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ARTICLE I.
ON THE DATE OF ZOROASTER. ¹

BY A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON,
PROFESSOR IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY.

Presented to the Society April 18th, 1895.

Great men are the children of their age. Heirs to the heritage of the past, they are charged with the stewardship of the possessions to be handed down to the future. Summing up within themselves the influences of the times that call them forth, stamped with the impress of their day, their spirit in turn shows its reflex upon the age that gives them birth. We read them in their age; we read their age in them. So it is of the prophets and sages, religious teachers and interpreters, which have been since the world began. The teaching of a prophet is the voice of the age in which he lives; his preaching is the echo of the heart of the people of his day. The era of a prophet is therefore not without its historic significance; it is an event that marks an epoch in the life of mankind. The age of most of the great religious teachers of antiquity is comparatively well known; but wide diversity prevails with regard to the date at which Iran's ancient prophet Zoroaster lived and taught; yet his appearance must have had its national significance in the land between the Indus and the Tigris; and the great religious movement which he set on foot must have wrought changes and helped to shape the course of events in the early history of Iran. The treatment of this question forms the subject of the present paper.

The Avesta itself gives us no direct information in answer to the inquiry as to the date of Zoroaster. It presents, indeed, a picture of the life and times; we read accounts of King Vishtaspa, the Constantine of the faith; but the fragments that remain of the sacred texts present no absolutely clear allusions to contemporary events that might decisively fix the era. The existing diversity of opinion with reference to Zoroaster's date is largely due to this fact and to certain incongruities in other ancient statements on the subject. The allusions of antiquity to this subject may conveniently be divided into three groups:

¹ This paper forms a companion-piece to the present writer's discussion of 'Zoroaster's Native Place' in J.A.O.S. xv. 221-282.
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I. First, those references that assign to Zoroaster the extravagant date B. C. 6000.

II. Second, such allusions as connect his name with the more or less legendary Ninus and the uncertain Semiramis.

III. Third, the traditional date, placing the era of Zoroaster’s teaching at some time during the sixth century B. C.

All the material will first be presented under the headings A.I., A.II., and A.III.; then a detailed discussion of the data, pages 16–19, under the heading B; and, finally, a summary of results, under the heading C, pages 19–22.

SYNOPSIS OF DIVISION A.

A.I. Classical passages placing Zoroaster at 6000 B. C.
   a. Pliny the Elder.
   b. Plutarch.
   c. Scholion to Plato.
   d. Diogenes Laertius.
   e. Lactantius.
   f. Suidas.
   g. Georgius Syncellus.

A.II. Passages associating Zoroaster’s name with Semiramis and Ninus.
   a. Ktesias.
   b. Kephallion.
   c. Moses of Khorni.
   d. Theon.
   e. Justin.
   f. Arnobius.
   g. Eusebius.
   h. Orosius.
   i. Suidas.
   j. Snorra Edda.
   k. Bar ‘Alī.

A.III. The native tradition as to Zoroaster’s date.
   a. Ardā-i Virāf.
   b. Bundahish.
   c. Albīrūnī.
   d. Masūdī.
   e. Tabarī.
   f. The Dabistan.
   g. Firdausī.
   h. The Mudjimal al-Tawārīkh and the Ulema-i Islam.
   i. The Chinese-Parsi era.
   j. Reports connecting Zoroaster and Jeremiah.
   k. Pahlavi Perso-Arabic allusions to Nebuchadnezzar.
   l. Ammianus Marcellinus and Eutychius.
   m. Nicolaus Damascenus, Porphyry, etc.

A. DATA FOR THE AGE OF ZOROASTER.

A. I. Allusions placing Zoroaster at 6000 B. C.

The allusions of the first group comprehend those classical references that assign to Zoroaster the fabulous age of B. C. 6000 or thereabouts. These references are confined chiefly to the classics, and their chief claim to any consideration is that they
The Date of Zoroaster.

purport to be based upon information handed down from Eu-
doxus, Aristotle, and Hermippus. Such extraordinary figures,
however, are presumably due to the Greeks' having misunder-
stood the statements of the Persians, who place Zoroaster's mil-
leennium amid a great world-period of 12,000 years, which they
divided into cycles of 3,000 years, and in accordance with which
belief Zoroaster's fravashi had in fact existed several thousands
of years. The classical material on the subject is here presented.

1 So the general classical statements of '5,000 years before the Tro-
jan war,' or the like, although some variant readings 500 (for 5,000)
are found. The number 5,000 (6,000) is, however, the correct one.

2 According to the chronology of the Bundahish 34. 7, Zoroaster
appeared at the end of the ninth millennium: compare, West Bunda-
hišh transl., S. B. E. v. 149-151 notes; Spiegel Eranische Alterthums-
Kunde i. 500-508; Windischmann Zoroastrische Studien 147-165;
also Plutarch Is. et Os. 47, θεώσωμεν δὲ φθηνα κατὰ τῶν μάγων ἀνά µέρος
τρισχλία ἐγν τῶν µέν κρατεῖν, τῶν δὲ κρατεῖσθαι τῶν θεῶν, άλλα δὲ τρισχλια
μάχοντα καὶ πολεμοῦν καὶ ἀνάλειβα τοῦ ἑτέρου τοῦ ἑτέρου — τέλος δ’ ἀπολει-
ποσὶν τοῦ 'Λήφν.

(a) Pliny the Elder (A. D. 23-79), N. H. 30. 1. 2 [Wn. 279, 288], cites the authority of Eudoxus of Cnidus (B. C. 388), of
Aristotle (B. C. 350), and of Hermippus (c. B. C. 250), for placing
Zoroaster 6000 years before the death of Plato or 5000 years
before the Trojan war: Eudoxus, qui inter sapientias sectus clari-
ssinam utilissimamque eam (artem magicam) intellegi voluit,
Zoroastreum hunc sex milibus annorum ante Platonis mortem
fuisse prodidit; sic et Aristoteles. Hermippus qui de tota ea arte
diligentissime scripsit et viciens centum milia versus a Zoroastre
condita indicibus quoque voluminum eius positis explanavit,
praecipuam, a quo institutum discret, tradidit Agonacem, ipsum
vero quinque milibus annorum ante Trojanum bellum fuisse.
For that reason apparently (N. H. 30. 1. 11) he speaks of Moses as living
multis milibus annorum post Zoroastren. But Pliny also expresses
uncertainty as to whether there was one or two Zoroasters, and
he mentions a later Proconnesian Zoroaster: N. H. 30. 1. 2 sine
dubio illic (ars Magica) orta in Perside a Zoroastre, ut inter
auctores convenit. Sed unus hic fuerit, an postea et alius, non
satis constat; and after speaking of Osthanes, the Magian who
accompanied Xerxes to Greece, he adds: (N. H. 30. 2.8) diligenti-
ores paulo ante hunc (Osthaneum) posuerunt Zoroastrem alium Pro-
connessum. Pliny's Proconnesian Zoroaster must have flourished
about the seventh or sixth century.

(b) Plutarch (A. D. 1st cent.) adopts likewise the same general
statement that places the prophet Zoroaster about 5000 years
before the Trojan war: Is. et Os. 46 (ed. Parthey, p. 81), Zoroa-
strus (sae) δ µάγος, ὅν πεντακαρχιλίους ἔτεσι τῶν τρωκτών γεγονέναι προ-
βατέρων ἱστοροῦν.

(c) The Scholion to the Platonic Alcibiades, 1. 122 (ed. Baiter,
Orelli et Winckelmann, p. 918), makes a statement, in substance
tantamount to the last one, as follows: Ζωρόαστρος ἄρχωτερος
τακαρχιλίους ἔτεσιν εἶχαν λέγεται Πλάτωνος.
A. V. W. Jackson,

(a) Diogenes Laertius (A. D. 2d, 3d century), de Vit. Philos. Proem. 2 (recens. Cobet, Paris, 1850, p. 1), similarly quotes Hermodorus (B. C. 250?), the follower of Plato, as authority for placing Zoroaster’s date at 5000 years before the fall of Troy, or, as he adds on the authority of Xanthus of Lydia (B. C. 500–450), Zoroaster lived 6000 years (some MSS. 600) before Xerxes. The text runs: ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν Μάγων, διὰ ἄρα Ζωροαστρὰγγον τὸν Πέρσην, ἔρμαδωρος μὲν ὁ Πολτωνικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ μαθημάτων φησίν εἰς τὴν Τρωάν ἀλών ἐν εἰς τὴν ἐν ταῖς Περσῶν ἐδέχατο ἐς τὴν Σέρβου διάβασον ἀπὸ τοῦ Ζωροαστρῶν ἔξοδος χλαδία φησίν, καὶ μετ’ αὐτῶν γεγονέναι πολλοῖς τοῖς Μάγων κατὰ διδασκίαν, ὁστάνας καὶ Ἀστραμαυέχους καὶ Γοβρύνας καὶ Παρατάσας, μέχρι τῆς τῶν Περσῶν ὑπ’ Ἀλκανδρῶν καταλύσεως.

(e) Lactantius, Inst. 7, 15, must have entertained some similar opinion regarding Zoroaster; for he speaks of Hystaspes (famous as Zoroaster’s patron) as being an ancient king of Media long before the founding of Rome: Hystaspes quaegue, qui fuit Medorum rac antiquissimus . . . sublatum iri ex orbis imperium nomenque Noeniamum multo ante praebatus est, quam illa Trojana gens conderetur (cf. Migne Patrolog. vol. vi and Windischmann Zor. Stud. p. 259, 298).

(f) Suidas (10th century A. D.), s. v. Ζωροαστρῶν, speaks of two Zoroasters, of whom one lived 500 (read 5000) years before the Trojan war, while the other was an astronomer of the time of Ninus—γενέστε ὁ πρὸ τῶν Τρωάων ἔτους φ’.

(g) Georgius Syncellus1 Chronographia, i., p. 147 ed. Dind., alludes to a Zoroaster as one of the Median rulers over Babylon. Cf. Windischmann Zor. St. p. 302, and Haug A Lecture on Zoroaster, p. 23, Bombay, 1865.

A.II. Allusions associating Zoroaster’s Name with Semiramis and Ninus.

Second to be considered is a series of statements which connect the name of Zoroaster with that of the more or less uncertain Ninus and Semiramis.1 These references also are confined almost exclusively to the classics, and the difficulty with them is that, in addition to their general character, which bears a legendary coloring, they are based apparently upon a misinterpretation of the name Ὄξωρτος or its variants in a fragment of Ctesias (discussed below), which has been understood as an allusion to Zoroaster.

1 The date of Semiramis, however, is regarded by Lehmann (Berliner Philolog. Wochenblatt, Jan. März, 1894) to be about B. C. 800.

(a) The authority of Ktesias (B. C. 400) is quoted by Diodorus Siculus (A. D. 1st century) 2. 6, for the statement that Ninus with a large army invaded Bactria and by the aid of Semiramis gained a victory over King Oxyartes. See Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias, ed. Gilmore p. 29. Instead of the name Ὄξωρτος, the manuscript variants show Ἐξαϊτῆς, Χαϊτῆς, Ἑαϊτῆς. The last somewhat recalls the later Persian form of the name Zoroaster; and Kephalion, Justin, Eusebius, and Arnobius, drawing on
Ktesias, make Zoroaster a Bactrian or the opponent of Ninus (see below); but 'Ως εν ζωραστής may very well be an independent name, identical as far as form goes with Άρ. υδησιατ-ερετα, Yt. 13. 128, and it is doubtless the better Greek reading. The other statements are here given as they similarly come into consideration with respect to Zoroaster's native place. They are:—

(b) Fragments of Kephaliôn (A. D. 120), preserved in the Armenian version of Eusebius, Chron. 1. 43, ed. Anchor: a passage describes the defeat of Zoroaster the Magian, king of the Bactrians, by Semiramis: "Incipio scribere de quibus et aliis commemoravit atque imprimus Ellanicos Lesbivos Ctesiasque Cnenidus, deinque Herodotus Alcarnassus. Primum Asiae imperaverant Assyrii, ex quibus erat Ninus Beli (filius), cujus regni aetate res quam plurimae celeberrimaeque virtutes gestae fuerunt." Postea his adiiciens profert etiam generationes Semiramidis atque (narrat) de Zoroastri Magi Bactrianorum regis certamine ac debellatione a Semiramide: nec non tempus Nini LII annos iussisse, atque de obitu ejus. Post quem quum regnasset Semiramis, muro Babylonem circumdedit ad eandem formam, qua a plerisque dictum est: Ctesia nimium et Zenone Herodotoque nec non alis ipsorum posteris. Deinde etiam apparatum belli Semiramidis adversus Indos essedemque cladem et fugam narrat, etc. Identical with this is Georgius Syncellus (c. A. D. 800), Chron. ed. Dind. i. p. 315: "Ἀρχάαι γαρ ἅγαι, ἀφ' ὧν ἄλλοι τε ἰαμάρινων, καὶ τὰ πρῶτα Ἑλλανικὸς τε ὁ Δέαβιος καὶ Κτησίππος ὁ Κνίδιος, ἐστατε Ἡροδότος ὁ Ἀλκαρνασσεὶς. ὁ παλαῖς τῆς Ἀσίας ἐβάσιλεν Ἀστυφρίας, τῶν ἢ τῶν Βῆλου Ἅνων." et ἐπάγει γένεσιν Σεμιράμεως καὶ Σαμοσαστουρὸν μάγων (Mss. βάτου) ἔτει νυ 7 τῆς Νίνος δασολαίας. μεθ' ὄν Βαβυλῶνα, φιλοί, ἣ Σεμιράμει ἐπέβαλε τρόπον ὡς πολλοὶ λακευματο, Κτησίας, Ζήνων (Müller Deśwegen), Ἡροδότου καὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτῶν: στρατεύσαι τε αὐτῆς κατὰ τῶν Ίνων καὶ ἦταν κ. τ. λ. Cf. also Windischmann Zor. Stud., p. 303, Spiegel Eran. Alter., i. 676–7; Müller Frag. Hist. Gr. iii. 627.

1 This mention of Herodotus might possibly be adduced as an argument that Herodotus was at least acquainted with the name of Zoroaster.

(c) Similarly the reputed work of the Armenian Moses of Khorni, i. 16, makes Zoroaster a contemporary of Semiramis, and calls him "a Magian, the sovereign of the Medes," so that she flies from him and is killed in Armenia. Cf. Gilmore Ktesias Persika, p. 80 n., Spiegel Eran. Alterthumskunde, i. 682, Windischmann Zor. Stud. p. 302, 308, Müller Frag. Hist. Gr. iii. 627, n. 328.

(e) Justin (A.D. 120), in his epitome of Trogus Pompeius’ Hist. Philippic., 1. 1, distinctly makes Zoroaster the opponent of Ninus, and says that he was king of Bactria and a Magician: postremum bellum illi fuit cum Zoroastre, regis Bactrianorum, qui primus dicitur artes magicas invenisse et mundi principia sideraunque motus diligentissime spectasse.

(f) Arnobius (A.D. 297), Adversus Gentes 1. 5, in like manner mentions a battle between the Assyrians and the Bactrians under the leadership respectively of Ninus and Zoroaster: inter Assyrios et Bactrianos, Ninus quondam Zoroastrique ductoribus. See Gilmore, Ktesius p. 36.

(g) Eusebius (A.D. 300), Chron. 4. 35 ed. Aucher, has a like allusion: Zoroastres Magus rex Bactrianorum clarus habetur adversus quem Ninus dimicat; and again (Windischmann, p. 290), Praeparatio Evang. 10. 9, 10, ed. Dind. 1. p. 560, Ninus, καθόν Ζωροάστρης ὁ Μάγος Βακτρίων ἔβαστενε.

(h) Paulus Orosius (5th century A.D.), the Spanish presbyter, of whose chronicle we have also King Alfred’s Anglo-Saxon version, states that Ninus conquered and slew Zoroaster of Bactria, the Magician. See Orosius, Old-English Text and Latin Original, ed. by Henry Sweet (Early Eng. Text Soc. vol. 79), p. 30–31: Novissime Zoroastrem Bactrianorum regem, eundemque magicas artis repertorem, magna oppressum interficit. Or, in Anglo-Saxon, and he Ninus Soroastrem Bactriana cyning, so cithre ærest manna drýcraftas, he hine oferwann and ofstóh.

(i) Suidas in his Lexicon (s. v. Zoroaster) assumes the existence of two Zoroasters (cf. p. 4), the second an astrologer: Ἀστρονόμος καὶ Νίνου βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων.


(k) In some Syriac writers and elsewhere an identification of Zoroaster with Balaam is recorded, for example in the Lexicon of Bar ‘Alt (c. A. D. 832), s. v. Balaam, ‘Balaam is Zardosht, the diviner of the Magians.’ See Gotthilf References to Zoroaster in Syriac and Arabic Lit., pp. 27, 30n, 32 (Drisler Classical Studies, N. Y., 1894). Sometimes he is only compared with Balaam.

A. III. The Native Tradition as to Zoroaster’s Date.

Third, the direct Persian tradition comes finally into consideration. This tradition is found in the chronological chapter of the Bundahish, 34. 1–9, is supported by the Ardâ-i Virâf, 1. 2–5, and is corroborated by abundant Arabic allusions (Albîrûnî, Mâsûdî, et al.). It unanimously places the opening of Zoroaster’s ministry at 258 years before the era of Alexander, or 272 years before the close of the world-conqueror’s dominion. According to these figures, the date of Zoroaster would fall between the latter half of the seventh century B. C. and the middle of the sixth century; his appearance in fact would be placed in the period just pre-
ceding the rise of the Achaemenian dynasty. This merits attention also in detail.

(a) The Ardâ-i Vîrîf 1. 1–5 in round numbers places Zoroaster three hundred years before Alexander’s invasion. Compare Hâng and West Arda Virâf p. 141. ‘The righteous Zaratusht made the religion which he had received, current in the world, and until the end of 300 years the religion was in its purity and men were without doubt. But afterwards the foul Evil Spirit, the wicked one, in order to make men doubtful in regard to this religion, instigated the accused Alexander, the Rûman, who was dwelling in Egypt, so that he came to the country of Iran with severe cruelty and devastation; he also slew the ruler of Iran, and destroyed the metropolis and empire.’

(b) The Bundahish chapter (ch. 34) ‘on the reckoning of the years’ (to which one MS. adds—‘of the Arabs’) more exactly computes the various millenniums that made up the 12000 years of the great world-cycle recognized by the worshippers of Mazda. In this period the era of Zoroaster falls at the close of the first 9000 years. He is placed in reality at the beginning of the historic period, if the long reigns attributed to Kaîr VISHTASP and to Vohûman son of Spend-dâd (Av. Spentō-dāta, N. P. Isfendiar), may with reasonably fair justice be explained as that of a ruling house. There seems at least no distinct ground against such assumption. The Bundahish passage 34. 7–8 in West’s translation (S. B. E. v. 150–151) reads, (7) ‘Kaîr VISHTASP, till the coming of the religion, thirty years, altogether one hundred and twenty years. (8) Vohûman, son of Spend-dâd, a hundred and twelve years; Hûmâb, who was daughter of Vohûman, thirty years; Dârâb, son of Oûhar-ûzâd, that is, of the daughter of Vohûman, twelve years; Dârâb, son of Dârâb, fourteen years; Alexander the Rûman, fourteen years.’

- Vishtasp, after coming of religion .............................. 90
- Vohûman Spend-dâd ................................................ 112
- Hûmâb .................................................................... 30
- Dârâb-I Oûharûzâd .................................................... 12
- Dârâb-I Dârâb .............................................................. 14
- Alexander Rûman ....................................................... 14

Total: 272

The result therefore gives 272 years from ‘the coming of the religion’ until the close of the dominion of Alexander the Great, or 258 years before the beginning of his power. A repeated tradition exists that Zoroaster was forty-two years old when he first converted King Vishtaspa, who became his patron. If we interpret ‘the coming of the religion’ to mean its acceptance by Vishtaspa, we must add 42 years to the number 258 before Alexander in order to obtain the traditional date of Zoroaster’s birth. This would answer to the ‘three hundred years before Alexander’ of the Ardâ-i Vîrîf. If, however, we take the phrase ‘coming of the religion’ to mean the date of Zoroaster’s entry upon his min-
istry (as does West, S.B.E. v. 218), we must then add 30 years, which was Zoroaster’s age when he beheld his first vision of Ormazd.

A calculation based upon the figures of this tradition would place Zoroaster’s birth 42 years + 258 years (=300 years) before B.C. 330, the date of the fall of the Iranian kingdom through Alexander’s conquest; in other words it would assign Zoroaster’s birth to about B.C. 630. According to the same tradition the duration of the various reigns of the Kayanian dynasty would be about as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reigned years.</th>
<th>Reignations date B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vishtâsp</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>618–493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vohûman (Ardasîr Dirazdast)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>498–386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hûmârî</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>386–356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dârâî</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>356–344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dârâî-i Dârâî</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>344–330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results would be somewhat altered if the computation be made according to lunar years or if a different point of departure be taken. The excessive lengths of the reigns of Vishtâsp and Vohûman seem suspicious and suggest round numbers unless we are to interpret them as comprising successive rulers; for example, in historic times, beside Hystaspes, the father of Darius, we have the names of two other Hystaspes, later connected with the ruling house of Bactria.¹ The historic reigns of the Achaemenians may be compared (cf. Stokvis Manuel d’Histoire, p. 107).

Cyrus ........................................ B.C. 558–529
Cambyses ..................................... 529–521
Darius I ....................................... 521–485
Xerxes ......................................... 485–465
Artaxerxes Longimanus ..................... 465–425
Darius Nothos ................................ 425–405
Artaxerxes Mnemon .......................... 405–382
Artaxerxes Ochus ........................... 382–340
[Arses] ........................................ 340–337
Darius Codomannus .......................... 337–330

Comparison may be made, as with West,² identifying the long reign of Vohûman who is called Ardashir (Artaxerxes or Ardasîr Dirazdast ‘the long-handed’) with Artaxerxes Longimanus and his successors. Historical grounds throughout seem to favor this. For Hûmârî, West suggests Parysatis as a possibility. The last two Dârâî answer to Ochus and Codomannus, and the reign of Kaî-Vishtâsp ‘seems intended to cover the period from Cyrus to Xerxes’ (West).³ There seems every reason to identify Vohûman Ardâshir Dirazdast with Artaxerxes Longimanus, according to the Bahman Yaht (Byt. 2. 17), as this Kayanian king makes the religion current in the whole world.⁴ One might be possibly tempted to regard the Vishtâsp reign as representing the Bactrian rule until Artaxerxes, and assume that Zoroastrianism then became the faith of Persia.⁵

This might account for the silence as to the early Achaemenians and shed some light on the
problem concerning the Achaemenians as Zoroastrians; but there seems to be no historic foundation for such assumption. Suffice here to have presented the tradition in regard to the reigns of the Kayanian kings as bearing on Zoroaster’s date and the traditional 258 years before Alexander as the era of ‘the coming of the religion.’


2 West, Bundahish translated, S.B.E. v. 150 n. 198 n.

3 de Harlez, Avesta traduit, Introduction p. ccxxviii, thinks that the early Achaemenians were intentionally sacrificed. Spiegel, Z.D.M.G., xlvi. 203, identifies the first Dārā with Darius I., and believes that he was misplaced in the kingly list. This I doubt.

4 West, Byt. transl., S.B.E. v. 199.

5 Dubeux, La Perse p. 57, sharply separates the Oriental account of the Persian kings from the historical account.

The sum of 258 years is given also by so careful an investigator as Albrūnī (A. D. 973–1048). His statements are based on the authority of ‘the scholars of the Persians, the Hūrbadhns and Maubadhns of the Zoroastrians.’ In his Chronology of Ancient Nations p. 17 l. 10 (transl. Sachau), is a statement of the Persian view in regard to Zoroaster’s date: ‘from his (i.e. Zoroaster’s) appearance till the beginning of the Æra Alexandri, they count 258 years.’ Several times he gives the received tradition that Zoroaster appeared in the 30th year of the reign of Vishtāsp. In another place, Chron. p. 196 (transl. Sachau), he gives further information in regard to Zoroaster’s time: ‘On the 1st Ramaḏān A. H. 319 came forward Ibn ‘Abī-Zakarriyā. . . . If, now, this be the time (i.e. A. H. 319=A. D. 931) which Jamasp and Zaradusht meant, they are right as far as chronology is concerned. For this happened at the end of the Æra Alexandri 1249, i. e. 1500 years after Zaradusht.’ From this statement we may compute back to the year B. C. 569 as a date when a prophecy is supposed to have been made by Zoroaster and Jamasp. Albrūnī is not exhausted yet. In Chron. 121 (transl. Sachau), he says ‘we find the interval between Zoroaster and Yazdajird ben Shāpūr to be nearly 970 years.’ This gives the date about B. C. 571 if we count Yazdajird’s reign as A. D. 399–420. Furthermore, the carefully constructed tables which Albrūnī gives from various sources are interesting and instructive, owing to their exact agreement with the reigns of the Kayanian kings as recorded in the Bundahish. Thus, Chron. p. 112, 107–114 (transl. Sachau):

Kai Vishtāsp till the appearance of Zoroaster........ 80
The same after that event.......................... 90
Kai Ardashir Bahman (Vohūman)..................... 112
Khūmān (Hūmān)..................................... 80
Dārā .............................................. 12
Dārā ben Dārā....................................... 14
On p. 115 he contrasts these dates with those given by early occidental authorities. Finally, Chron. p. 32 (transl. Sachau), the name of Thales is brought into connection with Zoroaster. So much for the information furnished by Albirunî.

1 Albirunî Chronology of Ancient Nations transl. and ed. by Sachau, p. 100.
2 According to Albirunî p. 32 (transl. Sachau) the Æra Alexandri would date from the time when Alexander left Greece at the age of twenty-six years, preparing to fight with Darius.

(d) Of somewhat earlier date but identical in purport is the statement found in Masûdi’s Meadows of Gold, written in A. D. 943–4 (Masûdi died A. D. 951). Like the Bundahish and like Albirunî, Masûdi reports that the Magians count a period of two hundred and fifty-eight (258) years between their prophet Zoroaster and Alexander.3 He reiterates this assertion in Indicatio et Admonitio by saying ‘between Zoroaster and Alexander there are about three hundred years.’ Nearly the same, but not exactly identical figures, are found as in the Bundahish, regarding the length of the reigns of the various Kayanian kings; Zoroaster is stated, as elsewhere, to have appeared in the thirtieth (30) year of Vishtasp’s reign and he dies at the age of seventy-seven (77) after having taught for thirty-five (35) years.4 The statement that Zoroaster lived to the age of 77 years is also found elsewhere.5 What Masûdi has to say on the subject of Nebuchadnezzar’s being a lieutenant of Lohrasp (Aurvatasp) and regarding Cyrus as contemporary with Bahman will be mentioned below, as a similar statement occurs in the Dinkart (Bk. 5).

3 Masudi Prairies d’Or, ii. p. 153 ed. Barbier de Meynard. ‘Youstas (Gustasp) régna après son père (Lohrasp) et résida à Balkh. Il était sur le trône depuis trente ans, lorsque Zeradecht, fils d’Spîman se présenta devant lui . . . . (p. 127).’ Youstas régna cent
vingt ans avant d'adopter la religion des Mages, puis il mourut. La prédication de Zeradecht dura trente-cinq ans, et il mourut âgé de soixante et dix-sept ans. The detailed reigns (Masudi op. cit. ii. 126-129) are Vishtasp 120 years, Bahman 112, Humâl 30 (or more), Dârâ 12, Dârâ son of Dârâ 30, Alexander 6 (cf. vol. iv. p. 107, 'Alexander, qu'ils font régnier six ans.'). The latter would answer pretty nearly to the commonly received years of Alexander in Persia, B.C. 330-323. Observe that the years of the last three reigns vary somewhat from the Bundahish. Deducting from Vishtasp's reign the 80 years till Zoroaster appeared and counting simply to the coming of Alexander, the resulting 274 years would place Zoroaster's appearance at B.C. 604 or, if 42 years old at the time, his birth at B.C. 646. But notice that instead of 274 years as here, Masudi elsewhere says (Prairies d'Or, iv. 106, quoted above) there were 258 years between Zoroaster and Alexander.

4 E. g. Dinkart Bk. 7 (communication from West) and in the Rivâyat.

(e) The period at which the Arabic chronicler Tabari (died A.D. 923) places Zoroaster in his record of Persian reigns, is practically identical with the preceding in its results, although he occasionally differs in the length of the individual reigns, e.g. Bahman 80 years (although he mentions that others say 112 years), Hûmâl about 20 years, Dârâ 23 years. He tells also of a tradition that makes of Zoroaster one of the disciples of Jeremiah. The latter, according to the generally accepted view, began to prophesy about B.C. 626. These points will be spoken of again below.

1 See Zotenberg Chronique de Tabari, traduite sur la version persane d'Aboü-Ali Mo'hammed Bel'ami, tome i. 491-508, Paris, 1867.

(f) The Dabistan (translated by Shea and Troyer, i. 306-309) narrates that the holy cypress which Zoroaster had planted at Kashmir and which was cut down by the order of Mutawakkal, tenth khalif of the Abbassides (reigned A.D. 846-860), had stood 'fourteen hundred and fifty years (1450) from the time of its being planted, to the year 233 of the Hejirah (A.D. 846). If these years be reckoned as solar years, according to the custom of the ancient Persians, and counted from the beginning of Mutawakkal's reign, the date of the planting of the cypress would be B.C. 604; but if reckoned according to the lunar calendar of the Mohammedans (i.e. equivalent to 1408 solar years), the epoch would be B.C. 562. The former date (B.C. 604) recalls the reckoning of Masudi alluded to above, on p. 10. The event of the planting must have been an occasion of special moment; from a reference to the same in Firdausi (translation of Mohl, iv. 291-93, Paris, 1877), the conversion of Vishtaspa is perhaps alluded to. If the conversion of Vishtaspa really be alluded to, 43 years must be added to give the approximate date of Zoroaster's birth. Perhaps, however, some other event in the prophet's life is commemorated. In any case the results lead us to the latter part of the seventh century B.C. and the first part of the sixth century.

2 See the calculation of Shea and Troyer, Dabistan, translated i. 308 n, Paris, 1843 and Mirkhond's History of the Early Kings of

In case the 1450 years be reckoned back from the date of Mutawakkil's death (A. D. 860) instead of from the beginning of his power, the numbers would be respectively B. C. 590 (if solar), or B. C. 545 (if lunar).

(g) The figures of the chapter-heading in the Shāh Namah of Firdausī (A. D. 940–1020) likewise place the opening of Vishtasp's reign at about three hundred years before Alexander's death.¹

Firdusi Schahname ed. Vullers-Landauer iii. p. 1495 seq. See also Shea & Troyer's Dabistan Introd. i. p. lxxxvi and p. 380. Consult the chapter-headings of the reigns in Mohl's translation of Firdausi vols. iv-v. Observe that Bahman is assigned only 99 years instead of the usual 112; the duration of Vishtasp's reign is given in Mohl, vol. iv. 587 'cent vingt ans' in harmony with the usual tradition.

(h) The Persian historical work Mudjmal al-Tawārīkh (A. H. 520=A. D. 1126)¹ following the authority of the Chronicle of the Kings of Persia, brought from Farsistan by Bahram, son of Mervanshāh, Mobed of Shapur, enumerates 258 years before Alexander.² The Ulema-i Islam counts three hundred.³

² Cf. op. cit. p. 260. The author acknowledges indebtedness also to Hamzah of Isfahan, Tabari, and Firdausi. His chronology may be deduced from pp. 389–389 of the work cited; it runs, Lohrasp 120 years, Gushtasp 120 years, Bahman 112, Humph 80, Darab 12 [or 14], Dara son of Darab 14 [or 16], Alexander 14 [or 28]. Observe the alternative figures in the case of the last three numbers.
³ According to Röth Geschichte unserer abendländischen Philosophie i. 351 the author of the Mudjmal al-Tawarikh places Zoroaster 1700 years before his own time; on this ground Röth places the death of Zoroaster at B. C. 522, and is followed by Floigl Cyrus und Herodot p. 18. Cf. Klenker's Zend-Avesta, Anh. 2, Bd. 1, Thel I. p. 347.

(i) Interesting is the fact noticed by Anquetil du Perron,¹ that a certain religious sect that immigrated into China A. D. 600 are evidently of Zoroastrian origin and that these believers have an era which dates approximately from B. C. 559; this date Anquetil regards as referring to the time when Zoroaster left his home and entered upon his mission—a sort of Iranian Hejira.


(j) Similar in effect as far as concerns the period at which they place the prophet, although of doubtful value or otherwise to be
explained, are those Syriac and Arabic reports which connect the name of Zoroaster with Jeremiah and which make him the latter's pupil or even identify him with Baruch the scribe of Jeremiah. 1 Presumably this association is due to confusing the Arabic form of the name Jeremiah Armiah with Zoroaster's supposed native place Urmiah (Urumiyah). 2

1 (a) The Syro-Arabic Lexicon of Bar Bahlul (about A. D. 963) s. v. Kasomâ (divinator): 'Divinator, like Zardosht, who people say is Baruch the Scribe; and because the gift of prophecy was not accorded to him he went astray, journeyed to [other] nations and learned twelve tongues.' Cf. Payne-Smith Thesaurus Syriacus, col. 3704.

(b) Also Bishop Ishodad of Hadatha (about A. D. 852) commentary on Matt. ii. 1, 'Some say that he (Zoroaster) is the same as Baruch the pupil of Eramya (Jeremiah), and that because the gift of prophecy was denied him as [had been] his wish, and because of that bitter exile and the sack of Jerusalem and the Temple, he became offended or angry and went away among other nations, learned twelve languages, and in them wrote that vomit of Satan, i. e. the book which is called Abhasta.' Cf. Gotthelf References to Zoroaster p. 29.


(δ) Tabari (died A. D. 923) likewise notices the association of Zoroaster with Jeremiah. According to him 'Zoroaster was of Palestinian origin, a servant to one of the disciples of Jeremiah the prophet, with whom he was a favorite. But he proved treacherous and false to him. Wherefore God cursed him, and he became leprous. He wandered to Adharbaijan, and preached there the Magian religion. From there he went to Bishtasp (Vishtaspa), who was in Balkh. Now when he (Zoroaster) had come before him, and preached his doctrine to him, it caused him to marvel, and he compelled his people to accept it, and put many people to death on its account. Then they followed it (the religion). Bishtasp reigned one hundred and twelve (112) years.' Gotthelf References to Zoroaster, p. 37. See also Chronique de Tabari traduite par H. Zotenberg, i. p. 499.

(ε) The same general statements of Tabari are repeated by Ibn al-Athir (18th century) in his Kitāb al-Kāmil fi al-tawārisīh. See Gotthelf References to Zoroaster, p. 39.

(γ) Once the Syrian Gregorius Bar 'Ebhrâyâ Abulfaraj (c. A. D. 1250) calls Zoroaster a disciple of Elijah (mistake for Jeremiah ?), see Gotthelf References to Zoroaster, p. 42.

(σ) Similarly the Arab historian Abu Mohammed Mustapha calls Zoroaster a disciple of Ezrâ (Ezra), see Hyde Hist. Relig. Vetereum Persarum, p. 318.

So suggested by de Sacy Notices et Extraits des Manuscripts de la Bibli. du Roi, ii. 319, see Gotthelf References to Zoroaster (Drisler Classical Studies p. 80 note).

(k) Pointing to a similar era are the Pahlavi (Dinkart bk. 5. and Mkh.) and Perso-Arabic allusions to Nebuchadnezzar as lieutenant of Vishtasp's predecessor Lohrasp and of Vishtasp himself as well as of his successor Bahman (Vohman). In the same connection Cyrus's name is joined with Vishtasp and Bahman.
(a) According to Tabari (10th century A.D.) and Masudi, Nebuchadnezzar was lieutenant successively under Lohrasp, Vishtasp and Bahman; the tradition regarding Lohrasp’s taking of Jerusalem is found in the Pahlavi Dinkart bk. 5 and Malnəg-i Khirad 37, 66-67, transl. West, S.B.E. xxiv. 64. Tabari (or rather the Persian version of the latter by Bel’am) gives two different versions of the story (see Chronique de Tabari, traduite sur la version Persienne de Bel’am par H. Zotenber, vol. i. pp. 491-507, Paris, 1867), and (Tabari op. cit. p. 503) the return of the Jews to Jerusalem is placed in the 70th year of Bahman. Signs of confusion are evident. So also in Mirkhond (15th century A.D.) who in his history repeats Tabari’s statement with reference to Nebuchadnezzar and Lohrasp, and makes Cyrus a son of Lohrasp although he is placed in the reign of Bahman. He regards Bahman (Vohûman) as a contemporary of Hippocrates (B. C. 460-357) and Xenocrates (B. C. 396-314) which would harmonize properly with the traditional dates above given (p. 8-9) for Bahman’s reign. See Shea Mirkhond’s History, pp. 264, 291, 343.

(b) Masudi is worth consulting on the same point, especially in respect to certain presumed relations between the Persians and the Jews. See Barbier de Meynard Maçoudi Les Pratiques d’Or. ii. 116-128.

(1) At this point may be mentioned two other allusions that place Zoroaster’s activity in the sixth century before the Christian era, although the former of these rests upon the identification of the prophet’s patron Vishtasp with Hystaspes the father of Darius. The first of these allusions, that given by Ammianus Marcellinus (5th century A.D.), directs calls Vishtasp (Hystaspes) the father of Darius, although Agathias (6th century A.D.) expresses uncertainty on this point. The second allusion is found in Euthychus, the Alexandria Patriarch, who makes Zoroaster a contemporary of Cambyses and the Magian Smerdis, a view which is shared by the Syrian Gregorios Bar ‘Ebhrīyā Abulfaraj (c. A. D. 1250).
The Date of Zoroaster.

4 Bar 'Ebbriyâ Arabic Chronicon p. 88, ed. Salhani, Beirut, 1890 (cited by Gotthell, References to Zoroaster, p. 38). "In those days (of Cambysses) came Zaradost chief of the Magian sect, by birth of Adharbijân, or, as some say, of Athôr (Assyria). It is reported that he was one of Elijah's disciples and he informed the Persians of the sign of the birth of Christ."

(m) Finally two other allusions are here added for the sake of completeness, as they have been interpreted as pointing to the fact that Zoroaster lived about the sixth century B. C. There seems to be nothing in them, however, to compel us to believe that Zoroaster is regarded as living only a short time before the events to which they allude. The first is a passage in Nicolaus Damascenus (1st century B. C.), who represents that when Cyrus was about to burn the unfortunate Croesus, his attention was called to Zoroâstreu Logia which forbade that fire should be defiled. The second item of information is found in such references as represent Pythagoras as following Zoroaster's doctrines. Lastly, the association of Zoroaster's name with that of Thales, by Albirani, has been noted above.

1 Nicolaus Damascenus Fragm. 65, Müller Fragm. Hist. Gr. iii. 409 δεωκρα δαμωνα εκπέτε, και οι τω της Σαββαλης χρημας τα τω Ζοροαστρου λογια εισηγε. Κροισου μιν ουν εβοω ητι μαλλων ιπ παλαι αοεων... Ταν γε μιρ Ζοροαστρου Περσαι αν' εκεινων δεικαμ, μητε νεκρωι καλει, μητε άλλωι μαινει πωρ, και παλαι τοτε καλεσαω το νομιμο τοτε βεβαιωμενον. (Latin version) Persas... religio ac metus divum inessent: Sibyllae quoque vatninicia ac Zoroastris oracula in mentem venterent. Haque đámatamulto, multo, quam ante, contentius, ut Croesus servaretur... At Persae excinde sanzetarunt justa praecepta Zoroastris, ne cadaverem cremare neque ignem contaminare posthac liceret, quod quan apud eos in veteri instituto obtinuisset, tum magis confirmaretur. Cf. de Harlez Avesta traduit, Introd. xlv, lxvii.

2 The principal references are to be found in Windischmann Zoroastrische Studien pp. 290-64, 274, from whose work their are taken. Several of these allusions mention Zoroaster's name directly; in others we may infer it, since Pythagoras is made a student of the Magi, whom classical antiquity regards as the exponents of Zoroaster's teaching. Such allusions are:
(1) Cicero de Fin. 5. 39 πρας Pythagoras et Aegyptum iustravit et Persarum Magos adiit; (2) Valerius Maximus 5. 4 extern. 2, ινε ad Persas projectus Magorum exactissimae prudencias se formandum tradiderat; (3) Pliny N.H. 30. 1.2 Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, Plato ad hanc (magia) discendam navigaver; (4) Porphyrius Vita Pythag. 41 ιπ τε κα τω θει, ητι παρα των Μαγων επικαθυνθεν, επι Ομονεν καιλαινε εκεινων; and Vita Pythag. 12 εν τε Βαβυλονι τοις 'αλλωι Χαλδαιωι συνεγενετο κα προς Ζάβαρατον [Zábaton, Nauck] (Zoroaster?) ὁβικετο; (5) Plutarch de animâ proor. in Timaeo 2. 2 ζαρατας ομ Πυθαγόρας δηδάκαλος; (6) Clemens Alexandrinus Stromata 1. p. 387 (ed. Potter) Ζωροαστραν δε των Μαγων των Περσων ομ Πυθαγόρας ἐκλησε (Ms. ομελως), cf. Cyrilius adv. Jul. 3. p. 87 where Pythagoras is called καννακτως ζωρωτως of Zoroaster; (7) Suidas s. v. Pythagoras, Πυθαγόρας: οιον θησιο-θησιον των μαγων (is it Zoroaster?); (8) Apuleius Florid., p. 19 (ed. Altilb.), σου πιν Pythagoram atiunt eo temporis inter captivos Cambiacae regis Aegyptum cum advehererunt, doctores habuisse Persarum magos ac praecepit Zoroastrem omnis divini arcani antistitem. (9) in Lucian's Dialogue Menippus, § 6, p. 468, the Babylonian Magi are the pupils and successors of Zoroaster ηοι... δεξετε εις Βαβυλωνα ηλθοτα δεξήθητε των των Μαγων των Ζωροαστρου μαθητων και διδαχων. Also some others.
B. Discussion of the Data.

The material above collected presents most of the external evidence that we have in regard to the age at which Zoroaster lived. We are now prepared for a more comprehensive view of the subject, for a discussion of the data in hand, for a presentation of certain internal evidences that need to be brought out, and for arguments and possible deductions. Several points immediately suggest themselves for comment.

First, in discussing the classical allusions above presented, one is justified from the connection in assuming that such allusions as are made to the name of Zoroaster as a religious teacher or sage, all refer to the one great prophet of ancient Iran. No account, I think, need therefore be taken of such views as assume the existence of two or of several Zoroasters, belonging to different periods in the world's history. Such a view was held by Suidas (s. v. Zoroastres) and was evidently earlier shared by Pliny; it met with acceptance also among some of the old-fashioned writers in more recent times; but there is no real evidence in its favor, and it is due to an attempt to adjust the discrepancy existing in classical statements with regard to Zoroaster's date. History knows of but one Zoroaster.

1 Pliny N.H. 30. 2.3, sine dubio ilic orta (ars Magica) in Perside a Zoroastre, ut inter auctores convenit. Sed unus hic fuerit, an postea et alius, non satis constat. He adds a little later (30. 2.8) diligentiores paulo ante hunc (i. e. Osthnenem) Zoroastrem altum Proconnestum.


Second, among the three dates which may be deduced from the material above collected and which are summarized on p. 2, we are justified upon reasonable grounds, I think, in rejecting the excessively early date of B.C. 6000 or thereabouts. The explanation above offered to account for the extravagant figures seems satisfactory enough.

Third, such dates as might be arrived at from the sporadic allusions that associate the name of Zoroaster with Semiramis and Ninus, with Nimrod and Abraham, or with Baal, Bel, Balaam, as above discussed, have little if any real foundation. In each instance there seem to me to be reasonable grounds for discard- ing them.

There remains finally a comparatively large body of material that would point to the fact that Zoroaster flourished between the latter part of the seventh century and the middle of the sixth century before the Christian era. The material when sifted reduces itself: first, to the direct tradition found in two Pahlavi books, Bundahish and Ardā-i Vīrāf, which places Zoroaster's era three hundred years, or more exactly 258 years, before Alexander's day; second, to the Arabic allusions which give the same date in their chronological computations and which in part lay claim to
being founded upon the chronology of the Persians themselves; third, to similar allusions elsewhere which place Zoroaster at about this period.


Certain objections may be raised to a view based upon this material last given.

First among these objections is a claim often urged, that the traditional date rests upon an erroneous identification of Vishtasp with Hystaspes the father of Darius. I cannot see, from the allusions or elsewhere, that the Persians made any such identification; the impression gained from the material presented is rather in fact to the contrary; one may recall, for example, how widely different the ancestry of Vishtasp is from the generally received descent of Hystaspes the father of Darius (a point which Floigl and Roth seem to have overlooked). It was only the classical writer Ammianus Marcellinus who, in antiquity, made any such identification. The point has already been sufficiently dealt with above, p. 14.

A second objection may be brought on the plea that the traditional date (7th to middle of 6th century B.C.) would not allow of the lapse of sufficient time to account for the difference in language between the Gathas and the Old Persian inscriptions and for certain apparent developments in the faith. Furthermore, that a longer period of time must be allowed to account for the difference between the fixed title Aryanmazda, Αραμαζόνιος, current in western Persia in Achaemenian times, and the divided form of the divine name Ahura Mazda (or Ahura alone and Mazda alone) as found in the Avesta, especially in the Zoroastrian Gathas. This point has been noticed in the interesting and instructive paper of Professor Tiele Over de Oudheid van het Avesta, p. 18, who comes to the result that Zoroastrianism must have existed as early as the first half of the 7th century B.C. If we accept, as I believe we should, the theses that Vishtasp ruled in eastern Iran, and that, although Zoroaster was a native of Azerbaijan, the chief scene of his religious activity was eastern Iran, and that the spread from Bactria westwards, I can not see that these arguments militate against the traditional date under discussion. Dialectic differences between the Bactrian region and Persia proper would sufficiently account for arguments based on language alone. This, added to national and individual differences, might well account for the fixed form of the name Aryanmazda among the Achaemenians as contrasted with the Avestan form. Who can say how rapidly the creed spread from the east to the west and what changes consequently in a short time may have resulted? New and converts in their zeal are often more radical in progressive changes than first reformers. Persis, with
its original difference in dialect, may in short time have developed the single title Auru'mazda from Ahur Mazda as watchword of church and state. See also note, p. 20, top.

1 Reprinted from the Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, 3de Reeks, Deel xi., 364-386.

2 Tiele's little work argues admirably for the antiquity of the Avesta as opposed to Darmesteter's views for the lateness of the Gāthās. I wish I could be convinced by Professor Tiele (p. 19) that the names of the Median kings, Phraortes (fravāzi), Kyaxares (ušahšatāra), Deikokos (*dāhyuka) as well as Eparna, Sitiparna of the early Esarhaddon inscription (explained as containing hūramuha 'glory'), are due to concepts originated by Zoroaster and are not merely marks of beliefs which Zoroastrianism inherited directly from existing Magism. The name of Darius's contemporary Khša-thrita (Bh. 2.15, iv. 19, E 9) is not so important for the argument. I confess I should like to place Zoroaster as early as the beginning of the 7th century. The earlier, the better.


4 See Jackson, Zoroaster's Native Place, J.A.O.S. xv. 230 seq. So in spite of Spiegel Z.D.M.G. xlv. 198 seq.

A final objection may be raised as to the real historic worth and chronological value of the Persian tradition which places Zoroaster three centuries before Alexander. This it must frankly be said is the real point of the question. Is there a possibility of Arabic influence at work upon the statements of the Bundahish and Ardā-i Vīrāt? Is the whole chronology of the Bundahish and that of the Persians artificial? And did the Zoroastrians intentionally tamper with history and bring Zoroaster down as late as possible in order that the millennial period might not be regarded as having elapsed without the appearance of a Saoshyant, or Messiah?

1 Spiegel Eranische Alterthumskunde i. 506, with Windischmann, regards the data of the Bundahish as 'unzuverlässig,' but it must be remembered that his figures, '178' years for the period between Zoroaster and Alexander, now require correction to 208, which alters the condition of affairs. See West, S.B.E. v. 150-151, and Spiegel Z.D.M.G. xlv. 293. Compare especially de Harlez Avesta traduit, Introd. p. cxxviii.

These questions require serious consideration in detail. The introduction to the chronological chapter of the Bundahish (Bd. 34) does indeed read, according to one MS, 'on the reckoning of the years of the Arabs' (see Bundahish translated by West, S.B.E. v. 149), but the word Tāzikān 'of the Arabs' is not found in the other manuscripts. Moreover, the scientific investigator Albrūrī, and also the Mujmal al Tawārikh, whose data agree exactly with the Bundahish, affirm that the dates given for the Kayanian kings are obtained from the records of the Persians themselves. There seems no reason, therefore, to doubt
that the Bundahish really represents the Persian chronology. But what the value of that chronology may be, is another matter. Personally I think it has real value so far as giving the approximate period of three centuries before Alexander as Zoroaster’s era. Every student of the classics knows the part that chronology plays with reference to the Magi; every reader of the Avesta is familiar with “the time of long duration;” every one who has looked into the scholarly work of Al búrání will have more respect for Persian chronology. Errors indeed there may be; attention has been called above to the lack of agreement between the years assigned by tradition to the reigns of the Zoroastrian Kayanian monarchs and the generally accepted dates of the reigns of Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes; to the dynasty of these three kings there corresponds only the long rule of Vishtaspa (120 years) and a part of that of Bahman Ardashir Dirazdast, some of whose reign answers to that of Artaxerxes Longimanus. As above said, it is difficult to identify the Kayanians of the tradition with the early Achaemenians of Greek history, but this need not nullify the real value of the traditional ‘three centuries before Alexander.’ What Masúdí (c. A. D. 943) in his Indicatio et Admonitio can add on this subject is full of interest. Little attention seems thus far to have been drawn to this important passage and to the explanation which it contains. Masúdí is fully aware of the difference that exists between the Persian and the generally accepted chronology and he shows how it was brought about by Ardashir’s purposely shortening the period between Alexander and himself by causing about half the number of years to be dropped from the chronological lists, but the 300 years of Zoroaster before Alexander were allowed to remain untouched, for the old prophecy regarding the time of Alexander’s appearance had been fulfilled. The passage in Barbier de Meynard is well worth consulting.  

1 See note above, p. 8.
3 See preceding note. I have since found the passage given by Spiegel in Eran. Alterthumskunde iii. 198; compare also Spiegel Z.D.M.G. xlv. 302.

C. Results.

To draw conclusions,—although open to certain objections, still, in the absence of any more reliable data or until the discovery of some new source of information to overthrow or to substantiate the view, there seems but one decision to make in the case before us. From the actual evidence presented and from the material accessible, one is fairly entitled, at least, upon the present merits of the case, to accept the period between the latter half of the seventh century and the middle of the sixth century B. C., or just before the rise of the Achaemenian power, as the approximate date of Zoroaster’s life.
Since the above was written Dr. E. W. West writes me (under date Dec. 19, 1895) the interesting piece of information that his investigations into the history of the Iranian calendar have led him to the date B. C. 505 as the year in which a reform in the Persian calendar must have been instituted. He suggests that Darius, upon the conclusion of his wars and during the organizing of his kingdom and putting in force new acts of legislation, may with the aid and counsel of his priestly advisers have introduced the Zoroastrian names of the months which have supplanted the old Persian names which were given in the inscriptions. If this be so, the point may have a special bearing towards showing that the Achaemenians were Zoroastrians. From Albrünni, Chronology pp. 17, 12; 55, 29; 205, 2; and 220, 19 (transl. Sachau), we know that Zoroaster himself must have occupied himself with the calendar. Konfey u. Stern, Über die Monatsnamen einiger alter Völker, p. 116, regarded the Medo-Persian year as having been introduced into Cappadocia probably as early as B. C. 750. [Dr. West's paper on the Parsi calendar has just appeared in The Academy for April 28, 1896.]

Similar results have been reached by others, or opinions to the same effect have been expressed; for example, Haug, Justi (private letter), Geldner (personal communication), Casartelli, and several names familiar to those acquainted with the field. Some effort might be made perhaps if the premises will allow it, and some attempts have been made, to define the period more exactly by a precise interpretation of the various time-allusions with reference to cardinal events in Zoroaster's life—the beginning of his ministry at the age of 30, the conversion of Vishtaspa in the prophet's 42d year, the death of Zoroaster at the age of 77 years.

1 Cf. Haug, Essays on the Parsis (West's introduction p. xlv); although Haug had previously adopted various earlier eras for Zoroaster, e. g. B. C. 2900 (Lecture on Zoroaster, Bombay, 1863), not later than B. C. 1000 (Essays p. 299, where the subject is discussed; cf. also pp. 15, 136, 264).
2 Personal letter from Professor Justi, dated June 14, 1892.
3 Geldner formerly placed the date of Zoroaster as prior to B. C. 1000 (see article 'Zoroaster' Encyclopaedia Britannica 9th edition).
4 Philosophy of the Mazdaean Religion under the Sassanids, p. ii. a bout 600.
5 The best collections of material on the subject are to be found in de Harlez, Avesta traduit, 2e ed. Introduction pp. xx—xxxv, ccxiv, Spiegel E.A. ii. . . . , and Windischmann Zoroastrische Studien; the latter suggested (Zor. Stud. p. 164) about B. C. 1000 as Zoroaster's date. The present writer (Avesta Grammar p. xi.) once held the opinion that Zoroaster lived 'more than a thousand years before the Christian era.' The date assigned by the Parsi Orientalist K. R. Kama is about B. C. 1800.
6 E. g. Anquetil du Perron Zend-Avesta i. Pt. 2, p. 6, 69—62, assigns B. C. 599—512 as the age of Zoroaster; compare also Kleuker (Foucher) Anhang zum Zend-Avesta, Bd. i. Thl. 1, pp. 327—374; Thl. 2, pp. 51—61. Flogl (Cyrus und Herodot p. 18), following Röth, gives B. C. 599—522 as Zoroaster's era and identifies Vishtaspa with Hystaspes the father of Darius. Neither Flogl nor Röth seem to take any account of the difference between the genealogy of Vishtaspa's ancestors as given in the Old Persian inscriptions and the lineage given in the Avesta, Pahlavi, and later Persian works. He does not, moreover, sufficiently take into consideration (p. 17) that 49 years (or at least 30) must be added in every instance to the 258 years before Alexander, as that was Zoroaster's age when Vishtaspa accepted the faith. This would in any event place the date of Zoroaster's birth before B. C. 600.
The Date of Zoroaster.

The above results, if they be accepted in the light at least of our present information on the subject, seem to be not without importance for the history of early religious thought and of the development of ethical and moral teaching. If one carefully works through the material, it must be acknowledged that the most consistent and the most authoritative of all the actual statements upon the subject place the appearance of the prophet at a period between the closing century of Median rule and the rising wave of Persian power, that is, between the latter half of the seventh century and the middle of the sixth century B.C. It is the sowing of the fallow land that is to bring forth the rich fruits of the harvest. The teaching of Zoroaster must have taken deep root in the soil of Iran at the time when the Jews were carried up into captivity at Babylon (586-536), where they became acquainted with 'the law of the Medes and Persians which altereth not'; the time was not far remote when the sage Confucius should expound to China the national tenets of its people, and the gentle Buddha on Ganges' bank should preach to longing souls the doctrine of redemption through renunciation. How interesting the picture, how full of instruction the contrast! And in this connection, the old question of a possible pre-historic Indo-Iranian religious schism\(^1\) comes perhaps once again into consideration.\(^2\) Certain theological and religious phenomena noticeable in Brahmanism are possibly not so early, after all, as has generally been believed. It may perchance be that Zoroastrianism in Iran was but the religious, social, and ethical culmination of the wave that had been gathering in strength as it moved along, and that was destined in India to spend its breaking force in a different way from its overwhelming course in the plateau land northwest of the mountains of Hindu Kush.

\(^{1}\) The view strongly upheld by Haug.

\(^{2}\) Deductions that might perhaps be made in the light of Hopkins, *Religions of India* pp. 177, 186, 302, 317. Consult especially the suggestive hints of Geldner, article 'Zoroaster,' *Encyclopædia Britannica*, where the much-mooted question of *asura-ahura, daëva-deva*, 'god-demon,' is discussed.

The kingdom of Bactria was the scene of Zoroaster's zealous ministry, as I presume. Born, as I believe, in Atropatene, to the west of Media, this prophet without honor in his own country met with a congenial soil for the seeds of his teaching in eastern Iran. His ringing voice of reform and of a nobler faith found an answering echo in the heart of the Bactrian king, Vishtaspa, whose strong arm gave necessary support to the crusade that spread the new faith west and east throughout the land of Iran. Allusions to this crusade are not uncommon in Zoroastrian literature. Its advance must have been rapid. A fierce religious war which in a way was fatal to Bactria, seems to have ensued with Turan. This was that same savage race in history at whose door the death of victorious Cyrus is laid. Although tradition tells
the sad story that the fire of the sacred altar was quenched in the
blood of the priests when Turan stormed Balkh, this momentary
defeat was but the gathering force of victory; triumph was at
hand. The spiritual spark of regeneration lingered among the
embers and was destined soon to burst into the flame of Persian
power that swept over decaying Media and formed the beacon-
torch that lighted up the land of Iran in early history. But
the history of the newly established creed and certain problems
in regard to the early Achaemenians as Zoroastrians belong else-
where for discussion.
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PRAGATHIKANI, PART I.—The Vocabulary.

In a preceding article, I have applied the delicate test of sacro-sanct numbers to the eighth mandala of the Rig-Veda, with the purpose of ascertaining whether the Kāṇya collection sides more in this regard with the other family books or with those books which, to have a collective name for them, I have called the General Books (i., ix., x.)*

That the latter is the case I think I have shown very plainly. But, as I admitted in the article, the range was so small that the results obtained could be accepted only tentatively. In view, however, of the conflicting opinions in regard to the age of the Kāṇya hymns, every possible criterion becomes of value; and the significant fact, brought out in the article on the holy numbers, that in many instances the Kāṇya hymns stand side by side with the later books of the Rig-Veda and with the Atharva-Veda, may point the way to find the true age of the Kāṇyas, though by itself it is too small a fact to lead one unhesitatingly to any definitive conclusion.

In the present article I take up the vocabulary of the eighth mandala in its relation to the General Books and to later literature.

A full third of this mandala is due to late additions, as has been shown by Lanman in his estimate of the per-cent of text in the arrangement of the whole Saṁhitā. I cite his table:†

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books</th>
<th>ii.</th>
<th>iii.</th>
<th>iv.</th>
<th>v.</th>
<th>vi.</th>
<th>vii.</th>
<th>viii.</th>
<th>ix.</th>
<th>x.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


† The first book is omitted, because, as Lanman says, were it divided into its family collections each would come before the second book. With the Vālakhilya omitted, the proportion is still too great; books vii., viii., ix., numbering even then 74, 108, 77 pages (of Müller’s text) respectively. See Lanman’s article Noun-inflection in the Veda; in this Journal, vol. x., p. 578.
The amount of text alone would, therefore, predispose one to think that any general statement in regard to the antiquity of viii. must be restricted by the counter-statement in regard to its bulk, which is out of proportion to its place in the collection. Such general statements are, therefore, to be deprecated, although at present it is possible to operate only with the text as it has been handed down. Neither in postulating extreme age without reservations, as do, for instance, Ludwig on the philological side, and Hirt on the linguistic side,* nor in maintaining the opposite opinion without reservations, can historical truth be approximated. But the work has not yet been done which will enable scholars successfully to segregate the older and the later portions of the eighth book. In adducing, therefore, certain lists of words, which, in my opinion, show affinity with later rather than with earlier literature, I think it is necessary to guard against the notion that such lists prove the date of the first form of the eighth book. It will be enough, for the present, to show that lateness overlays the book in its present form, as shown by its vocabulary. But it must not be supposed that the correspondence between viii. and the General Books is all in vocabulary; or that the statistical results based on analysis of forms must necessarily be interpreted quite as they have been.

In regard to the first point, in not a few instances, viii., from a metrical and grammatical point of view, coincides rather with the General Books than with the other family books. Thus: cases of the resolution of the vowel in genitive plural of ā stems occur only in i., viii., ix., x. (Lanman, loc. cit., p. 364); the only instance in RV. of a notable transition-form, which is common in later literature, is supplied by bītyā (loc. cit., p. 373) in viii. 64. 13 † another transition-form, ābhūram in viii. 46. 6 is paralleled only in x.; ayejā in viii. 51. 2 is paralleled only in i.; viṣṭāpā, another transition-form, is paralleled only in ix. (pp. 407, 462, 481); the Epic weakening of the perfect stem, found in viii. 66. 10, emusūm, is paralleled only in i. and x. (p. 511 ff.); and the only parallel to the accent of parīhṛtā in viii. 47. 6 is found in x. and AV. (p. 477). Moreover, there are certain anomalies in viii. which are far from having the appearance of antiquity, such as the elision of the ending in yādānvānām in 2. 87 (the only case of this sort), and the anomalous sandhi of acvinerā in 9. 9; not to speak of uce ca āva ca in 19. 23 (the only parallel is in x.); and the surely late imāsya† of 13. 21. Not to be passed as insignifi-

---

* Ludwig, Rig-Veda, vol. iii., p. 175; Hirt, Indogermanische Forschungen, i. 6. Less general is the presentation of Oldenberg, ZDMG., xliii., p. 216.
† Throughout this article I cite according to Aufrecht's first edition, in order to mark clearly the words that are found only in the Vālakhiliya. I have occasionally taken the liberty of referring to ii.–vii. as the 'early' books; more to avoid the inconvenient phrase "other family books" than to be dogmatic.
‡ The type of a host of forms that fairly run riot in Pali.—Ed.
cant is, further, the adverbial use of addás, found only in i., viii., ix., x., but never in the other family books; the frequency of tidás, a comparatively late form, whose occurrences in viii. alone equal in number all its occurrences in ii.–vii. together; and the similar state of things in respect of pacáta, also a late form: viii. alone has four* out of the seventeen occurrences of this word in the RV., which are as many as are found in all the material of ii.–vii. in its present shape; while of the four occurrences in ii.–vii., one is in the confessedly late "weapon-hymn," vi. 75.

But the second point is of still greater importance. I have always held that early forms do not necessarily prove early authorship; for it is evident that, at a period when the old forms were passing away, poets that desired to give archaic effect to their productions could do so very cheaply by overcrowding their verses with metrical or formal archaisms.† Now the statistical survey from which is inferred the probable priority of viii. is based on the most striking grammatical forms, where the difference between the old and new is most pronounced, add, and ani, ebhis and ais, asas and a, a and au.

That this is not theory but fact may be strikingly shown. Everyone admits that the Vālakhilīya hymns cannot be classed among the old hymns of the Rig-Veda. On the contrary, in all probability they are a late addition to the Kāṇva collection. But this is the statistical picture of these forms as given in these eleven hymns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aś</th>
<th>āśas</th>
<th>ās ebhis</th>
<th>āni</th>
<th>ā</th>
<th>au</th>
<th>ā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Late as are the hymns, their old forms, even apart from the stereotyped dual, exceed the new forms. Even the dānastui tags of the hymns in viii. show that the authors, while employing aś more often than āśas, keep the older a as against ani (and ā as against au) in a very great majority of the cases. In fact it must have been largely a matter of metrical convenience with poets who could use indifferently, not only in the same period but in the same hymn and verse, the two parallel forms side by side, as is so

* The cases in viii. are 50. 15. 16; 69. 4; 89. 1; Lanman, loc. cit., p. 457.
† The tendency to revive archaic Vedic forms is not confined to the period immediately following that in which these forms obtained, but characterizes even Sanskrit literature. It might be imagined, indeed, that the preservation of viṇā as neuter plural in Mbhā. i. 3. 57 was due to the real antiquity of this hymn to the Āčrins (especially as Holtzmann cites a as neuter plural only for this place, Grammatisches, p. 12). But what shall be said of a Čiva hymn that contains the same ending in the certainly late imitation of the Ātatarudrīya at the end of the seventh book? Here we find (Mbhā. vii. 201. 77):

bhūtam bhavām bhavatē cāpy adhṛṣyaṁ
tvātasahbhūtā bhuvānanīha viṇā
dhaktaṁ ca mām bhajamānām bhajasva
mā virīṣo mām aḥitāḥtītena.

There can be no doubt from the character of the whole section that both form and phrases, apparently ancient, are due here simply to imitation.
often the case. In the first eleven hymns of the eighth book, not only does the dual ending ā stand out of all proportion to ëu (one hundred and twenty-six cases against seven), but in the same hymns the new ās and ās endings considerably out-number those in āsus and ebhis; while there are eighteen āni forms against twenty-two neuter forms in ā; showing that the forms are not a very satisfactory criterion of date, until a period is reached when, as in the Atharvan, the older forms are so far antiquated that the poets use them less for empty show than for convenience; preferring to remodel according to new forms which now become the standard.

Not too much weight then, in my opinion, is to be laid on the supposittious antiquity of the Kāyā collection as evinced by statistics of forms. As is well known, by the application of the same statistical method to another class of forms, Brunnhofer has arrived at exactly the opposite result in estimating the age of the eighth book, and makes it out late as Lanman makes it out early.*

Curious confirmation of my view in regard to the value of forms has lately been afforded by Arnold's article on Literary Epochs in the Rig- Veda. The author starts out with the avowed purpose of extending and strengthening Lanman's tests with a new set of forms used as new tests. But he finds not only that from this point of view the eighth book is later than the 'cognate sections,' but also that by three out of his four new tests the results are exactly the opposite of what he desired to show, and that they point to a later date for the Kāyā collection. That the author does not renounce such tests altogether is due to his reliance on still other tests which he propounds, but which are of questionable value.†

Arnold unites his contradictory tests with Lanman's to support the proposition that viii. is older than the other family books, though he admits (p. 304) that in three out of four of his new tests book viii. has the larger proportion of later forms.‡ He

* Lanman, however, by no means postulates the early date of viii. without duly guarding against a too sweeping application of his statistics: "Our result indicates that the eighth is older than the other family books. . . . I will not lay stress on this result until the relations of book viii. to the rest have been more carefully determined" (loc. cit. p. 530). Brunnhofer's article 'Uber Dialektspuren im Vedischen Gebrauch der Infinitivformen' is in Kuhn's Zeitschrift, xxv., p. 329 ff., 374. It has been criticized by Collitz and defended by its author in Bezzenger's Beiträge, vii., p. 188; x., pp. 15, 294.

† This article has just appeared in Kuhn's Zeitschrift, xxxiv., p. 297 ff. It is a combination and extension of the methods of Lanman, in the article cited above, and of Oldenberg, in the latter's Protogomena to the Rig-Veda.

‡ It is important to notice, further, that the new forms which Arnold operates with, and which point to viii. being later than ii.-vii., are of less obvious and pronounced character than those used by Lanman. This shows clearly that the strongly marked forms continue to be used for show. The less striking changes are introduced freely at the same time that the more striking changes are used sparingly. In the latter
then adds a test of metre and a test of vocabulary. In regard to
the former he admits that "words and forms are a safer guide"
(p. 325). But it is the treatment of the test of vocabulary
which here calls for special notice. Arnold makes two rough
sets of words which he dubs respectively "older words" and
"later words" and uses these as a test of date by reckoning the
number of occurrences of these words in the 'Song Veda' (book
viii. and its cognate sections) and in the 'Veda of Recitation'
/books ii.–vii. and cognate sections/. To avoid a vicious circle,
the only test here of early and late must perform be the number
of times these words are found in AV. That this test is a futile
one is evident. The subject-matter, as the author grants (p. 307),
is the determining factor in many cases. That the list of "later
words" includes āvān, varśā, sarp, udāra, etc., is sufficient to
show the comparative uselessness of this test, and to make impera-
tive the need of a careful examination of viii. from this point of
view.

But, again, there is more to be said in favor of my view of the
age of viii. than that the chief support of the opposed view is
historically a weak one. And before giving the words which
constitute the body of this article, I should like to point out to
any reader who, on the strength of the statistics hitherto em-
ployed as a means of argument, may still be disinclined to admit
that viii. can be late, certain obviously late factors in the general
make-up of the Kāṇva collection.

No plainer reference to the sub-division of the people into
castes is given anywhere in the Rig-Veda, with the exception of
well-known passages in the tenth book, than in viii. 35.16–18:

brāhma jinvatam utā jinvatam dhiyāḥ
ksatrāḥ jinvatam utā jinvatam nṛṇ
dhenūr jinvatam utā jinvatam vīcaḥ

That this hymn is not early, as Ludwig thinks,* but late, is ren-
dered probable, moreover, by the word dhārmavant in verse 13
of the same hymn, employed in such a connection as to make
almost certain the interpretation 'accompanied by Dharma,' a
personification that takes us out of the theological sphere of the
older Rik.†

Socially also as well as religiously there is historical interest in
the fact that only in the eighth book among family books is
known the mad muni of later times. Here viii., as in the case of
the holy numbers, distinctly stands with x.‡

case the older forms give the archaic effect sought for; whereas, in the
former, not much is gained, and so the later forms are used as conve-
nience dictates.

* Der Rig-Veda, vol. iii., p. 217. Compare RV. viii. 87. 1, 5.
† Compare Scherman, Visionsliteratur, p. 152.
‡ viii. 17. 14; x. 186. Repentance, as expressed by "turning back
from sin" (pratiyān ēnasāl) is spoken of only in viii. 56.17. Compare
Kaege, Rig-Veda, note 106.
In religious fantasy the eighth book stands nearer than does any other family book to the General Books and to still later literature. It is, for instance, only in the eighth book that the Epic epithet of Indra, ākhandāla, is to be found;* only here in family books is Indra so knit with the sun, the later view, that his weapon is the discus, cakrā;† only in the first, eighth, and tenth books is his weapon called the āyasō vīśrāh; and only in the first and eighth books is this weapon represented as ‘three-edged’ or ‘three-pointed.’‡

It is distinctly a late view that makes Sūrya or Savitar (‘sun’) an Āditya. In x. 72. 8–9, the name of one of the Ādityas is Mārtinda. This view is recognized elsewhere only in i. 50. 13 (late addition to a Kāpya hymn), x. 88.11, i. 191.9; and in two passages of viii. (namely 90.11 and 18.2,3), where the new identification is made both explicitly and implicitly: bān mahāḥ asi sūrya bāl āditya mahāḥ asi; and further: anarvāno hy ēśām pāṁṭhā ādityāṇām .. tāt sā naḥ savītā bhāgo vārūno mātrō aryamā garman yachantu. This conception is one shared by viii. (as against other family books) with the late hymns of the General Books and with the Atharvan.§

Connection with later literature as against the earlier is seen, further, in the ascription to Indra of that mysterious “fourth name,” which is spoken of elsewhere only in the tenth book and in Brahmanical literature.¶ So purāṇāman, ‘having many names,’ is an epithet of Indra found only in viii. 82. 17; AV. vi. 99. 1.

But it is not my intention to inquire from how many points of view it may be injudicious to dub viii. an ‘early’ book. The illustrative examples I have given will show that before this can be done the late elements must be accounted for and disposed of. These late elements do not lie in a bunch, to be thrown out, like the Vālakhilya, as a dynamic intrusion. They are freely sown through the book, and before explaining them piecemeal it is incumbent upon the historical student to understand in how far the points of contact with later literature cover the field of the eighth book.

---

*See List i. (below).
† viii. 85.9; i. 53.9. Compare also viii. 52.8; 82.4. In iv. 81.4, 6, Indra is only likened to, and paired with, the sun.
‡ In the former paper I showed that the later AV. view of the cardinal points is represented in RV. only in the eighth book (possibly in the first). For references, see Journal, xvi., p. 276 ff.
§ The Atharvan goes a step farther, and while positing eight Ādityas, includes with the sun the moon, as another Āditya; AV. viii. 2.15; 9.31.
¶ viii. 69.9; x. 54.4. In Vāl. 4.7 ‘the fourth Āditya’; though this has been interpreted as ‘mighty’ by Weber. Possibly another of the General Books recognizes the ‘fourth name,’ for such would seem to be the case when x. 54.4 is compared with ix. 109.14. The latter reads: bībharti cāra indraśya nāma yena viṣvāni vṛtra jaghāṇa; the former: tvām oṁgā tánti (cātvāri nāma) viṣvāni viśe yābhitā kārman maghavān cakārha.
A comparison of the vocabulary of this book with that of the General Books will be useful from this point of view. But before instituting this comparison, I shall analyse first the "lone words" of viii., meaning thereby the words of viii. that are not used in other parts of the Rik; in order first to see how homogeneous is viii. in respect of its own exclusive vocabulary; then to see whether the parallels that can be found for these words take us into earlier or later literature; and finally to discover whether the words are in general of such character as to make it probable that they would have lain unused by the authors of the other family books, had they been current in the day those authors composed. For it will be noticed at once that a great many of these lone words are current words in later literature; and it is only by seeing their mass that one can judge fairly whether it is likely that this mass was current vocabulary in an assumed period A (i.e. viii., supposing viii. to be "the eldest of all," as Hirt calls it), unknown or unused in an assumed later period B (ii.-vii.), and current again in period C (AV., Brâhmaṇas, Epic).

List i.: Words occurring in RV. viii., but not elsewhere in RV.

In this section, I dispense with "viii." All Arabic numbers are to be understood as referring to book viii., except when other books are expressly cited. In this and in all following sections, each word is given with all its occurrences in the RV. The number of occurrences as given for the AV. is exclusive of occurrences in identical Rik-verses of the AV.

an̄gamānt, thrice in 55.13-15, in the form an̄gamāti; nowhere else in RV.; thrice in AV. (-mān, etc.).


ajirāy, 14. 10; lone denominative from ajirā.

ataśi, 3. 13. This appears to be an early word. Compare atadhyaya, i. 63. 6; ii. 19. 4 (Avestan at?).

ātārta, 88. 7. Compare atārta, i. 126. 1; x. 149. 1; and v. 25. 5; atārtaḍaṅga, voc., 26. 1; -panthā, v. 42. 1;* x. 64. 5.

*Even apart from the Atri hymns in viii., the vocabulary of the Kāvyā maṇḍala often coincides with that of the Atri maṇḍala when it shows no correspondence with that of other family books. This subject deserves special treatment, and I can offer here only an example or two to explain why I have occasionally given a parallel in the fifth book: yānah, occurs only viii. 62. 6 and v. 73. 9; yānahūti, only viii. 8. 18; x. 117. 3; v. 61. 15; hiraṇyaḥvaratani (dual) and cuhbāspatī, of the Aevins, are found only in viii. and v.; aruṇāpsu, is used only in viii. i. 1; 7. 7; 62. 16; v. 80. 1; i. 49. 1 (Kāvyā hymn); vasāvāna, occurs only viii. 88. 8; v. 88. 6; i. 90. 2; 174. 1; x. 23. 15; dēhokti, occurs only viii. 93. 15; v. 41. 16; i. 61. 3; 184. 2. There are some cases where the hymns in v. that thus correspond are plainly late. Thus in the same way that viii. 8 (yānahūti) corresponds to v. 61 which is a late hymn, yānah is found in viii. 62 and again in v. 78; and in this same hymn, v. 78. 5, is found atāp, elsewhere only in this same viii. 62. 8; but atāpā in i. 55. 1 and atāpāṇa in Smṛti alone show cases of ā+tap. So the ā+rdt compounds,
adhapriya, 8. 4, voc. Compare kadhapriya, i. 30. 20; kadhapri, i. 38. 1; viii. 7. 31.
adhipastra, 26. 13. Compare adhipasá, i. 140. 9; 162. 16; x. 5. 4; adhipasad, Bräh.; adhinirniraj, viii. 41. 10; adhirukna, 46. 33. All the compounds, therefore, are in vii., i., x., or later. The verb adhi-vas does not occur before x. 75. 8; imitation of adhi-dhá.
adhipaká, 16. 5; then AV. vi. 13. 2 (with paravaká) and ib. xix. 32. 9. The simple vaki occurs in RV. vii. 52. 4; i. 164. 24; AV. (etc.); Epic; but the tendency is to compounds. The only really early case, however, is jocavaki, vi. 59. 4. Then come caçavaká, in ii. 39. 3 (late); AV.; Epic, etc.; and dhara-vaká, in another late hymn, v. 44. 5 (compare evañadda, ib. 10). In ii., viii.-x.: upavaká, i. 104. 8; ṛçavaká, ix. 113. 2; (adhipaká, above); namavaká, vii. 36. 28; AV. xiii. 4. 26; Bräh., etc.; sükavaká, x. 88. 7. 8; AV. vii. 97. 6; Bräh.; etc. come a host, annavaka, acohivaka, amravaka, somapavaka, cáravaka, valivaka, etc. In ii. 23. 8; viii. 85. 20; i. 100. 19, is found adhiavaktá; in ix. 95. 5, upavaká; in i. 24. 8, opavaktár; while vaktár in RV. is found only in vii. 32. 15; ix. 75. 2; x. 61. 12; and the late vii. 104. 8; once in AV.; but frequently in Śmrī. The verb adhi-vac occurs but twice in all the other family books combined; but in viii. alone, four times. Later than RV. are all other vaktr compounds.
adhvagá, 35. 8 (AV. adhvagát); Bräh.; Epic word for traveller; Grassmann, as birds, combined with haisān! ‘Like two wayfarers’ is the meaning; compare ii. 39. 3, rathyéva after caçavakéva as here adhvagávvas after haisávva.
ánatidbhuta, 76. 3; the vicious product of a corrupt age.
ánabhavjan, 2. 1. No such form in Vedic literature; abhíla (Epic) is the only parallel (ṛ bhí).
ánistuta (ánistuta), 38. 9; then AV. vii. 82. 3.
ánistrata, 52. 8; 57. 7. Compare anuṣṭubh, only in x. 124. 9; 130. 4; anubharti, i. 88. 6; anugáyas, viii. 5. 34.* The verb anu-stu occurs twice in viii. (3. 8; 15. 6); but only once in the early books, withal in v. 73. 4 (see note above).
[anácandá, Vál. 10. 1; Brähr. The hymn is perhaps interpolated.] antaravabhara, 32. 12. The compound antar (antar ḍ) occurs but once in family books, iii. 40. 9; often in other books.
ánaya, only in 1. 10; 27. 11; then AV. xi. 4. 23, etc.
apakacakaśas, 64. 7; upákacakaśas, 6. 25. The nearest analogue in family books is viçvácakaśas, vii. 63. 3 (i. 50. 2, etc.).
apayá, ‘western,’ 28. 3; Brähr. (apā and apadina, both viii. and early books).

so common in the Epic, occur only in x. (grutarka, in viii. (grutakakaśa; grutivarana, this also in x.; and grutamagha); in i. (grutaratha); and in v. (grutaratha and grutavida), in v. 36. 6; 44. 12. But both 36. 6 and 44 are late (vs, and hymn).

* For anusúdamb see anukána in List v. (below).
áprahita, 88. 7 ; AV.
aprosivás, see pravásá, below.
apṣudá, 43. 28 (Agni); then AV. x. 4. 23 (snake); Cat. Bräh.
Compare in family books, abhá, vii. 34. 16 ; apsúdá, iii. 3. 5 (apsukhit, i. 139. 11); and in List vii. below, apsuṣit (like
granjít, only in 32. 14).
abhátraváyá, 21. 13 ; as in Bräh. Compare ayuṣá, áx. ley., 51. 2 ;
and asopatná, x. 159. 5 ; 174. 5 (AV. etc.).
amâtiván, 19. 26 (ámâti, vii. 1. 19 ; v. 36. 3 ; x. 42. 10 etc.).
ámbara, 8. 14 (where ámbare replaces turváge in the same verse, i.
. 47. 7). This is a common word in later literature. As
opposed to paráváti it means the enveloping, surrounding,
air, antárikṣé (which is one of the Epic meanings of ámbara),
as in 10. 6 : yád antárikṣé játathah purubhújá yád vené
ródañ ánu ; 9. 2 : yád antárikṣé yád divi. The etymology
is doubtful, but if it be ánu var it is worth remarking that
this combination occurs neither in RV. nor AV. But it does
occur in the Brahmanic and Epic periods. In i. 100. 17,
ambára is a proper name.*
áyaḥciras, 90. 3, epithet of the gods' messenger. Compare (the
only parallel) the Epic demon, ayaḥciras by name.
ayuṣá, see abhrátraváyá, above.
arátvá, 46. 27. In AV, xx. 131. 18 first occurs áratu(paṇa) or
áraḍu ; later arátu(danda).
áráya, 50. 11. Compare aráya, of the kanvajámóhaní, in AV.
i. 25. 3. The AV. poet says the káñva is aráya ; the Káñva
says he is not aráya (retort ?).
aríṣṭutá, see List iii. (below).
arváké, 9. 15. The parallel forms ápáke, paráké, uapáke, nireké
occur in other family books.
avabhthá, 82. 23 ; AV.; Bräh. Late word, and here in its usual
meaning.
aváryá (bráhu), 81. 8. With this sense and accent the word is
post-Vedic. For the compound, compare aviharyatákratu,
only in i. 63. 2. In this sense váryá itself is Epic (compare
Epic durbáryá).
avicetándá, 89. 10, 'unintelligible' (vicetana is Epic, but in the
same meaning, 'senseless,' just as Vedic, vicetas, 'wise,'
becomes 'foolish' in Epic. Compare vimanás in List ii.).
avódevá, 19. 12. This appears to me to be a new form, like
aruvávasu, VS., but it may perhaps be old.
agáśyá, 33. 17 ; in i. 189. 7 (and Epic), gáśya.
áçna (áçna, 'eating' occurs in an early passage) = áçán (áçman),
2. 2 (on the other hand, áçman is 'eating' in AV. xviii. 4.
54). This áçnás is a late form, parallel with puruvákhé
(which occurs only in x. 34. 11, Bräh., etc.); and with

* The antithesis (?) of paráváti and samudré in 12. 17 might raise
the question whether ámbara could mean water. Compare ambu
in later literature and kviyambu, RV. x. 16. 18.
arpat (with urvaropati, gopati, somapati), in voc., 21. 3.
Copied perhaps from ii. 21. 1 (arpat, urvaropati, gojat).
āgarāṣṭha, 26. 24. Formed like the Epic kūrmaprṣṭhasamā dhāmih, Mbh. xii. 313. 6, ‘bare.’ So here ‘sharp,’ with Pischel, ZDMG. xxxv. 712 (compare kharāyru), unless rather the ‘horse’ is Soma itself; as in 52. 2, where the press-stones are ‘soma-backed’ (somaprṣṭha, viii. 43. 11; 52. 2; x. 91. 14; AV; etc.). Another āraṣṭ formation of this sort is pṛdākusānu, 17. 15.
aṃpadi, compare nāvasrakti, below.
āsānāśa (=āsānāśa), 91. 14.
asunjā (=āsunjānta), 14. 15; but apparently not a late form;* compare hinnā, below.
ahaṁsana, voc., 59. 9; compare ahaṁṣyā, i. 167. 7.
āhitā, 51. 3; Bräh.; Smṛti. Chiefly late is hitā, ‘dear,’ ‘agreeable.’ See under hitā, in List vi., below.
ahāya (A.F. 3. 20), 45. 27 (hnu only in i., viii.).
ākhandala, voc., 17. 12. This is an Epic epithet of Indra (as here in RV.). Compare Mbha. xiii. 14. 75: viṣṇop cakraṁ ca tad ghornā vajrām ākhandalasya ca. AV. merely repeats RV. (AV. xx. 5. 6). Even the root appears later than RV., AV.
ājikā, 45. 7, of Indra, as in ājitā, only Vāl. 5. 6; ājipati, only Vāl. 6. 6.
ātvic, 27. 21; like āpitvā, 4. 3 (20. 22; 21. 13), is perhaps old (it may be a reduced form of tvāc), but it stands without parallel.
āturā, 20. 26; 22. 10; 61. 17. There is no other case in RV., and but one in AV., vi. 101. 2, for this is chiefly an Epic word. The negative is found in viii., i., x. (List iv., below); and each of the three hymns where it occurs in i. and x. is late (hymn to press-stones, hymn of physician, x. 94 and 97; hymn to Rudra, i. 114).
āpitvā, see ātvic, above.
ābhaga, Vāl. 5. 6; i. 136. 4; x. 44. 9; AV.
āyantār, 32. 14. Compare niyantar below, under niḍhāṇyaḥ. The verbal compound, current in post-Vedic works, occurs rarely in early family books (once in the third, twice each in the fourth and sixth, not at all in the second, fifth, and seventh books),† but often in the eighth book: ā yamant, 11. 7; 81. 3; ā yachanti, 4. 2; ā yachantu, -antu, 32. 23; 34. 2; ā yatas, 81. 7; ā yamaya, 3. 2; and in further composition, abhi ā yaman, 81. 31. In this regard viii. stands with the later use of ā yam, which is already exemplified in i., ix., x., where are found ā yamat, ix. 44. 5; x. 14. 14; ā yachantu, 1. 130. 2; ā yatas, x. 130. 1; ā yamayanti, i.

* In early family books are found asinva, jinva, and inva (in compounds); in ix., pinva.
† iii. 6. 8; iv. 23. 8; 32. 15; vi. 23. 8; 59. 9 (ā pra yachamat).
162. 16 ; sāmad yamus, x. 94. 6. The noun āyantar is not
found elsewhere, but other derivatives are cited, āyamana,
āyamya, from Upan., and Epic literature respectively.*
āyana, 22. 18 ; Epic. Meaning 'way' yāna itself is found x.
116. 2, Brāh., and Epic; meaning 'vehicle,' iv. 43. 6, and
Brāh. Of the other compounds only prāyāna and devayāna
occur in the family books. There are a number belonging
to the first and tenth books, and to AV.: pītyāna, x. 2. 7;
AV.; niyāna, i. 164. 47; x. 19. '4; 142. 5; AV.: avayāna,
i. 185. 8; AV.; ukiyāna, pūryāna,† rathayāna, AV. (with
rathayāna, RV. viii. 38. 2). Still later come svargayāna,
Ait. Brāh., goyāna, upayāna, Smṛti., etc., etc.
āroki, 43. 3 ; Cat. Brāh. In Nir., ārocana. The verb ā-ruc
(Avestan) appears in early books, as also do rōka and rōkā.
The base of āroki, therefore, is prepared for it early, but
the word itself it of the period viii.—Brāh.
ārksā, 57. 18 ; 63. 4, 13 ; Epic patronymic.
āvītvant, 45. 36 (āvārtana x. 19. 4, 5). In the early books, āvīt.
Compare note on paraçumānti, below.
āsava, see Note below, at the end of this article, p. 89.
āsava, 92. 10, may be old.
āhā, 32. 19 ; VS. 24. 38.
itthān, 59. 14. Later a very common equivalent of itthā,
but only here in RV. (four times in AV.; then Brāh., Smṛti., etc.).
ukthavardhana, 14. 11 (with stoma-vardhana, also āvīt). An
excellent example for viii. There are forty-seven vārdhana
compounds, of which six are in RV., whence they rapidly
increase in number (four new ones in AV.). Two of the six
are in this verse ukthavardhana (the idea being in i. 10. 5),
and stoma-vardhana, both found only here. Of the four
remaining, one, dyumnavardhana, is in ix. 31. 2; another,
nrnavardhana, is in ii. 86. 5; another pāgwardhana, is in
ix. 94. 1; and the last, pustivardhana, is in i. 18. 2; 31. 5;
91. 12; vii. 59. 12. That is to say, every instance of this
formation, popular in all post-Vedic times, is in non-family
books or in late passages of family books; for none will
deny that vii. 59. 12 is "ein gar nicht hierher gehöriger
Vers," who considers the whole hymn and the late tryāmbaka
of this verse; while ii. 36 contains a list of priests quite
unknown to the rest of the Rig-Veda, and is as a whole a
late hymn.
ukṣanyū, 28. 16; ukṣanyadyana, † 25. 22; ukṣany, 26. 9.

* The combination with new prefixes grows rapidly. AV. has more
than half a dozen d yam forms and adds ud d, ntr d, vi d; later come
upā, abhi sam d. It is of course a matter more of use than of posses-
sion.
† xvii. 1. 54 (v. l. for pāryābhī); ib. 4. 63 independently.
With this patronymic compare kāuraiṇa and kānuṇyana in 3. 21
and Vāl. 7. 4, respectively.
ukṣānna, 43. 11; of Agni, associated with vaṣānna (compare also drī-anna, ii. 7. 6; vi. 12. 4; x. 27. 18), and with the phrase sūmapraṇāya vedhāses, which occurs in x. 91. 14 (with which viii. 43. 11 should be compared).

ugrābāhu, 20. 12; 50. 10; twice in AV. Of other ugrā compounds in RV., ugrāputra (in Brāh., ugrāputrā) is found viii. 56. 11; ugrādhavan, x. 103. 3 and AV.; ugrādeva, i. 36. 18 (Kāṇḍa hymn). In AV. and later literature there are several such compounds; none in the family books of RV.

uccācakṣa, 61. 10. Compare uccābudhna, i. 116. 9 (no other similar compound), and nicakra, viii. 7. 29.

udayā, 41. 2; meaning ‘origin,’ post-Vedic.

upajīvika 91. 21; then AV. xx. 129. 20. All other compounds of the diminutive jīvika and upajīvā are late post-Vedic.

upārīmarṣya, 19. 12. Compare upārībudhna, x. 73. 8 (no such compound in ii.–vii.).

upahāsvan, 45. 23. Late Brahmanic combination (upa has).

See Note below, at end of article, p. 78.

upākācakṣas, see āpākau, above.

ubhayaunikārā, i. 2. Compare ubhayaunikārā, x. 152. 2; kiṃkara, vanānkarā, AV. This sort of compound is late. Compare the others: khajānakarā, i. 102. 6 and Brāh. (but khajakīt is early); in the Epic, priyaunikāra; classical forms, rī śākara, mokhana kara, meg晗ānkarā, vaṣānkarā.

urvarāpati, in voc., see avapati, above.

ṛṇākāti, see kāmakāti, below.

ṛtau, see uru, in List ii. (below).

ṛtaspati, 26. 21. This seems to be a late form (by analogy).*

The old word is ṛtapā.

ṛtvīyavant, 8. 13; 12. 10; 69. 7; see poracumānt (below).

ṛdūpā, 66. 11, of Indra: rī ṛdūpā eō ṛdavṛdhā. According to PW., for mrīvupā, ‘sweetness-drinking.’ Compare madhupā, 22. 17: madhvarā, x. 75. 8. But, as mrīvā neither occurs in RV. nor means sweetness, this is probably not the right explanation. In viii. 48. 10; ii. 33. 5; iii. 54. 10 occurs ṛdūdrā,† and this is probably the same word; not, therefore, late.

ṛśībandhu, 89. 6. Compare devabandhu, i. 162. 18; amśabandhu, x. 72. 5. Vīprabandhu is the author of v. 24. 4; x. 57 ff.

ṛśivas, voc., see List ii. (below).

ekaṛāj, 37. 3; AV.; Brāh.; Epic.

---

* For example, with cūbhāspati, a favorite of viii. (s. ātūrtā above). According to PW. and Grassmann, it is a contraction of ṛtāṣya pāṭi. Compare also rādhaspati, in voc., 50. 14, śr. kṛy.

† Compare apō dādar, iv. 16. 8; adādar ātāsam, v. 32. 1. In viii. 33. 18, ṅādārīvac chatā sahāstrā (see godari below); but regularly not of general gifts, but of water or its holder as in gōdāyasyaṁ vi. . . . adārāh, x. 67. 7. So when ṛdā is the object, it means the water which is to burst out; and Grassmann’s etymology seems correct.
edhatâ, 75. 3; twice in AV.; Brâh., etc. Despite L.F. ii. 31, edh is probably from ardha. The verb edh occurs but twice (once) in other family books, four times in viii. alone, four times in x., and once in i. (Kâtya hymn). Its peculiar province is in post-Râk literature, especially Epîc.*

evithâ, 24. 15; unique extension of evi. See final Note, p. 81.

ôjasvant, 65. 5; AV. See paraçumânt, below.

ôjodâ, 3. 24; 81. 17; Tâutt. S.

ôdanâ, 58. 14; 66. 6, 10; common in AV. and subsequent literature. See vyôdana, below.

kânâyâ, 35. 5. Old or new formation?

kârñagîhya, 59. 15. Compare TS., karnagâhîta (PW.).

karnagóbhāna, 67. 3. Important because gobhanâ is a Brâh.-Epic word, occurring neither in RV. nor in AV. Moreover, ear-rings are mentioned in no other family book; only in i. 122. 14, and possibly in i. 64. 10. Rings on neck and wrist alone are worn in the earlier period. Compare the âraç léyômew subhrakhâdâyas (voc.) in 20. 4.

kâld, 47. 17; with gaphâ, q. v., below.

kâvîvanâ, see janîtvanâ, below.

kâpîvant, kâpoâlakâti; see List iii. (below).

kânuñka, 66. 4. Roth connects with kânuñkayântis, in x. 132. 7.

kâmakâti, 81. 14, compare prnakâti, 50. 12; and later kâmakâmin, Epic; kâmakâma, Tâutt. Âr.; Epîc.

kêja and mûrka, 55. 3. Compare mruksâktvam, also âraç, 50. 10, of Indra. Early, vi. 6. 3; 18. 2, is Indra’s by-name tuvî-mrakshâ.

kundâpâya, 17. 13. Compare (? kundrânâci, i. 29. 6. The word kundâ is late; and appears only here in RV., though in AV., and common later (Sûtra, Epic).

kumârakâ, 30. 1; 58. 15; AV.; Brâh.; Epic. See putrakâ, below. That kumârin occurs only in 31. 8 (Brâh., kumârî) is doubtless chance.

kuhayâ, 24. 30 (and, voc., kuhayâkpte), unique extension of kûha, by false analogy; compare ubhayâ, etc., pronouns and substantives. So, later, ihatra is made in the same fashion.

kfûti, 79. 6; AV.

kûd (kâl), 26. 10; Æit. Brâh.

kûla, 47. 11; Brâh.; Epic (‘hill, bank’).

kútâvasu, 81. 9, see pratâvâsu, List iii. (below).

krpây, see List ii. (below).

kṛṇâvarthani, 23. 19; AV. Compare gâyatrâvarthani, 38. 6; VS.; also raghâvarthani, viii., ix.; and rudrâvarthi, viii., ix., x.*

* One of the two cases in the other family books is in the late vi. 47. 16. The other is in iii. 25. 5. The case in i. is i. 41. 2; those in viii. are 27. 16; 46. 5; 63. 4; 73. 9.
† Other compounds are dûvâvarthani, x. 61. 20; hiranyâvarthani, in both early and late books.
kāũrāyāna, 3. 31, nom. prop., for kāũrāyāṇa; related to kārū
as is kān̄vāyāṇa, Vāl. 7. 4, to kāũvā (?).
gambhiracetas, 8. 2, voc. Compare gambhirācaṇsa, vii. 87. 6;
-vapas in x. 62. 5 (i. 35. 7).
gārgara, 58. 9; gārgrā (apān), AV. iv. 15. 12; ix. 4. 4. In the
Epic gārgrā the original idea lingers faintly. Noise is at
the bottom of it, as in the (specially developed ?) bāţbror.
Here with gāũgā.
gāũdā, 1. 20. Not an earlier but a later form of gārd as in
gārdabha, whose noise (vāc not gāũdha) Indra dislikes (i. 29.
5). But Pischel, VS. i. 82 ff., unites gāũdāį gīrā correctly.
Compare Avestan gārēd.
gāyatrīvartanī, see kṛṣṇa, above.
guspītā, 40. 6; AV.; Brāh.
gūrdhāy, 10. 1; lone development of gur. In Vāl. 2. 5, gūrti is
common to i., ix., x. (in the same verse of Vāl. occurs the
dākā λεγεμων svadāven, pun and artificial).
godatra, 21. 16; godari,* 81. 11; godāū, Vāl. 4. 4; i. 4. 1; 164.
26; AV.; gopayāyatan, 25. 13, must be from (Epic) gopay,
not from earlier (RV.) gopāy; gōbandhū, 20. 8. With the
last compare gōmātā, i. 85. 3, of the Maruts. Both are
synonyms of pîgnīmātā. This last also is apparently not a
very old word. At any rate, it occurs only in i., viii., ix.,
and v. 57. 2, 3; 59. 6. With the bandhū part of the com-
pare the ār. λεγ. vājābandhavas, voc., 57. 19; abileceği,
bandhū, above; abandhū, List iii. (below).†
caturyūj, 6. 48. Compare in allegory ii. 15. 1, caturyūga.
carmāṇā, 5. 38; VS. Compare Vāl. 7. 3: cārmāṇi mitātāṇi. In
ii. 35. 13, ānabhimātavārṇa. 5. 38 is dānastuti.
cāratha, 46. 31; cēru, 50. 7 (niceru, i. 181. 5). The parallel
(māhi) keru occurs in i. 45. 4, hymn of Prasāṇa. The
form cāratha is in a dānastuti; and hymn 50, to judge by
jālu in vs. 11, is late.‡
cikītvedan and cikītvinnamānas, see cikīt in List ii. (below).
citrāvāja, see List ii. (below).
chardūpā and jagatpā, 9. 11 (with paraspā and tanūpā). Of the
four, the first two are unique. Like Epic jagatpati is
jagatpā, but the idea is old, jāgataḥ pāṭih, etc.
jatrī, 1. 12; once (again) AV.; also in later literature.
jālu (see PW.), 50. 11. Like later jaũdā.

* Both voc. Compare ṛdādrā, which is old and correct; while godari
seems to be an incorrect imitation (see note above, under ṛdāpā; and
compare puruṇhārdā).
† Two bandhū compounds are common in the early books, sūbandhū
and sūbdānu; two are solitary, gajībdānu, in iv. 1. 9, and pūtāb-
dānu, in vi. 67. 4. The other nine, abandhū, amṭabandhū, ṣībandhū,
gōbandhū, devabandhū, divbāndhū, vājābandhū, samānabandhū, occur
only in viii.; i. x.; viii., i.; or, mṛtyunbāndhū, viii., x.
‡ Unique but unimportant are carāṇi and carīṣūdhāma in 24. 23;
28. 1, respectively.
Janitvanā, 2. 42 (late verse?). The forms show in viii. a growth of the tvā-nā ending. The list of forms may begin with the Avesta, which, however, furnishes but one parallel, nāirīthvāna. Then in vi. 51. 14 occurs sakhitvanā (also in viii. 12. 6); in vii. 81. 6, vasutvanā (also in viii. 1. 6; 13. 12; Vāl. 2. 6); and in ii., iv., vi. there are several occurrences of mahitvanā, which is also found once in ix., thrice in i., and twice in viii. (i. 85. 7; 86. 9; 166. 12; ii. 23. 4; iv. 36. 3; 53. 5; v. 54. 5; 55. 4; 81. 3; vi. 10. 20; viii. 24. 13; 57. 2; ix. 100. 9).† The forms in the other family books are, therefore, few; and if sakhitvanā at vi. 51. 14 be in an added verse, as seems likely, there would, in fact, be but two examples of this formation in the early books. On the other hand, viii. alone has kavitvanā, 40. 3; janitvanā, 2. 42; martyatvanā, 81. 13; mahitvanā (above); vasutvanā (above); vṛṣatvanā, 15. 2; sakhitvanā (above). One other new example, patitvanā, is found in x. 40. 9. It is further to be remarked that the tvā form of these same words is not found in the family books, with the exception of sakhitvā (iii. 1. 15; iv. 25. 2; viii. 7. 31; 21. 8; once each in i. and x., four times in ix.). Of all the cases, only one, vasutvā, x. 61. 12, has a verbal parallel in the Avesta, varṇhūthvā. The tvā form of martyatvanā in viii. is not cited from Vedic literature; that of kavitvanā and janitvanā occur in x. 124. 7; 18. 8, respectively; while patitvā (to patitvanā in x.) is found only in i. 119. 5 (and Epic). Against the supposition that viii. shows earlier forms, rather than a revival and imitation of the old, stand the two examples in probably late verses (vi. 51. 14; viii. 2. 42), and the example in x. 40. 9. It is another example of a moribund ending manipulated to give archaic effect by late poets.

Jāmātar, see List iii. (below).

Jāvant, 83. 5. Compare vijāvant, AV. ix. 3. 13 (vijāvan, in different sense, RV. iii. 1. 23).

Takovā, 58. 13. The apparent analogues, tāku, tākvan, takvāt, tākavāna, takvāviya, are all in i., ix., x. The verb occurs once in vi.; otherwise in ix., x.

Taṭidarthā, 2. 16 (repeated AV., xx. 18. 1). Compare kādartha, x. 22. 6. The nearest verbal approach is in tāṭ id ārtham, ix. 1. 5 (compare x. 106. 1), and ii. 39. 1. The last is a late hymn.

* See on these forms, Whitney, Gr. §1240; Jackson, Gr. §§799, 847.
† In viii. 25. 18, Grassmann proposes to read mahitvā as mahitvanā, to get the requisite form syllables. This is effected by Lamman (loc. cit., p. 383) through resolution, mahitvedā.
‡ Why PW. calls this form an instrumental of vṛṣatvā (i. 54. 2, 91. 2) is not obvious. It is exactly like kavitvanā, which, according to PW., is the instrumental of kavitvanā. Grassmann erroneously groups satvanā with the tvanā endings.
§ But the Avesta has five examples of thva as a secondary ending. Since āstārthvāna reverts to stāthva, and this has a primary ending, it is not comparable with nāirīthvāna.
tanākṛthā, see tanākṛt, in List iii. (below).
tandrayī, 81. 30, from (Brāh.) tandraya.
tāmīścit, 48. 11; AV.; tamiś=tamas, as mahis (in māhiṣvantaṁ) =māhas,
tār, Vāl. 7. 2; Epic, tāra.
taravin, 86. 10, 12; VS.; common Epic word.
tarsuy, 88. 5 (tārus in iii. 2. 3).
tarād, 1. 12. It is perhaps worth mentioning that the combination ā tarā, though not infrequent after RV., occurs in RV. only here; ānu, ābhā, pārī, prā, being used elsewhere in RV.
tavisīyā, 7. 2; 23. 11.
tugrīvarāh, 1. 15; 45. 29; 88. 7. Compare the ātr. ley. kavi-
varāhā, 52. 4.
tāgvan, see suvāstu, below.
tuvikārmin (for tuvikārmi), voc., 55. 12; tuvikrato (voc.), 57. 2;
tuviksā, 66. 11.
tuvudēṣṇa, 70. 2; tuvimāṭra, ib. with tuvikārmi, tuvimagha.
tārānca, 32. 4.
tṛprāks (plural), 2. 5; AV. vii. 56. 3; Brāh. Perhaps synonym of āpi (as in AV.), which is used of soma only in viii., i., ix.
tvāmākāma, 11. 7. Compare tvānīd, 59. 10; yātkāma, x. 121. 10;
and AV. mām kāmena.

dādhrśvāṇi, 50. 3. Compare ṭugukvāṇi, 23. 5; jugukvāṇi, i. 142.
ś; tuturāṇi, i. 165. 1. These are the only parallels.
dācagvin, 1. 9. Compare cātagvin.
dāsmya (for dasmā), 24. 20.
dātra, 87. 10; Śūtra; Epic.
dānavaṇt, 32. 12; Epic.
dācūri, 4. 12; ādācūri, 45. 15. Compare, in early books, jāsuri,
sāhuri.
dīrghāprasadāman, 10. 1; 35. 20. Compare v. 87. 7 (late), where
the idea is given: dīrghām prthū paprathā sādma pārthi-
vam.
dīrghāvoy (voc.), 59. 7; 'transition-form,' Lanman, loc. cit., p. 573.
duronyās, 49. 19 (early, durondā).
diyugāt, 86. 4; 'dyumāt' (PW.).
dvīta (with trīta), 47. 16; nom. prop.
dhārmavant, 35. 13; personification, Dharma in late sense.
dharmakṛt, 87. 1.
nādā, 67. 4, 5 (nākām, 45. 23 and vi. 54. 7).
nādā (≡nādā?), 1. 33 (half a dozen times in AV.; compare
RV. x. 185. 7, nādi), in a dānastuti.
nābhavant, 25. 6; twice in AV.; and later. The early and late
meanings are connected as 'stormy,' and again as 'storm-
wind,' the Epic meaning (see paragumānt, below).
namovākā, see adhvāvakā, above.
nāryāpas, 82. 1; one of several compounds in viii. that express
coincisely an old idea, here the idea of e. g. vii. 21. 4; viii.
85. 19–21.
nāvaśrakti, 65. 12, with aṣṭāpadī (vdo).
nāva, 2. 17; an old word?
nāvta (=nāsata), 51. 12 (but of Indra). In 26. 8 occurs, as
āp. ley, 'indranāsata', dual!
ūcakra, see uccākakra, above.
nidhāanyak, 61. 18.—nidhārayā, 41. 4.—niyantā, 32. 15; the last
also Epic, etc. Compare añyatā, above.
nirmāyā, 4. 20; an old word?
nivarta, 82. 16. Observe that the combination nī var, common in
the Epic, is really used in RV. only here and in i., x.; for iii.
29. 6 (ānivarta) is late.
nistāra, 32. 27; 66. 2.
nṛṣāh, 16. 1 (nṛṣāhya, vi. 25. 8).
nēd=nā id, emphatic, 5. 39 (dānastuti), and AV. Elsewhere in
RV. nēd=īna ṛṣi. This prohibitive use is found in v. 79. 9;
x. 16. 7; 51. 4; AV. The use of nēd as in viii. is also
Brahmanic, but so is the prohibitive.
nityāncana, 27. 18; twice in AV.
patidvīśa, 80. 4.
paramāja, 1. 80; 79. 1. Though not uncommon in later literature,
all other paramā nominal compounds than this are later
than RV. As a noun, in this sense, jyā occurs only here;
earlier in jyāyāns. Ludwig, RV. iii., p. 159, takes the com-
pound as nom. prop.
paraçumānt, 62. 17. New mant and vanta adjectives form rather
a feature of viii. Compare aśumānt, āsivvant (45. 36),
śyavvant (three times, see above), ojaśvant, kauvamānt
(2. 22), kāsivvant, jāvant, dānavant, durkāvant (2. 20;
18. 14), dhārmavant, nābhavant, pustivvant (45. 16), bādhum-
ant, vibhumānt, viśivvant (38. 14), saśivvant (22. 2),
sāvastivvant (38. 10), hāsumānt (16. 4), which makes in all
nineteen* of these forms found nowhere else in RV., though
several of them appear in later literature. In this regard
viii. stands nearer to x. than does any other of the family
books; much nearer, wistal; for of such forms the tenth
book has thirty-nine; the first book, twenty-four; the eighth
book, nineteen; the sixth book, eleven; the third, fifth, and
ninth books, eight each; the fourth and seventh, seven; the
second, four.† It is reasonable, it seems to me, to suppose
that such forms, when once used, would be repeated; so that
those earliest used would stand little chance of remaining
unimitated. And such appears to be the case, for there are
nearly three hundred adjectives with this ending in the Rig-

* In 2. 28, rśivas, voc., is assigned to rśivas, but it may belong here.
The fem. rśivati occurs in Pāp. schol. (PW).
† There may be some omissions in Grassmann's list of mat and vata
forms, on which I rely in the case of the other books, so that the inter-
relation of these other books may not be exactly in accordance with
the order given below. But it is scarcely possible that forms enough
have been omitted to alter materially the proportion between viii. and
the other family books in the number of lone forms.
Veda, so that the numbers above, which represent isolated cases, are proportionally few. This may be surmised also from the fact that most of the solitary words of this sort are in the tenth book, too late to be copied. The greater number of these words are repeated in different books, sometimes very often. With the Vālakhīlya omitted, which has not been included, the length of no one family book is so out of proportion with viii. as to account for the excess in the latter of these forms. For this reason it seems to me right to explain the phenomena by the reason just stated, viz. (there are more unrepeated lone forms in viii.) because viii. comes after the other books; and so see in the likeness of viii. to x. in this regard the straw which shows the wind.*

Interesting corroborative evidence is furnished from another point of view. If one were asked the reason why so Epic a word as bīlavānt occurs in RV. only in x. 145. 1, one would perhaps say that it is mere hap. But why do kācaumānt, kārvāvant, kācāusmant, pārasvāvant, māhasvant, viśāvant, sāmovānt, and especially ānnavānt, pāsāvant, bīlavānt, hīstavānt, hīmāvant, all occur in post-Rik literature, and yet appear nowhere else than here in RV.? Clearly because the tenth book stands nearer than do the other books of RV. to that post-Rik literature. I have remarked above that several of the lone words of this sort in viii. are found also in later literature than RV. That this is true of x., the examples just given will show. In i. also asthavānt, pātāvānt, datavānt, etc. show that the same relation holds in less degree. On the other hand, the same sort of lone words in ix. and other family books than viii. show scarce a trace of Epic kinship, and in fact few of them appear again at all. Thus, if a scale be made in accordance with the facts stated in the last note, the books of the RV. will stand as follows:

ii. and vii.; iv.; iii., v., ix.; vi.; viii.; i.; x. But iii., iv., v., vi., and ix. have about the same proportion. In the first group of the four examples in ii., yuśmāvat and paśmāvat are not cited from other literature; while hārasvāt is possibly in AV.; and mānasvānt is an epithet of Indra in Brāhmaṇas and Śūtras. Of the seven examples in vii., not a single one is cited from later literature (agnimānt) occurs

---

*I have included in vi. the specimens found ib. 47. 24; and 48. 18; and in vii., those ib. 103. 3 and 104. 2. Were these (certainly late) examples omitted, the numbers would stand as follows: for x., 39; i., 24; viii., 19; vi., 9; iii., v., and ix., 8 each; iv., 6 or 7; vii., 5: ii., 4. In vii., moreover, māhīvant, at 68. 5, may be from māhīvanta which would put vii. and ii. on a level. I have not included as unique forms doublets that differ by a quantity or an accent only (e.g. devāvat, dehvāvat, sāhāvat = sahāvat). The form dhvasmanvānt, which appears in PW. for one passage and in Grassmann for another, is really part of a phrase which recurs in several books. Some of the examples in iv. are in 'new songs;' but this I have not considered. The doubtful form in iv. is ōkvant (elsewhere ōkvan).
instead of the late agnivánt). As for iii., iv., v., vi., ix., which may as well be considered together,—ix. has no form cited from later literature [the vant-forms in ix. are ārīvānasvat, pātrāvānant, pāravāndhāvāvant, matādāvant, maṣaradvāvant, rāmanvant, vacandvāvant, gubhrāvant]; vi. shows none of the later forms save tvātṛmaṇant, which occurs in VS.; v. has no such later form at all; iv., among its six or seven words, has one, āvimant, which occurs in AV., and one, māyāvant, which occurs in Brāh.; and finally, iii., out of its eight cases, has six āna ṣa lēgāmuva, one case, tokāvant, cited again from Bhāg. P., and one, rātanavant, cited again, in slightly different sense, from the Epic.

The eighth book, therefore, in this regard, not only stands next to the tenth, but has more rapport with post-Vedic and Sanskrit vocabulary than have all the other family books put together; it has dānnavant, nābhāsavan, bāndhumant, perhaps dhārvanvant, not to speak of aṅgumant, ṣāsvant, and viḍhumant, all, or nearly all, of which appear in post-Rik, if not in post-Vedic literature. There are, by far, more words of this class in viii., not repeated in the RV., than there are elsewhere in the RV.; and of these words, more show affinity with post-Rik literature. In fine, from whichever point of view it is studied, viii. here stands with x. rather than with ii.—vii.—does it not?

parāṅkāṭṭāt, Sā. 27. Most of the passages where these double ablative occur are in x.; the two exact parallels, adhārāṅkāṭṭāt, uttārāṅkāṭṭāt, occur only in x.; but pacoṭṭāt and ārdāṅkāṭṭāt are in vii.

* It will scarcely be necessary to give the long list of examples from x. and i. The others are as follows: ii. has yuṣmāvant, cōcīṣmant, each āṅ dv.; mānasvant, hārāsvant, also found in AV. (?!) and Brāh., respectively; iii. has kūvant, caḍālavan, māhīndavan, yasīdavan, yuvāvant, sūnumānt, all āṅ ḍv.; and tokāvant, rātanavant, Puranic and Epic, respectively; iv. has āvimant, also in AV.; aṅgīmānt, ṣāsvant, prāhāvardvant, hṛmyāvant, all āṅ ḍv.; and āvimant, AV., māyāvant, Brāh. (with ḍvānt beside ḍvānt); v. has aṅgīmānt, apīdhānāvant, abāmānt, udānamant, jīvant, tāvāmānt, pāsīvant, viḍkāvant, all in v. alone, and not cited from elsewhere (jāvānt is repeated in v.); vi. has tvīsfrānt in VS., with all the rest āna ṣa lēgāmuva, viz., kāṣṭāvant, āṅ ḍrāvant, dāṭhāvant, dādhāvant, pāsīvant, nādanumānt, ṣāsvant, ṣāsvant, pāsīvant, cōcīṣmant (compare cōcīṣmant in ii.), hṛmyāvant (dādhāvant and pāsīvant in late hymns); vii. has gātāmant, gopāvant, pāsāvant, māhīsvant (or māhīsvanta), viḍkāvant (agnīvant and ṣāsvat in late hymns), all āna ṣa lēgāmuva. For ix., see above.

† The lone indeclinable vāt-forms present the same relation. There is (unrepeated) manuvānt in ii. 10. 6; vasīṣṭhavānt in vii. 96. 3 (with the repeated jamadaṅgīvānt), withal in a hymn which lacks the family stamp. But in vii. alone there are apnavānvānt and āruvabhṛgūvant, 91. 4.; kāṇāvant, 6. 11; Vāl. 4. 8; nābhākāvant, 40. 4, 5; bhṛgūvant, 48. 18; māndhāṅtīvant, 40. 12; sthārayāvant, 38. 24. I think all other family forms are repeated in different books. The later poets have more new models. One other Kaṇva hymn has vīrīvant (l. 45. 3). Thrice in viii. and once in ix. appears vṛgavānt. To the list above add mūr̥tṛdvarvāvant, in vii. 56. 10 (dhārmavan, ib.), making twenty examples instead of nineteen in viii. (but not a new passage).
páridveṃs, 64. 9. This, besides being árτεχ λεγόμενο, shows quite unique union of púri and dévi (so púri + púd is found only in viii., x.). Compare below vídegas and vídveśana.

parogavāyi, 49. 20 (later in technical sense of gavyātī); and parómātra, 57. 6, áraṇ. All analogous forms (paróκa, parórajas, parobāhi, etc.) are later than RV.

parjánjakradya, 91. 5. Compare vii. 103. 1, parjánayajñivita.

páρcāna, 7. 34; 45. 41; and in the late vii. 104. 5.

pādakā, 33. 19; unique till Smṛti as ‘quarter.’

pāvakāvārma, 3. 3; VS. Compare -varcas,-pocis (formation early).

piṅga, 58. 9; parallel in Epic (PW.). In other meanings the word is Epic.

piyatnā, 2. 15. The verb piy occurs 21. 14; i. 147. 2; x. 28. 11; 68. 6; AV.; Brāh. In i. 174. 8; ii. 19. 7 (only case in ii.—vii.), occurs piyā.

prukakā, 58. 5; Brāh.; Epic, etc. Compare kumārakā, above.

purādparsavana, see prāravāna, in List iv. (below).

purahshṭhātār, 46. 13; analogue of early purohīta, puradvaṇ, puruṣyodhā; in i., x. occur purogava, purogā.

purumāṇa, 52. 17; AV. vi. 99. 1. Compare the árτεχ λεγόμενa

purumāṇa, 2. 38; pūrutrā,* 8. 22; purumāṇa, 45. 21; purumāṇa, 5. 4; 8. 12; puruvāpa, 44. 28; purusamḥīrtā, 55. 4; 59. 6; and the nom. prop. purumāyana, 57. 10, and puruṃhman, voc., 59. 2.†

pājana in cāciṣīpajana, 17. 12 (with cācigu, also áraṇ), both voc.

Neither puy nor pūjana occurs elsewhere in RV.

puruvapāya, 34. 5. Compare pūrvaipaś (āyas? cf. Aufricht, RV.; p. V), only 22. 2 (vivapās, only 26. 7); and pūrvaipī, only in viii., i., x. (List iv., below).

piḍāku (sānu), 17. 15; AV., etc.

prāṇapāt, 17. 13. Compare Smṛti prapātutra; classical prati-

naparṭ (pra as in AV. prapaṭamahā, and praśardha, below).

pritādeva, see List iii. (below).

pratidhā, 66. 4. Compare iv. 27. 5, prāti dhat pābādyāi.

prātiṣṭhā, 13. 38; Brāh. Compare pratiṣṭotar, Sūtra (prāti+stu not elsewhere used?).

pratīt, 28. 1; 26. 8; 39. 5. The verb is in early use.

prabhaṅga, 46. 19, Epic, and prabhaṅga, 50. 18, with abhīpra-

bhaṅga, 45. 35, the two last being árτεχ λεγόμενa, are unique nominal developments of prā bhaṅg (vi. 68. 6). The only parallels are cited from the Epic, prabhaṅjana (later, prabhaṅjura).

pramāda, 2. 18 (AV. xx. 18. 3), cited only here till Epic, but with change of meaning in AV. apramādam (the verbal compound is early).

* Compare papyutṛā in i. 117. 12. With the ascription of many names compare 11. 5 (here to Agni) and x. 54. 4.
† In viii., i., v., purumādhi, nom. prop.
prāṣṭhu, 19. 37; prāsā in iii. 29. 15 (late).
prāvidā, 29. 8; āprāśivānē, 49. 19. The verb prā-vas occurs only in 29. 8 and iii. 7. 3 (late). Both verb and noun are common in Brāh. and Epic respectively.
prācarādha (voc.), 4. 1. Comparing gārīha and gārdhant and the compound atiprācarādhatā, in 13. 6, it would seem that prā had here a sense common in post-Rik literature but rare in the Rik. In the Epic pravega, for instance, there is no forward movement; the word means simply ‘very rapid.’ So, too, Epic prabarā is ‘very strong.’ This is also the meaning of prāvāra in the Epic and in RV. x. 103. 5; possibly of prācravas, v. 41. 16; probably of ā-pramāra, i. 90. 2; and of prācarādha (to which PW. assigns the meaning keck, trotzig), for it is used exactly like gārdhastara in i. 122. 10. This idea of ‘very’ is found in prasaktān, which occurs only in 13. 10; 32. 27; Vāl. i. 8;* in prāpū, 32. 16; iv. 25. 6; in prāmahās, v. 28. 4; vii. 66. 2; viii. 25. 3; and perhaps in one or two words more, though it is doubtful in other cases whether eminence, ‘very,’ or movement, ‘forward,’ is felt as the sense of prā. For this use without verb, compare 9. 19: prā denayāntah (açvinā), “pre-eminent are the worshippers (of the Açvins).”
prācāya, 11. 2; Epic and later (early is prācānśya).
praksakīn, see under prācarādha.
prasthāvan,† voc., 20. 1; prahetār (hētar in viii.–ix.), 88. 7; prahośīn, 81. 4 (compare prahośā, i. 150. 2); prācāmnanyu, 50. 9 (compare prācādhyā, i. 140. 3). These are all āraś, though prasthāvant occurs in VS., as does praheti. I believe all prepositional compounds of manyū are late formations. In RV. in the family books, there are ānutamanyu, vii. 31. 12; viii. 6. 35; 85. 19; tuvīmanyu, voc., vii. 58. 2; samānyu, or samānyu (often);‡ but the prepositional compounds occur thus: abhīmanyu, Epic; upamānyu, i. 102. 9; nīmanyu, AV.; nīrmānyu, Epic; pāramānyu, i. 39. 10; prāmanyu, Epic; vīmanyu, i. 28. 4.
prāvargā, see List iii. (below).
plāyogī, i. 33, dānastūri. Exactly as prācū becomes plācū in the Brāh. period (may be dialectic), so prāyogī becomes plāyogī (or prayoga became playoga). Prayoga is itself late, first in x. 7. 5. Compare pulu for purū in i. 179. 5; x. 86. 22.
badā, 69. 1. See Note below, at end of article, p. 80.

*Compare prasādī, vi. 17. 4, etc. The prācū here is ‘very quick.’ The other prācū, meaning ‘eating,’ is found in i. 40. 1 and viii. 31. 6 (prācāvyā), unless the last be āraś, and i. 40. 1 goes with viii. 32. 16 (PW.). The form prācāvyā (31. 6), Epic prāca, has a parallel in v. 41. 20, ārāvyā (PW.).
† Compare sansthāvan below.
‡ There is only one lone word of this origin in viii. besides prācāmānyu, the adv. compound, viz. manvyasāvin, ‘in wickedness brewing.’
bândhumant, 21. 4; Brâh.; Epic. Compare gôbândhv, above; 
abandhù, in viii., i., etc.; and the note on yaragumánt, above.
bâbdajastukh, Vâl. 7. 3; bâbdaj is late; stûkâ is early; compare 
strûkâvin, 63. 13, त्र. ले.y.
brâdâ, 45. 4; 66. 6, 11.
brâdâukhâ, 32. 10. Compare bhûka, x. 27. 23. But the word is 
perhaps only for brâdâukhâ, as in v. 19. 3; x. 54. 6; 56. 7.
Compare bhâtâkṣayas, below.
brâtâkṣayas, 15. 9 (one word); later nom. prop.
bekanâta, 55. 10. This word for ‘usurer’ is paralleled only by 
prânâganda, in the late verse iii. 53. 14. In a contract 
tablet of the reign of Nabonnidos (558–538 B.C.) occurs 
bakatum, which ‘from the context here seems to be con-
ected with money-lending’ (Barton).
brâhmânyâ, 6. 33; cf. subrahmânya, post-Rîk.
bhâkti, 27. 11. A Brâh. word, here and in Brâh., ‘giving;’ later, 
‘faith.’ Perhaps it should be translated like bhâksâ.
bhâdrafè, 14. 11; later, technically.
bhârâbè, 64. 12; bhârman, ḁâraç, 2. 8; vâja-bhârman (v. l.), 
âraç, 19. 30. Compare bhârabharin, TS.; bhûribhûra, RV. 
i. 164. 13. For arîṣṭâbharman, 18. 4, see List v. (below).
bhîsaj, 9. 6; 22. 10 (cf. bhiśaj, 68. 2, and bhîsañjay, x. 131. 5, 
both ḁaç). The noun bhîsaj occurs ii. 33. 4 and vi. 50. 7; else 
only in viii., i., ix., x., AV., Brâh., etc.; bhesajá is both early 
and late. The interesting fact is that bhîsaj is almost ex-
cclusively Brahmanic, and very common in Brâh. works, 
while in the RV. it is found only here.*
bhûrigû, see ãgu, above.
bhêtâ, 17. 14; Brâh., Sûtra; common Epic word.
maksunjgamâ, 22. 16. Compare AV. yudhîngamâ. The RV. 
form is (false analogy) imitative of aranjgamâ (PW.).
mand, 67. 2. Babylonian.
manyâvâs, 15. 12. See Note at end of article, p. 75.
manyasâvin, 32. 21. See prasthâvan, above.
martyâvânanâ, 81. 13. See janîtvâna, above.
mahañhastin, 70. 1, of Indra. Compare mahâhasta, of Çiva, Mbhâ.
mahenadî, and mahemate, vocatives, in 63. 15; 13. 11; 54. 7; 
Vâl. 1. 7.
mâkt, 2. 42, dânastuti; mâkîna, 27. 8† 
mêksâ, see kîja, above, and mretsâkâvarâ, below.

* In AV., bhiśaj and bhesajâ are common enough, but there is no 
verb of this stem. The AV. verb nîś kar, ‘heal,’ occurs in this sense in 
RV. at x. 97. 8, and, as ñkar, in viii. 1. 12; 20. 28 (though the verb in 
other meanings recurs elsewhere). But AV. has already the Epic 
cikitsati.
† Perhaps mâkt is as S. interprets it; but I suspect it is no more than 
a form of the possessive, standing to mâkîna as does makt to mâkîna, 
a parallel to asmâka; compare the late Epic svaka (Pâli saka) for svâ. 
In position, the possessive could stand after its noun, as does mâmakkâ, 
in x. 108. 10. Compare yaka, below.
mṛgAy, 2. 6; AV.; a common Epic verb (mṛgAYás, ii. 38. 7, is referred to this stem).
mṛkṣakétvān, 50. 10. Compare mṛkṣá, 55. 3.
yaká, see anyaká in List ii. (below).
yājás, 40. 4; an old word?
yajñahotar, voc., 9. 17; in Śruti as nom. prop.
yāyayá, 67. 9. Compare yāvamānt in List viii., below.
yuvājñáni, 2. 19. The word jñáni does not occur alone. Compare the compounds dvijáni, x. 101. 11; vīttājñáni, i. 112. 15; sumājjñáni, i. 156. 2; ajñáni, vijñáni, AV. In v. 61. 4, a late hymn, occurs ṅhadājñānayas, voc. No other case in ii.–vii.

yuvādātta, yuvādāta, 26. 12.
vārenyakrati, 43. 12; AV. vi. 23. 1 (khila to x. 9).
rakṣastvá, only in 18. 13. Of the 43 times that rakṣas itself occurs, eleven cases are in ii.–vii.; of the 31 times that rakṣás occurs, eight are in ii.–vii., with about the same proportion in the compounds. In viii. alone each word occurs about a third of the number of times it does in ii.–vii. combined.
rajáta, 25. 22, dānastuti. Perhaps ‘silvery’?
rāṇāhira, 7. 26; an Epic word.
rábhi (hiraṇyāyá), 5. 29, with rathacárya in 19, two parts of the car elsewhere unknown. Compare hiraṇyapraśga (i. 35. 5)?
rambáh, 45. 20 (classical in various other senses).
rājáká, 21. 18, dānastuti; common in Epic. See vīraká, below.
rādhaspati, voc., 50. 14. See note to piśupati, above.
rúṣ. Later than RV. rúṣ is a common verb; especially Epic, but also in AV. and Bräh. In RV. only in viii. 4. 8; 88. 4.
vaktár, see adhiváká, above.
vāyuyu, see sunāstu, below.
vācañña, 43. 11. Compare uksáñña, above.
vásurocis, see vasurác, in List vii. (below).
vāsudā, 58. 4; AV.; Epic, vasuda. Compare vāsadāvan, ii. 27. 12.
vājadārvinas, 73. 6.
vājabandhu, see yobandhu, above, under godatra.
vātasvána, 91. 5. Compare vii. 56. 3, vātāsvánas.
vāpá, 19. 31. Compare vācra, used 16 times, and only once outside of i., viii.–x., viz. in the last verse of ii. 34. But PW. takes ‘obedient’ rather than ‘roaring’ as the meaning.
vīśas, 22. 10 (sajīšas in early books).
vīḍyāddyāhasta, 7. 25; like śuḥhasta, x. 103. 2; but also like the old form vājrahastra (elaborated to vājradaksina in x.). The word may be regarded as an elaboration, like the last. Were it early, it would be repeated like vājrahastra, which occurs again and again.
vīḍvēṣas, 22. 2; vīḍvēṣana, 1. 2. The former is śv. lēy.; the latter, as a noun, is Epic. The combination is late. The first occurrence of vī dvīs is in AV. iii. 30. 4, where is found also, vs. 1, vīḍvēṣa, while vīḍvēṣa occurs ib. v. 21. 1; and
avidvis, ib. i. 34. 5. Elsewhere vi dvis is eminently Epic and late. Except for these two instances in viii., RV. has no compound, verbal or nominal, of this sort.

viparādyā, 3. 4; cited again from classical literature; a significantly late word from its meaning, which is literal, 'in the sacrifices, the kingdom of the priests.'

viboddhāna, agenitis, 3. 22; actionis, Epic; viboddhā (or vibuddhā), x. 133. 4; vi budhī in causal, only i. 12. 4; 22. 1; Epic, etc.; simple vi budhī, first in Epic (?).

vibhumant, 85. 16; perhaps as later (Brāh.), 'with vibhus.' In any case a late word.

vibhutarati, see List iii. (below).

vimalā, 6. 44. Compare Epic vīmaṁant. PW. compares vīmahas, which is found in i. 86. 1, and in the late passage, v. 87. 4.

vivāksana, 1. 25 ; 21. 5; 35. 23; 45. 11; Vāl. 1. 4.

vīvadāvanī, see vīvāmanas, List ii. (below).

vīvāmanas, see List ii.; vīvāmanasa, 45. 42; compare saptamānasa, below, and vīvājanā, Brāh.

vīvāvārya, 19. 11; 22. 12 (early is vīvāvārya). The word vārya is early.

vīrākā, 80. 2; Epic. Compare kumārakā, pādaṇā, putrakā, rājākā, all for the first time in viii. Perhaps vṛdhikā, 67. 4, belongs here.

vīṣatrāṇand, see janitvanā, above. Other unique forms of this sort in vii. are vīṣanābhi, 20. 10; vīṣapatiṇī, 15. 6; vīṣādaṇji and vīṣaprayāvan, 20. 9; vīṣapsu, 20. 7, 10;—that is, chiefly in one hymn.

venū, Vāl. 7. 3; AV., etc.; Epic.

vēda, in late sense of wisdom, only in 19. 5; AV., Brāh., etc. In RV., suvēda is from vēd, 'find'; vīdyā, only in x. 71. 11.

vēdiśthā, 2. 24. Compare vēdiyānis in vii. 98. 1, perhaps late, as the Vasiṣṭha tag appears to be copied. The positive form, vēdītar, occurs first in AV.

vāigvānarā, in the sense 'complete,' 30. 4. This meaning is found in AV. and Brāh. In RV., only here; elsewhere vāigvānarā is applied to Agni in RV., except in x. 61. 16, where it is epithet of light. In 30. 4, vīUCE (deva) vāigvānarā utā, the word can have only its later sense.

vyājana, 67. 2, with abhyājana, which see in List ii. (below).

Both words are late (compare in PW. the use of vyājana as 'insignia'); but the verbal compound is early.

vratāti, 40. 6; Brāh., etc.

vratvā, 48. 8. Like avratvā, a Brāh. word, but there vratya.

patábradha, 66. 7. Considering the number of pada compounds strewn through the whole work, those that are here mentioned do not appear to be particularly significant. But it may be of interest to note that some of these are confined to viii. and its group. Thus besides patábradha, there is patáparvan (AV., Epic), at i. 80. 6; viii. 6. 6; 65. 2; 78. 3; patávant, viii. 5. 15; 24. 29; 53. 5; x. 94. 2; 102. 5, 9, and the late hymn (see
Lāman), vi. 47. 9; gatāvāja, viii. 81. 10; ix. 96. 9; 110. 10; gatāmarga, viii. 1. 5; 33. 5; 34. 7; ix. 62. 14; gatāvāda, viii. 4. 19; x. 62. 8 (and Śātras).*

**gatrāvāja, 45. 5.** A late word? (Sprüche.)

**gatrisi, 49. 6, and AV.**

**gānās, 45. 11; 80. 3 (with ganaśīs); common word in Brāb., Epic.**

**ganaśīs, 80. 3; a Śruti word, peculiarly Epic, and in (late) Upanishads.**

**gaphā, 47. 17.** This word for ¼ is united with kāla, 14. Compare the same, AV. vi. 46. 3; xix. 57. 1; but (not in technical sense) prakalavā, RV. vii. 18. 15. Both gaphā and kāla as fractions are Brahmanic (Śruti).

**gavrabhā, 83. 6, nom. prop.** To judge by the metre, the verse is late. As a common noun, gavrabhā is found in AV. and later.

**gavasī, 45. 5; 66. 2, Indra's mother.** Compare pāvasatī sāntā, of Indra, iv. 24. 1; vii. 79. 2.

**gātinā, 83. 6 (gātī, early).** Like late rathina (vaninā) compared with early rathin (vanin).† Imitation of vi. 45. 22?

**gācu, gācāpijanu, in voc., 17. 12; see pūr above; and ākhanjala (in same hymn).**

**gāstrā, 33. 16; a Śruti word.** Compare prapāstrā, ii. 36. 6 (late); ii. 1. 2 (i. 94. 6; ii. 5. 4, prapāstrā); x. 91. 10.

**gubharakhādi, see karnagobhāna, above.**

**gūvāra, 1. 22.** With the idea, if certain,† compare x. 73. 4, vasāvi, late; gavadhā, ii. 13. 6 (mystic; late ?). The last word occurs in AV., Brāh. etc. Compare also puvadhīpā, Vāl. 3. 9.

**grāmāti, 48. 2.** Compare yuddhāmprāustī, nom. prop., Brāh.

**grāvāskāma, 2. 38; pravojit, 32. 14.**

**grāvayātsakhi, 46. 12.** Compare grāvayātpati, v. 25. 5; dravaya- yātsakha, x. 39. 10; yāvayātsakha, x. 26. 5; mandayātsakha, i. 4. 7 (mandādvira, ṛ. leya, vii. 58. 1).

**grēṣṭhacocis, see ajirā, List vii., below.**

**gvaśāthā, 85. 7; Brāh.**

**gūvātrakāj, see gūvāṭrā, List iv., below; gvaśa, see List iii., below.**

**gvaśadvarī (river), 26. 18; compare pvaśād, x. 75. 6.** This is the only gvaśa compound in RV. They abound in later literature, several being in Brāh. The ydva compounds are found late and early. Compare gubhrajyāvān, viii. 26. 19. It is perhaps worthy of note that gubhamyāvān also is virtually in the later group, as v. 61. 13 is late (elsewhere, i. 89. 7).

Unique (in viii.) are akṣṇayāvān, svayāvān, rathayāvān.

---

* Catāpatra and catāracas are found only in the RV. at vii. 97. 7 and 100. 3, respectively (the former again in the Epic). In Vāl. 1. 2; 2. 2, catānīka, later nom. prop.
† The form rathina is late Sk.; vanin appears in early books of RV.; vaninā only in RV. x. 66. 6.
‡ The meaning is doubtful. One is tempted to connect with āvāla. But the idea generally assigned is common enough, as in x. 47. 2.
(sa-or) samsthavan, 37. 4; see prasthavan, above. Both forms, ḍāṇaḥ ley.

saṁśāda, 90. 4; a Brāhmaṇa and Smṛti word. Compare vāda, Smṛti.

[saṁśīd, Vāl. 10. 1; AV.; Brāh. The hymn is perhaps interpolated.]

satōmahant, 30. 1. There is a parallel to this in the late hymn to the weapons, vi. 75. 9, satōvīra; and a better in the Brah-

manic satōbhānt.

sadaṁi, 70. 9. Compare vasājā, 88. 8; udityājāta, 46. 5; all ṛ. ley.

sadhāstutya, 26. 1; for sadhāstutī.

sāṇḍhātar, 1. 12; Epic.

saṅdhi, 1. 12; AV.; Brāh.

sāptā, 1. 23; TS.

sāptāyadha, 61. 16; AV., etc.

sāptābhīna, 40. 5.

sāptāmānuṣa, 39. 8. Compare vipāmānuṣa, above, and, in 81. 20, saptā sanśādo, with 2. 23; must mean seven (many) people.

sāptā, Vāl. 7. 5; 11. 5 (tribhiḥ, sāptābhīḥ).

sābala, 82. 9; AV.; Epic.

samudrāvāsas, 91. 4–6; compare Epic samudrāvasin (sea-dwel-

lers).

sārāti, 27. 14, 17; Brāh.

saḥāsrāmi, 8. 11, 14, 15; sahaśraparṇa, 66. 7, and AV.; saha-

śrapoṣa, * 92. 4; sahaśrapāṇi, 45. 26, Epic. Compare in viii.–ix., sahāroṭi; in viii.–x., sahaśrapā. In viii. 34. 15 alone occurs the form sahaśrapā, quite common after RV. See Note, below at end of article, p. 75.

sisnu, voc., 19, 31; an old form?

svatī, 47. 1; an old word?

sukāra, 69. 6. This (like the Epic duṣkara) is a Smṛti word, for it means ‘easy to do,’ whereas su in RV. with kr is usually moral, rarely physical. In 13. 7; 46. 27, this moral side is apparent in sukīvam (the word is found only here). Compare suddhā, 67. 8, meaning ‘leicht theilbar’ (PW.). Compare also the many occurrences of sukīt, sukrāt, sukṛtyā, etc., always with the idea of ‘good.’† The word sukāra is found only here in RV., but is common in the Epic. With sukrāta in 66. 11 is joined the ṛ. ley, sūmāya, ‘well made.’

sugavṛdhā, 18. 2; sūjāmbha, 49. 13; sutārman, 42. 3; suṭṛthā, see tṛthā, List vii. (below); sutyāj, 49. 16.

suddāksīna, 83. 5 (with susavyā, ḍāṇaḥ); and in vii. 32. 3, the one late verse of the hymn! The word is Epic, ‘dextrous,’ not ‘generous.’

sudāta, 67. 8; with susā, ib. 4.

supraśātr, 23. 29; see prāṭārī, List iii., below.

* But sahasrapoṣa, -poṣaḍ are early.
† The physical side appears only in sukārman, iv. 2. 17; 83. 9.
supásáras, 26. 24; suhhás, 23. 20; sáyukta, 58. 13; suvástu, 19. 37: utá me prayáyor vayóho svástvá állhi tágvani (five átāk lehāvā), Nírūk., p. 43; sávidvāns, 24. 23; susámán, 49. 18 (23. 28, etc., susámán, nom. prop.); susáda, Vál. 10. 3; suśirá, 58. 12 (Bräh., Epic); susarvá, 27. 18; Epic ('escape,' either 'from' or 'to'); suhárá, 2. 5 (may mean Epic suhárá, sáuhárá, as it does in ÁV., and be the opposite of dhúhrár, ÁV.; compare vss. 21, 27).*

śādādahás, 58. 3. On śādā see Pischel, VS., i., p. 72.

srprákarusna, 32. 10, of Indra. After iii. 18. 5 (srprá-karásná dudhise vápnísi)?

stukāvin, 63. 18; see balbajastuká, above.

stomavárdhána, see ukhávárdhána, above.

spírá, 1. 23; an old word?

srámas, 48. 5; Bräh.

hāripá, 15. 4; Vál. 2. 10.

hásyáti, 78. 6. See upáhásvan above, and final Note, p. 78.

hínává, 40. 9; compare asunvá, above.

kírányakepya, see List iii., below, and compare the át. leh. ghrítaka, 49. 2.

kírányapepas, 8. 2; 31. 8. For zaranyapañce, see Note, p. 84.

kírányábhápu, 5. 28; 22. 5. Compare the át. leh. svabhípú, 57. 16, 18.

hóman, 'call,' 52. 4.

By way of convenient survey, I give in this paragraph the following late words (mostly Brahmánic and Epic) culled from the foregoing list, which words, were we to assume that viii. is the oldest book, would be particularly inexplicable.† The words are: adhvaigá, ánatidbhuta, ánádbhayín, apácyá, abhrátryá, ámpára, avabhírtha, aváryá, ácásyá, ágnás, ákhanála, áyána, udáyá, upáhásvan, ríspati, ekaríj (ÁV.), edhatá (ÁV.), odaná (ÁV.), karnaśobhána, kalá, kumáráká, kád, káta, taúdārtha, dátá, dánávant, Dútá, Dhárma(vant), parógyáti, púdáká, píngá, pútuká, (páct-pújana, prabhágá, (in, abhi-), bándhumant, bhíṣajyá, maháhostin, rándhra, vidhésetna, vijánáryá, vibhédhána, víraká, védá, váipivánard (‘complete,’ ÁV.), vyánjana, pútrátvá, pánás, pánakás, gopáh (fraction), Çavasti, gástrá, sáúdháatar, sukára, sráma. But the others, in the affinities of their forms and the location of parallel words, will also repay a careful consideration.

In addition to these, there are the following forms which, unless I err, and except for proper names, include nearly all the words used in RV. only in viii. Some are merely old forms with negative prefix. Some seem to me to indicate neither antiquity nor

---

* Usually rendered 'having a good hárdi or stomach.' But the poet perhaps means that bad preparations do not frighten a friendly guest.
† None of these occurs in a dánastuti. The only important dánastuti words in the list above are kuháyá, nágá, plágóti, yáká, rajáta, rájaká.
recent growth, but to be such compounds as might be old and remain unimitated or be quite new. They are forms for which I find no analogies either in later or early literature.* It is, however, only fair to give the list, that the reader may not think the proportion of apparently late words to be greater than it is. The forms are: águrukha, agára, ádánaka, ánapasphar, ánarcárti, áñúmrí, ápasphár, apiérti, ápúrnti, ápratínámu, aprámísutyá, ábhadhára, ábháryána, námáthára, árágí, áçresita, áscacandás, áśtrayáavana, ághñávásu, ámvestí, áçuddásu, ándrayopá, ánapa, ánávana (śupera, 32. 21), ávánáthá, ávánágí, árusú, ávádáhuti (VS.), átánasa, ábhústhíra, [chándya], jámújáhá, trádá, trípastyá, trájáñása, ádívásu, dráváccakra, (agn) ádáváda, nágánu, nícumpánà, nídhárayá, parivjá, paríhájí, púthopákás, bháryásuti, mádáraghu, mánotáí, mahásváni, mátámélá (Váíl. 5. 5), már, yónyá, ríjáesita, ráthásád, rúshádyána, rásád, rásáí, árváśíkhalátra, víprála, víbhánu, víbhukráta, vídúnya- vepas, vídúnyáavana (26. 15, doubtful), vídúvára, víthak (víthak 43. 4), gírídáci, gúcrauptápa, púnestá, cókón, sáptayá, súráchá, súnháti (or súnháti, 85. 13), śúmátpurándá, smádárisás, sádá- dháináva, svándráratha, svábdí, svágyávan, svágyáyá, híranyavá, híiddá (doubtful, 18. 19).

There may be in this list, and in the forms I have marked above as of questionable antiquity, enough that is archaic to offset the verbal kinship with post-Rik language evinced by the long list of late words in the eighth book; but I confess that I am unable to see any comparison in the bearings of the two sets of words. In the one case there are a few words which may be old. In the other there are a large number of words, any one of which might indeed by chance have escaped repetition; but their sum is momentous and indicative of a close relationship between viii. and the later language.

But, besides these, there are numerous words of viii. which occur in other books as well, but in those books which form in my opinion a sort of group with the eighth, viz., in the tenth and first, and in less degree in the ninth. These words make a no less important criterion of criticism. But, whereas, in the words peculiar to viii., the chief interest lies in the determination of their archaic value, there is interest in these new lists, not only in the age of each word but in the scope of parallelism between viii. and the books which stand apart from the family books; so that even negatives, if used only here, become instructive as showing a similar thesaurus.

---

* Some of the forms given above might have been included here; but I wished on the one hand to include there all forms that might be thought antique, and on the other to group forms of like sort, unless as in śvágyává some one form seemed too late to be put with others of its group. A few more are given in the Lists below.

† In viii. 8. 12; i. 46. 2. The difference is only the accent of manótar in early books.

‡ See List v., below.
“But,” some one may object, “any book has late words.” So indeed it has. And, accordingly, before proceeding to the study of these parallelisms, I consider this more closely. Every ṁandula has its store of words that do not occur again till a later period, and the question may naturally arise whether the words enlisted above do not give a false impression; and whether late words collected from one of the other family books would not give the same result. Anticipating this objection, I have collected all the corresponding words in the seventh ṁandula, which is next in size to the eighth, and is generally recognized as one of the oldest family collections. I find that the list of ‘Epic’ or of ‘Brahmanic’ words is such as might have been presupposed in accordance with the general theory of this essay. The conditions are not quite the same, for in vii. there are four hymns (33, 50, 103, 104) later than any in viii., and the group beginning with 15 is out of place and later than the first collection. Moreover such hymns as 4, 8, 18, 81, 83, which lack or copy the Vasiṣṭha stamp (or appended formula), are also in all probability later than the marked Vasiṣṭha hymns.

The ‘Epic’ or Sanskrit words, apart from these later hymns, are:
1. 19, dāvūṣas, in the Epic an epithet of Čiva; 3. 2, vṛdājana, in the Epic a proper name (Sk. ‘wandering,’ Veda ‘path’); 56. 3, vītasanasa, ‘noise of wind,’ but in Purāṇa, name of mountain; 64. 2, śīndhu-patī, ‘lord of S.,’ but in the Epic, ‘lord of Sindhu people;’ 66. 10, pāribhūṭi, ‘power,’ late Sk. ‘harm;’ 88. 6, yaksīn, ‘alive’ or ‘holy,’ but in the Epic, yaksīnā, ‘a female devil’;* 97. 7, patāpatra (lateral), in the Epic, of various unrelated meanings. It will be seen that the compounds are few and such as might easily be remade, while the uncompounded words are still rarer. The later group, of non-Vasiṣṭha and late hymns, adds the late words, 4. 8, anvādavya; 8. 2, sūmahant; 15. 3, amātya; 18. 20, dēvaka (in 16, yathākrtam is a Sūtra phrase); 34. 14, havyā (Epic havyā); ib. 19, mahāsena;† 81. 4, ratnābhdj, ‘giving gifts,’ against Epic ‘having jewels;’ 88. 2, kṛtādhyav, late Sk. kṛtādvaja, proper name; 94. 12, abhoḍā, Epic similar meaning;‡ 103. 2, sarast and vasiṣṭ (Frog Hymn);§ 104. 10, steyakṣīt; ib. 17, kharyā. Nor is much gained by adding the ‘Brahmanic’ words, 20. 6, bhres; 50. 1, 4, 2 (late hymn), ajakāvā, anudakā, kulphā; 66. 11, anāpyā; 85. 2, devahūya.

The plainly late and apparently late hymns of vii. contain naturally the most characteristically late words. But from the

---

* This and the preceding hymn (87. 5; 88. 3) contain praṇāhd. Both appear to be late hymns. On didékṣa, in 86. 8, see Gaedike, Acc., p. 189 (perhaps locative).
† This is probably not a Vasiṣṭha hymn, as 29 ff. is a later addition.
‡ In RV. a snake, in Epic the hood of the snake, and in other meanings. This is not a Vasiṣṭha hymn apparently.
§ This hymn has further the late words vratacārīn (Sūtra and Epic); praṇīṣ, AV.; dvādvaçd in Brahmanic sense; cākta, gomāyu, atirūtra (technical, AV., Brāh.), parivatsarīva, AV.

---
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comparison of vii. and viii. comes the important fact that all the hymns of vii. put together contain less than half as many late words as does viii., including withal the very latest hymns of the former collection. The late words in viii. are so strewn through the collection that there is little use in attempting to mark off late and early hymns except very generally, for the difference in age between them is not by any means so marked as in the case of the seventh mandala. There are of course some hymns (such as 17, 33, 45, 47, 58, 67, 80) which are verbally later than others. But on the whole the difference is small.*

These objections considered, I now proceed to take up first the verbal parallels between viii. and x.; then those between viii. and i.; then those between vii., i., and x. After these come the cases of similarity between viii., i., and ix., which are less important; then those between vii., i., ix., and x.; and, finally, those between viii. and ix., and between vii., ix. and x.

List ii.: Words occurring in RV. viii. and x., but not elsewhere in RV.

aḍhaspadá, viii. 5. 38; x. 133. 4; 134. 2; 166. 5; and half a dozen times in AV.
aḍhyakša, viii. 43. 24; thrice in x. (88. 13; 128. 1; 129. 7) and thrice in AV.; later, a common word.
aṇāpi, viii. 21. 13; x. 39. 6 (āpī is early; but āpānā is only in viii.).
anubandá, viii. 25. 9; x. 53. 6; Brāh. (úlba, only in x. 51. 1; AV.; Brāh.; úlbandá, Brāh.).
anuká, viii. 21. 18; 39. 1; x. 133. 1.
abhyārjana, viii. 3. 24; 67. 2; x. 85. 7; twice in AV. Both cases in viii. are late apparently, so that it is questionable whether PW. does well to render ‘adornment’ in distinction from ‘ointment,’ the later meaning. The limited verbal use may indicate the latter as well as the former. In ix. 86. 43 abhy ājñate means ‘anoint,’ and so, in my opinion, does the same verb in ii. 8. 4: ‘(he shines) with his flames when he is anointed’ (as in x. 87. 20, ajára is here a noun).
áyudáha, viii. 45. 3; x. 27. 10 (áyudáha, x. 103. 7; áyudhásena, x. 138. 5); all used of Indra or his weapons. Compare also áyudhvin, x. 108. 6, and ayoddhár,† i. 32. 6 (but not a Kānya hymn); áyodhíyá, AV.

* The group which seems to contain the oldest hymns, judged from this point of view, is that immediately following the Vālakhilīya (from 49 to 66, with the exception of 58), a fact which, taken in connection with the late character of the first hymns in viii., may tend to show that the Vāl. was prefixed to the original beginning; prior to the addition of the hymns that now precede the Vālakhilīya.
† And in the following hymns in the same refrain. Apparently a late formation, analogous to eka, etc.; comparable with yad, viii. 31. 18 (unique in RV.). Compare vįcvara, only in viii., i., x.; taká, only in i.; and amuka, asaká, post-Rik.
‡ Not ‘schlechter Kampf’; rather ‘not finding any one to fight him,’ or ‘unmatched’ (Whitney, AJP. xiii. 300).
av, in causal as 'devour,' only viii. 45. 38; x. 113. 8; but in AV. and Brāh.

ahāsūva, a demon, viii. 32. 2, 26; 66. 2; x. 144. 3. Compare ix. 77. 3, etc., ahi.

ādārdvā, viii. 89. 4; x. 78. 6.

ubhāyāvin, viii. 1. 2; x. 87. 3; once in AV.*

ūrā, viii. 34. 3; x. 95. 3, a late hymn.

ūrū, viii. 1. 34; 59. 10; x. 85. 37; 90. 11, 12; 162. 4; 163. 4; common in AV; Brāh., etc. In 59. 10 occurs the only instance where ṛtāyū, which occurs ten times, becomes ṛtāyū. ṛ'cya, viii. 4. 10; ṛcyadā, x. 39. 8; ṛ'cya occurs only here and in AV., Brāh., etc.

rśivas, voc., viii. 2. 28; rśivāt, x. 66. 14; Smṛti.

stādyā, viii. 91. 19; x. 27. 24 (late verse); Brāh., etc. Compare upadās in List vii. (below).

kavītvā, viii. 40. 3; kavītvā, x. 124. 7. The form in viii. is unique; that in x. ('song-art') occurs in Smṛti. See janitvanā in List i., above.

krpāy, viii. 46. 16; x. 98. 7; the nearest approach to Epic kṛpāy. So kṛpāy occurs only viii. 39. 4 (x. 74. 3), from kṛpāṇa, which occurs first in x. 99. 9. The older verb is krap.

khēḍā, viii. 61. 8; 66. 3; x. 116. 4; quasi personification of Indra's weapon, the Destroyer. In 61. 8 it is called śrīvā, an epithet which occurs only in viii., i., ix., x. Compare AV. xix. 27. 3, for the frequent later use.

godhā, viii. 58. 9; x. 28. 10–11; AV. and later, in more special meanings. In RV. 'bow-string' (not 'harp-string') in each case. Compare in viii. gārgara and piṅgā. In the song at viii. 58. 9, the words mean, 'sound the harp and twang the bow-string!'

gosāti, viii. 73. 7; x. 38. 1. Compare dhānasāti in x., dhanasāti in i.; but in other cases the formation with sāti is common in early books.

cikit, viii. 86. 14; 91. 2; Vāl. 3. 3; x. 3. 1; cikitā, Vāl. 8. 5; AV.; cikitvā, only viii. 49. 18; cikitvānmanas, viii. 84. 5; v. 22. 3. citrārādhas, viii. 11. 9; x. 65. 3; AV. Compare citrāvāja, only viii. 7. 33.

janitvanā, see List i. (above).

jālpī, viii. 48. 14; x. 82. 7; noun in AV., verb in Brāh.

turvāne (sic), viii. 9. 13; 12. 19; 45. 27; x. 93. 10. There is one other case, vi. 46. 8, notoriously late.

dabhṛacetās, viii. 90. 16; x. 61. 8.

dāyagāyutvā, Vāl. 11. 7; x. 62. 2; AV., etc.

devasyā, viii. 91. 2; x. 100. 12 (late verse?); early is duvoya.

dravīti, viii. 63. 14; 81. 15; x. 11. 9; 49. 9. Compare drāvayitū, ix. 69. 6; tanayitū, iv. 3. 1; x. 66. 11; pārayitū, iii. 4. 9 (Aprī); iv. 57. 1 (this is a late hymn); stanayitū, v. 83. 6. Compare also mādayitū, ix. 101. 1; stūdayitū,

* That is, once besides the parallel to RV.
x. 64. 9; anāmayito, x. 137. 7. The forms seem to be late with the exception of (s)tanayitvā. There is, I believe, no exact parallel to dravītva.

dhār uttarā, viii. 33. 18; x. 28. 6.

nābhantām, viii. 39-42; x. 133. 1; in different form, the verb occurs in AV., Brāh. The noun nābhā occurs only in i. 174. 8. The name nābhakā occurs only in viii. But nabhānaḥ, -nu, etc. are early parallels.

nīrītas, in plural, viii. 24. 24; x. 114. 2 (a late hymn). In other family books, only in singular.

nēdiyas, as adv., viii. 64. 5; Vāl. 5. 5; x. 101. 3. The adj. occurs in viii. 26. 10; x. 86. 20.

nyāk, as adv., viii. 4. 1; 28. 3; 32. 25; 54. 1; x. 60. 11; 94. 5; 100. 8. This use appears in Brāh., Epic, etc.

paripād, viii. 24. 24; x. 28. 10. Compare pāridvesas in viii. 64. 9. Unique verbal use with pārī. Compare also of similar meaning, paripātham, only in i., x.

pākātra, viii. 18. 15; x. 2. 5. Compare pākavānt, x. 100. 3; unique; pākacanad, vii. 104. 9, late hymn; pākasīrtran, x. 86. 19; pākasthāman, nom. prop., viii. 3. 21, 22. Early are pāka and pākā.

purānavā, viii. 40. 6; 62. 11; x. 43. 9. In the family books occur pūrvāthā, pūrvavāt, pratnāthā, pratnavāt, but not purānavāt, which, however, is not cited from later works.

prabudh, viii. 27. 19; x. 128. 6; former, noun; latter, adj. The verb, prābuddh, is used once in viii. 9. 16, and in causal, ib. 17; i. 113. 14; 124. 10; 134. 3; iv. 14. 3; 51. 5; x. 42. 2. Of these iv. 14 is apparently an imitation of iv. 13. Both prabudha and prabodha are late (Sruti) forms.

bhūj, viii. 8. 2; 91. 6; x. 106. 4.

dhārātrīvā, viii. 20. 22; 72. 8; x. 108. 10; Epic, etc.

manasy, viii. 45. 31; x. 27. 5; AV.; Brāh., etc. (manasya, only x. 171. 3).

mahāmahāḥ: aham asmi mahāmahāḥ says Indra, x. 119. 12. Nowhere else except in viii. 24. 10; 33. 15; 46. 10. Analogous forms are all late: ghanāghanā, x.; carṣeṣā, x.; calesāla, i. 164. 48; sarīṣpā, x.; vadavaddā, Æit. Brāh. Compare yavīrādh, only viii. 4. 6; x. 61. 9.

mūnī, viii. 17. 14; x. 136. 2 ff.; AV.; Brāh. In these RV. passages mūnī has its late technical sense of a mad devotee. In vii. 56. 8 the same word has an older sense: "Es ist nicht möglich hier mit Sāy, die Bedeutung Asket festzuhalten" (PW.).

mṛtyubāndhu, viii. 18. 22; x. 95. 18 (late hymn). The mṛtyu compounds are very common after RV. This is the only one in RV. For bāndhu compounds, see under ṭībandhū, above in List i.

yavīrādh, viii. 4. 6; x. 61. 9. See under mahāmahāḥ, above.

vedgū (vedate) as dulce, late idiom, found in RV. only in viii. 62. 8; x. 62. 4 (vadati).
vīmanas, viii. 75. 2; x. 82. 2. A common Epic word, nor is the Epic meaning impossible in vii. The abstract vīmanasyā, which also is Epic, occurs first Av. v. 21. 1. The verb vī maṇ occurs only x. 92. 3.

vīpākarma(n), viii. 87. 2; x. 81. 2–7; 82. 2; 166. 4; 170. 4; Av.; Brāh.

vīpāmanas, nom. prop., viii. 23. 2; 24. 7; adj., x. 55. 8. Compare vīpāmanas, ār. leya, viii. 46. 17 (see 45. 42); and in viii. 34. 6, vīpādatīdhi, ār. leya.

vīpāda, viii. 44. 26; x. 16. 6; twice in Av.; also in Brāh.

vīsa, 'servant,' viii. 19. 11; x. 109. 5.

gātāvant and gātāvya, see under gatābrahīna, List i. (above).

piṇḍura, nom. prop., viii. 5. 25; x. 40. 7. The verb piṇḍ occurs only i. 164. 29; vi. 75. 3 (both late).

sānāvānana, viii. 1. 2; x. 93. 12; three times in Av.; also in Epic.

sānvārγam, viii. 64. 12; x. 43. 5 (both with it); the adj. is Brāh. [sabhd, as 'assembly hall,' viii. 4. 9; x. (34. 6); 71. 10. In i. 107. 3; iv. 2. 5, the word appears to be used in an older sense. The late meaning here ascribed rather doubtfully to sabhd may be maintained for vi. 28. 6; but it is to be remarked that this hymn, which holds cows to be more sacred than gods, appears to be late. The word is sometimes translated by 'houses' (so by Müller, SBE. xxxii. p. 276). This certainly must be the sense in iv. 2. 5, where at any rate 'assembly-hall' will not do. But I bracket the word as a doubtful though probable case.]

salādravāja, viii. 81. 10; x. 104. 7; possibly accidental.

sāraghā, viii. 4. 8; x. 106. 10; twice in Av.

sabhadrā, viii. 1. 34; x. 10. 14; Epic. The example in viii. is in a late added verse.

susomā, viii. 7. 29; 53. 11; x. 75. 5.

susṭhū, viii. 22. 18; x. 107. 11 (susṭhumā), a late word.

sūryāṃsā, viii. 83. 2; x. 64. 3; 68. 10; 92. 12; 93. 5.

sōtu, viii. 19. 18; x. 76. 6; 88. 1.

sūmaprəṣṭha, viii. 48. 11; 52. 2; x. 91. 14 (with vedhāsī, as in viii. 43. 11); thrice in Av.

svāsetu, viii. 59. 10; x. 61. 16.

hānta, viii. 69. 5; x. 53. 2; 119. 9; once in Av.; Brāh.; Epic, etc.

hitāprayas, viii. 27. 7; 49. 17; 58. 18 (late verse); x. 61. 15 (late hymn); 112. 7. Except for the last case, always in the phrase, vṛktābarhiṣo hitāprayaṣaḥ. Compare ii. 37. 4; vi. 15. 15; viii. 32. 29; 82. 24. The phrase-form is new.

Observe that by far the greater number of these cases affect those hymns of viii. that precede the Vālakhilya.

I leave now the cases of correspondence between viii. and x, the remaining ones being common also to other books of the group viii., i., ix., x., and proceed to the parallels between viii. and i.
List iii.: Words occurring in RV. viii. and i., but not elsewhere in RV.

aksṇa in aksṇayāvān, viii. 7, 35; aksṇayādrūḥ, i. 122, 9; aksṇayā, Brāh.
advayas, viii. 18, 6; i. 187, 3.
anasthitāḥ(m), viii. 1, 34; i. 164, 4; AV.
abandhā, viii. 21, 4; i. 53, 9; twice in AV.
abudhānā, viii. 66, 5; i. 24, 7.
abhūṣjant, viii. 1, 6; i. 120, 12. Compare abhuj, x. 95, 11.
ari (=ta?) in compounds, only viii. 1, 22 (ariṣṭutā); i. 126, 5 (ariḍāhāyas); i. 186, 3 (ariḍārtā).
arkōn, viii. 90, 13; i. 7, 1; 10, 1; 38, 15 (‘havingarka, songs or beams’).
avayātār, viii. 48, 2; i. 129, 11; AV. ii. 2, 2. Compare avayātāhelas, i. 171, 6; avayādha, i. 185, 8; AV. viii. 1, 6. The verb occurs in this sense in vii. 66, 5: āva yusad ugran; iv. 1, 4: devaṣya hēlo iva yāsisīṣṭhū. On avayātādh(m) in i. 94, 12, see PW.
[avātā, viii. 68, 7; perhaps with i. 38, 7; 52, 4; 62, 10; but doubtful (PW.)]
avisya, viii. 45, 23; 58, 9; i. 189, 5; AV. iii. 26, 2; xi. 2, 2. The noun, avisya, ii. 38, 3.
amadrūḥ, viii. 49, 7; i. 36, 16; 176, 3.
ahravīḍ, viii. 5, 9, 21; i. 2, 2; 156, 4. Compare aharavṝṝ, viii. 55, 10. There is one more compound in RV., āharavīḍ, ix. 86, 41, and AV. v. 21, 6, but none in the family books; all other compounds being in AV., VS, or later.
āhrutapsu, viii. 20, 7; i. 52, 4.
adārin, viii. 45, 13; adārā, i. 46, 5; Brāh. etc. The verb (driyāte) and the nominal compounds with ā are all of the Brahmanic and Epic age. In iv. 30, 24, āduri is probably, with Sāyaṇa and in a better sense, to be derived from dar, ‘break’; but the verse itself seems to be late. Compare ādara, āḍṛya, etc.
adāya, viii. 23, 17; i. 28, 7.*
ārāṇa, viii. 59, 8; i. 112, 6 (ārāṇa and árā are found in family books).
ācitravant, viii. 84, 7; i. 23, 1; Sūtra.
[iddāhāgni, viii. 27, 7; i. 83, 4; sāmāḍdāgni, v. 37, 2; x. 63, 7. Clearlv an accident, if v. 37 is early.]
indrātvata, viii. 19, 16; i. 132, 1; indrādvista, only in ix. 73, 5; indragopāḥ, viii. 46, 32 (compare indragupta, AV. xii. 1, 11). The form indrātvata may have changed accent and in reality be from indrātvā, the Epic abstract.†

* But in ii. 9, 6, dyājīṣṭha.
† In Mbh. appears indragopaka, in the sense of Brāh. indragopa, an insect (Cat. Brāh. xiv. 5, 3, 10). If indrātvata be from ēdvṛtva (ii. 11, 16; PW.) the form is bizarre enough to be an unintelligent imitation.
úpagruti, viii. 8. 5; 34. 11; i. 10. 3; twice in AV.; in Çat. Brāh., etc. Compare upagrotār in vii. 23. 1. The verbal combination is common in family books.

upalvarā, viii. 6. 28; 58. 6; 85. 14; i. 82. 6; 87. 2; Epic.

dṛstra, viii. 5. 37; 6. 48; 46. 22, 31; i. 188. 2; compare uṣṭrā, x. 106. 2. In viii., only in dānastuti. See final Note, p. 83.

ōdatī (ūd) viii. 58. 2; i. 48. 6.

kakṣyaprā, vii. 3. 22; i. 10. 3. Compare kānaprā, i. 158. 2. For kakṣyā itself, a late word, see final Note, p. 77.

kadhaprā, see aadhapriya, in List i., above.

kācāvant, viii. 25. 24; 57. 18; kacaplakā, ib. 33. 19 (three dānastutiś). In viii. 33. 11; i. 22. 3; 37. 3; 157. 4; 162. 17; 168. 4, occurs kāpa; but also in v. 83. 3, besides trīkaḍa in ii. 18. 1. Possibly related are kapa, a proper name, in viii. 5. 37, and kaśika, i. 126. 6, ‘weasel’ (?). The word kapa is common in later literature (Brāh., Epic). Comparing kaśipū, ‘a mat’ (AV.), the meaning ‘plait, twine’ (kaśika, ‘creeping sinuously’?), suggests itself as radical. The limitation of occurrences is of great interest, for the word is not infrequent; yet with the exception of v. 83. 3 it is confined in reality to i., viii., for the lateness of ii. 18 is clear at a glance. Moreover, of the hymns where kapa occurs, that in which is found kacaplakā together with kāpa (viii. 33. 11, 19) is shown by pāstrā, verse 10, to be even later than most of viii. One is tempted, accordingly, to suspect that the occurrence of kāpa at v. 83. 3 may signify more than the other repeated coincidences between v. and viii.; but the suggestion of lateness for this Parjanya hymn (v. 83) will perhaps appear too heterodox. Kapa is probably rather avoided than not known, and is an example of restraint in the use of common words, since elsewhere in the hymns there are often occasions where this word might be expected, as in the facing hymns. But such restraint would be almost as good a test of age as one could desire. As in English one might guess at the age of a religious book from the presence in it of words which a preceding generation would not have admitted into literature of this sort, e.g. the gospel hymn-book of the Salvationists, so the conventional language of the hymns may exclude what is later admitted into religious poetry.

gāyatrīvedas, viii. i. 10; i. 142. 12.

gorita, viii. 21. 5; i. 137. 1.

chanda, viii. 7. 36; i. 92. 6 (chandā, vii. 11. 3, doubtful); Epic, as noun.

janjanabhavat, viii. 43. 8; jānjati, i. 188. 7 (only parallel).

jālāsabhajā, viii. 29. 5; i. 43. 4; AV.

jmātar, vjmātar, the former, viii. 2. 20; 26. 21, 22; the latter, i. 109. 2, ār. Aey. The former occurs in Smṛti, etc.

jihmadāra, viii. 40. 5; i. 116. 9. I think the only other form of bāra is nicnabāra, v. 85. 3; viii. 61. 10; x. 106. 10; another case of coincidence with v.
tanûkr't, viii. 68. 3; i. 31. 9; Sûtra. Compare tanûkrythā, viii. 75. 1, d̄v. - ley.; and final Note, p. 82, on the Avestan form.
tápurgambara, viii. 23. 4; i. 36. 16; 58. 5; always of Agni.
dīdāb, Vāl. 9. 2; i. 15. 11.
durmāda, viii. 2. 12; i. 32. 6; 39. 5; VS.; colloquial Epic. Compare for meaning surucā, viii. 21. 14, d̄v. - ley.
devātta, viii. 32. 27; i. 37. 4. Compare vásutt, in List vii., below.
drávātyān, of Aªvins' steeds, viii. 5. 35; of Aªvins, i. 3. 1. Compare dravācakrā, viii. 34. 18; but also dravādva, iv. 43. 2.
dvīpā, viii. 20. 4; i. 169. 3; dvīpā, AV. Compare nīpā, Vāl. 1. 9; 3. 1; and dhānu, only in viii., i., x. But Roth reads dvīvyā for dvīpā in viii. 20. 4.
dhītā, as noun, 'intent,' viii. 3. 16; 8. 10; 40. 3; 41. 1; i. 170. 1.
In the last case (with d) the participle is half noun; in viii. it is wholly so.
dhrṣanmanas, voc., viii. 78. 4; i. 52. 12.
nadvīt, viii. 12. 26; i. 59. 2.
namasyā, vii. 27. 11; i. 55. 4; Smārti. Compare the new forms manasyā, in x.; apasasyā, in i., ix.; māhkasasyā, in ix., x.; girvanasyā, in x.; for duvasyā, see List ii., above; panasyā, v. 56. 9; urusyā, viii. 48. 5; avisyā, i. 189. 5; viii. 45. 23; 56. 9.

nrvāhas, viii. 25. 23; i. 6. 2. In ii. 37. 5, nṛvāhana.
pandīyā, Vāl. 9. 3; i. 160. 5; Brāh.
pataiyinā, viii. 27. 12; i. 163. 11; pataiyinukā, AV. vi. 18. 3.
Causals in -iṣṇā all belong to the later group, if I am not mistaken. The only early adj. not causal so made is carinṣṇā, iv. 7. 9; vi. 61. 8; while like pataiyinā are mūdaiṣṇā, only i. 14. 4; viii. 71. 2; AV.; the unique nāmaiyinvas, voc., vii. 20. 1; pārtaiyinā, x. 97. 3; AV.; Brāh.; Epi.; tāpayiṣṇā, x. 34. 7. Compare also the companion-piece to carinṣṇā in āraviṣṇā, x. 94. 11.*
pattudā, viii. 43. 6; i. 32. 8; compare ēµvōdvōv, but here adv. from locative. This is the only form of this sort in RV. Compare hṛttudā, pattudā, in x.
pāprī, 'saving' in vii. 16. 11; i. 91. 21; AV.; and Brāh. As 'offering,' 'rich,' in early books.
pratādvasu, viii. 13. 27; kṛtādvasu, ib. 31. 9; and cātādvasu, i. 119. 1, are unique compounds and belong together. Early is vidādvasu, i. 6. 6; iii. 34. 1; v. 39. 1; viii. 55. 1. Compare rādhādṛi, viii. 46. 23; rādhādvāra, vi. 3. 2. Of the same form is the d̄v. - ley. mandādvāra, viii. 58. 1. Compare kṣayādvāra, in List iv., below.

* There are two more forms of this sort, pōṣayinā and gccayinā, both in AV. The observation above holds good only for causals. The other forms (here without d), jēnā, erdhāsnu, carinṣṇā appear in family books. In x., ix., and VS., respectively, are found nīṣatsnu, vadhāsnu, daṅksyā. 
(pratūr), supratūr, pratūrti, are implied in supratūrti in iii. 9. 1. prabhurtar, viii. 2. 35; i. 178. 3 (prabhurtavya, Smrī). The noun prābharmāṇ occurs in compound, v. 32. 4; otherwise only in viii., i., x.

praṭaṇaḥ, viii. 61. 1; i. 112. 3; Brāh.; Epic. In the late hymn of priests’ names, ii. 5, occurs praṇastār, vs. 4; elsewhere only in i. 94. 6; VS.; Brāh., etc. Compare the use of āstrī, in RV. only in viii. 33. 16; of the verb praṇ caus, in i. and x. only; and of praṇī in i., ix., x. only.

prāṣṭiḥ, viii. 7. 28; i. 39. 6 (100. 17); prāṣṭamant, vi. 47. 24 (dānastuti; late); further in AV., Brāh., etc.

prāṣṭakvya, viii. 3. 9; Vāl. 3. 2; 6. 8; i. 44. 6; 45. 3; author of i. 44–50; ix. 95; Vāl. 1. Compare Kāṇya, son of Ghora, of Aṅgiras race, i. 36. 10–11; 48. 4; 112. 5; viii. 5. 23; 8. 4; AV.; plural, i. 14. 2; 47. 2; viii. 8. 3.

prāvargāḥ, viii. 4. 6; suprāvargāḥ, viii. 22. 18; dānāpravarg, i. 92. 8 (pra as in prāyoga, x. 106. 2).

bāhūtā, viii. 90. 2; i. 41. 2.

bhujyād, viii. 21. 8; i. 126. 6; 128. 5; Epic form.

mathrā, viii. 46. 23; i. 181. 5. Compare Aufrecht², Preface, p. iv. mandādvīra and mādayisnī, see above under pratādvasu, patayisnī, respectively.

yasāydbhī, sic, viii. 87. 8; yasyā, i. 167. 4; 173. 12.

yahu, (vii. 15. 11;) viii. 4. 5; 19. 12; 49. 13; 73. 5; i. 26. 10; 74. 5; 79. 4.*

yuvāphā, viii. 35. 5; i. 161. 3, 7. The formation, like that of romapā, rāmā, and āruapa or aruapā, ārvān, is not found in other family books, unless turodāḥ be a case, which, however, probably comes direct from tuvā (not from tuvān), like etapa from etā.

ruvanī, viii. 85. 12; ruvanāḥ, i. 122. 5; both only here.

vaninī, viii. 3. 5; i. 64. 12; 119. 1; 139. 10; 180. 3 (7). But perhaps iii. 40. 7 also belongs here.

vādyāstī, viii. 75. 2–3; i. 25. 4; 176. 1.

vajjādvanī, viii. 2. 34; i. 17. 4. In Brāh., name of a Sāman, vajjādvarī.

vāsārā, viii. 6. 30; 48. 7; i. 137. 3. A late word for ‘day’, in RV. ‘by day’, or ‘clear’ (Hillebrandt, Ved. Myth., p. 26).

vidhindaḥ, nom. prop., viii. 2. 41; adj., i. 116. 20; vidhinduka; nom. prop. (see PW.), Brāh.

vidhūta, in composition, vidhūtarati, viii. 19. 2; vidhūtadvayamna, viii. 33. 6; i. 156. 1. Common in later literature, to judge by the fact that vidhūtamanas is used to explain vimanas in Nīr.

vivāsvan, viii. 91. 22; i. 187. 7.

vīvāgarīta, viii. 1. 22; 59. 3; i. 61. 9; vīvāgarīta, voc., i. 180. 2.

* As for vii. 15. 11, as is well known, hymns 15–17 in this collection are late. See final Note (on yazud), p. 83.
vīpātār, viii. 88. 5; i. 48. 16. SV. has a worse reading in the former passage. In ii. 3. 8, vīpātārī.

vīgāpyā, viii. 26. 7; vīgāpyā, i. 162. 22.

vīṣaṇavād, viii. 20. 10; nom. prop., i. 51. 13, Brāh., etc.

vīṣaṇavant, viii. 57. 18; i. 100. 16; 122. 3; 173. 5; 182. 1.
catāparvan, see under catābradhna, List i. (above).
catūkvanī, viii. 23. 5; catūkvanā, i. 132. 3 (late).
catūna, catūnyā, vii. 46. 31; i. 100. 18, respectively. The latter appears to be a late verse.

sacānas, (sacānastamā), sacānas, viii. 26. 8; i. 127. 11 (verb, sacānas, x. 4. 3). In vii. 22. 2, sacānadvant. But in i. 116. 18; vi. 39. 1, sacāndā.

sāmbhṛtāvya, viii. 34. 12; sāmbhṛtakrato, voc., i. 52. 8. These are both of Indra, and the only such compounds before Brāh., except sāmbhṛtajra, AV, xix. 49. 1.
sugāvyam, viii. 12. 33; i. 162. 22. Compare i. 116. 25, sugāva.

In Mbh., sugāva is a karmadhāraya.
sūgmya, viii. 22. 15; i. 48. 13; 173. 4.
sudvyāt, viii. 23. 4; i. 140. 1; 143. 8.
supravargā, see pravargā, above.

surīpā, viii. 4. 9; surīpakrtu, i. 4. 1; common adj. of the later period (not in AV.). The kṛtus extension is found in the Talavakāra Brāh., vi. 155 (Burnell's MS.), surīpakrtu.
sūcānṣkṛta, viii. 66. 11; i. 38. 12; Epic. Compare sācānskṛta, viii. 38. 9; v. 76. 2 (-kṛtā).

srprādānu, viii. 25. 5; i. 96. 8.
somakāma, viii. 50. 2; i. 104. 9; AV.

hāridravā, viii. 35. 7; i. 50. 12 (late). See Note, p. 79.
hiranyakeśa, i. 79. 1; hiranyakeśa, viii. 32. 29=82. 24. Later, Hiranyakeśa, Hiranyakeśin. In early form, hārikeśa, of Agni, iii. 2. 13.

Somewhat over one-fifth of the forms here noted as common to viii. and i. alone are found in the hymns of the latter book ascribed to various Kānvas (12–23, 36–50). Occasionally a word like arkin helps to show that hymns now placed before the Kānya collection of i. may have come from the Kānya family; thus this word arkin, for example, occurs in hymns i. 7 and i. 10 as well as in 38, and would also indicate that viii. 90 comes, like other hymns of viii. ascribed to other than Kāṇvas, from the Kānvas. The hymns placed before the Vālakhilya furnish most of the correspondence with i., but the final hymns of viii. are also well represented. This indicates again (compare the observations on pp. 52, 55) that hymns viii. 1–48 are in general later than the hymns that now follow right after the Vālakhilya.
Līṭīs iv.: Words occurring in RV. viii., i., and x., but not elsewhere in RV.

I take up now the common vocabulary of viii. and i., as it is shared by x. and ix. And first, the common vocabulary of viii., i., and x.

ajá, see note.*
adhvaram, viii. 4. 14; i. 44. 3; 47. 8; x. 36. 8; 78. 7.
anātura, viii. 47. 10; i. 114. 1; x. 94. 11; 97. 20. Compare ātura, only in viii. Both words occur in AV., and later ātura is common.
aduvāta, viii. 13. 19; i. 34. 4; 51. 9; x. 34. 2; four times in AV.; in Brāh., Epic, etc. Compare vivrata, below.
aparītvēta, viii. 67. 8; i. 100. 19; 102. 11; x. 63. 5. Compare parītvē, āp. lecy. in viii. 49. 6 (but in viii. 82. 7; ix. 79. 2, pārītvēti).
abhīṣīya, vii. 23. 5; i. 148. 5; x. 112. 10; but abhīṣīyātār in iv. 17. 17.
irīna, viii. 4. 3; 76. 1, 4; i. 186. 9; x. 34. 1, 9; once in AV.; also in Brāh., etc.
uḍāra, vii. 1. 23; 2. 1; 17. 8 (vapāḍāra); 67. 7; 80. 5; i. 25. 15; 30. 3; 49. 9; 162. 10; x. 86. 23; AV., Brāh., etc. Both uḍāra and jathāra are in use in Suṛṭi. But in RV., the former is not found in other family books, and the latter is found but once in viii. (81. 23, plural). This coincides with AV., where uḍāra is used often and jathāra but thrice. With vapāḍara, compare viii. 1. 23, svara. For the Avestan correspondence, see final Note, p. 81.
ksayādeśa (compare pratāḍēvasu, in List iii., above), viii. 19. 10; i. 106. 4; 114. 1–3, 10; 125. 3; x. 92. 9.
ksurā, viii. 4. 16; i. 166. 10; x. 28. 9. The word does not mean a razor, but a blade,—in i. 166 fastened upon a car-wheel (late); and so in viii. 4. 16, not scissors but a rapidly turning blade (AV. xx. 127. 4) is implied. In AV. it is the blade of an arrow. The word is old, but its special application is worked out differently in India and Greece.
[caṇḍrāmas, late word for 'moon,' v. 51. 15 (sūryācandramās, like sūryāmās, which, again, occurs only in viii., x.); i. 102. 2; x. 190. 3 (in both cases, sūryācandramās); and caṇḍrāmas in viii. 71. 8; i. 24. 10; 84. 15; 105. 1; x. 64. 3; 85. 19; 90. 13].
carūtra, viii. 48. 5; i. 116. 15; x. 117. 7; AV. Later as 'behavior.'
dānīśṛha, viii. 22. 1; 24. 25, 26; i. 182. 2; x. 143. 3.

* In viii. 41. 10; i. 67. 5; 164. 6; x. 83. 6, ajá means the 'unborn.' As this is a meaning used in later literature, the word deserves a place in the list. But other passages may be so interpreted, though the meaning here is that assigned by PW. and Grassmann to these passages alone.
[durhānā, i. 38. 6; 121. 14; durhanāy, x. 134. 2; durhanāyā, in the late verse iv. 30. 8; durhanāvau, viii. 2. 20; 18. 14.]
drāghīya dyuḥ, viii. 18. 18; the phrase completed by jvāse; in i. 53. 11; x. 18. 2–3; 115. 8, by pratarīm dāādhānāḥ. The same phrase in AV., Brūh.; not elsewhere in RV. Even drāghīyas happens to occur, in other application, only in x. Several other late forms occur in the same hymns of viii.
dhānu, viii. 3. 19; i. 33. 4; 144. 5; x. 4. 3; 27. 17. Compare dhāpu in i.
Compare also dhānu in Manu. Both late and early is the related dhānnu.
dhāmāketu, viii. 43. 4; 44. 10; i. 27. 11; 44. 3; 94. 10; x. 4. 5; 12. 2. In RV., epithet of Agni. Later, Epic, 'comet.' The idea is given (dhāmās te ketuk) in v. 11. 3.
nimrūc, viii. 27. 19; i. 151. 5; 161. 10; x. 151. 5; AV.; Brūh.
purupāyás, see final Note, below, p. 75.
pārću, viii. 6. 46; i. 105. 8; x. (33. 2); 86. 23; (prthupārću, vii. 83. 1). It is questionable whether in the last passage pārću is ax or people.
pīy, see pīyānā in List i., above.
pūrvaṕṭi, viii. 3. 7; i. 19. 9; 134. 1; 135. 1; x. 112. 1. With the exception of the last passage, where the nominative is used, always pūrvaṕṭaye. Compare pūrvaṕṭhīya only in viii. 34. 5. Early are pūrvaṕād and pūrvaṕāya.†
prāyat, viii. 58. 18; i. 109. 2; 126. 5; x. 129. 5. The corresponding nomen agentis occurs in early books.
prāyāj, viii. 37. 5; i. 186. 9; x. 33. 1; 77. 5; 96. 12; AV. In the first passage prāyāj (like prāyukti, yīga) is 'activity,' as opposed to kṣīma; in the other passages, 'team.'
prasāvana, viii. 33. 1; 54. 2; i. 180. 8; x. 148. 2; common in the Epic. In vii. 89. 9, purāhpraśavaṇa, aśr. ley.
[phēna, 'foam,' in the late verse iii. 53. 22; otherwise only in viii. 14. 13; i. 104. 3; x. 61. 8; AV., etc. Probably, however, the omission is not significant, as the meaning would not often have to be expressed.]
bāhūyas, vii. 20. 6; 82. 2; i. 135. 9; x. 111. 6; adj. except in 82.
brāhdbhānu, viii. 78. 2; i. 27. 12; 36. 15; x. 140. 1.
māde-madē, viii. 13. 7; i. 81. 7; x. 120. 4.
mānavas, the plural of mānu occurs only viii. 18. 22; i. 89. 7; 96. 2; x. 66. 12; 91. 9; twice in AV.
mandhātār, viii. 39. 8; 40. 12; † i. 112. 13; x. 2. 2; nom. prop., Epic māndhātar.
ruḍrīvartani, viii. 22. 1, 14; i. 3. 3; x. 39. 11; VS. Compare kṛṣṇīvartani in viii.; rāghavaṃvarani in viii., ix.
romapā, viii. 31. 9; 80. 6; i. 126. 7; x. 86. 16; post-Rik (Epic). For rōmaṇ is found lōmaṇ only in x.

* Compare Weber, Om. Port., p. 397.
† Compare pūrvācittaye in List v. (below).
‡ Here as mandhātṛvāt. In 48. 13 in one verse occur bhṛguvāt, man-
usvāt, aṅgīravāt.
vīvarta, viii. 12. 15; i. 63. 2; x. 23. 1; 49. 2; 105. 2 (all these of hāri); x. 105. 4, of rivers; ib. 55. 3, of light. The only other passage cited is AV. iii. 8. 5. Compare ānuvṛata, above.

vīgāka, viii. 75. 1; i. 116. 23; 117. 7; x. 65. 12. For the ending see under anyukā, List ii., above.

[verā, in the mystic verse iv. 1. 16; otherwise only viii. 2. 6; i. 124. 8; 126. 5; x. 123. 2; AV.]

gāṁtā, viii. 18. 7; i. 112. 20; x. 137. 4.

svātā, viii. 52. 5; i. 31. 4; x. 88. 4. Compare svātrakāyā, viii. 4. 9, ār. leśy.; and svātryu, x. 49. 10; 106. 2; 100. 2. Not in AV., but in VS.

haviśkṛt, viii. 49. 15; 91. 13; i. 13. 3; 106. 2; x. 66. 6. Compare -krīt, i. 18. 8; 93. 3; x. 91. 11; -pati, i. 12. 8; -pd, x. 15. 10; -vālī, i. 72. 7; havirād, x. 15. 10; havirmāthī, vii. 104. 21, late. Also in the family books, havirdāya and havirdā.*

List v.: Words occurring in RV. viii., i., and ix., but not elsewhere in RV.

anukāmā, viii. 48. 8 (adv., as in anuśvāpa, ār. leśy. in viii. 86. 3); 81. 13; i. 17. 3 (adv.); ix. 11. 7; 113. 9 (late).

gātra (for earlier dāṅga), viii. 17. 5; 48. 9; i. 162. 11, 19, 20; ix. 83. 1; seven times in AV.; and in all subsequent literature. Decidedly late is i. 162.

dohā, viii. 12. 32; i. 144. 2; ix. 75. 3. Compare the late word dōha, only in x. 42. 2; dōhas, only in vi. 48. 13 (vīga-, late ?);† viii. 58. 3 (sūda-); x. 11. 1. The first word is Brahmanic, Epic.

[napīḍ, viii. 2. 42; i. 50. 9 (Kānva hymn); ix. 9. 1; 14. 5; 69. 3; three times in AV.; and also in the first verse of the markedly late hymn RV. iii. 31 !]‡

payovādh, vii. 2. 42; i. 64. 11; ix. 74. 1; 84. 5; 108. 8. This and the last word are from the same (dānastuti) verse (2. 42); but the whole hymn appears to be as late as the tag.

pāri ṣū, viii. 2. 2; i. 135. 2; ix. 69. 3; 98. 7. The combination is common in Sk., where paripūta is colloquial and technical both. In RV., only viii., i., and ix. have the compound.

* The compounds increase rapidly in subsequent literature; and havīśkṛt itself occurs four times in AV. alone; though never in RV. ii.–viii.† This verse is expunged by Grassmann because of its metre and interference with the strophic arrangement.‡ In some of these cases, especially in ix., where the fingers and hands are called by this name, napīḍ seems to me to have lost all sense of relationship (‘daughter’) and to be equivalent to ‘girl’ or ‘young woman.’ In the late verse viii. 2. 42 also this seems to be the meaning. The poet praises the gift of two young women (as in 46. 38) whom he terms rūnasya naptyā, i. e. filles de joie.
pūrvācittaye. As pūrvāpīti occurs only in viii., i., and x. (above), so pūrvācittaye (sic) occurs only in viii. 3. 9; 6. 9; 12. 33; 25. 12; i. 84. 12; 112. 1; 159. 3; ix. 99. 5. The word is not found in RV. in other cases; but later the word (in nom. etc.) is the name of a nymph.

yājana, in the meaning ‘preparation’ (of song, like suvṛkta), is found only in viii. 79. 3; i. 88. 5; ix. 7. 1; 102. 3. The meaning ‘preparation’ is common in the Epic, and occurs in Sūtra.

vacovā, viii. 90. 18; i. 91. 11; ix. 64. 23; 91. 3.

vyaḻva(vāt). This man and his progeny and imitators are referred to in viii. 9. 10; 23. 23; 24. 22; 26. 9; i. 112. 15; ix. 65. 7 (a Kātyāya hymn). Compare vāḻyaḻva, in hymns of viii.

cyendbīrta, viii. 84. 3; i. 80. 2; ix. 87. 6.
sakṣāni (from sah), viii. 24. 26; i. 111. 3; ix. 110. 1. In v. 41. 4, occurs sakṣāna. In viii. 59. 8, sakṣāni (sac) should be compared with 22. 15.

snīhitī (v. i. snīhitī), viii. 85. 13; i. 74. 2; verb, in ix. 97. 54. Later, the verb is common. Verb and derivative in RV. appear only here.

List vi.: Words occurring in RV. viii., i., ix., and x., but not elsewhere in RV.

addās, adv., viii. 10. 1; 26. 17; i. 187. 7; ix. 65. 22; x. 72. 6; 155. 3; 186. 3; AV.; Brāh.

aydya, viii. 51. 2; i. 62. 7; ix. 44. 1; x. 67. 1; 108. 8; 138. 4; as nom. prop., reputed author of ix. 44–46; x. 67–68; common word in Brāh. Windisch., KZ, xxvii. 171, connects with aliṣtās. In the other family books, ayda.

ātmān. This word occurs but twice in the family-books, ii.—vii. In vii. 87. 2, ātmā te vātāh, the word must mean ‘breath.’* In the mystic Parjanya hymn, vii. 101, a phrase of the sixth verse (=i. 115. 1) makes Parjanya (or, in i. 115, the sun) the ‘self or soul of the world.’ So in i., ix.† and x., while not entirely losing the more primitive signification, ātmān has the later meaning of ‘spirit’ or ‘soul.’ In viii., this meaning occurs once, namely, in 3. 24 (dānastuti). For the other cases, see Grassmann. The form tmān=ātmān occurs in the family books, in the meaning ‘self’ (reflexive—not ‘soul’); but not in viii. I exclude tmānā, as not belonging to tmān.]

kṣīrā, viii. 2. 9; i. 104. 3; 164. 7; ix. 67. 32; x. 87. 16: kṣīra-pākāṃ, viii. 66. 10, common in AV., Brāh., Smtī.

* This, however, does not appear to be an early hymn.
† ix. 2. 10; 6. 8 (74. 4; 85. 8); 118. 1.
gāthā, gāthā. (Compare gāyatrā.) Significant of the relation between viii. and later literature is the fact that gāthā, gāthā, is a common Brahmanic word, that it is used several times in AV., that it occurs quite frequently also in RV. viii. i., ix., and x., and is yet almost unknown to the family books ii.–vii. In fact, save in the late hymn v. 44 (gīyāgathā, vs. 5), there is not a single occurrence of gāthā, gāthā, in these books. In the group of books now under consideration gāthā occurs at i. 167. 6; ix. 11. 4; gāthā śpati, i. 48. 4; gāthāgravas, viii. 2. 38; gāthā, viii. 32. 1; 60. 14; 87. 9; ix. 99. 4; x. 85. 6 (with nārāyaṇī); gāthānī, i. 100. 1; viii. 81. 2; the Epic gāthān, at i. 7. 1. In view of the revival of the word in AV., Brāh., etc., the total absence of gāthā, gāthā, in ii.–vii. (barring the sole exception just mentioned), and the occurrence of the word and its nearest kin in i., viii., ix., and x. is most noteworthy and significant.*

gāyatrā. (Compare gāthā.) The treatment of gāyatrā, śrī, is parallel with that of gāthā barring Iranian relations. gāyatrā is common in the later literature, not uncommon in AV., and not uncommon in RV. viii., i., ix., and x.; while in ii.–vii. it is found only in the notoriously late hymn, ii. 43. † Apart from that passage, the occurrences are: i. 12. 11; 21. 2; 27. 4; 38. 14; 79. 7; 120. 6; 164. 23, 24, 25; 188. 11; viii. 1. 7, 8; 2. 14; 16. 9; 38. 10; ix. 60. 1; x. 71. 11; gāyatrī, x. 14. 16 (AV. xvii. 2. 6) and 130. 4; gāyatrāvarṇani, viii. 38. 6; gāyatrāvapās, i. 142. 12; viii. 1. 10; gāyatrīn, i. 10. 1. The word gāyatrī, as a name for RV. iii. 62. 10, is not Vedic.

grābhā, viii. 70. 1; ix. 106. 3; AV. xiv. 1. 38; udagrābhā, RV. ix. 97. 15; grāvagṛabhā, i. 162. 5; hastagrābhā, x. 18. 8.

tīrthā (and sutīrthā). This word for ‘crossing’ or ‘ford’ occurs commonly from AV. on through later literature. So far as the literal meaning goes, it may mean a place to cross anything, but its special signification obtains in RV. In iv. 29. 3 there is one case where the more general (older) meaning applies. Here, tīrthā, in sutīrthā, seems to mean a ‘good path.’ In viii. 47. 11, the same form may mean a ‘good path’ or a ‘good ford.’ But tīrthā itself means a ford in i. 46; once or twice in x.; and in viii. 61. 7, tīrthā śandhor āldhi svār. The word occurs as above and i. 46. 8 (a Kāṇva hymn); 169. 6; 173. 11; ix. 97. 53; x. 31. 3; 40. 13; 114. 7.

triyot, see khēdā, in List ii., above.

triṣṭūd, see List viii., below.

* Oldenberg, ZDMG. xxxviii. 459–64, seeks to explain the phenomena by the fact that viii. is especially a Sāman-book. But this does not explain, e. g., why gāyatrā occurs in just the latest part of viii.
† In vs. 1, of the bird of evil omen. The hymn is the last of the book, and of distinctly Atharvan character. The words are: ubhā veda śva vadati sānaṇā ida gāyatrāḥ ca trāśuṭhakṣam cāmu rājati.
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nihs, viii. 43. 10; i. 144. 1; ix. 85. 3; x. 74. 2; 92. 2; 94. 9.
The word does not occur in AV., and is not cited from Brāh.,
but it appears in Pāṇini. The Epic word for 'kiss' occurs
in i. 185. 5, ghṛā (with abhi, as in Brāh.; but in Epic with
ava, a, upā, sama, etc.).

[prtany. In ii. 8. 6, the last verse of the hymn, there is a sudden
change of metre from gāyatrī to anuvātubh. Note also that
pida a has the Epic cadence. If these may be taken as
indications that the sixth verse is not part of the original
hymn, the rejection of the verse removes the only exception
to the rule that pratyay occurs in the group i., viii., ix., x.,
alone. The adjective pratyay occurs in the early books
(iv. 20. 1; vii. 6. 4); but of these at least the latter hymn
would seem to be late. The verb occurs as follows: ii. 8. 6
(see above); vii. 40. 7; 75. 5 (both ptc.); i. 8. 4 (ptc.); 32.
7; 54. 4; 132. 1 (ptc.); 6; ix. 35. 3 (ptc.); 53. 3; 61. 29 (ptc.);
x. 27. 10; 43. 6 (ptc.); 152. 4 (ptc.); 174. 2 (ptc.); and nine
times besides in AV.]

priyā (compounds). A formation common in Śrīma. Compare
Epic priyākara, priyakāroka, priyadarśa, priyadārśana,
priyāvāda, etc. In AV., VS., and Brāhmaṇa, these compo-
unds are also not uncommon. Compare priyādhaman,
priyādāna, priyāvādin, priyāpati. This is a formation*
known in RV. only to books vii., i., ix. Compare priy-
ākṣatra, voc., viii. 27. 19; priyājata, voc., viii. 60. 2; pri-
yādāhama, i. 140. 1; priyārathā, i. 122. 7; priyāvātā, x.
150. 3 (and Brāh.); priyāsā, ix. 97. 38; priyāstūtra, i. 91. 6;
priyāśriya, x. 40. 11. Compare also the name Priyāmedha
(author of hymns in vii. and of ix. 28, and, in plural, name
of his race): i. 139. 9; viii. 5. 25; plural, i. 45. 4; vii.
2. 37; 3. 16; 4. 20; 6. 45; 8. 18; 58. 8, 18; 76. 3; x. 73. 11;
priyamedhavā, i. 45. 3; priyāmedhāstuta, vii. 6. 45; prāi-
yāmedha, Brāhmaṇas.

madacyut, viii. 1. 21; 7. 18; 22. 16; 33. 18; 34. 9; 35. 19; 63. 13;
85. 6; i. 51. 2; 81. 3; 85. 7; 126. 4; ix. 12. 3; 32. 1; 53. 4; 79.
2; 108. 11; x. 30. 9; madacyuta, ix. 98. 3.

(madintara) madintama, vii. 1. 19; 13. 23; 24. 16 (madintara);
53. 11; i. 91. 17; ix. 15. 8; 25. 6; 50. 4, 5; 62. 22; 67. 18; 74.
9; 80. 3; 85. 3; 86. 1, 10; 96. 13; 99. 6; 108. 5, 15; x. 126. 6.
With the exception of vii. 13. 23; x. 126. 6; AV. xi. 7. 7;
always of soma. The comparative occurs only in vii. 24. 18.
mesā, mesi, and varāhā. Indra is a ram in vii. 2. 40; 86. 19;
Indra or Rudra, i. 51. 1; 52. 1. The Agvins appear 'like
two rams' in the spiritless similes of x. 106. 5; and their

* That is, with priyā as first member of the compound. For the
others, compare adhāpriya, kadhāpriya, and kadhāpri, only in vii.
and i., List iii. The two other compounds show the partiality of the
Kānyās for priyā. The first, harihāpriya, voc., occurs only in iii. 41. 8;
the second, puruṣpriyā, occurs in iii. 3. 4; v. 18. 1; vii. 5. 4; 13. 10; 18.
4; 31. 14; 43. 31; 63. 1; i. 12. 2; 44. 3; 45. 6 (Kānyā hymns).
protégé offers rams, i. 116. 16; 117. 17, 18. In ix. 8. 5; 86. 47; 107. 11, it is the ‘wool of the ewe’ (mesā) that takes the place of that of the usual āni. The remaining cases of mesā, mesē are i. 43. 6; x. 27. 17; 91. 14.

A similar state of things is found in the use of varāhā. The word or form varāhā occurs i. 88. 5; 121. 11; varāhā, in viii. 66. 10; i. 61. 7; 114. 5; ix. 97. 7; x. 28. 4; 86. 4; 99. 6. The foe of Indra, Vṛtra, is varāhā, and the varāhā of i. 61. 7. Rudra is a boar in i. 114. 5. In ix. 97. 7, the boar is Soma. Only in x. 28. 4; 86. 4 (varāhyān) is varāhā certainly an earthly boar. In x. 99. 6, the boar killed by Trita is the same demon as that killed by Indra. In viii. 66. 10, the boar seems to be an earthly one, but may possibly refer to a god.* Thus the old word ‘boar’ is employed in a new literary (religious) sense to describe gods or demons. The use here is that of i., ix., x., and possibly viii.; but not that of the books ii.—vii., which do not use the word. It is scarcely necessary to add that, in giving the title varāhā to deities, the RV. for the first time in this regard is here in touch with later religious conceptions. The boar of i. 114. 5 is not, however, that of later mythology.

vānā, viii. 20. 8; i. 85. 10 (PW.); ix. 97. 8; x. 32. 4; AV. x. 2. 7 (bānā); and Brāh. It is in respect of the use of this word (in the meaning ‘music’), and not in respect of the mention of music, that these books are here distinguished from ii.—vii.; for in the latter, vānā may at times be the equivalent of vānā.

vistāp, viii. 32. 3; 34. 13; 58. 7; 86. 5; i. 46. 3; ix. 12. 6; 34. 5; 41. 6; 107. 14; x. 123. 2; AV. quinques; Brāh.; Śūtra. Compare also vistāpa (Lanman, loc. cit., p. 481), only viii. 80. 5; i. x. 113. 10; AV. (vistāpa, vistapā, each once); Brāh.; Śmaṭi. Compare also viṣṭambhā, in i.; AV.; Brāh.; Śmaṭi; i. 46 is a Kāṇḍa hymn.

caryānāvant (-vati), viii. 6. 39; 7. 29; 53. 11; i. 84. 14; ix. 65. 22; 118. 1; x. 35. 2. Compare ārjikā, in List viii., and ārjikāya, in List viii., below.

hitā. The surprising use of āhita in viii. 51. 3 (List i., above), a use that is paralleled only in Brāhmaṇaś and Śmaṭi, leads to the question whether there is a difference between hitā of the early books and hitā of the late. In viii. 43. 25; 49. 4; i. 166. 3; ix. 25. 2; 44. 2; 68. 7; 70. 10; 86. 18; x. 71. 10; 140. 3, hitā comes from hī. Everywhere else it seems to come from dāhā.†

* The boar in i. 61. 7 is apparently Vishnu, and possibly viii. 66. 10 has reference to the same obscure legend. That the latter passage is late is attested by kṣtrapākā and odanā in the same verse, with sāsanākrta in the following, the two making an addition, in different metre, to the original hymn. Possibly in ii. 14. 4 the uṣrana may be identical with the demon elsewhere slain by Indra, but there is nothing to indicate this.

† In the assignment of these forms to hī or dāhā, the PW. (an unprejudiced critic) has been followed by me. At ix. 21. 4, the case is doubtful. The later Śmaṭi meaning, ‘agreeable,’ is rare; but is probable at v. 42. 8; in the late iv. 57. 1; perhaps also at vii. 25. 7, and a few places in x.
A comparison of cases of verbal agreement (Lists iii.–vi.) shows that after the sixty-fifth hymn of the first book the parallelism with the eighth suddenly ceases, or almost ceases, to be resumed, with less striking effect than in the first part of the book, with the eightieth hymn of i.; and that a corresponding blank occurs between hymns 145 and 161, when a close parallelism begins again. The last lists bear out the observation made above, that in general the first half and the very last hymns of viii. show closest connection with other late parts of RV.

List vii.: Words occurring in RV, viii. and ix., but not elsewhere in RV.

āṇiśkerta, see List viii., below.
apṣujit, viii. 13. 2; 36. 1; ix. 106. 3. Compare apṣujā, viii.;
apṣukṣit, i. 139. 11.
āśpata, viii. 71. 9; ix. 3. 8; of Soma.
ārjikā, compare ārjīkīya, in List viii., below.
apadīya, viii. 91. 15; ix. 54. 2.
urūḍhāra, viii. 1. 10; 82. 3; ix. 69. 1; Śūtra.
krakṣ, avakraksin, viii. 1. 2; krākṣamāṇa, viii. 65. 11; vanaka-
krakṣā, ix. 108. 7.
tatā, viii. 80. 5, 6; ix. 112. 3; AV., etc.
tēpī, viii. 71. 6; ix. 113. 10; AV. Later this is a common word.
dūroṣa, late form for dūroṣas, viii. 1. 13; ix. 101. 3.
dvayū (dvayu), viii. 18. 14, 15; ix. 104. 6; 105. 6.
dhījavana, viii. 5. 35; ix. 88. 3; 97. 49; dhīyā, ix. 86. 1, 4.
nāvā, viii. 25. 11; ix. 45. 5.
parisrūt, viii. 39. 10; ix. 1. 6; 68. 1; VS.; later, name of a drink
(AV., Brāh.).
bhandāna, bhandānāya; the noun, in viii. 24. 15, 17; ix. 86. 41;
the verb, in ix. 85. 2. Early is bhandā.
mādavan, viii. 81. 19; ix. 86. 35.
mandavādi, a phrase (accent!) that occurs only in viii. 61. 2;
ix. 63. 8; 65. 16.
raghavartani, viii. 9. 8; ix. 81. 2. Compare rudravartani, in
List iv.
rasīn, vii. 1. 26; 3. 1; ix. 113. 5; VS. As in Smṛti, 'tasteful.'
vāsuttī, viii. 50. 7; ix. 44. 6. So devattā (List iii.) occurs only in
vī. and i.; and bhāgattī only once, in ix. 65. 17; while
mahāttī occurs in viii. 24. 10; 45. 15; 59. 9; x. 156. 2;
but also in iv. 42. 8 and v. 79. 5. The former of the two
last passages is late. The latter remains a lone parallel in v.
to the usage of the later group, as often.
vanuruc, ix. 110. 6; vāsurocīs, viii. 34. 16. In AV., viii. 10. 27,
vāsuc, name of a Gandharva.
vṛā, as 'sieve,' viii. 2. 2; ix., passim; perhaps in i. 132. 3; in
Brāh., vṛā.
vīrayā, viii. 81. 28; ix. 36. 6. The substantive, vii. 90. 1 (vīrayā); ix. 64. 4. The verb, vīray, i. 116. 5; x. 103. 6; 128. 5; Brāh.

gatāvāya, catamagha, see List i. (above).
sāvitasu, viii. 39. 7; AV.; sāvitasamastikā, ix. 86. 17.
samśīvam, in phrase, viii. 58. 11 = ix. 61. 14. Compare i. 65. 4, sāpīvī.
sahāsroti, viii. 34. 7; ix. 62. 14 (in i. 52. 2, sahāsamūttā).
svārpati, vii. 44. 18; 86. 11; ix. 19. 2; Smṛti.
svātatu, viii. 66. 6; ix. 74. 2.
hētār [compare prahātār in List i. above], viii. 88. 7; ix. 62. 6; hetār, ix. 13. 6; 64. 29.

List viii.: Words occurring in RV. viii., ix., and x., but not elsewhere in the RV.

[āniskṛta, etc. With the exception of īskṛta at vii. 76. 2 (where the poet alludes to the ‘poets of old’ as if he himself were a later one), all cases of the late and misbegotten īskṛ-forms occur where we should expect them, in viii., i., ix., and x. They are plainly due to the misapprehended a-āniskṛta forms, felt as if made up of the elements an- and -skṛta.* The occurrences—of every sort—are worth locating. Most notable is the collocation īskartāram āniskṛtam, viii. 88. 8; less so, (pariskṛtvāṃ) āniskṛtam, ix. 39. 2, the only form of this ilk in ix. Further, we find: īskartā, x. 140. 5; īskartar, viii. 1. 12; 20. 26; īskṛta, vii. 76. 2; īskṛṇudhavan, x. 53. 7; 101. 2; īskaram, x. 43. 8; īskṛti, x. 97. 9; īskṛṭāhāva, x. 101. 6.]
asastihān, viii. 78. 2; 88. 5; ix. 62. 11; 87. 2; x. 55. 8.
ārjīkă, vii. 7. 29; ix. 65. 23; 113. 2; ārjīkāya, viii. 53. 11; x. 75. 5. See Hillebrandt, Ved. Myth., p. 137.
tristubhp, viii. 7. 1; 58. 1; ix. 97. 35; x. 14. 16; 130. 5. Trāśthubha occurs in i. 164. 23, 24 and ii. 43. 1 (both hymns are indubitably late), and in v. 29. 6.
durmārsa, viii. 45. 18; ix. 97. 8; x. 45. 8; Puranic in the sense ‘undeniable.’
yāvacanant, viii. 82. 3; ix. 69. 8; x. 42. 7; 131. 2. Compare yāvayā, only in viii. 67. 9.

yāc, viii. 1. 20; 2. 10; 56. 1; ix. 78. 3; 86. 41; x. 9. 5; 22. 7; 48. 5; about a dozen times in AV.; common in Brāh. and Epic. The late poets use both the older form (tāt tvā yāmi, viii. 3. 9) and the stronger yāc, which latter is unknown to, or at least not used by, the older poets.†

*Compare Lanman, loc. cit., p. 475; Bloomfield, PAOS, March, 1894, =Journal, xvi., p. cxxvi; and Scott, Transactions of the Am. Philol. Assoc., xxiii. 179 ff, who gives a mass of examples, for instance, an adder = a nadder.
† In either case, viii. shows a distinct advance toward classical usage. The old Bhaga worshipper says: bhāgam ānugro dāha yāti rādhām (vii. 38. 6); the later ānugro says rather: kā ṛcānam na yāciṣṭāt (viii. 19. 20).
With the exception of the late hymn, vi. 47 (Lamman, *loc. cit.*, p. 578), no hymn of the early *books* has the form *lokā* (vi. 47. 8). But *lokā* is the form in vii. 89. 12; ix. 113. 7, 9; x. 14. 9; 85. 20, 24; 90. 14; AV.; Brāh.; Śruti. The compounds vary according to the position of the word: *ulokakṛt*, ix. 86. 21; x. 133. 1; *ulokakṛtya*, vii. 15. 4; ix. 2. 8; *uvuloka*, x. 128. 2; *jīvalokā*, x. 15. 8; *patilokā*, x. 85. 43. The AV. has the last three, and six more such compounds; changing *ulokakṛtya* to *lokakṛt*, and having also one more compound like it, *lokajīṭa.*

As ix. 113. 7, 9 and x. 90 are certainly late, the supposition must arise that viii. 89. 12 and x. 14. 9 belong to the same period. x. 85 has such a mixture of old and new that it has no weight in the scale. In sense, *ulokakṛt* is like *uvukṛtya uvu nas kṛdhī*, viii. 64. 11 (compare *uvuloka*, x. 128. 2).

A comparison of the words in viii. and ix. shows that the group beginning with ix. 107 exhibits the closest resemblance to viii. The long hymn ix. 86 shows more correspondence than all the dozen preceding it, perhaps merely on account of its length. The cut-up hymns beginning with ix. 96 show very marked similarity. This hymn is ascribed to a Kāṇva, and has signs of the relation; yet the Priyamedha of ix. 28 leaves no verbal sign; but he has the phraseology, which reappears, though not exclusively there, in viii. 15. Nor does the Medhyāstithi of ix. 42 and 43 use the special vocabulary of viii., though there is one token in 41, also ascribed to him. The Kāyapa of ix. 53 has something in common with viii.; but even more has the Bhūru of ix. 62. In ix. 94 and 95, Kāṇva hymns, there is a remarkable absence of similarity. In fact the latter is marked by an older use (*jaṭhāvra*) as against that of viii.; and it is quite possible that these are earlier hymns of the Kāṇva family. Suggestive is the fact that in general the latter half of ix. has a much closer verbal correspondence with viii. than has the prior portion; probably because this latter half is the later, especially in the group, ix. 107 ff.

Ludwig, *Rig Veda*, vol. iii., p. 161, doubting Grassmann’s doubt in regard to the antiquity of the verse that contains *pūjana*, says...

*The modern explanation that u is a Tamil-like prefix, before l, does not seem to be supported by the evidence. But it is not a question of derivation; it is merely a question of historical literary form. And here it is evident, since *lokā* is used in late literature and only *ulokā* (fifteen times) in the early books ii.—vii., that *ulokā*, whether the original or only a contraction of two words, is the earlier form in Vedic phraseology. This older *ulokā* survives in i. 93. 6; ix. 92. 5; x. 18. 2; 16. 4; 90. 7; 104. 10; 180. 3. For the form, see IF. ii. 10; ZDMG. xlii. 499; xliii. 162.*
rather desperately: "pújana did not fall from heaven," meaning apparently that it must have been always in existence, and that it is folly to reject a verse of the RV. because it appears from its vocabulary to be late.

Words are of two sorts, simple and compound. The latter certainly have historical beginnings, and can often be traced back to them. The former do not, indeed, fall from heaven; but they often spring up from the earth; and new words, to which it is frequently futile to ascribe old roots, may rise and flourish without literary, and even without real historical background of any sort. In a literary age, such words are called slang. Some of them die soon; some live on, become respectable, and then become literary factors. In an age that is not critical such words must still more often become absorbed into the literature. This púj, or any such word, may have had its origin at any given time and be without historical antecedents. For this reason it is perfectly legitimate to question the antiquity of any fragment that contains words which do belong to a later age and are not found anywhere else in the age to which the fragment is ascribed. Especially is this the case when the fragment is part of a large body of literature and the word is one which from its meaning would naturally have been employed often in that literature, as it is in the later literature where it is current.

When a large body of words is found at the end of a certain literary period, when this body is found continuously employed from the said end of a period to one that is much later, then in the first period any one book that contains a vocabulary identical with that of the books constituting such end of a period will probably belong to the conclusion of the period rather than to its beginning.

If this be so, then the eighth book of the Rig-Veda, in its vocabulary, which agrees in so many details with the vocabulary of the later books of that work, with the later Atharvan, and with the still later Brûhmanas and Epic, probably stands nearer to the end of the period represented by the whole Rig-Veda than to the beginning of that period.

In the case of such a phrase as mā no niśrā īpata mōtā jāṭipā, if the reader were asked to assign it to a date, he would observe first that the later common root jaṭp is found in the Rig-Veda only here (as noun) and in x. 82. 7. He would remark again that niśrā is what may be called a thoroughly Smṛti word, that is, it is a noun customary and colloquial in the Epic and later literature, while it is utterly unknown in the Vedic language, so much so that even the root is unknown in the Rik, save for this passage, and the combination ni drā as a verb begins first in the Brahmanic period. It is of course barely possible, on the assumption that viii. is antique, that niśrā is thus used once in the earliest literature and never appears again till the Smṛti period, and that in the meantime drā +ni is developed as a verb. But this certainly appears to be a hysteron proteron of the worst kind.
The ordinary historical view must be that niṅdṛā arose after āṛṛ ā was combined with ni in verbal form; that above all niṅdṛā did not arise and disappear (in favor of svāpna?) and then reappear again in a later age. So far, then, as the contents of viii. 48. 14 can show anything, they show that the verse is a late one and awaken suspicion in regard to the whole hymn.

In viii. 59. 14 occurs īttām, and only here in the Rik. But it comes up again in AV., SV., Brīh., and Smṛti. Is it not more probable that the verse belongs nearer to the period where it is generally found than that the word has skipped the Rik period to reappear later?

Striking is the correspondence between viii. and ix. in respect of soma-epithets—see List vi., above. To what cause is to be attributed the fact that madacyāt(a) occurs eight times in viii., six times in ix., four times in i., once in x., and in no other passage? Is there congruence here between viii. and the family books or between viii. and the General Books? And its companion madintara, madintama? It occurs fifteen times in ix.; four times in viii.; once each in i. and x.; both of the latter being late (for the verse i. 91. 17 is later than the venerable hymn in which it is found, and x. 136 is as a whole a late hymn).

The word occurs also in AV. xi. 7. 7:

rājasyaṁ vājapayam agnistroṁ tād adhvarāṁ
drāvamadhāv ucchitte jīvāborhira madintamoh.

Is one to suppose that madintama was known to the poets of the family books, and avoided by them? There are soma-epithets enough in these books to make one look there for any expression current in their time. But whoso holds viii., to be older than the other family books must suppose viii. and ix. to have been unknown to the authors of the former set, or that they purposely avoided the choice epithet handed down to them. And either assumption is improbable.

**Final Note.**

In the lists given above I have here and there given a bracketed word the occurrence of which was found to be not quite exclusively in the General Books and viii.; and have called attention to the fact that the exception, where the word was actually found in a family book, was often itself in a late verse, so that it would form no real exception from an historical point of view.

There are quite a number of such cases, and some of them I have reserved for this Final Note. There are others, however, which do not, indeed, show the late stamp in the exceptions; but yet these exceptions are enough to raise an interest in the character and history of the word. Thus, neither v. 33. 6 nor vi. 20. 10 is to be marked as late; yet both verses occur in hymns of the same character, two triṣṭubh hymns to Indra, each more or less obviously “entstelle,” as Grassmann says of both. The first of
these verses contains *visavāna*, a word that occurs in i., viii., and x., but not elsewhere in family books; the second contains *pūraḥ cāraḍāḥ*, an expression found elsewhere only in i., and mentions Purukutsa, who is known only to i., and to the late *dīnastuti* of iv. 42 ("strife between Varuṇa and Indra"), if *purukūtsānī*, ib., imply the same person. Now this is not enough to show that these verses are late, but it is enough to make interesting the fact that they are the only places in the Rig-Veda where *pṛ stū* occurs in the family books. For *pṛ stū* is a very important word in a liturgical sense; and it is one of the commonest of words in late literature, being current as early as the Brāhmaṇas. Looking back, it is found five times in the Atharvan (apart from one Rik example); then, in x. 67. 3 of the Rik, and in x. 105. 6; both of them late among the late. And further, in i. 154. 2 and i. 159. 1, the former of which, by the way, seems to be an echo of x. 180. 2 (or perhaps is borrowed). Then *pṛstuti* occurs in i. 153. 2, to rise to light again in the Upanishads. All these hymns, it will be noticed, belong to the same Dirghatamas collection. Then *pṛa stū* occurs four times more, viii. 16. 1; 22. 6; 35. 11; 70. 5; and nowhere else in the Rik. Whether this sudden concentration of *pṛa stū* in viii. be the result of the *prastotar*’s added importance, or whether it be a new word working its way into literature, the result is interesting. It occurs in viii. and AV. about the same number of times. It does not occur at all in four out of the six remaining family books; it does occur in two late hymns of the late tenth book, and in the Dirghatamas hymns of the first (whose Epic name stands in RV. only in i. and viii.).

Whatever age is assigned to the two hymns of the family books where *pṛ stū* occurs, the marked difference between this twofold occurrence in six family books as against double that number in viii. alone, and the agreement of the latter with the General Books and later usage is noteworthy. That the same combination occurs in Avestan *fṛa stū*, which might have been separately developed, leads to the question in how many other instances viii. with the General Books and post-Rik literature agrees with Avestan as against the early family books.

Some of these are noticed below. At present I will discuss only one, *kṣirā*. In regard to the connection between viii. and ix., it would appear, from this word, that the former book were just later than the latter. To trace *kṣirā* back: In the Smṛti and Brāhmaṇas it is a common word; in AV. it occurs more than a dozen times, alone and in composition, besides *kṣirin* and *kṣiravant*. In short, up to the time of RV. it is used freely. But in RV. it occurs only as follows: once in the tenth book (where the demon that lifts milk from the cow is to have his head cut off by Agni) x. 87. 16 = AV. viii. 3. 15; twice in the first book, i. 104. 3; 164. 7; once in the ninth, ix. 67. 32; and twice in the eighth, viii. 2. 9; 66. 10 (*kṣirapākā*), where too occurs odanā, also a late

*But Māmāteyā in iv. 4. 13.*
word.* Now the contact with ix. is here wholly on the surface. The verse where the word occurs is the last of the hymn, in reference to which with its fellow (the penultimate verse) Grassmann says: "Added by a later hand and refers to the whole collection; found again in SV. increased by four verses." And the benedictory character of the verse supports this view ("who reads these hymns gets milk and honey," etc.).

In this instance the end of ix. is in tone with viii.; and viii. joins the later Avesta to post-Rik literature and the other General Books. The word, with misplaced accent, is related to ksar† as is tir to tar; withal not in Rik but in Epic application. Compare Epic tadā ksāraḥ ksauranty etāḥ (gāvah); cited with other illustrations by PW. Significant, however, is the fact that ksar, though often employed in RV., is not there used of milk. In ii.—vii., pāyah, gāvah, etc., do duty for 'milk.' But gō remains, of course, as equivalent throughout the Rik. While the gō compounds predominate in the later group,‡ the mixture called 'sour-milk mixture,' dādhyaṃś, does not occur in viii. at all (dādhān itself, only in vii. 2. 9), whereas the sweetening of the soma is a pronounced feature of this book: svadānti gāvah, ix. 62. 5; gōbhik svādām akarna prīṇāntah; ganyā vāstreva vāsadyantah, vii. 2. 3; 1. 17 (compare i. 135. 2; ix. 8. 5; 75. 5, etc.).§ The root ksar is used chiefly of soma, as in ix. 85. 5: gōdhir ajyase . . . indrasya jatahāvām akṣarāh; viii. 13. 4: iyān ta indra rātrih kṣarati savvutāh; sometimes of rivers, as in i. 72. 10. A good example of the way it is not used of milk is furnished by i. 90. 6 and 8: mādhava kṣarantī śāndhavah . . . mādhur gāvo bhavantu nah. In the Vālakhilya it is used of prayers (i. 6; 2. 4). In the family books it is used four times, once of a ship, twice of rivers, and once in a sense not obvious (v. 66. 5); never here of soma (as in viii. and ix.).

An excellent example of words that occur in viii. and the General Books, barring one exception in other family books, is jātira. This is especially interesting because it is such a thoroughly Epic word, almost colloquial in this and subsequent literature. In RV., it occurs in viii. 15. 3, 13; i. 102. 3, 5; 111. 3; ix. 106. 2; 111. 3; x. 36. 10; 103. 5; and also in iii. 31. 4. But just this hymn, iii. 31, has been very properly relegated by Grassmann to the hymns the style of which seems to show a late and mystical (Brahmanical) date. Some may claim that iii. 31 has

---

* As also varahā (see below). The verse reads viṣvēt tā viṣṇur abharad urukrandas teṣātha gam tham mahishān ksirapākham odanāṁ varahām indra emuṃ. The metre of this, the penultimate, as of the ultimate stanza, differs from that of the preceding; and emuṃ is a late form (Linnman, loc. cit., p. 511).

† Compare gāl, 'drop,' and yāṣa.

‡ gōmant (soma, svatā), viii. 3. 1; 13. 14; 71. 6; 81. 80; 88. 6; ix. 88. 2 (107. 9 ?); gōṛita, vii. 21. 5; i. 137. 1; gōparaṇa, vii. 45. 24; x. 62. 10; gōṣakha, v. 37. 4, but in viii. 14. 1 gōṣakha syāt (sotā me); in the family books, further, gōṛīka (iii. 58. 4; vi. 23. 7; vii. 21. 1).

§ Compare Hillebrandt, loc. cit.
as good a right to its place as any, but they can scarcely deny
the particularly mystic character of the production, which sets it
on a par with the hymns of like sort in the General Books.* It
is, therefore, not unimportant, to say the least, that in just such
a hymn of the family books, and in no other, should be found a
word used in viii., i., x., AV., Bräh., and particularly in (Epic)
Sanskrit—in short, a word peculiarly post-Vedic in its province.

Curious is it to find two exceptions of this sort, both suspicious.
Such is the case in the ārīṣṭa compounds. In AV. are found two
compounds not in RV., viz., ārīṣṭagū ṣ and ārīṣṭāsū. In AV., and
in RV. x. 60. 8; 97. 7; 137. 4 appears arīṣṭādāti, with the com-
pound arīṣṭānadhā in x. 6. 3. In i. 166. 6 is found arīṣṭānāma;
in i. 114. 3, arīṣṭāvīrīs (also in AV.); in viii. 18. 4, arīṣṭābharmān,
voc.; in i. 89. 6; 180. 10; x. 178. 1; iii. 53. 17, arīṣṭānemē (later
as n. prop.); in v. 44. 3, arīṣṭagātu. Now there is every reason
for regarding v. 44 as a late hymn; and iii. 53. 17 is apparently
the beginning of an after-hymn added to the original, and pre-
sumably later. These, however, are the only cases of ārīṣṭa com-
pounds in the family books.

Again: the hymn vi. 47 has rightly been regarded as late.
Here, vs. 26, occurs vidvāṅga, a compound that is found else-
where only in viii. 74. 7 and i. 118. 9†

Another interesting word is the compound svāhākṛta, or svā-
hākṛti. It is a common combination in either form in the Brahm-
manic period, and the former is found in AV. In the Rig-Veda
both forms are found in the group i., ix., x., but in the family books
there is only svāhākṛta, and this is confined to viii. 35. 24 and ii.
3. 11. At this verse in viii. it would, therefore, be in order to
place the note: 'not known elsewhere in the period of the fam-
ily books save at ii. 3. 11;' and, if nothing of especial significance
appeared to except the exception, to let it stand at that. But on
minute examination it is seen, first, that viii. 35. 24 is the only
case where the form is used apart from Āprī hymns, except in the
one instance, i.'110. 1 (a Kūsā hymn to the Maruts). How stands
the case, then, with the Āprī verse, ii. 3. 11, which makes the
exception? It runs as follows:

---

* This view of iii. 31 is supported by Lanman, loc. cit., p. 498.
† Words compounded with the ending ās offer a curious study,
though the cases in the early books preclude the use of them in argu-
ment. But the facts may be worth presenting. There are no less than
ten such words. The only cases which occur in family books (other
than viii.) are in the probably late verse ii. 38. 8 (sthañcās); in the late
hymn (to the sacrificial post) iii. 8. 9 (praviñcās; also in i. 163. 10); in iii.
21. 5, of very modern tone (devañcās); and in vi. 52. 12 (vayunañcās).
On the other hand, rtaçās occurs only in i. 162. 4; x. 2. 5; 55. 3; 98. 11;
AV.; dhamanācās and rūpañcās occur only in i. 164. 15; parvañcās, only in
viii. 6. 18; 7. 22, 28; i. 57. 6; x. 79. 6; manmañcās, only in viii. 18. 12;
and sahasrañcās, so common in the Epic, only in vii. 34. 15. The root,
if it be ās, is found in i. 162. 18; iv. 97. 8, as verb; i. 163. 12; x. 89. 14;
85. 35; and i. 162. 5, 19, 20, as noun.
But the ancient Āpī ending runs as follows: svāhā (dēvā amśtā mādayantām), which is found not only in the oldest Āpī, vii. 2. 11 (compare āśūra of Agni in verse 3), but also in iii. 4. 11, and (the whole phrase) in x. 70. 11. Further, the only other instance of Āpī in family books, v. 5. 11, also has the svāhā alone (svāhā kṛṇīye, etc.). On the other hand, in the General Books the formula, save where the whole old formula is preserved intact (in x. 70. 11), contains svāhākṛti or svāhākṛta in the parallel verse of their Āpī hymns. Thus svāhākṛtaṇā yā shyā yā ṣr̥yaḥ dvanāni viśaye, i. 142. 13; svāhākṛtya vocate, i. 188. 11; svāhākṛtyaṁ pāvamānasya gata (imitation of Āpī in majorem gloriam Somasya), ix. 5. 11; svāhākṛtyaṁ hāvitr adantu dēvāḥ, x. 110. 11.*

Not to animadvert upon the fade repetition of gṛtāṃ in ii. 3. 11, the svāhākṛta formula, therefore, is unique in the Āpī hymns of family books. The facts may thus be stated: Apart from ii. 3. 11, there are two closing Āpī formulas, one with svāhā, and one with svāhākṛta or svāhākṛtya, with an intermediate svāhā kṛ. The first alone is employed in Āpī hymns of the family books; the second contains a word common to i., ix., x., and the Brahmanic period, but it is not used at all in the family books ii.-vii., either in Āpī hymns or elsewhere—except for ii. 3. 11. This passage of the second book stands, therefore, on a par with i., ix., x., and Brāhmaṇas rather than with the family books. In consequence, ii. 3. 11 is not really an important exception to the statement that (svāhākṛtya) svāhākṛta standing in viii. 35. 24 indicates that the hymn or verse belongs rather to the period represented by Brāhmaṇas than to that of the family books. If, on the other hand, it is assumed that viii. 35. 24, which is not in an Āpī hymn, is early, instances of the phraseology should be found in other (assumedly contemporaneous or later) family books apart from Āpī hymns, as is the case with svāhā itself. And if it is said that it makes no difference whether ii. 3. 11 is an Āpī verse, and that it is itself early, then the question why the Āpī formula has passed the family books to reappear in i., ix., x., remains unanswered. So, for my own part, I should not hesitate to put svāhākṛta in the list, viii., i., ix., x., as belonging to this group, despite the exception.

The word nīṣṭya (viii. 1. 13; x. 133. 5; vi. 75. 19) might thus be referred to its AV. (and later) period; for vi. 75 is the last hymn to weapons.

* In i. 13. 12 the intermediate form is preserved in this position (last verse of Āpī), svāhā yajñāṁ kṛṇatamānādeṣya, as in i. 142. 12; x. 2. 3 (not Āpī). The verb need not, but may, be understood in v. 5. 11, above.
Interesting is kaksiyā, -ā. It occurs in the compound kaksiaprā, at vii. 3. 22; i. 10. 3; and uncompounded, in the Epic quite often,* in RV, i. and x.; and also in the family books,—but there, only in two apparently late passages, vii. 104. 6; v. 44. 11.

Somewhat similar is the case of tuvigriva. It occurs at vii. 17. 8; 53. 7; i. 187. 5; and v. 2. 12. But v. 2 ends with vs. 11, and 12 is a late addition.

Similarly fēśamana, an epithet of doubtful origin and applied only to Indra. It occurs: i. 61. 1; vii. 32. 26; 51. 6; 57. 6; 79. 1; 81. 9; x. 22. 2; and finally, vi. 46. 4. It might therefore be classed with the words of the period of i., viii., x., were it not for the last-named occurrence. But vi. 46, as appears from its position in the collection (see Grassmann, ad locum; Lanman, loc. cit., p. 578), is late. After all, then, the old books do not really support any claim or age for the word; the seeming exception "proves the rule."

So parnīṇ, in the Epic ‘a tree,’ approaches that meaning at ix. 82. 3. In the sense of ‘winged,’ it is found in vii. 1. 11; 5. 33; and nowhere else in RV., save in vs 11 of the late vi. 46, just mentioned.

Again, there are two sorts of evā compounds. One, from evā, may be claimed for the family books. As representatives of the other, evā, there is evāra, vii. 45. 38, and evāvādā, v. 44. 10. But evāra has for its make-up no real support in the family books, for just this hymn, v. 44, is late (Lanman, loc. cit., p. 581).

So sūparṇa, in use after RV., occurs in RV. vi. 48. 18; viii. 2. 1. 8. But the first verse is a late addition.

Less certain is turd, ‘swift,’ which occurs in vii. 86. 4, a hymn that will probably be claimed as old despite the modern tone conveyed by the ‘ancestral’ or inherited sin. Otherwise the adjective occurs only in i. 68. 9; vii. 26. 4 (according to Grassmann in other passages of this book also); x. 49. 11; AV., and later. But the related tuvaṇe is a case in point. It occurs in viii. 9. 13; 12. 19; 45. 27; x. 93. 10; vi. 46. 8; and the last hymn (above) is a modern one.

A very good example is furnished by citipṛsthā in vii. 1. 25. In the later literature citi compounds are very familiar. In RV. there are, however, but two such compounds, cittipāda in i. 38. 5 (Kāyā), and citipṛsthā in vii. 1. 25; iii. 7. 1. The latter is a notoriously late hymn. The word itself is common after RV., in Brahmanic literature. The passage in viii. goes with the late iii. 7 in giving it its sole support. Is one of these thus early and the other later, with no examples between? Rather are they both late, and approximate to the period where flourish the citi words.

Such judgment as may be passed upon these must also hold in the rarer cases where a word is not proved to belong to a later

* Meaning ‘girdle’ (so in hastikaksiyā) as well as ‘wall.’ The meaning ‘antargrha,’ by the way, is not unknown to Mbhā.: thus, xii. 326. 81, kaksiyā tirīyā rājaveśmanāḥ.
period, if in itself it shows a later tendency of meaning; such as *venā* as compared with Avestan *vəzewa*. In RV., the general sense of ‘movement toward’ is still felt in the verb, which also, however, has attained to the sense of ‘love.’* But the adjective substantive *venā* (*suvendā, venā*) is a product of the period i., viii., ix., x. For it occurs not infrequently, some eighteen times, yet never outside of this circle save in iv. 58. 4, which may be referred without discussion to the latest of the late. Like *venyā* it becomes a proper noun, and as such loses its adjectival character; though it is still found in AV.

There may even be cases where an example in a family book is still usable, though it is unsuspected and unimpeachable, to offset the unique appearance of a late word in viii. Who, for instance, can really believe that viii. 45. 23 actually belongs to the older part of the Rig-Veda? In iv. 7. 3 stands *haskartār*, and so it may be said that *has* has a certain antiquity. But the root is else unknown in the family books. It crops out again in i. 124. 7 (*hasrā*); in ix. 112. 4 (*hasanā*); in x. 18. 3 (*hāsa*); and three times in Kātyā hymns, once, in i. 23. 12 (*haskārā*), and twice in viii., *hāskyī*, 78. 8, and *upahāśvan*, 45. 23. They are all lone forms. But when we consider the Epic character of *upa has*, and the fact that before the latest Brahmanic period (*upahāsā* in Čat. Br. xiv.) not one other case of the combination is cited, it becomes impossible to believe that *upa has* has skipped from the early Vedic period almost into the Epic (where it flourishes like a weed) without leaving a trace. The root itself in other combinations, as shown above, is barely represented in the family books of the Rik. This Epic combination is known only in this verse (repeated in AV. xx.). The only reasonable way to state the case is that *upahāśvan* belongs to the end of the Rik period, not to the early period. There is mockery enough in the RV. to have brought the word into use, if it had been current then as it is in the Epic.

Under the head of stylistic peculiarities should be ranged the introduction into Vedic poetry of *vīpvačandra*, as embodying more emphatic laudation than the *puruṣačandra* of the old family books. This weightier *vīpvačandra* occurs only in i. 165. 8; viii. 70. 9; ix. 93. 5; x. 134. 3; and also in the late hymn (Lanman, loc. cit., p. 457), iii. 31. 16.

Under the same category belongs the pronounced preference in viii. and the General Books for superlatives and comparatives, a preference which doubtless is to be explained by the later taste. Thus: *udāṣṭtara, abhiḥkāṭara, acpaddātara, uruvvycastama, ofoddātama, gātvittama, cōdiṣtha, jūṣṭtata, makṣātama, madhu-pātama, varīgovittāra, vēdiṣṭha, cūcivratastama, sacānastamā* (PW.), *sāniṣṭha, sukṣṭtara, sapsūrastama*. Not one of these occurs in the group ii.–vii.; but every one of them is found in viii. alone or in viii. and the group i., ix., x. I may add from the Vālakhilya, *pārbhīttama, 5. 1, and mahāvattama, voc.,

* Compare “‘inclination,’” in the sense ‘affection, love’ (Beattie).
6. 5; while a Kāśva effusion in i. 42. 6 furnishes the mushy superlative hiranyavāśīmattama, fitly invented for Pūṇa. A good example of what a tasteless late poet will do in the way of heaping up laudation is given by viii. 81, where dhāṣṭha, dyummitama, citrāghanavistama, vytrahāntama, and ojodditama occur in the space of three verses (15–17).*

The word hiranyāmya is found about sixty times in all. Quite a third of the occurrences are in the General Books, i., ix., x.; another third is distributed over all the other family books; while viii. alone has another third. This constant repetition of ‘golden’ is on a par with the superlative use of superlatives, and betrays a late taste pleased with too much gilding.

A stylistic peculiarity, again, is the affectation of such alliteration as gikṣā gacchvah gacchibhiḥ, found only in viii., i., x.; while perhaps in the alteration of mahān mahībhīr utībhīh, of the other family books, to the twice repeated mahān mahībhīh utībhīh of viii. there lies nothing but a wish to strengthen the expression.

It may indeed well happen that a genuinely old word should occur only in viii. and the General Books. But compared with the lists of words common at once to this group and the following literature, such words are few. Perhaps aryāśya is ṛṣeis (List vi.); and ari- in arīṣṣutā, etc., may be the ṛṣe- or ṛṣe-of ṛṣeṣaḥ, ṛṣes. But, again, this may not be the case. Nor are udāra and uteras (If. ii. 15) to be equated with certainty. And kṣurā, though phonetically equivalent to ṛṣr, is not the same thing, but rather a developed ‘blade,’ for chariots, etc.†

With χρΌρες has been equated hāridravā (viii. 35. 7; i. 50. 12), but the case does not seem to be important. So hīmā chances to occur only viii. 32. 26; 62. 3; i. 116. 8; 119. 6 (x. 37. 10; 88. 10); hīmadvand, x. 121. 4. But hīmā is found in the family books, so that this too is unimportant. As for ṛyāis, which occurs only in viii. 55. 7; 88. 1; x. 55. 5, it is χρός, but as the latter does not occur till after Homer, so the word is not needed by the Vedic poets, and its absence in ii.–vii. has no especial weight. I have noticed no other examples like this.

Words with Avestan cognates.—In regard to such words in the above lists as show Avestan relationship, there is more to be said and considered. If Grassmann’s assumption that ṛtha is a late form of ṛṭha were correct, then the facts about these words,

* Some of these are noteworthy as illustrating the style and age of viii. Thus vytrahāntama occurs once in vi. (at 16. 48); once in viii. (at 94. 11); twice in v. (at 40. 1; and 35. 6 = viii. 6. 37); but twelve times in viii. So dyumnitama and its positive occur eighteen times, but only in i., viii., ix., and x., barring a single instance at vs. 8 of iii. 37, a hymn with divers marks of lateness.

† In viii. 4. 16, bhūrijoj iwa (as in AV. xx. 127. 4), not the sharpness but the speed is the thought. So sāṁjito is ‘active,’ as in AV. xii. 1. 21, tvṣimattar sāṁjitaṁ mā kṛṣu; and ‘activity’ is the general notion conveyed by bhūri, as in ix. 26. 4 (dhyam). Here, as said above, p. 61, it is not a pair of scissors, but an axle-blade rapidly moving, that gives the comparison.
so far as they go, would make against the view that viii. is not early; for in viii. there are 27 occurrences of ἄθα to about half as many of ἄθα. But both forms are used in x.; and both ἄθα and ἄθα are Avestan. Probably one is as old as the other.* But in running over the foregoing lists, the reader will doubtless have noticed quite a number of other words of Avestan belongings: such are udāra, iṣṭrā, evutāhā, gāthā, jāmātar, tākvi, tanūkā, meṣā, varūhā, and one or two more. In the RV., all of these are confined to viii. alone, or else to the group, viii., i., ix., x.

Now if these words were found in the Avesta and viii. alone with some of the hymns of the General Books, the solution of the puzzle here presented would be easy. To disregard the affinities of viii. with the later literature; to say that these words, which are so uniquely preserved in viii. and appear again later on, are mere play of chance; to point to the list of words common to the Avesta and viii. with its group, and say that here is proof positive that there is closer relationship with the Avesta, and that, therefore, viii. after all is older than the books which have not preserved these words, some of which are of great significance, would be a first thought. But this explanation is barred out by the fact that most of these Avestan words preserved in viii., withall those of the most importance, are common words in the literature posterior to the Rik. Hence to make the aforesaid claim would be tantamount to saying that these words have held their own through the period to which viii. (assuming it to be older than ii.–vii.) is assigned, have thereupon disappeared, and then come into vogue again after the interval to which the maker of this assumption would assign ii.–vii. This, despite all depredation of negative evidence, is not credible.

Take, for instance, udāra or iṣṭrā or meṣā: the first is found only in viii., i., x.; the second in viii., i.; the last, in viii., i., ix., x. Is it probable that words so common both early and late should have passed through an assumedly intermediate period (of ii.–vii.) without leaving a trace? Or, again: is a like assumption credible in the case of kṣārā, which appears in the Iranian kḥšārā; in RV. viii., i., ix., x.; disappears in the assumedly later group ii.–vii.; and reappears in the AV. and later literature as a common word? Evidently, the facts are not explained on the hypothesis that the Avesta and RV. viii. are older than RV. ii.–vii.

We must, I think, suppose either that the Avesta and RV. viii. are younger than RV. ii.–vii.; or else that the poets of viii. were geographically nearer to the Avestan people, and so took from them certain words, which may or may not have been old with their Iranian users, but were not received into the body of Vedic

---

* Somewhat similar is the case of baḍā (viii. 69. 1) as against bāḍ of ii.–vii. Avestan bāḍ and bāḍha show the variegation of the expletive. The Epic has bāḍha. Compare also RV. x. 86. 23; AV. vii. 56. 7; bhāla (with bhādrā, as if cognate); and Alkman, 8(12); ἑβάλε ὅ ἑβάλε κρύολος εἰπ. 

---
literature until a time posterior to the composition of ii.–vii. Milk, cattle, and the like lay very near to the hearts of the Vedic poets. Had such words as ksīrā or meṣā or ūṣṭra been current in the time or place of the poets of ii.–vii., they would surely be found in those books occasionally, in place of a pāyas or an āvī or a muhiṣā.

In the case of Iranian khshāra, Vedic ksīrā, there is found a word common in ĀV, and later literature, synonyms of which word are used in RV. in ii.–vii., while it is itself not found at all in ii.–vii.; but it is found in a late hymn of x.; in a late verse of ix.; in one apparently added verse of viii.; in another of viii.; and in the Avesta. Shall we represent the chronological advance thus: Avesta, known; RV. viii., known; RV. ii.–vii., unknown;* ĀV., etc., known and current? Extraordinary, to say the least. But reasonable would be the order: RV. ii.–vii., unknown; Avesta, end of RV. ix., RV. viii., known; ĀV., etc., current.

The following List contains:

Words common to the Avesta and the RV., but restricted in the RV. to viii. and the group i, ix., x.

śvāthā, viii. 24. 15; Avestan, aśvatha. The hymn is not marked by unique late words; but the correspondences with i. and x. (see Lists iii. and iv., above) include nīrṣiti (as pl.), paripād and dānsiṣṭha, all lacking in ii.–vii.

udāra, Avestan, udāra. The Vedic word is found at viii. 1. 23; 2. 1; 17. 8; 67. 7; 80. 5; i. 25. 15; 30. 3; 42. 9; 162. 10; x. 86. 23. Of the hymns in viii., each one is marked by late words of List i., above.†

ūṣṭra, Avestan usḥtra, viii. 5. 37; 6. 48; 46. 22, 31 (all these are dānuṣtusis); i. 138. 2. See under meṣī, below.

ksīrā, Iranian khshāra. Discussed above, pp. 64, 75. Like udāra, ksīrā is found in vii. 2; also in 66. 10, which seems to be an added verse. The Iranian word is also late.

gālā, viii. 1. 20, may be connected with Avestan garaḍ.

gāthā, gāthā, Avestan gāthā, found in books ii.–vii. but once (in a late hymn); elsewhere in i., ix., x., and in viii. 2. 38; 32. 1; 60. 14; 87. 9. Hymns 60 and 87 are not marked by late words of List i.; nor does 32 (a Kāṇva hymn) contain an important example. See above, p. 65.

* Or unused. But its synonyms are used so often in ii.–vii. as to make it unlikely that it would have been unused if known.
† See above, p. 61. There may be a choice here (gāthāra occurring only once in vii., and udāra never in ii.–vii.), rather than a lack. It is interesting to notice that the Prāskāṇva of ix. 93 not only uses the word regularly employed in ii.–vii., but also uses vārṇa in its original sense of water (“Trita holds the water in the sea,” ib. 4; cf. 94. 8, for the idea). In general the Kāṇvas of ix. make a more venerable impression than do those of viii. or i.
jdmatar, viii. 2. 20; 26. 21–22; ví, i. 109. 2 (p. 57); Avestan zōmatar. From the meaning of this word it might pass without literary employment for a long while, and the example, therefore, does not seem important. Yet it is to be noticed that it also occurs in 2, which has udāra, kširā, and gāthā. Hymn 26 is not marked by words unique in viii. (List i.), nor has it important correspondence with x. and i. takvā (taka, etc.), viii. 58. 13. Compare Avestan tukhna, tuka. This hymn contains odamô, not apparently in an added verse (14), and has correspondence with x. and i.
tanukhtā, viii. 68. 3; i. 31. 9 (tanukhtā, viii. 75. 1); Avestan, tanukereta. The Kānya Soma hymn 68 is without very late words, and remarkably free from correspondence with i. and x. The meaning of the Vedic word is one with that of the Avestan, though it is applied in RV. to self-made sin or hurt; in the Avesta, to sons. Compare putukvythā in v. 61. 3 (late hymn), and x. 63. 15. Above, p. 58.
[āñcar, viii. 67. 10 (Kānya hymn), Persian dās; and udā, viii. 1. 33, dānastū, Persian nardā (?).]
prābhārta, viii. 2. 35; i. 178. 3. Though this is also in hymn 2, I regard it as purely fortuitous that prābhārta corresponds to frabareta, for the latter is a priest; and the compound verb may easily have been developed independently, as in Greek and Latin, whence an independently made nomen agentis.
meṣq, Avestan maṣha. This word occurs only in viii., i., ix., x. In viii., in the same second Kānya hymn (2. 40), and in 86. 12 (ascribed to Rehba Kācyapa). Hymn 86 has scarcely any correspondence with i. and x., and contains very few unique words (of List i.). In 2, the word occurs in a verse introducing a dānastū, but in the interesting form meṣq bhūtā 'bhū yām āyāh; for here is close touch with the Avestan “incorporate ram” god (maṣhadāhē kehrpa), and RV. i. 51. 1 (compared by Justi). This seems to be the case also with 86. 12, which is addressed to “the ram.” But, as will be seen by the analysis above on p. 66, meṣq, meṣq is also the sheep as provider of the wool-sieve, and as a sacrificial beast. In iv. 2. 5 occurs the only early reference to the sacrifice of sheep* (āvī); and it is only in viii. 86. 2 that the forray gives sheep (āvayam bhágam). In the dānastūis there is but a single instance where sheep are given, and that is in Vāl. 8. 3, āṛṇávaṭāṇām, one hundred (along with one hundred asses and slaves). This can scarcely be because the gift of sheep was forbidden at this time, for in that case they would not have been given and publicly receipted for.† There seems,

* Perhaps “the sacrifice which has sheep” means rather “wins sheep.”
† Compare also ṣṛṣ, ‘ram,’ only in i. 10; śrō, only in viii. and x. Cases of meṣq other than in divine work are i. 48. 6 (Kānya hymn), where there is a rare blessing on sheep and horses. Doubtful allegory rules in x. 27. 17. In x. 91. 14 there occurs one of the four instances of sacrificial rams (also i. 116 and 117 and iv. 2. 5, the last questionable, as above). I forget who has suggested that sheep were forbidden.
indeed, to be a striking coincidence here between the occurrences of āśṭra and of mesā, which cannot be accounted for on any accepted historical ground. It is assumed by most scholars that āśṭra generally means a camel in the Brāhmaṇas, a bull in the Rig-Veda, and a camel again in the Avesta. But camels as wagon-haulers cannot have been unknown, since even in Manu the ‘camel-wagon’ is spoken of (ūstṛa-yāna), and in the Epic people journey on rathāin uṣṭrayuṇāh, Mbh. xvi. 7. 33, so that the passage which speaks of ‘four-yoked’ āśṭra* may be taken to mean camels (not ‘with four yokes’ but four harnessed together), since it was no uncommon thing to have four horses or even eight to a team, and if camels were used for draught at all it was easy enough to harness four together. The only weighty passage that has been thought to indicate cattle instead of camels is i. 138. 2. Here the sole reason given is that to compare Pāzan in his fury to a bull is more reasonable than to compare him to a camel. But a male camel is a most vicious and dangerous beast when he gets angry, and the objection has no more force than the still weaker one that in viii. 46. 31 krad is used to describe the noise of this āśṭra, a verb that is applied to horses as well as to bulls, and in fact to a variety of noisy things. Against these weak reasons I would set the historical improbability of āśṭra being used either indifferently for camel or for bull, or for camel first, then for bull, and then again for camel. The humped steer is known as such, kakāūtnān vṛṣabhah (in x.); kakāūnah (gāvām), viii. 20. 21; kakulō mrgāḥ, v. 75. 4, etc. Buffaloes, and wild kine, under the name of mahīṣa, gavāyā, gāvarā, are also known to the family books. They serve as beef and give milk. But not a word of āśṭra till i. and viii.§

yahū, Avestan yāzu. This word occurs in vii. 15. 11; but this is a late hymn, and it is the only passage in ii.—vii. where the word occurs. Elsewhere it is found in viii. 4. 5; 19. 12; 49. 13; 73. 5; i. 20. 10; 74. 5; 79. 4. Excepting 73, all

* āśṇā caturyājo didat, viii. 6. 48. In Āit. Br. ii. 8, where PW. thinks a bull is meant, the animal is distinguished from gavāyā and gāvarā, but that is no conclusive reason for taking it to be a bull.

† Apropos of mesā, it may be noticed how very rare is in any case the mention of sheep in the family books. The animal was known of course, but evidently not much attention was paid to it. The words for wool and weave do not necessarily imply sheep, as goats’ hair was woven, and āryā, wool, means only covering. The ādi (ovis, òic) is mentioned but twice in the family books, ii. 36. 1 (some passes through ‘sheep’ and several stones), and iv. 2. 5: gāvāḥ aṣnu vimān aṣnu yasūḥ. In the eighth book alone sheep, as ādi and mesā (the latter not in family books), are mentioned four times (see above). On the weaving of goats’ hair see Geiger, Ostirān. Kultur, p. 224, note. It would seem, from i. 126. 7, that sheep-raising was especially successful to the west of the Indus (in Kandahar), which (see below) may account for the greater familiarity of the Kāṇyas with this branch of farming.
these hymns of viii. contain late words, and correspondences with i., x. But after all, the equating of yazu with yahù is not phonetically certain.

rajañi, Avestan orēzenê (?), viii. 25. 22 (ascribed to a Vaiyāyaça). The hymn is very free of late words and correspondence with i., x. The word occurs in a dānastutis.

varōhi, Avestan, varōza, viii. 66. 10 (Kāńya hymn), and i., ix., x. The verse is late. See above, under meši, p. 66.

vāku in adhinākā, etc., List i., above. The Avestan correspondence, fravāka, is only with the Brahmanic pravāka probably specially developed, as in the case of frrubaretor, above.

vṛṣṇi, Avestan, varšhi, 'ram,' is mentioned only in i. 10. 2. In viii. 6. 6, the word is an adjective with the same meaning as vṛṣṇi. i. 10 is probably a Kāńya hymn.

pvātrā, identified with qāstra by PW., occurs viii. 4. 9; 52. 5; i. 31. 4; x. 88. 4.

stu in prā stu and prāti stu, Avestan fra stu and paitistavas. These, too, may have developed independently. But, on the other hand, there may as close a relation between the Avestan and the Vedic words as there is in the case of Trīta Aptya, who, as such, appears in RV. only in viii. 12. 16; 47. 13 ff.; i. 105. 9; x. 8. 8; but never in ii.–vii.*

kṛvyaapeṣa, viii. 8. 2; 31. 8; Avestan zaranymbasā.

To a certain extent the contradiction between the result tentatively arrived at in the body of this article and that which naturally appears necessary in view of this Avestan agreement, may be obviated by the assumption that the hymns marked by the latter constitute the older part of the Kāńya collection. But this answers for only a portion of the cases, notably not for dānastutis; and does not seem to be a very satisfactory solution, since their character and their place in the collection mark many of these hymns as later than others of the same book. This topic can be better and more fully treated after a still closer study of the relations of the other books to the eighth.

Indications of a difference between RV. viii. and RV. ii.–vii, in respect of time or habitat.

I have spoken above of the rarity of sheep in ii.–vii., and the comparatively frequent allusions in viii. The similes bear out the difference. The 'lamb-shaker,' as a descriptive name of the wolf (55. 8), is paralleled by the passage in 34.3, ārām nā dānute vēkab. It is significant that these two passages occur in viii., and that there is nothing like them in ii.–vii.

Moreover, there is not a single reference in ii.–vii., apart from

* The nearest approach is, as often, in v. (41. 9), where Aptya appears (without Trīta). For stu in compounds see List i. and this Note, ad intit.
one clearly late hymn,* to ploughing, or to any of the paraphernalia of agriculture. On the other hand, there are ten such references in the other books; and of these viii. has its share, two passages alluding to ploughing.† In one of these, yávānī vikéna kārṣathā, viii. 22. 6, the RV. stands verbally in touch with the Avesta, withal in the only formula of agriculture that is common to the two; for in other particulars than yao kāresh the agricultural words of the Avesta are not paralleled in RV.‡ Conversely, this yávānī kārṣ occurs in RV. only in i. 23. 15 (Kānya hymn); 176. 2 (repeated phrase); viii. 22. 6. The Atharvan has at least two valuable passages on agriculture. In one of these it states that agriculture is entrusted to the Āgyus (x. 6. 12), possibly with the notion that so new gods properly guarded an art so new (for the Āgyus are perpetually reminded that they are not equal in divine dignity to the other gods); and in the other it mentions that agriculture was invented by Prthūvānya. The interesting fact here is that this Prthūvānya is mentioned in RV. only in the eighth book.§

But I do not intend to go so far afield as to argue that ploughing was unknown to the early Vedic people. It is sufficient for my purpose to have shown that all allusions to it are lacking till a late hymn in other family books; and that, on the other hand, just as in RV. the eighth book alone has the Avestan word for sheep and speaks of sheep more familiarly than do the other family books; just as it alone of the family books (apart from the late hymn v. 44) has the Avestan word gāthā; so it differs from the other family books and agrees with the General Books in its allusions to agricultural life.|| It is interesting to note that

---

* This late hymn, iv. 57, is specially marked as such by its use of sāmāṇ for year, elsewhere found only in x.
† i. 23. 15; 117. 7, 21; 140. 4; 176. 2; viii. 20. 19; 22. 6; x. 34. 13; 101. 3-4; 117. 7; 146. 6.
‡ In the Avesta, aisei-varaz, to plough, and gurva, the plough, have no Vedic representatives; and yao kāresh, as stated above, is paralleled in RV. only in i., viii., x. That kāryaman means furrow (in RV. i. and ix.) is far from certain. It is merely the line drawn. This sense of kārṣ is certainly the more primitive, and it is shown in the Avestan dānkhārashka, not 'corn-ploughing' but 'dragging corn'; as well as in kārhārāza, 'making a collection' (draught) of people. It is, therefore, by no means certain that kṛṣṇ means a ploughing people. Like incola, it may revert to movement simply. In RV., kārṣ is used of a water-bag (āḍīthin sū kārṣa, v. 88. 7), of a foot, and of Indra's body (x. 28. 10-11; 119. 11); in all of which cases 'drag' is the meaning. That raising yēva does not imply ploughing has long been recognized (Hehn; and Schrader, p. 419). In RV. the only grain mentioned is yēva. Not till AV. are beans and rice alluded to. The Vedic people lived on pumpkins (urdraksh), wild fruit, yēva, meat, game, and intoxicating liquors.
§ Compare RV. viii. 9. 10; AV. viii. 10. 24: tāṁ prthūvānya dōhok tāṁ kṛṣṇa ca saeṣadē ca 'dōhok. The passage of AV. is referred to by Zimmer, AII., p. 335.
|| Not unimportant is the little circumstance that the only passages in RV. where the poets beg for (dvātad gomā) yavanat are viii. 82. 3; ix. 69. 8; x. 42. 7; 181. 2; while yavayū occurs only in viii. 67. 9.
the same difference, in degree at least, obtains between the Iranian Gāthās and the Vendidad, the agricultural life barely represented in the former being conspicuous in the latter.*

Some special contact with Iran may be inferred from these facts; and perhaps in this lies the explanation of the further fact, that 'Seven Rivers,' the Iranian name for India, is mentioned only in the eighth book; that in two of the three passages where the 'Five Peoples' are mentioned in viii. the poet speaks as if they were at a distance; that the geography of viii. takes us plainly across the Indus to the West more often than to the Puñ-

* Compare Geiger, Ostiran. Kultur, p. 403 ff. It is perhaps proper to specify in what particulars the agricultural words are found in the latter part of RV. and not in the earlier part. The late hymn, iv. 57, mentioned above, contains the words for plough, ploughman, and furrow. Elsewhere: the threshing floor, khāla, is mentioned only in x. 48. 7; vykha, plough, only in i. 117. 21, viii. 23. 6; śūnghala, ploughing, in iv. 57. 4; sīrā, plough, only in the same late hymn and x. 101. 3-4; pāvitravānt, of the plough, only in post-Rik literature; pōhāla, ploughshare, only in iv. 57. 8; x. 117. 7; vṛtī, the beast that drags the plough, only in iv. 57. 4. 8; kṛṣi, agriculture, only in x. 34. 13; 148. 6 (akṣṛśicāya); kīndu, ploughman, only in iv. 57. 8; śūla, furrow, only in iv. 57. 6-7; i. 140. 4. It is generally assumed that ploughing was an Indo-European accomplishment; but the facts are that ṣvṛpaḥ and arare have only Keltic, Slavic, Teutonic representatives; and other farm-words, such as harrow and sickle, show no Indo-Iranian kinship. The old connection of urvārā and ṣvṛpaḥ is now discarded, and the equation hirse, kṛṣi is admitted to be a guess (Schrader, pp. 410, 411, 454). In truth, the assumption, as a historical fact, rests only on the equations ṛṣāvav, kṛṣī, kārman; eśāya, vykha; and lāva, lavi, lavaka, lavāyla. In the last group, ṛṣāv means first grain cut, then the cutter; so, not to speak of the fact that all the Sanskrit words are preposterously late, it is evidently the root only and not the developed words which may be compared, and this robs the words of all value. The negative arykai shows in RV. so plainly that vykha is still a mere adjective noun, that it is quite uncertain whether the 'piercer' is not an independently developed noun in vykha and eśāya; just as in Avestan, eṣtra comes from eṣi, 'piercer.' Finally ṛṣēvan is like kārman (see above) in this, that it is the line drawn, and by no means the furrow of the ploughed land, but the limit, the line beyond the furrows (implied in ṣvṛpaḥ). It is noteworthy also that in RV. the word for sickle, āryaḥ, occurs only in i. and x., except for iv. 20. 5; and in this last passage it is quite impossible to render it 'sickle,' but it must be the conqueror's hook (i. 58. 4; x. 101. 3; 106. 6; in iv. 20. 5, āryaḥ nā jēta may be, as PW. suggests, a late adaptation of i. 66. 3; but the words can mean only 'victor with hook,' as in aṅkāin and āṅghāsa te astu aṅkūcā, viii. 17. 10; āṅghāin hy aṅkūcān yathā, etc., x. 134. 6). If it is the gambler's hook, to rake in winnings (ii. 12. 4. 5; viii. 45. 88; AV. iv. 16. 5), the word jēta is used in a very late sense. On the other hand, the word for sickle which is in touch with post-Rik literature (for sṛṣī is not long preserved in that meaning) is āṅtra (Persian dās), and this is found only in viii. 67. 10, till Śūtra and Epic (compare x. 131. 9). The modern wild tribes of India as well as the Indian tribes in U. S. show that mere scratching is for ages the only ploughing, and is all that really is necessary till the land is worked over too often (by a settled people). It is further to be remarked that the mill-stone, ḍṛṣṭād, is mentioned only in viii. 61. 4, and in the late passage, vii. 104. 23. The only passage that mentions upalā is ix. 112. 3 (also late); the nether mill-stone, upara, is mentioned at i. 79. 3; x. 94. 5; 175. 3. Ere mill-stones pressed, lone 'stones' pounded soma.
jáb (whereas in ii.–vii. the converse is the case, viz., the geographical data refer little to the West but often to the Puñjáb); and that in viii. especially many proper names seem to find their explanation in the West. These points I will now discuss briefly in their order.

It has strangely been assumed by Ludwig (Rig Veda, vol. iii., p. 200) that the title Seven Rivers, which is the Iranian name for India, occurring in RV. only in viii. 24. 27, is evidence of the antiquity of the eighth book. This can hardly be the case. The seven rivers are well known to the early poets. Had this been the name of their country given to it by themselves, it is incredible that they should have consistently used 'seven rivers' to mean seven streams and never once to mean the name of the country. Nor is it probable that having been the name of the country it should pass into such oblivion as never to be used as such (on the supposition that viii. is older than ii.–vii.). On the other hand, as the name given, not by the Vedic Aryans, but by their Iranian neighbors, it is quite conceivable that Seven Rivers should on occasion appear as a name among those who lived nearest to the Iranians, and perhaps occupied the same territory with the latter.

In regard to the Five Peoples, I have before this expressed doubt whether they are identical with those Vedic peoples who are supposed to be the Five, and as I hold still to this opinion, I do not refer the Five Peoples necessarily to the Puñjáb or to Turvaça, Yadu, etc., wherever they may have been located. But in regard to the relation between the poets of viii. and the Five Peoples, it is clear that while the poet of viii. 52. 7 speaks as if he belonged to the Five Peoples, those of viii. 32. 21–22 (Medhátithi Kānva) and viii. 9. 2 (Çaçakarna Kānva) speak as if the Five Peoples were remote. In the passage of viii. 32, the poet begs Indra to pass over the Five Peoples and come to him: dāhi manyudāvinam . . . updrane . . . ihi pañca jumāḥ dī. Just as the poet says "pass over the sinful presser," so he adds "and over the Five Peoples." In the passage, viii. 9. 2, again, the Five Peoples are correlated with two other words expressing remoteness: "whatever is in mid-air, in the sky, or among the Five Peoples;" just as in 10. 1 it is said "if ye are on the far stretch of earth, or yonder in the gleam of the sky, or on the sea."

In the geographical allusions of viii., as compared with those of the other family books, the following points are especially important. In the other books the Çutudri, the Vipāg, and the Paruṣāñ, all in the Puñjáb, are the best known rivers, apart from the Indus. The Ganges, the Drśadvatī, and the Jumma (Yamunā) are mentioned only in these family books. In respect of the Sarayu, which is probably a western stream, not an eastern river, a poet in iv. 30 alludes to it as if it were the boundary of his knowledge, and says

* Compare the use of dī in dī kyutam, viii. 62. 15, and in 54. 9, with the idea of 64. 15. Similar is the use of tīrṣa, in 33. 14; 55. 12.
† The Ganges is mentioned in x. 75. 5; vi. 45. 31; the Drśadvatī, in iii. 23. 4; the Jumna, in v. 52. 17 and vii. 18. 19.
that Indra slew "beyond the Sarayu." There is also a vague allusion to 'Drbhika,' so vague as to show that the Derbiker people were already a myth, ii. 14. 3.* In viii., one poet alludes to the Asikni and the Indus; and another apostrophizes the Parusni, but the latter hymn is not by a Kânya, but by a member of the Atri family; while the former hymn alludes not only to ploughing but at the same time to the Pañcilas (Krivis); so that it seems to be later than most of the hymns in the eighth book. The Sarasvatî is mentioned in one hymn of the Vâlakhilya and in a dânastuti; but otherwise only in an Atri hymn.†

In conformity with the intermediate character of v., between viii. and the other family books, stands the geographical agreement; for it is only in the Atri collection, v. 53. 9, that the Kabul and Kurum are mentioned (along with the mythical Rasa, the unknown Anitabha, the Sarayu, and the Indus). On the other hand it is a Kânya poet who gives us the only reference in RV. to the Swat river, northwest of the Puñjâb; and Vîryamanas Vâïyayaçya, who apparently belongs to the Kânya family, gives us what is the only allusion, apart from the General Books, to the Gomati, on the west of the Indus (viii. 19. 37; 24. 30). It is, further, worth mentioning that what may perhaps be the connecting links, geographically speaking, between the Kabul and the Puñjâb, viz., the Çaryañâvatî and the Arjikas, appear nowhere in other family books, but several times in the eighth.‡

The proper names in viii. afford a good parallel to the common vocabulary. The correspondence is such as to show a marked rapport between viii. and v., the General Books, and late literature. With the names of the other family books there is little contact save in the case of two or three seers and the peoples' names Turvaçya, Yadu, Anu (Anava), Druhyu and perhaps Puru (58. 10). § Jamadagni is cited once, and Divodâsa appears, but only as dâvodâsa (agni). Of poet's names, Kâkâvant is about the only one that connects viii. with other family books than v. (Aucîja, Pajriya; in viii. alone Varo-Pajra Sâman; Sușâman in viii. and Epic). † Thus Apnavâna is early; but in viii. only his method, as that of one of old, is known (apnavînavîvît).

* Not only is the interpretation of the name śrûparçu, in viii. 88, doubtful, but the date is impaired by the fact that the hymn lacks the Vasiṣṭha stamp.
† Indus and Asikni, viii. 20. 25; Parusni, 63. 15; Sarasvatî, 21. 17, 18; 88. 10; Vâl. 6. 4. That the first passage is late is indicated further by its vocabulary (dvipā). The only certain allusion to the Puñjâb among the Kâvyas is in this late hymn!‡ Hillebrandt, Ved. Myth., pp. 187-143. It is of course still doubtful whether the locality is N. W. of the Puñjâb.
§ Ayu, Manu, the Bhrgus and Uçanas Kâavya are early as well as in viii. But the Yatis appear only in viii., x. Kutsa Arjuneya appears (with Bhrgu) both early and late.
¶ Compare Çrûta-kâksa, only in viii. Kâkṣvant, iv. 26. 1; viii. 9. 10.
†† Ekadyā (once in viii.), said to be son of Nohas, is perhaps connected, as the latter is called Kâksîvata as well as Gâutama in later literature. The protectors of the Aevins, Babhrus and Paktâsa, also occur in viii. and early books. For the others, and the demons, see below.
A good test is afforded by the patronymics. In one case only, and that is in v., does viii. have the original name and the earlier book have the patronymic; viz., Rūgama in viii. (Pavīru in Vai.), Rūgāmās in v. But observe the difference. While Ātithigya occurs in other family books, Ātithigya occurs only in viii.; while Agyamedha occurs in v., Ageyamedha occurs only in viii.; while Tugra, and Bhujyu, his son, are early, the forms Tugrya and Tāugrya are found only in viii.† while Trasadasyu occurs early, Trāsadasavya occurs only in x. and viii.‡

But it is from the names that occur both in viii. and in subsequent literature that one sees how large a proportion of all the names in this book is late. Some of these are of Epic fame. Thus the saint Agastya, so well known in the Epic, is mentioned in RV. only in viii., i., x., and the late hymns† vii. 38. Pṛthī Vainya is known only to vii. and x., but is well known to AV. With him stands Dirghatmanas, known as such only in viii., i., and the Brāhmaṇas (Aucathya in i.; Ucathya, perhaps as adj., in viii. 46. 28; Māmateya in iv.; perhaps Mamatā in vi.); and, again, Vyāghya, Vāyaṇaṣya, viii., i. (ix. and vii., vyaghaṇādi), and Viyamanaṇas (adj. and name), x., viii. Other examples are Soghari, viii. and AV. (Saubhara in Brāh. and Epic); perhaps Ruma, viii., with Rumanvya, Epic; Črut-arvan Arkaṇa, vii., x., Epic; Čara (called Areatka in i., and also by the late name Čauradevya in viii.), occurring in viii., i., and Epic; Kali, in i., x., and (in pl.) viii.; Mandhātara in viii., Mandhātara in Epic (as father of Parukutsa); Upastuta in viii., i., x.; Viṣṇū (son of Viyaka, viii.), in viii., i., x.; Nabhiṇa (Nabhikṣa), viii., and Brāh.; Čiṇjara, vii., x.; Aṅga, viii. and VP.; Tričoka, viii., i.

Evidences of special rapport between viii. and v. are: first the Atreyan hymns in viii.; the Kāṇvahotar of v. 41. 4.; the Gopavana of viii. 63. 11, to whose name the Anukramaṇi adds the patronymic Atrey; and Čyāvīṇa, mentioned in viii., and author of hymns in v. In an Atri hymn, Saptavadi, known in viii., v., x., appears. The Atris are mentioned by the Kāvyas in viii.§

There is little to offset the array of names common to viii. and the late books. As said above, Agastya is surely late; and Virūpa is perhaps late. The other names in viii. are chiefly either names of foreigners or native names of late origin. Of the latter class, there is Kṛpa, Epic name found in RV. only in viii.; Asaṅga, a Brahmanic word, used as proper name only in vii.;

* So Sādhvaranā occurs in early books, while Sādhvaranī occurs only in Vai. Pārasadvāna in Vai. has no Prāsvadaṇa beside it.
† But Pārukkutsya (Kutsa) occurs in early books, as does Purukutsa. Compare Pāura (early), and Trkṣi, in viii. and vi. 46.
‡ Lanman, loc. cit., p. 578. In i. and vii. is mentioned Virūpa, who appears also in ii. 53. 7, apparently a late verse.
§ The Gātamas (Gotamas) also are mentioned, but only in their own hymn (viii. 77. 4). Only i., v., x. mention the Kāvyas. The Priyamedhas and Medhyātithī appear only in viii., i., x. and viii., i., ix., respectively. Kāvyas’s father, Medhātithi (Epic, but see RV. x. 31. 11; i. 117. 8, Nyṣad), appears only in viii.
Pläyogi, which is used only in viii., and is either late or dialectic, like Taiukṣa for Tarukṣa; vibhindī, as adj. in i., but as name in viii. and in Brāh. (Vibhinduka); durgāhā, adj. and common noun in early books, but a name in viii. 54. 12 (where are mentioned the māyāto durgāhāyasu), and recurring in the patronymic form durgāhāt, in the notoriously late addition to iv. 42, and in the Brāh.; svarnurṣa and pāvīṭha, as adjectives in early books, and then in viii. as names; and the late name Kṛṣṇa, a poet. Tīrṇoc, another poet, has a name of late look; it occurs only in viii. and Brāh. The value of Nāhuṣa and Vāvātar is doubtful. Another of these words which appear early as adjectives and later as names is adhīrīgū (as name, in vii. and i.); so probably prāvāthīn, an adj. in vi., a name in vii.

Other late names are Āruva, in durravat, in vii., Brāh., and Epic; Ĉarabhā, viii. and Epic; and Kūpda-pāyya, descendant of Črīga-vr. Compare the Epic Črīgin, name of a seer, and the Epic Kuru names Kūndaka, Kūndadhāra, Kūndāgin, etc.

The Kuras, Krivis, and Ĉedis, all of Epic fame, appear in viii., but not in i.—vii. The Ĉedi king, Kāṇu, is praised in vii. as a giver of uesta, etc. The Kuru-name appears in Pākasthāman Kāurāyāna and Kuruīgā.

The āspa-names, Vaça Āgyva (viii., i.), Vāya (p. 64), Nindi-tāçe, Ātreya Ĉīvācie (compare Ĉīva and Ĉīvaka in viii.), might suggest that Iranian āspa-names are here reproduced; and such may be the case. But it is worthy of note that the best district in India for horses is the Puṇjāb. The Sāindhavan breed is famous through Sanskrit and Pāli literature. The prince who "gives more horses than any other mortal" lives in the Puṇjāb on the Paruṣā (viii. 63. 13).† But Ĉīva lives on the Swat. The gifts of Vaça Āgyva come from Pṛthuĉravas Kūnīta, who has been credited with āśī-Indic origin, as have been also Balbūtha, Parcu, Tirindira, and Tarukṣa. All these are known only in (i.) viii. Pāravata, once in viii., may be the name of a western prince. With him is mentioned Vasuroids.

The puru-names I have given above, p. 42. Two are solitary, Purumāyya and Puruḥmanman; while Purumītha occurs in viii., i., and v. Whether their prior element is the proper name Puru or the common adjective puru is uncertain.

A few more names remain to be noted. Daçaĉraja and Gogarya, otherwise unknown, occur in viii. and Vāl.† Narya and Sthūrayūpa occur only in viii., the latter perhaps as a reminiscence. Praskanva (above, p. 50) is mentioned only in i., viii., and

---

* Kānvāyaṇa, Vāl., Ukṣanyāyaṇa, and Harayāyaṇa are lone nom. prop. in viii.; but probably the form is for Kāvāyaṇa. Kuru appears in x. (prācana).
† In Am. Journ. Phil. xv., p. 156, I have shown that India was not so badly off for horses as Roth and Brunnhofer supposed.
‡ The Vāl. abounds in names not elsewhere known: Rjūna, Dirghanītha, Daçaĉrīpa, Daoṣyaṇa, Daṣyave Vṛka, Nipātīthī, Puṣṭiṇa, Čruṣṭiṇa, Pṛṣadḥara, Čiṣṭa, Saṇvarta. The Vāl. contains Krca (also in x.), Syu-maracmi (also in i.), and Rjīcva (also in early books).
Vâl. The young woman, Apâlâ, is mentioned in a hymn not very old. Of the demons, Namuci, Arbuda, Pipru, and Çaśna (and Mrgaya?) are old names; much less old are Śrîinda and Anaçani (neither found till vii.).—compare the ār. ley. anaarpa-râti, also in vii.), and Ahûgava Aurnavâbha, which last occurs in viii. and x. Both the Kâñvas and the Pûrûs are occasionally regarded as devils in late works (so AV.; RV. x. 61. 13; RV. vii. 8. 4 as interpreted by Brâh.).

The possibility of western relationship is strengthened not only by the references to probably western princes, but by two or three further facts. Thus, the (Iranian) custom of exposing old people to die is alluded to as known only in a late Kâñva hymn.*

It is only in the eighth book that the Babylonian mund (67. 2) appears. From a religious point of view, it is, indeed, saying too much to ascribe to Iranian influence the fact that, as has been pointed out by Müller, *Vedic Hymns*, p. 244, the eighth book alone gives undivided homage to the abstract Aditi (viii. 10. 14). But the unique position of the Gandharvas, which has been recognized by E. H. Meyer and acknowledged by Hillebrandt (*loc. cit.*, p. 207) may perhaps be due to the proximity of the Iranians. In fact, tsiirâd gandrâvâm nistram (viii. 1. 11) reads almost like an echo of the yô ajanat gandrâwem in Yt. 19. 41 (which Geiger, *loc. cit.*, p. 206, makes refer to the Hindus).† Hillebrandt himself has called attention (*loc. cit.*, p. 438) to the peculiar position of the Kâñvas in respect of their preparation of soma.‡

But that the indications of western habitat do not prove that the hymns there composed are early is shown, apart from vocabulary, by the fact that the Swat is not mentioned in the body of the hymn in which it occurs but in its dûnâstu; that Tirindira also appears in a dûnâstu (6. 46); that the (western?) Pârîvata prince appears also only in a dûnâstu, etc. So the late Cedis appear in dûnâstus.§

The eighth book is not without other correspondence with the Avesta. The only cases of aātt for ātt, which in form at least is Avestan, are cited from viii. 5. 31; 11. 7; 48. 5; i. 30. 21; x. 22. 6; 158. 1. The short thematic a in ânâm of the genitive plural is Avestan, and this too is found only in i. 44. 2 = viii. 11. 2; i. 188. 11; x. 136. 6; 174. 5.¶ If this were an old license, one would expect to see it imitated in other family books. But apparently

---

† Compare viii. 66. 5: abhi gandrâvâm atryat.
‡ I may here refer again to the fact, brought out in my last paper, that the (Iranian) sacrosanct number 33 is employed in RV. almost exclusively in vii. among family books (i. 34. 11; 45. 2—both Kâñva hymns; 139. 11; iii. 6. 9; viii. 28. 1; 80. 2; 35. 3; 59. 9; ix. 93. 4; Vâl. 9. 2). It is quite inconceivable that, if vii. were the oldest book, such a designation of the gods should so pass the other family books to reappear subsequently (in AV. and all later literature) as the regular number of gods.
§ Compare viii. 20. 24; 22. 12; Vâl. 3. 8; viii. 5. 39.
it is introduced by the poets of viii. and imitated by the later hymnists of i. and x. All three hymns of viii. are assigned to Kāṇyas.

The time to formulate nicely any positive results in this field, which still invites investigation, is not yet come; but I would suggest tentatively that the observations made in the course of this paper indicate with some verisimilitude, first, that much of the Kāṇya collection is late (like the Avesta); and second, that at least a branch of the Kāṇyas lived in the Northwest, near the Iranians, perhaps not far from where the late Atharvan was patched together.

In the next paper, on the phraseology of the eighth book, I shall show to what extent the Kāṇya collection consists of scraps of older hymns. The title prāgāthikāni is meant to cover the Kāṇya collection as a whole.
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ARTICLE III.

THE MALAYAN WORDS IN ENGLISH.

BY CHARLES PAYSON GURLEY SCOTT.

Presented to the Society, April, 1896.

English etymologists have many imperious calls upon their attention. Every language within the corners of the four winds hoists a signal as they sail by in their hurried circumnavigation, and it is no wonder if in their haste to reach home within the time set in their articles, they are tempted to ignore many of these invitations to parley, or at most to cut the parley short, treating such outlying tongues merely as posts of call, to be seen and left within the waning of a winter's afternoon.

Even if time were given, it too often happens that the means of finding out these remoter facts and of forming therefrom a judgment, are not at hand, and can not be reached.

And even if time and means are granted, there is the difficulty to be overcome of learning, before the ship sails on, the details of many outlandish tongues, written often in outlandish characters, and ill provided with the critical apparatus which is so abundant for the principal Aryan and Semitic tongues.

Nevertheless, difficulties do not form a complete excuse; and the English etymologists who are compelled, by their very office, to touch many things which they can not hope to adorn, to enter many fields which they can not hope to conquer, may yet go some way forward, and make some spoil for their pains. And indeed they do sometimes make spoil, with other pains than their own.

Of such an excursion, made along etymological lines, in a remote but large and important group of languages, this paper presents some results.

It deals with the words which have come into the English language from the East-Indian or Malayan Archipelago, the land of the orang-utan and the sapi-utan, of the babirusa and the banteng, of the bruang and the dugong, of the siamang, the kahau, and the wauwau, of the maicu and the cassowary, and of that once mythic bird called the manucodiata, 'the bird of heaven' or paradise; the home of the kris and the gong; the
land of the myriad isles, the sea of lucid waters and rainbows in the deep—a region, if we are to believe the purpl tales of travelers, like that where

"—the spicy breezes
Blow soft o'er Ceylon's isle.
[Where] every prospect pleases,
And only man is vile."

Indeed, in one version, it is the same region; for in Heber's hymn, in one edition (1827), the breezes "Blow soft o'er Java's isle;"

(Julian, *Dict. of hymnology*, 1892, p. 399).

More precisely, the paper deals with Malayan words in English; that is, with English words, or words which may be regarded as at least entitled to recognition in an English dictionary (if there is any longer any such thing as an English dictionary), that have come, directly or indirectly, from Malayan sources. It is necessary to apply some tests, which will be indicated later, to determine what words shall be admitted under the name of English or of Malayan. In this paper I use "Malayan" in a general sense, linguistic and geographic, and confine "Malay" to the one language so called, which, however, owing to its receptive character, includes a great number of external "Malayan" words. It is hazardous to say of any "Malayan" word that it is original "Malay."

In the first process, that of collection, I have been rather liberal. The notion of a liberal collection must always be agreeable to the theological mind, and I am fortunate, reading this paper at the seat of a famous seminary of theology, in being thus able to secure at the outset a pleased attention from at least a part of my audience. I can only hope that when I hand up the plate and retire to my pew, the cheerful face of expectation will not be clouded by more than the usual gloom.

I have collected all the English, or nominally English, words I can find, which have, or are said to have, or seem to have, their origin in the Malay language or the Malayan group of languages. These English or nominally English words have been gathered out of general English literature, from books of exploration and travel, Hakluyt, Dampier, Hamilton, Forrest, Wallace, Bickmore, Forbes, Thomson, Bird, and others; from translations of foreign books of travel, as Linschoten, and others included in the Hakluyt Society's series; from works treating of the political and natural history of the Archipelago, as Marsden's *History of Sumatra*, Raffles's *History of Java*, Crawford's *History of the Indian Archipelago* and his *Descriptive dictionary of the Indian islands*; from political reports, commercial lists, etc., and of course from the English dictionaries, the Malay-English dictionaries, and such works as that of Colonel Yule. A list of the works most used is given further on.

To these English or nominally English words I have annexed other words or forms from other languages more or less involved in the
same history. All are supported by quotations, many or few, all
dated and verified.

The words so collected I then undertook to etymologize, at
the same time putting them into classes according to their ascer-
tained or probable status with respect to the English, and to the
Malayan or other Oriental languages.

The English or nominally English words were separated accord-
ing to their actual standing in English, several tests, as of fre-
quency of use, of acceptance in standard literature (I play that
there is a standard literature), of independent use by divers
authors, and of relative interest, being applied to discriminate the
words and lead to the final selection of the list which forms the
main basis of this paper—namely, the English words, truly
regarded as such, which have their ultimate origin in the Malayan
languages.

As the number of such words is considerable, and as they form
an important element in the English language, it is worth while
to make the attempt to ascertain and make known their true
history and their actual relations.

And there is also a larger view. These words from the Far
East which appear in English, appear also, most of them, in the
other great languages of Europe, and are a part of the universal
vocabulary of civilization.

On the Malayan side my investigations have been wholly etym-
ological. Every word in my lists I have sought to find and to
trace through all the Malay dictionaries at my disposal—Marsden
(1812), Elout, translation of Marsden (1825), Roorda van Eysinga
(1825), Crawford (1832), Pijnappel (1863), with Klinkert’s Sup-
plement (1869), Favre (1875), Wall and Tuuk (1877–1884), Bad-
ings (1884), Swettenham (1881, 1887), Klinkert (1893), Clifford
and Swettenham (A 1894, B 1895, the rest to come), and other
works cited in the quotations. [Of the above named works, Elout
(1825) and Badings (1884) are but seldom cited, being of little
independent value.] Then I sought the same or related words
in dictionaries of the related or adjacent languages, as Achinese
(Arriens 1880, Bikkers 1882, Langen 1889), Lampang (Helfrich
1891), Nias (Thompson and Weber 1887), Javanese (Roorda van
Eysinga 1835, Groot and T. Roorda 1843, Favre 1870), Sundan-
ese (Rigg 1862), Balinese (Eck 1876), Dayak (Hardeleanu 1859),
Macassar (Matthes 1859), Bugis (Thomsen 1833), together with
many minor glossaries and wordlists of the languages of the
same and other parts of the Archipelago, including some regarded
as ‘dialects’ of the general Malay, and some allied only as mem-
bers of the broad Polynesian group.

The present paper is intended to contain only “nativ”
Malayan words, that is, English words fairly entitled to be so
regarded, which can be definitely traced to the Malay language
as presented in Malay dictionaries, and can not be certainly traced
further, outside of the Archipelago. The three tests are (1) the
word must be in English use, (2) it must be found in one or more
Malay dictionaries, (3) if not ultimately Malay, it must at least hav originated, so far as known, within the Malayan region. The words which answer these tests, with the proofs and illustrations as they stand in my manuscript, ar too numerous to be treated in this paper. I select those which ar of most importance or of most interest, and giv the full list at the end.

The plan of the paper is as follows: The articles ar arranged in the alphabetic order of the English forms. Each article consists of several divisions, coming always in the same order:

1. The English form with a brief identifying definition, and with variant spellings, present or past, if any. In some cases, other European forms ar added.

2. The Malay form, in the Malay character, with transliteration; and explanation of formation, if known.

3. Form in other Malayan languages, if any.

4. Citations from various Malay dictionaries, in chronologic order, showing the actual form and definition assigned.

5. Citations for other Malayan languages, if any ar concernd.

6. Citations from English works in chronologic order, showing the actual use of the word in English.

All Malay words, that is, all words enterd as real or nominal Malay words in Malay dictionaries, ar given, in the first instance, in the Malay character (which is Arabic with a few additional letters distinguishd by three dots), and also in English transliteration, according to the noble "Roman" system, to which I hav made the Dutch and French conform. It beats the Dutch and the French both. I note here that Dutch әj answers to English ch, the establishd infelicity for tsh, Malay in one letter ә. Favar uses for this the otherwise unused infelicity ә. Dutch әj in like manner answers to English j, Malay әjim.

Dutch oe answers to English u or ә, Malay wәu. The rest is obvious.

For more precision, all Malay words as above defined, ar, in the Roman transliteration, whether English, Dutch, or French, printed in upright spaced letters.

Some of the Malayan languages, as Batak, Lampong, Javanese, Macassar, Bugis, and also the Tagala and Bisaya of the Philippine islands, hav peculiar alphabets of their own. The Sundaneese appears sometimes in Javanese characters, sometimes, like the Chinese, in Malay. All ar also renderd, by Europeans, in the Roman character. I regret that it is impossible to reproduce these nativ characters here. They would greatly add to the unintelligibility of my pages. I can giv only the Roman transliteration. For the original characters, where they exist in the passages I quote, I substitute three dots (...), which will probably satisfy nearly everybody.

The dates put before the author's name and the title of the book, if not followd by a later date within curves after the title, mean that the quotation is taken from the identical edition of
the prefix date. If a later date follows, after the title, the quotation is from the later edition so dated. In some of the minor wordlists quoted, taken from periodicals, the date and paging are of course those of the periodical.

A date in my own text, within curves, following a Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, New Latin or English form in italics, is the date of the earliest quotation for that form, in Yule’s collection of quotations, or in my own. It means only that the word is found at least as early as the date given. The actual first appearance of the word in the language mentioned, may have been twenty, fifty, a hundred years earlier. Historical etymology without dates is mere babble. Any date, if true, is better than none.

The quotations are all first-hand, unless marked otherwise. Those taken from Yule’s indispensable collection are marked (Y.). Some are due to the Stanford dictionary (S. D.); a few to the New English dictionary (N. E. D.), and the Century dictionary (C. D.).

In view of the near approach of the twentieth century, I have modernized some of our sixteenth century spellings in order to make them worthy of the nineteenth before it is too late. In this I follow the advice of all English philologists; who advise well.

The following is a list of the principal works used in the preparation of this paper. It is confined almost wholly to dictionaries and wordlists of the languages of the Malayan Archipelago, in my own library. A few English works of special value, as Yule’s Anglo-Indian glossary and Wallace’s and Forbes’s travels, are included in the list. The titles of other works used will appear in the quotations.

The works are listed in the alphabetic order of the authors’ names. When cited, they are preceded by the date as a constant part of the author-reference. The names of the works most often cited, or in the quotations commonly reduced to date and author’s name only, “1812 Marsden,” “1875 Favre,” etc., with the locus added.

AERNOUT, W., Een woordenlijstje der Tidoengsche taal [Borneo]. Amsterdam, 1885. Large 8vo. (In:...Deel I. 1885, p. 536-550, Amsterdam.)

Archives pour servir à l’étude de l’histoire, des langues, de la géographie et de l’ethnographie de l’Asie orientale, rédigées par MM. Gustave Schlegel et Henri Cordier. Leyden, 1890+. 8vo.

See SCHLEGEL.

ARRIËNS, P., Maleisch-Hollandsch-Atljeche woordenlijst. Amsterdam, 1886. 8vo, 8 + 94 p.

BATAVIAASCH GENOTSCHAP VAN KUNSTEN EN WETENSCHAPPEN.
Verhandelingen: Deel XXIX., 1862 (see Rigo). Deel XLV., 1891 (see HELFRICH). See also TIJDSSCHRIFT, etc.
Bulletin de la Société académique indo-chinoise. 2° série, 1882 +. See BLUMENTRITT, 1884.
Bikkers, Dr. A. J. W., Malay, Achinese, French and English vocabulary, alphabetically arranged under each of the four languages. With a concise Malay grammar. London, 1882. 8vo, 14 + 35² p.
Brooke, James. See Mundy.


EQUILAZ Y YANGUAS, D. Leopoldo de, Glosario etimológico de las palabras españolas (castellanas, catalanas, gallegas, mallorquinas, portuguesas, valencianas y bascongadas) de origen oriental (árabe, hebreo, malayo, persa y turco). Granada, 1886. 4to, 24+591 p.


EEKER, A. van, Woordenlijst van enige dialecten der landstaal op de Ambonsche eilanden. Rotterdam, 1864-65. 12mo. (In: ...


ELOUT, C. P. J., Dictionnaire hollandais et malai, suivi d'un dictionnaire français et malais; d'après le dictionnaire anglais et malais de Mr. W. Marsden. Harlem, 1826. 4to, 432 p.


FAYRE, P., Grammaire de la langue malais. Vienna, 1876. royal 8vo, 23+424 p.


FORBS, Henry O., A naturalist's wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago, a narrative of travel and exploration from 1878 to 1883. New York, 1885. 8vo, 10+536 p.


GROOT, A. D. Cornets de, Javansche spraakkunst, uitgegeven ... door J. C. F. Gericke. tweede verbeterde en vermeerderde uitgave, gevolgd door een lesboek tot oefening in de Javansche taal, verzameld en uitgegeven door J. C. F. Gericke; op nieuw uitgegeven en voorzien van een nieuw woordenboek door T. Roorda...Amsterdam, 1843. 8vo, 12+10+15+8+236+45+254+1[1] p.


HELFRIJCH, O. L. Proeve van een Lampongse-Hollandsche woordenlijst, bepaaldelijk voor het dialect van Kroë. Batavia, 1891. 8vo, p. 8 + 116 + 32. (Constituizing: Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch genootschap van kunsten en wetenschappen, deel XLV., 3e stuk.)


KLINKERT, H. C., Supplement op het Maleisch-Nederduitsche woordenboek van Dr. J. Pijnappel, Gz. Harlem, 1869. Large 8vo, 2 + 276 p.

KLINKERT, H. C., Nieuw Maleisch-Nederlandsch woordenboek met Arabisch karakter, naar de beste bronnen be wrekt. Leiden, 1893. Large 8vo, 7 + 712 p.


Pieters, J. A. J. C. See Helefrich, O. L.


Riggs, Jonathan, *A dictionary of the Sunda language*. Batavia, 1862. 4to, 16 + 537 + 5 p. (Constituut: *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch genootschap van kunsten en wetenschappen*, deel XXIX.)


Roorda van Eysinga. See Grashuis.


Serrano, Don Rosalio, *Diccionario de términos comunes Tagalo-Castellano, sacado de graves autores*. Manila, 1854. 12mo, 154 p.
Swettenham, Frank A. See Clifford, H.
[Thomsen], *A vocabulary of the English, Bugis, and Malay languages, containing about 2000 words*. Singapore, 1833. 8vo, 66 p.
Tuuk, H. N., van der. See Wall, H. von de.
Wall, H. von de, *Lijst van eenige in 't Maleisch gebruikelijke woorden van Sanskrit-voorsprong, waarvan die afstamming in de Maleische woordenboeken van Roorda van Eijssinga (1825), Elout (Marsden, 1825), Roorda van Eijssinga (manuscript, 1847), Craufurd (1852) en Pijnappel (1863) niet aangetoond is*. (In: ....Batavia, 1867.)
In the same, p. 330-339.
Abada, a rhinoceros, a word frequent in the Hakluyt period; also abado, and once abath. It is a transfer of Portuguese abada (c. 1598), Spanish abada (c. 1585), New Latin abada (1631). This is a mistaken form, arising probably by attraction of the vowel of the article la (in bada taken as l'abada), of what was also used in the proper form bada, Portuguese bada (1541), Spanish bada (1611), Italian bada (c. 1606), (not noted in English or New Latin). See the quotations in Yule. *Bada* seemed to be feminin, and hence was by some thought to be “the female Vinecone.”

The word is found in all the principal languages of the Malay Archipelago. *Bada* is from Malay بادق, a rhinoceros. Achinese badak, badék, baduék, Batak badak, Lampong badak, Javanese warak, Sundanese badak, Balinese varak, Dayak badak, Macassar bada, Bugis badak. The final แ in Malay pronunciation is faint, and often silent. It does not appear in the Macassar form, from which, indeed, the Portuguese and Spanish bada may have been derived. It is absent in the English rendering of several Malay names of places, as in Ava, Malay أورن, Avaک, Batna beside Batak, Malay باتِنِ, Sulu, Sooloo, Malay سولق, Suluک. So Perak تیرق, Pérak, Dayak دایق. Dáykāk ar usually pronounced without the แ.

The pronunciation of the form *abada* must have been, of course, a-bā’da. An erroneous accentuation a’ba-da may have been in use also; the form *abath* implies this. But the form *abdoa*, which if genuine, would prove the latter accentuation, is a mistake (see below).

BADAC. Rinoceros.

بادق bādak the rhinoceros. Tandok bādak or chūla bādak the rhinoceros horn.

بادات bādakh eenhoorn, rhinoceros. Bādakh gādjah rhinoceros met één hoorn. Bādakh kārbau rhinoceros met twee hoornen.

Badak (J. warak). The rhinoceros.

بادات bādak, neushoorn; — gādjah, n. met één, — kārbau n. met twee hoorns; līdah — cochenille-cactus. (Bat. id. Jav. warak. Mak. bada.)

بادات bādak, le rhinocéros....Jav. ... wadak [read ... warak].

Sund. ... badak. Bat. ... badak. Mak. ... bada. Day. badak.

Badak, neushoorn: tjœla b., het hoorn van den neushoorn: līdah b. (neushoorntong), naam der cactusachtige gewassen, inz. van den cochenille-cactus....

Bādak بادن a rhinoceros.

1631 HAEX, p. 4.

1812 MARSDEN, p. 31.

1825 ROORDA VAN EYSINGA, p. 36.


1863 PIJNAPPHEL, p. 27.

1875 FAVRE, 2:164.

1877 WALL and TUUK, 1:184.

1881 SWEETENHAM (1887), 2:7.
badak, rhinoceros, the neushoorndier; b. gadjah, die één en b. kërbau, die twee neushoornens heeft. 1893 KLINKERT, p. 50.

Badak, rhinoceros; Badak gadjah, eenhoornige rhinoceros; Badak kërbau, tweevoornige rhinoceros; Tjoela badak, hoorn van een rhinoceros; Lidah badak, opuntia cochinillifera, een heester, veel aangekweekt voor de cochenillecultuur. 1895 MAYER, p. 27.

Badak, rhinoceros...

1895 CLIFFORD and SWEENYAM, p. 106.


Badak (ook Ab[oengsch]. v. H.), rhinoceros.


1870 FAVERE, Dictionary javanais-francais, p. 290. Badak, the rhinoceros, Rhinoceros Sumatrensis....


1885 AERNOUT, Woordenlijstje der Tidjoensche taal, p. 541. ... Badd, beh. badaka. 't Mal. bādak h rhinoceros.

1859 MATTHES, Makassarsch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 173. Rhinoceros ... badak badak... 1833 [THOMSEN], Vocab. of the Eng., Bugis and Malay lang., p. 20.

The English use appears, as in the case of many other strange animals then first heard of in the far East, and the far West, in the voyages and histories composed or translated in the later decades of the sixteenth century.

It is a very fertile country, with great store of prouisioun; there are elephants in great number and abadas, which is a kind of beast so big as two great bulls, and hath vppon his snout a little horne.

1588 R. PARK, tr. Mendoza (orig. 1585), Historie of the great and mightie kingdom of China, etc. (Hakluyt soc., 1853), 2:311. (Y.)

We sent commodities to their king to barter for Amber-greese, and for the horns of Abath, whereof the Kinge onely hath the traffique in his hands. Now this Abath is a beast which hath one horne only in her forehead, and is thought to be the female Vnicorne, and is highly esteemed of all the Moores in those parts as a most sovereign remedy against poyson.

1592 BARKER in Hakluyt (1807), 2:591. (Y.)
The Abada, or Rhinoceros is not in India, but only in Bengal and Patane. 1598 tr. Linschoten, Discours of voyages into ye easte & weste Indies, p. 88 (Y.); repr. Hakluyt soc. (1885), 2:8.

Also in Bengal are found great numbers of the beasts which in Latine are called Rhinocerotes, and of the Portingalles Abadas. 1598 Id. p. 28 (Y.); repr. Hakluyt soc. (1885), 1:96.

Cambodia lyeth Southward from thence, a great and populous Countrie, full of Elephants and Abada's (this Beast is the Rhinoceros). 1613 Purchas, Pilgrimage, p. 387.

In Bengal are found great numbers of Abadas or Rhinocerotes, whose horn (growing up from his snout,)...is good against poyfon, and is much accounted of throughout all India. 1613 Id. p. 400.

[This passage is quoted, with the unmarket omission of some words (from "snout" to "is good"), and with the reference "(1869) 2," in the N. E. D.; and the word Abadas is erroneously printed Abdas.]

See other quotations in Yule and the Stanford dictionary; and references in Pennant, Synopsis of quadrupeds, 1771, p. 75.

*AILANTUS*, a beautiful East Indian tree, *Ailanthus glandulosa*, Desf., well known in European and American towns, where it is planted as a shade-tree. The name, which is also found as *ailanto*, is not commonly recognized as Malay, but that is its ultimate origin. It has been refered to the Chinese, to the Sanskrit, and to one of the languages of the Molucca islands; and in all of these languages it has been said to mean 'tree of heaven.' The reference to the Molucca islands is correct; but the final explanation lies in the Malay.

*Ailanthus* is also spelt, erroneously, *ailanthus*. It is from the New Latin *ailantus*, as used by Desfontaines (1786) in the erroneous form *ailanthus*, as the name of the genus.

*Ailanthus glandulosa*, Desf. in Mém. Acad. Sc. Par. 1786 (1789), 265, t. 8.—China. 1893 Index Kewensis 1:66.

The Index Kewensis mentions three other species, *A. excelsa*, *A. malabarica*, *A. moluccana*. The first and third of these specific names are especially appropriate to the name *ailantus*: for the name comes from the Molucca islands, and the tree grows high.

The Molucca name does not appear, in the precise combination required, in the glossaries and wordlists accessible to me; but the European reflex, and the meaning and locality assigned, make it clear that the original Molucca name from which Desfontaines, or the author on whom he depended, probably one of the Dutch naturalists, took the word, was *ai lanit*, or *ai lanitol*, which could be interpreted, literally, as 'tree of heaven,' tho the real meaning, as we shall see, is something different. *Ai* is the most common form, in the Molucca region, with numerous variants, *aai, aya, ayo, aoa, ov*, and *kai, kao, kau*, etc., of the general Malay word for 'tree' or 'wood', namely كاير käyū. *Lanit,
lanitol, with lanitol, are Moluccan forms of the general Malay word for ‘sky,’ لَانْي يتَ. The precise Malay combination *kāyu lāngit, the ultimate original of *ai lanit, and so of the English ailtus, does not appear in the dictionaries; but its existence is implied in the ‘dialectal’ form mentioned, and is also indicated by the presence in French of langit as a synonym of ailtante, ailtus. This langit must be a fragment of the full name *kāyu lāngit.

The name could be interpreted as ‘tree of heaven,’ if that is taken as ‘tree of the heavens.’ The exact meaning, if lāngit is to be taken in its most usual sense, is ‘tree of the sky.’ There is no Elysian poetry in this. It would merely imply a tree that rises high in the air, a very tall tree. And the native ailtus is said to grow very tall. But lāngit means also ‘a canopy, an awning, a ceiling, a cover;’ the reduplicated lāngit-lāngit also means ‘a canopy;’ and in view of the use of the ailtus as a shade-tree, it is probable that the name refers to that fact—that it means merely ‘canopy-tree,’ or, in substance, merely ‘shade-tree.’ So that the sarcastic allusions to the unheavenly odor of the blossoms of the “tree of heaven” arise from an erroneous etymology. There is no “tree of heaven.”

For the principal forms of kāyu, see the quotations under Cajufti in this paper. The Moluccan and other ‘dialectal’ forms of kāyu have in great part lost the initial consonant, becoming ayō, aya, ai, aai, oai, etc.

1864-65 A. VAN EKRIJS, Woordenlijst... Amibonsche eilanden, p. 69.
Hout | Maba, Gotowassai aai | Boeli, Wajamli, Bitjoli oai | Ingli aai.
1873 CAMBIER, Beknopte woordenlijst van talen op Tiëreeseh-Halmahera, p. i (265).
Sago-boom | Maba, Gotowassai pipe ayō | Boeli, Wajamli-Bitjoli poepie ayō | Ingli pipi ayā. 1873 CAMBIER, Beknopte woordenlijst van talen op Tiëreeseh-Halmahera, p. i (265).
Hout, | Maleisch kaijo | Aroe-eilanden—Wokam kai, Oedjir kai | Keij-eilanden—Eli Ellat kaijoe, Oorspronk ay.
1864 EIJBERGEN, Korte woordenlijst van de taal der Aroe- en Keij-eilanden, p. 5 (563).
Kaijoe kauoe.
1874 JELLESMA, Woordenlijst van de taal der Alifoeren op het eiland Boeroe, p. 15.
Some Burusee words....tree, kauim.
1885 FORBES, A naturalist’s wanderings in the Eastern archipelago, p. 411.

Wallace (Malay Archipelago, 1869, ed. 1890, App. p. 490) gives the equivalents of kāyu, wood, in 33 languages, or rather 33 localities, kāyu in 4, kāju in 1, kāhu in 2, kāhun in 1, kāya in 1, kāo in 3, kāi in 1, ai or a′i in 9 (chiefly in and near Amboina), an in 1, ow in 1, with other forms gagi, gāh, gōta, etc.
The word lāngit is found in nearly all the languages of the Malayan group: Malay lāngit, Achinese langit, Batak langit, Lampung langik, langit, Javanese langit, Sundanese langit, Balinese langit, Dayak langit, Macassar langi, Bugis langi, Barē jangit, Sangi-Manganituan lāngih, Jilolo langit, langat, Tagala langit, Bisaya langit, Malagasi lanitra, the sky, the firmament. It is a general Polynesian word, Maori rangi, raki, Samoan lagi, Tahitian rai, Hawaiian lānii, Tongan lagi, Rarotangan rangi, Marquesan aki, ani, etc. ‘the sky, heaven.’ See Tregear, Maori-Polynesian comparative dictionary, p. 392–394.

Lāngit. Aerem & vīfibles caelos denotat. Item connexitatem, concamerationem, teftudinem, que alicut imponitur exprimit.

_1632_ HAEK, p. 23.
_1825_ MARSDEN, p. 296.

lāngit the sky, visible heavens, firmament. Būmi dan lāngit earth and sky....

_1825_ ROORDA VAN EYSINGA, p. 349.

lāngit the lucht, het uitspansel, de zigtbare hemel....

_1825_ ROORDA VAN EYSINGA, p. 349.


lāngit, le ciel, le firmament....Jav. et Sund....langit. Bat....langit. Mak. et Bug....langi. Day. langit, Tag. et Bis....

_1875_ FAVRE, 2:499.

lāngit, uitspansel boven iets, br. boven een ledikant; hemel, hemelgewel.

_1884_ WALL and TUUK, 3:51.

lāngit, hemel, uitspansel.

_1889_ LANGEN, Woordenboek der Atjehsche taal, p. 234.

Langith, heuvel, uitspansel; lalangetik, hemel van een bed; langik-langik, verhemelte. _Langite = lāngit._

_1891_ HELFRICH, Lampongsch-Hollandsch woordenlijst, p. 83.

Lāngit, A. hemel, firmament, uitspansel, gehemelte....

_1835_ ROORDA VAN EYSINGA, Javaansch en Nederduitsch woordenboek, p. 292.

...[langit] N. K. le plus haut, l'étendue, le firmament, le ciel....


Langit, the sky, the heavens. (Jav. Mal. idem.)

_1862_ RIGG, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 244.

Langit, de hemel, het uitspansel, de lucht....

_1876_ R. VAN ECK, Balinesesch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 164.

Langit, batanglangit, Himmel, Himmelsgewölbe....Lālangit, die Decke (eines Zimmers)....

_1859_ HARDELAND, Dajacksch-deutches wörterbuch, p. 294.

...lāngi, nep. lāngika, uitspansel, firmament, hemel. Boeg. Sund.

Mal. Jav. idem....

_1859_ MATTHES, Makassarsch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 474.

Sky...langi langit.

_1833_ [THOMSEN], Vocab. of the Eng., Bugis, and Malay lang., p. 2.

1894 Kruyt, Woordenlijst van de Bareé-taal [Celebes], p. 28.
Hemels blauw, lângih bîrîh.

Hemel | Maba, Gotowassi langit | Booli, Waijamli, Bitjoli langit |
Ingli langat.

1873 Camblé, Beluoppte woordenlijst van talen op Tidoreesch-Halmahera, p. 1 (265).

The English use of aîlantus or aîlunthus began sixty years or more ago.

Aîlantus. An immense tree, a native of the interior of Coromandel.

O'er me let a green Aîlantus grow....the Tree of Heaven.

1845 Hirst, Poems, 158. (N. E. D.)

Aîlantus ... (aîlanto, tree of heaven, Sanscrit.) A genus of trees of lofty growth from China and the East Indies: Order, Terebinthaceae.

1847 Craig.

Also in 1860 Worcester, 1864 Webster, 1884 N. E. D. (where see other quotations), etc.

Aîlantus glandulósus, Desf., called Tree of Heaven,—but whose blossoms, especially the staminate ones, are redolent of anything but "airs from heaven,"—is much planted as a shade tree, especially in towns, and is inclined to spread from seed. (Adv. from China.)


Amuck, frenzied, a homicidal frenzy: the most famous of Malayan words in English, best known in the phrase to run amuck. It was formerly speld also amoek, and is now often speld amok, in more exact transliteration of the Malay. At one time the Spanish form amuco, Portuguese amouco, New Latin *amucus (plural *amucí, amuchi, amouchi), wer in some English use. The second syllable has also become detach as an independent word, muck. See below.

The Malay word is āmûk, āmók (pronounced ā’muk, ā’mok, or ā’му, ā’mo); Lampong amug, Javanese hamûk, Sundanese amuk, Dayak amok. It means ‘furious, frenzied, raging, attacking with ‘blind frenzy’; as a noun, ‘rage, homicidal frenzy, a course of indiscriminate murder’; as a verb, mengâmûk, ‘to run amuck,’ ‘to make amok’ (Dutch amok maken, or amokken).

Amóc. Est in vsu. Si quando quis non sanæ mentis, vel omnino desperatus, in interitum se precipitat. Item significat opprimere, occidere, inuadere, oppugnare, &c.

1631 Haex, p. 2.

Ca. āmûk, engaging furiously in battle; attacking with desperate resolution; rushing, in a state of frenzy, to the commission of indiscriminate murder; running a-muck. It is applied to any animal in a state of vicious rage....

1812 Marshden, p. 16.
A m u k (J). An a-muck; to run a-muck; to tilt, to run furiously and desperately at every one; to make a furious onset or charge in combat.

Am o k, woede, razernij, moord in arren moede; Mêngamôk, in razende woede alles overhoop loopen of steken (ook van dieren), een verwoed aanval doen, amok maken, in woede moorden, enz.; Pêngamôk, de persoon die, of het dier, dat amok maakt; het amok-maken, enz.

Also 1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 21; 1863 Piñapelle, p. 13; 1869 Klinkert, p. 15; 1875 Favre, i:103; 1877 Wall and Tuuk, i:105; 1881 Swettenham (1887) 2:3; 1894 Clifford and Swettenham, i:47; 1893 Klinkert, p. 42.


Hamoeck. A. moord; verwoed blindlings moorden. Amok. Negoro Botowi harang këllbôn hamoek, te Batavia ontstaat zelden amok....

1835 Roorda van Eysinga, Javaansch en Nederduitsch woordenboek, p. 135.

... [hamuk] N. K. furieux, un furieux, une attaque furieuse. ...

[ngamuk] attaquer avec fureur, attaquer avec courage; courir avec fureur pour tuer tous ceux qui se présentent....

1870 Favre, Dict. javanais-français, p. 51.

Amuk, to fight furiously, to attack indiscriminately, to smash and destroy. Said of any animal unmanageable from rage....

1862 Rigg, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 15.

Amok (zur Verstärkung oft ampur dahinter), wüthender, mörderischer Anfall. Mamok, mamok mampur, wuthend anfallen....


The corresponding word in Malagasi, hamu (hamou), means 'drunk'; a recognition of the fact which it took no Solomon to discover: "Luxuriosa res, vinum, et tumultuosa ebrietas" (Vulgate, Prov. 20:1); "strong drink is raging"; or, as in the revised version, "strong drink is a brawler." One who runs amuck is all these. The Malay version is mild. Amok is reserved for stronger occasions. In the Dutch presentation:

'Äjer 'angawri itûlah penjindir, dàn 'arakk 'itûlah pengganggguw ['water of grape, that (is a) mocker, and arrack, that (is a) brawler'].

1821 'Elkitâb, 'ija 'itu, sagala sùrat perdjandî't'an lâma dàn bahâruw tersâlin kapada bahâsa Ma-lâjuw, Tjâlsi [Chelsea], p. 754.

The earliest mention of the word in European literature, so far as my quotations show, is in Spanish (c. 1516), where it appears as Amuco, and is understood to mean the frenzied person himself.

There are some of them [the Javanese] who.... go out into the streets, and kill as many persons as they meet.... These are called Amuco.

c. 1516 Barbosa, tr. Hakluyt soc. (1866), p. 194. (N. E. D.)
The corresponding Portuguese amouco is found:

That all those which were able to bear arms should make themselves Amoucos, that is to say, men resolved either to dye, or vanquish.

1663 Cogan, tr. Pinto’s Travels, l. 199. (N. E. D.)

The Spanish or Portuguese form also appears as New Latin *amucus, plural *amucii, found speid amouki, amouchi.

There are also certaine people called Amouchi, otherwise Cháavi, which...going forth, kill every man they meete with, till some body (by killing them) make an end of their killing.

1613 Purchas, Pilgrimage, p. 425.

Those that run these are called Amouki, and the doing of it Running a Muck.

1696 Ovington, A voyage to Suratt, p. 237. (Y. p. 15.)

The word appears in the same sense, ‘a frenzied man,’ also in an English form, amock, amok.

To run amock is to get drunk with opium...to sally forth from the house, kill the person or persons supposed to have injured the Amock, and any other person that attempts to impede his passage.

1772 Cook, Voyages (1790), 1:288. (N. E. D.)

At Batavia, if an officer take one of these amoks, or mohawks, as they have been called by an easy corruption, his reward is very considerable; but if he kill them, nothing is added to his usual pay....

1798 S. H. Wilcocke, tr. Stavorinus, Voyage to the East Indies, 1:294. (Y.)

The Malay word having no precise grammatic label as adjectiv or noun, came into general English with no definite grammatic status, in the phrase “to run amuck,” where amuck, tho properly a predicate adjectiv, has been regarded also as an adverb, analogous to “to run a-till,” “to turn aside,” etc., and as a noun. See preceding quotations.

Most commonly the word was divided, a muck, and taken as an adverbial phrase, with the preposition a, which was then sometimes joint to a second syllable with a hyphen, to run a muck, or a-muck; as the adverbial phrase in to fall a sleep was written a-sleep, now asleep. Otherwise the word so divided was taken as a complementary accusativ, the article a with its noun muck—to run a muck, understood as ‘to run a course of indiscriminate slaughter.’

Like a raging Indian...he runs a mucke (as they call it there) stabbing every man he meets.

1672 Marvell, Rehearsal transposed, 1:59. (N. E. D.)

And they (the Mohammedans) are hardly restrained from running a muck (which is to kill whoever they meet, till they be slain themselves) especially if they have been at Hodge, a Pilgrimage to Mecca.

1698 Fryer, A new account of East India and Persia, p. 91. (Y. p. 15. See other quot. in Y.)
Macassar is the most celebrated place in the East for "running a muck."  

In fact he enjoyed the reputation of having run a-mok through every one of the Ten Commandments, which alone made him interesting.  

From "to run a muck," with muck regarded as a noun, came the separate use of muck in the sense of 'a course of frenzy.' Dryden is clear on this point. He "runs an Indian muck."

Frontless and satire-proof, he scour the streets  
And runs an Indian Muck at all he meets.

It is not to be controverted that these desperate acts of indiscriminate murder, called by us mucks, and by the natives mongamo [mengamok], do actually take place, and frequently too, in some parts of the east (in Java in particular).

They [the Javans] are little liable to those fits and starts of anger, or those sudden explosions of fury, which appear among northern nations. To this remark have been brought forward as exceptions, those acts of vengeance, proceeding from an irresistible phrenzy, called mucks, where the unhappy sufferer aims at indiscriminate destruction, till he himself is killed like a wild beast, whom it is impossible to take alive. It is a mistake, however, to attribute these acts of desperation to the Javans.

The spirit of revenge, with an impatience of restraint, and a repugnance to submit to insult, more or less felt by all the Indian islanders, give rise to those acts of desperate excess which are well known in Europe under the name of mucks.... A muck means generally an act of desperation, in which the individual or individuals devote their lives, with few or no chances of success, for the gratification of their revenge. .... The most frequent mucks, by far, are those in which the desperado assails indiscriminately friend and foe.

Amuck, or amok, is also found as a noun, 'a course of homicidal frenzy.'

One morning, as we were sitting at breakfast, Mr. Carter's servant informed us that there was an "Amok" in the village—in other words, that a man was "running a muck."

Hence it is simply said—they made "amok." The tale of the restless dread and suspense which held the whole community, when some mutineer, with the desperate spirit of amok in him, was at large, and the exciting efforts to effect and to elude capture, was a chapter which demanded little from the narrator's art to engage
my sympathies and my profound interest in this community, living its
chequered life so far from the sympathies of the world.

1885 Forbes, A naturalist's wanderings
in the Eastern Archipelago, p. 16.

It appears that "the desperate spirit of amok" is utilized some-
times as a social hint at a dance in Sumatra, much as a knife or a
revolver at a dance in Kentucky.

His [Master of the Ceremonies] office is both a delicate and a difficult
one. He must himself be of good position in the community, and be
more or less a general favourite;...for the parents or the relatives of
the higher-ranked of the dancers, feeling themselves insulted, have
suddenly revenged themselves by amok—that mode of retribution which
is to them the swiftest and most gratifying.

1885 Forbes, A naturalist's wanderings

Amok is also used as an English verb, 'to run amuck.' So
Dutch amokken.

The Magindiniao Illanun lashed himself to desperation; flourishing
his spear in one hand, and the other on the handle of his sword, he
defied those collected about him: he danced his war-dance on the
sand: his face became deadly pale: his wild eyes glared: he was ready
to amok, to die, but not to die alone.

1842 Brooke, Journal, in Mundy, Narrative of
events in Borneo and Celebes (1848), i:309.

But hearing nothing for some time, we went out, and found there
had been a false alarm, owing to a slave having run away, declaring he
would "amok" because his master wanted to sell him.

1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1890), p.
134. [Three more instances, p. 134, 134, 135.]

Babirusa, also speld babirussa, and, badly, babiroussa, and,
worst, babyroursa, babyrourssa, the so-called "hog-deer" of the
Malayan islands. New Latin babirussa, Sp. babiruza.

The Malay name is بابی رس bābī rūsa, meaning, not as
usually translated, according to the order of the words, "hog-
deer" or "pig-deer," but, according to Malay syntax, "hog (like)
deer," that is "deer-hog": بابی bābī, hog, رس rūsa, deer.

Babbi. Porcus.

1631 Haex, p. 4.

بابی bābī and بابی a hog; pig; pork. Bābī ātan the wild
hog. Bābī rūsa an animal of the hog kind with peculiar tusks
resembling horns, from whence it is named the hog-deer. (See Valen-
tyn, vol. iii. plate, fig. C.)

1812 Marsden, p. 30.

Babi-rusa. The hog deer; literally, "the deer hog," Babī-rusa
alfurus.

The Malayan Words in English.


babī, cochin, porc. ... — babī rūsa, le sanglier ou cochon-gerf (sus babi rusa).

1875 Favre, 2:166.
Also 1877 Wall and Tuuk, 1:178; 1893 Klinkert, p. 76; 1895 Mayer, p. 27; 1895 Clifford and Sweetenham, 2:103. Sweetenham 1881 gives only rūsa babī (2:94).

The word babī is in use throughout the Archipelago, in a great variety of forms: Malay babī, Lampang baboi (C.), Javanese and Sundanese babi, Balinese bahwi (C.), Madurese babi (C.), Bajuk bawoi (C.), Dayak bawoi, Macassar bawi, Bugis bawei (C.), Buru jafu, Aru and Ke islands fawu, wawu, waf, jef, Timor fahi (C.), Tetu (Timor) fahi, Kaladi (Timor) pahi, Rotti bafi (C.), Tagal (Philippine islands) bañay, baboy, all 'pig.' The forms markt "C."

in Crawford's History, 1820, 2:144.

Babi, L. zwijn, varken. 1835 Roorda van Eysinga, Javaansch en Nederduitsch woordenboek, p. 3.


Babi, a pig, a hog, a swine. 1862 Riga, Dict. of the Sunda Lang., p. 29.

Bawoi, Schwein.... 1859 Hardeiland, Dajacksch-deutsches wörterbuch, p. 60.


Babi, fafoe. 1874 Jellesma, Woordentijst van de taal der Alisoeren op het eiland Boeroe, p. 3.

Pig, Kaladi pahi, Tetu fahi [in Timor].


Babirusa appears in English use in the latter part of the seventeenth century.

The head of a Babiroussa; it hath two long Tushes on the lower jaw, and on the upper two Horns [the canine teeth] that come out a little above the Teeth and turn up towards the Eyes. 1673 Ray, Observ. made in a journey through part of the Low Countries, etc., p. 29. (S. D.)

See other quotations (1696, 1774, 1790) in the Stanford dict. and N. E. D., and references in Pennant, Synop. quadrupeds, 1771, p. 73.

The wild pig seems to be of a species peculiar to the island; but a much more curious animal of this family is the Babirusa or Pig-deer, so named by the Malays from its long and slender legs, and curved
tusks resembling horns. This extraordinary creature resembles a pig in general appearance, but it does not dig with its snout, as it feeds on fallen fruits. The tusks of the lower jaw are very long and sharp, but the upper ones instead of growing downwards in the usual way are completely reversed, growing upwards out of bony sockets through the skin on each side of the snout, curving backwards to near the eyes, and in old animals often reaching eight or ten inches in length.

1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1850), p. 211. (See also p. 213, 202, 299, 300.)

... the region in the S. E. of the Bay of Kajeli, where alone in Buru the singular Hog-deer (the \textit{Babirusa}), which is known elsewhere only in Celebes, was to be found... This singular animal uses its curious upturned and hooked teeth, the natives told me, to hold to the bottom of ponds by, when hard pressed by hunters.


\textbf{Balachan}, \textit{balachan}, also \textit{balachong, blachang, blachong}, formerly also \textit{balachaun, balachoung, balichang}, a fish condiment of a very pronounced nature, the same as the Javanese trassi (\textit{trasi}).

Malay \textit{balachan}, \textit{bölächan}, Achinese \textit{bólachan}, Sundanese \textit{bolachang}, also spread into various dialects of Borneo, and other islands.

\textit{balächan} caviare; small fish, prawns or shrimps, pounded in a mortar, and preserved with spices. Balächan \textit{ikan} caviare of fish. Balächan üdang kechil, caviare of shrimps.

1812 Morsesen, p. 44.

\textit{bélätjan}, toespijs bestaande uit gezouten en dan gestampte en gedroogde vischjes of dergelijke, 't Jav. mal. \textit{trasi}.

1863 Pijnappel, p. 38.

Klinkert is more emphatic:

\textit{bélätjan}, is geen toespijs, maar een dikke, bruine conserf van kleine vischen of garnalen, waarvan immer iets in de toespijzen, zooals kerrie, sambal, enz. gemengd wordt, om ze aangenaamer van smaak te maken. De stank er van is ondragelijk en het overmatig gebruik veroorzaakt verzwering van neus- en mond-holte.

1869 Klinkert, p. 36.

\textit{beläxan}, du caviar, petits poissons ou chevrettes séchés au soleil, broyés dans un mortier et formant une conserve que l’on mêle au carry, aux épices etc., pour servir d’assaisonnement au riz ... Sund. ... \textit{balaxang}.

1875 Favre, 2:302.

Also 1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 48; 1852 Crawfurd, p. 20; 1887 Lim Hiong Seng, 1:57; 1893 Klinkert, p. 112; 1895 Mayer, p. 42; 1895 Clifford and Swettenham, 2:189, 250.
bélatjan trassi, gezouten en fijn gestampte kleine garnalen, die met kerrie, sambal enz. worden vermengd.

1889 LANGEN, Woordenboek der Atjehsche taal, p. 37.

Balachang, a superior variety of Délan or Trasi. It is of a yellowish colour and made of the choice of materials from which Délan is made....

1862 RIGG, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 34.

Maleisch belatjan, Sampitsch balatjan, Katingansch balatjan, kaviaar (trassi).

1872 TIEDTKE, Woordenlijst der Sampitsche en Katingansche taal, p. 12.

The composition is first described by Dampier:

Balachau is a composition of a strong savour, yet a very delightsom dish to the natives of this country. To make it, they throw the mixture of shrimps and small fish into a sort of weak pickle, made with salt and water, and put it into a tight earthen vessel or jar. The pickle being thus weak, it keeps not the fish firm and hard, neither is it probably so designed, for the fish are never gutted. Therefore, in a short time they turn all to a mash in the vessel; and when they have lain thus a good while, so that the fish is reduced to a pap, they then draw of the liquor into fresh jars, and preserve it for use. The masht fish that remains behind is called balachau, and the liquor poured off is called nuke-num. The poor people eat the balachau with their rice. 'Tis rank scented, yet the taste is not altogether unpleasant, but rather savory, after one is a little used to it. The nuke-num is of a pale brown colour, inclining to grey, and pretty clear. It is also very savory, and used as a good sauce for fowls, not only by the natives, but also by many Europeans, who esteem it equal with soy.


There is one mode of preparing and using fish, of so peculiar a nature, but so universally in use, that it is worth a detailed description. This preparation, called by the Malays blachang, and by the Javanese trasi, is a mass composed of small fish, chiefly prawns, which has been fermented, and then dried in the sun. This fetid preparation, so nauseous to a stranger, is the universal sauce of the Indian islanders, more general than soy with the Japanese. No food is deemed palatable without it.

1820 CRAWFORD, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, 1:197.

Some fish, others manufacture balachan; some trust to their net, others to their stakes: and at this season salt is in great demand.

1842 BROOKE, Journal, in Mundy's Narrative of events in Borneo and Celebes (1848), 1:305.

Then we had a slim repast of soda water and bananas...and the boatmen prepared an elaborate curry for themselves, with salt fish for its basis and for its tastiest condiment blachang—a Malay preparation much relished by European lovers of durian and decomposed cheese. It is made by trampling a mass of putrefying prawns and shrimps into a paste with bare feet. This is seasoned with salt. The smell is penetrating and lingering.


See other quotations, 1784 MARSDEN, Hist. of Sumatra (1811), p. 57; 1817 RAFFLES, Hist. of Java, 1:98; 1852 CRAWFORD, p. 195.
Banteng, also banting, the wild ox of Java, Borneo, and the Malay peninsula, *Bos banteng*.

Malay بنتڠ banting, banting, Javanese banteng, Sundanese banteng, Balinese banteng, Dayak bunting. The word is regarded as original in Javanese.

بنتڠ banting wild koebeest.  
1825 Roorda Van Eysinga, p. 52.

Banteng (Jav.). The wild bull and domestic kine of the same stock.  
1852 Crawfurd, p. 16.

بنتڠ banting ... III. het roode of lichtbruine runderras van de Padangse bovenlanden, T. (Jav. banteng, en Daj. banting, wilde os. bos sundalicus).

بنتڠ [banting] ... II. naam eener soort van wild rund.  
1863 Pijnappel, p. 41.

بنتڠ banteng, Jav. e. s. v. wild rund, zie sula dang.  
1893 Klinkert, p. 122.

These ar the Javanese and other entries:

Bantêng, A. woudstier, wilde os. Bantêng tawan kanin, de gevangene wilde stier is gewond.  
1835 Roorda Van Eysinga, Javaansch Nederduitsch woordenboek, p. 9.

... [banteng] N. K. boeuf sauvage.  
1870 Favre, Dictionnaire javanais-français, p. 492.

Bantêng, the wild cattle, the wild bull. Found among the mountains, or in lonely forests in the Sunda districts. The bulls are handsome animals, sleek and black, with noble horns; the cows are inferior animals, and fawn-coloured.  
1862 Rigg, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 40.

Bantêng H. van sampi. [See Sapi-utan.]  
1876 Eck, Balineesch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 195.

Banting, eine Art sehr wilde auf Borneo lebendes Rindvieh.  
1859 Hardeland, Dajackesch-deutsches wörterbuch, p. 42.

The banteng has his share in English mention:

A wild ox is found in the forest of Java, the same which is found in the peninsula and Borneo, but which is wanting in Sumatra. This is the banteng of the Javanese and the *Bos sundalicus* of naturalists. The Dutch naturalists inform us that all attempts to tame it have been vain, as in the case of the buffalo of the American prairies.

1856 Crawfurd, Descriptive dict. of the Indian islands, p. 172.

The most striking proof of such a junction is, that the great Mammalia of Java, the rhinoceros, the tiger, and the Banteng or wild ox, occur also in Siam and Burmah, and these would certainly not have been introduced by man.

1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 92.

Not much less than the rhinoceros is the *banting* or *Bos sundalicus*, to be found in all the uninhabited districts between 2000 and 7000 feet of elevation.  
In the forests on the southern slopes of the Malawar and the Wayang [Java], the banteng (Bos banteng) lived in considerable herds. The full-grown animal has a magnificent head of horns... No more bellicose and dangerous inhabitant of the forest than a wounded bull need hunter care to encounter. 1885 Forbes, A naturalist’s wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago, p. 116.

See also Bickmore (1860), p. 72; and Riverside nat. hist. (1884–1885), 5:321.

**Bohon upas**, the poison-tree of the East Indies, of which fabulous stories were told, and which thus became a favorite matter of allusion in literature and rhetoric.

The name also appears as *bohon upas* and *bon upas*. The initial *b* is a blunder. The proper form would be *pohon* or *puhun upas*; Malay فُوهُنٌ أَوْتِسٌ pohon or puhun upas, ‘tree of poison’. See further under *Upas*.

Pohon upas, the poison-tree, arbor toxicaria Macassariensis, Thunb. [See full quot. under Upas.] 1812 Marsden, p. 24.


فُوهُنٌ أَوْتِسٌ pohon upas, arbre dont le suc est un poison (antiaris toxicaria et aussi strychnos tieute). 1875 Favre, 1:31.

The following appears to be the first mention in English of the “Bohon upas”:

The following description of the *Bohon Upas*, or Poison Tree, which grows in the Island of Java, and renders it unwholesome by its noxious vapours, has been procured for the *London Magazine*, from Mr. Heydinger, who was employed to translate it from the original Dutch, by the author, Mr. Foersch, who, we are informed, is at present abroad, in the capacity of surgeon on board an English vessel....

‘In the year 1774, I was stationed at Batavia, as a surgeon, in the service of the Dutch East India Company. During my residence there I received several different accounts of the *Bohon-Upas*, and the violent effects of its poison.’ [Etc., etc.]

1783 London magazine, Dec., p. 512–517. (Y. p. 731.)

From the fabulous narrativ thus introduced, the *Bohon Upas* and the simple *Upas* soon past into literary and oratoric allusion. See further under *Upas*.

C’est au fond des sombres forêts de l’île de Java que la nature a caché le pohon upas, l’arbre le plus dangereux du règne végétal, pour le poison mortel qu’il renferme, et plus célèbre encore par les fables dont on l’a rendu le sujet.... 1808 (?) Annales des voyages, 1:69. (Y.)
tusks resembling horns. This extraordinary creature resembles a pig in general appearance, but it does not dig with its snout, as it feeds on fallen fruits. The tusks of the lower jaw are very long and sharp, but the upper ones instead of growing downwards in the usual way are completely reversed, growing upwards out of horny sockets through the skin on each side of the snout, curving backwards to near the eyes, and in old animals often reaching eight or ten inches in length.

1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 211. (See also p. 213, 202, 299, 300.)

... the region in the S. E. of the Bay of Kajeli, where alone in Buru the singular Hog-deer (the Babirusa), which is known elsewhere only in Celebes, was to be found.... This singular animal uses its curious upturned and hooked teeth, the natives told me, to hold to the bottom of ponds by, when hard pressed by hunters.


Balachan, blachan, also balachong, bluchung, bluchong, formerly also balachawin, balachowung, bollachang, a fish condiment of a very pronounced nature, the same as the Javanese trassi (trasi).

Malay بالاچین balāchān, bēlāchān, Achinese belāchān, Sundanese balāchāng, also spread into various dialects of Borneo, and other islands.

بالاچین balāchān caviare; small fish, prawns or shrimps, pounded in a mortar, and preserved with spices. Balāchān ikan caviare of fish. Balāchān ūdang kechil, caviare of shrimps.

1812 Marsden, p. 44.

بالاچین bēlatjan, toespjies bestaande uit gezouten en dan ge-stanpte en gedroogde vischjes of dergelijke, 't Jav. mal. trasi.

1863 Pijnappel, p. 38.

Klinkert is more emphatic:

بالاچین bēlatjan, is geen toespjies, maar een dikke, bruine conserf van kleine vischen of garnalen, waarvan immer iets in de toespijzen, zoeals kerrie, sambal, enz. gemengd wordt, om ze aangenaamer van smaak te maken. De stank er van is ondragelijk en het overmatig gebruik veroorzaakt verzwering van neus- en mond-holte.

1869 Klinkert, p. 36.

بالاچین belāxān, du caviar, petits poissons ou chevrettes séchés au soleil, broyés dans un mortier et formant une conserve que l'on mêle au curry, aux épices etc., pour servir d'assaisonnement au riz. ... Sund. ... balaxang.

1875 Favre, 2:302.

Also 1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 48; 1852 Crawford, p. 20; 1887 Lim Hiong Seng, 1:57; 1893 Klinkert, p. 112; 1895 Mayer, p. 42; 1895 Clifford and Swettenham, 2:189, 250.
The composition is first described by Dampier:

**Balachuan** is a composition of a strong savour, yet a very delightson dish to the natives of this country. To make it, they throw the mixture of shrimps and small fish into a sort of weak pickle, made with salt and water, and put it into a tight earthen vessel or jar. The pickle being thus weak, it keeps not the fish firm and hard, neither is it probably so designed, for the fish are never gutted. Therefore, in a short time they turn all to a mash in the vessel; and when they have lain thus a good while, so that the fish is reduced to a pap, they then draw off the liquor into fresh jars, and preserve it for use. The mash fish that remains behind is called **balachuan**, and the liquor poured off is called **nukemum**. The poor people eat the **balachuan** with their rice. 'Tis rank scented, yet the taste is not altogether unpleasant, but rather savory, after one is a little used to it. The **nukemum** is of a pale brown colour, inclining to grey, and pretty clear. It is also very savory, and used as a good sauce for fowls, not only by the natives, but also by many Europeans, who esteem it equal with soy.

1697–1709 **Dampier, Voyages, 2:28.** (1820 **Crawford, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, i:197.**)

There is one mode of preparing and using fish, of so peculiar a nature, but so universally in use, that it is worth a detailed description. This preparation, called by the Malays **blachang**, and by the Javanese **trasi**, is a mass composed of small fish, chiefly prawns, which has been fermented, and then dried in the sun. This fetid preparation, so nauseous to a stranger, is the universal sauce of the Indian islanders, more general than soy with the Japanese. No food is deemed palatable without it.

1820 **Crawford, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, i:197.**

Some fish, others manufacture **balachan**; some trust to their net, others to their stakes: and at this season salt is in great demand.

1842 **Brooke, Journal, in Mundy's Narrative of events in Borneo and Celebes (1848), i:305.**

Then we had a slim repast of soda water and bananas... and the boatmen prepared an elaborate curry for themselves, with salt fish for its basis and for its tastiest condiment **blachang**—a Malay preparation much relished by European lovers of durian and decomposed cheese. It is made by trampling a mass of putrefying prawns and shrimps into a paste with bare feet. This is seasoned with salt. The smell is penetrating and lingering.

1883 **Bird, Golden Chersonese, p. 180.**

See other quotations, 1784 **Marsden, Hist. of Sumatra (1811), p. 57; 1817 Raffles, Hist. of Java, i:98; 1852 Crawford, p. 195.**
Banteng, also banting, the wild ox of Java, Borneo, and the Malay peninsula, *Bos banteng*.

Malay بانティング banteng, banting, Javanese banteng, Sundanese banteng, Balinese banteng, Dayak banting. The word is regarded as original in Javanese.

Banteng wild koeboest. 1825 *Roorda van Eysinga*, p. 52.

Banteng (Jav.). The wild bull and domestic kind of the same stock. 1852 *Crawfurd*, p. 16.

Banting... III. het roode of lichtbruine runderras van de Padangsche bovenlanden, T. (Jav. banteng, en Daj. banting, wilde os, bos sundaciatus). 1863 *Piñanapel*, p. 41.

Banting [banting]... II. naam eenen soort van wild rund. 1877 *Wall and Tuuk*, 1:256-7.

Banteng, Jav. e. s. v. wild rund, zie sōladang. 1893 *Klinkert*, p. 122.

These are the Javanese and other entries:

Bantêng, A. wondstier, wilde os. Bantêng tawang konin, de gevangene wilde stier is gewond. 1835 *Roorda van Eysinga*, *Javaansch Nederduitsch woordenboek*, p. 9.


Bantêng, the wild cattle, the wild bull. Found among the mountains, or in lonely forests in the Sunda districts. The bulls are handsome animals, sleek and black, with noble horns: the cows are inferior animals, and fawn-coloured. 1862 *Rigg, Diet. of the Sunda lang.*, p. 40.

Bantêng H. van sampi. [See Sapî-utan.]

1876 *Eck, Balineesch-Hollandsch woordenboek*, p. 195.

Banting, eine Art sehr wildes auf Borneo lebendes Rindvieh. 1859 *Hardeeland, Dajacksch-deutschen wörterbuch*, p. 42.

The banteng has his share in English mention:

A wild ox is found in the forest of Java, the same which is found in the peninsula and Borneo, but which is wanting in Sumatra. This is the banteng of the Javanese and the *Bos sundaciatus* of naturalists. The Dutch naturalists inform us that all attempts to tame it have been vain, as in the case of the buffalo of the American prairies.

1856 *Crawfurd, Descriptive dict. of the Indian islands*, p. 172.

The most striking proof of such a junction is, that the great Mammalia of Java, the rhinoceros, the tiger, and the Banteng or wild ox, occur also in Siam and Burmah, and these would certainly not have been introduced by man.

1869 *Wallace, Malay Archipelago* (1890), p. 92.

Not much less than the rhinoceros is the banting or *Bos sundaciatus*, to be found in all the uninhabited districts between 2000 and 7000 feet of elevation. 1881 *Encyc. Brit.*, 13:602, s. v. JAVA.
In the forests on the southern slopes of the Malawar and the Wayang [Java], the banteng (Bos banteng) lived in considerable herds. The full-grown animal has a magnificent head of horns. No more bellicose and dangerous inhabitant of the forest than a wounded bull need hunter care to encounter.


See also Bickmore (1869), p. 73; and Riverside nat. hist. (1884–1888), 5:321.

**Bohon upas**, the poison-tree of the East Indies, of which fabulous stories were told, and which thus became a favorit matter of allusion in literature and rhetoric.

The name also appears as *bohun upas* and *bon upas*. The initial *b* is a blunder. The proper form would be *pohon* or *puhun upas*; Malay فرِهْن آوْنَسُ pohon or puhun upas, ‘tree of poison’. See further under *Upas*.

Půhůn upas, the poison-tree, arbor toxicaria Macassariensis, Thunb. [See full quot. under *Upas*.] 1812 Marsden, p. 24.


*فرِهْن آوْنَسُ pohon upas*, arbre dont le suc est un poison (*antiaris toxicaria et aussi strychnos tieute*). 1875 Favre, 1:31.

The following appears to be the first mention in English of the “Bohon upas”:

The following description of the *Bohon Upas*, or Poison Tree, which grows in the Island of Java, and renders it unwholesome by its noxious vapours, has been procured for the *London Magazine*, from Mr. Heydinger, who was employed to translate it from the original Dutch, by the author, Mr. Foersch, who, we are informed, is at present abroad, in the capacity of surgeon on board an English vessel....

‘In the year 1774, I was stationed at Batavia, as a surgeon, in the service of the Dutch East India Company. During my residence there I received several different accounts of the *Bohon Upas*, and the violent effects of its poison.’ [Etc., etc.]

1783 London magazine, Dec., p. 512–517. (Y. p. 731.)

From the fabulous narrativ thus introduced, the *Bohon Upas* and the simple *Upas* soon past into literary and oratoric allusion. See further under *Upas*.

C'est au fond des sombres forêts de l'île de Java que la nature a caché le pohon upas, l'arbre le plus dangereux du règne végétal, pour le poison mortel qu'il renferme, et plus célèbre encore par les fables dont on l'a rendu le sujet.... 1808 (?) Annales des voyages, 1:69. (Y.)
Antiāris, Lesch. Antiar or Antschar, its Javanese name. Linn. 21, Or. 4, Nat. Or. Artocarpáceae. This is the far-famed Upas poison-tree of Java—the *Boom* [Boon f] or *Boon Upas* of the Javanese.


The name is found used, by error, for the poison itself.

While the juice of some ["of the Artocarpus tribe"] is nutritive, that of others is highly poisonous. Thus Antiaria toxicaria is the source of the famous poison called Bohun-Upas, or Upas-Antiar, by the Javanese, and which is said to owe its properties to the presence of Strychnia.


Emerson makes a characteristic use of the Bohun Upas; and many other writers mention it.

They [the English] stoutly carry into every nook and corner of the earth their turbulent sense; leaving no lie uncontradicted, no pretension unexamined. They chew hasheesh; cut themselves with poisoned creases; swing their hammock in the boughs of the Bohun Upas; taste every poison; buy every secret.

1856 Emerson, English traits, ch. 8. (Wks. 1876, p. 103.)

Bruang, the Malayan bear, Ursus or Helarctos malayanus, cald also the honey-bear and the sun-bear.

The Malay name is براغ़ brāang, brāwang, bōrāwang; Achinese beruwang, Batak baruwang, Sundanese bruwang, baruang, Dayak bahuang, Sampit (Borneo) bahuang, Macassar baruwang, Bugis baruang. According to Swettenham the word probably stands for *ber-rāang*, from ber-, a verbal prefix, and rāang, a hole; meaning "the animal which lives in a hollow." Compare cave-bear.

Bear (ursus) براغ़ brāang. 1812 Marsden (Eng.-Mal.), p. 389. [Not in the Malay-Eng. part.]

بروُه़ beroewaang of broeewang beer.

1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 45.


broeewang, de Maleische beer. (Mak. id. Bat. een oude beer, die een ronden, witten kring om den snuit heeft.) 1863 Pijnappel, p. 34.

Bruang براغ़ a bear. (Derived from raung a hole. Ber-rāang, or bruang a hole-maker.) 1881 Swettenham (1887), 2:19. Also 1875 Faye, 2:291; 1877 Wall and Tuke, 1:227; 1893 Klinkert, p. 102; 1895 Mayer, p. 49; 1895 Clifford and Swettenham, 2:221, 273.

بروُه़ beroeewang, de zwarte honigbeer. 1889 Langen, Woordenboek der Atjehsche taal, p. 33.
Baruang, Poison. The bear of Sumatra and Borneo.

1862 RIGG, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 42.

Bruuang, a bear. Not known on Java, except as brought from Sumatra or Borneo as a rarity. Ursus Malayanus.

1862 RIGG, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 65.

Bahuang, Bär.—Dengedengen bahuang, etwas taub (so taub als ein Bär) sein. 1859 HARDELAND, Drejacksch-deutsches wörterbuch, p. 30.

Berouwang, Sampitsch bahouwang, Katingansch oenda, beer.

1872 TIEDE, Woordenlijst der Sampitsche en Katingansche taal, p. 11.

Bear...buruang bruang.


See also RAFFLES, Hist. of Java (1817), 2 : App. 89.

The English use of the name is recent.

Here is also a small bear (bruangh) found elsewhere only in Borneo.

1883 Eneye. Brit., 15 : 322, art. MALAY PENINSULA.

The genus Helarctos, meaning Sun Bear, strictly embraces but one species, Helarctos malayanus. The Malayan Bear or Bruang, is confined to the Indo-Malayan sub-region, that is, to the Malayan peninsula and the neighboring islands, Borneo, Sumatra and Java. It is much smaller than the Himalayan bear, not exceeding four feet and a half in length.


The Bruang has a smallish head and a short neck which is very strong, enabling it to tear up the great plants... When tamed it shows so much affection and has so many droll ways as to make it an amusing and prized pet.

1888 Id., 5 : 372.

Bruhn, a Malayan monkey, Macacus nemestrinus. Malay bru, bërû, also with the weak final -k, bruûk, bëruûk, broûk; Achinese bëroûk, Balinese brug, Sampit and Katingan beruk.

bruûk and bruû a large species of monkey with a tail; an ape.

1812 MARSDEN, p. 39.

bëroûk, eene apensoort gelijk aan een bairaan, met eenen rooden en kleinen staart.

1825 ROORDA VAN EYSINGA, p. 44.

Bruûk. Name of a species of ape.

1852 CRAWFURD, p. 31.

bruû, brûû, v. bruû berûk.

bruûrûk, bruûk, nom d'une espèce de singe (magot, R. V.) (simius nemestrinus) (Pij.... On trouve aussi brûû.

1875 FAVRE, 2 : 292.

bëreuûk, naam eener soort van apen—de zoogenaamde lam-pongsche aap; inius nemestrinus....

1877 WALL and TUUK, 1 : 222.
Brok, a large monkey with a short tail, often trained to gather coconuts and duriens. 1881 Swettenham (1887), 2:19. (See also 1895 Clifford and Swettenham, 2:273.)

Bèrok, naam van een groot soort Lampionscbe aap.

1889 Langen, Woordenboek der Atjehsche taal, p. 33.

Broeg, ben. van een thans onbekende aapsoort.

1876 R. van Eck, Balineesch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 198.

Maleisch broek, Sampitsch beroek, Katingansch beroek, zeker soort van aap.

1872 Tiedtke, Woordenlijst der Sampitsche en Katingansche taal, p. 11.

See also Raffles, Hist. of Java (1817), 2: App. 89.

The bruh is not so well known in English as his brethren the kahau, the siamang, and the orang-utan.

In length of tail M[acacus] nemestrinus and M. rhesus hold a median position. The former species, remarkable for the length of the legs and the thinness of the short tail, is of the two the more terrestrial. It is a native of the Malay Archipelago, and is the Bruh of the Malays. The coat is brownish washed with yellow, the hair on the crown longer, and forming a radiating tuft behind. M. rhesus is, on the other hand, a native of India.... The tail is proportionally longer, thicker, and does not have the pig-like twirl of that of the bruh.

1884-88 Riverside nat. hist., 5:1517.

Cajuput, also cajeput, kahjuput, kajeput, caujaput, an East Indian tree, and an oil derived from it (and other trees).

Cajeput is more commonly, but less correctly, spelt cajeput.

Cajeput, pronounced in the dictionaries "kajê-pût" or "kajê-pût," that is, cadzhî-pût, -pût, is, like the Portuguese cajeput, a copy of the French cajeput, a bad form of cajeput. Cajeput or kajeput is an adapted form of cajuputi, which is also found: see Cajuput. The j is the Dutch spelling of what is in English y, and in cajuputi, at least, it should be pronounced as y (that is, like j in hallelujah). Webster (1890) gives cajeput with an alternative pronunciation rendering j as y.

(1) Cajeput or Cajeput tree.

Kayu-putih. The cajeput myrtle, Melaleuca cajeputi.

1852 Crawford, p. 70.

Prominent for their straight and shapely pillar-like stems stand out the Lakka (Myristica iners), the Rasamala (Liquidambar altingiana), and the white-stemmed Kajeput trees (Melaleuca leucadendron), all of them rising with imposing columns, without a branch often for 80 and sometimes 100 feet. 1885 Forbes, A naturalist's wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago, p. 74.

The road led over numerous small hills, from the top of which we got many pretty peeps of Haruka and Ceram, through Gum-tree—the famous Kajeput—forest and Kussu-grass fields. 1885 Id., p. 296.
(2) Cajeput oil, often reduced to cajeput. The Malay name is minia kāyu pūtih. But in Java kāyu pūtih is used also as the name of the oil (Rigg).


The leaf of the smaller [Cayuputi trees], [affords] by distillation, the fragrant essential oil which has been used for medical purposes, sometimes internally as a powerful sudorific, but more frequently externally as an useful embrocation, under the ignorant and corrupt denomination of Cajeput. 1820 CRAWFURD, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, i : 513.

The leaves of Melaleuca minor (Cajuputi of some), a native of the Moluccas, yield the volatile oil of Cajeput. It is a very liquid oil, of a grass-green colour, having a pungent camphoraceous odour, and capable of dissolving caoutchouc. It is used medicinally as a stimulant and antispasmodic. 1855 BALFOUR, Manual of botany (3d ed.), p. 428.

Doors all shut
On hinges oil’d with cajuputi.

a. 1845 HOOD, To Mr. Malthus (N. E. D.).

Its [Kajeli] great items of export are fish....and the famous Kajuput oil, distilled by the natives from the leaves of the gum trees (Melaleuca Kajuputi) which form a large part of the vegetation of the shores of the Bay of 1885 FORBES, A naturalist’s wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago, p. 391.

Cajeput. The name of a fragrant essential oil produced especially in Celebes and the neighbouring island of Bouro.... The drug and tree were first described by Rumphius, who died 1693. (See Hanbury and Flückiger, p. 247.) 1886 YULE and BURNELL, Hobson-Jobson, p. 109.

Cajuputi, also cayuputi, kajuputi, an East Indian tree, Melaleuca leucadendron, L. So in New Latin, cajuputi. Adanson used caju-puti as the generic name (1763, Fam. ii. 84); see Index Kevensis i : 372. Cajuputi should be pronounced as it is spelt, Romanly cā-yu-pū’ti, not “kaj-joo-pyoo’ty.” Spanish cayaputi, Dutch kajoe-poeti.

The Malay name is كيمبو كابور Kāyu pūtih. It means ‘white tree’ or ‘white wood.’ The bark is white, like the bark of the birch. The name appears also in other languages, Javanese and Sundanese kāyu pūṭih, Macassar kāyu pūṭī. In Bali kāyu pūṭih, ‘White Tree,’ is the name of a village (1876 Eck, p. 80).

... Kāyu pūṭih a species of tree which yields a medicinal oil, melaleuca-leucadendra, L. 1812 MARSSEN, p. 235.

... Kajoe poetih, e. s. v. boom, uit welks bladeren de aetherische olie, minja kajoe poetih, wordt getrokken. 1893 KLINKERT, p. 479.

Also 1852 CRAWFURD, p. 70; 1863 PIJNAPPHEL, p. 173; 1875 FAVRE, i : 231.
Kayu-putih, literally—white wood. The tree grows in the Moluccas; and on Java, the words kayu-putih, as in Europe, mean the essential oil derived from the tree. It is the Cajeput of Europe. *Melaleuca Cajeputi.*

1862 Rigg, *Dict. of the Sunda lang.*, p. 211.

... Kāyoe poeti, soort van boom, Melaleuca Cajeputi, vooral bekend om zijn olie.


Kayu is the general Malay term for 'wood' or 'tree':

Cayou. Lignum.

1631 Haex, p. 11.

Kayu (J). Wood, timber; a tree; an idiomatic term used in counting certain substances....

1812 Marsden, p. 251.

Also 1863 Plinapfel, p. 173; 1875 Favre, i:231; 1880 Wall and Tuuk, 2:486; 1893 Klinkert, p. 479; 1895 Mayer, p. 120; etc.

The word is found throughout the Archipelago; Achinese kāyih, kaybë, Batak hauy, Lampong kayu, Javanese, Sundanese, Balinese kayu, Dayak kayu, Macassar kayu, Bugis ajy, Sangi-Manganitoe kahù, Buru kau, Aru kai, Kei kayu, etc. In many of the eastern isles, as in Bugis, it is found without the initial consonant, ayo, aya, at, ati, aow, aw, etc. In the Moluccan form ai, it has emerged in English use as the unrecognized first element of the word aîantus. See AîANTUS, where the decapitate Malayan forms are given. The word also appears in the Philippine islands, Spanish căhun, Tagala and Bisaya kahong, and in Madagascan, Malagasi hasu (hasou), and throughout Polynesia, Fiji kau, Marquesan kau, akau, Tongan akau, Tahitian raua, Maori rakau, etc. (See Tregear, *Maori-Polynesian compar. dict.*, 1891, p. 387–8.)

Kajoe hout kajìh.


Kajoe, boom, hout....[Many kinds of trees are mentioned].


... [kayu] N.....[kajeng] K. bois, arbre....

1870 Favre, *Dict. javanais-français*, p. 163.

Kayu, wood, timber: sometimes used for a tree in general. Kha appears to be wood in Burmese. [A fanciful etym. follows.]

1862 Rigg, *Dict. of the Sunda lang.*, p. 211.

Kaju, Holz, Baum... Kajuun, Gehölz (Wald)....

1859 Hardeland, *Dajacksch-deutsches wörterbuch*, p. 204.

... kāyoe, b. kayoea, vzw. kayoengkoe, hout....


Boomstam, m. kāhùh.


Hout, o. kāhùh.

1860 Id., p. 389.
Malay 팟 тепло is the ordinary word for 'white.' It is found in many languages. I omit quotations.
In English use cau uputi, cau uputi, kau uputi all appear.

A remarkable example of this is afforded in the Cayuputi trees (Melaleuca leucadendron) of the Indian islands, which are gigantic myrtles. These trees are easily distinguished in the forest by the whiteness of their bark, which has some resemblance in structure and appearance to that of the birch. This white colour gives to the tree its commercial and vulgar name of Kayu-puti, which means literally "white wood."

1820 CRAWFURD, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, 1:513.

The far famed Kayu Putih.

1842 BROOKE, Journal, in Mundy, Narrative, etc. (1848), 1:283.
There was a little brush and trees along the beach, and hills inland covered with high grass and cau uputi trees—my dread and abhorrence.

1869 WALLACE, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 295.
Next day we took a westward course through fields of tall Kussu grass dotted with Kayu-puti trees, and through swamps full of sago palms.

1885 FORBES, A naturalist’s wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago, p. 394 (Buru).

So cau uputi-oil, cau uputi oil, kau uputi oil.

Cayu-puti oil.

1820 CRAWFURD, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, 3:413, 414.
Rattans from Borneo, sandal-wood and bees’-wax from Flores and Timor, tripanget from the Gulf of Carpenteria, cau uputi-oil from Bouru, wild nutmegs and mussel-bark from New Guinea, are all to be found in the stores of the Chinese and Bugis merchants of Macassar.

1869 WALLACE, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 309.

Kau upiti oil.

1869 BICKMORE, Travels in the East Indian Archipelago, p. 249.

Campong, also kampong, a Malayan village, a district or quarter of a city, an inclosure; the source of the Anglo-Indian term compound, which see.

Malay كم پونگ kam pong, kam pung, ‘an inclosure, district, village,’ (see quotations); also adjectiv, ‘collected, assembled, inclosed;’ with verb formatives, ‘to assemble;’ Batak tampung, Lampang kampung, Javanese kampung, Sundanese kampung, Dayak kam pong, Macassar kam pong, Tagal kampun, ‘an inclosure,’ etc.; Malagasi kambound, ‘inclosed.’


1631 HAEW, p. 11.

Kam pong an inclosure, a place surrounded with a paling; a fenced or fortified village; a quarter, district, or suburb of a city; a collection of buildings....

1812 MARSDEN, p. 267.
Kampong, een buurt oft menigte huizen, die alle door eenen algemeenen of ieder derzelver door eenen bijzonderen heining omgeven wordt. Eene wijk, buurt of kwartier in eene ftad. Een omheind ftuk land, eene befloten plaats, afheining; buurt, wijk....

1825 ROORDA VAN EYSINGA, p. 320.

Also 1852 CRAWFORD, p. 66; 1863 PIJNAPPED, p. 182; 1875 FAVRE, i: 345; 1880 WALT and TUUK, 2:543; 1881 SWETTENHAM (1887), 2:45; 1893 KLINKERT, p. 539.

Kampong, I. erf, wijk, aanplant; II. vereeniging van gezinnen (soenbraj). 1891 HELFRICH, Lampongisch-Hollandsche woordenlijst, p. 2. Kampung, a village; is properly Malay....

1862 Rigg, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 194.

Hardeland does not giv a Dayak kampong, 'an inclosure,' but he givs the adjectiv kampeng 'closed,' 'obstructed' (as a door, a river, and figurativly, the heart or mind), with numerous derivativs.

Kampeng, versperrt [etc.].

1859 HARDELAND, Dajackesch-deutsches wörterbuch, p. 222.

... kampong, Mal. een kampong, een omheine plaats.

1859 MATTHES, Makassarisch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 7.

In Malagasi the word (kambonndj) has only the original sense 'collected,' 'enclosed' (1896 Muire, p. 32).

Campong, kampong is common in English books of Eastern travel.

His campong was at Singi.

1844 BROOKE, Journal, in Mundy, 'Narrative, etc. (1848), i:371.

I obtained the use of a good-sized house in the Campong Sirani (or Christian village). 1869 WALLACE, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 256.

Like all the cities and larger settlements in the Dutch possessions, Ambon is divided into a native kampong or quarter, a Chinese kampong, and a quarter where foreigners reside.

1869 BICKMORE, Travels in the East Indian Archipelago, p. 132.

There are Malay campongs (villages) scattered over the island, made up of a few rude bamboo huts, and two or three clusters of fruit-trees. 1875 THOMSON, The Straits of Malacca, Indo-China, and China, p. 18.

All islands are liable to the linguistic difficulty of their littoral being occupied by a superior seafaring and commercial race, either continuously or in detached "campongs," while the interior and unexplored mountains become the refuge of shy and uncivilized indigenes.

1878 CUST, Sketch of the mod. languages of the East Indies, p. 132.

The great coco-groves are by no means solitary, for they contain the kampongs, or small raised villages of the Malas.... In the neighborhood of Malacca these kampongs are scattered through the perpetual twilight of the forest....

Cassowary, a large bird related to the emu and the ostrich. This name came into English use early in the seventeenth century, and went through various spellings, cassuowary (1673), cassuowary (1611), cassuowawy (1630), cassiounaty (1690), cassuary, also with a Latinized termination cassuvaris (1705), and sometimes cassuvar (1651), and (as a poetic truncation) cassuwar (1800 Southey); also in other languages, French casoar, Spanish casuñes (1705 Stevens), casobar, casoar (1878 Dominguez), casuel (“cassiovery, large bird of prey”! 1879 Meadows), Portuguese casuar (Michaelis), Italian casuario, Dutch casuaris, kasuaris, German cassebärce (1672 in Yule), kassuaris (1682 in Yule), casuar, ksuwar (1848); Swedish and Danish kusuar, Russian kusuar, New Latin casuarius (1631 Bontius), casuarius.

The word cassuouary has been generally referred to a Malay origin, but the statements have been more or less inexact. Bontius (1631) says the bird, which he calls emu, is “vulgo Casoaris,” that is, as he implies, the native name in Ceram is casoaris. Other statements followed; see forms and dates cited. From these earlier European mentions, the native name has been variously inferred and stated.

Worcester (1860) gives Malay casuwaris. “Webster” (1864) gives “Hindost. cassuwaris.” Littre (1877) gives Malay cassuwaris. Skeat (1879) quotes Littre for kasuwaris. Yule (1886) gives Malay kasuvari or kasuari. The earlier forms cited as nominal English, Spanish, German, or Dutch, are of course all intended to reflect the Malay origin.

The correct European reflex would be casuvari, casuari, or kasuvari, kasuari. The Malay word is kasuwari, less exactly transliterated kasuari. But it is worthy of note that no Malay dictionary records the word until the year 1863. No form kasuwari or one like it appears in Marsden (1812) or in Roorda van Eysinga (1825). Nor is kasuwari in Crawford (1852). The first entry of kasuwari in a Malay dictionary appears to be in Pijnappel (1863), where it is not given in alphabetic place, but is mentioned as an earlier form of suwari (soewari). In Macassar the word is recorded, as kasuwari, in 1859.

soewari, de casuaris (van een vorm kasoewari).

1863 Pijnappel, p. 143.
Klinkert, in his Supplement to Pijnappel (1869), takes no notice of either form.

The next dictionary entry, like Pijnappel's, is indirect, in the name pōhon kasuāri, 'cassowary tree' (1864-5 Van Ekris). See under CASSOWARIA. Then there are entries in 1875 Favre, 1880 Wall and Tuuk, 1895 Mayer.

كاسورى kasuwāri, kasuāri, le casoar (struthio casuarius).

إداله بارهغ كساسورى adā-lah bārang kasuāri, il y avait des casoars (H. Ab. 74). [No cognate forms cited.] 1875 FAVRE, 1:382.

قاسورى [chasoewāri] of soewāri, kasuaris (vogel).

كاسورى kasoewari, de casuaris. 1880 WALL and TUUK, 2:78.

Kasoewari, casuaris. 1893 KLINkERT, p. 522.

1895 MAYER, p. 126.

... kaseowari, bep. kaseowariya, Casuaris.

1859 MATTHEs, Makassarisch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 66.

Beside the name kasuāri, there is an other name suwāri, first mentiond so far as the quotations show, by Crawfurd, 1852. This appears also in Pijnappel 1863 (soewari), in Favre 1875 (suāri), and Wall 1880 (soewāri); and it is also recorded in Macassar (1859), as sowāri.

The two forms kasuāri and suwāri ar no doubt connected. Compare kapāyū and pūyū, a quail; lingking and kelingking, a fruit, the lichi. The office of the apparent prefix ka- is not clear. It does not seem to be the prefix ka- as used in connection with the suffix -an, to form certain verbal nouns or participles.

Suwāri appears in most of the dictionaries from Crawfurd (1852) down :

Suwari. The cassawary or emeu, Struthio cassuarius.

1852 CRAWFURD, p. 178.

Cassowary, Suwari.

1852 CRAWFURD, Eng. and Malay dict., p. 25.

Suwari soewari, de casuaris (van een vorm kaseowari). 1863 PIJNAPPeL, p. 143.

Suwari = kasuāri. 1875 FAVRE, 2:640.

Suwari soewāri, z. chasoewāri. 1880 WALL and TUuk, 2:296.


... sowāri, = kaseowāri, casuaris. 1859 MATTHEs, Makassarisch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 608.

The bird is mentiond, under a name now current as emu, in the following passage:
In Banda and other Islands, the bird called Emia or Eme, is admirable. It is foure foot high, somewhat resembling an Ostrich, but having three clawes on the feet, and the same exceeding strong: it hath two wings rather to helpe it running, then serviceable for flight: the legges great and long.

1613 Purchas, Pilgrimage, p. 430.

The first English mention of the name cassowary appears to refer to a bird brought to England:

St. James his Ginny Hens, the Cassawarway moreover. (Note by Coryat. An East Indian bird at St. James in the keeping of Mr. Walker, that will carry no coales, but eat them as what you will.)

1611 Peacham, in Paneg. verses on Coryat’s Crudities, sig. l. 3 r° (1776). (S. D.)

A Cassawaries or Emeus Egg.

1673 J. Ray, Journ. Low Countr., p. 28. (S. D.)
(See other quotations in S. D. and N. E. D.)

The Cassawaris is about the bigness of a large Virginia Turkey. His head is the same as a Turkey’s; and he has a long stiff hairy Beard upon his Breast before, like a Turkey.

1705 Funnel, in Dampier’s Voyages, 4:266 (1729). (Y.)
Cassawary, or Emeu, a large Fowl, with Feathers resembling Camels-Hair.

1708 and 1715 Kersey.

Another large and extraordinary bird is the Cassowary, which inhabits the island of Ceram only. It is a stout and strong bird, standing five or six feet high, and covered with long coarse black hair-like feathers. The head is ornamented with a large horny casque or helmet, and the bare skin of the neck is conspicuous with bright blue and red colours. The wings are quite absent, and are replaced by a group of horny black spines like blunt porcupine quills.... This bird is the helmeted cassowary (Casuarius galeatus) of naturalists, and was for a long time the only species known.

1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1890) p. 305.

See also 1774 Goldsmith, Hist. of the earth (1790), 5:6, p. 67, 73 (Jodrell); 1856 Crawfurd, Descriptive dict., p. 84; 1869 Bickmore, Travels in the East Indian Archipelago, p. 150; 1889 Wallace, Darwinism, p. 115.

The unreflecting voracity of the bird appears in the quotation in which he eats coals “as whot as you will.” In the “experience,” or at least in the travels, of a warlike German, quoted by Yule (1644–1659) he, the cassowary, swallowed 50 bullets, of a size not stated. According to a popular rime, the cassowaries of Timbuctoo, which are ignored by the leading ornithologists, make light of a still heaver diet:

If I were a cassowary,
Far away in Timbuctoo,
I would eat a missionary,
Hat and boots and hymn-book, too.

a. 1880 Auct. incert., loc. non cit.
Casuarina, an East Indian and Australian tree.

It is an Anglicized form of New Latin *casuarina* (Linnaeus, *Amoen. Acad.*, 1759, iv. 143, cited in *Index Kewensis*, 1893, 1: 457; Adanson, *Fam.* ii. 481, 1763, cited l. c.), a genus of trees of which many species are named.

This appears to be based on a Malayan name associating the tree with the casowary. In Van Eekh 1864 the Malay name pohon kasuari ‘casowary tree’ is given as the synonym of several names of the tree in the Amboina region—laweur, *laweur*, hweur, *kweule*, leahua. An other Malay name is ꞌrû or ꞌrû (1893 Klinkert, p. 14). In Barse (central Celebes) the tree is named *ogû*.

Laweur, zekere boom (pohon kasuari) (P.)—lewur (H. W. K.)—hweur (T. R.)—kweule (A.)—leahua (Kr.).


Ogû (T. ogû), casuarisboom.

1894 Kruyt, *Woordenlijst van de Barse-taal*, p. 47.

Casuarina, kas-u-a-rin’a, s. (from the supposed likeness of the branches to the plumes of the Casowary). A genus of plants, constituting the type and only genus of the order Casuarinae.

1847 Craig.

The *Casuarinas* [in Timur], especially, remind the observer of the Australian vegetation.


Surrounding Elie House, near Colombo, in which I resided, were a number of tall *casuarinas* and India-rubber trees, whose branches almost touched the lattices of the window of the room in which I usually sat. These were the favorite resort of the tree-snakes, and in the early morning the numbers which clung to them were sometimes quite remarkable.

1861 Tennent, *Sketches of the nat. hist. of Ceylon*, p. 305.

It was lovely in the white moonlight with the curving shadows of palms on the dewy grass, the grace of the drooping *casuarinas*, the shining water, and the long drift of surf.


Cockatoo, an East Indian parrot. The word has had many forms in English, cockatoe, cocutoe, kokatu, kakatou, cockatooa, and corruptly cockatoon, cocudore, crockudore, jacatoo, etc. Other European forms are French cacatôès, kakatôès, cacatois, Spanish cacatu, Portuguese cacatu, Dutch kakatoe, kaketoë, kakato, German kakadû, Swedish kakadû, cacatu, etc.

The Malay word is ꞌkakatûwa, kakatûa, ꞌkakatû, ꞌkakatûwa, ꞌkakatûha; Javanese kokotunoe, Achinese kaka-tuwa, Sundanese kakatuwa; in the Amboina region lakatua, or without the terminal syllables, laku, laki, laa, also with only the terminal syllables, reduplicated, tau-tau.
The name is imitative of the parrot’s utterance. This is indicated not only by the common belief (see the English quotations dated 1662, 1705, and 1884–8), but by the ‘dialectal’ forms, and by the existence of other similar imitative names for parrots, as Malay kekē, Sunda ekēk, a parrot, Bugis chakōlek, a cockatoo, Maori kaka, a parrot, kakapo, the owl-parrot.

An other notion is that the bird derives its name from the Malay kakatūwa, ‘a vise or grip’; but this is obviously a transfer from the name of the bird, in allusion to the grip of its claws or its beak. Compare crane, crow, cock, goose, English names of implements transferred from names of birds.

Wall and Tukc declare that kakatūwa, which they write also in a form corresponding to kakatūha, is a compound of kāka and tūha (tūha), meaning, I suppose, ‘old brother’ or ‘deeply colored brother’! This is not convincing.

Kakatowa, a vogel van de papagaaiensoort.


Kakatoea, kakatoe.

Kakatūwa, kakatūa, le kakatoes, oiseau du genre perroquet... Sund... kakatuwa.

1875 Favre, 1:302.

I. kakatōha en kakatōwa, of kakatōwa en kaka tōwa [66]—smst. van kāka en tōha enz.—naam eener soort van grooten, witte papagai, kakatoe, kakatoe. II. kakatōwa en kaka tōwa, batav., nijptang en kakatoe.—B. 1880 Wall and Tukc, 2:524.

Kakahu...kakahua.

1887 Lim Hiong Seng, Manual of the Malay colloquial, p. 128, 149.

Also 1881 Swettenham (1881) 2:44; 1893 Klinkert, p. 526; 1895 Mayer, p. 120.

The name appears in Sundanese kadayuwa, Achehese kadayuwa, kakkatua. In the Amboninsland it is lakatua, laka, lati, laa, and tautau.

Kakatuwa, a cockatoo; used as applied to parrots imported from countries beyond Java, as the parrots of the Moluccas. 1862 Riggs, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 187.

Kakatoewa, een groote witte papagai.

1889 Langen, Woordenboek der Atjehsche taal, p. 208.

Laka, witte kakatoe (R. Kr.)—lakatua (T. H. W. K. P.)—tau (=tautau) (P.)—laki (A.)—laa (Ht.).

1864-65 A. van Eekis, Woordenlijst...Ambonische eilanden. p. 104.
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The cockatoo entred English, according to the first quotation, with an evil reputation and a worse etymology.

Sparrowes, Robbins, Herons, (white and beautifull) Cacatoes (Birds like Parrots, fierce, and indomitable: and may properly be so called from the Greeke Κάκατος ἄποιος proceeding from an euill egg).  

1634 SIR T. HERBERT, Travels, p. 212. (S. D., p. 254.)

Some rarities of naturall things, but nothing extraordinary save the skin of a jaccall, a rarely colour'd jucatoo or prodigious parrot....  

1654 EVELYN, Diary, July 11. (Y., p. 175.)

An infinite number of Parrots, whereof there are several kinds.... Some are all white, or of a Pearl colour, having on their Crowns a tuft of Feathers of a Carnation red, and they are called Kahatou, from that word which in their chattering they pronounce very distinctly.  

1662 J. DAVIES, tr. Mandelslo (1665), i:26. (S. D.)

The Crockadore is a Bird of various Sizes, some being as big as a Hen, and others no bigger than a Pidgeon. They are in all Parts exactly of the shape of a Parrot... When they fly wild up and down the Woods they will call Crockadore, Crockadore; for which reason they go by that name.  

1705 FUNNEL, in Dampier, Voyages, 4:285-6. (Y. p. 174.)

See other quotations in Yule and S. D., 1638, 1698, 1719, 1750, 1775; also 1840 BROOKE (1848), i:53.

Small white cockatoos were abundant, and their loud screams, conspicuous white colour, and pretty yellow crests, rendered them a very important feature in the landscape. This [Lombock] is the most westernly point on the globe where any of the family are to be found.  

1869 WALLACE, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 119, 120.

Cockatoos [in the Aru islands]. [Their habits described at length.]  

1869 WALLACE, Id. (1890), p. 341-343.

The true cockatoos belong to the genus Cacatua or Plicophorus. With two exceptions, the fifteen species are white.... They make very interesting pets, crying now "cockatoo," now "pretty cocky," or screaming with a voice far from musical.  


Compound, an inclosure, a yard.

This is an Anglo-Indian sophistication of the Anglo-Indian kampong, representing the Malay word كمپوڠ kampung, kam-pung, in early mention (1631 Haex) also written campon. The sophistication is like that which appears in godown, sometimes, godon, for godong, gadong, a Malayan word which is excluded from this paper as being of Indian origin. The other proposed etymologies of compound (see Yule, p. 186-8) are not tenable. For the Malay form, see under CAMPONG, which is now establislsh in English use.

It is a curious coincidence that the Malay word which means literally ‘brought together,’ ‘assembled,’ has acquired an English form which assimilates it to a word which means ‘put together.’
There [at Pollicull near Madapollam] the Dutch have a Factory of a large Compound, where they dye much blew cloth, having above 800 jars set in the ground for that work; also they make many of their best paintings there.

1679 Fort St. George Consns. (on Tour), April 14. In Notes and extracts, Madras, 1871. (Y., p. 782.)

The houses [at Madras] are usually surrounded by a field or compound, with a few trees or shrubs, but it is with incredible pains that flowers or fruit are raised.

1812 MARIA GRAHAM, Journal of a residence in India, p. 124. (Y.)

See other quotations (1696, 1772, 1781, 1783, etc.) in Yule, p. 186, 782.

At the entrance to the Rajah's compound...I was startled by suddenly coming on a tall pole with a fringed triangle near its summit.


Coracora, a Malayan galley. Also kora-kora (1869 Wallace), corocoro (1774 Forrest) (= G. korrekorre 1659, in Yule); also (2) caracora (as New Latin, 1660, 1613), (3) caracore (1784), (4) caracoel, caracolle (1622 Cocks, 1666 Middleton), and karkollen (a mere Dutch spelling) (1613 Purchas); (5) caracao (from Spanish caracoa). The most correct form is coracora, derived, through the Portuguese coracora, corocora, from the Malay کور کور کور کور کور kōra-kōra or کور کور کور کور کور kora-kōra, kura-kūra, Macassar kōra-kōra, a kind of galley (see the quotations).

...Kōra-kōra, a large rowing boat or prauw used by the people of the eastern islands. (See plates in Forrest's Voyage to N. Guinea.)

1812 MARESDEN, p. 273.

Kura-kura. Name of a large kind of sailing vessel.

1852 CRAWFURD, p. 82.

کور کور کور کور کور koera.... Il koera-koera, soort van oorlogsprauwen in de Molukken. (Liever kōra-kōra. Port. carraca?)

1863 PIJNAPPEL, p. 186.

کور کور کور kura-kūra et kora-kōra, nom de certains prahuys de guerre dans les isles Moluques. Ce mot vient prob. du Port. carraca, une caraque. Mak... kora-kōra. 1875 FAVRE, 1:294.

Also 1880 WALL and TUUK, 2:561; 1893 KLINKERT, p. 554.

...1° kōra.... 2° kōra-kōra, bep. kōra-korraya, soort van vaartuigen, vroeër, vooral bij de honggi-togten in de Molukko's gebruikt.

1859 MATTHES, Makassasarsch-Hollandse woordenboek, p. 43.

The origin of the Malay kōra-kōra or kura-kūra has been variously stated.

(1) In one view it is a transferd use of the Malay کور کور کور کور کور kūra-kūra, also کور کور کور کور کور ku-kūra, a tortoise. The allusion would be,
one would suppose, either to the paee or to the shape; but the vessel is described as a “barque à marche rapide” (see quotation 1882 under CARACOA below), and nothing is said of its likeness in shape to a tortoise. It would seem more likely that the tortoise was named from the boat; but the words appear to be independent. The word for the tortoise is mentioned in all the dictionaries.

(2) In another view the Malay kōra-kōra, kura-kūra, a vessel, is from the Arabic යරළර gurqār, qorgār, kurkār, plural gurāqīr, karāqīr, a large merchant vessel.

gurqār, pl. gurāqīr, large long ship. 1884 STEINGASS, Arabic-Eng. dict., p. 832.

According to Arabic scholars, this Arabic term is not native, but was borrowed at an early date, from the Greek κέρκυρας (whence Lat. cercūrus, cercyrrus), a kind of vessel invented by the Cyprians. The Greek name itself is perhaps ultimately of Semitic origin (18. Fraenkel, Fremdwörter, p. 217; 1895 Levy, Die semitischen fremdwörter im Griechischen, p. 152). The Arabic word, in the plural gurāqīr, is asserted, by most writers, to be the source of the Romance word, Spanish carraca, Italian caracca, French caraque, whence the English carrack, carrick of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; but this view is without warrant.

In the absence of proof to the contrary, we may assume kōra-kōra to be native Malay.

I give the English and other European quotations in the order of the five forms above discriminated.

(1) Coracora, kora-kora, corocoro.

A corocoro is a vessel generally fitted with outriggers, having a high arched stem and stern, like the points of a half moon. The Dutch have fleets of them at Amboyna, which they employ as guardacostas. 1774 FORREST, Voyage to New Guinea, 23. (Y. p. 122.)

The boat was one of the kind called “Kora-kora,” quite open, very low, and about four tons burthen. It had outriggers of bamboo about five feet off each side, which supported a bamboo platform extending the whole length of the vessel. On the extreme outside of this sat the twenty rowers, while within was a convenient passage fore and aft. The middle portion of the boat was covered with a thatch-house, in which baggage and passengers are stowed; the gunwale was not more than a foot above water, and from the great top and side weight, and general clumsiness, these boats are dangerous in heavy weather, and are not unfrequently lost. 1869 WALLACE, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 266.

I add two French statements:

“The Malay kora-kora is a great row-boat; still in use in the Moluccas. Many measure 100 feet long and 10 wide. Some have as many as 90 rowers.” 18. tr. MARRE, Kata-Kata Malayou, 87. (Y.)
Le sculpture des korokoros malais ... annonce autant d'intelligence que de goût. 18. Rienzi, Océanie, 1:84. (Devic, p. 84.)

(2) Caracora:
... Nave consensâ, quam linguâ patriâ caracora nuncupant. Navigii genus est oblongum; et angustum, triremis instar, velis simul et remis impellitur. 1606 Harric, Thesaurus, 1:192. (Y.) They exercise sea-fights in their Caracore, or Galeots, with great Dexteritie. 1613 Purchas, Pilgrimage, p. 453.

(3) Caracore:
Caracores are light vessels used by the natives of Borneo...and by the Dutch as guarda costas in those latitudes. 1794 Rigging and seamanship, 1:240. (N. E. D.)

(4) Caracoole, caracolle (karkollen).
The foremost of these Galleys or Caracoles recovered our Shippe, wherein was the King of Tarnata. 1666 Last East-Indian voyage to Bantam and the Maluco islands, E 2. (Y. p. 122.)
They haue [in Amboina] Gallies after their manner, formed like Dragons, which they row very swiftly: they call them Karkollen. 1613 Purchas, Pilgrimage, p. 453.
7 or 8 carecoles (or boates). 1622 R. Cocks, Diary (1883), 1:279. (S.D.)

(5) Caracoa.
Caracoa is a Spanish form, a modification of the Malay kôrakôra.

Caracôa, a sort of large Indian Boat. 1706 Stevens, Spanish and Eng. dict.
Les Phillipines nomment ces batimens caracoas. C’est une espèce de petite galère à rames et à voiles. 1711 in Lettres édifiantes et curieuses (1780-83), 4:27. (Y.)
Caracoa (la).—Barque à marche rapide qui se construit principalement dans le Sud de l’archipel. 1882 Blumentritt, Vocab. de l'espagnol des Philippines, tr. Hugot (1884), p. 22.

Yule enters caracoa as a nominal English word, but I hav found no true English examples. Caracoa occurs 17 times in one of the Hakluyt society’s publications, an edition, publisht in 1855, of “The last East-Indian voyage” (1606), but there is no telling whether caracoa occurs even once in the original (a quotation with caracoles is given above, from Yule). The editor indeed says that in editing the text, he has brutally mutilated the orthography, has starcht and irond the punctuation, and has destroyd the proper names, substituting other names out of his own head. His exact words ar:
In editing the text, I have modernized the orthography and punctuation, and have restored the proper names to uniformity.

1855 ——, The voyage of Sir Henry Middleton to Bantam and the Maluco islands (Hakluyt soc. 1855), Advertisement, p. viii.

And in a note to his first mention of curaca in the text, he says:

The word occurs near twenty times, and is variously spelt. I have given it the Spanish form. 1855 Id., p. 34, note.

Yet there is no statement in the preface or on the title-page that the text was intended for kindergarten use.

Cuscus, an East Indian opossum. Sometimes Frenchified couscous; Dutch coescoes, F. couscous, N. L. cuscus; from Malay kuskus कुसक्स kūskus, in Amboina kusu, in Manado kusé, in Timor kuai.

कुस्कस कुसक् an animal of the opossum tribe; didelphis orientalis.
(See Valentyn, vol. iii., p. 272, and pl. fig. D.) 1812 Marsden, p. 274.
Kuskus. Name of a didelphine animal, Didelphis orientalis. 1852 Crawfurd, p. 83.

कुसक्स कौस्क्र, soort van buideldier, didelphys, in de Molukken. 1863 Pijnappel, p. 178.

कुसक्स कुसक्, nom d’un animal de la famille des marsupiaux (didelphe), dans les Moluques. 1875 Favre, i: 382.

Cuscus was made familiar in English by Wallace and Forbes, but it is found earlier.

Cuscus maculatus.... This species, which is named Coescoes at the Moluccas, according to Valentyn, varies much in its colouring. At Wagiu...the natives call it Schamscham.

1839 Penny Cyclo., 14:460a.
The naked-tailed and strictly prehensile Couscous of the Moluccas.
1839 Id., 460b.

Just as we had cleared away and packed up for the night, a strange beast was brought, which had been shot by the natives. It resembled in size, and in its white woolly covering, a small fat lamb, but had short legs, hand-like feet with large claws, and a long prehensile tail. It was a Cuscus (C. maculatus), one of the curious marsupial animals of the Papuan region. 1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1850), p. 350. [Also mentionend on pp. 104, 223, 301 and 324.]
The Marsupial species of Cuscus [italics in original] also, of which we have obtained three species, have interested us. They are very plenti-
ful, and at this season [May 21] the females all seem to have a little one in their pouch. One of these was a tiny creature about two inches long, quite hidden in its pouch, fixed by its lips formed into a simple round orifice to its mother’s teat. They are much eaten by the natives, by whom they are caught in nooses set in the trees, or by artifice. In moonlight nights creeping stealthily to the foot of a tree where they have observed one sleeping, taking care not to lift their heads so that the light flash in their eyes, they imitate at short intervals its cry, by placing the fingers in the nose; the Cuscus descends, and is fallen on by the watchers below. The python is their greatest enemy, and devours large numbers of them as they cling to the branches during the day in a semi-torpid condition.


Dugong, a large sirenian of the Eastern seas, Halicore dugong, also known in two other species, H. tabernaeculi, of the Red Sea, and H. australis, of the Australian waters. It is allied to the American manatee.

The form dugong follows the French and New Latin dugong of Cuvier, dugon of Buffon, a blunder for duyong. The Malay word is دیوین duyong, duyung, دیوین duyong; Achinese duyun, Javanese duyung, Macassar ruyung, Bugis rujung, Amboina rubun. In Bugis the name is applied to the dolphin.

دیوین duyong a very large sea-animal of the order of mammalia, vulgarly called the sea-cow, and by naturalists, the dugong (from the Malay word), which has given occasion to the stories of mermaids in the tropical seas.

1832 Marsden, p. 158.

دویین doejong een groot zeedier, gewoonlijk de zeehoe genaamd. Humba pön ter-kedjut-lah me-liechot doejjong jang amat befar doedokh di pantej, ik verschrikte op het zien van eene zeer groote zeehoe, welke op het ftrand zat.

1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 165.

Duyung (J). The lamantin or dugong. 1852 Crawfurd, p. 45.


1875 Favre, 1: 859.

Also 1880 Wall and Tuuk, 2: 116; 1893 Klinkert, p. 312; 1895 Mayer, p. 90.

Leloemba zeehoe. Doejoen zeevarken.

1879 Dias, Lijst van Atjehsche woorden, p. 159.

[These entries should be transposed, as to the Dutch words.]
doejoen, de zeecko.
Halicone dajong [sic] doejoen.

In Macassar it is *rûyung*, and its tears hav the property of call-
ing the ladies' attention to one's merits:

... roeyoeng, soort van dolfijn, Boegen roedjoeng, idem. De tranen
van dezen visch opgevangen, en daaraan het vermogen toegeschreven,
on het hart eener schoone aan zich te verbinden.
Rukun, zekere visch (Ml. doejoeng) (T. R. Kr.)
1864-65 A. VAN EERIS, *Woordenlijst
... Ambonsche eilanden*, p. 336.

In the first English mention of the animal which I hav noted,
the name is not given:
They haue no Kine, but a Fith of like lineaments, which they take in
their Nets.

Pennant calls it the "Indian walrus":

Indian [Walrus]. Le *Dugon* de Buffon ... W[alrus] with two short
canine teeth, or tusks, placed in the upper jaw ... [etc.] ... It is said
by one [traveller], that it goes upon land to feed on the green mofs,
and that it is called in the Philippines, the *Dugung.*
[Note: *De Buffon
xiii. 377, the note.]
It was probably aquatic, like the *Dugong* and Manatee.

*Dugong*. The Halicore dugong of naturalists is an inhabitant of the
shallow seas of the Archipelago, but it is not numerous, or at least is
not often caught by the fishermen. It is the *dûyong* of the Malays,
which naturalists mistaking a *j* or *y* for a *g*, have corrupted into
dugong. During my residence in Singapore, a few were taken in the
neighboring shallow seas, and I can testify that the flesh of this herb-
vorous mammifer is greatly superior to that of the green turtle.
1856 CRAWFORD, *Descriptive dict. of the Indian islands*, p. 125.

Tennent mentions the dugong as frequenting the shores of
Ceylon, and discourses pleasantly of the mermaid myths for
which the dugong is supposed to be responsible. He quotes
Megasthenes, Aelian, and Valentyn.

Of this family, one of the most remarkable animals on the coast is
the *dugong*, a phytophagous cetacean, numbers of which are attracted
to the inlets, from the bay of Calpently to Adam's Bridge, by the still
water, and the abundance of marine algae in these parts of the gulf. ...
1861 TENNENT, *Sketches of the nat. hist. of Cey-
lon*, p. 68. (See the whole account, p. 68-73.)
The mermaid, of the genus Halicore, connects the inhabitants of the land and water. This *Dugong*, described as a creature seven or eight feet long, with a head like that of an elephant deprived of its proboscis, and the body and tail of a fish, frequents the Sumatran and Malayan shores, and its flesh is held in great estimation at the tables of sultans and rajahs. 1883 Bird, *The Golden Chersonese*, p. 9.

Once the *dugongs* were very numerous. The early traveller, Leguat, tells of seeing schools of several hundred, grazing like sheep on the seaweeds a few fathoms deep, in the Mascarene islands. The flesh is regarded as a special delicacy, and the Malay king claims, as royal property, all that are taken in his domains. The flesh of the young is compared to pork, beef, and veal; but the old *dugongs* are tougher and not so highly prized. 1884-88 *Riverside nat. hist.*, 5:211.

See also 1869 Bickmore, p. 244; 1883 *Encyc. Brit.*, 15:390; 1885 Forbes, p. 313; 1886 Yule, p. 254.

**DURIAN**, a rich East Indian fruit; also the tree on which it grows, *Durio zibethinus*. Also spelt *duriien*, *durien*, *durean*, *dorian*, *duroyen*; Dutch *dorien*, French *dourian*, Italian *duri-uno* (c. 1440), Middle Latin *durianus* (c. 1440), N. L. *durio*(n-); representing Malay دریان دِریان, literally 'thorny (fruit)' formed with the suffix -*an*, from دُری a thorn, spine. The fruit has a thick rind set with short stout spines. It is in Achinese *durian*, *dëriën*, Lampong *deriyen*, Javanese *duren*, Ambonese *torian*, tolian, turen, tureño, torane.

دُریان a rich fruit much prized by the natives, but to which the European palate does not readily accommodate itself; *durio zibethinus*, L. It takes its name from its prickly coat. (Vid. درزی دُری.)

1812 Marsden, p. 132.

دُری a thorn, spine, prickle.... دری دُری-ان a fruit (so called from its prickly coat), *durio zibethinus*, L. 1812 Marsden, p. 137.

Doeriejan eene groote vrucht waarvan de pitten gegeten en door de inboorlingen voor zeer aangenaam gehouden worden, hebende eenen onaangename geur, die voor vele Europeërs onverdragelijk is. 1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 157.

دُری, épine, piquant, pointe.... دری دُری-ان, nom d’un fruit ainsi nommé parce qu’il est hérisse d’épines, le durian (durio zibethinus).... هنتر دارون دُری-ان dáum, deux. espèces de durian. Jav. . . . ri, épine, . . . durén, le durian. Bat. . . . duri, épine. 1875 Favre, 1:864-5.

...Doerijan (gew. uitspraak derriyan), naam eenen, voor velen, inz. Europeanen, walgelijke, doch door de ind. volken hooggeschatte
vrucht—*durio zibethinus*; de boom; soorten: d. dāoen; d. teng-gājōen; d. těmbāga, met geel vleesch.

1880 WALL and TUUK, 2:122.  
Also 1852 CRAWFURD, p. 43; 1863 PIJNAPPEL, p. 112; 1881 SWETTENHAM (1887), 2:29; 1893 KLINKERT, p. 299, 310; 1895 MAYER, p. 91.  
**Doerian**, doerian.  

دَرِجُنَطُ دَرِيجَنَطُ، de doerianvrucht.  
**Dėrijan**, doerian.  
... [duren] (nom d’un fruit épineux) le dourian malais.  
**Doerēn** naam van de bekende doerian-vrucht.  
1876 R. VAN ECK, *Balineesch-Hollandsch woordenboek*, p. 82.  
1864-65 A. VAN EKRIJS, *Woordenlijst... Ambonsehe eilanden*, p. 128.

See also RAFFLES, *Hist. of Java* (1817), 2: app. 100.

The durian is mentioned by Italian writers as early as the middle of the fifteenth century. See Yule.

The English mentions begin in the latter end of the sixteenth century, and, as usual, in translations of Spanish and Dutch writers.

There is one that is called in the Malacca tongue *durion*, and is so good that I have heard it affirmed by manie that have gone about the worlde, that it doth exceede in savour all others that ever they had scene or tasted.... Some do say that have scene it that it seemeth to be that wherewith Adam did transgresse, being carried away by the singular savour.

1588 PARKE, tr. Mendoza, *Historie of the great and mightie kingdom of China* (etc.), (Hakluyt soc., 1853) 2:318. (Y. p. 256.)  
See other quotations 1598, 1662, 1665, 1727, 1855, 1878, in YULE and S. D.

The highest rank among the indigenus fruits, in the opinion of the natives, is given to the *Durian* (Durio Zibethinus), not at all excepting even the Mangustin, but most of strangers, from its peculiar and offensive odour, have at first a violent aversion to it.

The Mangosteen, Lansat, Rambutan, Jack, Jambou, and Blimbing, are all abundant; but most abundant and most esteemed is the *Durian*, a fruit about which very little is known in England, but which both by natives and Europeans in the Malay Archipelago is reckoned superior to all others.  

The *Durian* grows on a large and lofty forest tree, somewhat resembling an elm in its general character, but with a more smooth and
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scaly bark. The fruit is round or slightly oval, about the size of a large
cocoonut, of a green colour, and covered all over with short stout
spines, the bases of which touch each other, and are consequently
somewhat hexagonal, while the points are very strong and sharp. It
is so completely armed, that if the stalk is broken off it is a difficult
matter to lift one from the ground. The outer rind is so thick and
tough, that from whatever height it may fall it is never broken.

1869 Id., p. 57.

If I had to fix on two only, as representing the perfection of the two
classes, I should certainly choose the Durian and the Orange as the
king and queen of fruits. 1869 Id., p. 58. (Also p. 41, 107, 235.)

From Muara-Rupit I proceeded to Surulangun, along a good road fol-
lowing the Rawas river, under a continuous shade of tall Durian trees
from thirty-five to forty feet high—a growth of ten years. The road
was carpeted throughout its length with their flowers, which were
dropping off in vast numbers. In the flowering time it was a most
pleasant shady road; but later in the season the chance of a fruit now
and then descending on one’s head would be less agreeable.


Mr. Wallace draws from the fall of the durian an uncomplacent
moral:

Poets and moralists, judging from our English trees and fruits, have
thought that small fruits always grow on lofty trees, so that their fall
should be harmless to man, while the large ones trailed on the ground.
Two of the largest and heaviest fruits known, however, the Brazil-nut
fruit (Bertholletia) and Durian, grow on lofty forest trees, from which
they fall as soon as ripe, and often wound or kill the native inhabitants.
From this we may learn two things: first, not to draw general conclu-
sions from a very partial view of nature; and secondly, that trees and
fruits, no less than the varied productions of the animal kingdom, do
not appear to be organized with exclusive reference to the use and con-
venience of man. 1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 58.

But perhaps the falling durian and Brazil-nut are a crude effort
of Nature, looking toward an extinction of savagery. If the
savages would not dodge! So ineffectivi ar the “intentions” of
Nature. The weighted fruits of the tropics and the stones of the
towers of Siloam continue to fall, upon the just and the unjust.
When gravity dispenses justice, the just must dodge, or be
crushed.

Gecko, a sprightly lizard of interesting nature and domestic
habits. Also spelt gecco, gekko; French gecko, German gecko,
Dutch gekko.

Malay gekok (Favre), gekok (Pijnappel), gekko (Marsden 1812, who says he has not found the Malayan orthog-
raphy). The final ک is faint, and is omitted in the European form, as it was in abada for bada, Malay بادان texting bādak, and as it is in bruš from Malay brū for bruķ, in Ava for Awaķ, in Batta for Bataķ, and so on. See Abada and Bruh.

The Malay تيكي gōkoķ is one of several different Malay names for the same animal, all within a small area of variation, and all evidently of an imitative nature, suggestiv of the creature's peculiar cry. The other forms are kēku, kēkuh, kēko, gaguh, gagoh, gago, gōkē, kōkē, tōkē, takē, takek; in Lampong gēgag, Katingun (Borneo) kekē.

Tōkē, takē, takek, are reflected in an occasional English form Tokay. From one of these forms, or from an Indian or other name of similar form because of imitative nature, we drew two forms which appear in English use of the eighteenth century, ohaco and jacco.

gaguh a large species of house-lizard which makes a very loud and peculiar noise; (also named kēku, gekko, gago, gōkē, and tōkē). 1812 Marsden, p. 286.

Lizard ... (great, noisy, house-) تيكي gaguh. (It, or other species nearly like it, is also named kēkuh, gekko, gago, gōkē, and tōkē, the Malayansk orthography of which words has not occurred.) 1812 Marsden, p. 483.

gokej, (gekkō) huishaagdis die een bijzonder geluid geeft. 1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 345.

gagoh, een groote huishaagdis, die om deszelfs geluid kēkō, gekko, gago, gōkej en tōkej genoemd wordt. 1825 id., p. 339.


Gōkoķ, le gecko, petit lézard ainsi nommé par imitation de son cri. On le nomme aussi en Mal. تيكي tōke. 1875 Favre, 1:402.

The form gōke is also well establisht.

gōkē, kokē, and tokē [read ő in each form] a species of lizard that haunts old buildings, and makes a loud and peculiar noise.

(Vid. تيكي gaguh.) 1812 Marsden, p. 292.

gokej, (gekkō) huishaagdis die een bijzonder geluid geeft. 1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 345.

Goke. A name for the tokey, or noisy lizard; v. Tākek [read Tākek]. 1852 Crawford, p. 51.
The form *keké* appears in the Bornean dialect of Katingan:

Maleisch *tjìtjak*, Sampitsch *tasakh*, Katingansch *keké*, hagedis.  
1872 TIEYTKÉ, *Woordenlijst der Sampitsche en Katingansche taal*, p. 27.

Maleisch *tjìtjak*, Sampitsch *tasakh*, Katingansch *jongjoe keké*, hagedis.  
1872 *Id.*, p. 29.

In the Lampong language it is *gétag*.

*Gétag*, gekko.  
1891 HELFRICH, *Proeve van een Lampong-Hollandsche woordenlijst*, p. 16.

An other name for this lizard, or some of its varieties is *chíchah* or *chíchak*, or *chéchak*, Achi-
nese *chíchuk*, Javanese *chéchak*, Balinese *chéhek*, Sundanese *chakchak*, Lampong *kichuk*, probably also imitative. There are similar Indian names. In Marathi *chukchuk* is the cry of the lizard (1847 MOLESWORTH, p. 409). In quotations below (1864, 1883), the Indian gecko says “chuck, chuck, chuck,” in an other (1861), “chik, chik, chit.”

The gecko became known first as a venomous and malicious creature. The later accounts make it a harmless, cheerful little reptile, with interesting habits, as the quotations show:

Of all animals the *gekko* is the most notorious for its powers of mischief; yet we are told by those who load it with that calumny, that it is very friendly to man; and, though supplied with the most deadly virulence, is yet never known to bite.


Tennent gives an interesting account of the geckoes of Ceylon:

The most familiar and attractive of the lizard class are the Geckoes, that frequent the sitting-rooms, and being furnished with pads to each toe, they are enabled to ascend perpendicular walls and adhere to glass and ceilings. Being nocturnal in their habits, the pupil of the eye, instead of being circular as in the diurnal species, is linear and vertical like that of the cat. As soon as evening arrives, the geckoes are to be seen in every house in keen and crafty pursuit of their prey; emerging from the chinks and recesses where they conceal themselves during the day, to search for insects that then retire to settle for the night. In a boudoir where the ladies of my family spent their evenings, one of these familiar and amusing little creatures had its hiding-place behind a gilt picture frame. Punctually as the candles were lighted, it made its appearance on the wall to be fed with its accustomed crumbs; and
if neglected, it reiterated it[s] sharp, quick call of chic, chic, chit, till attended to. ... 1861 Tennent, Sketches of nat. hist. of Ceylon, p. 231-2.

We saw several sorts of lizards, of which the only dangerous one was that called by the Egyptians Gecko.

1792 Heron, tr. Niebuhr, Travels through Arabia and other countries in the East, 2:332.

[That in the Arabic of Egypt this lizard is called Gecko is asserted only by Heron, not by Niebuhr; and is apparently an error due to a misunderstanding of Forskal, Descript. Animalium, 1775, p. 13. Ed.]

Gecko, n. A species of salamander. [With quot. from Goldsmith 1774, above.] 1820 Jodrell, Philology on (sic) the English language. [Marked with a star, as a new entry. I find no earlier dictionary entry.]

The Gecko occasionally utters a curious cry, which has been compared to that peculiar clucking sound employed by riders to stimulate their horses, and in some species the cry is very distinct, and said to resemble the word “Geck-o,” the last syllable being given smartly and sharply. On account of this cry, the Geckos are variously called Spitters, Postilions and Claquers.

18 ... Wood, New illustrated nat. hist., p. 504.

(See also Riverside nat. hist. (1885), 3:406.)

This was one of those little house lizards called geckos, which have pellets at the end of their toes. They are not repulsive brutes like the garden lizard, and I am always on good terms with them. They have full liberty to make use of my house, for which they seem grateful, and say chuck, chuck, chuck.

1883 Tribes on my frontier, p. 38. (Y. p. 280.)

The form chacco apparently arose from some Indian reflection of the Malayan name, or from a confusion with the other name chichak (compare Sundanese chakchak).

Chaccos, as Cuckoos, receive their Names from the Noise they make. They are much like Lizards but larger.

1711 Lockyer, An account of the trade in India, p. 84. (Y. p. 280.)

Jacco, found but once, and then speld jackoa, appears to be an other phase of chacco.

They have one dangerous little Animal called a Jackoa, in shape almost like a Lizard. It is very malicious ... and wherever the Liquor lights on an Animal Body, it presently cankers the Flesh.


Gingham, a cotton fabric woven of dyed yarn, in stripes, checks, and other figures.
The origin of this word has been much debated, and has remained undetermined. It has been derived from Guingamp, a town in France where gingham was alleged to be made; from an unidentified North Indian gingham; from a Tamil word, kindan; and from a Javanese word ginggang, to which no etymological sense, or a wrong one, has been assigned. It has even been sought in Egypt; and in the air.

The word is Malay; it is found in Malay, Achinese, Lampion, Javanese, Sundanese, Balinese, Macassar, in the precise sense of ‘gingham.’ Its etymological meaning is ‘striped.’ It is probably original in Javanese.

The European forms are English gingham, gingham, French guingan (1770), guingamp, Sp. guinga, guingon, Port. guingão (1602), It. gingo (c. 1567), guingano (18...), guingano (1796), also gingano (from Eng.), Dutch gingam (from Eng.), gingas, gingang, ginggang, Ger. Dan. Sw. gingang.

It is in Malay ginggang, Achinese ginggang, Lampion ginggang, Javanese ginggang, Sundanese ginggang, Balinese ginggang, Dayak ginggang, genggang, Macassar ginggang, a striped or checkered cotton fabric known to Europeans in the east as ‘gingham.’ As an adjectival, the word means, both in Malay and in Javanese, where it seems to be original, ‘striped.’ The full expression is kain ginggang, ‘striped cloth’ (Grashuis).

The Tamil “kindan, a kind of coarse cotton cloth striped or chequered” (quoted in Yule) cannot be the source of the European forms, nor, I think, of the Malayan forms. It must be an independent word, or a perversion of the Malayan term.

\[\text{ginggang, soort van stof, gingang.} \quad 1863 \text{PIJNAPPEL, p. 195.}\]

\[\text{ginggang, geruit hessen- of kielengoed. Op R[iouw] tjélé} \quad 1869 \text{KLINKERT, p. 212.}\]

\[\text{ginggang, nom d'une sorte d'étouffé, du guingamp. (Jav. et} \quad 1875 \text{FAVRE, i:424.}\]

\[\text{Sund... ginggang. Mak... ginggang.)} \quad 1878 \text{ROORDA VAN EYSGA, ed. Grashuis, p. 259.}\]

\[\text{ginggang, zekere gestreepte stoffe, ginggang.} \quad 1884 \text{WALL and TUKK, 3:18.}\]

\[\text{Ginggang, plang, rayée, striped.} \quad 1882 \text{BIEKERS, Malay, Achinese, Fr. and Eng. vocab., p. 33.}\]

\[\text{Ginggang, gestreep, b. n. (als stoffen).} \quad 1884 \text{BADINGS, p. 264.}\]

\[\text{ginggang, e. s. v. gestreepte stof, geruit of gestreep kielengoed, = tjélé.} \quad 1893 \text{KLINKERT, p. 579.}\]

\[\text{tjélé, e. s. v. geruit lijnwaad, = ginggang.} \quad 1893 \text{KLINKERT, p. 281.}\]

\[\text{Ginggang, geestreep, geruit, gestreepte stof.} \quad 1895 \text{MAYER, p. 106.}\]
The forms outside of Malay are entered as follows:

\*ginggang\*, geruit goed.


... \*ginggang\* N. K. s'écarter ; chanceler. (aussi, nom d'une sorte de toile), gingamp.


"Ginggang, a sort of striped or chequered East Indian linnen." 1876 Jansz, *Jav. dict.* (Tr. in Y.)

Ginggang, Gingham, a variety of coloured cloth with pattern in stripes. 1862 Rigg, *Dict. of the Sunda lang.*, p. 131.


Genggang, i. q. ginggang. [But ginggang has been accidentally omitted.] 1859 Hardeland, *Djajaksch-deutsches \*wörterbuch\*, p. 132.

... ginggang, soort van gestreept, of ook wel geruit Oost-Indisch lijnwaad, ginggang. Mal. en Jav. idem.


In the Spanish of the Philippine Islands it is *guingon*.

Guingon (el).—Espèce d'étoffe de coton, ordinairement bleue. 1882 Blumentritt, p. 38.

European mentions of gingham begin about the middle of the sixteenth century. Italian, Portuguese and Dutch instances are given by Yule. The English use begins with the seventeenth century.

Captain Cock is of opinion that the gingham both white and browne, which yow sent will prove a good commodity in the Kinge of Shasamhis cuntry, who is a Kinge of certaine of the most westermost ilandes of Japon... and hath conquered the islandes called the Leques.

1615 Letter app. to Cock's *Diary*, 2:272. (Y.)

The trade of Fort St. David's consists in longcloths of different colours, sallamporees, morees, dimities, ginghams, and saccotoons.

1781 Carraccioli, *Life of Clive*, 1:5. (Y.)

Even the gingham waistcoats, which striped or plain have so long stood their ground, must, I hear, ultimately give way to the stronger kerseymere.

1793 Hugh Boyd, *Indian Observer*, 77. (Y.)

Gingham. A kind of striped cotton cloth.

1828 Webster, *Amer. dict. of the Eng. lang.*

Such is the simple form in which the word appears, for the first time, in an English dictionary; but now gingham of all sorts constitute a part of the happiness of millions of English and American homes. Let me make the gingham of a nation, and I care not who writes its songs.

[For the rest of this article, see volume xviii.]
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
AT ITS
MEETING IN ANDOVER, MASSACHUSETTS,
April 9th, 10th, and 11th, 1896.

The Society assembled at Andover, in Bartlet Chapel of
Andover Theological Seminary, on Thursday of Easter Week,
April 9th, at 3 P. M., and was called to order by its President,
President Daniel Coit Gilman, of the Johns Hopkins University.
The following members were in attendance at one or more of
the sessions:

| Atkinson | Hicks | Moore, G. F. | Torrey |
| Brooks, Miss | Hopkins | Orne | Toy |
| Dickerman | Jackson | Robinson, G. L. | Ward, W. H. |
| Dike | Kellner | Ropes | Webb |
| Gilman | Lanman | Scott | Wilcox |
| Gottheil | Lyon | Skinner | Winslow |
| Haupt | Macdonald | Taylor | Wright, T. F. |
| Hazard | Merrill | Thayer | [Total, 31.] |

Professor John Phelps Taylor, of Andover, for the Committee
of Arrangements, presented a report in the form of a printed
program. The opening of the sessions was thereby set for half
past nine o'clock mornings and for three o'clock afternoons.
Professor Taylor extended to the Society an invitation from
Professor George Harris, for Thursday evening from eight to
nine, to meet at his house the Faculty of the Theological Semi-
nary and the Teachers in Phillips Academy; and also an invita-
tion from Professor Moore for Thursday and Friday evenings.
The report was adopted and the invitations accepted with the
thanks of the Society. The business session was deferred to
Friday morning; and the presentation of papers was begun.
The President appointed as a Committee to nominate officers for
the ensuing year Professors Moore, Haupt, and Gottheil. At
five o'clock the session was adjourned.
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The second session began at 9.30 Friday morning, President Gilman in the chair. The first hour or two were devoted to matters of business. The minutes of the last meeting, at New Haven, Conn., April 18th and 19th, 1895, were approved as printed.* Reports of outgoing officers were then in order.

The Corresponding Secretary, Professor Lanman, of Harvard University, laid before the Society some of the correspondence of the year.

This included letters of regret from the Bishop of Cairo, from Professors I. II. Hall and Henry Preserved Smith, and from Mr. Witton.—From S. E. Peal, Rajmai P. O., Sibsagor, Assam, came a letter stating that he was at work upon the languages of the Naga Hills, and asking for a certain publication of our Society thereupon by Rev. Nathan Brown, a missionary of the American Baptist Union in Assam. It is pleasant to state that Mr. Van Name was able to send Mr. Peal more than he asked for, namely vol. iv. as well as vol. ii. of our Journal, since both contained pertinent material. “Its value to us here,” says Mr. Peal, “is much greater than you might suppose. Dr. B. was a real genius.”—The Venerable Subhūti, a Buddhist High Priest, of Waskaduwa, Ceylon, whose kind offices were mentioned in our last Proceedings (see Journal, vol. xvi., page ccxv), in response to Professor Lanman’s request for the transcript of a Singalese manuscript of a Pali text, replies in a most obliging and efficient way.—Mr. Charles Johnston, of Ballykilbeg, County Down, of the Bengal Civil Service, retired, sends a dainty little volume of translations from the Upanishads (Dublin, Whaley); and with it, the welcome announcement that he has translated into English Deussen’s “System des Vedānta.” This translation is to run through the “Calcutta Review” and is then to appear in book-form.—Dr. Burgess of Edinburgh reports satisfactory progress upon his portfolios of collotype plates of ancient monuments in India to be issued by Griggs of London.—Professor Leumann of Strassburg writes about his Jaina studies, especially about his elaborate work on Śilāṅka and the Āvāśyaka literature and the biography of Haribhadra.—Professor Bühler sends from Vienna a copy of vol. ii. of the “Sources of Indian Lexicography,” published by the Austrian Academy, and dedicated to Weber and to the memory of Whitney; and writes of the progress of the “Grundriss der indischen Philologie,” and expresses the hope that nearly a third part of the whole will be issued before the end of 1896.—A recent

* The omission of the reading and of the approval of the Recording Secretary’s minutes is at variance with the usage of the Society and the advisability of the innovation is questionable. These minutes are intended to give a full and precise record of the actual doings of the sessions and to give them in their actual order. The printed “Proceedings,” on the other hand, contain only such matters as it seems worth while to publish; but they do not constitute so full and sufficient a record as it may well prove desirable to have. May it not become a matter of regret if the control of the Recording Secretary’s record is allowed to lapse?
letter, bearing the signature, still clear and firm, of our oldest Honorary Member, Böhlingk (he was elected in 1844), pleasantly attests the unexhausted vitality of our Sanskrit Nestor.—Professor Weber sends some of the documents (among them, the address of the Berlin Academy and that of the Philosophical Faculty) relating to his recent fifty-year jubilee, which was saddened by the death, only a week before, of Mrs. Weber.—Professor Hermann Vierordt of Tübingen sends some interesting papers concerning the life and death of his father-in-law, Professor Roth.—Pandit Lala Chandra Vidyā Bhāskara, of Jodhpur, Marvar, Rajputana, sends a copy* of a Sanskrit poem narrating the life and achievements of the late Professor Whitney, and entitled Viśyam-Dvāiit-Viṭāni-vidhūso jīvana-carita-kāvyam. It is a beautifully written manuscript of 33 pages in folio. The author says it is a version of the obituary notice of Mr. Whitney which appeared in the New York Nation of June 14, 1894. A reprint of this notice had been sent to him.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the names of recently deceased members. The record is as follows:

**HONORARY MEMBERS.**

Professor Rudolf von Roth, of Tübingen;
Dr. Reinhold Rost, of London.

**CORPORATE MEMBERS.**

Rev. Talbot W. Chambers, of New York City;
Hon. Charles Theodore Russell, of Cambridge, Mass.;
Dr. Henry Martyn Scudder, formerly of Niigata, Japan.

**CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.†**

Sir James Redhouse;
Rev. Dr. William Waterbury Scudder, formerly Missionary at Madanapalli, Madras;
Rev. Dr. Cornelius V. A. Van Dyck, of Beyrouth, Syria.

The Treasurer, Mr. Henry C. Warren, of Cambridge, Mass., presented to the Society, by the hand of Professor Lanman, his accounts and statements for the year ending April, 1896. President Gilman had already appointed, before the meeting, Professors Toy and Lanman as an Auditing Committee to examine the Treasurer’s funds and accounts. The Committee reported to the

* He has since then sent a copy for the Society’s library and one for Mrs. Whitney.

† The names of the following, several years deceased, had for some reason not been reported to the Society:

Rev. Cephas Bennett, Missionary at Rangoon, Burma, died Nov. 16, 1885; Rev. Dr. Nathan Brown, Missionary at Yokohama, Japan, died Jan. 1, 1886; Dr. George Rosen, Detmold, Germany, died 1891; Rev. Dr. John H. Sheed, Missionary at Oroomiah, Persia.
Society during the meeting that on the 6th of April, 1896, they had examined the accounts and vouchers of the Treasurer and his evidences of actual possession of the Society's property and had found all to be in a satisfactory condition. Their report was duly accepted by the Society. The usual analytical summary of the General Account follows:

**RECEIPTS.**

Balance from old account, April 18, 1895 .......... $1,578.39
Assessments (179) for 1895-96 .................... $895.00
Assessments (30) for other years .................. 150.00
Sale of publications .................................. 178.62
Income from funds (other than Bradley Fund) ..... 138.53

Total income of the year .......................... 1,937.15
Total receipts for the year ....................... $2,095.54

**EXPENDITURES.**

Journal, xvi. 2 .................................. $518.64
Job printing ........................................ 80.50
Books for Library .................................. 29.52
Postage, etc. ...................................... 59.78

Total disbursements for the year ................. 988.39
Credit balance on Gen'l Account, April 6, 1896 1,947.15

$2,935.54

The Treasurer adds several general statements: The account, so far as receipts are concerned, is an almost precise repetition of the one for 1894-95; and the similarity holds also in respect of the three several principal sources of revenue, to wit, assessments, sale of publications, and interest. As was the case in 1894-95, the Society's outlays for 1895-96 were well within its income.

The state of the funds is as follows:

**A. PRINCIPAL OF SPECIAL FUNDS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apr. 18, 1895</th>
<th>Apr. 6, 1896</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1452.76</td>
<td>$1542.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1498.38</td>
<td>$1897.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.84</td>
<td>109.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. BALANCES BELONGING TO GENERAL ACCOUNT.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1528.15</td>
<td>$3364.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$5186.15
The Librarian, Mr. Addison Van Name, of Yale University, presented his report for 1895–96. It is as follows:

The accessions of the past year have been 67 volumes, 64 parts of volumes, and 136 pamphlets. All received up to the middle of March are included in the list of "Additions" printed in the Society's Journal, vol. xvi., No. 2, just distributed. The most important single contribution is a series of twelve volumes of the publications of the École des langues orientales vivantes, Paris, sent in exchange for a set of our Journal. One noteworthy gift, received too late for entry there, deserves special mention—"The Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great," Ethiopic text and English translation, by Dr. E. A. Wallis Budge of the British Museum, London, 1896. These two sumptuous volumes, on large paper, "two hundred and fifty copies only printed for private circulation," are the gift of Lady Meux, of Theobald's Park, Hertfordshire, who bore the expense of publication and to whom the work is dedicated.

The current number of titles in the library is now 4881.

For the Committee of Publication, its Chairman, Professor Lanman, reported as follows: Number 2 of volume xvi. of the Journal had been issued March 31, 1896. It contains Articles V., VI., and VII. of the Journal proper, with the Arabic paging 201–317; and as an Appendix, in Roman paging from exli–celxxiii, the Proceedings for Dec. 1894, and for April, 1895, the Additions to the Library, and the List of Members.*—Concerning the size of the last few volumes, the following figures may be of interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>1883–4</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sum total for the six volumes is 3444 pages; and the average is 574 pages per volume. For the fifteen years, the average is about 230 pages per year.

The Directors reported by their Scribe, Professor Lanman, as follows:

They had appointed the next meeting of the Society to be held at Baltimore, Md., Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Easter Week, April 22d, 23d, and 24th, 1897: the Corresponding Secre-

* Number 1 of vol. xvi. of the Journal was issued (without Proceedings) in April, 1894. The Proceedings for April, 1893, were issued separately in June, 1893; and the Proceedings for March, 1894, were issued separately in September, 1894. Volume xvi. complete consists therefore of No. 1, of these two pamphlets and of No. 2.
tary, _ex officio_, and Professors Bloomfield and Haupt, to serve as a Committee of Arrangements. [Note that in 1898, Easter falls April 10th.]

The Corresponding Secretary, Professor Lanman, had already in his circular letter to the members issued just before the meeting said in his own name as follows:

It is quite true that the By-Laws of this Society do not in any way charge the Corresponding Secretary with the duty of editing its publications. On the other hand, it cannot be said that in recent years the Committee of Publication have charged themselves with that duty. As a matter of fact, since the beginning, the work has been, for the most part, in two or three pairs of hands. Perhaps the function of the Committee has latterly been held to be consultative and appellate; although the acting-editor would certainly not refer a doubtful paper to the Committee in a case where the judgment of an expert more competent on that particular subject chanced to be available outside of the Committee. The Committee has now been increased to six, and is so large that, as a matter of course, there is no sense whatever of individual responsibility among its members.

We may well rejoice in the healthy growth of the Society during the last decade, and in its greatly increased activity and power of achievement. This growth and activity, however, has greatly increased the burdens of the office of Corresponding Secretary. It is manifest that a redistribution of the labor which, whether legally or prescriptively, attaches to that post, has become imperatively and immediately necessary. The most natural division is into the legitimate duties of the office on the one hand and its adscititious editorial functions on the other. I suggest that the Directors appoint one or two persons to edit the Journal, and hold him or them responsible for the proper conduct of that work. Such appointees need not be regarded as officers of the Society, and this change would accordingly involve no alteration of our laws; and the Committee might continue as before.

Even with this change in the incidence of duties, the place of Corresponding Secretary will remain—just as it has been, and like that of the Editors—a laborious one, with much clerical work; and upon the efficient administration of its duties will depend in no small measure the prosperity of the Society. Inasmuch as the transfer of the office with its duties and traditions from one man to another is at best a very wasteful proceeding, it is clear that no one ought to accept the place who is not willing to serve for, say, at least a decade. And finally, since the Society refused to consider this matter last year on the ground of the lack of time, it seems proper to ask now, before the meeting, for any suggestions upon this subject, and for expressions of willingness to undertake this serious responsibility and heavy labor from any member of the Society who will be kind enough to make them.

The Directors reported by their Chairman, President Gilman, as follows:
The Directors recommended that the Society rescind Supplementary By-Law Number II.

Whereupon, a vote being taken, the By-Law was rescinded by the Society.

In the last printed form, that By-Law read as follows: "The Committee of Publication shall consist of five members; they shall be appointed by the Directors, and shall report to the Society at every regular meeting respecting the matters committed to their charge." And it was amended in April, 1895, so as to read as follows: "The Committee of Publication shall consist of six members, of whom the Corresponding Secretary shall be one. The Committee shall be appointed annually by the Board of Directors, and shall report to the Society at every regular meeting concerning the matters committed to its charge. The Corresponding Secretary shall be the Chairman of the Committee."

President Gilman announced that a Committee of the Directors had considered various questions relating to the Society's method of publication, and had made a written report to the Directors; and that, by authority of the Directors, Professor Charles R. Lanman, of Harvard University, and Professor George F. Moore, of Andover Theological Seminary, had been appointed to serve as Responsible Editors of the Journal.

In the manuscript Records of the Directors, vol. i., pages 23 and 24 (compare Journal, vol. i., page xlvii), we read, under date of May 30, 1848, as follows:

"We have been led by some experience to believe that it would be well to distinguish three classes of members, namely, Corporate, Corresponding, and Honorary. The reasons in favor of creating a class of Corresponding Members are, that the Society will often find it for its advantage to seek communication with persons in Europe and in the East, not Americans, by attaching them to itself in this character, without going so far as to name them Honorary Members; and that those Americans resident in the East, who are elected into the Society, sustain to it in fact the important relation of Corresponding Members, and might feel a stronger obligation to act for the Society, if placed formally in that position, while it is quite out of their power either to exercise the rights or to discharge the duties of Corporate Members."

The changes in the times—notably the vastly increased facilities for communication with the Orient through the Universal Postal Union and otherwise, and the presence in the East of many scholars besides those devoted to the work of Christian Missions—have brought it about as an incidental result that the category of Corresponding Members has lapsed into practical desuetude. It is desirable that this fact should be formally recognized by the Society.
It was accordingly recommended by the Directors that Article III. of the Constitution be changed so as to read as follows:

Article III. The members of this Society shall be distinguished as Corporate and Honorary.

Whereupon, a vote being taken, the amendment was adopted by the Society. [Note, however, that the class of Corresponding Members will continue to appear in our printed lists until extinguished by transfers or by deaths.]

By the vote of October, 1887 (Records of the Directors, vol. i., page 51; Journal, vol. vi., p. 579), it was provided

"That the Directors may, at their discretion, and in view of the circumstances of each case, transfer to the list of Corresponding Members persons elected as Corporate Members, but who may have since permanently left this country, and to the list of Corporate Members persons chosen as Corresponding Members, but who may have since transferred their residence to this country."

In view of the above facts and as a corollary to the above changes, it was provided

That members who have, by vote of the Directors, been transferred from the list of Corresponding Members to that of Corporate Members be restored to the list of Corresponding Members, unless they desire to remain Corporate Members, paying the annual assessment.

By-Law Number VII. in its last printed form read as follows:

VII. Corporate members shall be entitled to a copy of all the publications of the Society issued during their membership, and shall also have the privilege of taking a copy of those previously published, so far as the Society can supply them, at half the ordinary selling price. Corresponding and honorary members shall be entitled to the Society's publications only in return for services rendered,—for communications to the Society, or donations to its library or cabinet.

Upon recommendation of the Directors, the Society voted to amend it: first, by adding the words "and Honorary" after the word "Corporate" at the beginning; and, secondly, by striking out the second sentence. [Note that the "membership" of a new member shall be construed to begin with the calendar year in which that new member was elected.]

Upon recommendation of the Directors, it was voted to add the following two paragraphs to By-Law Number III.:

III. b. After December 31, 1896, the fiscal year of the Society shall correspond with the calendar year.

III. c. At each annual business meeting in Easter week, the President shall appoint an auditing committee of two men—preferably men residing in or near the town where the Treasurer lives—to examine the Treasurer's accounts and vouchers, and to inspect the evidences of the
Society's property, and to see that the funds called for by his balances are in his hands. The Committee shall perform this duty as soon as possible after the New Year's day succeeding their appointment, and shall report their findings to the Society at the next annual business meeting thereafter. If these findings are satisfactory, the Treasurer shall receive his acquittance by a certificate to that effect, which shall be recorded in the Treasurer's book, and published in the Proceedings.

The President appointed Professors Toy and Lanman to serve as Auditing Committee for the fiscal year ending Dec. 31, 1896, with Professor Lyon as a substitute in case of the inability of one of the above-named gentlemen so to serve.

Reported—That the Directors had voted that, in case of the adoption of the proposed By-Laws III. b and III. c, the assessment for the fiscal year extending from April 7, 1896 to December 31, 1896 shall be three dollars.

Next in order of business was the report of the Committee on the Nomination of Officers, consisting of Professors Moore, Haupt, and Gottheil. The Corresponding Secretary, Professor Lanman, after nearly twenty years of such labor in the service of the American Philological Association and of the American Oriental Society, desired once more to be relieved of his secretarial duties; and accordingly Professor Hopkins, the successor of Professor Whitney at Yale University, was nominated in his stead. No other changes in the administrative offices were proposed. The nominees of the Committee were duly elected by the Society. The names of the Board of Officers for 1896-97 are as follows:

President—President Daniel Coit 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. Edward W. Hopkins, of New Haven.†
Recording Secretary—Prof. George 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 Prof. Lanman, of Cambridge; Professors Gottheil and Jackson, of New York; Prof. Jastrow, of Philadelphia; Professors Bloomfield and Haupt, of Baltimore; Prof. Hyvernat, of Washington.

With a view to avoiding much useless duplication of labor, Professor Lanman had urged the Board of Directors to recommend that the two different offices of Treasurer and of Corresponding Secretary be borne by the same person, as is virtually the case in the American Philological Association‡ and as was the

---

* More, namely, than the years of incumbency in the offices concerned.
† With Professor Hanns Oertel, of New Haven, to serve as his Deputy during the absence of Professor Hopkins in Europe and India.
case in the Oriental Society in the year 1891–92. It is highly important that both the Corresponding Secretary and the Treasurer should have—so far as is possible—some personal knowledge of the members. This is a difficult matter at best. The results of the inquiries of the one officer have to be communicated, with accurate dates and details, to the other, and vice versa. The plan of putting both offices into the hands of one man has resulted in a very clear saving of time and labor both in the case of the Philological Association and in that of the Oriental Society.

It did not appear feasible to carry out the above suggestion at present.

The Directors further reported by their scribe, Professor Lanman, that they had voted to recommend to the Society for election to membership the following persons:

**AS CORPORATE MEMBERS:**

Edward V. Arnold, Professor of Latin, University College of North Wales, (Bryn Seiriol) Bangor, Great Britain.

George M. Bolling, Instructor in Comparative Philology and Sanskrit, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

Miss Sarah W. Brooks (Graduate of Radcliffe College), 28 Inman st., Cambridgeport, Mass.

Rev. Prof. Joseph Bruneau, S. T. L., St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.

Rev. John Campbell, Church of the Incarnation, 4 West 104th street, New York, N. Y.

Miss Elizabeth S. Colton (Student of Semitic languages, and teacher at Miss Porter's School at Farmington), Easthampton, Mass.


Rev. Adolph Guttmacher, 1838 Linden ave., Baltimore, Md.

Ralph B. C. Hicks (Harvard University), 65 Hammond st., Cambridge, Mass.

Leonard Keene Hirshberg (Johns Hopkins University), 581 Gay st., Baltimore, Md.

Miss Eliza H. Kendrick, Ph.D. (Radcliffe College), Hunnewell ave., Newton, Mass.


Rev. Clifton Hady Levy, 728 Lennox st., Baltimore, Md.

Henry F. Linscott, Instructor in Sanskrit and Philology, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

Rev. George Palmer Pardington, 194 Park Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Hugo Radau, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Prof. J. H. Stevenson, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.


[Total, 18.]
Whereupon, ballot being had, the above-named ladies and gentlemen were duly elected Corporate Members of the Society.

Professor Gottheil, on behalf of the Committee appointed to make a Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts existing in American Libraries, reported progress and added that new manuscripts were coming in. The Committee was continued and requested to report at the next meeting.

Professor Morris Jastrow having laid before the Society a scheme for an "Association for the Historical Study of Religions," to be organized, possibly, under the auspices of the American Oriental Society,—President Gilman reported that the Directors recommended the appointment of a Committee to consider what measures may be taken to promote the study of the History of Religions.

The recommendation was adopted; and the Chair appointed as this Committee the following gentlemen: Professor Gottheil, Chairman; and Professors Lanman, Toy, Jastrow, Hyvernat, G. F. Moore, and Jackson; President W. R. Harper; Professor Haupt; Dr. Cyrus Adler; Dr. W. Hayes Ward; and Mr. Talcott Williams.

Incidentally, President Gilman suggested that in the conduct of our future meetings it would be desirable if one of the sessions were reserved for papers of a non-technical character and of general interest, in order that such friends of the Society as are not professional Orientalists may with pleasure and profit take part in its proceedings.

Professors Toy and Haupt were appointed a Committee to present to Professor Green upon his coming anniversary the felicitations of the Society, and therewith the following minute:

The American Oriental Society desires to extend to Professor William Henry Green, the Nestor of teachers of Hebrew in this country, its very hearty congratulations on the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of his appointment as instructor in Hebrew in Princeton Theological Seminary, and to wish him yet many years of fruitful work.

At the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, held in New York City, Dec. 27, 1895, it was "Voted to inform the American Oriental Society that we are engaged in the effort to establish at some point in Bible Lands a School of Oriental Study and Research; and to invite the co-operation of the Oriental Society." This vote was duly communicated to the Oriental Society; and Professor Thayer, the President of the Biblical Society, presented the draft of an interesting plan.* Thereupon, on motion of Professor Lyon, the following resolution was adopted:

---

* This may be found in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, at the end of volume xv.
The American Oriental Society has received with great pleasure the communication of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis regarding an "effort to establish at some point in Bible Lands a School of Oriental Study and Research."

The Oriental Society cannot express too warmly its approval of this enterprise, believing that the existence of such a School would give a new impulse to Biblical and Oriental scholarship.

With the promise of such cooperation as may become practicable, the Oriental Society wishes the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis all possible success in the development of their plan and the establishment of the proposed School.

The business thus dispatched, a brief recess was taken. At 11.30 the reading of papers was resumed at the point where it stopped on Thursday afternoon. The sessions of Friday afternoon and of Saturday morning were devoted almost exclusively to the presentation of papers. The social gatherings of Thursday evening at the houses of Professors Harris and Moore and of Friday evening at the house of Professor Moore were exceedingly pleasant and satisfactory. This was the first meeting of the Society at Andover. The place is in every way so convenient and suitable, and the expressions of pleasure and satisfaction on the part of the visiting members were so cordial, that it is to be hoped that the Society may meet again there at some not distant time.

After the Society had passed a vote of thanks to the Authorities of Andover Theological Seminary for the use of Bartlet Chapel, to Professors Harris and Moore for their kind and most acceptable hospitalities, and to the Committee of Arrangements (Professor Taylor, Chairman) for its efficient services, a final adjournment was had at 11.30 Saturday morning.

The following communications were announced in the Program of the meeting. Number 2, however, was not presented. Numbers 4, 11, 18, 26, 27, and 34 were presented by title. Parts of numbers 9 and 20 were presented informally at the social gathering at Professor Moore's.

1. Professor E. V. Arnold, University College of North Wales, Bangor; Grammatical development in the five epochs of the Rig-Veda and in the Atharva-Veda.

2. Rev. Dr. Blodget, of Peking; Ancestral worship in the Shu King.

3. Professor Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University; The meaning of the compound *atharvāṅgirasas*, the ancient name of the fourth Veda.

4. Professor Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University; On the "Frog-hymn," Rig-Veda, vii. 103.
5. Dr. Casanowicz, United States National Museum; Alexander legends in Talmud and Midrash, with reference to Greek and Assyrian parallels.

6. Mr. Edmunds, Historical Society of Pennsylvania; On the compilation of the Pāli Canon.

7. Professor Gottheil, Columbia University; Further references to Zoroaster in Syriac literature.

8. Professor Haupt, Johns Hopkins University; On usharnā, Ezra v. 3, 9.

9. Professor Haupt, Johns Hopkins University; Notes on Genesis ii. 6 and iv. 1.

10. Professor Haupt, Johns Hopkins University; Strack's Abriss des Biblischen Aramäisch.

11. Professor Hopkins, Yale University; Prāgāthikāni, I. The vocabulary.

12. Professor Hopkins, Yale University; The root skar.

13. Professor Hopkins, Yale University; Conversion-tables for the references to the Calcutta and Bombay editions of the Mahā-Bhārata.

14. Professor Jackson, Columbia University; On Mahā-Bhārata iii. 142. 35–45, or an echo of an old Hindu-Persian legend.

15. Professor Jackson, Columbia University; Some Persian names in the Book of Esther.

16. Professor Jackson, Columbia University; The iterative optative in the Avesta.

17. Dr. Johnston, Johns Hopkins University; Epistolary literature of the Assyro-Babylonians.

18. Professor Lanman, Harvard University; Professor Whitney's translation of the Atharva-Veda.

19. Professor Lanman, Harvard University; Pāli miscellanies.

20. Professor Lanman, Harvard University; Sanskrit epigrams.

21. Professor Lyon, Harvard University; The distinctive feature of Babylonian poetry.

22. Professor Lyon, Harvard University; The argument from silence in discussions of Hebrew poetry and literature.

23. Professor Macdonald, Hartford Theological Seminary; A table exhibiting in a new form the interchange of sibilants and dentals in Semitic.

24. Professor Macdonald, Hartford Theological Seminary; The place of al-Ghazālī in the development of the theology of Islam.

26. Professor Oertel, Yale University; The Çāṭīyāyaṇa Brāhmaṇa and its relation to the Jāmineya Brāhmaṇa.

27. Rev. Dr. Peters, St. Michael's Church, N.Y.; The original site of civilization in Babylonia and the date of the same.

28. Dr. Scott, Radnor, Pa.; The Malayan words in English.

29. Dr. Scott, Radnor, Pa.; "Universal" qualities in the Malayan language.

30. Mr. Skinner, Harvard University; The plural termination ע, umi in Assyrian verbs.

31. Dr. Torrey, Andover Theological Seminary; Announcement of an edition of Ibn Abd el-Hakam's "Futūḥ Miṣr."

32. Dr. Torrey, Andover Theological Seminary; The meaning of the term "Mharrasḥē" as applied to books of the Syriac Bible.

33. Dr. Torrey, Andover Theological Seminary; The origin of the Old Testament Apocryphon called "I. Esdres."

34. Professor Wright, New Church School, Cambridge; Note on a Greek inscription at Kolonieh, Palestine.

1. The Beginning of the Judaic Account of Creation; by Professor Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

We read at the beginning of the second account of creation in the Book of Genesis (2, 4): When  Jehovah had made heaven and earth, and formed man out of the dust of the ground, breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, so that man became a living being—at that time there were yet even no wild plants of the desert, much less plants cultivated for food, because  Jehovah had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was no man to cultivate the ground, but  מים used to go up from the earth, watering the whole surface of the ground.

The Hebrew word מים, which I have here left untransliterated, is rendered by most scholars, mist, vapor.† We find the translation, "a mist


† This would have produced at least the wild plants.

‡ Cf. Vogel in his edition (Halae, 1776) of Hugonis Grotii Annotationes in V.T. ("Mumes signifiest, qui de terra adscenderunt"); Bohlen (1835); Böhmer (1862); Schrader (1863); Tisch (1871); Kell (1878); Delitzsch (1887); Fripp (1892); Ad- dis (1892); Dillmann (1892); Spurrell (1896). If מים meant mist or vapor, it would be better to take מים as Hif'il as in Jer. 10, 13 (=51, 16; quoted in
used to go up,"* without a query,† even in the new German Version, edited by Professor Kautzsch, of Halle. In the second edition of Kautzsch and Socin's critical translation of the Book of Genesis, however, which appeared one year after the publication of the Book of Genesis in Kautzsch's AT, the word מים is left untranslated, and in a footnote the editors state that the traditional rendering mist or vapor is very doubtful. They call attention to Friedrich Delitzsch's remarks in his great Assyrian Wörterbuch (Leipzig, 1886), p. 125, where מים in our passage, as well as in Job 36, 27, is combined with the Assyrian 揆 "flood."‡ The reference to the Assyrian 揆 is also given in the last edition of Dillmann's Commentary on Genesis, p. 52, and in Gesenius-Buhl’s Hebrew Dictionary.§ The notes on מים in Friedrich Delitzsch's Hebrew Dictionary (Assyr. Wörterb., p. 136) are, unfortunately, still in store for us.

The rendering flood was suggested a hundred years ago by the Scottish Roman Catholic Biblical critic Dr. Alexander Geddes,¶ who published a new version of the Bible "faithfully translated from Corrected Texts of the Originals, with Various Readings, Explanatory Notes, and Critical Remarks." The work appeared in 1792, and was followed in 1800 by "Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures." Geddes says, like Friedrich Delitzsch, that מים means flood, and that even in Job 36, 27 it does not mean mist or cloud; perhaps we should read in the passage of Job, with Houbigant, מים. His remarks are also given, in German, in J. S. Vater's Commentar zum Pentateuch, vol. i, p. 18 (Halle, 1802).

* 35, 7) מים דאשא מעילא לכו רום = He causes the vapors to ascend from the ends of the earth, i. e. probably from the universal sea encircling the disc of the earth. Cf. Am. Or. Soc. Proc., March, 1894, p. civ.

† This is the translation given by Rabbi Saadya (892–942) in his Arabic Version of the Pentateuch. But Saadya inserts the negative: מים. Cf. Lagarde, Materialien zum Pentateuch, i, p. 3 (Leipzig, 1867). Grotius (who, however, translates spring) thinks that Saadya read the negative in the Hebrew MS. he used. But Houbigant (1777) is no doubt right in remarking that the negative was merely supplied by Saadya suo Marte. After all, the insertion of the negative is more sensible than the traditional rendering.

‡ Wellhausen has queried the rendering Nebel in all his editions of his Prolegomena; cf. fourth edition, p. 304; first edition (1878), p. 342.

¶ Delitzsch's father, in his commentary on Job (1876), compared מים with the Assyrian 揆 "asphalt," which in the Assyrian Wörterbuch is derived from the same stem as 揆.

§ See also Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos (Göttingen, 1895), p. 15.

¶ Geddes was the priest of a Roman Catholic congregation near Aberdeen, and he received the honorary LL. D. degree from Aberdeen. He is said to have resembled Herder. Cf. Cheyne, Founders of Old Test. Criticism (London, 1893), pp. 4–12; Holzinger, Einleitung in den Hexateuch (Freiburg, 1893), p. 43.
If we adopt Geddes' suggestion, the translation of v. 6 would be: a flood used to come up from the earth, watering the whole surface of the ground. Kautzsch and Socin refer to Gen. 7, 11 in the priestly account of the Deluge, where we read that in the 600th year of Noah's life all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven opened. Assyrr. eudd, however, is never used of underground water. In all the passages I know of, it refers to the water of seas and rivers. I believe that we should read יִאֹרָה יֶלֶּה יֶלֶּה מִיְּהוּדָאִים instead of יִאֹרָה יֶלֶּה יֶלֶּה מִיְּהוּדָאִים. This would mean: The water used to come over the land, and flood the ground.

We must remember in this connection that the Biblical accounts of Creation, both the priestly and the prophetic,* go back to Babylonia,† just as the story of Paradise points to Babylonia.‡ Babylonia is not like Palestine, as we read in Deut. 11, 11, a land of hills and valleys that drinks water from§ the rain of heaven, a land which JHVH cares for, whereon His eyes are from the beginning of the year to the end of the year; Babylonia was, like Egypt, a land where it was necessary to water the seed that was sown, with the foot¶ like a garden of vegetables. Without artificial irrigation Babylonia is a desert¶¶; the higher regions dry up, and the lower districts become swamps.¶¶¶ Many a part of Babylonia that was a land of gardens a thousand years ago, during the reign of the Abbasside Caliphs, is now covered with water. The overflowing of the Euphrates and Tigris is not, like the annual inundation of the Nile, a blessing, but it inflicts incalculable damage. In Babylonia not only the fertility of the soil, but the soil itself is, just as in Holland, the product of human labor.¶¶¶¶ Without drainage and irrigation, cultivation of the ground is impossible. The Babylonians forced the Tigris to flow along the eastern boundary of the alluvial plain, and the Euphrates was made to take its course to the sea through Lake Nájaf, instead of losing itself in the swamps of Southern Babylonia.¶¶¶¶

From this point of view, the words, And man was not there to cultivate the ground, but the water of the sea and the rivers used to come over the

* For the past fourteen years I have always stated in my classes that the Judaic accounts of Creation, the Deluge, etc., were of course pre-exilic, but that they had afterwards been retouched in some passages.
† Cf. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos, p. 169.
‡ See my paper in Über Land und Meer, vol. 73, no. 15, p. 349.
§ Literally according to.
¶ I. e. either by water-wheels turned by men pressing upon them with the foot in the same way that water is still often drawn from wells in Palestine; or "the reference may be to the mode of distributing water from the canals over a field, by making or breaking down with the foot the small ridges which regulate its flow, or by using the foot for the purpose of opening and closing sluices." Cf. Driver's Commentary on Deuteronomy, p. 129 (Edinburgh, 1895).
¶¶ See Sprenger, Babylonien (Heidelberg, 1886), pp. 19, 27, 22, 23, 73.
land flooding the whole surface of the ground, appear in a new light. The Biblical idea of Chaos, the whole earth submerged, with no separation between land and water, is specifically Babylonian. Wellhausen supplies at the beginning of the second account of creation: \[ Es war alles trockene Wüste, \] it was all an arid waste. He should have substituted \textit{Wasserwüste}, a watery waste.†

The reading \textit{יִהְיֶה} instead of \textit{יִהְיֶה} is found in a manuscript of the Targum on the Pentateuch (Cod. Mus. Brit. Or. 2228) of which Merx has published some extracts in his \textit{Chrestomathia Targumica} (Berlin, 1888), p. 61:

\[ יִהְיֶה רֹאֶה טֵחָן עִלָּה יִלּוּלָה. \]

Most editions of the Targum have \textit{כֹּל}, including the Editio Ulyssipomensis, quoted by Merx in the footnotes, \textit{i.e.} the Lisbon edition of 1491.‡ The Samaritan Targum also reads:

\[ יִלָּוָה יִכְלְלָה יַעֲלֶה רֹאֶה טֵחָן כֹּל אֲנָשָׁה. \]


The substitution of \textit{כֹּל} for \textit{יִלָּוָה} was, of course, necessary if \textit{יִלָּוָה} was interpreted to mean \textit{mist} or \textit{spring}. The meaning of the word must have been lost at a very early period. The Ancient Versions vary very much. The LXX, Aquila, and the Vulgate, as well as the Peshitta, translate \textit{spring} (πηγή, ἐρευνήμος, fons, ماء).

The Targum, on the other hand, renders \textit{cloud}, \textit{יִלָּוָה}, both the Targum Onkelos and the Targum Jerusalem. In the same way the LXX translates \textit{יִלָּוָה} in Job 36, 27 \textit{νεφέλη}. The rendering \textit{νεφέλη} is also found in the translation of our passage, Gen. 2, 6, in the Graecus Venetus: \textit{νεφέλη δ' ἀναβαινός πρὸς τῆς γῆς καὶ ἅρδον ξύμαν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς}. And J. D. Michaelis, 1775, translated: \textit{Es stiegen aber Wolken von der Erde auf und tränkten die ganze Überfläche des Landes}.

\textit{יִלָּוָה} is not found in any other passage of the O. T. except in Job 36, 27, at the beginning of the second half of the last discourse of Elihu:

---

* L. 6 of the first fragment of the cuneiform Creation Tablets reads: \textit{giçara la giçura}, \textit{כֹּל} \textit{כֹּל} \textit{אֲנָשָׁה} “no ground had yet been diked (i.e. surrounded and protected with dikes or embankments to prevent inundations), no fields were to be seen.” Cf. Delitzsch, \textit{Das babyl. Weisheitssagen} (Leipzig, 1896), p. 120. \textit{Giçara} is a synonym of \textit{ți} in Il 135 of the Deluge Tablet: \textit{kiına ări mitzurat wali}, “inundation had become like the diked field,” \textit{i.e.} everything was covered with water.

† Cf. Berossus’ \textit{σεόδος} καὶ \textit{τὸ} (Gunkel, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 17). Several Jewish scholars propose to read in the first verse of the Bible: \textit{In the beginning God created the water and the earth}, \textit{כֶּרֶם} \textit{כֶּרֶם} instead of \textit{כֹּל} \textit{כֹּל} (Grätz, \textit{Emendationes}, ad loc.).


The Authorized Version renders:

He maketh small the drops of water;
They pour down rain according to the vapor thereof,
Which the clouds do drop,
And distil upon man abundantly.

The rendering *abundantly* would require the emendation $לֵב$ adopted by Siegfried in his edition of the Hebrew text. Delitzsch translates: *sie sickern als Regen bei seinem Nebeldunst* (they ooze as rain at His misty vapor); Hitzig: *sie seien zu Regen seinen Dunst* (they filter His vapor into rain); Siegfried-Stade: *lassen den Regen in Nebel auf* (they dissolve the rain into vapor); Hoffmann: *er zieht Wassertropfen heran, die von seinem Nebel zu Regen gesetzt werden, welche der Wolkenhimmel herabbrinnt lässt, sodass sie auf viele Menschen triefen* (He attracts drops of water which are filtered into rain by His mist, which the welkin causes to flow down, so that they drip on many men). According to Hoffmann the mist or vapor is the strainer through which the drops of water are filtered, and become rain. He reads $יָלְדָּם$ instead of $יָלְדֶה$. Dillmann translates: *in consequence of His mist (auf seinen Nebel hin, in Folge desselben).*

The suffix occasions some difficulty. I am inclined to think, with Geddes and Friedrich Delitzsch, that $יָלְדֶה$ in the line of Job means *flooding, watering, irrigation*, just as in our passage of Genesis, but the final $י$ is probably not the suffix, but a trace of the old vocalic case-ending, as we have it in the Assyr. *edū* and in Hebrew forms like $יָלְדָּם$. *Köning, Lehrgebäude, ii, 1, p. 432, s.*

The combination of Hebrew $יָלְדֶה$ with Assyrian *edū* is all the more probable as the ideogram of *edū* shows that it means *water of irrigation*, the ideogram for *edū* is explained in the vocabulary if R. 30, 15 by $שָׁאָעַת שָּׁאֵל (חַ֣רְבָּל)* "irrigation of the field," and *edū* is also used in connection with the Shafîel $שָׁאָעַת$, the Assyry. equivalent of $יָלְדֶה$, in the Cylinder Inscription of Sargon II, commented on by

Professor Lyon, l. 37: "kî gîkîš etî me nuwšî šušqî (cf. Lyon’s Sargon, p. 67; Schrader’s KB. ii. 45, 87) “to irrigate the land with abundant water like the flood of the sea.” The word דַּנֵּש calamity may be a differentiation of דַּנֵּש flood. Flood or high water is a common metaphor in Hebrew for affliction, calamity, distress.\* In Assyrian we have for דַּנֵּש distress the Piel form عقل, plur. عقلתי.\† The comparison of דַּנֵּש calamity with Arabic عرش to bend, to trouble, is just as doubtful as the combination of דַּנֵּש mist (?) with Arabic עיראא.

2. The seat of the earliest civilization in Babylonia, and the date of its beginnings; by Dr. John P. Peters, New York, N. Y.

One of the conspicuous and unpleasant features of travel in Babylonia are the mortuary caravans which one meets conveying the dead from Persia to the sacred city of Nejef. All travelers in this region refer to their experience in encountering these caravans, and especially to the unpleasantness of spending the night at the khan with one of them. The Persians believe that the man who is buried in the sacred soil of Nejef will find a quick and more certain entrance into paradise. Not unfrequently, persons approaching death, if they are able, come down to Nejef to die. I recall an instance of my own experience. I was awakened very early in the morning in the khan at Nejef by the request that I would get up, as my next-door neighbor had died during the night and they wished to carry out the corpse. He had come down for the purpose of dying there. In other cases, a man having died at home, his pious friends bring the body to Nejef to be buried; a journey, it may be, of a month or more. When one considers the way in which the coffins are made and the heat of the climate, it may be imagined that it is exceedingly unpleasant to spend a night in a khan close to a family bent on such a pious errand. Families coming down to Nejef for such a purpose frequently bring with them handsome rugs, one of which will be used as a pall for the dead at the funeral, while afterwards all will be sold to pay the expenses of the journey. I have one such rug—and I prize it highly—which served, before I bought it, as a pall at the funeral of a man in Nejef. It is a dated Persian rug, about eighty-five years old. Ordinarily several families bent upon such an errand unite together to form a caravan. One of the common routes of travel is through Baghdad, across Kerbela, which is itself a sacred burial city, although of

\* For nuwšû, see my remark in Die akkadische Sprache (Berlin, 1883), p. xiii.

\† Cf. e. g. Prov. 1, 27: דַּנֵּש están your calamity comes like a whirlwind.

\‡ Is. 8, 7, 8; Ṣ 18, 17; 124, 4, 6, etc.; cf. Dr. Stevens’ Commentary on the Songs of Degrees (Johns Hopkins thesis) in Hebraica, xi, 77.

\§ See Delitzsch’s Handwörterbuch, p. 22*.
a sanctity in that regard much inferior to Nejef, and so down to Nejef. Another route is from the south. I do not know at what point pilgrims by this route enter Babylonia. I have met them first on the Atshan canal above Samawa. They ascend this canal, cross a portion of the Bahr-i-Nejef, and go up the continuation of the Hindieh Canal above the sea to a point opposite Nejef, called Seheir, about three hours by donkey caravan from Nejef. Pilgrims carrying their dead to Nejef frequently place a coin in the mouth of the deceased for payment of expenses. Robbers infest the road and plunder smaller caravans, even stealing the coin from the mouth of the corpse. Between Samawa and Nejef, some of these robbers fell upon us, as we were making the journey after dark, mistaking us for pious pilgrims carrying their dead to the sacred city. We were better armed than the brigands, and the consequence of their attempt to plunder us was that we captured them.

But not only do relatives bring the bodies of their dead to be buried in holy ground; there are also contractors who make it their business to go about from place to place and collect bodies of persons whose relatives wish to have them interred in Nejef but are unable or unwilling to incur the expense of the journey to that city. Bodies are dug out of the ground and consigned to the care of these contractors, who engage to transport them to Nejef and secure them proper burial there. The coffins used for this purpose at the present time are ordinary plain boxes of rough board. The Arabs of Babylonia use, instead of coffins made of boards, reeds, in which they encase the body, binding the two ends of the roll together with palm cords. Formerly it was the practice to bury the dead in the city of Nejef itself; and travelers tell us that caravans camped outside of the walls of the city, haggling with the Imáms of Ali's shrine with regard to the price, while the air was polluted by the terrible stench arising from the decomposing bodies. Under Turkish rule a stop has finally been put to this practice, and interments within the walls of Nejef are now either no longer made, or only made on special occasions by the payment of a great price. The whole plain about the city is, however, one vast cemetery.

The reason why Shiite Moslems have chosen Nejef as a place of interment is because it is the burial place of their prophet, Ali. But Nejef and Kerbela are not the only sacred burial sites. Half way between Diwanieh and Hillah, on the west shore of the Euphrates, lies a little weli, known as Imám Jasim, surrounded by a few miserable mud hovels. The neighborhood of this weli is reputed sacred, and many acres of ground are covered with the graves of the Shiites. There are also other similar burial places in lower Babylonia. The interesting fact to notice is, that while the particular locality in which interments take place may be new, the general practice of burial in this region is of the greatest antiquity. From time immemorial it has been the custom to bring the dead from great distances to be buried in the sacred soil of Babylonia. Such is the practice to-day; and excavations in the burial fields of Erech, Zergul, and other places, have shown that the same practice was in existence in the Persian period, in the Parthian
period, and in the Babylonian period. Age after age, the dead have been brought from distant countries to be buried here.

It is evident, when we compare the modern use with the ancient and observe the persistence of the custom, that for some reason, at a very early period, the soil of a certain part of Babylonia came to be regarded as sacred for purposes of interment. With the change of races and the change of religions in Babylonia, the original causes which led to the interment of the dead in that country passed away; nevertheless the custom still continued, being inherited as a fact by each new religion and each new race, and incorporated in its practice in precisely the same way in which old sacred sites and ceremonies are taken over from their predecessors by new nations and new religions, even where from the point of view of logical consistency such adoption would seem to be utterly out of the question. In the matter of sacred sites and ceremonies, every one who has read history is familiar with the phenomenon. The sacred sites of Aphrodite have been inherited by the Virgin Mary; and the liquefaction of blood, practiced as a heathen miracle in the time of Horace, is continued under the Christian religion with a different name. So also the custom of burying the dead in Babylonia, having been once established, was continued from age to age and from religion to religion under substantially the same forms. The question is, How did the practice of bringing the dead from distant countries to bury them in certain parts of Babylonia originate?

I do not think that we shall have to search long for the answer to this question. Everyone familiar with the records of the Hebrew religion will remember the indications of a similar practice among the Hebrews, in connection, primarily, with the cave of Machpelah at Hebron. We are told in the twenty-third chapter of Genesis that Abraham bought "the field of Ephron which was in Machpelah, which was before Mamre," and that he buried there Sarah his wife. Afterwards Isaac and Rebecca his wife were buried there. There Jacob buried Leah. Later Jacob himself died during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt; and it was considered necessary to bring his body back to his own land, and bury it with his ancestors in Machpelah. Not only that; we are told also that, although Joseph died in Egypt, it was considered necessary, when the Israelites came up to Canaan, to carry his body with them and bury it there. Now, while this may not represent history in a literal sense, certainly it is history in a broader sense. It gives us a picture of the Hebrews carrying their dead from distant places to be buried in the sacred soil of Canaan, and tells us that they did so because that was their ancestral home. Hebron became a burial place to them, not because it was originally sacred in itself, but because their forefathers had lived and were buried there. We have enough similar examples among uncivilized and half-civilized peoples to establish the general principle that there is a tendency to carry the dead for burial to the ancestral home.

Inversely, we may argue, where we find people carrying their dead a long distance for interment, that they do so because they count as
their ancestral home that place to which they are now carrying back their dead. Of course, the custom once established, a religious sanction of a new description may be given to it, so that the place becomes holy in and for itself, and peoples who have no ancestral connection with the place may ultimately come to bring their dead to be buried there by the side of the people to whose ancestors it belonged. In the custom existing at the present day of bringing bodies from distant parts of Babylonia, from Persia, and even from India to be buried in Nejef or some other similar sacred site in Babylonia, we have this secondary development, in which the practice of interment, having been once established, has received a religious sanction, and the place itself has come to be regarded as holy. The same was true, presumably, with reference to the practice of burial in Babylonia by the Persians and the Parthians; but there must have been behind all these a period when people brought their dead to be buried in Lower Babylonia because that was the place from which their ancestors had gone forth; and the origin of the practice of burying in Babylonia persons who have died in distant lands is to be sought in the fact that the region in which those burials have always taken place was the ancestral home of some people who originated that custom by bringing back their dead to Babylonia from the new homes to which they had migrated.

To just what portion of Babylonia do we find this practice of burial attaching itself? One of the most famous and largest of the necropolises of Babylonia is that at Erech, which was partially explored by Loftus and is described by him in his "Chaldaea and Susiana." The heading of the eighteenth chapter in that volume is in itself suggestive; "The absence of Tombs in the Mounds of Assyria.—Their abundance in Chaldaea.—Warka a vast Cemetery," etc. The opening part of the chapter is worth quoting in this connection: "It is a remarkable fact that, in spite of the long succession of years during which excavations have been carried on by the English and French governments in the mounds of Assyria, not a single instance has been recorded of undoubted Assyrian sepulture. . . . The natural inference therefore is, that the Assyrians either made away with their dead by some other method than by burial, or else that they conveyed them to some distant locality. If, however, Assyria be without its cemeteries, Chaldaea is full of them; every mound is an ancient burial-place between Niffar and Mugeyer! It would be too much, with our present knowledge, to say positively that Chaldaea was the necropolis of Assyria, but it is by no means improbable that such was the case. Arrian, the Greek historian, in describing Alexander's sail into the marshes south of Babylon, distinctly states that most of the sepulchres of the Assyrian kings were there constructed, and the same position is assigned them in the Peutingerian tables. The term Assyria, however, in the old geographers, is frequently applied to Babylonia, and the tombs alluded to may therefore be those only of the ancient kings of Babylonia. Still, it is likely that the Assyrians regarded with peculiar reverence that land out of which Asshur went forth and built Nineveh, and that they interred their dead around the original seats of their forefathers.
Whether this were so or not, the whole region of Lower Chaldæa abounds in sepulchral cities of immense extent. By far the most important of these is Warka, where the enormous accumulation of human remains proves that it was a peculiarly sacred spot, and that it was so esteemed for many centuries. It is difficult to convey anything like a correct notion of the piles upon piles of human relics which there utterly astound the beholder. Excepting only the triangular space between the three principal ruins, the whole remainder of the platform, the whole space between the walls, and an unknown extent of desert beyond them, are everywhere filled with the bones and sepulchres of the dead. There is probably no other site in the world which can compare with Warka in this respect; even the tombs of ancient Thebes do not contain such an aggregate amount of mortality. From its foundation by Uruk until finally abandoned by the Parthians—a period of probably 2500 years—Warka appears to have been a sacred burial-place. In the same manner as the Persians at the present day convey their dead from the most remote corners of the Shah's dominions, and even from India itself, to the holy shrines of Kerbella and Meshed Ali, so, doubtless, it was the custom of the ancient people of Babylonia to transport the bones of their deceased relatives and friends to the necropolis of Warka and other sites in the dread solitude of the Chaldaean marshes. The two great rivers, the Tigris and Euphrates, would, like the Nile in Egypt, afford an admirable means of conveying them from a distance, even from the upper plains of Assyria.

I was nowhere enabled to ascertain how deep in the mounds the funereal remains extend, although in several instances trenches were driven to the depth of thirty feet, beyond which the extreme looseness of the soil prevented my continuing the excavations with safety to the workmen; but I have every reason to believe that the same continuous mass of dead reaches to the very base of the highest portion of the platform—a depth of sixty feet. On this account there is considerable difficulty in obtaining information concerning the most ancient mode of disposing of the dead at Warka. It is only at the edges of the mounds where least built upon that the undoubted primitive tombs and their accompaniments occur.19

Not far from Erech or Warka, perhaps a day's journey away, lies the mound of Umm-el-Aqarib. This was visited by de Sarzec, who found there one of the heads of statues now in the Louvre. He does not seem to have recognized the character of the place, which he calls by the name of Moulagareb. It was visited by Dr. Ward on the Wolfe expedition, and recognized by him as a necropolis. At the time of my visit, in 1890, I had the advantage of the report of the Germans of the work of their expedition at Zergbul and Hibba. I found at Umm-el-Aqarib a cemetery regularly laid out. There were recognizable streets, on which abutted the places of burial proper. I dug out some of these sufficiently to ascertain their general character as tombs, and also that one tier was built upon another, so that presumably the whole mound is one vast
accumulation of burials. In those portions of the mound which I excavated there were no burials of the later period, as at Erech, but every thing belonged to the old Babylonian period, presumably 2000 B. C. and earlier. There was one structure of considerable size, which may have been a temple, but I found no evidence of the existence of a city of the living in connection with this necropolis, although there was, a few miles away, a very large and important group of cities, represented by the ruin-mounds of Yokha, Ferwa, and Abu-Adham. It will be seen that this necropolis is in many respects similar to the one which the Germans excavated at Zerghul south of the Shatt-el-Haf.

Not far from Nippur, about a dozen miles south-south-east, lies the ruin-mound of Delehem. I was unable to conduct excavations at this point, but from my experience I think I may safely say, after an examination without excavation, that Delehem is a necropolis of a similar character, although smaller than Umm-el-Aqarib. In the immediate neighborhood of Nippur there are, further, a considerable number of small mounds, such as Derehem, about four or five miles away to the south-east, and Abu-Jowan, about the same distance to the north-east, as well as some still smaller unnamed mounds closer to the actual ruins of Nippur, which appear to have been burial mounds. I was able to examine these only slightly, but such examination as I made revealed nothing but graves; so that I concluded that in all probability these mounds represented places of burial at the time of the prosperity of Nippur. Delehem is too far from Nippur to have been the necropolis for that city only, and it is equally remote from the large ruins of Bismya. I have assumed that it was an independent necropolis like Zerghul and Umm-el-Aqarib. Taylor, in excavating at Mughair and Abu-Shahrein (which, by the way, is no longer known, as far as I can ascertain, by that name, but is now called Nowawis), found frequent interments, although he seems to have found no separate necropolis.

Similarly, I found at Nippur interments in all parts of the ruins, among the houses and temples or under them, just as we find at the present day in some of the more remote Turkish and Arab towns. As Loftus has pointed out in the passage quoted above, these are the conditions prevailing everywhere, from Nippur southward, where excavations have been conducted. On the other hand, north of Nippur, in Babylonia as in Assyria, we find no necropoleis, and comparatively few interments in or about the cities and ruins which have been explored. In exploring Babylonia from Nippur southward the question which arises is, Whence have we so many burials? Whereas from Nippur northward the question which arises is, What did they do with their dead? From our present knowledge it would seem that it was the practice to bring the dead out of both northern Babylonia and Assyria, to be interred in the region of Lower Babylonia, from Nippur southward. The suggestion to be derived from this fact, if it be a fact, and I am inclined to think that it is, is that the region mentioned above was the original home of the ancestors of both the people of northern Babylonia and of Assyria, to which the inhabitants of those
countries looked back as a sacred spot because their ancestors had come from there. This view is further supported by the fact that there existed at the northern limit of that region, at Nippur, a temple looked upon as the most ancient and sacred in the Babylonian world, namely, E-Kur, the temple of En-Lil, or the great Bel. At a later date the land of burials was extended a little to the northward.

And now, assuming this original land of burials to be the home of Babylonian civilization, what was the date of the origin of that civilization? The southern limits of the region above mentioned differ greatly according to the date at which you consider it. The natural boundary on the south is the Persian Gulf. At the present time that is some 230 miles south-east of Nippur, in a direct line, and about 100 miles below Mughair, the ancient Ur. According to the calculations of Ainsworth (see Ainsworth's "Researches in Assyria, Babylonia and Chaldea," London, 1838, pp. 181 ff.), there is added each year at the mouth of the Shatt-el-Arab ninety feet of land. That is, the land encroaches upon the sea that much each year. Using Arrian's narrative of the voyage of Nearchus, and Pliny's account of the country at the head of the Persian gulf, largely derived therefrom, Ainsworth endeavors to determine the position of the head of that gulf in the time of Alexander the Great. He observes that "Alexander called by his name the Arabian colony of Tospinusus, Spasinus Charax, or Charax, and that this was situated a little less than one mile from the sea."

Pliny, N. H. vi. c. 27, describes the situation of Charax: "Charax . . . . . . habitatur in colle manu facto inter confluentes, dextra Tigrim, leva Euileum." From the fact that it was at the confluence of the two rivers, this site can be readily determined. It is occupied by the modern town Mo'ammerah, which is situated at the junction of the Shatt-el-Arab and the Karoun. But Mo'ammerah was forty-seven miles away from the Persian gulf at the time of Ainsworth's measurements. Between the time of Nearchus, 325 B.C., and the time of Ainsworth, 1835 A.D., a period of 2160 years, forty-six miles of new land had therefore been formed at the head of the Persian gulf. According to my calculations this would make the average deposit from Alexander's time to our own about 114½ feet a year, but Ainsworth makes it 90.

Ainsworth further attempts to locate the Teredon or Tiridotus, said to have been founded by Nebuchadrezzar at the mouth of the Euphrates. For the location of this place, however, we have not the same data; and Ainsworth's location of it at Jebel Sinam, some ten miles below Zobeir, and therefore about that distance below the modern Bassorah, must be accepted with caution. If it were situated at the place named, it must have been about nine miles from the sea in Nebuchadrezzar's time, and not upon the sea, as Ainsworth seems to suppose; unless Ainsworth's calculations are quite untrustworthy and the rate of deposit between Mo'ammerah and Bassorah was more than twice as rapid as between Mo'ammerah and the sea. I fancy, however, that a site for Teredon even as far as nine miles from the coast in Nebuchadrezzar's time would in reality quite suit the requirements of the situation as actually described.
But this is a side question. The fact of a large alluvial deposit, measurable at least by average over a long period of years, at the head of the Persian gulf is obtained by the determination of the fact that the site of the modern Mo'ammerah was one mile from the sea in 325 B.C. Now from the gulf up to about the parallel of Baghdad the entire Babylonian plain is an alluvial deposit, mainly from the rivers Tigris and Euphrates; and from the general configuration of the region we may, I think, fairly argue that the rate of deposit is likely to have been always approximately the same. Having thus fixed the rate of deposit for the section from Mo'ammerah to the gulf, we may reckon back from this to obtain the date of formation of any given part of Babylonia. On the basis of Ainsworth's figure of 90 feet a year, we find that the sea would have reached up to the site of Ur about 7550 B.C. Taking my figures derived from Ainsworth's measurements, 114 feet a year, we find that the seacoast would have been at that point about 5500 B.C. I believe that Ainsworth's figure is based not entirely upon calculation from the site of Mo'ammerah, but partly at least upon measurements of the present rate of increase. Possibly a middle rate would more nearly represent the actual average, giving us, say 6600 B.C. as the date required. I have no way of determining this matter, however; and while I believe that we can place reliance for the determination of the earliest possible date of Ur upon the measurement of the rate of alluvial deposit, I fancy that we must regard the date obtained by such measurements as only approximate and liable to vary a few hundred years from exactitude.

In old Babylonian tradition there is but one city further south than Ur and Eridu (Eridu stood on the solid plateau of the Arabian desert on the edge of the alluvial deposit, just within sight of Ur), and that is Surippak, the city of the ark. Whether this was a mythical place or not I do not know, but at least the site of Surippak has not yet been identified. Assyriologists regard Ur as having been originally a coast-city from the references in the inscriptions. This condition might, however, be fulfilled by a location a dozen miles or so from the actual coast on a navigable river or canal; but at least, if not on the sea, a city to be regarded as a coast-city must have been within a very few miles of the coast. As situated, not in the middle of the alluvial tract, but close to the western edge of the same, it is possible, and I suppose probable, that the land on which Ur stood was formed before that in the middle of the plain. The gulf might have extended further northward for some time after this strip of land along the shore had already become habitable.

Judging from the references in ancient Babylonian inscriptions, Ur must have been, as already stated, about the most southerly city of Babylonia in the earliest period. It was also at the southern limit of the burial-region, so far as we know. At the northern limit of that region apparently lies Nippur. Now, in the inscriptions, Sin of Ur is mentioned as the son of En-Lil or Bel of Nippur. This suggests an earlier date for Nippur, or at least for its temple and worship, than for Ur or its temple and worship, but establishes a close relationship
between the two. Our excavations at Nippur, if we accept the date of Sargon of Agane as fixed, as all Assyriologists assume that it is, at 3800 B.C., compel us to relegate the founding of that city to a period considerably antedating 6000 B.C., and perhaps antedating 7000 B.C.

My suggestion, from the various facts here marshalled, would be that the original home of civilization in Babylonia was the strip of land from Nippur southward to the neighborhood of Ur, and not, as has sometimes been argued, the region about Babylon and northward to Sippara. While the latter region is in itself older, it does not seem to have been older as the home of civilized man. The ancestors of the civilization of Babylonia seem to have come from the region between Nippur and what was then the coast of the Persian gulf. This would accord also with the tradition preserved to us in later sources that civilization came to Babylonia out of the Persian gulf. Possibly Eridu, on the Arabian plateau near the western shore and not far from the head of what was then the Persian gulf, may represent the oldest seat of that civilization. However that may be, at a very early period Nippur became the center of civilization and religion, being founded at a time when everything below Ur probably, and possibly some part of the region to the north of it, was still under water. As early as the close, if not the beginning, of the seventh millennium B.C., this strip of land at the head of the then Persian gulf seems to have been the home of civilized men, and from here civilization spread northward.

3. The termination $u$, $\bar{u}ni$ in Assyrian verbs; by Macy M. Skinner, Assistant in Semitic Languages in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

The third masculine plural of the present, preterite, and permansive of Assyrian verbs, which usually ends in $u$, is frequently found with the longer form in $\bar{u}ni$. An examination of prose texts extending over a period from Hammurabi to Cyrus, as well as of some poetic material, has yielded the following results.

* The feminine in $\bar{u}ni$ is of very rare occurrence and we shall accordingly confine ourselves to the masculine.

† The texts consulted were: for Hammurabi, the Louvre inscript., in Ménant's Inscript. de Hammourabi, pp. 13–20; for Agû-kakrimi, VR33; for Ramman-nirari I, Harvard Semitic Museum tablet; for Nebuchadrezzar I, VR55–57; for Tigrath-pileser I, Prism inscript., IR3–16; for Nabu-apal-iddin, VR60–61; for Assurmainal, Annals, IR17–26; for Shalmaneser II, Bl. Ob., in Abel und Winckler's Keilschrifttexte, pp. 7–12, also Monolith, IIR7–8; for Šamši-rumman, IIR32–34; for Ramman-nirari III, IR35 Nos. 1 and 3; the Synchronous Hist., in Winckler's Untersuchungen, p. 148 and ff.; for Tigrath-pileser III, IIR67 and IIR9,2; for Sargon, Winckler's Keilschrifttexte Sargons, vol. 2, pp. 30–36; for Sennacherib, Prism inscript., IR37–42; for Esarhaddon, IR45–47 and IR50; for Assurbanipal, Rassam cyl., VR1–10; for Šamaššumukin, Cyl., Biling., and Letter
1. The longer form in ānī is employed almost exclusively in the first stem (I. 1 Pe'āl). The total number of cases found of the form in ānī was 140. Of these, 118 were of stem I. 1: for example, īš-šn-u-ni, VR2,118; īs-bat-u (var. bat-tu) nīm-ma, VR1,129.

2. The verbs occurring with this longer form are mainly weak verbs. Of the 140 occurrences of the form in ānī, 109 were weak verbs: for example, īl-li-šu-šu nīm-ma, VR3,87; īl-šu-ni, IR24,35; īš-bu-ni-im-ma, No. 7, Rev. 7, in Thontalesfund von El Amarna.

3. The form in ānī is seldom used with suffixes. Of the third masculine plural, 87 cases with suffix were found; 10 of these were in ānī, and 77 in ċa. Examples of the longer form with suffix are: ā-tir-ru-niš-šu, VR5,34; āb-bi-šu, IR18,76.

4. The use of the form in ānī does not appear to be influenced by syntactical considerations.

It is possible that the termination ānī had an old rhetorical function which has survived in certain verbs. We have seen that it occurs most frequently with stem I. 1 (Pe'āl). As this is the light stem, and the other stems are increased in various other ways, may this not have been a method of strengthening the stem? Moreover the form in ānī has been retained mainly in weak verbs. This fact leads to the conjecture that one of the functions of the ānī termination was to preserve more nearly the normal number of syllables or to compensate for the loss of a weak letter. Naturally in the course of time the original force and significance of the ending was lost, and we find such forms as īpparšīdāni as well as numerous other strong roots with the termination ānī.

A point of some interest in this connection is the relation of the Assyrian ending ānī to the plural termination ān in Hebrew, Aramaic, etc. In the perfect, ān occurs more or less frequently in Samaritan, Syriac, and later Targumic,* but only three times in Hebrew.† In the imperfect, the Arabic (ānā) and Aramaic have retained it regularly; the

to Assurb, in Lehmann's Šamaššumukīn, Taf. II, VIII, IX.; for Nebuchadrezzar, the East India House inscript., IR39–64, Grot. cyl., IR65–66, Build. inscript. of Nin-Karrak. in Abel und Winckler's Keilschrifttexte, p. 93 and f., and Borsippa inscript., IR51 No. 1; for Nabonidos, Ur inscript., IR69, also IR68 No. 1, VR63, and VR64; for Cyrus, Clay cyl., VR35.


* See Böttcher's Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Heb. Sprache, §930.

† See Driver's Traces (3d ed.), p. 6, Note 1.писыва, Dt. viii. 3, 16, and presume Is. xxvi. 16. This last, Stade, Gram., §411a, rejects as suspicious. It is apparently a textual error. pls. p., Is. xxix. 21, is evidently an imperfect.
Hebrew, some 813 times.* In Hebrew prose, the form in ān is more common in the pre-exilic literature, the general principle being as follows: the older the book, the more frequent is its use; and the absence of the form is a mark of later date.† There does not seem to be any defined law of growth or degradation traceable in the history of the form in Assyrian. In the El-Amarna tablets examined, the forms in ānī were in predominance over those in ā, and a further investigation of this material from so early a period (15th century B.C.) might yield some significant results. The use of the termination ānī in Assyrian and that of ān in Hebrew have this in common, that they occur mainly with the first stem, and seldom with suffixes.

The following is a list of verbs which occur most frequently in the texts examined with the termination ānī, in the order of their frequency: abādu, tībā (14 times in ānī); alāku (15 times); ārādu, tāru (9); našī, šābātu (7); āsū, kībū, līkū (5); paršādu (4); īlū, īrību, ādāku, šakānu, šārāku (9).

4. On the ‘Frog-hymn,’ Rig-Veda vii. 103, together with some remarks on the composition of the Vedic hymns; by Professor M. Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

At the meeting of the A. O. S. in October, 1890, the writer presented a paper entitled, ‘On a Vedic group of charms for extinguishing fire by means of water-plants and a frog,’ an abstract of which appeared in the Proceedings of that meeting; the subject was afterwards treated more fully in the second series of ‘Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda,’ Amer. Journ. Phil. xi. 342 ff.‡ The primary object of the article was the interpretation of RV. x. 16. 13, 14, and sundry related stanzas, but incidentally there came to light a wide-spread custom of employing a frog and certain water-plants as symbols of water, as instruments for quenching fire, and as a means of producing water where formerly there was none. Ethnologically speaking, this is the simplest kind of folk-lore, and it would have required no special emphasis but for the fact that it helped us to discover in a considerable number of more or less vaguely understood Vedic passages the plainest kind of ordinary meaning.

An interesting modulation of this theme is the employment of the frog as a cure for fever. Stanza 2 of AV. vii. 116, a charm against takman or fever, reads: ‘May (the takman) that returns on the mornow, he that returns on two (successive) days, the impious one, pass into this.

† Ibidem, p. 34.
‡ The following additional passages, illustrating the matters there treated, may be noted: TS. v. 4. 2. 1; vii. 4. 18. 2; TB. iii. 9. 5. 4; MS. iii. 3. 3. 6; 12. 19; VS. xxiii. 10; ČB. xiii. 8. 3. 15; ĀÇ. ii. 12. 2; x. 9. 2; LÇ. iii. 5. 13; Rigvidhāna iv. 11. 1.
frog.' This prayer is supported symbolically at Kāuç. 32. 17 by fastening a frog beneath the bed of the patient and rinsing the patient off, so that the water shall wash the fever down upon the frog; cf. especially Keçava to the passage, and see the treatment of the hymn in our forthcoming translation of the A.V. in the Sacred Books of the East.

Aside from these uses the frog occurs in the accessible Vedic literature, barring casual mention, only in the so-called frog-hymn, RV. vii. 103, and a few scattered but closely related stanzas in the Khīna of the RV. itself, in A.V. iv. 15. 13 ff., and in the Suparṇākyāna ix. 3. A literal translation of RV. vii. 103 is as follows:

1. The frogs that have lain (quiet) during the year, (like) Brāhmaṇas devoted to a vow (of silence), have uttered their voice that has been quickened by Parjanya (the god of rain).

2. When the celestial waters came upon them,* lying like a dry (water-) skin in the pool, then the voice of the frogs rises in concert, as the lowing of cows with calves.

3. When at the arrival of the rainy season it hath rained upon them plagued by thirst and longing, then uttering (the sound) akkhala,† as a son to his father one approaches the other croaking.

4. One of them takes hold of the other when they have rejoiced at the pouring forth of the waters, when the frogs sprinkled by the rain did skip, when they mingle their voices, the speckled and the green.

5. When they reply to one another's shouts as a pupil (repeats the words) of his teacher, then all that with them is like a pat† lesson, when with loud croaking they shout upon the water.

6. One bleats like a cow, the other like a goat; one of them is speckled, the other is green; though of different shapes they own the same name, in many ways they modulate their voice when they speak.

7. Like Brāhmaṇas at the all-night soma-sacrifice (ātirātra), chanting round about the full bowl (of soma), ye are about on that day of the year when the rainy season has set in.§

* The text reads enam 'him.' The slight change removes the anacoluthon.
† Brūkkekkē kōdē kōdē. In Paṇc. Br. xii. 4. 16 the croaking of the frogs is described by the verb ādkaroti 'to utter the sound āt (Scholiast, vaṇḍako vṛṣṭyanantaram ātō tī evam ānabān ārōti). Cf. also the Sāmans bearing the title ādṛkārṇīdhana (-niḥdana), Paṇc. Br. viii. 1. 1; 2. 1; Ind. Stud. i.ii. 206; and see Weber, Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth, p. 136, note 4. [Cf. also the names of sounds (some onomatopoetic) of various creatures and things, ZDMG. xxxii. 734. —En.]
‡ samḍhā is to be taken as an adverbial instrumental from samḍhā 'accomplishment, success.' The assumption for this one place of a stem samḍhā (Pet. Lex., Grassmann, and Hillebrandt, Vedachrestomathie) is uncalled for. We have avoided the anacoluthon between ṭṣam and vīḍathana by rendering the latter as a third person.
§ There is no fun and no conviviality in all this. The Brāhmaṇas do not drink the soma at the ātirātra; it is sacrificed at regular intervals, each libation being preceded by the chanting of holy hymns. Four libations are poured at three dif-
8. As Brāhmaṇas over the soma they have raised their voices, performing their annual song; as Adhvaryus (serving priests) that have sweated over the pots of hot milk (gharma) they are (all) in evidence, none of them are hidden.

9. The divine order of the twelve-month they observed: these men do not disregard the season. Each year when the rainy season has arrived the heated pots (of heaven) are emptied out.¹

10. He that bleats like a cow, he that bleats like a goat; the speckled and the green one have bestowed upon us wealth; the frogs bestowing hundreds of cows shall extend (our) life at the thousand-fold pressing (of the soma).²

The hymn is 'late.'] It is the only hymn outside of the first and tenth books of the RV. in which occurs the word brāhmaṇa; the combination akkali-kītya represents the only instance in the RV. of the change of final a to ā in composition with the verb kar (and bhū); cf. Whitney, Sk. Gr.¹ 1001a, 1008a. Ritual words are common: attirātri, gharmā, adhvarya in addition to brāhmaṇa. The expression vratacārin (st 1 = AV. iv. 15. 18), common in the later literature, occurs nowhere else in the Rik or Atharvan.

Stylistically and from a literary point of view the composition is mediocre. Not that it does not lose somewhat, by a prose rendering, in what we at least feel to be a certain naïveté, directness, and quick-

different points of the night, and silence reigns between these points. As the chants of the Brāhmaṇas indicate that the bowl has been filled anew, thus the croaking of the frogs indicates that the pot has been filled by the rains of the monsoon. See Haug, Brahma und die Brāhmaṇen, p. 41 (cf. Altaraṇya-Brāhmaṇa, Translation, pp. 263 ff.). The word sāras is a voz media 'pool,' and 'bowl.'

* Sāyaṇa, gharmiṇa gharmena pravargena caranāḥ 'performing the pravargya-ceremony.' At the pravargya-ceremony the priests empty pots of milk which are heated before they are emptied. Similarly the frogs have sweated during the hot season. The word gharmiṇa thus harbors a double entente: 'heated by the pots of milk' (in relation to the priests), and 'affected by the hot season' (in relation to the frogs). Cf. Haug, l. c. p. 42; Hillebrandt's Vedachrestomathie. under gharmā and gharmiṇ; Oldenberg, Die Religion des Veda, p. 450, note.

† Sāyaṇa, āḍḍaḍaṃsatmakasya saṅvatsarasasya. Jacobi, Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth, 'of the twelfth month.'

‡ The simile between the heated pots of the priests and the hot season is continued: the heated pots are the heated heavens which pour forth their rain.

§ Doubtless again with double meaning: 'the generating of thousands of plants.' Thus Sāyaṇa, sahasra-saṅkhyaḥ oṣadhaḥ sāyun.²

† The Pet. Lex. s. v. atirātra: 'Das lied ist zu den jüngsten zu zählen.' What is meant by late is, that a given hymn does not accord with the stereotyped, hieratic language of the family-books, the books of the soma-sacrifice, but approaches the less esoteric more popular diction of the A.V., the Brāhmaṇas, and the classical language. The distinction exists, but it is one of dialect and style, rather than chronology. Many of the criteria employed for chronological purposes are obviously dialectic, e. g. 'late' ṭvāyami = Avest. zbayems; sārva = Avest. haurva; karōmi: taruk, etc. Of this another time.
ness of movement in the original. As to that, different readers will differ in accordance with their individuality and the scope of their observations of matters Hindu. The hymn is in our view thoroughly conventional: it is full of repetitions, and extreme in its employment of the catenary arrangement of its stanzas. The very opening in the livelier anustubh metre, continuing with the more stately triṣṭubh-jagatī, is one of the standard devices of the AV.† Two clummy anacoluths in sts. 2 and 5 contribute to the characterization of the literary standard of the hymn, which is no higher than that of scores of Atharvan hymns. It has been suggested frequently and denied just as frequently that there is in the composition humor, nay that it is a satire on the Brāhmaṇas to compare their doings with those of frogs. As regards the latter point, we must regard it as extremely unlikely, in view of the attitude of the Vedas as a whole towards their priesthood. What is more to the point, however, is that the hymn obviously breathes the spirit of anxious conciliation: the frog, the symbol of eagerly craved water, is no joking matter, and the comparisons with the Brahmans and the sacred rites are begotten of the desire to praise, and not to disparage.

But aside from and above these considerations stands the broad question that must be asked for every Vedic hymn, namely, whether its composition was utilitarian or bellettristic. Shall we conceive this poetry as the product of the mildly frenzied rhapsodist among the people, or, perhaps, as the child of the muse of some Rāja’s poet laureate ‘given to infinite tobacco,’ as he walks along the jungle in the cool of the evening, at the opening of the rainy season, eager to bag some good subject for the delectation of the court of his patron? Or shall we let the Vedic writings continue their tale of a literature, practical, tendential, everywhere ‘on the make?’ The Vedic Hindus, to judge by their literature, were the most practical people of ancient times. This literature of a hundred works more or less, the Upanishads not excepted, has positively no aim in view except personal advantage, the favor of the gods, the granting of wishes, the destruction of enemies, and that continues clear down to the pessimistic Upanishads which pander to the desire for emancipation from the round of existences. The Rig-Veda is confessedly in part made of the same stuff. Anent other parts there are those whose literary feeling does not permit them to follow out the consequences of all that part of Vedic history which is clear. Here and there the sordid mass appears leavened by true beauty of conception, fineness of observation, good style, and all the other paraphernalia of literary composition which we of modern times are accustomed to see at work more or less divorced from any practical consideration. Why not?

As if a hieratic literature excluded by its very terms the operations of literary taste and literary canons. The Vedic poets themselves boast that their poems are ‘well-hewn,’ and so they are in many cases. After

† Cf. AV. i. 29; iv. 16; vi. 49. The same effect is produced by introducing an anustubh-hymn with a gāyatrī, ii. 32; iv. 12, and probably also by placing a stanza in long metre at the head of one in short metre, e. g. ii. 4; vi. 111.
all the crust of priestly conventionalism has been pared off, there remains in the Vedic mantras enough beauty to make them attractive as a phase of the world's literature. But this incidental merit has nothing whatever to do with the prime object of their composition, the pursuit of some priestly object, not necessarily sordid, not necessarily devoid of true elevation of spirit. All preachers are not Peters of Amiens nor Savonarolas, but must be content to serve their religions, while maintaining that the laborer is worthy of his hire; and all scientists are not Galileos, but demand salaries as high as the market allows: and yet, after all, the spiritual guidance of civilized peoples and the great bulk of scientific advance are on the whole safe in the hands of people who are no less dependent upon baksheesh than the poet-priests of India.

The finikin literary non possumus, born of modern sensitiveness, of any one who feels that somehow he is individually incapable of imagining so good a literature—good in his eye, not necessarily in the eye of others—to be composed by priests for priestly purposes, may be respected as a personal frame of mind, but it is wholly otiose as an historical argument. The literary quality of the RV. might have been infinitely higher than it appears to its most enraged admirer, and yet be a purely hieratic performance, provided only that the priests themselves had risen to a correspondingly high plane of literary perception. To deny peremptorily that they could have so risen, though at the same time having an eye to the practical side of their calling, and the practical applicability of the products of their muse, is a dictatorial machtspruch which may inspire awe for a moment, but will not cause any one to flinch in his endeavors to fix more clearly the outline of Hindu antiquity in the light of those of its data which are already clear. This is the homespun method which has finally commended itself in all philologies, and Hindu philology, too, is, on the whole, in good hands. The burden is now on the other shoulder, and he that assumes for a given Vedic hymn a purely literary origin, he who denies that a given hymn was composed with reference to some definite occasion (gelegenheitsdichtung) and for some practical purpose, may no longer be allowed to fortify himself behind shifting aesthetic estimates. That is begging the question. It may be difficult, yea impossible—that can be decided only in the future of Vedic philology—to point out the precise occasion in the case of one or another hymn. The great mass of the hymns are obviously practical, not only in their application but by the evidence of their innermost structure, and until it is proved that a given hymn is not so we shall be repaid by searching every time for the occasion and the purpose to which its origin is due.

This oratio pro domo on the part of the expounder of the frog-hymn will seem in the end unnecessarily fervent, and it would indeed be altogether superfluous if it were not still very necessary to draw the moral from what is simple and plain for the future usufruct of those Vedic hymns that are vague and nebulous, or do not at any rate betray on the face of them the exact motive of their composition. The frog-hymn is a
rain-charm, in style and purpose no better than many other productions of the medicine-man and the weather-maker. The chief interest of the hymn is to be found in the fact that it completes the chain of folk-lore beliefs and practices elaborated in the article quoted above. The frog in his character of water-animal par excellence quenches fire, produces water where previously there was none, is the proper repository for fever, and finally is associated with the annual appearance of rain in the rainy season. One will look in vain in the accessible Vedic literature for any mention of frogs—and they are mentioned quite frequently—which fails to suggest or state outright this practical view of the animal.* The frogs, too, are everywhere taken seriously; their comparison with the Brähmanas in vii. 108 is a bit of nice diplomacy, intended as a captatio benevolentiae of the frogs, not as a satire upon the priests engaged in the difficult performance of the all-night sacrifice (ātirātrī), or the still more arduous manipulation of the heated pots (gharmū). That this is so, we may gather from Harivaṇa, Viṣṇuparvan 95. 28 = 8808, a passage which is clearly modelled after sts. 7 ff. of our hymn, and which by its very terms cannot be intended as a satire upon the Brahmans: ‘The frog having lain asleep eight months croaks with his wives, as a Brahman devoted to the precious and true law recites hymns surrounded by his pupils.’ Langlois in his translation remarks aptly, that according to our customs nothing would be quite as impertinent as the comparison of a respectable ecclesiastic with a frog, but the Hindus were not conscious of any taint of impiousness in this raprochement. This attitude seems to us queer, but the Hindu is practical, and the frogs have water to give. The Hindu’s worship of the to us intensely repulsive animal with forked tongue, ‘the toothed rope’ as he himself at times calls the serpent, is still more grotesque. And yet even the modern Hindu housewife does not attack an intruding serpent with the broom-handle, but places milk before him, her hands folded in the attitude of a suppliant.

The present hymn betrays its purpose most plainly in its last stanza, which contains, as in hosts of other charms, the true point, the khal-effect, of the hymn. The statement is made in the so-called prophetic aorist, the things desired are stated as having already taken place; that the frogs are able to bestow wealth, cattle, and long life by no other inherent virtue than that of rain-making, needs hardly to be pointed out. Aside from the evidence from within, the charm is immediately preceded in the RV. itself by two hymns that are rain-charms. They are addressed directly as prayers to Parjanya, the rain-god, and their char-

---

* Cf. especially the familiar passage, RV. ix. 112. 4, where the natural affinities of various kinds of men, animals, and things are described graphically; the poet winds up with the statement, cēpo roamvaṇtāh bhedaḥ, vār in maṇḍaka tchat. See also Māitr. Up. i. 4; vi. 22.

† The commentators feel this: in all such cases they render the aorist by the imperative. Thus Sāyaṇa here, adāt, i.e. adātā. Cf. also Delbrück, Syntaxische Forschungen ii. 87.
acter may be understood from stanza vii. 101. 5 as a specimen: ‘May this prayer penetrate into the heart of the self-sovereign Parjanya, may he take delight in it: refreshing rains shall be ours and plants with goody fruit protected by the gods.’ The only difference between these hymns and the frog-hymn is that in the latter the frogs in their capacity as producers of water, are, as it were, the agents of the rain-god upon earth, and the prayer is shifted to them.

The khālikāni sūktāni contain a later addendum to the hymn which shows how clearly it was understood at that time in the sense of a rain-charm: ‘Join the chorus, O female frog; announce the rain, O tadpole; stretch out thy four feet, and paddle in the middle of the pool.’ This stanza appears in AV. iv. 15. 14, a very lengthy and conglomerate rain-charm,* preceded by the first stanza of the frog hymn, and followed by another stanza in which khanvakāhā and khāimakāhā, two fanciful frog-females,† are again implored to produce rain (varṣīth vanudhvacam). Again both the first stanza and the khīla of our hymn occur in Yāska’s Nirukta ix. 6, 7, and Yāska explains, ‘Vasiṣṭha desiring rain praised Parjanya, the frogs acclaimed him. He perceiving the acclaiming frogs praised them with song. That is what this stanza means.‡ Clearest of all is a passage in the Suparṇākhyāna ix. 3, not concerned directly with the frogs at all, and certainly serious. It describes the conjuring of a great storm in vivid language: ‘Shout, thunder, reach the clouds; these waters of thine shall be level with the mountain-tops. . . Undefined, wholly water, the shore shall be; the frog-female shall croak all the night. (The winds) shall milk the cloud (cow) whose trail drips with milk, the wild beast shall come seeking firm land.’ The Suparṇākhyāna is a very interesting composition, a kind of an addendum (khīla) to the RV., at any rate, so strongly reminiscent of the RV. as to leave one in doubt not infrequently whether a certain passage of it is to be regarded as a Vedic mantra or not. The fact that it weaves two of the main ideas of the frog-hymn, the croaking frog, and the all-night performances, into a highly poetic account of a storm, shows at any rate what its composer conceived that composition to be. Finally the hymn was still in use in India in 1871, when the late Professor Haug reported that ‘in times of great drought, when the eagerly expected rain will not come, twenty or thirty Brāhmaṇas go to a river, and recite this and the preceding hymn.’§ This is again the ancient reliance upon the frog, the Vedic quencher of fire, heat, and fever, a very Trident in the hands of the ancient sorcerers.

* Cf. Kāuç. 103. 3, sam ut patantu (AV. iv. 16) pra nabhaeva (vii. 18) ili varṣīth jukhoti.
† Obviously personifications of another of the many onomatopoetic attempts to render the croak of the frog. It is worth noticing that throughout the varied frog-charms with which we have dealt, the female (maṇḍalikā, maṇḍakā) rather than the masculine (maṇḍikā) is often chosen as the emblem of moisture. This is sound physiology as well as folk-lore.
‡ Cf. Sadguruṣaṇya, p. 136; Sāyaṇa in the introduction to RV. vii. 103.
§ Brahma und die Brahmanen, p. 12 (cf. also the note, p. 40).
5. The meaning of the compound atarvängirasah, the ancient name of the fourth Veda; by Professor Bloomfield.

In general the fourth Veda is designated in ancient times by the compound atarvängirasah. Quite frequently, however, the two members of the compound are separated, so that each is mentioned by itself, but always in more or less close conjunction with the other. This shows that the compound is not a congealed formula, but that the texts are conscious of the fact that each has a distinct individuality, and a right to separate existence. In other words, the A.V. consists of atarvävan and ängiras matter, and the question arises what elements in the make-up of this Veda these terms refer to. The answer may be given with a considerable degree of certainty: the term atarvävan refers to the auspicious practices of the Veda, the bheṣajñâni (A.V. xi. 6. 14), those parts of the Veda which are recognized by the Atharvan ritual and the orthodox Brahmanical writings as cānta 'holy,' and pāusṭika 'conferring prosperity;' the term ängiras refers to the hostile sorcery practices of the Veda, the yātu (Çat. Br. x. 5. 2. 20), or abhicāra which is terrible (ghora).

In J.A.O.S. xi. 387 the writer pointed to the existence of this distinction at Vāīt. Sū. 5. 10 (cf. also Gop. Br. i. 2. 18), where two lists of plants are differentiated, one as atarvävanah, the other as ängirasah. The former refers to a list of plants catalogued at Kāuç. S. 8. 16 and described as cāntāḥ 'holy'; the second list is stated at Vāīt. Sū. 5. 10 itself, and described as ängirasah: the name of the last of the list, nīr- dahantaḥ 'burning forth,' proves that they were employed in unholy sorcery practices (abhicārika).* The adjective ängirasah is in general in the ritualistic texts of the A.V. a synonym of abhicārika (Kāuç. 14. 80; 47. 2, 12; Ath. Pariç. 3. 1); hence the fifth kalpa of the A.V., usually known as ängirasakalpa, bears also the names abhicāra-kalpa, and vidhāna-kalpa; see ibid. 376 ff.

Of non-Atharvanic texts, the Rig-vidhāna iv. 6. 4 has the following člokā: 'He against whom those that are skilled in the āngirasakalpa practice sorcery repels them all with the Pratyāngirasakalpa.† The term pratyāngirasah is the exact equivalent of pratyabhicāraṇa 'counter-witchcraft' (A.V. ii. 11. 2), and the keṛṭyāpratiharaṇāni, Ath. Pariç. 32. 2 (cf. Kāuç. 39. 7, note). The texts of the sort called ātharvanapratyāngirākalpa (see Ind. Stud. i. 469), pratyāngirātāvya, pratyāngirā-paṅcānga, and pratyāngirāsūkta (Böhtlingk's Lexicon), probably deal with the same theme; at any rate we may regard it as certain that the words ängiras and ängirasah are reflected by the ceremonial literature in the sense of abhicāra and abhicārika.

Far more important is the evidence of certain texts of greater antiquity and higher dignity, which have occasion to mention the Atharvan incidentally, and enunciate clearly this two-fold character of the Veda.

* Cf. A.V. iii. 2. 5; vii. 108. 2; ix. 2. 4; 5. 31; xiv. 2. 48.
† Cf. also the following člokās, and iv. 8. 3; see Rudolf Meyer's preface to his edition of the Rig-vidhāna, p. xxxi.
They make the very same distinction between atharvan and aṅgiras that appeared above, Vait. Sū. 5. 10. At Čāṅkh. Čr., the fourth Veda figures in its double character as atharvan and aṅgiras; here we find bheṣajam, i. e. ‘remedial charms,’ recited from the atharvan; and ghoram, i. e. ābhicārikam ‘sorcery,’ from the aṅgiras. Similarly in Ādv. Čr. the ātharvaṇa vedaḥ and aṅgiraso vedaḥ are treated individually, and again the former is correlated with bheṣajam, the latter with ghoram; cf. also Čat. Br. xiii. 4. 3. 3 ff. Indirect, yet significant testimony that this double character of the ĀV. was clearly established in Brahmanical times may be deduced from the formation of the names of two apocryphal teachers. One is Bhīṣaj Ātharvaṇa, Kāṭh. S. xvi. 3 (Ind. Stud. iii. 459); the other is Ghora Aṅgirasa, Kāṇḍ. Br. xxx. 6, etc. The formation Bhīṣaj Ātharvaṇa is illustrated further by Caṇhyp Ātharvaṇā, Gop. Br. i. 2. 18; by Paṇc. Br. xii. 9. 10, bheṣajāḥ vā ātharvaṇāni, and xvi. 10. 10, bheṣajāḥ vāi devānām atharvaṇo bheṣajāyāi vā ‘ṛṣṭyāśi; and by the expression atharvavahīh cāntāḥ, Kāṇḍ. 125. 2.* These names never, as far as is known, occur in inverted order: there is no Ghora Ātharvaṇa, and no Bhīṣaj Aṅgirasa; they reflect perfectly the individual character and the individual function of the two members of the compound aṭharaṅgirasaḥ.

It seems now, further, that the texts of the Atharva-saṁhitā mark this same distinction with no uncertain touch. At ĀV. xi. 6. 14 four Vedic mantra-classes are indicated by the expressions jcaḥ, sāmāṇī, bheṣajā(ni) and yājñāṣi. The choice of the word bheṣajā is certainly one-sided and eclectic. The passage appeals to the auspicious aspect of the holy texts, and naturally chooses the auspicious side of the Atharvan also. Its precise complement is Čat. Br. x. 5. 2. 20 where yātu ‘sorcery’ and the yātuvidaḥ ‘those skilled in sorcery’ are the representatives of the fourth Veda. The bheṣajā of the Atharvan passage and the yātu of the present passage make up together what is embraced in the name aṭharaṅgirasaḥ (ĀV. x. 7. 20). Moreover the Saṁhitā exhibits a decided predilection, bordering on rigorous distinction, for associating the term aṅgiras with aggressive witchcraft, or the practice of spells (kṛtyā). Thus viii. 5. 9 (kṛtyā aṅgirasāḥ): x. 1. 6; xii. 5. 52; cf. also vi. 45. 3=RV. x. 164. 4. In xi. 4. 16 (cf. also viii. 7. 17) the distinction between Atharvanic and Aṅgirasic plants appears again, not, however, in a connection which conveys of necessity the contrast between ‘holy’ and ‘witchcraft’ plants. But it may do so, precisely as is the case in Vait. Sū. 5. 10. Cf. also ĀV. xix. 22. 1, 18; 28. 1; Gop. Br. i. 1. 5, 8; 3. 4; Pāṇini v. 2. 87.

As regards the chronology and cause of this differentiation of atharvan and aṅgiras the texts are apparently wholly silent. The association of both names (and in the ritual texts of the ĀV. of the name bhṛṣu also) with the texts and practices of the fourth Veda may be sought in the character of these mythic beings. They are fire-priests, fire-churners, and the Atharvanic rites as well as the house-ceremonies

in general center about the fire, the oblations are into the fire. Fire-priests, in distinction from soma-priests, may have had in their keeping these homelier practices of common life. But whence the terrible aspect of the Āṅgiras in contrast with the auspicious Atharvans? In RV. x. 108. 10 Saramā threatens the Papis with the terrible Āṅgiras (āṅgirasāc ca ghordaḥ). This statement, wholly incidental as it seems to be, is, of course, not to be entirely discarded. More important is the fact that Byhaspati, the divine Purohitā, is distinctly āṅgirasā. In Kāuś. 183. 9 Byhaspati Āṅgirasa appears distinctly as the representative or the divinity of witchcraft performances. In the Mahābhārata he is frequently called aṅgirasānī ārṣṭhāyā. In his function of body-priest of the gods it behooves him to exercise those fiercer qualities which are later in a broader sense regarded as Āṅgirasic. Thus RV. x. 164. 4=AV. vi. 45. 8 certainly exhibits this function of the divine purohitā. The composer of AV. x. 1. 6, when he exclaims, ‘Pratīcinā (‘Back-hurler’), the descendant of Āṅgiras, is our overseer and chaplain (purohitā): do thou drive back again (prattellō) the spells, and slay yonder fashioners of spells,’ has also in mind the divine purohitā. The stanza foreshadows the later formation pratyaṅgiras, discussed above.

We look in vain, however, for statements of the reason why the word atharvan should be especially associated with čānta and bheṣaja, and must assume for the present that this was accomplished by secondarily contrasting it with aṅgiras, after the sense of ghora, ābhicārika had incurred itself over it.* The uncertainty of all this does not endanger the result that at a comparatively early time the terms atharvāṇaḥ in the sense of ‘holy charms,’ and aṅgirasāḥ in the sense of ‘witchcraft charms,’ joined the more distinctively hieratic terms pṛcaḥ, yajñāṇi, and sāmāṇi as characteristic types of Brahmanical literary performances. But this distinction was at a later period again abandoned: in the end, the name atharvan and its derivatives prevail as designations of the charms and practices of the fourth Veda, without reference to their strongly diversified character.

6. The root kar, skar; by Professor E. W. Hopkins, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The supposititious root skar is accepted rather doubtfully by philologist and etymologist alike.† There is good reason for the suspicion with which this form of the root is regarded. From a comparative point of view, the root would be quite unique in showing sk in Sanskrit and in no other language. Other roots with assured initial sk all show the sibilant somewhere, as in the case of skand, scando, scinnim; skabh, skoba, scabellum; skar (Avestan), skaipu; skū, skōra, scutum,

---

* A dash of popular etymology may have helped on the process: a-tharvan ‘not injuring’; cf. the root thur in the sense of ‘injure’ Dhatup. 15. 62, and perhaps MS. ii. 10. 1. Also the roots ñr and dhārv with similar meanings.
† Whitney, Grammar, § 1087 d; Fick, Wörterbuch, i 4, p. 24.
Hopkins, Root kar or skar.
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Obscurus, sky.* But skar has not even an Avestan parallel. To be sure, Fick attributes skarana in garemu-skaranat (Vd. 14. 7) to kar, herein following Justi; but Professor Jackson calls my attention to the fact that skarana is now identified with the Persian sukar, 'coal'—so by Horn, Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie, p. 163; Geldner, Kz. xxv., p. 566.

On the other hand the rapid growth of skar at the expense of kar in the post-Vedic language naturally raises the question whether this encroachment cannot be traced to its beginning. Such forms as sah-caskara, apaskara, upaskara, vishkara (vishkara = vikara) are plainly an extension of the earlier use of skar (almost confined to cases where the root is combined with pārī or sām) and suggest of themselves that s is a parasitic growth.

We can summarize this spread of the sibilant very easily. Till the period of the Rig-Veda no s is found (Latin creo, cerus, ludicrum; Greek κράνος; Slavic kreči; Lithuanian kurti; Avestan kar, hakeret = sakfīt). In the Rig-Veda, there are but two cases of skar in books ii.—vii., and these are not in the oldest part of this group (iii. 29. 2; v. 76. 2).† In the ninth book is one repeated word which occurs always in the same application, seven times as passive participle (pārīśkrta), once as active participle, pārīśkyuṇaṃ anīśktam, 39. 2, and twice as a third plural with the same preposition (pārīśkyuṇantī), 14. 2; 64. 23.§ It is here a stereotyped phrase. In the tenth book there are four occurrences of the participle, and the application is varied, though the combination with pārī is preserved. Three of these four cases are quite certainly in late hymns or verses. In x. 32. 3 (a late verse), the vahatūs is thus 'adorned'; in x. 85. 6, the vāsas; in x. 107. 10 (praise of dākṣīna), the vēṃa; in x. 135. 7, ayām (Yama). The only case where the verb is used freely occurs in this tenth book, wthal in the hymn to Night, where (after a preceding nir) is found askṛta, x. 127. 3.

The tenth book, excluding this last form, has the same number of cases as has the eighth. The latter has pārīśkrta, of sōma, 1. 26; and of vipra (Agni), 39. 9; sānśkrta, of Indra, 33. 9; and sūsānśkrta, 66. 11 (a late verse). The last form occurs also i. 88. 12 (a Kānya hymn). There are thus twice as many cases in the tenth book as in ii.—vii.; and the Kānya collection has as many cases as has the tenth book.¶

* The palatal of candr, candeo, is not in the same category and probably the sibilant is not original (see below). The lost s of kṛdā (āskrādāyu) is kept by the Greek and Lithuanian parallels. Compare Fick, loc. cit., p. 142.
† Fick, l. c., p. 184. Compare the other compounds (without s) saranyākereta, hastākereta; and see Geldner, Kz. xxv., p. 566; Horn, Grundriss d. neupers. Etym. §742.
‡ In the former case pārīśkṛta is used (of the puroḍās); in the latter, sāṁskṛta (of gharmā).
§ The seven cases of the participle occur in ix. 43. 3; 61. 13; 86. 24; 99. 2; 105. 2; 113. 4 (all pārīśkṛta); and 46. 2 (pārīśkṛtāsae). The application in every case of participle and verb is to sōma (indu, hārī, etc.).
¶ It is to show this point that the data are here collected. If viii. is late there is historical progression in the spread of the form.
Brahmanic and later literature add abhisaṃskar, upasaṃskar, prati-
saṃskar, parayaśkarot (Pāṇinī), etc.

A perfect parallel to the gradual growth of skar, as opposed to kar, is supplied by skir, upaskirati, which comes to light after the Rig-
Veda; and perhaps by skart (= kart?) in saṃskṛtatrd. The former root (s)kr like (s)kar shows no sign of an s in Slavic, Lithuanian, or Teutonic parallels;* yet after the Rig-Veda, which also shows no s, the sibilant is found. The identity of skart and kart is doubtful.† Other parallels are to be found in some palatal roots. Parallel to the older car (colo, ṇelavākṣ, kalys) of the Rig-Veda, stands çaar in the later Mā티. Saṅhītā (not noticed by Fick, s. v., i., p. 25). Even in RV. çaam, i. 104.
2, the metre shows that the preceding vowel is short and ça or çam (kārw?) must be the form. In the case of çaand (caandeo, caadru), despite caṇḍighat and çaandrd, strong evidence for the priority of the form çaand is given by the fact that in the old compounds, puruṣaçaandrd and viṣṇuçaandrd, the preceding syllables have to be read short in almost every case.

The cause of the origin of skar may be more or less theoretical, but it is easy to see how the new form spread. The verb is compounded with especial frequency with āvis, purēś, mahāś, and also very commonly with nis(ś). An early case is duskereta, duskrtd in Avestan and Vedic; so later we may compare the frequent nominal combinations, namaskāra, etc. An example may be taken from (Sanskrit) avasakara = avas kara. The temporal relation between the two forms is illustrated by Vedic (Sūtra) upakaraña, but Epic upaskara (upaskāra). It is noteworthy that, despite the regular RV. saṃskar, the form saṃkṛti still holds its own in TS. and later (see P. W., s. v.).

The form ḍskra, referred to this root by the lexicographers, has nothing to do with it. In each of the three instances where the word occurs it means 'united' (i. 186. 2; iii. 6. 4; vii. 43. 5). Now kar + ā never has this meaning. In Avestan, the combination means simply 'make.' In the Rig-Veda (ākṛṭe grhē, viii. 10. 1, etc.), it has either this meaning or, commonly, that of 'bring hither.' We cite as a typical example, x. 186. 2, yādā gā ākārāmahe sēnaye ā. There are half-a-dozen examples of ā kar in x. used in the same way. In the family books, compare vii. 77. 4: dācāśe 'tvādācāh rayim ā kṝdhi. So too in x. 8. 9, where gōṇām ācakrāyās, means only 'bringing to himself the cows'; while ānākṛta, i. 141. 7, is 'what one cannot bring to himself.' The meanings 'make,' 'form,' and 'bring hither' are still shown in Sanskrit ākāra, ākāraña (compare ākṛti, RV. x. 85. 5). As kar + ā never makes āskar in RV. and never means 'unite,' āskra 'united' cannot be from this root.

* Fick, loc cit., p. 25.
† Avestan kāreta, Greek κελψ, Latin curtus, render the identity more than questionable. The meaning (RV. vi. 28. 4) is quite uncertain.
‡ It is discussed in Professor Hopkins's article above, page 69.—Ed's.
7. On Mahā-Bhārata iii. 142. 35–45, an echo of an old Hindu-Persian legend; by Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, Columbia University, New York City.

The subject of the Yama-Yima legend has always been a fruitful field of study in the department of Indo-Iranian research. Parallels and resemblances, as well as contrasts and differences, between the Hindu Yama and the Persian Yima, or Jamshid, have often enough been discussed. The figure of the Vedic Yama, that mortal, the first to go the way of death and to point out the path for departed souls to follow, or, again, of that potent sovereign of the south, the stern judge hereafter, as found in the later Sanskrit literature, is familiar to every student of Indian antiquity. Consult, for example, Hopkins Religions of India pp. 128–135, 150 (Yama bibliography); Kaegi Rig-Veda (translation by Arrowsmith) pp. 67–70; and Spiegel Arische Periode pp. 248–256.

In Iranian legend the most marked feature of Yima’s personality is that of the kingly ruler in whose reign the Golden Age of the world prevailed. Under his princely sway, as is described in the Avesta (Vd. ii. 4–19), the earth flourished and brought forth in abundance, the flocks and herds multiplied, mankind increased; for it was from Ahura Mazda himself that Yima received the command to ‘further and increase the world’ (Vd. ii. 4 ąt mē gaēthāo frādhaya, ąt mē gaē-thāo varedhaya). The Vendidad further portrays the scene (cf. Geldner K. Z. xxv. 182):

‘Then the earth became abounding,
   Full of flocks and herds of cattle,
   Full of men, of birds, dogs likewise,
   Full of fires all bright and blazing.
   Nor did men, flocks, herds of cattle,
   Longer find them places on it.’

So overcrowded had the earth thus become! This excessive plenitude was due to the sovereignty of Yima, for neither sickness nor misery, disease nor death, existed as long as princely Yima ruled (Ys. ix. 4–5; Yt. v. 25–26, xv. 15, xvii. 28, xix. 31). Ferdausi’s picture of royal Jamshid’s reign, as drawn in the Shāh-Nāmah, is worth placing beside this particular description, in the present connection (cf. Schahname, ed. Vullers, i. p. 23 seq.; cf. Mohl Le Livre des Rois, i. p. 33–36 and especially p. 37, ‘ainsi s’étaient passés trois cents ans, pendant lesquels la mort était inconnue parmi les hommes. Ils ne connaissaient ni la peine, ni le malheur, etc.’ One of the Iranian characteristics, therefore, of Yima’s reign was this plenitude of life and increase on earth.

In Indian literature, so far as I recall, special attention seems not to have been drawn to the increase of mankind and the over-population of the earth under Yama’s beneficent sway. For this reason I call up to notice a passage in the Mahā-Bhārata that seems to show an Indian likeness to the Iranian idea. This will be but a point to add to others, in which, as has been shown for example by Darmesteter, Persia may serve to throw a side light upon the Mahā-Bhārata.
The passage in the Mahā-Bhārata (iii. 142. 35 ff = 10933 ff), to which I should like to direct attention, narrates the unprecedented deed of Vishnu, who, in his incarnation as a Boar, rescued the earth that had sunk into the nether regions in consequence of over-population. But how did this over-population come to pass? The text here rendered has the answer:

'In times gone by, the Krita Age, fearful, prevailed upon the earth,
And (Vishnu,) Primal God Eterne, acted the part that Yama played;
And when the all-wise God of gods acted the part that Yama played,
No creature any longer died, but only births occurred on earth.
Accordingly the birds began to multiply, and beasts, and kine,
The cows and horses, and the deer, and all carnivorous animals;
Likewise the human race began increasing, and to multiply
By thousands and by myriads, just as a stream of water grows.
Now, when on earth had come to pass this overcrowding terrible,
The earth o'erburdened by the weight sank down a hundred leagues in depth,
Suffering dire pain in all her limbs, and by the pressing weight distraught;
The earth distracted, then sought help of Vishnu, best of all the gods.'

Thereupon, as the story goes on to narrate, the divine Vishnu gives ear to the appeal uttered by suppliant earth; he becomes incarnate in the form of a Boar, and upon his shining tusk, as is recorded also elsewhere in Hindu mythology, he raises the trembling and afflicted earth out of the depths and saves her from disaster.

The point of resemblance to the Iranian legend, so far as relates to the increase of life under Yima, is patent. As soon as the God Supreme in the Mahā-Bhārata begins to play the rôle of Yama (yamātvam kr), death ceases, 'while the births are as usual' (thus jāyate vā is rendered in Roy's version—vā = eva); the flocks, the herds, the fowls of the air, and the whole race of man increase and multiply in numbers in the Mahā-Bhārata, precisely as the pasu, staoa, maśyāka, svan, vāi are augmented in the Avesta; the earth becomes overburdened in the Mahā-Bhārata, exactly as the crowded throng in Yima's day no longer find for themselves places on the earth in the Avesta (noiḥ him gātvō viṇḍen). The means of relieving the difficulty, however, differ of course in the Mahā-Bhārata and in the Avesta, as the attendant circumstances themselves are somewhat different; but that the characteristic feature of the yamātvā is plenitude, increase, augmentation, is evident enough.

A somewhat kindred idea of the nature of Yama's realm is preserved in his sabbā described in Mbh. ii. 8. 2-4, which bears a certain likeness to the Avestan varā of Yima, since 'neither cold nor heat, grief nor old age, hunger nor thirst' exist in it. Cf. Hopkins Proceedings A. O. S. May 1891, p. xcv, and April 1892, p. clxxix, on ārūd; see also Lanman Sanskrit Reader p. 378. Fairly certain, however, it seems that the word yamātvā above discussed, with all its association of increase and plenitude, receives new light when brought into connection with the Avesta, and the passage is of value because it preserves a reminiscence
of Yama's character, which, though familiar in Persia, seems otherwise to have been lost in Sanskrit literature, and thus the Mahā-Bhārata with its yamātvaṃ kṛ etc. keeps for us an echo of an old Hindu-Persian legend, a bit of antique lore from the days of Indo-Iranian community.

8. On the iterative optative in Avestan; by Professor Jackson.

In a limited number of instances in the Avesta the optative mode is used iteratively to express a customary, repeated, wonted, or general action. Its employment is like that of the subjunctive of typical action which occurs quite commonly in Avestan. This iterative use of the optative is doubtless a development out of the potential force inherent in the mode; the optative, thus employed, assumes a significance almost like a present or a preterite. To English ears, a usage precisely parallel to this modal phase is familiar in such a periphrastic form as 'she would sit the livelong day and weep.'

The instances in the Avesta which I have been able thus far to collect are here presented. Some of them have already been noted by Bartholomae Das altiranische Verbum, p. 212. Other additions to the list may later be made. It will be observed that I have not been able as yet to quote for the list a positive occurrence of an iterative optative in the metrical Gāthās. Most of the examples cited are from later texts, but it will be noticed that half the instances are from metrical portions of the Avesta. It will likewise be observed in several of the occurrences that the optative stands in a relative or subordinate clause. The number of these latter might have been increased. Two of the instances of the iterative optative occur in sentences which denote a comparison. The material follows:

1. Av. (Gāthic prose) athā athā cōṅ ṣahurō mazdāo zarathuṣṭrem ādakhiṣayaēta—athā athā cōṅ daēvāṅ sarem vyāṃrviṅta—athā azemotī daēvāṅ sarem vīmruye 'just as Ahura Mazda taught Zarathushtra and as Zarathushtra renounced connection with the Demons, so do I renounce connection with the Demons' (i. e. 'as Ormazd was wont to teach, etc.') ṣadakhă, cf. Ys. xliii. 16). Ys. xii. 5. But note that Caland, KZ. xxxiii. 303, takes vyāṃrviṅta as preterite indicative.

2. Av. (prose) zarathuṣṭrō ahunem vaiṅrīṃ fraśravavat (v. l. optative fraśṛvavāyī);—āpō vaiṅrūḥ fraṇyażēta—daēnām mazdayasnīm fraoreṇaēta 'Zarathushtra repeatedly chanted the Ahuna Vairya formula and worshipped the good waters and professed the law of the worshippers of Mazda.' Vd. xix. 2.

3. Av. yō anu aēdān baresma fraṣtareṇīti yatha ākava jamāspa fraṣtareṇaēta ratufrīṣ 'whoso forms the bundle of barsem as the righteous Jamaspas was wont to form it (or would form it, if living), such a one is satisfactory to the priest' (Nirangistan 88, cf. Darmesteter Le Zend-Avesta iii. 186; also ed. by Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana p. . . . ).
4. Av. (metrical) mithrem vouru-gaoyautiṃ yō bādha ustāna-zastō | urvasennō ava rowsīt vacīm `Mithra, the lord of wide pastures, who constantly raises (opt) his voice joyously and with uplifted hands.' Yt. x. 78.

5. Av. (metrical) karsnahe-fravashīm yazamaide—yenhe mnāne ašī vamūhī | srīra kḥōtiṃhi fravaraēta `we worship the Fravashi of Karsna in whose house tarried (i.e. was wont to abide) Ashi Vanhuhi. Yt. xiii. 107. So also Caland.

6. Av. (metrical) tūm zemargūzō akerenavō | vīspe daēva zarathuṣtra | yōi para ahnāf vīrōraodha | apatayen paitī āya zemā `thou, O Zarathushtra, didst banish under the earth all the Demons that formerly in human shape were wont to fly upon this earth.' Ys. ix. 15.

7-10. Likewise in these general relative clauses: YAv. (metrical) rekhōatī haomahe madho | yō yatha guthrem taurunem | haomem vañ-daēta maṣyo | `the intoxication of Haoma makes lively the man who greets (whosoever is wont to greet—opt.) Haoma like a young son.' Ys. x. 8;—Av. yaḥ tūm aṁīm a va ṇōiś soacayaca kereṇavaṅtem—āṇat tūm niśidhōiś gāthō-srāvōyō—fratāre gātvō āōhanam fratarō-tairē gātvō niśhadhayōiś `as often as thou didst see another causing annoyance, then thou wouldst sit chanting the Psalms, and thou didst make me (thereby) to sit in a foremost place, who was already sitting in a forward place.' Hādhoṅk Nask ii. 13-14 (Yt. xxii. 13-14).


9. "Universal" qualities in the Malayan language; by Dr. C. P. Scott, Radnor, Pa.

This paper set forth some of the characteristic phonetic, lexical, and syntactic features of the Malayan tongue, the general language of the Eastern Archipelago; pointed out their remarkable fundamental likeness in these respects to Latin and English; and sought to find the bases for the approximately "universal" use to which each of the three languages has attained within its historical and commercial sphere, in certain fundamental characteristics which concern universal grammar and logic, and in anthropology. There was also a skit at "Volapük" and "Spelin."
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CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I. This Society shall be called the AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.
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ARTICLE IX. An Annual meeting of the Society shall be held during Easter week, the days and place of the meeting to be determined by the Directors, said meeting to be held in Massachusetts at least once in three
years. One or more other meetings, at the discretion of the Directors, may also be held each year at such place and time as the Directors shall determine.

ARTICLE X. This Constitution may be amended, on a recommendation of the Directors, by a vote of three-fourths of the members present at an annual meeting.

BY-LAWS.

I. The Corresponding Secretary shall conduct the correspondence of the Society, and it shall be his duty to keep, in a book provided for the purpose, a copy of his letters; and he shall notify the meetings in such manner as the President or the Board of Directors shall direct.
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I. FOR THE LIBRARY.

1. The Library shall be accessible for consultation to all members of the Society, at such times as the Library of Yale College, with which it is deposited, shall be open for a similar purpose; farther, to such persons as shall receive the permission of the Librarian, or of the Librarian or Assistant Librarian of Yale College.

2. Any member shall be allowed to draw books from the Library upon the following conditions: he shall give his receipt for them to the Librarian, pledging himself to make good any detriment the Library may suffer from their loss or injury, the amount of said detriment to be determined by the Librarian, with the assistance of the President, or of a Vice-President; and he shall return them within a time not exceeding three months from that of their reception, unless by special agreement with the Librarian this term shall be extended.
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TO CONTRIBUTORS.
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4. Communications for the Journal should be sent to Prof. C. R. Lanman, 9 Farrar Street, Cambridge, Mass.

CONCERNING MEMBERSHIP.

It is not necessary for any one to be a professed Orientalist in order to become a member of the Society. All persons—men or women—who are in sympathy with the objects of the Society and willing to further its work are invited to give it their help. This help may be rendered by the payment of the annual assessments, by gifts to its library, or by scientific contributions to its Journal, or in all of these ways. Persons desiring to become members are requested to apply to the Treasurer, whose address is given above. Members receive the Journal free. The annual assessment is $5. The fee for Life-Membership is $75.
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