thac oaksāḥ pratiḥāraṇaḥ prarūnā niḥāhanam. ye suṇyaṇco lokās
tāṁ jayati. 9. athā 'tud devatāsū sāma. tasya vāyur eva hiṁkāro
'gnaḥ prastāvo cāitya udgīthac candrāṇa pratiḥāra dīga eva
niḥāhanam. 10. tu u etad devatāsū sāma. sa ya evam etad deva-
tāsū sāma vedā devatānām eva salokatāṁ jayati. 36.
āvādače 'nūvāke dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 37. 1. tasyāī 'tās tīṣra āghā āgneyy ekāi 'nāryō ekā vāyucu-
devy ekā. 2. sā ya mundrā sā "gneyi. tayā prātussavanasyo
'dgayeṣam. āgneyāṁ vāi prātussavanam āgneyo 'yāṁ lokāḥ.
svayā "gaye prātussavanasyo 'dgayeṭyā yāhnoti 'maṁ lokam.
3. athā 'ya ghoṣīṇy upadīmaṇi" sāi "nāri. tayā mādhyāndina-
sya' savanasyo 'dgayeṣam. āṇḍram vāi mādhyāndināṁ savanam

are crosswise. Of it the hair of the head is the hiṁkāra, the
skin the prastāva, the flesh the udgītha, the bone the pratiḥāra,
the marrow the niḥāna. 7. Of it he sings three openly, viz. the
prastāva, the pratiḥāra, the niḥāna. 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 hiṁkāra, speech the prastāva, breath the
udgīthā, sight the pratiḥāra, hearing the niḥāna. The worlds
which are converging, those he conquers. 10. And this is the
sāman in the divinities. Of it Vāyu is the hiṁkāra, Agni the
prastāva, the sun the udgīthā, the moon the pratiḥāra, the
quarters the niḥāna. 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 āgās: 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 udgīthā
of the morning-libation should be sung. Verily the morning-
libation belongs to Agni, this world belongs to Agni. He [then]
sings the udgīthā of the morning-libation with his (Agni's) own
āgā, he enjoys this world. 3. And that which is loud [and]
oisy, that belongs to Indra. With it the udgīthā of the noon-

36. 8 A. lāk. 9 C. hiṁkāraṇaḥ.
37. 1 C. āśrī. 2 A.B. 'nār. 3 C. om. sā . . . . 'd. 4 B. maṁnaudhi. 5 A.
om. atha . . . . lokam. 6 C. space for -abāt-. 7 C. -īdīna.
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 āgā, he enjoys yonder world. 4. And [the āgā] 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 āgā, he enjoys this intermediate world. 5. Now above (?) they say: “The udgītha should be sung with one āgā 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 Cāikitāneya sings the āgā of one sāman only, viz. of the gāyatra-sāman]. That should be sung without taking breath. That [part] of the sāman unto the pratihāra should be sung without taking breath. Thus breath is the gāyatra-sāman. Verily he thus enjoys breath. He thus attains complete life.
I. 38. 1. atha ha brahadattavan' caikitāneyam udgāyantavya kurvaka upodur ujjukhi' sāma dālbye 'ti. 2. sa ho 'podyamāno nitarāni jagāv. tavi ho "cuh kim upodyamāno nitarām agusîr iti. 3. sa ho 'vacc 'dani vai lome' ty etad eavī 'tat pratyapagṛn-maḥ' tasmād u ye na etad upāvādīṣur lomaṇaṇi 'va teṣaṁ śaśāṇāni bhavitarāh. atha vayam ud eva gātaraś' sma iti. 4. atha ha rūjā jāivalir galānasamī arksākāyanaṁ pāmāla-parṇāḥyam uṣṭhitam papraccha reṇa "gātā" galāvatyād sāmnāḥ iti. 5. nāi 'va rūjānm rce 'ti ho 'vaccu na sāmne 'ti. tad yāyaṁ tarchi sarva eva paṇāyāh bhavisyatha ya evam viḍvānīso 'gāyate 'ti. 6. atha yad dāh vākṣyad rca ca sāmnā ca "gāme' 'ti dhūtena vāi tad yātayāmā 'malakāṇḍenā' gāte 'ti hāi 'nūnās tad avakṣyat, tad dāh tad uvcu svaṛena caī 'va hiṅkāreno ca "gāme 'ti. 38.

dvādaśe 'muvaie tṛtiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 39. 1. atha hu satyādvivača cāitrarathis satyayajñam pāhuṣitam uvcu praśīnayahe 'ti māma' ced vāi tvaṁ sāma vidvān sāmnā "rtvīyāṁ karisyasi nāi 'va tarchi punar dhāksam abhidhyātāsi 'ti. mukūrīkṣi 'hi āsa." 2. su ho 'vaccu yo vāi

I. 38. 1. Now the Kurus reproached Brahmadatta Cākitāneya when he was singing the udgīthā, (saying) : "Stop the sāmān, O Dālbya." 2. He being reproached sang so much the more(?). They said to him : "Why hast thou, being reproached, sung so much the more?" 3. He said : "Verily this is the hair-(loma-) [sāman]; thus we make answer. And therefore the funeral-places of those who have thus reproached us will be hairy (lomaḍa), as it were. Now we shall only sing the udgīthā." 4. Now king Jāivali asked Gālunasa Arksākāyaṇa, who had stood up with a woolen shirt (?) and a leaf : "O Čālāvatya, wilt thou sing with the rc [or] with the sāman?" 5. "Not with the rc," he said, "nor with the sāman." "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 sāman," truly he would have told them : "Singing with a sucked-out, used-up branch of the amalā-plant." Therefore he spoke thus : "Let us sing both with tone and with the hiṅkāra."

I. 39. 1. Now Satyādvivaśa Cāitrarathi said to Satyayajña Pāluṣiṭa: "O Praśīnayahe, if thou, knowing the sāmān, shalt perform the priestly office for me with the sāmān, then thou wilt not think of a second consecration." For he was one who repeatedly consecrated. 2. He said: "He who knowing the for-

38. 1 tāc. 2 ujjhi. 3 some. 4 upāc. 5 A.B. -sul. 6 tāra. 7 A.B. galānasam; C. guñnasam. 8-ta. 9 paṇāryaṇ. 10 ca āgama.
39. 1 mac. 2 -kṣī. 3 ā.
sāmnaḥ cāriyāṁ vidvān sāmnāḥ "r̥tvijyāṁ karoti śrīmān eva bhava-
vati. mano vāvā sāmnaḥ cāri iti. 3. yo vai sāmnaḥ pratiṣṭhāṁ
vidvān sāmnāḥ "r̥tvijyāṁ karoti praty eva tiṣṭhāti. vāg vāvā
sāmnaḥ pratiṣṭhe 'ti. 4. yo vai sāmnas suvarnaṁ vidvān sāmnā
"r̥tvijyāṁ karoty adhy aṣya gṛheśu suvarnaṁ ganyate. prāṇo
vāvā sāmnas suvarṇam iti. 5. yo vai sāmno 'pacitiṁ vidvān
sāmnā "r̥tvijyāṁ karoty apacitiṁ eva bhavati. caksur vāvā
sāmno 'pacitr iti. 6. yo vai sāmnaḥ ċrutim vidvān sāmnā
"r̥tvijyāṁ karoti ċrutimān eva bhavati. protrain vāvā sāmnaḥ
črutit iti. 39.

dvādaśe 'nuvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. dvādaśo 'nuvākas samāptah.

I. 40. 1. cavitvār vāk paraṁitā pādāni
   tāni vidvān brahmaṇāḥ ye maniṣinaḥ:
   guhāṁ trīṇi nihiṁ na 'ṛgoyantī
   turiyāṁ vāco manuṣyān vadvanti
  'ti. 2. vāg eva sāma. vācā hi sāma gāyati. vāg eva 'ktham.
vācā hy ukthamā caṁsati. vāg eva yajuh. vācā hi yajuraunvar-
tate. 3. tad yat kim ca 'r̥vacinām brahmaṇas tad vāg eva
sarvam. athā yañā anyatra brahmaḥ 'padīcyaṁ. nāt 'va hi tenā
"r̥tvijyāṁ karoti. parokṣenāi 'va tu' kṛtam bhavati. 4. tasya

tune of the sāman performs the priestly office with the sāman,
he becomes fortunate. Verily mind is the fortune of the sāman.
3. 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. 3. 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. whatsoever 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. 4 C. -ho.
40. 1 B.C. -hāni. 2 C. -hitāni. 3 C. om. 4 -kt-. 5 A.B. vācaṁ. 6 ne.
7 A. om.
etasyaivâco manâh pûdâç caksûkâ pûdâç çrotram pûdo vâg eva caturthah pûdah.  
1. tad yañc vâo manasû dhyâyatâ tañc vucû va- 
dati. yaç caksusâ papatyâ tañc vucû vadati. yaç chrotena çrûnoti  
taad vucû vadati.  
2. tad yañç etat sarvah vâcam eva 'bhismayati'  
tasmâd vâg eva sâmâ. su ha vâi sâmavit su sâmâ veda yaj evam 
veda.  
3. tasya etasyaivâc vucû prûnâ eva 'suh. esu hi 'dañm 
sarvam asûte  
40. 
trayodasâ 'nuvâke prathamah khañçâh.

I.  
41. 1. tenâ hiti 'tënu 'sûnâ devâ jivantih pitaro jivantih ma- 
nusyajjivantih pâçavo jivantih gandharvôparsâso jivantih sarvam  
idâm jivati.  
2. tad âhur yad' asume 'dañm sarvah' jivati kas 
sûmnû 'sur iti. prûna iti brâyât. prûno ha vâva sâmno 'suh.  
3. su esu prûño vâci pratiçhito vâg u prûne pratiçhita. tâv 
etâv evum anyo 'nyasmin pratiçhitaû. pratiçhîitaû' ya evam 
veda.  
4. tad etad yëc 'bhayanûcyate  
'ditir dyûûr aditir antariksham'  
aditir mâtâ so pitâ sa putrañh:  
vîçve devâ aditiña pîñca  
aditir jatam aditir janitvam

this same speech mind is a quarter, sight is a quarter, hearing is 
a quarter, speech itself is the fourth quarter.  
5. 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 (\sqrt{1}+sam) into speech, therefore speech is the sâman. Verily 
he is sâman-knowing, he knows the sâman, who knows thus.  
7. The breaths of this same speech are the vital air (asu). For 
in them this all was born (\sqrt{8â}).

I.  
41. 1. By this same vital air the gods live, the Fathers live, 
men 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 sâman?" Let him say: "Breath." Verily 
breath is the vital air of the sâman.  
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 rç: "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.”  

I. 42. 1. Āruṇi went to Vāśiṣṭha Čāikitānyeya to serve his studentship. He (V.) said to him (Ā.): “Thou knowest, my dear Gāutama, that we Čākitāneyas worship this sāman. What divinity dost thou worship?”  

2. “The sāman, reverend sir,” he (Ā.) said. 3. He (Ā.) asked him (V.): “Dost thou know that which is in the fire?”  

4. “That is the brightness of that sāman which we worship.”  

5. “Dost thou know that which is in the earth?”  

6. “That is the firm standing of that sāman which we worship.”  

7. “Dost thou know that which is in the waters?”  

8. “That is the tranquillity of that sāman which we worship.”  

9. “Dost thou know that which is in the atmosphere?”  

10. “That

---

42. 1 (vācā) āja. 2 C. yam. 3 -māha ; after this insert īti. 4 C. leaves space for -sa. 6 -vata. 7 B. inserts here, in margin, 5. 8 ētasya. 4 ēt. om. yad . . . . . . īti. (end of 5).
ātmā vā eṣā tasya sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha iti. 1. yad vāyau tād vethāḥ iti. prṛ vā eṣā tasya sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha iti. 7. yad dikṣṇu tād vethāḥ iti. vyāptir vā eṣā tasya sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha' iti. 8. yad divi tād vethāḥ iti. vibhūtir vā eṣā tasya sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha' iti. 42.

caturdaṣe 'nuvāke prathamāḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 43. 1. yad āditye tād vethāḥ iti. tejo vā etat tasyāḥ sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha iti. 2. yac candramasi tād vethāḥ iti. bhā vā eṣā tasya sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha iti. 3. yan nakṣatresu tād vethāḥ iti. prajñā vā eṣā tasya sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha iti. 4. yad anne tād vethāḥ iti. reto vā etat tasyāḥ sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha iti. 5. yat pauruṣa tād vethāḥ iti. yapo vā etat tasya sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha iti. 6. yad ṛci tād vethāḥ iti. stomo vā eṣā tasya sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha iti. 7. yud yauṣi tād vethāḥ iti. karma vā etat tasya sāmno yad vayām sāmō 'pāsmaha iti. 8. atha kim upāsā iti. akṣaram iti. katamat tād akṣaram iti. yat kṣarān nā 'kṣiyate 'ti. katamat tāt kṣarān nā 'kṣiyate 'ti. indra

is the self of that sāman which we worship.” 8. "Dost thou know that which is in the wind?” “That is the fortune of that sāman which we worship.” 7. "Dost thou know that which is in the quarters?” “That is the pervasion of that sāman which we worship.” 8. "Dost thou know that which is in the sky?” “That is the display of that sāman which we worship.”

I. 43. 1. “Dost thou know that which is in the sun?” “That is the splendor of that sāman which we worship.” 2. “Dost thou know that which is in the moon?” “That is the light of that sāman which we worship.” 3. “Dost thou know that which is in the asterisms?” “That is the understanding of that sāman which we worship.” 4. “Dost thou know that which is in food?” “That is the seed of that sāman which we worship.” 5. “Dost thou know that which is in the domestic animals?” “That is the glory of that sāman which we worship.” 6. “Dost thou know that which is in the vr̥c?” “That is the praise of that sāman which we worship.” 7. “Dost thou know that which is in the yajus?” “That is the action of that sāman which we worship.” 8. “Now what dost thou worship?” “The syllable, "Which is that syllable?” “[That] which flowing (√kṣar) was

42. 10 A.B. om. sāmno . . . . 'pa. 11-ḥā. 12 A.B. om. ṣa . . . . -smaha.
43. 1 A.B. om. rest of quotation. 2 C. prājā. 3 A.B. om. tat of etat.
4 C. om. 5 vo. 6 A.B. ste-. 7 C. leaves space for -ssa. 8 d. 9 akṣaraḥ.
I. 44. 1. rūpaṁ-rūpaṁ pratirūpo babbhava
tud asya rūpaṁ praticekṣanāya:
   indro māyābhīḥ pururūpaṁ iyate
   yuktā hy asya harayaḥ ca ta daśe
ti. 2. rūpaṁ-rūpaṁ pratirūpo babbhava ti. rūpaṁ-rūpaṁ hy eṣa
   pratirūpo babbhava. 3. tud asya rūpaṁ praticekṣanāya ti. pra-
   ticekṣanāyaḥ ha syai’tud rūpaṁ. 4. indro māyābhīḥ pururūpaṁ
   iyata iti. māyābhīḥ hy eṣa etat pururūpaṁ iyate. 5. yuktā hy

not exhausted (√ksī).” “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 exist-
ence. He shines beyond the sky. He it is who must be wor-
shiped 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 under-
standing, possessing seed, glorious, possessing praise, active, pos-
sessing the syllable, possessing Indra’s power, possessing the sā-
man. 12. And this is also spoken of in a re:

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
became 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
asya harayaç-catâ daçe 'ti. sahasram hâi 'ta ādityasaya raça-

yâh. te 'sya yuktâs tâir idâm sarvaṁ harati. tad yad etâir
idâm sarvaṁ harati tasmâd dharayah.

6. rûpam-rûpan11 maghavâ bohbhavit

mâyâh krvânah pari tanvâni svâm:

trir yad divâh pari mûhartam'âgât

svâir mantrâir anûtpâ ytâve

'ti. 7. rûpam-rûpan maghavâ bohbhavit 'ti.'10 rûpam-rûpan11 hy

esa maghavâ bohbhavit. 8. mâyâh krvânah13 pari tanvâni

svâm iti. mâyabhîr12 hy14 esa15 etat svâm tanvân goâyati. 9. trir

yad divâh pari mûhartam âgâd iti.'18 trir ha và esa etasya mu-
hûrtasye 'mân prthivîn samantaḥ paryet 'mâh prâjâs saîcâ-
ksânâh. 10. svâir mantrâir anûtpâ17 ytâve 'ti. anûtpâ hy esa

etad ytâvâ.'18 44.

caturâge 'nûvâke trîyâh khanjâh.

I. 45. 1. tad dhâ prthu vâinayo divyân vâyân papracche

'nâm' uktham ōcam udgitham âhur

brahma sâma prânaṁ vyânām:

nano5 và cakṣur apânam âhur

grotâm grotiyâ bahudhâ vadanti

'ti. 2. te pratyâcour

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 (√hr) with them this all,

therefore they are called bay (hari). 4. "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. 6. 'Exercising

magic around his own body,' for through magic he thus

protects his own body. 9. 'When he thrice in a moment hath

come from the sky,' for thrice in this moment he goes com-
pletely 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 Prthu Vâinaya inquired this of the divine men-
dicants: "They call Indra uktha, ri, udgitha, brahman, sâman,
breath, vyânâ, or they call [him] mind, eye, apânâ, ear; the learned
speak [of him] in many ways." 2. They answered: "These hymn-

--

44. 7 C. om. harayaç . . . . te 'sya. 8 A.B. insert ma. 9 mûh-

10 C. om. iti. 11 repeats rûpam-rûpan . . . . -vîti 'ti (!). 12 A. krâvâ.
13 A. -bhi. 14 A. ca. 15 A. om. 16 atî. 18 C. nrt-. 18 C. 'tâ.
45. 1 C. -idam. 2 C. no.


I. 46. 1. Prajāpatis a veda agru āṣī. so 'kāmayata bahus syām prajāyeya bhūmānam' gacchayam iti. 2. sa şoḍaśaḥṛthā "tmanām vyaśah̄ra haddaṁ ca samāpti ca "bhūṭi ca sam-

composing sages of old are born hither again for the keeping of the Vedas; verily they knowing [it], O Vāin yā, say this, that one and the same person is entered into many places.” 3. So some cause the attainment in the threefold knowledge of this divinity, this same one, others do not. 4. Verily he who knows this thus, he thoroughly knows this divinity. 5. That same Indra is the udgītha. When this same Indra comes as udgītha, he is not distinguished both of the udgītar and the upagītās. He rises upward from here to heaven; he twinkles 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 sāman. 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 udgītha.

I. 46. 1. Prajāpati in the beginning was the Veda. He desired: “May I be many, may I beget progeny, may I attain manifoldness.” 2. He divided himself into sixteen parts: bliss

46. 1 A. travyaḥ; B. trpyaḥ. 4 A.B. īmaṁ. 2-nā. 6 C. ny. 7 A.B. ha yā vai. 8 insert ti. 9 A.B. -tṛṇ-. 10 insert ti. 11 rāhva. 12 svara. 13 pariṣe. 1 C. ce.
bhūtāḥ ca bhūtāṁ ca sarvam ca rūpaṁ ca 'parimitam ca 
graś ca yaçaḥ ca nāma ca 'grāṁ ca sajñātān ca pāyaḥ ca 
mahāyaḥ ca rasac ca. 1. tad yad bhadrām hṛdayam asya tat. 
tataḥ saṁvatsaram asrjata. tad asya saṁvatsara 'nāpaṁśhate. 2. 
saṁyaktāḥ kārya 'syā tat. karmāṇa hi saṁāpyati. tataḥ isn 
asrjata. tad asya itavo 'nāpaṁśhante. 3. abhūtir annam asya ' 
tat. [tac] caturdhaḥ bhavati. tato māsīn ardhāmasūn ahorā 
trānīḥ uṣāso 'srjata. tad asya māsā ardhāmasūn ahorātrānīḥ uṣā 
'nāpaṁśhante. 4. saṁbhūtiḥ reto 'syā tad. retasāḥ hi saṁbh 
vaṭati. 46. 

pañcadaśe 'nūrāke prathamah khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 47. 1. tataḥ ca sāndrasasam asrjata. tad asya ca sūdhīr 
a'nāpaṁśhate. tasmāt sa retasāḥ pratirūpāḥ. 2. bhūtāṁ prāmo 
'syā saḥ. tato vāyūn asrjata. tad asya vāyur a'nāpaṁśhate. 3. 
sārṇam apiṇā 'syā saḥ. tataḥ pācuṁ asrjata. tad asya pācuvo 
'nāpaṁśhante. 4. rūpaṁ vāyano 'syā saḥ. tataḥ prajā asrjata. 
tad asya prajā a'nāpaṁśhante. tasmād āsu prajāsu rūpānī 
adhigamyante. 4. apanimitam mano 'syā tat. tato diço 'srjata.

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. 3. 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. Exist 
ence, 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 vāyana. 
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

46. 2-yañ. 3 A.B. -ante. 4 A.B. insert ta. 5 A.B. tad; C. om. 6 A.B. aṁcchā; C. arāḥ. 7-ti. A.B. -tā; C. -ta.
47. 1-ta. 2-ya. 3 A.B. rūpaṇo. 4-yate. 5 C. om. tato . . . . tas-
māt.
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 (√i+sam),

"tmānaṁ viśertaḥ sārdhaṁ samāit, tād yat sārdhaṁ samāitatō
tat sāmman sāmatvam. 3. sa evā ’ṣa hiranyaṁṛaḥ purusā ud-
atīṣṭhat praṇāṁ jānatō. 11 48.
apaścadaśe ‘nuvāke trītyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

I. 49. 1. devāsurā asparśhanta. te devāḥ praṇāpatiṁ upādha-
vaṁ jayāṁ ’surān iti. 2. so ‘braviṇ na vai māṁ yūyam vittha’
nā ’surāḥ. yad vai māṁ yūyam viḍyātē tato vai yūyam eva
syātā paraṁ ’surā bhaveyur iti. 3. tād vai brāhī ’ty abrvaṇ. so
‘braviṇ puruṣaḥ praṇāpatiṁ sāme ’ti no ’pāḍāhānam. tato vai yū-
yum eva bhaviṣyathā para ’surā bhaviṣyaṁti ’ti. 4. tam puru-
ṣaḥ praṇāpatiṁ sāme ’ty upāsata. tato vai devā abhavan para
’surāḥ. su yo hāṁ ’vaṁ vidvān puruṣaḥ praṇāpatiṁ sāme ’ty upāste
bhavati ātmaṁ para ’ṣya dviṣaṇ bhṛṭṛvyo bhavati. 49.
apaścadaśe ‘nuvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. apaścadaśe ‘nuvākas samāptaḥ.

I. 50. 1. devā vai viṣhyānā’ abrvaṇ dvitiyaṁ karavaṁmahāī.
mā ’dvitiyā bhāme ’ti. te ’brvaṇ sāmā ’va dvitiyaṁ karava-
mahāī. sāmā ’va no dvitiyaṁ asta iti. 2. ta ime dyauyāprthivi
abruṇ sametam sāma praṇānayaṁ am iti. 3. so ’sāv asyā abhi-
bhaṁsata. 4 so ’braviṇ hau vā etasyāṁ kiṁ ca kiṁ ca kurvanv
that is the reason why the sāman is called so. 3. That same
one arose, a golden person, a generator of offspring.

I. 49. 1. The gods and the Asuras contended. These gods
ran unto Praṇāpati [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, Praṇāpati, Sāman.’ Verily
you will then prevail, the Asuras will perish." 4. They wor-
shiped him [saying]: “Puruṣa, Praṇāpati, Sāman.” Thereupon
the gods verily prevailed, the Asuras perished. He who know-
ing thus worships [saying]: “Puruṣa, Praṇāpati, 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].

48. 10 C. samāit; A.B. after this repeat: tad yat sārdhaṁ samātit (!).
11 Jayitā.
49. 1 B. sattha. 2 -yāta. 3 A.B. -ḥi.
50. 1 A. viṣhyānā. 2 A.B. vā. 3 sā. 4 abhāvat-.
adhiṣṭhīvantyā adhicaranty adhyāsate. punitaḥ na evaṁ apūtā vā iti. 4. te gāthām abruvam tvayā punāme 'tī. kiṁ tatas syād iti. ātatasāsyā syā iti. tathē 'tī. te gāthayā 'punan. tasmād uta gāthayā catāṁ sunoti. 5. te kumbyām abruvam tvayā punāme 'tī. kiṁ tatas syād iti. ātatasāsyā syā iti. tathē 'tī. te kumbyayā 'punan. tasmād uta kumbyayā catāṁ sunoti." 6. te nārācaṁśiṁ abruvam tvayā punāme 'tī. kiṁ tatas syād iti. ātatasāsyā syā iti. tathē 'tī. te nārācaṁsyā 'punan. tasmād uta nārācaṁsyā catāṁ sunoti. 7. te rāibhīṁ abruvam tvayā punāme 'tī. kiṁ tatas syād iti. ātatasāsyā syā iti. tathē 'tī. te rāibhyā 'punan. tasmād uta rāibhyā catāṁ sunoti. 8. se 'yam pūtā. athā 'mum abravidbahu vāi kiṁ ca kiṁ ca punāṅc carati. tvamāṁ ānupravuṁsye 'tī. 50.

śoḍaṁe 'nunāke prathamah khaṇḍah.

I. 51. 1. sa āśabenaḥ punitaḥ. pūtāni ha vā asya sāmāni pūtā rcaḥ pūtāni yajūṣi pūtam anāktaṁ pūtam sarvamā dhavati 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." 2. 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 nārācaṁsi: "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 nārācaṁsi. And therefore one obtains a hundred with the nārācaṁsi. 6. They said to the rāibhi: "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 rāibhi. And therefore one obtains a hundred with the rāibhi. 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 ṛc's are cleansed, the yajuses are

50. ṣṭhīva.- 4.-ni: C. -nī, and so all MSS. in 5, 6, and 7. 7 C. -bhy.- 8 A.B. repeat 5. 9 C. tena. 10 C. catāṁ. 11-bhīm. 12 C. tā. 13 tam.-
51. 1-lav-; B. ātavāṁsām. 2-vām.
evam veda. 2. te sametya sāma prājanayatūṃ. 3. tad yat sametya sāma prājanayatūṃ tat sāmnasā sāmatvam. 3. tad idaṁ sāma śṛṣṭam ada utkramyo lelayad atiṣṭhat. tasya sarve devā mama- tvina asan mama mame" ti. 4. te bruvan vi 'dam bhajāmahā iti. tasya vibhāge na sanapādayan. tūn prajāpatir abraśīd apeta. mama vā etat. aham eva vo vibhāksyāmī "ti. 5. so 'gnim abraviṭ tvam vāi me yjeṣṭhaḥ putrāṇām asi. tvam prathamo vrniṣve "ti. 6. so 'bravin manāraim sāman vrṇe "mnādayam" iti. sa ya etad gāyūd appāda" eva so 'san mām u sa devānūṁ yechād ya evam vidvānasm etad gāyantam upavadād iti. 1. athe "nāram abraviṭ tvam anuvṛṣne "ti. 8. so 'braśīd ugrain" sānano vrṇe priyam" iti. sa" ya etad gāyac" chirmān eva so 'san mām u sa devānūṁ yechād ya evam vidvānasm etad gāyantam upavadād iti. 9. atha soman abraviṭ tvam anuvṛṣne "ti. 10. so 'braviṭ valgu sānano vrṇe priyam iti. sa ya etad gāyät priya eva sa kārtēḥ priyaç caikṣuṣah priyas sarvesām asan mām u sa devānūṁ yechād ya evam vidvānasm etad gāyantam upavadād iti. 11. atha bhraspatin abraviti tvam" anuvṛṣne "ti. 12. so 'braviṭ kṛवुळcāmi sānano vrṇe brahmavacaram iti.

cleansed, the anākta 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

51. 2 A.B. prōj- 4 -at. 5 A. me. 6 C. leaves space for vi 'dam ; A.B. vidām. 1 B.C. bhavīṣy-. 8 B.C. priyam. 9 B.C. gāyatrac. 10 B.C. chrimān. 12 B.C. ataha. 13 B.C. somam. 14 B.C. valgu. 15 B.C. priyam. 32 A. om. sa ya . . . so 'braviṭ in 9. 16 B.C. gāyatrac. 17 A. om. 18 A. nwv-
sa ya etad gāyād brahmavarcasy eva so 'san mām u sa devānām 
rechād ya evān vidvānsam etad gāyantaṃ upavadād iti. 51.
śoḍače 'nuvāke dvitiyāḥ khanḍaḥ.

I. 52. 1. atha viṣvān devān abravid yāyam anuvṛṣṭidhavam iti. 
2. te brvavān vāyugadvām sāmno vṛnīmahe praṇananam iti. sa 
y etad gāyāt praṇāvān eva so 'sad' asmān w devānām rechād 
y evān vidvānams etad gāyantaṃ upavadād iti. 3. atha pacān 
abravid yāyam anuvṛṣṭidhavam iti. 4. te brvavān vāyur vā asmā- 
kam iče. sa eva no varisyataḥ iti. te vāyuḥ ca pacāvač ca 'bru- 
vav niruktaniḥ sāmno vṛnīmahe paćavyam iti. sa ya etad gāyāt 
pacumān eva so sad asmān u ca sa vāyur ca devānām rechād 
y evān vidvānams etad gāyantaṃ upavadād iti. 5. atha pra- 
jāpatir abravid ahām anuvṛṣṣiya iti. 6. so 'bravid aniruktani 
sāmno vṛne svargyunam iti. sa ya etad gāyāt svargalokā eva so 
'san' mām u sa devānām rechād ya evān vidvānams etad gāyan-
tam upavadād iti. 7. atha varuṇaṃ abravit tvam anuvṛṣṣīye 
ti. 8. so 'bravid yau vo na kač caṇā 'vṛta tud ahām pariha-
to Bhāspati: "Choose thou after [him]." He (B.) said: "I 
choose the plover-like of the sāman, 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 sāman 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: "Vāyu is our lord; he will choose for us," 
4. They, Vāyu and the domestic animals, said: "We choose the 
distinct [part] of the sāman, i. e. that which belongs to the domes-
tic animals. Whosoever shall sing this, may he be rich in do-
meric animals; and may he encounter us and Vāyu of the gods 
who speaketh ill of one who knoweth thus, who singeth this." 
5. Then Prajāpati said: "I will choose after [them]." 6. He said: 
"I choose the indistinct [part] of the sāman, i. e. that which be-
longs to heaven. Whosoever shall sing this, may he be in posses-
sion 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 Varuṇa: "Choose thou after [me]." 8. He said:

52. 1 B. inserts ma. 2 insert from below ca sa vāyuḥ. 3 C. varīṣṭha. 
4 anir-. 5 B. -yug. 6 A.B. omit the rest, to iti. 7 A.B. ti. 8 A.B. svar-
gam. 9 B. samut.
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risya' iti. kim iti. apadhvântani' sămno vṛne 'paçavam iti. sa ya etad gāyād aparçur' eva so 'saman mām u sa devānām rcohād' ya etad gāyād iti. 9. tāni vā etān uṣṭān gītāgītāni sāmnaḥ. imāny u ha vai supta gītāni. athe' 'yam eva vārūny āgā 'gītā. 10. sa yām ha kāmā' cāi 'vaiṁ vidvān etāsūm sapānām ágānām gāyati gītām eva 'syā bhavaty etān u kāmān śrādhnoti" ya etāsū kāmāḥ. athe 'śyām eva vārūṇīm āgāṁ na gāyet. 52.

śoḍaṇe 'nuvāke trīyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ. śoḍaṇo 'nuvākas samāptāḥ.

I. 53. 1. dvayāṁ vāve 'dam agru āsīt sac cāi 'vā 'sac cu. 2. tavayor yat sat tat sāma tan manas sa prāṇāḥ. atha yad asat suṛk śa vāk so 'prāṇāḥ. 3. tad yan manac ca prāṇac cu tat samānam. atha yā vāk cāi 'prānac ca tat samānam. idam āyatanam manac ca prāṇac ca 'dam āyatanāṁ vāk cāi 'prāṇac ca tasmāt purāṇ daksinato yosām upacete. 4. se 'yam ṣy asmin sāmanā mithunam aicchata. tām aprachet kā tvam asī 'ti. sā 'ham āsī 'ty abравit. atha vah am asī 'smī 'ti. 5. tad yat śa "What no one of you hath chosen, with that I will gird myself (?) ." "What is it?" "I choose the ill-sounding [part] of the sāman, i.e. that which does not belong to the domestic animals. Who- soever shall sing this, may he be without domestic animals, and may he encounter me of the gods who singeth this." 2. These same then are eight [āgās] of the sāman, sung and unsung; and verily there these seven are sung, but this āgā belonging to Varuṇa is not sung. 10. Whichever of these seven āgās any one know- ing thus sings, of him [the sāman?] is sung, and he accomplishes those wishes which are in these [āgās]. And this āgā belonging to Varuṇa 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 sāman, 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 sāman. He (the sāman) asked her (the re): "Who art thou?" She answered: "I am she (sā)." "Verily, then, I am he (ama)." 8. What was she (sā) and he (ama), that became the sāman; that

52. 10 A.B. ḫryy; A.B. yatā. 31 A.B. apaddhamātan; C. apadhmatam. 13 C. paḥ. 13 A. prim. m. radhād. 14 B. -tha; C. katha. 11 A. -o. 16 A.B. kāmā. 17 C. niruddha; A.B. nirudhaṇi.
53. 1 B. myaḥ; after this A.B. insert asmy adādyā bhavite 'ti; C. asty (space) bhavite 'ti (a misplaced gloss?). 2 -nā. 8 C. upavačete. 4-ma,
cā 'maṣ ca tatr sāmā 'bhavat tat sāmnas sāmatvam. 6, tāu vāi sambhavīve 'tī. ne 'ty abhavī svosū vāi māma tvam asy anyatra mithunam icchasne 'tī. 7. sā 'bravīt na vāi tvam vindāmī yena sambhaveyam." tvayai 'va sambhavānī 'tī. sā vāī punīṣve 'ty abhavīt. aputāt vā aśī 'tī. 8. sā 'punītā yaḍ idān viprā vādayāntenā. sā 'bravīt kves 'dam bhavīṣyati 'tī. pratyūhe 'ty abhavīt. dhīr vā esā. prajānām jīvānaṁ vā etad bhavīṣyati 'tī. tathē 'tī. tatt pratyūhat. tasmād esā dhīr eva prajānāṁ jīvanam eva. 9. punīṣve 'ty abhavīt. sā 'punītā gāthayā sā 'punītā kumbyayā" sā 'punītā nārāpaṁyasā sā 'punītā purāṇetiḥāsena sā 'punītā yaḍ idām11 ādāya nā12 "gāyanti tenā. 10. sā 'bravīt kves 'dam bhavīṣyati 'tī. pratyūhe 'ty abhavīt. dhīr vā esā. prajānām jīvānaṁ vā etad bhavīṣyati 'tī. tathē 'tī. tatt pratyūhat. tasmād esā dhīr v eva prajānāṁ jīvanam eva. 11. punīṣvāi 've 'ty abhavīt. 53. saptadāçe 'nuvāke prathamah khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 54. 1. sā madhunā 'punītā; tasmād uta brahmācāri madhunā 'punīyād vedasya pālatex iti. kāmaṁ ha tv acāryādattam aṇīyat. 2. atha rk sāmā 'bravi bhāu 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." 1. She said: "Verily, I find no one with whom I might have intercourse; let me have intercourse 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 nārāpaṁsi, she cleansed herself with the purāṇa 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. 3. They enclosed the *sadās* for their intercourse. Therefore in the night of the fast-day one should not lie in the *sadās*; for there, in the *sadās*, these two, *ṛc* and *sāman*, 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 *udgātar* they have intercourse; one should not look at the mouth of the *udgātar*.” 5. But they also say this: "He may look at pleasure at the mouth of the *udgātar*. Only in this night of the fast-day he should not lie in the *sadās*; for there, in the *sadās*, these two, *ṛc* and *sāman*, 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] *hīṅkāra* and *āhāva* and *prastāva* and first [āgā?] and *udgītha* and middle [āgā?] and *pratiḥāra* and last [āgā?] and *nidhana*

---

54. A. haraṇḍakēṣṇenā; B. bharanḍa- (second a corr. from u); C. bharaṇḍakokṣenā. 4 A. -van. 5 A. -dhīyām; B. -gīyām. 6 I. A. yita; B.C. yeta. 8 A.B. -dh-. 9 A. ēcad. 10 A.B. munalava; C. annulw-. 11 C. na. 12 A.B. -th-. 13 B.C. insert raṇa. 14 A. -pr-. 15 sambhavata. 16 atyaricaya. 17 C. hā.
yatām.\textsuperscript{19} te amum ajanayatām yo 'sāu tapati. te vyadravatām.\textsuperscript{54} 54.
saptadace 'nuvaē dvitiyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 55. 1. mad adhy abhūṣn mad adhy abhūṣd iti. tasmād uḥur madhyaputraś iti. 2. tasmād uṭa striyo madhú nu 'ṛṇanti putrāṇām idāṃ uṛdānā cārinaṃ iti vadaṇāḥ. 3. tad ayaśa tṛcch 'nāda-prayata. iyam\textsuperscript{3} eva gāyatri antāriṣṭaṃ\textsuperscript{3} triṣṭub asāu jagātī. tasyāḥ 'tat tṛcch. 3. sa upariṣṭāt sūnā 'dhyāhitānā tapati. so 'dhrva ima 'śīd adeśyād ima. sa no 'ṛdhvam 'tapati. 4. sa devān abraśīd un mā gāyate 'ti. kīna tataś syād iti. priyam vah pra-yaccheyam. mān iha dhīhete\textsuperscript{6} 'ti. 5. tatha 'ti. tam uḍaṇgāyan.\textsuperscript{4} tam etad atṛa 'dṛhihan.' tebhyaṣ cṛiṣyam prāyaṣcchat. sāi 'sa devānāṃ cṛih. 6. tata etad ृdāhvaś tapati. sa nā 'ṛvān atapat.\textsuperscript{7} 7. sa rṣin abraśīd anu mā gāyate 'ti. kīna tatas syād iti. cṛiṣyam vah prāyaṣccheyam. mān iha dhīhete\textsuperscript{6} 'ti. 8. tatha 'ti. tam anvagāyan. tam etad atṛa 'dṛhihan. tebhyaṣ cṛiṣyam prāyaṣcchat. sāi 'sa rṣiṇāṃ cṛiṣih. 9. tata etad arvān tapati. sa na tīrṇaḥ

and vasātkāra—thus having become the virāj 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” (madhyaputra). And therefore women do not eat honey, saying: “We perform this vow of sons.” 2. Then this triplet rose up in consequence: this [earth] the gāyatri; the atmosphere the triṣṭubh; yonder [sky] the jagati. That is its triplet. 3. He (yonder sun) burns on high, a sāman 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 uḍgītha.” “What would be the result?” “I would bestow fortune upon you. Make me firm here.” 5. “Very well.” They sang him the uḍgītha. 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 (rṣi): “Sing after me.” “What would be the result of it?” “I would bestow fortune upon you. Make me firm here.” 8. “Very well.” They sang after him. They thus made him firm there. He bestowed fortune upon them. That is that fortune of the sages. 9. Hence he thus burns hitherward.

\textsuperscript{54} \textsuperscript{15} ca. exam. \textsuperscript{19} prāj-. \textsuperscript{20} A. vyadrptām; B. bhyaḍrvatām; C. vyadrpatām (?).

55. \textsuperscript{1} A.B. -ā. \textsuperscript{2} B.C. idam. \textsuperscript{3} C. -iṣ-. \textsuperscript{4} A.B. ddh-; C. dh-. \textsuperscript{5} dūmket. \textsuperscript{6} uḍagāt. \textsuperscript{7} B.C. -hat. \textsuperscript{8} tap-. \textsuperscript{8} B.C. tiyyamād.
atapat. 10. sa gandharväpsaraso 'bravid à mū gāyate 'ti. kīṁ
tattas" syād 'ti. gṛiyāṁ vah prayaccheyam. mūm iha drīhete 'ti.
11. tathē 'ti. tam āgāyan. tam etad atra 'dyāhan. tebhyaṁ gṛiyām
prayacchat. sā 'śa gandharväpsarasaṁ gṛiḥ. 12. tāta etat
tiryāṇaṁ tapati. 12. tūni vā etāni triṇī sūṃna udgītam anugītam
āgītam. tad yathe 'dāmī vayam āgāyo 'ddāyāna etad udgītam.'
atha yaḍ yathāgītan tad anugītam. atha yat kīṁ ce 'ti sūṃnas
tad āgītam. etāni hy eva triṇī sūmnāh. 55.

saptadāce 'nuvāke triṇayāh khaṇḍaḥ. saptadāgo 'nuvākas samāptah.

I. 56. 1. āpo vā idam agre mahat suñilam āsit. sa ārmir
ūrmin askandat.1 tato kīrṇayānkuṣyān2 samabhavatāṁ
te eva3 rksime.4 2. se 'yam yām idāṁ sāṁ 'bhyaivasvata.5
tām aprcchat kā tvam asi 'ti. sā 'ham asmīt yāvāt, atha vā aham
amo 'smīt 'ti. tad yat sā ca 'maç ca tat sūmnas sāvatvam. 3. tāu
vāi sambhāvave 'ti. ne 'ty abhavāt svasā vāi mama tvam asi.
anyatra mithunam icchāvete 'ti. 4. sā pariśāvata mithunam
icchāmānā. sā samās sahasraṁ saptāṭh paryāvavata. 5. tad
esa cokas

He did not burn crosswise. 10. He said to the Gandharvas and
Apsarases: "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
there. He bestowed fortune upon them. That is that for-
tune of the Gandharvas and Apsarases. 12. Hence he thus burns
crosswise. 12. Verily these are the three of the sāman [viz.]:
what is sung as udgītha, what is sung after (anugīta), what is
sung unto (āgīta). As we here having sung unto sing the udgītha,
that is what is sung as udgītha; and what is sung like the āgīta,
that is that which is sung after; and anything of the sāman
[that is sung], that is sung unto. For there are just these three
[parts] of the sāman.

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.]: rc and sāman. 2. This same
rc floated unto that same sāman. = I. 53. 5. 3. = I. 53. 6.
4. She floated away desiring intercourse. She floated around a
thousand seventies of years. 5. Regarding this there is this
strī småi 'vā 'gre samcarati' 'echintī' sulile patim: samūs sahasvarāṁ saptalī tato jāyata paṭyata iti. 6. asū vā ādityāḥ paṭyataḥ. 9 eṣa eva tathā ajāyata. etenu hi paṭyati. 7. sā 'vittvā nyapavatā. sā̀ bravin na vāi tuṁ vindāmi yena sambhaveyam. teṇvā 'vra sambhavāṇi 'ti. 8. sā vāi dūtiyāṁ icchāvā 'ty abravin na vāi māi 'ko dyaṁsyaśā 'ti. sā dūtiyāṁ vittvā nyapavatā. 9. [ṭṛṭyaṁ] icchāvati 've' 'ty abravin no vāvā māvā dvevā udyaṁsyaśā iti. sā ṭṛṭyaṁ vittvā nyapavatā. so 'bravulātra vāi mo 'dyaṁsyathe' 'ti. 10. sa yad ekayā 'gre samavatāḥ tasmād ekarce śāmā. atha yad dve apāśedhat tasmād dvayor na kureṇti. atha yat tiṣyabhīsā samapaśayatā tasmād u trec śāmā. 11. tā abravīt puniḍhvāni na pūtā vāi sthe 'ti. 56.

aṣṭāduce 'nvāke prathamāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 57. 1. sā gāyatri gūthāyā 'punīta nārāṇayyā' triṣṭub rāibhīyā jagati. bhūnam batu malam apūvadhiśate 'ti. tasmād bhūmalā dhiyo vā etāḥ. dhiyo vā imā malam apūvadhiśate 'ti.

The meaning: "In the beginning the woman used to go seeking [her] lord in the flood, one thousand seventies of years; thence the beauteous one was born." 8. Yonder sun is the beauteous one (paṭyata); he was born then, for by him one sees (paṭyati). 7. She, not having found [anyone], floated in. She said: "Verily I find no one with whom I might have intercourse. Let me have intercourse with thee." 9. "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 sāman is in one rc. And because he refused two, therefore they do not do (sing) it in two [rc's]. And because he agreed with three, therefore the sāman is in a triplet. 11. He said to them: "Cleanse yourselves, verily you are not clean."

I. 57. 1. That gāyatri cleansed itself with the gūthā, the triṣṭubh with the nārāṇaśi, the jagati with the rāibhī. "Lo, they have struck away fearful (bhūma) defilement (mala)." Therefore these devices are terrible (? bhūmalā). "Verily, these devices have struck away defilement." And therefore [they are] terrible (? bhūmalā). And therefore one should not eat [any-
asmaud u bhūmaiḥ. tasmād u gāyatāṁ nā ’gniyat," malena hy ete jivanti. 2. atha rñś śāma ’bhrāvīd bahu vāi king ca king ca pumāṇc carati. tvam anupuniṣve ’ti. su ārdhvagāneṇa ’punita. 3. pūtāni ha vā asya sāmāṇi pūtā ’rcaḥ pūtāni yajāṇi pūtām anūktamā pūtām sarvam bhavati ya evain veda. 4. tābhyām dīpo mithūnaye paryāhan. tām sambhavisyann 10 āhavatā ’no ’ham asmi sā tvām sā” tvam asy amo ’ham iti. 5. tām etad ubhayato vācī” tyariceyate 11 hiṅkāreṇa purastūt stobhana madhyato nidhanena ’paristit. ati tisro brāhmaṇāyānaḥ sadṛṣī ricyate ya evain veda. 6. tayor yas sambhator ārdhaḥ pūṣo 12 'dravat [prāṇas] te. te prāṇa evo ’rdhvā udravan. 10. 7. so ’śev adityas sa eṣa eva ud agnir eva gī candramā eva tham. śāmāṇy eva ud rca eva gī yajāṇsy eva tham ity adhidevatam. 8. athā ’dhyātmam.” prāṇa eva ud vāg eva gī mana eva tham. sa eva adhidevatam cā ’dhyātmam co ’dgithah. 12. 9. sa ya evam etad adhidevatam co ’dgitham vedaī ’tena hā ’syav sarvēva ’dgitaṁ” bhavaty 13 evasmād u eva sarvasmād avṛpeyate ya evain vidvānasam upavadati.

57. asṭādaśe ’nāvake dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍalā.

thing] of those singing; for they live on defilement (mula). 2. Then the rca said to the sāmaṇ: “Verily, much does a man pratice of this sort and of that. Cleanse thyself also.” He cleansed himself with the upper series (?). 3. 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 niḥkana 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 sāmans are ud, the rca’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 udgītha with regard both to the divinities and to the self. 9. He who thus knows the udgītha with regard both to the divinities and to the self, verily his udgītha is sung by this all; and he is cut off from this all who speaks ill of one who knows thus.

57. 4-tā. 5A. ’gnī-. 6A.B. rkka. 1-tāni. 8A. -tā. 9A. niṅ-. 10-syany. 11A. avacayata; B.C. ahvayanta. 12A.B. sāma. 13C. -cā. 14A.B. tyariceyate. 15A.B. cā-. 16A.B. dra-. 17A. ’ddhā-. 18C. gīth-. 19C. -gīth-. 20A. bhavatye ’ti; B. bhavanti.
I. 58. 1. When they say here: “As who hast thou sung the udgītha?” 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 udgāta [leads] that from the mind by means of speech unto the sacrificer whose wishes he fulfils.
5. Whoso by sacrificial gifts conciliates the udgāta, 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 hiṅkāra, Agni the prastava, Indra the ādi, Soma and Brhaspati the udgītha, the two Ācīvins the pratiḥāra, all the

nam. 10. etā vai sarvā devatā etā hiranyam.²⁴ asya sarvābhīr devatābhīs stuntam bhavati ya evain vedā, etābhya u eva sa sarvābhīyro devatābhīyāuṝṇyate ya evain vidvānsam upavadati. 58. aśṭādače 'nūvāke tryiyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 59. 1. atha ha brahmadatta caikitiṇeyah kuruṇiḥ jagāmā 'bhupatrārinām hākṣasenim. sa hā'smāi madhuparkasīn yayāca. 2. atha ha 'asya viṇi pratapadya purohito 'nte niśasāda gānakaḥ. tāṁ hā 'nāmantrya madhuparkam papaṭa. 3. tāṁ ho 'vāca kīṁ viḍvān no dālbyā 'nāmantrya madhuparkam pibasi 'ti. sāmaṇavīryāṁ pratapade 'ti ho 'vāca. 4. tāṁ ha tatrāi 'va papraccha yad vāyuṇ tad vetthāḥ iti. hiṁkāro vā asya sa iti. 5. yad agraṇu tad vetthāḥ iti. prastūvo vā asya sa iti. 6. yad indrā tad vetthāḥ iti. ādīr vā asya sa iti. 7. yat somaṃyhasputyoś tad vetthāḥ iti. udgītho vā asya sa iti. 8. yad aścinos tad vetthāḥ iti. pratihāro vā asya sa iti. 9. yad vigvesu deveṣu tad vetthāḥ iti. upādravo vā asya sa iti. 10. yat praṇāpatai tad vetthāḥ iti. nīḍhanām vā asya tad iti ho 'vāca. ārṣeyam vā asya tad

gods the upādrava, Prajāpati the nīḍhana. 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 purohitā Gānaka, stepping forth, sat down near by. He (B.) drank the honey-potion without addressing him (C.). 3. He (C.) said to him (B.): “As knowing what, O Dālbyā, dost thou drink the honey-potion without addressing [me]?” “Having recourse to that which belongs to the strength of the sāman (?)”, he (B.) said. 4. He (C.) asked him (B.) just there: “Dost thou know that which is in Vāyu?” “Verily, the hiṁkāra of it.” 5. “Dost thou know that which is in Agni?” “Verily, the prastava 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 Bṛhaspati?” “Verily, the udgītha of it.” 8. “Dost thou know that which is in the two Aṛvins?” “Verily, the pratihāra of it.” 9. Dost thou know that which is in all the gods?” “Verily, the upādrava of it.” 10. “Dost thou know that which is in Prajāpati?” “Verily, the

58. ²⁴hīrany.
59. ²B. kū-; A. ārām. ²C. ends here. ²-yap. ²A. -mantraḥ. ²sā-
mavāryyā, the r cancelled. ²A. tata. ²A.B somāb-. ²B. repeats d-
²A. om.
bandhūtā vā asyaṁ 10 se 'ti. 11. sa ho 'vāca namas te 'stu bhagavo
vidvān apā madhuparkam iti. 12. atha he 'taraḥ papraccha
kimdevatāṁ 13 sāmavāyryam 14 prapadye 'ti. yaddevatāyās stu-
vata iti ho 'vāca taddevatāyam iti. 13. tad etat sādhv eva pra-
tyuktam. 15 vyāptir vā asyaṁ 'se 'ti ho 'vāca brūhy eva 'ti. me
'dam te numa 'karme 'ti ho 'vāca. mār 'va no 'tiprākṣir iti.
14. sa ho 'vāca 'praksyaṁ vāva tvā devatām apraksyaṁ vāva
tvā devatāyāi devataḥ. vādevatāyām sāma vāco mano devatā
manah pačāvaḥ pačānaṁ osadhya osadhānām apah. tad etad
ādhya 16 jūtam sāmā 'psu pratiṣṭhitam iti. 59.

aṣṭādaśe 'nūvāke caturtalā khaṇḍāḥ.

I. 60. 1. devāsūrā asparghanta. te devā manaso. 'dagāyan. 1 
tad eṣām asūrā abhīdrutāyā pāpamā sāmasṛjan. 2 tasmād bahu
kiṁ ca kiṁ ca manasā dhyāyati. pūryanam cāi 'nena dhyāyati
pāpaṁ ca. 2. te vāco 'dagāyan. tāṁ tathāi 'vā 'kurvan. 3 tas-
mād bahu kiṁ ca kiṁ ca vācā vadati. satyaṁ cāi 'nayā

nidhana of it,” he said; “that of it belongs to the sages (ṛṣī);
that is its connection.” 11. He (Ç.) 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 sāman (?) 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 sāman 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 sāman 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

60. 1 'gāy-. 2- draksya or -dratya. 3-sraj-. 4 va. 5 kūr-. 6-tya.
vāt.
vadaty anṛtam ca. 2. te caksuso 'dagāyan. tat tathāi 'vā 'kurvan. tasmād bahu kiṁ ca kiṁ ca caksusa paśyati. darçanīyaṁ cāi 'nena paśyatya adarçanīyaṁ ca. 4. te grotreno 'dagāyan. tat tathāi 'vā 'kurvan. tasmād bahu kiṁ ca kiṁ ca' grotrena gṛṇoti. gṛvanīyaṁ cāi 'nena gṛṇoty agrvanīyaṁ ca. 5. te pūneno 'dagāyan. taṁ tathāi 'vā 'kurvan. tasmād bahu kiṁ ca kiṁ ca 'pūnena jighrati. surabhi cāi 'nena jighrati durgandhi ca. 6. te pūneno 'dagāyan.' athā 'surā ādṛavaṁ tathā kariṣyāma iti manyamānāḥ. 7. sa yathā 'śmānam ētvā loṣtho vai dhvāṇetāi ēvaṁ eva 'surā vyadhvaṁsanta.11 sa eso 'śmā 'khaṇaṁ12 yat prāṇaḥ. 8. sa yathā 'śmānam ākhaṇaṁ13 ētvā loṣtho vai dhvāṇaṁ suva eva eva sa vidhvāṁsate ya evam eva vidvāṁsam upavadati. 60.

aṣṭādaśe 'nuvāke puñcamah khaṇḍaḥ. aṣṭadaśo 'nuvākas samāptah.

II. 1. 1. devānāṁ vai saḥ udgātāra āsan vāk ca manaḥ ca caksuṣa ca grottrai cā 'pānaḥ ca prāṇaḥ ca. 2. te ādhriyanta tene 'dgātrā diṅkṣaṁhaḥi yenā 'pahatyam mṛtyum apahatyam pāpmānāṁ

same way. Therefore with speech one speaks many a thing of this kind and of that; both [what is] true one speaks with it and [what is] untrue. 3. They sang the udgītha with sight. That [sight] they treated in just the same manner. Therefore with sight one sees many a thing of this kind and of that; both [what is] seemly one sees with it and [what is] unseemly.

4. They sang the udgītha with hearing. That [hearing] they treated in just the same manner. Therefore with hearing one hears many a thing of this kind and of that; both [what is] worth hearing one hears with it and [what is] not worth hearing.

5. They sang the udgītha with exhalation. That [exhalation] they treated in just the same manner. Therefore with exhalation one smells many a thing of this kind and of that; both what is fragrant one smells with it and what is of bad odor.

6. They sang the udgītha with breath. Then the Asuras ran up, thinking: "We will treat it in the same manner." 7. As a clod of earth colliding with a stone would break to pieces, even so the Asuras broke to pieces. Breath is this stone as a target.

II. 1. 1. Of the gods there were six udgātaras: viz., speech and mind and sight and hearing and exhalation and breath. 2. They resolved: "Let us consecrate ourselves with that udgātar by

60. 8 A. om. 9 B. -gāt. 10 -ṣto. 11 A. sate; B. -ṣantā. 12 -nom. 13 B. āṇem.
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 udgátar.” They consecrated themselves with speech as udgátar. 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 udgátar.” 6. They consecrated themselves with the mind as udgátar. 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 udgátar.” 9. They consecrated themselves with sight as udgátar. 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 udgátar.” 12. They consecrated themselves with hearing as udgátar. 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
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 udgātar.” 15. They consecrated themselves with exhalation as udgātar. 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 udgātar.” 18. They consecrated themselves with breath as udgātar. 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

1. 8 aparīti.
van. tā u eva viṣve devaḥ. 5. atha yas so 'pānā āsīt sa bhṛhaspa-
tir abhavat. yad asyai vāco bhṛatyai patis tasmād bhṛhaspatiḥ.
6. atha yas sa prāna āsīt sa prajāpatir abhavat. sa esa putri
prajāvān udgītho yaḥ prāṇaḥ. tasya svara eva prajāḥ. prajā-
vān bhavati ya evam veda. 7. tāṁ hi 'tāṁ eke pratyakṣam eva
guyanti prāṇaḥ prāṇaḥ prāṇaḥ hum bhā ovā iti. 8. tad u ho
'vāca guṇyāyanis tata etan arhutī pratyakṣaṁ gātam. yaṁ vāva
vācā karoti tad etad eva 'syā kṛtam bhavati 'ti. 9. atha vā ata
'ṛksānmor eva prajātiḥ. sa yaḥ dhīkaṅkātory ahby eva eva tena
krandati. 9. atha yat prastānty āi 'vu tena plavate. atha yad āṣim
ādaṭte reta eva tena sīncati. atha yad udgāyati reta eva eva tena
siktaṁ sambhaṅgayati. 10. atha yat pratihaṁri reta eva tena sa-
bhitaṁ pravardhaṁ. atha yad upadravaṁ reta eva eva pra-
vyddhaṁ vikaroḥ. atha yan nīḍhanām upāṭī reta eva eva tena
vikṛtam prajānayati. sūi 'sa rksāṁnoḥ prajātiḥ. 10. sa ya
evam etāṁ rksāṁnoḥ prajātiṁ veda pra hāṁ 'nam rksāmanī
janayataḥ. 62.

prathame 'nuvāke dvitiyaḥ khandaḥ. prathamo 'nuvākas samāptalāḥ.

became these quarters; and these are all the gods. 5. And what
this exhalation was, that became Bhṛaspati. Because he is the
husband (lord, pati) of this great (bhṛati) speech, therefore he is
[called] Bhṛaspati. 6. And what this breath was, that became
Prajāpati. That same, viz. breath, is rich in sons, rich in off-
spring, the udgītha. Of it tone is the offspring. Rich in off-
spring becomes he who knows thus. 7. Some sing that [breath]
only: "Breath, breath, breath, hum, bhā, ovā." 8. And Ča-
tyāyāni said regarding this: "Therefore it is possible to sing it
directly. Verily, what he performs with speech, that same is
performed of him." 9. Now [about] the generation of the rc
and the sāman. In that he utters the hiṅkāra, thereby he
cries to [her]. In that he utters the prastāva, thereby he
mounts. In that he utters the adī, 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 pratihaṁra, thereby he
causes the seed, come to life, to grow forth. In that he utters
the upadrava, he develops the seed, having grown forth. In that
he enters upon the nīḍhana, thereby he causes the seed, being un-
folded, to be born forth. That is the generation of the rc and
of the sāman. 10. He who thus knows this generation of the rc
and of the sāman, him the rc and the sāman propagate.

2. 1A. yat. 2A. atam; B. atha. 3B. kurvati. 4e. 5-bhāv; A.
om. yati. atha yat pratihaṁra. 6A. sāmnoḥ; B. ksāmnoḥ.
II. 3. 1. eṣa eve’dam agra āśīḍ ya’ eṣa tapati. sa eṣa sarvesaṁ bhūtānāṁ tejo hara indriyaṁ viryaṁ ādāyo ’rdhva udākṛamat. 2. so kāmayatai’ kam eva’ kṣaraṁ svāduṁ mṛduṁ devānāṁ va- nāme’ ’ti. 3. sa tapo ’tapyata. sa tapas taptvāi ’kam eva’ kṣaram abhavat. 4. tam devā ca rṣaya ca pasmaṁipan. athāni ’so surān bhūtahano sṛjatāi’ tasya pāpmano ’nanvāgamāya. 5. tam vācō pasmaṁipan. te vācaṁ samārohan. teṣāṁ vācaṁ paryāddatta. tasmāt paryāddattā vāk. satyaṁ ca hy enaṁ vādaṁ anṛtaṁ ca. 6. tam manaso’ pasmaṁipan. te man- nas samārohan. teṣāṁ manah paryāddatta. tasmāt paryāddattam manas. pṛṇayāṁ ca hy enena āhyāyati pāpayā ca. 7. tam caksuṣo’ pasmaṁipan. te caksus samārohan. teṣāṁ caksuḥ paryāddatta. tasmāt paryāddatām caksuḥ. darçanīyāṁ ca hy enena paryaty adarçanīyāṁ ca. 8. tam grotrenō’ pasmaṁipan. te grotreṇ samārohan. teṣāṁ grotreṇ paryāddatta. tasmāt paryāttām grotreṇ. gavānaṁ yāṁ ca’ yena guṇoty agravānaṁ yāṁ ca. 9. tam apāneno’ pasmaṁipan. te ’pānāṁ samārohan. teṣāṁ apānem paryāddatta. tasmāt paryāttō ’pānāḥ. surabhī ca hy

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. There-

3. 'B. sa. 2-ṣā. 3madu. 'om. 4eti. 5āivā. 6repeat from above udevānām. 7paryāttām. 'A. paryāttā; B. paryāptām.
enena jighrati durgandhi ca. 10. tam prâñeno 'pasamâipsan.
tam prâñeno 'pasamâipsan. 11. athâ 'sura bhâtahana údra-
væn mohayisâyama iti manyamanã. 12. sa yathâ 'sura
atâ "lośtho" vidhvaîsetāi 'evam eva 'sura vyadhvaîsanta. sa evo
'surâ" khâna yat prâñãh. 13. sa yathâ 'sura am ãkhaanam ãtvâ
lośtho" vidhvaîsata evam eva sa vidhvaîsate ya evam vidvîsãm
upaçadati. 63.
dvitiye 'nûvâke prathamaê khãndãh.

II. 4. 1. sa eva vaci dîptâgra udîtho yat prâñãh. 1 esa li 'dâm
sarvam vaçe kurute. 2. vacî bhavati vaçe suûn kurute ya evam
veda. asya hy añãn agre dîpyate3 amusya4 vâ sah. 3. tâm hái
'tam udîtham cátyâyani acâste vaci dîptâgra iti. dîptâgra ha
vâ asya kirtir bhavati ya evam veda. 4. âbhûtar iti kârâda-
yah prânam vâ anu prajâh paçava ãbhavanti. sa ya evam
etam âbhûtar6 ity upûsta âi 'va prâñena prajâyã paçubhir bhav-
ati. 5. sambhûtar2 iti sâtyayañâyah prânam vâ anu prajâh
paçavas sambhavanti. sa ya evam etam sambhûtar ity upûste
sam [eva] prâñena prajâyã paçubhir bhavati. 6. prabhûtar iti
gâilânâh. 6 prânam vâ anu prajâh paçavah 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 Asuras 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
udîthha. For it gets this all into control. 2. He becomes
controlling, 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 udîthha Cátyâyani calls ‘the controlling
one, the flame-pointed one.’ Verily flame-pointed becomes his
fame who knows thus. 4. The Kârâdás [call it] ‘existence’
(âbhûti). 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 Sâtyaya-
jnîs [call it] ‘origination’ (sambhûti). 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 Câilanas [call it] ‘prevalence’ (pra-
bhûti). Verily, along with breath offspring and domestic ani-

3. 10 lośho.
4. 1 insert esañ ta hi 'dám sarvam vaçe kurute. 1 -go. 3'mus-. 4'atah.
2-bhû. 6'gauî.-
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II. 5. 1. ekavira' ity' āruneyaḥ. 2 eko hy eva'i 'sa vīra yat prāṇah. ā ha 'syāi 'ko vīra vīryavān jāyate ya evam veda. 2. ekaputra iti caikitāneyaḥ. 3 eko hy evai 'sa putro yan yat prāṇah. sa u eva dviputra iti. avin hi prāṇaṁpatān. 4. sa u eva triputra iti. trayo hi prāṇo 'pāno vyānaḥ. 5. sa u eva catusputra iti. caturāhi prāṇo 'pāno vyānas samānav. 6. sa u eva pañcaputra iti. pañca hi prāṇo 'pāno vyānas samāno 'vānaḥ. 7. sa u eva satputra iti. sah 'ahi prāṇo 'pāno vyānas samāno 'vāna udānaḥ. sa u eva sataputra iti. sapta hi 'me ārṣaṁvyāḥ prāṇah. 8. sa mals prevail. Whoso thus worships it as prevalence, with breath, with offspring, with domestic animals he prevails. 7. The Bhālavins [call it] 'coming into being' (bhāti). 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. Pārśna 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. Āruneya [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. Cāikitāneya [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.
II. 6. 1. if he should say: "Sing one unto me," knowing that breath is the udghita, 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 udghita, 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 udghita, he should think three with his mind. For breath, exhalation, vyāna are three. Truly, three are born unto him. 4. if he should say: "Sing four unto me," knowing that breath is the udghita, he should think four with his mind. For breath, exhalation, vyāna, samāna are four. Truly, four are born unto him. 5. if he should say: "Sing five unto me," knowing that breath is the udghita, he should think five with his mind. For breath,

5. 8 A.-ām. 9 B. vasuputra. 10 A. yam; B. dayam. 11 -gāna. 
6. 1 A. aik-. 2 B. trayo. 3 B. inserts vyānaḥ. 4 B. inserts sa hai 'vā syā 'jāyante. 5 mana. 8 A. om. sa yadi . . . . . vyānas.
prāṇo ‘pāṇo vyānas samāṇo ‘vānaḥ. paṁca hāti ‘vā ‘syā ”jāyante.
6. sa yadi brāyūṭ sat ma āgāye ‘ti prāṇa udgītha ity eva vidvān
saṅ manasaḥ dhūyāyet. saṅ dhīḥ prāṇo ‘pāṇo vyānas samāṇo ‘vāna
udānah. saṅ dhāi ‘vā ‘syā ”jāyante. 7. sa yadi brāyūṭ saptap
ma āgāye ‘ti prāṇa udgītha ity eva vidvān saptap manasaḥ dhūyā
yet. saptap hāi ‘me cīraṇyāḥ prāṇāḥ. saptap hāi ‘vā ‘syā ”jāyante.
8. sa yadi brāyūṇ nava ma āgāye ‘ti prāṇa udgītha ity eva
vidvān nava manasaḥ dhūyāyet. saptap cīraṇyāḥ prāṇā dvāv
āvāncāu. nava hāi ‘vā ‘syā ”jāyante. 9. sa yadi brāyād daça
ma āgāye ‘ti prāṇa udgītha ity eva vidvān daça manasaḥ dhūyā
yet. saptap cīraṇyāḥ prāṇā dvāv āvāncāu nābhyyaṁ daça maḥaṁ,
daça hāi ‘vā ‘syā ”jāyante. 10. sa yadi brāyūṭ sahasraṁ ma
āgāye ‘ti prāṇa udgītha ity eva vidvān sahasraṁ manasaḥ dhūyā
yet. sahasraṁ hāi ‘ta añityaracmayāḥ. teś ‘syā putraṁ. saha
raṁ hāi ‘vā ‘syā ”jāyante. 11. evaṁ hāi’ ‘vāt ‘tam udgītha
para añṭāraḥ kaksīvaṁ trasadayur iti pūrve mahārājaḥ prā-
triyaṁ sahasraputram upaniṣedūḥ. te ha saṁca eva sahabraputra
āsuḥ. 12. sa yaś evaṁ veḍa sahasraṁ hāi ‘vā ‘syā putra
bhavanti. 66.

dvitiye ‘nuvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. dvitiyo ‘nuvākas samāptaḥ.

exhalation, vyāna, samāṇa, [and] avāna are five. Truly five are
born unto him. 6. If he should say: “Sing six unto me,” know-
ing that breath is the udgītha, he should think six with his mind.
For breath, exhalation, vyāna, samāna, avāna, udāna are six.
Truly, six are born unto him. 7. If he should say: “Sing seven
unto me,” knowing that breath is the udgītha, he should think seven
with his mind. For these breaths in the head are seven. Truly,
seven are born unto him. 8. If he should say: “Sing nine unto
me,” knowing that breath is the udgītha, he should think nine with
his mind. There are seven breaths in the head [and] two down-
ward ones. Truly, nine are born unto him. 9. If he should say:
“Sing ten unto me,” knowing that breath is the udgītha, 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. 10. If he should say: “Sing a thousand for me,”
knowing that breath is the udgītha, 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. 11. Para Aṭṭāra,
Kaksīvant, Trasadayu, great kings of old, scholars in sacred lore,
thus studied this same udgītha 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. ċaryāto 2 vai mānavaḥ prācyāṃ sthālyām 3 ayajata. 8 tasmin ha bhūtāny udgīthe 'pitvam 4 eśire. 5 taṁ devā bhṛhas- patino 'dṛgārā dīkṣāmahā iti purastād āgacchāni ayaṁ ta udgāyatī iti. bāmbenā "jādvīṣeṇa pitaro daksīṇato 5 yāṁ ta udgāyatī ity uccanasū kāvyenā "surāḥ 9 paścād 10 ayaṁ ta udgā- yatī ity ayāsyaṇā 11 "āgirasena manusyaḥ uttarato yāṁ ta udgā- yatv iti. 6 sa he 8 "ksīmān okre hungū 'nūn prcohāni kīyato 12 vā aka icē kīyata ekaḥ kīyata eka iti. 7 sa ho 'vāca bhṛhaspatiṁ 13 yan me tvam udgāyēh kiṁ tatas syād iti. 8 sa ho 'vāca dēven ēva ērī syād dēven ēca svargam u tvām lokān gamaye- yam iti. 9 atha ho 'vāca bambam ājādviṣam yan me tvam udgāyēh kiṁ tatas syād iti. 10 sa ho 'vāca pītēsv ēva ērī syāt pītēsv ēca svargam u tvām lokān gamayeypam iti. 11 atha ho 'vāca 'panasānā kāvyenā yan 14 me 17 tvam udgāyēh kiṁ tatas syād iti. 12 sa ho 'vāca 'sureṣv ēva ērī syād asureṣv ēca 18 svargam u tvām lokān gamayeypam iti. 13 atha ho 'vāca 'yāsyam āṅgira-
saṁ yan me tvam\(^{10}\) udgāyeḥ kīṃ tatas syād iti. 11. sa ho 'vāca
devān eva devaloke dadhyām\(^{30}\) manusyaṁ manusyaloke pīrṇ\(^{31}\)
pitrloke nuḍeyā 'smāl lokād asurān\(^{32}\) svargam u tvāṁ lokāṁ
gamayeyam iti. 67.

tīṇye 'nunāke prathamāḥ khanyāḥ.

II. 8. 1. sa ho 'vāca tvam me bhagava udgāya ya etasya sarva-
sya yaḥo\(^{1}\) [śi] 'ti. 2. tasya hā 'yāṣya evo 'jagāṇu. tasmād udgāta
vyāta uttarato nineçanam lipṣeta. etad dha nā 'ruddham nineçan-
ām yañ uttaraṁ. 3. uttarata uḍgato 'yāṣya uṇgirasaç ca-
yātasya' mānavaṁ yo 'jagāṇu. sa prāṇena devān devaloke 'da-
dhād ayānena manusyaṁ manusyaloker nīṇānena pīrtn\(^{3}\) pitr-
loke hiṃkāraṇa vajrenā 'smāl lokād asurān anudatu. 4. tīṁ
ho 'vāca dūrvāṁ gacchate 'ti. su dūro ha nūma lokāḥ, tāṁ ha
jagnuḥ. ta ete 'sūra asambhāvyam\(^{2}\) parābhūtāḥ. 5. chudobhir
eva vāca gāryātāṁ mānavaṁ svargāṁ lokāṁ gamayaṁ cakāra.
6. te ho 'caur asūrā etu tāṁ vedāma yo no 'yam ittham adhatte 'ti.
tato\(^{5}\) gacchate. 7. te 'bruvann ayāṁ vā
āṣya iti. yañ abravann ayāṁ vā āṣya iti tasmād ayamūṣyaḥ.

the udgītha for me, what would be the result of it?” 11. He
said: “I should place the gods in the world of the gods, men in
the world of men, the Fathers in the world of the Fathers; I
should push the Asuras away from this world; and I should cause
thee to go to the heavenly world.”

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 udgītar, 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 Aṅgirasa sang the udgītha of Cāryāta
Mānava. By breath he placed the gods in the world of the gods,
by exhalation men in the world of men, by the vyānā the Fathers
in the world of the Fathers, by the hiṃkāra [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 Cāryāta 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. 10 A. nvaṁ. 29-dhyāt. 31-tīṇ. 52 insert u.
8. 1-casa. 2-tīṇ. 4-asamhīyayam- 4dhyā-. 5 A. ta. 6-chās.
ayamāsyaḥ ha vai nāmāḥ sāḥ. tasm arāsyā iti parokṣam āca-
ksate. 8. sa prāno vā ayāsyah. prāno ha vai enān sa munude.
9. sa ya evāṁ vidvān udgāyatī prāṇenāḥ 'va devān devaloke
dadhāty aprānenaḥ manusyaḥ 10 manusyaloke vyānena pitṛn2
pitr-loke hūkāryanāḥ 'va vajreṇāḥ 'smāl lokāḥ devisāntam bhūtvāryaṁ
nudate. 68.

trāye 'nāvake dvītyayā khāyāḥ.

II. 9. 1. tain hu brāyād dūrām gucche 'ti. sa yam eva lokam
asurāy acchān'tain hai 'va' gacchati. 2. chandabhir eva vucā
yajñīmanāṁ svaryāṁ lokaṁ gamayati. 3. tā etā vyāhṛtayāṁ
prāṇa 'tye 'ti vāy [iti] bhūr bhuvās svar ity [ud iti]. 4. tad yat
prāṇa tad ayaṁ lokas tad imam lokam asmiṁ loka
abhajati. 5. e 'tye aprāṇas tad asīt lokas tad amuṁ lokam amuṁ
niṁ loka abhajati. 6. vāg iti tad brahma tad idam antarikṣam.
7. bhūr bhuvās svar iti sā trāyī vidyā. 8. ud iti so 'sāva udātyaṁ,
tad yad ud ity ud īva āśeṣayati. 9. tad yad ekam eva bhisaṁ-
padyate tasmāt ekāvṛtāh. eko ha tu san vīro vīryavān bhavati,
ā hā 'syāi 'ko vīro vīryavānā jāyate ya evāṁ veda. 10. tad u ho
'vāca pāṭyāyānāt bahuputra esa udgūṭha ity evo 'pāṣitavyam.

fore he is [called] Ayamāsya. Ayamāsya, verily, is his name.
Him they call Ayāsya in an occult way. 8. This breath is Ayā-
sya. Verily as breath he pushed them away. 9. He who know-
ing thus sings the udgūṭha places with breath the gods in the
world of the gods, with exhalation men in the world of men, with
the vyāna the Fathers in the world of the Fathers, with the hīn-
kāra [as] thunderbolt he pushes his hateful rival away from this
world.

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, ā, vāc, bhūs
bhuvās svar, [ud]. 4. What pra is, that is breath, that is this
world, that gives a share of this world in this world. 5. Ā, that is
exhalation, that is yonder world, that gives a share of yonder
world in yonder world. 6. Vāc, that is the brahman, that is this
atmosphere. 7. Bhūs bhuvās svar, that is the threefold knowl-
dge. 8. Ud, that is yonder sun. Inasmuch as it is ud, it causes
to cling up (?/plīṣ + ud), as it were. 9. Inasmuch as it forms a unit,
therefore it is sole hero. But being one it becomes a hero possess-
ing heroism. To him a sole hero possessing heroism is born who
knows thus. 10. And Cāṭyāyani said this: “One should worship

8. 7-aso. 8A. pān-. 9 ehūk-. 10-śān.
9. 1B. 2-syā-. 3sat. 4A. gyes-. 5A. e-. 6-yāvān. 7-e(ity).
II. 10. 1. They say the gods and the Asuras strove together. Truly, the gods and the Asuras did not then strive together. Both Prajāpati and Death then strive together. 2. Now the gods were near to this Prajāpati, [being his] dear sons. They resolved: "Let us consecrate ourselves with that udgātar by 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 udgātar." 4. They consecrated themselves with speech as udgātar. Speech sang to them that which one speaks here with speech, which one enjoys here with speech. 5. Evil was created after it. Just what evil thing one speaks with speech, that is that evil. 6. They said: "Verily, this one hath not carried us beyond death nor beyond evil. Let us consecrate ourselves with mind as udgātar." 7. They consecrated themselves with mind as udgātar. Mind sang to them that which one thinks here with the mind, which one enjoys here with the mind. 8. Evil was created after it. Just what evil thing one thinks with the mind, that is that evil. 9. They said: "Verily, this one, too, hath not carried us beyond death, nor beyond evil.

II. Oertel.

bahavo hy etā adītyasya' raṃmayas te 'syā yutrā. tasmād bhuputra esa udgītha ity eva 'pāsitavyam iti. 69.

trīya 'nvaśke trīyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. trīyo 'nvaśkas samāptaḥ.

II. 10. 1. devāsurās samayatante 'ty āluḥ. na ha vai tu devāsuvās samayetire praJayatīc ca ha vai tan mṛtyum ca samayetāte. 2. tasya ha praJayatīc devāḥ priyāḥ yotrā anta āluḥ. te dhryānta teno 'dguṭrā dīkṣāmahāy yenā paḥatya mṛtyum apahatya pāṃmānaḥ svargaṃ lokam iṣyāme 'ti. 3. te 'bruvan vāco 'dguṭrā dīkṣāmaḥ iti. 4. te vāco 'dguṭrā dīkṣānta. tebhyā idam vāgy āgūyad yad idam vāca vadati yad idam vāca bhuṣjate. 5. tām pāṃmā 'nvāṣpyata. sa yad eva vāca pāpanaḥ vadati sa eva sa pāṃmā. 6. te 'bruvan na vai no 'yam mṛtyum na pāṃmānam atyavāksīt. 7. manaso 'dguṭrā dīkṣāmaḥ iti. 8. te manaso 'dguṭrā dīkṣānta. tebhyā idam manu āgūyad yad idam manuṣā dhṛṣāyati yad idam manuṣaḥ bhuṣjate. 9. tat pāṃmā 'nvāṣpyata. sa yad eva manuṣaḥ pāpanaḥ dhṛṣāyati sa eva sa pāṃmā. 10. te 'bruvan no nvāva no 'yam mṛtyum na pāṃmānam atyavāksīt.

[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. 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 Ayāśya. He (ayam) is placed in the mouth (āsyā); therefore he is [called] Ayāśya. And as he rests in the mouth, therefore also he is [called] Ayāśya.
9. That same is Āngirasa. For from him these limbs (āṅga) take their sap (rasa); therefore he is [called] Āngirasa. And because he is the sap of these limbs, therefore also he is Āngirasa.
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
caturthi 'nuvāke dvitiyāh khaḍāh.

II. 12. 1. yatro ha vāi kva căi 'tā devatā nisprāṇaṁ na hāi 'va tatra kaś cana pāṃmā nyāṅgāḥ pāriścyate 2. sa vidyān ne 'ha kaś cana pāṃmā nyāṅgāḥ pāriścyate sarvam evaṁ 'tā devatā pāṃmānaṁ niḥdhaśyante 'ti. tathā hāi 'va bhavati. 3. ya u ha vā evam uśivas 'rocchati yathā 'tā devatā 'tva nāyād evan nyeti. etāṁ hi evaṁ 'nam devatāśc prapannam etāṁ vasantam upavadati. 4. tasya hāi 'tasya nāi 'va kā canā 'rūrā asti evaṁ veda. ya evaṁ 'nam upavadati sa ārtim ārochati. 5. sa ya enam 'rocchād eva 'tā devatā upasṛtya brāyād ayam ma 'ratā na iṁām ārtim' nyetu iti. tām hāi 'va 'rūrā nyeti. 6. yāvadāvasāh u hā 'syē 'me prāṇā asmin loka etāvadāvasāh u

immunity from illness (?).” 11. “Verily enter that.” “Then make spaces.” He made these breaths spaces [for them]. 12. Fire, having become speech, entered that; [so did] the moon, having become mind; the sun, having become light; the quarters, having become hearing; the wind, having become breath. 13. Verily, this is the divine assembly, the divine congregation, the divine conference. 14. He goes to that divine assembly, divine congregation, divine conference, who knows thus.

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

11. 12 asī. 14 ākācāt. 15 açāsanam. 16 kūruts. 17 om. the -th. 18 právī. 19 ce. 2 ksate. 3 evam. 4 etā. 5 -vid or -vīda. 6 ducchati. 7 neti. 8 -tir. 9 āchchati. 10 om. 11 rāt. 12 atti. 13 -dāvačā.
hā 'syāī 'tā devata amuśminī loke bhavantī. 7. tasmād u hāi 'vānī vidvān nāī 'vā 'grhātayāī' bibhīyān nā 'lokātayāī. etā me devata asmiṁī loke grhānī karisyantaī. etā amuśminī loke bhavantī. tasmād u lokam pradāsyantī'16 'ti. 8. tasmād u hāi 'vānī vidvān nāī 'vā 'grhātayāī' bibhīyān nā 'lokātayāī. etā me devata asmiṁī loke grhābhyo grhānī karisyantaī svebhya17 ayatanēbhya itī hāī 'va vidvād [etā] devataī' amuśminī loke lokam pradāsyantī 'ti. 9. tas-
mād u hāi 'vānī vidvān nāī 'vā 'grhātayāī' bibhīyān nā 'lokāt-
ayāī. etā ma etad ubhayaiv saṁnaṁsyantī 'ti hāī 'va vidvāt. tathā hāī 'va bhavatī. 72.

caturthe 'nuvāke ṛṭiśaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. caturtho 'nuvākas saṁnāptaḥ.

II. 13. 1. devā vāī brahmāṇo vatsena vācāṁ āduḥraṇ. agnir ha vāī brahmāṇo vatsaḥ. 2. sā yā sā vai vṝmaī 'va tat. atha yo 'gnir mṛtyus saḥ. 3. tām etāṁ vācāṁ yathā dhenuṁ vatseno4 'parṣyam prattāṁ āduhī 'vam eva deva vācāṁ sarvān kāmān āduḥraṇ.5 4. duhā' ha vāī vācāṁ sarvān kāmān ya evāṁ veda. sa hāī 'so 'nāṁto vācāṁ devīṁ udindhe6 vada vada vade 'ti. 5. tad yad iha' puruṣasya pāparn kṛtam bhavati tad āvīśkaroti.

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-
fore 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. 13. 1. Verily, the gods milked speech by means of the calf
of the brahmaṇ. Verily, fire is the calf of the brahmaṇ.
2. This speech, that is the brahmaṇ; and fire, that is death. From
this same speech—as one would milk a given cow by means of a
calf, admitting [it to her]—even so the gods milked from speech
all desires. 4. Verily, he milks from speech all desires who knows
thus. He, not being untruthful, kindles (?) divine speech [say-
ing]: "Speak, speak, speak." 5. What evil is done here by man,

12. 14graḥ-. 15B. asmi. 16pravādā-. 17B. inserts āyatanēbhya.
18eva tā. 18A. pastena; B. patsena. 3vākṣ-. 3-ra. 4jahe. 5A. udīgāhe.
6amīṭha.
II. 14. 1. ēsa u ha vāva devānāṁ nēdisthām upacaryo yād agnīḥ. 2. taṁ śādhū 'pacaret. ya enam asmiṁ loke śādhū 'pacarati 1 tam ēsō 'muśmiṁ loke śādhū 'pacarati. atha ya enam asmiṁ loke nā "driyate tam ēsō 'muśmiṁ loke nā "driyate. tasmād vā agniṁ śādhū 'pacaret. 3. taṁ nāi'va hastābhyaṁ spṛṣen na pādābhyaṁ na dhandaṇā. 4. hastābhyaṁ spṛṣati yad asta 'nīkam avanenikte. atha yād abhipraśārāyati tat pādābhyaṁ. 5. sa enam āsṛṣṭa īpvaro dhāṅhāyāṁ dhūtoḥ. tasmād vā agniṁ śādhū 'pacarati. śādhāyāṁ hái nāī'naṁ dadhāti. 74.

paṃcame 'nuvāke prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

II. 15. 1. ēsa u ha vāva devānāṁ mahāçanatam ē ko yad agnīḥ. 2. tan na vratyaṁ ādudūnā 'cṇiyat. yo vāī mahāçane 'nagnaty agnāti "pvāro hái 'nam abhiśaṅktoḥ. 3. pātiṁ īva hā 'cṇiyat. 4. atha ha prokte ācane brāyāt saminterva 'gnim iti. sa yathā
that it makes manifest. Although he thinks that he does it secretly, as it were, still it makes it manifest. Verily, therefore he should not do evil.

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 'pane greyañsam pariveṣṭavai bruyát tudāk tat.' 4. etad u ha vāva sāma yak vāk. yo väc caaksus sāma protrañm sāme 'ty upāste na' ha tena karoti. 5. aha ya' adityas sāma candramās sāme 'ty upāste na' hāi 'vu tena karoti. 6. aha yo vāk sāme 'ty upāste sa eva 'nusthyā sāma veda. nūcā hi sāmnā "rtvijyām kriyate. 7. sa yo vācas svaro jāyate so 'ynir vūg v eva vāk. tađ atrū' kadhā sāma bhavati. 8. sa ya eva etad kadhā sāma bhavad vedūi 'vaṁ hāi 'tad ekadhā sāma bhavati 'ty ekadhē 'vu preṣṭhas śānām bhavati. 9. tasmād u hāi 'vanvi-dam eva sāmnā "rtvijyām kūrayeta. sa ha vāva sāma veda ya evaṁ veda. 75.

pañcamē 'nuvāke triyāh bhavaḥ. pañcamo 'nuvākas samāptaḥ.

III. 1. 1. ekā ha vāva kītaṇa devatā 'rākṣādevatā eva 'nyāḥ. ayam eva yo 'yam pavate. 2. esa eva sarveṣāṁ devānāṁ gra-hāḥ. 3. sa hāi 'so 'stauṁ nāma. astam iti he 'ha puṣṭā' grahān ācakṣate. 4. sa yad adityo 'stam agūd iti grahān agūd iti hāi 'tat. tena so 'sarvaḥ. sa etam eva 'pyeti. 5. astam candramā eti. tena so 'sarvaḥ. sa etam eva 'pyeti. 6. astam nakṣatrāṇi

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 sāman, viz. speech. Verily, he who worships [saying]: "Sight is the sāman; hearing is the sāman," he does not thereby perform it. 5. And he who worships [saying]: "The sun is the sāman; the moon is the sāman," he does not thereby perform it. 6. Now he who worships [saying]: "Speech is the sāman," he at once knows the sāman. For with speech as the sāman 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 sāman. 8. He who thus knows that which becomes one, the sāman [saying]: "Verily that becomes one, the sāman," he becomes one, as it were, the best of his [people]. 9. And therefore one should cause one knowing thus to perform the priestly office with the sāman. Verily he knows the sāman 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 [represents] the seizors 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. 7 B. tam. 8 nā. 9 yad. 10 etr.-
1. 1 B. pañcā.
yanti. tena tāṇy asarvāṇi. tāṇy etam evā 'piyanti. 7. anu aṣṭi
 gačchati. tena so 'sarvāḥ. sa etam evā 'pyeti. 8. ety ahaḥ. eti
 rāthi. 9. tena te asarve. te etam evā 'pūrṇaḥ. 10. mihyanti diço na
 vāi tu rātrī prajñāyante. tena tā asarvāḥ. tā etam evā 'piyanti.
 vṛṣeṣṭi ca parjanya uc ca grāhpati. tena so 'sarvāḥ. sa etam
 evā 'pyeti. 11. kṣiyanta āpa evam oṣadhaya evam vanaspatya-
 vara. tena tāṇy asarvāṇi. tāṇy etam evā 'piyanti. 12. tad yad
 etat sarmāh nāyum eva 'pyeti tasmād vāyur eva sāma. 13. sa ha
 vāi sāmuvit sa [kṛṣṇam] sāma veda ya evam veda. 14. athat
 'dhyātmam. na vāi svapna vācā vadi. se 'yam' eva prāṇam
 apyeti. 15. na manasa 'dhyāyati. tad idam eva prāṇam apyeta.
 16. na caikṣāsā pacyati. tad idam eva prāṇam apyeti. 17. na
 crotrena āṣnoti tad idam eva prāṇam apyeti. 18. tad yad etat
 sāram prāṇam eva bhīsanei tasmāt prāṇa eva sāma. 19. sa ha
 vāi sāmuvit sa kṛṣṇam sāma veda ya evam veda. 20. tad yad
 idam āhura na batā 'dya vāti [sa] hāi 'tat puruṣe 'ntar
 niramātā sa pūrṇā' svedamānā. 21. tad aha cāmnaka' ca
 kāpēya abhipratārīṇam ca [kākṣasenīm] brāhmaṇaḥ parive-
 visyamānā upāvairaja. 22.

prathame 'nvāke prathamaḥ 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.
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 Cāmnaka Kāpēya and Abhipratārin [Kāk-
saseni], while they were being waited upon, a Brāhmana came.

1. 2A. -raḥ. 3-tāḥ. 4-tām. 5B. inserts sa sāma veda. 6B. eṣ-; A.
oṣa-. 7'mam. 8-yati. 9-mite. 10-ṇa. 11A. -kā. 12-visyā-. 13-prājā.
III. 2. 1. tāu ha bibhikṣe 1 tāvīn ha nā "dadrē" ko vā ko ve 'tī man¥amānāu. 2. tāu ho 'pojañāu mahātmanau caturu deva ekaḥ
   kasa vā jagāra bhavanasya gopāḥ:
   tāvīn kāpeya 1 na vijñānunty eke
   Bhipratañīn bahudhā nivṛttaṃ
   iti. 3. sa ho 'vācā 2 'bhipratañī 3 'manī vā 2 pra padya pra tyabhā 3
   'tī. tvayā vā 2 ayaṃ pratyaca 4 iti. 11 4. tāvīn ha pratyvācā 12
   "tīmā devānāṃ uta martyānām 13
   hiraṇyudanto rapasa 14 na 15 sūnuḥ:
   mahāntanu asya mahimānān 18 ahur
   anādyamāna yad 17 adantam 16 utī 19
   'tī. 5. mahātmanau caturu [deva] eka iti, vāga 20 vā 1 ayznih, sa
   mahātmā devaḥ. sa yatra svapita 22 tad vācam praśno girati.
   6. manau candramas sa mahātmā devaḥ, sa yatra svapita tan
   manau 23 praśno girati. 7. caksur 24 ādityas sa mahātmā devaḥ,
   sa yatra svapita tac caksur praśno girati. 8. grotamadi 25 tā 26
   mahātmāna devāh, sa yatra svapita tec chrotam praśno girati.
   9. tad yan mahātmanau caturu deva eka ity etad dha tat.
   10. kas 26 sa 27 jagārā 28 'tī. prañjapati vāi kaha. sa haí '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 magnanimous ones,
being a keeper of creation; him, O Kāpeya, some do not know;
him, O Abhipratañīn, settled down in many places." 3. Said
Abhipratañīn: "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 magnanimous ones:’ speech
verily is fire; that is a magnanimous god. When one sleeps,
them breath swallows up speech. 6. Mind [is] the moon; that is a
magnanimous god. When one sleeps, then breath swallows up
mind. 7. Sight [is] the sun; that is a magnanimous god. When
one sleeps, then breath swallows up sight. 8. Hearing [is] the
quarters; those are magnanimous gods. When one sleeps, then
breath swallows up hearing. 9. So, when [it is said]: ‘One god
four magnanimous ones,’ this is what that means. 10. ‘Who (kā)
is he who swallowed up? Kā is Prañjapati. He swallowed this
III. 3. 1. aśayī 'ṣa cṛīr ātmā samudrādho' yad aśīv ādityāḥ. tasmād gāyatrasya stotre vā 'vānīyān nev cṛīyā avadhiyā vā iti. 2. sa eṣa eva 'ktham. yat purastād avinītā tad etad ukthasya cīro yan dakṣiṇatā sa dakṣiṇāḥ pakoṣa yan uttataras executed iti ukthas janīnam avadhiyā vā ukthas iṣṭhānam ātmā pratiyogitam putra sa hā muṣṭiṁ loke sāṅgās satanas saharatī samahavati. 4. cārvad dha vā amuṣṭiṁ loke yad idam puruṣasyā tīkṣṇa cīnaṁ 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 Abhiprātārin, 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 stotra of the gāyatra [-sāman] [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,
karnāu nāsike yat kim cā 'nāsthikāvam na sambhavati. 5. atha ya evam etam' ukthasa2 "tmānam atman pratiśhitam voḍa sa hāi 'vā 'muśmān loke sāṅgas satamā sarvas sambhavati. 6. tad etad vaiśvāmitram uktam. tad annam vai viśvam prāno mitram. 7. tad dhā vaiśvāmitrag prampena tapassā vratacaryene2 'ndrasya priyāṁ dhāmo 'pajāgama. 8. tasmā u hāi 'tāt pravāca yuṭa10 idam manuṣyān agatam. 9. tad dhā sa upaniṣasāda jyotir etad uktam11 iti. 10. jyotir iti āve akṣare prāṇa iti āve annam iti āve. tad etad anna eva pratiśhitam. 11. atha hāi 'nām jamadagnir upaniṣasūda "yur12 etad uktam iti. 12. āyur iti āve akṣare prāṇa iti āve annam iti āve. tad etad anna eva pratiśhitam. 13. atha hāi 'nāṁ13 vasiṣṭha upaniṣasūda gāyu āve etad uktam iti. tad etad14 annam eva. annan hi gāyu. 14. tad āhur yad asya prāṇasya puruṣasya Āśirvam athu kenū 'naye15 prāṇāc ārāvanto bhavanti 'tī. 15. su bhūyād yad vācā vadati tad vācā āśirvam yan manasa dhyāyati tan manasaḥ āśirvam yac caṅkṣas paśyati tace caṅkṣasā āśirvam yac chhotrena gṛṇoti tace chhotrasya āśirvam. evam u hā 'naye prāṇāc āśirvanto bhavanti 'tī. 78.

prathame 'muvače tṛtiyāḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

the two ears, the two nostrils: whatever does not come into being boneless. 5. Now whoso thus knows this self of the ukttha firmly established in the self, truly he comes into being in yonder world with limbs, with a body, whole. 6. That same is the ukttha belonging to Viśvāmitra. Verily, food is all (viśva), breath is a friend (mitra). 7. Now Viśvāmitra 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. 9. Now he went for instruction [to him] [saying]: "Light is this ukttha." 10. '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 ukttha." 12. 'Life' has two syllables, 'breath' two, 'food' two. That same is firmly established in food. 13. Then Vasiṣṭha went for instruction to him [saying]: "The cow is this ukttha." That same is just food. For the cow is food. 14. This they say: "If man be the body of this breath, how then do the other breaths (senses) come to have bodies?" 15. 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."

---

8. 'A. -tād. 8 A. akth-. 9 pr-. 10 tad. 11 utth-. 12 A. (sāda) gāur; B. āyugāur. 12-14 ud. 15 B. 'nyena.
III. 4. 1. That same uktha is sevenfold. Chanted is the stotriya (strophe), the anurūpa (antistrophe), the dhāyya (kindling verse), the pragātha (tristich), the sūkta (hymn), the nīvid (notification), [and] the paridhāniyā (closing verse). 2. This [earth] is the stotriya; Agni the anurūpa; Vāyu the dhāyya; the atmosphere the pragātha; 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 paridhāniyā. 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 pragātha; the head the sūkta; sight the nīvid; hearing the paridhāniyā. 4. Now some recite its paridhāniyā with a tristubh, others with ananstubh. But let him recite the paridhāniyā with a tristubh. 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 brahma united with the brahma. 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 brahma united with the brahma.' Verily the sun is the brahma, the sky is the brahma. 10. Of these divinities each two divinities make up nine syllables respec-

III. 5. 1. — Even so this all is twined in with it, viz. Gandharvas, Apsarasas, domestic animals, [and] men. 2. Now Muñja Samaçravasas went forth. Çvājani, a Vaiçya, went before him. 3. Falling from the atmosphere, a lump of fresh butter fell down on his breast. He, taking it, put it in addition [in the fire (?)]. 4. Thereupon he saw the stoma spread out in the atmosphere, greatly shining; he also saw its application (?). 5. Having set himself about the bahispavamāna, he should say śitra viyi prānya; śitra grhita apānya, 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. ^15 B. -āu. ^16 B. -kāu. ^17 sā. 18 sā. ^19 rañtam. 5. 1 A gloss, the second quotation in 5, is inserted at the beginning before evami (B. evā). ^2 mātṛjñ. ^3 sāhāṣ. ^4 A. sec. m.; B. tamasmāti. ^5 prōyāya. ^6 teto. ^7 A. -a. ^8 A. -i. ^9 śitra, the first letter may be an ā. ^10 grhītra. ^11 A. asti; B. hanasti. ^12 yad.
'pāpnyāt. pa ity eva 'pāpnyāt, tad yathā bimbena mrgam ānayaed evam evāi nam etayā devatayā "nayati. sa yuktaḥ karoti. esa eva 'pri yuktah. 80.

prathame 'nūvāke paścamañāh khayālaḥ, prathamo 'nūvākas samāptah.

III. 6. 1. yo 'sānu sāmyāh prattini' veda pra hū 'smāi diya. 2. dādā3 iti ha va ayam angnir diya. vate 'ti vāyuḥ pava. hante 'ti candramā om ity ādityaḥ. 3. esa ha va āsāmyāh prattih.3 etāni ha va āsāmyāh prattih4 sudāksināh kṣāmiṁr vidām cakāra. 4. tān hai-tān hotur va "yeye āyeno mahāvaruṇaṣya va tān dāda4 tathāb hantāb lokāhi virah eva iti. pra ha va asmaī diya. 5. [so] 'pya anyān bāhūn praryupārya10 ya evam etāni sāmyāh prattih veda. 6. ya u ha va abandhu11 bandhumāt sāma veda yatras hū 'pya enaṁ na vidur yatras roṣanti yatras pari 'va ca kāsate tad dhā 'pi prājaṣṭhiyam ādhipatyam annādayam purodhām13 paryeti. 7. angnir ha va abandhu11 bandhumāt sāma. kasmād va hy enaṁ daruḥ kasmād va paryāvṛtya maṇthanti sa prājaṣṭhiyāya13 'ādhipatyāya 'nādyaya purodhāyāyī14 jāyate. 8. sa yatras ha va apya evāśварaṁ na vidur yatras 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 sāman, verily unto him it is delivered. 2. [Uttering] dādā, this fire here shines; [uttering] tathā, the wind cleanses (blows); hanta the moon [utters], om the sun. 3. Verily this is the delivery of the sāman. Verily this delivery of the sāman Sudāksinā Kṣāmiṁr knew. 4. One should sing that same in the ājya-chant of either the hotar or the māitrāvaruṇa-priest: dādā, tathā, hantā, him bhā ovā. Verily it is delivered unto him. 5. He is much superior to even many others who thus knows this delivery of the sāman. 6. And whoso being without relatives knows the sāman 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 purohiṭa. 7. Verily Agni, being without relatives, is the sāman rich in relatives. For in whatever way they chum him, from the wood, or by turning, he is born for excellence, for supremacy, for food-eating, [and] for the office of a purohiṭa. 8. Verily even

---
5. 31-50. 14-tīḥ.
6. prattih. 3A. tadān; B. dādān. 3A. prattih; B. pravktyih.
5tām. 5B. inserts hantās. 3A. om. 8 apy. 2-hāny. 20A. -upā.
11-dhu. 12-dhā. 18 grēṣṭh-. 14A. -āye.
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 purohita.

III. 7. 1. And [that happens] of itself where they know him. 2. Sudakṣina Kṣāimi, Prācinaçāli, the two Jābālas—they were fellow-students. 3. These, viz. Prācinaçāli and the two Jābālas, recited much of what is to be muttered and of other [prayers]. 4. Then Sudakṣina Kṣāimi 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: “Çudrā, ignoramus!” Thus they, viz. Prācinaçāli and the two Jābālas, used to cry out against Sudakṣina Kṣāimi. 6. Then Sudakṣina Kṣāimi used to say: “Where most of the Kurupaçālas shall be assembled together, there shall be this disputation of ours; we will not dispute without witnesses, like Çudras.” 7. Now the two Jābālas, Çkrā and Goçru, consecrated themselves. Of them Prācinaçāli [was] chosen ūdgātar. 8. Then Sudakṣina became aware: “The two Jābālas have consecrated themselves.” He said to his driver: “Sirrah, conduct [me thither]. The two Jābālas have consecrated themselves. Thither we will go.”
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.” 7. 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 Kurupāñcālas knew this. “He is thy attendant,” they said. 8. His younger brother said to him: “Sir, attend upon the udgātar.” He attended upon him. 9. He said: “Verily thrice, O householder, man is born. From his father he is born first, then from his mother, then from the sacrifice. 10. And thrice he likewise dieth. When his father emitteth him as seed thus into the womb,—

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 udgātar 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. And when they lay him, having departed from this world, upon the funeral-pyre, then he dies for the third time. 7. = 6." 8. Having said this much, mounting the chariot, he drove off. 9. To this Jābāla, having come back, [his] younger brother said: "Sir, what words hath the Čidra spoken? Thou hast sought a shallow with an elephant." He (the older Jābāla) 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 sāman, he as udgātar carries beyond death."

9. 1 ananth-. 2 vo. 2 B. s. 4 ce. 5 A. dl-. 6 ajaty. 7 ava-. 8 yāya-. 9 sa. 10 B. inserts kā. 11 yāmītas. 12 -iti. 13 vā. 14 insert vahāti 'iti, cancelled in B. 15 yaj-. 16 -vac.
III. 10. 1. tāṁ vāva bhagavas te pito 'dgātam amanvate 'ti ho 'vaca. tad u ha prācināçālā vidurṣya esām ayaṁ vṛta udgātā 'so.' tasmin ha na 'nuviduḥ. 2. te ho 'our anudhāvata kāndviyam' iti. tāṁ ha 'nususrih.' te ha kāndviyam udgātāraṁ cakrire brahmanāṁ prācināçāl śi ca. 3. tāṁ ha 'bhavyekṣyo' vācāi 'vam esa brāhmaṇo moghāya vādāya na 'glāyat. sa na 'nu sāmno 'nvicchati 'ti. ati hāi 'vāi 'nam tac cakre. 4. sa ya'd dhā vā' enam' etat pītā yonyāṁ reto bhātāṁ śi ca ca. tāṁ 'nusambhavati prānaṁ ca. yādā ēva eva retas sīkām prāṇa āvīcāty ato tat sambhavati. 16. ato ya'd evāi 'nam etad dīkṣayante agnir hāi 'vāi 'nam tād yonyāṁ reto bhātāṁ śi ca. sa hā 'sya tatra mṛtyor ēce. 17. ato yāṁ evāi 'tāṁ vāiserjanīyāṁ āhutim adhvaryur jukoti tām ēva sa tāt 'nusambhavati chandānī' cāti 'vā. 18. ato ya' enam etad āsmāl lokāt' pretam cityām ādāhāti candramā hāi 'vāi 'nam tād yonyāṁ reto bhātāṁ śi ca. sa u hāi 'vā 'sya tatra mṛtyor ēce. 19. ato ya'd evāi 'nam etad āsmāl' lokāt' pretam cityām ādā-
dhaty atho yā evāi 'tā avokṣanīyā āpas tā eva sa tato 'nusambhavati' prāṇam v eva. prāṇo hy āpah. 10. taṁ ha v evāṁvād udgātā yajamānam om ity etenā 'ksareṇā ''dityam mṛtyum ativahati vāg ity agniḥ hum iti vāyum dhā iti candramāsam. 11. tān' vā etān mṛtyun Ṡāmnō 'dgātā ''tmānāṁ ca yajamānam ca 'tivahaty om ity etenā 'ksareṇa prāṇenā 'munā ''dityena. 12. tasyāi 'sā cūka
utāi 'sām jyeṣṭha'o uṭa vā kuniṣṭha
utāi 'sām putra uṭa vā pitāi 'sām:
eko ha devo manasi praviṣṭaḥ
pūrvo ha jaṅge sa u garbhe 'ntar
iti. 13. taḍ yaḍ eṣo 'bhṛyukta'ā inam eva purusāni yo 'yan ṛchannō' 'ntar om ity etenā 'vā 'ksareṇa prāṇenā' vā 'munā 'vā ''dityena [...... ] 85.
dvitiye 'nūvāke paṅcamah khavāh. dvitiyo 'nūvākas samāptāḥ.

III. 11. 1. trīr ha vāi puruṣo mṛiyate trīr jāyate. 2. sa hāi 'tad eva prathamam mṛiyate yaḍ retas sīktaṁ sambhūtam bhavati. sa prāṇam eva 'bhīsambhavati. apām abhijāyate. 3. athāi 'tad dvitiyam mṛiyate yaḍ dikṣate. sa chandāṇsy eva 'bhīsam-
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 udgātār who knows thus carries beyond the sun, [i. e. beyond] death, by means of this syllable, viz. om; [saying] vāc [he carries him] beyond Agni; [saying] hum, beyond Vāyu; [saying] bhū, beyond the moon. 11. Verily beyond these same deaths an udgātār 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 cūka: "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."

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. 3. Then he dies for the second time, when he consecrates himself. He is converted into the metres; he is born unto the sacrificial

10. 19 A. tā. 20 jāṣṭha. 21 B. hyu-. 22 aḥaṁn.

11. 1 A. he. 2 insert sa hāi 'tad eva prathamam mṛiyate. trīr jāyate, 3 saṁh-. 4 A. ova.
bhavati. dakṣinām abhijáyate. 4. athāi 'tat tṛtyam mriyate yanś mriyate, sa praddhām eva 'bhisambhavati. lokam abhijāyate. 5. tad etat tṛtyaśd gāyatram gāyati.' tasya prathamāyā "vrte 'nam eva lokam jayati yad u cā 'smīni loke. tad etena cāi 'nam prāṇena samardhayati' yan abhisambhavaty etām cā 'smā āśām' prayacchati yāṁ abhijāyate. 6. athā dvītyayā "vrte 'dam eva 'ntarikṣāṁ jayati yad u cā 'ntarikṣe. tad etāiç cāi1 'naṁ chandobhiś samardhayati' yan abhisambhavati. etām cā 'smāi dakṣināṁ prayacchati yāṁ abhijāyate. 7. athā tṛtyayā "vrta 'mun eva lokam jayati yad u cā 'muśmiṁ loke. tad etayā cāi 'naṁ praddhāyā samardhayati gāyāi 'vai 'nam etac chraddhayā 'gnān' abhyādhati sam ayam ito bhavisyaṭi ti. etāin cāi 'smāi lokami" prayacchati yan abhijāyate. 86.

tṛtye 'nivāke prathamah khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 12. 1. etad vai tisṛbhīr avṛtābhīr imaṁ ca lokāṁ jayat evaṁ cāi 'nam bhūtaś samardhayati' yan abhisambhavati. 2. athā vai ato hiṁkārasyāi 'va. tāṁ haś svaṁ loke santam mṛtyur anveti apanayā. 3. -gṛhā vā eśā prajāpatis śāmno yad dhiṁkārāḥ. tām id' udgātā gṛiṇā prajāpatinaḥ hiṁkārenā 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 gāyatra [-chant] in three turns (avṛt). 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 hiṁkāra. After him, being in the heavenly world, death goes, hunger. 3. The hiṁkāra is the fortune, Prajāpati of the sāman. That death the udgātar drives away by means of for-

11. 8-m. 6-trīy. 7-B. -anti. 8-im-(l). 9-mṛdh-. 10 insert nyabhisambhavati, cancelled in red. 11 ca. 12 'cnāv. 13-ā. 12. 4-vok-. 2-mṛdh. 8-A. om. 4-B. sitam. 8-B. aneti. 6-gṛi. 7 ed.
tun apaseñha.  4. hum me 'ty āha mā 'tra nu¹ gū yatrāi 'tañ yajamāna iti hāi 'tat.  5. sa yathā geyasāidhā pūpyān pratīvijeta' evain² hāi 'vā 'smān mṛtyun pūmsā prativijate.⁶  6. yan me 'ty āha candrāmā vāi mā māsāh. esu ha vāi mā māsāh. tasmān me 'ty āha. bhā¹ iti hāi 'tat paroksēva vā. yasmād v eva me 'ty āha yad v eva¹⁷ me 'ty āhāi 'tāñi trīni. tasmān me 'ti brāyāt.  87.

trīye 'nūvāke dvitīyaḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

III. 13. 1. hum bhā iti brahmavaracasukāmasya. bhāti 'va hi brahmavarcasam.  2. hum bo¹ iti paçukāmasya. bo iti ha paçavo vaçyante.  3. hum bag iti grīkāmasya.² bag iti ha priyam pañyanti.  4. hum bhā ovā ity etad eva 'pagitam.  5. mahañ īvā 'bhiparivartayan gāyed iti ha små ’ha nāko mahāgrāmo mahāniveçohavati ’ti. sa yathā sthānum arpayitve¹° 'tareṇā ’ve 'tareṇa va pariñyāyit tadṛk tad.  6. tad u ho ’vaçca gāñyayaniḥ kosmāi kāmāya sthānum arpayet. atho 'pagitam evai ’tat. nāi ’vāi ’tad ’āriyete ’ti.  1. [iti] nu hiṅkāraññam.² atha vā ato nidhanam eva. ovā iti dve aksare. anto vāi sāmno nidhanam.

tune, of Prajāpati, of the hiṅkāra.  4. He says hum mā: 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 mā, mā is the moon, the month. Verily, this month is mā. Therefore he says mā; that is bhā, in an occult way, as it were. As to why he says mā—in that he says mā, there are these three [meanings]. Therefore he should say mā.

III. 13. 1. Hum bhā are [the utterances] of him who desires lustre in sacred lore. For lustre in sacred lore shines (√bhā), 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 extol fortune.  4. Hum bhā ovā, that is sung in response. “Let him sing turning about unto something great, as it were,” Nāka 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] Čātyāyani 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 hiṅkāras. Henceforth regarding the nidhana. Ovā is two syllables. Verily the ni-

12. 8 insert iti.  9 -vica-.  10 evam.  11 bhāga.  12 āiva.
18. 1.vo.  2 grīk-. A. -su.  3-vā; A. ayitvā.  4 B. -ree.  5 paryyā-.  6 A. 'tañā.  7 ādā-.  8 hiṅkāk-.
antar svarga lokanām anto bradhnasya vistapam. 8. tam etad udgātā yajamānam om ity etenā 'ksarenā nte svarge loke adhāti. 9. ya u ha vā apakṣa vyakṣagrahān gacchaty ava vāi sa tataḥ padyate. atha yad vai paksi vyakṣaṃ yad asiḥḥārāyāṃ yat kṣurādhārāyām āste na vāi sa tato 'vapadyate. paksāḥhyāṃ hi swāhyata āste. 10. tam etad udgātā yajamānam om ity etenā 'ksarenā svarapaksāṃ krtyā nte svarge loke adhāti. sa yathā paksy abhihyad āśītāi 'vam eva svarge loke 'bibhyad āste 'tha' "carati. 11. te ha vā ete aksare devalokaḥ vāi om manusyalokaḥ ca. āditya ca ha vā ete aksare candramāṃ ca. 12. āditya eva devalokaḥ candramāṃ manusyalokaḥ. om ity ādityo vāg iti candramāṃ. 13. tam etad udgātā yajamānam om ity etenā 'ksarenā "dityam devalokam gumayati. 88.

III. 14. 1. tam hā "gatam prachati kus tvam asī 'ti. sa yo ha nāmnā vā gotreṇa vā prabṛde tam hā "ha yas te 'yam ma'yā' ātmā 'bhūd esa te sa iti. 2. tasmin hā"tman pratipat. tam" ātavas sampadāryapad gṛhitam api karṣanti. tasya hā horātre dhana is the end of the sāman, heaven is the end of the worlds, the summit is the end of the ruddy one. 8. Thus the udgātā places the sacrificer by means of this syllable om in the end in the heavenly world. 9. Verily he who without wings goes up to the top of a tree, he falls down from it. But if one having wings sits on the top of a tree, or on the edge of a sword, or on the edge of a razor, verily he does not fall down from it. For he sits supported by his wings. 10. Thus the udgātā, making him, the sacrificer, by means of that syllable om possess sound as wings, puts him in the end in the heavenly world. As one with wings would sit without fear, even so he sits without fear in the heavenly world, [and] likewise moves about. 11. These same two syllables are the world of the gods and the world of man. The sun these two syllables are, and the moon. 12. The sun is the world of the gods, [and] the moon is the world of man. The sun is om, the moon is vāc. 13. Thus the udgātā causes him, the sacrificer, to go to the heavenly world by means of this syllable om.

III. 14. 1. Him, having come, he asks: "Who art thou?" When he announces himself, either by his [personal] name or by his family [name], he says to him: "This self of thee that hath been in me, that same is thine." 2. In this self is the beginning (? pratipat). Him seized . . . . . the seasons drag away; of him day and night

13. 9 hiṃsāyata. 10 A. -o. 11 -e. 14. 1 B. -dhy. 2 ta.
lokam āpnumaḥ. 3. tasmā u hāī 'tena' prabrūvitaḥ ko 'ham asmi suvas tvam. sa tvāṁ svargyaṁ svar agum iti. 4. ko ha vai prajāpatir atha hāī 'vanaṁ eva svargarah.sa hi swar gacchati. 5. taṁ ha "ha yas tvam asi so 'ham asmi yo 'ham asmi sa tvam asy eli 'ti. 6. sa etam eva sukratarasam pravacchati. yad u ha vā asmiṁ loke manuṣyā yajante yat sādhaṁ kurantaḥ tud eṣaṁ urdhvaṁ annādyam utsidati. tad annāṁ candramasam manuṣyalokam pravacchati. 7. tasya 'dham mānuṣyanikaçanam añandam udare'ntas sambhavati. tasyo 'rādhvam añṇādyam utsidati stanavah.abhi. sa yad uñjyate 'thā 'smāi mātā stanaṁ annādyam pravacchati. 8. ajāto ha vāi tāvat puruso yāvan na yajate. sa yajñenai va jañyate. sa yathā 'ndam prathamanirbhinnam evam eva. 9. tadu taṁ ha vā evanvīd uδgūṭa yajamanam om ity etenā 'ksareṇa 'dityañ devalokam gamayati. vāg ity asmā uttareṇa 'ksareṇa candramasam añṇādyam aksīrim prayaçchati. 10. atha yasyāi 'tad avidvān uδgāyati na'hai vāi 'nam devalokam gamayati no enam annādyena samarāhaya. 11. sa yathā 'ndam vidigāvah añyāta 'nnādyam alabhāmānāṁ evaṃ eva vidigāhac yete 'nnādyam alabhāmanāḥ. 12. tasmād

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 uδgātār 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 uδgǐtha 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
III. 15. 1. vāg iti heऽ 'ndro viṣṇumitrāyo 'kthamऽ uvācu. tad
etad viṣṇumitrā upāsate vācam eva. 2. manur ha vasīṣṭhayā
brahmatvam uvāca. tasmād āhur vasīṣṭham eva brahme 'ti.
3. tad u vā āhur evanvid eva brahmā. ka u evanvidam vāsīṣ-
ṭham arhati 'ti. 4. prajāpatiḥ prajijanīṣata. sa tapo 'tapyata.
sa āikṣata hanta nu pratiṣṭhāṁ janayāt tato yāḥ prajās
srakṣye tāऽ etad eva pratiṣṭhāsyanti nā 'pratiṣṭhāc carantiḥ prada-
ghizyanta iti. 5. sa imaṁ lokam ajanayad antarikṣalokam
amunē lokam iti. tāṁ imaṁ trāṁ lokāṁ janayitvā 'bhayaṁrāṁvat.
6. tāṁ samataḥat. tebhyaḥ sanātaptabhyas trīṇi cūkṛāṇy uḍāyann
tagnih prthivyā vāyur antarikṣād ādityo divah. 7. sa'etāṁ
cūkṛāṇi punar abhy eva 'tapat. tebhyaḥ sanātaptabhyas trīṇy
eva cūkṛāṇy uḍāyann yveda eva 'gner yajurvedo vāyos sāma-
veda ādityat. 8. sa etāṁ cūkṛāṇi punar abhy eva 'tapat. tebhya
y any food. 12. Therefore he should cause only one knowing thus
to sing the udgītha. Only one knowing thus here being ad-
dressed with "O udgūṭar" should answer.

III. 15. 1. Indra said the uktha for Viṣṇumitra [with] vāc.
That same the descendants of Viṣṇumitra worship, just speech.
2. Manu declared to Vasīṣṭhā brahman-hood. Therefore they
say: "The brahman belongs to Vasiṣṭha." 3. 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 tilted 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 Sāmaveda
from the sun. 8. He again heated these bright [bodies]. From

14. 21 cūnu-.
15. 1 hāi. 2 utth-. 3 A. jāye; B. janaye. 4 pk-. 5 tām. 6 -mu. 7 sam-
abhavan. 8 ssa. 9 -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,' 'adhvarya,' 'udgata' 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 gastra 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 prātaranvaṅka 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

15. 10-m. 16. 1-ām. 2 B. ċr-. 3-nām. 4 ta. 5-o. 6 B. repeats ās-. 7-n. 8-gur. 9 'ntaryyuṅ.
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itaresāṁ stutacāstrānāṁ evāṁ "saṁsthāyāi pavamānānām.
1. sa yathā puruṣa ubhayāpād' yan' bhresāṁ na' nyeti ratho vo
'bhayācakro vartamāna evam etarhi yajño bhresāṁ na nyeti. 91.
caturthe 'nuvāke āvitiyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

III. 17. 1. sa yādi yajña yākto bhresāṁ iyād' brahmane pra-
brūte 'ty āhūḥ. atha yādi yajus'to brahmane prabrūte 'ty āhūḥ. 
atha yādi sāmato brahmane prabrūte 'ty āhūḥ. atha' yady an-
upaśmṛtāt kuta idam ajanī 'ti brahmane prabrūte 'ty evāṁ "huḥ.
2. sa brahmā prāṁ udetya sruvenā "janāhra ājyaṁ jhunyād
bhūr bhūvas svar ity etābhir vyāhṛtibhiḥ. 3. etā vāi vyāḥṛtyās
sarvaprāyaścittayaḥ. tad yathā lavanena swarvanā satad-
āhyātā swarvanā rajatam rajatena trapitā trapunā lohāyasa
lohāyasena kārṇāyasanā kārṇāyasanā dāru dāru ca carma ca
glesmānāī vam evāṁ vidvāṁ sat sarvam bhīṣajyati. 4. tad
āhūr yad ahaṁśin me grahāṇ me 'grahād ity adhvaryave dakṣinā
nayanty acaṁśin' me vaśu' kāś ca" ma' iti hotra uḍāgaśin ma

prātaranuvāka is begun, till the final verse, till the utterance of
vasat of the other stotra and castra, even till the completion of
the libations. 7. As a two-legged man, going, does not take to
umbling, or a two-wheeled chariot, rolling, even so the sacrifice
then does not take to tumbling.

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 sāman, 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 āgniāhra, with these exclama-
tions: bhūs, bhūvas, svar. 3. For these exclamations ex-
piate 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 know-
ing 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 adhuvṛṇu; if with the
words: 'He hath sung the castra for me, he hath uttered the
vaśaṭ for me,' to the hōtar; if with the words: 'He hath sung
ity udgātre 'tha kiṁ cakruṣe brahmaṇe tūṣṇeṁ āśinaya sanāvatīr eva 'tarūr̄' rtvighbir daksinā nayunī 'ti. 5. sa brūyād ardhabhāg 1 gaṁ vāi sa 1 yajñasyā 'rāhaṁ hi esa yajñasya vahati 'ti. ardha ha sama vāi purā brahmaṇe daksinā nayunī 'ti. ardha itarebhya rtvighbiyāḥ. 6. tasyāi 'śa gloko
mayi 'dam manye bhuvanādi sarvam
mayi lokā mayi diçaça catasraḥ:
mayī' 'dam manye nimiṣad yad ejati
mayy āpa osadhayaça ca sarvāḥ
iti. 7. mayī 'dam manye bhuvanādi sarvam ity evanvidāṁ hai vāvā 'dam sarvam bhuvanam anvayattam. 8. mayī lokā mayi
diçaça catasra ity evanvidi hai nāva lokā evanvidi diçaça catasraḥ. 9. mayī 'dam manye nimiṣad yad ejati mayy āpa osadhayaça ca sarvā ity evanvidi 10 hai vāvā 'dam sarvam bhuvanam pratīṣṭhatam. 10. tasmād u hāi 'evanvidam eva brahmāṇāṁ kurvā. sa ha vāvā 11 brahmā ya evam veda. 92.
caturthe 'nūvāke ṛtiyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

III. 18. 1. atha vā atas stomabhāgānāṁ evā 'numantrāḥ. 2. tad dhūi 'tad ēke stomabhāgāṁ evā 'numantrayante. tat tathā na 2 kuryāt. 3. devena savitrā prasūtaḥ pratotar deve-
the udgātha for me,' to the udgātar—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?" 5. 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 gōka: "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 depend-
ent. 8. 'In me the worlds, in me the four quarters:' for in one knowing thus are the worlds, in one knowing thus the four quarters. 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 stomabhāgas. 2. Now some recite the after-verses just with the stomabhāgas. One should not do that. 3. And some recite the

17. 15 -rer. 13 -aṅgh. 14 om. 15 yāi. 16 sa. 17 A. matihī. 18 -dam. 19 B. eva. 18. 1 stomā-. 2 ṛtu. 3 kurvād.
bhyo vācām isye 'ty u hāi 'ke 'numantrayante savitā vāi devānām prasavitā savitrā4 prasūtā idam anumantrayāmaha iti vadantaḥ, tad u tathā na5 kuryāt. 4. bhūr bhūvas svar ity u hāi 'ke 'numantrayanta esā vāi trayē6 vidyā trayyāū7 've 'daun vidyayā8 'numantrayāmaha iti vadantaḥ, tad u tathā no eva kuryāt. 5. om ity evā 'numantrayeta. 6. athāī 'sa vasiṣṭhasyāī 'kastombhāgānumantraḥ, tena hāi 'tena vasiṣṭhaḥ prajātikāmo 'numantrayāmaka devena savitrā prasūtāḥ prastotar7 devo bhayo vācām isya bhūr bhūvas svar om iti. tato vāi sa bahuḥ10 prajayā pāpuḥhiḥ prajāyata.12 7. sa eva tena vasiṣṭhasyāī 'kastombhāgānumanтренā13 'numantrayeta14 bahur eva prajayā11 pāpuḥhiḥ prajāyate, iyam18 tv eva sthitir om ity evā 'numantrayeta. 93.

caturthe 'nūvāke caturthaḥ16 khanyāḥ.

III. 19. 1. athāī 'sa vācā vajram udgrhaṇāti. yad7 āha somāḥ pavata iti vo 'pūvartaḍhvaṃ iti vā vācāī 'va tad vāco vajram vigrahaṇāt vacas satyenā 'timucyate. tasmād om ity evā 'numantrayeta. 2. devā vā anayā2 trayyā [vidyayā] sarasayo "rāhvās 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 Savitar." One should not do that either. 4. And some recite the after-verse [with] bhūs, bhūvas, svar, 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 stomabhāga-after-verse. With this same Vasiṣṭha, desirous of offspring, recited the after-verses: "Impelled by god Savitar, O prastotar, send [thy] speech to the gods; bhūs, bhūvas, svar, om." Thereby he was greatly propagated through progeny [and] cattle. 7. Let him recite the after-verse with this one stomabhāga-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. 4ṛā. 5A. ne, e cancelled in red. 6-4. 7trāyīyen. 8va. 9yāyā. 10-hu. 11-jāyā. 12prāj. 13tastom-. 14-yete. 15iya. 16B. pañcamah. 17-stā.
19. 1ya. 2-ā.
svargam lokam udakraman. te manusyānám anvāgamād bhāyatasū trayāṃ vedam apīlayan  1. tasya pīlayanta ekam eva 'kṣaram nā paknuvan pīlayitum om iti yad etat  2. esa u ha vāva sarasaḥ sarasaḥ ha vā evāvīdās trāyā vidyā bhavati  3. sa yām ha vāi trayā ś vidyāyā sarasayā jītim jayati yāṃ rādhisti rāhnoti jayati tām jītim rāhnoti tām rādhisti ya evām veda  4. etad dha vā aksaraṃ trayāyāi vidyāyāi pratiśthā om iti vā hotā pratiśthita om ity adhvaryur om ity udgāyā  5. etad dha vā aksaraṃ vedānāṃ trivistapam etasmin vā aksaraś tvāvjo yujamānam udbhaya svarge loke samudāhanti tasmād om ity eva 'numantrayetā  6.4

caturthe 'nuvāke pañcamāh khaṇḍāh. caturtho 'nuvākas samāptaḥ.

III. 20. 1. guhā 'si devo 'syu upāvā 'syu upa tmāṃ vāyasva 'yo 'smān dveṣṭi yāṁ ca vayam dvimahā  2. mahanā 'si bahula 'si brhaty asi rohiny asy apanā 'si  3. sambhūr devo 'si sam aham bhāyāsam. ābhātisā asy ābhāyāsam. bhitiri asi bhāyāsam  4. yās te prajā upadiṣṭā 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).  3. 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 thrust one thrives with the threefold knowledge full of sap, he wins that victory, he thrives that thrust, 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 adhvaryus, [saying] om the udgātār.  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 (bhūtati), 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. 1vīh-. 2trāy-. 3pratiśthā. 4-e.
20. 1devāsmi. 2py. 3vāyasvi. 4mahikā. 5ābhūritir.
I do not comprehend (?). That [offspring] of thee I declare.  
5. 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.  
6. 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.”  
8. “What now of thee is there in me?” “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.”
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 Varuna. In that thou blowest from the left, thou blowest as king Soma. In that thou blowest down from above, thou blowest down as Prajāpati. 3. Thou art the Vṛatya, the only Vṛatya, not released of the gods (?). Thou hast closed the opening. 4. The progeny, the herbs, the waters follow after thy departing. 5. = 20. 6. = 20. 4. 7. My breath and exhalation, my learning, that of me is in thee. That of me do not take unto thyself," he said to Vāyu. 8. Him having come thus Vāyu joyfully receives [saying]: "Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common." 9. = 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?"

21. 1 A. 'pa-. 2 A. pr-. 3 sraṣṭo. 4 (a)vaḍhīḥ. 5 samrbhūr. 6 A. prā-nāṇāu. 7 vayi.
punar dehi 'ti. 14. kim nu te mayi 'ti. aham ma aukaah. sa ne tvayi. tan me punar dehi 'ti. tam asmah aukaam antariksah lokah punar dadati. 15. tam ahah pra maha vahet 'ti. 96.

pañca 'nuvahā dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 22. 1. kim abhi 'ti. diça iti. tām' diço bhīpravahati. 2. tām tathāvā 'gataṁ diçaḥ pratinandantya' ayaṁ te bhagavo lokah. saha no 'yaṁ loka iti. 3. yad vāva me yuṣmāsv ity ahā tad vāva me punar datte 'ti. 4. kim nu te 'śmaśv iti. protraṁ iti. tad asmāi protraṁ diçaḥ punar dadati. 5. tā ahā pra mā vahate 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. ahorātryor lokam iti. tam ahorātryor lokam abhipravahanti. 6. tām tathāvā 'gataṁ ahorātre pratinandato 'yaṁ te bhagavo lokah. saha no 'yaṁ loka iti. 7. yad vāva me yuwayor ity ahā tad vāva me punar dattam iti. 8. kim nu ta āwayor iti. aksitir iti. tām asmā aksitim ahorāre punar dattaḥ. 9. te ahā pra mā vahatam iti. 97.

pañca 'nuvahā tṛitiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 23. 1. kim abhi 'ti. ardhamusaḥ iti. tam ardhamusah abhipravahataḥ. 2. tām' tathāvā 'gataṁ ardhamusah pratinandantya' ayaṁ te bhagavo lokah. saha no 'yaṁ 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. 18. 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. 3. 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,
1. yad váva me yuśmāsv ity āha tad váva me punar datte 'ti.
2. kīṁ nu te 'smāsv iti. imānī kṣuḍrāṇi parvāṇi. tāṇi me yuṣmāsu. tāṇi me pratisvanāṭte 'ti. tāṇy asyā rddhāmāśāḥ punaḥ pratisvanādhati. 3. tān āha pra mā vahate 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. māsān iti. tam māsān abhipravahanti. 4. tam tathāī vā "gataṁ māśāḥ pratinandanty" ayāṁ te bhagavo lokāḥ. saha no 'yaṁ loka iti. 5. yad váva me yuśmāsv ity āha tad váva me punar datte 'ti. 6. kīṁ nu te 'smāsv iti. imānī sthūlāṇi parvāṇi. tāṇi me yuśmāsu. tāṇi me pratisvanāṭte 'ti. tāṇy asyā māśāḥ punaḥ pratisvanādhati. 7. tān āha pra mā vahate 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. saṁvatsaram iti. 8. tam tathāī vā "gataṁ saṁvatsaraṁ abhipravahanti.

pañcane 'nuvāke caturthaṁ khaṇḍaṁ.

III. 24. 1. kim abhi 'ti. yūtāṁ iti. tam yūtā abhipravahanti.
2. tam tathāī vā "gataṁ yūtāvaḥ pratinandanty ayāṁ te bha-

gavo lokāḥ. saha no 'yaṁ loka iti. 3. yad váva me yuśmāsv

ity āha tad váva me punar datte 'ti. 4. kīṁ nu te 'smāsv iti.
imānī jyāyāṁsi parvāṇi. tāṇi me yuśmāsu tāṇi me pratisva-

nāṭte 'ti. tāṇy asyā rītavaḥ punaḥ pratisvanādhati. 5. tān

āha pra mā vahate 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. saṁvatsaram iti. 6. tam saṁ-

vatsaram abhipravahanti. 7. tathāī vā "gataṁ saṁvatsa-

reverend sir. This world is ours in common."

3. = 22. 3.
4. "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. 5. He says to them: "Carry me forth."

"To what?" "To the months." They carry him forth to the 

months. 6. Him having come thus the months 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?"

"These gross joints. These of me are in you. These of me put 
together respectively." These [joints] of his the months put 
respectively together. 9. 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." 3. = 22. 4. "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. 5. He says to them: 
"Carry me forth." "To what?" "To the year." They carry 
him forth to the year. 6. Him having come thus the year

raḥ pratinandaty ayaṁ te bhagavo lokāḥ. saha nāv ayaṁ loka iti. 7. yaḍ vāva me tvayi t'iy āha tad vāva me punar dehī 'ti. 8. kim nu te mayi 'ti. ayam ma ātmā. sa me tvayi tan me punar dehī 'ti. tam asmā ātmānāṁ saṁvatsaraḥ punar dadāti. 9. tam āha pra mā vaḥe 'ti. 99.

daնcame 'nūvāke daṇcameḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

III. 25. 1. kim abhi 'ti. divyān gandharvān iti. tamā divyān gandharvān abhiprakahāti. 2. tamā tathā vā "gataṁ divyā gandharvāḥ pratinandantly ayaṁ te bhagavo lokāḥ. saha no 'yaṁ loka iti. 3. yaḍ vāva me yuṣmāsu ity āha tad vāva me punar datte 'ti. 4. kim nu te 'smāsu iti. gandho me modo me pramoḍo me. tan me yuṣmāsu. tan me punar datte 'ti. tad asmā divyā gandharvāḥ punar dadāti. 5. tām āha pra mā vaḥate 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. apsarasā iti. tam apsarasā bhiprakahāti. 6. tamā tathā vā "gataṁ apsarasāḥ pratinandantly ayaṁ te bhagavo lokāḥ. saha no 'yaṁ loka iti. 7. yaḍ vāva me yuṣmāsu ity āha tad vāva me punar datte 'ti. 8. kim nu te 'smāsu iti. haso me krūśā me mithunam me. tan me yuṣmāsu. tan me punar datte 'ti. tad asmā apsarasāḥ punar dadāti. 9. tā āha pra mā vaḥate 'ti. 100.

daṇcome 'nūvāke śaṣṭhaḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

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?" "This self of mine. That of me is in thee. Give that back to me." That self the year gives back to him. 9. He says to it: "Carry me forth."

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." 3. = 22. 3. 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. 5. He says to them: "Carry me forth." "To what?" "To the Apsarases." They carry him forth to the Apsarases. 6. Him having come thus the Apsarases joyfully receive [saying]: "Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common." 7. = 22. 7. 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 Apsarases give back to him. 9. He says to them: "Carry me forth."

24. 2 B. tvadhi. 3 vahate. 25. 1 A. ta. 2 B. gandharvo. 3 B. yuyad.

VOL. XVI. 25
III. 26. 1. kim abhi 'ti. divam iti. tam divam abhipravahanti
2. tam tathāi 'vā 'gataṁ dyāuḥ' pratinandaty ayaṁ te bhagavo
lokaḥ. saha nāv ayaṁ loka iti. 3. yad vaṁ me tvaiy 'ty āha
tad vaṁ me punar dehi 'ti. 4. kim nu te mayī 'ti. typtir iti.
sakṛt typte 'va hy eṣā. tām asmāi typtirn dyāuḥ punar dañāti.
5. tam āha pra ma vahe 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. devān iti. tam devān
abhipravahati. 6. tam tathāi 'vā 'gataṁ devāh pratinandanty
ayaṁ te bhagavo lokaḥ. saha no 'yaṁ loka iti. 7. yad vaṁ me
yusmāsv ity āha tad vaṁ me punar dañāte 'ti. 8. kim nu te
'śūṇsa iti. amṛtaṁ iti. tad asmā amṛtaṁ devāh punar dañāti.2
9. tān āha pra ma vahe 'ti. 101.
pāñcame 'nusvēke saptamāh khaṇḍhāh.

III. 27. 1. kim abhi 'ti. udityam iti. tam udityam abhipravaha-
hanti. 2. sa udityam āha vibhūh purastāt sampat1 paṣcāt.
samyaṁ2 tvam asi. samāc manuṣyān acroś3 ruṣatas ta ṛṣiḥ
pāṃmaṁhanti. apahatapāṃma bhavati yas tvā4 'vāṁ' veda.
3. sambhūs4 devo 'si sam aham bhūyāsaman. ābhūtir asy ābhūya-
sam. bhūtir asi bhūyāsam. 4. yās te prajā upadīṣṭā na 'haṁ
tava tāh paryemi. upa te tā dīcāmi. 5. ojo me balam me caksur
me. 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. 7. 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. 3. 4. = 20. 3. 5. “My power, my strength, my
sight: that of me is in thee. Do not take that of me unto thee,“

26. 1dyāu. 2-dāti.
27. 1A-vaṭ. 2samyaṁdaṁ. 3A. aroțis, the ti cancelled in red. 4tv.
evaṁ. 5B. -bhūtir. 6bhūtir.
6. Him having come thus the sun joyfully receives [saying]: “Thine is this world, reverend sir. This world is ours in common.” 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 Brähman, thou dost worship. Therefore the true, both gods and men, bring food for thee. Food-eating becometh he who knoweth thee thus.” 12. 13. = 20. 4. 14. “My mind, my seed, my offspring, 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 offspring, 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.”

27. 8 “gatā. 9 A. om. 10 A. tvīyī; B. tvīyīti. 11 acan-. 12 A. vā. 13 B. -āsa. 14 A. om. amṛtasya pāndhā (so reads B!) . . . . . . devo ‘si sam aham. 15 -ti. 16 me. ma. 17 B. kin nu.
III. 28. 1. *kim abhi 'ti. brahmaṇo lokam iti. tam ādityam abhipravahati. 2. sa ādityam āha pra ma vahe 'ti. kim abhi 'ti. brahmaṇo lokam iti. tam candramasam abhipravahati.* 3. sa evam ete devate anusūncarati. 4. eso 'nto 'ṭaḥ prārṇḥ pravāhu nā 'stī. yān u kāṇḍa cā 'taḥ prāco lokān abhyāvādīma te* sarva āptā bhavanti te jītās teṣā sasya sarveṣu kāmacāro bhavati ya evam veda. 5. sa yadi kāmāyeta punar iti "jāye ye 'ti yasmin kuto bhidhāyayē yadi brahmaṇakule yadi rājakule tasminn ājāyate. sa etam eva lokam punaḥ prajānann abhyārohann eti. 6. tād u ho 'vāca cātīyāyanīr bāhuśyāhito vā ayam bāhūṣo lokāḥ, etasya vāi kāmāya mā bruvate[5] prāmyanti11 vā ku etat prāsyā punar iti "yād atrā' vā syād iti. 103.

pañcame 'nuvāke navamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. pañcamo 'nuvākas samāptāḥ.

III. 29. 1. uccāīcgravaḥ ha kāupayeyah kāyuravyo rājā "sa. tasya ha keṣa dārbhyaḥ pāṇḍulo rājā svasriya śa. taṁ hā 'nyonyasya priyāv āsaṭṣaḥ. 2. sa ho 'cācāīcgravaḥ kāupayeyo 'smāl lokāt preyāya. tasmin ha prete keṣa dārbhya 'rāṇye māga-

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 Brāhmaṇ-family, be it a royal family, into that he is born. He keeps on ascending to this world again fore-knowing. 5. And Cātīyāyani 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. Uccāīcgravas Kāupayeya was a king of the Kurus. Now Keśin Dārbhya, king of the Pañcālas, was his sister’s son. And they were dear to each other. 2. This Uccāīcgravas Kāupayeya departed from this world. When he had departed, Keśin


yām ca cārū 'priyāṁ vininīṣamānaḥ. 3. sa ha tathāi 'va paḷya-
yāmaṇo mṛgaṁ prasarann' antareṇāi 'vo 'cāṇḍravasani' kau-
payeyam adhiṣṭaṁ. 4. taṁ ha 'vāca ḍṛṣṭyāmi swāj jānāmi 'ti. na 'ṛṣya 'ti ho 'vāca jānāsi. sa' eva 'sni yam mā manyasa iti. 5. atha yad bhagava āhur iti ho 'vāca ya 'āvir bhavanat anye 'syā lokam upayanti 'ty atha katham aṣaқa ma 'āvir bhaviti-
tum iti. 6. om iti ho 'vāca yadā vai tasya lokasya gopārman avide 'tas' ta 'āvir adhūvam aprīyaṁ cā' 'syā vinesyāmy amu caī 'nam pāsīyāmi 'ti. 7. tathā bhagava iti ho'11 'vāca. taṁ vai nu tvā pariśvajā iti. taṁ ha sma pariśvajāmāno yathā dhū-
manā vai 'pi 'yād vāyuṁ vā12 'kāpaṁ vai 'gnyarciṁ vai 'po vai 'vah ha smāi 'nam nyeti. na ha smāi 'nam pariśvaṅgāyo 'pala-
bhate. 104.

saṣṭhe 'nuvāke prathamaḥ khanḍaḥ.

III. 30. 1. sa ho 'vāca' yad vai te purā rūpam āsit tat te rūpam. na2 tu tvā pariśvaṅgāyo3 'palabhā' iti. 2. om iti ho 'vāca brāhmaṇo vai me sāma vidvān sāmno 'dagāyat. sa me 'carīreṇa sāmna 'carīr̥nyā adhūnot. tad yasya vai kila sāma

Dārbhya went hunting in the woods, wishing to remove his sadness. 3. While he was thus roaming about, chasing deer, he perceived just between [himself and the game] Uccāśiṇḍras Kāṇpayeya. 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 manifest 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 Brāhman who knew the sāman sang the udgāthā for me with the sāman. By means of the bodiless sāman he shook off my bodies.

29. 'prassar-. 7 A. 'ccaśr-; B. 'cāśr-. 8 ya. 9 ata. 10 B. vā. 11 he. 12 vā.
30. 1 A. 'vā. 2 ne. 3 -goyo. 4 'palabhate, e cancelled in red. 5 -rāravy.
III. 31. 1. Vyūdhacchandasā vāi dvādaśāhena yakṣyumāno' 

Verily, whose udgīthu one who knoweth the sāman singeth with 
the sāman, him he causeth to go to the same world with the 
divinities." 2. "Patanīga Prājāpatya," he said, "was a dear son of 
Prajāpati. To him he told this sāman. With it he sang the 
udgīthu of (for) the sages (ṛṣi). [Thus] these same sages have 
shaken off their bodies. 4. And with this sāman," he said, 
"Prajāpati sang the udgīthu of (for) the gods. [Thus] these same 
gods above have shaken off their bodies." 5. In this he (U.) in- 
structed him (K.). Having instructed him, he said: "Whoever 
shall know this sāman, let only him sing the udgīthu for thee." 
6. He, being instructed, returned. He went about asking ques- 
tions of the Brāhmans of the Kurus and Pañcālas.

III. 31. [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 udgīthu 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 he (P.) 
started away. 4. He (K.) said to him: "Who art thou?" "I am a 
Brāhman, Prātrda Bhālla." 5. "As such what dost thou know?" 
"The sāman." 6. "Very well," he (K.) said; "I am going to
yaksyamāṇo\textsuperscript{18} 'smi. sa yadi tvāṁ tat sāma vetha yad aham veda\textsuperscript{11} tvam eva ma udgūsyasi.\textsuperscript{12} mīmāṁsasve 'ti. \textsuperscript{7} tasmāi ha mīmāṁsāmānas tad eva\textsuperscript{13} sampraty abhidaddhāu. \textsuperscript{8} tāṁ hō 'rācā 'yam ma udgūsyati 'ti.\textsuperscript{14} 9. tasmāi ha kuraṇaṁcūlānām\textsuperscript{15} brāhmaṇā asūyanta\textsuperscript{16} āhur esu ha vā ayaṁ kūlesen\textsuperscript{17} sateṣa 'dgūsyati.\textsuperscript{18} kasmā ayam alam\textsuperscript{19} iti. \textsuperscript{10} alam nūt\textsuperscript{20} mahyam iti ha smā "ha. sāi 'vā 'lam masyā 'lam matāyāi 'tasya ha 'lam\textsuperscript{21} evo\textsuperscript{22} 'jagāv. tasmād ālāmyāilājodgūte 'ty ākhyāpayanti. \textsuperscript{106} 

saśthe 'nunāke trītyah khaṇḍah.

III. \textsuperscript{32} 1. tād aha śatyakīrtā āhur yāṁ vayaṁ devatām upāsmaha ekam eva vayaṁ tasyāi devatāyāi rūpam gavy ādiścāma ekāṁ vāhana ekāṁ hastiny ekāṁ puruṣa ekāṁ sarveśu bhūtesu. tasyā eva 'dam devatāyāi sarvaṁ rūpam iti. \textsuperscript{2} tad etad ekam eva rūpam prāṇa eva. yāvād ahy eva prāṇena prāṇītī tāvad rūpam bhavati tad rūpam bhavati. \textsuperscript{3} tad atha yād prāṇa utkārmati dāru eva bhuto\textsuperscript{23} 'narthiḥ' pariśiṣyate na kiṁ cana rūpam. \textsuperscript{4} tasyā 'ntarātmā tapah. tasmāt tapyamānasyo 'ṣnataraḥ prāṇa bhavati. \textsuperscript{5} tapaso 'ntarātmā 'yinīḥ. so 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." \textsuperscript{7} He, pondering, answered him that precisely. \textsuperscript{8} He (K.) said to him: "This one here shall sing the udgītha for me." \textsuperscript{9} Complaining of him the Brāhmans of the Kūrus and Paṇačalas said: "While those here are of the family, shall he sing the udgītha? To whom is he acceptable?\textsuperscript{20} He, in accord with his 'alam (alam) acceptably (alam). Therefore they call him the ālāmyāilāja-udgātar? ().

III. \textsuperscript{33} 1. This the Śatyakīrtas 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." \textsuperscript{2} That same one form is breath. For as long as one breathes with breath so long there is form; that is form. \textsuperscript{3} And when breath departs he is left useless, having become just like a log, [and] no form whatever [is left]. \textsuperscript{4} His inner self is heat (penance). Therefore the breath of one who is heated (who practices penance) becomes hotter. \textsuperscript{5} The inner self of heat

\textsuperscript{31} kṣam-. \textsuperscript{11} B. inserts yad ahaṁ vetha. \textsuperscript{12} A. corrected from -ti. \textsuperscript{13} B. inserts tta. \textsuperscript{14} om. iti. \textsuperscript{15} B. -pān-. \textsuperscript{16} āśi-. \textsuperscript{17} kūlen-. \textsuperscript{18} pās-. \textsuperscript{19} B. arṇam. \textsuperscript{20} A. nūt, after this a ma is cancelled in A. \textsuperscript{21} insert ma. \textsuperscript{22} evāu.

\textsuperscript{33} A. yad. \textsuperscript{2} eyo. \textsuperscript{3} e. \textsuperscript{4} thāḥ.
III. 33. 1. sa yo vāyuḥ prāṇa eva suh. yo ‘gnir vāg eva sā.
yaḥ candramā mana eva tad. yaḥ ādityas svara eva suh.
tasmād etam ādityam āḥus svara eva ti ‘ti. 2. sa yo ha vā amūr devata
upāste yā amūr adhīdevatāṁ dārūpāṁ vā etā duranusamprāpyaṁ
iva. kas tad veda yady etā anu vā samprāpyyāṁ na vā. 3. atha
ya eva adhyātmaṁ upāste sa hā ’ntidevo bhavati. nirgijyanti tva
vā tā ita etā. [l]asya vā etār gāvīsya sāhā prāṇena nirgijyanti.
ka u eva tad veda yady etā anu vā samprāpyyāṁ na vā. 4. atha ya
enā ubhayāṁ ekadāḥ bhavantār veda sa eva ‘nusṭhyā
donces 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. 7. His inner self is heat. Therefore it blows hotter
when [the sun] shines. 8. The inner self of heat is lightning.
That is distinct. Therefore it also burns. 9. 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. 5 A. dati. 6 B. -dāiv-. 7-p-. 8 B. repeats tāni vāsitavyo (!) yad
asminn āpo ‘ntas . . . . . . tasmāt so ‘pi daḥati.
33. 1 B. yadā. 2-rūvā. 3-āpā. 4 A. cā. 5 vā. 6 ubhedhār.
III. 34. 1. Those are this couple, viz. speech and breath; a couple are रो and सामन. 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 हिन्दुरा along with speech, with mind, with breath, with tone. With the हिन्दुरा a couple is thus brought about. 3. They also perform the मिठाहा along with speech, with mind, with breath, with tone. With the मिठाहा a couple is thus brought about. 4. That is the sevenfold of the सामन. Seven times the उद्गातर
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 (pataṅga). 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 causes himself and the sacrificer to be born from the body. 7. 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. 8. 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 7c.
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 ṛc, on the _yajus_, on the sāman, thereby they guard this [wisdom].
III. 37. 1. apaçyam goçam anipadyamänam
   ã ca parã ca pathibhiç carantam:
   sa sadhrícis' sa visúcir vasaña
   ã varivarti bhuvanesvä antar
   iti. 2. apaçyam goçam anipadyamänam iti. prânö vai goçam
   sa hí'dam sarvam anipingamáno gopäyati. 3. ã ca parã ca
   pathibhiç carantam iti. tad ye ca ha và ime prânå ãmi ca vaj-
   maya eñãir ha và esa etad ã ca parã ca pathibhiç carati. 4. su
   sadhrícis sa visúcir vasåña iti. sadhrícis ca hy esa etad visúcir
   ca praçä vaste. 5. ã varivarti bhuvanesvä antur iti. esa hy eväi
   'su bhuvanesvä antar varivartti. 6. sa esa indra udgithaḥ. sa
   yadäi' sa indra udgitha úgacchati nai' vo 'dyutu sc 'pugatryñäñä
   ca vijñyäte. ita evo 'râhvas' svär uñeti. su upari mûrdhno
   leçyäti. 7. sa vidyäd ãgamadä indro ne 'ha kac cana pâmä
   nyanãgah präçeksyata iti. tasmin ha na kac cana pâmä nyan-
   gah präçisyäte. 8. tad etad' bhraçtvyanä' sümä. na ha và
   indraḥ kam cana bhraçtvyan paçyate. sa yathe 'ndro na kam
   cana bhraçtvyan paçyata evam eva [na] kan cana bhraçtvyan
   paçyate ya etad evam vedä 'the yasyäi' vaiṁ vidvän udgäyati.
   112.

   saṣṭhe 'nuvāke navamah khaṇḍaḥ. saṣṭho 'nuvākas samāptāḥ.

III. 38. 1. praçäpatim brahma 'sjata. tam apäçyam amu-
   kham' asjrata. 2. tam aprapäçyam' amukham gayānam brahma
   'vicat. purusyañä' tat. prâno vài brahma. prâno vàvai 'naññ tud
   âvicat. 3. sa udatiṣṭhat prañānām janayitā. tam raksānsyä' anvü-

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 con-
verging and diverging ones’: for he is thus clad in converging
and diverging offspring. 5. ‘He oft turneth hither within created
beings’: for he often does turn hither within these created
beings. 6-8 = I. 45. 4-6.

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 Rākṣasas fastened on.

37. 1-riç-; at the beginning of this pâda all MSS. insert atim. 2 B.
saste. 3-tyñ-. 4-Çhva. 5-agad. 6-pariṣ-. 7 eta. 8-bhr-. 38. 1-mukh-. 2 aprav-. 3-sam. 4 A.-āsy.
III. 39. 1. He sang unto [him] sixteen syllables: ovāc, ovāc, ovāc, hum, bhū, ovā. 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 (vāc) is the brahma; that

38. ānusâc. 5 gāyatrayin. 7 cravasya. 8 pāgā. 10 B. -lām. 21 prast-. 13 tam. 12 A. -yata. 14-sās.
39. 1-ā.
tad brahma. tad id antarikṣam so 'yam vāyuḥ pavate. hum iti
candrāṇāḥ. bhū ity ādityah. 3. etasya ha vā idam aksarasya
krator bhūti ity ācakṣate. 4. etasya ha vā idam aksarasya
krator abhram ity ācakṣate. 5. etasya ha vā idam aksarasya
kratoṛ kubhrām ity ācakṣate. 6. etasya ha vā idam aksarasya
kratoṛ pūbhrām ity ācakṣate. 7. etasya ha vā idam aksarasya
krator vrṣabhaḥ ity ācakṣate. 8. etasya ha vā idam aksarasya
krator darbhā ity ācakṣate. 9. etasya ha vā idam aksarasya
krator yo bhūti ity ācakṣate. 10. etasya ha vā idam aksarasya
kratoṛ śambhavati ity ācakṣate. 11. tad yat kīṁ ca bhūḥ iti ca
bhūḥ iti ca tad etan mithunam gāyatram. pra mithunena jāyate
ya evām veda. 114.
saptame 'nvāke dvitiyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

III. 40. 1. tad etad amṛtam gāyatram. etena vāś prajāpatir
amṛtatvaṁ agacchaḥ etena devā etena rṣayaḥ. 2. tad etad brahma
prajāpataye 'bravit prajāpatiḥ paramesṭhiṁe prajāpatyaṁ
paramesṭhi prajāpatyaḥ devaṁ savitre devas savitā'gnaṣe 'gnir
indrāye 'ndraḥ kāyapāya kāyapā raṣyāṅgāya kāyapāya
raṣyāṅgāḥ kāyapā devatarasī caṇvasāyaṇāḥ kāyapāya
devataraḥ caṇvasāyaṇaḥ kāyapācaḥ caṇvasī caṇvāya vāhneyāya
cānيري-ra ṣuṣo caṇvāya ṣāvikaṃ caṇvāya iṁdrotāya caṇvāya
śāntam/ātmastri caṇvāya is Vāyu who cleanses here; hum is the moon; bhū
is the sun. 1. In virtue of this syllable they say of him: “He
shineth.” 4. In virtue of this syllable they say of him abhra
(cloud). 5. In virtue of this syllable they say of him kubhra.
6. In virtue of this syllable they say of him pūbhra (white).
7. In virtue of this syllable they say of him vrṣabha (bull).
8. In virtue of this syllable they say of him darbhā. 9. In virtue
of this syllable they say of him “he who shineth.” 10. In virtue
of this syllable they say of him “he cometh into existence.”
11. Whatsoever is bhū and bhā, that is the couple, the gāyatra
[-sāman]. By copulation he is propagated who knows thus.

III. 40. 1. That is the immortal gāyatra [-sāman]. By means
of it Prajāpati went unto immortality, by means of it the gods,
by means of it the sages (ṛṣi). 2. That same the brahman told
to Prajāpati; Prajāpati to Paramesṭhiṁ Prajāpatya; Paramesṭhiṁ
Prajāpatya to god Savitar; god Savitar to Agni; Agni to Indra;
Indra to Kāyapa; Kāyapa to Roṣaṅgī Kāyapa; Roṣaṅgī Kāyapa
to Devatarasī caṇvasāyaṇa Kāyapa; Devatarasī caṇvasāyaṇa Kāyapa
to Čruṣa Vāhneya Kāyapa; Čruṣa Vāhneya

39. 2ṛ.  5 so MSS. 4-sva. 5 B. vrṣabha; B. sambhavati.
∵ ya bhūti. 8 bh. 40. 1 B. inserts kāyapo. 12 A. caṇvasāya. 3 A. bhūṣo; B. caṇvā. 4 B.
vākhne. 5 A. indrāि.
III. 41. 1. — Caṅkha Bābhraya to Daksā Kātyāyani Ātreya; Daksā Kātyāyani Ātreya to Kaṁsa Vāraki; Kaṁsa Vāraki to Proṣṭhapāda Vārakya; Proṣṭhapāda Vārakya to Kaṁsa Vārakya; Kaṁsa Vārakya to Jayanta Vārakya; Jayanta Vārakya to Kubera Vārakya; Kubera Vārakya to Jayanta Vārakya; Jayanta Vārakya to Janaقرuta Vārakya; Janaقرuta Vārakya to Sudatta Pārācarya; Sudatta Pārācarya to...
pāraśāryā "śādhāyo" īttarāya pāraśāryāyā "śādhā" uttaraḥ pāraśāryo vipācoite ṣakunimitrāya pāraśāryāya vipācic chakuni-
mitrāḥ pāraśāryo jayantāya pāraśāryāya jayantāḥ pāraśar-
yāḥ—116.
saptame 'nvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

III. 42. 1. — ṣyāmājayantāya lāuhāya ṣyāmājayanto lāuh-
āhāḥ palliguptāya lāuhāya palligupto lāuhāyas satyaḥrasno
lāuhāyaḥ satyaḥrasno lāuhāh kṛṣṇadhṛtyaḥ lāuhāyaḥ kṛṣṇa-
dhṛtyaḥ sātyakaye kṛṣṇadhṛtyaḥ sātyakaye kṛṣṇadhṛtyaḥ lāuhāyā
āhāḥ kṛṣṇadhāttāya lāuhāyaḥ kṛṣṇadhāttāya lāuhāyaḥ lāuhāya
mitraḥbhūtaye lāuhāyaḥ lāuhāyaḥ mitraḥbhūtaye lāuhāya
ṣyāmājayantāya lāuhāyaḥ ṣyāmājayanto lāuhāyas trivedāya
kṛṣṇarātāya lāuhāyaḥ lāuhāya trivedāya kṛṣṇarāto lāuhāyo
yaṣasvī jayantāya lāuhāyaḥ jayakāya lāuhāyaḥ jayako
lāuhāyaḥ kṛṣṇarātāya lāuhāyaḥ lāuhāyaḥ kṛṣṇarāto lāuhāyo
dakṣājāyantāya lāuhāyaḥ daksājāyanto lāuhāyo vipācietā
dṛḍhajāyantāya lāuhāyaḥ vipācetā dṛḍhajāyanto lāuhāyo vaipāceti-
āya dṛḍhajāyantaye dṛḍhajāyantāya lāuhāyaḥ vaipāceto dār-
dṛḍhajāyatīṃ dṛḍhajāyanto lāuhāyo vaipācetiāya dārdhajāya-
taye guptaḥ lāuhāyaḥ. 2. tad etad amṛtaṁ gāyatram atha
yānī anāṁ gāṁ kāmyānī eva tāni kāmyānī eva tāni. 117.
saptame 'nvāke pañcamah khaṇḍaḥ. saptamo 'nvākas samāptaḥ.

Asādha Uttara Pāraśārya; Asādha Uttara Pāraśārya to Vipācīt Ṣakunimitra Pāraśārya; Vipācīt Ṣakunimitra Pāraśārya to
Jayanta Pāraśārya—

III. 42. 1. — to ṣyāmājayanta Lāuhāya; ṣyāmājayanta Lāu-
hiya to Palligupta Lāuhāya; Palligupta Lāuhāya to Satyaṛa-
vas Lāuhāya; Satyaṛavas Lāuhāya to Kṛṣṇadhṛtya Satyavi;
Kṛṣṇadhṛtya Satyavi to ṣyāmāsjayantā Lāuhāya; ṣyāmās-
jayantā Lāuhāya to Kṛṣṇadattā Lāuhāya; Kṛṣṇadattā Lāuhāya
to Mitrabhūti Lāuhāya; Mitrabhūti Lāuhāya to ṣyāmājayan-
tā Lāuhāya; ṣyāmājayanā Lāuhāya to Triveda Kṛṣṇarātā Lāu-
hāya; Triveda Kṛṣṇarātā Lāuhāya to Yaṣasvin Jayanta Lāuhāya;
Yaṣasvin Jayanta Lāuhāya to ṣyaṇa Lāuhāya; ṣyaṇa Lāu-
hāya to Kṛṣṇarātā Lāuhāya; Kṛṣṇarātā Lāuhāya to Daksāja-
yanta Lāuhāya; Daksājāyanta Lāuhāya to Vipācīt Dṛḍhaja-
yanta Lāuhāya; Vipācīt Dṛḍhajāyanta Lāuhāya to Vaipācītā
Dārdhajāyalantī Dārdhajāyantī Lāuhāya; Vaipācītā Dārdhajāyantī
Dārdhajāyantī Lāuhāya to Vaipācītā Dārdhajāyalantī gupta
Lāuhāya. 2. That is the immortal gāyatram[ -saman]; and what other
chants there are, they are optional only, they are optional only.

41. 4 A. sudattā; B. sudattatāya. 5 A. as- (l); B. ās-.
42. 1 loh-. 2 A. -ti. 3 insert ṣyāmājayanta lāuhāyaḥ. 4 vaivīp-. 5 d.
IV. 1. 1. svetātvo darçato harinilo 'si haritasprças samānubuddho mā hiṁṣih. na mām tvām vettha pradrava. 2. yad abhyavacarano 'bhavāisi svapantam puruśam akovidam açmamayena varmanā varuno 'ntar dadhātu mā. 3. yad abhyavacarano 'bhavāisi svapantam puruśam akovidam ayasmayena varmanā varuno 'ntar dadhātu mā. 4. yad abhyavacarano 'bhavāisi svapantam puruśam akovidam lohamayena varmanā varuno 'ntar dadhātu mā. 5. yad abhyavacarano 'bhavāisi svapantam puruśam akovidam rajatamayena varmanā varuno 'ntar dadhātu mā. 6. yad abhyavacarano 'bhavāisi svapantam puruśam swarṇamayena varmanā varuno 'ntar dadhātu mā.

1. āyur mātā' matiḥ pitā namas tu avīṣaṇa:
graha namā 'si vipāyus tasmāi te vipālā' namo
namas tāmṛāya namo varunāya' namo jighānsate. 2. yakṣma rājan mā' mām hiṁṣih. rājan yakṣma mā hiṁṣih. taysu suvinida-
nayos sarvam āyur ayānta' aham. 118.

prathamo 'ruvākas samāptaḥ.

IV. 2. 1. puruṣo vai yajñāḥ. 2. tasya yāṇi caturviniçatiris,
varṣāni tat prātassavanam. caturviniçatyaaksarā gāyātrī. gāya-

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 silver armor. 6. When moving down
against [him] thou descendest against the sleeping man un-
knowing, 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 gāyātrī has twenty-four syllables.

1. 1-nd. 3. B. iti manmamayena. 4 in the following the MSS. abbrevi-
ate. 5. B. mātana. 6-vadhāya. 7. A. runḍaya. 7añe. 8.
2. 1-ñī.
The morning-libation is connected with the gāyatrī. 3. It belongs to the Vasus. The breaths are the Vasus; for the breaths take to themselves all this that is good (vasu). 4. If in that time an illness should attack him, he should say: "Ye breaths, ye Vasus, 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 (ङ्रुद). 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 Adityas. The breaths are the Adityas; for the breaths take to themselves (ङदा+ा) this all. 10. If in that time an illness should attack him, he should say: "Ye breaths, ye Adityas, continue this my evening-libation by my life-time." Verily he becomes well. 11. Now the Brāhmaṇa Mahidāsa Aiṭareya, 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. tryāyuṣam¹ kaṣyapasya jamadagnēs tryāyuṣam¹:
   trīṇy amṛtasya puspāni trīṇyā āyūnśi me kṛṇoḥ.
2. sa no mayobhūḥ pitavā aviṣasva çāntiko⁵ yas⁴ tanuve syonaḥ.
3. ye 'gnayaḥ purisyāḥ pravistāḥ prīṭhivim anna:
   teṣāṁ tvam asy utamaḥ praḥ no jīvātave suva. 120.
   trītiyo 'nvākās samāptāḥ.

IV. 4. 1. aranyasya vato 'si viṣṇunāmā viṣṇābhiraśanā
dām pakvo 'si varuṇasya dāto 'ntardhināma.⁵ 2. yathā tvam
   amṛto marṣebhyo 'ntarhito 'sy evam tvam asmān aghāyubhyo
   'ntar dhehi. antardhir asi stenebhyaḥ. 121.
   caturtho 'nvākās samāptāḥ.

IV. 5. 1. vyuṣi savitā bhavasya udesyan viṣṇur udyan puruṣa¹
   udito bhavaspatī abhirayan maghava'ndro vāikuṇṭho mādhyan-
   dine bhago 'parāhna⁵ ugra devo lohitāyann astamite yamo
   bhavasi. 2. açnasu soma rājā niśāyām pitṛrājas⁵ svapne manu-
   syān praviṣcasi payasā paṣcūn. 3. virātre bhavo bhavasya apararā-
   tre 'ngirā agnihotravelāyām bhṛguḥ. 4. tasya tada⁵ etad eva maṇ-

IV. 3. 1. The threefold life-time of Kaṣyapa, of Jamadagni
the threefold life-time, the three flowers of immortality, three
life-times thou madest for me. 2. Enter into us, O thou ben-
eficent food, which, tranquilizing, art pleasing to the body.
3. What dirty fires are entered into the earth along, of them
thou 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-
cealment from robbers.

IV. 5. 1. When it dawns, thou becomest Savitar; when about
to rise, Viṣṇu; rising, Puruṣa; risen, Bhavaspati; ascending, the
bounteous one; at noon, Indra Vāikuṇṭha; in the afternoon,
Bhaga; growing red, the formidable god; having set, thou
becomest Yama. 2. In the stones king Soma, 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. ¹tryāyuṣ, ²trīṇ, ³āyūnśi, ⁴-to, ⁵cānaṁtoka. ⁶ya, ⁷-om, ⁸prā.
4. ¹viṣṇon-ā, ²kṣamā. ³A. 'rddhaḥnāma. ⁴ta. ⁵marttebhya.
5. ¹-o, ²A. 'parāheya. ³-ja, ⁴ta.
IV. 6. 1. Bhageratho hai \"kśvāko rājā kāmapreṇa yajñena yaksyamāna āsa. 2. tad u ha kurupaṅcālaṁuṁ brāhmaṇā ucer bhageratho ha vā yam aikśvāko rājā kāmapreṇa yajñena yaks-
yamānaḥ. 3 etena kathaṁ vadisyāna iti. 3. tam ha \"bhreyuri, tebhāyō ha \"bhyyategatebhīyo \"pacitīc ca kārā. 4. atha hai \"śāṁ sa bhūga avavṛţo \"ptvā kepamagṛṇi nakhān nikṛtyā \"jyena \"bhyagyā daṇḍopānaham bibhāat. 5. ātām ho \"vāca brāhmaṇā bhagavantaḥ katamo vas tad veda yathā \"prāvita-pratya-grāvite devām gacchata iti. 6. atha ho \"vāca katamo vas tad veda yad-
vidūśas sūgdūta suhotā svadhvaryaṃ samūnasavīd ājayata iti. 7. atha ho \"vāca katamo vas tad veda yac chandāṇiṣi prayuj-
yante yat tāni sarvāni saṁstutānī abhisampaṇḍyanta iti. 8. atha ho \"vāca katamo vas tad veda yathā gāyatryā uttame akṣare 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. 5. These wishes I wish. Bhūs, bhuvas, suvār. When [the sun] hath risen, show brightness. I place that in [my]self.

IV. 6. 1. King Bhageratha Āikśvāka was about to sacrifice with a wish-fulfilling sacrifice. 2. Then the Brāhmans of the Kurupaṅcāla said: \"Verily this king Bhageratha Āikśvāka 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 adhivaryu, one who knoweth men well, is born?\" 6. 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?\" 6. Then he said: \"Who of you knoweth this:

5. 6ya. 6āśiṣa. 7ādiṣa. 6. 1B. -pāṇo-. 2yaksam-. 3etaṭena. 4insert bhā. 5upatvā. 6fyā.
punar yajñaṃ apigacchata iti. 9. atha ho 'vāca katamo vas tad veda yathā daksīnāḥ pratyaghitā na hiṁsanti tī. 123.

saṣṭhe 'nvāke prathamah khaṇḍah.

IV. 7. 1. etān hāi 'nān pañca praṣnān papraccha. 2. teśāṁ ha kumapaṇālānām' bako dālbhyo 'nucāna āsa. 3. sa ho 'vāca yathā "pravitapratyācīvite devān gacchata iti prācyām" vai rūjan dīcy ācīvita-prācīvite devān gacchataḥ. tasmāt prān tīṣṭham ācīvayati prān tīṣṭhan pratyācīvayati 'tī. 4. atha ho 'vāca yaḍvidyāvā sūṅgatā suhotā svadhāvṛyus suṁānusavāvid' ājyata iti yo vāi manusyaśya sambhūtin vede 'tī ho 'vāca tasya sūṅgatā suhotā svadhāvṛyus suṁānusavād ājyata iti prānā u ha vāva rūjan manusyaśya sambhūtur' eva 'tī. 5. atha ho 'vāca yac chandānī pravṛjyante yat tāni sarvāni saṁstūtāni abhisampadyanta iti gayatrīm u ha vāva rūjan sarvāni chandānī saṁstūtāni abhisampadyanta iti. 6. atha ho 'vāca yathā gayātryā uttame akṣare punar yajñaṃ apigacchata iti vasaṅkāreno ha.vāva rūjan gayātryā uttame akṣare punar yajñaṃ apigacchata iti. 7. atha ho 'vāca yathā daksīnāḥ pratyaghitā na hiṁsantā tī— 124.

saṣṭhe 'nvāke dvitiyāh khaṇḍah.

how the last two syllables of the gayatṛi 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 Kurupaṇcīlas Baka Dālbhya 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 udgātṛ, a good hotar, a good adhvāryu, 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 adhvāryu, 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 gayatṛi, O king, all the metres when used in praise together are equivalent.” 6. Then he said: "'How the last two syllables of the gayatṛi go again unto the sacrifice?'—verily by means of the vasaṅkāra, O king, the two last syllables of the gayatṛi go again unto the sacrifice.” 7. Then he said: "'How the sacrificial fees, being received, do not injure?'——

7. 1 B. -pāṇe. 2 asm-. 3 sam-. 4 A. sambhūtiḍdhura; B. sambhūtir dāhara. 5 hāi. 6 prāc-. 
IV. 8. 1. — Verily whoso knoweth the mouth of the gāyatārī,” he said, “him the sacrificial fees, being received, do not injure. 2. Verily Agni, O king, is the mouth of the gāyatārī. Therefore in that one puts [things] in the fire, it thereby becometh greater, it increaseth; even so a Brāhman knowing thus, receiving [sacri-
ficial fees], becometh greater [and] increaseth.” 3. He (Bhage-
ratha) said: “Verily this one was a learned Brāhman. I come to thee with this sacrifice.” 4. “Verily, I will sing for thee its udgītha,” he (B.) said, “in such wise that thou shalt go to the heavenly world having become sole king.” 5. For him he sang the udgītha by means of the gāyatra-udgītha. He (Bhageratha) having become sole king went to the heavenly world. By means of this same [udgītha] 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 [udgītha] Pratīdarṣa sang the udgītha for this Bhayada Āsāmātya. 8. 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. 9. This same udgītha 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 udgītha.
IV. 9. 1. puruṣo vā yajñāḥ puruṣo ho 'dgīthāḥ. athā i'ta eva mṛtyavo yad agnir vāyuḥ ādityaḥ candramāḥ. 2. te ha puri-saṁ jayānām eva mṛtyupācār abhidadhāti. tasya vācam evā'gnir abhidadhāti prāṇam vāyuḥ caksur ādityaḥ grotam candramāḥ. 3. tad āhūs sa vā udgātā yo yajamānasya prāne-bhyo 'dhi mṛtyupācān unnuñcatai 'ti. 4. tad yasyāi 'vaṁ vidvān prastāuti ya evā 'syā vāci mṛtyupācās tam evā 'syō 'nmuñcatai. 5. atha yasyāi 'vaṁ vidvān udgāyati ya evā 'syā prāne mṛtyu-pācās tam evā 'syō 'nmuñcatai. 6. atha yasyāi 'vaṁ, vidvān pratiharati ya evā 'syā caṅkṣuśi mṛtyupācās tam evā 'syō 'nmuñcatai. 7. atha yasyāi 'vaṁ vīḍvān nidhanam' upāiti ya evā 'syā pṛotre mṛtyupācās tam evā 'syō 'nmuñcatai. 8. evam vā evaṁvid udgātā yajamānasya prānebhīyo 'dhi mṛtyupācān unnuñcatai. 9. tad āhūs sa vā udgātā yo yajamānasya prānebhīyo 'dhi mṛtyupācān unmuṣyā 'thāi 'naṁ sāṅgam satanom sarvaṁṛtyoes sprṇāti 'ti. 126.
saptame 'nuvāke prathamah khaṇḍah.

IV. 10. 1. tad yasyāi 'vaṁ vidvān hiṅkaroti ya evā 'syā lomasu mṛtyupācās tasmād evāi 'naṁ sprṇāti. 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 udgātar 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 pratiharā, 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 udgātar knowing thus releases the fetters of death from the breaths of the sacrificer. 9. This they say: "He is an udgātar who, having released the fetters of death from the breaths of the sacrificer, rescueth him then with his limbs, with his body, from every death."

* IV. 10. 1. Now for whom one knowing thus utters the hiṅkāra, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his hairs. 2. And for whom one knowing thus sings the prastāva, him he

9. ¹avā. ²yajā-. ³umun-. ⁴dvā. ⁵B. udgāyati. ⁶B. prāne. ⁷B. om. ⁸B. pratiharati.
rescues from that fetter of death which is in his skin. 3. And for whom one knowing thus begins the ādī, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his flesh. 4. And for whom one knowing thus sings the udgītha, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his sinews. 5. And for whom one knowing thus sings the pratiḥāra, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his limbs. 6. And for whom one knowing thus sings the upadrava, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his bones. 7. And for whom one knowing thus enters upon the nidhana, him he rescues from that fetter of death which is in his marrow. 8. = IV. 9. 9. This they say: "Verily he is the udgātar who, 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, placeth him in seven parts in the heavenly world." 10. That same one, rising, is Indra Vāīmṛdha; risen, Savitar; Mitra at the time when the cows are driven together; Indra Vāikuntha at noon; when returning, Ċarva; when it is becoming red, the formidable god; Prajāpati when it has gone home to lie down. 11. Thus for whom one knowing thus utters the hīṅkāra, what heavenly world there is of him rising, in that he thus places him. 12. And for whom one knowing thus sings the prastāva, what heavenly world there is of him when he has risen, in that he thus places him. 13. And for whom one know—
ādatte ya eva 'syā saṁgavakāle' svargo lokas tasminn evai 'nam dadhāti. 14. atha yasyāi 'vaṁ vidvān udgāyati ya eva 'syā madhyāndiṁ svargo lokas tasminn evai 'nam dadhāti. 15. atha yasyāi 'vaṁ vidvān pratihārati ya eva 'syā parāhṇe svargo lokas tasminn evai 'nam dadhāti. 16. atha yasyāi 'vaṁ vidvān upadravati ya' eva' 'syā stamyatus svargo lokas tasminn evai 'nam dadhāti. 17. atha yasyāi 'vaṁ vidvān nidhanam upāiti ya eva 'syā stāmitte svargo lokas tasminn evai 'nam dadhāti. 18. evaṁ vā evāniḥvid udgātā yajamānasaya prānebhya 'dhi mṛtyupāpaśumucyā' 'thaī 'nam saṁgaṁ sataṁ mahin sarvamanvīyos sprtvā svargo loke saptadhāa dadhāti. 127.

saptame 'nvāke dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. saptamo 'nvākas samāptaḥ.

IV. 11. 1. saṅghā vaṁ devatās sayambhavo 'gnir váyur asvā adityāḥ prāṇo 'nam vák. 2. tāc grāiśthye vyavādaṁ 'ham creṣṭāḥ 'smy ahān creṣṭāḥ 'smy mām śrimām upādīvaṁ iti. 3. tā anyonyāyāi creṣṭhatayāi nā 'tisṭhanta. tā abrūvann na vā anyonyāyāi creṣṭhatayāi tisṭhamahā etā samprāvāmarahāī yathā creṣṭhās sem iti. 4. tā agnim abrūvann kathāṁ

ing thus begins the ādi, 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 pratiḥāra, 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 nidhāna, 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 preeminence [saying] : "I am the best, I am the best; worship me as excellence." 3. They did not recognize each the other's preeminence. They said: "Verily we do not recognize each the other's preeminence. Let us therefore explain together how we are best." 4. They said to Agni: "How art

10. 'B. mādha-. 'B. sa. 'A. āiva. 'sapta.
11. 'saṅghā. 'ṣa. 'dā. 'the. 'svava-. 'grāiś-. 'anyā-. 'hāi. 'eta.
VOL. XVI. 28
tvāṁ” gṛṣṭho ‘sī ’ti. 5. so ‘bravid aham devānāṁ’ mukham asmy aham anyāsāṁ prajānām. mayā” hutayo kṛiyante. aham devānāṁ annaṁ vikaromyāḥ aham manvasyānām. 6. sa yan naśyām amukhā eva devās syur amukhā anyāḥ prajāḥ. nā” hutayo hāyeraṇāḥ na devānāṁ annaṁ vikriyetyāḥ na manvasyānām. 7. tata idāṁ sarvam parābhavat tato na kim cana pariṣīṣyate10 ’ti. 8. evam evē ’ti ho “cur nāī ’ve ’ha” kim cana pariṣīṣyeta yat10 tvāṁ na syā ātī. 9. atha nāyum abhruan katham u tvāṁ gṛṣṭho ‘sī ’ti. 10. so ‘bravid aham devānāṁ prāṇo ‘smy aham’ anyāsāṁ prajānān. yasmād aham utkṛṇāmi tatas su praplavate. 11. sa yan aham na syān tata idāṁ sarvam parābhavat tato na kim cana pariṣīṣyete ’ti. 12. evam evē ’ti ho “cur nāī ’ve ’ha kim cana pariṣīṣyeta yat10 tvāṁ na syā ātī. 128.

aṣṭame ‘nuvāke prathamah khaṇḍāḥ.

IV. 12. 1. athā”dityam abhruan katham u tvāṁ gṛṣṭho ‘sī ’ti. 2. so ‘bravid aham evo ’dyann aham bhavāmy aham astāṇyan rātriḥ. mayā caṅkuṣā karmāṇi kṛiyante. sa yud ahāṁ na syāṁ naī ’vā ’has’ syān na rātriḥ. na karmāṇi kṛiyeron. 3. tata idāṁ sarvam parābhavet tato na kim cana pariṣīṣyete ’ti. 4. evam evē ’ti ho “cur nāī ’ve ’ha kim cana pariṣīṣyeta yat tvāṁ na syā ātī. 5. atha prāṇam abhruan katham u tvāṁ gṛṣṭho ‘sī ’ti. 6. so ‘bravit prāṇo bhūtvā ‘guṇir dipyate. prāṇo bhūtvā thou the best?” 4. 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. 5. 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. 7. Thence this all would perish; thence nothing at all would be left.” 8. “Just so,” they said; “nothing at all would be left if thou wert not.” 9. Then they said to Vāyu: “And how art thou the best?” 10. 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. = 11.7. 4. = 11. 8. 5. Then they said to breath: “And how art thou the best?” 6. He said: “As breath, Agni shineth; as breath, Vāyu

11. 10 tvā. 11-kār-. 12 a. 13 hūyente (l) corrected to huyaran (l). 14 prim. m. 15 sye. 16 ya. 17 ahamah. 18 va ha.
12. 1 haṇha. 2 e. 3 uk.
vāyur ākātam' anubhavati. prāna bhūtāḥ "dīyā udeṭi. prañād annam prañād vak.

7. sa yad ahaṁ na syāṁ tata' idāṁ' sarvam parābhave tato na kīṁ cana pariṣīṣyeta 'tī.

8. evam eva 'tī ho "cur nāi 've 'ha kīṁ cana pariṣīṣyeta yat tvāṁ na syā iti. 2. athā 'nman abruvam katham u' tvāṁ pṛeṣṭham aṣi 'tī.

10. tad abruvān mayi pratiṣṭhāyā 'gnir ādiṣṭhate. mayi pratiṣṭhāyā vāyur ākātam anubhavati. mayi pratiṣṭhāyā "dīyā udeṭi. maṇeva prāṇo mad vak.

11. sa yad ahaṁ na syāṁ tata' idāṁ' sarvam parābhave tato na kīṁ cana pariṣīṣyeta 'tī. 12. evam eva 'tī ho "cur nāi 've 'ha kīṁ cana pariṣīṣyeta yat tvāṁ na syā iti 12. athā vācam abruvan kathām u' tvāṁ pṛeṣṭhā chā 'tī.

14. sā 'bravān mayāi 've 'daṁ vijñāyate mayā 'daḥ. sa yad ahaṁ na syāṁ nāi 've 'daṁ vijñāyeta nā 'daḥ. 15. tata' idāṁ sarvam parābhavane nāi 've 'ha kīṁ cana pariṣīṣyeta 'tī. 16. evam eva 'tī ho "cur nāi 've 'ha kīṁ cana pariṣīṣyeta yat tvāṁ na syā iti. 129.

āṣaṁe 'nuvāke avitiyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ.

IV. 13. 1. tā abruvam etā vāi kilu sarvā devatāḥ. ekā 'kām evā 'nu smaṭāḥ 2. sa yan na nas sarvāṁ devatānām ekā cana na syāt tata idāṁ sarvam parābhavet tato na kīṁ cana pariṣīṣyeta.

hanta sūrāṁ sametāṁ yac pṛeṣṭham tad asāme 'tī. 2. tā etasmin prāṇa okāre vācyā okāre samāyun. tad yat samāyun tat sāmnaṁ sāmatvam. 3. tā abruvan yāṁ no mṛtyaṁ anapaha-

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. = 11. 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. = 11. 7. 12. = 11. 8. 13. They said to speech: "And how art thou the best?"

14. It said: "By me this is distinguished, by me that. If I were not, neither would this be distinguished nor that." 15. = 11. 7. 16. = 11. 8.

IV. 13. 1. They said: "Verily these are complete divinities. We are dependent each upon each. Now if of us complete divinities any one were not, then this all would perish, then nothing at all would be left. Come, coming together let us be that which is best." 2. They came together in this breath, in the sound o, [and] in speech, in the sound a. Because they came together (√i + sat), therefore the sāman is called so. 3. They said:

12. 4 añk. 5 tat (!). 6 abbreviate, omitting the rest down to sa (I for na) syā iti. 7 abbreviate: ṣ ṣ ṣ ṣ. 8 'ty (!). 9 -cīṣya. 10 A. tur.

18. 1-a. 2 sām-. 3-nte. 4 vācc.
Removing those syllables of us which are mortal, whose evil is not smitten 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. 5. 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,
11. apahatya mṛtyum apahatya pūpmānāṁ svargāṁ lokam eti ya evam veda. 130.

aṣṭame ‘nuvāke tṛṭiyah khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 14. 1. tā brahmā 'bruvan tvayi pratiṣṭhāyai 'tam udyacchāme 'ti. tā brahmā 'bravād āṣyena prānaṇa yuṣmānā śyena prānaṇa mām upāpnavaūthe 'ti. 2. tā etena prānaṇāṁ 'kāreṇa vācy ahūram abhinimesyanto hūṁkarat brahūram okāreṇa vācma anuvartantya ubhābbhyām prānābhyyāṁ gāyatram agaṇāṁ ovāṣe ovāṣe ovāṣe hum bhā vo vā vā ti. 3. sa yatho 'bhavāpadī pratiṣṭhāyai evam eva svargye loke pratyatiṣṭhan. prati svargye loke tiṣṭhati ya evam veda. 4. yu u hu vā evaṇād asmāl lokāt prāti sa prāna eva bhūtvā vāyum apyeti vāyor adhy aḥūrany ahūrebhyo 'dhi vṛṣṭini vṛṣṭyāṁ vo 'manh lokam anuvibhavati. 5. ṭṣayo ha satrāṁ āṣāṁ cakire. te punah-punar bahvibhir-bahvibhīḥ pratipadbhis svargasya lokasya dvāraṁ nā 'nu canā bhubhīh. 6. ta u prāmena tapasā vratacaaryeṇā ndram avarubhīh. 7. tāṁ ha 'cus svargāṁ vāi lokam āipsīṣma. te punah-punar bahvibhir-bahvibhīḥ pratipadbhis svargasya lokasya dvāraṁ nā 'nu canā 'bhutsmahi. tathā no 'nuṣṭhā 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 brahman: “Standing firm in thee we will hold this one up.” To them the brahman 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 hūṁkāra, sang the gāyatra with both these breaths: ovāṣe ovāṣe ovāṣe hum bhā vo vā. 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 (sattrā). 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. ¹āṣyehnena. ²A.-ā; B.-āṁ. ³-āt. ⁴p-. ⁵-tr-. ⁶A. āipsīṣtu.
B. inserts bahvibhir. ¹²bhū. ¹⁰mesant.
svargasya lokasya dvāram anuprajñāyā 'nārtās svasti saṁvatsarasyo 'dvāram gatvā svargam lokam iyāme 'tī. s. tān ho 'vāca ko vas sthāviratama iti." 131.

aṣṭame 'nuvāke caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 15. 1. aham ity agastyaḥ. 2. sa va ehi 'ti ho 'vāca tasmāi va' te. 'Romā tad vahṣeyāmi yad vidvānsas svargasya lokasya dvāram anuprajñāyā 'nārtās svasti saṁvatsarasyo 'dvāram gatvā svargam lokam ēṣyate 'tī. 3. tasmā etacā gāyatrasyo 'dvītham upaniśadām amṛtam uvācā 'gnau vāyān āditye prāne 'nne vāci. 4. tato vāi te svargasya lokasya dvāram anuprajñāyā 'nārtās svasti saṁvatsarasyo 'dvāram gatvā svargam lokam āyan. 5. evan eva' evaṁ ni-docā svargasya lokasya dvāram anuprajñāyā 'nārtās svasti saṁvatsarasyo 'dvāram gatvā svargam lokam eti. 132.

aṣṭame 'nuvāke pañcamāḥ khaṇḍaḥ. aṣṭamo 'nuvākas samāptat.

IV. 16. 1. evam vā etām gāyatrasyo 'dvītham1 upaniśadām amṛtam indro 'gastīyaḥ', 'nāca 'gastya iṣāya gṛivačvaya iṣaṣ gṛivavācvar gauśuktaye gauśuktaṁ jvalāyaṁ 2 jvalāyaṁ gauśuktaṁ gauśuktaṁ pāṭya-yānaye' pāṭyayanti rāmāya krātujāteyaya vāyāghrapadyaya3 rāmah krātujāteyo vāyāghrapadyah— 133.

navame 'nuvākā prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

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." s. 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." s. To him he told this udgīthā of the gāyatra[-sāman], the upaniṣad, 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 udgīthā of the gāyatra [-sāman], the upaniṣad, the immortal, to Agastya, Agastya to Isa Čāvācvi, Isa Čāvācvi to Gauśukti, Gauśukti to Jvalāyana, Jvalāyana to Čātyāyani, Čātyāyani to Rāma Krātujāteya Vaiyāghrapaday, Rāma Krātujāteya Vaiyāghrapaday—

14. 3add aham ity (I).
15. 1A. om. 2-śāmī. 3B. inserts dvāram uvāi 'vah. 4vāy.
16. 1-gīt-. 2-āvo. 3B. bhv-. 4-āye. 5vāyā-.
IV. 17. 1. — cāṅkhaṁ bābhruvāya cāṅkho bābhruvayo daksāya kātyāyanaya ātreyaṁ daksāya kātyāyanun ātreyaṁ kānsāya vārakṣyāya kānsa vārakṣyas suyajñāya pāṇḍilyāya suyajñāç gāndīlyāyā 'gñidattāyā gāndīlyāyā' guṇidattāç gāndīlyās suyajñāç gāndi[/missing word] yāyā jayantāya vārakṣyāya jayantō vārakṣo janaçrutāya vārakṣyāya janaçrutō vārakṣyasō sudattāyā pāṇḍavgīyāya. 2. sāi 'sā' gāyatraṁ gāyatraśyo 'panisad evam upāsitavyā. 134.

navame 'nūvāke dvitiyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ. navamo 'nūvākas samāptatō.

IV. 18. 1. kene 'ṣītam patati preṣitum manuḥ
kena prānaḥ prathamaḥ prāti yuktaḥ:
kene 'ṣītaṁ vācām inām vahantī
caksuḥ grotram ka u deva yunakti.
2. grostrasya grotram manaso mano yad
vāco ha vācām sa u prāṇasya prānaḥ:
caksuṣaç caksur atimucya dhīrāḥ
pretyā 'smāl lokād amṛtā bhavanti.
3. na tatru caksur gacchati na vāg gacchati no manuḥ:
na vidmaṁ na vijānīmo yathāś 'tad anucisyāt.'
4. anyād eva tu dviditād ato aviditād adhi:
itī pūrṇamaç pūrveśān ye nas tad vyāvacaksire.

IV. 17. 1. — to Cāṅkha Bābhruvaya, Cāṅkha Bābhruvaya to Dakṣa Kātyāyanini Ātreya, Dakṣa Kātyāyanini Ātreya to Kaṅsa Vārakṣya, Kaṅsa Vārakṣya to Suyajñā Cāndīlya, Suyajñā Cāndīlya to Jayanta Vārakṣya, Jayanta Vārakṣya to Janaçruta Vārakṣya, Janaçruta Vārakṣya to Sudatta Pāṇḍavgīyā. That same upānisad of the gāyatra [-sāman] of Cātyāyanini 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. 1-āya. 2-p-. 3-o, and insert janaçrutāyā vārakṣyāya janaçrutē (1) vārakṣyas. 4-o.
18. 1-vīḍu. 2-a. 3 B. inserts 'vāi. 4-cīṁs-. 5-cṛū-. 
5. yad vācā 'nabhuyām yena vāg abhyudyate:
   tad eva brahma tvāṁ viddhi ne 'dāṁ yad idam upāsate.
6. yan manasaṁ na manute yena "hur mano" matam:
   tad eva brahma tvāṁ viddhi ne 'dāṁ yad idam upāsate.
7. yac caṅkṣuṁ na pacyati yena caṅkṣuṁ paacyati:
   tad eva brahma tvāṁ viddhi ne 'dāṁ yad idam upāsate.
8. yac chrotrena na' grñoti yena crotream idāṁ prutam:
   tad eva' brahma tvāṁ viddhi ne 'dāṁ yad idam upāsate.
9. yat prāṇena na prāṇiti" yena prāṇah prāṇyate:
   tad eva brahma tvāṁ viddhi ne 'dāṁ yad idam upāsate. 135.

daḍame 'nurvāke prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 19. 1. yadi manyase su vede 'ti dahram eva 'pi nūnāṁ
   tvāṁ vettha brahmaṁ rūpaṁ yad asya tvāṁ yad asya deveṣu.
   atoha nu mīmāṁsyam eva te manye 'viditaṁ.
2. nā 'ham manye sv vede 'ti no na vede 'ti veda ca:
   yo nas tad veda tad veda no na vede 'ti veda ca.
3. yasyā 'matam tasyā matam mataṁ' yasya na veda saḥ:
   avijñātaṁ vijñānatāṁ vijñātaṁ avijñātaṁ.

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 de-
clared, only that know thou as brahman, not that which they wor-
ship 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
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

18. ¹ A. manyo. ² B. matem. ³ noç. ⁴ MSS. abbreviate. ⁵-ṇīti.
19. ¹ am-.
Jaiminiya-Upanisad-Brähmana.

IV. 20. 1. brahma ha devebyo vijigye. tasya ha brahmano vi-
jaya deva amalihyanta. tu āiksantā 'smākam eva 'yaṁ vijayaḥ. 
asmākaṁ eva 'yaṁ mahine 'ti. 2. tad āhā śāṁ vijajñāu. tebhya 
ha prādūr bahūva. tan na vyajānanta' kim idāṁ yakṣam iti. 
3. te 'gnum abrūvañ jātavedā etad vijanīhi kim etad yakṣam iti. 
tathē 'ti. 4. tad abhyadravat. tam abhyavadat ko 'si 'ti. agnir 
vā aham' asmi 'ty abrviṣ jātavedā vā aham asmi 'ti. 5. tasa-
miṁs tuvajī kīṁ viyam iti. api 'dviṁ sarvaṁ daheyaṁ yad idam 
prthivyāṁ iti. 6. tasmāi tuvajī nidadhāv etad dahe 'ti. tad 
upapreyāya sarva-vajarena. tan na pācāka dagdhum. sa tata eva 
nivavṛte nāi 'nād acaśaking vijñātin yad etad yakṣam iti. 7. aha 
vaiyam abrūva vaiyav etad vijanīhi kim etad yakṣam iti. tathē 
'ti. 8. tad abhyadravat. tam abhyavadat ko 'si 'ti. vaiyur va 
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-
tal.

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 
recognize it [saying]: “What is this spectre?” 3. They said to 
Agni: “O Jātavedas, find that out, what spectre this is.” 
“Yes.” 4. He ran to it. It said unto him: “Who art thou?” 
“I am Agni,” he said; “I am Jātavedas.” 5. “What strength 
then is in thee?” “I could burn even everything which is here 
on earth.” 6. 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.” 7. Then they said to Vāyu: “O Vāyu, 
find that out, what spectre this is.” “Yes.” 8. He ran to it. It
IV. 21. “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, Vāyu, 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 divinities. 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. 8 A. suk- 9 samvāṁksanti. 10-0. 11-6. 22. 1 repeat āçā vā. 2 yeđ. 3 apāna. 4 p-. 5-mādam. 6-raipam. 7-vinot. 8 A. -im. 9 A. ṣupā-.
diças samāna ś candramā udānaḥ. 10. tad vā etad ekam abha-
vat prāṇa eva. sa ya evam etad ekam bhavat vediś 'vān hāi 'tad ekadā hāvātī 'ty ekalhāi 'va āśeṣhās svānām" bhavati. 11. tad agnir vai prāṇo vāg iti prthivī vāyur vai prāṇo vāg ity antarikṣam uditya vai prāṇo vāg iti dyāu dyau dīpā vai prāṇo vāg iti dīpān candraṃ vai prāṇo vāy iti mahaṃ pumāṇ vai prāṇo vāg iti strī. 12. tasye 'dān śystam āśiśhām bhavavan āśiś aparāyāntam. 13. su mānāyāṃ ankuraṃ tenu taḥ paurāy-
not. āśeṣhām hu vai asye 'dān śystam āśiśhām bhavavan paurāyāntaṃ bhavatīya evam vedā. 139.

ekādaśe 'nvaśe prathamaḥ khaṇḍaḥ.

IV. 23. 1. sāt 'sā caturdhā vihitā pār udgithās sāma 'rkyaś
jyesthābrāhmaṇaṃ. 2. prāṇo vaśa 'd vāg gī sa udgithak.
3. prāṇo vāvā 'no vāk sā tāt sāma. 4. prāṇo vāva ko vāg yā
tad arkyam. 5. prāṇo vāva jyestha vāg brāhmaṇaṃ taj jyest-
ha brāhmaṇam. 6. upaniṣadād bhā brahmi ti. uktā ta upaniṣad
yasya te dhāva uktāh. 7. tridhātu visu vāva ta upaniṣadān
abrūne ti. 7. etoc chuklaṃ kṛṣṇām tāmraṃ sāmakaraṃ iti ha
smā "ha yadāī 'va gūklakṛṣaṇe tāmro vāno vṝ̄hāvāti su vāi 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
udgitha, the sāmaṇ, the arkya, the chief brāhmaṇa. 2. Verily
breath is ud, speech is gī; that is the udgitha. 3. Verily breath
is he (ama), speech is she (sā); that is the sāmaṇ. 4. Verily
breath is ka, speech is ṛk; that is the arkya. 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 sāmaṇ," he
used to say; "when the copper-red color descendeth into the

22. 10 svā.-
23. 1 saṣ. 2 vihitā. 3 B. agīh; A. giḥ. 4 brū-. 5-āḥ. 6-śad. 1-dā
8 ve.
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 brahman-throne. Unto him they bring the brahman-throne, he mounts the brahman-throne, who knows thus. 11. That same brahman-glory is encompassed by fortune. But being the brahman 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 ro's; what is black, that [is the form] of the sāmans; what is copper-red, as it were, brownish, as it were, that [is the form] of the yajuses. 13. What this per-
Indra esa prajāpatis samaḥ pṛthivyā samaḥ ākāśena samo divā samas sarvena bhūtena. esa para dīvo dipyate. esa eva'ḍīm sarvam ity upāstavyam. 141.

ekādaśe 'māvak śṛiṇāḥ khayḍhaḥ.

IV. 25. 1. sūca 'sūca 'sūca ca sūca ca vaś ca maṇaś ca [maṇaś ca] vaś ca ca kāṣṣa' ca grotam ca grotam ca ca kāṣṣa ca pradāhā ca tapaś ca tapaś ca pradāhā ca taṇi sādaṃva. 2. sādaṇaṃkalam brahma. sa ya evam etat sādaṇaṃkalam brahma veda tam evai 'yat sādaṇaṃkalam brahma yāyeti. 3. veda brahma tasya satyaṃ ayatanam samaḥ pratiṣṭhā damaca ca. 4. tad yathā śvaḥ prātiṣṭhānaṃ pāpāḥ karmano jugupetā eva eva 'har-ahāḥ pāpāḥ karmano jugupetā 'kalitāt. 5. athāt' sa'mi daśapadi virāt. 6. daśa pūruse svaroṣaṇarākāni. tāṇy evaiṃ svaroṣaṇa gatāni svaroṣaṇa gamayanta narakāṃ gatāni narakāṃ gamayanta. 142.

ekādaśe 'māvak ca tārthāḥ khayḍhaḥ.

IV. 26. 1. maṇa narako vāṁ narakāḥ prāṇo narakāḥ cāksravān narakas tvaṅ narako hastāvān narako guḍavān narakāḥ pāḍāvān narakāḥ. 2. maṇaśa parīkṣyantī vede 'tī veda. 3. vācā rasān vede 'tī veda. 4. prāṇena son in the eye is, that is Indra, that is Prajāpati, 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 brahman. He who thus knows this sixteenfold brahman, him this sixteenfold brahman comes unto. 3. The Veda is the brahman, 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.”

24. 8-ūr. 25. 1-āc. 26. 1-kṣā-. 8 vad-. 
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? Varuṇa is Savitar, the waters are Sāvitrī. 4. Where Varuṇa is, there the waters

26. ³komo. ⁴A. -sāmaya; B. -sāmāya. ⁵etur-. ⁶corrected from pārhyuṣ-. ⁷-may.

are; or where the waters are, there is Varuṇa. These are two wombs. [This is one couple.] 5. What is Savitar? What is Śāvi-
trī? Vāyu is Savitar, space Śāvitrī. 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 Śāvitrī? The sacrifice is Savitar, the metres are Śāvitrī. 8. Where the sacrific-
ifice 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 Śāvitrī? Thunder is Savitar, lightning Śāvitrī. 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 Śāvitrī? The sun is Savitar, the sky Śāvitrī. 12. Where the sun is, there is sky; or where the sky is, there is the sun. These are two wombs. This is one couple. 13. What is Savitar? What is Śāvitrī? The moon is Savitar, the asterisms are Śāvitrī. 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 Śāvitrī? Mind is Savitar, speech is Śāvitrī. 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 Śāvitrī? Man is Savitar, woman Śāvitrī. Where man is, there is woman; or where woman is, there is man. These are two wombs. This is one couple.

27. 1 p-. 2 abbreviate here and in the following. 3 B. -un. 4 -ih (!).
IV. 28. 1. tasyā eṣa prathamaḥ pādo bhūs tat savitur vareṇyam iti. agnir vāi vareṇyam. āpo vāi vareṇyam. candramā vāi vareṇyam. 2. tasyā eṣa dvitiyāḥ pādo bhārmanayo bhuvobhargo devasya dhīmati. agnir vāi bhargah. udityo vāi bhargah. candramā vāi bhargah. 3. tasyā eṣa tretiyāḥ pādas svar dhiyo yo naḥ pracoḍayād iti. yajño vāi pracoḍayati. strī ca vāi purosag ca prajanayataḥ. 4. bhūr bhuvas tat savitur vareṇyam bhargo devasya dhīmati. agnir vāi bhargah. udityo vāi bhargah. candramā vāi bhargah. 5. svar dhiyo yo naḥ pracoḍayād iti. yajño vāi pracoḍayati. strī ca vāi purosag ca prajanayataḥ. 6. bhūr bhuvas svas tat savitur vareṇyam bhargo devasya dhīmati dhiyo yo naḥ pracoḍayād iti.2 yo vā etām śaviṭrīṃ evaṃ vedā 'pa punarmṛtyūṁ tarati śaviṭryā eva salokatāṁ jayati śaviṭryā eva salokatāṁ jayati. 145.

dvādaśa 'nvāke dvitiyāḥ khaṇḍaḥ. dvādaśo 'nvākas saṃāptah. ity upaniṣadbrāhmaṇaṁ saṃāptam.

IV. 28. 1. This is its first pāda: "Bhūs; that desirable [splendor] of Savitar." Fire indeed is what is desirable. Waters indeed are what is desirable. The moon indeed is what is desirable. 2. This is its second pāda, 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 pāda: "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 Śaviṭrī thus overcomes second death, he wins the same world with the Śaviṭrī itself; he wins the same world with the Śaviṭrī itself.

28. 1-sañ. insert yajño vāi pracoḍayati. strī ca vāi purosag ca prajanayataḥ.

VOL. XVI. 30
NOTES.

The MSS. have this heading: talavakārabrāhmāne (!) upaniṣadbrāhmaṇam.

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. 1, 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 2; 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 78; iii. 32. 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 (prajāpatiḥ) khalu prthivyā evā 'gnih nirāmimatā 'ntarikṣād vāyuḥ diva 'ādityam. The rest is different. — prā-ṇedat: cf. JB. i. 354, tasya (i.e. yajñasya) yo rasah prāṇedat...


I. 1. s. tāṇy ... aṣṭau: i.e. prthivyā, agni; antarikṣā, vāyuḥ; dyuḥ, 'āditya; vāc, prāṇa. — The whole paragraph is repeated at i. 6. 6; and, omitting etāṇya, i. 33. 11; 34. 2. — aṣṭācaphāḥ pačavaḥ: cf. JB. iii. 241, 247, aṣṭākṣaraḥ vāi gāyatrī. aṣṭācaphāḥ pačavaḥ; TMB. iii. 8. 3 (QB. vi. 2. 2. 15). Elsewhere—e. g. TS. vi. 1. 6. 2; iii. 2. 9. 4; AR. i. 21. 15; 28. 11—the jagati is connected with the domestic animals.

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

I. 2. 4. parāṅi: here 'to no purpose,' as AB. iii. 46. 2, 3, 4. In paragraphs 5 and 6 it has its ordinary meaning. The -āṅ for -āk also in nyan i. 6. 1: cf. Kāṭh. U. ii. 4. 1 (and Böhtlingk's note): Āit. U. iii. 3; Māit. U. vi. 17 (avāṅ); but paraṅ and arvāṅ at i. 9. 5.

I. 2. s. sa sarvā ... 'nusahvāti: cf.TB. ii. 3. 9. 6, sarvā doçu 'nusah-vāti; iii. 10. 4. 2, sarvā doçu 'nusahvāti.

I. 3. s. etahbhāma: scil. devatābhyaṁ: cf. below, 8, etabhīr devatēbhīr.

I. 3. s. sa yathā ... : cf. QB. xiv. 6. 1. 8 (=BAU. iii. 1. 8); ix. 3. 3. 6; JB. ii. 415, sā yathā vṛksam ākramayāṁ ākramāmyāva iyād evam eva ... svargam lokah rohanto yantī (AB. iii. 19. 6-7).

I. 3. s. mṛtyu is also identified with açanāyā BAU. i. 2. 1, and below iii. 12. 2. The peculiar ā is supported by 4; iii. 12. 2; iv. 24. 9; and JB. i. 186 (three times); but açanāyantiḥ and açanāyeyuḥ JB. i. 117.
I. 3. 4. annam ... candramāḥ: cf. KBU. iv. 2, candramasy annam; Māt. U. vi. 5.
I. 3. 4. s. Cf. JB. i. 136, annena 'vāṇayāṁ ghnanti. tāṁ-tāṁ açana-
yāṁ annena hatvā swargam lokam ārohan.
I. 3. 8. The emendation rathasyu is made certain by RV. viii. 91 (80).
7, khe rathasyu khe 'nasaḥ.
I. 3. 7. The meaning of atha yad ... prathihārāt is obscure.
I. 3. 8. s. yathā 'gninā ... samśajyeta: cf. JB. i. 81 (twice) yathā 'gnāv
gāmin abhisamādaddyāt tāḍāk tat. The precative āśicyađ (AÇS. ii. 3. 5,
āśicyađ) among these optatives is very captivating, and calls perhaps
for an emendation (āśicced)?
I. 4. 1 ff. Cf. iii. 39. 3 ff.
I. 4. 2. atiyyadhi ... cūráḥ: a Vedic reminiscence: cf. VS. xxii. 22,
rājanyah cūra āsvayo 'tīvāyāhī; TS. viii. 5. 18, rājanyah āsvayo cūro
mahāratho jāyatām; ÇB. xiii. 1. 9. 2, rājanyah cūra āsvayo 'tīvāyāhī
mahāratho jāyatām.
I. 4. 4. daṇḍavātī: perhaps 'of tenfold strength.'
I. 4. 4. On the inferiority of the ass to the horse cf. TS. v. 1. 2. 2 ff.;
ÇB. vi. 4. 4. 7.
I. 4. 4. s. kubhra 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 ṛgy to ṛth would be
easy in a Devanāgari MS. Instead of rājñāḥ, rājyam would be expected:
: cf. TS. ii. 6. 6. 5, ya evam veda pūr rājyam annādyam āpnoti;
ÇB. ii. 4. 4. 6, rājyam iha vāḥ prāpnoti ya ... 
I. 4. 4. s. hīm vo: hīm bhā would be expected, as in 1.
I. 5. 1. ye: read so with the MSS.; य as below iii. 3. 1; 14. 8, -nir-
bhīṣya; iv. 3. 3; 21. 8, sarvāṅgāni; iv. 1. 8 MSS. ayāy; AB. i. 13. 4;
30. 5; cf. Tāt. Prāś. vii. 4.
I. 5. 5. satyam: the emendation is doubtful, the whole chapter ob-
scure.
I. 5. 5. s. yāvatī ... prthivī: cf. TS. ii. 6. 4. 8; 5. 2, etc.
I. 5. 8. vgrh+ud of the lifting up of a cup, as AB. viii. 33. 2, tāṁ
(i. e. camasāṁ) yatro 'dṛghnīyus tad ānam upodgrhṛṇīyāt. — manasā:
: i. e. 'in silence,' opposed to vācā, as i. 58. 6, etc.
I. 6. 1. tēna vā etam ... nīdānāyād iti: the text as it stands is unin-
telligible, the chapter obscure throughout.
I. 6. 2. raçmin ... vyāhāti: cf. Içā U. 16, yama sūrya prājāpatya
vyāha raçmin ... 
I. 6. 4. anālayanam: formed from ālaya as anilayana (Tāt. U. ii. 7)
from nilaya, 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. 2. e. catvāri vak ... vadanti, = RV. i. 164. 45; repeated below, at
i. 40. 1.
I. 7. e. sa yathā 'ṭmānām ... : the same comparison occurs again
below at i. 60. 8 and ii. 3. 12-15; in all three passages read lośto (for
loṣto) : cf. Chānd. U. i. 2. 7, 8, yathā 'ṭmānām ākhaṇam rūvā (Bōhtlingk
inserts mṛtpiṇḍo) vidhvāṁsata evam hai 'va sa vidhvāṁsate ya ... ;
BAU. i. 3. 8, sa yathā 'jomānam tīvā loṣṭo vidhvaṇsetāi 'vanū āhi 'va vidhvaṇsamānā viṣeṇo vineṣuḥ.

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. marīṁgraṇṭvā: the exact meaning is as doubtful here as it is CB. iv. 5. 1. 10: cf. Eggeling's note, SBE. xxvi. 388.
I. 8. 11. tenāʾ 'nam . . . : cf. JB. i. 322, sa yathā madhunā lājān praṇyaḥ evam evāṁ 'tenāʾ 'ksareṇa sāmnā (!) rasah dādāhāt; and ii. 77, yathā madhū āsceya lājān āvapet tād anayathāi 'va syāt tādyāk tat.
I. 8. 12. ayāsm: the clause is so much abbreviated as to be obscure. The peculiar position of the phuti-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 ity ṛk: cf. Chānd. U. i. 3. 4; 7. 1; BAU. i. 5. 5.
I. 9. 4. aṣṭāu: those enumerated in 2. — bahur bhūyas: cf. RV. i. 188. 5, bahviṣ ca bhūyasī ca.
I. 9. 5. vyomānta vācaḥ: I have taken vyomāntaḥ here in its primary sense; see below, note to i. 10. 4.
I. 10. 1. yathā sūcyā . . . : cf. JB. ii. 10, yathā sūcyā paḷāṇāni saṃtvṛṇāmi syur evam etenā 'ksareve 'me lokās saṃtvrṇyāḥ; Chānd. U. ii. 23. 4, tad yathā caṅkunā sarvāṇi parāṇāni saṃtvrṇāny evam oṁkāreṇa sarvā vāk saṃtvrṇā. These parallel passages show that caṅku in the Chānd. U. may be taken in its ordinary meaning of 'pin' (AB. iii. 18. 6).
I. 10. 4. daḍadhā . . . : the same series of numerals is repeated at i. 28. 8 and 29. 5. Cf. Weber, ZDMG. xv. 182 ff. The series at TMB. xvii. 14. 2 is very similar to this; the chief difference is budva (cf. AB. viii. 23. 4) for padma; vyomānta 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 parvariyaśāṁ abhyupeyāt. trīṇ āgri standāṁ atāṁ dvāṁ athāi 'kam paraspara eva tāṁ lokān varīyaṁ kal kurte; AB. i. 25. 6, parvariyaṁs vā āme lokā arvāg ahīyaṁsāḥ.
I. 10. 10. satyam . . . āpa: cf. RV. x. 85. 1, satyena 'tābhūti bhūmih.
I. 11. 1. annakācitor: it would be easy to emend to-kaṅkaśīr or kāmūnir, were it not for the fact that the word occurs twice again, without any variants, in a similar story, JB. i. 88, prajāpatiḥ prajā asṛjata. tā nam śṛṣṭi annakācitor abhitā samantam paryaviṇ. tāhīya hiṅkāreṇā 'nādyām asṛjata . . . tam etat ātmat prajā annakācitor abhitā samantam pariṇcanti. tāhīyo hiṅkāreṇā vā 'nādyām asṛjate; also JB. ii. 148, tā nam annakācitor prajā abhyupavaṛūḥ; and at JB. ii. 149, tā nam annakācitā (MSS. -cīn-) prajā abhyupāvartante.—The same tautological expression tam . . . sarve devā abhitā samantam paryaviṇ occurs at JB. ii. 142.
I. 11. s-2; 12, 1-2, 4. Cf. Chānd. U. ii. 9. 2-8, where however the pratihaṇa is connected with the embryos, and the upādrava with the forest-animals.
I. 11. s. Cf. JB. iii. 218, praṇāpātīḥ pacuin asṛjrata. te 'smaṭ (MSS. -n) sṛṣṭā asaṁjānāṇā apakārāmaṇ (MSS. -kṛ-). so 'kāmayatā 'bhī mā paṇcavas saṁjānirā. na mad apakārāmayur iti. sa etat sāma 'paṇyat tenā 'stuta. tato vāi tam paṇcav vaḥsamaṇāṇa (MSS. -samaṇ-) tato 'smaḍ anapakramiṇo 'bhavan. tad u (MSS. vi) hiṅkāram bhavati. hum iti vāi paṇcavas saṁjānate hum iti mātā putram abhyeti hum iti yuṭro mātaram.

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

I. 12. 1. upadravan gṛhyanta : the pun here is not quite clear to me; perhaps upadrava is to be taken as 'nimshap,' and reference is made to the harmful nature of the Gandharvas : cf. AV. viii. 6. 19; Pischel, Ved. Stud. i. 80.


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

I. 12. 8–13. 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 oṣadhayo jāyante.

I. 13. 3. Cf. Chānd. U. ii. 7. 1 ; below, 32. 3.

I. 15. s. aroṣena saṁmā : cf. A. C. Burnell's Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa (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 AÇS. ix. 9. 9 (see Weber, Ind. Stud. x. 156, and Sitzungsbl. d. Berliner A. d. W. (1892), p. 807), and below i. 18. 8 and 21. 9.

I. 15. 4. prasāma, prasāmi : the former is not found elsewhere, the latter occurs in the likewise obscure passage CB. iii. 9. 1. 9, vra vāi sarasvaty annah somas tasmād yo vācā prasāmy annādo hāti 'va bhavuti, from which it would seem that prasāmi might mean 'abundantly' rather than 'imperfectly' (PW., pw., Eggeling): cf. Chānd. U. ii. 8. 3.

I. 16. 3. rei sāma gāyāma : i. e. 'sing a re to a sāman-melody': cf. Burnell's Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa, Introd. p. xii, "A sāman is sung (gā) on (or, as we should say, to) a re (rei). This idiom is an old one, for it occurs in the Brāhmaṇas repeatedly ; if the re (or words) really formed part of the sāman, this idiom would be impossible."

I. 16. 5. te : i. e. the chants of the noon and evening libations.

I. 16. 6. The present kāmayatē of all MSS. has certainly crept in from 9.


I. 18. 1. Cf. JB. i. 288 ff. (partly translated by Whitney, Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc. xxiii. 80), praṇāpātīr devān asṛjrata. tān (A.B tā) mṛtyuḥ (-uḥ) pāṃmā 'nvasṛjrata. te devāh praṇāpatim (praṇām) upetyā 'brauvan kasmād (asām) u no 'sṛṣṭā (sṛṣṭā) mṛtyuḥ cen naḥ (na) pāṃmānam anvavasakṣyān (-ṣky-). āsīthe 'ti. tān (A.B. tā) abravīc (A.B. br-), chandāhī sambharata tānī yathāyatanam praviṣṭata tato mṛtyuṁ pāṃmāṇaḥ vyāvarṣīyate (vyṛṣṭy-) 'ti. vasavo (savo) gāyatrīṁ samabha-
ran (sahibh-). tāṁ te prāviçan. tāṁ sā (sa) 'chādayat. viçve devā anu-
ṣṭubhaṁ samabharaṇ. tāṁ te prāviçan. tāṁ sā 'chādayat (-n). marutaḥ
pālītiṁ samabharaṇ. tāṁ te prāviçan. tāṁ sā 'chādayat. sañhyāc că
"ptyac că 'ticchandaśaṁ (C. -daśam) samabharaṇ. tāṁ te prāviçan.
tāṁ sā 'chādayat (C. -n). 284. savānāny eva 'nārāṇī anuprāvīçatām.
tato vai tāṁ (tā) mṛtyuḥ pāpma na nirajānāt. kuto hi tasya mṛtyuḥ
pāpme "ciṣyate yah na nirjānati. na hā 'nam mṛtyuḥ pāpma 'nurin-
dati eva evah veda. chandaśe vāva tāṁ mṛtyoḥ pāpmano 'chādayan
(C. -dāy-). tad yad evaṁ (nā) chandaśe mṛtyoḥ pāpmano 'chādayaṃs
tac chandaśeñ chandaśtvam. chādayantī eva 'nām chandaśe mṛtyoḥ
pāpmano eva evah veda.

I. 18. s-4. Cf. Chānd. U. i. 4. 2, devā vāi mṛtyor bibhyatas trayaṁ
vidyāṁ prāviçan. te chandobhir acchādayan. yad ebhir acchādayaṁs
tac chandaśeñ chandaśtvam.

I. 18. s. āry aṣvarāyāṁ : cf. i. 21. 9, etāvad vāva sāma ṣaeva svaraṇ.
ṛg vṛ eṣa rite svarād bhavati, whence it appears that a r̥ without mel-
ody (śaeva = svara) is meant : see above, i. 15. 3 ; 16. 4.

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

I. 19. s. etena ha 'syā sarvēno 'dātām... : cf. i. 57. 9 ; 58. 10. The
construction of ṣvara + ạ with the ablative (instead of dat. or loc.)
is noteworthy.

I. 20. s. tad yathā... : cf. JB. i. 144, yathā vā akṣeṣa vaikrāu vi-
śkabhdhāv evam etene 'māu lokāu viṣkabdhdhāu ; RV. vii. 99. 3.

6. The three ṣaṁs are described below, i. 37. 1. — The precise tech-
nical meaning of ṣaṁ, vibhūṭi, pratiṣṭhā, and pragā is obscure.

I. 21. 4. The paragraph is not clear to me ; ahorātrā as feminine 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. r̥ g vā... : cf. above, i. 18. 8.

I. 22. s. Cf. TS. vi. 3. 1. 4-5, nā 'dhvanyur upagāyey. vāgvr̥yo vā
adhvanyuḥ. yad adhvanyur upagāyey udgātre vācaṁ samprayacched
upadāsukā 'syā vāk syāt.

I. 23. s. tasāya 'bhipiṣitasya... : this is a clear contradiction of i. 1. 6.

I. 24. i. The same play between akṣara and kṣ̄aṛ in Amṛtañāda U.
24, yad akṣaram na kṣarat kadaćit (Ind. St. ix. 32): cf. also ÇB. vi. 1.
3. 6.

I. 24. s. The same play between akṣara and kṣ̄i is repeated below,
i. 48. 8.

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

I. 25. v. Cf. JB. i. 324, träśṭubha vā asāv ādityaç çuklaṁ kṛṣṇam
puruṣaḥ.

I. 25. s. yo 'gnir mṛtyus saḥ : cf. ÇB. ii. 2. 4. 7, 9, agner mṛtyor
ātmānam atrāyata ; JB. i. 12, devā vāi mṛtyunā samayatanta. sa yo ha
sa mṛtyor agner eva saḥ. — Chānd. U. iii. 1-4 and vi. 4. 2 are quite
different from this paragraph.

I. 25. 10. On the puruṣa of the sun cf. KBU. iv. 8 ; Chānd. U. i. 6. 6 ;
iv. 11. 1 ; BAU. ii. 1. 2 ; iii. 9. 12.

I. 26. s. Cf. JB. i. 254, trīvra caksuṣa çuklaṁ kṛṣṇam kaninizä ; 324,
trāṣṭubham idam cakṣuḥ cūklan kṛṣṇam puruṣaḥ; ÇB. xii. 8. 2. 26, trīryā vā idam cakṣuḥ cūklan kṛṣṇam kaninakā; below i. 34. 1.
I. 26. s. tad yās tā āpo...: cf. i. 29. 5; 83. 5; ÇB. 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. adhyāste: very likely in the sense of 'prevails,' which PW. assumes for it in RV. i. 25. 9. — annaṁ kṛtvā: because death is hunger: above i. 3. 3; BAU. i. 2. 1, 4.
I. 28. s. sa eṣa saptaraṇasmir vṛṣabhas tuviṃsān: the last three words are quoted from the rc below, 29. 7 (RV. ii. 12. 12a).
I. 28. s. On these numerals see above, note to i. 10. 4.
I. 29. s. The rc is RV. ii. 12. 12.
I. 29. s. eṣa hy eva...ṛṣabhaḥ: cf. JB. ii. 87, indro vā akāmayaṇa vṛṣabhas sarvasāṃ praṇāṁ syām ṛṣabhatāṁ gaccheyam iti. sa etam yajñam aparṇat tam āharat tenā yajata. tato vā sa vṛṣabhas sarvasāṃ praṇāṁ abhavaḥ ṛṣabhatāṁ agachat. — mahāyā here and below (46. 2; 48. 5) was certainly connected with mahānt rather than with y/mahā: cf. PW. s. v. y/mahā; the commentator of TS. vii. 5. 10 explains it by pūjā.
I. 30. s. anīṣedhānāsāma: nīṣedha is the epithet of several sāmans.
I. 30. s. = i. 45. 6.—AB. iv. 2. 3. states that the nāndanāṁ sāma (SV. ii. 653) is abhrātrvyaṃ and bhṛātrvyaḥ: cf. also Ind. Stud. iii. 203, 208.
I. 31. s. Very differently on the sevenfold sāma, 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 vāi brahma sa prāṇaḥ: this is the doctrine of Kāśitaṇi and Pāṇīgya (KBU. ii 1; 2), of the sacrificial fires as revealed to Upakosala Kāmalāyana (Chāṇḍ. U. iv. 10. 5), and one of the explanations of Varaṇa to Bhrigu (Tāl. U. iii. 3. 1). The same was taught by Udāka Āṇubāyana (BAU. iv. 1. 2). For a refutation of it see BAU. v. 18. 1.
I. 33. 4. karyo eva vācā: cf. below ii. 2. 8; iii. 32. 9, sa eṣa prāṇo vācā karoti; ÇB. iv. 6. 7. 5, sā yatre 'yakehā ṛṣaḥ āsīt sarvam eva tatrā kriyata sarvam prajñāyatā 'tha yatra mana āsin nā 'va tatra kṣīṁ canā kriyata na prajñāyatā no hi manasa dhīyāyataḥ kac canā 'jānte; Mahānār. U. iv. 7, vācā kṛtah karma kṛtam; VS. xii. 58 and comment on it, CB. viii. 1. 2. 9. — gamayati manasaḥ: cf. Chāṇḍ. U. v. 10. 2 (= iv. 16. 6), tat puruṣo manasa enān brahma gamayati. — tad etan... manaḥ: cf. Mātī. U. vi. 34, tāvān mano niroddhavyam hṛdi yāvat kṣayam gatam.
1. 33. s. **agniḥ prastāvaḥ**: cf. Chānd. U. ii. 2. 1. — āditya udgīthāḥ : cf. Chānd. U. ii. 30. 1 (i. 3. 1).

I. 33. 7. The same etymology recurs below, 40. 6; 48. 7; 51. 2; iv. 18. 2.

I. 33. 8. For the identification of sun and moon with the sāman cf. Chānd. U i. 6. 3, 4.


I. 34. 8. sa eṣa āhutim atimatya and ta eṣa āhutim atimatya in 5 refer to pāda c of the 7c quoted in 6.

I. 34. 9. The stanza is AV. x. 8. 35, which reads sadhricāḥ for samicāḥ in b, and āhutim in c. In b dadante (manuscript reading : see Whitney, Index Verb.) should be restored for dadate of the edition. For dīcas samicāḥ cf. CB. vii. 3. 1. 24.

I. 34. 11. The stanza is AV. x. 8. 36, which has eṣām for eko in c, and eke for anye in d.

I. 34. 11. tā etās ... anāddyāya: obscure and probably corrupt.

I. 35. 1. samhavatsara : 36. 1, parjanye, 4, puruse, and 10, devatāsu, prove it to be locative.

I. 35. 2 ff. Cf. above, i. 12. 7.

I. 35. 4. A similar play on varṣāḥ and varṣāḥ CB. ii. 2. 3. 7.

I. 35. 8. nidhanakṛta : nidhanakṛta would be expected, but cf. the similar passage SB. iii. 1, which ends hemanto nidhanam. tasmād dhemantam praṇāya nidhanakṛta āvā "sate nidhanarūpam āvā 'tāhri."

I. 36. 1. Cf. Chānd. U. ii. 3. 1 and 15. 1 ; similarly TS. i. 6. 11. 3-4 ; CB. i. 5. 2. 18.

I. 36. 8. pratyag : contrasted with ārdhva in 4, as Kāth. U. i. 5. 3, ārdhvat prāṇam umanyaty apānam pratyag asyati (cf. Chānd. U. iii. 13. 3, yo 'syā pratyayān suṣiḥ so 'pānaḥ. 5, yo 'syā "ārdhvaḥ suṣiḥ sa udānāḥ). It corresponds to āyṛṣṭa in Chānd. U. ii. 2. 2, lokā ārdhvač ca "verṭṭa ca.


I. 37. 1 ff. On this distribution of the savanas among the different divinities see Eggeling’s note, SBE. xii., p. xviii.

I. 37. 2. On the manner in which the ṇastraṣ of the three savanaṣ should be sung cf. AB. iii. 44. 5. Also below i. 51. 6 ff.—The term māndra is frequently connected with Agni in the RV. Differently Chānd. U. ii. 22. 1, where the vinardī sāmnaḥ is regarded as Agni’s udgīthu. — ṛāhnuti with accusative, like ṛṣṭas.

I. 37. 8. ghoṣini, upabdīmati : these two adjectives are also combined JB. i. 358, yasmād etad ghoṣī 'vo 'pabdīmaθ iva giyate tasmād ghoṣī 'vo 'pabdīmaθ iva garbhā jāyante : cf. AB. iv. 9. 3, aṣvarathene 'ndra ajim adhāvat. tasmād sa uccārghoṣa upabdīmaθ kṣatrasya rūpam. āndro hi saḥ. The Chānd. U. assigns to Indra the čakṣuṃm balavat sāmnaḥ.

I. 37. 9. uccā : i. e. ‘further on’: cf. below 7.

I. 37. 9. The Chānd. U. also attributes the krāumcaṃ sāmnaḥ to Brahaspati, while in TS. ii. 5. 11. 1 it is assigned to the Asuras: yat krāumcaṃ anvāhā "suraṃ tad yan māndram mānuṣaṃ tat. As to its char-
acter, cf. comment. on TS. v. 5. 12. 1, krāunco dāruṇasvanah pakaṁ-
viçeṣaḥ.
I. 38. 2. nitarām may mean 'in a low tone.' The rest of the chapter is
obscure and partly corrupt.
I. 38. 3. A loma sāman is mentioned TMB. xiii. 11. 11. The point of
the pun between loma [sāman] and lomaçāni (perhaps 'covered with
herbs') çmaçināmī is not clear.
I. 38. 4. galānasa : the exact form of the name is not quite certain;
at J.B. i. 316, A.B.C. read galāna, D. galāna. — çāmulaçarpānābhyām :
probably corrupt; but I have not corrected the ु into ɪ, because çāmila
is only found as adjective, 'made of çāmi-wood.'
I. 39. 1. Pāuluṣita is probably the same person as Pāuluṣi, Chānd. U.
v. 11. 1 (CB. x. 6. 1. 1), who is (Chānd. U. v. 13. 1) also addressed as
Prācīnayogya.
I. 39. 2. sāmnah pratiṣṭhā : cf. BAU. i. 3. 29, tasya hāti 'tasya sāmno
yaḥ pratiṣṭhāṁ veda prati ha tiṣṭhati. tasya vāi vāg eva pratiṣṭhā ētc.;
Sāmavidh. B. i. 12, yo ha vāi sāmnah pratiṣṭhāṁ veda prati ha tiṣṭhaty
asmiṁ ca loke 'muṣmīṁ ca. vāg vāva sāmnah pratiṣṭhā. yad v etad
vāy ūgyedahl saḥ. rci sāma pratiṣṭhitam.
I. 39. 3. sāmnas suvarṇam : cf. BAU. i. 3. 28, tasya hāti 'tasya sāmno
yaḥ suvarṇam veda bhavati hā 'syā suvarṇam. tasya vāi svara (!) eva
suvarṇam ētc.; Sāmavidh. B. i. 11, yo ha vāi sāmnah svah yaḥ suvar-
ṇam veda svah ca ha vāi sāmnah suvarṇam ca bhavati. svcro (!) vāva
sāmnah svah tād eva suvarṇam.
I. 40. 1. The verse is RV. i. 164. 45.
I. 40. 2. vāg eva sāma : cf. BAU. i. 3. 24, vāg vāi sāma.
I. 40. 3. The meaning of this paragraph is not quite clear.
I. 40. 4 ff. Cf. KB. ii. 8.
I. 40. 5. prāṇa eva 'suḥ : cf. CB. vi. 6. 2. 6, prāṇo vā asuḥ.
I. 41. 4. The ṛc is RV. i. 89. 10.
I. 41. 5. The same five puruṣas are mentioned BAU. ii. 1. 2 (sun), 3
(moon), 4 (lightning), 5 (waters); 3. 9 (eye); KBU. iv. 3 (sun), 4 (moon),
5 (lightning), 10 (waters), 17 and 18 (eyes). Slightly different Chānd.
U. iv. 11. 1 (sun); 12. 1 (moon); 13. 1 (lightning); 15. 1 (eye), 6 (mind).
I. 43. 6. yat paçuṣu . . . : cf. Tāit. U. iii. 10. 3 ; TB. iii. 8. 7. 2.
I. 43. 7. Cf. Māıt. U. vii. 11, puruṣaç oçako yo 'yaḥ daksine 'kṣiṣny
avasthāḥ | indro 'yam . .
I. 43. 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. 1. The ṛc is RV. vi. 47. 18.
I. 44. 4. haraçayā = ādiyasya raçmaṇayā : cf. Nirukt. vii. 24, ādi-
tyasya haraçayā suçarpā raraṇa ādiyaraçmayaḥ te. — For the etymol-
ogy cf. SB. i. 1. 18, pūrvaçakṣaparāpakaśtvā vā īndrasya hari tābhyaḥ
hi 'daṁ survaḥ harati.
I. 44. 5. The stanza is RV. iii. 53. 8.
I. 44. 6. imāḥ . . . samacaśaṇaḥ : cf. RV. vi. 58. 2.
I. 45. 1. The metre of the verses in 1 and 2 is defective. The
thought of the first gloka 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, i.ii. 2. 1.

I. 45. 4. to the end is repeated verbatim at iii. 37. 6 ff., which has been used in emending the MSS. reading here. — lelayati: the verb, in the same sense, is repeated below at 51. 3; 55. 3; 58. 7; also JB. i. 299, prajāpatir yasmad yoneḥ prajā asrjata so 'layaeva sa dīpyamāno bhū-
jamāno 'tīṣṭhati; MS. i. 8. 6 (p. 123. 12.), yad aṅgāreṇu nivavācīnteyu lelaya vi 'tva bhāti tad devānām āsyam: cf. ApČS. vi. 9. 2.

I. 45. 5. pāpma nayaṅgaḥ: pāpmanyayaṅgaḥ would be expected, but cf. below ii. 12. 1, and JB. i. 10, tad yathā 'hir... (MSS. anvedātmate) na kaça ca na nayaṅgaḥ pāpma pariṣiyate evaṁ hai' va 'smīn na kaça ca na nayaṅgaḥ pāpma pariṣiyate ya evaṁ vidvān aṇihotrai jahoti.

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

I. 46. 5. caturdhā: the conjecture is uncertain; perhaps the reading was paṇcadhā.

I. 48. 5. The paragraph is not clear.

I. 48. 7. sanātītā: it would be easy to regard this form and anvaṅtāt (ii. 88. 10) as due to dittography of the following tat, were it not for AV. xviii. 3. 40, anvaṅtāt, which is protected by the metre.

I. 48. 8. janitā: so emended after Chānd. iv. 3. 7. Perhaps it would be better to correct it into janayitā: cf. below, iii. 38. 3, and JB. ii. 386, prajāpatih prajānāṃ prajanayitā.


I. 50. 4. sunoti is the MSS. reading throughout, although one would rather expect sanoti. But cf. AB. iv. 17. 8, where asunvan (so all MSS. and Aufrecht; P.W. emends to asunvan) corresponds to asisāsatyas in 2.

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

I. 51. 5. Cf. below, i. 58. 8.

I. 51. 5. Cf. above, i. 87. 1 ff.

I. 52. 5. apadhvāntam: emended after Chānd. U. ii. 22. 1, apadhvāntam varunasya.

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

I. 53. 4. tasmāt...: the logical connection of the two sentences is obscure. For the second one, cf. CB. i. 1. 1. 20 = ii. 5. 2. 17, evaṁ hi mithunaṁ kiptam uttarato hi stri pumāṁsam upaçete; vi. 3. 1. 30 = vii. 5. 1. 6, daksiniato vai vṛṣṇī yosān upaçete. The reason is very probably the desire for male offspring: cf. Bhāt S. lxxviii. 24, daksīṇapārye puruṣo vāme nāṁ yamāv ubhayasaṁsthāu.

I. 53. 4 ff. On the superiority of the sāman over the rc and its chronological bearing see K. T. Telang's introduction to the Bhagavad-
gītā, SBE. viii. 19. — sāman is loosely treated as male and masculine (amaḥ; 54. 2, sa): cf. CB. iv. 6. 7. 11, tad vā etad vṛṣṇī sāma yosān rcāṁ 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; Chând. 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. 1. tasmād ... : cf. ApDhs. i. 1. 2. 23; GāutDhs. ii. 18. — kū- mam ... : cf. ApDhs. i. 1. 4. 5 ff. it would seem that students were at times offered forbidden food by their teachers : see Bühler's note.
I. 54. s. bharanadakeṣyena : correct form and meaning are unknown.
I. 54. s. On the intercourse of sāman and ṁc in the sadas and the prohibition of witnessing it (except through the door), see ČB. iv. 6. 7. 9 ff.
I. 54. s. amo 'ham ... : different versions of the formula AV. xiv. 2. 71; ČB. xiv. 9. 4. 19 (= BAU. vi. 4. 20); AB. viii. 27. 4 (for appointing a purohita); TB. iii. 7. 1. 9; GB. ii. 8. 20; ApČS. ix. 2. 3; Ka. xxxv. 18; ČGS. i. 18. 4; AGS. i. 7. 6; PGS. i. 6. 3; MānGS. i. 10; BāudGŚS. i. 12; BhāradGŚS. i. 19; HGS. i. 20. 2.
I. 54. s. sambhavann atyaricayata : the emendation after i. 57. 5.
I. 54. s. hīṅkāraç ca ... : cf. AB. iii. 23. 4, te vāi pañcā 'nyad bhūtvā pañcā 'nyad bhūtvā ākañṭām āhāvā (? Aūfr.-vāc) ca hīṅkāraç ca prastāvā ca prathamā ca rī udgīthāc ca mañjayamā ca prathīhāraç ca 'ittamā ca nīhanām ca vāsāṭkāraç ca. — nyādravatām, the emendation after ČB. iv. 6. 7. 10, tasmād yady api jāyāpati mithunah carantānu paçyanti vy eva dravata āga eva kurvāte.
I. 54. 13. tad yathe ... : text and meaning of the clause are uncertain.
I. 55. 7 ff. Cf. AB. iii. 23; GB. viii. 20 ff., and Haug's note, AB. ii. 197.
I. 57. 1. gāyatām : for this pregnant use of the genitive see Weber, Ind. Stud. ix. 247.
I. 57. 7. Cf. Chând. U. i. 3. 6-7; BAU. i. 3. 25.
I. 57. 9. Cf. above, i. 51. 3.
I. 58. 1. Because the udgīthā (ud) is the sun : cf. above, 57. 7.
I. 58. 2. gāpayeyur : with the same meaning which the causative of yovād usually has.
I. 58. 8. pratīci : the MSS. read here and iii. 6. 1, 3 pratīci, as do five MSS. of TS. v. 4. 7. 2. — manasā ‘in silence,’ as above, i. 5. 6.
I. 58. 7. hiraṇyam avikṭam : cf. JB. iii. 1, sa (Frajāpati) idam sarvan vyakarot. yathā ha vāi hiraṇyam vikṭam evam.
I. 58. 8. Cf. i. 51. 3.
I. 59. 1. sāmovairyaṃ : the meaning is uncertain. According to JB. i. 219, the nidhana is the vīrya of the sāman : tad u ho 'vāca jānaçruteyo vīryam vā etat sāmmo yan nidhanam.
I. 59. 18 ff. The distribution of what follows among the several speakers is not clear; tad etat sādhv ... bruhy eva probably belongs to Čāunaka, 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 Čāunaka and Abhipratārin. To this either Čāunaka or Abhipratārin object with me 'dam tē
namo ‘karma (with reference to 11) ... atiṇḍraḥ. 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 ... atiṇḍraḥ is spoken by Brahmadatta, although what he refers to by idān nāmās is not clear. The text is not above suspicion, especially the absolute mā = ‘don’t,’ for which BAU. v. 18. 2, sa (Prāṇḍa’s father) ha smā ‘ha pūrṇa mā prāṇḍa seems to be the only parallel case.

I. 60. Cf. below, ii. 1 and 10; Chānd. U. i. 2; BAU. i. 8 (CB. xiv. 4. 1); cf. also JB. i. 289, manasā suhārdaṣaḥ ca durhārdaṣaḥ ca viyānātī prāṇeṇa surabhi ca surabhi ca viyānātī caksuṣā darṣaṇīyaḥ ca darṣaṇīyaḥ ca viyānātī grotrenta graṇvāṇyaḥ ca graṇvāṇyaḥ ca viyānātī vācā svādu ca svādu ca viyānātī.

I. 60. s. apānena jīvṛati: this peculiar conception occurs also at BAU. iii. 2. 2, so ‘pānena ‘tīgṛaheya gṛīthaḥ, apānena hi gandrāhā jīvṛati. In the latter passage Bōhtlingk has changed the reading, although supported by both recensions, into sa gandrāhā 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 pāpan gandrham 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. 7. Cf. above, i. 7. 6.

After chapter 60 the MSS. have this very corrupt colophon: gaṇābhi-dhāno-paṇiṣadaṁ caṇāṁ saṣṭikhaṇḍakaṁ niyoṇāvivanaṁ (B. -c) dāhīya-yaṁ gṛiṃṣeṇa (B. gṛiṃṣeśā) likhat (B. -n), mudāgirvan hi samudra-kānakṣaṁti rudrākṣi-paṇḍāgnaṁ goṇaḥ. kuṇakarna-karacāvī (B. -kara-kacāvī) saṅkarṣṛuti gaṅgaṭṭeḥva goṇaṁ gajesavaḥ.

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

II. 2. sā vācā bṛhatā gatiḥ: bṛhati as a name for vāc and the same etymology of Bhāspati also Chānd. U. i. 2. 11; BAU. i. 3. 22.

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

II. 2. s. yaṁ vāca ... : cf. i. 33. 4.

II. 3. svādu ... vanāme ‘ti: the emendations are not quite certain.

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

• II. 8. 11 ff. Cf. above, i. 7. 6.

• II. 4. s. asya hy ... vā saḥ: unclear.

• II. 6. 16. sahasraḥ ... putrāḥ: cf. ii. 9. 10.

• II. 6. 11. Cf. TS. v. 6. 5. 3, etāṁ vāi para āṭṭāraḥ kakṣivān auṣṭāvāḥ graṇasas trasadasyāḥ pāṇurūtasyāḥ praṇākāmā acinvata. tato vāi te sahasraḥ-sahasram putrān avindanta; TMB. xxv. 16. 3, para āṭṭāras trasadasyāḥ pāṇurūtso viṭahāvāḥ graṇasas kakṣivān auṣṭās ta etat praṇātikāmāḥ satāryāyaṁ upāyaṁ te sahasraḥ-sahasram putrāṁ apuṣyāṁ evam vāva te sahasraṁ-sahasram putrān puṣṇanti ya etad upayanti.

II. 7. 1. The emendation of sthālyām to sthālyām after JB. iii. 128 (transl. Proceedings for May, 1888, p. x), atha ha cyavano bhāṛgaṁ punar yuvā bhūtvā ‘ga[cho]cchā charyātām mānavam. tam praṇāṁ sthā-
yām āyāyat. In the AB. the name of the sage is Čāryāta Mānava, in the CB. the a is short, as in our text.

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

II. 8. 8. etad dha nā ... : cf. AB. i. 14. 5 [udēci] dig aparujitā; CB. iv. 6. 6. 1 ff.

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

II. 9. 8. Five vyāhṛtis are also mentioned at JB. ii. 354, pañcabhir vai vyāhṛtibhir idān devā ajayan.—For pra and ā, cf. Chand. U. ii. 8. 1, and Eggeling, SBE. xii. 101, note.—ud must be supplied: see 8.

II. 9. 5, 6. The identification of pra with prāṇa (but of ā with udāna) is also found CB. i. 4. 1. 5; differently Chānd. U. ii. 8. 1.

II. 9. 8. ud iti so 'śiv 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. tasya ... asūḥ : the same phrase is repeated below, iii. 30. 3: cf. JB. iii. 190, atha ha vai vāikhānasā ity āṣikā īndrasya priyā asūḥ.

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

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

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

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

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

II. 12. 1. pāyām nyanāgha : see above, i. 45. 5.

II. 12. 7. alokatāyai = alokyatāyai, BAU. i. 8. 33.

II. 13. 8. yathā dhenum ... : cf. TS. ii. 3. 6. 2, yathā vatsena prattāṁ gāṁ duha evam eव 'mān lokān prattān kāmān annāyain duhe.

II. 14. 1. nēśṭham : cf. Aufrecht on AB. 1. 1.; and CB. i. 6. 2. 11.

II. 14. 4. atha yañ ... pādābhyaṁ : cf. CB. iii. 1. 1. 7, tasmād u ha na pratidnāprārā çañjita. ne 'd devān abhiprasārya çañjā iti.

At the end of the chapter there is the following colophon: ġrutiyañtacamaḥ devācgṛīṁvāsa iti prataḥ : ekāhinakalākhaṇḍaṁ caṅdāhyāyaṁ adīkkhat.

III. 1. 1. For this and the following chapter, cf. Chānd. U. iv. 3. 1. On the grahās see Eggeling on CB. iv. 6. 5. 1; Vāyu is similarly contrasted with the other divinities at BAU. i. 5. 33, sa yathāi 'śāṁ prāyānām madhyamaḥ prāya evam etāsāṁ devatānāṁ vāyuk. mlocanti hy anyā devatā na vāyuk. sāiśa 'nastamātā devatā yād vāyuk. (Somewhat similar is AB. viii. 38. 2 ff.). But at CB. iii. 9. 2. 5 we read sarvan vā idam anyad ilayati yad idam kimcā 'p iyo 'yam pavate 'thāi 'tā (the waters) eva ne 'lāyanti.

III. 1. 4. Cf. JB. ii. 48, yadā 'dityo 'stam eti vāyum (MSS. -r) evā pyeti.

III. 1. 7. Cf. JB. ii. 48, yadā vā agnir udvāyati vāyum evā 'pyeti.


III. 1. 14. Cf. JB. ii. 49, yadā vāi tūṣṇīm āste prāyam eva vāg apyeti ; KBU. iii. 3.
III. 1. 16. Cf. JB. ii. 49, yadā svapitī prāṇam eva caṅṣur apyeti.
III. 1. 20. Vāyu enters man, CB. i. 1. 3. 2; v. 2. 4. 10.
III. 1. 21. In the corresponding story of Chānd. U. iv. 3, the beggar is a brahmacārīn.
III. 2. 2. The Chānd. U. version in c reads t. k. nā 'bhipacyanti mar-
tyāḥ; and, at the end of d, vasantam (b of the cloka at JB. ii. 26 ends ba-
hudā nīvīṣāt); in b the MSS. of the Chānd. U., as ours, read so for sa.
III. 2. 4. The Chānd. U. version in a has janītā prajānām for uta m.; in b, hiranyadaṅgraḥ bāhhasa 'nasīrī ūḥ; in d, ananām 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 i. 5. 1.
III. 3. 3. Breath is identified with the uktha in BAU. v. 14. 1.
III. 3. 4. cācval: Eggeling now takes the word to mean 'probably' in the Brāhmaṇas: note on CB. 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. 3. 4.
III. 4. 3. triṣṭubhā paridadhati: cf. AB. vi. 15. 5.
III. 4. 10. nava-nāvā 'ksarāṇi sampadyante: this statement is correct for agni + prthivī + mahān + mahī, and aditya + dyu + brah-
man + brāhmaṇī; but not for vāyu + antarikṣa + deva + devī, which make ten syllables, unless vāyu is read for vāyu.
III. 4. 18. For the comparison, cf. JB. ii. 248, yathā (MSS. cāha) vāi maṇḍau maṇisūtram otaṁ syād evam esu lokeṣu trirātra otaḥ (MSS. odaḥ); CB. xii. 3. 4. 2; TMB. xx. 16. 6.
III. 5. 2. muñjas: 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 sanādhi 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 ... ṁāitravaruṇasya vā: see Eggeling's note on CB. iv. 8. 2. 1 (SBE. xxvi. 325).
III. 6. 6. 7. The correction of abandhu (neuter) to the masculine -dhur seems necessary to bring out the contrast: cf. RV. viii. 21. 4, vayasy hi tvā bandhumantam abandhavo viprāsa indra yemima.—
kasmād vā ... manthanti: these words are not quite clear to me.
III. 8. 2. anyatarāṁ upāgād: I take this to be a euphemistic expression, similar to CB. v. 1. 3. 13, 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; CB. ix. 6. 3; RAU. 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, Synt. 399 (end). — suyamān: the word is very appropriate in talking to a driver.
III. 8. 7. In the following this much is clear, that Sudaksīpa Kṣāmi by his unexpected arrival within the sacred enclosure succeeds in out-
witting Prācīnaśāli (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. 53. 18).

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

III. 9. 10. enaḥ... yaḥ katham avocad bhagavā itī = 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. 12. The stanza is AV. x. 8. 28, where however b reads utāi 'yām pito 'ta vā putra eşām, and precedes a; in e AV. reads prathamo jātaḥ s. u. g. antaḥ.

III. 10. 13. 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 imam puruṣam depends.


III. 12. 1. imāṇaḥ ca lokān: cf. CB. xiii. 1. 7. 2, tryāvṛta ime lokāḥ.

III. 12. 2. açanāyā: see note on i. 3. 3.

III. 13. 2. paṇāyanti: so far only found in Pān. iii. 1. 28: cf. above, i. 38. 5, paṇāyyāḥ.

III. 13. 5. Nākā Māudgālya (CB. etc.). — The bearing of yathā... tādṛk 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 arpayitu and arpayet (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, rathā sthānum ārat.

III. 13. 6. The śtī should perhaps be placed after arpayet.

III. 13. 7. bradhnasya visṭapam: this phrase occurs frequently in the JB: tad bradhnasya visṭapam gacchanti (ii. 387, 344, 351, 353, parallel passages); atha yāc catasras tad eva bradhnasya visṭapam. tasmān etad devis sarvān kāminān duhre (iii. 328); tad etat svargyam sāmā 'cute svargam lokam ya evam veda. tad yathā ha vai bradhnasya visṭapanān evam etāni vilīlasya visṭapāni svargasya lokasya samaṣṭyāi pra svargam lokam āpnoti ya evam veda (iii. 219); samudrasya (MSS. -d) visṭape occurs JB. iii. 218: cf. below, iii. 19. 7, trīvīṣṭ pam.

III. 14. 1-2. This is repeated, almost verbatim, JB. i. 18, where however the text is unfortunately even more corrupt than here: viz. tam ha "gatam prochati kas tvam (C. tasyam) asi 'ti (C. om. iti). sa (C. -e) yo ha nāmnā vā (A.B. om. vā) gotreṇa vā prabrāte (B. -braite) tam ha "ha yas te 'yam mayy (C. for hā "ha ... mayy has bhā bha ye su; for mayy
B. reads maruy, A. may) ātmā 'bhūd (B.C. ārā) eṣa te sa (C. sī) iti. tasmin hā "tman pratipat (C. prativart) tam (B.C. ta) ṛtavas (A. ṛtavas sampalāryapad (so A. and B.; C. sampalārya) ghītām apakārsanti.

Then, with only a few orthographical differences, to the end of 5 (all MSS. read suvas, svertyam, svar, svertyah, svar in 3 and 4). After this, sa etam eva sukyaratamasam (so C; A.B. savikṛt-) api tasya putrā dāyam upayanti pitarās sahdhukṛtyam. — In the text the division pratipat. ta is purely conjectural, the MSS. reading pratipatta, which might be an ablative depending on apakārsanti, but it seems not improbable that a past pple is hidden in the word. For sampadāryapad I have been unable to find an acceptable emendation.

III. 14. s. sa yathā ... eva: cf. JB. ii. 12, yathā ha vā idam āṇḍā (MSS. -āṇ) nirbhidyerann evam evai 'tasmād aṅkha nirbhidyaṇte; ākit. U. i. 4. 1, tasyā 'bhūtaptasya mukhah nirbhidyata yathā "yāṇam (cf. also RV. i. 104. 8, āṇḍā mā no ... nir bhet). — The yu in nirbhīṇam is noteworthy: see above, note to 1. 5. 1.

III. 15. s. Cf. ṢB. i. 5. 1 ff., indro ha vai viṣṇumitrāya 'ktham uva ca vasiṣṭhyā brahma. vāg ity eva viṣṇumitrāya mano brahma vasiṣṭhyāya. 2. tad vā etad vasiṣṭhah brahma; also TMB. xv. 5. 24. Hence a Vasiṣṭha should be chosen as brahman-priest, TS. iii. 5. 2. 1: vasiṣṭho brahma kāryaḥ; cf. ṢB. i. 5. 3.

III. 15. 4 ff. Cf. AB. v. 32; ṢB. 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; ṢB. i. 5. 4 ff.

III. 16. t. ubhayāpād, ubhayācakro: cf. iv. 14. 3, ubhayāpād (also ubhayādant): the AB. has ubhayatākpāt and ubhayatacakra.

III. 17. 1–2. Cf. Chānd. U. iv. 17. 4 ff.; AB. v. 32. 5 ff.; ṢB. xi. 5. 8; JB. i. 358, yan nu no 'dyā 'yaṅ yajñō bhreṣṭam iyāt (MSS. iy-) kenā 'nam bhīṣajyāme 'ti tān prajāpatir abruvid yad vā etasya trayasya vedasya teja indriyaṁ viryam rasa āśid idam vā āhām tad vā (MSS. vam) udayaccham (MSS. insert ity). etē vyāhṛtiḥ prāyačcham. etābhīr enam bhīṣajyate 'ti sa yadi yajña ṛkto bhreṣṭam iyād (MSS. i-) bhūs svāhe 'ti gārhapatyā jihvāthā. sā' tvā tatra prāyaçcittiḥ, attha yadi yauṣṭo bhuvas svāhe 'ty agniḥdre jihvāthā. sā' tvā t. pr. atha yadi sāmatas svas svāhe 'ty āhavaniye jihvāthā. sā' tvā t. pr. atha yadi 'ṭtiṣṭapūrṇamās a carkapūrṇamāsoyar vā bhuvas svāhe 'ti anvāhāryapacane jihvāthā. sā' tvā t. pr. atha yady anupasmṛtāt kutā idam ajānī 'ti bhūr bhuvas svas svāhe 'ty āhavaniye jihvāthā. sā' tvā tasya sarvasaḥ prāyaçcittiḥ.

III. 17. 3. tath yathā ...: very similar is Chānd. U. iv. 17. 7; the comparisons in AB. v. 33. 6 and ṢB. xi. 5. 6 differ, especially in the latter: cf. also comm. on KBU. (Bibli. Ind. p. 4, line 4 ff.), baddhāvā kāṣṭhe na 'na kāṣṭham niḥsaṁdhibhānaṁ jaturajjulohādibhiḥ.

III. 17. 4. tad āhur ...: almost verbatim as AB. v. 34. 1 ff.; GB. iii. 8.

III. 17. 5. With c of the gokha cf. Munḍ. U. ii. 2. 1, atrā' tat samarpatam ejat prāyanā nyāsac ca yat.

III. 19. 1. somāḥ pavate and upāvartadhvan: cf. below, iii. 34. 2 ṢB. iv. 2. 5. 7, 8; and Eggeling’s notes, SBE. xxvi. 307, 308.

III. 19. 3, 4 = i. 8. 4, 5.
III. 20. 1. yo 'smān . . . dvīṣmaḥ = KBU. ii. 8 (Mahānār. U. iv. 13);
the phrase (without the ca after yam) is very frequent in AV., e. g. ii.
11. 8 ; 19. 1-23. 5.
III. 20. 2. aparāna : cf. BAU. v. 15. 10 (CB. xiv. 8. 15. 10), apad asi
na hi padyaše, in an invocation of gāyatrī.
III. 21. 1. Text and translation are uncertain; the last two words
are emended after AV. vii. 35. 2 b, aham . . . bīlam apyādāhām.
III. 25. a. modo . . . pramodo : as in Tāt. U. ii. 5. 1, modo dakṣināḥ
pakṣaḥ pramoda uttarāḥ pakṣaḥ (of the atmā "nandamaṇyaḥ).
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. 1. 2 ff.
III. 28. 2. atra = loke 'cokāntare 'hime (BAU. v. 12. 1).
III. 29. 1. 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. 234 ff.) and Naciketas (TB. iii. 11. 8.
1 ff. ; Kāṭh. U. i. 1), and, in later literature, that of Kādambari calling
her lover back to life by her embrace (Weber, ZDMG. vii. 588 = Ind.
109.
III. 29. 2. Cf. Hom. II. 7. 99 f., ὃς ἀρα φωνῆσας (Achilles) ὄρεξατο χερσὶν
φύλασσεν| οὐ δὲ ἐλατεὶ 'ψυχή (of Patroclus) δὲ κατὰ χρονὸς, ἤδη κατιὼς,| θεοῦ τερπενία.
III. 30. 1. praajāpater . . . āsa : the same phrase occurred above, ii. 10.
2. — 'ṛṣṇām is perhaps to be taken with sa, and devānām in 4 with pra-
jaṭātīr.
III. 31. 1. Cf. JB. iii. 7, praajāpatri jāyamāna eva saha pāṃpanā
jāyata. so kumayatā 'pa pāṃpanā̗n haniye 'ti. sa etān vyādha-
chandanasā dvādaśaḥ yajñam apaṣyat. tam āharat. tenā 'yajata, tenā
vīśvaṅcam pāṃpanāḥ vyāuḥata. sa yāḥ pāṃmgraḥita iva manyeta sa
etena vyādhaṇḍaśa dvādashaḥ yajeta. vīśvaṅcam hāi 'va pāṃ-
panāḥ vyāhate.
III. 31. 2. The emendations of this corrupt passage are tentative only.
III. 31. 10. I have not been able to restore a satisfactory text.
III. 32. 2. tad atha yadā . . . : cf. CB. iii. 8. 3. 15 = 4. 5, yadā 'smāt
prāṇo 'paprāmātī dārv eva tarhi bhūto 'narthyaḥ cete ; KBU. ii. 14,
asmae charirād uccakramus tad dhā 'prāṇat dbhānāh dārubhātaḥ ācya.
III. 32. 3. sa . . . : as is seen from 8, they refer to antarātmā.
III. 32. 3. vācā kuroti : see above, i. 38. 4.—tasya svara . . . praajāh : 
cf. above, ii. 2. 6 ; in Chānd. U. i. 13. 2, svara and prāṇa are identified.
3, sā vāc so 'gnih. — ādityas svara . . . : cf. Chānd. U. i. 3. 2, samāna
u evā 'yaṁ cā 'sāu ca. uṣṇo 'yaṁ uṣṇo 'sāu. svara iti 'mam ācakṣate
pratyāsvara ity ānum ; i. 5. 1, ity asāu vā āditya udgīthā esa praṇavaḥ.
on iti hy esa svarann eti : cf. i. 8. 1, ya evā 'sāu tapati tam udgītham
upāśita. udyan vā esa praṇābhya udgāyati.
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III. 33. 7. brahmaṇa ávartaḥ: cf. Chând. U. iv. 15. 6, mānavam ávartam.

III. 34. 1. tad etan... yksāme: cf. Chând. U. i. 1. 5. — ácaturam: to the passages from MS., KB., and Kâṭh., quoted by Böhltingk (on Pâpini viii. 1. 15) and Schroeder (Monatsberichte d. Berl. Akaad., July 24, 1879, p. 683), must be added JB. ii. 276, ácaturam ha khalu vai mithunam prañanam; iii. 42, ácaturam (MSS. ácatuḥ) mithunam prañanam; iii. 87, ácaturam víva m. p.

III. 34. 2. somaḥ pavate and upāvartadhvam: see above, iii. 19. 1.

III. 34. 5. Cf. CB. vi. 6. 1. 6, yādṛg vai yonān retāḥ sicyate tādṛg jñayate; vii. 4. 1. 1, yādṛcād vai jñayate tādṛnī eva bhavati; Bṛh. Sañh. lxxv. 2.

III. 35. 1. The verse is RV. x. 177. 1.—On maricinām in d see Weber, Ind. Stud. ix. 9, note.

III. 35. 2. ati ratham udikṣate: these words are doubtless corrupt.

III. 35. 3. mariccaḥ I have left unchanged, regarding it as one of the frequent instances of confusion of ī-stems and ī-stems.

III. 36. 1. The verse is RV. x. 177. 2.

III. 37. 1. The verse is RV. x. 177. 3 (=i. 164. 31).

III. 38. 3. prañāṇāṁ janayātā: cf. i. 48. 8.

III. 38. 4. A similar etymology of gāyatra is given at BAU. v. 15. 7.

III. 38. 5. upā 'smāi... 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 devāḥ (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 (iyāksatā), and by the insertion of hum-bhā between the second and third syllable of the latter. The Bibl. Ind. gives the verse, yajñāyaṇāyaṁ, thus: upā 'smāi | gāyātā lá nārāḥ | pāsvāmāṇā | yādṛg | hummāyā | dāśāyā | ābhi devāḥ iyāksatā || te.

III. 38. 8. 5. soḍaṇaṇaṁ vāt brahma: cf. below, iv. 25. 2.

III. 38. 10. anvātāt: cf. note on i. 48. 7.


III. 39. 2. tad... avṛdyaṭ: I have not been able to restore a readable text. From what follows it would appear that parts of ovāc, as ā and o, are commented upon and mystically explained.

III. 39. s. ff. are similar to i. 4. 2 ff.

III. 40 ff. Only very few of these names occur in the Vaiṣṇavaḥmaṇa; a number of names are repeated in the vaṅga at iv. 16 ff.

After III. 42, the MSS. have this colophon:

bahuḥvād dhāraṇācaṅkā vismaranty alpabuddhayah:

yam ahaṁ triṣṇad adhyāyam alikhaṁ tam bhadgayaṁ.

IV. 1. 1. haritasṛṣyas samānabuddhaḥ: the correctness of the MSS. reading is doubtful, the meaning obscure.

IV. 2. 1 ff. Cf. Chând. U. iii. 16. The correspondence is very close, even to the misreading caturvriṇḍīvatvānti in 2.

IV. 2. 2. sarvaṁ vasv addadate: Chând. U. sarvaṁ vāsāyanti (cf. CB.
xi. 6. 3. 6; BAU. iii. 9. 4); cf. BAU. iii. 9. 4, etesu hi 'idan vasu sarva hitam (= JB. ii. 77, JAOS. xv. 240).

IV. 2. 6. For the etymology cf. JB. ii. 77; CB. xi. 6. 3. 7.

IV. 2. 3. For the etymology cf. JB. ii. 77, idan sarvam adadana yanti = CB. xi. 6. 3. 8; ii. 1. 2. 18 (of the sun), tasmad aditya nama yaod edah vishnu yajtram adatta.

IV. 8. 1. The AV. v. 28. 7 reads: tryayusam jamadagni aja tryayusam | tredha mrtasya ca karya trivy ayanite te karam; padas a and b, of the AV. version are also found VS. iii. 62.

IV. 8. 2. Cf. RV. i. 187. 1, upa naah pitav acara . . . | mayobhur . . .

IV. 8. 3. = TS. v. 7. 5. 7; also VS. xviii. 67, with these var. lect. : in a, pancejanya for purisyah; in b, asyam prthivyam abhi; in c, asi tvam. — purisyah: see Eggeling's note to CB. vi. 3. 1. 33. — yo: cf. above, 1. 5. 1.

IV. 5. 1 ff. Cf. below, 10. 10 ff.

IV. 5. 2. viratra, not so much "the end of the night" (PW., pw.) as the second half, or after-part of the night: cf. vyadhva. — agnihotra
delayam = after sunrise (AB. v. 31).

IV. 6. 4. Tallies with the description given of a Vedic student returning after he has completed his studentship, ÇGS. iii. 1; PGS. ii. 6; GGS. iii. 4; dandopanaham occurs also ÇGS. iii. 1. 18.

IV. 6. 5. sudgata . . . : cf. TS. xiii. 1. 6. 1, a 'syaa catvaa vira jayante suhotaa sudgata svadhvaryuh susabheyaah.

IV. 8. 2. Cf. BAU. v. 15. 12.

IV. 8. 7. For Pratidarca Aibhavaata, see CB. xii. 8. 2. 3.

IV. 9. 1. |spṛ follows the na-class only here and below, 10. 1-8: cf. e. g. stabhnati, stabhnoti; sinati, asinot (JB. iii. 210 ter); skabhnnati, skabhnnvanti; lnniti, lnoti; kshнатi, kshnoti; strнiti, strnoti, etc.

IV. 10. 1. saptadhah: i. e. by means of the seven vibhaktis of the sman enumerated in 1-7; cf. below, 18.


IV. 11. 1; o. Cf. ii. 32. 5.

IV. 13. 8. Chànd. U. viii. 3. 5; KBU. i. 6; BAU. ii. 3. 1 similarly divide satyam into an immortal (sat) and mortal (tt) syllable.

IV. 14. 8. The paragraph is obscure.


IV. 14. 8. 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 vai ke ca 'smal lokit prayanti candramason eva te sarve gacchanti . . . etad vai vargasya lokasya dvaram yac candramah. tam yaah prayyaha tam atisrayate. aha ya enam na prayasa ha tam iha vrśtr bhvāt varṣati. sa iha . . . teṣu-tesu sthānesu prayyājayante (Böhtlingk, Ber. d. Sächs. G. d. W. 1889, p. 201 ff.).

IV. 16 ff. Some of the names occurred above, iii. 40 ff.

IV. 18-21. The Kena-Upanishad. In Çaṅkara's recension it formed the ninth adhyāya. One of Burnell's MSS. of a fragment of JB. (i. 1-178) contains a commentary on this Upanishad, with the title Kṣudravivarana.
IV. 18. 2. Röer compares Kāth. U. ii. 6. 12 ; Tāit. U. ii. 2. 4 (=9);
Munḍ. U. iii. 1. 8.
IV. 18. 4. Both the Bombay ed. and the ed. of Röer count paragraphs 3 and 4 as one. — The second half-stanza of 4 occurs also Iṣa U.
10, 13 ; see also Weber, Ind. Stud. ii. 183.
IV. 18. 5. mano matam : this was also the reading of the author of the
Kṣudravivarāya.
IV. 18. 8. praṇīyate : for a similar pun between praṇa and ṣṇī + pra see Praç. U. iv. 3, yad gārhapatyāt praṇīyate praṇayanād āhava-
niyaḥ praṇaḥ ; also CB. vii. 5. 1. 21.
IV. 19. 1. daḥram : both edd. and the Kṣudravivarāya read dabh-
ram. The AV. recension reads daharam (Ind. Stud. ii. 182). — Both Č.
and the Kṣ. place a period after eva te and take manye viḍitaṁ (so, with-
out avagraha, all edd.) as a remark of the student, which is harsh and
unnecessary ; by reading av violates we obtain a fit transition to what
follows. The AV. recension differs considerably here, and begins the
second paragraph with viḍitaṁ.
IV. 19. 4. viḍayā ... 'mrtaṁ : cf. Iṣa U. 11, viḍayā 'mrtaṁ acnute
= Māit. U. viii. 9.
IV. 19. 5. vivicīya : Röer vicintya, Bombay ed. and the Kṣ. vicītyā ;
but the latter explains dhīrāḥ by vivekinaḥ : cf. Kāth. U. i. 2. 2, tāu
samparītya vivekāt dhīrāḥ.
IV. 20. 4. tad : both MSS. here tam ; in 8, A. tad, B. tam ; in 11, both
m (!) ; the AV. recension has tam throughout.— vā aham : the faulty
reading of the MSS. vā 'ham (here and once below, in 8) is found also
in Chamb. 137 throughout (Ind. Stud. ii. 182).
IV. 20. 5. nāi 'nad acakaṁ : the edd. here, and below in 10, 'tad for
'nad.
IV. 20. 6. ādadiya : the edd. and Č. ādadiyam.
IV. 21. 1. The edd. insert sā before brahma 'ti.— For mahīyadhva the
edd. have -dhvam.
IV. 21. 7. pasparcus : the edd. have the faulty form pasparcus.— 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. 137 (Ind. Stud. ii. 182). It is probable that the whole clause
is a gloss.
IV. 21. 4. vyayutad āt iti nyamiśad āt : Röer, vyayutadā iti 'ti
nyamiśadā; the Bombay ed., vyayutadā iti 'ti nyamiśadā. The author of the Kṣ. read nyamiśad. The ā after the verbs is
surprising ; both commentaries explain it as having the force of com-
parison (Kṣ. ā āve 'ty upamārtha açacaddaḥ). After nyamiśad an iti
seems to be wanting.
IV. 21. 5. yad eva ... cāi 'nad : the edd. twice etad.
IV. 21. 8. sarvāṇgāni : the edd. -nē : see note to i. 5. 1.
IV. 21. 9. 'jye : the edd., Č., and the Kṣ., jye (Č. = jyāyasi; Kṣ.
= mahati sarvamahati ; both explanations are impossible). But there
can be no doubt that the true reading is ‘jyeye, as suggested by Müller. Here ends the Kena-Upaniṣad.

IV. 22. 11. aṅāṅ 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 ṇmedicine (see arka (see PW.), I have not corrected it to arka, which would better fit the etymology here given.

IV. 23. 6. prāṇaṃ vāvo ’d: cf. Chand. U. i. 3. 6; BAU. i. 3. 25.—vāg gī: cf. Chand. i. 3. 6; BAU. i. 3. 25 identifies vāc with gīthā.

IV. 23. 8. Cf. Chand. U. i. 7. 1; BAU. i. 3. 22 differs.

IV. 23. 4. BAU. i. 2. 1 derives arkyam (so MSS.) from ḍṛc ‘honor’ and ku ‘joy.’

IV. 23. 6. Cf. above, 21. 7. The second half of this and the first half of the next paragraph are corrupt. The translation is purely tentative.—vīṣu as independent word is unsupported, and calls for emendation.

IV. 23. 7. The cūklam, kṛṣṇam, and tāmram are the three dāhūts. The rest of the paragraph is obscure, and I have not succeeded in restoring a satisfactory text. In da(space)çga of the MSS. perhaps damaç çama are hidden.

IV. 24. 8 = i. 43. 10.

IV. 24. 10. Cf. note to i. 26. 1.—In i. 25. 8, cūklam rūpam is also assigned to the ḍ, but 9 connects kṛṣṇam rūpam with the yajus.


IV. 25. 2. Cf. above, iii. 38. 8.

IV. 26. 8 ff. Similar are KBU. iii. 6 and BAU. iii. 2.—s. KBU. manasā sarvaḥ dhyānādy āpnoti; BAU. manasā hi kāmān kāmayañ. 

IV. 26. 9. vācaḥ: i.e. jīvayā, as KBU. (jīvayā hi rasānān āpnoti) and BAU. (jīvayā hi rasānān āpnoti) read: cf. CB. viii. 5. 4. 1, sarveṣām aṅgānāḥ vācaḥ ’vā ’nāsya rasānān āpnoti’; x. 5. 2. 15, na vācā ’nāsya rasānān āpnoti. See further, TMB. xx. 14. 8 (PW.), and JB. i. 269, in the note to i. 60.

IV. 26. 7. There are no corresponding passages in KBU.; BAU. has tvacā hi sparçan vedayate; for 9—11 there are no corresponding passages in BAU.

IV. 26. 10. KBU. upaśthenā ’nandaḥ ratim prajātim āpnoti.

IV. 26. 11. KBU. pādābhyāṁ sarvā ityā āpnoti.

IV. 26. 11. atisāmayaḥ ’taretayaḥ: the text seems to be corrupt.—dharṭarāṣṭra and pṛthuṛavas are mentioned together at TMB. xxv. 15. 3; AV. viii. 10. 99 reads dharṭarāṣṭra, and Kāuḍ. 9. 10 and 17. 27 pārtha- gravasa.

IV. 28. The sāvitrī is here given (as directed e.g. by ApGS. iv. 11. 10) pāda by pāda, hemistich by hemistich, and as a whole.

IV. 28. 6. apa... tarati: I have not corrected to ava... tarati on account of AV. vi. 6. 3 (RV. x. 183. 5 reads ava... tira in this verse).
INDEX.

I. Contains the ἀνάξ εἰρήνεια 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 vaṇça.

II. Gives a list of the etymological explanations.

III. Gives a collection of the more important grammatical points.

IV. Gives a list of quotations.

I.

akāra, iv. 13. 2 ; 14. 2.
akovida, iv. 1. 2, 3, 4, 5.
akṣaya, i. 24. 2 (bis).
akṣaram-akṣaram, i. 17. 2.
*akṣaravant, i. 48. 11.
akṣiti, i. 9. 5 ; 10. 4 ; iii. 14. 9 ; 22.
8 ; (*numeral) i. 28. 3 ; 29. 5.
aqada, iv. 2. 4, 7, 10.
Agastya, iv. 15. 1 ; 16. 1 v.
*agīta, i. 52. 9. Cf. gītāgīta.
*agṛhatā, ii. 13. 7, 8, 9.
*agnihotrela, iv. 5. 8.
*agnyarcī, iii. 29. 7.
aghāyu, iv. 4. 2.
vaacet *adhī-pari, i. 35. 8.
akṣas (*easy *), iii. 7. 4.
ayu (sāmnah), iii. 10. 3.
atipurasa, i. 27. 2.
ativyādhin (quot.), i. 4. 2.
*Atisāma *Etucreta (a demon), iv.
28. 15.
*atyaogra, iii. 5. 6.
 *atrasad, iv. 24. 3.
adṛhva, i. 55. 3.
adhvaryu, iii. 10. 7 ; 16. 2 ; 17. 4 ; 19. 6.
anantatā, i. 35. 8.
*ananvogama, ii. 3. 4. Cf. anvogama.
ananvīta (-an śāma), iii. 35. 8.
*anaparuddha, ii. 4. 8.
anapahaatapōpman, iv. 13. 3, 4, 5,
6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
anavānam (adv.), i. 37. 7 (bis).
anasthika, iii. 3. 4.
'anāmantra, see mantray + ā.
anāmayatva, ii. 11. 10.
'anālayana, i. 6. 4.
*anūsesha (-aḥ sāma), i. 30. 2, 8.
anugita, i. 55. 18 (bis).
anucara, iii. 11. 13.
anupadṛśa (locat. *secretly *), iii.
7. 6.
*anupasmta, iii. 17. 1.
*anumatra, iii. 17. 1: see ekastomabhāgānumatra.
anurūpa, i. 27. 4 (bis); (noun) iii. 4.
1, 2, 3.
*Anuvakt 'Sātyakirta, i. 5. 4.
anuvrata (fem.-tā), i. 56. 6.
anuśūbh, i. 18. 7.
anuśhyā, ii. 15. 6 ; iii. 33. 4.
anukta, i. 51. 1 ; 54. 2 ; 57. 8.
*anātthatṛ, iii. 8. 7 (bis).
anṛca, i. 15. 3.
ant (-te, adv. locat.). ii. 10. 2.
antarāman, iii. 32. 4, 5, 7, 8.
*antarikṣanāman, i. 20. 2.
antarāhi, iv. 4. 2.
*antarāhināman, iv. 4. 1.
*antaryakṣa, i. 20. 4 (bis).
antideva, iii. 33. 3.
anha, iii. 9. 1.
*annakṣiṇi, i. 11. 1.
annamaya, i. 29. 5.
*annāṣubha, i. 10. 1.
annāda, i. 51. 6.
*anyatodvāra, i. 30. 2.
*anvāga, iii. 19. 2. Cf. anavāga.
anvāhāryapacana, iv. 26. 15.
apakṣa, iii. 14. 9.
apaciti, i. 39. 5 ; (plur. with ivaR) i. 6. 3.
apacitīta, i. 30. 5.
apanna, iii. 20. 2.
apararātra, iv. 5. 3.
aparāhāra, i. 16. 5.
aparāhiya, iv. 5. 1 ; 10. 15.
aparimita, i. 46. 2 ; 47. 5.
aparodha (*independent word), ii. 4. 8.
aparyāpta, iv. 22. 12.
apaśa, iii. 38. 1.
apahatapāgman, iii. 27. 2 ; 39. 2 ; iv. 13. 3-10.
apitva, ii. 7. 1.
apitīta, i. 8. 10.
apita, i. 50. 3 ; 53. 7.
apratiścaya, i. 9. 5.
apratīśṭha, i. 15. 4.
apraptapaśa, iii. 38. 2.
Abhayada *Asamātya, iv. 8. 7.
Abhipratārin, iii. 1. 21 ; 2. 2, 3, 13.
Abhipratārin Kākṣaseni, i. 59. 1 ; iii. 1. 21.
*abhrāṅga, i. 30. 2.
abhrāṭroja (aṅ śāma), i. 30. 5 ; 45. 6 ; iii. 37. 8.
am, i. 53. 4, 6 (bis) ; 54. 6 (bis) ; 56. 2 (bis) ; 57. 4 (bis) ; iv. 23. 3.
amalākāṇḍa, i. 38. 6.
amānuṣa, ii. 9. 4.
amāvāsya (-ā rātrī), i. 38. 6 (bis).
amukha, iii. 38. 1, 2 ; iv. 11. 6.
ayana, i. 34. 2.
*ayamousya, ii. 8. 7 (bis).
ayasmaya, iv. 1. 3.
Ayuśya, ii. 8. 7, 8 ; 11. 8 (ter).
Ayuṣya Aṅgirasa, ii. 7. 2, 6 ; 8. 3.
*ayutadhā i. 10. 4 ; 28. 3 ; 29. 5.
*ayutadhāra, i. 10. 1.
arūka, iii. 32. 6 (bis).
artha, iv. 29. 3.
artha devatā, iii. 1. 1.
ardhabhāj, iii. 17. 5.
ardhodita, i. 12. 4.
*ardudadhā, i. 10. 4 ; 28. 3 ; 29. 5.
alabhamāna, i. 14. 1 (bis).
alam, iii. 31. 9, 10 (quater).
*alokatā, ii. 12. 7, 8, 9.
avakāya (-āṅ kṛ with dat.), i. 7. 2.
avikṛta, i. 58. 7.
avokṣaya, i. 10. 9.
avyāśīktta, i. 37. 6.
açan, iv. 5. 2.
açanayā, i. 3. 3, 4, 5 ; iii. 12. 2.
aceritā, iv. 22. 13.
acīmaya, iv. 1. 2.
acīrī, iii. 8. 1.
Aśāhita Uttarā Pārācarya, iii. 41. 1 v.
astacīvārinadāksara, iv. 2. 8.
āstacīphā, i. 1. 8 ; 6. 6 ; 9. 4 ; 33. 11 ; 34. 2.
vās + anus, iv. 13. 1.
asaṃbhāvyam (adv.), ii. 8. 4.
asaṃdhārā, iii. 13. 9.
asaṃmaya, i. 29. 3.
*vāsī, iii. 31. 9.
avara (*without melody, sāman) i. 18. 8.
ahorātra (dual), i. 25. 5 ; (neut. plur.) i. 46. 5 ; (fem. plur.), i. 21. 4.
ā (one of the five vyāhṛtis), ii. 9. 3, 5 ; (exclamation, *after the verb) iv. 21. 4 (bis).
ākramaṇa, i. 3. 2.
ākranti, i. 26. 6.
ākhaṇa, i. 7. 6 ; 60. 8 ; ii. 3. 12, 13.
āgā, i. 20. 6, 7 ; 37. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 ; 52. 9, 10 (bis).
*āgīta, i. 20. 6, 8 (bis) ; 55. 18 (bis).
āṅgīdhrā, iii. 17. 2.
Āṅgirasa, ii. 11. 9 (ter) : see Āyaśya Ā.
ācaturam, iii. 34. 1.
*ācāryadatta, i. 54. 1.
*ācāryokta, i. 22. 3.
*Ājakečin (plur.), i. 9. 8.
*Ājadvīsa, see Bamba Ā.
ājya, iii. 6. 4.
Ājñāra, see Parā Ā.
ātmavant, i. 48. 11.
Ἄτρεγα, see Δάκτα Κάτγαγανι ᾽Α.,

Chāta Κάτγαγανι ᾽Α.

άδι, i. 11. 7; 12. 4; 19. 2; 31. 2, 5;
58. 9; 59. 6; (άδικ, δά+ά), ii. 2.
9; iv. 10. 9, 13.

*άδιταρα, ii. 6. 10.

άδιπατγa, iii. 6. 6, 8.

γάρ + *υπα-σαμ, ii. 3. 4-10.

άπινα, i. 8. 12, 13 (bis).

άδίδι, i. 46. 2, 5; ii. 4. 4 (bis); iii.
20. 3, 11; 21. 5; 27. 3, 12.

άγατινα, i. 53. 3 (bis); ii. 12. 8.

Άρμυρ, i. 42. 1.

Άρινεγα, ii. 5. 13.

*Άρνικάγαγα, see Gατανιάνι ᾽Α.

άργγα, i. 59. 10.

*άλαμπάλαδόγατρ (ʔ), iii. 31. 10.

άλόπα, see μάθαλαπα.

*Άλλακεγα, see Χήτσαγαγα ᾽Α.

άντεα, iii. 33. 7 (bis).

άνιγκανα, i. 1. 7.

άντρη, iii. 11. 5, 6; 7; 12. 1.

*άντραγιγανα, iii. 31. 3.

άντραγανια-ά (τγ), iii. 38. 6.

*άντρα-γατρατρα-γατραβίτα (dual), iv. 6.

5; 7. 3 (bis).

γάς + αδη, i. 27. 1.

άσανγαγανα (adv.), i. 12. 4.

Άσαμάγα, see Αβάγαγα ᾽Α.

άσαρα, i. 16. 2.

άλλαναγια, iv. 26. 15.

άλλαγα, i. 54. 8.

γί + αβη-πρα (of the sun), iv. 5. 1.

γί + παρή, iii. 20. 4, 12: 21. 6.

γί + παρή, iii. 29. 3; 31. 8.

γί + *σαμ-υδ-ά, i. 35. 2.

ιτθάσα, see πυραντιθάσα.

γίδη + *υδ (conject.), ii. 13. 4.

ινδριγαναντ, i. 43. 11.

ινδραγαντγα, i. 10. 1.

Indrota Dāśvāpa Čānukaka, iii. 40.
1 v.

Iṣa Τγαναίνα, iv. 16. 1 v.

γίνη + *ν, i. 37. 4.

uktha, i. 40. 2 (bis); 45. 1 (quot.);

iii. 3. 2; 6 (νακκανάτα u.), 9 ff.;

4. 1.

ugra (-aη sαμαη), i. 51. 8; (-ο
deη), iv. 5. 1; 10. 10.

Uccāṅgrraṇas Kāνuγγεγα, iii. 29. 1,
2, 3.

uγχραγα, i. 5. 7.

ut (one of the five νγάλτ), ii.
9. 3, 8.

uktάντ, i. 26. 5.

Uttara, see Asadhga U. Pārṣaγαγα.

udṛc, iv. 14. 7; 15. 4, 5.

udgāṛ, i. 22. 2, 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. 3; 13. 8, 10, 13: 14. 9; 17. 4;

19. 6; 34. 4; iv. 9. 8, 9; 10. 9, 18.

udγάτα, i. 55. 13 (bis).

udgīθa, i. 11. 8; 12. 4, 7; 13. 1, 3,
5; 19. 2; 21. 7; 31. 2, 6; 33. 8,
5, 9, 10; 34. 1; 35. 4; 36. 1, 3, 5,
6, 8, 9; 54. 8; 58. 9; 59. 7; ii. 4.
1, 3; 5. 12; 6. 1, 3 ff.; 7. 1, 9;

10; iv. 8. 5; 9. 1.

upagāṛ, 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.

upadravṣa, i. 54. 3.

upanīṣad, iv. 15. 3; 21. 7; 23. 6.

upabdiṃant, i. 37. 3.

uparām (adv.), i. 58. 8.

upary-upārī, iii. 6. 5: 83. 5, 6.

upavasathiya, i. 54. 3 (bis), 5 (bis).

upavā, iii. 20. 1.

upāstamaγa (adv.), i. 12. 4.

*ubhayācastra, iii. 16. 7.

*ubhayāpad, iii. 16. 7; iv. 14. 3.

Umā Hāmavati, iv. 20. 11.

*Ulkūga (ʔ) Jānaγreγeγa, i. 6. 3.

Ucνaγa Kāγya, ii. 7. 2, 6.

*urdhvaγaγa, i. 57. 2.

urmi, i. 56. 1 (bis).

γαρ + *σαμ-υδ, iii. 19. 7.

γε (caus.), iii. 18. 5, 6.

γκτας, iii. 17. 1.

*γκpάda, i. 15. 5, 6.

γκράma, i. 54. 8, 5: 56. 1.

γκράμαν, ii. 2. 9 (bis), 10.

γγέδα, i. 1. 3; iii. 7. 8.

Rγaγrγγγa Kāγγyaγa, iii. 40. 1 v.

γγkαλπα, i. 4. 2.

ekacona, iii. 16. 5.
ekapad, iii. 16. 5.

ekaputra, ii. 5. 2.

ekarāj, iv. 8. 4, 15.

ekaviṣa (-aṃ sāma), i. 19. 1, 3
(bis).

ekavīra, ii. 5. 1.

ekavrātā, iii. 21. 3.

ekasthā, i. 37. 5.

ekastomadhāgānumantra, iii. 18.
6, 7.

vej, i.ii. 17. 6, 9.

etavādāvāsa, ii. 12. 6.

*Eluteta (?), see Atisama E.

Āikṣavaka, see Bhageratu Ā.

Āikṣavaka Vārṣa, i. 5. 4.

Āitareya, see Mahidāsa.

Āindrati, see Dṛti Ā. Āśāūṇaka.

āulaba, i. 51. 1.

om va, iv. 8. 6 (ter).

om vāGE om vāGE om vāGE hum bhā
om vāGE, iv. 8. 9.

okāra, iv. 13. 2; 14. 2 (bis).

om, i. 1. 6, 7; 2. 1 (quater), 2 (qua-
ter); 3. 5; 9. 2 (quater), 3 (bis); 10. 2, 7, 11; 18. 10, 11; 23. 7.
24. 4 (bis); 30. 1; iii. 6. 2; 10. 10,
11; 18. 8, 10, 12, 18; 14. 9; 18. 5,
7; 19. 1, 6, 7. Rule as to its pro-
nunciation, i. 24. 3. — (‘yes’) iii.
8. 5; 29. 6; 30. 2; 31. 6.

ovā ovā, i. 9. 1; 17. 1.

ovā ovā ovā hum bhā ovā, i. 3. 1.

ovāGE ovāGE ovāGE hum bhā ovā, i.
2. 3; iii. 39. 1.

ovāGE ovāGE ovāGE hum bhā vo vā,
iv. 14. 2.

kaṅsa (neuter !), i. 25. 5.

Kānsa *Vāraka, iii. 41. 1 v.

Kānsa *Vāraka, iii. 41. 1 v.; iv.
17. 1 v.

Kāṅśvant, ii. 5. 11.

kathā, iv. 6. 2.

kam (particle), i. 45. 2.

karmavant (‘active’), i. 43. 11.

kalācās, iii. 38. 8; 39. 1.

kalyāṇa (comparat.), iii. 34. 6
(quater).

Kācyapa, iv. 3. 1.

Kāśasen, see Abhipratārī K.

Kāṇḍviya, iii. 10. 2 (bis).

see Janaçruta K., Nagarīn
Janaçruteya K., Sāyaka
Janaçruteya K.

Kātyāyana, see Dakṣa K. Ātreya.

Kāpeya, iii. 2. 2, 12.

see Āśāūṇaka K.

kāma (adv. accus.), i. 54. 1, 5.

kāmacāra (noun), iii. 28. 3.

kāmaduṅgākiṣṭi, i. 10. 1.

kāmapra, iv. 6. 1, 2.

kāmāgāya, i. 5. 12.

Kārtrīdā (plur.) ii. 4. 4.

kāryṣāyaśu, iii. 17. 3 (bis).

Kāvyā, see Ucchānas K.

Kācyapa, iii. 40. 2 v.

see Kṛṣaṅga K., Devatasas
(‘vānasāyana, K., Ćruṇa
Vāñkay K.

kīṁkāma, i. 11. 2.

kīṁdevatā, i. 59. 12.

kuṣyā, i. 56. 1.

Kubera *Vārakya, iii. 41. 1 v.

kudhra, i. 4. 5; iii. 39. 5.

kumbyā, i. 50. 5 (ter); 53. 9.

Kuru (sing.), i. 59. 1; (plur.) i. 38.

1 : see Kārupava.

Kurupaṇeala (plur.), iii. 7. 6; 8. 7;
30. 6, 9; iv. 6. 2; 7. 2.

kuṭāla (with dat.), iii. 8. 3.

y/kṛ + vi, ii. 2. 9.

Kṛṣyadatta Lāhuṭiya, iii. 42. 1 v.

Kṛṣyadhṛti Śātyaki, iii. 43. 1 v.

Kṛṣyadāta Lāhuṭiya, iii. 42. 1 v.

see Trīveda K. Lāhuṭiya.

kṛṣṇājina (‘poss. cpd.’), iii. 8. 7.

kṛṣṇagacru (*plur.), iii. 9. 4; iv. 6. 4.

Kečin Dābhya, iii. 29. 1, 2.

Kārupaya, see Ucchādasyas.

kāraṇava, i. 39. 1.

kratru, iii. 39. 3-10.

y/kṛand + abhi, ii. 2. 9.

*Kṛaṭuṭaṭe, see Rāma K. Vāyū-
ghrapadyna.

kṛūḍa, ii. 25. 8.

kṛâuṇa, i. 37. 6; 51. 12.

y/kṣar + *adhi-vi, i. 10. 1.

Kṣāmī, see Sudakṣiṇa K.

kṣudra, ii. 23. 4.
kṣuradhārā, iii. 18. 9.
khalā (-ā devatā), i. 5. 1, 4.
*Gaṇānāsa *Aṛṣheśākṣayā, i. 38. 4.
Gaṇadhārvāpsaras (plur.), i. 41. 1;
55. 10, 11; iii. 5. 1.

vṛgam + anu (of the fire), iii. 1. 7.
vṛgam + adhi (pass.), i. 39. 4-47. 4.
vṛgarh (with genit.), i. 16. 11.
vṛgā (caus. "play"), i. 58. 2.

vṛgā + 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.

vṛgā + upa (‘address’), iii. 2. 2.
gāthā, i. 50. 4 (ter); 53. 9; 57. 1.
gāthā, iii. 9. 9.
gāyatra, i. 1. 8; 2. 8; 3. 7; 37. 7; iii.
11. 5; 38. 4, 7, 9; iv. 8. 5; 18. 3, 10; 14. 2; 15. 8; 16. 1.
gāyatṛi, i. 1. 8; 17. 2; 18. 4; 55. 2, 57. 1; iv. 2. 2; 6. 8; 7. 6; 8.
2, 1.

*gāyatrimukha, iv. 8. 2.
gārhapātaya, iv. 26. 15.
*gitāgīta (plur.), i. 52. 9.
Gupta, see Vaiśeṣicīcita Dāryahaya-
yantī G. Lābhītya.

vṛgh + ud, i. 5. 6.

vṛgh + prati, iv. 6. 9; 7. 7; 8. 1, 2.
vṛgh + vi, iii. 19. 1.
gotra, iii. 14. 1.
gotrā, iii. 29. 6.
Gośala Vārṣya, i. 6. 1.

*gośhaga, i. 10. 1.

*Goçru (a Jābāla), iii. 7. 7.
Gaṇatama (patron. of Aṛuni), i.42.1.
Gaṇuṣkī, iv. 16. 1 v.

vṛgā (with dat.), iii. 10. 3.
caṣurmayā, i. 28. 7.
caṣuṣcrotra (poss. ephd.), i. 10. 1,
caturāṅgula, iii. 33. 6.

caturvīṇacatayakṣara, iii. 38. 9; iv.
2. 2.
caturvīṇacatayardhamāsa, iii. 38. 9.
catuṣpadra, ii. 5. 5.
catuṣcatvīṇacatadoḍakṣara, iv. 2. 5.

vṛcar (with pple.), iii. 7. 5.

vṛcar + anu-sam, iii. 38. 2.

vṛcar + abhi-ara, iv. 1. 2 ff.
vṛcal + anu-vi, iii. 21. 4.
vṛcal + vi, iii. 21. 4.
cātvāla, i. 5. 5.
vṛcā (conject.), iii. 31. 3.
citi, iii. 10. 8. 9.
Cākkitānena, i. 37. 7; ii. 5. 2;
(plur.) i. 41. 1.

see Brahmudattra C., Vāsi-
štā C.
Cāṭirathī, see Satyādhitvākū C.
jagati, i. 18. 6; 55. 2; 57. 1; iv.
2. 8.

jau + abhi (with accus.), iii. 11.
2-7.

Janaçrula Kāśāvīya, iii. 40. 2 v.
Janaçrula *Vārakya, iii. 41. 1 v;
iv. 17. 1 v.

Japya, iii. 7. 3.
Jamadaṅgi, iii. 3. 11; iv. 3. 1.

Jayaka Lābhītiya, iii. 42. 1 v.
Jayanta, see Yaçasvin J. Lānhi-
tya.

Jayanta Pāñçaryya, iv. 41. 1 v.
Jayanta *Vārakya, iv. 41. 1 v
(two persons of this name); iv.
17. 1 v.

Janaçrula, see Nagarin J. Kāś-
āvīya.

Jānaçruteya, see Ulukya J., Sā-
yaka J. Kāśāvīya.

Jābāla, iii. 9. 9; (dual) iii. 7. 2, 3,
5, 7, 8 (bis).

see Goçru, Çukra.

Jīvana, i. 53. 8 ff.

vṛj + nis (‘prim. conj.’), iii. 33. 3.

Jāivali, i. 38. 4.

jiyeṣṭabhrāmaya, iv. 23. 1, 5.

jiotishmant, i. 43. 11.

*Jvālāyana, iv. 16. 1 v.
tathā (exclam.), iii. 6. 2, 4.
taddevatya, i. 59. 12.
tadvana, iv. 21. 6.

vṭan + anu-sam, iv. 2. 4, 7, 10.

vṭap + ā (adv. locat. of pple.), iii.
32. 7.

vṭap + upa, iv. 2. 4, 7, 10, 11 (bis).

*tapastantu, i. 10. 1.
tāmra, iv. 1. 7; 23. 7; 24. 12.
tītīyasavana, i. 16. 5; 37. 4 (ter); iv. 2. 8 (bis), 10.
∗yṛṣ + *anu-sam, i. 14. 4.
tejśavin, i. 43. 11.
trapu, iii. 17. 3 (bis).
trayā vedā, i. 1. 1, 2; 8. 1, 3, 4, 10.
trayā vidyā, i. 18. 10; 19. 2; 28. 6; 45. 3; 58. 2.
∗trayodaśamāsā (poss. cnd.), i. 10. 6.
Trasadasun, ii. 5. 11.
tridhātu, iv. 23. 6, 7.
∗triputra, ii. 5. 4.
trivisñuṣa (neuter), iii. 19. 7.
∗Triveda Kṛṣṇarāta Lāuhitya, iii. 42. 1 v.
tristubh, i. 18. 5; 55. 2; 57. 1; iv. 2. 5.
tryāṭya (quot.), iv. 3. 1 (bis).
tryaṣṭi, iii. 11. 5.
Dakṣa Kātyāyani Ātreyā, iii. 41. 1 v; iv. 17. 1 v.
∗Dakṣajayanta Lāuhitya, iii. 42. 1 v.
∗yadgh + pra (*future ind.), iii. 15. 4.
∗daṇḍopānaha, iv. 6. 4.
∗daddā (exclamation), iii. 6. 2.
daddā tathaḥ hantā him bhā ovā, iii. 6. 4.
darśata, iv. 1. 1.
∗daçapurtra, ii. 5. 9.
daçavājī, i. 4. 3.
∗Dārāhajayanti, see Vāipaçaḍīta D. Gupta Lāuhitya, Vāipaçaḍīta D. Dārāhajayanta Lāuhitya.
Dābhya, see Keśin D.
Lābhya (patron of Brahmadatta Cākitānaya), i. 38. 1; 56. 3.
Dābhya, see Baka D.
∗divastambhana, i. 10. 9, 10.
∗dīh + *vi, iii. 14. 11 (bis).
∗dīptāgra, ii. 4. 1, 3 (bis).
∗duranuṣaṁprāya, iii. 33. 2.
∗duranuṣeṇa, iii. 7. 5.
durdhā, ii. 14. 6.
∗durdhiva, iii. 33. 2.
∗dudredevatā, i. 14. 1.
ḍṛṣṭha, iv. 23. 18.
∗Drīḍhajayanta, see Vāipaçaḍīta D. Lāuhitya, Vāipaçaḍīta Dārāhajayanta D. Lāuhitya.

Drīti Āṅdroti Āṇnaka, iii. 40. 2 v.
∗yṛṣ, iii. 29. 4 (bis).
∗yṛṣ, i. 55. 4 ff.
∗Devataram[732], yānasāyana Kācyapa, iii. 40. 2 v.
devaṛut (sāman), i. 14. 2.
devāśa, iv. 8. 8.
Dāivāpa, see Indrota D. Āṇnaka.
āvāśvarthiśvī, i. 50. 1.
∗yāṭu + *anu-sam, i. 25. 4.
∗yāṭu + upa (‘sing the upadraya’), ii. 2. 9; iv. 10. 6, 15.
∗yāṭu + vi, i. 54. 8.
āvā-daśāha, iii. 31. 1, 6.
∗dviputra, ii. 5. 3.
∗yāhā + apa-ni, i. 8. 6.
∗yāhā + abhi, iii. 31. 7.
∗yāhā + prati-sam (active), iii. 4. 6; 23. 4 (bis), 8; 24. 4 (bis).
∗yāhā + vi-a (pple.), iii. 28. 5.
∗yāḥā (pple. dhāta), i. 38. 6.
āhāyyā, iii. 4. 1-3.
āhi, i. 58. 8 (bis), 10 (bis); (plural) i. 57. 1 (bis).
āhāśāgarīra, iii. 30. 3, 4; 39. 2.
Dṛḍharaśtra (a demon), iv. 26. 15.
Nagarin Jānaçruteya Kāṇḍiva, iii. 40. 1 v.
∗yam + sam, ii. 13. 9.
∗yavaniçapīyā, ii. 5. 3.
∗yavaputra, ii. 5. 9.
Nāka, iii. 13. 5.
∗nāmarūpa, iv. 22. 8.
ṃrācaṃśi, i. 50. 6 (ter); 53. 9; 57. 1.
∗nīkharvadhā, i. 10. 4; 28. 3; 29. 5.
∗nīj + avam (‘intens.’), ii. 14. 4.
nītārām, i. 38. 2 (bis).
nīdhana, i. 12. 3, 4; 7; 13. 1, 3, 5; 19. 2; 21. 7; 31. 2, 9; 35. 6; 36. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; 54. 8; 57. 5; 58. 9; 59. 10; iii. 34. 3; (nīcondaṃ i + upa), ii. 3. 9; iii. 34. 3; iv. 9. 7; 10. 7, 15.
∗nīdhanaśra, i. 35. 6.
∗nīdhanaśāṃsī, i. 12. 2.
*niyutadhā, i. [10. 4]; 28. 3; 29. 5.
niyid, iii. 4. 1, 2 (ter), 3.
niça, iv. 5. 2.
niśka, i. 35. 7, 8.
vī + abhi-ati, i. 12. 7, 9; 13. 8, 5.
vī + vi, iii. 29. 2, 6.
1 vned + pra, i. 1. 3–5; 23. 3–8.
nyāṅga, i. 4. 2–5; 45. 5; ii. 12. 1, 2; iii. 37. 7 (bis).
*nyarbudadhā, i. 10. 4; 28. 3; 29. 5.
*nvāva, i. 12. 8; 13. 2. 4; ii. 10. 9, 12, 15, 18, etc.
nvā, i. 4. 7; iii. 31. 10.
*pañca-patra, i. 5. 6.
vyāṇy, iii. 18. 3.
vyāṇa, i. 38. 5.
vyat + upa-apa, i. 11. 7.
Patarīga Prājāpatya, iii. 30. 3.
vyad + sam (causat.), i. 51. 4; 56. 10.
padma (numeral), i. 10. 4; 28. 3; 29. 5.
para, i. 9. 3.
Para Aṭṭāra, ii. 6. 11.
paramapuruṣa, i. 27. 2.
Paramaśṭhin Prājāpatya, iii. 40. 2 v.
paral-parovariyant, i. 10. 5 (bis).
*parā-kṛnti, i. 26. 5.
parā (‘useless’), i. 2. 4, 5.
paridhānīya, iii. 4. 1–3; 16. 6.
parīsad, ii. 11. 13, 14.
parisvāṅga, iii. 29. 7; 30. 1.
parvan, iii. 23. 4, 5; 24. 4.
palava (‘sang’), i. 54. 1.
*Palligupta Lāuhitya, iii. 43. 1 v.
vyā + anu, i. 8. 7 (bis).
papya, i. 56. 6.
vyath (causat.), i. 87. 4.
pāñcalā, iii. 29. 1.
Pārāṣārya, see Asaṭṭha Uttara P.,
Jaya P., Vipaṭṭet Çakunimitra P., Sudatta P.
*Pārthuḥgravasa (a demon), iv. 36. 15.
*Pārśa Cāñlana, ii. 4. 8.
pitū, iv. 3. 2.
pitṛajaran, iv. 5. 2.
*puvyakṣa, i. 5. 1.
puvyakṣtya, i. 80. 4.
punarheiro, iii. 35. 7, 8 (bis).
*punassambhūti, iii. 27. 18, 17.
*purāṇaṇīḍha, i. 53. 9.
purisya (quot.), iv. 3. 3.
purodhā, iii. 6. 6, 7, 8.
purovāta, i. 12. 9; 36. 1.
Pulusa Prācinayogya, iii. 40. 2 v.
puspa (quot.), iv. 3. 1.
vyā + anu, i. 50. 8; 54. 2; 57. 2.
pāti, ii. 15. 2.
vyṛcekh + ati, i. 59. 13.
*prathaksalita, i. 10. 1.
*prthivipraṣṭha, i. 10. 9, 10.
*prthivipravara, i. 10. 1.
Pṛthu Vāinya, i. 10. 9; 34. 6; 45. 1.
Pāluṣṭi, see Satyaśaṭṭha P. Prācin
ayogya.
Pāluṣṭita, see Satyaśaṭṭha P.
pra (one of the five vyākṛtis), ii. 9. 3, 4.
*pragā, i. 20. 6; 21. 3.
pragātha, iii. 4. 1–3.
prajāktāna, iii. 18. 6.
*prajāpatinātra, i. 8. 12.
prajāvat, i. 53. 2.
*prajāvavant, i. 48. 11.
pratigraha, i. 58. 6.
pratipat, iii. 14. 2 (?); iv. 14. 5.
pratibodhavīda, iv. 19. 4.
pratirūpa, i. 27. 5 (bis); 47. 1.
pratiśthā, i. 20. 6; 21. 2.
pratiśṭhāvant, i. 48. 11.
pratiśāra, i. 3. 7; 11. 9; 12. 4, 7; 13. 1, 3, 5; 19. 2; 21. 7; 31. 2, 7;
35. 5; 36. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; 37. 7;
54. 8; 58. 9; 59. 8.
Pratidatva, iv. 8. 7.
pratti, i. 58. 6; iii. 6. 1, 2 (bis), 5.
pratyakṣam (adv.), i. 33. 5; ii. 2. 7, 8.
*prathamamirbhīṣṇa, iii. 14. 8.
*prapatīṇu, i. 48. 5 (bis).
prabhāti, ii. 4. 6 (bis).
pramoda, iii. 25. 4.
*prayutadhā, i. 10. 4; 28. 3; 29. 5.
pravāha (“carrying forth”), iii. 28. 3.
*prasāma, i. 15. 4.
prasāmī (adv.), i. 15. 4.
prastāva, i. 11. 6; 12. 4. 7; 18. 1. 3, 5; 17. 3; 19. 2; 21. 7; 31. 2. 4; 33. 3, 5, 9, 10; 34. 1; 35. 3; 36. 1, 3. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; 54. 8; 58. 9; 59. 5; iii. 38. 9.

prastotṛ, iii. 18. 3. 6.

Prācēnayoga, i. 39. 1.

see Puluṣa 'P, Satyayajīa
Pauḷuṣi P, Somaścūna Sātya-
jāti P.

Prācēnaçāla (plur.), i. 10. 1.

*Prācēnaçāli, iii. 7. 2, 3, 5, 7; 10. 2.

Prājāpatya, see Paramēṣṭhin P.

praṅe ("successive"?), i. 21. 4.

praṇyamaya, i. 29. 1.

*praṇyāsāhākita, i. 10. 1.

praṇāpāna (dual), ii. 5. 3; 6. 2; iii. 21. 7. 10.

praṭāranañvāka, iii. 16. 5, 6.

praṭāssava, i. 16. 5, 12; 37. 1 (ter); iv. 2. 2 (bis), 4.

Prāṭāḍha Bhālla, iii. 31. 4.

prādecaṃatā, i. 33. 5.

Prāravana, see Plakaṣa P.

*Prastuḫapāda *Vāraṇya, iii. 41. 1 v.

prayā + a (causat.), i. 8. 12.


prat + a, ii. 2. 9.

prat + *ni, i. 56. 7–9.

prat + *parā, i. 56. 4.

prat + pra, iv. 11. 10.

prat + sam (causat.), i. 36. 1.

Baka Dāḷhīya, i. 9. 8; iv. 7. 2.

bandhutā, i. 59. 10.

Banda *Ājadvāsa, ii. 7. 2. 6.

*bālivāhana, iv. 24. 9 (bis).

bālīvara, i. 4. 3.

bahiṣpavamāṇa, i. 5. 6; iii. 5. 5.

bahuputra, ii. 5. 11; 9. 10.

bahiṣa, iii. 20. 2.

bahaṛca, iii. 4. 2.

Bobhārvya, see ʿaṅkha B.

bimbha, iii. 5. 6.

bila, ii. 21. 3.

bhrant (fem. -ḥati), ii. 2. 5.

bradhna, iii. 18. 7.

brahmavatva, iii. 15. 2.

Brahmadatta Ćaṅkītāneya, i. 38. 1; 59. 1.

brahman, i. 1. 8; 25. 10; 26. 8; 33. 2; 40. 3; ii. 18. 1. 2; iii. 4. 5, 9; 15. 2, 8; 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.

brahmaçeas, iv. 24. 11.

brahmavarcasākāma, i. 37. 6.

*brahmāsandā, iv. 24. 10 (ter).

brahmapakula, iii. 28. 4.

*brahmaśaṅkakta, i. 10. 1.

brahmaṅgī, iii. 4. 5, 9; 21. 7 (b. upaniṣad).

bha (exclam.) i. 4. 2 ff.

bhakāra, iv. 14. 2.

Bhageratha Aśikvāka, iv. 6. 1, 2.

bhadra, i. 46. 2, 3.

bhandunant (-mat sāma), iii. 6. 6.

bhara (epith. of the moon), iii. 27. 11.

*bharṇaḍakeṣya (?), i. 54. 2.

bhāṣ bhāṣ, iii. 39. 1.

bhā, iii. 10. 10 (or bhāṣ ?).

Bhālla, see Prāṭāḍha.

Bhāllabīn (plur.), ii. 4. 7.

*bhāvant, i. 48. 11.

bhāma, i. 57. 1.

bhāmala, i. 57. 1 (bis).

*bhuvanādi, iii. 17. 6, 7.

bhūvas, i. 1. 4; 23. 6; iv. 28. 2.

ybhu + anu, i. 54. 7; iv. 12. 6.


ybhu + adhī, i. 55. 1 (bis).

*bhūtaḥan, ii. 3. 4, 11.

bhūti, ii. 4. 7 (bis); iii. 20. 3, 11; 21. 5: 27. 3, 12.

bhūman, i. 46. 1.

bhūr bhūvas, iv. 28. 4.

bhūr bhūvas svār, ii. 9. 3, 7; iii. 17. 2; 18. 4; iv. 5. 5; 28. 6.

bhūrībhāra, i. 10. 9, 10.

bhūs, i. 1. 3; 28. 6; iv. 28. 1.

bhoga, i. 85. 7.

ybhrēṣ, iii. 16. 5 (bis): 17. 1.

bhṛṣa, iii. 16. 7 (bis).

*madhūdhāna, i. 22. 1.

madhunāti, i. 22. 1.

madhuparka, i. 59. 1–3, 11.

*madhuputra, i. 55. 1.
moda, iii. 25. 4.
yaksma (rājau), iv. 1. 8.
yajurveda, i. 1. 4 ; iii. 15. 7, 8.
yajas, iii. 17. 1.
yajñakāma, i. 14. 4.
yathāgīta, i. 55. 13.
yathāyatana (adv.), i. 18. 3.
yādevatya, i. 59. 12.
yāvidvānas, iv. 6. 6 ; 7. 4.
yāyam + vi-ā, i. 37. 5.
yācasvin, i. 43. 11.
Yācasvin Jayanta Lāhuṭa, iii. 42. 1 v.

yugas + *prati (conjunct.), i. 5. 7.
yātayānan, i. 88. 6.
yāvadāvāṣa, ii. 12. 6.
yāyu + pra, iv. 6. 11 (bis).
yukti, iii. 5. 4.
yāyu + pra, iv. 6. 7 ; 7. 5.
rajaṭamaya, iv. 1. 5.
rapasa (?), i. i. 2. 4, 15.
rahasti (adv.), ii. 18. 5.
rājakula, ii. 28. 4.
Rāma *Krāhuṭāyē Vāiyāghrapadaya, iii. 40. 2 v ; iv. 16. 1 v.

yruṣ, iii. 27. 2 (bis).
yruḥ + *sām-ud, iii. 3. 1.
retasvin, i. 43. 11.
reṣman, i. 2. 6.
raibhā, i. 50. 7 ; 57. 1.
rodhasti, i. 25. 5.
Rāhuṇa, a demon (quot.), i. 29. 7, 10.

labh + upa, i. 29. 7 ; 30. 1.
lāja, i. 8. 11.

bIII, i. 45. 4 ; 51. 3 ; 54. 3 ; 58. 7 ;
iii. 37. 6.
lokajīt, iii. 20. 10.
loma [-saman f], i. 38. 3.
lomaṣa, i. 38. 8.
loṣṭa, i. 7. 6 ; 60. 8 ; ii. 3. 12, 13.
lohamaya, i. 1. 4.
lohāyasa, iii. 17. 3 (bis).

lohitastoka, iii. 9. 2.
lohīṭāy, i. 12. 4 ; iv. 5. 1 ; 10. 10.
Lāhuṭa, see Kṛṣṇadatta L., Kṛṣṇarāta L., Jayaka L., Triveda
Kṛṣṇarāta L., Daksajayanta L.,
Palligupta L., Mitrabhūti L.,

madhvālopa, i. 22. 8.
manus, iii. 15. 2.
manoneto, ii. 32. 9.
mānaṇyaya, i. 28. 5.
mānyukt (?), iii. 5. 5.
mānurīpa, iv. 22. 13.
māνaṃtraya + anu, iii. 18. 2, 3 (bis),
4 (bis), 5, 6, 7 (bis) ; 19. 1, 7.
māνaṃtrray + ā, i. 59. 2, 3.
māndra, i. 51. 6.
māmatvin, i. 51. 3 ; 58. 8.
mayaḥ, iv. 3. 2.
mariči, iii. 35. 6.
martyāyīta (dual, *copul. cpd.), i.
25. 8.
mala, i. 57. 1 (bis).
mahāgrāma (*possess. cpd.), iii.
18. 5.
mahānīveca, iii. 10. 5.
mahāmāṃsa (plur.), i. 48. 5.
mahācana, ii. 15. 2 ; (superlat.), ii.
15. 1.
Mahidda Aśitareya, iv. 2. 11.
mahina (conject.), iii. 20. 2.
mahāy, i. 48. 5.
mahāy, i. 29. 8 ; 46. 2 ; 48. 5.
mā (absolutely), i. 59. 18.
Mātaricvan, iv. 20. 8.
-mātra, see praṣajāpatimātra,
mādhyanāṃ savana, i. 16. 5 ; 37.
3 (ter.) ; iv. 2. 5 (bis), 7.
Māṇava, see Ćaryāta M.
manusniṣṭhakaṇa, iii. 14. 7.
māhāvīṣa, iii. 40. 2.
mi + abhi-ṇi, iv. 14. 2.
Mitrabhūti Lāhuṭiya, iii. 42. 1 v.
miṣ + ni, iii. 17. 6, 9 ; iv. 21. 4.
miṣc + abhi-ati, i. 30. 4.
Mudja Sāmaravasa, iii. 5. 2.
muduridhiṣṭ, i. 39. 1.
mūta, i. 20. 5.
mṛgatva (ām car), iii. 29. 2.
mṛtyupadga, iv. 9. 1, 3-9 ; 10. 1-9,
18.

mṛt + pra, ii. 11. 1.
mṛt, ii. 3. 2.
mṛṣ (intens.), i. 8. 10.
mṛṣ + prati-abhi, i. 29. 6.
māṭrāvaruṇa, iii. 6. 4.
Yaçasvin Jayanta L., Vipaçeit Dr̥ḍhajayanta L., Vipaçeita Dāṛḍhajayantī Guptā L., Vipaçeita Dāṛḍhajayantī Dr̥ḍhajayanta L., Čyāmañjayanta L., Čyānasuṣjayanta L., Satyaçra-vas L.

vra[ā] (intens.), iii. 16. 3. 5.  
v[ṛ]vāi + a[va], iii. 7. 5.  
vāna (conjunct.), iii. 31. 3.  
*vāraṇaparīyatana, i. 10. 1.  
vartani, iii. 16. 1-3.  
*vāraṇapavitra, i. 10. 1.  
varyika, i. 30. 2.  
valgu, i. 51. 10.  
vara (ce kr.), ii. 4. 1. 2.  
vāṣa, iii. 17. 4; vāṣākāra, i. 54. 8.  
*v[ṛ]vas + vi (adv. locat. of pple), iv. 5. 1.  
vasantā (adv.), i. 35. 2.  
Vāsiṣṭha, ii. 2. 13; 15. 2; 18. 6 (bis), 7.  
Cf. vāsiṣṭha.  
v[ṛ]vā + ava, iii. 21. 2 (bis).  
*vāṃprabhūta, i. 10. 1.  
vāṃdevatya, i. 59. 14.  
vāṃnaya, i. 28. 3.  
vāc (one of the five vyāhṛtis), ii. 9. 3, 6; (exclam.), iii. 10. 10; 14. 9.  
vācanyama, i. 16. 6.  
*vāraiki, see Kaṅsa V.  
*vāra[ka, see Kaṅsa V., Kubera V., Janaçruta V., Jayanta V., Pras-ṭhapāda V.  
Vāraṇa, see Āikvāka V., Gobala V.  
vāsiṣṭha, iii. 15. 2.  
Vāsiṣṭha Cāktitāneya, i. 42. 1.  
Vān[eyya, see Čruṣa V. Kācyapa.  
*v[ṛ]vij + *prati (conjunct.), iii. 10. 5 (bis).  
*v[ṛ]vid + anu (‘assent’), iii. 10. 1.  
Vipaçeit Dr̥ḍhajayanta Lāuhiṭya, iii. 42. 1 v.  
Vipaçeit Čakunimitra Pārācārya, iii. 41. 1 v.  
vipra (conjunct.), i. 53. 8.  
vibhū, iii. 27. 2.  
vibhāti, i. 20. 6; 21. 1; 42. 8.  
vibhātimant, i. 43. 11.


\(\text{saṁgrahīty,}\ iii. 7. 8 ; 8. 3.
\)

\(\text{saṁveça, iv. 10. 10.}\)

\(\text{saṁsad, ii. 11. 13, 14.}\)

\(\text{saṁsava, i. 9. 8.}\)

\(\text{saṁsthā, i. 20. 6 ; 21. 4.}\)

\(\text{saṁsparça, iv. 26. 7.}\)

\(\text{sajāta, i. 46. 2 ; 48. 3.}\)

\(\text{sajātavanasyā, iv. 5. 4.}\)

\(\text{aśaṁj + abhī, ii. 15. 2.}\)

\(\text{saṭam, iv. 8. 9 ; 9. 9 ; 10. 8, 9.}\)

\(\text{Satyaśayānā Pālūṣita, i. 39. 1.}\)

\(\text{Satyaśayānā Pālūṣi Prācīnayogya, i. 40. 1 v.}\)

\(\text{Satyaśayavas Lāuhītya, iii. 42. 1 v.}\)

\(\text{Satyaśudhibhū Cāitravathī, i. 39. 1.}\)

\(\text{ṣuṇā sud + ud, iii. 14. 6.}\)

\(\text{sadas, i. 54. 3 (ter), 5 (bis).}\)

\(\text{saptakeṭvan, iii. 34. 4.}\)

\(\text{saptaputra, ii. 5. 8.}\)

\(\text{saptarṣaṁqi (quot.), i. 28. 2.}\)

\(\text{saptavatī (aṁ sāma), i. 31. 8 (bis) ; iii. 34. 4.}\)

\(\text{sabhā, ii. 11. 13, 14.}\)

\(\text{samānabuddha (?)}, iv. 1. 1.}\)

\(\text{samāptī, i. 46. 2, 4.}\)

\(\text{sampat, i. 27. 2 ; iv. 8. 9.}\)

\(\text{sampratī, i. 5. 5 ; 45. 3 ; iii. 31. 2, 7.}\)

\(\text{samibhā, iii. 20. 3, 11 ; 21. 5 ; 27. 3, 12.}\)

\(\text{samibhūti, i. 46. 2, 6 ; ii. 4. 5 (bis).}\)

\(\text{iv. 7. 4 (bis).}\)

\(\text{saras, i. 25. 5.}\)

\(\text{sarvajava, iv. 20. 6, 10.}\)

\(\text{sarvatodvāra (aṁ sāma), i. 30. 2, 3.}\)

\(\text{sarvapraṇācittā, iii. 17. 3.}\)

\(\text{sarvamṛtyu, iv. 9. 9 ; 10. 8, 9, 18.}\)

\(\text{sarvarūpa, i. 27. 6 (bis).}\)

\(\text{saḥasrāputra, ii. 6. 11 (bis).}\)

\(\text{saḥasrākṣara, i. 10. 1.}\)

\(\text{sāṅga, iii. 8. 3, 5 ; iv. 8. 9 ; 9. 9 ; 10. 8, 9, 13.}\)

\(\text{Sātyakī, see Kṛṣṇadhṛti S.}\)

\(\text{Sātyakīrtha (plur.), iii. 32. 1.}\)

\(\text{see Anuvākt S.}\)

\(\text{Sātyayajñī (plur.), ii. 4. 5.}\)

\(\text{see Somācīṣma S. Prācīnayogya.}\)

\(\text{sāmatas, iii. 17. 1.}\)
sāman, see anavītā, anīśedha,
abhṛtṛtya, ekaviṅga, devaçrut,
bandhumant, loma, saptavidha,
suvatodvāra.
3. sāman (masc.), i. 34. 11.
sāmanvin, i. 43. 11.
sāmapathā, i. 6. 1.
sāmadeva, i. 1. 5; iii. 15. 7, 8.
sāmanvīrya, i. 59. 3, 12.
Sāmaçravasa, see Muñja S.
sāmi (with genit.), iv. 2. 11.
Śāyaka Jñānaçratya Kāyādiya, iii.
40. 2 v.

vćcī + vī-ā, see avyāsīka.

svuñçitarasa, iii. 14. 6.

Suciṣṭa Cāṣālana, i. 14. 4.
Sudakṣīṇa, iii. 7. 8; & 6 (see Sudak-

Śaṇḍa Kṣāmī).

Sudakṣīṇa Kṣāmī, iii. 6. 3; 7. 1,
4, 5, 6 (see Sudakṣīṇa).

Śaṇḍa Pāraçarya, iii. 41. 1 v;

iv. 17. 1 v.
sudāh, ii. 14. 6.
sūmanuvāvid, iv. 6. 6; 7. 4 (bis).

Suyājñā Çāṇḍīya, iv. 17. 1.
suvama, ii. 8. 4.
suvra, iii. 14. 3, 4.
suvarga, iii. 14. 4.
suvarya (epith. of hiranya), iii.
34. 6.
suvregnāvaya, iv. 1. 6.
suhō, iv. 6. 6; 7. 4 (bis).
suśka, iii. 4. 1-3.
sucī, i. 10. 8.
sudgār, iv. 6. 6; 7. 4 (bis).
sunurūpa (?), iii. 2. 15.

sv + abhī-pra ("ind. of causat.",

i. 14. 4.

sv + pra ("approach"), iii. 29. 3.
sopāna, iii. 8. 7.

Somābhhaspati (dual), i. 58. 9.
Somacṣumā Sātyayajñī Prācīna-

yogya, iii. 40. 2 v.

stana, iii. 14. 7.

vṣṭu ("sing the stotra"), i. 59. 12.

vṣṭu + pra, i. 17. 2; ii. 2. 9; iv. 9.
4; 10. 2, 12.

vṣṭu + sam, iv. 6. 7; 7. 5 (bis).

stutaçstra (plur.), iii. 16. 6.

VOL. XVI. 34

stotra, iii. 3. 1.

stotriya, iii. 4. 1-3.

stobha, i. 20. 6; 21. 5; 57. 5.

stoma, i. 13. 3; iii. 4. 11; 5. 4.

stomabhāga, iii. 8. 1, 2.

stomavan, i. 49. 11.

sthā, ii. 7. 1.


vsthū + anu-upa, i. 46. 3-5; 47.
1-7; 48. 1-6.

sthānu, iii. 13. 5, 6.

sthiti, iii. 18. 7.

vṣpr, srṣuti, iv. 9. 9; 10. 1-8.

vṣpr + ni, ii. 12. 1.

vṣand + vi, i. 10. 5.

vṣvaj + pari, iii. 29. 7.

svadhyārya, iv. 6. 6; 7. 4 (bis).

svayambhū, iv. 11. 2.

sva, i. 1. 5; 23. 6; iv. 28. 5.

vsva + anu, iv. 14. 2.

vsva + abhā, i. 21. 10, 11.

svanapaka, iii. 13. 10.

svarganaraka (plur.), iv. 25. 5.

svarya, iii. 83. 5, 6.

svarsya, iii. 29. 1.

svāhākāravasaṭkāra (dual), i. 13. 3.

vhan (desid. pple.), iv. 1. 7.

hantā (exclam.), iii. 6. 1. 4.

haras, i. 21. 7; ii. 3. 1.

harastra (?), iv. 1. 1.

hastina, iv. 1. 1.

hasta, iii. 25. 8.

v3 hā + pra, iii. 31. 3; (pple.), i.
25. 5.

hiṅkāra, 1. 3. 7; 4. 1, 6, 8; 11. 5.
12. 4, 7, 9; 13. 3, 5; 19. 2; 21. 7;
31. 2, 3, 33. 3, 5, 6, 9, 10; 34. 1.
33. 2; 36. 1, 8, 5, 6, 8, 9; 38. 6;
54. 5; 57. 5; 58. 9; 59. 4; iii. 12.
2, 3; 34. 2.

vhiṅkr, i. 3. 4; 4. 1, 6; ii. 2. 9; iii.
34. 2; iv. 10. 1, 11; (intens. pple.),
i. 11. 5; 35. 2.

hima bha, i. 4. 1.

hima bhā ova, i. 4. 6.

hima vo, i. 4. 8.

hiraṇyadanta, iii. 2. 4, 15.

hum, iii. 10. 10.

hum bag, iii. 10. 3.
II. Oertel.

hum bo, iii. 13. 2.
hum bha, iii. 13. 1.
hum bha om vac, iv. 8. 6.
hum mā, iii. 12. 4.
*huss (exclam.), iv. 22. 2.
\(\text{vṛ} + \text{abhī-vi-ā}, \) iii. 4. 5, 11.
\(\text{vṛ} + \text{pari}, \) i. 52. 8.

vṛ + pari-ā, i. 35. 7.
vṛ + prati, ii. 2. 9; iv. 9. 6: 10. 4, 15.
*Hṛtvacaya Ālakaṇa, iii. 40. 2 v.
*hrdayāgra, i. 10. 1.
heman (adv. locat.), i. 35. 6.
Hāimavatī, see Umā H.
hotṛ, iii. 16. 2; 17. 4; 19. 6.

II.

ETYMOLOGIES, ETC.

akṣara: vykṣar, i. 24. 1; 43. 8.
\(\text{vṛṣi}, \) i. 24. 2; 43. 8.
antarikṣa: antaḥ, antaryakṣa, i. 20. 4.
Ayāśya: ayam + āśya, ii. 8. 7; 11. 8.
arkya: re + ka, iv. 23. 4.
asu: vyā, i. 40. 7.
asura: asu + vṛam, iii. 35. 3.
Āṅgirasa: aṅga + rasā, ii. 11. 9.
ādi: vyā + ṅā, i. 11. 7.
\(\text{vṛdā} + ṅā, \) i. 19. 2.
āditya: vyā + ṅā, iv. 2. 9.
vārta: vyṛt + ṅā, iii. 33. 7.
uras: uru, iv. 24. 2.
re: vṛc, i. 15. 6.
gāyatra: gāyam atrāyuta, iii. 38. 4.

devačrut: devatāḥ + vyṛcu, i. 14. 8.
pataṅga: vṛpat + aṅga, iii. 35. 2.
pacṛyā: vṛpač, i. 56. 6.
pratihāra: vṛ + prati, i. 11. 9.
prasāma, prasāmi: pra + sāman, i. 15. 4.

prastāva: vṛstu, i. 11. 6.

Byhaspati: (vāco) bhṛtyāi pati, ii. 2. 5.
bhimala: bhima + mala, i. 57. 1.
madhuputra: mad adhyabdhi, i. 55. 1.

mahīyā: vṛmahīya, i. 48. 5.
Rudra: vṛud, iv. 2. 6.
rodasi: vṛud, i. 32. 4.
Vasu: vasu, iv. 2. 3.
vāiguinītra: viḍva + mitra, iii. 3. 6.

gatasani: gatam + vṛstu, i. 50. 4 ff.
sajāta: vṛjan + saha, i. 48. 3.
samudra: vṛdu + sam, i. 25. 4.
sāman: vī + sam, i. 33. 7; 40. 6; 48. 7; 51. 2; iv. 18. 2.

sama: i. 12. 5.

sā + ama, i. 53. 5; 56. 2; iv. 28. 3.
sindhu: vṛsi, i. 29. 2.
suvarga: suvar + vṛgam, iii. 14. 4.
hari: vṛṛ, i. 44. 5.

III.

GRAMMATICAL.

The Grantha characters are liable to confuse pa and va, tta and kta, r and ra, th and dh, dh and y, also long and short vowels, especially u and ū. There is no distinction made between mma and mama. No avagraha is used.

Lingual ū for n: see note to i. 1. 5.
wv: v, tanwce, iv. 3. 2 (verse); suvar, iii. 14. 3, 4; suvarga, iii. 14. 4.
Locat. of stems in -an without ending; as sāman, i. 21. 8; 53. 4; aksan, i. 41. 7; 43. 9.

Confusion of i-stems and ī-stems:

marci, iii. 35. 6.

Numerals: see note on i. 10. 4; sahasram sapatī = 70000.

Verbs: vṛṣṭ, pres. spruṇṭi, see note on iv. 9. 9; vṛṣṭ according to
a-conjugation, ii. 10. 4 ff.; ⊙, irregular imperfects samātatt, i. 48. 7 (see note) and anvātatt, iii. 38. 10; ⊙, preceptive ăśicīyād, i. 3. 8 (see note); yćā + pari-ā, past pples paryādatta and par-yātta side by side, ii. 3; yćāt, 3d. sing. pres. ćaye, i. 35. 7; periphrastic future with plural of pple: ćmaćānāni bhavitāraḥ, gā- tāras smaḥ, i. 38. 3; transitive use of passive aorist in -i (?), iii. 9. 9 (see note); adverbial gerund, upāpapātām, i. 11. 7.

Composition: nidhanakṛta for -nī- kṛta, i. 35. 6 (see note); apposition instead of composition: pāp-mā nyaṅgaḥ, 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 vetica, ii. 15. 3; kam after dat. infin., i. 45. 2 (verse); vetica with accusative, i. 37. 3 ff.; vetica + a with ablative, i. 19. 3; i. 57. 9; 58. 10; locat. absolute of pples: ātapatī, iii. 32. 7; upatapatī, iv. 2. 11; vyust, iv. 5. 1; verb in plural after ćaturviṅgati, i. 17. 2; iii. 38. 9.

IV.

1. Verses.

[atīvyādhi rūjanyāc ćūraḥ, i. 4. 2, a Vedic reminiscence: see note.]

aditit dyūur aditit, i. 41. 4: RV.
i. 89. 10, etc.
apacitam gopām anipadyamānam,
iii. 37. 1: RV. i. 164. 31=x. 177. 3, etc.
ātma devanām uta martryānām, iii.
2. 4: cf. Chānd. U. iv. 3. 7.
āyur mātā matiḥ pitā, iv. 1. 7.
indārum uktham rcam, i. 45. 1.
imām esām prthivīm, i. 34. 7: AV.
x. 8. 36.
ūtāi sām jyeśṭhāḥ, iii. 10. 12: AV.
x. 8. 28.
upā 'smāi gāyata, iii. 38. 6, 8: RV.
ix. 11. 1 (SV. ii. 1, 113), etc.
ṛṣayu ete mantrakṛtaḥ, i. 45. 2.
catvāri vāk parimitā, i. 7. 3; 40. 1: RV. i. 164. 45, etc.

tat savitru vareyam, iv. 23. 1 ff.: RV.
iii. 62. 10 (SV. ii. 812), etc.
tryāṇusāṁ kaçyaṣpasya jamadagnes
iv. 3. 1: AV. v. 28. 7.

[navo-navo bhavasi jāyamānāḥ,
iii. 27. 11, Vedic allusion: see note.]
pataṅgam aktam, iii. 35. 1: RV. x.
177. 1, etc.
pataṅgo vācam manasā, iii. 36. 2:
RV. x. 177. 2, etc.
mayi 'dam manye bhuvanādi, iii.
17. 6.
mahātmane catuḥ devaḥ, iii. 2. 2:
yād dyāvā indra te ćatam, i. 32. 1:
RV. viii. 70. 5 (SV. i. 278; ii.
212.), etc.
yas saptaṛṣaṁvīr vaśabhas, i. 29. 7:
RV. ii. 12. 12, etc.
ye 'gnayaḥ purīṣyāḥ, iv. 3. 3: TS.
v. 5. 7. 4, 5; VS. xviii. 67.
yebhir vāta iṣitaḥ, i. 34. 6: AV. x.
8. 35.
rūpaṁ-rūpaṁ pratirūpo, i. 44. 1:
RV. vi. 47. 18.
rūpaṁ-rūpam maghavā, i. 44. 6:
RV. iii. 58. 8.
sa no mayobhūḥ, iv. 3. 2.
sa yadā vai mriyate, i. 4. 7.
strī smāt 'vā 'gre, i. 56. 5.
sthūnām iśivastambhanīm, i. 10.
9, repeated in 10, but different in d.
2. YAJUSES, ETC.

abhijāt asy abhijayāsām, iii. 20. | prāyāḥ prāyāḥ prāyāḥ hum bhā
10. | ovā, ii. 2. 7.
amo 'ham asmi (longer version), i. | mahān mahāyā samadhatta, iii. 4. 5.
54. 6; (abbreviated), 57. 4. | yat purastād vāsi 'ndro, iii. 21. 1.
arānasaya vato 'si, iv. 4. 1. | vibhūḥ purastāt sampat paścāt,
upāvatadham, iii. 19. 1; 34. 2. | iii. 27. 2.
guhā 'si devo 'si, iii. 20. 1. | vṛṣṇi savitā bhuvasi, iv. 5. 1.
diṭas stha cgrotam, i. 22. 6. | ājñāvo darçato harinīlo 'si, iv.
devena savitrā prasūtaḥ, iii. 18. 3, 6. | 1. 1.
puruṣāḥ prajāpatis sāma, i. 49. 3, | satyasya panthā, iii. 27. 10.
4 (bis). | somaḥ pavate, iii. 19. 1; 34. 2.

CORRECTIONS.

P. 81. (Text) i. 1. 8, read aṣṭācaphāḥ for aṣṭācaphāḥ.
P. 85. (Text) i. 5. 1, read akar ṛ 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 losṭho, and cancel note 1.
P. 115. (Translation) i. 37. 5, read further on for above (?)
P. 122. (Notes) 411, read rūpam-rūpam for rūpam-rūpam.
P. 122. (Translation) i. 54. 8, read three times [ṛc] for [āgā ṇ].
P. 140. (Text) i. 60. 8, read losṭo for losṭho, and cancel note 19.
P. 145. (Text) ii. 63. 12, 13, read losṭo for losṭho, and cancel note 310.
P. 148. (Translation) ii. 66 (end), insert 12 before He who.
P. 154. (Notes) 111, read -aḥ for aḥ.
P. 164. (Translation) iii. 5, line 6, read 4 instead of 3.
P. 166. (Text) iii. 7, line 4, read 4 instead of 3.
P. 168. (Notes) 914, read -yaj- for yaj-.
P. 176. (Translation), iii. 10. 6, read brahman-priest for Brahmān priest.
P. 187. (Translation), iii. 27. 11, read Bearer for Burden.
P. 188. (Translation) iii. 28. 5, read bahu vāhyātto for bahuvyāhito.
(Notes) 291, read -āīcīr- for āīcīr-.
P. 201. (Translation) iv. 2. 2, read gāyatri for gāyatri.
(Notes) 19, supply ayāny.
P. 216. (Text) iv. 19. 2, read su for sv.
P. 237. line 13, read ativyadhi for ativyadhi.
P. 237. line 43, read kimcā 'pī yo for kimcā '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-Mausulī), the foremost singer and composer in the reign of that celebrated despot, Ḥārūn 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-Ağānī—a work which I class by its contents as a musico-biographical encyclopædia and from which Ibn Hallikân 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 Moḥtār al-Ağānī; also by Ahlwardt,‡ 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 Nowās, p. 13.
§ Journal Asiatique (1873), 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 Kitâb al-Âgânî in Ibrahim’s own words, as they purport to have been repeated to his son Ishâk, by him to his son Hammâd, and by the latter to Mohammed ibn Maziyad,† who passed it on to Al-Ishbahânî, the author of the Âgânî.‡ Yet it is identical with the anecdote in the Thousand and One Nights, entitled “Story of Abu Ishâk an-Nâdirî Ibrahimî al-Maṣûlî (and his adventure) with Abu Murrâ.”§ 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-Mas‘ûdî (“French translation, vol. vi., p. 340”); for the passage cited relates the appearance of the Devil to Ishâk, his son (also known as Al-Maṣûlî), 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 Halba(t) al-Kumait, is of course the correct one.** This anthology was written by Shams ad-Din an-Nawwâjî (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 Âgânî 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 Murrâ in speaking of the Devil accords with the latter. There are also other agreements with the Âgânî account. The story, however, received an addition or two: e. g. the statement that Ar-Rashîd, after appointing Saturday for the “day off,” gave Ibrahim two thousand dinars.

---

* Cf. some remarks by Derenbourg in the Revue Critique (1888), no. 15.
† Also known by his surname Ibn Abi-l-Âzhar (cf. Âgânî, v. 66 below middle; at the conclusion of this story, v. 38, incorrectly Ibn al-Âzhar).
§ So Macnaghten. But Cairo ed. (1892 A. H.) iii. p. 163 has Iblîs for Abu Murrâ.
¶ Perhaps the index to Al-Mas‘ûdî (vol. vi.) misled him. It makes the same blunder.
** Cf. Lane, l. 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 Ishâk 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 māḏārī 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 Ağâńî, 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. Şalḥānî (Beirut, 5 vols.), however, "Ibrahim."
‡ In one case (اذًا ذًا ذًا، then the Nights has a more apposite reading. But the Bulâk text of the Ağâńî 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 Yusus the Scribe (and his adventure) with Al-Walid ibn Sahl," exhibits such a history. For the basis of it is to be found in the Kitāb al-Āgānī, in the biography of Yūnus. Likewise the "Story of Jamīl ibn Ma'amr (told) to Hārūn ar-Rashīd," the eighth of these anecdotes, describes a scene, though not the incidents, of one of the traditions adduced on authority in the biography of Jamīl.§

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 Ishāk; 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-Maṣʿūlī's Murāj ad-Dahab, so unhappily referred to by Burton. There are also in the Āgānī 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. 295, 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 Āgānī. The story of "Isaac of Mosul and the Merchant" (ed. Lady B., iii. 238) should be carefully compared with the version in the Āgānī (v. 126). The Basket-story of Ishāk 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 Āgānī, v. 41-2).
al-Mahdī,* a story of Ibn Jāmiʿ, who was not of Persian but of
good Ḫoreishite birth, inspired by a jinni,† and a story of Moḥā-
rik, Ibrahim al-Manṣūlī's favorite pupil, surprised by a vision of
Iblīs in the form of an old sheikh.‡ Under the same category of
weird stories come the traditions, also found in the Ḵânīf, that
one of Ishāk's most famous melodies was learned from cackling
geese,§ and that his father Ibrahim one night, in a grotto belong-
ing to his estate, enjoyed a secret opportunity to plagiarize on
the efforts of two miauling cats.|| It must not be supposed, how-
ever, that educated persons of the tenth century, among whom
one would certainly class the author of the Ḵânīf, believed in
the truth of these narratives. With acumen Al-Īṣbahānī tells, at
the close of the account of Ibrahim and the Devil: "Thus am I
informed of this story by Ibn al-Azhar (Ibn Abī-l-Azhar). 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 follow-
ing), 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 Dār-Rimma (= "he of the withered limb," not Dār-
Rumma), to the amazingly fine new melody which he had just
composed in the māḥārī metre. But, though the idea that Ibra-
him 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 māḥārī 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 Harun 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 māḥārī metre or not matters lit-
tle, 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-Īṣbahānī'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 Harun's father, the caliph Al-Mahdī, 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 sing-
ing, among whom were Yaḥyā ibn Marzūk (al-Makki) and Ibn

---

* Cf. Barbier de Meynard in Journal Asiatique (1869), 6e série, xiii.
307.
† Cf. Caussin de Perceval, l. c., p. 542, and Ḵānīf vi. 71 top.
‡ See Brünnow's vol. xxi. of the Ḵānīf, p. 282.
§ Ḵānīf, v. 89 middle.
|| Ḵānīf, v. 20 bottom.
Jāmi‘, and to stand forth conspicuously in his profession. His old master Siyāṭ had just died. Meanwhile, Fuleih ibn al-‘Aurā‘ was ranked of the old school of composers, Ḥakam al-Wāḍī was only mediocre in his rendering, Mūḥammed ar-Ra‘f (az-Zaff?) was unoriginal, and Mojamā‘, ‘Alawīyya, and Iṣḥāq were yet young and of the new generation. Ibrahim ibn al-Mahdī, 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-Ma‘ṣūlī 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 censure may be given to the following account of a musical scene at the caliph Al-Hādī. In the “Tārīkh ar-Rusul wa-l-Mulāk” of At-Ṭabarî it reads thus:

One day [Ibrahim speaks] we were with Mūsā [i. e. Al-Hādī], and Ibn Jāmi‘ and Mo‘ād ibn at-Ṭobeib† were with him (too). It was the first day that Mo‘ād had come in to our presence, and Mo‘ād was excellent in (singing) songs and well acquainted with some of the old ones. (Al-Hādī) said: “Whoever of you pleases me (with a song) shall have his choice (of reward).”‡ So Ibn Jāmi‘ 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:

“Suleimān 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 Aḡānī seems to offer nothing respecting this person.
‡ Literally, “Whoever of you pleases me, his choice (shall be) to him.” The exact sense of طَرِبُ 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-Ḥarrānī 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-Ḥarrānī took me into the treasury and said “How much will you take?” I said “One hundred ṣadra.”* 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 ṣadra 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 Aḡānī.‡ It appears, however, to have descended (from Ishāk) through a different channel of tradition. Although agreeing verbally in parts, it varies considerably concerning the circumstances of the occasion. At-Ṭabarī 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-Iṣbahānī 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 Aḡānī is here translated. After describing the morose and sour-tempered Al-Ḥādī, 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 Sureij he praised more highly than the school of Maʿbad. 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 بَدْر (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 Marwān 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-Harrānī, 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 dinārs.

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-Ṭabarî 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 Agâñî 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 ‘Alî 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 Agâñî was a youth of fifteen.† It may be said, therefore, with all probability, that Yahyâ put into Al-Iṣbahānī’s hands papers in his possession which contained this story of Ibrahim and Al-Hâḍî, 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 Agâñî 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. اَخْصَسْتُ يَلَّهُ أَبُو يَرَكَ.
† See ed. Flügel, p. 143. Ibn Hallikân closely follows the Fihrist in his articles on ‘Alî and his son Yahyâ.
‡ See v. 102 bottom.
That At-Tabari, however, gives his little anecdotes on less good authority, there is an indication in his tradition from a certain Al-Karmāni, who related that Al-Hādī despatched Yahyā ibn Ḥalid with a ring as token of good-will to Ibrahim al-Manṣūlī for the purpose of bringing him back to court. For, in the later years of Al-Mahdī, Ibrahim had been forced to seek a hiding-place through having violated his oath that he would not associate with his two sons, Mūsā and Hārūn. But, according to the family tradition, known to Al-Iṣbahānī directly from Ḥammād, 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-Hādī’s presence, where he announced in touching lines of his own composition the sad news of his favorite wife’s decease.* Had Ḥammād known that Yahyā 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 At-Tabari 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.

AGĀNĪ.

I asked Ar-Rashīd 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 maidens 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-Rashīd 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.


1 So Lane (from Ḥalba(t) al-Kumeit version).

2 Lane here agrees with the Agānī.

3 Lane adds “and he gave me two thousand dinārs.”

4 Ahlwardt (l. c.) freely: “auf den Tag gebe ich nicht viel.”
But while I was in my sitting-room with the harem around me and maidens in line before me, behold I (was visited) by a sheikh of comely and reverend (aspect), clad in short boots and two fine shirts, a kalansuwa\(^1\) 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\(^4\) 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\(^5\) 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 Ishāk,\(^6\) are you (inclined) to sing us something of your art wherewith you have good custom from high and

---

\(^1\) For “women,” the Āghānī has ﻨِاْرُمَأٓ ﺔَرُمْ ٖ ﺔَرُمْ with masc. pl. verb, the 1001 Nights ﻨِاْرُمَأٓ ﺔَرُمْ with fem. pl. verb (all eds.).

\(^2\) Burton for feilasān “a doctor’s turband.” Lane does not know the form of the kalansuwa.

\(^{3}\) Lane adds “from his clothes.”

\(^4\) Lane has “chamberlain” here and at the opening of the story. Aḥlwardt refers the “turning off” to the visitor. This may be supported by the reading of the Gotha epitome, which he used.

\(^5\) Likewise Lane, “tales of war.”

\(^6\) Lane “Ibrahim.”

\(^7\) 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 Ishâq! 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 Salhâf (Beirut, 5 vols.) corrects to "Ibrahim," in accordance with the context.
2 Salhâf (Beirut, 5 vols.) omits ۱۰۹.
3 Lane has "proves himself unworthy of my conversation" (a mistranslation?).
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 لَقَبُ 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."

(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" صىوت.
² Following Burton's translation. Ahlwardt, "Culvers of the hedge, back hither return."
³ Ahlwardt, "Euch girren hören ist mein einzig Glück."
⁴ Agâñf شرطبن; 1001 Nights شربتین . The translation of this line is too free to be faithful. Lit. "(as though) they had drunk wine or madness were in them."
Ibrahim of Mosul.

Then he sang also these couplets:

"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.
Bespake 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 said: "Ibrahim, this song is māḥārī. 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, bared it, ran to the doors of the harem and found them closed. I

Then he said: "Ibrahim, sing this song which you have heard, 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 astonished, rose for my sword, drew it, then hastened to the door of the harem and

---

1 This musical note is very interesting (Moḥ. ibn al-Harīṭ was slightly younger and outlived Ibrahim, to the reign of Al-Maʿmūn). 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. I found it closed. I said to the maidens "What have you heard?" They said "We have heard the sweetest and finest of singing." I went out astounded to the house-door, found it closed, and asked the door-keepers about the old man. They said: "What old man? By Allah, no one has come in to you to-day." So I went back thinking it over.

But lo, he called me from one of the corners of the house, and said: "No harm to you, Abu Ishâk! I am Iblis, who have been your guest and companion to-day, so trouble not." Then I rode off to Ar-Rashîd, 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-Rashîd 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!"
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 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 gloriæ.
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 Kaṇva 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 Kaṇvas.

The first example is the one already cited. In x. 95. 14 we find a plurality of “far distances” implied in paramād parāvat; 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 Kaṇva-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 (triṣv ā rocāne dīvās, i. 105. 5; viii. 69 (58). 3); the mystical “three dawns” are known only in viii. 41. 3; x. 67. 4; and nīrtri, 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 trivor’t, occurring quite a number of times, is found in the Atharvan, but in RV. only in the Kaṇva 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 trivor’t 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 smṛtis; often employed in the Brahmanic period; not rare in the AV.; found in RV. in the General Books and Kaṇva, 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 triṣadāhasthe barhiṣṭi in i. 47. 4 is paralleled only by the similar trīdāhātu barhīṣ of viii. 102 (91). 14; and by trībarhiṣi 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 land which is elsewhere ascribed to Agni, that he is “born in three

* Trikakudh (Indra) in sense refers to three-forked lightning.
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. 10ff.). The same growth in appreciation of esoteric wisdom, especially affected in the Brāhmaṇas, may perhaps be traced in the fact that “concealed” padāṇi are spoken of only in i. 164. 45; viii. 8. 23; x. 13. 3 (=AV. xviii. 3. 40, v. 1.). 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 raṃmāyas of the sun” are spoken of only in i. 105. 9 and viii. 72 (61). 16, although synonyms of raṃmāyas are often found elsewhere, and Indra’s seven raṃmāyas are common. Ludwig, indeed, will not accept Śayana on i. 105. 9, when the latter says saptasāṁkhyaḥ raṃmayaḥ śūryasya to explain antī yē saptā raṃmāyas tātṛa me nāhbhir ātataḥ; 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 śūryasya saptā raṃmibhis 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 kavāyas, 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-inflection, p. 578).

I reckon as late, not early, coincidences with cīs-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 hendra, this
designation occurs only in viii. 24. 27, where it stands on a par
with the one mention of Babylon’s mintage, the “mande 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 gaphá
is ⅔ and kolu is ⅗.* So AV. vi. 46. 3; xix. 57. 1.

Before leaving the province of seven, I may add the fact that
saptamunusa 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
munusa can stand here for “priest.” We may accept the ex-
planation that seven means “many” (PW.), but another explana-
tion 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-collec-
tions make the first Rik-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 collec-
tions, 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 numer-
oun, 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”
(ṛṣayas), 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 ṛṣi, and to this division refers
the “Agni of the seven tribes” (saptamunusa) 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, munasa,
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. 260.
seven, such as “seven gifts,” “seven rivers,” are raised by trebling to twenty-one; just as, conversely, in the Atharvan the three bonds of Varuṇa 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. 10); and “Varuṇa 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 Indric 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” (padā) 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 vispulīnagakās, and thrice seven peahens (Maruts).” In all the Family Books (with the exceptions just mentioned) there are no mystic thrice sevens. But in viii. 69 (58). 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 trīṣaptā saptatinām (8×7×70) 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 Kaṇva verse.

* Compare v. 52. 17; saptā me saptā - ēkam-ekā ṣatā dadus in a gift-laud.
† Bergaigne, La Religion Védique, ii. 122, 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 pravātas may be hills. Seven fortresses are mentioned in vi. 20. 10; vii. 18. 18 (Family Books).
‡ Not “sixty-three” (trīṣaṣṭis).
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 Vāl. 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 Kanya and General Books. For the Kanya 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 pātnivantas ‘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 Dvita invented to go with the ancient Trita (as later still Ekata goes with both), vii. 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. 5. 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 ayyita=10,000 (viii. 1. 5; 34. 15; and gift-lauds, ib. 2. 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 baksheesh!

The “double one,” deuyū, is found only in viii. 18. 14, 15; ix. 104. 6; 105. 6; dvipā, ‘island,’ only in i. 169. 3; viii. 20. 4. The old “pair” of horses is replaced by a spike-team: i. e. horses with a leader (prātis+prātis), 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 e‘ka‘catam=100, loc. cit., p. 152. Compare RV. x. 85. 45.
† The 8899 gods of iii. 9. 9 really belong only in x. 52. 6. The still later group of thirty-five gods has been discussed by me, loc. cit., p. 153. It is found i. 103. 18 and x. 27. 15, 16.
age (see Ludwig's citations). In viii. 80. 9 the fourth name is taken as a matter of course. Compare the Kāṇva 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 Kāṇvas respectively, in regard to which I hope to read a paper at the next meeting.*
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كتاب المطر لابن زيد سعيد بن اوس الانصاري رواية
ابي عبد الله حمّد بن العباس بن حمّد بن ابي حمّد يحيى بن
المبارك البزدي عن عمه ابي جعفر أحمد بن حمّد عن
ابي زيد رجيبة الله

(fol. 1b)

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم الاُعتماذ على رب العباد
قال أبٍ زيد الانصاري قال القيسيون أَوْلُ السُّمْطِ الرِّسِيْيِ
وأنواهُ الطرُّفِانُ الْمُوَهَّرَانُ من الدُّلُوِّ نَمُّ الْشِّرْطُ ثُمَّ الرُّبُّيَا
وَبَيْنَ كُلّ كَنْتِينَ كَنَّهُ مِن خَنْسٍ عَشرَةَ لِيَلَةٍ ثُمَّ الشِّرْطٌ
بَعْدَ الرِّسِيْيِ وَأَنْوَاهُ الْجُزَاءَ ثُمَّ الْذِّرَائَيْيِ وَنَشْرُهُمَا ثُمَّ الجَبَهَةُ
وَكَيْلِي اخْتُرُ الْشُّتِّيْيِ وَأَوْلُ الْذِّيِّيْ وَأَنْوَاهُ اخْتُرُ الجَبَهَةَ وَالْقَوْةَ ثُمَّ
الْصَّرَّفُةَ وَهُيَّ فَنَصُّ بَيْنَ الدُّلُوِّ وَالْقَسيِّ ثُمَّ الْقَسيَّ وَأَنْواهُ
Kitāb Al-Maṭar.

الشمساكان الأول والأخير والأخير الرئيب وما بين السماكين
صيف وصيف نحو من أربعين ليلة ثم الخيم وهو نحو من
عشرين ليلة إلى خمس عشرة عند طلوع الدُّربَان وهو بين
الصيف والخريف وليس له ثوب ثم الخريف وانوار النَّسْرَان ثم
الحَضْر ثم عَرَكُونا الدَّلمَان الأَولِيان وكل مَثْر من الوَسَّمَي إلى
الذَّفيء (fol. 2a رَبِيعٌ وانِبّ هَذِه الأَنْواَء في غِيَبَة وَغِيِّبَ هَذِه
المُنجومٌ أول القَفِّط طلوع الْفَرْيَة واخْرُدُ طلوع السماك في أول الصفرية
الصفرية طلوع سهيل واخْرُدُ طلوع السماك في أول الشتاء
ارفعون ليلة يختلفُ حُرَّها وترددُها المُعَتَّدَلِان ثم أول الشتاء
السماك واخْرُدُ طلوع الجبهة واولَ الديَّى وتِّفُوعُ الجبهة واخْرُدُ
القَفِّط أول القَفِّط السماك الإَحرُ وهو الأول واخْرُدُ السَّمَّي
السماك الآخر الذي يقال له الرَّتَّب وبينهما أربعون ليلة أو
نحو ذلك أول اسماء البَّتَم القَفِّط وهو أصغر المطر والرَّدَان
قوق القَفِّط يقال تَفْقَطت السماء فهي مُقَقَّطتة واردةً فهى
مُرَّة إِنَادًا ومنه الطَّش وهو نَوَّة القَفِّط والرَّدَان يقال
طَّش السماك (fol. 2b) تَفْش طَشًا ومنه البَعْش وهو نَوَّة الطيَّ
يرقال بيَّشَتَ البَعْش والغِبَيْتَ فوَق البَعْش فوَق المُدَّتَة وكذلِك الحَلَّي
والحِجْذة يقال أَفْقَت فهى مُعَبَّرَة إِنَّبَا وحِلَّتَ حَلَّباً
وَتَحْكَّمُ تُنْتَجُّ التَّجَازَاءُ وَهُوَ فِوقَ الْبَعْقَةِ وَمِنْهُ الحَقَّةُ وَهَٰذِه
يَمُتْ الْقُبُّةُ يقُالَ حَفَّاشُ السَّبَاءُ حَفَّشَ حَفَّشًا وَاحْكَمَةُ مِثْلَهَا
يَقُالُ حَمَّاشُ تَحَمَّشَكُ حَشَّكًا وَمِنْ الْبَطِرِ الْدِّينَةِ وَهُوَ الْبَطِر
الْدِّينَةِ الَّذِي لِيْسَ فِيهُ رَعْدًا وَلَا طَرْقَ أَقْلُهَا ثُلُثُ الْمَحْرَارَ أَوَّلِهَا
اللِّيلِ وَأَكْثَرُها مَا بَلَغَتْ مِنْ الْعَلَّةِ وَالْقَلْبِ فِي الْدِّينَةِ تَالُو
الْمَرْجِ
يَا حَبْنَا تَحْكِيكُ بِالْبَشَّارِ كَأَنَّ ثُمَّاَنِيْنَ يَعْمُ مَاْيِمِرْ
وَمِنْ الْدِّينَةِ الْحَضَرِ وَالْقَلْبِ يقُالُ حَضَّبَتْ تَحْضُبَتْ حَضُبًا
وَحَضَّبَتْ تَحْضُبَتْ حَضَبًا وَهُمْ بِأَنَّهَا تَالُو الصَّاعِر
بَيْدَ الرَّسُّمِ مِنْ ذَاتِ الْمَرْجِ عَدَّجَتْ
عَلَيْهَا ذَهَابُ الصَّيْفِ تَهْضُبُهَا حَضُبًا
الْذَّهَابُ الأََّمْتَارُ الصَّيْفِيَةُ وَالْمَشْدُودُ وَيَقُالُ سَكَانُهَا
(fol. 3a) دَايِنَةٌ وَمُدْمِحَةٌ وَقَدْ عَدَّجَتْ إِذْجَاوًا وَعَدَّجَتْ عِدَّجُنَّ دَجِنَّ وَدُجُنَّ وَالْذَّجَنَّةُ مِنْ الْقَيْمَ الْمُّطَبِقَةُ تَطْبِيْقَهَا الرِّيَٰٰبُ الْمُظْهَرُ
الَّذِي لَيْسَ فِيهِ مَطْرُ يَقُالُ يَوْمُ دَجِنْ وَيَوْمُ دَجِنْ وَذَجَنْ. وَكَذَٰلِكْ
اللِّيْلَةُ عَلَى الْوَجَهِينِ بِالْمَطْرِ وَالْإِضَافَةُ الدَايِنَةُ المَبْطِرَةُ
الْمُطْبِقَةُ خَوَ الْدِّينَةِ وَالْدِّجِنُ الْبَطِرُ الْكَثِيرُ وَمِنْ الْدِّينَةِ الْرَّهْمَةُ
وَهُوَ اِسْتَدَّ رَقَّةٌ مِنْ الْدِّينَةِ وَإِسْرَعُ ذَهَابًا. يَقُالَ تَدْأَرَّضَتْ
السماء فهي مَرْقِعَة وجمُعَّاهَا الرُّحْمُ والرَّحَمَمُ ومنها الْهَفَاءُ 
واحْدِنْهَا عِفْفَةً وهي نحْو الْهَفَاءِ وتقال العَنْبَرِيَّةْ أَنْفًا وَأَفْنًا مَنْهَا 
الذَّنَةُ وهي الْبَطْرَةُ المُخْتِيَّةٌ والْهَدْمَةُ مَنْهَا وجمُعَّاهَا الْهَدْمَمُ 
والْهِدْمَمُ والدَّتَّ والدِّيَّاتَ وَيَقَال أَرْض مَدْنُوْنَةٌ وَمَهْدُوْنَةٌ وَالْوَلْقَاءُ 
الديمَة السُّمَّحٌ (fol. 3b) المَحْتِيَّة ان طال مَتَّرُها او قَصَّ وَمَنْهَا 
الْمَتَّرُ وَهُوَ فِي كُلِّ البَطْرَة صَعِيْقَةٌ وشَدِيْدَةٌ وَمَنْهَا الذِّهَابُ وَهُوَ 
اِسْمٌ لِلْبَطْرَة كَلَّهَا صَعِيْقَةٌ وشَدِيْدَةٌ وَالرَّشُّ الْقَطْرُ المَخْيِفُ القلِيلُ 
الْمَلَّى تَدْرَجُنَّا اِئْضَتْ السَّمَاءَ نَفْشًا إِرْشَاشًا وَجَمَعَ الرَّشِّ الرِّسَاهُ 
وَمِنْهَا الْنَّوَابُ وَهُوَ اِغْفِرْ الْبَطْرَة وَاعْتَظَّمَهُ قَطْرًا يَقَالُ بَلْبَلِّي الْإِرْضَ 
وَبَلْبَلِّي نَهَى مَوْبُولًا وَالجُوُودُ مِنَ البَطْرَة الْكَثِيرَةِ الْعَامَّ وَهُمْ فِي كُلِّ 
رَمَيِّي قَالَ الشَّاهِرِ 
أَنَا أَجَوَادُ بِنْ جُوُادُ بِنْ سَبَطِيَّ نَقِيمُكُمْ يَا جَانَادُ إِنَّكُمْ جَادُوُئَا بَنْبُلُ 
وَتَالَّكَ الْعَنْبَرِيَّةَ انْكُوَّمْكُمْ جَانَادُ وَالْهُدْيَازَرُ وَالْلِّيْلاُ فِي كُلِّ الْامْطَارِ وَهُوَ 
الذَّى يُتَبْعَعُ بَعْضُهُ بَعْضًا وَجَمَعُ الْهِيَارِ الْمِدْرَرٌ (fol. 4a) 
وَالرُّكْمُ مِنَ البَطْرَة الضعِيفُ الَّذِي لا يُنْقُعُ أَلَّا إِنْ تَكُونَ لَهُ 
تَبْعَعَةُ وَالتَّبَعَةُ البَطْرَةُ بَعْدَ البَطْرَة يَقَالُ اَرْضُ مُرْكَبَةٌ تَرْكِيَّةٌ وَجَمَعُ 
الْرُّكْمِ الْمِكْرَانُ وَيَقَالُ وَابْلُ (fol. 4a) سَاحِيَّةُ وَسَاحِيَّةٌ وَابْلُ وَهُوَ البَطْرَة 
الذَّى يُتَبْعَعُ مَا أَنْتُ أَلِيِّي فَبَيْسِدُ به وَيَقَالُ اَرْضٌ مَّاَكُورةً وَهُمْ الَّذِي 
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ياخذوها المطر الجوء فلا يزل بها حتى تقلب نباتاتها وتقلعها
من أصوله ويغلب ظهر الأرض لبطنها سطح الأرض سحراً ويقال
لمطر الذي لا يدلع شيا لآسالة جاز الصبع وذلك أنه
يكثر سيله حتى يدخل في جسم الصبع فيخرجها منه والعتقل
المطر الجاهز المتدارك والسح ممثلاً عضان أن السح رفماً لم
يتبين قطره والمنهيم مثله والود جمع السح والقطر والسرب
المطر الصغير واليدقان مثل ذلك واحدها دهن يقال دهنها
وألى مدهونة

والموطنة التي تزروي الأرض والجاهزة من المطر الذي ينده
وجبة الأرض ويسكين التراب والحي فيما المطر الكبير والراضيب
واحدها هضاب وواحد الهضاب (fol. 4b) هضب وهي خمداً
القطر بعد القطر والهجل أول المطر والمتعكير والبكتير السيل
الكثير والرئي المطر بعد المطر في كل حبى والعهد المطر
الأول وجماهها العقان يقال ارض معهودة إذا عم مطرها
والرض المعهدة عهدت تعهدًا التي تصبحها النقصة من
المطر والنقصة المطرة التي تصبح القطعة من الأرض وقحتى
القطعة يقال ارض منقحة تنفيصة والشوائب المطر يصبح
المكان ويضفي الاحمر وجماهة الشايب ومثله الكح وجماهه
السيّاء والارض المئودةُ هي البَجَرْدَةُ نَصائحتُ نَصائحتُ وَالغيثُ اسم للمطر كله وجمعةُ الغنيثُ ويتقال ارض مُغيبَة وَمَغْيَوبة. ويتقال استهدفت السماء وذلك في أوّل المطر والاسم الهيال وَاسم السماء إِسْبَالا والاسم السبَل وهو المطر بين الحساب والارض حين يخرج من الحساب (ولَبَنَّا يَصِلُ إلى الأرض) ويقال للمطر القليل العَرْضٌ فَحَرّابة إن قدر قَثرة أو كثيرة وهو مثل الشَثُوبي ومثل ذلك السبَل العَتَابين وهو المطر بين الحساب والارض واحدها عشيَن ويتقال هو الضِريب والصقِيق والجَيَلٍ والتَلَج نافتاً الضِريب والصقِيق والجَيَلٍ فانه لا يكون إلا بالليل والتَلَج بالليل والنهار في القيَم وفَنَّ لا يَكنَ إلا في الصبح ويتقال ارض ضِربة إذا أصابها الجَيَلٍ فاحترق نباتها وقد ضربت ضربًا واضربتها الضِريب إِسْرَابًا وصقِيق الارض إذا احتر الصقِيق نباتها وُلْجَت فهى مظلمة. والطلُب اثَر الندى في الأرض من المطر أو الجَيَلٍ والصقِيق أو الضِريب ويتقال أيضا لتندى الذي تورجع غروف الكَبْر الورج. وُصَنَّرها طَلُب. والصقِيق والضِرب والجَيَلٍ والسقيط ندى يخرج من جَرَدة. ويقال السماء جَرَدة إذا لم يكن عليها غيَم. (fol. 5b)
وقد جرّدت السماء جرّداً، إذا لم يكن عليها عَيْمَهُم، والاسم المُجرّدة... 

وَيُقَالُ كُلِّ شبَّة السماء [تَصَلَّعَ]، إذا انقطع شبَّاتُها، ثم تَجَرَّبُهُ.

بعد ذلك حين يذوب السماء كله، يقال اصطحاب السماء اصطحاب... 

والاسم المُكرّم، وقالوا: أَقَـَل المطر، وَأَقَـَل المطر، وَأَقَـَل المطر. إذا اصابهم المطر، وقيل:

طالما كان إذا عُرِيف قاتلة فمَّلَت، وَكَبَبَ دَمْهُ فهو مَتِلَوَّنَ، وَأَقَـَل على الله، بالاذكيَّة، إفطاراً، وذلك ان لا أنزل الله، فالمطر. 

ويقال: هَدَرَ دمَّهُ يُهُدِّرُ هَدَرًا، إذا عَرِيف قاتلة فابتز هُذُّهُ السِّلْطَان.

وَكَبَبَ دمَّهُ هَدَرًا، وأهداره السلطان إغضاراً.

ومن المطر: الرَّكِّان، وَيَقَفُ، وَيَقَفُ، وَيَقَفُ. عليه الظَّارِح المتتابعة: يُفْصِل بينهنَّ سَكُونَ (fol. 6a) أي: ما بينهن ساحة، وَكثُرَ ما بِينهَا يوم وليلة.

ويقال: ارض مَرْضَيَّة، تَرْكَيفًا وواحد الظَّارِح، بِقَطْر، والرَّكِّان، والغَبَّار، والقَتْر، بالليل، والنهار، يقال: اَرْكَحَت الأرض إمَغانًا واصْبَتْ إضيابًا.

وتُلفت تلقَّبُ قُتْنِمًا وَمَن الظَّارِح السَّيِّف وهو السحاب الذي تسُوق الريخ، وليس فيه ماَ، والإغsnap المطر اليوم الذي ليس فيه فرَج، وفرج يوم اليوم والليلة، وإكر من ذلك: اسماء الريخ، الرَّعَد، وجمعَة الرَّعَد يقال: رُعَدُ السماء.

فهي رَعَدُ رَعَدًا وَرَعَدُ الْقُوَّم ارتفادًا، إذا اصطلهم الرَّعَد، وفى
الرعد الازرارم وهو صوت الرعد غُيرم الشديد، منه يقال ارزم الرعد ازرارماً وفيه التهرهم وهو اشد صوت الرعد شديده وضعيفه وهو الهزيم (fol. 6b) ويقال تهزم الرعد تهزمماً وانهزم انهراماً وفيه القمعة وهو يتتابع صوت الرعد في شدة وجماعها الفعاقع وفيه الوجب والوجبان وهو صوت الرعد الثقيل رجم الرعد ورجسة السماء ترجس رجساتَا ورجسًا وفيه الصاعقة وفيه جموعها الصماعق وهو نار تتساقط من السماء في رعدٍ شديد، ويقال اصطفت علينا السماء إصطفًا وفيه الأَزيز وهو صوت الرعد تشَّيَّعه من بعيد والرَّز الصوت مثل الأزيز يقال ان الرعد ينيرُ آزًا وآزًا وآزًا السماء تترُّ رُّر قال الراجز 130 جارتنا من وإيل ألا اسمى الا اسمى اسماء صوت عيد البكر لم يئمن يئرُ داراً من وراء الأگم رر الرواية بالمرأد المتضامن 130

ويقال جُنَّجَل الرعد جُنَّجَلْة وهو الصوت (fol. 7a) يتقلل في جنوب السماء وتهرُّج الرعد تهرُّجًا وهو مثل الجُنُّجَلْة ورمزُ الرعد 135
البرق زمرة وهو أحسن صوت وثابتة مطر ضيق فيقال أذن السماء
ارتفع وهو صوت الرعد الذي لا ينقطع
اسماء البرق البرق وجماعة البرق وقيل برق السماء
تُبرَّق برقاً وبرق القوم إبراقاً إذا أصابهم البرق وتكتشف البرق
تكتشفاً وهو إضاءة في السماء واستطالة البرق استطالة وهو مثل
التكتشف ولبع البرق يلمع لمعاً ومبعان أعمى البرقة ثم الأخرى
المرأة بعد البرق ولبع البرق يلمع لمعاً ومبعان ولباطان وهو مثل
اللبع عينه أن اللمع لا يكون إلا من بعيد وتبسم البرق
تتبسم وهو مثل التكتشف واستطالة البرق استطالة وهو تداركة
لا يكسو

(fol. 7b)
وأوّل البرق إيشامو وهو أول البرق حين يبرق والاستطالة والتكتشف البرقة تباث السماء والسياسة لبرق
النهار وبرق الحساب القرآن وهو البرقة الدقيقة قال الراجع
كريبت والدهم عندها فأل
أثار أثرين برقا سلاسل
وينقال هذا برق الحلب برق حلب وبرق حلب وهو الذي
ليس فيه مطر وينقال حفظ البرق يخفف حفظاً وحافظاً وهو
تنابِعُهُ وَخَفَا البرقِ يَخْفَوَانْ حَكِيَّةً وَهُوَ أَنَّ تَرَاهُ مِنْ بَعْدِ هَذِهِ حَقِيَّةً \(155\)

وَهُوَ أَحَدٌ مَا يُخْرِيجُ مِنَ الْبَرَقِ وَأَوْمَشُ الْبَرَقِ إِيَّاءً وَهُوَ الْوَمْيُضُ

وَهُوَ الْخَفِيفُ مِنَ الْبَرَقِ وَيَقَالُ هُوَ سَنَةُ الْبَرَقِ وَهُوَ ضُوءُ الْبَرَقِ

تَرَاهُ مِنْ غَيْرِ أَن تَرَى الْبَرَقِ أَوْ تَرَى حَكِيَّةً فِي حَيَاةٍ فَأَنْهَا يُكَونُ السَّنَا بِالْلِيْلِ دَوْنَ النَّهَارِ وَرَبَّما كَانَ ذَلِكَ فِي غَيْرِ وَرَبَّما كَانَ ذَلِكَ بِغَيْرِ حَكِيَّةٍ وَالْسَمَاءِ مُصَشِّحَةٌ \(8a\)

(الْوَمْيُضُ الْبَرَقِ)

مَثْلَ سَنَا وَخَفَا الْبَرَقِ تَنَابَعُهُ وَهُوَ مَثْلَ التَّنَابِعِ وَخَفَا الْبَرَقِ

تَخَلَّصُوْهُ وَهُوَ دَوْامُ الْبَرَقِ وَتَنَابِعُهُ فِي الْعَيْنَةِ الدَّيْنَاءِ وَتَلَّالَ الْبَرَقِ تَلَّالَهُ وَهُوَ الْبَرَقُ الخَفِيفُ الْمَتَنَابِعُ الْسَرَّيْعُ وَمَضَعُ الْبَرَقِ يَتَصَنَّعُ مَضَعًا وَرَمَتِهِ يَرَضَعُ رَمَعًا وَهُمْ سَوَاءٌ وَهُوَ الْبَرَقُ السَّرَّيْعُ الخَفِيفُ الْمَتَنَابِعُ وَالْهَيْبُ الْبَرَقِ إِلَهَابًا وَإِلَهَاةٍ سَرَعَةٌ

(الْوَمْيُضُ الْبَرَقِ)

رَجُعَ وَتَذَاكِرَةً لَّيْسَ بِيَنِبَتِيْنَ فَرَجُّةٍ وَالْعَرَّاضُ الْبَرَقِ الْذِّي

يُضَعُّ وَلَا يَفْتُرُ نَمَى الْبَتْمُ عَرْضٌ السَّمَاءِ تَعْرَضُ عَرْضًا إِذَا

ذَمَّ عَايَكُهَا وَبَيَانَ السَّمَاءِ عَرَّاضَةٌ وَفَرَا الْبَرَقُ تَقَرُّ فَرْقًا وَهُوَ

تَلَّالُهُ وَدُوْرُهُ في السَّمَاءِ \(8b\)

(الْوَمْيُضُ)

اسْمَاء الْعَشَابِ حَكَابَةٌ وَجَمِيعَهَا

وَجَمِيعَهَا الْغَيْوُمُ وَهُوَ يَكُونُ فِي تَلَّالِ الْعَشَابِ وَكَحِيَّةٌ وَالْعَالَمُ
وأخذتْها عَمَامًا وهى الغَرَاءُ البَيْضَاءُ من الحَصَاب وجماعَة
الغراء الغرْهٌ *

والميْرُ من الحَصَاب البَيْضُ وواحدَتْها مَرَّةً ومنه الحَصَاب وهى
الحَصَابة السَوْدَاءُ ومنه السَّيْفُ وهو كله ما طرَدَتُه الروحُ وافترزته
من الحَصَاب إن كان فيه ماءً أو لم يكن واحْلَفَ من الحَصَاب
كَلّ حَصَابةٍ يُزْجِّي أن يكون فيها مطرٌ وواحدَتْها حَلْقةٌ وصَبحَهُ
من الحَصَاب الذي ترَاهُ مُتَراحِيًا اعتناءً في بَيْانِ وجماعَة
الصَبِيرُ والسَدُ من الحَصَاب النَّشْمٌ الأَسْوَدُ يَنَشَأُ من اَي

180 انتظار السماء نَشَأَ قال الشاعر
تَبْصَرْ هَذِهُ تَرَى أَلوَاحُ دِرَىَ أو إِيلَةٌ على الأَفْعَالِ تُقُودُ
تَعْدُتْ لهُ وشَيْعُيَنِي رَجُالٌ وقَد كَثَرَ المَعايِلُ والسُدُودُ
(fol. 9a) والقِيَامُ الحَصَابة تراها في ناحية السماء وهي مثل
الجَلْبِ إِلَّا أن الجَلْبُ أَبَعَدُ وراضِفٌ من العارض والعارض
الأَبِيضُ والجَلْبُ أَكْثَرُ ما يَكُونُ إلى السَوْدَاءُ وفي الحَصَاب النَّسْدُ
وهو مثل الصَبِيرُ وجماعَة الأَنَضْبادُ والمُكَلَّمُ الذي قد تراكم
بعضُهُ على بعضٍ مثل النَصّد ومهِن الرِبَاب وواحدَتْهُ رَيَابِهُ وهم
الحَصَابة الرَقيقَة السَوْدَاءُ تكون دونَ الغَيْحِ في المطر ولا يقال
لها رِيَابِهِ الاَّ لَ في مطرٍ **
ومنه الريَّق وهو أول setState(السَّبَعَة) والكَتَبُ الكُتُب السَّبَعَة
السَّبَعَة البِينِين ويلقال عَبَّامَة كَتَبُ كَتَبُ وعَمَيْنَ كَتَبُ وقَلَب كَتَبُ
ومنه الّذِي نازعُ وَهُوَ السَّبَعَة الرَّقَّاقُ وَاحِدَتَهُ عَلَى عَلَى وَمنه
الْفَرْعُ وَهُوَ السَّمَّارُ السَّمَّارُ وَاحِدَتَهُ قَرْقَةٌ وَمَنِيمَةُ وَهُوَ
الْقَيْمُ الذي ترى في خلْلِهَا يُقَاطِعُ وَواحَدَتَهُ (١٢١) نَقْطَةٌ
وجماعةُ السَّبَعَة وَمَثلَ الجَفَّ وَهُوَ كَلَّ سَفَاحٌ سَفَاحَةٌ الْرَّيْبِ تَصُبَ
ماَثَّ والجَهَامُ مَثَلَ الجَفَّ وَواحَدَتَهُ جَهَامَةٌ قالَ إِبْوَ زَبْدَةٍ سَعْبت
رُبْعِيَتْ يَقُرُّوا فَامَا الْرَّيْبِ فَيَقِلُ جَفَّالَا قالَ يَقِلُهُ الْرَّيْبُ.
وَمنهُ الْقَرَّادُ وَواحَدَتَهُ قَرَّادٌ وَهُوَ مَثَلَ الجَفَّ وَمَثلَ الْرَّيْبِ مِن
الْقَيْمِ

وَمنهُ السَّيِّقُ وَالْحَيْيُ وَهُوَ الْقَيْمُ فِي عَرْضِ السَّمَاء الْقَرَّابِ
المَسْنُونَ

وَمنهُ الْحَيْيُ وَهُوَ الْقَيْمُ يُنْشِئَهُ مَعَ المَبْطِرِ فيْجَيْهِنَّ في السَّمَاء وَمَنْهُ
بَعْتُ كَيِّبٌ وَهُنَّ كَيِّبٌ كَيِّبٌ في الْبَحْرِ بَيْنَ الخَرِيفِ وَالْرَّيْبِ
طَوَالٌ عْرُ مُشْكَرَاتٌ وَمَنِيمُ الرَّيْبِ وَهُوَ مَثَلَ الرَّيْبِ وَالْسَيِّقَ
وَمَنِهُ الْعَمَاءُ وَهُوَ شِبْهُ الدَّخَانِ يُرْكِب رُوَّسَ الْجِبَالِ وَمَنِهُ الْدَخَانُ
وَهُوَ شِبْهُ الدَّخَانِ وَالْمَدَى يُطَلِّي السَّمَاء وَواحَدَتَهُ صَيَبَةٌ
يقال قد أَثْبَتَ السماة فهى مُضَبَّةً ومنه الطَّلْلُ وَهى
اول سحابة يُطَلِّلُ ومنه الطَّخْلُ وَاحْدُها طَخْلُرُ وَهو السحاب
الصَّفْرَاءُ والجَيِّبَاتُ طَلِّلُ السحابَةُ وَتَقَال بَعْضُ العَرْبِ بَل هى السحابَة
وُقَال بعَضِهِم غَيْبَة وَقَال كَثِيرٌ عَرْة كَسَائِع إلى طَلِّلُ العَيَاةِ بَيْنَ وَيْقِل الأَرْضِ
مَقِيلًا فَلَمْ يَا أَنَّاهَا أَصْحَبْتَ وَمِن لَّغَة الكَلاَمِيَّة
أَمَضَحَلَتُ •

والسَّكَّيفُ السحاب الظَّكَّامُ والرَّكَمُ وَيُقَال مَجَاجِجٌ مُكَفَّحَةً
وَطَرَةُ الغَيْمَ ابْعد ما يَزْرَى مِن الغَيْم وَيُقَال طَرَةُ الكَلا وَطَرَةُ
القَبَسُ وَهِي نَاحِيَتُهُما وَمِنَ الشَّشَاص وَهُوَ الطَّيْروُ مِن السحاب
والواحِدةُ النَّشَاشَةُ وَهِي الطَّوْرَةُ الْبَيْضَاءُ اكْتَُرَّ مَا يَنْشَاءُ مِن
تَبْلِ العِين وَالعِين كَل سحاب يُبْثَدُوا مِن تَبْلِ القَبْلَةِ •

اسماء الِبِيْثة النَّهْرُ وَالنَّهْرُ وَجمَاعَةُ الْانَهَارِ وَهوُ نَهْرُ
ابن شُفَر أو عَظَم مِنْهَ الجَدُّوُل وَهُوَ ما شَفَف مِنْ الْانِهَارِ لَيْسَ يَقَل
الْحَرْث وَالْخَانُ وَمِنْهَ الْأَنَفَاء وَاحْدُهُ قَنَّا يُقَال هَذَا قَنَّا وُهُوَ جَرْجِي
الْعِين فِي جَدُّوُلِ فِي بَطْنِ الْأرض وَلَا يُقَال لَهُ قَنَّا حَتِى يُغِبْهَا
تَغْبِيَةٌ اَيْ يُغَطِّى تَغْبِيَةٌ وَقَال بَعْضِهِم قَنَّا وَبَعْضِهِمْ قَنَّا وُهُوَ جَرْجِي
وَالْجَدُّوُل كَل حَجْرٍ لَم تُغَطِّهِ وَالْخَانُ وَمِثلُ الجَدُّوُل وْلَتَّنَّهُ أَحْدَهُ
ونقل الجماع وقيل لحنان قنات وجذور وخدع إن جرى فقيمة
الماء أو لم يحمر ومنها الكسر وهو الحسن وزجاجة الأعصار
والتكرر قال والكسر المبتل الذي يجعله الإنسان في رسته ويضعه
بها الخشنة

ويقال للنافذ الذي يُلبسه الناس ماء لعين الوشم الماء القديم من كل شيء وجماعه الماء الدائم
والخضر من الماء ما لم يعيح الكعاب وملئة الخضاح
والريحان ويقال خضر الماء يعسخ فتحولا إذا قال
والبرش الماء القليل يسخامة برسم المسن يبرش برض
والتبرش الاستثقاء ويقال للركسان إذا أنيط فيه الماء مشاشة
الماء ويقال للجبيل الليح المجبف هُرَّمَم قال الراجز

هَرَّمَة في جِبَلٍ هَرْسِم
تبدأ ليجار ولا عن العين
والجذيب المذق المِلَيم
والحشر كذان الأرض واحدة حشرجة وقال بعضهم الحشرج
المسن الحصب ويقال رسم الماء أو النبض يشرج رحمة ونشعم
السقاء والأرض والأنهاء وهو النشف نشف ينشف نشفا ويقال
للكبيّة طَمَتْ تَطُوُّرٌ طُمَوْرًا وهو كَثْرُاءٌ الماء والبَائِقَةَ المَبْتِلَيْةَ ماء وهى الطَّائِيّة والوى ذلك في كلّ ذِّكرٍ وثّبتُ إذا فَقَضَ قُتْنَتُ بَثُورًا ولَّضِطْبُ الماء القليل يُرِشْعُ من الأَضْرَاء ومن السَّقَاةِ بَنَّ يَبُّضُ بَنَّ끔ٌ والمَسَاكَ المِكَانُ الذِّي يُذْكِرُ الماء والإِضَاءَةُ الغَدِيرُ في القُعَّاء والسَّبَتّة البَقْيَة من الماء حيث ما كانت وجمَعَها السَّبَتّ والبَائِقَةَ وجمَعَها المَبْخَضُ والمَبْخَضُ وهى ما جَازَ الناس فيما مُشَاءَ ورَكِبَانَا وما جَدَدَ الْحَدِيثُ ولا يقال لها جَدَدُتَا إلا وفيها ماء وجمَعَها الجَدِّدُ ونملَّها المَلِئَهُ ويقال للجَدِّدُ في السَّبَتّ الفَلْحُ وجمَعَهُ الآثَالَجُ والسيْنُ حَيَّاً من نَهْرٍ أو عين ساح الماء يَسْيَمُ سِيْحَاً تَسْيِكَاً وهو الذي تَنْصَبِ منه جَدِّادَاً الْحَرِيقُ والثَّقْلُ قال الراجز يَنْتَلَّهَا من وَخْيَنَادِبّاء سُكَّة تَطَبُّعُ إذا الْوَرْدُ عَلَيها النَّكَّةُ 335 الْبَيْكَةُ كَذَا ارْتِحَامُ والمَسَاكَ المَبْتِلَيْةَ مَيْنَ أَعْلَامَ ما أسَقُلُها والمُتَلَبِّسَةُ الْرَّكِيبةُ الكَبِيرَةُ الماء والخَيْبَطُ مِن الماء الرَّقَصٍ وهو ما بَينَ اللَّنَّةِ مِن النَّفَسِ من السَّبَتّ والخَيْبَطُ والغَدِيرُ والإِناَء ويقال لهِ اِيْضًا حَبْيَبُ التَّالِي الراجز
إن تَسْمِمَ الدَّفْوَآءَ والضَّرْوُط
يُصِيبُهُ لها في حَرْضَهَا خَبْيَطُ
ومن الماء الأَجِن وَهو الخَبيث المَتَعِظُ الطَّعْمُ ومنه المَعْرِيض
والمَطْلَكَبُ هِمَا واحِد وَهو الأَخْصَمُ الذي يَخْرَجُ من أسفل
الماء حَتَّى يَكُون فَوق الماء والرَّكْبَة المُوسَنَة التَّيى يَوْسَنُ فيها
الإنسان وُسْنَا وَهَذَا قَول عَاقَةٍ الكِلَابَيْيِن وَهَوْوَ عَقْسٍ يَخْذُلُ
الإنسان مِن تَنْتِ رِيح ماء الرَّكْبَة وَقَال بَعْض هُم اسْم الماء
يَبَّسُن آسَمَا نَهْمَر وَالماء المَطْرُوقْ وَهو الطرَقْ وهو ماء السماء
الذَّي تَبْلُوُ فيهِ الإِبْل وَتَبْعَر فَذَلِك الطرَق والمَطْرُوقْ
وِالرَّجْعُ اسْمُ من النَّهي وَحَوْا وَجمَاعَة الرَّجْعَان وَالنَّهياء وَهِي
عُذْرُان في الأرض وَكُورْب (fol. 128b) الماء حَسْف في الرَّكْبَة وَحَسْفُهَا
عَتْرُجُ عَينِهَا وَيَقَال لِلرَّكْبَة التَّيى تَهْدَمَت فَنقَص مَاؤُها وَذُرِّت
عُزْرُان وَتَرِكَة وَيَقَال لِأَوْلِ النَّبْط فَرْجَة يَقَال ذَلِك عند النَّبْط
فَرْجَة الرَّكْبَة تَفْرَجُ قَروحا وَأَتَلِجت الرَّكْبَة اتَّلَاجا حِين يَتَلَجَ النَّبْط وَيَنْدُى التَّرَاب وَالنَّاجِج قَبَل الفَرْجَة وَهو حِين يَنَدُى ال
الترَاب والفرْجَة قَبَل النَّبْط والماء الساَكِن الساَكِن الذَّي لا يَتَرَجَّي
يَقَال سمَّر الماء يَسْكُن سِكْرَاً
ويقال الغطاء غطاء الركيبة والاناء وكل شيء غطته تغطية وذلك إذا جعلت على رأس الركيبة جراراً فتلم التغطية أو جرحاً إذا غطيت فيه رأسها والغباء التراب الذي جعله فوق الغطاء حتى تواريه وإذا لم جعل على رأس الركيبة جراراً ولا جرحاً ثم ضب فيها التراب فذلك الدفن وكذلك كذل كيفية ضburst (fol. 18a) أو كبرت جعلت على رأسها شيء يغطيها به ثم دفنت رأسها بالتراب فتلك التغطية وإذا دفنتها بالتراب ولا شئ على رأسها فذلك الدفن والتفرير وغطيت الإنسان ليس فيه غير التغطية والترغيم من الماء القليل المخلوط بالطين والذعر مثله يقال كذر الماء يكدر (كدرًا) ويقال نصب الماء ينضب نضوباً مثل النشف ونص الماء يضن يَضنَّض يَضنَّض وهو ان يَضنَّض الماء يَضنَّض واجتماعة نضيضة ونص الماء يضن يَضنَّض وهو مثل البضيض يقال ماء علب ومعياء علاب وقد علب الماء غَذَوَبَة ومنه الْحَلَّال وهو أَسْمَّى الماء غَذَوَبَة واطيحة طغعا ومنه الفَلْح وهو علاب ومنه الشُّجَم وهو البَرْجٌ علب كان أو يملك والقَارسُ البارد من كل شراب قِرْسَ يَقْرِسَ ومنه البَلَح وهو الذي لا يشرب منه وهو الزعاف وهو أشد ملحوظة وهو الذي لا يطعمه*
ومنه المُضْحِيصُ وهو الشرب من الماء ويقال له حَفْيَجُُّ

ومنه المُقَلِّمُ وهو أشدّ الماء مَسْرَةً ومنه الغَلَبِيَّةُ وهو المُضْحِيصُ

ومنه الفَلَحُ وهو أشدّه مَلْوَحَةٌ واَحِبَّةٌ ومثله الأَجَاجُ قال الراجز

يَشْرَبُنّ مَا سَيِّخًا اِجَاجًا

لَوْ يَلَغَ الذِّيبُ بِهَ مَا عَاجَجًا

لا يَمْعِيِّفُنّ الأَجَاجَ الْمَاجَا

قال ويقال وَلِبَغَ الكلَّبُ شَرَابًا وفي شَرَابًا ومن شَرَابًا وهو

الشُّبُبُ

والماء الامْدَانُ المَلْحِ الشَدِيدُ المَلْوَحَةُ ومنه الصَّرَى وهو

الأَجَاجُ ومنه التَّرَائِنُ وهو الدَّايِمُ المَعِينُ الذي لا يَذهَب وَقُم

الماء بَيْنَ وُقُودًا ومنه النَّزُورُ وهو القَلِيلُ من الماء ومن كل

شَهٍّ ومنه الذَّوَارُ وهو الكَثْيُ (fol. 14a) من كلّ مَاء وَيُقال لِلْمِثْلِ

المَتَوَكِّيَةُ حُينَ تَأْجِنُ الْجِرْنَى سَيَدَامُ جماعها السَّدَامُ وَيُقال لِلْمُكْرَأَة

الَّاء تَنَحِّدَمَتْ وَتَحْفَرَتْ عُوْزَانُ وكَذَلِكَ الجَمِيعُ

وقالوا الأَنْهُارُ كَلْلَا بِحَارٍ وَالْنَّهْرُ بَحْرٌ ويقال للماء إذا غَلْطَ

بعد عُلَّوِّةٍ قد استَبْخَرَ وَاستَبْخَرَ بِبَرَكَمْ إِذَا غَلْطَ مَأْوِهَا ويقال

مااء طَيِّبٍ وهو أشدّ حَفْرًا من الكَكْدَرِ طَيِّبَ الماء طَيِّبًا وَاحِمَةٌ
السَّوَاء، الْمُتَقَهِّرَةُ الْرِّيح، حَبِيبَةُ الْرَكْبَة، حَمَّامٌ، وَالْقَرْبِينُ
الطين الذي يُحِلُّهُ السَّيْلُ فيَبَقِّي على وجه الأرض رطبًا كان
أو يَبِسًا

تم الكتبَ والنَّبيِّ لله على نعمة وصلى على نبيِّهِ سيدنا

عليّ
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Alice in Wonderland
NOTES.

6. Cf. Fleischer, ZDMG. vi. 390; Flügel, Die Grammatischen Schulen der Araber, p. 5; Yākūt, iv. 369, 3; Zamaḥšari, al-Muḏassāl, 189, 3; 162, 3. On the influence of the stars upon rain, see Wellhausen, Skizzen, iii. p. 173, and the passages cited there.

2. So called—according to the Muḥti al-Muḥti, p. 3350—لاَّنَّةُ... يَسِيِّى

On the مَذْرَبَ عَرْضُ يَسِيِّى, see Lane, s. v. رَمَان, and compare the table there given; Muḥti, p. 2140; Lisān, i. p. 171; Ibn Ḥišām (ed. Wüstenfeld), ii. p. 150; Kāzwiṇī, i. p. 42; ZDMG., iii. 97; and above all, Wellhausen, Skizzen, iii. p. 174. Albērūnī, ed. Sachau, pp. 336, sq. On the mansions of the moon, see Ideler, Untersuchungen über den Ursprung und die Bedeutung der Sternnamen, Berlin, 1809, p. 287; Stein-schneider, ZDMG., xviii. p. 113; JRAS. 1890, p. 328; Ibn Kutebah, Adab al-Ḳāṭib, i. p. 32; Whitney, Oriental and Linguistic Studies, Second Series, pp. 418, seq. Ibn Kutebah wrote a special work upon this subject. See Sproull, An Extract from I. K.'s 'Adab al-Ḳāṭib (Leipzig, 1877), p. 3.

Lisān, s. v. نَمَو، has the whole passage from أَوْلِ الْخَيْرَاتِ line 6, to line 18, but in the name of Abū Maṣūr. I note the following variants: 7

ربٍين، says قَالَ أَبُو مَنْصُورٍ هَذَا الفَرْعُ لَيْلَةٌ مِنَ الدَّلَو to لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ Līlāt; 8, omits from وُنَثِرتَهَا لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ Līlāt; 9 om. لَيْلَةٌ لَيْلَةٌ Līlāt, which is perhaps the better reading, cf. Ideler, Untersuchungen, p. 158. The two roots are similar in meaning. For a similar confusion, see De Goeje, Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum, iv. p. 363; 10 al-šāṭī; 11 دَفَى لَيْلَةٌ Līlāt; 12 الصَّوْقُ لَيْلَةٌ Līlāt; 13 المَخْرِيفُ لَيْلَةٌ Līlāt; 14 om. لَيْلَةٌ Līlāt; 15 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 16 دَفَى Līlāt; 17 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 18 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 19 دَفَى Līlāt; 20 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 21 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 22 دَفَى Līlāt; 23 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 24 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 25 دَفَى Līlāt; 26 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 27 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 28 دَفَى Līlāt; 29 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 30 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 31 دَفَى Līlāt; 32 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 33 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 34 دَفَى Līlāt; 35 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 36 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 37 دَفَى Līlāt; 38 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 39 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 40 دَفَى Līlāt; 41 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 42 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 43 دَفَى Līlāt; 44 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 45 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 46 دَفَى Līlāt; 47 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 48 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 49 دَفَى Līlāt; 50 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 51 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 52 دَفَى Līlāt; 53 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 54 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 55 دَفَى Līlāt; 56 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 57 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 58 دَفَى Līlāt; 59 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 60 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 61 دَفَى Līlāt; 62 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 63 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 64 دَفَى Līlāt; 65 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 66 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 67 دَفَى Līlāt; 68 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 69 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 70 دَفَى Līlāt; 71 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 72 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 73 دَفَى Līlāt; 74 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 75 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 76 دَفَى Līlāt; 77 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 78 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 79 دَفَى Līlāt; 80 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 81 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 82 دَفَى Līlāt; 83 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 84 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 85 دَفَى Līlāt; 86 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 87 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 88 دَفَى Līlāt; 89 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 90 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 91 دَفَى Līlāt; 92 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 93 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 94 دَفَى Līlāt; 95 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 96 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 97 دَفَى Līlāt; 98 المَخْرِيفُ Līlāt; 99 الصَّفِيفُ Līlāt; 100 Dārūf.
قال أنو منصور وهمأ الدلُّ الأوليان 16; ثم الخريفي
g the foot of the frere the preceding.

7. The straiten \( (\beta \text{ and } \gamma \text{ of Aries}) \) Kazwīnī, i. p. 42; Ide-
ler, Untersuchungen, pp. 184, 287.

10. We ought to read ُالدَّيْنِ, as in the authorities cited above; cf.
also Lisān, i. 70; Muḥīf, p. 331.

12. The sky and the sun are made up of ُالقُطِيع, Ideler, Untersuchungen, p. 51; Lisān, xiii. 469 [ZDMG., xlix.
116]. In the order we seem to have a more general name, "a star
which watches (is opposite to) another star," Lane, p. 1134. See line
22.

17. غيروبة وغيروب; on the margin ُهِمْهَا لغتان. The passage is
quoted Lisān, 172, but without غيروب.

18. MS. قَيْفَة; Muḥīf, s. v. and Lisān, ix. 339 ُقَيْفَة; on the marg.
of the MS. one has made the correction ُقَيْفَة.

19. MS. has distinctly َصِفَرَة, with kesr; but see Lane and Muḥīf,
s. v.; and Lisān, vi. 134, where our passage is quoted.

22. حاشية الصِّرْواب المُعَتِّبَات بذال مُعَتِّبَة لبيس غيروبة; but see Thorbecke, Al-Harīrī's Durrat-al-Ǧawwās (Leipzig,
1871), p. 85; Lane, pp. 1975, 1899. Lisān, vi. 134, cites this passage,
with ُدِلَ.


25. So the MS. Read ُأَرْزَتْ.

26. So the MS. Lane, p. 937 ُدِيْبَة; Muḥīf, p. 699.

32. Marg. حاشية رواه الإُرِيدَن المُعَتِّبَة وغيروة يروي نَحْصُلَ بالحاي.
Lisān, xvii. 321, cites the verse with the variant reading ُيَا حَبْدًا نَحْصُلَ.

52. Read ُالسَّح.

59. The verse is cited by Lane, p. 936, and by Lisān, xv. 109, with
in place of ُانَّا. Marg. السِّكْرِي انا الجواد من الجواد (MS. has
clearly الجواد, which is an evident mistake.) On Al-Sukkari, see Flügel,
Lisān, xiii. 343:  

But in spite of this, see the remark of Lane, loc. cit.

83. Read ِشَكْبُيبُ ِابْو زِيد, reads ِابْو زِيد ِشَكْبُيبُ.  

85. On ِمَغِيِّبَت and ِمَغِيِّبَت, see Wright, Grammar, i. 165.

91. Marg. حاشية كذا الرواية عن أبى حاتم وغيره ضربت وقد ضربت ِوهُمْقَعْتُ الْأَرْيَاشَيْيَةُ فَانَّهُ لم يَبْرو ضِرْبَةً.

On Abū Ḥātim al-Sajastānī (d. 248 or 255 A. H.) see Flügel, Die Grammatischen Schulen, p. 87; Yāqūt, iii. 44; and Wüstenfeld’s note, ad loc. On Abu-l-faḍl ibn al-Faraḍ al-Riyāshī, see Flügel, Grammat. Schulen, p. 85; and the authorities cited by Fleischer, Kleinere Schriften, iii. 474. (d. 257 A. H.)

103. I have added ِتصلعأصح. Marg.


Marg. حاشية قال السكري طل مكَان فُنِّطَلَ.

109. Read ِيَهُدِرُ.

111. Marg. حاشية الرثائ بالتخفيض رثائ. Muḥīf, p. 703 and Freytag رثائ; so also the Lisān, s. v.; but the Tāj says: ِوقع في نسمع الهجاء مضبوط بالكسر.
Kitāb Al-Maṭār.

118. Cf. Beidawī, i. p. 30, 8. Marg. أخبرنا أبو زيد عمرو بن عبيد عن الحسن قال الرعد ملك موكَّل بالسُكَّة وتسبُّبُه صوتة الذي تسمعون في كتاب السَّكَّة تُرَّ وابو حاتم تُرَّ

129. Marg. 

130. The text in line 131 isnot clear; we must evidently read the verse:

اللاَّ اسْلَمَيْي أَسْقِيمُ صَرْبَ الْدِّيْمَ

I am indebted for this to Prof. Ignaz Goldziher of Buda-Pesth. A close scrutiny of the MS. seems to bear out this reading.

135. زرَمٍ


137. Ms. ٌاستطاء ؛ but it must be read with ط ؛ see line 141.

138. Rather substantiates the reading of the Kāmūs (Lane, p. 1307, s. v. سُكَّة), and not as Lane suggests.

139. Ms. with or ألف فصلة ألف رائية يعجبها; Wright, i. p. 10; ZDMG., xxx. 297; Nöldeke, Geschichte des Qorans, p. 257; Fleischer, Kleineere Schriften, i. 29. But I doubt if it was ever used with the singular.

140. Ms. يُبَرِّقُ، evidently a mistake for the feminine.

141. Ms. وتدارك, and above the end of the word some letters which I read as معار, which may perhaps be معا referring to the possibility of either punctuation.

142. Read والخَلَف.

143. Read يَنَشَّا; Lisān, iv. 192, citing this passage, reads السُكَّا.

144. Read نَشَا.

145. Ms. has الرباب العامم; but read الرباب العامم. Cf. Muhīt, p. 740, الرباب العامم ادبيض أو السِكَّة الذي تراه، دون السِكَّة الأعلى

146. ويكون أبيض أو أسود.

The same mistake is found in line 194, where I have made the correction in the text.

149. Marg. غيرة النَّحَر.
195. Marg. حاشية عن أبي عبد الله بنمية.


198. Marg. حاشية غير عن أبي عبد الله جَفَّأَتْ.

203. MS. Read طِلِّيْلٌ and correct lines 206 and 207 accordingly.

211. Muḥi', pp. 1254 and 1985, gives both forms. Read also الكلابّيَّين, against the MS.

222. MS. seems to read أَحْدَةٌ, but the correct reading is وَسَلَّمَةٌ أَحْدَةٌ; cf. Līsān, iv. p. 140.

233. Līsān, xvi. 90, cites the first two lines, with ولأُنْبِذُلْ تَبَّذَلْلُ, and both of which readings must be accepted. Before this our author is cited. قال أبو زيد يقال للجبل الليثين الحفّر غَيْرَ شَمَّ.

240. Marg. حاشية أبو حاتم نَشَفُ يَنْشَفُ.

244. Read بَضَا. وَطَمُّوا.

247. Read فيهم؟

253. In the Tāj, vii. 174 and Līsān, iii. 474; xii. 332 the reading of the first word is صَخَّان. Dr. Torrey has been kind enough to examine the MS., and finds the correct reading to be ۗيَنْتَعُكَن. On the margin of the Tāj is the remark وَكَسَّى هِيَ اسم بَعْدِ. The same remark is made in Līsān. *loc. cit.*; cf. also Yākūt, iv. 929, 1. 22.

252. *النَّطِيَّة* in MS. with مَعا written above. Does this again refer to a double pronunciation?

255. I have inserted كَدَرًا صح. كَدَرًا صح. Marg.
AL-ANŞÂRĪ was one of the most renowned of the early Baṣra grammarians. His full name was Abū Zaid Saʿīd, and his genealogy is given by Ibn Ḥallikān as: ibn Aus ibn Thābit ibn Zaid ibn ʿĀṣ ibn Zaid ibn al-Noʾmān ibn Mālik ibn Thaʿlabī ibn Kaʿb. He belonged to the noblest family of the Ḥazraj. His grandfather Thābit is said to have been one of the six who collected the Qurʾān while the prophet was still alive. Ibn Ḥallikān 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-Nadīm 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 Ḥallīl and Sibawaih. Yūnūs 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-AṣmaṬ or Abū Ubeidah in grammar. For this reason he is called Abū Zaid al-Nahawī (the grammarian).” Nawāwī calls him “the Imām” in matters of philology. Simply as “Abū Zaid” he is cited by many authors, e. g. Yaḥṣūb, Januhrī, the editors of the Tāj al-ʿArāḍ and Lisān al-ʿArab, etc.

In the strife which divided the Baṣra from the Kūfa school, al-Anṣârī seems to have been catholic in his choice of authorities. Abū Saʿīd says of him: “I do not know any of the Baṣriān philologists who have come to Kūfa to study the speech of the Beduin Arabs except Abū Zaid; for he relates traditions coming from al-Mufaḍḍal al-Ḍabbī.” According to Abū ʿAmr al-Māzinī, traditions going back to Abū Zaid have been handed down by Abū ʿUbeid al-ʿĀṣim, Muḥammad ibn Saʿd, Abū Ḥāṭim al-Sajastānī, Abū Zaid ʿOmar ibn Shabbah, Abū Ḥāṭim al-ʿRāzī, etc., etc. Our author is generally praised for his great knowl-

---

1 Biographical Dictionary, Tr. de Slane, i. p. 570; other authorities call Thābit: ibn Bashīr ibn Abī Zaid. To this ibn Ḥallikān wisely remarks: “and God knows which of the two is correct.” See also, Hammer-Purgstall, Literaturgeschichte der Araber, i. 303.
2 Flügel, Kitāb al-Fīhrīst, i. p. 54, 20.
3 Flügel, Die Grammatischen Schulen der Araber, Leipzig 1862, p. 71; Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Muḥammad, iii. 359; Noldeke, Geschichte des Korans, p. 189.
4 Flügel, Kitāb al-Fīhrīst, loc. cit.
5 Biographical Dictionary of Illustrious Men, ed. F. Wustenfeld, p. 721.
6 See e. g. Flügel, Schulen, passim; Košut, Fünf Streitfragen der Baṣrenser und Kūfenser, Wien, 1878.
7 Flügel, Schulen, p. 142.
8 Nawāwī, loc. cit.
edge of tradition. Al-Thaurī says, quoting Ibn Munādir: "Al-ʾAṣmaʾī has the best-stocked memory of them all; Abū ʿUbeidah surpasses them in general information; and Abū Zaid al-ʾAnsārī is the surest authority in traditional knowledge." Even al-ʾAṣmaʾī himself was not slow to recognize his worth. There is a tradition, the authority for which rests with ʿUthmān al-Māzīnī, that he (ʿUthmān) was once present when al-ʾAṣmaʾī 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-ʾĀḥmar came, kissed him and sat down and said: "This one has been our teacher for twenty years." Upon the authority of both al-ʾAṣmaʾī and Abū ʿUbeidah, 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 Ḥadīrites—the upholders of the doctrine of free-will, who afterwards received the name of Muṭṭasilites.

Of his life we know nothing other than that he came to Baghdad about the year 158 A.H., when al-Mahdī 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 (86, 96 or 98). He died at Baṣra.

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 Muḥammadan 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 البلد والشأء. On the words used in Arabic for camel and sheep. Fi., Ḥal., Fl.; H. Ḥ. v. 30 simply كتاب البلد.
2. كتاب الإنبیات. On versified gnomes. Fi., Fl.

---

1 Ibn Ḥallikān, loc. cit.
2 Nawāḥi, who also relates the story, says thirty years.
3 This is added by Nawāḥi. On Ḥalaf al-ʾĀḥmar see Ahlwardt, Chaif Elahmar's Quasside, p. 17.
4 Al-Fūhrist, loc. cit.
7 Flügel, Schulen, loc. cit.
8 Suyūṭī, Al-Muzhir, ii. p. 231.

In the following list I have been careful to give my authorities. Fl. = Fūhrist; Ḥal. = Ibn Ḥallikān; H. Ḥ. = Ḥāfiẓ Ḥallīfah, ed. Flügel; Fl. = Flügel, Gramm. Schulen; Su. = Suyūṭī, as cited by Flügel.
4. كتاب خلق الإنسان. On words used in regard to the human body. Fi., Ḥal., Fl., 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.²
7. كتاب النواضر. 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 تخفيف الهمز, H. H. كَتَبْ تَخْفِيفَ الْحِمْزَ. On the lightening of the Hamza.⁴ There is another reading تَحْقِيق. "On the full pronunciation, etc." Ḥal., Fi., Fl.
11. كتاب البدر. On the words used for "milk." Ḥal., Su.; H. H. v. 142 has كتاب اللبن الحليب.
12. كتاب التمر. On the words used for the date. Fi., Ḥal.
13. كتاب المياه. 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 القضيب. Ḥal., H. H. v. 137. Fi. has كتاب المقتصب.
15. كتاب الوحش. 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, Kleine Schriften, iii. 471 sq.] The whole has lately been published by the Catholic press of Beirut and under the superintendence of Sa'd al-Hūrī al-Shartūnī. 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 Abū Zaid's works. [Cf. Nöldeke, ZDMG., xlix. p. 330.]
⁴ Cf. Fleischer, Kleine Schriften, pp. 35 and 47.
17. كتاب فعلت وفاعلات. On the first and fourth forms of the verb. Fi., Ḥal., Fl., H. H. v. 131.¹


22. كتاب النبات والشجر. On expressions used for plants and trees. Fi., Fl., H. H. v. 162.²

23. كتاب القرائين. On the combination of letters (?). Mentioned only by Fi.

24. كتاب في اللامات. On words commencing with lām; only in Fl.

25. كتاب الواحد. On the singular; only in Fi.

26. كتاب نعت المشافهات. Fi.

27. كتاب نعت العنم. Description of the 'Anam tree (see Führst, ii. p. 84). Fi.


29. كتاب [المعدي. On transitive verbs?? Fi.

30. كتاب بيروتات العرب. On the noble Arab families. Ḥal., Su., H. H. iii. 84.

In addition to these, Al-Nadîm 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 إيبان عثمان. On the religious belief of 'Uthmān?

32. كتاب حيلة وحكاية. On mechanics and the secret arts??

33. كتاب الهروش والنوش. On the expressions used for battle and war?

34. كتاب الجزيلة. Dozy, Suppl., i. 207. "Droit d'occupation"??

35. كتاب نابة ودبيبة.

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; Flügel, Gramm. Schulen, p. 103. Ibn al-Qāṭiyya, Il libro dei Verbi, pp. 10, seq.

² 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 كتَاب المطر from the first subject of which it treats.¹ 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), برق (lightning), حَمَّام (mist) and مَاء (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, Lisān, 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. 1328), 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,² 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. Derenbourg the proof was once more compared (by Mr. Conzelmann) with the original. It was Prof. Derenbourg 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 الضعفاء من الفقهاء لا يحرق
مقصورة ابن داريد الأزدي بشرح ابن خالويه
خطا العوام للجواهري
كتب 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-'Arab. 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 Hālawa'i, see Derenbourg, Hebraica, 1894.
⁴ Published from this MS. by H. Derenbourg, Le livre des locutions viciées, in Morgenländische Forschungen, Leipzig, 1875, pp. 107, seq.
⁵ Published from a MS. in Gotha by H. Thorbecke, Ibn Duraid's Kitāb almulahān, Heidelberg, 1882.
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:

Babbitt  Ferguson  Jenks  Moore, G. F.  Thayer
Berle  Frame  Kellner  More  Torrey
Bierwirth  Gilman  Lanman  Mullan  Ward, W. H.
Channing, Miss  Goodwin, C. J.  Lindsay  Oertel  Warren, H. C.
Chester  Harper, W. R.  Lyon  Orne  Warren, W. F.
Clark, Miss  Haupt  Martin  Reisner  Winslow
Dahl  Hazard  Macdonald  Ropes  Wright, T. F.
Dike  Higginson  Mitchell  Steele  Young
Elwell  Jackson  Moore, C. H.  Taylor, J. R.  [44]

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
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were referred, with book and vouchers and the evidences of the property, to the above named Committee of Audit. The Committee 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 (33) for other years 190.00
Sales of publications 183.30
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 36.00
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. 3 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 143-283), issued June 22, 1892; Proceedings of the Washington meeting of April 21-23, 1892 (= vol. xv., pages cxli-cxxxix), issued Nov. 28, 1892; and finally, Journal, vol. xv., number 3 (= pages 283-322 and cxxxxi-cclxivii 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 determinant 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 disgraceful.

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 Archaeological 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 P. 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 Clafin 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 87 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 προςαρθμία, 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, 8, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, 1, 2; 13. 28; 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 Ketib; 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. Brünnnow, 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 departures 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 difficulties 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 mistake 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 reason 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 verecundia 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 Gilgameš = Τύγαμος (Ael. n. an. xii. 21), cf. Dr. Casanowicz's note in No. 98 of the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, p. 91. Mark Lidzbarski (ZA. vii. 110: cf. ibid. 327) suggests that the name of Nimrod's ancestor Ξισοσάρος or Ξασίσατρα or Atrazasis, may be identical with the Arabic خضر, who lives at the confluence of the two great rivers (مکیم لبکردن) : cf. Koran, Sura 18, v. 59 fl.). For the name Atrazasis see Beiträge zur Assyriologie, ii. 401.
National Museum, Washington, D. C., from a clay tablet which I caused to be prepared some months ago by Rev. Dr. Rudolf Zehnpfund, of Rosslau, 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 383) 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 2252. A diagram showing the dimensions of this fragment is given on p. 132 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 184–149 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. 64 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 ² 57, n. 2; Delitzsch, Assyr. Wörterbuch, p. 143, n. 12.
‡ See the engraving in Geo. Smith’s Chaldean Account of Genesis (London, 1880), p. 9 (German ed. p. 10), or Kaufen’s Assyriken 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.
The new fragment, though very small (ca. 1 ½ x ⅛ in.), contains 5 variants to ll. 139-145 of my edition: viz., līs instead of lī-is in appalis ‘I beheld.’ l. 139; the upright wedge for the preposition a-na at the beginning of l. 141; in l. 143, the phonetic complement -a is omitted after the number 2 (= šanā); in l. 145, we have the accusative xaššu (character GAR) instead of xaššu ‘fifth.’* If 81. 2-4, 460 joins 81. 2-4, 296, the plural kibrāti ‘regions’ would be written defective in l. 139, just as the infinitive kuṣatā ‘arrival’ is written defective in l. 130 on 81. 2-4, 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 I).†

These graphic variations are not of much consequence, but in l. 140 we read on the new fragment, instead of ana 13 ta-a-an itelā nagā ‘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 13 is only preserved on Deluge Tablet B, i.e. K 3375 (p. 109, l. 31 of my edition). This variation is not surprising; fragment I exhibits a number of peculiar readings: e.g. inā nārub nissāti in l. 126, and sabbā šaptā-sumu instead of katmā; rādu after šāru in l. 129; and in l. 139 a-ab-ba = tāmduwa¶ follows immediately after kibrāti.

I give here a reproduction of the new fragment, based on the copy kindly sent me by Mr. Pinches.

---

* Cf. IV² 5, 22; xaššu stands for xanšu (IV², additions ad pl. 56, l. 5) = xanšu, just as šumšu ‘his name’ occasionally appears as šuššu (IV² 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 appalsī-ma tāma-ta ‘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. z. Assyir. i. 135). I think it should be read ud-ma = ḫašt ‘land.’ It is possible that we should also read udmu instead of šmu in l. 119, udmu ulla ana šṭī šā-ul-tar-ma, although the frequent occurrence of šme ullaṭi etc. (Delitzsch, AW. 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 Bezzengerber'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 dîner 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 Icluded will be published. I understand that the first volume of the Transactions of the Stockholm Congress, containing the papers of the Islamic Section I, 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 Pāṇini’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 Pāṇini 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 Pāṇini reposse 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 Pāṇini’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 (Bezzenberger’s Beiträge etc., vol. xvi., 1890), a kindred subject is taken up by Dr. R. Otto Franke (now privat-docent at Berlin), in a paper entitled “the case-system of Pāṇini compared with the use of the cases in Pāli and in the Açoka inscriptions.” The author builds upon Liebich’s foundation, looking in the later dialects mentioned for agreement with the Paninean 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 Pāṇini 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 Pāṇini’s rules; or that Pāṇini may have “collected the phenomena of very diverse dialects, and fused them together into an integral whole.”

But the question as to what Pāṇini’s language really was is approached again by Dr. Franke under the heading “what is Sanskrit?” in Bezzenberger’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 Pāṇini 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 “Pāṇini’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 Prākrit. That is precisely the present character of Sanskrit, the spoken and written tongue of the educated class; that has been its character for over 2000 years; and that must have been its character at the beginning, when the distinction of Sanskrit and Prākrit 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 conspectus 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 Prākrit 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 uttā (or appā) and ātmā, that pakkhiṭta and prakṣipta, that hodon and thavutu, 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 Prākrit 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” (8vo., 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-Āraṇyaka, 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 Bhad-
Aranyaka is fairly homogeneous. It is much to be regretted that,
instead of the acknowledgedly late Bhagavad-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 samhitās, the mantra-
dialect; the second he makes include the Brāhmaṇa and Śāstra 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 ungenuine
roots in the dhātupāṭha, 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 prescriptive, 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 to them the value he does is a secondary question. Prayoktaṣe 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 yasyāhe 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. 3. 78, 79) defining when dhvam and dhave 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 ṣ is 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, ṣ 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 ṣ 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 ṣ 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 dhave in the same rule, that could have reason only if the original and proper form of the endings were sāhvam and sāhve; and, if that were so, we should find ṣ 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 avayayābhāva class of adverbial compounds, regarded as primary, and coordinate 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 coordinate; 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 comple-
teness. 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 mahābāhu ‘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 \( (\text{minus-}\text{plus})^a = \text{minus-}\text{minus} \),
certainly \( (\text{plus-}\text{minus})^b = \text{minus-}\text{minus} \) 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 avargībhāva 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. 61) 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, daddāti ‘he gives,’ daddātāt-
ram ‘he gives more,’ daddātātāmām ‘he gives most’—precisely as if one
were to say in Greek δοθέως, δοθέωτος. 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 ḍhavam—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 ḍhā, and that Prakritic changes sometimes work their way into Sanskrit. So in Prākrit, and on a very large scale, ṅ becomes ṇ; but that would hardly support a Hindu grammarian who should teach that a r altered the next following ṅ to ṇ 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 (Svo, pp. xl, 80, Breslau, 1892), entitled "Two chapters of the Kāṇākā." 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 partisan 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 Kāṇākā 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-
nature 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 Jāsimiṇīya 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 Grantham manuscripts of the Jāsimiṇīya 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, 1883, Journal, vol. xi., p. cxlivi). 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 (khaṇḍa) of the third are a vaśīga. 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 vaśīga. 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 Uccāścravas Kāūpayeya, king of the Kurus, and his friend Kečin Dārāhya: ‘They were dear to each other, and then Uccāścravas Dārāhya departed from this world. When he had departed, Kečin Dārāhya went hunting in order to get rid of his gloomy thoughts. While he was roaming about, Uccāścravas 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 hadst 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 sāman which Prajāpati revealed to his dear son Patanga sang for him the udgīthā. Thereupon Keçin seeks in vain among the Brahman-priests of the Kurus and Pañcālas for a knower of this sāman, till at length he meets Prājśra Bhālla, who answers his questions correctly, and whom he chooses as udgītar for his twelve-day sacrifice.

Burgu 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 Manichaeism; by Mr. Paul Elmer More, of St. Louis, Mo.

The Manichæan religion, which was promulgated by Mānî, a Persian, in the third century of our era, and which spread rapidly from Babylonia 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 Manichæism, 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 Manichæism 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. Geyler, in his dissertation Der Manichæismus 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 Fihrist of Muḥammad ben Ishāk bearing on Manichaeism 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 Fihrist 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 Sémiliques sums up the matter admirably: “Buddas 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 Budasp 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 kathā tathāvīn.”

On the other hand, internal evidence, drawn from a study of the religions 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 Sāṅkhya 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 Manichaeism 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 Fihrist 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 philosophic 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 Mani 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 Mashyof 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 darwands, and their souls shall remain in hell even unto the resurrection. Aji Dahuka, 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 Mani'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 tenèbrarum, 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 tenèbrarum; 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 Sankhyan theory of the five tanmātras and the five mahābhūtas. He is for the time overwhelmed by Eblis, or Saclas, 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 tenèbrarum 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 Mânî’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 mâyâ, 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, Mânî’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 syncrasis. 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 travaileth 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 Manichean Christology will make the subject plainer.

Mânî 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 patibulis, while the latter is the Christos. When the world was created out of the union of the spiritual Primus Homo and the material regnum tenebrarum, 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 patibulis. 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 \textit{omni suspensus ex ligno}. The feeling which inspired this conception of the suffering Jesus is beautifully told in that stanza of Omar Khayyám:

\begin{quote}
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.
\end{quote}

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 devouring their offspring, produce man, who contains the quintessence of all the spiritual light remaining to them. Adam is begotten by Satanas and Nebrod, their leaders, in the likeness of the \textit{Primum 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, imparted by the Savior. In all this we see strong traces of the Zoroastrian sun-worship, as might be expected. The Christos represented as \textit{distantus 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 imported from India, either directly or through the earlier Gnostic sects. Docetism is a transparent adaptation of the Hindu Māyā which plays so important a rôle in Indian philosophy, in later Buddhism, and in the Krishna cult. A single quotation from the \textit{Bhāgavata Purāṇa} or the \textit{Lotus of the True Law} would show the close resemblance of these doctrines—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 Māyā is a western conception, originating in Gnostic Docetism. For instance, we read in the \textit{Bhāgavata Purāṇa} (iii. 15. 5, cited by Senart) "It is through his Māyā, by means of Māyā, that Bhagavant has taken upon himself a body;" and in the \textit{Lotus of the True Law} (chap. xv., SBE. xxi. 302) it is written: "The Tathāgata 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 Manichaean 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 Manichaean church we see the same principles at work. This was divided into two bodies, the electi (or τέκτων) 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 गृहसर; 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 abhiṣā, 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 Manichaean 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 Manichaens. 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 Manichaean 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.
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 diptote declension of the plural: viz., nom. u (Ĭ?), and gen. i (Ĭ?). The plural in u occurs four times, as follows: Biling. Insc. H. Col. ii., line 9, niš-su ra-ap-ša-tum li-ši-ti-ni-ya-kum; Cyl. Insc. H. Col. i., line 7, and also Col. ii., line 4, šarru ša iš-šu-tu-šu a-na ši-ir Sh. u M. ū-ba; Samsu-iluna, Col. iii., line 1, mu-šar-bi-u šar-ru-ti-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. Alltab. Privatrecht, No. 48, line 25, ši-bu-tum pa-nu-tum, ša Mar-ilu-Mar-tu i-na bab i-ši Nin-mar-ki Inu-ba-ni in-u ma-ru a-nu-ku u-ša-mu ik-bu-u-ma, kiram u bitam a-na Inu-ba-ni u-bi-ru; No. 78, lines 4-7, a-na ta-az-ki-tim da-a-a-ni ik-šu-du-u-ma a-nu bit i-šu Šamaš i-ru-bu-nu ma i-na bit Šamaš da-a-a-nu di-nam u-ša-li-zu-u-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 eklim 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-aš ni-i-nu lu ū-bu-nu. 'Saying, as our fathers (were) with one another, we, let us be friendly:' line 13, i-na-an-na damkar-pl-u-a, ša itti Ašu-ša-a-im ti-bu-n, i-nu milk Ki-na-ša-li a-na ši-ma-a-ti it-ta-ak-tu-n; Berlin VA. Th. 151 (Winckler, No. 6), back, line 4, sum-ma la-bi-ri-tum ya-a-nu ša-šu-ti li-ši ... . . . . If there are no old ones, let [them take?] new ones' (acc.); Berlin, unnumbered (Winckler, No. 3), line 14, aššatu-pl ba-na-tum i-ba-aš-ša; and line 24, binatu-pl-u-a i-ba-aš-ša-a; Bulaq 28179 (Winckler, No. 9), back, line 10, ma-ta-tum ru-ka-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-na-ša-a-u. Besides these examples, there are no other nominative plurals in these tablets. Once also, Winckler, No. 7, line 37, the phrase šar-ra-ni ma-ša-ra-nu-ma is a genitive. Everywhere else, the genitive and accusative end in i. Cf. also Agum-kakrimi, col. vii., line 19, ir-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 diptote 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
this with the Hebrew, we find that there too the plural, whether feminine or masculine, with pronominal suffixes, ends in i. 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-i is originally made simply by analogy from the masculine or not, the Hebrew feminine מְ å — with pronominal suffixes goes back to a real usage of this full form without the pronominal suffixes. Second, this full form מְ å — is descended from a diptote declension of the plural (masculine and feminine) in u-i. 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 saṃkheśaras; on the saṃkheśaras 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. Coplestone, 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. 123) "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 paṭicca-samuppāda.* Paṭicca is a gerund, equivalent to the Sanskrit pratiṣṭha, from the verbal root i 'go,' with the prefix prati '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 paṭicca-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. 463; 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 saṁkhāra 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 Buddha 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 *saṁkhāra*, and the Consciousnesses result from such *saṁkhāras*. All the *saṁkhāras* are really also consciousnesses, but some thirty-two are marked off as the results of the others, and called *vipāka-viṁśāyaṇas* ‘resultant consciousnesses.’ Thus the relation of these thirty-two consciousnesses to the others called *saṁkhāras* is that of effect to cause.

The *saṁkhāras* 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 *saṁkhāras*.

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 *saṁkhāras* of a former birth; others (e. g., those of the Trances), on *saṁkhāras* 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 *saṁkhāras*, 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 Pariṣṭas of the Atharva-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, *Āsuri-Kalpa*, in the *Am. Journal of Philology*, 1889, x. 165 ff. Codex A is a clean MS. of 217 leaves, or of 484 pages, each of nine lines. Twelve Pariṣṭas, 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 Pariṣṭas 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 Paricīṣṭas are wont to present two treatments of the same ceremonial, one in prose, the other in ālokas. 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 Paricīṣṭas 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 Paricīṣṭas, 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 largess; 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:

āçcayam aparityāgyo drṣṭanastāpadām api
avivekleśāhahabudāhīnān svānaubhāvo 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 1855, Boehltingk and Roth set up for anubhāva the meaning “3. Gesinnung, Denkungsart (?),” but merely for the sake of this one passage. Thus svā-anubhāva (sva = ‘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 9. 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:

\[ \text{avivekāndhabuddhānaṁ svabhāvāk sudurātmānām}. \]

Copyist A left out su-; he, or his corrector, placed su- in the margin; copyist B put it back from the margin into the text, but in the wrong place, thus, svu-su-bhūva durātmānāṁ; for the senseless svu-su-, copyist C substituted what in nāgarī letters looks very nearly like it, namely svānu-. Thus arose the corruption.

The reading svabhānuḥ, 'own nature,' yields just the sense we want, and fits the metre. For the combination sudur-, compare duḥ-sparṣa (opposite of su-sparṣa) with su-duḥsparṣa, and the like.

10. On the áقتر. le'y. rujanāḥ, RV. i. 32. 6, with a note on hapology; by Prof. M. Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

The hymn containing the word rujanāḥ is one of the most prominent of the large class which describe the conflict of Indra and the demon of the cloud, Vṛtra. The passage in question, RV. i. 32. 6 c, d, reads:

\[ \text{nā tārīd asya sāmṛṭiṁ vadānāṁ saṁ rujanāḥ pipīṣa āndrāṣatruḥ}. \]

'(Vṛtra) has not survived the blow of his (Indra's) weapons, etc.' The fourth pāda is rendered by Grassmann: “im Sturz zerbrach der Indrafeind die Klüfte;” Ludwig translates “die gebrochenen burgen zermalnte er (selber noch im sturze) des feind gott Indra.” Both translators ignore the native treatment of the word. In Yāska’s Nāighaṇṭuka i. 18 = Kāutsavayā 30,* it occurs in a list of words for ‘river,’ and in Yāska’s Nirukta vi. 4 we have, more explicitly, rujāṇa nadvyo bhavanti rujantī kūlānī† 'the rujāṇa are rivers; they break (ruj) the banks.' This purely etymological rendering is adopted by Sāyaṇa: indreṇa hato nadiśa potiṁtaṁ san... vṛtradeshaṁ pātena nadiṁāṁ kūlāṁ tatravayopāvādikāṁ cūrībhūtaṁ. Even at the time of the present arrangement of the naighaṇṭuka there must have been some perplexity, for the word occurs a second time in Nāigh. iv. 3, in one of those lists which even in Yāska’s time stood in need of especial elucidation. And Mādhava, in explaining the parallel passage at TB. ii. 5. 4. 4, renders quite differently: bhāṅgaṁ prāṇyuvaṁtīsvakīyā eva senāḥ... vajreṇa hato bhūmāṇu patan san samīpaṁvītaṁ sarvān ĝurān ārṇāṁ cūrṇikṛtavān ‘his own armies while they are fishing, all the heroes standing near,’ (Vṛtra) slain by the bolt, falling upon the ground, has

† Cf. under Pāṇini ii. 3. 54: nadi kālāṁ rujati.
ground to pieces;’ here rujanah is explained by bhunam pramunwantih ... senaḥ, in a manner totally different from the Nirukta. But all these translations are certainly incorrect, because they make rujanah 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 Grassmann’s Lexicon and Whitney’s Index Verborum. Thus sām pīpiṣa indracatruḥ 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, ciro dāvasya sāṃ pīyaḥ; iii. 30. 8, ahasām indra sāṃ piyak kūyāram; iv. 30. 13, pāro yād asya (sc. ċūṣyasya) sampiṣyaḥ; vi. 17. 10, yena uṇvamādānām dhvām sampiṣyaḥ; viii. 1. 28, tvam pūrnavi ... cūṣyasya sāṃ piyak. One may say that but for the presence of rujanah in the pada no one would have ever thought of regarding sām pīpiṣ as an active. We are thus constrained to search in rujanah 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 rujanah here states that such injury was inflicted upon Vṛtra by Indra. Thus RV. x. 89. 6, 7, (indral) ċṛṇātī viśu ṛujāti sthirdi ... jaghāna vṛtrān ... ruroja pūrāḥ: cf. also i. 6. 5; 51. 5; iv. 32. 10; vi. 32. 3; ix. 48. 2. Very similar are RV. vili. 6. 13, vi vṛtrān parvaṇo ṛujān; i. 59. 6, vi vṛtrāṣya ... pasyaḥ rujah; x. 152. 3 = AV. i. 21. 3 = SV. ii. 1217; also TS. i. 6. 12. 5, vi vṛtrāṣya āvina ṛuja. Elsewhere Vala is treated in the same way: e.g. RV. iv. 50. 5, vālaḥ ruroja; RV. vi. 39. 2, rūjād ... vi vālaṣya sānum; AV. xix. 28. 3, ṛudāḥ sapāṭnāṃam bhindhi ‘nāra iva virujān valām. At RV. x. 49. 6, sām ... ċāsaṁ vṛtrahā ṛujam, and AV. iv. 24. 2, yō (sc. indro) dānāvítāṃ bālam āvuruṣa, the same theme is treated. At RV. vi. 22. 6, the words rūjo vi āvṛhā express essentially the same thing, the cleaving of the clouds: cf. also vii. 75. 7; vii. 45. 13; ix. 34. 1. At RV. vi. 32. 2 we have rūjād ādrama (cf. i. 73. 2); at RV. vi. 61. 2, arjat sānu girvāṃ. Again, of Indra it is said at RV. x. 84. 3, rujān ... ċātrān; at RV. i. 102. 4 = AV. vii. 50. 4, prā ċātrāṇām maghavan vṛṣṇyā ṛuja. Every additional example strengthens the impression that rujanah originally stood in agreement with indracatruḥ, the subject of the sentence, and we are at once led to the emendation rujanah ‘broken’ in the sense of a passive: cf. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 294. But why should the correctly accented and easily intelligible rujanah have given way to this discordant lectio difficiliuma with anomalous accent? The sense, too, is tautological in the extreme: ‘Vṛtra having been 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 *ruj* is employed very frequently in connection with parts of the body. Thus we have above the expressions *vi vrtrasya hānā ruja; vi* *

vrtrān parvaçō rujān; rujaud ... vi válasya sānun.* In a different connection we have *AV. ix. 8. 13, figuratively, yāh sūmānāṃ virñjānti mūrdhānam praty arṣayāḥ ‘the pains which break the crown of the head and the head;’ AV. ix. 8. 18, yāh ... pārāhāri virñjāntī; CB. iv. 5. 2. 3, virñjāja çroñī. At Rām. iii. 72. 20 we have *nākañjīnākāhīj ... gātrāvy ārujatā; at Har. 5694, stānān ārujya.* With this use are related the common expressions like *muñkāru-ruj ‘pain in the mouth,’ Varāh. Br. S. 5. 82; dgp-ruj, ibid. 104. 5; aksī-ruj, ibid. 51. 11; 104. 16; netra-ruj, AK. iii. 4. 26. 203, ‘pain in the eyes;’ pārṣva-ruj, Suçr. i. 165. 9, ‘pain in the side;’ *lalāfe ca rujā jajūe, Rām. iii. 29. 15; cīro-ruj, Varāh. Br. S. 53. 111; cīro-rujā, MBh. iii. 16829; cīrāso rujā, ibid. 16816.*

My suggestion, now, is that *rujānāḥ* is a compound of a derivative of the root *ruj* with some designation of a part of the body. It might be = *rujānā + ās ‘having a broken mouth;’ but it seems to me more likely to be *rujānā + nās ‘nose,’ which would yield *rujānānas,* changed by dissimilation (haplology) to *rujānas.* The word would then mean ‘with broken nose.’ In stanza 7 of the same hymn the statement is made that Vytra was broken into many small pieces: *puratā vrtrā açayad vyāstalā;* which augurs that his nose was not exempt from the general catastrophe. This, at any rate, yields good sense, and accounts for the anomalous (bahuvr̥iḥ) 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 dáseyūr aṃr̥ṇo vadhēna.* The padapāṭha divides *an-āso,* and both the Petersburg lexicons and Grassmann follow, translating the word by ‘without face or mouth.’ Ludwig, *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 (*rujānāḥ = rujānānas*) 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 bahuvr̥iḥ with a participle in -na as the first member we have in *daudrānā-pavi, yauyānā-sapti* (Whitney, Sk. Gr.² § 1299c): cf. also *uttānā-hasta, uttānā-pad.* The participle *rujāna* is to be regarded as belonging to the root-aorist: cf. ib. 840, 6.*
Whitney, Sk. Gr. 2 § 1021b, mentions *irādhyāi for *irdh-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-loku from uru-lokā (see below), are: madūgha ‘sweet-wood, licorice,’ for *madhu-dugha, *madhu-gha, with loss of aspiration, both intermediate forms being found occasionally in the MSS.: see e. g. Kaṭu, 35. 21, note 9; trīcā and trīcā for *trī-yeu ‘a group of three stalks’ (so already Yāska, Nir. iii. 1); hirany-maya for *hirany-nyaya ‘golden,’ where the loss of the first ya by dissimilation operates across the syllable ma; čuṣmaya for *cuṣma-maya, Ts. ii. 2. 12. 4, ‘fiery,’ which the Petersburg lexicon erroneously regards as the corruption of a theoretical *cuṣma; čeṇḍha for *ceva-ṛdhā ‘kindly, friendly’ (Grassmann): sādus-pāti for *sadaśas-pāti ‘protector of home’: compounds with pāti having two accents regularly exhibit a genitive as the first member: cuchās-pāti, bṛhas-pāti, brāhmaṇas-pāti, and by imitation rūnas-pāti, jās-pāti, rūthas-pāti; cīrakti ‘head-ache’ may stand for cīr-a-sakti ‘affection of the head’ from root sac in the sense of ‘fasten upon:’ cf. AV. i. 12. 3, where cīr-a-sakti 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 kṣrayāmi, etc., to the p-type: kṣapayāmi etc.: cf. also the change of rohāyāmi of the mantras to rōpāyāmi 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 maṇḍalas 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. 30. 6; iii. 2. 9; 29. 8; 37. 11; iv. 17. 17; v. 1. 6; 4. 11; vi. 23. 3; 73. 2; vii. 20. 2; 33. 5; 60. 9; 84. 2: 99. 4; viii. 15. 4 (here u loka-kr̥tvām). In the ninth book, there are two occurrences of simple lokā, i. 113. 7, 9; and three of u lokā, ix. 2. 8 (u lokakṛtvām); 86. 21 (u lokakṛtya); 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 lokakṛtya); 180. 3; 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; jīvalokām, in x. 18. 8; and pātulokām, in x. 85. 43. This shows on the whole a perceptible growth of lokā at the expense of u lokā in the ninth and tenth books; and the AV. 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, *Vedic Hymns* (SBM. xxxii), p. lxxv, who notes only viii. 100. 12.
the same direction. Here lokā occurs so often as to render a count useless, but u lokā occurs only three times, in one hymn of the Yama-
book, xviii. 4. 11, 44, 71, in the obviously archaizing phrase sukṛṭām u lokām. I do not count three other occurrences which coincide with
the RV., namely vii. 84. 2=RV. x. 180. 3; xviii. 2. 8=RV. x. 16. 4; xviii. 3. 38=RV. x. 13. 2. The AV. abounds also in compounds in which
loka forms the second member; see Index Verborum, p. 257a. In the
Yajus-texts, both u lokā and lokā occur; but we have no means of con-
trolling their frequency or proportion. We have suvabhā u lokā in VS.
xii. 35=TS. iv. 2. 3. 2=MS. ii. 7. 10; sukṛṭām u lokām in VS. xviii.
52=TS. iv. 7. 13. 1=MS. ii. 12. 3; and in VS. xviii. 58. The parallel of
VS. xviii. 58 in TS. v. 7. 7. 1 has sukṛṭasya lokām instead of sukṛṭām
u lokām. 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;
120. 1; 121. 1, 2; vii. 88. 4; xi. 1. 8, 37, etc. In VS. xi. 22=MS. ii. 7. 2
occurs the pāda dkaḥ sū lokān sukṛṭam pryṭhyām, which is varied in
TS. iv. 1. 2. 4 to dkaḥ sū lokān sukṛṭam pryṭhyāḥ. Both sū and sū
are modern variants of u; and they testify that the combination u lokā
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. 21; x. 133. 1), occurs in other texts always without u: AV. xviii.
3. 25; TS. i. 1. 12. 1; TB. iii. 7. 2. 10; AÇS. iv. 13. 5.

Most Vedic scholars have recognized the unusual character of u before
lokā. In many cases it makes no sense; and in RV. iii. 2. 9; 37. 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 lokā, regarded as
two words, could have been propagated secondarily;‡ hence all the
interpreters have agreed in assuming ulokā as a single word, misunder-
stood by the padapātha and the Prātiṣekhya of the RV., owing to the
occurrence of lokā in the same text.

Adalbert Kuhn, in Ind. Stud. i. 350 ff., after comparing lokā with
Lith. and Old Pruss. laukas, Lettish lauko, all meaning ‘open space,
field,’ Low Germ. louch, lōch ‘village,’ derives the words from Skt. urū,
vēp-, 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 rue ‘shine,’ preceded by a preposition
u, a reduced form of ava. Bollensen, ZDMG. xviii. 607 ff., xxii. 580,
derives it from an adjective *uruv-aue, through the weak stem *uruv-ac,
extended into an a-stem *uruvaka, *uroka. Ascoli, Corsi di glottologia,

* The same expression occurs in RV. v. 1. 6.
† Hence the RV. Prātiṣekhya (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; anudātanā tu pādaātu novarjayān 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 -tacā‘ (‐tacā‘ u).
p. 236 (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 l. Grassmann modifies the view of the Pet. Lex. by assuming a reduplicated stem *urukau 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 ulokā and the word uru. I assume a simple stem lokā, and a descriptive compound urulokā, changed by assimilation of the linguals to *ululokā and by haplology to ulokā. Naturally, after the loss of one of the syllables, the origin of the word was forgotten, and the padakāra, perplexed by the existence of the simple word lokā, construed u as the particle.

The Vedic poets themselves had lost all knowledge of the composite character of the word: but the expression ulokā clearly betrays its elective affinity for the word uru, which frequently occurs as its predicate: e.g. RV. i. 93. 6; vii. 23. 7; vi. 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 uru having been exhausted by its phonetic fate, a second uru is put into requisition; its fitness as a predicate of lokā (ulokā) has not passed by.† But there appears to be a certain shyness in putting uru near ulokā; in all cases where the two occur together, uru stands at the beginning and ulokā at the end of the pāda: e.g. i. 93. 6, urukā yajñāya cakrathur ur lokām. So also vi. 23. 7; vii. 35. 5; 60. 9; 84. 2; 99. 4; x. 180. 3.

The occurrence of the áx. key. urulokā in RV. x. 128. 2 = AV. v. 3. 3 = TS. iv. 7. 1. 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: *urolkā changed to ulokā is a karmadhāraya, and accordingly oxytone; urulokā is a bahuvrīhi in both function and accentuation. It is quite likely that the identical grave intonation of the two similar first syllables in urulokā 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-kā, but u-rū-lo-ku). But there seems to be also a chronological difference:

† Cf. Bechtel, Uber gegenseitige Assimilation und Dissimilation der beiden Zitterlaute, pp. 45 ff. Aufrecht's essentially similar view, ZDMG. xii. 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 prtsūsu 'in battles,' with double loc. plur. ending su. This is rendered natural by a compound like prtsutā, where prsū may have been felt as a stem-form. Similarly patsu-tās 'at the feet' and patsutak-qi' 'lying at the feet;' comparatives and superlatives like cṛcchatiama, nādis-\thtama; Pali abhiruhyita for *abhiruhyita = Skt. abhirūhya, ogayhīva for *ogayhā = arauyāya, etc. See E. Kuhn, Pali-grammatik, p. 120.
since the AV., though it does not directly compound urū and lokā, places them closely together, e.g. ix. 2. 11, urūṃ lokām akaram māh-yam eḥatūm; xii. 1. 1, urūṃ lokām prthiśi naḥ kṛṣṇu; 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 urūṃ ... ulokām, e.g. vii. 84. 2. urūṃ na ēndrāh kṛṣṇavād u lokām. 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 (Ys. xxx. 2, mazē yāoīhō); each man should choose the best, and seek for the ideal state; mankind shall then become perfect, and the world renovated (fraśem ahūm, fraśōtema: cf. fraśōkereti, 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 khšathra, khšathra vaīrya). 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. lviii).

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 Theopompus, quoted by Diogenes Laertes, Proemium p. 2, ed. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum i. 280, and again by Æneas of Gaza, Dial. de animi immort. p. 77, both cited by Windischmann, Zoroastrische 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 Saoshhyant '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; xlii. 19; 1. 11; cf. Yt. xix. 11; Vd. xviii. 51; Ys. lxii. 3; Yt. xiii. 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.; xxxii. 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. xiii. 128; xix. 89; Bund. xxx. 2 ff.; BYt. iii. 61; Dd. ii. 13, et al., and a passage in a Syriac MS. commentary on the N. T. by 'Ishōdād, as well as Apocryphal N. T., Infancy, iii. 1–10.

Finally, the resurrection passages Yt. xiii. 138; xix. 89–96; Fragm. iv. 1–3 were translated in full and commented upon. The latter fragment (iv. 1–3) appears in the Dīnkart ix. 46. 1–5 as taken from the Varshtmānsar Nask (cf. West, Pahlavi Texts transl. S. B. E. xxxvii. 302). A number of Pahlavi allusions were then instanced, occurrences of Phl. tuntē-pasīn 'the body hereafter' were treated, and an extended discussion was given of the well-known Bundahish passage xxx. 1–32, and of its relation to the ancient Dāmdāt Nask. Statements bearing upon the resurrection were also cited from the accounts given in the Dīnkart and the Persian Rīvāyats, of the contents of the original Avestan Nasks 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 Nasks, 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. gambhīrā, 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 u 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 *gufra* ‘deep’ quite clear. Presumably, Av. *gufra* stands for *gumfru*: cf. Av. *jaf-ra*. This can be none other than Skt. *gambhi-rā*, *gabh-ī-rā*. 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. 28 for the similar word *guf-ya*, *guf-ya* would seem to show that fact; but that such a *u* does occur in Av. for *m*, *u*, seems unquestionable, and an acceptance of Horn’s suggestion may perhaps clear up other words.

2. Skt. *achāyā*, RV. x. 27. 14, and Av. *asāya*, Yasna lvi. 27.

In the Avesta, Ys. lvi. 27, the divine horses of Sraosha are thus described:

*yim cattwārō aurvaiūdī
aurūśa raokhāna frāderesra
speītā vuḍhvōoūhō asāyā
mainivvasūhō vseūtī

‘Four white steeds, bright, shining, sacred, knowing, and .... , bear Sraosha through the heavenly space.’

The epithet *asāya*, 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 *sāyako*, with which he compared Mod. Pers. *asāy*, ‘shadow.’ The hint was an excellent one; *asāya* might well mean ‘not casting a shadow.’

Turning now to the Sanskrit, we find a precise parallel in the word *a-chāyā* ‘shadowless’ in a passage of the Rig-Veda, x. 27. 14: *bhahūn a chāyā o’ apalāçō’ arvā*. The meaning at once becomes clear, and the forms match exactly. For the phonetic changes (Skt. *ā* = Av. *ā*; 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’: *anvērōpōn evāmaivo eixwōtē*, μῆτε τροφῆς δεμένων μῆτε σκιῶν ποιώντας. See also Windischmann, Zor. Studien, p. 234.

The epithets Skt. *achāyā*, Av. *asāya* 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. Men-
tion was made, for example, of Zoroaster's reputed teacher Barzín-
karīs. Possibly that name may rest upon some good foundation.
Allusion to a spiritual teacher (aētherpatī) of Zoroaster is at any rate
now quotable from an ancient Avesta fragment of the Hādḥōkht 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. 483:

mā āzāravāyā, Zarathuštra! mā Pournāaspem mā Dugh-
dhovām, mā aētherpatī;

which may be rendered: 'Mayest thou, O Zoroaster, not anger thy
father, Pourushasp, nor thy mother, Dughdhuva, nor thy spiritual
teacher.' Might Barzīnkāris be the very aētherpatī 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 writ-
ings. See, for instance, Bd. xxxii. 10; Sl. x. 4; xii. 11, and the refer-
ence 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 sū in the Rig-veda; by Prof.
Herbert C. Tolman, of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

As an inseparable prefix, the particle sū 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 sū used as an indepen-
dent 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 mean-
ing to usaya, 'sans faire d' ombro.' To have the support also of such authority is
gratifying.
(Ludwig), sogleich; and mà u śū is rendered by nimmer: thus, for example, in RV. i. 38. 6, mó śū vaḥ...nirṛtir durḥāya vaddū. 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, tátro śu mādāyādhrāti, ‘so enjoy yourselves as their (the Vānas’: tátro = kāyresu) guests, well or thoroughly: i.e. have a rousing good time with them.’ And, as examples under b.: i. 136. 1, prā śū jij̄j̄aḥ naeitr̄bhyaṁ bhūdān nāma...bhavatā, ‘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, abhīdātho gharmais tād u śu prā vocum, ‘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 śu...codaye ‘ndru rūyé, ‘be so good, O Indra, as to help us on to prosperity’; i. 17. 7, asmān śu jīgyāsas kṛtam, ‘be ye two so good as to make us victorious’; i. 26. 5, imā u śu grudhī giraḥ, ‘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 vāhī narā sv āvase...havāmahē, ‘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, παρακαλῶ was attached for alike 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.’

† Δες μου, παρακαλῶ, ἔλαυγε, ‘Please hand me the olives.’ Compare the Latin bene in nume te opsecro ut me bene ēxes, Mostell. iv. 3. 41.
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 schon, 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-Agâmi (ed. Bulaq, I. p. 17, l. 16), first-rate evidence is to be found that the Arabs of the time of Moâwiya, the first Damascens 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 Moš'âb ibn Amphâr, a descendant of the famous Ibn az-Zubeir of Medina, relates that Sa'îd, 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'îd desired that 'Amru should be able to offer the calif something that he might sell to advantage and incur no expense. Accordingly, Moâwiya accepted his relative’s offer with the words “What* has he made over to me?” ‘Amru replied “His castle in Al-'Arâsa.” 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 waâfi’s.” 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 (وَكَانَ أَكْثَرُهَا "عدّات")”

The Arabic word عَدَّة here used appears to have a technical sense, an illustration of which is afforded by the conclusion of Moš'âb’s story, which runs thus:

A young man of the Koreish came to him (viz. ‘Amru, on his return to Medina) with a document (صح) to the amount of twenty thousand dirhams with Sa'îl'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 فاَعَضَ (عَلَيْهِ), not مَا عَرَضَ (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 ṭafī. Give it to him.’ And the twenty thousand dirhams were weighed out to him in ṭafī!*

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 fulfill them. This fact really invalidated his note, at least according to the Mohammedan 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 كِنَّ , 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 كِنَّ and the سَلَّم وُسَلَّف , 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 كِنَّ, 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 Hanфite and the unorthodox Shi'ite sects insist still further that the creditor may claim no interest; but the شافعیites more rationally permit him to convert the contract immediately into the سَلَّم وُسَلَّف . Ordinarily, a written contract is made out, with the signatures of sev-

---

* Ar.﴾( = in ṭafī kind). The ṭafī was then equivalent to the silver دَرْهَم , 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 Mo'awiya to pay in full!'
eral witnesses, in whose presence the loan must be made. Yet the contract is valid if oral only, provided the creditor pronounces the word ُقَمَلْتُ 'I lend,' and the debtor ُغَيَتْ ُأَتْرَضَتُ 'I receive.'

To return to our story of Sa‘īd and the time of Moāwiya (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 عَدْة (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 عَدْة 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 (أَمانة)," in order to marry off one of his young servants.

But now let us pass from Moāwiya 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 disestablish 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 Mekka, 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 Sahih of Al-Bokhârî, in his chapter on "Borrowing, Payment of Debts, Cheating, and Failure" (ed. Kreidl, 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 dinár, no more, with which to meet any obligation. Somewhat discrepanantly, 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 Bedáwin 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 *dkíûn* has only the general sense of 'debt,' usually referring to a simple bill of sale. It is interesting to notice the word *skifə*, which was used in the story of Sa'd to signify the 'sheet of paper' on which the *dkíûn* 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 document 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 Bedáwin 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 Dr. 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. Nevertheless, it is equally probable that the Arabs, no less than the Babylonians, 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 Mohammed, who was himself a keen trader, they easily adopted a regular requirement of documentary evidence in the undertaking of business obligations.


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-Khenu-ensu, referred to in Assyrian texts as Hininsi, afterwards named Heracleopolis by the Greeks, and called by the natives at present Almas, sometimes Henassieh; it is referred to in Isaiah xxx. 4, as Hanes. Henassieh may be a corruption of Hanes, the ch being a common terminative. As to the age of the site, Brugsch (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 government 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 Pihah, 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 XIth Dynasty, as the architraves bear the cartouches of that king; but they can be absolutely dated only from the reign of Rameses.

The royal inscriptions, clearly emblazed, 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 Sotep en Ra; si Ra; the cartouche, Ramessu 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 khaui; the smaller cartouche repeated; the symbol of life repeated; Neb Taui; the larger cartouche repeated; Neb Khaui; and the smaller cartouche. On the column's right, with the same or equivalent titles,
Rameses is offering to Horus (figures 2 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.
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, President 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:

Adler
Arbeely
Arnold, W. R.
Babbitt
Barton
Binney
Bloomfield
Bradner
Briggs
Brinton
Carpenter
Casanowicz
Chambers
Chester
Collitz
Dahl
Deinard
Dickerman
Drisler
Eiwell
Fay
Frame
Frothingham
Gilman
Goodwin, C. J.
Gottheil
Grieve, Miss
Hall, I. H.
Haupt
Hazard
Hopkins
Howard
Hyvernat
Jackson
Jastrow, Jr., M.
Kent
Lauman
Levias
Lyon
MacDonald
McConnell, Mrs.
Myer
Oertel
Olcott
Perry
Peters
Prince
Ragozin, Mrs.
Rogers
Rudolph, Miss
Smith
Smyth
Steele
Torrey
Toy
Ward, W. H.
Watson
Webb
Werren
Williams
Wise
Wood
Woodward
Wright, T. F.
Yohannan

The minutes of the last meeting, at Boston and Cambridge, were read by the Recording Secretary, Professor Lyon of Har-
vard 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 Lamman, 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 reports 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 Pâli, 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 bazars to gullible tourists."

Rev. George N. Thomssen, of the American Baptist Mission, Kurnool, Madras Presidency, India, writes under date of September 28, 1893, concerning the Vadagalai 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, Sankarâchârya 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 Ahobolam, 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 Ahobolam 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 Hiranyan. 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 Hiranyan'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 Ahobolam, 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. Ahobolam 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 Ahobolam, 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 Brahmins, 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 Marjalapattu, 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 8-12, 1894. Messrs. Brinton, Gottheil, 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 "Attappa, 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.**

Balance from old account, April 6, 1893 .................. $1,045.96
Assessments (168) for 1893-4 .................. $940.00
Assessments (84) for other years .................. 170.00
Sales of publications .................. 114.26
Income of investments, so far as collected .................. 36.46
Interest on balances of General Account .................. 30.50
Supplement to anonymous gift of $1,000 .................. 8.00

Total collected income of the year .................. 1,199.22
Total receipts for the year .................. $2,245.18

**Expenditures.**

Journal, xv. 3, and distribution .................. $212.52
Journal, xvi. 1 (part) .................. 154.12
Proceedings, April, 1893 .................. 138.49
Authors' extras from Journal and Proceedings .................. 31.75
Paper .................. 105.10
Job printing .................. 21.00
Postage, express, etc. .................. 38.69

Total disbursements for the year .................. 696.67
Credit balance on Gen'l Account, March 29, 1894 1,548.51

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 126) 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:

1893, Jan. 1, Amount of the Bradley Type-fund ............... $1,369.88
Interest for one year .................................. 55.82

1894, Jan. 1, Amount of the Bradley Type-fund ............... $1,425.20
Amount of Publication-fund ................................ 2,127.19
1894, March 29, Balance of General Account .................. 1,548.51

Total of funds in possession of the Society ............... $5,100.90

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 Archaeological 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 $25 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 (260 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 lli.


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. Martín, 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.;
Mr. Macy M. Skinner, Cambridge, Mass.;
Mr. A. W. Stratton, Toronto, Canada;
Miss Cornelia Warren, Boston, Mass.;
Rev. J. E. Warren, 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 1857. 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 repeat-
ing:

"We believe that Oriental studies have a high and positive value for
all who are studying the history of the human race; that natural his-
tory, 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 apprecia-
tion 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 hun-
dred 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 pre-
siding 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 constitu-
tute 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 knowl-
dge. 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 Woolsey, Professor
C. C. Felton, Professor Hadley, and Professor Whitney.
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 13th, 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 represented at all. It was inevitable that John Pickering should be elected 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, Romaic, 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 Senator, 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 represented 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 cooperation 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 country, and which found its field in what was then the almost utterly unknown 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 Chrestomathies, 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 Chrestomathy, 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 1837. 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. Grotendorst, 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, Hinx, 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. 43):

"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 Archæological 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 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 type-written 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 '成员单位' 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 יִשְׂרָאֵל , צִיוֹן , and יָשָׁב וּבָלָל . Of these, the יָשָׁב וּבָלָל is sufficiently explained in the Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum. The exact meaning of the other two is, however, much debated.

As to יָשָׁב וּבָלָל , Vogüé and Blau think this word an adjective descriptive of the יָשָׁב וּבָלָל , corresponding to the Hebrew יָשָׁב וּבָלָל . The following uses of the word in Hebrew may be urged in support of this opinion: יָשָׁב וּבָלָל ‘thy beauty for it was perfect,’ Eze. xvi. 14; יָשָׁב וּבָלָל ‘perfect in beauty,’ Eze. xxvii. 3. This view is, however, shown to be incorrect by the inscription itself; for we have in l. 3. יָשָׁב וּבָלָל , in the case of a יָשָׁב וּבָלָל , where יָשָׁב וּבָלָל is evidently the name of a sacrifice. Saulcy, Munk, Schröder, 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, "he shall be to Yahwe a holocaust, burned as incense;" Lev. vi. 16, 'every minhath 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 בָּן 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 בָּן the priest should have three hundred shekels of flesh,* and that in the case of a calf as a בָּן 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 בָּן 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 בָּן יִשָּׁמֵע clear? In this phrase the יִשָּׁמֵע appears to have been the name of the sacrifice, and the בָּן an adjective describing it. If so, the adjective meant 'complete' or 'whole,' if we may reason from Hebrew analogy.

The root-meaning of יִשָּׁמֵע 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 commensal idea of sacrifice. Lev. xix. 5 reads 'when ye offer sacrifices of to Yahwe, ye shall offer them that ye may be accepted.' From Lev. iii. 3, vii. 31, etc., we learn that the fat of the was burned on the altar, and the inwards without the camp, and that the flesh was eaten. Lev. vii. 11–21 divides the 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 as a sacrifice would lead us to think not. The term has disappeared from the Carthage tablet. We have also no means of determining the exact force of in the compound expression. It may have applied either to the victim, implying that the whole was a , or to the idea of the root , 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 (P‘shîtâ and Harqelssian 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 x 31,* written part 26 x 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. 8; then (colored ornament across page) .

b.—Colored ornament across page, then .


b.—Luke v. 20–25.

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;
a full line averages 11 letters; single point punctuation; small ornaments between verses 4 and 5, 9 and 10. Harq. 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; Pšhitā text.

a. — John xii. 12-17.

b. — John xii. 17-22; at foot of col. 2 a rubric of 8 lines, but much damaged.

D. A single vellum leaf; double cols.; 43 × 32, written portion 30 × 21, between cols. 2.5; a full line averages 10 letters; single point punctuation; rubrics and colored ornaments: Harq. text.


b. — Luke xiii. 28-30; then, in a small hand, | | (along margin). Then, in a larger hand, | |, 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 Kurdistan. 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; 25 lines; a rounded regular hand, sloped slightly backwards, and with much closer resemblances to Plate LIX. in the Palæographical Society's Fac-similes (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 — , and the rest of the word, كم, 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 95, where there is no mark); but all these are apparently later additions, for the ink is much blacker and fresher; terminal ornament to 1. 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 Sūra xi., v. 86, ولأنت بحسبِنا الناس; بعدا لِمَدينِتَكَ and there is no ruling visible.

There are the following differences of orthography from the Qur'ān text as given in Flügel and in Fleischer's Baitāwī (compare generally Nöldeke, Geschichte des Qorāns, pp. 248 ff.): The alif of prolongation is omitted in l. 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 20, 21, 25, 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. 5 (Nöld., p. 254); in l. 8 in آنِهيكم (and in l. 16 آنِها كِم) are written for ِنْنِك (accepting the later diacritical points) is read for ِنْنِك in Baitāwī's text, but he gives ِنْنِك as a various reading (compare also Nöld., p. 258); but in the text given with the Calcutta edition of az-Zamakhshari’s Kashshāf several of these words are written as in this fragment— ِأْنَّهِيكم، أَنْهِيكمْ، لَرُجُمَّكِنْ، حَفْيِينَ، صُلْعًا، نَشْأَةً، لَرُجُمَّكِنْ—and in all the cases of the vocative; in the Qur'ān 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'ān 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'ān text. No one could describe Flügel’s edition as reliable, and Fleischer edited Baitāwī, not the Qur’ān. The following extracts from p. 167 of the غيبت النفع في القراءات السبع لسيدى عليّ النورى الصفافن (on the margin of Ibn al-Qāsīh's Commentary on the Shāfi‘i셔, Cairo, A. H. 1904) may be of interest as to two of the above readings: ِنِشَأُ انْكَ) ِتُرَّا الحرميي، وبصريا بِبادِكَلْثانِيّة وآوًا (on p. 18 in the وَأَعْنِي بالخدميي إمامي طيبة he explains: مَضْطَلِعُ الكتَّاب ومَكَّة أبا رُؤُيِّم نافعا وأبا مَعْبَد عبد الله بن كَشَين. **

Carefully written on Oriental glazed paper; fully pointed and, generally, with the waqf signs (Kosegarten, Gramm. arab., p. 88; Dictionary of the technical terms used in the sciences of the Musalmans, pp. 1498-1500; as-Suyūṭī, Ḥalqān, Calc. edit., pp. 195 ff.; Cairo edit. of A. H. 1806, pp. 87 ff.; Nöld., Gesch., pp. 352 ff.). Consists at present of 329 leaves, but one is missing between F. 326 and F. 337 (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, 18.5 × 7.5; 13 ll. to the page; catchwords to leaves; no ruling visible; Sūra titles, sections, and pauseal signs in red; has been carefully collated, with corrections on margin; on b of last leaf came last words of سورة الناس, and an Arabic-Turkish colophon: بعون الله وَاللّٰهَ ۠ تَمَتْ تَبَارَكَ الملك البنان كتبه أمير الفقراء، و خادم الأَلْسِنَة المحتاج إلى رحمة الله تعالى أضعف عبد الفقیر ابراهیم سردر. [sic] [sic] بان استانه بابهمايون بدر السلطنة جرى ذلك وحرر في اوايل ربيع الأول من شهر سبتمبر سنة ثمان سبعين وتسع ماه.

Stamped oriental leather binding; bookplate with D. G. Iohannes Wilhelmus D. S. I. C. M. A. & W. | EX BIBLIOTHECA SERENIS- SIMÆ DOMUS | SAXO-ISENACENSIS.


Written in a legible hand on Oriental glazed paper, without vowels, but with many diacritical points; rulings with dry point (the ّ",), 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 @ 2(?); the second leaves of the first and last gatherings are lost; leaves 1a and b, 199b, and 173-4a 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 إحياء علوم الدين, being the last sections of the 4th (ربع المنجيات) and last quarter of the work: compare Gosche, pp. 254 ff. The titles of the sections are:
كتاب التفكر (39) كتاب المحسابة والمر اقتصة (38) كتاب النية (37)

they correspond to Vol. iv., pp. 327—end of Cairo (Azhariya) edit. of A. H. 1302; the beginning of § 37 is missing down to وجهئ ثم ينادي الملائكة , p. 327, l. 26 of above edit.; on leaves 110-171 is كتاب منهج الغرابين , complete down to علينا وان يعصه , p. 89, l. 30 of Cairo (Mainunfiya) edit. of A. H. 1305; the closing four lines and the colophon were on the lost leaf, 172; on leaf 109a is colophon to the 'Ihyāʾ al-ʿUlūm (in this and in other notes I supply diacritical points, which are mostly lacking):

فرغ من تعليقة الفقيه الى رحلة يدة محمد ابن [sic] ابن بكر
ابن الحنصى [؟] الشافعى عفا الله عنهم اجمعين وذلك في يوم الاثنين الحادي والعشرين من شهر شوال سنة خمسين

وعتمى مائة *

On the margin there comes in the same hand:

بلغ به سعد الله مقابلته على دف عديدة فص ان شاء الله تعالى بتاريخ حادي عشررين شهر ذي القعدة سنة

خمسين وثمانى مائة وخمسمائة لله رب العالمين *

On the blank pages there are several notes scribbled in very illegible hands, of which the following may be of some interest:

الحمد لله رب العالمين ولد الولود المبارك محمد حمد

الدين بن الشيخ الصالح زين الدين عم رئيس المباكرة وهي سنة اجزا [؟] في آخر ليلة يسفر صاحبها

عن يوم اثنين رزى عشر شمر رجب الفرد من شهر سنة احده وستين وثمانية مائة انشاه الله نشوا صالحًا ببنّة

كرمة ُ واحمد الله لله ألح

الحمد لله رب العالمين بتاريخ خمس عشررين شهر الله

المعظم قدره رمضان من شهر سنة خمسين وثمانية مائة

اندرج بالوفاة الى رحلة الله تعالى الفقيم الى الله ..........................
This volume has apparently been a Waqf at one time; for on leaf 1a stands وقف بيرام بيك. On the same page: Ex bibliotheca ducali Hilpertohusana. Stamped oriental leather binding; book-plate as No. 2. 4-5. Al-Idrīṣī (the Sharīf 'Abū 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. M. b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Idrīs)—Nuzhat al-mushtāq fi ikhtirāq al-'āfāq.

A very careful collation (with Roman abridgment ‘e typographia Medicea,’ 1592?) of the Oxford MSS., Pococke 375 and Grav. 42, DCCCLXXIV. and DCCCLXXXVII., in Biblioth. Bodl. Cat. Vol. I., p. 192. The collator was Rev. George Cecil Renouard, and in the second volume the date 18 Aug., 1828, 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 enterpris 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, 1854, 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 Idrisi Palæstina et Syria (Bonn, 1885: 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, 1888), 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. 1, it may be worth mentioning that Renouard read the date of Pococke 375 as A. H. 960, in opposition to Gagnier’s 896 and Uri’s 906. Dozy read it as 860.

From a notice prefixed to Lee’s translation of Ibn Baṭṭaṭa (London, 1829) it would appear that this was a preparation for a translation to be published by the Oriental Translation Committee.


A carefully written manuscript in a European hand (Schultens’), with few vowels. It begins—

قصيدة ابن دريد خطبة برسم حزينة مولانا السلطان
الملك المظفر أعز الله نصرته مقصورة
[the space of a line blank]
أبي بكر بن محمد بن الحسن بن دريد الأزدي
Thus it is a commentary that follows, and not a "Tafsir". The following colophon: 

"tam bi'Allah wassalin tofiqa wa'dhar" 

From a translation of Abü-l-Mubâraq's work in the edition of Muhammad b. Abdullah al-Kâfî, volume ii, pp. 49ff. This may be from that MS: then the Nawâbigh begin: 

اللهم ان ممنكتنى من النعم السوا歧 

"الهام هذه الكلام النوايق" 

الهام هو من قولهم: الله ذا الهمام، يا اجلها مى 

It appears to be a copy of Cod. 814 (8) Warn., leaves 219-243 (Cat. Bibl. Lugd., Vol. i, [2d ed.], p. 219); and contains the text with extracts from at-Tâftâzânî's Comm. up to p. 103 of Schultens' ed. (Lugd. Bat., 1772); there it breaks off abruptly, and there follows immediately: Explicit MS. Cl. Schultensii manu descrip- tum nullo finito operis addito indicio. There are interlinear and marginal glosses in Latin.

7. Al-Jurjânî ('Abd al-Qâhir b. 'Abd ar-Raḥmân)—Al-awâmil al-mâ'a. 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 x 10.5, of written part 9.5 x 6.5.

The commentary is anonymous, and in the manuscript catalogues accessible to me I can find traces of two other copies only, also anonymous, and both in the Escorial: see Derenbourg, Les manuscrits arabes de l'Escorial, Vol. i., pp. 103-4; Casiri, Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana Escurialensis, Vol. i., p. 40. Casiri gives name of author as Khâlid b. 'Abd Allâh b. Abî Bakr al-'Anşârî, 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. 180 (II. 330 No. 1164 in Flügel's Cat.), apparently made for Müller by Hassan and Langer. It consists of 848 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 encyclopedia 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 Calendarae, Saturnalia, Cratesim, the day of the Generis of the kings, the days of birth and death. These are the words of Rabbi Meir.* 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 Calendarae takes place eight days after the solstice (of Tebeth=December), the Saturnalia eight days before the same solstice." (i. 1. 6a.)

Calendarae 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 Calendarae, i.e. the first day of each month, were consecrated to Juno. Also to the Lares gifts were offered on the Calendarae.|| The Calendarae of January, which are alluded to in our passage, were celebrated with special solemnity, and were called the Calendarae 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 (Cronos), with sacrifices in open air, and were accompanied by great merriment.‡‡

The meaning of the word genesia (γενεσία) is discussed 10a, and decided to mean the assuming of the reign by the king, while that of cratesim (σπαρταίς) is said to be the obtaining of the supremacy of Rome, 8b. The Latin equivalent of genesia, natalis, was also employed in a wider sense. Thus Spartanus, Vita Adriani 4, says: "quando

---

* Lived in the second century A. D.
† Lived 299–352 A. D., in Machuza.
‡ Saturn i. 16.
§ De re rustica i. 37.
¶ Grünbaum in ZDMG. xxxi. 277.
** Livy ii. 21. 2.
†† Dio Cass. 59. 6; Macrobr., l. c., i. 10; Suet. Caligula 17.
‡‡ Macrobr., l. c., i. 7, 8, 10, etc.
et natalem adoptionis celebrari jussit. Tertio Iduum earundem quando et natalem imperii instituit celebrandum;" to which Casaubon remarks: "Antiqui vocarunt natales omnes dies propter aliquam laetitiam insignem sibi solemnnes; inde in historis principis ejusdem tot natales." The Jerusalem Talmud, i. 39c, takes γενεάς in the meaning of birthday, and κατάργεως 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.

Rabj said there were five principal (established) places of idolatry: the house of Bel in Babylon, the house of Nebu in Cursi, Tar'atha 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 Nebu 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. Hist. ii. 79; Pliny, Panegyricus 53.
† Peller, l. c., p. 491.
‡ Juvenal v. 84; Augustine, Confessions vi. 2. 2.
§ Principal of the Academy of Sora, died A. D. 247.
‖ Levy, Wörterbuch iv. 222.
¶ Lived 969–1038 in Pumbeditha.
** Levy, ib. iii. 455.
†† Gamaliel II, President of the Academy and Synhedron 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. 53b) “platforms (βήμα) of kings” are men-
tioned, 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. 49b.) 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 con-
sidered a deity of crops, flocks, and roads, and particularly as Hermes
τάφως, 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 ἔρευς or ἐρευτός θάφτοι were
known.‡ But it is a well-known fact that the crude primitive
representations of the deities, like the Χοαινες 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 Χοαινες, in particular, not only were seen by Strabo in Egypt.§
and Pausanius in Greece,‖ but have also been found by recent trav-
elers 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
suckling 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. (?)
Æsculapius, 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 Cæsarea, Ptolemais (Acco), Neapolis (Shechem), and Ælia Capitolina (Jerusalem).† Serapis as Zeus-Serapis was represented—as may be seen from the surviving colossal bust in the Vatican—with a modiūs, 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 Matrona, 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), Æsculapius; 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, lekyths, 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 Æsculapius, who was brought from Epidaurus to Rome in the shape of a snake when his worship was introduced into that city 298 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, Æn. v. 95.
§ Cf. e. g. Vergil, Georg. iii. 332; Æn. 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, cembrnuts, 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. 18b.)

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. 2. 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 Synhedrion at the time of the Judeo-Roman war.
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“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.
Whitney, Jacobi on the Age of the Veda.

p. x,* his argument appears to have fallen into the oblivion which alone it merited.

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 (Bāl Gangādhar 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 Āditya (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 Mrgācīras, or the head of Orion; if, therefore, it can be made to appear that the Hindus once began their asterismal system with Mrgācīras, 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 Āditya (Aries) was at the equinox than when Kṛttikā (Pleiades) was there, and about two months earlier than when Mrgācīras (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, Mrgācīras (Orion)

---

* His language is as follows: "Anything more completely the opposite (Widerspiel) 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. 108. 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 dvādaṣṭa, 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 dvādaṣṭa 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 (18) 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 (vahatū) of Sūryā hath gone forth, which Savitar sent off; in the Maghā's (RV. Aghā's) are slain the kine (i. e., apparently, for the wedding-feast); in the Phalgūnī's (RV. Arjuni's) is the carrying-off (RV. carrying-about: vivāha 'carrying-off' is the regular name for wedding)." The Maghā's and the Phalgūnī's are successive asterisms, in Leo, Maghā being the Sickle, with a Leonis, Regulus, as principal star; and the Phalgūnī's (reckoned as two asterisms, "former" and "latter" Phalgūnī's) are the square in the Lion's tail, or β, δ, θ, and 98 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 Phalgūnī's; and this would imply the vernal equinox at Mrgaṣiras (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 (sūryā instead of sūrya), while always masculine else, should be the moon's bride, is very startling: nor, indeed, is it anywhere distinctly stated that the moon (soma) is the bridegroom, though this is inferable with tolerable confidence from intimations given. Sūryā is repeatedly said to go (vs. 7d) or go forth (vs. 13d) to her husband (and only vs. 38 to be "carried about:" but for Agni, not Soma), or to go (vs. 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 Phalgunīs, 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 earthy 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 Grhya-Sūtras as to the time when a Vedic student is to be received by his teacher, and to commence study. Çānkāyana 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 Çrāvaṇa, which (Çravaṇa being β, α, γ Aquilae) 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 Rāmaṇya (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 Çravaṇa 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 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 caprice 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 Brāhmaṇas between the Phalguni's (β, δ, etc. Leonis) and the beginning and end of the year. The Tāttiriya-Saṃhitā (vii. 4. 8) and the Pancaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa (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-pada's (α Pegasi etc.), and determine the Phālguna month, beginning 14 days earlier, as first month. The Kauśitaki-Brāhmaṇa (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 Tāttiriya-Brāhmaṇa (i. 6. 25) 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-Brāhmaṇa (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 Phalguni 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 Phalguni was recognized by the Brāhmaṇas as a first month, and from the other that the summer solstice was determined by them to lie between the former and latter Phalguni's—as if the sun in the Phalguni's entered into the question at all, and as if the Brāhmaṇas ever made any pretense to such astronomical exactness as would be implied in their drawing the solstitial colure between the former and the latter Phalguni'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 Phalguni, 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 succes-
sion. All that we have any right to infer from these Brāhmaṇa 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 (ṛtu) 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 Mṛgaśīra (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 Brāhmaṇas), I would repeat my suggestion, made in the notes to the Śūrya-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 Viṣṇūkha ‘divaricate’ (α and β Librae) it branches apart toward Svāti (Arcturus) and Citrā (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" (yogatārā) of the asterisms, which positions they called dhrvāva '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 ṙṛgacīras (Orion's head) to Kyttikā (Pleiades) in the later Vedic period, I hold it as alone
probable that they received the system from abroad with Kṛṣṭikā 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 Kṛṣṭikā to Aṣvinī (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'y '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 Bhagavad-Gītā, "I am Mārgaṭhrsha 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 Mṛgāças (lit'y '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 alias 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 satra 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 pitryāna: 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 pitryāna, 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 Açvinī (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 Mṛgaśīras (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 Tāittiriyā 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 Cāitra, and four days before the full-moon (i.e., doubtless, of Cātra; but some native authorities regard Māgha as intended: see Weber, Nakshatras, ii. 348); 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 vishuwaṇt 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 vishuwaṇt 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 Śūtras. So far as any preference is shown in connection with the incidence of the vishuwaṇt-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 Mārgaĉīrsha (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 Mṛgaĉīrṣa (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, āgrahāyaṇī 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 Mṛgaĉīrṣa, 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 (mṛgaĉīrṣa) 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 Ādrā ('wet'); the whole constellation of Orion has been viewed as the antelope (mṛga); and, correspondingly, the neighboring Sirius is named mṛgayādha 'deer-hunter,' while the three stars of Orion's belt, which point just in the direction of Sirius, are the "three-jointed arrow" (iṣus trikāṇḍā) shot by the hunter. Mṛgaĉīrṣa, 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 (mṛga) 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-pi) 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 Saramâ, and Cerberus, and the dog whom (RV. i. 161. 13: 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 Prajâpati.

The sixth chapter, "Orion and his Belt," continues the same argument, and with evidences to which we must take equal exception. Agrahâyana and its derivatives are again brought forward for explanation, and its hâyana is made out to come probably from ayana, with an indifferent h prefixed (for which various supporting facts are adduced, as hinu and inu) and the vowel lengthened; and thus agrahâyâni is identified with agrâyâni, 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 Brahmans 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 Vrishákapí," is of the same character. It is suggested that the means—turiyena brahmaya (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 bhÁspati, in cákra and manthín, and in vena, both vena and cákra (= cyprís) 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. 161. 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, literally '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' (savát-sáre) 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 improbabilities 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 Vrishákapí 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 Ṛgveda-Brāhmaṇa, 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. cxxxiv; and vol. xiv., p. vi) 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 Brāhmaṇa, 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 Brāhmaṇa. Book v. concludes the exposition of the regular soma-sacrifices, being chiefly occupied with the vājapeya and rājastāya ceremonies, and, at the end, with the sāutrāmaṇī; 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 Brāhmaṇa 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; 3.8. 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: mahāte twice, v. 3.8.12, and repeated at v. 4.2.8; śiṣtras, v. 4.1.9; iḍare, v. 4.2.1; yuṣmās, vi. 4.4.16; vittam, vi. 6.2.4; riketas, vii. 1.2.9; sahwatsare, vii. 1.2.11), or even a part of a word...

---

(as -stomam, v. 1. 3. 1; a-, v. 5. 4. 88, 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. 3. 11; hip for hips (du.), vii. 5. 1. 35; seed once (vi. 4. 3. 2) for seat and once (vii. 3. 1. 38) for sand; head (vi. 5. 4. 16) for heat; substance for sustenance (āry: vi. 7. 3. 8); saline salt for saline soil, vii. 1. 1. 7; worship for worshiper (dācāvān: 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 (so 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” (imprv.), 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 accordances and differences of expression have their decided value. For example, in books vi. and vii. the verb upa-dhā, literally ‘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. 338), give (396), endow (380): these last being fairly to be called mistranslations, as they import into the term something which it does not itself contain. So, again, at v. 3. 4. 8 ff., the verb grāh 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: ājya 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-yaṁ, repeated in two successive lines (p. 138), "aim" and "raise"; nir-maṁ "churn out" and "kindle" (217); ausaṁ "rock" (147), "pebble" (148), and "stone" as distinguished from pebble (158); rasa "sap, essence, vital sap, vital essence"; abhi-saṁ "anoint" and "sprinkle," and declared (68 n.) to mean literally "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: Prthivī instead of Prthī (p. 81); ānāḥçeṣṭha instead of āčeṣta (95 n.); "Indra" for diṇḍra (123), and "Varuṇa" for vārūṇa (405); "half-month" instead of "half-year" for ayana (334); "lay on the ground" instead of "fell" for aśīyaṇa (380); "erect" for rohāti, as if it were causative (22, and similarly 278), and pratī-sthā also as causative (55); "over" instead of "under" for antara (31-32); "may we obtain" for the aorist āpāma (100); anupaśram rendered as if anurūpa (166); "bearded" for tūpāra (173); "innocuous" for anacāṇḍaya (305); "primeval" for ātuva (306); "skin" for vapa (347); "foam" for abhra (415)—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 kṛp (80, 107-8), "favor" for anu-sac (392), and so on. Then there are such unhappy selections of equivalents as "slaughter" for a-labh (162 et al.), "rend asunder" for ava-dṛ (34 et al.), "cart" for ratha (135), "prayer" for yajus (155 et al.). On p. 348 (vii. 5. 1. 28) he fails to notice that the root īs as well as the adjective mahant goes to make up the artificial etymology of mahīśa; and on p. 332 (vii. 2. 1. 11) it seems to escape him altogether that the forms of nir-arpay and nir-rṛḥ which are used are for the purpose of a play of words upon nirṛti. 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 (Prać. Up. iv. 3; JUṬiv. 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 dhavaniya, that the sky, that the head ... that is the gārhapatiya, that the foundation, that this world"; at vi. 1. 1. 9, "wherever 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' āṇuṛyamānapaκe, 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 *adhyātmam* (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 *adhyātmam* 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 sanskriyamāṇayoḥ, "after the two ends have been completed" (vii. 1. 2. 28: 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 cetayamāṇānāṁ 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, Prajāpāti' did so and so.

The translator still insists on viewing the pronoun *ayam* when applied to the wind as the equivalent of *asāu* 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" (*gnās*: vi. 5. 4. 7) of those elegant gentlemen the gods; and the *mahiṣā* (litly '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 (*pratīka*) 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, 282, 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, 193, 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-
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 rājastāya 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 to 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] Vāiṣṇava 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 Vāiṣṇava 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 candramas, 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
Haupt, Transitive and Intransitive Verbs in Semitic.

Iunacy 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 sāmi‘a) 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 involuntarium. The corresponding verbum voluntarium is écouter, 'listen,' Heb. hīqśith, or hā‘zin, or hēḏāh ḍēn—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 rā’dā 'see' has therefore the characteristic semipassive vowel ą in the imperfect, while the corresponding verbum voluntarium 'look at' is again expressed by causative stems in Hebrew: hibbēḥ, or hīqṣēf.

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 a in ĭrkab 'he rides.' It is interesting to note in this connection that the Hebrew expression for he dismounted is 'he fell from the horse.' Ħrkab 'he rides' means simply 'he was carried;' the verbum voluntarium would be 'he manages a horse as an equestrian' (חֵרָטָן). Ĭlmad 'he learns' means really 'he is taught a lesson;' the lesson is hammered into him. It is characteristic that the nominal derivative of ĭlmad 'he learns,' the noun ălmădāh, 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-exilian congregation. The law which Ezra brought from Babylonia in 458 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 qorban, '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' Asien (Leipzig und Berlin, 1892), p. 5.

‡ For the form psôn instead of *psôn, 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. șându,† properly the 'gray gem'). Ḥavilāh, 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 Ḥavilāh, 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 ṣorāmuṭ. 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 baisamodendron mukul, which is often found mixed with myrrh. It is not impossible that Heb. bēḏēḥālāh is an older name for myrrh, as suggested by Delitzsch (Paradies, p. 132). We may find a cuneiform name bidalluwu or bidalluwu some day; the d is probably due to a partial assimilation of the prefixed t to the initial b.

† See Meissner-Rost, Bauinschriften Sanherib's (Leipzig, 1893), p. 25, 30; sān-ādatiš (Sarg. Cyl. 21) means 'like a pearl-diver' (عَرَاض).

‡ 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 Ḥavilāh, 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 (نصب في الباطانة) 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: *nākū-ma ulla da nīšāʾ-ha ma kī màre ʾašīr u na alā šammā tāmtā-ma.* † 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 Codex Inscriptionum and the Old Testament (KAT, p. 66, 15): ‘I do not bear my people that they should fill the sea like fishspawn.’ § Delitzsch, in his great Assyrian Dictionary (p. 326 below), adopted my translation; but Professor Peter Jensen, of Marburg, in his Cosmology of the Babylonians (Strassburg, 1890), p. 419, remarks: ‘It is true, ḏ may mean ‘not,’ but only in prohibitive clauses, and not at the end of such sentences’ (against Delitzsch, Assyr. 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 Mündungsgebiete des Euphrat und Tigris gemacht haben.

† See the map of the ‘Irāq in the Gotha MS. (written 1173 A. D.) of al-Ṭabkhīr (c. 950), reproduced in Aug. Müller’s Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland (Berlin, 1885), i. 576; and compare Reinaud’s Géographie d’Aboufalida (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 (Zh. iv. 367). Pliny (v. 26, sec. 90) says: Scinditur Euphrates a Zegovite DLXXXIII milibus passuum circa vicem Massicum, et parte leva in Mesopotamiam vadiat, per ipsum Seluciam, circa eam praefluenti infusus Tigri; dexteriores autem alveo Babylonis quondam Chaldææ caput petit, mediumque permeans, item quem Mothrin vocant, distrahitur in paludes.

‡ I stated in my paper On a modern reproduction of the eleventh tablet of the Babylonian Ninurta Epic, printed in these Proceedings for April, 1893, p. xi, note l, that we seemed to have a masculine form tamma instead of tammu or tamdu ‘sea’ in l. 133 of the Deluge text; but that I thought it should be read ādāma=Heb. ādāmāh ‘land.’ Some Assyriologists may feel inclined to combine tamma with the Arabic ʿlām ‘sea.’

§ Ich aber gebäre die Menschen nicht dazu dass sie wie Fischbrüt 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 impute 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 ʾa-ma (cf. Heb. ʾil-nā)* 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 ʾa at the end of the preceding line would be the same as in the last line of the Esarhaddon cylinder, i. R. 47, 58: 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., 439): "what I bore—where is it?" A beginner could tell Professor Jensen that this would be in Assyrian ša ʾlidu ʾnu šā (or šī), not anakumma ʾulladina šā aiama. Ullada is present or future, not imperfect or preterit; and for the benefit of the goddess Ištar it might be better to take ʾullada as the present of the Piel: ʾullada=ʾuwallada: cf. uddaš=ʾuaddaš, ʾuaddaš 'I renew,' ʾubbat =ʾubbat 'I destroy,' etc. It is enough for Ištar to be the muʾallidat (or muʾšēšāṭ), the divine midwife or superintendent of the birth of the post-diluvian race; she could not well be the ʾalidat gimir nānāṭi ša arki ʾabūbi, the real mother or generatrix.

For the synonym of muʾallidat see my ASKT. 116. 10: cf. ibid. 85. 40. The stem is not ʾuššuru 'direct' (cf. Corān, sura 80, v. 20) but uššru with Nš†=muššuru (Beitr. z. Assyr. i. 98 n.) 'deliver' (that is 'liberate,' 'save,' or 'surrender,' or 'communicate,' or 'relieve of a child in childbirth,' etc.): i. e. Arabic māsara (=sāla wasīdārāja): cf. my Beitr. z. assyr. Lautlehre, Göttingen, 1888, p. 91, n. 2). We find the same stem in post-Biblical Hebrew (see Levy, vol. iii., p. 117*, no. 3), and the term Masora must be derived from it (contra Lagarde, Mittheil. i. 94): see

* See the abstract of my paper on the Hebrew particle -nd in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 112, May, 1894.
† In the prospectus just issued of the Assyrisch-Englisch-Deutsches Glossar, herausgegeben von W. Mus-Arnolt (the title is cautiously worded), it is stated: "Ein Nš und Nš für ursprüngliches Anfangs- m und -n: e. g. itaplusu für mitaplusu anzusetzen, wie es im Jahre 1887 in der Ankündigung des von dem Semitic Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, Mt. [sic!]) versprochenen Glossars proponiert wurde (vergleiche Proceedings of the American oriental society, vol. xiii., p. xiv ff.), war keine Ursache vorhanden."

As this is the only reference to the Johns Hopkins University in the Prospectus of Dr. W. Mus-Arnolt's Glossary, it may be well to place here side by side some extracts from Dr. Arnold's prospectus and from the Announcement of a New Assyrian-Glossary, presented on behalf of the Semitic Seminary of the Johns
Strack in Herzog's *Realeycylopaedie*, ix. 888, and cf. König, *Einleit. in das A. T.* (Bonn, 1893), p. 38. The ἀναφέρειν wayyimmāserā, Num. xxxi. 5, means 'they were sent forth.' Assyr. muššuru is a synonym of Heb. ūlādā (cf. Lev. xiv. 7, 58; Deut. xxii. 7; and II. 147, 150, 153 of the Flood-tablet). The Nifal nimsār has the same meaning as the Pual šūlādā, Prov. xvii. 11.

_Hopkins University_, by Mr. Edgar P. Allen, of the Johns Hopkins University (A. O. S. Proc. at Baltimore, Oct. 1887, p. ccxivii), 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.

Diese Anordnung hat zwei wesentliche Vorzüge für sich. Zum ersten bietet sie einen Uberblick dar über die Klasse von Wörtern, die zwar mit denselben Präfixen versehen sind . . . .

Ausserdem erweist sich dadurch die relative Frequenz gewisser Wortbildungen. Speziell bequem, wie schon gesagt, ist diese Anordnung für Wörter, deren Ableitung eine noch bestirnte Sache ist . . . .

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 Consonanten ist die von Haupt und Delitzsch in ihren Werken beliebt. Alle Anfangsgutturalen werden unter נ behandelt . . . . e. g. abu . . . ., alaku 'gehen,' alību 'süße Milch,' agrabu 'Skorpion,' arību 'Rabe' . . . .

_Baltimore, 1887._

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 . . . . Ethiopian 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 נ . . . for example abu 'father,' alāku 'go,' alību 'milk,' agrabu 'scorpion,' and arību '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 123 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. kî in such passages as Eccl. iv. 14, "כֶּלֶב מְלָכֵי גוֹיִם בָּֽרֶם "though he may come from a family of outcasts," paraphrased by the following explanatory gloss:* יְרִי מְלָכֵי בָּֽרֶם מִּנַּּוּר לָזִיל "though he may have been poor in (what subsequently became) his kingdom." ki, of course, in ki māre nāne can only be the kaph simultudinis. 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: v atta vil kanāta; † "the number of thy years does not change," where kanāta is made to express both years and change (see Johns Hopkins University Circulars, Feb. 1889, No. 69, p. 17 a). ki māre nāne umallā tāmtā-ma is a concessive circumstantial clause (Gesenius-Kautzsch (28), §160), introduced by the enclitic -ma 'and' appended to nīšū′ā: cf. Heb. ως- in passages like Gen. xviii. 27; xxxvi. 27; Is. xxxiii. 1; Jer. xiv. 15; ἀκρ. xliv. 18: i. 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 nīšū′ā-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. 189, 14), and this interpretation is certainly favored by the fact that there is no space between nīšā and ū-ma on the original (cf. Beitr. z. Assyri. i. 132, n. † NE. 108, n. 7). The form nīšū′ā is not exceptional; it is a form like abū′ā 'my father,' šepū′ā 'my foot,' etc. The singular nīšū is used because the goddess speaks of the post-diluvian race: nīšū′a means 'my race;' the plural nīšē′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 nīše 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 permensive forms of the verba tertiae infinivs. The language tries to strengthen these forms as much as possible: cf. the feminine termination in the forms of the infinite construct in the verbs tertis gi in Hebrew, etc.
‡ My remark, Beitr. z. Assyri. i. 132, was known to Jensen, and should have prevented him from reading ullahani šla tama.
the first person singular was -ya, with a long final vowel: cf. Arabic pause forms, as ‘abdiyá (عبدی or عبدی) ‘my servant’ (Kosegarten, §1016, p. 444; Ewald, Gramm. arab. §367; Caspari-Müller, §36, note d).* We find the same lengthening in l. 41 of the Deluge (NE. 136): ūna qqaggar Bel ul āšiš ān rešša-ma (or āšiša) ‘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. 320, ad p. 129): ‘nicht werde ich meinen Geist auf Bel’s Erde rich-ten.’ Šakīnu ša reši, 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: šalalti šanāti al Uruk lamū nakru, Istar ana nakrišu ul āšiš ān qagqadsa ‘three years was the enemy besieging the city of Erech; the goddess Istar could no longer resist its (Erech’s) enemies.’

Another form like rešša-ma ‘my head’ is quxrīša-ma ‘my youth,’ in l. 299 of the eleventh tablet of the Gilgamesh legends (NE. 147): anāku lākul-ša šat quxrīša-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, 1898, pp. 68, 70, sub abu ‘father’ and axu ‘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, abu’at, is certainly wrong (cf. Bezdol’s remarks, l. c. §3). Nor do I believe (with Jensen, ZA. v. 100) that abu- ’a-a was pronounced abuya.

* 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 Tiglathpileser I. (cf. Lotz, 118), in the annals of Assurnasirpal (cf. Ernst Müller, ZA. i. 363), and in the el-Amarna texts (cf. ZA. v. 156, 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;n 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-xasis or Xasis-atra, i.e. Ζιζοζωρος,‡ had about the same meaning as the Hebrew שִׁנֶּן יְרוֹם יְַָּרוֹת מִתי מִתִּי 'a just and perfect man,' as Noah is called in the priestly narrative of the Biblical Flood. I stated that Xasis-atra meant 'wise and reverential, God-fearing.' Now Jensen remarks (Cosmol.,

* Cf. e. g. Zimmermenn, Buss-psalmen: 26. 1 (Pir-napsitim); 118. 1 (attari, Delitzsch); 47 (déparráti); 55. 1 (šaxarratu); 17 (naplusu); 20. 19 (letu);—De-
litzsch, Wörterbuch: 61 below (Ubara); 205 (Ubara-Tutu); 168. 1 (Aadar); 185
(márakatu 'length'); 139, below (šar); 248 (exub); 127 (áde stbišu); 126. 4
(ketu); 135 (ddánu); 143 (igrida); 133 (adt 'along with'); 321 (kukki); 274
(fábat rigma); 314 (ixréti); 238. 3 (vi. urra, vii. mášiti); 288, below (mexši);
237 (urru ixtágut); 210 (ana náši uši úddin); 120. 3 (adagur); 222 (aban
kisádi); 262 (xasisu); 250 (itézix); 168. 2 (Atra-xasis: cf. Beitr. z. Assyrisch.,
i. 401), etc., etc.

† On p. 367 of his Cosmology, Jensen speaks of my Übersetzungsversuche!  
‡ As I stated in my note on Gilgamesš=Τιλκαμος (A. O. S. Proc. for April,
1893, p. ix, n. †), Mark Lidzbarski suggested that Ζιζοζωρος might be the proto-
type of the Arabic el-Khídr, 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: Ἰαπάδας means 'bluish green,' like
γαλακτός; and, of course, the Greek sea-god Πλάτωνς (Πόντος) is the same
mythical personage (ZA. vii. 320). Professor Bezold ought to have added (ZA.
vi. 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'analogie est si
frappante qu'il est inutile d'insister davantage. J'ajouterai seulement que le mot
Khídr lui-même n'est rien autre que la contraction de la forme grecque Xisuthros,
où la forme babylonienne 'Hasis-Adra, transmise directement aux Arabes sans
passer par le grec'). It would also have been well if Professor Bezold, before
printing Lidzbarski's and Dyroff's articles in his Zeitschrift, had called their
attention to Clermont-Ganneau's paper Horus et Saint Georges, published in the
Revue archéologique, nouvelle série, xxxii. 388-397, and cited by Lenormant, i. c.
Compare also Lidzbarski's reply to Dyroff in Parts 3 and 4 (issued Jan., 1894) of
p. 385) : "Warum an Xisuthros das Moment der Furcht besonders hervorgehoben 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 ehrfürchtig, gottesfürchtig, 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-xasis after all means 'most reverential or God-fearing, just and perfect,' like the Hebrew אַרְּטַה יְהֹוָה המיל. 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 יָאָטִיב,† while Assyrr. xastas has about the same meaning as Syrian سمعز ماضي لما سمعز; so that Atra-xasis or Xasis-atra is סמעז מاضי لما סמעז or סמעז מاضי لما סמעז; 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. 28 (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 "juvenile" remark is Jensen's statement, Cosmol., p. 384: "šamaš-napištim könnte nur bedeuten 'Lebenssonne.' So bezeichnen zwar bei uns Verliebte einander [1], und ein solcher Ausdruck wäre für einen König eine vielleicht auch im Munde eines Babyloniers passende Bezeichnung; aber warum Xisuthros Lebenssonne 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, הרוח הנה פִּקְרֵי 'exceedingly strong,' or vii. 19, יהוה הנה פִּקְרֵי 'exceedingly dreadful.'

‡ As Nöldeke, § 246, states, סמא 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-xasis), and afterwards to have been affixed (Ξιουνφος = 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 1853,* 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 Pirakiruthi ‘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 subtones 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-
merated 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 Akavētpā, the heroic; another for
Kalippā, 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 Keerttinai 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 sub notes, the three key-tones and the seven Thālas, 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, 1.2 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, 2.3 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. ΑΓΙΟΣ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ
2. ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑΝΩ
3. a. ΤΩ ΔΟΝΤΑΙΟΤΙ
   b. ΟΥΤΩΦΟΡΟΗΙ
4. a. ΟΚΑΤΟΙΚΩΝΕΝΒΟΗΙΑ
   b. ΤΩΥΙΟΤΩΒΟΗΙ
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., 0.85 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:

"Αγιος Κύριος | Ιουλιάνος | τῷ δούλῳ σου τῷ φοροντί | δ κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθίᾳ | τῷ ἰσίατῳ βοήθη.

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 ἰσίατῳ; but I incline to take it as a dative of manner or degree. The italics 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. Giuntendi. 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, 3, 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, 359-338 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 alphabetical catalogue of authors and subjects would considerably increase the usefulness 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, the 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 institutions 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. Q. 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 scramble 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 (39–36). 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 damns 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. (īṣvaraprērita, 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 Krishnaisrn. 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 Bṛhaspati" 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 Bṛhaspati 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.
cule than historic basis for the fact that he was the seer of the hedonic Cārvāka, who was the infidel and Epicurean (if we may call him so) of failing Brahmanism. There may possibly be some connection between Bṛhaspati's name and rites (sects) not held in much esteem by orthodox Brahmans.

16. Trīta, the scape-goat of the gods, in relation to Atharva-Veda vi. 112 and 113; by Professor M. Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

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 (dvittyam); from that Dvita (was born). (He threw) a third one (tritīyam); from that Trīta (was born) ... The gods came wiping themselves upon (Ekata, Dvita, and Trīta); 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 CB. i. 2. 8; KCS. ii. 5. 26; Mahādhara to VS. i. 23; ĀpŚS. i. 25. 15); and similar lists of sinful personages are to be quoted from a variety of Śūtras and later Śmārtā-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, Althindisches Leben, p. 315. All those mentioned in the lists are obviously regarded as burdened with guilt (ānas); 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 CB. 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. āpya in the account of the Tāit. Br. above) deities, Trita, Dvita, and Eka.ta.

"They roamed about with Indra, even as nowadays a Brāhmaṇa follows in the train of a king. When he slew Viṣvarūpa, the three-headed son of Tvāṣṭar, they also knew of his going to be killed; and straightway Trita 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 dakṣīṇā upon the officiating priest. Further, the impure rinsing-water is poured out for the Āptyas with the formulas, "For Trita thee! For Dvita thee! For Eka.ta thee!" (cf. VS. i. 23, and Mahādhara's comment thereon).

Similarly Sāyaṇa to RV. i. 52. 5 describes the relation of Trita and the rest of the Āptyas: cf. also his introduction to RV. i. 105.

The human beings upon whom Trita 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 puroṣamedha, the human sacrifice, and, in verse 9, the parivottta, the parivividāna, and the edihāsuhpati (!) are sacrificed respectively to the female personifications of evil, Nirṛti, Arāddhi, and Niśkṛti. In ĀpCS. ix. 12. 11 an expiatory rite is performed for a still larger part of these lists, and in Vasistha's Dharmācāstra they are designated as enasvin 'loaded with guilt (ēnas).' It follows that Trita 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 Namuci, 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, Vṛtra is betrayed in TS. vi. 5. 1. 1-8; MS. iv. 5. 6; PB. xx. 15. 6 ff. Especially the death of Viṣvarūpa, 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 Çāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata (xii. 18210 ff.), and the Rig-vidhāna iii. 5. 4.
Since, now, Indra's mis deeds on account of their prominence are likely to have given rise to the notion of misdeeds on the part of the gods (devānasā, AV. vii. iii. 8; 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, pitūm nū stōgam . . . yásya trito vy ējāsā vṝtrāṁ vīparvam arḍāyat, '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; vi. 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. 168. 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 Tvāṣṭar.' 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. 336, 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 AV. vi. 113. the gods in general, without specification, are said to have wiped off their guilt upon Trita.

The rites within which AV. vi. 113. 114 are embedded in the Kāuḍika-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 Kāuḍika embraces but one side of the hymn in employing it in connection with the expiatory performances of the parivittā and the parivividāna. 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 Keçava's mind when, commenting upon Kāuḍ. 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 *bhrūqahan*, 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 *devadācaadhā* in vi. 113. 3, '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 Ludwig, Rig-Veda iii. 469, 444; by Grill,pp. 15, 171; Hardy, *Die Vedisch-brahmanische Periode*, p. 201; cf. also Zimmer's luminous allusion to vi. 113 in his *Altindisches Leben*, p. 315; and Ludwig (l. c., p. 469, 470). Grill treats both hymns rather too vaguely, under the caption "Krankheit" (pp. 8 ff.). The Anukramaṇī defines vi. 113 as *āgneyam*; vi. 118 as *pāuṣam*.

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 Pūṣan, 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 Pūṣan, the misdeeds upon him who practices

---

* 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).
17. On the group of Vedic words ending in -gva and -gvin; by Professor Bloomfield.*

In 1852, Professor Roth in his note on Nirukta xi. 19 (p. 149) said somewhat as follows: "The suffix -gva is to be found outside of navagva and its correspondent daçagva only in etagva and atithigva. An extension of it seems to be -gvin in çatagvin. 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 daçagva könnte die 'Neuner, Zehner,' d. h. die Glieder einer soviel Theile zählenden Gemeinschaft, etagva ein buntgearteter, çatagvin hundertfach sein." The suggestion of a similar view may be found also in Benfey's glossary to the Śāman-Veda, s. v. etagva 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 -gva 'coming,' from a root ḡvā 'to come,' an "older" form of the root ḡā, having in mind doubtless the labialized forms of the root in bhūw, 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 çata-gv-in 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 rich in goods, containing a hundred cattle (çatagvinam);' iv. 49. 4, rayin çatagvinam dçavantah sahasriyam. And again: viii. 45. 11, 'going easily, O thou to whom belongs the press-stone (Indra), rich in horses, having a hundred cows' (dçavantah çatagvinah); ix. 65. 17, çatagvinah d̐avam poṣan śvāvyam; ix. 67. 6, çatagvinah rayin gomantam aqvam: cf. in general RV. ix. 63. 12.

The word çatagvin does not differ in structure fundamentally from saptdgu in RV. x. 47. 6, 'to Brhaspati, who gives (or obtains) seven cows (saptdgum). The words saptdgu and rayin in the relation of cause and effect are obviously parallel to çatagvinam and rayin. And in Gāut. Dharmāç. xviii. 26, 27; Manu xi. 14; Mahābh. xiii. 3742, çata-gu and sahasragu 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, Vâit. Śū. 24. 20. But the additional suffix -in (pata-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, cataguvnám rayāh gómantam, where cataguvnam is sufficiently faded and generalized to admit of the additional gómantam. 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: ye te sánti dacagvi-naḥ catina ye sahasrikāḥ... 'with thy horses in tens, hundreds, and thousands!'

The proper name atithigvá has, so far as is known, never been translated. Grassmann’s -gva ‘going’ does not yield appreciable sense.

If we analyze structurally atithi-gu-ā ‘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 Śūtras. 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 ÇGS. ii. 15. 1; AGS. i. 24. 30, 31; PGS. i. 3. 26, 30; Gobh. iv. 10. 1; ĀpGS. 13. 15; HGS. i. 13. 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 (atithigvā) in viii. 68. 16, 17. The adjective atithin is a āp.ace. in RV. x. 68. 3; it occurs in the expression atithinir gāh; and, whatever it may mean, it suggests forcibly the proper name in question. The rendering of atithin 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 (972) ‘wie gäste kommend’ is a compromise between the etymology and the ordinary

* The Homeric bahar-thi-compounds τεσσαράβο(ξ)-ιος ‘worth four steers,’ and similarly ἐνέδ-, ὄδεκα-, λεικόδ-, ἐκατόμ-βους, 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 ἐκατόμβη, which almost reflects a possible Vedic *pata-gu-a ‘a body of hundred cows or steers.’ ἐκατόμβη has undergone a somewhat similar fate with catagvna; it means originally ‘a sacrifice of a hundred steers,’ but the meaning of its component parts must have been thoroughly lost sight of before Pelleus, ll. xxiii. 146, could promise a hecatomb of fifty rams; cf. also the tāφων τε καὶ ἄρνειῶν ἐκατόμβη, Od. i. 25, and the ἐκατόμβη ταφων ᾗ αἰγῶν, ll. i. 315. In a different way the meaning has faded out of bου- in bουκόλος, so as to enable it to appear in the compound ἰπποβουκόλος ‘horse-herd.’ Another type and use of numerals in composition with the stem gōu is exhibited in the Phrygian proper name Οκταγός (cf. saptgū, and navagvā, dagagvā, below); see Bezz. Beitr. x. 196; Indog. Anzeig. ii. 15.
meaning of *ātīthi*. The passage in question reads: 'Bṛhaspati has divided out like barley from bushels the (rain-) cows propitious to the pious, fit for guests (*atīthin*), strong, desirable, beautiful in color, faultless in form, after having conquered them from the clouds.' The proper name *atīthi-gv-ā* means therefore precisely one who has *atīthinir gālī*.

It seems scarcely possible to hesitate, after these considerations, when we come to analyze the words *navaugu* and *daçaugvā*. Whatever their precise meaning, they also are *bahuvrīhi*-compounds, 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 Bṛhaspati, frequently with the qualifying attribute Aṅgiras or Aṅgirasa; next, to the Aṅgirases themselves; further, to the Navagvas and Daçaagvas, who are also frequently designated as Aṅgirases; and finally, to Saramā in the specific character as a messenger of Indra. Bṛhaspati Aṅgirasa is designated as *saptāgu* in x. 46. 7. Indra, the Aṅgiras, Bṛhaspati, 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 Daçaagvas are found in R.V. x. 62. 6. 7; v. 29. 12; 45. 7; and similarly x. 108. 8; iii. 39. 9. Note also the more general relation of *navaugu* in ix. 108. 4 to *gālī* in st. 6; of *navauguḥ* to *gopām* in x. 61. 10 and of *daçaugvāḥ* to *gōarnasā* 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. 207 ff.), it seems to me that we must choose one of two interpretations of -gva in these two names. Either the Navagvas and Daçaagvas are heavenly assistants of Indra or Bṛhaspati, and distinguished themselves in these exploits by obtaining or freeing nine or ten of the cloud-cows; or, like the Aṅgiras, they are mythical sacrificers who, by giving nine or ten cows, strengthen Indra or Bṛhaspati in his attacks upon the cloud-cows. In fact, the name seems to carry a changeable force involving both aspects, just as the epithet *saptāgu* applied to Bṛhaspati 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, *ētagvā*. Grassmann, under the coercion of his theory that *gua*=*gā* ‘go,’ translates it by “coming quickly, hurrying”; the Petersburg lexicons by “bunt schimmernd”; Ludwig at i. 115. 8 (125) by “schillernd,” but at vii. 70. 2 (54), and viii. 59. 7 (618) by Etagvā, a makeshift clearly indicative of embarrassment. Sāyaṇa’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’; *ētagvā* means ‘having bright rays,’ and
so ‘shining brightly.’ In v. 80. 2-4 Ušas is spoken of as follows: bṛhad-rathā ... esā gōbhir aruṇēbhir yujānā ... vyēnī bhavati; 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 vi-ṣṇu ‘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 ȁniṣkṛta, which was misunderstood to be Ȗn-iṣ-kṛta, but is in reality d-niṣ-kṛta. In this way arose the expression ȉskartāram ȁniṣkṛtam, RV. viii. 99. 8. That iṣ + kr is identical with niṣ + kr appears from a comparison of RV. x. 97. 9: ȉskṛtir nāma vo mātā, with TS. iv. 3. 6. 2: niṣkṛtir nāma vo mātā. Cf. English apron, from a nāppon, (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. Phyll. Assoc. xxiii. 179 ff.

The difficult word ādhriigu I shall hope on some other occasion to explain as d-ādhriigu ‘not poor, rich, liberal,’ ādhriigu=Zend ādīgu ‘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 SNORRA 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 Sturlusonar, formāli 2, ed. Jónsson, p. 5, is here given for convenience of future reference: Ok sā, er fremstr var, hēt Zōrōastres; hann hō, fyrr enn hann grēt, er hann kom i veröldina; enn forsmithir voru II ok LXX, ok svā margar tungur haфа sīthan drefst um veröldina, eptir thvī sem risarir skiptust sīthan til landa, oh thjóðhírnan fjólfugðust. Í thesum sama stath var gjör ein hin ágetasta borg ok dregit af nafni stōpulsins, ok kōlktut Babūn. 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, thä fjöllumgust svä nöfnin mannanna ok annara hluta, ok sjä sami Zöroasteus hafti mörg nöfn; ok thö at hann undir-
stanthi, at hans ofsi veri legthir of sogthri smith, thä færthi haan sik thö fram til veraldigs metnathar, ok löt taka sik til konungs yfir mör-
gum thjóðum Assirorum. Af honum höfst skurthgotha villa; ok sem
hann var bótathr, var hann kaüathr Baal; thann köllum vör Bel; hann
hafti ok mörg önnur nöfn. Einn sem nöfnin fjöllumgust, thä tyndist
meth thä sannehkrinn.

5 (p. 7). Ok af thessu höfst önnur villa millum Kritarmanna ok Mace-
doniorum, svä sem hin fyrrir methal Assiriörum ok Kaldeis af Zöroaste.

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, accord-
ing as the giants were scattered over the land and the nations multi-
plied. 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. idol-
atry); and when he was sacrificed unto, he was called Baal; we call
him Bel; he had also many other names. But, as the names multi-
plied, 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 Chaldeans arose from Zoroaster.'

This passage is interesting for several reasons.

First, it preserves the tradition elsewhere recorded regarding Zoroas-
ter'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: *risisse
eodem die quod genitus esset, unum hominem accepimus, Zoroaestrem.
Again, in the Pahlavi Dinkart vii., pavan xarkhunishno barâ khandito
'he laughed at the time of his birth' (cf. Darab Peshoton 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 Nähmah (cf. Wilson's Parsi Religion, p. 483) 'as he left the womb
he laughed; the house was enlightened with his laughter.' In Shahra-
stânflikewise we read that Zoroaster "as he was born uttered a laugh"
(see Gottheil'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 mo-
ment of his birth."

Second, the two allusions here connecting Zoroaster with Assyria,
Chaldaea, 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 contempo-
rary of Semiramis, and appointed by her to be ruler of Nineveh and
Assyria. (See Spiegel, Eränische Alterthumskunde, 1. 682.)

Third, in connection with the reputed multiplicity of names of Zoro-
aster, and the association of his name with Baal, Bel, attention might
be called to the citation in the Syro-Arabic Lexicon of Bar ‘Ali (ca. A.D.
882) s. v. Balaam, ‘Balaam is Zardosht, the diviner of the Magians’ (cf.
Gottheil, References in the Drisler Classical Studies).

II. PLUTARCH’S ARTAXERXES, CH. III. 1-10.

A passage in the above designated chapter of Plutarch is worth con-
sidering in the light of ancient Persian antiquities. The famous biog-
grapher’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 de-
scribes some of the priestly ceremonies that accompanied the corona-
tion.

Shortly after the death of Darius, the new king went to Pasargadæ,
according to Plutarch, to be installed in the kingly office by the Per-
sian priests. The ceremonies were performed in the temple of a god-
dess 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:

Εἰς τὸ τόπον δὲ τὸν τελοῦμενον παρελθόντα τὴν μὲν ἱδίαν ἀποθέσακα στολήν, ἀναλα-
βεῖν δὲ τῷ Κύρῳ ὁ παλαίος ἐφόρει πρὶν ἡ βασιλείας γενέωσαι, καὶ σῶκων παλάθης
ἐφαγόντα τερμινθὸν κατατραγεῖν καὶ ποτήριον ἐκπιεῖν δεξιάλακτος. (Plutarch: Vitas parallelæ, Artaxerxes, Ch. iii. p. 106, recogn. Sinentis).

This may be rendered: ‘After entering the temple, the one to be con-
secrated 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 acidi-
ulated milk.’

A comparison with one or two elements in the sacrifice of the Aves-
tan ritual may naturally be instituted.

First, the suggestion at once presents itself that the “cake of figs,”
σῶκων παλάθης, answers to the Avestan draonah, Mod. Pers. darūn,
which with the milk, butter, fruits, flowers, and small bit of meat,
composes the myazda or oblation. See Darmesteter, Zend-Avesta Tra-
duction, i. p. lxvi; Spiegel, Avesta übersetzt, ii. p. xi; de Harlez, Avesta
traduit, p. clxxviii; Haug, ‘Some Parsi Ceremonies’ in Essays on the

Second, the mention of the turpentine tree, τέρμακος, naturally sug-
gests the peculiar tasting haoma stalks which play so important a part
in the Avestan ritual.
Third, the acidulated milk, curds, or whey, ḍėryaḷa, may not unreasonably be identified with the mixture of the haomā-juice and milk which was regularly used at the sacrifice: cf. Ys. x. 14:

Yuse-tē bādha haomā zāirē
ğaṇa iristahē bakhšahē
- Whoso, golden Haoma, ever
Drinketh thee when mixed with milk.'

Again, Vd. xviii. 72 zoorthranām haomavaitinām gaomavaitinām . . .
ḥām-irista aṛṭayāo urvarayāo ya vaoē hadhānaēpāta 'libations accompanied by haoma-juice and meat, mixed also with the hadhānaēpāta-plant (benzoin). Consult also the renderings of Geldner, Studien i. 48, and de Harlez, Avesta Trad. pp. 289, clxvi.

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 Nahriana, 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 Khuena-
ten 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 Burna-
buriash, then we might put these large serpentine cylinders as early as
1800 or 1200 B.C.; and from these large Hittite or Mesopotamian cylin-
ders 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 cylin-
ders which bear the name of Kurigalzu, one of the kings of the Kas-
site 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 gen-
erally one human figure standing, with one hand raised, and accompa-
nied 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 be-
longed to me but has now been transferred to the Metropolitan Museum.
It bears the name of Kurigalzu’s father, Burnaburiash, and it is dis-
tinctly stated that the owner of the seal, a servant of Burnaburiash,
washimself 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 mil-
limeters 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. 
7. Son of Kašši (i.e. the Kassite),
8. Servant of Burnaburiššu,
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-Šutaḫ. 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 Duriulmas, 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 Burnaburiššu, father of Kurigalzu, one of Kurigalzu’s son, one of Kurigalzu’s servant’s son Duriulmas, and one of the son of Duriulmas, 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 Cesnola, 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 Phoenician 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 onomatopoeetic 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 q) 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 physonymous 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 posted 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 Yangtse 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
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 Chorasmian, Alberuni. 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 heights; 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-hsi. 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 Cramaepera ('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 Cramaepera'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 Fa-hien propounds to the thieves. When tested on the touchstone of the Buddhist Sutta-pitaka, this correctness is so striking that I am tempted to point out the precise book and chapter which may have suggested to Fa-hien his ready, appropriate, and courageous words.

* Precisely so the Bodhisat, for example, Jataka, 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, enraged, and sulky, and manifested anger, hatred, and heartburning; but has given alms to monks and Brahmans, 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 thereof; 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, enraged, 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 Brahmans, 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 thereof, 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
raged, or sulky, nor manifest anger, hatred, and heartburning. I will give alms ** * & 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 Čāṅgadhara’s Paddhati,* no. 274, page 43, ed. Peterson, we read:

*bodhayanti na yācante bhikṣācārā grhe-grhe:
dīyatām dīyatām nityam adātuḥ phalam idṛṣam.*

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 kīma ūri mitaurat usallu, ‘like the trunks of trees did the bodies float.’ He also reads Adra-khasīs, with d, instead of Atra-khasīs, explaining the name to mean ‘the reverently intelligent’ (l. c. p. 109). Line 164 (cf. NE. 141, n. 12) is translated, ‘the great goddess lifted up the mighty bow which Anu had made;’ ceteiz, 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, Iṣdubār-Nimrod (Leipzig, 1891), p. 37, 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’akhā] is to become a Buddha.” Some readers may be interested to know that it is a condition, sine qua non, for becoming a Buddha that the creature in question should be a human being and of the male sex. *Ituki-bhavāṇa gachanti,* ‘the Buddhas are never of the female sex,’ says the Introduction to the JātaKA, i. 452.
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. Peet, 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 DIACET 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.
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 philological associations and attended the other separate sessions, to prepare a complete list of those present at our separate sessions. A partial list follows:

Adler, Cyrus Gilbert, H. L. Lawler, T. B. Steele, J. D.
Barton, G. A. Gilman, D. C. Lovias, C. Stratton, A. W.
Batten, L. W. Gotthell, R. J. H. Lyman, B. S. Taylor, C. M.
Binney, John Grape, J. Lyon, D. G. Taylor, J. P.
Bloomfield, M. Hall, I. H. Macdonald, D. B. Tyler, C. M.
Briggs, C. A. Harris, J. R. Mead, C. M. Van Name, A.
Easton, M. W. Hildebrandt, H. V. Oicott, G. N. White, J. W.
Ewell, L. H. Hopkins, E. W. Paton, L. B. Williams, T.
Fay, E. W. Jackson, A. V. W. Perry, E. D. Wright, T. F. [54]
Ferguson, H. Jastrow, M., Jr. Ramsay, F. P.
Frothingham, A. L., Jr. Lanman, C. R. Schmidt, Nathaniel

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 3-12, 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 Sabæan 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,
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 Aryans. 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 Aṃvins 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. 48. 8, sky begets fire.
‡ In x. 173. 6 Indra carries Dyāus as an ornament.
of many gods (i. 129. 3; 136. 6; iii. 51. 5; 54. 2; v. 46. 8; x. 68. 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. 2; 59. 7-10), ‘father and mother.’ But the natural sex of Dyāus as an impregnating bull (Dyāur vṛṣā, v. 36. 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. 131. 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 (vii. 7. 5; x. 8. 11; 88. 2, 8).

That to be father of the gods is not to be a Supreme Father-God is evident from i. 69. 2: bhūvo devānām pitā putrāḥ sān, ‘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,’ vii. 29. 4.

So Bṛhaspati is father; and Tvāṣṭar 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 orginal supreme Aryan Father Sky must point to him on early Aryan soil or in Indā. 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 Maruts 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, Prōmatēs. 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 decadent 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 Graeco-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 Sūrya and like Fire, ‘the undeceived Herdsman’: viṣṇur gopā adābhyaśas, i. 23. 18; (agnir) adabho gopās, vi. 7. 7; (sāryo) 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. 189). 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. 100=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; vii. 3, 9, 12, 15, 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 Aryan, vii. 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 Viṣṇu (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. 238): “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 urugāyā 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-kram, ‘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, Mitra 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 (Mitra, 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 something 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. 188), 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 Aṃvins?

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 Aṃvins they are to Oldenberg the morning and the evening stars. They had previously been identified with the Gemini by Weber and with Venus by Bollenszen. 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 Aṃvins are ‘born here and there’ (*iḥeha jāṭād*), and the second that they are *nāmā jāṭādu*, 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 Aṃvins 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 Aṃvin.” 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 Aṃvins according to the Rig-Veda:

i. 157. 1: “Agni is awake, the Sun rises, Dawn shines, the two Aṃvins have yoked their car to go.”

i. 180. 1: “You two Aṃvins accompany Dawn.”
i. 188. 2: “You two Aşvins accompany Dawn.”
viii. 5. 2: “You two Aşvins accompany Dawn.”

And so on, in many cases, the Aşvins as a pair accompany the morning light. Their united duality is a part of their being, no less pronounced than is their mutatunality. 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 Aşvins are in the distance or in air;” 22, “in many places;” 28, “Three places of the Aşvins there are now revealed, formerly secret.” Threefold is the nature of the dual Aşvins for this very reason (compare i. 34). ‘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. 39. 1; 40. 4, etc.) represents only a part of the three-fold calling (morn, noon, and night, v. 76. 3), ‘the sky, the mountain, and the waters’ are these three places (v. 76. 4). But above all they come always in union together (ekasmin yoge samadhe 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 Aşvins’ intercourse with Śūrya as the equivalent of a Lithuanian folk-song, which must itself, in order to fit into Oldenberg’s interpretation of the Aşvins, 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. 3: ‘May thy lighting 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. 38. 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 didyut ‘gleaming bolt’ (literally ‘lightning’) of vii. 46. 3, regarded also as an arrow of his bow (ii. 38. 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 Čiva, 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 (jñāna) cure that 'carries off the celestial hurt,' and of Rudra's storming like a wild bull, a warrior aloft upon his car (ii. 33, 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. 28. 20 "all medicines are in the waters" (apsa antār viśvāni bheṣajā). In i. 89. 4, Wind, Earth and Father Dyāus are besought for medicines, along with the Aṣvin. Of which gods are used the verbs 'to heal with medicine'? With one exception only, the dewy Aṣvin.* Are these, therefore, mountain-gods as well as separated stars? If we do not err, only hyperbolic Soma, the waters, the Aṣvin, 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=88. 2 (compare viii. 72=61. 17; x. 175. 2) Soma as priest and poet heals (bhisajāti; the other verbs bhisajy and bhīṣajy are used of the Aṣvin). 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. 13). 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. 3, 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 pārvatēṣu, 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. 20). What says the poet directly? "From the sky come the medicines" (x. 59. 9, divaṅ caranti bheṣajāḥ). And it is only as dew-gods that the Agvis are physicians in the eyes of the Vedic poets: "When ye two mount your car ye wet our realm with sweet 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 dogms 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 Çarva-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 position to understand the meaning of 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 I intended. In answer we say: "Well, yes, Varuṇa in some hymns is not like the ritualistic gods, and Xenophanes’ God is not like the god of Aristophanes; but that is no reason for supposing that Xenophanes 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
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 Nīrṛti (‘going out,’ like
Nīrṛtya, ‘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 nowa-
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 Brāh-
maṇas, 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 Gṛṣamāda, 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 Gṛṣamāda'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 Brāhmaṇas. 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 Brāhmanic 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.
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, li. 6-10 (Hosh-enji 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 Hoshenji. The text runs

\[
\begin{align*}
narś vaghāhanem \\
astem aēvō mastravanām \\
vīspaca yō mastraghnām a māst a \\
hvarō-cīthānām aēlēē anyē cikayatō.
\end{align*}
\]

With due allowance for the wretched syntax, *aēvō* 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 *aē vanāskār vaghtān gabrā barā sūmbēnd ... ast aēvāk mastarg ... zag hamānī zaniēnō 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 *amāsta* 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. *diāhsta* (*tan* 'to stretch,') and *mānāsta*, 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*, L., 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 *śiro dāsasya nāmucere mathāyān* and RV. vi. 20. 6 prā *cyenō nā maḍhirāṃ aṁcūm aṁ-

*māi śiro dāsasya nāmucere mathāyān.* Cf. also AV. vii. 50. 5, of a wolf

shaking a sheep: *āvīṁ vṛko ydāḥa 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 (mahīnā, variṇā, prathinā, bhūnā, etc.).

This problem has been discussed very frequently, the previous treatments being recorded by Professor Collitz, Beemann’s Beitraege, 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 mahīnā, by far the most common of these words: it occurs 35 times in the Rig-Veda. All the occurrences are restricted to two metrical types. First, in octosyllabic pādaś the word occupies the fourth, fifth and sixth syllables. There are four cases of this kind, iii. 59. 7; viii. 12. 29; 68. 3; x. 119. 8, e. g., iii. 59. 7: abhi yō mahīnā divam.

Secondly, in the other 31 cases (for which see Grassmann) the word follows immediately upon the caesura of a tristubh-jagatī-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 īthā | mahīnā nībhyo ṛṣṭi (tristubh).
ii. 17. 2: cītvāni dyām | mahīnā prāyio amuṇcata (jagatī).
iii. 6. 2: dīvoc cṣ cāgne | mahīnā prthivāḥ (tristubh).
vi. 68. 9: ayām yā urvṛt | mahīnā māhivṛataḥ (jagatī).*

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 tristubh-jagatī pādas is regularly followed by an anapaest (— —) (ibid. p. 56). It is evident at once that the regular instrumental mahīmnā, 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 mahī, occurring 34 times in the RV. This is the true metrical complement of mahīnā.‡ It occurs either at the end of tristubh lines (7 times), where the final — is needed, e. g., RV. ii. 35. 2: apāṁ nāpād asuryāsya mahīnā,§ or before the caesura in

* Of the three cases of mahīmnā in the RV. only one holds this position, i. 59. 7, vaiŋvānarō | mahīmnā vipādekṣitiḥ; the remaining two appear before the caesura, where they are free to stand (vi. 61. 13; x. 88. 14).
† The A.V., whose diction is less hieratic and in closer contact with popular speech, whose metres are far less tramelled, reads at iv. 30. 8 (var. of RV. x. 125. 8) etāvat | mahīmnā saṁ dābhūva.
‡ Cf. e. g. RV. vii. 60. 10, dākṣ三亚 cān mahīnā mṛlaṇaḥ, with iii. 62. 17, mahīnā dākṣ三亚 rājaḥ. Cf. also RV. v. 87. 2*, prā yā jātati | mahīnā yā ca nā svayām, with the fourth pāda of the same stanza, mahīnā tād caṁ dāhṛṣṭasya nā tādvāya.
§ 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
spondaic mahnā to the types prevalent in the divisions before the caesura,
since these are liberal enough to accommodate any group of two sylla-
bles no matter what their quantity may be (see Oldenberg’s tables, ibid.
pp. 14, 49 ff.).

Now the form mahnā 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 mahimnā is also a matter which concerns the
instrumental only. I assume that mahimnā is a contaminated (blend)
form of mahnā and mahimnā, instigated, or elevated to a position of
prominence, by the obvious metrical and stylistic conveniences briefly
sketched above.

The word mahimnā means ‘with greatness.’ The former considera-
tions of the problem have failed to take note of the semantic character
of the remaining words that are involved in the discussion: varinā
means, ‘with extent’; prathimnā, ‘with extent’, and bhīnā, again,
‘with greatness’. These are so obviously congeneric† with mahimnā 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. xviii. 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 instru-
mental is the cause of their appearance in company. The passage
reads, mahimnā ca me varimnā ca me prathimnā ca me . . . yaśñēna
calpantām ‘may greatness, and scope, and breadth . . . form them-
selves for me with the sacrifice.’

The only remaining form, preṇā, seems in every way out of agree-
ment. The form occurs twice, and is taken as an instrumental from
preṃān ‘love.’ It is permitted, of course, to assume that by this time
instrumentals in nā from stems in mān 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
preṃāt ‘with Vedic loss of m’ (makāralopaḥ chāndasaḥ).

We may finally note as a curiosum that the form drāghnā, 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
drāghnā (MS.), drāghimnā (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 heteroclitic declension,
together with the stem mānas for the causus recti.
† See for this term and the linguistic principles involved our two essays On
1 ff., and On the so-called root-determinatives in the Indo-European languages,
Indogermanische Forschungen, iv. 66 ff.
2. On the relation of the vowel-groups ār and ur to īr and īr in Sanskrit.

De Saussure's theory of dissyllabic roots (Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles, pp. 289 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. īr) corresponding to SK. ār (I. E. ār*). Thus the root-forms īr in tīr-tvā, and īr in tīr-dīśi are regarded as weak form of the dissyllabic root ārī in tārī-tum, precisely as kr in kṛ-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. īr: only ār and ur are found. Thus the desiderative which has for some reason generalized the long reduced vowels ī, ā, īr, and ār never exhibits īr after a labial. A root beginning with a non-labial may exhibit either īr or ār (titīrśati and tātīrśati), a root beginning with a labial can have only ār, not īr (bubhūrśati from bhīr '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. īr*), occurring respectively before consonants and vowels, of the strong forms Sk. ārū (I. E. ārū). This may be stated in the following proportion:

\[
\text{ār and ur : ārū = īr and īr : ārī.}
\]

* Perhaps also ārū; 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 drū and ārī. The former occurs before vowels in the form drū; the type ārī never occurs before vowels in the form āry; instead the monosyllabic ar appears. Thus the Avestan stem tār-ru-aya by the side of Sk. tāru-te, but there is no tār- anywhere to match tārī-tum, tār-tar, etc. The varying quantity of the u of drū is interesting, because it shows that the long ī of ārī is not of an origin radically different from that of the ī of ārī, and is not the root-determinative ī (I. E. ī) which has crowded out ī (I. E. ī). 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 tār-ṣas (by the side of tār-ṣa), vār-ṭar and vārāṭha, jārāṭha, etc., have derived their š? Unless we assume purely metrical lengthening we are compelled to acknowledge both ārū and ārī as I. E. types, ārū and ārī. 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-, taru-: tūr, tur 'pass.'

The base taru occurs in the verbal forms, Vedic taru-te, taru-sama, tāru-ṣante. This is the anteconsonantal form. The antevocalic form is tarv- in Avestan tārvavaya 'overcome' (e.g. tārvv-ayeni, Yasht xiv.4). Nominal forms are numerous: tāru-s, tāru-ṣa, tāru-tar, tāru-tra, perhaps also, tāru-, tāru-ya and tāru-ṣas. Further, tsāru-, if the root tsar is a contamination of tar and sar, as I have assumed (Indogermanische Forschungen, iv. 72).* The reduced forms, ante-consonantal viçva-tār(ṣ), su-pra-tār(ṣ), tār-tā, tār-ṇa, viçva-tār-ti, -tār-ya, tā-tur-ṣati, tūr-ṇi; ante-vocalic tur-āti, tur-āte, tār-tur-āna, (ap-) tūr-am, tūr-ā, tur-ṇa, tur-i, tā-tur-i, tār-tur-a.

Cf. the dissyllabic base in ṝ: -tār-ṝar, tār-ṝṇi, tār-ṝ-tum with the reduced forms, anteconsonantal tīr-ṇa, tīr-ṭa, tīr-ṇa, and antevocalic tīr-āti, tīr-ṛ-us, tīr-ṇa, tīr-e, etc. The materials, of themselves, yield the proportion:

\[ \text{tārū (tarv)}: \text{tūr, tur} = \text{tār-ṝ: tīr, tīr.} \]

2. jārū, jarv: jūr, jūr 'waste, grow old.'

The Rig-Veda has jārūṭha '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; x. 80. 3. The antevocalic strong form appears in Avestan zamédia-ta 'old age'; cf. zra-an 'time'.‡ The anteconsonantal weak form in jār-ṛati, jār-ṇa, jār-ṇi, and amā-jār(ṣ) 'aging at home'. The antevocalic weak form in jūr-ṛati, jā-gur-i, a-jūr-ṃ. Cf. with this jari-maṇ: jīr-ṇa. The weak antevocalic form perhaps in a-jīr-ṛ (see above). Again we may state the proportion:

\[ \text{jārū: jūr, jūr = jār-ṝ: jīr, jīr.} \]

3. cărū, carv: căr 'crush'.

The strong anteconsonantal căru-s 'missile'; antevocalic căro-d, Avestan samédia-a 'god of destruction'. The weak anteconsonantal form căr-tā (RV. i. 174. 6) 'slain'. Cf. on the other hand the infinitive căr-tos with căr-ṇa and căr-tā.

4. caru, carv: căr 'grind'.

This root presents the relation very clearly. Anteonsonantal strong căr-s 'porridge'; antevocalic cărv-ati, carv-ayati 'grind, chew'.

---

* Cf. τερό-σκεραί: νοσεί, ἕθνει, τερό-σκερο: ἱερεῖτο (Hesych).
† The word is ordinarily, but doubtfully, compared with Lat. agilis 'agile', and derived from the root of 'drive'.
‡ Cf. also Greek γρασ- (Attic), γρῦ- ( Ionic), γρῦ- (poetic), as evidence of in the second syllable.
weak form in cūr-νa 'ground, flour'. The congeneric root bharu, in bharu-ati 'chew', Avestan aš-boṣru-a 'eating much', is in some way related to this root, but no weak forms of the root occur.*

5. karu, kuru: kūr, kur 'make'.

The strong forms of the verb karó-mi are built upon a base karó- which is in direct relation to karu in karú-νa 'deed'. The antevocalic strong form in kárv-ara 'deed'. The weak antec consonantal form in turi-kár-mi, kúr-mín 'acting mightily'; the antevocalic perhaps in kuru 'make thou'.† Vedic krñ-ñ-mi, krñ-u-útē also point to a dissyllabic base ending in ū.

6. paru, parv: pūr, pur 'fill'.

Whitney in his Roots of the Sanskrit Language, p. 100, treats under root 1 pṛ the words pārũ-s and pāru-an 'knot, joint' (cf. pārvata, Avestan paʿrva-ta, 'mountain'). This etymology is none too certain, because Greek πᾶρα (pēra-ν-ν) and ἀνεπάρκει (ἀνεπάρκει) exhibit European ṛ and the root for 'fill' has I. E. ḷ. These words doubtless represent an I. E. base pēr ē. But we have I. E. pēlu in Gothic filu which is related, along with its strong base fillu (genitive fillu-s) to Sk. purú, Greek πῶλε, as Sk. karu (karo) with its strengthened base karo is to kuru. Avestan pošru, Achemenidan paru may also be referred to I. E. pēlu (Goth. filu).§ The weak antec consonantal base in pār-dhi, pār-nã, pār-ti, 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 dissyllabic base with ordinary sh'va in pār-man may have a share in these weak forms, since the labial initial seems to prevent the occurrence of the weak stems *pūr, *pīr.

7. varū (I. E. yērū): ār, ur 'cover, protect'.

The strong stem in váru-tar 'protector', váru-tha 'protection', and perhaps váru-νa 'covering sky'.| Further in Avestan vošru 'broad', i. e. Aryan váru (cf. vohu = 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 kur-u, because the form is an especial weak manifestation of kuru. Perhaps originally barytone kāru: oxytone kuru: low tone kār. We shall meet with this type again below.
§ Cf. also par-u-t 'in the past year', and parut-ina '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 πᾶρα (πᾶρα) 'a year ago'.
| Greek θeβ-ὁθα 'protect', θeβ-μα 'protection' also exhibit the strong stem
between itself (I. E. ērū) and Sk. urū, as between Gothic filu, and perhaps also Avestan po'uru (I. E. pēlu), and Sk. purū, Greek πολύ. The weak antaconsonantal stem in ār-ṇoṭī 'cover', ār-vā 'reservoir'; the weak antevocalic form, perhaps in ār-as 'breast'. The type urū: vāru = kuru; karu = purū; parū (Goth. filu), etc. The dissyllabic types with sh'va, varīman, varītum, etc., suggest the same caution as in the preceding group, because of the initial labial.

8. varū (I. E. yeļu): ār, ur 'surround, turn'.

An apparently kindred I. E. root-word yeļu in the sense of 'surround, cover, turn' is bound up with Sk. varū, because the latter fails to differentiate r and l. Latin volv-ō, Goth. valv-jan 'roll'; Greek θέν in ἑλο-σφυ (Π. xxiii. 388), ἑλο-σθεῖς (Od. ix. 438) 'roll, compress', ἑλο-τρων 'cover'. It is obviously impossible to decide in each particular case of Sk. varū whether it represents I. e. ērū or yeļu. So e. g. ār-ṇoṭī may be from either. But the antaconsonantal weak form ār in ār-ṇa 'wool' belongs to yeļu, as is attested by the European words for 'wool'; the antevocalic weak type may be assumed in ār-ṇa 'ram', and further ālbo (ālva), Lat. vulvae shows a base ālu- on a level with kuru, purū and urū (cf. also gurū).

9. dhāru: dhūr, dhur 'hold'.

The strong type in dhārū-na 'holding'; the weak antecho-nosomal type in dhūr-sū, loc. plur. of dhur 'wagon-pole,' the antevocalic type in acc. sing. dhūr-am.

In addition to the types that show the presence of u treated above under tārū, namely tārū (tavr), tūr, and tur, there are other types which have in some way arisen as modfications of the same original dissyllabic base. They are tūrv in tūrv-ati 'overcome' and tvār 'hasten.' Similarly jārv 'consume' and jvar (jval) 'burn.' Now there is a root in the sense of 'injure' which correspondingly exhibits the following types: dhūrv in dhūrv-ati, dhvar in dhūr-ati, by the side of dhūr in dhūr-tā 'robber,' and dhūr-ā 'forcibly,' CB. x. 5. 2. 12 (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:


Here x is dharu, and we are thus led to a real etymon for the last series: dhūr, etc. must have meant originally 'to hold by force.' The etymologist should, moreover, not fail to take note of the congeneric meaning of tūrv, jārv, and dhūrv; the grammarian may well be appalled by
the protean variety of these types, and the apparently hopeless task of coordinating them.*

10. (sarū): sārū 'move.'

The perf. pass. partic. a-sār-ta 'untrodden, remote' occurs in this indubitable meaning at AV. x. 3. 9; cf. sār-ta and a-sār-ta, RV. x. 83. 4, and Pāñini viii. 2. 61 (sār-ta = śr-ta). Further sār-mī 'water-pipe'; sār-myā 'located in canals.' The dissyllabic stem sāru is wanting (sarū in sār-maṇa), but the root sru 'flow' is so evidently a modification of I. E. sēru (cf. dḥur-ti, type 7 in the foot-note, above), as to justify us in speaking of sār-ta as a participle from the root *sarū. The parallel root gṛu is equally an early development of I. E. kūlu; the full root is apparent in kele-s-w 'to make hear, to order,' which seems to stand on the same morphological plane with Sk. kart, except that it appears in a thematic form (cf. ṛav-s-w : Sk. tan-u-ta).

11. maru: mār, mur 'die.'

Nothing is coercive in this number. The perf. pass. partic. mār-ṇa 'crushed' goes with the secondary root mṛṇa, but its long vowel points to a dissyllabic strong stem. The antevocalic weak type in mvr-ya. Weber, Indische Studien iv. 398, and Whitney, Roots, etc., p. 24, derive maru 'desert' from the root mṛṇ 'die,' and this may represent the strong dissyllabic type. The secondary root mār-ch 'thicken' which forms a participle mār-ta and the abstract mār-ti 'form' may possibly claim a place in this company, but its etymological relations are complicated and obscure.

The weak stems gur, gur 'greet' in gur-ta, gur-ḍe, etc. are wanting in any kind of a strong stem, directly connected with them.† Similarly the root hāṛ 'be crooked' exhibits the forms ju-hāṛ-thaṣa, ju-hur-anta, hṛva-ṛte and hru-ti which suggest forcibly the proportion:


This points to an original type *haru (see No. 9, and the note there). Deficient in strong correlatives types are also jār-gur-ṇa and jāl-gul-as : root gṛ 'swallow'; bhur-ḍntu, bhūr-ṇi, and bhur-ṛṇi (type xur-ṇa, as in tur-ṛṇa, ulv-a) : root bhur 'quiver'; cf. Lat. ferv-eo. It is of interest to-

* We may profitably resume here all the basic forms which seem to be descended from dissyllabic xarū, z being the varying initial consonant: 1. xarū (tara-te, tara-ṣas, etc.). 2. xarva (taraṇva-a, aṭaraṇva, aṭara, etc.). 3. xur (tūr-ta, etc.). 4. xur (tue-ti, etc.). 5. xuru (kuru, puru, etc.). 6. xuru (ulv-a, turv-a, etc.). 7. xuru (sru-an, drhu-ti 'injury,' etc.). 8. xuru (dhrur-ā, firm). 9. xuru (dhrur-ātī, jār-ātī, tār-ātī). 10. xur (tār-ātī, tār-ātī, tār-ātī, dhrur-ātī). I am tempted to pervert: 'he who reads may run.'—Avestan zru-an may belong rather to type 8 (=zru-an), than to type 7.

† Cf. perhaps Gr. ἀγμό-ν 'sing' in relation to jārī-taṛ 'singer,' gṛ-βhīs 'with songs.'
glance over the list under the suffix \( \text{d} \text{n} \) Whitney, Sk. Gr. 2 § 1170. Seven examples are given, but five of them are \( \text{t} \text{r} \text{v-d} \text{n} \), \( \text{h} \text{r} \text{v-d} \text{n} \), \( \text{d} \text{h} \text{r} \text{s} \text{v-d} \text{n} \) (\( \text{p} \text{a} \text{c} \text{v-} \text{s} \), \( \text{d} \text{h} \text{s} \text{r} \text{v-} \text{n} \), \( \text{t} \text{r} \text{v-d} \text{n} \), and \( \text{j} \text{u} \text{r} \text{v-d} \text{n} \). Nominal suffixes beginning with \( v \) makes a very feeble showing in the light of the theory of dissyllabic types in \( u \). Cf. also \( \text{d} \text{g} \text{h} \text{v-an} : \text{d} \text{g} \text{h} \text{n} \text{u-y} \text{t} \text{t} \); \( \text{p} \text{r} \text{s} \text{v-} \text{a} \); \( \text{p} \text{r} \text{s} \text{v-} \text{u-t} \text{e} \); \( \text{t} \text{ak} \text{v-an} : \text{t} \text{ak} \text{u} \), etc. Conversely there need be little doubt that the dissyllabic strong stem \( \text{a} \text{r} \text{u} \) in \( \text{a} \text{r} \text{v-ant} \), \( \text{a} \text{r} \text{v-an} \), and Avestan \( \text{a} \text{r} \text{v-a} \) is a type on the same morphological plane with the preceding, though the weak forms \( \text{ur} \), \( \text{ur} \) do not happen to occur. The stem \( \text{a} \text{r} \text{u} : \text{r} \text{n} \text{b-ti} = \text{stem} \text{karu} : \text{kr-n-b-ti} = \text{stem} \text{*d} \text{h} \text{r} \text{s} \text{v} \text{u} (\text{p} \text{a} \text{c} \text{v-s} = \text{d} \text{h} \text{r} \text{s} \text{v} \text{u}) : \text{d} \text{h} \text{r} \text{s} \text{n-b-ti} \), etc.

When the group \( \text{ur} \) is followed by a consonant the morphological antecedents of the types are generally wanting. Thus \( \text{m} \text{u} \text{r} \text{d} \text{h} \text{a} \text{n} \) (cf. Av. \( \text{k} \text{a} \text{-} \text{m} \text{e} \text{r} \text{e} \text{a} \), \( \text{b} \text{h} \text{r} \text{j} \), \( \text{s} \text{p} \text{h} \text{t} \text{r} \text{g} \text{-} \text{a} \text{t} \text{i} \), \( \text{k} \text{u} \text{r} \text{d} \text{-} \text{a} \text{t} \text{i} \) (\( \text{g} \text{u} \text{r} \text{d} \) : see J.A.O.S. xi., p. cxivii), \( \text{u} \text{r} \text{j} \), \( \text{u} \text{r} \text{d} \text{h} \text{v} \text{d} \), etc.

The solitary form \( \text{s} \text{p} \text{u} \text{r} \text{d} \text{h} \text{a} \text{n} \) from \( \text{s} \text{p} \text{r} \text{d} \) (cf. Avestan 6th class stem \( \text{s} \text{p} \text{e} \text{r} \text{e} \text{d} \text{a} \text{-} \text{a} \)-) shows a labial before \( \text{ur} \), as do several other of these, and is therefore of doubtful value. If we compare \( \text{c} \text{u} \text{d} \text{a} \) 'crest' with \( \text{s} \text{o} \text{p} \text{u} \text{-b} \text{o} \text{c} \) 'crested lark' we may assume for it the value \( \text{c} \text{u} \text{r} \text{-} \text{d} \text{a} \). The ablaut relation of \( \text{c} \text{u} \text{d} \text{a} : \text{s} \text{o} \text{p} \text{u} \text{-b} \text{o} \text{c} \) would then be parallel to that of \( \text{b} \text{n} \text{-} \text{n} \text{o} \text{c} \). Sk. \( \text{s} \text{v} \text{p} \text{d} \text{-} \text{n} \text{a} \text{s} \). Similarly von Bradke, Kuhn's Zeitschrift xxxiv. 157, would explain Sk. \( \text{k} \text{u} \text{t} \text{a} (\text{t} \text{u} \text{b} \text{-} \text{t} \text{a}) \) 'without horns' upon the basis \( \text{k} \text{a} \text{l} \text{u} \) in Lat. \( \text{u} \text{l} \text{v}-\text{os} \) 'bald' (cf. Sk. \( \text{u} \text{l} \text{v}-\text{a} \)).

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 1560 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 \( \text{k} \text{a} \text{r} \text{u} \), \( \text{k} \text{o} \text{r} \text{u} \), see Vanicik Grieschisch-Lateinisches Wörterbuch, p. 126; Persson, Wurzelerwetterung, p. 222.
Among the Coptic MSS. may be named No. 15, containing the Gospel of St. Mark in the Memphitic or Bahric dialect; although not much older than the XVIIth 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 Chalikkan, in Arabic from ١ to ٨٨٠.

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 whosoever 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—1792 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; 3½ 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 5½ 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; 7½ 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 Bibl. 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, Koiak, Taubeh, Emshir, 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, 3½ inches wide. Folios 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; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios 174, the first three wanting; 9 lines on a page. Date 1461 of Martyrdon—1745 A. D.

No. 12. Calendar or abridged Martyrology for Coptic Church, in Arabic. Neat hand; complete; 6½ inches long, 4½ 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; 6½ 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;” 9½ inches long, 6½ inches wide. Folios 153,—folios 1, 2, 48, 111 wanting. 15, 16, 17 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVI Century.

* For these last three MSS. compare Bibl. 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, 6½ 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. 2. Prayers of midnight. Complete. Uniform; at end is a subscription of the copyist, an inhabitant of Cairo; 6⅓ 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, Razek Joseph Reshide; worn; 8½ inches long, 6 inches wide. Folios 277, marked in Coptic letters; 18 lines on a page. Date in note by the copyist at the end, 1552 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 Carshooni; 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 Carshooni, 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 Carshooni, Matt. XII—32—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 Carshooni, 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 ١—١٠; clean, clear hand, not elegant; Oriental binding, 10¼ 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 כ 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 כ is used in some passages of the Old Testament to emphasize a noun; and that classical Hebrew likewise employs כ כ in the meaning 'whether-or,' sive-sive or et-et; and כ כ, after a preceding series or enumeration, to sum up, 'every,
all. In the past, ਃ in these cases has been commonly regarded by exeges and grammarians as a variety of the preposition ਃ in its meaning *as to*, *quod attinet ad, quoad*. Professor Haupt, in a paper read before the American Oriental Society, April 22, 1892, * pointed out that we have here to do with a special emphatic particle in Hebrew, ਃ being the Hebrew equivalent of the Arabic ٣٦ and Assyrian ٣٦, 'verily'; ਃ = Assyrian ٣٦ ٣٦ (٣٦), which is a compound of ٥ or ٦, the Assyrian equivalent of Hebrew ٥٥, and the emphatic ਃ; while ਃ in ٥ is a variety of the same emphatic particle ਃ. In illustration of this view Professor Haupt quoted the following passages: Gen. ix. 10, xxiii. 10; Ex. xxvii. 3, 19; Josh. xvii. 16; Ezek. xlii. 9; Eccl. ix. 4; Ezr. 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 ਃ has apparently one of these three meanings:

I. 'ਃ, 'verily.'

1. Ps. lxxxix. 10. 'כੀ ਜੀ ਮੋਗਨਾ ਲਕਖੀ ਬੀਜਾਲੀ ਮਲੰਬੀ, 'for verily] Jhvh is our shield, and the Holy One of Israel is our king.'

2. Eccl. ix. 4. 'ਹਲਵਲ ਜਿਵੇਂ ਦੋਮ ਮੋਗ ਦੀਰਾਦੀ ਹਥਾ, 'for verily a living dog is better than a dead lion.'

3. II Chr. vii. 21. 'ਰੋਬਿਤਿ ਜਿਵੇਂ ਦੋਸਾਰ ਰੋਬਿਤਿ ਜਿਵੇਂ ਤੱਲਾ ਬੁਰੇ ਜਿਵੇਂ ਜਿਵੇਂ, '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. 107f., under the title, *A New Hebrew Particle.*
‡ Cf. Delitzsch, *Assyrian Grammar, § 78, p. 214; § 93, p. 258; and § 145, p. 353.*
§ 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 ਃ 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 Israels (was den anlangt, der) ist unser König.'

** The ਃ here is authenticated by Symmachus's rendering, φίλατμα πέθανον ἦν ἕνωσεν τεθυμνότα.

†† 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.
II. לְלָבֵל, sive-sive.

4. Lev. vii. 26 (P). — כל דם לא יהא בבל מחָבְתוֹנִים לְעֹזֶר, ‘and ye shall eat no manner of blood, whether it be of fowl or of your beast, in any of your dwellings.’

5. Lev. xxii. 18 (P). — אשר יברא כִּי רֹאֵב, ‘whosoever of the house of Israel... offereth his oblation, whether it be any of their vows or of their freewill offerings.’

6. Num. xxix. 89 (P). — אלו הנה הָעֹשָׂה לְדוֹרָה נַעֲמָתוֹ לְבֵן מִגְּדוֹלָה וְלֶמֶנֶת הָבָה וְלֶמֶנֶת הָבָה, ‘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. — רְכֶב בֵּית בֶּן הָעַנְיֵנִי חֻשָּׁב בֵּין הָעָם, ‘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. 1 Kings vi. 30. — וַיְנַעֲשׂה הָוֹא לְבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל, לְעָצַר צִוַּה וְהוֹדַעְתָה וְלַחֲצָה לְעָצַר צִוַּה, ‘and he overlaid the floor of the house with gold, both within and without.’

9. 1 Kings x. 23. — וגוּרְמֶלֶל שָלָמָה מֵכָל מַלֶּכָּה, וְלַעֲצהֵו רְאוּם, ‘and King Solomon excelled all the kings of the earth, both in riches and in wisdom.’

10. II Kings xviii. 24 (Is. xxxvi. 9). — הָבָה הַלַּעֲצוּ מְצָיו לְרִבְכָּה, ‘and thou hast put thy trust in Egypt, both for chariots and for horsemen.’

11. Ezr. i. 11. — כל בֶּן לְוָה לְמַסָּה, ‘all the vessels, both silver and gold.’

12. II Chr. xxii. 3. — יִתְנַה לְזָה אֲבוֹתָם מְשֹׁנָה רוּחַ לְמַסָּה לְוָה, וְלַמְעָרֹנֶה, ‘and their father gave them great gifts, silver as well as gold and precious things.’

III. לְלָבֵל, ‘in short, every.’

18. Gen. ix. 9, 10 (P). — לֵאמָּה הָנָּנָה מִקְּטָם אֲנָה בְּאֵרִים, אֲנָה לֵאמָּה רַעָּה, ‘and they every one of them ate every living thing.’
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.*

14. Gen. xxiii. 10 (P). יַעַרְבָּן וְחָבֵית אֲבָרָם בָּאָלָי בָּנָי, '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. 3 (P). וּרְשֵׁית תְּרוּחַּת לְגַלְגַלְגַלְגַלְגַלְגַלְגַלַּת, '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-pan, in short, all its vessels shalt thou make of brass.'

16. Ex. xxvii. 18, 19 (P). וַאֲרֵנֵית נַחֲשָׁתָא: לְכֹל כַלַּה יִמַּכְסֵת, בַּכֹל עַבְרֵיהוֹ לְכֹל יִמַּכְסֵת לְכִלְּיָרוֹת הַחֵרְשָׁת, '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. 49 (P). כִּכָּל חָלֹךְ עַל הַגָּזָה כִּכָּל חָלֹךְ עַל אָרְבָּעָה, כִּכָּל מַרְבָּחׇן רַגְלֵיהֶם כִּכָּל חָלֹךְ עַל אוֹרֶשֶׁי וְלַא רָכַלְוָה, 'whosoever 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 ταῖς ἐκπενῶσις τοῖς ἐκπονοεῖν κ. τ. λ. צָרַכְלָנָה.

* Delitzsch, ad loc.: 'Erst ἐν der Teile, in welchen das Ganze besteht, dann des genus ex quo d. i. des Allgemeinen, unter das das Einzelne sich subsumirt, hierauf ἐν des Gesamtbegriffs, wonach sich das darunter befasste Einzelne bestimmt.' This explanation seems rather strained; לְכָל חָלֹךְ חַיָּרָה is superfluous, and is probably a later addition; it is omitted by the LXX.

† Here 'בָּנָי could also be taken as an epexegetical limitation of לְכָל בָּנָי, 'as many of them as used to enter the gate of his town,' i.e. those who were his immediate neighbors. In vs. 18 בָּנָי is used in the same phrase, on which J. H. Michaelis in his edition (1720) observes: Pro habet בָּנָי 3. sed contra Mas. impressam ad v. 10.
18. Num. xviii 8 (P).  *‘and behold, I have given thee the charge of all my hallowed offerings, even of all the hallowed things of the Israelites.’*

19. Ezek. xliiv. 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. xliiv. 9.  *‘no alien, 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 Jehovah.’*

22. Ezr. vii. 23.  *‘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. 24.  *‘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. 12.  *‘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 ל admits a different explanation:—

Is. xxxii. 1.

‘Behold, a king will reign in righteousness, and princes will rule in judgment.’—Here ל is rejected by most modern commentators as a mistake, though it is supported by Symmachus’s rendering, ἵσθη εἰς δικαίωσιν τοῦ βασιλέως, and emphasis would be here quite in place.

In Ps. xvi. 8, לקרקיס אליא בר הארץ, the ל may be dependent on תמות in vs. 2; cf. Delitzsch in loc., and Haupt in the Abstract mentioned above.

In I Chr. iii. 2, לшедшבלו宾 את Tổngה בוכנה, I Chr. vii. 1, ولךין יאא יאמלרכות, and I Chr. xxiv. 1, ל؊ךין שישב תולדת, and the ל is evidently due to a copyist’s error; see Haupt l. c.

In the following passages the ל may be explained as introducing the accusative, a use which is common in Aramaic:—Job v. 2, ב לאזאל, ‘for vexation killeth the foolish man, and jealousy slayeth the silly man.’

I Chr. xvi. 37.

ונעך יש לפלים ארוך בריית יהוה לאמסה ולאחרים, ‘and he left there before the ark of the covenant of Jhvh, Asaph and his brethren.’

II Chr. xxxi. 2.

ולימר יוחיו אלה מלך蝗 ההכנים והלד“. מוהלך את כספי עזרה להכנים ולהדויים לולע хаיאל, ‘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, לינובלו חפרים לכל בחש, ‘and they carried them on asses, every one that was feeble,’ ל is best explained as the exponent of the accusative.

Not counting the passages in which either the authenticity or the meaning of the ל is doubtful, there have been found three cases of the emphatic particle ל ‘verily;’ nine cases of לל ל equivalent to sive-sive; and thirteen cases of בלא ‘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., 1894, p. xi) that one of the descriptions of Agni in the Vedas, viz.: *Apāṁ nāpāt, ‘Waters’ son,’ is repeated in Lat. Nept-unus (<*ud-nos) ‘son of water,’ and, less literally, in Ποράδᾶς (for *Ne-por-idaun) ‘son of the *īdās, *īdā being interpreted as something like ‘kindlings,’ ‘fuel.’ I accounted for the apophatic in Greek by a completer personification in consequence of which there was a shift of conception from ‘son of the *īdās’ to ‘lord of the *īdās.’ I failed to explain Πορ in Corinthian Πορ(ο)δᾶς; this, if not merely orthographic, may be explained as belonging to the suffix -von, *udoFov being interpreted as ‘possessing fuel.’ I do not claim cogency, however, for the supposition that Πορ- is for *Ne-por, nor does my interpretation of *idiun reach probability.

We can, however, from other mythological sources largely augment the probability of my comparison.

1) Nārā-γάνσα.

The epithet Nārā-γάνσα is separable in the Rig Veda (x. 64. 3), though only the last part is inflected. In Νηπεῖς we have the dualic nom. in ἕν (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 Νηπεῖς is the variant quantity of the stem-vowel. All will admit, I take it, the probability that Νηπεῖς may have been originally but an epithet of Πορίδᾶς.

Not only was the epithet nārāγάνσα separable, but there was a distinct divinity Čānṣa in the Vedas. He was associated with Bhūga, and Bhágā with Pāṣān (cf. Grassmann, Wört. s. v.). The compound epithet Nārāγάνσα is used of Pūṣan as well as of Agni, and we may infer that Čānṣa is one of the forms of Agni-Pūṣan.

In Latin Consus, the phonetic equation with Čānṣa is perfect, and the mythological sphere is the same, for Consus is, according to Livy (i. 9. 6), Neptunus Equester.

2) Agni-Mātaričvan.

The Rishis had etymologized on this epithet quite early; thus we read in RV. iii. 29. 11th. mātarīcva yād āmīnīta mātāri vātāsya sārgo abhavat sārīmaṇi: ‘When Mātaričvā roared in his mother he became a gust of wind, to howl.’ Here I have referred āmīnīta to помн ‘bellow,’ and defined sārīmaṇi after Śārasvati ‘goddess of the voice’ (cf. Lat. sermo ‘speech’); amīnīta has, however, been taken heretofore in the sense ‘was fashioned,’ and mātaričvan understood as *mātāri-ćvan ‘growing in his mother.’ The accent of the compound demands, however, a division mātar-ićvan 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- *ićva-’ or ‘with a roaring *ićva-’ and this *ićva- might have a sense like apāṁ
in Ἀπάμ Νάπατ, 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 ἁρα- ‘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 Ἀπάμ Νάπατ, 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 ἄκρα- ‘water’ and ἀκρε- ‘horse,’ uniting in a still more primitive ἁκα- (cf. A.J.P. xv, 493). Sibree in the Academy (Nos. 1018, 1052) had made the same suggestion, though this was quite unknown to me. Inasmuch as the vocalization of ἰππος ‘horse’ is abnormal in Greek, it is possible there was a ἰππη ‘water.’ Thus Sibree interprets Ἁγανίππη as ‘great-spring,’ Μελάνιππον 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 ἰππη ‘water’ in Δ 500: δς ὁ Ἀμφώδης ἰππη ταρ’ ἰππον ὄχειλον. ‘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. ἁρα-. Not to take account of Sibree’s Sanskrit and Avestan names of rivers, I cite RV. viii. 26. 24:

\[ tvām hi svāśāstantam nṛṣādanaṁ hūmāhe grāvānām nāçvārṣtham maṁhāna \]

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 trägt”—a translation got by correcting nāçvārṣtham to nācūrṣtham. Grassmann’s translation seems to me absolutely correct, and we can reach it without a textual correction if the stem ἁρα be taken to mean ‘fluid.’ This it does also in the name of the acvatthā tree which was either regarded directly as a source of Soma (RV. I. 185. 8), or used for making a vat for the Soma. The acvatthā (‘ficus religiosa’) was, like all the figs, rich in sap, and caoutchouc is made from it in modern times (Encyc. Brit.* s. v. fig). As to its formation, I would explain -thā thus; -ṭṭa (ptc. of ṣāṭṭa): ṣāṭṭā = ṭṭṭa: ṭṭṭā, and so ἁρα-ṭṭhā 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 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 ekewe- ‘horse’ is concerned, the Greek abnormality may be stated as an interchange of ē and ē, and is to be ascribed, in my opinion, to an Aryan doublet ę | ē.
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(cf. A.J.P. xvi, 5 ff.). Thus we might have in Sanskrit a doublet *îśva- | dāśva-, and in -îśvan of our compound I would see a haplolalic *mātarīcva-tan ‘possessing a roaring water.’ Another explanation would be to assume a stem *mātarīcva- extended by -n- on the analogy of ādhavān, etc.

3) Tānū-nāpāt.

This epithet of Agni is traditionally explained as ‘self-son.’ 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’ (V(ā)tan). It is not preserved in the Veda as simplex, but the suffix -u- is found in tanayātus, tanyatū, tanyū and stánthu; the inferred *tānu- is warranted by Lat. tonus=tonitus (Seneca, Q. N. ii. 56: antiqui autem tonitrum dixerunt aut tonum), for this tonus can hardly be the borrowed τὸνος, which has no such signification in Greek.

I interpret the compound as ‘thunder and lightning’; for nāpāt as short for apām nāpāt I refer to RV. ii. 35. 14 and to x. 15. 3r (?).

4) THE NUMERAL GODS.

The Vedic fire-god Agni, if not an actual derivative of Vāj ‘lead,’ was liable to such a popular association. Hence we can explain his epithet purōhīta- ‘set before’ (RV. i. 1. 1); he is also known as prathama-jā ‘first-born’ (RV. x. 5. 7; 61. 19), though not the exclusive possessor of this epithet. We may therefore infer that Pāurevī, which is a by-name of Poseidon, harks back to the primitive period for its meaning. In Latin Portunus (suffix from Neptūnus), usually explained as ‘harbor-god,’ we have the self-same name.

We have further in the Veda a numeral divinity Trītā Āptiya (<*āpt- ya- : nāpāt ‘lightning?’) where Āpt-ya is usually interpreted as ‘son of the waters.’ Now Poseidon’s wife was ’Aμφ-τριτη and their son was Τριτων; 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 Trītων we have, I believe, a reduplicated form of Vētan ‘thunder’ in reverse order to Lat. ton-i-tr-w-. Its precise Aryan form can not be constructed from the material surviving, for already in the Aryan period association with trī-tō ‘third’ had taken place, suggested doubtless by Agni as ‘first.’ In the Greek forms, t doubtless belonged to the original reduplicating syllable, cf. the Sk. intensive doublet var-ī-verty | varvṛt. For the interchange of r and n in reduplication a good example is Grk. καρ-καρ-ος by the side of Lat. can-cre ‘crab.’

In Sanskrit a Dvītā- ‘second’ stands beside Trītā- ‘third.’ In the Old Norse mythology Odhin has the epithets Thridhi ‘third,’ and Tveggi ‘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 Ashʿār al-ʿArab, 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 Ashʿār al-ʿArab 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 Six Divans, besides descriptions, more or less incomplete, in different 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 Qaṣidas, 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. 57–93, gatherings 8–12, in which the verses are partly vowelled. Why these five sheets should be excepted, I cannot guess. The title-page is dated, The Amīrīya Press, Būlāq, 1808; 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 Fihrist, the title-page, and a page with the Mugaddima of the editor. He names himself Saʿīd Effendi b. ʿAntūn ʿAmmūn, 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 Muḥammad 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 ʿAmmūn, 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 fewness 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 Ḥamharat aṣḥār al-ʿArab in Z.D.M.G. xlix. 1895, p. 290–293.—Ed.
manuscript which is in our hands; but it is very corrupt (ṣaḡīma), so correct it." But the manuscripts seem to have been used faithfully, for on p. 114, at the poem of ʿUrwa b. al-Ward, there is a note to the effect that in the Majmuʿ ad-Dawāʾīn⁸ 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. 137 there is the remark: "'Alqama stands here in the manuscripts; but according to the Qāmūs 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. 85, '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 Muʿallaqa, thus leaving only six poems in the second class. This is probably due to the manuscripts; the poem of 'Antara in question became his Muʿallaqa-poem when he was reckoned among the Muʿallaqa-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 Qīsm i, Jusʿ 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 Muʿallaqaṭ (!), 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 Muʿallaqaṭ we need not pay much attention to that, and the date will be shown later to be absolutely impossible. Then in Jusʿ vii. p. 192, Majmuʿ 141, 1, there is another copy. In the beginning of the text quoted is a various reading for عِن الْعَرَب (p. 3, l. 8 of the printed text.)

To return to the description of the book, pages 1-89 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 Qurʾān was revealed, and from whose words the Arabic language is derived, and from whose poems are taken the witnesses for the meanings of the Qurʾān 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 whom they 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 (Dīwān) 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 Arabian poets with their verses. Then, in succession (p. 24–34), the claims of Zuhayr, an-Nābihgha adh-Dhubaynī, al-A'shā, Labīd, 'Amr b. Kulfūm, and Ṭaráfa are set forth. At the foot of p. 34 begins a general consideration of the Classes (Tabaqa‘) 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-Qurashi. 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-Qurashi who is named in an Isnād in the Kitāb al-Aghānī, 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. 463; 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-Muḥannā (full name, p. 12; generally Abū 'Ubayda); Muḥammad b. 'Uthmān al-Ja'fari; Abū-l-'Abbās al-Warrāq al-Kātib; and al-Muḥafḍal. 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 Hizām b. Arṭāb, from Abū ʿUbayda, from Abū Bakr al-Muzanā; p. 25, Abū ʿUbayda, from Abū ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān al-Ghassānī, from Sharīk b. al-Aswad; p. 25, Abū ʿUbayda, from ash-Shaʿbī[12] [but on the margin from another MS., Sunayd, from Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Jahmī[12], of Jahm b. Ḥudhayfa, from Abū ʿUbayda, from Abū ʿAmr al-Mukhashshi (?) and Muḥālīd[14], from ash-Shaʿbī]; p. 26, Abū ʿUbayda, from Qutayba b. Shaḥib b. al-Awwām b. Zuḥayr; p. 20, al-Jahmī, from Abū ʿUbayda, from Abū ʿUbayda, from Abū ʿAmr b. al-Ālā[16]; p. 25, Abū ʿUbayda, from Abū ʿAmr b. al-Ālā; pp. 24, 24, 35 are simple references to statements of Abū ʿUbayda, without *Ismāds*. It will be noticed that between Abū Zayd and Abū ʿUbayda two links come in twice. One of these, al-Jahmī, was a contemporary of the Khalīfa al-Mutawwakkil, A. H. 232–247.

As to Muḥāmmad b. ʿUthmān, I can only make one suggestion: he may be the Abū Jaʿfar b. ʿUthmān b. Abū Shayba al-ʿAbṣ of the *Fihrist*[17], who died A. H. 207. But in the *Jamhara* the name is al-Jaʿfari; though that may be through confusion with his Kunya. Further, of his books, the *Fihrist* only mentions one, *Kitāb as-Sunan fi-I-Figh*. His *Ismāds* are: from al-Ḥasan b. Dāʾūd al-Jaʿfari, from Ibn ʿĀʾisha at-Taymi[19]; p. 18, from Abū Ar-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, from al-Haytham b. ʿAdī[19], from Muḥālīd, from ash-Shaʿbī; p. 14, from Muṭarrīf al-Kīnānī[20], from Ibn Daʾūd[20], from Abū Lihzim al-ʿAnbarī, from ash-Shaʿbī; same p., from Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab[20]; p. 10, from Ibn ʿIshāq[20], from Abū Allāh b. ʿAbd-Tufayl, from his father, from his grandfather; p. 25, from Abū Mīsmaʾ, from Ibn Daʾūd; p. 20, from Muṭarrīf al-Kīnānī, from Ibn Daʾūd; p. 27, from Abū ʿAlqama, from Muṣīlīj (?) b. Sulaymān, from Abū al-ʿĀzīz b. Abū Ar-Raḥmān b. Zayd, from ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, from Ḥassān b. Thābit; p. 32, from ʿAli b. Tāhir adh-Dhuhili. As Ibn ʿĀʾisha died A. H. 228 and al-Haytham in 209, and as Muṭarrīf was probably the Qāḍī of ʾṢanāʾ, who died about 191 (the two intermediaries I cannot fix), it is evident that A. H. 207 is not an impossibly late date for our Muḥāmmad b. ʿUthmān.

Abū-l-ʿAbbās, also, is hard to fix. The Kunya is common and was borne, among others, by al-Mubarrad (d. 285), Thalʿab, (d. 291), the elder al-Mufaḍḍal aḥ-Dabbī (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*, an Abū-1-Ḥasan Muḥammad without date, and an ʿUmar[24] contemporary with Abū Nuwāṣ, who died A. H. 195 or 196. The Kunya of the last may have been Abū-1-ʿAbbās, and that is all we can say[24]. But it was the Kunya of the grammarian al-ʿĀwal; and in the *Fihrist* he is described as Nāṣīkh (scribe), and by Ḥājī Khalīfa as Muṭarrīf (correct scribe or corrector). From the *Fihrist* we learn that he edited (ʿamaṣla) the poems of Dhūr-Rumma and Imr al-Qays. Wüstenfeld 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 Ḩaṣād: p. 12, Abū Talha Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh al-Khuza‘ī, from Bakr b. Sulaymān, from Muḥammad b. Ishāq, from Hīshām b. 'Urwa, from his father, from 'Abd Allāh b. Zam'a b. al-Aswad b. al-Muṭṭalib; p. 18, from Abū Talha, from Bakr b. Sulaymān, going back to 'Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd; p. 16, from Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh, from Abū ʿUbayyda; 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 Talha 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" 27. The strange nisba az-Zarūdī, which is not in as-Suyūtī's Lubb al-Lubāb, seems to have caused the difficulty 28.

Last comes al-Muḥaqiq al-Muḥammad ad-Ḍabbi; and on p. 10, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Muḥaqiq al-Muḥammad ad-Ḍabbi. Elsewhere he is simply al-Muḥaqiq. Nöldeke, who used the Berlin manuscript of the Jamhara (Cod. Sprenger 1815), seems to have understood al-Muḥaqiq ad-Ḍabbi 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 two al-Muḥaqiqs are known. The one was Abū-l-'Abbās [or Abū 'Abd ar-Raḥmān, or Abū Muḥammad] al-Muḥaqiq al-Muḥammad ad-Ḍabbi. He was the collector of the Muḥaqiq ad-Ḍabbi, and died, as stated above, in A. H. 170 29. The other was Abū Ṭalib al-Muḥaqiq al-Muḥammad ad-Ḍabbi. He was the collector of the Muḥaqiq al-Muḥammad ad-Ḍabbi, and died after 300 30. It may be worth noticing that he wrote a Kitāb Jamāḥir al-Qabā‘ī. But the two fuller indications in the Jamhara are inconsistent with one another, and only the first agrees with the elder al-Muḥaqiq, while the question still remains, how we are to explain the indication on p. 10, and especially the strange nisba, al-Muḥabbāri. On the margin of p. 3 there is given as the reading of one copy, al-Muḥaqiq al-Muḥammad ad-Ḍabbi. 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Abū-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-Muḥaqiqs. Further, there is a serious difficulty in the genealogical chain. Ibn Qutayba 31 tells us that 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb had a son al-Muḥabbār (or al-Muḥabbāb) 'Abd ar-Raḥmān, and he again had a son whose name we learn from an-Nawawī 32 was also al-Muḥabbār (or Muḥabbāb), 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-Mu'ārif, through which men traced up their origin to a distinguished name and did not notice lā 'aqba lahu, '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 Isnāds it can be decisively proved that we have not here the elder al-Mufaḍḍal. On page 3 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 Zabyan, from Ibn 'Abbās (it will be noticed that the first two links in this chain occur in almost all the Isnāds); p. 10, he asked his father; p. 11, from his father, from his grandfather, from Muḥammad b. Ishaq (without doubt the Ṣāhib al-Maghāzī, d. 151), from Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh, from Abū Sa'ūd al-Khuza‘ī, from Abū-Ṭ-Tufayl 'Āmir b. Wāṭhila; p. 17, no Isnād 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 Ishaq, from Muḥāhid, from Ibn 'Abbās; p. 21, from his father, from his grandfather, from al-'Alā b-Maymūn al-Āmīdī, from his father; p. 29, from Abī Ṭāhir adh-Dhuhi, from Abū 'Ubayda, from al-Mujājid, from ash-Sha‘ī; pp. 16, 14, 25, references, but no Isnāds. 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 Isnāds contained in the Jamhara I must add the following: p. 15, Ibn Ishaq, from 'Abd Allāh b. at-Ṭufayl, from his father, from his grandfather; p. 16, al-Maqna', from his father, from al-Asma'ī; p. 19, Muṭarrif al-Kinānī, from Ibn Da'b; p. 31, Ṣā b. 'Umar; ibid., Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā. Hommel cites from the copy that von Kremer had made from a Cairo MS., Sunayd b. Muḥammad al-Azdī, from Ibn al-Arābī; 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 Qaṣida (p. 98) a line is quoted from Abū Tamīmān, the compiler of the Hamāsa, 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 Jamhara 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, Ahlwardt
and Hommel had before them. This is especially the case in the section describing the classes (tabaqāt) 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 Jamhara, 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 ' Ubayda 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-A'ashā, and Labīd, and Ṭarāfa. And it is said that al-Farazdaq said, Imr al-Qays is the greatest poet; and Jarīr said, an-Nābigha; and al-Akhtal said, al-A'ashā; and Ibn Aḥmar said Zuhayr; and Dhūr-Rumma said, Labīd; and Ibn Muqbil said, Ṭarāfa, and al-Kumayt said, 'Amr. b. Kulthūm; but our opinion [apparently Abū Zayd's] is that of Abū ' Ubayda; that is, Imr al-Qays, then Zuhayr, and an-Nābigha, and al-A'ashā, and Labīd, and 'Amr [Abū ' Ubayda does not mention 'Amr above], and Ṭarāfa. Al-Mufadḍal said: These are the authors of the seven long poems which the Arabs call as-Sumūt [the strings of beads or pearls], and whoever says that a place in 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.

Mufaḍḍal said: These nine and forty Qaṣidas 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 them46. And Abū ‘Ubayda mentioned in the third class of poets, al-Muraqqish and Ka‘b b. Zuhayr, and al-Khuṭay’a and Khadāsh b. Zuhayr, and Durayd b. aṣ-Ṣimma, and ‘Antara, and ‘Urwa b. al-Ward, and an-Namr b. Tawlab, and ash-Shammākh b. Ḍirār, and ‘Amr b. Aḥmar. 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 Jarīr, and al-Akhṭal."

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‘allaqa 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-Naḥḥās48 (d. 338), the seven Mu‘allaqaṭ 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 Mu‘allaqaṭ, the seven Mu‘allaqaṭ, or, as they are called here, Sumuṭ. 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 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 Ṭabagāt, 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 Ṭabagāt Shu'arā Najd, or simply ash-Shu'arā, 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-Shi'r wash-Shu'arā.

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 Muntaqayt al-'Arab and the Mashābūt al-'Arab, just exactly as we have the poems called as-Sumūḥ by the Arabs. So, too, we have the seven Mulḥamāt. If we did not know of the Sumūḥ, or Mu'allaqāt (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-Rāwiya 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 Sumūḥ or Mu'allaqāt, so the others might be called the Mujamharāt or the Mashābūt. 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 Ḥamāsa. He had a Kitāb al-Ikhtiyār min Ash'ār al-Qabā'ūl, 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-Mujamharāt? Could a name not be derived from that of the first group, the Sumūḥ, 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 Qur'ān. 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:

`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, Jarīr and al-Akhtāl are the greatest poets of the time of al-Islām, a remark that that is always excepting Hassān 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 Qur'ān, he takes up the stiffest and most orthodox position. The Qur'ān 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 Muṣaffāt al-Muḥtab 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 Ismāds 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 Lajabs, Kunyas, Nisbas and Isms 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:

اًلاَّ عيِّبُ في نعَمِ اِن تَجد عيِّبًا فَسَدَ الخُلَلُ
NOTES.
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5 The poem of 'Antara which stands second in the second class in Hommel's list, stands first in the Bulaq text. Further, the Bulaq 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.
7 وما ذكر في هذا الكتاب المعالمات التسع والاربعون مقصمة إلى سبعة أقسام كل تسم سبع قصائد ملقبات بلقب خصوص بها نسخة في مجلدين بقلم عادي.
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9 Ahlwardt has on p. xix. of the "Six Divans," ʿalī elkhâththāb as the reading of the Berlin MS.; but on p. |q45| (the Arabic preface to the ابن أبي الخّطاب تعلیقة.
10 Bulaq edition, x. 160.
11 Part ii., p. 481, note. I quote through Hommel, as this catalogue is inaccessible to me. It refers also to the Mushûr of as-Suyûtî. ʿAbd al-Qâdir al-Baghdâdî, in his list of books used in writing the Khizâna al-Adâb, includes the Jamhara, but does not mention Abû Zayd.
12 Wüstenfeld, Grammatische Schriften, p. 68 ff.; Führst, p. 53 ff.
14 Führst, p. 111.
15 Ibn Qut., p. 169; an-Nawawî, s. v.
16 Ibn Qut., p. 268.
17 P. 229, and references in note.
18 De Slane, Ibn Khallikân, iv. 259, note.
19 Ibn Qut., p. 267.
20 Wüstenfeld, Ibn Khallikân, No. 732.
21 Ibn Qut., p. 267.
34 De Slane, Ibn Khall., iv. 225.
35 To these may be added a Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Warrāq, who died في حدود الثلاثين ومائتين, and who wrote mostly religious and gnomic poetry (Fawāt al-Wafayāt, ii. 356); and an Abū-l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Kātib, who wrote كتاب الخراج, and died 270 (Ḥājji Khalifa, v. 80).
36 Fīhrist, pp. 79; 157, l. 18; and 158, l. 21. In the last passage simply under his Kunya. Ḥājji Khalifa, iii. 150. Wüstenfeld, Gramm. Schulen, p. 196 ff.
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38 Was confusion produced by the Abū-l-'Abbās al-Marwāzī who died in 274 (Fīhrist, p. 150)?
40 Wüstenfeld, Gramm. Schulen, p. 163 ff.
41 P. 92, 94.
42 Wüstenfeld, An-Nawawī, p. 385. 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 المکسیر of the Jamhara appears to be quite false. In the Cairo reprint of Ibn Qutayba it has become المکسیر. An-Nawawī tells how it was gained:
قال ابن عبد البار وانما قيل له المکسیر لأنه وقع وهو غلام فتمكسم فتحمل إلى عمتة حفصة أم المؤمنين فقيل انظرى إلى ابن أخيك المکسیر فقالت ليس بالمکسیر ولكننا المکسیر.
33 Ibn Qut., p. 1 and 2.
34 Ibn Durayd, Kitāb al-Ishtiqâq, p. 289.
36 An-Nawawī, p. 540.
37 Ibn Qut., p. 270.
39 "باب ذكر طبقات من سينا منهم قال ابن عبيد الله أشعار الناس أهل wereld خاصة . . . . .
قال المفضل عوولة أصحاب السبع الطوال التي تسبحها العرب السموط فمن قال أن السبع لغيرهم فقد خالف ما أجمع عليه"
Macdonald, *A Description of the Bûlûq Edition, etc.* clxxxvii

It may be of use, perhaps, to reprint here the fragment from the Berlin MS. given by Nöldeke in the *Beiträge* (p. xx):

وقال المفصل: القول عندنا ما قاله أبو عبيدة في ترتيب طبقاتهم وهو أن أول طبقاتهم أئشاح السبع معلقات وهم أمرو القيس وعبيد والنباغة والأعشى وعبيد وعبيد بن كلثوم وطبرة بين العبد قال المفصل هم أئشاح السبع الطوال اللذين تسميها العرب بالسمول ومن زعم غير ذلك فقد خالف جمهور العلماء

The repetition of the mafṣal shows that something is wrong with the text, and comparison with the Bûlûq edition shows what it is. Notice, too, the occurrence of the term البعلقات, which never appears in the Bûlûq edition. The later form of tradition will be found in as-Suyûtî’s *Musâhir*, Naw' 49; ed. Cairo 1282, iii. 234.

41 Nöldeke translates die Berühmten. I have followed Lane.

قال المفصل فهذه التسعة الأربعون تسبيحة عيون اشعار العرب في الجاهلية والإسلام ونفس شعر كل رجل منهم

I am not certain that I have caught the exact meaning of the last phrase.

43 This tradition was only known to Nöldeke through a note by al-Khafajî on the *Durra al-Ghawwâs* of al-Ḥarîrî, but see Appendix.

44 Father Lewis Cheikho, in *Les poètes arabes chrétiens*, p. 233, 234, gives the *Jamhara* poem of Umayya b. Abî-ṣ-Salt, and remarks: وهي تصنن تقدَّم من جمُهُرات العرب. This may mean nothing; but it may also mean that there is a separate MS. of the *Mujamharât al-'Arab* 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.

45 Compare with this as-Suyûtî’s *Iltisân*. On p. 125 ff. (‘Uthmâniyya ed., Cairo 1806) there is a long section on the subject, in which Ibn ‘Abbâs is represented as saying: Poetry is the Record (*Dîwân*) of the Arabs.
Then, whenever anything in the Qur'ān which God has revealed in the tongue of the Arabs is obscure, we turn to their Record.

46 In Ahlwardt's Six Divans, p. 199, this line is quoted from the Berlin MS., but the second Miṣrā' is different:

روَّذِلٌ عَيْبٌ الأَطْلَالَ عَيْبِ الْقَُلْعَاتِ, 'And has aught changed the ruins save falling to ruin?'

47 Compare al-Jawālīqī's Kitāb al-Mu'arrab, p. 3-5 of Sachau's edition; and as-Suyūtī's Itgān, 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'ān; it is pure Arabic. So, too, we are to interpret 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-Naḥḥās knew not only the story of the hanging on the Ka'ba, but also the name al-Mu'allaqāt 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 published twice; once by Thorbecke in his edition of Ḥāriri's Durra al-Ghawwās (p. 47), and in the Constantinople edition (Press of Jawā'ib, A. H. 1299) of the Durra, with al-Khafājī's sharḥ (p. 229). Compare too, Wüstenfeld, Ibn Khallikān, No. 204, and Kosegarten, Mu'allaga of 'Amr, p. 66—the last is an anonymous scholiast. Al-Khafājī, à propos of a mention of Ḥammād in the Durra, says:

وهو الذي جمع السبع البعلقات، وسمي معلقات لأنهم كانوا إذا أنشدوا شعراً

في جمعهم يقولون كبارؤهم ملَّقاهم إشارة إلى أنهم ما ينبغي أن يحفظ وما قيل من أنها ملَّقفة في الكعبة لا أصل له كما قال ابن الَّحَساس [Constat. edit.]

But Frenkel in his edition of the Mu'allaga of Imr al-Qays with the commentary of an-Naḥḥās (Halle a/S, 1876), has given from the Berlin MS. (Wetzstein i. 56) an-Naḥḥās'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'allaga. It comes at the end of the commentary on 'Amr b. Kulthūm, whose Qaṣīda stands

* Compare his article, 'Mo'allakät,' Encyclopaedia Britannica, 9th ed., xvi. 536 ff. —Ed.
قال أبو جعفر: فهذا أخر السبع المشهورات.

على ما رأيت أهل اللغة يذهبون إليه منهم أبو الحسن بن كيسان وليس لنا أن نتعترض. في هذا فنقل من الشعر ما هو أجرد من هذه. كما أنه ليس لنا أن نتعترض في الألقاب وإنما نُولِّدُها على ما نقلت إلينا نحو المصدر والحال والتنبئين وقد رأيت من يذهب إلى أن تصيَدة الأعشى وَزَعُّ النَّهَرَة.* وقصيدة النابِعَة وهي يا كَرَمَيْةٌ من هذه القصائد، وله بَيْنَان أن هذا لا يَوْحَد بقياس غير آنَّا رأينا أكثر أهل اللغة يذهب إلى أن أشعار الجاهلية أمروُّ القيم وزهير بن أبي سلمى والنابِعَة والأعشى إلا آبا عبيدة فإنَّهُ قال أشعارُ الجاهلية ثلثة أمروُ القيم وزهير والنابُعَة نجدنا قول أكثر أهل اللغة على إملاء تصيَدة الأعشى وقصيدة النابِعَة لتقديمهم إياهم وإن كنا ليستا من القصائد السبع، فقد خلأتموا في جمع هذه القصائد السبع وقيل أن العرب كان أكثرهم يجمع بكاظم ويتناشدون الشعر فإذا استحسن الملك تصيِدة قال علَّقَها وأثبتها في خرائطنا فانًا قول من قال أنها علَّقَت في الكعبة فلا يعرفه أحدٌ من الرواة. وأَنْجَم ما تقبل في هذا أن حمَّادَ الراويَّة لَمْ تَرَى رُحَبَ الناس في الشعر جمع هذه السبع وحضهم عليها وقال لهم هذا على المشهورات نُسِبُت القصائد المشهورة لهذا ونُبِدَا بقصيدة الأعشى لأن آبا عبيدة قال لم يُقَل في الجاهلية على رُبْيَّها مثلها.
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-Khafājī gives us to understand, that Ḥammād collected the seven poems. He simply gives it as the sounder opinion: asalḥu mā qila fi ḥādāh. 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 Ḥammād. As to which poems were included in this collection, he follows Abū-l-Ḥasan 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, يَا دَارُ مَيَّةٍ زَدَّعْ مُهَرِّبَةٍ [both in the Jamhara seven, but not with these poems]; but this was not based on a regular tradition, but simply because these two poems 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 ‘Ukāz, and that the best poems were selected and preserved there. Others affirmed that they were hung in the Kaʿba; but an-Naḥḥās rejects this utterly,—“not one of the Rāwīs knows anything of it.” He then gives his adherence to the story about Ḥammād, 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. Hence 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 him 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-Tibrizī (d. 420), in his commentary on ten poems (the nine of an-Naḥḥās with the addition of the Bā Qaṣīda of ʿAbīd b. al-Abras edit., Lyall), who follows an-Naḥḥās closely, speaks only of ‘the seven Qaṣīdas,’
Similarly, az-Zawzanî (d. 486), so far as I can trace him, speaks only of 'the seven Qasidas,' and never uses the term Mu'allaqat. Ibn Khallikân (d. 681) is the first whom I find using that term, and he speaks of 'the nine Mu'allaqat.' In Wüstenfeld's text there stands السع, but the reading in Ibn Khallikân's autograph MS. in the British Museum is التسع. [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-Khafâjî (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-Naḥḥâs does not use the term Mu'allaqat, yet he uses the verb علّق, apparently in the sense 'to select and preserve a poem.' Does this mean that Mu'allaqat 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'allaqat of an-Naḥḥâs. 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 Sumût, and Ḥammâd's seven? Are they not, perhaps, quite distinct sevens? It is true that five names occur in both: Ḥmr al-Qays, Zuhayr, Labîd, 'Amr and Ṭârâf. But neither 'Antara nor al-Ḥârîth are in the Jamhara, nor are an-Nâbigha or al-A'shâ in Ḥammâd's seven. The names are different: Ḥammâd's are called al-Mashhûrât; the Jamhara's, as-Sumût. 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-Sumût 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 Şahâh and the Lîsân, سَمَّط and سَمَّط are explained by علّق; and we have in the Lîsân والسَمَّط حَبْطَ النِّظَمِ لَأَنَّهُ يُعْلَقَ.

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 Kouyunjik 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 Kgs. 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 Mušannītu; 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 נמשננינまと, 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 נ DISPLAYED, meaning to be “pointed,” and the form is contracted from mušannītu = mušānītu = mušanītu. In the technical sense of “embankment,” the Talmudic term was shown to be a loan-word from the Babylonian, the writing מפרושניינת instead of מפרושניינת 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, musannāt. There appears also the form מפרושניינת, 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:

לַאֲחָזֵר
יִרְבִּיעֵי
בַּנַּאֲתָה יְשָׁא
עַל מִי מְנַחֵת לוֹדִילְי
לַעֲמַעְנוּלִי צֶרֶק
לַא אָרָא רֶע
נְכֶם כֶּלֶם בֹּנֶא זָלָם
שַׁכְּפֶל וְמַשְׁעַעְנִרְךָ חָפֵז יְעָמֵנַי
נְגַר צָרִי
רַשְׁנָת בְּשֵׁמֶן רַאֵשֵׁי
אָר מָוֵל חֵסֵר אָרְפֵי
כִּל יִמֵּי תָּי
לָאָרְלִי יִימָן
שְׁבָתֵי בַבִּית יְהוָה

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 Jāiminiya-brāhmaṇa; by Dr. Hanns Oertel, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn. To be published in the Journal.

18. An emendation of Sāyaṇa 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. \( \text{ARYAN } tr_1^\circ = \text{GRK. } \pi\lambda^\circ = \text{LAT. } cr^\circ, \text{ ARY. } dr_1^\circ = \beta\lambda^\circ = \text{LAT. } gl^\circ. \)

5. Prof. C. R. Lanman of Harvard University. Reflected Meanings; a Point in Semantics.


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.
the Natural Unit for the Thought.

13. Prof. Frank L. Van Cleef, of Cornell University. Confusion
of ἀικα and ὑποσφετες in Thucydides.

14. Dr. B. Newhall, of Brown University. Women’s Speech in
Classical Literature.

15. Prof. E. G. Sihler, of the University of the City of New York.
St. Paul and the Lex Iulia de vi.

16. Dr. James M. Paton, of Cambridge, Mass. Some Spartan
Families under the Empire.

17. Prof. H. W. Magoun of Oberlin College. Pliny’s Laurentine
Villa.

18. Prof. John Williams White, of Harvard University. The
pre-Themistoclean Wall at Athens.

19. Prof. Hermann Collitz, of Bryn Mawr College. The ety-
ymology of ἀρα and of μαψ.

20. Prof. J. Irving Manatt, of Brown University. The Literary
Evidence for Dörpfeld’s Enneakrousos.

21. Prof. Benjamin Ide Wheeler, of Cornell University. The
Greek Duals in -ς.

22. Prof. John Henry Wright, of Harvard University. A note

23. Prof. Herbert Weir Smyth, of Bryn Mawr College. On
Greek Tragic Anapaests.

24. Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College in the
City of New York. Two ancient Persian Names in Greek,
Ἁρταὐκτης and Φαδέμη.

25. Mortimer Lamson Earle, Ph.D., of Barnard College. Some
Remarks on the Moods of Will in Greek.

ARYAN gn = LATIN mn.

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 Dis-
course.
31. Prof. M. Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University. On the Etymology of ἀεὶω.

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. σῶ εἰπας, σω 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 ἀνα, 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.

3. Prof. George Lyman Kittredge, Harvard University. The Friar's Lantern.


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.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batten</th>
<th>Gottheil</th>
<th>Martin, W. A. P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>Grieve, Miss</td>
<td>Moore, G. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binney</td>
<td>Haupt</td>
<td>Oertel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaustein</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradner</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Staley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Jewett</td>
<td>Steele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, J. D.</td>
<td>Lanman</td>
<td>Van Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickerman</td>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilman</td>
<td></td>
<td>[26]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 archæological 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. Subhūti, Therō, F. N. M., a learned Buddhist High Priest, of Waskaduwa, Kaltara, 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, Subhūti has sent to Mr. Warren a complete and excellent transcript, on about 1700 pages, of the Paramattha Mahājāta, which is a commentary upon Buddhaghosa's Viśuddhi Magga, and was much desired by Mr. Warren in his work upon the Viśuddhi Magga.
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 Lauman, 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;
Raol 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
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>$905.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments (31) 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 Fund</td>
<td>195.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income of the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,406.49</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total receipts for the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,955.00</strong></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>310.95</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><strong>1,376.61</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit balance on Gen’l Account, Apr. 18, 1895</td>
<td>1,578.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,955.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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,
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. 29, 1894:</th>
<th>Apr. 18, 1895:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1425.20 I. Bradley Type Fund (deposited in the New Haven Savings Bank)</td>
<td>$1482.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000.00 II. Cotheal Publication Fund (deposited in the Provident Institution for Savings, Boston)</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000.00 III. Whitney Publication Fund (invested in eight shares of State National Bank stock)</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.00 IV. Life Membership Fund (deposited in the Suffolk Savings Bank, Boston)</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Balances Belonging to General Account:

| $1548.51 I. Cash in Cambridge Savings Bank | $1498.38 |
| 40.40 II. Cash in Provident Inst. for Savings, Boston | 71.84 |
| 8.79 III. Cash in Suffolk Savings Bank | 8.17 |

$5092.90 Totals of A and B $5186.15

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, 105 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. cccxlv 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 1½ 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 Lanman, 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 compeers 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.

Chleo, 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, molai mochü, 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 centuries, 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 philosophy?"

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. 50). 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 general, especially from the later, Babylonian and Assyrian literature. But they are invariably derived from the records of the patesis themselves, and they stand as attestations of the faith of Shirpurla. They make known the conceptions of the gods, not as entertained in different 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 Babylonian religion this is a matter of importance. A fixed point is established 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,

---

*The references, unless otherwise noted, are to the plates in Découvertes en Chaldeé, par Ernest de Sarzec.
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 Gutumug, 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 Gutumug, “the mother of Shirpurla” (5 no. 2, l. 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; 18 no. 2 col. i. 8; 18 no. 4 col. i. 3), 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; 18 no. 2 col. iii. 20 sq.), and was worshipped
as the mistress of this town (13 no. 2 col. i. 4, col. iii. 18, 19; 13 no. 4 col. i. 4). The goddess Bau is identified by Amiaud with Gatumdug, partly on the authority of a fragmentary text (IIR 59, 27 e, f, see Tableau comparé, no. 155), and partly on account of her being called a "daughter of Ana" (RP. n. s. i. 58, presumably having in mind 35 col. ii. 4-2 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. 3, 9-12; 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 Shirpuria. 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-azagga (13 no. 3, col. ii. 3-6); and he was the brother of Ninâ, the protectress of Ninâ-ki (35 col. v. 17; see Zimmern, ZA. iii. 232 sq.). The goddess Ninâ 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 Nincharisag under another name. It would be rash to assert that she was. The argument is direct (Ninâ=Ishtar=wife of Enlil, VR. 8, 92 and 10, 52 variant), but it is derived from other texts than those of the patesis. Still, Gudea most honorably associates her with Enlil (Ménant, Babylone 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 Shirpuria 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 Nincharisag (op. 18, last column bottom; 36 col. xiii. 1, 2); 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 Dunshagga (39 no. 1, 1-3).

Bau, the mistress of Uru-azagga, 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-azagga (13 no. 2 col. viii. 12, 13; and 36 col. xxiii. 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 Ensû (PSBA. xiii. 158–159, l. 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 patesis 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 patesis 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 Shirpuría, properly so called. Not that they alone were known, nor that they alone were worshipped. Allusion is made to other gods. Shitlamtaduua, 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. Duzuzaub probably belonged to the group of Ninâ (IIR56, 83). From sources outside of the records of the patesis, it is known also that Shitlamtaduua had a temple in Girsu and was regarded as a son of Enlil (IIR61, 18. 19 b; IIR 88, 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 Shirpuría. 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 sanctuaries. But the god Shitlamtauddua need not have been worshipped there by reason of his kinship to the tutelary deity. A sufficient explanation 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 Shirpurula 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 Shirpurula 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 Shirpurula 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 inscriptions 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. Urkagina, one of the earliest of the patesis, tells of certain temples which he erected (Collection de Clercq, tom ii. pl. viii). He does not once mention relationships; but it is evident that he is constructing sanctuaries 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 Shirpurula. Yet similar phenomena of orderly enumeration appear. The temples erected are in Girsu two, namely, to Ningirsu and to his father’s wife, Ninbarsag; 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 enumeration 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, Enlil and wife Nincharsag, Ea, and Ensu. Then follow the tutelary gods; Ningirsu of Girsu, Ninâ and her consort of Ninâ-ki, Gatumdug of Shirpurla 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 Shirpurla. 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. Duneyley 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 י 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 alšu esiršu,* “I shut him up within his city”

* The verb eseru is also used with ana; cf. ana ššen maxasu—inu esiršumuit (I. R. Tig. c v. 77/8); ana ančili esiršu, “I shut him up in prison” (?) (I. R. Senn. c. ii. 72).
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(I. R. Ašurn. c. iii. 40); and also in composition with libbu and qirbu: e. g., with libbu, I. R. 27, No. 2, 37/8; with qirbu, 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 étēgu, 'to march,' I. R. Esarh. c. i. 53. This usage is of course found with libbu and qirbu: ina libbi ušerib, "I caused to enter therein" (II. R. 67, 11a); ina qirib Ninā illikamma, "came into Ninovēh" (V. R. 1, 62).

Ina, 'within, into,' came to be used very naturally also in the sense of 'among'; cf. the familiar phrases, ina šarrānī maaxrāti, "among the former kings"; ina puxur ikāni, "among all the gods," etc.; also frequently in composition with libbu. Ina is employed similarly in composition with birit, to express 'between'; cf. I. R. Ašurn. c. i. 47, and passim.

It is hardly necessary to cite 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 libbu and qirbu is exactly equivalent to that of the Hebrew ב with ל and נ. The Heb. ל, the cognate of libbu, is found sometimes, though rarely, in the sense of "midst" (cf. בלב, Exod. xvi. 3; Ps. xlvii. 3; 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, Athiop. 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. 811/2).† In Arabic the separate prep. ف 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 Labama, ina šep Ialmān, "at the foot of Lebanon," etc., are of most common occurrence, and agree with such ordinary usages as the Hebrew ביבים, "by the river Sorek," and the Arabic باب القاهرة, "at the gate of Cairo." The familiar use of ina denoting position at or near, in composition with battuβitii, maaxar, pān, pūt, gabal, šadīl, and tārçu, must also be classified under this head.

---

*The prep. ana is also occasionally used in the sense of 'into'; cf. ana mē nādū, "whoever casts it into the water," (IV. R. 39, rev. 19; I. R. Tig. c. viii. 65). The use of נ seen in Jon. i. 12, מזון מזון should be compared in this connection. We also find erēbu with ana (I. R. Ašurn. c. i. 83).

† Westa from √wesata with t instead of f, owing to the preceding sibilant, is probably cognate with Assyrian šitu, '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 ubanāt zurānī ardišunuti*, “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 tamnušuma*, ‘she delivered him into (unto) the hands of his servants” (V. R. 8, 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. 88; c. iii. 9/10); sometimes, however, with no preposition at all (cf. I. R. Senn. c. iv. 50). *Ina* in composition with *elī,* however, occasionally admits of the interpretation ‘unto,’ as *ša ina elī Aṣṣur amuru*, “who looked towards (i.e. belonged to) A.” V. R. 8, 82.

The Hebrew also occurs in this sense, as ראתא בושם, Gen. xi. 4. Idioms like ב יוינא, ב נהוֹלָת, ה נהוֹלָת, ב נוֹלָת 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 לוע.

*Ina*, “into,” in the sense of ‘against,’ is quite common in Assyrian; thus: *ina adīa ʾikṭū*, “they sinned against my ordinances” (V. R. 1, 118, 182). In this sense it is frequently found also in composition with *irtu*; e.g., *ina irtia ʾillikānimma* (Senn. Const. 45); and with *elī*, as in *ša ina elī Aṣṣur ʾilha sillatu ʾigpudu* “who planned treason against A. my God” (V. R. 4, 67; II. R. 65, 4a). The meaning ‘against’ may be expressed by *elī* alone, to which the signification properly belongs, as well as by *gīru*, especially in the later inscriptions; cf. *kakkia ša elī nakri aškunu*, “my weapons which I had aimed against the foe” (Sargon Nimroud, 18; I. R. Senn. c. iii. 21/2), and *gīr gīmir ummanāti*, “against all the troops” (I. R. Senn. c. v. 61; V. R. 1, 60); etc. The idea of ‘against,’ which is the *dative incommoti*, is also expressed quite properly in Assyrian by *ana*, which is essentially the preposition of the dative: cf. *ana čalmia šuatu limnāti ilē u*, “whoever plans evil against this my image” (I. R. 27, no. 2, 87/8; I. R. Aṣṣurn. c. ii. 51; etc.).

The use of ב in both Hebrew and Aramaic in the sense of ‘against’ is well known; for example, in Isaiah xix. 2, with the verb לוע.
muxxi; ina muxxi ašfur (c. vi. 18/9); with qirbu; ina qirbiša ašfur (Shalm. Obelisk, 72, and passim).*

The Hebrew-Aramaic ב, like ́ına, is also used to denote position on a height; cf. בחרב, 1 Kings viii. 9; נָחָלִים מְנֵיעָר, Num. xiv. 10; Deut. xxxi. 15; בֵיהלֵם מֹשֵׁל, Isaiah lxvi. 20. The Heb. verb בחרב, 'to write' (upon), like the Assyrian šafāru, is used with ב (cf. Deut. xxviii. 61; 1 Kings xxi. 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 ın̄a must be regarded as developments from the ın̄a 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 ın̄a of condition and manner; 2. the ın̄a of time; 3. the ın̄a of accompaniment; the ın̄a, 4. of instrument; 5. of quality; 6. of cause; 7. the partitive ın̄a, and its natural development, the ın̄a 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 ın̄a to denote manner may be seen in the sentence: ı̄na xidāti rišāti ērub ın̄a bêt riḍuti, "in joy and gladness I entered into the harem" (V. R. 1, 28). ın̄a is very commonly applied in adverbial phrases like ın̄a ḥittī, "victoriously" (I. R. Esarh. c. iv. 40); ın̄a la meni, "without number," passim.† This latter expression is more usually found with ana; cf. ana la minam (Shalm. Monol. c. ii. 43; I. R. Senn. c. ii. 17; etc.). The use of the preposition in ın̄a kāša nādi 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 פֶבֶר, Ps. lxxiii. 8; כְּמָה בְּנֵיאָם, Josh. xxiv. 14, and in the many adverbial idioms like הָבְלָל, 'hastily' (cf. also the Aramaic נַפַרנַפֶל, 'finally'). A similar usage is found in Ethiopic with ba; cf. Matth. xxviii. 8.

3. 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 ın̄a alākīka, "when thou goest" (IV. R. 17, 45, a; 24, 84b; HT. 208, no. 49); and even more vividly in ın̄a ʾištēn āmi, "on one day," ın̄a šālalṭī āmi, "on the third day," passim.§ ın̄a is used in this sense in compo-

---

* Șafāru also occurs with eĺi and with ʿiru; Sarg. Prunkinschr. 53; I. R. Senn. c. ii. 5.

† In Heb. and Arabic superposition is generally expressed by ُعٍلٍ. ُعٍلٍ.

‡ Also ana eššāti, "another"; ana pāt girmišunu, "in their entirety."

§ The preposition is not infrequently omitted; āmi, 'then.'
sition with maxar and pān for 'before,' and with tarṣu to denote a
definite point of time; cf. ina tarṣu abia, "at the time of my fathers," passim. The ina expressing duration of time ('while') is also of very
common occurrence; cf. ina kussi, "while on my throne" (I. R. Senn.
c. iii. 76); ina tārītā, "during my return" (l. c., c. i. 40); ina mitig
girriā, "during the progress of my march," etc.*

The familiar use of the Heb. תָּנָא with the infin., to express 'when,
while, although, because,' as in בָּנָא חָנוּר, "when thou comest
hither," is an exact cognate of the Assyrian idiom seen in ina alākīka.
Expressions like בָּנָא דָּבָר may be cited as parallel to ina išṭen
āmi. Duration of time ('while') is usually expressed in Heb. by בָּלָא;
e.g., Jer. xv. 9; Ps. cxxxvi. 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 ẓabé iṣātu. In this case it
appears to usurp the function of adi (I. R. Ašurn. c. iii. 19), of itti
(I. R. Tig. c. viii. 59); and of gadu (Sarg. Prunkinschr. 28).

This construction of ina has an exact counterpart in the Heb. ב
accompanied by expressions like בָּנָא בְּכָלָה, Gen. ix. 4; xv. 14;
etc., and in the common idiom בָּלָא בְּכָלָה, 'come with,' i.e. 'bring' (cf.
Arabic بِت, 'come with, bring,' etc.).

The composition of ina with balu, to express 'without,' should also
be mentioned in this connection; cf. ša ina balušu, 'without whom,'
passim. Cognate usages are the Hebrew בָּלָא and the Arabic بِلا and
بغیر.

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-
paniment 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 šuṭṭu ušabrišuma, 'in a dream I dreamed it'
during,' or by means of, a dream ?), V. R. 2, 97; ina epitu  ragaz, "who buries it in (or by means of) the dust" (I. R. 27, no. 2, 59); etc.
In such expressions as ina tukulti Ašur—alāki, "by means of the aid of
Ašur (or 'along with' ?) I went," the instrumental force of ina is more
apparent. We find it still more vividly in ina kākki ramānšu uqatt
napisitu, "he destroyed his life with (by) his own weapon" (Sarg. Cyl.
27); ša ina Ašur bēlītu akṣīdu, "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 atmūx rutā, "I seized with my hand" (I. R. Senn.
c. v. 60).

* Cf. also ša ina išṭen āmi la ʾuballāmu, "for a single day he did not let him live";
III. R. No. 6, 18.
The instrumental use of the Hebrew and Aramaic ב, as in
כְּרָנָא, Isaiah lviii. 1; also, to strike with the sword, בָּהֶרֶב, Josh. x. 11 (also Aramaic נְשָׁעַל בְּ), is well known. The idiom נָשָׁעַל ב, 'to swear by' (1 Kings i. 17, 30) has its exact equivalent in tamū īna. The Arabic and Ethiopic ba is also used instrumentally; cf. قنَّتَه بِالسَّيِف, "he slew him with the sword," and in Ethiopic, Ps. xvi. 9, "cover me with thy wings." The idiom baēda, "in the hand, by means of," is the same as the Syriac أَصَم (Nöldke, Syr. Gramm., p. 171).

5. Very nearly allied with the īna of instrument is the use of the preposition to denote the material of which a thing is made; cf. īna agurri raṣpu, "which were constructed of brick" (I. R. Tig. vi. 11); īna agurri šûnuṣat, "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 īna of cause, 'by reason of,' follows very closely on the īna of instrument, and is quite as frequently used; cf. īna qibit Ašur-anā Zamua aššunu diḵūtu, "by reason of the command of A.—I ordered an expedition against Z." (I. R. Ašurn. c. ii. 55, passim).

In this connection it should be mentioned that īna 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. īna elī ardī ša Amuše, "concerning the servant of A." (K. 486, 1, in B.A. i., p. 187), and in the epistolary literature, passim. Elī 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 īna 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, 20 mane šipātī īna pappasu Ululu, "20 m. of wool among (i. e., from) the revenue of the month Ululu" (Strm. Nbd. no. 41; B.A. i., p. 494); GUN šipātī īna pappasu ša bit Anunittu (Strm. Nbd. no. 109; B.A. i., p. 495); still more vividly: īna liḇī ša manā, 7 šiqqā ḫaspi rēxti, "from this (a sum before specified) he paid 4 m., 7 š. of silver" (Strm. Nbd. 262; B.A. i., p. 510). A passage precisely parallel to this, and illustrative of the full force of īna in this sense, is found in Strm. Nbd. 410 (B.A. i. 522), where ultu† is used instead of īna: 2š. mane šipātī, 5 šiqeq ultu ḫaspi. This explains also the extraordinary application, so common in Assyrian, of īna 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 šitā: īna liḇī ḫulu ḫutū, "they ate and drank therein" (V. R. 6, 21; IV. R. 18, 55/6); īna pšunu ḫabī luṯamman, "from their exalted mouth (i. e., by means of) let it go forth"

* We occasionally find י in this sense in Heb. as יְרִנָה יְ, Gen. ii. 19; cf. also the Arabic مَنْ ذَهَبَ, "of gold,"
† Ultu is very probably a fem. formation from the same stem as elī.
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(IV. R. 45, rev. 37/9). The most vivid use of ʾina, 'out of,' is seen in sentences like ʾina māṭi luwalliḡū, "may they destroy (his family) from the land" (l. c. 35). The construction of verbs of fleeing and fearing with ʾina pān should also be mentioned here; so with palāxu, I. R. Tig. c. iii. 17/8; Ašurn. c. ii. 118; with ipparšidu, I. R. Tig. c. v. 55/6; ʾina is also used with efēru, naqāxu, šuxubu, and other verbs. The fact that palāxu, for example, is construed with ʾīstu pān serves to illustrate the force of ʾina here as 'away from'; cf. Ašurn. c. ii. 61/2; 99.*

In agreement with the Assyrian usage, we find both in Hebrew and Aramaic the ד used idiomatically with בִּרְאָל and הָרָשֶׁה, "to eat or drink from a vessel," cf. Ps. cxli. 4; Gen. xliii. 5; and in Aramaic, Dan. v. 2.

As to the derivation of ʾina, the last word has clearly not yet been said. The numerous attempts to derive both ana and ʾina from stems containing ד, such as מִלַּל (Hincks), מָלַל (Sayce), מְלַל (Bertin), are not very satisfactory; nor does it seem necessary with Lagarde to separate the two prepositions etymologically (GGN. 1881, p. 376). It is certainly strange also to derive ana, which denotes motion towards, from a stem מְלַל, expressing motion from, as seen in the Arabic مَن; nor can the derivation of ʾina from this stem be admitted (in spite of Del., Prol. p. 182, n. 1), because the secondary meaning, 'out of, away from,' sometimes seen with ʾina, 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 ʾina the same stem as that found in the Hebrew מְלַל (ملك) and Arabic مَن. It is highly probable, as Kraetzschmar has pointed out, that the ʾina in both ʾina and ana is the demonstrative enclitic stem seen in šīnatna, which is also evident in the verbal particle ʾin = nu (BA. i., p. 397/6). His explanation of the root-vowels ʾ and ʾ as being more or less arbitrary developments from an unknown stem ' + ʾna is very satisfactory.

If this view be adopted, the striking syntactical similarity between ʾina and ד may be explained by supposing that, while the Assyrian was content merely to prefix the vowels ʾ and ʾ to the demonstrative root ʾna,† it became necessary in the other Semitic idioms to add to these combinations the distinct prepositional elements ד and ד. Traces of this are seen in the Sabaean form ד = ד, ד = ד. It must be supposed then that the final ʾ ultimately disappeared. It is decidedly not permissible to assume an aphaeresis of an original ד or ד in Assyrian;

* The verb palāxu is also construed with ana; V. R. 5, 96.
† Traces of the same demonstrative ʾna are to be found in the cognate prepositions; the Ethiopic enta (e+n+ta), the Hebrew מ (Assyr. itti), and perhaps the Arabic مَن.
that is, that ïna and ana were worn down from *bina and *lana respectively. The prepositional element י is well known in Assyrian in the combination lapân, ‘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 ïna-ana may be said in a certain sense to be actually cognate with the י and י 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 ½ to ¾ inch high; very peculiar: Ê for H; Æ and A for A; Y for Y; Z, with the bottom stroke curved. Otherwise like later Greek; Ε, Α, Λ (M), &c., being approximately the forms for these letters. No division of words. Lines run clear across. Reading:

Line 1. ἘΤΟΥΧ ΗΤΤ ΜΗΝΟΣ ΑΠΕΔΛΑΙΟΥ ΖΚ ΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ
  2. ΚΟΡΑ ΣΗΚΑΓΑΝΤΙΟΝΑ ΣΤΑΤΗΡ ΔΑΜΗ
  3. ΤΡΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΕΥΤΥΧΟΥ ΤΑΡΠ ΙΧΟΝΔΟΥ
  4. ΜΗΤΡΟΚ ΑΠΑΘΗΣ ΜΟΧΡΑΤΟΤΟ ΟΙ ΤΑΤ
  5. ΤΗΧ ΤΟΝΙΟ ΑΝΕΘΚΑΝ ΜΝΗΜΗΧ ΧΑΡΙΝ
  6. ΖΗΚΑΚΑΝ ΕΤΗ Ο ΜΕΤΑΛΛΑΞΑΚΑΝ ΔΑΙ
  7. ΤΟΥ ΖΜΥ ΤΟΥ [Μ]Η[Ν]ΟC ΑΠΕΔΛΑΙΟΥ Ε

The substance of it is that Sekagantigona, daughter of Dametrios and Socrates (here, as sometimes elsewhere, a feminine name), was born on the 27th of the month Apellaes in the year 488; that she departed this life at the age of 9 on the 5th day of the month Apellaes, 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 com-
plete (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. 126; 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, Ardash Vira i. 1-5 and Bun-
dashish 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
Namah, 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 *gna-th in Avestan; by Professor A. V. Williams Jackson.

Our chief authority for the existence of the Sanskrit root *gna-th ‘cut, pierce, kill’ in Avestan rests upon the noun *sna-tha- ‘a blow,’ snaithīṃ ‘weapon’ and upon the occurrence of the obscure form dōisnaθenīti (is it drū snathešiti, cf. M 8) in Fragm. 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. 53 seq. (Darmesteter, Le Zend-Avesta, traduc- tion iii. 47), aētahē thnasaf fbišanuha ‘he wounds through his malice.’ In this event, thnasaf would stand for snathaṭ, an assumption which is perfectly permissible on phonetic grounds. The interchange of th and s implied in th na s th at is not uncommon in later texts, cf. Jackson Av. Gram. i. 77 n 2, and consult Bartholomae Vorgeschichte § 38 n, in Geiger and Kuhn’s Grundriss d. i ran. Sprachen.


Under normal phonetic conditions *hi-sva would correspond to Sk. *sihva, Indiranic *sihva, but the actual Sk. word is jihva < Indiranic *sihva. Did Indiranic have a pair *sihva, *sihva? were both or was only one of them normal? The Sk. doublet jihva, jhūt ‘tongue’ doubtless belongs, esoterically considered, to root ḥū, hva ‘call,’ and if Indiranic *sihva be the abnormal term, there may have been beside it a *sushū. Now this term is found at VS. i. 80 in the sentence aṅgīr jihva ‘si suhūr ‘thou art Agni’s tongue, the loud-calling,’ where suhūr seems, barring a proper name, hāpax legomenon. If the Indo-Iranians had *sushū ‘tongue,’ and alongside of it *sushū ‘loud-calling’ as its epithet, then not only *sushū but also *sihva were liable to a popular change to *sushū, *sihva.

Into exoteric 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. 261 sq., for two different attempts to vindicate the relation of jihva* to γλώσσα, Lat. lingua, etc.

* What I there say of Avest. hīsva 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. 38) 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. jāniṣṭhā ugrāḥ sāhase turāya
    mandrā bājiṣṭho bāhułābhīmānaḥ
    āvārāhann īndrāṃ marūtaḥ cid ātra
    mātā yād virāḥ dadānād dhāniṣṭhā

'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 c immediately suggests the cloud-battle, and it is safe to say that if ā were blotted out, scholarly emendation would fill the gap by a reference to Ahi-Vṛtra, Indra's arch-antagonist. I therefore refer virām to Vṛtra, and mātā—dhāniṣṭhā to his mother, Dānu, noting the assonances in the names, and asking whether ātra 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;

nīodiya abhavad vṛtrāputrā
indro asya āva vādhar jabhāra
uttarā svar ādharāḥ putrā āsīd
Dānuḥ pāye sahāvatsā 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 virām to Vṛtra. Thus in RV. ii. 30. 4 Indra-Bṛhaspati is charged to slay virāṅ (demons), and here allusion to Vṛtra is indubitable; while at vii. 99. 5 Indra again slays virāṅ, where the allusion, though less definite, is certain too.
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. 77. 1-3 Indra, at birth, jātānādh, asks his mother to tell him kā ugrāḥ kē ha grāvire ‘who are mighty, who are famed;’ she thereupon points out to him the demon ahīṣwā 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 the mother addresses her new-born son:

utā mātā mahiśām ānv avenad
amā tvā juhati putra devāh
ātā bravi vṛtrām āndro hanisyān
sākhe viśṇo 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 were vain to deny that from these passages we might speak of Indra’s mother—whoever she was—as his helper in battle, and moreover, in the first passage jātāh and ugrāḥ suggest jāniṣṭhāh and ugrāh 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 Vṛtrā; but ‘may be’ is a far cry from ‘must be.’ Does the hymn contribute further in our dilemma?

Stz. 2. druhō nišattā prṇant ciḍ ēvāih
purā āṁsenu vāyāhūs tā ēirdam
abhīvṛte 'va tā mahāpadēnā
dhīntāt praptīvād ud aranta gārbhāh

Here Ludwig takes prṇant as prṇantis and corrects abhīvṛtā to abhīvṛtā, while he construes tā as inst. sg. (=tēna), remarking that “als neut. plur. ist es so gut wie sinnlos, da es sich nur um die gārbhāh handelt.” His translation runs: “in der Dhruk weise sass Prṇant [die nacht od. Prṇant?], sie erhöhten mit vilem preise Indra; das war gleichsam umhüllt vom groszen ortse, aus 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 Maruts] 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 Tagesfrüh erhoben sich die neugeborenen [Wasser].”
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 (cīd) 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 pāda a is closely parallel with i. 32. 9d: e.g., nīsattā 'crouched' is parallel with cāye lies; prapati 'close-clinging' is parallel with sahāvatasā nd dhenul 'like a cow with her calf.' I further call attention to the chiasmic arrangement of cā of stz. 1, and ab of stz. 2: a (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. rṣvā te pādā prā yāj jīgāṣṭ
dāwardhan vājā utā yē cīd ātra
tvām indra sālāyākān sahāsram
āsān dadhiṣe aśvinā vavṛtyāḥ

'Swift are thy feet as thou stridest forward,
Thou wast helped by thy steeds also that were there,
Thou, O Indra, didst a thousand Sālā-wolves
In thy mouth uptake; like to the Aśvins canst thou press onward.

Here I vary from the other translators in taking vājā as 'steeds,' thus carrying on the thought of a; and similarly at the end I take ā of aśvinā ā in the sense of 'just like' (cf. Grassmann Wört. s. v.), and so describe Indra's speed again by likening him to the Aśvins in his advance.

---

* I am inclined to follow Bloomfield (l.c., p. 24 sq.) in referring "prapitā to pīṭā 'drink,' taking prapitā here in the approximate sense of 'cloud' as a source of water. The 'cloud-children' (gārṇākā) are of course the rains. The semantic relation may be stated proportionally thus: gārṇa 'womb'; gāṛṭṣa 'child' = gāṛṭṣa 'cloud-womb'; gāṛṭṣa 'cloud-child.'

† I note the connection of Grk. γίγας with this word, comparing ἔφυρος γίγας 'rushing wind' Aesch. Ag. 692. (See Am. Jr. Phil. xiii. 226.)
Stz. 4. samanā tāṁnir upa yāśi yajñāṁ
dā nasatyā sahīyā vākiṣa
vasāvyāṁ indra dhārayāḥ sahāsrā
ācvinā pūra ṛudātur māghāni

'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 Ācvin, O hero, have given thee [a thousand] gifts.'

Stz. 5. māndamāṇa rtaḥ ādhi praṇāyaṁ
sákhibhīr indra iṣirēbhīr ārtham
ābhīr hi māya upa dāsyum āgān
mihāḥ pra ṛamrā avapat tāmāni

'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 α I construe ādhi as a verb with agāt in c, and in c I recognize two
verbs ā [agāt], and later on upa āgāt. Now as the roots i and gam with
ārtham mean 'go to work' (cf. Böhtlingk, Wört. s. v. ārthā), I
construe ādhi + gā with ārtham, followed by the datīvus commodi pra-
ṇāyaṁ. Against this construction the most pertinent objection rises
from the dissociation of ādhi and rtaḥ, of which combination we have
two other instances in RV. Still hi 'for' of c strongly implies a declarative
sentence before it, for which ādhi [agāt] seems far the most nat-
ural verb. We must assume that the pada-kāra is in error in reading
ā-agāt 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 agāt with
upa. I take ābhīr 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 ābhīr as referring to praṇāyaṁ and translating "um
ihretwillen" with Grassmann. Ludwig construes ābhīr 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 māyāḥ inst. sg. (cf. the author, Am. Jr. Phil. xv
428). I ask if the māyā of our text may not be inst. sg. with pragṛthya
vowel? Such vowels are after all a mere diacritic device, and thus nom, and inst-
in ā might be distinguished. I note the loc. in ā to -i-stems (cf. Whitney*, 138,
d, and 336, f). At any rate in x. 29. 3 manīgā ṛ is written with a pragṛthya inst.
sg. in -d. If māyāḥ can be taken as inst. sg., then it is in apposition with ābhīr:
'these as his trick.' In that case the pada text may be in error in taking
ābhīr as ā + ābhīr in place of the accented demonstrative (cf. Whitney*, 502 b).
'For by means of these (the clouds, to wit) he hath resorted to tricks, [to tricks] upon the demon he hath resorted.'

Stz. 6.  sánāmānā cid dhvasayo ny ãsmā
         āvahann indra usásō yãthā 'nah
         ṛśvair agachah sākhibhir nikāmānī
         sākām pratiṣṭhāḥ hṛ' dyā jaghantha

'The two of like names (Dasyu and Dānu?) thou didst sprinkle down here (asmā),'

Indra, thou brakest them asunder as [thou didst] the car of Uśas.
With thy swift friends thou can'st and strong,
With their cordial support (pratiṣṭhā) thou slewest—'

In sánāmānā I find still another reference to Dasyu-Vśtra and Dānu his mother. The occurrence of dāsyum in the half-stanza just preceding prepares for sánāmānā. 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 sánāmānā refer to mihās tamrāh and tāmāñṣi of the previous stanza. I note that by my explanation a mentions Indra’s enemies as c does his friends, in line with the chaotic 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 hṛādyāḥ gen. sg. fem. of hṛā- (sic).

Stz. 7.  tvāṁ jaghantha nāmucim makhasyūm
         dāsain kṛṇvānā šaye vīmāyam
         tvāṁ cakartha mānave syonān
         pathō devatrā ʾējase'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
         ʾypaṇa indra dāhiśe gābhastāu
         ānu tvā devāh pāvasā madanti
         upāribudhnān vanināc cakartha.

‘Thou hast widely extended these 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.’

* Böhtlingk defines īdām by “dieses alles, alles um uns her.” This comes very near to the first person; thus ãsmā may be looked on as a quasi-singular to ãsmē. Cf. infra, stz. 9.
† I note the common phrase “like greased lightning.” [To Prof. Whitney also, dāya suggested the same phrase.—Ed.]
‡ I take 6 to mean that Indra has won the property-rights to all his names.
Stz. 9. cakrāṁ yād asyā ṭsv ā niṣattam
    utō tád asmāī mádhiv Íc cachadyāt
    páthivyāṁ átiśitan yād údhaḥ
    páyo gōṣv ádadhā ósadhiṣu.

    'When his discus* has gone down into the water,
    Why then that will seem to this world (asmāī)† 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 ádadh ās in the aoristic sense (cf. Whitney's 929b).
    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 ádadh ās, which Grassmann emends to
    adadh ās, while Ludwig explains, with all too evident finesse, by assum-
    ing gōṣv [adadh ā] adadhā ósadhiṣu. I construe údhaḥ páyo—ádadh ās
    as a double accusative: 'thou hast rendered thy teat (into) milk.'

Stz. 10. ádvād iñyē 'ti yād vádanti
    ójaso jātām utá manya enam
    manýor iñyāya harmyēṣu tasthāu
    yātaḥ prajāyā indro asya vedā.

    '"From ádeva he came"—when men say [this]—
    From ójas 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 páda is noticeable. In b the
    writer seems to pique himself on his cleverness in defining ádeva by ójas.
    I would therefore venture to suggest that we have here a sort of riddle
    or brahmaṇḍya, which Bloomfield (JIAOS. XV. 172 sq.) explains as a sort
    of theological quiz. If this is true, we might expect to find unusual
    meanings here for ádeva and ójas.

    By prehistoric etymology ádeva might mean 'cloud' or 'water' (cf.
    1894, p. xi). I have urged (PAOS., Dec., 1894, p. clxxiii) that ádeva
    means 'liquid' at RV. viii. 26. 24. So, if Agni, the lightning, is apām
    nāpāt 'waters' son,' then it might be said of Indra, the lightning,
    ádvād iñyāya 'from water he came.' Along this line we may reconcile
    the statement of RV. ii. 35. 6a, ádevaṣya dītra jānīma, 'the birth of ádeva
    is in him' [sc. apām nāpāt], with the statement of our present stanza
    'he came from ádeva': rain and lightning are contemporaneous phenom-

* Cakrāṁ means 'wheel,' but was used in the Epic period preeminently of the
discus employed by Viṣṇu for his weapon. I propose to take it here of Indra's
thunderbolt. In Vergil's description of Vulcan's labors (Æn. 8, 429), the thun-
derbolt of Jupiter was being provided with 'spokes' (radiō).
† For asmāī 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 dvāra ‘rain,’ with dvāra ‘horse,’ and indeed both words proceeded doubtless from a common epithet dvāra ‘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, I. c. 178, note).

In páda b we can give to dvāsa also the meaning ‘water,’ not only by etymology (cf. Grk. ἑγήρ ‘wet’), but on the positive testimony of the Vedic lexicographers.*

In manyú I see the sense of ‘wrath,’ used to define dvāsa in its ordinary sense of ‘might’ more narrowly. Thus, by way of double entendre, dvāsa mediates between dvāra and manyú. We might press manyú into the sense of ‘storm’ as a display of wrath and might. In RV. x. 88 the personified Manyu is called, among other things, Várūṇa ‘sky’ (Grk. Ὄυρανος), 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 (harmyēṣu + tathāu). It even has been supposed that Agni‡ is the subject of the verbs in these pádas, 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 aṅgā veda yādi và nā veda
‘he (the supreme god) alone knows (the origin of the world)—or suppose he does not know?’

Stz. 11. váyaḥ suparnā āpa sedur indram
priyāmedhā tśayo nādhamānāḥ
āpa dhvāntām ārdhaḥ pūrdha čāksur
munugdhī āsām nādhāye’va baddhān.

‘The strong-winged birds have drawn nigh to Indra,
The Priyamedha Rishis, begging for help;
Uncover the darkness, fill thy eye (= bring back the sun),
Release us, caught in a net as it were.’

* The Nāgīrṇaṇukakāṇa, reported by Pāska, i. 12. This early Vedic commentator and lexicographer is surely as reliable in a matter of definition as Hesychius, say, in Greek.

† Have the etymologists noted that harmyā ‘house’ stands in the same semantic relation to the root hr ‘be hot’ as Latin aedes ‘house’ to aetius ‘best’?

‡ Cf. Bloomfield, I. 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? urdhvo' hy dsthād ādhyy antārūkṣē 'dhā vrtrāya prā vadhān jabhāra mihām vāsāna āpa hīm ādurot tigmāyudho ajayac chātrum 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 dva keśpa dīvo' dezmānam: “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 indro viśvadaraṇīr diviḥ gārdhena mārutenā sukṛatuh, etc.¶ Not only does the god stand on the inter-space, but even the paramā rājāsī, 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 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.
‡ RV. ii. 30. 3.
§ That Indra’s weapon is not wind but lightning is sufficiently shown by the use of acāmi (below), the bolt itself, as well as of didyut (below). Compare v. 31. 4: takṣaṇ tvāṣṭa váryam dyumántam.
¶ 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, didyut, vii. 57. 4.
†† iii. 30. 2, 11. Compare also viii. 71=82.4; 89=100. 5.
‡‡ iii. 52. 10. Compare iv. 17. 4.
Hopkins, The Real Indra of the Rig-Veda.

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 jirddānus, an expression applied to the work of the atmospheric Maruts (i. 165. 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. 8). 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. 15; 178. 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 mahāvedha; he shares with Parjanya the 'thunder' expressed by stanāyan (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, kūḍā, as have also the rain-giving Agvis and Maruts (viii. 83. 11; i. 22. 3; 87. 3; 157. 4; 168. 4); his regular epithet is rathesṭā, just as Parjanya in this hymn is rathītā. 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," RV. 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. 52. 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 "send 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. 89); while Agni does so too (vi. 13. 1; ii. 6. 8).
'whose sweat is rain.' They alone are varṣānirṇijas. In prayer, Indra-Bṛhaspati 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. 14–16, "This one" also is Indra, apparently. The form of Indra's appearance is as a rain (x. 28. 4; compare viii. 12. 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 Rīk there is perhaps all that could be expected of the rain-god. Yet in x. 98. 4 Indra sends rain (as Bṛhaspati).

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 Varuṇa 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 (mahāvadha), or more particularly, has the 'sharp gleaming' weapon 'of the sky' (lightning), peculiar to Agni and the Maruts (dīdyūṭ), or to Dyāus (açāni),§ who has the 'rain-bejewelled 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-Rīk).** 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

* ʿud īrayathā marutah samudratō ivaṁ vṛṣṭāṁ varṣayathā puriṣīnah (v. 55. 5), etc.
† Compare viii. 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 açāni belongs to Dyāus, Agni, and Indra (iii. 30. 16, and below).
‖ ii. 13. 7. Vṛtra is nādiry, but he is also svāreṣṭa, viii. 12. 26; i. 62. 2, 6.
¶ 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 occasional reference, the poet treats him no more as storm-god but as battle-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 Mountains, 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 warriortship and a promise of rich gain: yāh puspiniḥ ca pras-
vāg ca ṭharmāndāhi dāne vy āvinir dāhārayah: yāg cāsamed tījano
dīyata dīvā urūr ārohā abhitah śasy uktihyāt.†

12. Theories of Sacrifice as applied to the Rig-Veda; by Professor 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 expiation of sin, the object of his sacrifice, and his relations with his gods were reviewed. Smith’s theory of consanguinity is not found represented in Vedic hymns. Neither is the view that the gods are to be caught or to be duped by magical medicinal power one that can be referred 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, however, 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 (aḍāṅg, the bolt which strikes a tree, ii. 14. 2) is Indra’s, as in i. 54. 4, where Indra shakes “high heaven” and fights with the aḍāṅg; cf. i. 80. 13, viii. 104. 20. It belongs also to Dyāuṣ and Agni—see above. Compare also ayaṁ gṛiva ṭhaha jayann 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 Dyāuṣ with the thunderbolt smiting ... he enriches the praiser.’
† Dīvi nā keśair ādhi dhāyi hārayah vīyācād vajrā hārito nā rākhyā: haddā
dān dūrāḥ hārāpiro yā dyāmāḥ sahārāpokā abhavād dhārīmbhārd (x. 98. 4); va-
vādayāty āga dyāmā yas te vajrā ārovan (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.

18. On the legend of Indra’s visit to Medhātithi, Sāyana on RV. i. 51. 1; by Dr. Hanns Oertel, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The subrahmānyā-chant which the subrahmānyā-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 Medhātithiḥ mesā ‘ram of Medhātithi’; (2) as Vṛṣaṇāṃvasya Mene ‘Meṇā (wife?) of Vṛṣaṇācwya’; (3) as Ahalyādī jāra ‘paramour of Ahalyā’; and (4) as Kāucīka brahmāṇa Gautama brūdāṇa. I propose to say a few words with regard to the first allusion.

Sāyana 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 ŚŚ (i. 1.): medhātithih hi kāṃṣāyanīm meso bhūtvā "jahārā ‘for he (Indra) having become a ram, carried off Medhātithi the descendant of Kaṇva.’* Once he states practically the same in his own words (viii. 97. 13): indro meso bhūtvā medhātīthih 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 (meso bhūto ‘bhī yan nayah for yann ayah of the samhītā) possibly under the influence of the Greek Ganymede-legend. Without entering into this question I pass on to the other statement which Sāyana makes in connection with it (on RV. i. 51. 1): Kaṇvaputra-tram medhātithīh yajamānam īndro mesarupeṇā "gatiya tādiyam somān papādu. sa rṣis tam mēṣa ity avocat. ata idānim api mesā tī ti īndro nīhīhīyate, for which he quotes the subrahmānyā-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 Sāyana, but (1) that he repeats here a form of the legend current at the

* Cf. Sāy. on T.A. i. 12.4.
time of the Brähmanas, and (2) that, although he does not cite it, his source was the lost Cātyāyana-brähmana, 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 meṣgēti. medhātīther ha meṣo bhūtvā rājānam papānū.

(2) The second proposition rests on these considerations:

(a) The Cātyāyana-brähmana was a Sāmaveda brähmana. A material and formal correspondence to the TMB, and the JB. is, therefore, a priori probable; and in the case of the Cātyāyana brähmana 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 Brähmanas, for which the material is partly collected, I must defer till some later time.

(b) In his commentary to RV. i. 51. 12 Sāyaṇa, in explaining menā of the subrahmanya-formula, quotes from the TMB, and the Cātyāyana brähmana. This last quotation is as follows: vṛṣaṇacāya 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 phraseology in Cāt. B. and JB. (just as the story of Apālā).

Hence I conclude that the above indro meṣo bhūtvā somam papāu goes back to the Cāt. B.

14. On Klemm's edition of the Saḍviṇa brähmana; by Dr. Hanns Oertel, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The Saḍviṇa brähmana is one of the most barren of Brahmanical treatises, and Jibānanda Vidyāsāgara* 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 vss.

I. 1. 6. Read 'ga for s ōa; in the translation (p. 51) insert 'hier.'

I. 1. 8. (Trans. p. 51) 'lockt' for åha 'addresses' is too strong. The very similar passage CB. iii. 2. 1. 19 f. uses upamāntray 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, 1891.
i. 1. 18. A similar etymology of harî is found at JUB. i. 44. 5.
i. 1. 11. In the translation insert ‘so’ or ‘dann’ between ‘ihn’ and
‘herbel.’
i. 1. 17. Read gâurâ vaskandinn (cf. 23, gautama bruvâna).
i. 1. 22. Read Kauçiko and Kauçikaḥ.
i. 1. 24. na utsahe is rather ‘I cannot.’
i. 1. 27. brahmânas is ‘brahman-priests.’
i. 1. 28. I should place a period after manusyadevâ and translate
‘Gods verily are the gods, and then also these human gods. Those who
are Brahmins, learned, students, these are the human gods (read
—devâh).’

The whole khaṇḍa has a very close parallel in JB. ii. 78 ff.
i. 2. 8. Read (10. line) brahmaṇaḥ.
i. 2. 10. Read eṣa.
i. 3. 2. The quotation trayo rvâncu . . . mûtrapurîsa is to be
emended after AB. i. 20. 4, ta ime rvâncu retasyo mûtryaḥ purîṣya iti.
i. 3. 16. anubrûte rather ‘learns,’ Delbr. A.S. p. 246.
i. 3. 22. 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.’
i. 4. 4. For abhyupagramâna Jibânanda and the MS. of the P. W.
read abhyupaç—.
i. 4. 5. samârambhâya rather in its usual meaning ‘for the begin-
ning,’ as contrasted with sanâtatyâ ‘for the continuance.’
i. 4. 10 ff. JB. i. 74 ff. offers a rather close parallel.
i. 4. 16. yh + anu-vi-â, rather, as usual, ‘curse.’
i. 5. 1. Rather ‘(Saying,) “Speech is the uktha,”’ (he told it, i. e. the
uktha) to Vîcâmitra ; (saying,) “Mind is the brahman,”’ (he told it, i. e.
the brahman) to Vasiṣṭha.’ It would seem that an iti is wanting after
 mano brahma.
i. 5. 8. Read ryvedah.
i. 5. 9. Read ‘Feuern’ for ‘Fällen.’
i. 5. 10. Read trtâyam.
i. 6. 7. Read ‘durchlaufen’ for ‘durchgehen.’
i. 6. 19. Read rayînâḥ.

15. Emendations to the Jâminiya-Upanisad-Brâhmaṇa, sent in
part by Böhtlingk and in part by Roth, to the Editor, Dr. Oertel.

Of the following emendations to the Jâminiya-Upanisad-Brâhmaṇa
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 con-
sent of their authors.
Counsellor Böhtlingk's emendations:

"i. 2. 6, hätte ich janayamāno lieber gesehen, und in diesem, sowie in kurvāyāh in 7 das Medium hervorgehoben."

"i. 3. 7, lesen wir tādītarat (als Comp.) 'ein von diesem (gāyatra) verschiedene sāman,' so wird der Satz grammatisch correct."

"i. 3. 8, āsicyāt ist, wie auch Sie annehmen, verdorben. Ich nehme aber nicht nur am Precativ, sondern auch am Act. Anstoss. Man hätte āsicyeta erwartet. AQS. ii. 8. 5 steht pratiśiścēyāt, nicht āsi-, wie Sie angeben."

"i. 4. 5, ich möchte 'narthisas... rāyāh (von rā) lesen."

"iii. 19. 7, triviśtapam fehlerhaft für triviśtabhām; vgl. PW. unter triviśtapa 3) und PW. unter stabh mit vi. Dieses Wort passt hier vortrefflich."

"iv. 24. 8, atrasada gehört eher zu devatā."

Professor Roth's emendations:

"i. 4. 5, arāyyas sann api rāyām prāpnoti.

"i. 5. 7, pratyasaya, 'wie er eine Höhe (dennoch) betritt, nachdem er (zunächst) Anstoss dabei gefunden'; AQS. viii. 12. 14."

"i. 22. 8, ālopam, abs. 'bischen um bischen'."

"i. 25. 3, vātaraṇi als Grenzfluss."

"i. 38. 4, cānīlapārṇābhyaṃ, 'Holzstücke oder Zweige von ċāṇī u. pārṇa'; Kātyā. iv. 2. 1; Gobh. i. 17. 16."

"iii. 14. 2, tam ṛtavas sampalāyya padgrhitam apakarsanti 'ihn entfliehend (da er entspringen will) packen sie an Fuss und schleppen ihn weg'."

"iii. 14. 11, halte ich vidigdha für Gegensatz zu nirbhīṣṇa 'verklebt', soviel als 'verschlossen'; vgl. Āpast. Čṛ. xv. 17. 8."

"iii. 31. 10, sa | eva | alammasya | alammatā | yā | etasya | ha | alam | alam | eva, etc. u. etwa: 'alamja aila-ga singet.' Tāṇḍya xii. 10. 8, tad alammasyā 'lammaṭavam."

"iv. 1. 1, sa mā na budho 'bemerke mich nicht'."

"iv. 8. 2, caṁ tokāya tanuve."

I add a few corrections of my own:

i. 8. 12 read ayāśm for ayaśm.
i. 45 (translation) dele 4, and read 4 for 5, 5 for 6, 6 for 7.
With i. 50. 3 compare ČB. ii. 1. 1. 2.
i. 58. 8, dhīyā-dhīyā, cf. Whitney AJP. xi. 433.
With iii. 11. 1 f. compare ČB. xi. 9. 1.
iii. 14. 11 read perhaps vyṛdāham for vidigdham, cf. TS. vi. 5. 6. 1.
iii. 25. 4, cf. BĀU. iv. 3. 11, mudaḥ... pramudaḥ.
In the note to i. 45. 5 read JB. i. 10, tad yathā hiranye dhmāте ('when the gold is refined').

To note on iii. 29. 3 add reference to Ind. Stud. xiv. 190. To the note to iii. 35. 6 add that marīṣayāh occurs at JB. i. 45. 8.
Pg. 258, add to the list of etymologies: ākāṇa: /kāc + 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. lxxxi), 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 Tipiṭaka, in 89 volumes, which had already been mentioned by the Librarian. The books are printed books, and are in the Pāli 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 Tipiṭaka, sent as a present by His Majesty, Somdet Phra Paramindr Maha Chulalonkorn Phra Chula Chom Kla, 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.
    Evanston, Northwestern University.
Ind., 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.
    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.
    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 University.
    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 Tipițaka 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 39 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 Krittana-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 152 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 Vimāna-vatthu, Petavatthu, Theragāthā, Therigāthā, 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 39 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 39 volumes of the Royal Siamese Edition.

A.—Vinaya-piṭaka (8 vol’s).—Volumes 1-8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 1</td>
<td>Mahā-vibhaṅga</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 2</td>
<td>Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 3</td>
<td>Mahā-vagga</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 4</td>
<td>Culla-vagga</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 5</td>
<td>Parivāra</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>Dīgha-nikāya</td>
<td>9, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 2</td>
<td>Majjhima-nikāya</td>
<td>12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 3</td>
<td>Saṁyutta-nikāya</td>
<td>15, 16, 17, 18, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 4</td>
<td>Āguttara-nikāya</td>
<td>20, 21, 22, 23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 5</td>
<td>Khuddaka-nikāya</td>
<td>25, 26, 27, 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. 1</td>
<td>Dhammasaṅgati</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 2</td>
<td>Vibhaṅga-ppakaraṇa</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 3</td>
<td>Kathāvatthu</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 4</td>
<td>Dhātukathā</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 5</td>
<td>Puggalappaññatti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 6</td>
<td>Yamaka-ppakaraṇa</td>
<td>33, 34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 7</td>
<td>Paṭṭhāna-ppakaraṇa</td>
<td>36, 37, 38, 39</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. Terasa-kaṇḍa (the “13” Saṁghādisesa rules);
   3. Aniyata-kaṇḍa;

2. Mahā-vibhaṅga, Part ii.:
   4. Nissaggiya-kaṇḍa;
   5. Pācittiya-kaṇḍa;
   6. Paṭidesaniya-kaṇḍa;
   7. Sekhiya-kaṇḍa.

3. Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga:
   1. Pārājika-kaṇḍa;
   2. Sattarasa-kaṇḍa (the “17” Saṁghādisesa rules);
   3. Nissaggiya-kaṇḍa;
   4. Pācittiya-kaṇḍa;
   5. Paṭidesaniya-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. Civara-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. Saṅghabheda-kkhandhaka;
   8. Vatta-kkhandhaka;
   9. Pātimokkhaṭṭhapana-kkhandhaka;
   10. Bhikkhuni-kkhandhaka;
   11. Pañcasatika-kkhandhaka;
8. Parivāra.

B.—Suttanta-piṭaka.
9. Dīgha-nikāya, Part i., Silakkhandha-vagga:
   1. Brahmajāla-sutta;
   2. Sāmaññaphala-sutta;
   3. Ambatṭha-sutta;
   4. Soṇadaṇḍa-sutta;
   5. Kūṭadanta-sutta;
   6. Mahāli-sutta;
   7. Jāliya-sutta;
   8. Mahā-sīhanāda-sutta;
   9. Poṭṭhapaḍa-sutta;
   10. Subha-sutta;
   11. Kevaṭṭa-sutta;
   12. Lohicca-sutta;
10. Dīgha-nikāya, Part ii., Mahā-vagga:
   1. Mahāpadāna-sutta;
   2. Māhānidāna-sutta;
   3. Mahāparinibbāna-sutta;
   4. Mahāsudassana-sutta;
   5. Janavasabhā-sutta;
   6. Mahāgovinda-sutta;
   7. Mahāsamaya-sutta;
   8. Sakkapāñha-sutta;
   9. Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna-sutta;
11. Dīgha-nikāya, Part iii., Pāṭika-vagga:
   1. Pāṭika-sutta;
   2. Udumbarika-sutta;
   3. Cakkavatti-sutta;
   4. Aggaṇīṇa-sutta;
   5. Sampasādanīya-sutta;
   6. Pāsādika-sutta;
   7. Lakkhaṇa-sutta;
   8. Singūlaka-sutta;
   9. Āṭānāṭiya-sutta;
Volume.
10. Saṅgiti-sutta;
11. Dasuttara-sutta.

12. Majjhima-nikāya, Part i., Mūla-paṇṇāsaka:
1. Mūlapariyāya-vagga;
2. Sīhapāda-vagga;
3. Opanna-vagga;
4. Mahāyamaka-vagga;
5. Cūlayamaka-vagga.

13. 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. Suññata-vagga;
4. Vibhāṅga-vagga;
5. Salāyatana-vagga.

15. Saṁyutta-nikāya, Part i., Sagātha-vagga:
1. Devatā-saṁyutta;
2. Devaputta-saṁyutta;
3. Kosala-saṁyutta;
4. Māra-saṁyutta;
5. Bhikkhuni-saṁyutta;
6. Brahma-saṁyutta;
7. Brāhmaṇa-saṁyutta;
8. Vaṅgisa-saṁyutta;
9. Vana-saṁyutta;
10. Yakka-saṁyutta;
11. Sakka-saṁyutta.

16. Saṁyutta-nikāya, Part ii., Nidāna-vagga:
1. Abbhisamaya-saṁyutta (Feer, 12 and 18);
2. Dhātu-saṁyutta (14);*
3. Anamatagga-saṁyutta (15);
4. Kassapa-saṁyutta (16);
5. Lābhasakkāra-saṁyutta (17);
6. Rāhula-saṁyutta (18);
7. Lakkhapas-saṁyutta (19);
8. Opanma-saṁyutta (20);

17. Saṁyutta-nikāya, Part iii., Khandhavāra-vagga:
1. Khandha-saṁyutta (22);*

*With 3 paṇṇāsas, each of 5 vagga’s. See Feer’s edition, vol. 3, “Contents” and “Introduction.” So the Salāyatana-saṁyutta (35) fills more than half of volume 18.
Volume.
2. Rādha-saṁyutta (23);
3. Diṭṭhi-saṁyutta (24);
4. Okkanta-saṁyutta (25);
5. Uppāda-saṁyutta (26);
6. Kīlesa-saṁyutta (27);
7. Sāriputta-saṁyutta (28);
8. Nāga-saṁyutta (29);
9. Supaṭṭha-saṁyutta (30);
10. Gandhabbakāya-saṁyutta (31);
11. Valāhaka-saṁyutta (32);
12. Vacchagotta-saṁyutta (33);

18. Saṁyutta-nikāya, Part iv., Saḷāyatanavagga:
1. Saḷāyatanasaṁyutta (35);
2. Vedaṇā-saṁyutta (36);
3. Mātugāma-saṁyutta (37);
4. Jambukhādaka-saṁyutta (38);
5. Sāmaṇḍaka-saṁyutta (39);
6. Mogallāna-saṁyutta (40);
7. Cittagahapatipucca-saṁyutta (41);
8. Gāmangisaṁyutta (42);
9. Asāṅkhata-saṁyutta (43);
10. Abyākata-saṁyutta (44).

19. Saṁyutta-nikāya, Part v., Mahāvāra-vagga:
1. Magga-saṁyutta;
2. Bojjhāṅga-saṁyutta;
3. Satipaṭṭhāna-saṁyutta;
4. Indriya-saṁyutta;
5. Sāmappadhāna-saṁyutta;
6. Bala-saṁyutta;
7. Iddhipāda-saṁyutta;
8. Anuruddha-saṁyutta;
9. Jhāna-saṁyutta;
10. Ānāpāna-saṁyutta;
11. Sotāpatti-saṁyutta;

20. Aṅguttara-nikāya, Part i.:
1. Eka-nipāta;
2. Duka-nipāta;
3. Tiṅka-nipāta;

21. Aṅguttara nikāya, Part ii.:
4. Cātukka-nipāta;

22. Aṅguttara-nikāya, Part iii.:
5. Pañcaka-nipāta;
6. Chakkha-nipāta;

23. Aṅguttara-nikāya, Part iv.:
7. Sattaka-nipāta;
8. Aṭṭhaka-nipāta;
9. Nāvaka-nipāta;
Volume.
24. Aṅguttara-nikāya, Part v.:  
   10. Dasa-nipāta;  
   11. Ekaṁasa-nipāta.
25. Khuddaka-nikāya, Part i.:  
   1. Khuddaka-pāṭha;  
   2. Dhamma-pada;  
   3. Udāna;  
   4. Ivvuttaka;  
   5. Sutta-nipāta.
26. Khuddaka-nikāya, Part ii., Mahā-niddesa:  
   Aṭṭhaka-vaggika:*
      1. Kāma-sutta-niddesa;  
      2. Guhaṭṭhaka-sutta-niddesa;  
      3. Duṭṭhaṭṭhaka-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. Tuvātaka-sutta-niddesa;  
     15. Atta-dāpā-sutta-niddesa;  
27. Khuddaka-nikāya, Part iii., Cūla-niddesa:  
   Pāraśyana-vagg:†
      1. Vattthu-gāthā:  
      2. Ajita-mañavaka-panhā-niddesa;  
      3. Tissameyya-mañavaka-panhā-niddesa;  
      4. Puṇṇaka-mañavaka-panhā-niddesa;  
      5. Mettagū-mañavaka-panhā-niddesa;  
      6. Dhotaka-mañavaka-panhā-niddesa;  
      7. Upasīva-mañavaka-panhā-niddesa;  
      8. Nanda-mañavaka-panhā-niddesa;  
      9. Hemaka-mañavaka-panhā-niddesa;  

*The Aṭṭhaka-vaggika is the fourth book of the Sutta-nipāta, and has sixteen suttas, which correspond in their titles and in their order to the sixteen niddesa's.
†The Pāraśyana-vagg is the fifth book of the Sutta-nipāta. Besides the vattthu-gāthā, it has sixteen puṇccha's, corresponding in the names and the order to the sixteen paṇhā's whose niddesa's are here enumerated.—The Khagga-visānasutta is the third of the first book of the Sutta-nipāta.
Volume.
10. Todeyya-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
11. Kappa-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
12. Jatakuṇḍī-māṇavaka-pañhā-niddesa;
13. Bhadrāvudha-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., Paṭissambhidā-magga:
   Mahāvagga:
   1. Nāṇa-kathā;
   2. Diṭṭhi-kathā;
   3. Ānāpāna-kathā;
   4. Indriya-kathā;
   5. Vimoṭṭha-kathā;
   6. Gati-kathā;
   7. Kamma-kathā;
   8. Vipaṭṭhāsa-kathā;
   9. Magga-kathā;
   10. Māṇḍapeya-kathā.

Yuganaddha-vagga:
   1. Yuganaddha-kathā;
   2. Sacca-kathā;
   3. Bojhāṅga-kathā;
   4. Mettā-kathā;
   5. Virāga-kathā;
   6. Paṭissambhidā-kathā;
   7. Dhammacakkha-kathā;
   8. Lokuttara-kathā;
   9. Bala-kathā;
  10. Sutta-kathā.

Paññā-vagga:
   1. Mahāpaññā-kathā;
   2. Iddhi-kathā;
   3. Abhisamaya-kathā;
   4. Viveka-kathā;
   5. Cariyā-kathā;
   6. Paṭihāriya-kathā;
   7. Samaeśa-kathā;
   8. Satipaṭṭhāna-kathā;
   9. Vipassanā-kathā;
  10. Mātika-kathā.

C.—Abhidhamma-piṭaka.

29. Dhamma-saṅgāni.
30. Vibhaṅga-ppakaraṇa.
31. Kathā-vatthu.
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 Cālidās, 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 Sanscritum praelo 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], inventur, codicis manuscripti instar aestimandum est.' There follows Jones's "preface" entire. And Gildemeister, in his 'Bibliothecae Sanskritae Specimen' (Bonn, 1847, p. 70), says: "Liber sanscritus omnium qui typis exscripti sunt primus isque rarissimus."

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, 1793).

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 Yayâti; by Professor Lanman.

Read by title.
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.
Aitareya Brâhmaṇa of the Rig Veda. Vol. i. 3–5, ii. 1–3.
Aniruddha’s commentary, translated. Fasc. 3.
Ayadána Kalpalatá. Vol. i. 4, 5, ii. 3, 4.
Byhadr-Dharma Puráṇam. Fasc. 4, 5.
Madana Pārijáta. Fasc. 11.
Nyáya-Kusumánjali-Prakaraṇam. Vol. ii. 3.
Nyáya Várttikam. Fasc. 2.
Parás’ara Smýti. Vol. iii. 4.
S’ránta Sútra of S’ámkháyana. Vol. iii. 1–3.
Táltitírýa Sanhítá. Fasc. 38.
American Oriental Society.

Tul’ei Šat’sai. Fasc. 4.
Vṛhat Svacambhū Purāṇam. Edited by Paṇḍit Haraprasād Śāstṛ. Vol. i.
1-4. 8".
Appendix to Pag-Sam Thi S'în. Fasc. 4.
Sher Phyn. Vol. iii. 1.
Āfān i Akbari, translated. Vol. iii. 2-5.
Māsir-ul-Umara. Vol. i, 10, 11, (index), iii, 11, 12, (index).
Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh, translated from the original Persian by Surgeon-
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.
Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. No. 49, 49a, 50,
51. Bombay, 1892-95. 8°.

From the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. No. 40, 41, 43-45
index to vol. i-ix. Colombo, 1893-95. 8°.

From the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
xxv, xxvi. Shanghai, 1893-94. 8°.

From the Asiatic Society of Japan.
Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan. Vol. xxii-xxviii, xxviiii supplement;
genèral index to vol. i-xxiii. Tōkyō, 1893-95. 8°.

From the Asiatic Society of Paris.

From the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences.
Deel xlvi, xlviii, 1. Batavia, 1892-94.
Notulen van de algemeenen en bestuurs-ergaderingen. Deel xxix, 4, xxx, xxx,
Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde. Deel xxxv, 2-6, xxxvi,
Dagb.register gehouden int casteel Batavia, 1664, 1665. Door J. A. van der
Nederlandsch-Indisch plakaatboek, 1602-1811. Door J. A. van der Chijs. Deel
Catalogus der ethnologische verzameling. 4. druk, supplement. Batavia, 1894. 8°.
From the Royal Academy of Sciences, Berlin.

From the Royal Library, Berlin.
Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin:

From Mr. C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh.

From R. G. Bhandarkar, Ph.D.

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 Archaeology.

From James L. Bowes, Esq.

From Prof. P. 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 Peshotan Sanjana. Bombay, 1892. 8°.

From the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press.


The Jñātaka; 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.

Reisebeschreibung über die Krim. Von E. Deinard. Warschau, 1881. 8°. [Hebrew.]
Reise durch Europa. Von E. Deinard. Pressburg, 1886. 8°. [Hebrew.]
"War of the Lord against Amalek." [Against the use of the Ehrog (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 tomas quintus quo continenter libri apocryphi. Ad libr um MSS. fidel em 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.

Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. Bd. ix, 4, x, 1. Leipzig, 1893-95. 8°
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 tsun sheng yu'g'eh sie ts'ian hwa]. Hankow, 1891. 4°.

From Prof. Ignazio Guidi.

Proverbi, strofe 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 Bhatteprōjulu Gudi-vāda and Ghaṇṭās’āla. . . By Alex. Rea. Madras, 1894. 8°.

Progress report of the Archaeological Survey of Western India, May, 1893, to April, 1894. 4°.


Discovery of the exact site of As’oka’s classic capital of Pātaliputra, the Palîbothis 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. f°.


Report on publications issued and registered in the several provinces of British India during 1892, 1893, 1894. Calcutta, 1893-95. f°.

Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. existing in Oudh province for the year 1889, 1890. Allahabad, 1893. 8°.


Descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the library of the Calcutta Sanskrit College. By Hrishikesa S'astri and Siva Chandra Gu'i. No. i-iii. Calcutta, 1892-95. 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 floodtablet:

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 Chessed. New York, 1894. 8°.


From Prof. E. Kuhn.

Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. Ed. xxxi, 3, 4, xxxii, xxxiii, xxxiv, 1, 2. Göttingen, 1892-95. 8°.

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. Jiwaji Jamshedji Modi

Modi, J. J. Astôdân, and recorded instances of children having been nourished by wolves and birds of prey. Bombay, 1889. 8°.

———Dante and Virâf, and Gardis and Kâhus. Bombay, 1892. 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-samhitâ: the sacred hymns of the Brâhmans, together with the commentary of Sâyañâkârya. 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.


v. 12, Cent-dix lettres grecques de François Filètta publiées intégralement pour la première fois d’après le Codex Triulzianus 873 avec traduction, notes et commentaires par Émile Legrand. Paris, 1892. 8°.

v. 13, Description topographique et historique de Boukharâ par Mohammed Ner-châkhî, suivie de textes relatifs à la Transoxiane. Texte persan publié par Charles Schefer. Paris, 1892. 8°.


From the Musée Guimet, Paris.


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.

Additions to the Library.

From Rev. S. D. Peet.
The American Antiquarian. Vol. xv. 2-6, xvi, xvii, xviii, l. Chicago and Good Hope, Ill., 1893-95. 8°.

From the Peking Oriental Society.

From Mr. Jeajeebboy Framjee Petit.
The Dinâ-i-Mainû-i-Khrât; or, The religious decisions of the spirit of wisdom. The Pahlavi text, edited with an introduction, etc., by Darab Dastur Peshotan 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. Pullá.

From the Geographical Society of Quebec.

From the Geographische Verlagshandlung Dietrich Reimer, Berlin.

From the National Museum of Rio de Janeiro.
From Dr. S. Roubin.

A scroll of the law, supposed to have been written by Maimonides. Explanations by Dr. S. Roubin. San Francisco, n. d. 8°.

From Pratépa 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 Peshotan Sanjana.

From the Royal Saxon Society of Sciences.
Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Bd. xiii. 4-7, xiv, xv, xvi. 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 P. W. Hodge. Washington, 1894. 8°.

From the Editor, Maj. Richard C. Temple.
The Indian Antiquary. Vol. xxi, xxii, i-7, 9, 11, 12, xxiii, xxiv. Bombay, 1892-95. 4°.

From Prof. Vilhelm Thomsen.
American Oriental Society.

From the United States Geological Survey.


From the United States Bureau of Education.

—Catalogue of "A. L. A." library; 5000 volumes for a popular library, selected by the American Library Association and shown at the World's Columbian Exposition. Washington, 1893. 8°.

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°.


— Weitere Beiträge zur Erklärung des Zend. Göttingen, 1852–53. 16°.


— Ein erster Versuch über den Accent im Sanskrit. St. Petersbourg, 1848. 4°. [Bound with the above.]

— Die Uṇādi-Affixe. St. Petersbourg, 1844. 4°. [Bound with the above.]


—Appendice aux Rudimens... contenant... des lettres hindoustani originales, accompagnées d’une traduction et de fac-simile. Paris, 1833. 4°.
[Bound with the above.]
—Über die Metrik des jüngeren Avesta. Tübingen, 1877. 8°.
Hall, Fitzedward. A contribution towards an index to the bibliography of the Indian philosophical systems. Calcutta, 1859. 8°.
Hayden, F. V. Contributions to the ethnography and philology of the Indian tribes of the Missouri valley. Philadelphia, 1892. 4°.
Hübbschmann, H. Das Indogermanische Vocalsystem. Strassburg, 1885. 8°.
Iqwarda Krishana. The Sankhya Kârikâ; or, Memorial verses on the Sankhya philosophy. Translated by H. J. Colebrooke. Also the Bhâsha; or, Commentary of Gaurapâda; translated by H. H. Wilson. Oxford (printed for the Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland), 1837. 4°.
Additions to the Library.


Actes du sixième Congrès international des Orientalistes, tenu en 1883 à Leide. 1°–4° partie. Leide, 1884-85. 8°.


Locman. Fabulae quae circumferuntur, annotationibus criticis et glossario explicantibus ab Aemilio Roedigerō. Halis Saxoniæ, 1830. sm. 4°.


Martins, Dr. Carl Frederich Phil. v. Beiträge zur Etnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerika’s zumal Brasiliens. Leipzig, 1867. 2 v. 8°.


[Mills, Lawrence H. A Study of the Zoroastrian (Zoroastrian) Gāthās, with texts and translations, also with the Pahlavi translation for the first time edited with collation of manuscripts... Proof-sheets of part i, (pp. 1–393), issued in 1882.]

Müller, Dr. Friedrich. Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft. Bd. i, Abth. 1, 2; Bd. ii, Abth. 1; Bd. iii, Abth. 1. Wien, 1878–84. 8°.
Schleicher, A. Linguistische Untersuchungen. II. Die Sprachen Europas in systematischer Uebersicht. Bonn, 1850. 8°.
— Same. 2. vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig, 1881. 8°.
Udayana Aćhārya. The Kusumānant; or, Hindu proof of the existence of a Supreme Being, with the commentary of Hari Dāsa Bhattachārya, edited and translated by E. B. Cowell, assisted by Pandita Mahes’a Chandra Nyāyaratna. Calcutta, 1864. 8°.
Uhlemann, Max Ad. Linguae Copticae grammatica cum chrestomathia et glossario. Insertae sunt observationes quasdam de veterum Aegyptiorum grammaticae. Lipsiae, 1853. 8°.
— De veterum Aegyptiorum lingua et litteris sive, De optima signa hieroglyphica explicandi via atque ratione. Accedunt indices et vocabularii hieroglyphici specimen. Lipsiae, 1851. 8°. [Bound with the above.]


Zeißberger, David. Indian dictionary: English, German, Iroquois—the Onondaga, and Algonquin—the Delaware. Printed from the original manuscript in Harvard College Library. [Edited by Eben Norton Horsford.] Cambridge, 1887. 4°.


From Mr. John Henry Wigmore.


From the Society for inquiring into the Zoroastrian Religion, Bombay.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

1895.

The number placed after the address indicates the year of election.

I. HONORARY MEMBERS.

Prof. Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, Dekkan Coll., Poona, India. 1887.
His Excellency, Otto Boehtlingk, 35 Seeburg St., Leipzig, Germany. 1844.
Prof. Georg Buehler, Univ. of Vienna, Austria. Corresp. Member, 1876; Hon., 1887.
Dr. Antonio Maria Ceriani, Ambrosian Library, Milan, Italy. 1890.
Prof. Berthold Delbrueck, Univ. of Jena, Germany. 1878.
Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch, Leipzig, Germany. 1898.
Prof. Ignazio Guidi, Rome, Italy. 1893.
Prof. Hendrik Kern, Leyden, Netherlands. 1893.
Prof. Franz Kielhorn, Univ. of Goettingen, Germany. 1887.
Prof. Theodor Noeldeke, Univ. of Strassburg, Germany. 1878.
Prof. Jules Oppert, Paris, France. 1893.
Dr. Reinhold Rost, 1 Elsworthy Terrace, Primrose Hill, London, England. 1893.
Prof. Rudolph Roth, Univ. of Tübingen, Germany. Corresp. Member, 1848; Hon., 1869.
Prof. Eduard Sachau, Univ. of Berlin, Germany. 1887.
Prof. Eberhard Schrader, Univ. of Berlin, Germany. 1890.
Prof. Friedrich Spiegel, Munich, Germany. Corresp. Member, 1868; Hon., 1869.
Prof. Albrecht Weber, Univ. of Berlin, Germany. Corresp. Member, 1890; Hon., 1869.
Prof. Ernst Windisch, Univ. of Leipzig, Germany. 1890.
II. CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Names marked with + are those of life members.

REV. CORNELIUS STEVENSON ABBOTT (St. Peter’s Church), 347 State St.,
Brooklyn, N. Y. 1891.


NAKEE J. ARBEE, 45 Pearl St., New York, N. Y. 1893.

Mrs. EMMA J. ARNOLD, 29 Greene St., Providence, R. I. 1894.

WILLIAM R. ARNOLD, 41 East 69th St., New York, N. Y. 1893.

Dr. ROBERT ARROWSMITH, 236 Degrave St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1884.

Rev. EDWARD E. ATKINSON (Episcopal Theo. School), 1 Lawrence Hall,
Cambridge, Mass. 1894.

IRVING BARRITT (Harvard Univ.), 65 Hammond St., Cambridge, Mass. 1892.

Prof. MARK BAILLIE, Jr. (State Univ. of Washington), 2200 4th St., Seattle,
Wash. 1891.

Miss ANNIE L. BABBIT, 715 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1892.

Prof. GEORGE A. BARTON, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1888.

Prof. L. W. BATTEN (Episcopal Divinity School), 4805 Regent St., Philadel-
phia, Pa. 1894.

Rev. DANIEL M. BATES, St. Stephen’s Rectory, Clifton Heights, Pa. 1890.

Hon. TRUXTON BEALE, Rancho del Tejon, P. O. Bakersfield, Kern Co., Cal.
1894.

Prof. CHARLES W. BENTON, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. 1890.

JOSEPH F. BERG, Montgomery, Orange Co., N. Y. 1893.

Dr. HEINRICH O. BIERWIRTH (Harvard Univ.), 38 Weld Hall, Cambridge,
Mass. 1893.

Dr. WILLIAM STURGIS BIGELOW, 60 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1894.

Prof. JOHN BINNEY, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. 1887.

Rev. DAVID BLAUSCHN, 20 Summer St., Providence, R. I. 1891.

Prof. MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
1881.

LESTER BRADNER, JR., 12 West 11th St., New York, N. Y. 1889.

Prof. JOHN EVERETT BRADY, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1890.

J. HENRY BREASTED, 515, 62nd St., Englewood, Chicago, Ill. 1891.

Prof. CHAS. A. BRIGGS, 120 West 93rd St., New York, N. Y. 1879.


Prof. CHAS. RUFUS BROWN, Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre,
Mass. 1886.

Prof. FRANCIS BROWN, Union Theological Seminary, 700 Park Ave., New
York, N. Y. 1881.

Prof. CARL DARLING BUCK, 5748 Madison Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1892.

Prof. M. M. D. BUELL, 72 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass. 1890.

Prof. S. BURNHAM, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1886.


Prof. HENRY E. BURTON, Rochester University, Rochester, N. Y. 1881.

Prof. GEORGE R. CARPENTER, Columbia College, New York, N. Y. 1894.
Prof. A. S. Carriger, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill. 1890.
Miss Eva Channing, Jamaica Plain, Mass. 1888.
Dr. Frank Dyer Chester (Harvard Univ.), Hotel Bristol, Boston, Mass. 1881.
Rev. Edson L. Clark, Hinsdale, Mass. 1867.
Wm. Emmette Coleman, Chief Quartermaster's Office, San Francisco, Cal. 1885.

George Wetmore Colles, 231 Schermerhorn St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1882.
Prof. Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1887.
Samuel Victor Constant, 420 West 23d St., New York, N. Y. 1890.
Dr. Frederic Taber Cooper, 177 Warburton Ave., Yonkers, N. Y. 1892.
Miss Lutie Rebecca Corwin, Mt. Holyoke Seminary, South Hadley, Mass. 1895.
Clark Eugene Crandall (Univ. of Chicago), 5455 Monroe Ave., Hyde Park, Chicago, Ill. 1886.
Rev. Oliver Crane, 12 Concord Square, Boston, Mass. 1866.
Prof. Angus Crawford, Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va. 1892.
Stewart Culin (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 127 South Front St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1888.
Prof. Edward L. Curtis (Yale Univ.), 61 Trumbull St., New Haven, Conn. 1890.
Olaus Dahl, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1889.
Dr. Chas. H. S. Davis, Meriden, Conn. 1893.
Prof. John D. Davis, Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. 1888.
Prof. George E. Day (Yale Univ.), 125 College St., New Haven, Conn. 1848.
Rev. Ephraim Deinard, 38 Windsor St., Kearny, N. J. 1894.
Dr. P. L. Armand de Potter, 1122 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1880.
Rev. Dr. Samuel F. Dike, Bath, Me. 1888.
Epes Sargent Dixwell, 58 Garden St., Cambridge, Mass. 1848.
Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, 9 Cliff St., New York, N. Y. 1867.
Prof. Henry Drisler, 48 West 46th St., New York, N. Y. 1888.
Rev. Dr. George S. Duncan, 1208 North Second St., Harrisburg, Pa. 1895.
Samuel F. Dunlap, 18 West 22nd St., New York, N. Y. 1854.
Harry Westbrooke Dunning, 7 St. John St., Jamaica Plain, Mass. 1894.
Dr. August Hjalmar Edgren (University of Nebraska), Lincoln, Neb. 1876.
Carl J. Elofson, 8828 Eighth Ave., Rock Island, Ill. 1891.
Prof. Levi H. Edwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1883.
Prof. CHARLES CARROLL EVERETT (Harvard Univ.), 58 Garden St., Cambridge, Mass. 1859.


Prof. HENRY FERGUSON, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1876.


FRANK B. FORBES, 56 Rue de la Victoire, Paris, France. 1864.

Hon. JOHN M. FORBES, 80 Sears Building, Boston, Mass. 1847.

Miss MAUDE FORTESCUE, 57 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1890.

JAS. EVERETT FRAME, 80 White St., East Boston, Mass. 1892.

Prof. ARTHUR L. FROTHINGHAM, Jr., Coll. of N. J., Princeton, N. J. 1888.

HENRY LEE GILBERT, 3508 Hamilton St., West Philadelphia, Pa. 1892.

Prof. BASIL L. GILDERBREEF, Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. 1888.

Rev. DANIEL COIT GILMAN, Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. 1867.

RALPH L. GOODRICH, Clerk of the U. S. Courts, Little Rock, Ark. 1888.

CHARLES J. GOODWIN, Wesleyan Univ., Middletown, Conn. 1889.

Prof. WILLIAM WATSON GOODWIN (Harvard Univ.), 5 Follen St., Cambridge, Mass. 1857.

Prof. RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL (Columbia Coll.), 169 West 83d St., New York, N. Y. 1886.

Rev. JOHN T. GRAECEY, 177 Pearl St., Rochester, N. Y. Corresp. Member, 1869 ; Corp., 1877.

JACOB GRAPE, Jr., 430 East 20th St., Baltimore, Md. 1888.


Miss LUCIA GRAEVE GRIEVE, 157 East 49th St., New York, N. Y. 1894.

Dr. J. B. GROSSMANN, 138 North Sixth St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1894.

Rabbi Dr. LOUIS GROSSMANN, Temple Beth El, Detroit, Mich. 1890.

Rev. LEWIS GROUT, West Brattleboro, Vt. Corresp. Member, 1849 ; Corp., 1862.

CHAS. F. GUNTER, 212 State St., Chicago, Ill. 1889.

The Right Rev. CHAS. R. HALE, Bishop of Cairo, Cairo, Ill. 1860.

Prof. ISAAC HOLLISTER HALL, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fifth Ave. and 83d St., New York, N. Y. 1874.

Dr. ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1888.

Rev. WILLIAM RAINNEY HARPER, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1885.

Prof. SAMUEL HART, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

Dr. WILLABE HASSELL, 96 Dwight St., New Haven, Conn. 1877.

WILLIAM W. HASTINGS, Haverford, Penn. 1893.

Prof. PAUL HAUPT (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 3811 Linden Ave., Baltimore, Md. 1888.


Rev. WILLIS HATFIELD HAZARD, West Chester, Pa. 1898.

Col. THOS. WENTWORTH HIGGINS, 25 Buckingham St., Cambridge, Mass. 1889.

Prof. HERMANN V. HILPRECHT (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 403 South 41st St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1887.
Prof. Edward Washburn Hopkins (Yale Univ.), 251 Lawrence St., New
Haven, Conn. 1881.
Prof. James M. Hoppin (Yale Univ.), 47 Hillhouse Ave., New Haven, Conn.
1862.
Rev. Samuel R. House, Waterford, N. Y. Corresp. Member, 1855; Corp.,
---
Montague Howard, 264 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1891.
George Carter Howland, 5735 Washington Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1887.
Dr. Abel H. Huizinga (McCormick Theological Seminary), 8 Chalmers
Place, Chicago, Ill. 1890.
Miss Annie K. Humphrey, 1114, 14th St., Washington, D. C. 1878.
Prof. Henry Hyvernat (Catholic Univ. of America), Washington, D. C.
1889.
Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson (Columbia Coll.), 16 Highland Place, Yonkers,
N. Y. 1885.
Rev. Marcus Jastrow, 65 West Upsal St., Germantown, Pa. 1887.
Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr. (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 248 South 23d St.,
Rev. Henry F. Jenks, P. O. Box 149, Canton, Mass. 1874.
Dr. James Richard Jewett (Univ. of Minnesota), 266 Summit Ave., St.
Paul, Minnesota 1887.
Prof. Joshua A. Joaffé (Jewish Theological Seminary), 730 Lexington Ave.,
New York, N. Y. 1894.
Dr. Christopher Johnston (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 1620 North Calvert St.,
Baltimore, Md. 1889.
Prof. Maximilian Lindsay Kellner, Episcopal Theological School, Cam-
bridge, Mass. 1886.
Rev. Samuel H. Kellogg, Theological Seminary, Toronto, Ontario. Cor-
resp. Member, 1872; Corp., 1877.
Dr. Charles F. Kent (Brown Univ.), 1 College Court, Providence, R. I.
1890.
Prof. Charles Rockwell Lanman (Harvard Univ.), 9 Farrow St., Cam-
bridge, Mass. 1876.
Thomas B. Lawler, 39 May St., Worcester, Mass. 1894.
Caspar Levias, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1892.
Robert Lilley, 72 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1894.
Prof. Thomas B. Lindsay, Boston Univ., Boston, Mass. 1883.
Gen'l Charles G. Loring (Museum of Fine Arts), 1 Mt. Vernon Place,
Boston, Mass. 1877.
Miss Helen L. Lovell, Flint, Mich. 1892.
Prof. Jules Luquiens (Yale Univ.), 219 Whalley Ave., New Haven, Conn.
1879.
Prof. David Gordon Lyon (Harvard Univ.), 9 Buckingham St., Cambridge, Mass. 1883.
Prof. Duncan B. Macdonald (Hartford Theological Seminary), 181 Laurel St., Hartford, Conn. 1893.
Prof. Herbert W. Magoun (Oberlin College), 115 West Lorain St., Oberlin, O. 1887.
Dr. Max L. Margolis, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O. 1890.
Prof. Allan Marquand, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J. 1888.
Prof. David C. Marquis (McCormick Theological Seminary), 322 Belden Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1890.
Rev. Dwight W. Marsh, Amherst, Mass. Corresp. Member, 1852; Corp., 1867.
Prof. Winfred Robert Martin, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1889.
Prof. Chas. Marsh Mead, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. 1867.
Dr. Alfred Bernard Moldenke, care of Dr. C. E. Moldenke, 124 East 46th St., New York, N. Y. 1892.
Dr. Charles E. Moldenke, 124 East 46th St., New York, N. Y. 1885.
Prof. Clifford H. Moore, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1893.
Prof. George F. Moore, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. 1887.
Paul Elmer More, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1893.
Prof. Edward S. Morse, Salem, Mass. 1894.
Isaac Myer, 21 East 60th St., New York, N. Y. 1888.
George Nathan Newman, 288 Linwood Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1891.
Dr. Hanns Oertel (Yale Univ.), 31 York Sq., New Haven, Conn. 1890.
George N. Olcott, Columbia Coll., New York, N. Y. 1892.
John Orne, 104 Ellery St., Cambridge, Mass. 1890.
Prof. Lewis B. Paton, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. 1894.
Dr. Charles Peabody, 197 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass. 1892.
Rev. Stephen D. Peet, Good Hope, Ill. 1881.
Rev. Ismar J. Peritz, 710 Madison St., Syracuse, N. Y. 1894.
Prof. Edward Delavan Perry (Columbia Coll.), 188 East 55th St., New York, N. Y. 1879.
Prof. John P. Peters, 225 West 89th St., New York, N. Y. 1882.
Prof. David Phillipson, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O. 1889.
Prof. Samuel Hall Platter, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. 1885.
Murray Anthony Potter, 508 California St., San Francisco, Cal. 1898.
List of Members.

Prof. IRA M. PRICE (Univ. of Chicago), Morgan Park, Ill. 1887.
Prof. JOHN DYNELEY PRINCE (University of the City of New York), 19 West 34th St., New York, N. Y. 1888.
Rev. F. P. RAMSAY, Augusta, Ky. 1889.
Dr. GEORGE ANDREW REISNER (John Harvard Fellow of Harvard University),
6 Feurig St., Friedenau, Berlin, Germany. 1891.
Dr. HUGO ALBERT RENNERT (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 539 North 18th St.,
Dr. CHARLES RICE, Bellevue Hospital, New York, N. Y. 1875.
EDWARD ROBINSON, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1894.
Rev. GEORGE LIVINGSTON ROBINSON (Roxbury Presbyterian Church), Rox-
bury, Mass. 1892.
WILLIAM WOODVILLE ROCKHILL, Department of State, Washington, D. C.
1880.
Prof. ROBERT W. ROGERS, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
1888.
JAMES HARDY ROPES (Harvard University), Divinity Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
1893.
SANFORD L. ROTTER, 55 Oak St. (or care of E. J. Smith & Co., 65 and 67
Asylum St.), Hartford, Conn. 1894.
Miss ADELAIDE RUDOLPH, 63 West 55th St., New York, N. Y. 1894.
Hon. CHARLES THEODORE RUSSELL, Sparks St., Cambridge, Mass. 1870.
THOMAS H. P. SAIDER, 217 South 49th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1890.
†Prof. EDWARD E. SALISBURY, 237 Church St., New Haven, Conn. 1842.
Dr. H. ERNEST SCHMIDT, White Plains, N. Y. 1886.
Prof. NATHANIEL SCHMIDT, Colgate Univ., Hamilton, N. Y. 1894.
Dr. CHARLES P. G. SCOTT, Radnor, Pa. 1895.
Rev. HENRY M. SCUDDER, Niigata, Japan.
J. HERBERT SENTER, 10 Avon St., Portland, Maine. 1870.
THOMAS STANLEY SIMMONS, Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. 1892.
MAGY M. SKINNER, 2849 Washington St., Boston, Mass. 1894.
Dr. DAVID H. SLAVIK, 42 West 97th St., New York, N. Y. 1892.
Prof. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, Lakewood, New Jersey. 1877.
Prof. HOMER WEIR SMITH, Bryn Mawr, Penn. 1894.
Dr. EDMUND NATHANIEL SNYDER, 64 Fifth Ave., Cleveland, O. 1891.
MAXWELL SOMMERVILLE, 124 North Seventh St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1890.
Dr. EDWARD H. SPEICHER, Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. 1884.
M. VICTOR STAILLY, 826 W. Pearl St., Oshkosh, Wis. 1894.
Rev. JAMES D. STEELE, 29 West 93rd St., New York, N. Y. 1892.
ALEXIS W. STEIN, Jr. (St. George's Church), 16th St. and Stuyvesant Square,
New York, N. Y. 1891.
MRS. SARA YORKE STEVENSON, 237 South 31st St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1890.
Prof. GEORGE SYBRETT, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Penn. 1891.
ALFRED W. STRATTON, 404 Euclid Ave., Toronto, Canada (or Chicago Univ.,
Chicago, Ill.). 1894.
Prof. JOHN PHILIPS TAYLOR, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. 1884.
Prof. J. Henry Thayer (Harvard Univ.), 67 Sparks St., Cambridge, Mass. 1874.

Dr. William M. Thomson, 112 West 43d St., New York, N. Y. Corresp. Member, 1848; Corp., 1878.

Prof. Henry A. Todd (Columbia Coll.), 730 West End Ave., New York, N. Y. 1886.

Prof. Herbert Cushing Tolman, Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, Tenn. 1890.

Dr. Charles C. Torrey, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. 1891.

Prof. Crawford H. Toy (Harvard Univ.), 7 Lowell St., Cambridge, Mass. 1871.

Prof. Joseph Vincent Tracy, St. Mary’s Seminary, Baltimore, Md. 1892.


Hon. J. Hammond Trumbull, 734 Asylum St., Hartford, Conn. 1860.

Prof. Charles Mellen Tyler, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N. Y. 1894.

Addison Van Name (Yale Univ.), 121 High St., New Haven, Conn. 1863.

Edward P. Vining, 532 Market St., San Francisco, Cal. 1883.

Thomas Walsh, Yokohama, Japan. 1861.

Miss Susan Hayes Ward, Abington Ave., Newark, N. J. 1874.

Dr. William Hayes Ward, 130 Fulton St., New York, N. Y. 1869.

Miss Cornelia Warren, 67 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass. 1894.

Henry Clarke Warren, 12 Quincy St., Cambridge, Mass. 1882.


Prof. J. E. Wrenn, P. O. Box 149, Abington, Mass. 1894.

Prof. Benjamin Ide Wheeler (Cornell Univ.), 3 South Ave., Ithaca, N. Y. 1885.

Prof. John Williams White (Harvard Univ.), 18 Concord Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 1877.

Dr. Moses C. White (Yale Univ.), 48 College St., New Haven, Conn. Corresp. Member, 1858; Corp., 1860.


Frederick Wells Williams (Yale Univ.), 138 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1895.

Talcott Williams ("The Press"), 331 South 16th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1884.

Rev. William C. Winslow, 520 Beacon St., Back Bay, Boston, Mass. 1885.

Dr. Adolph Wirth, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1894.


Prof. Henry Wood, Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. 1884.

George Edward Wright, Room 213, Stock Exchange Building, Chicago, Ill. 1890.

Prof. Theodore F. Wright, D.D., 42 Quincy St., Cambridge, Mass. 1893.


Rev. Edward J. Young, 519 Main St., Waltham, Mass. 1869.
III. CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Prof. Graziadio Isaia Ascoli, Royal Academy of Sciences and Letters, Milan, Italy.
Rev. C. C. Baldwin (formerly Missionary at Foochow, China), 105 Spruce St., Newark, N. J.
Prof. Adolph Bastian, Univ. of Berlin, Germany. 1866.
Rev. Henry Bledgett (formerly Missionary at Peking, China), 318 State St., Bridgeport, Conn. 1858.
Rev. Alonzo Bunker, Missionary at Tomgoo, Burma. 1871.
Rev. Marcus M. Calhoun, Missionary at Ambala, India.
Rev. William Clark, Florence, Italy.
A. A. Gargulio, U. S. Legation, Constantinople, Turkey. 1892.
Henry Gillman, U. S. Consul at Jerusalem, Turkey. 1890.
George A. Gridson, Bengal Civil Service, Howrah, Bengal. 1898.
Prof. J. H. Haynes, Central Turkey Coll., Aintab, Syria. 1887.
Dr. James C. Herburn, Missionary at Yokohama, Japan. 1873.
Dr. A. F. Rudolph Hornyle, Madras, Calcutta, Bengal. 1898.
Dastur Jamaspji Minocheherji Jamasp Asana, Parsi Panchayet Lane, Bombay, India. 1887.
Prof. L. Léon de Rosny, École des hautes études, Paris, France. 1857.
Rev. Prof. Albert L. Long (Robert College), Constantinople, Turkey. 1870.
Rev. Robert S. MacKay (formerly Missionary at Tokyo, Japan), President of the Univ. of the Pacific, Fernando, Cal.
Dr. Divie Bethune McCarter. 1857.
Prof. Everhard Nestle, Ulm, Wurttemberg, Germany. 1888.
Dr. Alexander G. Paspati, Athens, Greece. 1861.
Alphonse Pinart, San Francisco, California. 1871.
Rev. Elias Riggs, Missionary at Constantinople (Bible House), Turkey.
Rev. D. S. I. J. Scherschewsky, Shanghai, China.
Rev. William W. Scudder, Missionary at Madanapalle, Madras, India.
Rev. W. A. Shedd, Missionary at Groomish, Persia. 1883.
Dr. John C. Sundberg, U. S. Consul, Baghdad, Turkey. 1893.
Rev. George N. Thomassen, American Baptist Mission, Kurnool, Madras, India. Corp. Member, 1890; Corresp., 1891.
Rev. George T. Washburn, Missionary at Patumalai, Madura, India.
Rev. James W. Waugh, Missionary at Lucknow, India. 1878.
Charles Edwin Wilbour, Cairo, Egypt. 1892.
Rev. George W. Wood, Missionary at Constantinople, Turkey.